U. S. Congress.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 77th CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

VOLUME 88—PART 4

MAY 25, 1942, TO JUNE 30, 1942
(PAGES 4453 TO 5836)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1942

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 77th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

SENATE

MONDAY, MAY 25, 1942

The Reverend Armand T. Eyler, rector, St. Margaret's Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

In Thy presence, great God, we pause for a moment to lift up our hearts and minds to Thee, where we may be still and know that Thou art our constant friend and companion.

God of our fathers, who, by Thy spiritual mastery and infinite power, hast been pleased to lead the founders of this noble country on the march for freedom, we, the grateful inheritors of a land brought gloriously and triumphantly through toil and suffering and struggle, do stand before Thee now and invoke Thy spirit upon our work and labor.

Be Thou the sustainer and helper of these Thy servants that they, feeling the great responsibility placed upon them and feeling the strain and care of a great nation, may have strength of body and infinite wisdom and patience to labor diligently and faithfully to bring to life and light the beauty and the richness inherent in the dream of democracy.

Be pleased especially to remember Thy servant, the President of the United States, and those joined with him in authority. May they administer their trust in Thy fear and with purity of heart.

And, O God, against the tyrants of the world, who have chosen the evil way, the way of battle and murder, send our armed forces with courage and strength and invincible power, that they may teach effectively and impress mightily the servants of diabolism that we stand for liberty and justice and humanity and freedom. In every battle of right against wrong, in every contest that we fight, lift Thy white banner above our soldiers and sailors and our winged warriors, and keep them in Thy constant and perpetual peace and safety.

And wilt Thou grant to physicians and doctors wisdom and skill, and also to nurses, that through their hands may flow healing and curative powers as they tend our sick and wounded.

And, O God, look upon the people of this great land. Fill them with industry, fidelity, morality, and piety. More and more purge from us all ignorance and corruption and every inherent and attendant evil, and establish not only in this country but in the whole world Thy great truth, and so hasten the day when this world shall no longer roll eclipsed.

And before we close, our Father, we would remember before Thee Thy servants who have given their lives in the service and in defense of this great land. Crown with the crown of righteousness those who have poured out their blood sacredly and holily to protect our homes, our institutions, and our temples.

And may we also remember that we are not our own but we have been bought with a price, the price of the last full measure of devotion poured out in sacred and holy blood.

Hear us now, our Heavenly Father, and grant to us a new token of Thy love and guardianship. Hear us, Thou great and mighty One, whose arms stretch to the utmost bounds and range of life and time. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, May 21, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6908. An act to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941; and

H. J. Res. 314. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the marine and war-risk insurance fund.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 207)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1943, amounting to $5,420,000, and draft of a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations, in the form of amendments to the Budget for the fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

COSTS, CANCELATIONS, AND MISCELLANEOUS DATA, INDIAN IRRIGATION PROJECTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of costs, cancelations, and miscellaneous data pertaining to Indian irrigation projects compiled as of June 30, 1941 (with an accompanying statement); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War, Post Office, and Agriculture, and the Maritime Commission, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of the Propeller Club of the United States, port of New York, favoring the enactment of legislation to provide the same emoluments for the cadets of the New York State Merchant Marine Academy as are now granted to United States Maritime Commission cadets; to the Committee on Commerce.

A petition of members of the Fifth Reformed Church, of Albany, N. Y., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of New York; to the Committee on Commerce:

Senate Resolution 83

STATE OF NEW YORK, IN SENATE,
Albany, April 22, 1942.

Whereas the New York State Merchant Marine Academy has been in existence since 1874, being the first such academy founded in the Nation for the training of officers for the United States' merchant marine; and

Whereas the United States Maritime Commission has, due to conditions arising out of World War II, instituted an educational program for additional officers required for the merchant marine; and

Whereas the United States Maritime Commission offers as an inducement to young men to enter upon training in the Maritime Commission schools, a monthly compensation of $65 and full maintenance; and

Whereas although the Federal Government has contributed over the years an amount of approximately 10 percent of the cost of the maintenance of the New York State Merchant Marine Academy, the cadets thereof are required themselves to pay certain fees for the purchase of their uniforms, books, and other incidentals; and

Whereas the merchant marine of the United States in time of war constitutes a definite and indispensable unit for national defense, as an auxiliary of the United States Navy and subject to the hazards thereof; and

Whereas the existence of the New York State Merchant Marine Academy is of paramount importance in maintaining the ever-increasing demand for officers vitally needed to man American merchant ships, which in this grave hour of national crisis are contributing as a basic factor to the successful prosecution of the present war: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is, respectfully, memorialized to pass appropriate legislation to eliminate the inequitable discrimination against the New York State Merchant Marine Academy, to provide the same emoluments for the cadets of the New York State Merchant Marine Academy as is now granted to United States Maritime Commission cadets, in order that the two training programs may be on a parity, and to take such other proper steps as may be necessary to secure such parity and to enhance the value and usefulness of the New York State Merchant Marine Academy; and be it further

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That a copy of the resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, the Commandant of the United States Coast Guard, the Secretary of the Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of Congress from this State.

By order of the senate.

WILLIAM S. KING,
Clerk.

In assembly, April 22, 1942. Concurred in without amendment.

By order of the assembly.

ANSLEY B. BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Clifton, Lucas, and Erie, Neosho County, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. WAGNER:

A petition of sundry citizens, members of the student body and faculty of the State Teachers College, Buffalo, N. Y., praying for the enactment of pending legislation to provide Federal aid for elementary and secondary schools; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A memorial of sundry citizens of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the adoption of the proposal providing joint income-tax returns by husband and wife; to the Committee on Finance.

A resolution of the Board of Supervisors of Suffolk County, N. Y., favoring increase in the allotment of Suffolk County (N. Y.) for tires, tubes, retreads, and recaps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Petitions of sundry citizens and religious organizations in the State of New York, praying for the prompt enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTIONS OF MIDWINTER CONFERENCE, NEW YORK STATE ASSOCIATION OF THE IMPROVED, BENEVOLENT, PROTECTIVE ORDER OF ELKS OF THE WORLD

Mr. WAGNER presented resolutions adopted by the midwinter conference of the New York State Association of the Improved, Benevolent, Protective Order of Elks of the World at the home of Brooklyn (N. Y.) Lodge, No. 32, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR PEOPLE AND THE WAR

Our country is at war—at war to preserve our national independence and to liberate oppressed humanity everywhere.

To win this war, Hitler and his Axis partners must be destroyed. Hitlerism throughout the world must be destroyed.

President Roosevelt has rightly declared that we can win this war only through the unity of all Americans and through the united efforts of America and its Allies.

Our enemies know this. There are forces, therefore, within and without, who seek to divide us in order to destroy us.

One of the chief weapons of our enemies at home is the policy and practice of discrimination and brutality against our Negro citizens in civilian life and in the armed forces. Our enemies abroad exploit this to raise doubts and suspicion among our citizens and among our Allies as to the sincerity of our war aims. These undemocratic policies undermine the morale of our people both in civilian life and in the armed forces.

In this dark hour of national danger, in this crisis when all people are faced with the threat of world slavery under the Axis partners, the grave responsibility rests upon all loyal Americans to break the bottlenecks to national unity which traitors create through persecution of and discrimination against colored Americans. Only if we break the bottlenecks to unity can we outproduce, outfight, and outlast our common enemies.

To save our country from these satanic monsters who are out to enslave mankind: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the New York State Association of the Improved, Benevolent, Protective Order of Elks of the World, representing some 25,000 Americans in the State of New York, call upon the President, the Congress, the Governor and legislature of this State, upon the mayor and council of the city of New York, and upon the State and local governments throughout the Nation to take effective action—

(1) To put a speedy end to those policies and practices of discrimination and brutality against Negro Americans in civilian life, in production, in the armed forces, and in the Red Cross which create bottlenecks to unity;

(2) To punish, as the traitors they are, those who persist in these practices; and

(3) To strengthen national morale and the total war effort by making it possible for the 15,000,000 Negro Americans to make their unrestricted contribution to winning the war.

As loyal Americans, with a glorious tradition of valor and loyalty in defense of our country, we denounce our enemies at home and abroad, especially those who seek to trick our people with the slogan "Japan is the savior of the darker races."

We pledge our lives, our fortunes, our all for complete victory over our enemies and their agents here at home.

BUREAU FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

In order to discharge in part our duty as loyal Americans and as members of the Improved, Benevolent, Protective Order of Elks of the World, the New York State Association of the Improved, Benevolent, Protective Order of Elks of the World, in midwinter conference assembled, hereby creates and establishes a State bureau for victory and civilian defense, which is authorized and instructed to organize, initiate, and direct a program for victory and civilian defense for the New York State Association of the Improved, Benevolent, Protective Order of Elks of the World and its member lodges and temples. The aim and program of this bureau shall be in keeping with those of our Government for these purposes. The State bureau is further authorized and instructed to make special provisions for the sale of Defense bonds through its lodges and temples.

This bureau shall consist of not less than five and not more than seven members, appointed by the presidents of the male and female branches of the State association.

OFFICE OF CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Whereas the program for the social services vital to morale and the well-being of the people on the home front, as set forth in the official manual of the Office of Civilian Defense is a necessary part of winning the war: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the New York State Association of the Improved, Benevolent, Protective Order of Elks of the World, are opposed to the restriction of the program of the Office of Civilian Defense to the protective services alone and urge the retention and development of the social-service phases of this program.

NEGRO WOMEN IN PRODUCTION AND CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Whereas the victory program of our country has created an increasing demand for the services of women in production and in civilian defense; and

Whereas Negro women have in the main been excluded from all but a few occupations and, therefore, are limited in their preparation to assume their rightful place in this new situation: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the New York State Association of the Improved, Benevolent, Protective Order of Elks of the World call upon the Federal, State, and local authorities responsible for production and civilian defense, to provide such special facilities as are necessary to equip Negro women to perform the duties which their patriotism urges them to assume.

THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

Whereas President Roosevelt through Executive Order 8802 has forbidden discrimination in defense industries and has created the Fair Employment Practices Committee to enforce the same; and

Whereas the Fair Employment Practices Committee is handicapped because of lack of specific legislation to enforce this order: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the New York State Association of the Improved, Benevolent, Protective Order of the Elks of the World, support the Fair Employment Practices Committee and urge our members thereon; and therefore be it further

Resolved, That we urge the President to recommend to Congress legislation which will enable the Fair Employment Practices Committee to impose penalties on those refusing to comply with its recommendations.

BOARD OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Whereas Councilman A. Clayton Powell, Jr., has introduced a resolution into the Council of the City of New York calling for the employment of qualified Negroes by the board of

DEPOSITED BY THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

APR 7 '44

education in the municipal colleges and universities: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the New York State Association of the Improved, Benevolent, Protective Order of Elks of the World endorse this resolution and call upon the mayor and Council of the City of New York to act favorably thereon.

Be it resolved, That midwinter conference of the New York State Association of the Improved, Benevolent, Protective Order of Elks of the World instruct its officers and committees to take such steps as are necessary to effect action on the resolutions adopted at this conference; that copies of these resolutions be sent to all officials of government concerned and to the press; that copies be sent to each lodge and temple of the New York State Association for reading and action; that the State presidents appoint a committee to direct and take action on these resolutions; and that expenses necessary for carrying out these resolutions be borne by both branches of the New York State Association.

By virtue of the authority vested in us and pursuant to the resolutions adopted by the third midwinter conference of the New York State Association of the Improved, Benevolent, Protective Order of the Elk of the World held February 14 and 15, 1942, the State presidents of the male and female branches, have appointed the following to serve with us as members of the New York State Bureau for Victory and Civilian Defense, of the New York State Association of the Improved, Benevolent, Protective Order of the Elk of the World, and as the committee to act on these resolutions as prescribed by the conference:

Hon. Rosa Blocker, P. G. D. R., past State president, executive board member, grand temple; Richard E. Warner, chairman, credentials committee, New York State Association; Marian Taylor, chairman, trustee board, female branch, New York State Association; Thomas Higgins, grand assistant chairman of education; M. Moran Veston, district chairman, ways and means committee, New York State Association; Hon. Pope Billups, legal adviser to the committee; Hon. Edward A. Watts, legal adviser to the committee.

Hon. WILFORD E. LEWIN,
President, New York State Association, Improved, Benevolent, Protective Order of the Elk of the World.
Hon. MARGARETE STOUTE,
President, Female Branch, New York State Association, Improved, Benevolent, Protective Order of the Elk of the World.

Pursuant to the instructions of the third midwinter conference of the New York State Association of the Improved, Benevolent, Protective Order of the Elk of the World, the above resolutions, adopted or authorized by said conference, have been printed for distribution.

We certify these to be a correct and exact copy of the resolutions adopted by the conference.

Executive Committee for Action on Resolutions:
WILFORD E. LEWIN, *Chairman.*
MARGARETE E. STOUTE, *Vice Chairman.*
RICHARD E. WARNER, *Treasurer.*
MARIAN TAYLOR, *Secretary.*
THOMAS HIGGINS.
M. MORAN WESTON, *Executive Secretary.*

Attest:
Dr. J. FINLEY WILSON, *Grand Exalted Ruler.*
Hon. ELIZABETH GORDON, *Grand Daughter Ruler.*

GASOLINE RATIONING—RESOLUTIONS OF LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL OF KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to resolutions adopted by the Legislative Council of the State of Kansas on May 19, 1942, protesting against gasoline rationing in Kansas and other States in the middle of the oil fields and oil refineries.

I ask that certain statements of the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statements from the resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SEC. 2. That such a proposed rationing cannot be justified upon any practical or economic grounds whatsoever, and that recent action by the Federal Government in modifying restrictions in areas adjacent to sources of oil production in the East is compelling proof of the absence of any need for such extreme measures in Kansas and the Midwest. Also that fuel oils are a vital and indispensable factor in the Kansas and Midwest war effort. Rationing of fuel oils in Kansas and the Midwest would constitute a serious handicap to the successful pursuance of the war program.

SEC. 3. That the Kansas and Midwest area now has more refining facilities and gasoline than it can market; that Kansas, as a State, has demonstrated its willingness to cooperate with the Federal Government in the war effort in every practical, progressive way, but by no extreme exercise of imagination can a rationing of gasoline and consequent break-down of refining facilities in Kansas be justified on the same reasons such a program is being carried out in the East.

SEC. 4. Therefore the Legislative Council of the State of Kansas hereby resolves that the proposed rationing of motor fuel in Kansas and the Midwest, a sorry business in itself, be condemned in all principle as nonsensical, unjustified, and asinine, constituting a real and basic threat to the Kansas war program, the Kansas economic life, and the Kansas general business activity, now geared to high efficiency on a war-production schedule.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to comment very briefly on the foregoing resolutions, and on the subject of gasoline rationing. The people of my native State of Kansas, and of that entire area, will cheerfully give up use of the highways and make any other sacrifice necessary to win the war, but I think they are justified in asking that some showing be made that sacrifices asked for are necessary, that they will help win the war, and not retard the war effort.

Mr. President, we are told daily—I am almost tempted to say we are told hourly—that production is necessary to win this war. Production of farm products, transportation of farm products, and production and transportation in industry, in Kansas and the Midwest generally, are built around the use of gasoline and fuel oils. Rationing of gasoline in that section of the country, when supplies are abundant and production already is being seriously curtailed, should not be undertaken unless there clearly is nothing else to be done to meet the admittedly critical shortage of rubber. In all earnestness I say that, in my judgment, such a showing has not been made. It should be made, and made so clearly and unmistakably that none can doubt it, before any arbitrary rationing is hastily put into force.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the RECORD letters I have received on the subject of rationing from several citizens of Kansas: O. B. Landes, secretary-treasurer of the Shockey & Landes Furniture Co., of Abilene, Kans.; H. A. Martin, of Ottawa; D. M. Cochran, of Cochran Loan & Investment Co., Burlington; D. R. Scott of Scott & Hughes, Pratt; D. H. Sanders of United Signal Service Co., Kansas City; the Reverend C. Mansfield Mills, of the First Presbyterian Church, Osage City; and a telegram from several citizens of Madison on this and related subjects.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letters and telegram will be printed in the RECORD.

The matters referred to are as follows:

PRATT, KANS., *May 20, 1942.*
The Honorable SENATOR ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I know you are receiving a lot of letters from people pertaining to the gasoline rationing in the Middle West. You know as well as the people who live in this sparsely settled country that the same rationing as now is in effect in the East would be very detrimental to us. Our people will appreciate anything you can do to make rationing as liberal as possible should the Government find it necessary to do this in this territory.

* * * * *

Very truly yours,

D. R. SCOTT.

ABILENE, KANS., *May 20, 1942.*
Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Care of Senate Office,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: * * * We notice that in a recent order we will be limited to a 15-mile radius of travel. This is very detrimental to us from a service and business viewpoint and we notice this morning of the contemplated gas rationing for Kansas. This also we do not understand why an action of this kind should be put in force when Kansas is one of the great gas-producing States of our Union. There are a certain number of joyriders—people who are so situated that they do not have anything else to do except travel—but as we are in this business we are protesting both actions as we wish to continue our business and our business is essential for victory in this serious war. We are all interested in this war and we are all interested that we win. Continuing our business is just as essential for victory as any other action in the move for victory.

We hope that you will give this due consideration and that we will be given an opportunity to continue our program and if you will investigate you will find that we are not so situated as those in the military and defense zones. Our trade area is essential. If we were in a military or defense zone it would be entirely different as business is so intense in a small area; but situated as we are, it takes a larger area to do the business that we are doing to maintain a legitimate business from both a merchandising and service angle.

I hope that you will be in position to offset these two detrimental factors so serious to an area in which we are so located.

Yours very sincerely,

O. B. LANDES,
Secretary-Treasurer, The Shockey & Landes Hardware & Furniture Co.

OTTAWA, KANS., *May 20, 1942.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I heard your radio talk over WIBW and was gratified to know that you are on the people's side as regards gasoline rationing.

* * * This thing of depriving us of gasoline in this area, where supplies are abundant and burdensome, just to appease the selfish attitude of the East, is about the last straw, and plenty of hell is going to be raised if it is put into effect.

The statement that rationing is to be used to conserve rubber is dishonest. The Government already has access to all new tires, hence they could only be talking about the tires we now have on our private cars, and why should it be of any concern to them if a few people are foolish enough to wear out their tires in 6 months and then jack up the car for the duration? Most of us are conscious of the fact that we cannot replace present tires, hence gasoline rationing is already voluntarily being practiced as only necessary miles are being driven.

The Senator from Colorado was right when he said that under excuse of the present emergency the people are being pushed around by a bunch of egotistical bureaucrats, anxious to test out their new powers.

We can only win this war if the Nation is united, and this unity is largely dependent upon the honesty of government itself.

Yours very truly,

H. A. MARTIN.

BURLINGTON, KANS., *May 20, 1942.*
ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: It is with the utmost amazement that I read in today's paper that the gasoline rationing is to be extended to include Kansas and the Middle West. If ever a Government scheme was without logic or valid reason, this is it.

I feel that I am a good patriot and willing to do anything sensible to win the war, but I certainly don't enjoy being pushed around by a bunch of bureaucrats. * * *

Rationing of gasoline would deprive not only Kansas but other States of one of their main sources of revenue, the gasoline tax. Kansas has been deriving nearly one-third of all its tax revenues from this source, and now to start rationing gasoline, especially when no possible justification for it can be found, certainly is going to be the "straw to break the camel's back."

I, for one, would certainly like to know why, back there in Washington, everyone is so worried how many miles we drive, where we go, what we eat, how many buttons on our pants. It all sounds like so much poppycock. Instead of pulling together, as we should be doing in these vital times, this so-called poppycock is creating bitterness and hate. It is making us forget the real issue—the winning of the war.

I buy as much as 20 gallons of gas a week, and it is not to spend the time at Uncle Joe's or carry on petting parties. It's to carry on my own business of real estate and insurance. On a small weekly gas ration how much business will I be able to take care of? And still you and your colleagues have the nerve and guts to stand up and ask for more war bonds, more Defense stamps sales, higher taxes. Just what do you intend to have us pay with, coat buttons?

* * * * *

Yours very truly,

D. M. COCHRAN.

UNITED SIGNAL SERVICE CO.,
Kansas City, Mo., May 20, 1942.
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: I was astonished to read in the morning paper that gasoline rationing is being contemplated for this section of the Nation. We have been led to believe that the shortage of gasoline was purely a matter of transportation to certain areas.

This section of the Nation is served adequately by pipe lines and all with whom I have talked believe that the rationing of gasoline in this area is wholly unnecessary.

I am sure that you will find all in this section of the country glad to make any essential sacrifices for the war effort, but I do not believe that the rationing of necessities in the midst of plenty will meet with approval.

I hope that you will lend your efforts to avoid any unnecessary sacrifices in winning this war, which we are all determined to win.

Very truly yours,

D. H. SANDERS.

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Osage City, Kans., May 19, 1942.
Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CAPPER: * * * This business of rationing sugar and gasoline out here where we raise both of them, and more than will supply, should raise a howl from this great country. Pay a man to keep from planting beets for sugar, then shut off our supply of sugar—what kind of morale can you build with that process? Then shut off gasoline, when they keep the wells and refineries from producing—what kind of morale will you build with that? Sacrifice for sacrifice sake will make a lot of storms around this country of ours. Whether you are elected or not, or the men who are in Congress are elected or not, if all of them want to win this war it will mean getting down to business, not trying to make smoke screens.

* * * * *

Yours truly,

C. MANSFIELD MILLS.

MADISON, KANS., *May 23, 1942.*
Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

We protest strongly against gasoline rationing in Kansas. With oil production held to lowest limit here, we feel that oil rationing is unnecessary and an imposition on our people: Please use all influence possible against such rationing.

Bennett, Peterson, Lose, Shaffer, Lindberg, Ott, Fellay, McGilvray, Bean, Campbell, Beach, McIlvain, Laird.

GASOLINE RATIONING—RESOLUTION OF WEST MICHIGAN TOURIST AND RESORT ASSOCIATION

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I ask to have printed in the body of the RECORD at this point a resolution adopted by the West Michigan Tourist and Resort Association at a meeting held at Muskegon on May 21, 1942, regarding the pending hazards to this $400,000,000 industry in my home State.

I also ask that a statement of the Petroleum Industry Committee appointed by the Petroleum Coordinator for War be printed in this connection.

And, finally, I ask that a telegram which I have just sent to Mr. Henderson upon this subject be printed in the RECORD.

I desire to point out in this connection, Mr. President, that the Office of Defense Production, testifying before the Senate Commerce Committee last Friday, unequivocally stated that gas rationing in the Chicago area in general, and in the Michigan area in particular, is not necessary and is not justified through any present or prospective lack of gasoline supplies or lack of petroleum transportation facilities. In other words, this proposed gas rationing in Michigan must be solely a devise to help police restrictions upon the use of cars and tires. On that basis I respectfully submit that no conclusive proof of need has been adequately established. We all agree that nothing must be allowed to interfere with the war effort. But, Mr. President, the business of taking America off its automotive wheels is one of the things that can very definitely interfere with—and in many instances actually disrupt—the domestic war effort. Therefore there is nothing repugnant to the war effort itself in the request which I have made of Director Henderson, of O. P. A., to reexamine this whole problem.

The exhibits which I am submitting speak for themselves. A decision in this matter is not sought on the basis of favoritism or special privilege or sympathetic exemptions for my State and my section of the country. It is sought on the basis of sound public policy involving an appropriate weighing of all these different elements involved in the national defense effort. These elements include not only an almost total disruption of private transportation in essential defense areas; not only the wreckage of a $400,000,000 industry in my State and a larger economic catastrophe elsewhere; not only a further crisis for the already hard-pressed automotive distributive businesses of the country; not only a blow at the summer morale of millions of people who have a lifetime habit of "living on the lakes" during the hot season; but also, and highly significantly, a sharp attack upon public revenues—local, State, and National. We are ready to make any sacrifice for the war effort, but we respectfully submit that those who sacrifice should have the conscious knowledge that their sacrifice is indispensable and unavoidable and that, all things considered, it is not calculated to do more harm than good.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the documents presented by the Senator from Michigan will be printed.

The resolution, statement, and telegram are as follows:

RESOLUTION PASSED AT WEST MICHIGAN TOURIST AND RESORT ASSOCIATION MEETING HELD AT MUSKEGON, THURSDAY, MAY 21, 1942

WEST MICHIGAN TOURIST
AND RESORT ASSOCIATION,
Grand Rapids, Mich., May 22, 1942.

In a time of national peril the first duty of every citizen is to make every sacrifice that is necessary for the preservation of the Nation and the liberties we hold so dear.

With firm faith in the justice of our cause, we cheerfully pledge our utmost loyalty and devotion to the maintenance of these liberties, the preservation of our form of government, and the American way of life.

The strength of a democracy lies in the voluntary cooperation of its citizenship. Such cooperation must essentially be based upon a sound understanding by the average citizen of the objects to be achieved by the curtailment of personal liberties, the rationing of the essentials of life, and other forms of regulation.

We urge therefore that government, in the prosecution of its plans, take the public into full confidence insofar as military exigencies permit.

The tourist industry of Michigan is particularly concerned with the threat of gasoline rationing in the Midwest. The industry is the second largest in Michigan, with an estimated total annual volume in normal times exceeding $400,000,000. It is the main dependence for livelihood of the majority of people living in that portion of the State north of the Muskegon-Bay City line.

The proposed stringent regulation cited in the public press will virtually eliminate two-thirds to three-fourths of this business. It will mean ruin to many small businessmen in western and northern Michigan.

Midwest stocks of gasoline are at record levels, that Michigan and neighboring States are large processors of petroleum products, a substantial part of midcontinent production is refined and marketed in the Chicago-Detroit-Toledo area, it is difficult therefore for the people of this State to understand why the rigid restrictions imposed on 17 eastern seaboard States should be extended to this region of plenty.

We firmly believe that the public has been thoroughly educated to the need for conservation of tires. Vacations this year will be carefully planned and budgeted. Residents of our major cities—many of them defense workers giving long hours and 7 days a week to the production of war material—need a brief period of relief and relaxation to enable them to maintain normal productivity in the shop during months to come.

Long drives of several thousand miles might properly be banned. But certainly excursions from our major cities into the abutting resort territory, enabling city dwellers to get the benefit of sunshine and cooling breezes, would increase their physical endurance and promote rather than retard the war effort.

We respectfully point out that the threatened extinction of a business of this magnitude will seriously reduce the national income and the ability of the small business man and his employees to buy bonds, pay income taxes, and otherwise contribute to the financial support of his Government.

The rationing program has already made severe inroads on retail volume. A national income of $110,000,000,000 as estimated by our economists, is impossible of attainment if the velocity of the dollar is to be reduced not only by the rationing of consumer goods, but by the elimination of vacations as well.

In fact, vacations today are the one way in which the average workman can profitably spend his surplus income with benefit to his physical self and the Nation without reducing stocks of goods and commodities and raw materials essential to the war effort.

We respectfully urge, therefore, that the entire question of gasoline rationing in the Midwest be reevaluated by those in authority and that a reasonable solution be found which will permit the defense worker, as well as those engaged in essential civilian activities, to enjoy the vacation that will so desperately be needed—as England's experience has shown—to maintain shop productivity and national morale.

Resolved, therefore, That the Honorable Murray D. VanWagoner, Governor of Michigan, together with Senators ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG and PRENTISS M. BROWN and the several Congressmen of this State, be and are hereby requested to present the facts embodied in this resolution to the appropriate Federal authorities, with the request that gasoline rationing in the Great Lakes region be either deferred until the close of the vacation season, or that suitable provision be made to provide defense workers and other vacationists with sufficient motor fuel to enable them to travel a reasonable distance for their annual vacation, unless it be adequately demonstrated that such measure will impede the war effort.

JOHN C. BEUKEMA,
Chairman.
A. T. MCFADYEN,
GEORGE E. BISHOP.

PETROLEUM INDUSTRY COMMITTEE APPOINTED BY PETROLEUM COORDINATOR FOR WAR

CHICAGO, May 24.—The following statement was issued by Frank Phillips, general chairman of the petroleum industry committee for district 2, appointed by Petroleum Coordinator for War, Harold L. Ickes, at the conclusion of a 2-day meeting held in Chicago. District 2 comprises the following important oil-producing and consuming States in the Middle West: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Wisconsin.

"From news dispatches bearing Washington date lines and utterances of prominent Government officials, it appears certain that gasoline rationing will be national in scope and that reducing the civilian use of domestic heating oils is in the offing. The committee expressed confidence in Petroleum Coordinator Ickes working out the industry's problems. The committee appreciates the magnitude of the gigantic task confronting the Petroleum Coordinator in supplying the essential requirements of petroleum in those areas of the United States where the normal transportation facilities for the movement of petroleum have been disrupted.

"The committee definitely opposes the rationing of gasoline or any other petroleum products in the Middle West at this time. We believe it is our responsibility to the people of the Middle West, in view of the seriousness of the situation, to make clear to the public and to all concerned in government, the reasons for these unwanted developments.

"The oil industry wishes to clarify any public misunderstanding as to the responsibility for this enforced petroleum scarcity. Petroleum Coordinator Ickes has on many occasions clearly stated there is no shortage of petroleum or its products.

"Rather there exists a shortage of normal petroleum transportation facilities to the East and in the Pacific Northwest due to the war. The committee fully agrees with this statement, and stresses that these curtailing or rationing actions might properly be called 'transportation and not 'petroleum rationing.'

"It is the unanimous opinion of the committee that the principal motivating reason on the part of the several governmental agencies is to conserve rubber now on civilian cars and trucks. If the use of rubber now on automotive equipment must be further conserved (and the public in the Middle West is doing a fine conservation job daily), why not label the action rubber rationing and set up machinery through the several State governments to curtail car and truck mileage rather than through the curtailment of gasoline sales. This will immediately bring to the public a fuller realization of how serious the loss of our natural rubber supply sources in the Southwest Pacific really is and stimulate responsible Government authority to launch immediately an adequate synthetic rubber-production program. People in the Middle West are realistic and have the faculty of calm and sound understanding of the war and the part they must play to help win it. Curtailment of gasoline consumption affects what the average citizen depending on motor transport can do relative to his part in the war effort.

"Distances, unlike in the densely populated East, are great in the Middle West. The Middle West is the bread basket of the world and the farmer must get an unrestricted supply of petroleum products to produce and market his production. It is our studied opinion that rail and bus facilities cannot handle the transport problem in the Middle West.

"Evidently the sources that are suggesting and predicting Nation-wide rationing of gasoline base their judgment upon conservation of rubber and are ignoring the effect of national rationing upon the production of essential petroleum war products and munitions of war, such as toluene for the armed forces, and to supply essential war industries and railroads. The committee has suggested to Petroleum Coordinator Ickes that he immediately place before the Army and Navy, War Production Board, Office of Defense Transportation, Office of Price Administration, and all other agencies of Government concerned the facts ascertained and conclusions reached by this committee.

"All refineries in the Middle West are engaged in the production of petroleum products essential to the successful prosecution of the war. All war industries and rail transportation facilities throughout the greater portion of the Middle West depend to a great extent upon an adequate supply of heavy fuel oils for efficient and continued operation. Conversion to other fuels is impractical in many instances because of the shortage of materials to accomplish conversion and long distances from sources of supply of coal and natural gas. If materials for conversion were available, and if the loss of time due to conversion were unimportant, the transportation of coal and other fuels from sources of supply to point of consumption would place an impossible burden upon the already overtaxed rail facilities.

"To produce essential war products a barrel of crude oil must be separated into its component parts, a substantial part of which is motor gasoline. Consumer rationing of gasoline in the Middle West will result in curtailment of refinery operations, thereby reducing production of essential war products or will force wasteful disposal of surplus gasoline because of lack of storage facilities. Such a wasteful disposal of gasoline would impose an economic burden upon the oil industry which could not be borne and would accelerate the processes of liquidation of capital assets already straining many units in the oil industry. We believe that such gasoline purchased by the Government through subsidy, or otherwise disposed of, would place an unnecessary burden and would have a devastating effect upon the morale of the people. No one could explain away a gasoline rationing program and at the same time wastefully dispose of gasoline.

"Surveys made by the committee disclose the fact that adequate transportation facilities are available to transport gasoline and light petroleum products from refineries, water, and pipe line terminals to retail facilities in this area without the use of tank cars, and complete conversion of tank truck hauling has or will be fully accomplished almost immediately. Consumer rationing thus will not add to the number of tank cars available for movement into the East. Refineries, pipe lines, and water terminals are so located in the Middle West that average distances traveled by motor transport are short.

"The many proposals emanating from Members of Congress and Government officials suggesting the purchase of all new tires in the hands of dealers by the Government, purchase by Government of all spare tires in use above five for each automobile, purchase by Government of passenger automobiles in excess of one owned by any individual or family, purchase of all passenger cars in the Nation except those engaged in essential service, and numerous other proposals, emphasize the necessity only of conserving rubber.

"The committee is convinced that the greatest possible conservation of rubber can be accomplished by reduction in speed at which automobiles may be operated, and if the States, towns, and cities enforce speed limits not greater than 30 miles per hour within incorporated towns, and 40 miles per hour upon the county and State highways, tires now on automobiles will yield two or three times the service heretofore performed and not less than 75 percent of the tires now in use will render essential service for at least 2 more years. We believe proper continued

use of tires now in service will actually cause less deterioration than the ravages of time, and we understand the rubber already processed into tires for passenger automobiles cannot be recovered and re-formed into tires suitable for use by the armed forces. We believe that sufficient rubber can be reclaimed from thousands of tons of rubber lying around rotting, exposed to the weather, to retread for several years to come all of the tires now in use by civilians.

"We further believe that agencies of Government will actually conserve more rubber, add less disturbance to our already burdened economy, and substantially improve the morale of the people if their energies were devoted to the continued encouragement of the proper use of that which we have instead of denying the use of a product in areas where that product is in oversupply."

[Telegram]

Office of Defense Transportation says gas rationing in Michigan is not necessary because of any lack of supply or transportation and that it is not justified for any such purposes. Therefore it would be ordered only for rubber conservation or to satisfy selfish eastern demands that rationing shall be Nation-wide. Michigan is not satisfied that mere tire restrictions warrant all-out gas rationing, which will wreck the $400,000,000 tourist business upon which half of our area depends for subsistence, and upon which Federal, State, and local governments depend for taxes, and which will threaten serious jeopardy to essential transportation in the metropolitan Detroit area and throughout the defense production arsenal, and which threatens other needlessly unfortunate and repressive results. Michigan thinks there are other ways to more reasonably limit nonessential driving. The recapture of waste rubber should be tried on a far more vigorous scale. The so-called Pontiac plan for the joint operation of group cars should be pressed. The reasonable rationing of vacations would be preferable to their total elimination both as a matter of good morale and good business. The enforcement of tire-saving speed limits should be undertaken. There are other alternatives. Michigan is not convinced that gas rationing in the Middle West is either necessary or warranted at the present time. There is too much confusion in what has been said and done in respect to the whole rubber situation. Michigan respectfully asks, through its great tourist and resort associations and through its responsible public officials, that "the question be reevaluated and that a reasonable solution be found which will permit the defense worker, as well as those engaged in essential civilian activities, to enjoy the vacation that will so desperately be needed, as England's experience has shown, to maintain shop productivity and national morale." I again add my urgent plea for a reexamination of the subject. This is highly serious. We will make any sacrifice necessary to win the war, but we are entitled to know indisputably that the sacrifice is indispensable and unavoidable.

Senator A. H. VANDENBERG.

VICTORY SAVINGS PLAN OF GRAND VIEW GRANGE, ADDISON, VT.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, at the Grand View Grange in Addison, Vt., a victory-savings plan was originated a short time ago, which, I believe, is both practical and far-seeing in its furtherance of our immediate war effort, and in considering the problems we shall face after victory is won. Coming, as it does, from a small group of people at a country crossroads, I would say that this undertaking shows how alert our rural areas are to the world situation, and disproves many of the misleading statements concerning selfishness and complacency on the part of our farm population which have been going the rounds.

In the May issue of the National Grange Monthly the Honorable Albert S. Goss, national master of the Grange, recognizes the value of the Addison Grange contribution in his leading editorial. He writes:

A PRACTICAL WAR-SAVINGS PLAN

Many granges are raising funds for war savings bonds. Among the methods is one adopted by the Grand View Grange, of Addison, Vt., which seems so practical that the resolution authorizing the action is quoted in part, in the hope that other granges may find in this plan a practical program for their own use.

The plan is to hold the bonds in the treasury of the grange until the war is over and to use the proceeds by vote of the grange in such grange activity as will "either directly or indirectly create employment.

"If grange and service clubs generally would take up a collection of dimes at each meeting, the total would run into large figures, which would be very helpful in war financing and would render a double benefit, when the war is over, by providing the organization with needed repairs or improvements and aiding in the adjustment of the labor problem which is apt to follow."

Mr. President, I understand that after having successfully publicized this program throughout the Champlain Valley and adjacent territory, entirely on the initiative of the local organization, and following Mr. Goss' editorial sanction for the National Grange, the Treasury Department has given its approval to the undertaking as a supplement to individual purchases of war bonds and stamps. I am informed that the Department intends to aid in publicizing on a national basis. I ask that the resolutions which put this victory savings plan into effect be printed in the RECORD at this point and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas our country is involved in a global war, on the winning of which depends the fundamental verities of our daily lives; and

Whereas the money necessary to win this war must come eventually from the people; and

Whereas it is considered desirable that such money furnished by the people be from their current income in order to avoid the tragedy and chaos of inflation; and

Whereas one of the greatest problems that will face the American people when victory is won will be an orderly change from wartime to peacetime economy; and

Whereas it is desirable that there be created through savings a potential purchasing power with which to create employment during this transition period: Therefore be it

Resolved, That at each and every meeting of the Grand View Grange, Addison, Vt., a contribution of 10 cents be accepted from each member present, the proceeds from each and every one of these collections to be converted immediately by the Treasurer into War Savings Stamps, said stamps to be converted into United States War Savings Bonds when and as sufficient stamps are acquired; further be it

Resolved, That said bonds be held in the treasury of Grand View Grange until the conclusion of those armed hostilities in which our country is presently engaged; further be it

Resolved, That at such time following the close of those hostilities it may be judged by a majority vote of members present at a grange meeting that the expenditure of funds represented by bonds purchased under this plan will do most to maintain the American way of life, such bonds be converted into cash, said cash to be expended for such purpose or purposes as will either directly or indirectly create employment; further be it

Resolved, That this plan shall in no way detract from the obligation of each and every member to purchase war stamps and war bonds for their personal account to the fullest extent of their individual capacities; nor shall the contributions accepted at each grange meeting be in any sense obligatory; nor shall such contributions be collected in such a manner as to make any member conspicuous who, because of pecuniary difficulties, cannot contribute; further be it

Resolved, That, on the basis of return on the investment, the wisest policy that could be pursued would be to hold bonds purchased under the plan to maturity, other circumstances permitting; finally be it

Resolved, That this be known as the victory savings plan of Grand View Grange, Addison, Vt.

IOWA-ILLINOIS MEMORIAL BRIDGE BETWEEN MOLINE AND BETTENDORF

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who is unavoidably absent, I submit a letter from Mr. Louis M. Harvey, president of the Moline Association of Commerce, relative to the Iowa-Illinois Memorial Bridge between the tricities of Rock Island, Moline, and Davenport, with an attached table, and request that they be included in the RECORD and referred to the Senate Commerce Committee.

I read a statement prepared by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS]:

It will be noted that this letter deals with a situation created by war necessities and should receive prompt attention. The condition was developed by the award of a contract for tanks to the International Harvester Co., which operates the Bettendorf plant in Bettendorf, Iowa, just across the river from the city of Moline.

The contract calls for the manufacture of 500 tanks a month, which is expected to be increased to 1,000 tanks a month. It is estimated that 6,000 workmen will be required, and that probably 3,000 of these employees will cross the bridge from Rock Island and Moline daily. It is also estimated that at least 25 percent of the material to be used by the International Harvester Co. must be transported over the bridge daily from the Illinois side.

The Iowa-Illinois memorial bridge is a toll bridge, and every employee and vehicle must pay a toll before crossing. This means that, so far as the employees are concerned, the daily payment of toll renders it practically impossible for them to report from the Illinois side and there are insufficient accommodations for all of them in Bettendorf, on the Iowa side. I have been informed by the War Department that it has no authority to take over this toll bridge permanently, and no authority to pay tolls for the transportation of workmen and war materials. A representative of the Bureau of Public Roads informed me that it had no funds available and no authority to meet the situation. As I understand, the Government must either purchase the bridge or provide a fund for the reimbursement of the owners of the bridge for toll purposes.

The structure was built by the Davenport Bridge Commission, a nonprofit public corporation, under a plan providing that it

should become a free bridge as soon as the cost had been liquidated. The original cost was $1,480,000. The outstanding bonds amount to $950,000, so that it would require practically a million dollars to free the bridge and open it to the free passage of traffic.

In view of the emergency, I hope that prompt action may be taken to meet the situation described in the letter to which I referred.

There being no objection, the letter and table were referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

Hon. C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
United States Senator,
Hon. SCOTT W. LUCAS,
United States Senator,
Hon. ANTON JOHNSON,
Member of Congress,
Hon. W. S. JACOBSEN,
Member of Congress,
Hon. THOMAS E. MARTIN,
Member of Congress,
Hon. GUY M. GILLETTE,
United States Senator.

GENTLEMEN: We wish to call your attention to a condition existing in this community which is going to develop into a very grave situation and seriously affect the production of war equipment in the immediate future.

As you know, the International Harvester Co. and the War Department have taken over the plant which was formerly operated by the Bettendorf Co., in Bettendorf, Iowa, just across the river from Moline. This plant is rapidly being converted into an industry for the production of army tanks. The first contract called for the manufacture of 500 tanks a month by the International Harvester Co. Since the negotiation of this first contract the same has been revised so as to call for the production of 1,000 tanks a month. The first of these tanks will come off the line probably within the next 60 to 90 days.

You, of course, fully appreciate the size of this stupendous job. The amount of money involved in this contract has, of course, not been stated. The War Department did state publicly at the time the first contract for 500 tanks a month was negotiated that such contract was larger than any contract ever awarded in the Chicago ordnance district, and that the largest contract theretofore awarded involved $80,000,000. This contract for the production of 1,000 tanks a month no doubt involves close to $200,000,000.

It is estimated that at least 6,000 workingmen will be engaged in this International tank plant. Most of these workingmen are expected to be employees heretofore engaged by the Farmall tractor plant and the Harvester plant of the International, both of which are located on the Illinois side of the Mississippi River. Many other employees of farm-equipment manufacturers located on this side of the river will no doubt be transferred to the tank plant in Betterdorf. In addition to these workmen to be supplied from the Illinois side of the river, at least 25 percent of all the material and parts which will go into the production of these 1,000 tanks a month will be produced on the Illinois side. There will be more than 3,000 workmen to travel from this side of the river for employment at the tank plant every day, and in addition a vast amount of material will be transported by truck over to the Bettendorf plant.

All of these employees and all of this material will move to the tank plant over the Iowa-Illinois Memorial Bridge between Moline and Bettendorf. As you know, this is a toll bridge. The moving of these men and material over this structure is going to produce a serious bottleneck and gravely interfere with the production of these army tanks. The number of vehicles passing over this bridge during 1941 amounted to 1,566,015. As soon as this tank plant gets in full operation there will be at least 400 cars attempting to cross this bridge within an hour preceding each of 3 shifts. These 400 cars will have to contend with an average of 3,500 cars which are now daily using this structure. (This 3,500 is the average number of cars using this bridge during the first 90 days of this year.)

If you can visualize what it means to transport 25 percent of all the material going into these 1,000 tanks a month to be turned out by this plant over this toll bridge you will have some appreciation of the vast amount of toll charges involved. We are convinced that the Federal Government, through these toll charges, will pay all of the outstanding indebtedness against this bridge during the time this contract for the building of 1,000 tanks a month is in operation and the toll to be paid by workingmen will, no doubt, amount to $50,000 a year.

While the vast amount of toll charges for the movement of material and workingmen to this plant from the Illinois side of the river is a matter which should be given careful consideration, the fact remains that the most serious situation to be confronted is the ability to move these workingmen and this material across the bridge without a long delay because of the toll payments which must be made. This condition is going to produce a situation which will seriously interfere with the execution of this all-important war contract.

We believe the Federal Government should immediately purchase this bridge. This structure was built by the Davenport Bridge Commission, a nonprofit public corporation, under a plan providing that the bridge should become a free bridge just as soon as the cost of the same has been liquidated. The original cost of the bridge was $1,480,000. The outstanding bonds at this time amounts to about $950,000. With the retirement of this bonded indebtedness this bridge will become a toll-free structure.

The Iowa-Illinois Memorial Bridge is one of the best structures across the Mississippi River. It is the only logical thoroughfare affording passage from the Illinois side of the river across to the International tank plant in Bettendorf. The Government free bridge between the Arsenal Island and Davenport, in addition to being taxed to its capacity, is closed several hours of the day on account of traffic from the Rock Island arsenal, at which over 14,000 people are working at this time. Besides, this bridge is far out of line for traffic from the western section of Rock Island, Moline, East Moline, and Silvis. The heavy traffic to and from the United States arsenal may result in the necessity of closing the free Government bridge entirely.

We are enclosing herein a schedule showing the number of vehicles using the Iowa-Illinois Memorial Bridge since it was opened in November 1935. We are also enclosing a printed leaflet issued by the bridge commission, which gives all pertinent facts pertaining to this structure.

We believe this subject to be most important and we respectfully ask you gentlemen to call the same to the proper attention of our Federal Government. This organization would be very pleased to be of any assistance possible in the submission of any additional facts and information desired.

Respectfully submitted.

LOUIS M. HARVEY,
President.

Bridge crossings, Illinois-Iowa Memorial Bridge

	1935	1936	1937	1938	1939	1940	1941	1942
January		20,828	35,567	46,965	50,602	49,360	72,898	98,133
February		16,521	26,072	43,739	42,465	53,418	72,333	90,464
March		38,872	56,351	58,485	55,794	67,466	89,583	123,771
April		42,569	62,469	67,878	69,493	74,387	106,701	126,181
May		55,460	80,534	75,302	80,477	89,287	123,946	
June		62,787	85,691	74,692	84,250	102,111	152,679	
July		66,630	95,289	82,887	93,481	105,617	174,610	
August		72,971	100,579	82,726	95,585	122,850	190,393	
September		63,131	89,351	74,410	94,299	115,513	175,262	
October		58,252	82,403	68,783	87,545	108,519	153,401	
November	17,966	47,832	65,965	58,804	76,675	89,702	127,046	
December	32,488	50,100	53,729	57,459	77,823	86,513	127,163	
Total		595,953	843,900	783,440	908,489	1,005,267	1,566,015	

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 6845. A bill making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1380).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 1818. A bill to authorize the lease or sale of public lands for use in connection with the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1381); and

H. R. 5394. A bill to authorize the lease or sale of public lands for use in connection with the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, etc.; without amendment.

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 5013. A bill for the relief of James P. Crawford; without amendment (Rept. No. 1382);

H. R. 5210. A bill for the relief of E. M. Conroy; without amendment (Rept. No. 1383);

H. R. 5680. A bill for the relief of James M. Hays; without amendment (Rept. No. 1384);

H. R. 5723. A bill for the relief of Anna Danielson and Betty Tiedeman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1385); and

H. R. 5910. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Rudolph Treiber, Jr., a minor; without amendment (Rept. No. 1386).

By Mr. HATCH, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 925. A bill for the relief of Lemuel T. Root, Jr.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1387);

H. R. 1162. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the final homestead proof submitted by Henry Martin Coffman; without amendment (Rept. No. 1388);

H. R. 4347. A bill to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the North Pacific Union Conference Association of Seventh-Day Adventists; without amendment (Rept. No. 1389);

H. R. 4733. A bill to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest, the Salmon National Forest, and the Targhee National Forest in the State of Idaho; without amendment (Rept. No. 1390);

H. R. 4975. A bill to add certain lands to the Sequoia National Forest, Calif.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1391);

H. R. 5016. A bill to amend section 1 of the act approved August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 700), entitled "An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to notify the State of Virginia that the United States assumes police jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Shenandoah National Park, and for other purposes"; without amendment (Rept. No. 1392);

H. R. 5490. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim to the States of Oregon and California, respectively, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands of Goose Lake in Oregon and California; without amendment (Rept. No. 1393);

H. R. 6071. A bill to grant a preference right to certain oil and gas leases; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1394);

H. R. 6102. A bill confirming the claim of Augustin Dominique Tureaud for the Church of St. Jacques to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, parish of St. James, said claim being listed as No. 392; without amendment (Rept. No. 1395); and

H. R. 6625. A bill granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the Constitution of the State of New Mexico, providing a method for executing leases for grazing and agricultural purposes on lands granted or confirmed to the State of New Mexico by the act of Congress approved June 20, 1910; without amendment (Rept. No. 1396).

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment and appointment by transfer, in the Regular Army; and also sundry officers for promotion and temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of law.

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. WILLIS, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Arthur J. Ewing, of Idaho, to be register of the land office at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho (reappointment);

Lloyd T. Morgan, of Colorado, to be register of the land office at Pueblo, Colo. (reappointment);

Paul A. Roach, of New Mexico, to be register of the land office at Las Cruces, New Mexico (reappointment); and

Clarence W. Ogle, of Oregon, to be register of the land office at Lakeview, Oreg. (reappointment).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2551. A bill for the relief of Vernon Van Zandt; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 2552. A bill for the relief of Alfred Jacob Kettner; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2553. A bill to create the title of flight officer in the Army Air Forces, to amend the Army Aviation Cadet Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado introduced Senate bill 2554, which was referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GILLETTE:

S. J. Res. 150. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect of meat-packing establishments engaged in intrastate commerce only, in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat food products by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 6908. An act to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. J. Res. 314. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the marine and war-risk insurance fund; to the Committee on Appropriations.

RECOMMITTAL OF A BILL

On motion of Mr. ELLENDER, the bill (S. 2432) for the relief of Almos W. Glasgow was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Mr. HAYDEN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely:

On page 62, after line 2, to insert:

"That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay to the enrolled members of the Seminole Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma entitled under existing law to share in the funds of said tribe, or to their lawful heirs, out of any money belonging to said tribe in the United States Treasury or deposited in any bank or held by an official under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, not to exceed $50 per capita: *Provided*, That said payment shall be made under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided further*, That in cases where such enrolled members or their heirs are Indians who belong to the restricted class the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, withhold such payments and use same for the benefit of such restricted Indians: *Provided further*, That the money paid to the enrolled members or their heirs as provided herein shall be exempt from any lien for attorneys' fees or other debt contracted prior to the passage of this act: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to use not to exceed $1,500 out of said Seminole tribal funds for the payment of salaries of necessary employees and other expenses for the distribution of said per capita payments."

On page 62, after line 22, to insert:

"The State of Oklahoma is hereby authorized to acquire by condemnation, under judicial process, for use for highway purposes in connection with the highway designated as United States Highway No. 60, any lands or interests in lands within the Seneca Indian School property in Ottawa County, Okla. The United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma shall have jurisdiction of proceedings for such condemnation. The practice, pleadings, forms, and modes of proceedings in proceedings for such condemnation shall conform, as near as may be, to the practice, pleadings, forms, and proceedings in like cases in the courts of record in the State of Oklahoma."

On page 62, after line 22, to insert:

"The State of Minnesota is hereby authorized to acquire by condemnation under judicial process, for use for highway purposes in connection with State Trunk Highway No. 61, also designated as United States Highway No. 61, any lands or interests in lands within the Grand Portage Indian Reservation in Cook County, Minn. The United States District Court for the District of Minnesota shall have jurisdiction of proceedings for such condemnation. The practice, pleadings, forms, and modes of proceedings in proceedings for such condemnation shall conform, as near as may be, to the practice, pleadings, forms, and proceedings in like cases in the courts of record in the State of Minnesota."

On page 112, line 3, after the numerals "1942" and before the semicolon, to insert: ": *Provided*, That section 3709, Revised Statutes, shall not be construed to apply to this appropriation, or to the appropriation for development and operation of helium properties (special fund) in section 3 (c) of the act of September 1, 1937 (50 U. S. C. 164)."

On page 113, after line 3, to insert:

"Effective immediately and for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior, or any official to whom he may delegate such authority, may, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, appoint skilled and unskilled laborers, mechanics, and other persons engaged in a recognized trade or craft, including foremen of such groups, employed at experimental plants and laboratories of the Bureau of Mines."

Mr. HAYDEN also submitted several amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 6845, making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of the amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

FLOOD DAMAGE IN PENNSYLVANIA

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, this morning I received a telegram from Scranton, Pa., reading as follows:

Our flood victims need financial help in this area. Won't you secure a grant to help our forgotten section?

R. W. VORIS.

Mr. President, last Saturday a disaster occurred at Scranton, Pa., as a result of floods. There was loss of life and much property damage. A number of bridges were wiped out and roads were badly damaged. It will be necessary to have Federal funds to repair this damage because of the poverty-stricken condition of that community. I should like to have the appeals of the citizens which have come to me called to the attention of the Emergency Section of the Work Projects Administration in order that the necessary repairs may be made as soon as possible. This is a situation definitely related to the national responsibility which the Federal Government has for flood control. In no sense can it be interpreted simply as a local or State responsibility.

I understand that the W. P. A. has made an allocation of $68,000 for this purpose, at the request of the State W. P. A. administrator, and that additional funds may be obtained if urgently required. I wish to commend the W. P. A. for its prompt action in this emergency need.

THE DEMOCRATIC CAMPAIGN IN 1942—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD

an address delivered by him on May 20, 1942, to a group of Democrats at Fort Collins, Colo., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR SMATHERS ON RECEIVING AN HONORARY DEGREE FROM JOHN MARSHALL COLLEGE

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator SMATHERS at the graduating exercises of John Marshall College, in Jersey City, N. J., May 24, 1942, on the occasion of his receiving an honorary degree, which appears in the Appendix.]

MARITIME DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on National Maritime Day at Superior, Wis., May 22, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY FRED S. WALLACE, CHIEF, AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT AGENCY

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Fred S. Wallace, Chief, Agricultural Adjustment Agency, before the A. A. A. State chairmen meeting in Chicago, Ill., on May 18, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

AGRICULTURE AND FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY WHEELER McMILLEN

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Wheeler McMillen, editor in chief of Farm Journal and Farmer's Wife, on the subject Agriculture and Freedom, before the Ohio Society of New York, at the Pennsylvania Hotel, May 11, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN-KOREAN TREATY—ADDRESS BY KILSOO K. HAAN

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Kilsoo K. Haan, Washington representative of the Sino-Korean Peoples League, on the subject of the American-Korean treaty, which appears in the Appendix.]

LACK OF BARGES FOR TRANSPORTATION OF OIL

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial published in the Marine News, dealing with the lack of barges for transportation of gasoline on the inland waterways, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE NEW AMERICAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Times-Herald of May 23, 1942, by Frank C. Waldrop, entitled "Where Our New American Expeditionary Force Came From," which appears in the Appendix.]

PENSIONS FOR SENATORS

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Pensions for Senators," from the Washington Times-Herald of Saturday, May 23, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT, as in executive session, laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TARVER, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. LEAVY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. PLUMLEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 to the joint resolution.

PROGRAM OF THE WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION (H. DOC. NO. 734)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my Budget message to the Congress in January of this year, I estimated tentatively that $465,000,000 would be required during the ensuing fiscal year for continuing the work-relief program by the Work Projects Administration and indicated that a specific recommendation would be submitted later in the year.

The Work Projects Administration and its predecessor organizations were created to meet a temporary relief and employment need for millions of persons out of work during the depression years. The program has been successful. It has provided thousands of useful public projects, and it has permitted millions of persons to maintain their self-respect through gainful employment. More recently the Work Projects Administration has contributed greatly to the defense and war efforts through participation in the construction of airports, access roads, sewer and water facilities, and other useful public works.

Since my January message, funds appropriated or recommended for the conduct of the war have tremendously increased. Shortages of labor and material are rapidly developing. To meet labor shortages, the recruitment of workers from every available source will be required, and possibly even organized migration in some instances. However, it is estimated that at present there are still some 3,000,000 unemployed. Of these, many will be hired during the coming year; yet in a labor force exceeding 60,000,000 persons there will remain a substantial number of individuals who will not be hired by private employers because of age, lack of skill, or other handicaps. A certain number may not be able to migrate from regions having surplus labor to regions where workers are needed. In this connection, I cannot emphasize too strongly the need for industry to abandon prevailing practices of discrimination, racial and otherwise, in recruiting labor for war production.

The program of the Work Projects Administration for the next fiscal year must, in a large measure, be held to one of work relief for employable persons who, by reason of circumstances, cannot obtain employment either in war activities or in other work. It is urgent that our labor reserves be fully utilized, and that productive labor now on the rolls of the Work Projects Administration be engaged in other productive employment.

Provision has been made by direct appropriation to other Federal agencies for the construction of access roads, streets, and airports, and public works have been authorized for localities whose needs have been materially expanded by the defense and war efforts. The types of projects to be undertaken in the relief program in 1943 will be those which can be prosecuted by day labor of the residual unemployed available on the Work Projects Administration rolls and which require a minimum of critical materials.

In the circumstances a reduction of work relief is now possible without causing undue hardship, and I recommend an appropriation of $280,000,000 to the Work Projects Administration of the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year 1943. This amount together with an estimated balance of $57,000,000 of the 1942 relief appropriation, will permit an average monthly employment of about 400,000, including administrative expenses of the Work Projects Administration. I recommend additional appropriations of $2,767,000 to provide for the administrative expenses of the General Accounting Office and units of the Treasury Department for services in connection with the relief program, making a grand total of $282,767,000 for the fiscal year 1943.

For the period beyond the fiscal year 1943 the provision of work and other forms of aid for those who cannot be absorbed in private employment must be considered as an integral part of comprehensive measures for social security and public assistance. I am now giving attention to proposals for revising and extending the Social Security Act, and expect to make recommendations to the Congress for such legislation as may be necessary to extend the protection of our social-security measures to provide alternative means of meeting the needs presented by the residual group now being aided by the Work Projects Administration. The action to be taken by the Congress in the near future on such proposals will determine the extent to which we can move toward the further reduction or the possible elimination of the Work Projects Administration.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 25, 1942.*

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOXEY in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Overton
Andrews	Glass	Pepper
Austin	Green	Radcliffe
Bailey	Gurney	Reynolds
Ball	Hatch	Rosier
Bankhead	Hayden	Russell
Barbour	Hill	Schwartz
Barkley	Holman	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hughes	Smathers
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Bulow	La Follette	Taft
Bunker	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lee	Truman
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Caraway	McCarran	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	White
Doxey	Murdock	Wiley
Ellender	Norris	Willis
George	O'Daniel	
Gerry	O'Mahoney	

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. BURTON) is attending the meeting of the so-called Truman Committee in Detroit.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] are necessarily absent.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] are members of the Committee to Investigate National Defense, and are, therefore, detained on official business.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained on official business in his State.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR and Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names there is a quorum present.

CONFIRMATION OF POSTMASTER NOMINATIONS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, before we begin the memorial services of the day, I wish to ask that, as in executive session, the nominations on the Executive Calendar be confirmed. With the exception of the nominations in the Navy they are all postmasters. These nominations in the Navy were passed over last week at the request of the Senator from Oregon (M. McNary).

Mr. MCNARY. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Is there any reason why they cannot be disposed of now? The only reason the four nominations in the Navy went over is because a question was raised with respect to Admiral Andrews.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, I am advised by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], who is absent from the Senate on account of official business, thought that these nominations would go over until Tuesday. I think it probably was the understanding that they would go over until Tuesday because of the memorial services which were to be held today.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is agreeable to me that the nominations in the Navy go over until tomorrow, but I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be now confirmed, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed, and the President will be notified forthwith.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON DECEASED SENATORS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On May 14, 1942, the Senate agreed to Senate Resolution 250, which will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That on Monday, May 25, 1942, at the conclusion of the morning business, the legislative business of the Senate be suspended for the purpose of permitting the delivery of memorial addresses on the life, character, and public service of the late Senators PAT HARRISON, of Mississippi; ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON, of Texas; ALVA M. LUMPKIN, of South Carolina; and ALVA B. ADAMS, of Colorado, respectively.

PAT HARRISON, OF MISSISSIPPI

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I submit a resolution, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 254), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. PAT HARRISON, late a Senator from the State of Mississippi.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, of all the beautiful and impressive ceremonies observed in this body, none is more beautiful and none more impressive than the time-honored custom of assembling once each year to pay tribute to the memory of our colleagues who have answered the roll call of eternity.

It affords a fitting opportunity to commemorate their services and to express our sentiments of love, esteem, and appreciation for departed comrades whom we loved in life and whom we revere in death. It provides the incentive to revert to a serious contemplation of the footprints they have left behind. It serves to inspire those of us still in our pilgrimage so to live that we, too, may be counted among earth's benefactors.

So live, that when the mighty caravan
Which halts one nighttime in the vale of death
Shall strike its white tents for the morning march,
Thou shalt mount onward to the eternal hills,
Thy foot unwearied, and thy strength renewed
Like the strong eagle's, for its upward flight.

This solemn occasion reminds us, so forcefully, of the uncertainty and frailty of human life; of the profound mystery of death.

Leaves have their time to fall
And flowers to wither at the north wind's breath
And stars to set, but all,
Thou hath all seasons for thine own, O Death!

What a multitude of deep and varied emotions are called from the soul by the mere utterance of that word "death."

Since time immemorial man has sought in vain to penetrate the veil that separates time and eternity; to define the transition from the finite to the infinite.

Even science in all its profundity, with all its miraculous achievements in every department of life, must retreat in silent acquiescence before the unfathomed mystery of death that passeth understanding. It is not for us to know why some must fall before the sickle of the Reaper in the very dawn of life, why some go out with the noontide, while others linger far into the twilight until life can hold no more.

Today we are thinking of the dire loss to this body by the decree of a fate that has removed from this Council Chamber of the Nation, at the noontide of their usefulness, some of our most beloved and most valuable Members.

Memories of happier days crowd our brains as we look back through the vista of years. Scenes of bygone days when they were in our midst flit before us in swift succession and we see clearly, as if reflected in a shining mirror, their familiar forms and faces. The years will pass, yet the images of those we honor will appear again and again as the recollection of a well-remembered dream. Their names and their deeds will illumine history's pages long after we who extol them now shall sleep, too, in dreamless dust.

Today we are deeply aware of the heavy duties and increasing exactions which have drawn so heavily upon the endurance of men in high places and hastened their departure from this earthly vale. We cannot refrain from lamenting. We cannot refrain from wondering why we were deprived of their talents and influence at a time when they were needed most.

In searching for an answer to the eternal question, we come upon the

words of a philosopher of long ago who sought to assuage the sorrow of the multitude mourning for a great man who had been snatched from life at the zenith of his career:

Yet, after all, it may be best, just in the sunniest, happiest hour of all the voyage, while eager winds are kissing every sail, to dash against the unseen rock and in an instant hear the billows roar above the sunken ship. For whether in midsea or among the breakers of the farther shore, a wreck at last must mark the end of each and all.

Mr. President, on June 22 of last year, as the soft, faint rays of a new day were appearing on the horizon, one of the Nation's greatest statesmen was summoned to answer the roll call of eternity. On the wings of that Sabbath morning the genial, valiant spirit of PAT HARRISON, senior Senator from Mississippi, was borne away from its earthly abode to take its place in the parliament of the skies.

He needs no encomiums. His more than 30 years of public service have engraved their own record in the hearts of the people. His fellow countrymen who loved him in life and who honor him in death will transmit his illustrious name to posterity.

On that June day, as the morning light was faintly bathing the dome of the world's most beautiful Capitol, the somber tidings of Senator HARRISON'S death were flashed over the Nation by wire, by press, by radio, and by word of mouth. The State and the Nation which he had served with so great distinction were bowed with grief.

The press throughout the country throbbed with universal lamentation.

In Mississippi, where the name of PAT HARRISON had long been a cherished household word, the news of his passing took precedence over all else. At the end of the year, when the editors of the State compiled their chronology of leading events of 1941, Senator HARRISON'S death was unanimously chosen as the leading news story of the year in Mississippi. That the story of his demise was accorded first place in a year when a tidal wave of war rode the headlines to dwarf most all other news, is in itself an eloquent testimonial to the secure place he held in the hearts of his people.

The World Almanac, in its chronology of the most notable world events of 1941, listed the death of Mississippi's PAT HARRISON as the most notable event of June 22, 1941. This bespeaks the place accorded him in the scale of world events, at a time when every day of the year was filled with the most exciting and sensational of history-making incidents.

Volumes of beautiful and eloquent eulogies poured from the Nation's presses to tell the inspiring story of the humble newsboy who had risen to a place of eminence as President pro tempore of the United States Senate, as chairman of the all-powerful Finance Committee, and ranking member of the important Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate.

Although Senator HARRISON had not at all times supported administration measures, the President led the Nation in mourning this beloved statesman, this renowned standard bearer of the Democratic Party. President Roosevelt fittingly voiced the sentiments of the American people. I quote his utterance, in part:

Senator HARRISON'S death is a great sorrow to all of us. It is a great loss to the Nation in this hour of grave emergency. His exceptional talents won increasing recognition, rewarded in successive posts of great responsibility. It was as natural as it was fitting that he should finally attain the charmanship of the great Committee on Finance and that his colleagues should, in due course, select him as President pro tempore of the Senate.

Friend, statesman, great Mississippian, great American, he has left a memory which will be part of the imperishable heritage of all who passed his way.

Eulogists have vied with one another to describe his colorful and effective personality; the brave gentilities of his character; the generosity of his heart and mind; his eloquence and wit in public forum; his resourcefulness in strategy; his affable temperament, his contemporary influence, and the inspiration that his life had set aglow for future generations. They have searched the gardens of their hearts and minds for garlands with which to crown him.

Of all the eloquent and impressive eulogies spoken or written on the life of Senator HARRISON, I think none is more touchingly beautiful, none more significant than the simple tribute paid him by the saintly woman who was the first of his teachers at the little school in Crystal Springs, Miss., where he was born and where he worked so industriously as a mere lad to help support a widowed mother.

The venerable teacher said of him, "Pat was always such a busy little boy." She told of her admiration for the boy who had been christened BYRON PATTON HARRISON. She remarked his unfailing courtesy and chivalry. She said it was this genial youth she called upon most often whenever there were unusual tasks to be performed in the classroom. She said it was Pat the other boys most generally depended upon "to find the ball." She praised the tireless energy and integrity that secured for him the extra jobs the community had to offer for a youth so earnestly doing his part to support the fatherless household. She extolled the courage and determination which were destined to carry him to the heights of fame while she looked on with so great pride in her former pupil.

We may well imagine that the golden precepts taught him at his noble mother's knee and the kindly influence of the understanding teacher went far to inspire the ambitious boy to fruitful thought and earnest will.

There is no chance, no destiny, no fate
Can circumvent or hinder or control
The firm resolve of a determined mind.

As we reflect upon the story of his pilgrim progress, step by step, from the tender boyhood days when he was "such a busy little boy" on through the years, we acknowledge that it remains for the fluent pens of able historians to do full justice to the intimate life story of this remarkable man.

It would seem that he had assimilated the characteristics of the great oaks in whose cool shadows the busy boy rested from his youthful labors. Like the oaks, he grew tall and strong and stanch.

It would seem that he drew warmth and stature from the sun and the sea which had lured him to establish his home, in early manhood, on the idyllic strands of the Mississippi gulf coast. For he enjoyed a fullness of life such as few men, indeed, are privileged to enjoy.

Give me the fullness of life like to the sea and the sun; give me fullness of physical life; mind equal and beyond their fullness; give me a greatness and perfection of soul higher than all things; give me my inexpressible desire.

By his own efforts, with money earned at playing baseball and then by waiting on table at school, he paid his way through college. After a brief period of teaching school, he took up the practice of law. He chose as the devoted wife of his bosom one of Mississippi's fairest and finest young ladies, Miss Mary Edwina McInnis, of Leakesville. Entering politics first as district attorney at the age of 23, he showed marked ability from the beginning. Soon it became apparent that PAT HARRISON could measure lances with the best of men in public strategy.

A few years later, in 1910, the people of his district nominated him as their Representative in the Halls of Congress. His 8 years of service in the House won him increasing recognition and he gained a prominent place in the deliberations of that body. In 1918 he was elevated to the United States Senate. He enjoyed the rare distinction of never having been defeated for any office he ever sought for himself at the hands of the people. Thus was he honored by a State noted for its keen interest in politics and government.

His three successive decades of service in the National Congress embraced some of the most momentous years in the history of our Republic.

During those fearful days of 1914 to 1918, when the world was embroiled in war, he rendered creditable service in the House. President Wilson counted Mississippi's PAT HARRISON as one of his stalwarts. Pat felt the call to arms and had intimated his intention to don the uniform and join the ranks of American men marching off to war to save the world for democracy. But the President protested and urged Congressman HARRISON to stay at his post in Washington. He reminded Pat that men of experience and proven worth in the council chambers of the Nation should stay at their posts because, he said:

We do not feel that we have the right to weaken one branch of the Government to strengthen another.

So it was that PAT HARRISON remained in Congress and did his bit to aid the tragic wartime President throughout the devastating experiences of that era.

Pat had the capacity to become a fine soldier in arms, I have no doubt. The same sure-footedness and the same keen perception that had made him an outstanding athlete in his youth and in manhood a recognized strategist in public affairs would have served him well on the battlefield, there is no doubt. He exemplified the type of man William Wordsworth had in mind when he said:

Who, if he be called upon to face
Some awful moment in which Heaven has joined
Great issues, good or bad for human kind
Is happy as a lover; and attired
In sudden brightness like a man inspired.
This is the happy warrior; this is he
Whom every man in arms should wish to be.

Yes; I think Pat might have covered himself with glory on the battlefield in that World War of 25 years ago; but his seasoned experience in national legislation was such that he was needed most in Congress during that trying period. He gave good account of himself, and was entrusted with higher and higher assignments as the years slipped by.

Came the economic crash of 1929, and the stressful, harrowing, crushing years of depression which followed. Having been elevated to the Senate in 1918, and as chairman of the powerful Senate Finance Committee from 1933 forward, Senator HARRISON played a vital role in legislation enacted by this body during that memorable depression era.

Now the world is at war again, engulfed in a globe-encircling, all-pervading war, the cruelest and most disastrous of all time. Senator HARRISON was still with us as we began to shape and launch our national defense program in this second World War, which is truly a war of survival. By virtue of his important committee assignments he shouldered grave responsibilities fraught with indescribable stress and strain.

His death, coming as it did in a time of severest national crisis, was widely lamented as a great tragedy for this Nation. A sorrowing people, stunned and bewildered by his untimely passing, so far short of man's allotted span, found it difficult to believe that the sands of time had run so swiftly for him.

We know that tears are vain,
That Death ne'er heeds nor hears distress,
Will this unteach us to complain,
Or make one mourner weep the less?
And thou, who tellst me to forget,
Thy looks are wan, thine eyes are wet.

But when we meditate upon his long and eventful service, embracing three decades of the most crucial and fateful years in our country's history, we find it easier to lay aside our robes of mourning. We bow to the will of the Infinite One who doeth all things well. We are reconciled to a merciful destiny which bade our beloved colleague abandon his arduous toil and care and rest forever in the calm and peaceful bosom of eternity. We acknowledge that if the duration of Senator HARRISON'S existence may be measured by service and not by years of life he lived well beyond the proverbial span.

When historians shall have written his imperishable biography, well may they say of him that he went before the Almighty Judge with his obligations well fulfilled. Well may they call him a great Mississippian, a great American, a great statesman.

His body has its hallowed resting place in the soil of his beloved Mississippi, hard by the sparkling waters of the Gulf he loved so well, where his proud but sorrowful fellow citizens laid him to rest beneath a wilderness of fair and fragrant flowers. His mortal dust will return eventually to the land which gave him birth and which he served with honor and distinction, but his memory will linger on in the hearts of the people, his place in the annals of State and Nation secure forever.

The noble wife, the lovely daughters, the splendid son who mourn for their illustrious loved one will find solace in the knowledge that the world has been enriched because he lived and worked and served.

All will find comfort in the thought that it is not the whole of life to live nor all of death to die.

And very near us, though unseen
These dear, immortal spirits tread;
For all the boundless universe is life—
There are no dead.

May the hand of a merciful God rest gently upon all who mourn and brush away their tears.

All glory to the honored name of PAT HARRISON. May his immortal soul find peace and joy eternal in the land of everlasting life.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I always find it difficult to give expression to the sentiments of my heart, when commenting upon the life, character, and public achievements of my colleagues in this body; but, if I had the facility of speech which I might wish to have under all circumstances, I should find my language peculiarly inadequate at this hour.

I recall that in 1913, when as a young man I entered the House of Representatives, beginning my term on the same day when Woodrow Wilson was inaugurated President of the United States, one of the first men whom it was my pleasure to meet on the day of that inauguration was PAT HARRISON, of Mississippi; and from that day until the day of his death, he and I were warm, close, bosom, devoted friends. Champ Clark used to say that no man could ever be said to be really popular or to have a warm place in the hearts of his fellow men until they gave him a nickname; and while that statement may not be always accurate, the fact that any man in public life, or in private life, for that matter is called by some affectionate name given to him by his neighbors and friends, I have always regarded as a tribute to his personality and his character.

I do not deem it essential at this moment to go into any detail in describing the public services of PAT HARRISON; but if the Speaker of the House of Representatives was accurate in his estimate of the test of popularity and humanity, PAT HARRISON qualified in the highest degree. He was a friendly man; he was a warmhearted man; he was a sympathetic man. He had an uncanny way of sensing public reactions to public questions. I used to think that he and another of my predecessors in this body, Ollie M. James, of Kentucky, could more nearly gage public opinion on any important matter than could any other two men with whom I ever came in contact.

When I first met PAT HARRISON he was in his early thirties, barely beyond 30, I think. He had preceded me in the House by a couple of years. Tall, handsome, colorful, he created attention wherever he went. I recall that in the House of Representatives in the discussion of many an important problem PAT HARRISON was always in the forefront. His service in the other branch of Congress was of such outstanding character and so endeared him to the people of Mississippi that at the August primary, as I recall, in 1918, he was nominated over the sitting Senator for a place in this body. That nomination came to him not only because of his outstanding record in the House of Representatives, but because of his loyal support of President Wilson in the great war which it fell to his lot to conduct in 1917 and 1918.

I remember PAT HARRISON as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, and later, when I entered this body, of the similar committee of the Senate. I remember him as a hard-working, affable, diplomatic chairman of the Committee on Finance; and I used to think that PAT HARRISON, the chairman of that committee, conducted its hearings and its deliberations with a finer sense of proportion and was able to iron out difficulties in the solution of tremendous problems of taxation and of finance better than was any man who ever occupied that place before him.

Now we mourn his loss.

The faithless man, the man without hope, says there is no future for the human soul. Such a man, when he sees the leaves falling from the trees in the autumn, and the ground of the earth seared with the frosts and snows, and gazes upon the naked forest, may say, "There comes no spring." But, by and by, the snows melt, and the warm rays of the sun bring forth the green carpet on the earth's surface, and the foliage of the trees burgeons forth again to give shelter to man and beast. I believe that that is only symbolic, Mr. President, of the human soul.

In his wonderful poem Invictus, Henley uses this language:

It matters not how strait the gate,
How charged with punishments the scroll,
I am the master of my fate;
I am the captain of my soul.

In our complex civilization, when as individuals we are buffeted around by circumstances over which we have no control, it may be difficult for us to say that we are the masters of our fate; but we can say that we are captains of our souls. PAT HARRISON, though, was the master of his fate and he was likewise captain of his soul.

Somewhere in the skies—it may be on the beautiful Isle of Somewhere—in my humble judgment, that soul still lives.

I could do nothing more appropriate in describing him than to read a little poem by Edgar A. Guest, entitled "A Man's

Ideal." I can well imagine that PAT HARRISON himself might be speaking in this language:

To live as gently as I can;
To be, no matter where, a man;
To take what comes of good or ill
And cling to faith and honor still;
To do my best and let that stand,
The record of my brain and hand,
And then should failure come to me,
Still work and hope for victory.

To have no secret place wherein
I stoop unseen to shame and sin;
To be the same when I'm alone,
As when my every deed is known.
To live undaunted, unafraid
Of any step that I have made;
To be without pretense or sham,
Exactly what men think I am.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, there is little more that can be said in praise of the life and deeds of former Senator BYRON PATTON HARRISON, of Mississippi. However, because I loved him dearly this brief expression of my affection will relieve my heart of a welled-up emotion.

Properly to appraise his worth and to appreciate his friendship, one had to know him intimately. It was my fate and good fortune to have known him closely from the beginning of his service in the Senate in 1919 until his untimely passing in the summer of 1941. His charming personality, pleasant manner, common honesty, and unquestioned loyalty endeared him to the Members of Congress and a host of friends throughout the Nation. He was a true and devoted friend and the orbit of his friendship was expansive. Little spites and small vexations never challenged the attention of his responsive mind; but large problems of state and great issues moved him into aggressive action.

As vividly as though it were yesterday, I recall his comment when he was to deliver the keynote speech at the Democratic National Convention in New York in June 1924. He said, "This is a great responsibility and a great honor, and if I put it over, it may help the party."

Then he read me his speech, and I was so greatly interested in my companion's success that I went to New York and witnessed its delivery. Those who listened to his speech will recall that it was a masterpiece, measured by Democratic standards, and it evoked many ovations of applause and commendation.

Mr. President, while I am in a reminiscent mood, let me recall another incident in his impressive life where he decided a question with the skill of a prophet. To me he exclaimed one day that an opportunity had opened whereby he could become a member either of the Agricultural Committee or the Committee on Finance. I advised him to go on the Agricultural Committee, as I thought that committee dealt with problems more closely related to the welfare of the people of Mississippi. He chose otherwise, and years later became chairman of the powerful and oft-punished Finance Committee. If he had followed my advice, he never would have become chairman of the influential Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, because its great chairman, the beloved Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] remains with us in health and vigor.

He was a true sportsman in all his human relations and varied political activities. When our distinguished and capable leader, Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky, defeated him by a single vote in the Democratic caucus, Senator PAT HARRISON accepted the verdict uncomplainingly and with all the grace and sweetness of a victor.

Senator HARRISON was loved because he was square, approachable, and intensely human. He leaves with us a rich harvest of high achievements.

Mr. President, to me it is a precious privilege to pay brief but reverent tribute to the memory of our beloved colleague, PAT HARRISON.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I well recall the day when I was privileged to take a seat in this body. I had previously met PAT HARRISON, but I had not known him intimately. I well remember in those days, when those of us on this side of the aisle were in the minority, how his party depended primarily upon PAT HARRISON in all the parliamentary debate of that period.

He was an able debater. He was keen of wit, but his wit was without a sting, because he was a just, and a magnanimous man, and a magnanimous man is never vindictive; indeed, the lack of the spirit of magnanimity is often marked by the most extreme vindictiveness displayed in human character.

PAT HARRISON was a kindly, friendly man. He had that fine, quiet culture of the South, unobtrusive, gentle, considerate. He had great patience. Genius, Mr. President, has been defined as the capacity for great patience. He was a very loyal man; nothing disturbed him more than dissension within his own circle of friends, whether political or otherwise. He liked unity. Disunity disturbed and distressed him. He was a wise man, and had that peculiar wisdom which enabled him to handle legislation with greater ease, I think, than any other man I have ever known. He rarely encountered any stubborn battles over the most difficult legislative problems handled by him on this floor. He always accomplished his purpose with great ease because of his fine qualities of character which were known to all men who were associated with him.

I was associated with him very closely on two important committees. For a number of years, I sat by his side on the Foreign Relations Committee, and when the Honorable Key Pittman, of Nevada, was called, I went to Senator HARRISON and asked him if he would not assume the duties and responsibilities of the chairmanship of the Committee on Foreign Relations. He was entitled to the position, but he graciously declined. I earnestly suggested, and urged it because I knew the work would be lighter than that imposed on the chairman of the Finance Committee, and I had already felt that he was bending under the burden of work.

It was my pleasure to associate with him intimately as a member of the Finance Committee. For many years I sat by his side on that committee. There were great men serving upon that committee, on both sides of the table. On the side of the minority, there were such men as Simmons, of North Carolina, and Andreas Jones, of New Mexico, wise, patient, industrious, able men, and PAT HARRISON, always with the ability instinctively to gage political and economic issues, and always with the patience and gentleness and kindness which marked him throughout his life.

He was able to make himself felt back in the days when we were but a minority upon that committee, and a very small minority. Then, he came to the leadership of the committee, and, after the inauguration of President Roosevelt, handled some of the most important legislation which has been considered by the Congress during the last 10 years. Before that committee came the Retirement Act, before it came the Social Security Act, before it came all the legislation that has to do with the welfare and well-being of the veterans of World War No. 1, besides matters affecting the tariff and the great body of revenue legislation which has been considered and passed since the Roosevelt administration came into power. Not many of our colleagues will recall it, but, within these years, and after he became chairman of the Finance Committee, some 14 distinct important revenue measures have been considered and passed, and always his was the guiding genius that enabled us to steer those difficult measures through the Senate, oftentimes without even extended debate.

Senator HARRISON loved the coasts. I recall that on more than one occasion he said to me that he would like to return home by the coastal route. Somehow or other he caught the music of the waves as they came in and receded, and he was familiar with the music of God laid upon the quivering leaves of the forest.

He was kindly of soul, gentle, patient, magnanimous, able in debate, truly a wise leader.

His advice was always good in the party councils. I do not believe that any of his colleagues who knew him well would be able to recall when his advice on any important question was far wrong or far out of line with the position which the party leaders should have taken.

His advice was potent in the national councils, and he left his impress upon his party, and the policies his party pursued during his long and active career, although he passed away at a relatively early age.

PAT HARRISON had the quality of leadership which enabled him to accomplish great things without bluster and without display. I think he knew, keenly knew, that there was no honor in false pretense, and he quickly appreciated the genuine man when he met him. When he had the pleasure of associating with his colleagues, he rarely misjudged any one of them.

He was beloved on both sides of the aisle in this body back in the days when there were sharp party issues. In those days his lance flashed brightly in debate, yet he held the esteem, the confidence, and the personal affection of men on both sides of the aisle.

In a deep sense PAT HARRISON was not a partisan; he was too magnanimous. In a deep sense he was too just to have

any of the spirit of vindictiveness in him which too often mars the records and the lives of lesser men.

He has left his impress on this body. His place in the Senate and in the country has not been filled, and cannot be filled, because he understood, without tedious application, the true answers to many of the difficult problems of his time, and of the time in which we now live.

Mr. President, I pay this unstudied tribute to a personal friend, a coworker in a most difficult legislative field, a patriot, a statesman, and the beloved son of the great State of Mississippi.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, while other Members of the Senate are paying tribute to the life and character of the greatly beloved PAT HARRISON, I have thought it would be appropriate to have printed in the RECORD a statement about the life and character and accomplishments and ability of PAT HARRISON which was published in the New York Times the day following his death, which so saddened us all. This article gives in detail some incidents which I believe should be recorded at this place, so that future historians may have the benefit of the information furnished by a great independent newspaper.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

Senator BYRON PATTON HARRISON, Democrat, of Mississippi, who signed his name as "Pat," was a favorite among his colleagues in the Senate and regarded as one of the most skillful political maneuverers ever to serve in that body.

The senior Mississippi Senator, who would have been 60 years old on August 29, 1941, was President pro tempore of the Senate and chairman of its powerful Finance Committee, and in 1937 missed being elected majority leader by one vote after the administration threw its full weight behind Senator ALBEN W. BARKLEY, of Kentucky.

As first lieutenant of the late Senator Joe T. Robinson, of Arkansas, majority leader in the first Roosevelt Congresses, Senator HARRISON helped engineer the early New Deal legislation through Congress. Senator Robinson and Vice President Garner used every available pretext to send measures to Senator HARRISON'S Finance Committee, where they might have the handling not only of the shrewd Mississippian but also of the group of able Senators whom he gathered around him in that body. He all but personally selected the members of his committee.

Thus was the original National Recovery Administration bill, the Social Security Act, the beer bill, parts of the original Agricultural Adjustment Act, and other measures routed through the Senate. In putting through the National Recovery Administration law the Senator, with Edward F. McGrady, Assistant Secretary of Labor and formerly legislative agent of the American Federation of Labor, acting as his "lobbyist," literally "horse-traded" it through a dubious Senate.

Happy-go-lucky by nature, a sympathetic and lovable character, and a keen observer of men and the things that make them "tick," Senator HARRISON was regarded as without peer in the art of persuading his colleagues to do or not to do things. He had a way of standing his ground that did not embarrass his fellow Members. He did most of the tougher part of his work behind the scenes, in cloakrooms and committee rooms, and from these stories often came of how the Senator, moved to exasperation, would dress off some opponent or contentious bureaucrat.

He was known as a gay cavalier among the Democrats before they came to power in 1933. Almost daily he was on the trail of the Republicans, thrusting them here and there to their constant dismay.

When the Democrats came into power in 1933, Senator HARRISON was made chairman of the Finance Committee, and from then on his gay floor action was at a minimum. There was never, however, any diminution of his gaiety and effectiveness in the cloakrooms. One of his most hilarious efforts in the former days was his reading, with aside explanations, of a Department of Agriculture pamphlet on the Love Life of the Bullfrog.

Although greatly chagrined when the administration raised a hand against him for the leadership in 1936, Senator HARRISON retained no rancor. Many a time since he has been called in to straighten out situations in the administration. He took an active part in putting through the lease-lend bill. What happened when a budding filibuster on that measure was crushed is a pointed illustration of the regard in which he was held by his colleagues.

It was evident that the Senator's health was fast slipping away. Some of his cronies pleaded with him to take some time off. But no, he felt that he was needed in the cloakrooms and around "among the boys." He had taken on the particular assignment of handling the new Members.

Senator HARRISON'S specialty was taxation and revenue matters although he was ranking member of the Foreign Relations Committee and had the refusal of the chairmanship when Senator Key Pittman died last year (1940). He was a key member of all the steering committees and inner councils of the Democratic Party, both in the Senate and in the country at large.

He was a great favorite with the Press Galleries whose members referred to him always as The Old Fox. Correspondents often were tipped off to important backstairs action when they saw The Old Fox walk out on the floor, his tall frame slightly stooped, his thumbs thrust into his lower vest pockets, and his eye fixed on some Senator. If Senator James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, recently nominated for the Supreme Court, happened to walk up beside him, the newspapermen knew that something was afoot. Incidentally, Senator HARRISON led the delegation of himself, Senator BARKLEY, and Senator CARTER GLASS to the White House to urge the appointment of Senator Byrnes to the Court when Associate Justic McReynolds recently retired.

As chairman of the Finance Committee, Senator HARRISON had charge of tax and revenue bills in the Senate. He frequently clashed with administration officials, because he had his own ideas about taxation. A conservative by nature, with his ear attuned to the "Main Streets" that run up and down the towns of his own State, also a crony of businessmen, he never could swallow some of the Treasury tax theories. He was credited with the major part in stopping the wealth-sharing tax bill in 1936, and with undoing the undistributed profits tax measure in 1937.

He lived modestly in Washington with Mrs. Harrison. He was a man's man, given to the pleasures of the golf course and club room.

For several years Senator HARRISON'S relations with President Roosevelt were quite strained. This coolness started when the Senator organized a drive which led to the repeal of the undistributed profits tax, one of the President's favorite fiscal policies. HARRISON had pushed the tax through the Senate, but, after a year of its operation, he became convinced it was unsound. The President was so annoyed that he allowed the repealer, which had been attached to another measure as a rider to discourage a veto, to become law without his signature.

This breach was apparently healed in 1940, after the death of Key Pittman, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee and President pro tempore of the Senate. Senator HARRISON was elected President pro tempore in his place, and President Roosevelt wrote: "It is not surprising that your colleagues have come to lean heavily on you whenever there is something to be done."

Senator HARRISON was a Wilsonian Democrat and a constant supporter of President Roosevelt's foreign policy. He worked indefatigably for the Hull reciprocal trade agreement program. One of his chief targets during the Republican's control of Congress was their alleged lack of a foreign policy. He supported the Wilsonian plan for American adherence to the League of Nations and, when that failed, backed various Republican plans for American entry into the World Court.

He was born in Crystal Springs, Miss., on August 29, 1881. His name was BYRON PATTON HARRISON, but he was known throughout his life as PAT HARRISON.

In 1916, after he had been in Congress for 5 years, he explained the abbreviation as follows:

"No one has ever called me Byron Patton since I got the name. As a boy I was known as Pat, and it has followed me into Congress. In a way I'd lose something of my identity if I took up with Byron Patton now—and I think it's a good plan for a man in public life to keep his familiar, popular name."

His father, who had been a Confederate soldier, was so weakened by injuries received in the war that he died when Byron Patton was 4 years old. The Harrison family income was small, and the boy supplemented it by hawking newspapers and driving a bus during his high-school days. The newsboy episode occurred during the Spanish-American War, and young HARRISON learned quickly that newspapers would sell better when they contained stories of big battles. It is asserted by some in Crystal Springs that he annihilated more Spaniards than there were in Spain to promote his paper sales.

A lanky, wiry youngster, he was an excellent baseball player. After he had finished at high school, he started at Mississippi State University, but his prowess as a pitcher earned him an invitation to Louisiana State University, and he attended there for several terms, playing semipro ball in the summer. This fondness for baseball remained with him throughout his life, and it was not unusual for him to slip out of the Senate on a warm afternoon when a good contest appeared on tap at the Washington ball park.

A report was current in 1935 that he might become the head of organized baseball. Denying an offer had been made, HARRISON commented:

"I've been in politics so long, I would be like a fish out of water away from it."

He began the practice of law in Leakesville, Miss., in 1902, and soon took a part in politics. He was elected district attorney in 1905 and again in 1907, resigning in 1910 to go to the House of Representatives. He remained in the House through 1919. In 1918 he engaged in a primary contest with Senator James K. Vardaman for the latter's seat in the Senate. They still talk in Mississippi about the campaign. Senator Vardaman was opposed to President Wilson. Senator HARRISON favored the war President, and he won, taking the chair once occupied by Jefferson, president of the Confederacy.

As a Senator his tongue was sharp, but very often the targets of his attacks remained his good friends, despite his oratorical outbursts. Once he said some kind words regarding

President Harding's father, and the latter wrote in a note of appreciation: "In your capacity as chief troublemaker of the Senate you have said things which caused me to lay my newspaper down and turn to a fresh pipe of tobacco for consolation. This very generous and considerate article has antidoted all the things which have gone before."

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, PAT HARRISON was an unusual man. I entertained a very strong affection for him. He easily won the respect and confidence of those with whom he associated. When our great leader, Senator Joseph T. Robinson, died, I believed that PAT HARRISON possessed in eminent degree the qualifications essential to a highly successful majority leader. I had full confidence in and sincere regard for Senator ALBEN BARKLEY, a feeling which has grown stronger as the years have passed. Yet I cast my vote for the election of PAT HARRISON as majority leader. That was a real test of the admiration and esteem which I held for him.

I have never ceased to miss his smiling presence, his loyal friendship, and his helpful advice. He was truly a wise man.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the splendid tributes which have already been paid to our great friend and coworker, the late senior Senator from Mississippi, PAT HARRISON, meet with my full approval of course, and I shall consume but a moment of the Senate's time in adding my personal encomium to his memory.

When I came to the House of Representatives in 1917 I had the pleasure of serving on the same committee with PAT HARRISON, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House, until he came to the Senate. In the Senate I served with him on both the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Finance. He was a useful and outstanding member of both those committees, and contributed mightily to their labors on the problems before them.

Senator HARRISON was a brilliant man. In addition to the sterling qualities which have been recited by his colleagues, he was a man of rare talents in the forum. When his party was in the minority there was no more skillful debater upon this floor in attack. He was a great strategist. He possessed rare powers of conciliation among his own forces, bringing about their unification in attack against the opposition.

I had the pleasure of knowing PAT HARRISON rather intimately, personally as well as in an official capacity, and I entertained for him very real affection. To me his passing carried with it a great personal loss.

We cannot tear aside the veil of the future and look into the things which lie beyond mortality, but wherever that place is which may be reserved for the gallant and the good, for the loyal and the devoted, for the able and brilliant public servant, there now abides the spirit of PAT HARRISON.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, with deep and abiding sadness I join in this memorial tribute to PAT HARRISON, one of the best friends I ever had. His services to his Nation and State were so valuable, his life was so useful, his talents so many, and his personal charm so overwhelming that it is difficult to become reconciled to the absence of PAT HARRISON from among us. How many of us find ourselves subconsciously wondering when he will appear through the doors of this Chamber—his workshop, where he labored to such constructive ends for so long? Can it be that he has been away nearly a year?

I first saw PAT HARRISON, Mr. President, when he was the temporary chairman and keynoter of the Democratic National Convention in New York in 1924. I never saw a more forceful personality on the rostrum. His great speech on the day when he opened that convention will take its place among the very finest Democratic utterances.

When I came to the Senate as a new Member I was deeply moved by his kindness and unfailing courtesy to me, but this was characteristic of his attitude toward all newcomers to this body.

I was closely associated with him as a Member of the Senate Finance Committee, and there had an opportunity to observe intimately his great ability and the patriotic performance of the many difficult tasks confronting him as chairman of that great committee. He was an expert on all matters of taxation and fiscal policy.

I am one of those who sought and respected his counsel. I am proud to have been among the legion of his friends who loved him and who will never cease to mourn his absence. I shall always feel keenly my obligation to him for his kindness, for his understanding, sympathetic, and logical counsel. More than anyone I have ever known, he had a way of arriving at reasonable conclusions and solutions.

Enhancing his other enviable characteristics, it seems to me the most endearing of all was the simplicity of BYRON PATTON HARRISON, of Mississippi, who was always known as just plain Pat.

I admired him as a statesman, but in doing so I always had the feeling there was something more than statecraft. Likewise, there was something more than eloquence in his debating on this floor. As a legislator he was superior, but in that superiority there was a warmth that drew you very close to him.

PAT HARRISON had few enemies, for, no matter how sharp were the prongs of his wit, his friendly manner, his keen intellect, and his uncompromising loyalty made association with him something to be desired. These were the attributes which drew men to him, great and small. Perhaps no man in recent times was leaned upon more heavily—even until the last day he was upon this floor—than PAT HARRISON. His eye was never dim, nor was his natural force ever abated.

It is no exaggeration to say, Mr. President, that no Member of the United States Senate was held in higher regard or looked upon with more deference than was he—liberal, indeed, in his views upon the rights of his fellow man; conservative, indeed, in his views and action in matters of public finance.

Such was his logic, seasoned by 30 years in Congress, spent for the greater good of his Nation. As a basis for that logic was a boyhood spent in hard work for the support of a widowed mother. His father had been a veteran of the War between the States. As he worked for the assistance of his family he attended the public schools and later paid his way at college. He taught school and studied law in the evenings.

Then he came to Congress, entering the House of Representatives after his election in 1910. In the House of Representatives his voice was heard with growing respect, and at the time of the first World War he had come to be regarded as one of President Wilson's most trusted spokesmen and advisers.

By the time he began his career in the Senate at the end of the last war, the world knew PAT HARRISON as a man of no words without knowledge. He taught his opponents and his friends alike the force of right words spoken at the right time.

How sad it is that he is not with us now, that all might have in this day of great crisis the benefit of his long experience, of his brilliant intellect, of his force in conflict, of his mildness of manner, so conducive to the best in tranquillity.

We miss him so deeply. We take consolation only in the knowledge that for him conflicting opinions and partisan passions and world strife cannot live in the presence of death and character, for death teaches unity and tolerance and peace. Like the men who today are dying on so many battlefields, our colleague was a man of character and high patriotic purpose who died in the service of his country.

He was a cavalier, impetuous, passionate in any cause in which be enlisted; gallant, bold, and dashing in supporting those things he championed. To me he was the embodiment of the true meaning of the expression, "a southern gentleman"—courteous, courageous, honorable, and upright.

Mr. President, "He has written his virtues and memory on the rocks and his faults have we written in the sands."

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I was one of the army which loved PAT HARRISON. Before I came to the Senate I was privileged to be the law partner of a gentleman who was PAT HARRISON's first secretary in the House of Representatives, and so the PAT HARRISON tradition came to be very real to me before I came to know the man himself. Mr. Waller, the gentleman to whom I referred, a Mississippian, was privileged to have Senator HARRISON visit in his home as the Senator would go to and from the capital and his residence. There I first came within the range of the warmth of his friendship and the mellowness and the strength of his character.

When I came to Washington as a Senator he was the first man upon whom I called, the first one to take my hand in helpfulness to try to assist in guiding my footsteps toward a useful course. He spoke, I am sure, to Senator Robinson, then our incomparable leader, about the committee assignments to which I

aspired. Although I did not always subscribe to the views which Senator HARRISON so eloquently and ably expressed, I never failed to go to him for counsel; I never differed from him without regret.

I believe there is nothing I can say which would so adequately express the affection and the esteem which I hold for him than the words which I have before me, which were written of him by a citizen of his own State immediately after his death. Those words appeared in an editorial published in the Jackson Daily News, of Jackson, Miss., of Monday, June 23, 1941, under the title "PAT HARRISON." They are from the eloquent and devoted pen of its editor, Frederick J. Sullens. They were written while a State and a Nation mourned his loss. They speak works of eloquence worthy of his illustrious name. I read the following excerpts therefrom:

PAT HARRISON is dead.

Mississippi's greatest statesman of his generation is no more.

"Our Pat" has passed into the Great Beyond.

Peerless Pat, prince of gentlemen, patriot of patriots, peer of any party leader, America's most ardent champion of the principles of democracy, best beloved Member of the world's greatest deliberative body, has answered the last roll call.

Mute are the lips from which poured a golden flow of eloquence that charmed millions with its magic.

Silent is the tongue ever ready with a witchery of words that swayed multitudes with masterful logic and perfect reasoning.

Closed forever are those brilliant brown eyes, windows of a brave and dauntless soul; eyes that flashed so much force and meaning to the words his lips uttered—eyes always unafraid; eyes clear as the heavens; eyes that spoke the truth in the spirit of truth; eyes that could look any human being in the face without flinching; eyes so eloquent of expression that they could flood the hearts of friends with tender love or hurl defiance and bring fear to the minds of those who opposed any righteous cause for which he fought or any high purpose he sought to accomplish.

Cold and still in death are those hands that admiring multitudes clamored eagerly to clasp; hands that were always warm and friendly; hands ever ready to help a friend; hands willing to meet more than halfway any personal or political enemy; hands that labored long hours throughout all the days of his life; hands that were useful, faithful, energetic, ever seeking some worthy thing to do; hands that never felt the touch of a dirty dollar; hands that never performed a dishonest act; hands that he kept clean and stainless when always about their owner was ample opportunity to fill them with ill-gotten gains.

Forever stilled is that most priceless of all human possessions, a marvelous mind richly stored with useful knowledge; a brain that functioned with perfect precision, trained to quick and accurate thinking when in action; a brain of such limitless resources that admiring friends were often amazed and opponents confused and confounded by its versatility; a brain that won renown because its possessor never stooped to cheap demagogy, tawdry claptrap, or lurid sensationalism in order to attract attention; a brain that always thought and acted with courageous independence and of such superior strength that men instinctively recognized him as a leader worth following; a brain too sincere to be prostituted to any sort of servility that was repugnant to his own rugged honesty or integrity of purpose.

PAT HARRISON is dead.

In a few short hours that beloved face and towering form so familiar in every nook and corner of the Nation will be lost to the sight of man forever.

"Our Pat" has gone the way of all flesh.

The frets and worries, perplexing problems, and mighty questions of a world in turmoil concern him no more.

For him all the tumult and the shouting, all the strife and the contending, all the bitter battling and strenuous struggling among men of many minds is finished forever.

"Our Pat" has fallen in the midst of action.

Peerless Pat, whose white plume like that of Henry of Navarre was always proudly flaunted in front-line fighting, no longer leads in battle.

Princely Pat, who always fought with a gallant smile on his face and a rose on his rapier, who was never happier than when urging the forces of democracy to go onward, ever onward, to glorious triumph, will henceforth live only in the saddened memories of those who loved him.

PAT HARRISON has gone to join the immortals.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, to me, PAT HARRISON was the ideal Senator. From the time I first heard him as chairman of the Democratic National Convention of 1924 in New York to the sad June evening I last saw him in his home when the light of day was passing he has been in the forefront of my list of great contemporary Americans.

With the passing of the weeks and months, now nearing a year, our grief softens and we have a feeling akin to gratification that there was such a man as PAT HARRISON and that we were privileged to know him here in the United States Senate. I would recall a bit of his life as it was.

Senator HARRISON was the perfect committee chairman. He heard all that should be heard, but not more. How many hours of time he saved his committee by his adroit "Thank you, Mr. Smith," interposed in an unwary pause made by a wearisome witness will never be known. His benign smile made it impossible for even the most obstreperous to continue. In bringing about agreement among the rather high-powered group who make up that committee he was superb. Somehow he could harness the Kings, Georges, Walshes, Connallys, Baileys, Clarks, Byrds, Vandenbergs, and La Follettes and make them march all one way. He could listen with patient and apparent agreement to the most potent arguments against his position, delay a bit, perhaps joke a little, and then ignore it all, and, with that bland smile, disarm opposition and come out of the discussion with the necessary votes. Friendliness characterized his conduct of a hearing; but woe to the unfair witness, whom he would either subdue by studied and purposeful inattention or silence by a deserved shaft of wit.

On the Senate floor he was first the voice of his beloved native Mississippi; then he became the principal spokesman of his fair Southland. In his later years when his party took the reins of Government, he was the eloquent voice of the average American.

He knew the plight and the needs of the underprivileged. He was aware of the excesses of wealth built up unbridled by law. He knew middle-class America. He was never identified as a "bloc" Senator. He knew the interrelationship of all, and he charted his own course, which was the middle road, between the extremes of opinion. He recognized the necessity for the upbuilding of the mighty enterprises of the great cities, although he came from a State that had none. He knew the need for the labor of the humble plowmen in the quiet places, whose joint contribution to the common cause equals that of any others. The adjustment of their relationships and of all others in the economic life of the Nation was his great task. Undoubtedly at various times, in the common good, he disagreed with all, as every conscientious man will. He never posed as the champion of any one group. He was the solid, substantial, sensible, plain American.

I know a personal word will be pardoned. Senator HARRISON placed unusual responsibilities on the Senator from Michigan. Those responsibilities were opportunities. He was more than kind to me. Never volunteering advice, he was ever ready to give it when asked, and he was often asked. I may remain here but a few months; I may stay for years, but I know that I shall not see his like again. To me he was the greatest Senator of our time.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, when we express today the respect and devotion which we all entertain for one of our best, bravest, and most distinguished colleagues, when we express the deep sense of personal loss which was occasioned by his departure, we also know that more important even than the pain caused to his devoted family and to his dearest friends is the irreplaceable loss to the interests of the Nation at this time of stress and emergency in the death of this devoted public servant.

Mr. President, at the time of Senator PAT HARRISON's death in 1941 it had been my privilege to enjoy a close, intimate, and confidential personal friendship with him for a few months more than 30 years, a relationship which I will always treasure in my memory as one of the finest experiences in my life.

I first met PAT HARRISON on the day he arrived in Washington to take his seat as a freshman Representative, the youngest member of that distinguished body, at the beginning of the Sixty-second Congress. That was a momentous Congress in American history, particularly to those who adhere to the faith of the Democratic Party. The great battle of 1910, which was the prelude to the battle of 1912, resulting in two Wilson administrations, had been fought. After 16 years of wandering in the wilderness of defeat, the great party of Jefferson and Jackson was returned to power and was about to enter upon its great record, which, for beneficial, constructive legislation in the next 10 years, has, in my view, never been excelled in our entire history.

It was under such circumstances that PAT HARRISON, the young Representative from Mississippi, made his entrance upon the scene of national affairs. My father was about to be elected Speaker of the House. That splendid statesman and gentleman, Oscar W. Underwood, of Alabama, with whom Senator HARRISON was to be so intimately associated, both in the House and in the Senate, was about to be elected majority leader. That brilliant debater and magnetic leader, Claude Kitchin, of North Carolina, was their trusted first lieutenant. The Republican forces in the House were ably led by the gifted parliamentarian James R. Mann, of Illinois, supported by the former Speaker, the famous "Uncle Joe" Cannon, also of Illinois.

If the young Representative could have read the future he would have seen that there were others in that body at that time who were destined to be intimately associated with him in future years.

There was John N. Garner, of Texas, beginning his fifth term, already moving rapidly along the career of power and service which was to make him one of the outstanding figures in American history.

There was Cordell Hull, destined to be a Senator and one of the greatest of all our Secretaries of State, already recognized as one of the ablest Members of the House and one of the most potent forces on the great Committee on Ways and Means.

There was CARTER GLASS, now the revered President pro tempore of this body, who for several years had been a most respected, but almost uniformly silent, Member of the House, but who, a scant 2 years in the future, was suddenly to launch himself, by his unforgettable championship of the Federal Reserve Act, on the career which has made so indelible and splendid an impress upon the history of his country.

There sat GEORGE NORRIS, the beloved Nestor of this body at the present time, just concluding his fine career in the House and about to be "translated," as my father used to say, to this august Chamber.

Then there was the "young lion of Arkansas," destined to become the "old lion of Arkansas," the thunder of whose eloquence still reverberates in this chamber, Joseph T. Robinson. With him the young HARRISON immediately formed a devoted friendship which was to be ended only by the untimely death of Senator Robinson. As one who was intimately familiar with both of them I have often heard them speak of each other, and I know that in their affection for each other there was never any deviation or shadow of turning. When HARRISON entered the House in 1911, Robinson was already a candidate for the Governorship of his State, to which he was elected; but following the sudden death of Senator Davis he was immediately elected to the Senate and thus preceded Senator HARRISON into this body by 6 years.

There were others in those first years of Senator HARRISON'S congressional experience who were later to become his intimate friends and associates, of whom I can mention only a few.

In that freshman class of 1911 was a young Representative from South Carolina by the name of James F. Byrnes—now Mr. Justice Byrnes of the Supreme Court of the United States, but still known to all of us in the Senate affectionately, if perhaps irreverently, as "Jimmy." Those two young men seemed to complement each other, a quality and relationship which they maintained until the death of Senator HARRISON. I have seen them work together in both the House and the Senate, and I can testify to my belief that there was never in either body a more effective legislative team than PAT HARRISON and Jimmy Byrnes.

In that great class of 1911 was CARL HAYDEN, whom we who sit here have all long regarded as the ne plus ultra of legislative efficiency.

KENNETH MCKELLAR, so long and intimately associated with PAT HARRISON in both the House and Senate, entered the House in November of 1911, following Pat's entry in March.

ALBEN BARKLEY, so long associated with him as ally, once a rival but always a friend, with great credit to both of them, was to succeed the brilliant orator, Ollie James, 2 years later.

Mr. President, I wish that I might have the felicity of expression and description which he himself possessed to such a very greatly marked degree, so that I might be able to describe the PAT HARRISON whom I learned to know and love in 1911. Of course, it was natural that I should be attracted to him. He was only 29, 4 years over the minimum constitutional age requirement for membership in the House. I myself was barely 21, and just a few months before, in the election of 1910, had been denied the right to vote because I lacked just 2 months of being 21 years of age. It was natural that I should be very much entranced and attracted by PAT HARRISON'S remarkable personality; but I soon observed that Pat's ability and attractiveness had commended him to others far older and wiser than I.

When PAT HARRISON came into the House and advanced to the bar to be sworn in, he entered under the handicap of being the "baby of the House," a term of affection which has unaccountably—and, I am certain, without intention on the part of anyone—served to ruin the careers of several brilliant young men who held that title. No so with PAT HARRISON.

A moment ago I said that I should like to be able to describe him as he was; that I should like to possess his own power of expression, so that I might describe him as I remember him at that time. I cannot hope to do that; but I can say that he was tall and broad, as straight as an arrow, but, withal, exceedingly graceful, with his handsome face carrying the look of an eagle, with his dark hair, then untinged with gray, with his dark eyes flashing fire as he spoke, or quietly twinkling as he settled into a humorous mood, but always with that wonderfully winsome smile which he retained until his death. The last time I saw him, when he was sick unto death and we were talking about his illness, he still retained that old humorous quirk about his mouth. No one who knew him will ever forget that expression.

Mr. President, looking back, it now seems remarkable to me—although it did not seem so then—that as the youngest newcomer in that great House, in which there were so many able veterans who had fought their way up through years of discouraging minority service, and who were inclined to look askance at newcomers, particularly new Members from the Southern States, which had been regularly contributing minority Members but which were not supplying the extra numbers required to make the majority, PAT HARRISON should win immediate recognition and encouragement and set his feet upon the path to leadership. He entered, modestly but brilliantly, upon the debates of the House. He very early showed the suavity, the wit, and the penetration in debate which later so much distinguished his career in the Senate. In the meantime, he was exercising that God-given capacity for making friends and tying them to him with hooks of steel, which was one of his greatest qualities. Few men, of whom I have ever heard excelled him in this capacity. By the beginning of his second term he was definitely marked for leadership. In the remainder of his 8 years' service in the House he consistently developed. I have never had any doubt that if he had remained in the House he would ultimately have been majority leader or Speaker.

He decided, however, to take a shorter cut; and in what seemed to be a suicidal campaign he abandoned his seat in the House and opposed and defeated Senator James K. Vardaman, one of the finest and most patriotic of that long and honorable line of statesmen who have represented Mississippi in the Senate.

He came to the Senate in those trying days immediately after the conclusion of the first World War, and almost immediately came to high rank in this body. Early in his senatorial career he won membership upon the great Committee on Finance, of which he was later to be for so long the distinguished chairman. He applied himself diligently to the great problems of taxation and revenue which so largely compose the jurisdiction of that committee. He was an able and diligent member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and became deeply versed in the intricacies of our international affairs. He developed a talent for debate, of which he had already shown so much promise in the House, and was soon recognized as one of the outstanding spokesmen for his party in the Senate and before the country. Few minority members in the history of the Senate have more brilliant records than he in the long years in which he served in the minority—sometimes in a pitifully small minority. His scintillating irony, his devastating but good-natured criticism of the administration and the opposition, his resourceful skill in parliamentary procedure, firmly established him in an enviable place in the annals of this body.

At the same time his extremely attractive personality endeared him to all of his colleagues. Caustic and effective as he could be when he so desired, he never intentionally wounded the feelings of any person, and no one was ever personally offended or angered by his witty retorts. Perhaps the high lights of this senatorial debating career were in his memorable and repeated attacks upon the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill which made legislative history and contributed so much to the result of the election of 1932.

With the advent of his party into power in 1933, Senator HARRISON became chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance and one of the undisputed leaders of the Democratic Party in this body and in the country. No committee ever had a more devoted and self-sacrificing chairman than was he, and no chairman was ever more beloved by the members of his committee than was Senator HARRISON. To the arduous and exacting labors which he devoted, over a period of over 8 years, to the great tax and social-security measures which came before his committee, his untimely death may be directly traced. He was unswerving in his devotion to duty. I know that when it became apparent to all who knew him well that he was in a desperately failing state of health his family and his friends begged him to suspend his work and go away to take treatment and rest. He steadfastly refused to do so until he felt that the work for which he had assumed some responsibility had been completed. He told me that he realized that he was sick but that he felt that he could not leave his post in the Senate until the passage of certain legislation, to which he had been committed, had been completed; and he promised me that at that time he would leave to seek treatment and rest. He did so, but it was too late, and we saw him no more in his familiar place upon this floor. We all miss him greatly today, and his country will miss him greatly in the future. As Hamlet said of his father:

> He was a man, take him for all in all,
> We shall not look upon his like again.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] had prepared a brief address on the life of Senator HARRISON. He was called away from the city on important matters, and so I ask that at this point the address prepared by the Senator from Tennessee be inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MILLIKIN in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The address prepared by Senator MCKELLAR is as follows:

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, PAT HARRISON was born in Crystal Springs, Miss., August 29, 1881; was educated in the public schools of Crystal Springs and the Louisiana State University; studied law and early became district attorney and served in that capacity for 6 years. He resigned in September 1910 to accept the nomination to the Sixty-second Congress. He served 8 years in Congress, and in 1918 was elected to the United States Senate and continued to be reelected until his death.

In 1905 he married Miss Mary Edwina McInnis, of Leakesville, Miss. They had three children, two daughters and a son.

PAT HARRISON and I served in both the House and in the Senate together, and we were always the most intimate of friends. I recall when I first entered the House in 1911, he was one of the first to welcome me in that body. Not long after I became a Member, I listened to a very remarkable speech he made on the seal industry in Alaskan seas, one of the most captivating speeches I ever listened to. As a rough and tumble debater in the House and Senate he had no superior, and the beauty about his debates was that he never became angry. He was always in a good humor and always able to resist every attack in the most genial way.

His personal popularity in both the House and Senate knew no bounds. He was known as "Pat" to everyone. I doubt if he had an enemy in either body. He was admired and loved by everyone. In a personal way he was irresistible, kindly, gentle, honorable, able, gifted, and whenever he exerted himself he naturally drew men to him.

In politics he knew more about politics than anyone else. If there was danger in a certain position, he naturally sensed it. If there was victory in a position, he naturally saw it. Some of the ablest and shrewdest men in Mississippi were opposed to him, but their opposition came to naught. He treated those who differed with him with the greatest respect, and to his friends he was devoted.

He was on the Finance Committee all during his service in the Senate, and no one on that great committee was more powerful than he. Even before he was chairman his influence on the committee could hardly be overestimated. As chairman, he handled its affairs with the greatest skill and dexterity and with the greatest success.

PAT HARRISON'S popularity was not confined to Mississippi or Washington, but he was popular in every State in the Union. He had friends in every State. He made speeches in practically all States, and wherever he made a speech he naturally made friends, and what a gracious, delightful speaker he was. Eloquence flowed out of his mouth. His facial expression, the glance of his eyes, the shrug of his shoulders, the gesture of his hands—all were eloquent. If ever a more pleasant or more gracious or more eloquent man served in the Senate in my time, I do not recall him.

His family life was beautiful and delightful. His lovely wife, his two charming daughters—both since married—his splendid son, all adored him and he adored them. His son is much like him, and I could pay his son no greater compliment.

PAT HARRISON was a great Senator, a warm-hearted and generous friend, and he had a marvelous personality that exuded good nature, kindness, gentleness, and lovableness. His like will not soon be seen among us again.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have embodied in the RECORD a statement prepared by the senior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] in tribute to the late Senator PAT HARRISON and the late Senator ALVA B. ADAMS.

There being no objection, the tributes prepared by Senator DAVIS were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I am glad to have an opportunity to express heartfelt appreciation of Hon. PAT HARRISON, of Mississippi, with whom I was intimately acquainted since the fall of 1921. All during his days in the House of Representatives I was associated with him on matters relating to immigration, of which he had much knowledge. And, in connection with economic problems, I found him a man of deep understanding and extensive knowledge. During our days together in the Senate, we served as members of the Senate Finance Committee, of which he was chairman. I have profound respect for his memory. I entertain the highest regard for his integrity and his forward-looking statesmanship.

My association with Senator ALVA B. ADAMS, of Colorado, has been equally long. I knew him before he came to the Senate, and before either of us had entered into public life in Washington. No man has served with greater devotion in this body. He literally gave his life for the work of the committees on which he served. He was entirely dedicated to good government, sound finance, and economical administration. His services to the Nation have been many, his memory will live long among us.

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. President, this day, Monday, May 25, 1942, has been officially designated by the Senate of the United States as Memorial Day to commemorate the memory of our colleagues who have within the last year passed from our midst into the Great Beyond.

With a heart that is saddened, I pay my tribute of admiration and love to the memory of your friend and my friend, a noble Mississippian and a great American, an outstanding statesman, a man among men—BYRON PATTON HARRISON. He was a true exemplification of American spirit, life, and character.

PAT HARRISON ran the gamut of human experience. He came up the hard way. He richly deserved all the honors that were bestowed upon him. Divine Providence was good to him and blessed him with the full measure of happiness in his public and private life. His gentle nature found and shared life's true happiness with his wife, his children, and his friends.

His devoted family and his social relations were sources of delight and comfort to him throughout his most eventful career. His achievements would not have been possible without the inspiration, understanding, and help of his faithful and loving wife.

His was a rare spirit—brilliant, forgiving, loyal, kindly, courageous, confident, and considerate. The life, character, and achievements of PAT HARRISON will remain always an inspiration to all who knew him, to all who were associated with him, and to all who come after him. As I stand here there come surging through my mind and heart thoughts and memories tender and sacred because

I knew him; I was associated with him; I come after him; and I love, revere, and respect his name and memory.

Often have I said, and deeply and sincerely do I feel, that no one can fill the place of PAT HARRISON, but someone has to take it as Mississippi's United States Senator. As his successor in office, God helping me, I am doing the best I can to live up to the high standards set by him.

There may be a popular notion that Members of Congress have a life of ease, but that, of course, is not true; the fact is that, take them as a whole, they work longer hours and more intensely than any other class of men of whom I know. No doubt the long hours and hard work he devoted to the duties of the office hastened his untimely death; but Senator HARRISON is dead only so far as the mortal flesh is concerned. While we shall not again recognize the active presence of our departed friend, yet he still lives in the record of his service to his fellow men, to his State, and to his Nation. He loved his Nation, and his Nation loved him.

Death came to him while he was still in the service of his country, while the affairs of Government were still in his grasp. He served his purpose in the divine plan. He passed across the stage of life, and the world is richer for his having done so. He left the greatest and most precious of all legacies—an honored name and an array of good deeds well done. He lives in the memories and thoughts of his friends, and lives enshrined in the hearts of those who loved him. He loved people; people loved him. No man ever tried to serve his people better, and I think few men succeeded so well.

It is difficult through the poor medium of mere words to express the high esteem and affectionate regard that his constituents as well as his colleagues entertained for him.

On the morning of June 22, 1941, when the news was flashed that PAT HARRISON was dead, the entire country mourned, the entire Nation suffered an irreparable loss.

The presence of many thousands of people at his funeral at Gulfport, Miss., and the attendance there of the Vice President of the United States and large delegations from both the House and the Senate, and many other distinguished personages, constituted a tribute that comes to only men great in soul, mind, and deeds.

I shall not attempt to pronounce a long eulogy, as no human words can adequately portray PAT HARRISON. His life is a perpetual eulogy.

He was born at Crystal Springs, Miss., August 29, 1881. He attended the public schools of Crystal Springs and finished his formal education at the Louisiana State University. He was married in January 1905 to Miss Mary Edwina McInnis, of Leakesville, Miss., and they had three children. Mrs. Harrison, the two daughters, Catherine and Mary Ann, and one son, Pat Harrison, Jr., survive.

PAT HARRISON was elected district attorney of the second judicial district of Mississippi and served in that capacity for 6 years, resigning in September 1910 to accept the nomination to the Sixty-second Congress; he was elected to the House in the Sixty-second, Sixty-third, Sixty-fourth, and Sixty-fifth Congresses; in 1918 he was elected to the United States Senate, and served with distinction continuously in this greatest of all deliberative bodies until his untimely death.

History will record him as one of the most distinguished and able men that Mississippi has ever sent to Congress. He held high rank in the councils of the Democratic Party and for many years was one of its potent and influential leaders. He fought the battles of his party in foul weather as well as in fair all during his public career. He was strictly a party man, true and tried, but he was loved and respected by all, even by those who differed with him on political matters.

He was a distinguished parliamentarian, and was universally conceded to be one of the ablest debaters on the floor of the Senate. His ready wit and biting sarcasm were held in due respect by all who opposed him. He was ever ready to give and take. He was a true disciple of the Jeffersonian principles of democracy. He loved the right and spurned the wrong. He cooperated, but did not blindly follow.

His philosophic turn of mind helped him to overlook the faults of others, but he could evaluate and magnify and appreciate profoundly the good traits of friend and foe alike.

PAT HARRISON possessed a brilliant intellect, and had one of the most remarkable memories of any man I ever knew. His character was as strong and as enduring as the seasoned oak, but he was not of the cold, reserved temperament. He always had a ready smile and a warm handclasp for one and all—the high, the low, the rich, and the poor. He was a tender and devoted husband and an exceedingly affectionate and indulgent father. He was intensely loyal to his God and his church, to his family and his friends, to his State and his Nation.

Such a man was my illustrious predecessor. I knew him intimately and loved him much. He was not only a great Mississippian, and a nationally known leader and statesman; he was also truly a great man and left his footprints indelibly on the sands of time.

Our friend has gone from our midst, but we find much comfort in the words of the poet Longfellow:

There is no death! What seems so is transition;
This life of mortal breath
Is but a suburb of the life Elysian,
Whose Portal, we call death.

Believing in eternal life, I feel that our beloved friends in whose memory we have gathered here today, have simply gone on to a higher and broader experience.

Recently I read an article that has helped me much in thinking of loved ones who have passed on, and I should like to share it with my colleagues.

It told of a beautiful young woman who sat on the deck of an ocean liner idly watching the sea gulls that played about the mast of the ship. Her heart was heavy with the deep tragedy of the passing of a loved one, but she was earnestly trying to be brave and endeavoring to grasp the tender loving assurances regarding life and immortality that had been taught her in the church she attended. Suddenly she noticed that one sea gull had left the others, and with wings widespread was climbing higher and ever higher until it had separated itself entirely from those around the ship's mast and was apparently taking a course away from the ship. On and on it flew, rising higher and yet higher, steadily and surely, until it became a mere speck in the sky, and then still higher and higher until finally it was lost sight of altogether by her. But the silent watcher knew that the sea gull had not ceased to exist simply because it had gone beyond her limited human vision. She knew it was still identified with life and strength and was continuing even though no longer seen by her mortal eyes. Then, thinking of her loved one in the same way, her anguished soul was comforted and into her being there flowed an indescribable peace that passeth all understanding, and again the words of the Prophet Isaiah were fulfilled:

He hath sent me to bind up the broken-hearted, * * *
To appoint unto them that mourn in Zion,
To give unto them beauty for ashes,
The oil of joy for mourning,
The garment of praise for the spirit of heaviness.

And the spirit of heaviness was lifted, as the young woman was able to realize that though her loved one had passed beyond her mortal vision, he was still going on and on, sustained throughout all eternity by his immortal Maker.

And so I feel it is with our departed colleagues in whose memory we are gathered here today.

Such souls as PAT HARRISON live forever.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO.]

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

ALVA B. ADAMS, OF COLORADO

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, which I offer and ask to have read.

The resolution (S. Res. 255) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ALVA B. ADAMS, late a Senator from the State of Colorado.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, it is now almost 6 months since the

Members of this body stood in the presence of a new and great loss. We were terribly shocked with the passing of our beloved colleague, ALVA B. ADAMS. It seemed to me then that his passing left a vacuum, and there still seems to be a vacuum. I cannot become adjusted to his loss. His place can never be filled.

If I should single out one quality over another in the life of ALVA ADAMS, it would be his devotion to his lovely family and his deep concern for this his native land. There was a fineness of quality in the late Senator's nature. His character was pure gold, without dross. He placed his motives and objectives on so high a pedestal that one hesitated even to suggest that there was room for error or misplaced judgment, as seldom there was. He never argued for the sake of arguing. When he took issue, his convictions were intense. Seldom did he speak, but when he did he spoke to the point, and the Senate listened.

I see him now as he occupied the seat only recently graced by his dearest friend, Mr. Justice Byrnes. I see him now, the most serious expression on his countenance, his right arm extended, and his index finger pointing about the Chamber as he expounded his viewpoint in clear tones, and clearer logic.

Three weeks before he was so suddenly stricken he solemnly uttered in this very Chamber words so striking, so revealing of his character and his attitude toward his own responsibility in the performance of his public duty, that they simply must be made a part of this memorial. He said:

> Mr. President, I regard this as a very solemn occasion. The future of our country is involved, and certainly the lives of millions of the young men of the land are involved in the decision which we are about to make.
>
> * * * I am speaking my own opinion, the result of much study and much thought. I am obliged in many ways to my neighbors, to my friends, to my family, and by the oath which I took on yonder stand. * * *
>
> * * * My books can be closed tonight; and if they were closed, the Auditor would have to say that I had had all that was coming to me, and even more. My problem here, so far as I have one, is to try to play the part of a good citizen, so that those * * * for whom I am responsible and the others may have a fair deal in this world.

I am certain my colleagues join me in feeling that the unseen Auditor to whom the Senator referred, who alone checks the records of men, has found Senator ADAMS' books fully balanced. The responsibilities of his life were great, but they were met fully, without flinching.

His remarkable achievements and accomplishments balanced well the heavy demands made by destiny upon this good man.

In 1936 the Congress authorized the construction of a mighty reclamation project in Colorado known as the Colorado-Big Thompson. Senator ADAMS, in the Senate, and Representative Cummings, of the Second Congressional District, sponsored this immense undertaking. Because of the great importance of this project to the people of Colorado and its worthiness in every respect, the late Senator ADAMS devoted much thought and energy to it.

In fact, the last public service he rendered his State and Nation was in connection with this splendid public work. A few hours before he was stricken he visited the Bureau of the Budget to secure an increase in its current appropriation. One evening while taking his customary stroll with his beloved companion, Mrs. Adams, the conversation turned on the naming of the Caddoa Dam, a large and beneficial reservoir being constructed in the lower Arkansas River. It was to be named for the late beloved Representative from the Second District and the Senator's home, good old John Martin. Senator ADAMS expressed his great satisfaction with the deserved honor and tribute paid his fellow townsman and his fellow legislator, and then he added, "I hope some day to have my pet project, the Transcontinental Tunnel of the Colorado-Big Thompson, named for me."

At this moment, Mr. President, it is my privilege to initiate the action which will name this magnificent tunnel for our late colleague. Out of order I ask permission to introduce a bill for that purpose and to have it referred to the appropriate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 2554) to provide that the transmountain tunnel constructed in connection with the Colorado-Big Thompson project shall be known as the Alva B. Adams Tunnel was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, this tunnel is more than 13 miles in length. It is built in solid, imperishable granite, and pierces the Continental Divide at one of its highest and most picturesque points, one end on the western slope at Grand Lake, the other opening into the beautiful, scenic, and popular Estes Park on the eastern slope. There it will remain as long as the American Continent remains, serving mankind, carrying precious water to the desert plains below, bringing life and comfort to future generations. What a fitting memorial to our beloved colleague. What a magnificent monument to his memory. How emblematically it will represent the life and character of Senator ALVA B. ADAMS.

The name of Adams is one of the most revered names in Colorado history. The Senator's father was elected Governor three times. His uncle, William H. Adams, saw 50 years of exalted public service, three times as Governor. The Senator's father and the Senator's uncle were the only men ever to be elected Governor three times in Colorado. Another uncle served with distinction as State senator.

Senator ALVA B. ADAMS was a kindly, friendly, modest man who understood his fellow man, respected his rights, and loved him. He never tried to cultivate anyone for his support or to exploit him for any purpose, and God pity the soul who ever tried to exploit him. The self-discipline he imposed upon himself was hard and exacting, but he imposed nothing upon his fellow man. In his heart he was the most independent man I have ever known. He simply could not tolerate being beholden to anyone, and yet he was extremely cooperative with all men. He yielded gracefully in personal matters, yet stood like the immovable Rock of Gibraltar in things of consequence.

In the present-day political world, courage is the rarest of jewels; Senator ADAMS forsook not his great courage even there. He feared no man, however powerful. He had nothing to trade. He made no promise and he exacted no promise. He could not be swerved from the right as he saw the right. In the political field, as in other places, he had the courage to suffer his conscience to be his compass. He possessed a sense of humor and a sparkling wit that was a joy to his companions. He had a sharp tongue without injury. He was courageous without being haughty. He was high-minded without being sanctimonious. He was intensely patriotic without parading it. He loved books without being a bookworm. He was modest without being wishy-washy. He was independent without being unsocial. He was proud without being conceited. He was honest, trustworthy, loyal, and friendly, without effort and without display.

I have lost a dear personal friend, Colorado has lost her noblest son, and the Nation one of its most faithful public servants.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I cannot let the moment pass without saying just a word in memory of Senator ALVA ADAMS. In all my dealings with him as an individual, and as a legislator from an official standpoint, and in all my contacts with him as a personality and as a friend, I soon learned to hold him in deepest respect and affection. He and I did not always agree on public measures or public policy. When we did agree I knew that I had an ally upon whose strength and wisdom I could rely, and when our views clashed I always knew I had a foe worthy of any steel.

I do not recall a more earnest, sincere man in the advocacy of his views. Yet when in the earnestness of his soul he was engaged in the solution of many problems which he viewed with some apprehension for the welfare of his country, there was always a twinkle in his eye that gave evidence of the fact that he understood not only his own position but the position of those who could not agree with him from the standpoint of a human viewpoint.

He was an able lawyer, and in his legislative duties here he approached many problems from the standpoint of the lawyer. He was an able advocate.

I have enjoyed his association. I have enjoyed the little shafts of wit, humor, and sarcasm that passed back and forth between us not only in public debate but in private conversation, which showed him to be intensely human and intensely practical.

There was never a more hard-working Member of this body, and I dare say that his untimely end was in some measure brought about by his devotion to the details of legislation, to the hard drudgery, which gets little publicity, in the executive sessions of committee rooms,

where he found no item too small to merit his careful and meticulous consideration.

It seems difficult even yet to realize that when an appropriation bill is before the Senate, ALVA ADAMS is not here to explain it or to discuss it.

But, Mr. President, beyond that, one of the things that endears his memory to us was the beautiful family life of ALVA ADAMS. Not only was he a lawyer, and a careful, painstaking, hard-working legislator, but he was a lover of art and of music. He had a deep aesthetic nature. When it was my pleasure, as it was many times, to be the beneficiary of his hospitality in the sanctity of his home, I have seen upon the walls works of art of a native painter in Colorado depicting the scenes of that great State, which is one of the beautiful creations of Almighty God. Frequently I asked him if there were any way by which I could come into possession of one of the beautiful paintings which adorned his home.

A more lovely, gracious, beautiful, charming woman never presided over the destinies of any man than Mrs. Adams. We all loved her. We loved her children. No man who lives under such an influence can fail to be a real man.

We honor him for what he did here. We honor him for his companionship. We honor him for those tender, more intimate associations which were our pleasure and our joy.

I quote a little poem from Whittier which seems to me to fit his life and our memory of him:

Drop thy still dews of quietness
Till all our strivings cease;
Take from our souls the strain and stress,
And let our ordered lives confess
The beauty of thy peace.

May his soul rest in that peace of which Whittier spoke, and as the days go by may his memory grow fresher and greener to us who knew him.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it may be truthfully said that in the long history of the United States Senate, no Member ever brought to his service here a more loyal and courageous spirit than did ALVA B. ADAMS, whose passing was universally mourned by the people of Colorado and by his colleagues. He was a man to whom the best traditions of parliamentary government were a sacred obligation, and he never deviated by a hair's breadth from the course of action his respect for such obligation imposed upon him.

Nothing that I can say will add luster to the memory or the record of this really great and noble Senator. He himself furnished that record by his own deeds, by the high estimate he placed upon the office he held, by the ability, the integrity, the industry, and the dignity with which he carried his responsibilities, and by his unwavering devotion to the welfare of the people of his State and of his country.

It is proper, nevertheless, that we who were his colleagues, who observed him at his work, who benefitted from his counsel, and were inspired by his example, should here give testimony of the high place he held in our admiration and affection. His intellectual qualities elicited our applause, his human qualities our love.

Time was when one of the finest compliments that could be paid a citizen was to say that he was a man of great public spirit. Deservedly that compliment was often paid to Senator ADAMS. The worthy scion of a distinguished family, he learned as a child from his father, whom all the West admired and revered, that a man can best honor himself by rendering unselfish service to his community, his State, his Nation. Public office came to this man because he was capable of wise and efficient service, and his career led upward to ever broader duties because he discharged with complete fidelity every public trust that was placed upon him.

First to his neighbors in his own city and in his own county, then to his State, and to his Nation, he gave of his energy, his talents, and his judgment. Finally, he was sent here, once by gubernatorial appointment and twice by popular election. Over a period of more than 30 years, public office was to him, not an opportunity to gratify ambition for personal power or prestige, but an opportunity to serve the people under the Constitution and the law.

ALVA B. ADAMS was a public-spirited man. It was his aim always to preserve and defend the rights of his constituents. Ever mindful though he was of the interests of Colorado and the West, he never forgot that he was a Senator of the United States and that the Nation's welfare is paramount. In all his acts, public and private, he was guided by the purest motives and the most undiluted loyalty to the public good.

No man of my acquaintance had a clearer understanding of the principles on which this Government was founded. He knew that it belonged to the people, and his entire public service was a recognition of the trusteeship of public office.

That he was at all times loyal to his convictions all who knew him will testify. He did not temporize. He did not waver. He did not compromise on fundamentals. He hewed to the line, and every Member of this body knew that when ALVA ADAMS rose in his place it was to speak the truth as he saw the truth.

To his labors in the Senate, both on the floor and in the committee rooms, he brought a deep sense of responsibility and prodigious industry. Faithful in his attendance upon all sessions and indefatigable in his application, he omitted no effort in the performance of his duties. Negligence was a word which had no meaning in his personal or official life. He was not content to give attention only to part of the manifold problems which came before the Congress, but gave of his time and energy to all. No Senator had a more complete knowledge of the bills pending here than he. Not even routine matters escaped his scrutiny. Yet he was never over-zealous, and he never spoke without adding to the debate.

Patient, tolerant, and able, with keen insight and sound judgment, he was of inestimable value to the Senate as a whole, to every committee of which he was a member, and to the individual Senators who were fortunate enough to work with him.

With all his diligence in the work of the Senate itself, he did not overlook the needs of his constituents. No Member was more attentive than he to the correspondence that comes to a busy legislator, and no request was too minor to escape his care. Midnight always found the light still burning in his study. Indeed, it was without doubt this unflagging industry which contributed to his untimely death.

Great as was his capacity as a lawyer and a legislator, distinguished as were his qualities of mind and will, ALVA ADAMS was greater yet in character and in human understanding. He was loyal not only to his oath of office and to the concepts of public and private morality instilled into him by an illustrious father, but also to himself. No man who worked with him ever knew him to qualify the high standards he had set for himself. Admirable as he was in these respects, it was the quality of his sympathy for and comprehension of people that endeared him to all.

He knew human nature. He knew its strength and its frailties. He knew its simplicity and its capacity for affection. He himself was a simple man and an affectionate one. He himself had no consciousness of his own virtue. He was a modest man, and the great things he did and said were done and said simply. He was the possessor of a subtle and penetrating wit that proceeded from his understanding of human nature. It enlivened all about him, and pretension could not exist in its presence. It endeared him to all and revealed him as a great and simple American who shed honor on his State and on the Senate, of which he was such an able and distinguished Member.

So long as America produces statesmen of the quality and ideals of ALVA B. ADAMS the structure of our democracy cannot be undermined.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I had the rare privilege of serving on four of the standing committees of the Senate with ALVA ADAMS, namely, the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, of which he was chairman for several years; the Rules Committee, the Committee on Banking and Currency, and the Committee on Appropriations. As is well known, the last two named committees are among the busiest and hardest working committees of the Senate.

He was always regular in his attendance upon the sessions of committees. He took a very active part in their work. His views had great weight with members of a committee, and his position always impressed itself on the committee and had great weight with it in many decisions on most important phases of legislation. I was always glad to have his views. Of course, we did not agree upon all subjects, but I had the highest respect for his judgment; I had absolute and implicit confidence in his good faith, integrity, and the purity of his motives. I was very fond of ALVA ADAMS, and was very greatly distressed when he was called to leave us under such sad circumstances.

I can think of no better description of his fine qualities than that which is found in Kipling's poem "If":

If you can talk with crowds and keep your virtue,
Or walk with kings—nor lose the common touch,
If neither foes nor loving friends can hurt you,
If all men count with you, but none too much;
If you can fill the unforgiving minute
With sixty seconds' worth of distance run,
Yours is the earth and everything that's in it,
And—which is more—you'll be a man, my son!

He was forceful, fearless, and fair; and we all miss him.

Mr. BARKLEY. The senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] has prepared an address on the life and character of Senator ADAMS. The Senator from Tennessee was unexpectedly called from the city on important business. I ask that his address be printed at this point of the RECORD as a part of the proceedings.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The address prepared by Mr. McKELLAR is as follows:

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I first met Senator ADAMS in 1923 when he was appointed by the Governor of Colorado to succeed Senator Samuel D. Nicholson, deceased, of that State. From that time on until his untimely death I know him very intimately. I served on the Appropriations Committee with him. He was an active, vigorous, efficient, and capable member of that committee during all the time he was here, and I came to have the greatest respect, esteem, and admiration for him and his ability.

ALVA BLANCHARD ADAMS was born in Del Norte, Colo., October 29, 1875, and died in Washington, D. C., December 1, 1941. He was just a little more than 66 years old.

Senator ADAMS came from a long line of Adamses who voted and practiced straight democracy, a fact of which he was very proud. His father, likewise named Alva Adams, was Governor of the State of Colorado for three terms; and his uncle, William H. Adams, was Governor of the same State for a like period. I am advised that in the political life of Colorado, since its induction into Statehood in 1876, until the death of the late Senator ADAMS on December 1, 1941, there was never a time when some member of the Adams family was not in public office.

Senator ADAMS was educated in the common schools of Colorado, and then went to Phillips-Andover Academy where he was graduated in 1893. In 1896 he was graduated from Yale University, and in 1899 from the Columbia Law School in New York. He stood high in each of these institutions.

Early in life he settled in Pueblo, Colo., and after leaving school began the practice of law in his home city, where he was attorney for the county of Pueblo in 1909–11. He was a member of the charter convention of the city of Pueblo in 1911; a member of the board of regents of the Colorado State University in 1911–12, at the same time serving as city attorney from 1911 to 1915. He was active in defense work in his city, serving as chairman of the Pueblo County Council of Defense in 1917–18, and served as a major in the National Army, 1918–19. He was associated in the practice of law with Robert S. Gast, under the firm name of Adams & Gast, before his election to the Senate.

On October 25, 1909, Senator ADAMS married Miss Elizabeth L. Matty, of Denver, and he and Mrs. Adams had four children—Alva B., Jr., William H., Elizabeth, and Ella Adams. The two boys are now serving in the United States armed forces, and one daughter is the wife of a captain in the United States Army. His widow, Mrs. Elizabeth Matty Adams, is still living here in Washington.

Senator ADAMS was in the United States Senate from May 17, 1923, until December 1, 1924, under appointment by the Governor of Colorado to succeed Senator Nicholson, deceased, as before related. Senator ADAMS was elected to the United States Senate for a full term on November 8, 1932, by a majority of 27,977, and was reelected November 8, 1938, by a majority 3 times as great, or 81,509.

Senator ADAMS often expressed the view that no greater honor could come to an American in way of public life than to serve as a Senator from one of the 48 States of the Union. His record in the Senate was one of outstanding public service to his Nation, State, and his constituents; and he took exceptional pride in doing for his Nation, State, and people the very best that could be done by human endeavor.

Splendidly educated, of fine stock, with a clear mind and outstanding courage, with a great imagination and capacity for work that was almost a passion with him, it was very natural that he made a success as a Senator of the United States. He examined all questions that came before him in a methodical, painstaking, and careful way, and when he once reached a conclusion it was exceedingly difficult to change his views. He was honest in the highest degree, morally honest and mentally honest. He examined questions on their merit. He reached his conclusions and steadfastly fought for his convictions. If he was on your side he was a powerful aid, and if he opposed your view you had a most vigorous, active, and intelligent opponent.

He loved his work in the Senate. He especially loved the work on the Appropriations Committee. Sooner or later, almost all questions arising before the Senate got to that committee; and nothing pleased him more than to go through the long bills that fell to him for consideration and report, and to study them, to work on them, and make a report on them.

In the multitudinous questions which have arisen in that committee in the last few years, he and I did not always agree; indeed, we often disagreed. Sometimes we fought over a question in subcommittee, in full committee, and in the Senate itself, but we always fought in decency and in order. I always knew in such cases that I had a vigorous, determined, able, and manly, and outspoken opponent; but so far as I recall we never had a personal difference. He was a real legislator and a real Senator.

On the floor of the Senate he was a good debater, a good fighter, and an able speaker. He never doubted the justice of his own cause when once he reached a decision; and his logical mind always gave a reason—and usually a good reason—for any cause he espoused. He was one of the best Senators who has ever sat in the Senate since I have been a Member of the body.

When Mr. Justice James F. Byrnes, Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, was a Member of the Senate, perhaps there were no closer friends in the whole body than Senator Byrnes and Senator ADAMS. They both served on the same committee, their families were very intimate, and they themselves were the most genial and loyal friends. They traveled together during vacation time, and I think even traveled together in Europe. They were very devoted friends.

Senator ADAMS had a lovely family. His wife was a beautiful and lovely woman, and their devotion knew no bounds. Their children were well reared, brought up under the most excellent auspices, given splendid educations, and I have no doubt they will keep up the high record of the Adams family.

Personally, I was greatly shocked and grieved over Senator ADAMS' death. I did not know that he was in ill health at all. He was such a hard worker on the committee that I never dreamed that anything was the matter with him. I have missed him greatly, especially in the work on that committee. He loved it, and I loved it, and it was a great pleasure and satisfaction to be associated with him and to have the advantage of his judgment and of his opinions. One of his closest friends and associates said to me not long ago:

> Having been associated with him for 20 years, were I privileged to eulogize him, I would say with all the candor and sincerity at my command that I have never known Senator ADAMS to do a dishonest act, express a dishonest thought, and I firmly believe that he never even harbored an unkindly thought concerning his opponents whether in private life or in public life. He never failed to express himself forcefully, always standing for what he considered to be for the best interests of his Nation, his State, and his people. The political results of any act on his part never entered his mind; he was never concerned with the political effect such acts might have on his political life.

This is a high tribute, and one in which I can wholeheartedly concur. He was a grand character and a great Senator.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, it was with some reluctance that I sought recognition for the purpose of adding a few words of tribute to the memory of the late Senator ADAMS. My hesitation came because of my somewhat intimate knowledge of one of the strongest elements of his character—his impatience with anything that savored of display, his love of the natural as opposed to the artificial, of the simple as against the ceremonial, of spontaneity rather than of pomp or parade. But there has not been, nor will there be, a semblance of ostentation in these services today when

we all pause in our legislative tasks to honor in memory our former associates who have recently gone on before to that bourn from which no traveler returns.

I loved ALVA ADAMS, and I needed him. I need his counsel and guidance today more than at any time in the past. I do not believe a legislative proposal of a controversial nature came before the Senate for action within the 2 years preceding his death in connection with which he did not place at my disposal the sound advice that a rugged honesty of character, a natural shrewdness of analysis and intellect, a dependable judgment of training and education, and a bountiful harvest of industry and study, made possible to those who sought his help and guidance. While in his passing I share in the great loss to the Senate and to the Nation, there came to me a personal loss which is difficult to measure and impossible to express.

As a vivid commentary on the life of this fine man, let me allude to one incident. In December of 1940, Senator ADAMS planned to give his family a delightful vacation in the way of a holiday cruise in the Caribbean. All arrangements had been made with an eye single to their recreation and pleasure. As the family were embarking at the steamship dock, a careless stevedore dropped a heavy packing case, seriously bruising the Senator's foot, from which injury he had not fully recovered at the time of his death. Although he sustained this severe injury, and although he suffered acute pain and agony throughout the voyage, he did not allow any change of plans whatever which might in the least degree limit or lessen the pleasure of the family and of their friends. Although constantly under the severest pain, and the care of the ship's doctor, he invariably appeared at mealtime and at the various ship diversions with his winning smile, his ready wit, his whole-souled unselfish thought alone for the happiness of others.

ALVA B. ADAMS, the mortal, was laid to rest late last summer near the mountains he loved.

ALVA B. ADAMS—a spirit—has long since appeared, unafraid, at the bar of Divine judgment.

ALVA B. ADAMS—a memory—will be cherished by his colleagues and friends until those individual memories fail with our own approach to dissolution.

ALVA B. ADAMS—an influence—will live on and on in the legislation he sponsored, the principles he advocated, the honesty which he typified, the lives that he touched, guided in part, and helped to shape.

When applied to him, these oft-quoted words have a clearer and more poignant meaning:

Statesman, yet friend to truth; of soul sincere,
In action faithful, and in honour clear;
Who broke no promise, serv'd no private end,
Who gain'd no title, and who lost no friend.

And, again, in the words of the immortal bard of Avon:

His life was gentle, and the elements
So mix'd in him that Nature might stand up
And say to all the world "This was a man!"

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, to me ALVA B. ADAMS stood as a symbol of American patriotism and American achievements—a statesman whose everyday work symbolized those things which have made our country great; whose character was carved out of truth and loyalty and sincerity; a private life and a public career which we may proudly hold up for emulation and tribute by our children and generations to come who seek the ideal of the highest American citizenship.

He was loved because of his tender sympathy, his tolerant understanding, and his loyalty. He was respected for his fearless honesty and straight thinking. Whether one agreed or disagreed with his clear-cut and boldly expressed opinions, it is certain that people everywhere admired him for upholding his own convictions on the most controversial subjects, completely indifferent alike to criticism and to praise.

Mr. President, Senator ADAMS was always for the things that are good in life; for the things that have made America great; for the things that will continue to make our country better. His ambition was to make his people and his country better because he had lived. A more noble purpose can motivate no man.

Honor came to him from his State and Nation, but he disliked the accompanying pomp, and loved to mingle among unpretentious friends, where no man was better company, and his wit, humor, and sympathy made association with him a joy to all who knew him.

As an influential member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, he made heroic efforts for years to protect the solvency of the Nation, an act of a true liberal, because financial solvency will always be the foundation stone of any organized government. He knew that large and increasing debts for future generations to pay are ever to be avoided, except under the necessity of some great national emergency. That his efforts for economy were not more successful was no fault of his. Senator ADAMS knew from long experience that farsighted, long-enduring, true liberalism worthy of the name must be based upon farsighted, long-enduring, true conservatism in fiscal policies. As a Senator his concern always was to act in accordance with his conscientious convictions and his own good judgment. I know of no man of my association in public life who voted his convictions more completely, regardless of political effect.

He came from a very distinguished family of Colorado. Since Colorado was admitted to statehood in 1876, until the death of Senator ADAMS, one or another of his family held an important office either in State or National politics.

He labored so prodigiously and so earnestly in the public service, without rest or recreation, that he sacrified himself for his country.

I loved ALVA ADAMS, and my devotion to him was second only to my admiration for him as a patriotic and great American statesman. On his second entrance to the Senate of the United States, following an appointment to this body nearly 10 years previously, he and I took the oath of office on the same day. We became devoted and intimate friends. I soon formed for him a most profound respect and admiration for his many manly and fine qualities. He was easily in the very front rank of the most useful and influential Members of this Senate.

There is hardly a day I do not think of him and feel deeply the loss of his superb intellect and his high patriotism in these trying days that are testing our souls and the institutions of all democratic governments.

Mr. President, Samuel Butler once said that a man's work is always a picture of himself. If this be true, then in the long perspective of the work of ALVA BLANCHARD ADAMS you will observe an enlightened vision that enabled him to find the right way of service and an honesty and courage that kept him steadfastly on that path.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I think this occasion should not pass without note being made of the fact that one who was particularly close to the late Senator ADAMS and to the late Senator HARRISON, one who now graces the highest tribunal in the United States, the Supreme Court of the United States, Mr. Justice BYRNES, is present to show his interest in this obituary proceeding.

The Nation has lost a statesman of rare independence and unusual knowledge, integrity, and courage in the passing of ALVA B. ADAMS. I felt that I knew him intimately; I worked with him in committee on many Senate measures. He was ever a searcher for the whole truth, and, no matter what the question or who the witness before the committee was, Senator ADAMS upheld the prestige and dignity of the Senate as a coordinate branch of the Government.

Colorado has lost its ablest son, one of the most influential men in the Senate. The common, average, inarticulate man has lost a champion; the man who never writes a letter to a Senator, the taxpayer who never protests, has lost a real friend. But such a life as his is not lost. The example of Senator ADAMS remains an inspiration; we are all better Senators because we knew him.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I cannot permit this occasion to pass without paying a brief tribute to the noble qualities of mind and heart and the great patriotic services to his country of our beloved colleague whose recent sudden death so deeply saddened all Members of this body, Senator ALVA B. ADAMS, of Colorado.

Mr. President, ALVA ADAMS was an extraordinary man. He was extraordinary in the breadth and in the depth of his intellect; he was extraordinary in his capacity both to view great questions in their widest aspects and still on occasion to regard details with microscopic care; he was extraordinary for his tremendous industry, for his great capacity for friendship, for his unswerving courage, and his incorruptible honesty of intention.

Son of one of the most outstanding of that group of great liberal leaders who in the nineties and the first decade of this century made history in the Rocky Mountain region and in the Nation. Senator ADAMS was by birth and early association, by experience and inclination

and training, magnificently equipped to bear a most efficient part in a democratic form of government. He had served in the United States Senate for almost 2 years in the 1920's only to be caught in the Republican landslide of 1924. When he entered the Senate again in 1933 he was superbly equipped in every way to assume immediately a role of greatest efficiency and usefulness. He was an invaluable member of the great Committees on Appropriations and on Banking and Currency. He was a recognized authority in this body on all matters in charge of those committees, as, indeed, he was on every other matter upon which he turned the powers of his capacious and penetrating mind. He was one of the most influential and valuable figures of this body. His immense knowledge of facts, his utter fearlessness, his absolute integrity of purpose made him respected in debate as much as any man whom I have ever known in this body. In the words of Browning, he was—

One who never turned his back but marched breast forward,
Never doubted clouds would break,
Never dreamed, though right were worsted, wrong would triumph,
Held we fall to rise, are baffled to fight better, sleep to wake.

ALVA ADAMS was so deep, honest, and so sincere a person that he could not possibly be effusive. He abhorred ostentation, and had as little of the arts of the demagogue as any man who ever lived, but he had great capacity for friendship, and all who were associated with him soon came to have such respect for his candor and integrity as well as his directness and fearlessness that in this body, where friendships run very deep, no one had more respect and more friendship than he.

Members of the Senate had the utmost confidence in ALVA ADAMS. I think that one of the finest tributes that could be paid any Senator was that paid to Senator ADAMS by the wife of one of our colleagues the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. It was reported to me by my own wife. Mrs. O'Mahoney said that it was always a comfort to her at the beginning of a roll call to hear ALVA ADAMS, first on the list, answer, with his fresh, crisp voice, "yes" or "no."

She said that whether she happened to agree with or to sympathize with the side on which Senator ADAMS voted or whether she happened not to sympathize with that view, she knew that he would be punctually on hand, that he would never intentionally fail his vote, that he would have formed a definite conclusion on the subject, and that his vote would simply be an expression and reflection of his splendid mind and brave heart. It is hard for me to conceive of a finer tribute.

Mr. President, I was privileged to know ALVA ADAMS not only as a friend but to know something of his family relationships. Let me say that in all my life I have never known more of devotion than was evidenced in his family, more of paternal affection, and more of general love. His lovely wife has had calamity piled upon her since the calamity of Senator ADAMS' death. She has withstood all trials with fortitude worthy of her husband and to her and her family we extend the deepest sympathy and affection.

Mr. President, ALVA ADAMS literally worked himself to death. He knew that he had an ailing heart—not heart in the figurative sense of courage and determination, but the ordinary, physical muscle which sometimes does wear out.

He had been warned that he must not overwork; but his intense devotion to duty, his utter love of country compelled him to remain at the job where he thought he could most effectively render aid to his country in this emergency. He died as truly and as bravely in the service of his country as any soldier or sailor who has fallen or will fall in battle in the course of this war. In his death his country lost an invaluable and truly irreplaceable public servant.

Mr. President, shortly before the end of his remarkable public career, John Quincy Adams, in the course of recovering from an illness, expressed the hope that he might "die upon the breach." That hope was granted. John Quincy Adams was literally stricken from the floor of the House. As Senator Benton, of Missouri, said in his impressive eulogy of President Adams:

Punctual to every duty, death found him at the post of duty; and where else could it have found him for many years of his illustrious public life?

That summation of the great Missourian with regard to President Adams I can wholeheartedly apply to the career of ALVA ADAMS.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, Senator ALVA B. ADAMS, of Colorado, was endowed with the qualities of personality and statesmanship which have constituted the dauntless spirit of America in times of trial for the Republic and for her people. During all my association with him in the Senate, Congress was challenged by economic depression within the country, or the gravest problems affecting the common defense from external enemies. The attitude of Senator ADAMS toward all the dangers prevalent in those years of legislative storm and stress was one of sturdy independence, willing consecration of all his brilliant faculties, and devoted service for his country.

No Senator worked harder or more persistently than did he to preserve the soundness and stability of our fiscal structure while our Government ventured upon fiscal experiments directed toward reconstruction of business, commerce, and banking, and toward relief to suffering mankind. Yet he firmly adhered to fundamental principles of government and fought for frugality and thrift in governmental expenditures.

Senator ADAMS believed in a system of free economy, and denounced collectivism. He was vigilant in discovering and opposing such legislation as tended to impair the validity and vigor of constitutional safeguards of the people's treasure and of their rights.

His office and my own were on the same floor in the Senate Office Building, and frequently we were together when going to or from the Senate. An intimacy of thought and of great friendship illuminated our relationship. The fact that he was a Democrat and I a Republican was only a superficial factor in our consideration of the grave questions which engaged our private conversation.

I always felt benefited by his views, even when we differed, and I gained strength whenever I had the corroboration of his judgment.

I miss his genial fellowship and his stanch patriotism. To his bereaved family we give our heartfelt sympathy, and the sustaining belief expressed by Samuel Longfellow:

Embosomed in Thy dear love,
Held in Thy law, I stand;
Thy hand in all things I behold,
And all things in Thy hand.
Thou leadest me by unsought ways,
Thou turn'st my mourning into praise.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, in Colorado, ALVA ADAMS was universally admired and respected. He came to the Senate with votes from all parties. All of us knew that there was a man—a man of courage, a wise, honest, industrious, and patriotic man—a statesman in the truest sense.

The consciousness of this did not come upon us in Colorado with surprise; it did not grow upon us with the lengthening of the years of his service in the Senate. These qualities were taken for granted, for, as has been pointed out here today, he was the son of his father, and his father, Alva Adams, had been thrice Governor of Colorado, and his father's brother, William H. Adams, had been three times Governor of Colorado, and other men of the same name and same blood had always occupied, as they occupy today, places of highest distinction in the private life of that State. Thus from the time of the entrance of Senator ADAMS into public life, our people gave him the compliment and the awful responsibility of great expectations. These were never disappointed.

His adjustment with his outer life was sure; his inner life was in harmony; there were no warping compulsions to push, to elbow, to strut, to make offensive show of his virtues, to indulge a single snobbery or pretense. He could be and he was a plain, modest, quiet, unassuming man, unabashed and unbowed in the presence of the mightiest, and at home completely comfortable with the most humble of his constituents.

He reflected his own character in his tests of others. His associates in his office, who have been good enough to stay on with me, tell me that in measuring a man ALVA ADAMS would ask three questions—is he loyal; is he competent; is he honest?

His mental operations were notable for their fine sense of balance. While a tireless, eager student of books, he did not cloister himself from life—from the thoughts, activities, or interests of those around him. I am told by members of his staff that the problems of their daily lives were to him a matter of constant solicitude. A healthy inquisitiveness took his inquiries into wide ranges of human phenomena. I am told that he lightened the heavy load of his official responsibility and brought his most serious concerns into balanced perspective

with a quiet, quick wit and an ever-present sense of humor.

He did not allow the demands and harassments of office to isolate him from his family. Those who knew him intimately have stated that at night he would put aside the study material which he had taken home and would go out walking arm in arm with his wife—that doubly bereaved, brave, wonderful lady who had always inspired his life. On those walks, in silent understanding or in the mutually respected interchange of two splendid, free minds, the worries of the day were buried and refreshment and courage were gained for tomorrow's labors.

Senator ADAMS derived constant inspiration from a poem which he always carried with him, and which might well comprise his epitaph, entitled "The Bridge Builder," by Will Allen Dromgoole:

An old man going a lone highway
Came in the evening cold and gray
To a chasm vast and deep and wide,
Through which was flowing a sullen tide.
The old man crossed in the twilight dim,
The sullen stream had no fears for him,
But he stopped when safe on the other side
And built a bridge to span the tide.
"Old man," said a fellow pilgrim near,
"You are wasting your strength with building here;
Your journey will end with the ending day,
You never again will pass this way,
You've crossed the chasm deep and wide,
Why build you this bridge at evening tide?"
The builder lifted his old gray head,
"Good friend, in the path I have come," he said,
"There followeth after me today
A youth whose feet must pass this way.
This chasm which has been as naught to me
To that fair-haired youth might a pitfall be,
He, too, must cross in the twilight dim,
Good friend, I am building the bridge for him."

Mr. President, each man on this floor will recall the contributions of Senator ADAMS to the work of the Senate. It is reflected in a thousand betterments of our Nation. Where ships move through widened and deepened channels and safer harbors, where rivers have been tamed to carry commerce and to flow their courses without destructive anger, where great dams and turbines bring light out of darkness, and multiply the strength and lessen the labors of man, where precious waters are carried to arid regions to expand the fruitfulness of the earth, there is the spirit of ALVA ADAMS, for his was a giant's share in the labors here that brought those results into being.

Whenever a public official says "No," when selfish clamor cries "Yes," whenever a public official stands with lonely right against popular wrong, there is the spirit of ALVA ADAMS. There is Alva's bridge for spanning the tide, for crossing the chasm deep and wide.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I had not intended saying anything on this occasion, but as I have listened to these words of eloquence and praise, I feel I cannot let the moment pass by without saying at least one or two words, not in eulogy of ALVA ADAMS, for nothing I can say can add anything to the place which is his by reason of his character, his courage, his strength, and his service in this body, but simply because I happened to be a neighbor of his, living as I do in a State which adjoins his, and also having sat side by side with him here in the Senate for many months, I want to say that the word "neighbor" connotes and includes some but not all of the high respect, admiration, and affection in which I held ALVA ADAMS. I join in all the tributes which have been paid to him.

Mr. President, it is true that his State has lost a great representative in this body, a courageous public servant. It is true that the Senate of the United States and the country, the United States of America, have lost a great official; but, Mr. President, I have lost a friend.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON, OF TEXAS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S Res 256), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON, late a Senator from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased, the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate, at the conclusion of these exercises, shall stand adjourned.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the late Senator ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON, of Texas, was born at Independence, Tex., on June 21, 1854. Independence, Tex., was then a flourishing center of culture and education. Since the advent of the railroads it has fallen into decay. It was then the location of what has become the oldest educational institution of higher grade in the State of Texas, Baylor University, which is now located at Waco, Tex.

Senator HOUSTON was the son of Gen. Sam Houston. Gen. Sam Houston, as all Senators know, was a Member of Congress from the State of Tennessee, Governor of the State of Tennessee, and later the general in chief of the armies of the Texas revolutionary forces which on April 21, 1836, triumphed on the field of San Jacinto over the armies of Mexico, and achieved the independence of the Republic of Texas.

Gen. Sam Houston was the first President of the Republic of Texas. Later, upon the admission of Texas to the Union, he was one of the first two Senators from the State of Texas to the United States Senate. Later he served as Governor of Texas. When the secession movement swept over the South he was Governor of the State, and, not favoring secession, was ousted from his office, but remained firm in adherence to his views.

Sam Houston was one of the great historic characters, not alone of Texas, but of the United States. He was an intimate of Gen. Andrew Jackson, and popular rumor credits their intimate consideration of the movement headed by General Houston which eventuated in the independence of Texas. He was an intimate of Gen. Andrew Jackson, and so his son was named for Gen. Andrew Jackson.

Senator HOUSTON was appointed as Senator in this body to fill the unexpired term created by the death of our late distinguished and beloved colleague, Morris Sheppard. He was appointed by the present junior Senator [Mr. O'DANIEL], who was then Governor of the State of Texas. His appointment was made upon the 21st day of April 1941, the anniversary of the day upon which his father with his sword carved an enduring place out of the hard and unyielding granite of history.

Our late colleague, Senator HOUSTON, was a modest man. He was a man of unblemished reputation and character. His tastes were essentially along military lines. He attended old Bastrop Military Institute in our State, later Texas Military Institute at Austin, and finally was graduated from the West Point Military Academy.

During the reconstruction turbulence of 1874 in our State, Senator HOUSTON, who was then quite a young man, organized a military company known as the Austin Rifles, interested in maintaining the sovereignty and the integrity of our own State government. Later, in the War with Spain he recruited a company which he tendered to Col. Teddy Roosevelt in connection with his Rough Riders.

Later Senator HOUSTON served as clerk of the United States Court for the Northern District of Texas from 1879 to 1889. Later, he was appointed by President Theodore Roosevelt to be United States marshal for the southern district of Texas, in which position he served for a number of years.

Senator HOUSTON was not essentially a politician. On one occasion, he became a candidate of the Prohibition Party for Governor of Texas at a time when that party, of course, had no hope whatever of triumphing. He was a man of splendid ability. He was a member of the bar, and practiced for some years with a fair degree of success. He lived a life without ostentation or without boasting of his ancestry or his distinguished connection.

When he came to this body, of course, he was at an advanced age. Time had enfeebled his physical being, and, while his mentality was still keen, his physical infirmities made it impossible for him to lead the vigorous and turbulent life that is sometimes the part of a Senator on this floor. But he was honored, respected, and loved throughout our State, among all classes of our people.

While his tenure here was short, he discharged his duties with a degree of modesty and ability which attracted the admiration of all his colleagues.

Mr. President, I am glad to pay my tribute of respect and admiration for this kindly, this gentle man of unblemished reputation and character, in whose veins

flowed the blood of militant heroes, and who in the varied activities of a quiet civilian life undertook to discharge his duties with the same degree of fidelity that his distinguished ancestor displayed upon the field of battle.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, today we pay honor to the memory of the late Senator ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON. The occasion is of unusual significance because those of us who had the privilege and honor of actually rubbing shoulders in the flesh with this son of one of America's most outstanding, sturdy empire builders are able more easily to connect the problems of the present with those of the past in this rapidly changing world.

The lessons of the past loom large in our thinking as we face the problems of this new day. The contribution of the centuries to our present life and mode of living is a notable one, indeed. Too often, when we flash on the screen of our mind the picture of 150 years ago and then change it quickly to the picture of today, we are tempted to marvel at our present advanced state in contrast to the primitive simplicity of those days gone by, and to commend ourselves too highly for bringing about this stupendous change. In studying the intervening pages of history, however, we see that our growth has not been of a mushroom variety. We see that our progress has been step by step, and that the superstructure of American democracy which now towers so high has been built, stone upon stone, timber upon timber, through the ages, and that into the building of the structure of our present society has gone not only the genius of what we might want to term our own supertalent but also the intelligence, the strength, the courage of mind, body, and soul of great and noble men who are no more and whose departure we mourn. Contemplation on the contribution of great men of the past gives needed restraint to our own vanity, a heightened appreciation of the intellectual qualities and attributes of character of those great patriots who have gone before, and encouragement and inspiration in the thought that—

Lives of great men all remind us
We can make our lives sublime,
And, departing, leave behind us
Footprints on the sands of time.

The faith which we have was the "faith of our fathers" before us. The Commandments which they obeyed, and which we, too, should obey, are those which were engraved on stone on the summit of Sinai and spoken from the lips of the Nazarene in His Sermon on the Mount. Religion and democracy are twin hand-servants which are inseparable. Neglect one and the other suffers. Destroy one and the other perishes. God grant that we may cling to these eternal verities which come as our sacred heritage of the past; that, faced with the fury of storms which now beset us, we may chart our course by the compass that has been tried and found true by those who captained our ship on its early voyage:

Lord, God of Hosts, be with us yet,
Lest we forget—lest we forget.

One hundred and fifty years in this rapidly moving world seem to us like ages—yet almost that length of time was spanned by the late Senator ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON and his illustrious father. The Constitution of the United States of America was adopted by the convention in 1787, just 6 years prior to their time.

You, fathers of the land we love,
You are not far away;
You're only back along the road
A little piece today.

The man whose memory we revere today lived and breathed in this Chamber less than 1 year ago. Personally to know the late Senator ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON was to love and respect him. To know the heroic history of his immortal forebears and their pioneer background is forever to perpetuate that love and respect.

His father was the great pioneer whose strategy and efforts won one of the most decisive victories in the history of the world, a victory starting a chain of events which brought to the United States a third of its present area; a victory which laid the groundwork for a change in sovereignty over nearly a million square miles; and more important than all that, a victory which decided that our people should be free—free to work, free to worship, free to build in the added area a new promised land which would contribute to the happiness and well-being of mankind. That was one of the great achievements of Gen. Sam Houston and his valorous men—greatly outnumbered, low on rations, and with inadequate arms.

I could say more today of the leader of our forces at the Battle of San Jacinto. I could mention the methods by which he and his brave men won victory on San Jacinto's battlefield on April 21, 1836. I could recount the events of his earlier life which contributed to the military genius for which he was renowned—of his campaign with Andrew Jackson in the War of 1812 and the brilliance of his achievement then for the service of his country. Or we could examine the heritage which was his—the stanch record of his father, a soldier in the Revolutionary War; of earlier ancestors in Scotland who fought with John Knox for God and country. What a record was his as a statesman, a leader in the civil life of every community in which he dwelt! I know of no other character in our State or National life who served as Governor of two different States, as a Representative in Congress from two different States, as one of the first two United States Senators from his newly annexed State, and as President of an independent republic. Let us search for the reason for his phenomenal success, the cause of his courage, the guiding principles which led him to such great fame.

In an obscure document, penned by his hand on October 8, 1835, I think I have discovered that creed. It will be remembered that he was then commander of the department of Nacogdoches. His first act in that capacity was to issue a general order to the forces at his command. While it was in the form of a military order, it seems to me that that message, and particularly its conclusion, was an address to the people of Texas and America, an expression of the sentiments of heart of one of their number, a promise of freedom to come, a consecration to duty, a call for high courage from all men of good will who might follow after him. It was so striking and significant in its content, so sincere in its tone, that I know it must have brought a warm, fervent, and zealous response from those whom he had been chosen to lead. Before reading that order I point out that it was written 107 years ago; yet we may well marvel at its application to the present time. Here it is:

The morning of glory is dawning upon us. The work of liberty has begun. Our actions are to become a part of the history of mankind. Patriotic millions will sympathize in our struggles, while nations will admire our achievements. We must be united—subordinate to the laws and authorities which we avow, and freedom will not withhold the seal of her approbation. Rally around the standard of the Constitution, entrench your rights with noble resolution, and defend them with heroic manliness. Let your valor proclaim to the world that liberty is your birthright. We cannot be conquered by all the arts of anarchy and despotism combined. In heaven and valorous hearts we repose our confidence. Our only ambition is the attainment of national liberty, the freedom of religious opinion, and just laws. To acquire these blessings we solemnly pledge our person, our property, and our lives. Union and courage can achieve everything, while reason combined with intelligence can regulate all things necessary to human happiness.

Those words were penned 107 years ago, but oh, how true they ring today. Thank God for truth, which withstands the onslaught of time. Thank God for the sentiments of heart of free men, which do not change though faced with the dark forebodings of an uncertain future. May there be engraved just as deeply upon the tablets of our hearts today the heroic words of Gen. Sam Houston when he called upon the freedom-loving citizens in 1835 to pledge to this sacred cause "our person, our property, our lives," and let us share with him the noble thought that "in Heaven and valorous hearts we repose our confidence."

That philosophy, propounded by Gen. Sam Houston to his people was bred into his son, ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON. His was also a full and useful life of military skill, patriotic devotion, and honest service, and he died in the service of his country. Proud was I, as Governor of Texas, whose 170,000,000 fertile acres and unlimited natural resources were bequeathed to six and one-half million happy citizens by the great liberator, Gen. Sam Houston, to wend my way on April 21, 1941, to that quiet, retired, modest little home on the shore of Trinity Bay, where lived his son, ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON, and to tender him, on behalf of the grateful citizens of Texas the honor of an appointment to the Senate, to occupy the same seat occupied by his illustrious father almost a century ago. To whom could six and one-half million Texas citizens owe a greater

debt of gratitude than to the only living son of the liberator of Texas? How could that debt be better paid than by such an appointment? It meant that in the dull, dreary days as ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON neared the end of the trail, the shining rays of the great Lone Star would brighten his pathway so that he could better see to cross the great final chasm on the strong bridge built for him by one of the greatest bridge builders of this Nation, his heroic father.

An old man going a lone highway
Came in the evening cold and gray
T a chasm vast and deep and wide,
Through which was flowing a sullen tide.
The old man crossed in the twilight dim,
The sullen stream had no fears for him,
But he stopped when safe on the other side
And built a bridge to span the tide.

"Old man," said a fellow pilgrim near,
"You are wasting your strength with building here;
Your journey will end with the ending day,
You never again will pass this way,
You've crossed the chasm deep and wide,
Why build you this bridge at evening tide?"

The builder lifted his old gray head,
"Good friend, in the path I have come," he said,
"There followeth after me today
A youth whose feet must pass this way.
This chasm which has been as naught to me
To that fair-haired youth might a pitfall be,
He, too, must cross in the twilight dim,
Good friend, I am building the bridge for him."

Mr. President, Gen. Sam Houston was a bridge builder and a great empire builder. He blazed his way into the wilderness, and builded bridges of liberty, freedom, and democracy, which his children and their children and their children's children might use. His son, the late Senator ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON, was also a great bridge builder of liberty, freedom, and democracy. May we who lived and breathed and worked with him feel that Houston human touch. May we absorb some of that priceless gift. May we grasp that torch of liberty, freedom, and democracy from failing hands and carry it ever onward and upward. May we, through God, have wisdom and strength to build today the bridges of liberty, freedom, and democracy as strong and lasting as those built by Senator ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON, whose memory we honor today, and his family and all associated families of yesteryear who builded this great Nation—the United States of America. To that true, honest, old-fashioned democratic philosophy of our forefathers, let us here dedicate our persons, our property, and our very lives; and

On this day of remembrance
Let us full faith renew;
From our brave past take courage
And strength for the thing to do.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution submitted by the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

ALVA M. LUMPKIN, OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution, which I ask to have read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The legislative clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 257), as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ALVA M. LUMPKIN, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, the man to whose memory we are paying this tribute was here so short a time that very few had opportunity to know him as he really was.

In speaking of a friend who has passed away it is easy and natural to speak of his good points in his relations with his fellow man. There never was a man in my State who excelled ALVA LUMPKIN in genial relationship with those with whom he came in contact. He was practically a self-made man. He naturally took advantage of every opportunity to improve his position in life, and he succeeded wonderfully well.

He was a good lawyer. He obtained and kept the confidence of his legal colleagues and his clients. He was forthright, yet very agreeable. He maintained a position in his profession that was an honor to him and to his State. He rose to the responsible position of judge, which he filled with full satisfaction and honor to the bench. It was a distinct loss to the judiciary when he resigned his position to become United States Senator.

In all my long experience in the Senate I never had a more satisfactory and congenial colleague than ALVA LUMPKIN. Our association was perfect. Though we might differ, yet the difference was a difference of friends who understood each other. It is a great asset to a State to have a cordial relation exist between its Senators, who represent the entire State, and this was preeminently true of my relationship with ALVA LUMPKIN.

I think it of incalculable benefit to any State to have represent it two men who are thoroughly congenial. He and I could discuss matters pertaining to legislation with perfect freedom of expression, knowing that each thoroughly understood the other, and that both were doing their best to serve their State and Nation.

ALVA LUMPKIN thought for himself—a characteristic which, in my opinion, is the finest a real man can have. During his legal and judicial careers he had an opportunity to know the philosophy of our Government and to reach his own conclusions based upon that knowledge. He thought clearly and logically, regardless of the trend of events.

I knew his family, and my relation to them was as cordial as to Senator LUMPKIN. His death was a shock to me and to his other friends. He was in the very prime of life, and he ripened finely as the years went by.

I do not think any higher tribute can be paid to any man than the sincere tribute which I know I, as well as others, can pay Senator LUMPKIN—that he was loyal to himself, to his friends, and to his duty.

In the evening of my life I shall cherish my association with and memory of ALVA LUMPKIN.

I know that the other Members of the Senate had not the opportunity to know him as I knew him. It seemed as if fate opened the way for him to move onward and upward, as he did, as a man. He was subject to all the infirmities of mankind, but in the midst of it all he was a man. Death does not make any of us perfect; that is for us to achieve while we are alive.

In the words of Shakespeare, he dared—

* * * do all that may become a man;
Who dares do more is none.

I am sorry that Senator LUMPKIN did not live long enough after he became a Member of the Senate to enjoy here the respect and affection which were universally accorded him in the State of South Carolina. I never knew of his attempting to push himself forward. He forged ahead because of his sterling character and ability; the momentum of his manhood carried him onward.

Mr. President, if it were not so late, I should like to refer to the relations between this man and me, not in the positions he held of lawyer, judge, and Senator, but as two friends living their lives in South Carolina. I am proud to say that I was a friend of ALVA LUMPKIN, whose face comes before me now.

Mr. President, I have had a rather peculiar experience in this body. The number of Senators who have come from my State I can hardly enumerate, but, of all with whom I have served, for a short time or a long time, there never has been one whose friendship I more sincerely cherished or from which I derived greater benefit than that of ALVA LUMPKIN.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I rise to pay tribute to the memory of the late Senator ALVA MOORE LUMPKIN, who achieved distinction as a citizen, a lawyer, and a jurist. Endowed as he was with high qualities of mind and heart, he would undoubtedly have attained renown as a wise and able legislator, but this field of public activity was foreclosed by his untimely passing shortly after he became a Member of this body.

Senator LUMPKIN was outstanding as a citizen because of his sincere interest and active participation in the affairs of his community and because of his affection for and consideration of his fellow man. He gave unstintingly of his time and talents to civic organizations, and strove for the betterment of his city, county, and State. The progress of his community bears the imprint of his guiding hand. His broad and sympathetic understanding of human instincts enabled him to counsel wisely those who sought his aid, which he was ever ready to extend. He

was recognized as a poised and skillful advocate. His natural abilities, untiring devotion to his work, and sound judgment earned for him a wide and lucrative practice at the bar. He possessed unusual powers of perception and analysis, and the breadth and clarity of his vision was not beclouded by adherence to dogma or restrictive doctrines. Probably the two factors which contributed to his success more than any others were the unbounded confidence his clients had in his advice and the personable and persuasive manner in which he lucidly and eloquently represented their interests in court and at the counsel table.

Senator LUMPKIN was eminent as a jurist because of his deep understanding of the fundamental principles of jurisprudence and a thorough appreciation of the principles of natural justice. Combined with this knowledge was a sympathetic and tolerant attitude which enabled him to administer the law with an even hand and with mercy. He verily used his office as United States district judge for the eastern and western districts of South Carolina, which he relinquished to accept an interim appointment to the Senate, to serve the people and the State, and he served them well. He was ever mindful of the obligations and duties devolving upon him as a jurist, and he fulfilled them with great distinction. All persons desiring to be heard were given an attentive and sympathetic hearing, and a decision was rendered only after careful research and thought. He was highly respected and greatly admired by judges and lawyers alike, which admiration he returned in unselfish measure.

Senator LUMPKIN was born in Georgia of a family whose name is brilliantly identified with the social, political, and judicial history of that State. While in his early teens his family removed their residence to South Carolina, and in his adopted State his activities covered numerous fields of endeavor. During his comparatively short life he occupied many positions of honor and trust. He was a member of the South Carolina House of Representatives, and at other times he was an Assistant Attorney General and Acting Associate Justice of the Supreme Court of South Carolina. President Roosevelt appointed him a member of the Conciliation Commission for the promotion of good will between the United States and Uruguay.

His connection with fraternal organizations was extensive, and at one time he was supreme chancelor of one of the largest fraternal orders. Prior to his elevation to the bench he was chairman of the board of one of the large insurance companies in the Middle West. He participated actively in the affairs of the local and national bar associations and juridical societies, and was by these associations respected and honored because of his attainments. He was devoted to his family and was ever considerate of their happiness and welfare. He is survived by his wife, the former Mary Sumter Thomas, of Columbia; a daughter, Mrs. T. H. Pope; and a son, Alva M. Lumpkin, Jr.

The positions which were held by Senator LUMPKIN served to emphasize the high esteem in which he was regarded by his friends and associates, but do not wholly reveal the true essence of his character. He had an innate affection for people and an unexcelled capability of endearing people to him and holding them as his friends. His close and devoted friends were numbered in the hundreds, coming from all corners of this country and springing from all walks of life. He did not distinguish between personages in his demeanor or in his affection, and he gave of his amiable and gentle disposition to all his friends alike. He was a man of recognized generous, sympathetic, and understanding nature, and his graciousness and kindness to all with whom he came in contact will not soon be forgotten. Exquisite manners and a warm greeting were intimately associated with his habits of life. He took peculiar pleasure in affording happiness to others. His friends knew and loved him for his loyalty, sincerity, and kindliness.

We mourn the passing of an able lawyer, distinguished judge, and sincere friend.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the late Senator LUMPKIN was personally known to me for many years before he became a Member of the Senate. His tenure here was very short, and I thoroughly agree with the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] in the suggestion that he was of such a modest, unassuming character, and his tenure was so brief, that the Members of this body had really no opportunity to form a just estimate of his noble character, his fine personal qualities, and his high conception of public duty. I knew him as a personal friend for a good many years; I want to say that I entertained for him a very close and deep personal affection, and I was deeply grieved at his untimely passing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the resolution offered by the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

HAMILTON F. KEAN, OF NEW JERSEY

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I am very glad, indeed, to embrace this welcome and long-awaited opportunity to pay a tribute, however inadequate, to the revered and honored memory of my dear friend and former colleague, the late United States Senator from the State of New Jersey, Hamilton F. Kean, who, on December 27, 1941, in his eightieth year, passed over the Great Divide.

Senator Kean's service in the Senate of the United States, from March 4, 1929, to January 3, 1935, was one of unusual effectiveness and power. He was a real statesman. He was a true patriot; patriotism actuated his every action, and his conscience and judgment alone controlled his every vote in this august body, which he graced with dignity on the one hand and with democratic friendliness to all with whom he came in contact on the other.

His fatherly helpfulness and guidance to me when I became the junior Senator from our State in 1931 makes for a memory that will always remain one of my most dear and cherished possessions, and his example still guides me in the path he himself trod so conscientiously, for, in my heart and mind, as in the heart and mind of countless thousands of his friends in his native State, his memory is still fresh and his example compelling.

Mr. President, Senator Kean came from one of the oldest and most distinguished American families in the United States, as his membership in all the great and honored patriotic and colonial societies attests. His was a fitting background for the very able and enviable record of constructive statesmanship he left behind him as a member of the Finance, Interstate Commerce, Naval Affairs, and District of Columbia Committees of this body.

Senator Kean's great-grandfather, John Kean, had been a member of the Continental Congress from South Carolina and John Kean, his brother, also served in the Senate of the United States from 1899 to 1911, and in the years that followed his distinguished brother's able service in the Upper House of the Congress of the United States, Hamilton Kean labored faithfully and ably in the party to which he gave his allegiance. This service was so widespread and fraught with such unselfish devotion that it beggars appraisal, but, enough to say, that our party in the Garden State rewarded him each year for 20 years with membership on the county committee of his home county. He also served the Republican State Committee of New Jersey as State committeeman from Union County, and, finally he was rewarded for his many services and labors in the cause of good government by being chosen by the State of New Jersey as its representative on the national committee, where he made an outstanding record from 1919 to 1928.

The proud tradition of this distinguished family which the late Senator, my former colleague, did so much to further in his long and useful life, is being perpetuated and ably represented today in the person of the Senator's able and popular son, ROBERT WINTHROP KEAN, now serving with distinction his second term in the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States. Thus, the torch of an illustrious father has passed to the steady grip of a worthy son who is fast adding laurels to one of the most honored names in the history of the State of New Jersey.

Mr. President, words of themselves mean but little, yet they are all we have with which to express ourselves; so I close this faltering, but deeply sincere, tribute by merely adding that, while the wound inflicted on us all by Senator Kean's passing will heal, for God wills it so, yet the scar will ever remain, but his memory, enshrined in the hearts of all who knew him, will more and more become a priceless possession. This is certainly so in my own case.

ADJOURNMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In accordance with the provisions of the resolutions heretofore unanimously agreed to, the Senate will stand adjourned.

Thereupon the Senate (at 4 o'clock and 14 minutes p. m.) adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 26, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 25, 1942:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Ganson Purcell, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1947 (reappointment)

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named passed assistant dental surgeons to be dental surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the dates set opposite their names:

James F. Lewis, July 21, 1942.
Thomas L. Hagan, July 22, 1942.
Ray P. Breaux, July 21, 1942.

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the dates set opposite their names:

Chapman H. Binford, July 1, 1942.
John A. Trautman, July 1, 1942.
Joseph A. Bell, July 1, 1942.
Edward C. Rinck, July 1, 1942.
Gordon A. Abbott, July 1, 1942.
Sidney P. Cooper, July 1, 1942.
Waldemar C. Dreessen, July 1, 1942.
Noka B. Hon, July 1, 1942.
Otis L. Anderson, July 1, 1942.

The following-named assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the dates set opposite their names:

James J. Griffitts, June 23, 1942.
John B. Vander, June 23, 1942.
Albert L. Chapman, June 23, 1942.
George K. Massengill, July 1, 1942.
Michael B. Shimkin, July 1, 1942.
Lloyd S. Rolufs, July 1, 1942.
Lloyd R. Hershberger, July 1, 1942.
Daniel D. Chiles, July 1, 1942.
Dorland J. Davis, May 27, 1942.
Harlan E. Wilson, July 1, 1942.
Joseph C. Sturgell, July 1, 1942.
Robert A. Hingson, July 1, 1942.
Robert L. Griffith, June 1, 1942.
Kenneth W. Chapman, July 1, 1942.
Edward C. Jenkins, June 30, 1942.
James K Shafer, July 12, 1942.
Benno K. Milmore, July 1, 1942.
John D. Porterfield, June 30, 1942.
John T. Wright, August 1, 1942.
Benjamin Wolfman, July 17, 1942.
Allen B. Eschenbrenner, August 16, 1942.
Haskell B. Rosenblum, August 16, 1942.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Capt. Charles M. Cooke, Jr., to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 29th day of November 1941.

Capt. John W. Reeves, Jr., to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 2d day of May 1942.

MARINE CORPS

The following-named lieutenant colonels (temporary) to be lieutenant colonels in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942:

William W. Davies
Vernon E. Megee

The following-named majors (temporary) to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942:

Clovis C. Coffman
Alva B. Lasswell
William B. McKean

Capt. (temporary) William E. Boles to be a captain in the Marine Corps from the 8th day of July 1940.

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 31st day of March 1942:

Thomas M. Leineweber, a citizen of Oregon.
Charles J. Kimmel, a citizen of Ohio.
Daniel H. Davis, a citizen of Mississippi.
James B. Davis, Jr., a citizen of Mississippi.
John F. Gheen, a citizen of California.
John E. King, a citizen of Georgia.
Robert T. Gillespie, a citizen of California.
George Boot, Jr., a citizen of Michigan.
William W. Curtis, a citizen of Mississippi.
Robert W. Nelson, a citizen of Kansas.
James H. Naylor, a citizen of Massachusetts.
Willard A. Pate, a citizen of Connecticut.
Hugh J. Irish, a citizen of New York.
Raymond H. White, a citizen of Utah.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 25, 1942:

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

John P. McGee, Carrollton.
James T. Monnier, Demopolis.
Samuel J. Sanders, Fayette.
Robert G. Davis, Gordo.
Dezzie A. Littlejohn, Jemison.
Maurice F. Law, Linden.
William F. Beverly, Sweet Water.
Thomas O. Smith, Jr., Wilsonville.
Roy G. Carpenter, Winfield.
Ruby E. Page, Woodville.

ARKANSAS

John R. Harkness, Belleville.
William L. Walton, Black Oak.
Robert D. Reagan, Danville.
Shelby L. Jones, Emmet.
Walter R. Dunn, Foreman.
Halton B. Stewart, Greenwood.
Floy R. Parr, Jonesboro.
George O. Yingling, Searcy.
Elizabeth Horton, Washington.

MINNESOTA

Kenneth N. Hullett, Lakeville.

MISSISSIPPI

Margaret L. Henry, Anguilla.
Will N. Guyton, Blue Mountain.
Ivy G. Hill, Cleveland.
Harry L. Callicott, Coldwater.
James M. Thames, Decatur.
Allison P. Shoemaker, Jr., Edgewater Park.
John B. Vinson, Magee.
Johnnie L. Posey, Philadelphia.
Charles E. Crook, Vicksburg.

NEW JERSEY

Frances E. Schmidt, Emerson.
Martin Kenneth Collins, Marlboro.
Robert T. Lentz, National Park.
Willie E. Austin, Ocean Grove.
William Dudley Carleton, Ringwood.
Kathleen R. McCabe, West Trenton.
Walter W. Lance, White House Station.

NORTH DAKOTA

George B. Vermilya, Towner.

OREGON

Gardner T. Hockensmith, Albany.

VIRGINIA

R. Milton Crump, Chester.
Ira D. Newcomb, Clarksville.
Kenneth H. Woody, Crewe.
Burley M. Garner, Emporia.
James H. Ashby, Exmore.
Alfred C. Darden, Fort Monroe.
E. Keith Taylor, Hanover.
Margaret H. Hardy, McKenney.
Joseph W. Harvey, Montross.
Leslie N. Ligon, Pamplin.
John P. Mugler, Phoebus.
James V. Lewis, Prospect.
Joseph F. Judkins, Surry.
Jesse F. West, Jr., Waverly.
R. Tyler Bland, West Point.

WEST VIRGINIA

Warren H. Miller, Spencer.
Myrtle W. Orndorff, Wardensville.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MAY 25, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we praise Thee that Thou hast made us the heirs of Thy everlasting kingdom. Breathe upon us the prayer divinely taught: "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven." What a marvelous land Thou hast given us, so much to do, so many to share our blessings, so many failures to grieve us, and so many sins to make us ashamed. In loss and in pestilence Thou hast saved us a free people. Do Thou frown upon all our follies, deliver our people from the ways of thoughtless indifference, and throw the light of condemnation upon those who fail in this dire hour of our country's need.

Forbid that we should ever lay our tasks, with trembling fear, on the altar of faithless compromise. Hold back our country from all violations and disorders among ourselves, and from all factions which threaten our social order; may we never yield to the changes and chances of a doubtful life. Put to our lips the Holy Grail and from that blessed cup may we drink of the water of eternal life. Oh, happy is that people who have the light which no storm can extinguish and the peace which no darkness can dim. In the name and for the sake of Jesus, our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 21, 1942, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On April 7, 1942:

H. R. 2922. An act for the relief of Albert Edward Whiteside;

H. R. 4625. An act for the relief of Karl K. Wilkes;

H. R. 5500. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles L. Clark;

H. R. 5576. An act for the relief of A. L. Freeman; and

H. R. 6023. An act to provide for the payment for accumulative or accrued annual leave to certain employees of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia, who voluntarily enlist or otherwise enter the military or naval forces of the United States.

On April 20, 1942:

H. R. 5802. An act to amend certain provisions of law relative to the withdrawal of brandy for fortification of wines and production of wines, brandy, and fruit spirits so as to remove therefrom certain unnecessary restrictions.

On May 1, 1942:

H. R. 4180. An act for the relief of Edward Keating and others;

H. R. 4413. An act for the relief of Olive Z. Ressler; and

H. R. 5433. An act for the relief of the guardian of Charles Jirinec, an infant.

On May 14, 1942:

H. R. 3572. An act to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended by section 34 (c) of the Customs Administrative Act of 1938 (U. S. C., 1934 ed., Supp. IV, title 19, sec. 1001, par. 1529 (a));

H. R. 4402. An act to amend existing law to provide privilege of renewing expiring 5-year level-premium term policies for another 5-year period;

H. R. 5275. An act for the relief of Weslie A. Coulter, Sr.;

H. R. 5468. An act for the relief of J. Furman Richardson;

H. R. 6293. An act to establish a Women's Army Auxiliary Corps for service with the Army of the United States; and

H. R. 6913. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the seventy-sixth anniversary convention of the Grand Army of the Republic to be held at Indianapolis, Ind., September 13 to 18, inclusive, 1942.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6599. An act making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. WHITE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 6979) entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the Corps of Cadets at authorized strength," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. REYNOLDS, Mr. LEE, Mr. HILL, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1694) entitled "An act for the relief of Mrs. Claud Tuck," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of Commerce.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. Department of the Treasury.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the life of our distinguished colleague the Honorable Patrick Boland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SWEENEY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

[Mr. CAPOZZOLI addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a foreword by Dr. Kilpatrick to a recently published book.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COX addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

THE DISUNITY BUND

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the despicable smear stories recently directed at a Member or Members of another body of the Congress.

It now appears that a companion program along different lines is to be directed at the House of Representatives, attacking us either individually or seeking to sabotage the functions of Congress as an institution.

For example, I have it from an unimpeachable source that there is now in the mails what purports to be a poll to designate the 10 worst Members of Congress. It is apparently sponsored by the same group which recently set out to purge certain Members of Congress headed by MARTIN DIES, JOE STARNES of Alabama, GENE COX, and other Members who have actively opposed the operations of Communists in America.

The results of this so-called poll which were prejudged by its authors before the questionnaires were sent out is to be obtained through ballots which are being sent only to left-wing and pinkish correspondents, and which even go so far as to suggest the names which are to be designated.

The ballots are to be returned to No. 120 East Sixteenth Street, New York City, which appears to be the national headquarters of a new disunity bund in America for which the Union for Democratic Action is apparently serving as the Fuehrer in this drivel drive to disrupt, disorganize, and defeat American unity in this war effort.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a part of a radio speech delivered by me expressing my views on the St. Lawrence waterway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address I delivered at Weirton on I Am An American Day, May 17.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article published in the Evening Star on May 4, 1942, relating to Bonneville and Grand Coulee power development.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

PROPOSED NEW TAXES

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury Department has proposed new taxes which, in the main, are rightly based on ability to pay. I hope the House Ways and Means Committee will agree with most of their suggestions, and will vote for higher excess profits taxes rather than for a sales tax, which hits the poorest people the hardest.

With one Treasury proposal, however, I cannot agree. That is the suggestion that Federal taxes be levied on part of the income of churches, hospitals, and educational institutions, which are now exempt.

This country was colonized by people seeking freedom to worship God. One of Thomas Jefferson's greatest principles was the separation of church and State. The independence of the church has always been safeguarded by its exemption from taxation. The whole principle of Christianity, and the whole belief in a loving God, are challenged today. This is no time to weaken the independence of religious institutions.

The Treasury is trying to close loopholes in the tax laws. But this particular tax would close the out-patient departments of hospitals. It would cripple the endowed private and parochial schools, and keep the colleges from giving scholarships to poor but deserving students. Above all, it would hinder the vital work of the churches. I hope and urge, therefore, that the proposal for such a tax be rejected.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in connection with the submarine menace and the sinking of the tankers, and further to extend my own remarks in connection with the rubber and gasoline shortage as it affects the farmer and the small businessman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, first to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution adopted by the Legislative Council of the State of Kansas; second, to extend my own remarks and include therein a short editorial from the Fort Scott Tribune; and third, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Long Beach Independent, entitled "A Forgotten People."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL UNITY

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the organized efforts to smear those who, before the treacherous attack on Pearl Harbor, tried to keep this country out of war are not conducive to national unity. Whether we wanted to intervene or not in this war is no longer an issue. We are in the war now and all of us must fight, work, and sacrifice for victory and a lasting peace. Our freedoms and our national existence are at stake. Every loyal American is willing to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to bring this war to a successful conclusion as soon as possible. When Communist-front organizations, such as the Union for Democratic Action, collaborate with the New Republic as evidenced by its recent issue, attempt to purge Members of Congress, it is indeed time we learned their real reasons and their ultimate objectives.

Ostensibly these 16 Republicans and 10 Democrats of the House, of whom I am one, are to be purged because they wanted to keep this country out of war or because they voted to cut down unnecessary nondefense expenditures or because they supported the Smith labor bill and the Dies committee.

Their real reason for the attempted purge is to eliminate those members of Congress who have been actively combating the subversive influence of communism in this country. Their ultimate objective is to gain control of organized labor, industry, and finally the Government itself. Let us be united against our enemies at home as well as those abroad.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include excerpts from a survey of forestry resources in Starke County, Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BEITER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include an article in each extension, and also to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

WOOD PIPE LINES FOR THE NORTHWEST

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the threatened shortage of petroleum products in the Pacific Northwest, particularly Oregon and Washington, is a matter of grave concern. The oils heretofore have been provided largely from the California oil fields and by ocean tanker service. The critical situation existing in tanker transportation, due to submarine sinkings as well as the need for tankers elsewhere, has resulted in a critical shortage in this area.

It is only a few hundred miles from this territory to the California oil fields. A pipe line, of course, would be a solution. However, when pipe lines are suggested, we think at once of steel and the shortage that exists in that necessary strategic material. Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, has recently said that we cannot have pipe lines if we are to have ships and tanks in combat service. We in the Northwest have had experience for many years in wood pipe lines for irrigation purposes as well as supplying water for municipal uses. These pipe lines have not only been practical and serviceable but durable and of moderate expense. Engineers with long experience in this type of construction are of the opinion that wood pipe lines may be used successfully in the transportation of petroleum products. Unlimited supplies of forestry products are available in the Northwest for utilization in the construction of such pipe lines for the transportation of oil.

I urge upon those who are giving this matter consideration the utilization of wood for pipe-line service in the Northwest territory. A pipe line of wood could be constructed in a comparatively short time without interfering with the war program, and would, on the other hand not only supply oils for heating purposes in this area but would provide fuel for industrial enterprises and thus keep the wheels of industry producing war material turning at full speed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, on May 20 I was given permission for an insertion in the RECORD. The Public Printer advises me that it exceeds the allowable space by one-third of a page, at a total cost of $105. I now renew the request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain excerpts having to do with rationing of tires and gasoline.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALBOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file for printing in the RECORD at this point, the report of the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy, consisting of Members of the Senate and the House. The meeting was held on May 2, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

CONGRESSIONAL BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY, 1942.

The PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

GENTLEMEN: Pursuant to the act of July 15, 1939 (Public, No. 183, 76th Cong., 1st sess.), the following Senators and Members of the House of Representatives were designated in January this year to constitute the 1942 board of visitors to the Coast Guard Academy:

Senators: Hon. LISTER HILL, of Alabama, and Hon. HAROLD H. BURTON, of Ohio, appointed by Hon. JOSIAH W. BAILEY, of North

Carolina, chairman of the Committee on Commerce, United States Senate, and ex officio member of the board of visitors. Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN, of Michigan, appointed by the President of the Senate. The Honorable DAVID I. WALSH, of Massachusetts and the Honorable JOSH LEE, of Oklahoma, were later appointed to serve in place of the Honorable JOSIAH W. BAILEY and the Honorable LISTER HILL, respectively.

Members of the House of Representatives: Hon. FRANK W. BOYKIN, of Alabama; Hon. JAMES C. OLIVER, of Maine, and Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON, of Florida, all appointed by Hon. SCHUYLER O. BLAND, of Virginia, chairman of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries and ex officio member of the board of visitors. Hon. JOHN TABER, of New York, and Hon. CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, of Virginia, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Later substitutions were made in the membership with the Honorable HENRY M. JACKSON, of Washington, and the Honorable JED JOHNSON, of Oklahoma, in place of the Honorable FRANK W. BOYKIN and the Honorable CLIFTON A. WOODRUM, respectively, who were unable to attend.

Provision was made for the board to leave Washington on the Colonial at 10 a. m., May 1. Senators BURTON, BROWN, and Representatives BLAND, JOHNSON, PETERSON, and JACKSON departed on the above train and were joined in New York by Representative TABER. Upon arrival in New London at 5 p. m. the party was met by Capt. James Pine, superintendent of the academy, accompanied by other Coast Guard officers. Representative OLIVER was already in New London awaiting the arrival of the other members of the board. The board then proceeded to the academy where at 7:30 a ceremonial evening parade of the cadet battalion was witnessed. At 8 p. m. the superintendent entertained the board at dinner at the Mohican Hotel, which was attended by a number of senior Coast Guard officers attached to the academy and other units at New London. Following the dinner the new color film depicting academy cadet life was shown.

The next morning, May 2, Senator DAVID I. WALSH arrived at 6 a. m. and joined the other members for the formal meeting of the Board at 9:30 a. m. at the academy. Following the custom of choosing a chairman on alternate years from the House and Senate Members, Senator WALSH was elected chairman for the Board of Visitors, 1942. Capt. Ellis Reed-Hill, United States Coast Guard, was again designated as secretary of the Board and so served. The Board invited Capt. James Pine, superintendent of the academy, to appear before it. At the same time the members present of the advisory committee of the Coast Guard Academy, namely, Dean H. E. Clifford, Harvard University; Prof. G. E. Russell, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; and Judge T. W. Swan, United States Circuit Court of Appeals, were requested to be present during the meeting of the Board. The gentlemen of the advisory committee who attended formed a quorum of that committee. Prof. H. L. Seward, of Yale University, chairman of the advisory committee, was unable to attend on account of being a member of the Secretary of the Navy's board on the *Normandie*, then meeting. Dean J. W. Barker, of Columbia, was unable to leave Washington, where he is serving as a Special Assistant to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

Captain Pine was asked if he had any special recommendations to make for improving the facilities of the academy, to which he replied that since all previous recommendations of the Board of Visitors had been complied with, with the exception of a new chapel, he had nothing further to suggest at this time. He suggested that at a convenient time the Board allow Capt. W. J. Moore, Chaplain Corps, United States Navy, to appear before it in the interest of a chapel, the construction of which, however, Captain Pine did not immediately recommend on account of the importance of matters more directly connected with war effort.

The Board discussed with Captain Pine the status of the crew of the *Danmark*, the Danish training ship taken over by the Coast Guard for use at the academy, which followed a recommendation made by the Board of Visitors of the previous year. The Board was assured by Captain Pine of the loyalty of the Danish officers and crew of this ship, which are now efficiently serving the Coast Guard in training its cadets.

The Board then questioned Captain Pine regarding the recreational facilities of the academy and asked him to state the program for a cadet's day. Captain Pine explained in detail the routine life of a cadet and explained the amount of recreational time given to outdoor exercise and the program for liberty, which the Board considered as liberal as could be extended to a cadet body. The superintendent explained to the Board the present crowded condition for the housing of cadets and that this condition is being improved by recent construction.

The Board invited Professor Russell, who spoke for the members of the Advisory Committee present, to outline for it the history of his Committee and the part it had played during the last 9 or 10 years in the development of the Coast Guard Academy. He mentioned that the Committee had originally been formed as a voluntary body following letters addressed to the presidents of Harvard, Yale, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Columbia to designate a member of their faculty to serve on a voluntary basis without any remuneration. He further described how this Committee had functioned in an unofficial capacity until the act approved April 16, 1937, recognized the Advisory Committee as an official body. He stated that the original membership had continued to date, with the addition of Judge T. W. Swan, who became its fifth member, to assist in matters connected with law—a subject which is so important to the training of a Coast Guard officer. In the work of the Advisory Committee he outlined how it planned the original curriculum for a well-balanced 4-year course, and that its efforts had been so successful that the Association of American Universities had recognized the Coast Guard Academy, resulting in the authorization of the academy to grant bachelor of science degrees. He also spoke of the very high rating now afforded the academy by the Engineering Counsel for Professional Development, an association inspecting educational institutions where engineering is taught.

In reply to a direct question by the Board as to the cooperation between the administration of the Coast Guard and the Advisory Committee, he replied that the cooperation had been satisfactory to the nth degree, both with the academy and with headquarters.

The Board asked Professor Russell his opinion about increasing the course of study at the academy to 5 years, following the termination of the present war. To this Professor Russell replied that the Massachusetts Institute of Technology believed 4 years too short, and that on account of the time necessary for fundamentals an institution granting professional degrees, such as Massachusetts Institute of Technology, recommends at least 5 years, and that for the Coast Guard Academy he believed 5 years an excellent idea, which should be referred to the full Advisory Committee for consideration.

The Board then requested the presence of Cadet Robert J. Clark, battalion commander, and interviewed this cadet in regard to student discipline.

Chaplain Moore appeared before the Board and showed the Board sketches he had had prepared for the new chapel which he believed so vitally important.

The Board then requested the presence of Prof. C. E. Dimick, senior member of the permanent instruction staff of the Coast Guard Academy. Professor Dimick explained to the Board that he had been at the Academy as instructor and professor of mathematics for about 36 years and that the academic board consisted of seven members—superintendent, executive officer, commandant of cadets, himself, and other members designated by the superintendent; that the Board met at least once each month and that it considered matters in connection with discipline, failures, aptitude, and other subjects connected with the cadet and his relationship with the academy. The Board was particularly interested in gaining from him information in connection with procedure in the classroom and his opinion as to the balance between various subjects being taught.

The Board then requested the presence of the commandant of cadets and Lt. Comdr. Walter W. Richards appeared before the Board and outlined his duties as commandant which consist primarily in being the officer charged with the discipline of all cadets. He explained the system of estimating aptitude and the comparatively small loss of cadets on account of inaptitude. Also he discussed the subject of myopia which is always the source of loss of cadet material prior to the graduation. He assured the Board that in the administration of discipline in the cadet corps that the cadet officers in the battalion organization played an important part.

Commander McElligott, the executive officer, was then interviewed by the Board and outlined his duties as well as those of all personnel which were given in an operation chart that he submitted.

The Board continued in session until time to leave for the afternoon train to New York, departing New London at 2:22 p. m., except for adjournments to view the cadet parade and for lunch when members sat with cadets from their home States.

The Board finds the academy to be well administered; to be in excellent physical condition; to be an institution of high scholastic attainments; to have a cadet corps whose esprit and discipline are of the highest order and which is composed of a group of young Americans drawn from every part of the country by a competitive examination open to all. The Board is particularly impressed by the outstanding work being done by this institution while undergoing great emergent expansion, including the training of 900 cadets yearly for reserve commissions, and without appreciable increase of officer personnel.

Based on its observations, inspections, and the testimony adduced from officers and cadets, and after careful discussion and consideration, the Board makes the following recommendations:

That the officer while serving as Superintendent at the Coast Guard Academy hold the rank of rear admiral; that any practicable provision of emergency legislation to be used at this time to accomplish this; and that legislation be introduced to provide rear admiral rank for the incumbent as a permanent provision of law.

That the cadet mess hall be enlarged.

That a suitable and appropriate chapel be constructed as soon as conditions warrant.

That the chairman of the Board be authorized to appoint committees during the year to consider such matter in connection with the academy as becomes necessary.

That the administration of the academy take such steps as are practicable to increase the responsibility of the cadet officers and battalion organization in administering discipline within the Cadet Corps.

That as conditions warrant a higher percentage of officer personnel be assigned to the

academy, particularly regular officers in the tactical department.

That whereas the Board, in conclusion, desires to register its high opinion of the excellent and invaluable contribution made by the advisory committee in its relationship with the academy, and that in recognition of the personal sacrifices being made by its members, the members of the advisory committee be paid a per diem of $25 for such days as they serve. The advisory committee, its personnel, and contributions to the academy, made a marked impression on the Board of Visitors.

Respectfully submitted.

DAVID I. WALSH.
PRENTISS M. BROWN.
HAROLD H. BURTON.
JOHN TABER.
JED JOHNSON.
J. HARDIN PETERSON.
S. O. BLAND.
JAMES C. OLIVER.
HENRY M. JACKSON.

ELLIS REED HILL,
Secretary.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include therein a statement by Dr. George W. Sutherland, of Newport, Wash., a veteran of the Indian wars on the Pacific coast.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial about the late Morris Gest, by the Honorable William Randolph Hearst, which appeared in the issues of the New York Journal-American and the Washington Times-Herald of Thursday, May 21, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after the conclusion of the legislative business and other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by the inclusion of a news article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TREASURY LEECHES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I do this to call to the attention of the House the Treasury Statement to show that we are $16,728,000,000 in the red according to the statement as of May 21, 1942, as shown by that red sheet which has been issued for the last 10 years. I call attention also to the fact that too many people who are in cahoots with the administration are getting too much money, and the only way to keep this statement from getting red is to stop their activities. I call attention particularly to this news article which I have asked permission to insert in the RECORD, in respect to Puerto Rican civilian defense, where that island has obtained $1,009,000, when 18 important States get only $816,000. The fact is that Rexford Tugwell is extracting great sums from the Treasury of the United States, getting all of the money for those islands that he can, when it is not necessary. We have got to stop this leech activity.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after completion of the legislative program and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, and in one to include a letter and in the other a brief statement of the experience of a young Norwegian in respect to the German occupation of Norway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an Associated Press report showing that the farmers of South Dakota are working 80 hours a week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement relative to Senate bill 2025, respecting the adjustment of pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, and so forth.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION
(H. DOC. NO. 734)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

In my Budget message to the Congress in January of this year, I estimated tentatively that $465,000,000 would be required during the ensuing fiscal year for continuing the work-relief program by the Work Projects Administration, and indicated that a specific recommendation would be submitted later in the year.

The Work Projects Administration and its predecessor organizations were created to meet a temporary relief and employment need for millions of persons out of work during the depression years. The program has been successful. It has provided thousands of useful public projects, and it has permitted millions of persons to maintain their self-respect through gainful employment. More recently, the Work Projects Administration has contributed greatly to the defense and war efforts through participation in the construction of airports, access roads, sewer and water facilities, and other useful public works.

Since my January message, funds appropriated or recommended for the conduct of the war have tremendously increased. Shortages of labor and material are rapidly developing. To meet labor shortages the recruitment of workers from every available source will be required, and possibly even organized migration in some instances. However, it is estimated that at present there are still some 3,000,000 unemployed. Of these, many will be hired during the coming year; yet in a labor force exceeding 60,000,000 persons there will remain a substantial number of individuals who will not be hired by private employers because of age, lack of skill, or other handicaps. A certain number may not be able to migrate from regions having surplus labor to regions where workers are needed. In this connection, I cannot emphasize too strongly the need for industry to abandon prevailing practices of discrimination, racial and otherwise, in recruiting labor for war production.

The program of the Work Projects Administration for the next fiscal year must, in a large measure, be held to one of work relief for employable persons who, by reason of circumstances, cannot obtain employment either in war activities or in other work. It is urgent that our labor reserves be fully utilized, and that productive labor now on the rolls of the Work Projects Administration be engaged in other productive employment.

Provision has been made by direct appropriation to other Federal agencies for the construction of access roads, streets, and airports, and public works have been authorized for localities whose needs have been materially expanded by the defense and war efforts. The types of projects to be undertaken in the relief program in 1943 will be those which can be prosecuted by day labor of the residual unemployed available on the Work Projects Administration rolls and which require a minimum of critical materials.

In the circumstances, a reduction of work relief is now possible without causing undue hardship, and I recommend an appropriation of $280,000,000 to the Work Projects Administration of the Federal Works Agency for the fiscal year 1943. This amount, together with an estimated balance of $57,000,000 of the 1942 relief appropriation, will permit an average monthly employment of about 400,000, including administrative expenses of the Work Projects Administration. I recommend additional appropriations of $2,767,000 to provide for the administrative expenses of the General Accounting Office and units of the Treasury Department for services in connection with the relief program, making a

grand total of $282,767,000 for the fiscal year 1943.

For the period beyond the fiscal year 1943, the provision of work and other forms of aid for those who cannot be absorbed in private employment must be considered as an integral part of comprehensive measures for social security and public assistance. I am now giving attention to proposals for revising and extending the Social Security Act, and expect to make recommendations to the Congress for such legislation as may be necessary to extend the protection of our social-security measures to provide alternative means of meeting the needs presented by the residual group now being aided by the Work Projects Administration. The action to be taken by the Congress in the near future on such proposals will determine the extent to which we can move toward the further reduction or the possible elimination of the Work Projects Administration.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 25, 1942.*

INCREASE OF CADETS AT UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I present for printing under the rule a conference report and statement upon the bill (H. R. 6979) to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength.

WELFARE OF ENLISTED PERSONNEL, UNITED STATES ARMY

Mr. MAY. Also, Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report and statement for printing, under the rule, on the bill (H. R. 4476) providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES, PERSONNEL OF ARMY, NAVY, ETC.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I also present a conference report and statement upon the bill S. 2025, to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, for printing under the rule.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MASON was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio speech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER. This is District of Columbia day. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

LICENSE TO PRACTICE CHIROPRACTIC TO DR. WESLEY K. HARRIS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6297) to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Dr. Wesley K. Harris, and I ask unanimous consent that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I have the attention of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs? I see he has left the Chamber. I just want to serve notice on the House now that I am going to insist on my amendment to raise the base pay of enlisted men to $50 a month, and that I expect to move to recommit it with instruction to further insist on this amendment. I will never give up this fight until the Senate votes this amendment down by a roll call. And even if that is done I shall attach this same provision to the next measure that comes up to which it would be germane.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding any limitation relating to the time within which an application for a license must be filed, the Commission on Licensure to Practice the Healing Art in the District of Columbia be, and it is hereby, authorized and directed to issue a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Wesley K. Harris in accordance with the provisions of the act of Congress entitled "An act to regulate the practice of the healing art to protect the public health in the District of Columbia," approved February 27, 1929, and on condition that the said Wesley K. Harris shall be found by said Commission to be otherwise qualified to practice under the provisions of said act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this measure is to provide for the issuance of a license for the practice af chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Dr. Wesley K. Harris.

This measure comes before the District Committee through a bill introduced by our colleague the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]. Upon investigation of the subject, we found that the Commission on Licensure advises that Dr. Harris practiced the healing arts in the District of Columbia prior to the passage of the Healing Arts Act, in 1929, and had he been in the city at the time the act went into effect, he would have been eligible for a license. However, he was absent from the city, and he did not make formal application. The Commission advises that the standards maintained by Dr. Harris are such that no objection is raised by them to the passage of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

UNITED PHILIPPINE WAR VETERANS

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6961) to incorporate the United Philippine War Veterans as a body corporate in the District of Columbia, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That N. E. Goodridge, James Dennehey, Luther O. Folson, Philip J. Bernier, of Maine; Arthur G. Hayes, William Lake, of New Hampshire; Michael E. Gallagher, Milo H. Scribner, of Vermont; Francis Connolly, Harry J. Howard, of Massachusetts; Col. Jarius A. Moore, Edmund W. Cordes, George E. Frost, of Connecticut; Edward J. Gailes, Edward C. Mitchell, of New York; Thomas W. Petitt, John H. Westerhoff, of New Jersey; Melvin W. Hill, James R. Marion, Fred E. Wertman, of Pennsylvania; Victor Ohman, of Delaware; Dr. Henry A. McMains, Dudley Ockendon, Joseph E. Watts, of Maryland; Frank R. Carroll, of Ohio; James Devitt, George Hunt, of Indiana; Roy L. Davis, Benjamin R. Hall, Edwin Harrell, Lester P. Hanchett, Henry W. Manire, of Illinois; Henry L. Hines, of Michigan; Fred M. Mitchell, Arthur S. Wright, Dr. Rod S. Williams, of Wisconsin; William J. Baker, of North Carolina; Capt. Oscar Bishop, Maj. Arch C. York, of Kentucky; Charles F. Coss, Ralston P. Holcomb, John H. Lee, of Tennessee; James A. Fowler, Louis Miller, Samuel Williams, of South Carolina; Maj. Elmer Kemp, of Georgia; Elling O. Ellingson, George W. Hansford, Robert S. Rankin, Arthur B. Parker, of Florida; Frank M. Carter, Alexander E. Humphrey, Joseph Humphrey, Joseph W. Thompson, of Alabama; Cleo A. Hunt, Robert Haddox, Thomas Jamar, Benjamin P. Selvidge, of Louisiana; William A. Robertson, of Arkansas; Leslie W. Mallonee, Albert R. Miles, of Oklahoma; William R. Duke, Harvey E. Poteet, of Texas; James Darcy, Morris Siskin, Cecil M. Nichols, Thorvald M. Thomson, Ernest Stechel, Charles V. Stevens, Herbert E. Birch, Clarence J. Zane, of Minnesota; John M. Bleibaum, of North Dakota; Capt. Palmer D. Sheldon, Chester K. Snyder, of South Dakota; Wilson Hinkley, of Iowa; Oscar E. Sincebaugh, of Nebraska; Claude Bard, of Kansas; Dolph Lyon, Charles M. Cantrell, Peter J. Schindler, of Missouri; Henry A. Gibson, James W. Treece, of Wyoming; Fred G. Cupp, Capt. John K. Wiggins, of Washington; William J. Clark, Albert E. Edwards, of Oregon; Ernest E. Hanks, Dr. Claude E. Hilton, Arthur F. Ford, of New Mexico; Paul H. Bryant, Henry C. Granger, Alfred Ekstrand, Robert McDowell, Charles F. Knowlton, of Utah; James B. Mathiason, of Arizona; Nels T. Syveru, of Nevada; Walter Benn, William J. Betzold, James H. Black, James F. Boyd, Fred H. Hansen, Henry H. Hendrickson, Harvey K. Howard, Alfred Jagger, Otis N. Johnson, Edward M. Keeney, Frank S. Lawrance, Maj. Thomas W. Long, James E. Newbauer, David D. Olds, Peter E. Rauscher, Frederick A. Sims, Edward E. Ward, Marvin E. Hodges, of California; John Bowe, Wyatt Cline, of District of Columbia, together with all members of the United Philippine War Veterans, and their successors, who are, or who may in the future become, members of the United Philippine War Veterans, a national organization of men composed of soldiers, sailors, and marines, who have served honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States of America, during the period from May 1, 1898, to December 31, 1913, or since December 7, 1941, in wars, campaigns, expeditions, or insurrections, in the Philippine Islands, or in waters adjacent thereto, and such soldiers, sailors, and marines, who may serve in any subsequent wars, campaigns, expeditions, or insurrections, in said territory, or in connection with said wars, campaigns, expeditions, or insurrections, are hereby created and declared a body corporate of the District of Columbia by the name of the United Philip-

pine War Veterans (hereinafter referred to as the "corporation").

SEC. 2. The objects and purposes of the corporation shall be—

(a) Fraternal, patriotic, historical, to perpetuate the name of the United Philippine War Veterans, the organization as now or hereafter maintained and continued and to thus provide and continue an agency and instrumentality created to unite the fraternal bonds those men who served with honor in the Philippine Archipelago from May 1, 1898, to December 31, 1913; or since December 7, 1941, during any wars, campaigns, expeditions, and insurrections, or in Philippine waters, or in connection with said wars, campaigns, expeditions, or insurrections.

(b) To perpetuate the memory of those who participated in the above-mentioned wars, campaigns, expeditions, or insurrections.

(c) To honor the memory and preserve from neglect and oblivion the graves of the departed defenders of our Nation in these far-off lands.

(d) To uphold the Constitution of the United States of America, and all the noble principles for which it stands, and dedicate ourselves to the greatest service to our community, our State, and our great Nation. To advocate a loyal obedience to its laws; an unbounded fidelity to its Constitution and sow the seeds of true patriotism and bolster the institutions of American freedom, and defend with our lives the United States of America from all her enemies, either foreign or domestic.

SEC. 3. This organization shall include all persons who served honorably in the military or naval forces of the United States of America from May 1, 1898, to December 31, 1913, and/or since December 7, 1941, in wars, campaigns, expeditions, or insurrections in the Philippine Islands, or in Philippine waters adjacent thereto.

SEC. 4. (a) The corporation shall not engage in political activity, and shall have no power to issue capital stock or engage in business for pecuniary profit or gain.

(b) The persons named in section 1 are hereby authorized to complete the organization by the selection of officers, the adoption of a constitution and bylaws, and doing of such other acts as may be necessary for such purposes.

SEC. 5. The corporation shall have perpetual succession and shall have the following powers: To sue and be sued in courts of law and equity; to acquire, receive, hold, own, use, and dispose of such real estate and personal property as shall be necessary for its corporate purposes; to adopt a corporate seal and alter the same at pleasure, and administer a constitution, not inconsistent with the laws of the United States, or of any State; to perpetuate and to have exclusive right to the emblems and badges, uniforms, and caps of the organization; to establish departments, outposts, councils, both national and local, or departmental, and their subdivisions of the organization; to establish a woman's auxiliary, national, departmental, and local. However, such auxiliaries shall be subordinate to the parent organization, and may be disbanded by a vote at any national convention for acts detrimental to the welfare of the organization as a whole; appoint committees, national, departmental, and local; to adopt and have the exclusive right to manufacture and use such emblems and badges as may be deemed necessary to fulfill the purposes of the corporation; to establish and maintain offices for the conduct of its business; to establish, regulate, or discontinue local outposts, auxiliary chapters, or departments; to publish a magazine, paper, or other publications; to issue general orders, bulletins, circulars, or announcements; and generally do any and all things necessary and proper in carrying into effect the objects and purposes of this corporation.

SEC. 6. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act, or any part thereof, is expressly reserved.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 3, line 22, after "1913" insert "and from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918."

Page 4, line 17, after "1913" insert "and from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918."

Page 5, line 16, after "1913" insert "and from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this measure came before the District Committee, introduced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALE]. The measure would provide for the granting of a Federal charter to the United Philippine War Veterans.

We looked into the matter very carefully and found after presentation of the subject matter by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. GALE] that this organization is a nonprofit organization and its only objectives are fraternal, patriotic, and historical. In other words, its purpose is to perpetuate the name and organization of the United Philippine War Veterans, and unite in closer bonds of comradeship those who have served with honor in the Philippines.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONDUIT ROAD-MACARTHUR BOULEVARD

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 6986) to amend the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That the highway now known as Conduit Road, extending from Foxhall Road in the District of Columbia to Great Falls in the State of Maryland shall hereafter be designated MacArthur Boulevard in honor of the gallant defense of the Philippines by Gen. Douglas MacArthur."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I think an explanation is due the membership of the House as to the reason for a second bill coming from the District of Columbia Committee to rename Conduit Road as MacArthur Boulevard. Conduit Road, as you know, lies not only in the District of Columbia, but extends beyond the District line into Maryland. It is Federal property. The gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON] brought this measure to us, which would amend the present act changing the name of Conduit Road to MacArthur Boulevard. That is, the portion of the road extending from the District line to Great Falls, Md. We believe that the continued designation of this road, which is Federal property and upon which the Congress must pass, is appropriate at this time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Would that conform to the laws of the State of Maryland? Even though it might be Government-owned property, it would be in the State of Maryland. Would we have a right here to make the change? Would it not be necessary also to have the State of Maryland do likewise?

Mr. RANDOLPH. The State of Maryland was approached on this matter by the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. BYRON]. It was found that they had no objection to the District acting in this matter because, although the land is in Maryland, it is Federal property.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHANGING LOCATION OF PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD TRACKS TO ELIMINATE INTERFERENCE WITH ACTIVITIES OF THE WASHINGTON NAVY YARD

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 7097) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to extend its present track connection with the United States navy yard so as to provide adequate railroad facilities in connection with the development of Buzzards Point as an industrial area in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1932 (47 Stat. 322), as amended by the act approved June 20, 1939 (53 Stat. 849), and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to extend its present track connection with the United States navy yard so as to provide adequate railroad facilities in connection with the development of Buzzards Point as an industrial area in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1932 (47 Stat. 322), as amended by the act approved June 20, 1939 (53 Stat. 849), is hereby further amended to read as follows: "That the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. is hereby authorized to establish a switch connection with an existing track in its New Jersey Avenue yard, at a point north of the north curb line of Eye Street SE.; thence southward on First Street SE. to and connecting with the existing track on First Street SE. at or about N Street, with a switch connection at or about Quander Street and spur track running over, across, and through square 743 to and into the United States navy yard; thence southward on First Street SE. to and thence along Potomac Avenue to the

west line of Second Street SW., with all necessary switches, extensions, turnouts, and sidings and such other track extensions through and along One-half Street SW., and Second Street SW., south of Potomac Avenue and north of Potomac Avenue to P Street, and One-half Street SE., south of Potomac Avenue and north of Potomac Avenue to O Street, as may be or become necessary for the establishment of adequate railroad facilities in connection with the development of Buzzards Point as an industrial area in the District of Columbia."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this bill is very important, and it comes to us from the Secretary of the Navy. It has as its purpose the change of location of the tracks of the Pennsylvania Railroad leading from what is now known as Jersey Yard to Buzzards Point. The legislation is made necessary in order to eliminate serious interference with the activities of the navy yard in connection with the war expansion program which is on at this time. It has been requested, as I have stated, by the Navy Department. They have told us it is urgent. I trust the House will speedily enact the bill.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If this request of the Navy Department is granted, will it interfere with any of the other departments of the District government?

Mr. RANDOLPH No; it will not. We checked with all the departments of the District government. They have no objection; in fact, I believe they realize that the Navy needs this new trackage to take care of the prosecution of the war.

Mr. RICH. Then all the departments of the District government are satisfied with this legislation?

Mr. RANDOLPH. They all gave their approval, I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this concludes the District business for the day.

WAR HOUSING AND WAR PUBLIC WORKS IN AND NEAR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on House Joint Resolution 308 making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia; and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, and 5; and agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 1.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARTER GLASS,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) entitled "Joint resolution making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report, namely:

No. 2: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, authority for the use of $5,000 for purchase and exchange of passenger automobiles in connection with administration of the appropriation for war public works.

Nos. 3 and 4: Makes a technical correction in the text of the House provision for the detail of a commissioned officer on the active list of the Army as chief engineer of the Federal Works Agency.

No. 5: Strikes out the provision in the House bill providing that an Army officer detailed as chief engineer of the Federal Works Agency shall receive, while so detailed, an amount in addition to his Army pay and allowances sufficient to make his total compensation equal to the salary provided by law for the position of such chief engineer.

Amendment in disagreement

No. 1, relating to the amount to be appropriated for war housing in and near the District of Columbia. The House bill provides $12,000,000 for dormitory units for single workers. The Senate bill provides an additional $13,500,000 to construct 3,000 family units for married workers.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, as a result of war activities and the attendant increase in departmental personnel connected with the war program, a shortage of housing for war workers was anticipated in the city of Washington and the surrounding area. To meet this expected demand the act of April 10, 1942, authorized the appropriation of $30,000,000 to expedite the provision of housing in connection with the national defense in the metropolitan area, including two counties in Virginia, two counties in Maryland, and the District of Columbia, itself.

A Budget estimate for the $30,000,000 was submitted by the President on April 14 which was based upon using $12,000,000 of this sum for dormitory units to accommodate 15,000 single workers and $18,000,000 for the construction of 4,000 houses for married workers with families.

The House Committee on Appropriations reported out House Joint Resolution 308 April 29 appropriating the $12,000,000 for accommodations for single workers and omitted the $18,000,000 for family houses.

The Senate Appropriations Committee, on May 19, reported the joint resolution and increased the amount for war housing from $12,000,000 to $25,500,000, an increase of $13,500,000 to provide 3,000 of the 4,000 family units which had been requested by the Budget estimates.

The conference report brings the difference of $13,500,000 for the 3,000 family units back to the House for action. The House managers have refused to agree to the Senate amendment and the Senate managers have refused to yield from their position.

The remaining differences between the two Houses were largely technical and of a minor nature and were amicably disposed of when the House managers yielded on all of them. This item, however, involved so large a sum and established so important a commitment that the managers on the part of the House felt constrained to insist on its exclusion from the bill. Accordingly we bring back to you this morning in disagreement, for your disposition, the Senate proposition to add to the appropriation the sum of $13,500,000 to be expended in the construction of 3,000 family dwelling units in and about the city of Washington.

The House committee held hearings on the proposition and went into it rather thoroughly. The question at issue was the need for the additional family dwelling units. The evidence adduced was largely speculative and contingent and the committee was not convinced of the need for the family units. The decision of the committee on the question was unanimous, and was disapproved by the House without dissent.

No additional data was developed in conference. The House conferees are willing to provide dormitory accommodations for workers without families but do not feel that the housing situation in Washington justifies an appropriation for family dwelling units at this time, and that is the issue between the two Houses on this amendment.

I think it will be generally agreed that in times like these when support of our armies places such a burden on our national resources at a time when we are searching every possible source of revenue to provide for taxes to meet the unprecedented expenses of the war, we should scrutinize with care all proposals to spend money, even when related to the conduct of the war itself, and unless justified beyond the possibility of a reasonable doubt, resolve any doubt in favor of economy.

There is grave doubt of the need of the proposed housing. The proponents have not made their case. And there is convincing argument on the other side. For example, in the real-estate sections

of all Washington papers there is a marked preponderance of family units for rent or sale over those asking such accommodations. I have here yesterday's issue of one of the leading Washington papers in which there is only half a column of advertisements asking for housing and 31 columns of advertisements offering to rent or sell. The ratio on that basis in this paper is 62 to 1, a rather convincing disparity.

The committee also has the information this morning from a source which it considers reliable that there was no need at this time, or in the immediate future, for the erection of additional housing units, and if such a need develops there are funds available for their construction.

The committee feels that the bill as it passed the House makes ample provision for present and prospective needs and if further need should develop we will be in position to supply them at any time. The House managers recommend insistence upon the House disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman point out in connection with the action of the conferees on the family dwelling units that the evidence showed that Government funds were available at this time for the construction of 8,000 family-dwelling units, that they expect private industry, and had been assured that private industry, was prepared to take care of more than 42,000 family units during 1941 and 1942, giving a total of 50,000 family-dwelling units. The committee felt that that number of family-dwelling units certainly ought to be sufficient and if we saw it were not sufficient we could take care of it later, but would not go into any further program involving family-dwelling units at this time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from Virginia convincingly sums up the whole situation in his statement, and, I think, accurately expresses the opinion of the committee and the House. Supplementing his figures, we have just this morning been informed that according to the latest estimate, instead of provision for 8,000 units, there are now available funds for the construction of 17,500 units.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I want to congratulate the committee on its recommendation. If what the gentleman says is true, and I have a right to believe it is true, that the cost of a family dwelling is so much more than for individual dormitories, then during wartime instead of people bringing their families to the District, which is overcrowded, the individual ought to come in here and work for the duration. If we do this, it will be much more economical because individual units are less expensive than family dwelling units.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Of course, the question as to whether or not a family unit should be constructed depends, in my judgment, upon two things; first, whether or not the need really exists and, secondly, whether or not if such units are to be permanent they can be disposed of for permanent residence after the war period. I understand the committee has gone very thoroughly into the matter of the necessity for such housing. If the House agrees to this conference report and the Senate disagrees to the conference report the question of determining even more accurately that need would naturally come before the conferees, would it not?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It would. The gentleman is one of the most distinguished parliamentarians of the House and knows that by direction of their respective Houses the conferees could again take up the questions in disagreement. And, as he also knows, the House proposing an amendment yields in event of a stalemate or accepts responsibility for loss of the legislation.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I would like to know the area, as near as the gentleman can tell me, in which this 400,000 units would apply, whether it covers just the District of Columbia or the surrounding area, or just where it is.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. According to the estimate submitted, it covers the metropolitan area, which consists of the District of Columbia, Fairfax, and Arlington Counties, Va., and Montgomery and Prince Georges Counties, Md.

Mr. Speaker, if there are no further questions, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 2, strike out "$12,000,000" and insert "$25,500,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which the several motions were agreed to was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an excellent editorial which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on Saturday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

INTRASTATE MEAT INSPECTION

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 315) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect of meat-packing establishments engaged in intrastate commerce only, in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat food products by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. HOPE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the joint resolution?

Mr. FULMER. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose of this joint resolution is to extend Federal inspection of meat products to packers doing business wholly within a State. This would enable many of these packers to bid on Government orders, especially within the States. At this time they are not permitted to bid on those orders and only the larger packers, who have this type of inspection, are really permitted to bid.

We had a hearing on this joint resolution and had before our committee representatives of the Bureau of Animal Industry. We also heard General Hardigg, representing the War Department. I want to quote from General Hardigg's statement:

> The War Department has always desired, so far as possible, to use local products. We regard that as sound business. We regard it as a saving in transportation, and in furtherance of the good-neighbor policy.

I understand that those departments and agencies who are purchasing meat products for the Government are giving the large packers a differential of from 2 to 4 cents per pound. Naturally, this operates against the small packers, and in turn it will operate against the farmers in the various States where large packers are not located. Under program we shall be shipping hogs out of the State and shipping meat products back into the State for these various agencies. This will mean extra expense and considerable shipping space that is so much needed at this time.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this resolution change in any manner the sanitary requirements now in effect under the Bureau?

Mr. FULMER. Not at all. Those seeking to operate under this joint resolution would have to make application and comply with the requirements.

Mr. THOM. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, do these inspections require the payment of a fee by the meat packer?

Mr. FULMER. The inspection will be done by representatives of the Bureau of Animal Industry without expense to these packers.

Mr. THOM. Will there be a charge for the inspection?

Mr. FULMER. No.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in a State where the standards of inspection are equivalent to those of the Federal Government, the small packers will be able to bid on Government orders regardless of the fact that they do no interstate business?

Mr. FULMER. They may, under the supervision of the Bureau of Animal Industry. I am told by Dr. Miller, who

represents the Bureau in the Department of Agriculture, that the Bureau wants to be just as sympathetic as possible with these packers, yet do nothing that would lower the standards of the grading of meat at this time. They must operate purely on a sanitary basis.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee feels, in other words, that this resolution does give the Bureau of Animal Industry plenty of leeway to exercise proper discretion and at the same time give considerable relief to the local packer?

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman's statement is correct.

Mr. BOREN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is there no fee involved in this, either to the producer of the cattle or to the packer, or anyone on that end of the line?

Mr. FULMER. No fee at all. I understand that if the packer has a veterinarian that is doing the right type of work, and it is satisfactory to the Bureau of Animal Industry, the Bureau will appoint him as an inspector and, of course, pay him. Therefore, there would be no charge made against the packer or those who sell the animals to the packer.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is there any time limit on this measure?

Mr. FULMER. It is limited to the emergency and 6 months after the close of the emergency.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief if we do not give this relief to the small packers and if those in charge of the inspection do not cooperate helpfully and sympathetically that you are going to find many of these small packers going out of business. If this happens it will give to the large packers a real monopoly, all of which will prove to be expensive to the taxpayers and disastrous to farmers and meat retailers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution as follows:

Whereas regulations of certain departments and agencies of the United States require that meat and meat food products purchased by the United States be federally inspected and approved; and

Whereas such Federal inspection is limited to meat and meat food products which are to be used, transported, or sold in interstate or foreign commerce; and

Whereas approximately 40 percent of all pork products and a correspondingly large percentage of other meat and meat food products are not subject to such inspection; and

Whereas a shortage exists, in respect of the supply, for the armed forces and civilians, of meat and meat food products which are federally approved as sound, healthful, wholesome, and fit for human consumption; and

Whereas legislation authorizing Federal inspection of meat and meat food products during the present war at meat-packing establishments doing only an intrastate business will aid in the prosecution of the war effort by relieving congestion of transportation facilities and insuring a more adequate supply for the armed forces and civilians of sound, healthful, and wholesome meat and meat food products which are fit for human consumption and which have been federally inspected: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That upon application for Federal inspection by any slaughtering, meat-canning, salting, packing, rendering, or similar establishment which is not subject to the provisions of law, as amended, known as the Meat Inspection Act, which follow the subheading "For meat inspection" under the heading "Bureau of animal industry" in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908", approved March 4, 1907, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to cause to be made the same or similar examinations and inspections and cause such other action to be taken in respect of the soundness, healthfulness, wholesomeness, and fitness for human food of meat and meat food products as would be made or taken if meat and meat food products from such establishment were to be used, transported, or sold in interstate or foreign commerce.

SEC. 2. (a) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, insofar as may be practicable, to carry out the provisions of this act through the existing officers, employees, and facilities through which he carries out the provisions of the Meat Inspection Act, as amended.

(b) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to prescribe such regulations as may be necessary in order to carry out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 3. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and each fiscal year thereafter, the sum of $———— for expenditure in carrying out the provisions of this act.

SEC. 4. This act shall cease to be in effect 6 months after the termination of the present war.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 3, line 16, after "thereafter", strike out the remainder of line 16 and all of line 17, and insert "such amounts as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

On page 1, following the title, strike out the preamble.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. TARVER, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. LEAVY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. PLUMLEY.

PROMOTION OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the resolution (H. Res. 488) for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of the successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider without the intervention of any point of order the substitute amendment recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency now in the bill, and such substitute for the purpose of amendment shall be considered under the 5-minute rule as an original bill. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any of the amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or committee substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the Senate bill (S. 2250) and provides for 2 hours of general debate and makes the House substitute for the Senate bill in order for consideration.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is a measure that will aid the small businessman. For many months many of you gentlemen have honestly endeavored to be of service and have shown an interest in the small businessman. I myself have introduced several bills, beginning way back in 1930 after the Hoover crash, and unfortunately it was not until 1932 that the Reconstruction Finance Act was enacted. I regret that bill was not the one I advocated because it did not extend relief to the small businessman, but only provided help to the banks, railroad companies, and insurance companies. President Hoover vetoed the bill insisting that provision should be made that loans would only be made on self-liquidating projects. The bill was reintroduced carrying this provision, passed by the House and Senate, and was signed by the President, and the small businessman and municipalities were unable to obtain relief or the benefit of loans from the Government. Since that time I am pleased to say that we have amended the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act several times so as to aid the small businessman, but notwithstanding such amendments and the authority given to the Federal Reserve Board to make loans, the small businessman could very seldom bring himself to comply with all the requirements of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Therefore, on May 22, 1939, I introduced H. R. 6448, to liberalize extension

of credit to small business, to stimulate business, to create employment, and for other purposes. On March 1, 1940, I introduced H. R. 8731, to establish a permanent loan corporation to assist financing institutions in making credit available to commercial and industrial enterprises. Various plans had been advocated as a medium of providing assistance to small business, and on March 1, 1940, I introduced House Resolution 548 to create a select committee to conduct a research and survey into the problems of small business enterprises and their relation to unemployment and national defense. Upon the convening of the Seventy-seventh Congress I reintroduced the bill to establish a permanent loan corporation, H. R. 2839, and introduced a further bill, H. R. 6615, on February 15, 1942, titled "To amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, in order to provide loans and credits with a minimum of delay to small business enterprises, and for other purposes." I sponsored these bills knowing the President's desire to aid the small businessman in every possible way and, therefore, I am immensely pleased that the Banking and Currency Committee has brought in this broad and liberal bill upon which a broad and liberal rule has been granted to give each and every Member an opportunity, to those inclined, to offer amendments to improve or strengthen the bill. After carefully reading and studying the bill, being so vitally interested in relief for the small businessman, I am satisfied that the Banking and Currency Committee, which has considered the Senate bill, has done a splendid piece of work. Without going into too great detail, the bill, briefly, directs the Chairman of the War Production Board, Mr. Donald M. Nelson, to—

First. Mobilize all small concerns to insure their participation in the manufacture of war materials.

Second. When the Chairman of the War Production Board certifies capacity and credit of small concerns to Government procurement officers, it must be accepted as conclusive.

Third. If costs are higher on some articles than might prevail from larger corporations, the smaller corporations shall be favored.

Fourth. When the Smaller Plants Corporation effects a transaction, it is transferred to the Defense Plants Corporation to service and administer, but only as the agent for the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which remains the principal.

Fifth. Study terms on which prime contractors have sublet contracts.

Sixth. Obtain from the War, Navy, and Treasury Departments, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and other agencies reports on contracts let and loans made.

Seventh. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans under such terms and conditions as the Smaller War Plants Corporation shall prescribe.

Eighth. Authorizes the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission to make or participate in loans of the Corporation.

Ninth. The capital of the Corporation shall be $200,000,000.

Tenth. There shall be five directors appointed by the Chairman of the War Production Board.

Eleventh. The Corporation shall expire as of July 1, 1945, unless extended by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, we know that the Senate has been considering this legislation for over 3 months. The Senate committee held extended hearings and finally reported their bill. Notwithstanding this fact the House Committee on Banking and Currency has seen an opportunity to improve and strengthen and broaden the bill so that it will really accomplish the things that you and I have urged and advocated throughout all these months.

The bill, as I have stated, gives the Chairman of the War Production Board power to designate five members or five directors to carry out the wishes of Congress and in every way aid in securing not only financial aid wherever it is necessary, but aid in bringing about a utilization of the small manufacturers throughout the United States.

The small manufacturer, unfortunately, never has the personnel and the experience to obtain Government work or contracts, because it is rather a complicated matter for him to obtain the information so he can properly bid and obtain favorable consideration. Under this bill the organization or the corporation which is being created—and $200,000,000 is provided for the corporation—will also aid the small businessman or manufacturer to get into position to obtain the utilization of his plant or factory. As you know, today we have hundreds of small plants that have no Government work, and they are unable to obtain priorities for the production of the materials they have been manufacturing heretofore. Consequently, they are in a dangerous position, being threatened with the closing of their plants. On the other hand, the Government needs the production of many of these plants, and this organization which is provided for will be able to aid the small businessman or manufacturer in being of service to the Government.

I think this is legislation in the right direction. It is needed, and it will be helpful and beneficial. Gentlemen who have from time to time urged that something extraordinary be done for the small businessman are here given an opportunity to vote for such a measure as will bring aid and relief to them. I know the administration has been extremely desirous for over a year to help the small businessman and feels that this legislation will enable the Army and the Navy and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation as well to carry out the wishes of the administration, and the wishes of these gentlemen, all in the interest of expediting the production of needed war materials. I compliment again the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency and the members of that committee for having brought this bill to the House. I think it is most needed legislation and one of the most important measures that that committee has ever submitted to the House. I hope that there will not be any delay in the adoption of the rule and the passing of the bill.

I reserve the remainder of my time and yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to my distinguished colleague the Republican leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, one of the pressing problems of today is the preservation of the small businessman. Unless a life line is thrown out, he is threatened with extinction. I hope the present bill will not be administered so it will prove to be another mirage

Unless we do come to the rescue of the small businessman in a substantial way, there will be many a ghost town in the United States. We must not forget there are many communities which do not share in the war prosperity. To these industries the war has delivered a knockout blow.

When we speak of small business we must remember small business concerns employing fewer than 200 workers each comprise 99 percent of all the business in the United States; they have handled 65 percent of the Nation's commerce and employ 53 percent of all the wage earners.

This largely neglected reservoir of industrial output must be put to work in the all-out war effort. We must not permit a huge industrial monopoly to be built up in this country. These small industrial concerns, which are fighting for a chance to live, a chance to put people to work, a chance to increase the wealth of the Nation, and contribute taxes to support the war, must not be permitted to perish.

The two Attleboros in my own district are a striking illustration of what is true in many sections of the country. The Attleboros are supported by jewelry factories and the workers are skilled artisans. It is impossible for the smaller concerns to fit into the war picture, and only a few of the larger concerns can get war orders to keep a few of their force working.

They have been unable to change over because it has been impossible to secure the machinery although the skilled workers are available. The younger men can go elsewhere for work, the older people will be out of jobs and unable to give up their homes, established for years, and seek new fields.

The tire and gasoline shortage adds to their difficulties by preventing transportation to and from distant jobs. Small industries like the jewelry industry were singled out for adequate consideration in the first World War. Steps were taken then to prevent ghost towns.

Now they are threatened with the denial of silver, which is being utilized in lieu of other metals to keep some of the workers employed. This in face of the fact that the United States Government has an immense pile of unused silver.

Certainly in this era of governmental domination of business some arrangement can be made to get these firms silver so the older people can earn a living.

Small business will be needed in the days following the war when the millions of young men will be coming back anxious for a new start in life.

I congratulate the committee in submitting this legislation and sincerely hope it will contribute in a measure for the preservation of the small industries.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN].

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I believe this bill is a constructive piece of legislation and it is my purpose to utilize this 1 minute to speak aside from this subject.

The curtain rises on another act in the tragic affairs of bureaucratic folly. This time Dr. Quack proposes Nation-wide gasoline rationing. Anyone with one eye and half sense knows there is not any shortage of gasoline in the United States of America; only a shortage of transportation facilities in particular areas. I do not guarantee, however, that there will not be a national shortage of gasoline very soon if you leave it up to Dr. Quack.

Mr. Speaker, the most charitable thing I can say about the proposed Nation-wide rationing of gasoline is that it is asinine. Dr. Quack proposes to amputate Uncle Sam's leg because Uncle Sam has a toothache.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD at length on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this bill comes before the House with the unanimous support of the Committee on Rules. As far as I know, I have not heard of any open objections to the bill. It is sound, meritorious legislation, somewhat delayed, which should have the support of Members on both sides.

The rule is an open rule and provides for amendments and 2 hours of general debate.

Small business today looks somewhat like a pincushion. It has been squeezed and pinched from all sides by the war conditions. Small business in my district represents probably 90 percent of all industry there. Today it is staggering along, burdened by taxes, wobbly in the knees, and in fear and confusion, uncertain as to the future. Small business is the backbone of our American system, based upon private initiative and reasonable profit. It is under this system of free enterprise that America has been developed into the greatest, richest, and freest Nation in the world and with the highest wage scales and standards of living. There is no Member on either side of the House who is not in favor of doing everything within our power immediately to help solve the problems with which small businessmen are confronted. They are not only burdened with taxes, but now they face such serious problems as priorities, loss of gasoline for their salesmen, and numerous restrictions on use of materials and sales. They are actually groggy and they are not sure that they can continue in business for long under the prevailing limitations and conditions. They are practically exhausted financially and at the end of their economic rope. It is hoped that this bill, reported by the Banking and Currency Committee, one of the ablest committees of the House of Representatives and certainly one of the hardest-working committees, will afford needed relief. It is an effort in the right direction. No one claims that it will solve all the problems of small businessmen, but I believe the purpose of the bill to mobilize the productive facilities of small business and to put their factories to work in helping to win the war is highly desirable. I believe it has tried at least to help solve in part one of the main problems of small business. Whether it is possible in this bill to solve the question of priorities, higher costs, higher wages, transportation, and adequate material and supplies is very doubtful, but if this legislation is not sufficient, then I hope the Committee on Banking and Currency will continue its good work and make additional legislative efforts to keep the small businessmen on their feet and give them a chance to survive.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote for the rule and I am going to vote for the bill. Whether it is going to meet all of the expectations of the public generally I have my doubts.

I call your attention to a colloquy that occurred between the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS], and the author of the Senate bill, as shown on page 28 of the hearings:

> Mr. WILLIAMS. Is this legislation designed to help only those industries that are engaged in production, or does it cover the trades, power and transportation facilities, and all those?
>
> Senator MURRAY. No. Of course, this is not designed to aid the small retail merchants or wholesale merchants and concerns of that kind. If there was anything necessary to be done in that direction, it would have to be done by some other legislation. This is only designed to mobilize the small industrial plants of the Nation and to aid plants that are engaged in civilian production to continue also by permitting them to convert their plants so as to use some substitutes for essential materials.
>
> Mr. WILLIAMS. Then it will be confined to the production field alone?
>
> Senator MURRAY. Yes.
>
> Mr. WILLIAMS. And not to the other?
>
> Senator MURRAY. Not to the retail business. The wholesale and retail people of the country are now engaged in a very serious study of the effect of the war program on them and I suppose they may find it necessary to have some protection if we are going to maintain that system in this country, and I do not see how we can escape giving them some assistance, within reason, to continue those enterprises in the country.

It can be readily seen that this bill is not going to help any small businessman who is not directly connected with the production of war materials or whose business cannot be converted to the production of war materials, or engaged in essential civilian production.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am sure the gentleman has not had time to study the bill in the form in which it was presented at the time that interrogation took place and compare it with the form in which the bill is here presented since being amended by the committee. I got the distinct impression that was the situation when the bill was presented. I am sure, however, we have amended the bill in the House Banking and Currency Committee to a point where its benefits will be available to small industry.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Are we considering the Senate bill or the House bill?

Mr. SABATH. The House bill will be in order.

Mr. O'CONNOR. But we are now considering the Senate bill?

Mr. SABATH. The provisions of the House bill will be offered as a substitute for the Senate bill.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. STEAGALL. The parliamentary situation is that the Senate passed the bill S. 2250. The House amended the bill in numerous details and substituted the House provision for the Senate provision by striking out all after the enacting clause, but the Senate bill is technically before the House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. May I ask the distinguished chairman if the facts as developed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS] to the effect that the bill would be of no aid to any small businessman not engaged in the production of war material and not capable of being converted to the production of war material has been remedied by the amendment to the House bill?

Mr. STEAGALL. The bill provides for the relief of small business concerns engaged in the manufacture or the supplying of material essential for the war program, or essential civilian uses.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The great majority of what may be termed small business, such as retail stores, repair shops, and so forth, are suffering severely from the effects of the war, primarily on account of priorities, shortages of materials essential to their business, and our manpower leaving the State to engage in defense industries, enlisting and being drafted into the Army. This condition coupled with the fact that we have no war industries in the State make it pretty hard on our businessmen. There is no doubt but what this bill will help some and is a step along the right direction, but it does not answer the problems of such businessmen as I have enumerated, who are not engaged in the production of war materials or who cannot convert their

businesses into production of war materials or into essential goods for civilian use. The bill, as I view it, is primarily for the purpose of helping war production, and in that respect it has many virtues as, no doubt, small concerns will be awarded contracts and be able to fulfill such contracts as a result of the passage of this bill.

We will now have more casualties in business in Montana if gasoline is rationed as indicated recently. Montana has a large supply of gasoline—far more than enough for her own use—and can export great quantities which would relieve or help the gas shortage in other States. Gasoline should not be, by any means, rationed in a State like Montana, where there is an abundance of it. Our oil wells could be increased and our refining facilities enlarged to alleviate the shortage in other places. Another point I want to make is that gasoline is being shipped into Montana from Texas and Oklahoma in competition with our local gasoline. I want to point out that the transportation facilities used for hauling gasoline to Montana could be used to transport it to the eastern seaboard where there is a dearth of it.

Moreover, our farmers who are producing sugar beets, grain, and other agricultural products and raising thousands of head of cattle and sheep, which foodstuffs are vital to our national defense, should have the right to use gasoline in getting back and forth to their ranches from their trading places as well as for marketing their products. There is no other way this can be done. If gasoline is rationed in Montana, even if the farmers and ranchers have good tires on their trucks and cars, they would be unable to secure gasoline even though the State is full of it. Many farmers are required to use more than 3 gallons of gasoline in just driving to town for supplies, as a 50- or 75-mile drive is not uncommon among our stockmen and ranchers in getting to town.

The whole proposal to ration gasoline, as it affects Montana, seems to me to be absolutely ridiculous and does not make sense.

Getting back to this bill, however, I am heartily in favor of it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM].

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, any intimation that the Roosevelt administration has not been helpful to small business in distributing war contracts is unfair and untrue. I have had occasion to deal with the War Production Board and have seen them come to the aid of small industry not only in my own district but elsewhere. Many aluminum plants manufacturing kitchen utensils which were faced with absolute shut-down because of priorities on their materials, have now received war orders, and in most instances are working at full capacity. There is located in my district a company which manufactured washing machines. Through the intervention of the Government that company, threatened with a shut-down because of an order preventing the further manufacture of its product, has been able to continue in business by reason of being given a very valuable war order for gun mounts.

However, this bill is necessary because none of us is willing to see a single industry wink out. There is room for more progress in this field. We are today giving congressional sanction to the program of dividing war orders, and by vesting definite powers in the Chairman of the War Production Board, we are asserting anew that this war should not be won at the sole expense of little industry.

I particularly am pleased that the bill compels the Chairman of the War Production Board to furnish a résumé of his accomplishments each 60 days. His own pride in being able to show the Congress that he is solving this problem will be an incentive to the best efforts on his part.

It is to be hoped that attention may be given to the pooling of machinery in idle automobile garages for the purpose of using it to produce war materials.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS.]

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I am going to support this bill. The so-called small or independent businessman is the backbone of our American economic system. Free enterprise is dependent upon the highly competitive system, possible only when there is great dispersion of business. It is the most effective check upon exorbitant prices and the antidote to monopoly.

The bulk of the taxes in the United States that support our Government and its war effort flows from small business. The greater mass of American labor is employed in the aggregate in small business. Our economic and social system is built around the small enterprise.

Any real hope of substantially increasing our war production must be dependent upon harnessing the smaller and independent businesses into war production. Time after time in the last several years plans have been announced for so distributing war contracts as to genuinely share them with the smaller manufacturer. Reorganization after reorganization of this endeavor has taken place, and increasingly optimistic prediction after prediction has been made. But to date nothing has happened.

The vast bulk of the orders go to a comparatively few big firms, and the raw materials needed by the smaller manufacturers to stay in business are more and more withdrawn, so that the outlook for the small, independent businessman is a blank wall with a closed door—his door.

The Army and the Navy still refuse to place orders with the small manufacturer or merchant. This may be understandable from the standpoint of extra work involved in dealing with hundreds of firms when it is so much easier to place one order. However, there is no excuse for the Government's not aiding smaller firms to pool their facilities so as to take prime contracts in combination, or to at least facilitate subcontracting.

If the Government really wants to expand its war-production effort and to harness up the small manufacturer, then it is time to act and stop talking promises. If, however, the Government does not really want to include the smaller businessman in the war effort, it should tell him now so that he can adjust his affairs and liquidate now so that he can save something with which to start up again after the war. If he is strung along and strung along, expecting to get war contracts or subcontracts, until he goes broke, he can't reopen after the war; he won't have any capital with which to open up again.

If, under the guise of the war emergency, this squeezing out of small business is part of a so-called social reform to eliminate the independent business from our economic and social system, the country should know it now.

It will not do to simply continue to promise aid. Either tell the small businessman that he is through or take some immediate constructive steps.

This bill is a step in the right direction. Let us pass it—and now.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, we have under consideration S. 2250, or rather the substituted S. 2250 favorably reported by the House Committee on Banking and Currency to mobilize the production facilities of small business to aid in the successful prosecution of the war and for other purposes.

I have read with great care and interest the testimony of Hon. Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, and the testimony of Senator MURRAY, who introduced in the Senate S. 2250, and the testimony of Hon. Bradley D. Nash, Chief of the Bureau of Finance of the War Production Board. These gentlemen strongly urge the passage of this measure, and while it may not accomplish all that its sponsors claim, I feel that it will be a substantial service to thousands of small businessmen, promote war production, and aid in the successful prosecution of the war.

According to the Bureau of the Census report there are approximately 2,800,000 so-called small businesses in this country. Eighty-four thousand of these are engaged in manufacturing; 646,000 service industries, 200,000 wholesale concerns, 1,770,000 retail. This gives a bird's-eye view of the magnitude of the problem before us. Tens of thousands of small business concerns have already become casualties of the war. They have been forced out of business or have become bankrupt. These 2,800,000 small businesses are the backbone of the economic and commercial life of this country. They furnish millions of persons with employment and pay annually in direct and indirect taxes billions of dollars.

There will be produced, sold, and consumed this year approximately $50,000,000,000 of products for our civilian population, and almost a like sum will be expended for war purposes. It is estimated that next year that on account

of the war effort, the civilian population will have to be satisfied with about $40,000,000,000 worth of goods and services, while there will be produced for war purpose $60,000,000,000 worth of equipment and supplies for war purposes.

The group that was hit hardest and first were the motor dealers, repair and service stations. There are nearly 50,000 of these; they provided employment for approximately 2,000,000 persons. This great group has been hit hard, indeed. I am afraid that this bill may not bring much relief to them.

The astonishing statement was made on the floor of the House today that we are utilizing only 10 percent of our manufacturing facilities in our war production. The great reservoir of 90 percent is going unused. In order to win this great war we must greatly outmatch the Axis Powers in merchant and war ships, in planes, bombers, tanks, guns, shells, and other munitions of war, and also provide clothing and other supplies for our armed forces. As the paramount task before the American people is to win the war at the earliest moment possible, every facility for producing the naval equipment and supplies should be utilized. It was pointed out that on the Pacific coast in the Los Angeles area alone there are 35 manufacturers of boats, but only 7 of them have contracts to produce boats for the Government.

The problem that is worrying those in charge of our war efforts, as well as the country generally, is the bottleneck that is being created for lack of ships to carry our men, munitions of war, and supplies to the various combat areas throughout the world. Every shipyard, large and small, every manufacturer, large and small, of ships wherever possible should be utilized at once. I cite this as an example. Why have 90 percent of our manufacturing concerns not been utilized?

This measure creates a board and authorizes the expenditure of $200,000,000 to enable small plants and businesses to improve their plants to make necessary war materials, and the board also has the authority to help tool and equip plants that are not now in shape to handle war contracts and to have large contracts broken down and handled by a number of subcontractors in furnishing materials and supplies for our war effort, and this board may help to finance and extend credit to these small business concerns.

Until recently a very few big concerns had 75 percent of these war contracts, representing tens of billions of dollars. Many of them are located in the great congested centers of the country. Persons living in the small towns and rural sections of the country had to leave their homes and go to these great congested centers and great plants to secure work in these plants having the big Government contracts. This added to the congestion of these great centers, created serious housing and school problems, and the administration has spent perhaps $300,000,000 in providing housing and additional school facilities. In other words, it has concentrated the contracts and the workers of this country to the detriment of the small towns and rural sections of the Nation, and it has created a serious economic problem in these small towns and rural sections. It is hoped that this bill will develop and encourage these smaller plants and businesses in the smaller towns and rural sections, and thereby bring into play the productive capacity of tens of thousands of small plants, increase of war production, and provide employment for the people living in those small towns and rural sections.

It is a serious matter for working people with families to break up their homes and move from one State to another and then find themselves with the inconveniences of these great congested centers. Of course, tens of thousands of them must remain at home. Much of the necessary raw materials may be had near these small plants, and it will relieve the heavy burden upon our transportation facilities in carrying these raw materials to the few great congested centers.

Mr. Nelson very well observed that the success of this plan will depend upon the manner in which it is administered. I sincerely hope that those who administer this bill will keep constantly in mind the great economic need of it to the small business plants, the smaller cities, and the people living in those sections. Let us utilize all the necessary materials, plants, and the manpower in each and every section of our country so that we may produce such number of merchant and war ships, planes, bombers, guns, tanks, shells, and other supplies as will give to this Nation mastery on land, in the air, on the sea, and under the sea, and back up our heroic fighting men with sufficient equipment as will insure speedy victory and the saving of their lives.

Congress has already voted $165,000,000,000 for war purposes alone. I am afraid that the $200,000,000 provided in this bill will not be a sufficient sum to accomplish the greatest possible results that should be accomplished under the provisions of this bill. The bill is not all that I should like it to be in some other respects, but it is the best bill that we have an opportunity to speak and vote for at this time. Many of us have been for more than a year urging more consideration and help for the small businesses.

The bill relieves another situation. Because of the facilities of the big plants and their ability in mass production, they can produce more cheaply than the 180,000 small plants and the tens of thousands of other small businesses. This bill provides that this condition may be taken into consideration in making the contracts with small business concerns. A number of the big concerns have been making plenty of money. For instance, the Naval Affairs Committee reports that through their investigation a number of big business concerns have returned to the Government more than $500,000,000 of profits on war contracts. The profits were so big that they felt that they must turn part of them back to the Government. While this was going on a multitude of small business plants and concerns were forced to close their plants and businesses, and many of them were forced into bankruptcy.

Let us give the 90 percent more opportunity to help in our great effort to win the war. The policy followed has been to make big business bigger and small business smaller, and shut out tens of thousands of them altogether. We must give small business a chance in this country.

Another serious matter confronting the small businessman and plant is the never-ending reports, rationing, priorities, and red tape required of them under bureaucratic control. I do not condemn any necessary rationing or priorities, but it is my hope that these small plants and businesses be given the materials and equipment with which to work, and that a lot of the unnecessary reports and inventories and red tape be cut out. They do not have large staffs of men and women to do this work.

There is no group in this land now that needs help and encouragement so much as these small plants and businesses. No greater calamity could come to this country than to eliminate this great group of patriotic business concerns that desire so much to help at this time and who contribute so much in the way of providing employment, the paying of taxes, and the purchasing of defense bonds. They need help and they need it now.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include some excerpts from the bill and the report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order to speak today. I understand the entire day will be taken up with business, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that the time set for today may be put over until next Thursday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objections to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

CONGRESS COMES TO THE RELIEF OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, this rule now before us has for its purpose the consideration of S. 2250, which is an act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes. In a word, it is the legislation toward which we have been working for some time, providing some relief for so-called small business. We have had much legislation throughout the history of our war effort which has for its purpose the aiding of large business enterprises in speeding up to the full limits of plant capacity the production of war material. However, scattered throughout the United States, in every city, hamlet, and countryside, are numerous small business enterprises,

employing from a dozen to several hundred workmen engaged in carrying on the productive enterprise of this Nation. In times of peace these small establishments are the backbone of our business activity. In times of war such as we are confronted with now, these little businesses, so-called, are driven to the wall. They are unable to share in the huge war contracts which have been entered into with the great industrial organizations of the country which have the equipment, organization, and financing to carry out successfully such enterprises.

Almost a year ago there was created a committee of the House having for its purpose the solving of this problem of keeping small business going during this emergency and providing ways and means that these small enterprises might share in war production. The distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] headed this committee, and through a series of hearings took the views of cross sections of our whole country on this important problem. One of the major segments of the problem is that having to do with the automotive trade. The work of this committee was taken over through the regular committees of the House and Senate having to do with banking and currency. The Senate has already passed the bill now under consideration, S. 2250, and the House committee has recommended for passage the measure now before us, which in reality is a substitute for S. 2250, although it carries the same number and enacting clause.

One of the features of this legislation is the creation of a corporation to be known as the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which will be provided with a revolving fund of $200,000,000, to be managed by a board of five directors familiar with the problems of small business and appointed by the Chairman of the War Production Board. This corporation is to cease to exist on July 1, 1945, unless its life is extended by a subsequent act of the Congress. This corporation will be empowered to enter into contracts directly for the production of war material and also essential civilian supplies, and thereupon to parcel out or sublet varying portions of the total contract to these small business concerns throughout the Nation, and by this method parcel out to the little businesses of the country a portion of war production.

This Corporation also is empowered under the terms of the bill to transfer loans, supply plant equipment and facilities, machinery, and other materials so as to make them available to carry out the purposes of the legislation. Various other powers are granted under the act to this Corporation and to implement existing agencies for the purpose of utilizing these little business concerns in the combined war effort for the production of material, supplies, and utilities for carrying on the war as well as for providing for the essential supplies of the civilian population during the war period.

It perhaps is true that this bill does not solve the whole problem and will not cover the whole field of this intricate and complicated undertaking, namely, the utilization of small business as a part of our major war efforts. It does, however, go a long way in that direction, and those who have had active participation in its formulation and presenting it to this body for action do so with the recommendation that it be enacted. They assure us that it will accomplish the results for which we all are working, namely, preventing bankruptcy from overtaking small business and at the same time pooling these small enterprises with the great industrial plants of the Nation in working for final victory in our war effort.

It is my purpose, Mr. Speaker, to support the legislation, and I hope that it will not only achieve the purposes which its framers assure us it will but that it will go even further and prove to the country at large that we in the Congress stand ready to do everything within our power to find a solution for this important problem.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be fair to say that the principle "too little and too late" applies to this bill, and I certainly hope it will not bear out such prophecy, but the hour is very late and the amount is very little from the standpoint of solving a problem as serious as the problem confronting the small businessmen of America today.

Consequently I hope that at least two things will be kept in mind in connection with the administration of the bill: One, that it will be administered in such a way that Congress will soon increase the amount from the small $200,000,000 now appropriated to something much more commensurate with the needs of small businesses if they are to divert their activities into the production of war supplies. Secondly, I hope the administrators of this bill recognize that small businesses are sometimes very small, employing 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, or 15 employees, and that the allocations of this small revolving fund of $200,000,000 will not be made in the first instance in such large amounts that just a few concerns of the larger small fellows will be helped. I strongly urge that this bill be so administered that the little man needing ten, twenty, or thirty thousand dollars to help him get some materials to convert his factory over to war production will not once more find the gate barred against him.

I know if we can greatly increase his engine, lathes, and other tools for war production in America, the little fellow will vindicate our efforts. If these smaller small businesses have a chance to lease from the Government the tools necessary to make war supplies, just as today Ford, Chrysler, and General Motors are leasing from the Government vast factories needed to make bombing planes and the larger materials of war, the war production of America will be greatly increased. So I put in here a plea that the administrators of this act recognize the value of leasing and lending to the little fellow small amounts, often fifteen or twenty-five thousand dollars, to help him get started in war production. At the proper place in the bill, I intend to offer an amendment directed to this objective.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, there are numerous small businesses scattered all over the State of Minnesota that are more than willing to do their part in this war effort. The only thing that restrains them is financing.

I hope this bill will do what we want it to do, and that is to help the small businessman of the Nation stay in business and be enabled to take his part in the great job of winning this war.

Unless, however, we definitely set aside a large portion of this appropriation for cities of a certain size, I fear, Members of the House, that we will find that very little of this $200,000,000 will trickle down through the arteries and veins into the small business establishments of rural Minnesota.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and I have discussed this point and as a result Mr. MUNDT will in due course offer an amendment adding $100,000,000 to this aid for small business and stipulating that this amount of money go exclusively to cities under 100,000 in population. Unless we make this mandatory we will see, as we too often see, bureaucrats going entirely against the intent of Congress in our desire to help small businessmen in these small cities and towns weather this storm.

Let us support this bill; but let us also make sure it will help those who need the help. The automobile dealer, the tire dealer, the radio and refrigerator retailer have been practically squeezed out by necessary priorities being enforced. Here we can help furnish them with money to turn their business establishments into worth-while cogs in the great gears of war production. They will do their share to defeat the Japs and Nazis if Congress will do its part.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I have only three more speakers with 5 minutes apiece.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM].

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, the subject matter of this bill is of vital concern and importance to our beloved country. It is gratifying that after so much discussion and consideration at last an opportunity is afforded us through this measure to take some affirmative action.

The bill may not be perfect, but it is certainly inspired by a very laudable

purpose. Not only can small business be of great advantage in these critical times of the war in producing many articles useful for our defense and offense, but small business in the aggregate constitutes the backbone of American civilization and the prime source of revenue for the operation of our Government.

It is going to be increasingly necessary in the time of reconstruction following this emergency to have that source of revenue and employment unimpaired. These brave boys at the front who will come back after the victory to seek channels of work in which they may exercise their abilities for the advancement of our country will have through small business, if we maintain it and sustain it, an outlet for their labors, not only for their own subsistence but for the permanent security of this Nation.

I repeat, it is most gratifying that after so long a time we may have an opportunity through this measure to take a step at least in the right direction for the preservation of small business.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, we have long looked for a bill to encourage and enlist the small businessman in our war effort. I am glad this bill is before us today. I propose to vote for the rule and also for the bill, if satisfactory in final form, or as nearly so as it can be made.

I hope that in the interpretation of this bill or in its final passage—and especially in its administration—we shall not be too narrow in our interpretation of the word "production." I have not yet found any reference to the production of war minerals, which I think should be specifically mentioned. I hope it includes by implication the production of mining materials, the critical materials to be found within our own country. These small mine operators constitute one kind of small businessmen who can produce that which is vitally needed in the war effort. I am hopeful that this bill or some other bill will furnish aid to the small mining man, along with other small businessmen.

I wish to emphasize what has already been said regarding the great present need to encourage the small businessmen so that they may be secure and able to contribute to our security in the days of peace just ahead.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does the gentleman recall that our unemployment conference of Members of the House nearly 2 years ago recommended that very sort of action in the case of the mining of strategic metals?

Mr. MURDOCK. I do recall that our nonpartisan group recommended it, and I hope it is included soon in legislation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a question of the committee. Suppose a man in the automobile business has an original investment in buildings of approximately $80,000. The automobile business has got to the point where he is out of that business now, but he has an opportunity to lease these buildings to the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. In order to do this, however, he must get the buildings in condition to lease them, and he must remodel them at a cost of approximately $9,000. A ceiling of $5,000 has been placed by the War Production Board on the remodeling of buildings. Unless he can remodel these buildings to suit the tenant, at a cost of $9,000, he will lose his original investment. Will this bill in any way help a situation of that kind?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I would say not. I would say that this bill will not cover that situation. This bill is designed to cover production only.

[Here the gave' fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to have the opportunity to speak on the rule which will make possible the consideration of the pending bill, in the interest of the small businessmen in our country. At the very outset I wish to state that our small businessmen have had an eternal struggle, since the war emergency developed, to keep their doors open, and to continue the operation of their business. Many of those who were engaged in the operation of small plants, stores, garages, filling stations, and machine shops have been forced to abandon their business because of priorities and restrictions being placed upon the necessary materials for fabrication, and by reason of rationing the needed articles for the operation of their particular shop or store, and those small businessmen have disappeared. They have been forced to the wall, and they have been compelled to take up another and a different pursuit in order to try to gain a livelihood. The vast number of men and women who were employed by those so engaged, who have been forced out of business, are largely out of jobs, and the unemployment in our country has been augmented materially because of these very great misfortunes.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the personal experience of holding meetings in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent for the benefit of the small factories, plants, stores, garages, filling stations, and machine shops, and I know the problems with which they have to contend. I have worked with them for the purpose of securing their needs in material in order to continue their business, and for the further purpose of securing information regarding their ability to produce war materials and supplies for our Government. All of this information was delivered by me to the War Production Board, and the unemployment situation in each locality was presented to the Labor Department, which operates in connection therewith, in an effort to secure either the needed materials for civilian production, which would not conflict with our all-out war effort, or to secure contracts for those plants not engaged in war work to start production of materials and supplies for our war.

May I say, at this point, that many of the owners and managers of the small plants and businesses have been completely confused by the various rules and regulations which have been put in force by the various agencies of government and which must be followed in order to be able to secure any contract for such work. These rules and regulations have been changed repeatedly, and the people throughout the country have been driven into a state of utter confusion by reason thereof; they did not know what to do, or where to go, or how to proceed in the event they were directed to the proper department of government. It is regrettable, Mr. Speaker, that simple rules and simple procedures which all might easily understand, have not been inaugurated and put into force by the agencies and departments with which our small businessmen have had to deal. This simplification of procedure would have aided materially in many plants throughout the country, and the confusion which has resulted would have been entirely avoided.

Our small businessmen in this Nation have been the backbone and the sinew of our country. If they are destroyed and forced out of business, then the very backbone of our country will have been destroyed. When we are engaged in war, we must put forth an all-out war effort. We must win this war. The job of winning this war is the job of every man, woman, and child within the confines of our Nation, and our possessions. If those at the head of the departments of government create rules and regulations which confuse the people, and cause discontent to reign throughout our land, we might find ourselves in a very ugly position respecting our national unity—that which is so essential to victory.

Mr. Speaker, the very recent observations made respecting the proposed rationing of gasoline throughout our entire country, even in those localities wherein there is an abundance of gasoline and where there is no transportation problems, has created much confusion and great discontent. If there is a shortage in gasoline, and if the general rationing of that commodity is necessary to win this war, then the people of our Nation will gladly abide by any such order. The people want to win this war. Yet, they do not want to make unnecessary and useless sacrifices which do not lead to that end. The people know that there is an abundance of gasoline and oil in the great Southwest, in the West, and in the Central and Midwest. All storage facilities are taxed to capacity. When it was first observed that the gasoline rationing was necessary, it was based upon the shortage of the gasoline and oil. But, later, the explicit statement was made by one in authority that the general rationing of the gasoline was not made necessary because of any shortage of the commodity in the Central and Midwestern States, but that it would be

done "to compel the people to conserve their automobile tires." Every person in this country knows that automobile tires are now placed under rationing orders, and when the tires now on the automobiles are worn out the owner must take his proper place before the rationing board and get new tires if and when he is permitted to purchase the same. But, in the meantime, and while his tires are yet serviceable, he has his own problems to solve—he has his produce to deliver, and he must secure supplies for his business—these are the problems of our farmers, our businessmen, and our people. They want to help in this all-out war effort, and they want to help as long as they can—they want to help as long as their cars and tires will last—and they do not want to be confronted with some useless and unessential order. The people understand the problems that we are facing, and they will do their part—and more. They will do everything within their power to conserve, and to produce, and they hope that their only method of transportation, in many, many instances, will not be entirely taken away from them, so they cannot go forward in their all-out effort to win this war.

Mr. Speaker, these are some of the problems of the small businessmen, the plant owners, the stores, shops, mills, and garages, they are the problems of our small businessmen in this country. They are patriotic—they love our country—they want to make their contribution to victory. It is my fervent hope that those in power in our Government will lend its aid to them.

The pending bill does not go as far as I would suggest, but this is a step in the right direction, and I will support this measure. It is my hope that this legislation will lend some aid to those who need that help—now, because our small businessmen have been facing the peril of destruction, and at a time when we can ill afford to lose any segment of our trade and commerce in this Nation.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LEONARD W. HALL].

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, this bill is not perfect, but it does afford some solution at least of the problem of converting the capacity of small plants and industries throughout the country to our war program. For that reason I am heartily in favor of its passage. Such relief for small business has been too long delayed already.

The great majority of the manufacturing establishments in the United States are small in size. They are located in every hamlet and community. While small in size in the aggregate, they afford a tremendous capacity for the production of war matériel and essential civilian needs.

Up to this time this great capacity of small business has scarcely been tapped. While some contracts and subcontracts have been given to small plants, in the main they have been ignored. In their efforts to play a part in the gigantic program in which our country is engaged, small businessmen have been shunted from department to department and from bureau to bureau. No one person, no central authority, has been constituted to look after their interests.

This bill is the answer to that problem. The Chairman of the War Production Board, under its provisions, will appoint a deputy whose duty it is—

to mobilize aggressively the productive capacity of all small business concerns and to determine the means by which such concerns can be most efficiently and effectively utilized to augment war production.

Similar provision is also made for the part such plants will have in the production of materials for essential civilian purposes. These provisions set up a central authority to look after small business which has been found to be so necessary.

It has been a recognized fact for a long time that small business did not have the financial ability to convert their plants and shops. Under the provisions of this bill that serious situation is provided for by the establishment of a Smaller War Plants Corporation. This Corporation will have the authority, directly or in cooperation with banks, to loan money for the purpose of expansion of plants, buying of equipment and supplies, and furnishing of capital funds.

Most important of all, this Corporation will have the authority to enter into contracts with the United States or any department or agency thereof as a prime contractor. The Corporation then can let such contracts or portions thereof to small business concerns. It can be readily seen that under these provisions production of material and supplies for the Government will be spread to a far greater extent than is true today.

Careful examination of the provisions of this bill convinces me it provides the machinery that all of us have been seeking to aid small business and to answer its just demand that it be allowed to cooperate in our war program.

The policy declaration in this bill is clear. The provisions for its implementation are adequate. The bill is emphatic in its directive that it is the will of the Congress that the administration translate and administer this law not only sympathetically but aggressively. Depending on the type of men who will be placed in control of its operation, and the real solicitude for small business by those in over-all command of our productive machinery, will depend the results of this legislative program.

In this bill is not only every authority needed, but in this bill also is the desire and the will of Congress that the authority delegated for aiding small business be determinedly used. Let those in control keep that in mind.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain excerpts from reports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is my prediction that after the oratory dies away from the passage of this bill the small businessmen of America will find it very disappointing. This bill is premised upon that very familiar policy that has been followed for a number of years, that by making some governmental loans available to certain groups we solve problems. It is not that simple and it will not work here.

I have carefully studied the bill S. 2250, which has for its title, "To mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interest of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes."

I am sure that if we took a vote upon the agreeing or disagreeing to that objective that everyone here would approve of it.

Unless some drastic action is taken, small business will disappear in America. In the early months of the war in England over 20,000 small businesses closed their doors. I have a report that indicates that a year before Japan started her present war that over 12,000 small business houses were closed in that tiny country. The present plight of the small businessman in the United States is not a happy one. It is not just idle oratory when we say that small business is the backbone of American industry—it is true. I shall support this bill that is now before the House, but I wish that it went to the real heart of the difficulties for the small businessman. I do not believe that this bill does that. It does provide some added facilities for making loans to small businessmen, which may do some good, and for that reason I am supporting it.

I am very disappointed in this bill. Let us analyze this proposed legislation. Section 1 of the bill provides for the appointment of a deputy to the Chairman of the War Production Board, whose specific job will be to help small businesses toward utilizing them in the war effort.

Let us look at section 2. Item 1 calls upon the Bureau of the Census to take an inventory of the productive facilities of the small businesses of the United States. In a hearing of the Tolan committee on defense migration, held on October 28, 1941, I questioned Mr. Donald Nelson, now head of the War Production Board, in reference to various proposals for taking an inventory of the available manufacturing facilities in our country. In part, that testimony is as follows:

Mr. NELSON. I believe that the very best method of gathering the information is through industry itself.

Mr. CURTIS. That would be superior to utilizing a branch of the Government, such as the Bureau of the Census, and assigning enumerators not trained in mechanics or anything else.

Mr. NELSON. Yes, sir. There have been too many surveys made by all kinds of organizations—State governments, chambers of commerce, the National Manufacturers' Association, and others—on what machinery is available. But I think we need a method that more directly animates the whole program. That is the ability of management to make the machines do the job. Just a plain

enumeration of machines, in my opinion, has never been enough.

Mr. CURTIS. And the enumerator has to have knowledge of what is needed.

Mr. NELSON. Yes, sir. He must know how to adapt what we have to the need.

Every small businessman in the country knows that what Mr. Nelson is saying is true. He has submitted data by the bushel basket full to his Government. His chamber of commerce has made surveys, and his Congressman has repeatedly told the story to the War Production Board, and the procurement agencies.

Item 2 of this section 2 is that this deputy of the War Production Board Chairman will direct the attention of the officers of the Government having procurement powers to the productive capacity of plants operated by small business. That might be a noble gesture to the countless thousands of small businesses that already have been called to the attention of our procurement agencies, and they have not received any business. The point that I wish to make is that the bill misses the boat in regard to helping small business.

I want to give this House an illustration of what small businessmen have already done to display their wares to the Government.

The Committee on Defense Migration, of which I am a member, came to the early conclusion that whenever the war production program could be geared to utilize the facilities of the small businessmen that many of our troublesome problems of large-scale migrations of people would be over. With this in mind, the committee held three public hearings in the interior of the country, and we called small manufacturers in and asked them why they were not receiving any Government war business.

One of the witnesses was a manufacturer in a small county-seat town of less than 2,000 people. This man operated a successful peacetime business and his products were distributed by such large concerns as the Western Auto Supply, Montgomery Ward Co., and 15 or 16 other concerns. I asked him if he had made any trips to the Office of Production Management office in Omaha. He replied that he had been there 15 or 20 times and that the distance was 400 miles for the round trip. He further testified that he had spent several days at the defense clinic in Kansas City, traveling a distance of 500 miles. He made 2 other trips to Kansas City and 2 trips to Chicago. All he had received up to date was cooperation, bulletins, rules and regulations, and no contracts.

Since the committee took the testimony of this man, I happen to know that the Navy Department sent an engineer to inspect his plant and it was approved. The Navy O. K.'d his set-up and invited him to submit a proposition for a negotiated contract for a defense article. Before the deal was over the Navy changed their mind and ruled that the contracts would have to be on the competitive-bidding system. Although this manufacturer was competing with three or four of the largest concerns in America, he almost got the bid but not quite.

To small businessmen who have tried to get Government war contracts, it will appear rather silly to tax them further to provide an agency to inform another agency that they can do Government work. What we should do is to change our system of procurement so that small business can be put to work.

Items 3 and 4 of section 2 deal with securing contracts in the war effort for small business. If it is assumed that small business must secure its war contracts under the competitive-bidding system, I am afraid that we are in for disappointment.

The negotiated contract should be further employed in order to incorporate small factories in the war activity. This is especially necessary in the first few orders that a small concern may obtain. Small plants just cannot secure war work under the present competitive-bidding system. The result is that larger concerns that should be utilized for more difficult jobs are making things that should be made by the small concerns.

The small concern, without full-time accountants, auditors, tax experts, Washington agents or lobbyists, and other aids, cannot compete with those concerns that do have these advantages. However, with some help on the part of the Government in the way of direction and guidance, they can make these articles at as low a cost as the larger concerns. Under the present system they are wasting a great deal of time and money attempting to bid and are securing no business, thus being unable to render the war program any material assistance.

Item 5 of section 2 deals with provisions for making Government loans to small businesses. If this will make loans available, which cannot be had in private enterprise, or under existing agencies, then I am for it.

Item 6 gives to this deputy chairman the power to certify to Government procurement officers with respect to the competency, as to the capacity and credit of any small business concern, or group of such concerns to perform a specific Government procurement contract. So what? There is nothing in this law that says the procurement agencies must give these small businesses some war contracts. If this certification means that they are eligible to engage in competitive business, they still will not get any war business. The point I am trying to make is that unless we change some of our procurement methods, granting loans to small businesses is not going to help them very much.

We should bear in mind through all of our deliberations that merely by giving small business the opportunity to go further in debt, and not specifically helping them any to get business, is not rendering them a service. This Congress must soon realize that to make appropriations and to make Government loans available does not solve problems.

Item 7 of section 2 admits one of the fundamental weaknesses of our procurement system. This item enumerates as procurement agencies the War Department, the Navy Department, the Treasury Department, and any other agency engaged in war procurement.

Months ago in the study of the problems of the small business the Tolan committee recommended that a single civilian board of the Federal Government be charged with full responsibility for procurement of war production.

A single civilian agency for procurement of all articles needed by the Army, the Navy, the Air Corps, and all other branches has not been created. The businessmen of the country must still investigate countless number of different procurement offices and agencies in order to sell their services and products. The War and Navy Departments still compete with each other. Different procurement offices let contracts on different wage scales, and workers are drawn from one plant, which may have an Army contract, to another plant which may have a Navy contract, or vice versa. A single procurement agency, with the responsibility vested in one place, would take care of this.

Item 8 calls for the making of certain studies to assist small business concerns in receiving supplies of essential raw materials and to receive fair and reasonable treatment from all Government departments and agencies. I am for this, but it is a sad confession that it is necessary.

Section 8 says in effect that the procurement agencies shall not raise any question as to the capacity and credit of a business firm, once that it is certified by the Chairman of the War Production Board. If we are still operating on a competitive bidding system, the small businessman will still be out in the cold.

I have suggested that we make further use of negotiated contracts. The Government should employ production engineers to go from plant to plant among small manufacturers to help them get started in producing war goods. After having full knowledge of all articles needed, they could, upon inspection of a plant, suggest what a particular plant could best make, and how its work might be dovetailed with that of other plants in the region or the industry of which it was a part. They should provide the plant with specifications and models, allow them a short time to try their hand at producing such articles. If the firm is successful, they should then and there negotiate a contract for the manufacture of the said articles at a standard price. This same service could be extended to the manufacturers' pools that have been created.

By this means countless manufacturing facilities can make a direct contribution to the war effort. This will employ people where they are, in their own home towns, thereby relieving the congested centers, eliminating the necessity for building new plants, and the necessity of using scarce materials for new machinery. The crying need of the time is military equipment and more military equipment. We should require that our procurement agencies go out and put every shop and factory in the country to work.

The Congress has already enacted legislation making it possible to streamline our procuring of war goods. Among other things Public Law No. 354 of the

Seventy-seventh Congress, which was approved by the President, December 18, 1941, has this provision:

SEC. 201. The President may authorize any department or agency of the Government exercising functions in connection with the prosecution of the war effort, in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President for the protection of the interests of the Government, to enter into contracts and into amendments or modifications of contracts heretofore or hereafter made and to make advance, progress, and other payments thereon, with regard to the provisions of law relating to the making, performance, amendment, or modification of contracts whenever he deems such action would facilitate the prosecution of the war.

Time will not permit me to discuss the remaining sections of the bill in the manner that I would like to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], who just preceded me, mentioned my city, St. Louis, as one of the places his committee visited. He said the small businessman had not been recognized. The gentleman speaks on a subject he is not fully informed on. Then the gentleman relates what the chambers of commerce have done. With all due respect to the chambers of commerce—and they have been very active, I admit—let me tell the gentleman and everyone else that all the small businessmen in this country do not belong to the chambers of commerce. The big ones do. Naturally, the chambers of commerce look after their own. I do not blame them for that, but a small businessman would hesitate to appeal to an organization he does not belong to.

St. Louis, I will tell the gentleman from Nebraska, has received a tremendous amount of national defense work. In St. Louis we have an office known as the Bureau of Field Operations for the War Production Board. They have a contract distribution manager. I have a report from the contract distribution branch of the St. Louis office showing that during the month of April 1942, $13,708,565 in prime contracts were awarded in St. Louis. Fifty-six contractors participated in the awards. There was one award for $2,600,000; another award for $1,290,000; another award for $1,667,000; another award for $1,400,000; and an award for $1,000,000. Aside from this, the balance of money was divided up among contractors, only one of which amounted to $500,000. During the same month 68 subcontracts were awarded in St. Louis in the amount of $2,538,289, and all of them went to a small businessman. Remember, this was for the month of April alone. This has been going on month after month, but I admit that only a small portion of this type of businessmen have received recognition, and this is due, of course, to the fact that St. Louis is a great industrial center and has thousands of small businessmen within its borders.

The gentleman says that the small businessman is unable to get anywhere under competitive bidding. Practically all of the contracts I refer to are negotiated contracts, which, of course, as the gentleman knows, are different from competitive bidding.

One thing I do want to call attention to, and that is that I regret to say I did receive information that the various procurement agencies discontinued sending out inquiries to the field offices about April 1. This information which was sent out by the procurement agencies notifying the field offices of the War Production Board of awards in the making or awards that had been made enabled the field offices to contact the businessmen in the community and advise them and also advise prime contractors of small businessmen whose establishments were in a position to accept subcontracts for parts for the finished product which the prime contractor was to make. I do feel that the various procurement agencies should continue to send this information to the Bureaus of Field Operations of the War Production Board and I hope our select committee organized to assist the small businessmen will see that they do.

Now we have a bill before us and it seems to me that if a Member of Congress is criticized because small businessmen in his district do not receive recognition, if speeches such as we have just heard are to be made, probably that Member of Congress will refer to his speech when this bill was pending. I do not think we should prepare an alibi now that we can refer to at a later date if the small businessmen say that this legislation has not helped them. If any Member of Congress knows how this bill can be perfected so that it will be more beneficial to the small businessman, then I say it is his duty to present an amendment when the bill is read for amendment and see whether or not he can sell his idea to the Members of the House. I am open to sound suggestions.

I noticed in a St. Louis paper that came to my desk within the last few days where the mattress manufacturers in St. Louis pooled their interests and, as a result, secured a very large Government contract. They undoubtedly determined the amount they could produce individually, then all came to an agreement, and jointly looked for the contract which they succeeded in getting. It seems to me if small businessmen who have all been doing the same type of work would pool their interests they might as a whole secure a large contract and parcel it out among those who participated in the pool. I know at the outset when the War and Navy Departments were going to build large camps and shore stations, regardless of the fact that some outstanding contractor would seek the job, the War and Navy Departments wanted that contractor to join with another responsible contractor because of the size of the job. That was done in many instances. In other words, you had one contractor who specialized in ground work, sewers, streets, sidewalks, water mains, and so forth, who joined with a contractor who had specialized in construction of buildings. It seems to me that was good business on the part of the Government officials who were in charge of letting these contracts.

I had a matter called to my attention last week which seemed to indicate to me that the small businessman was not being treated fairly, although I do not want to accuse anyone of taking advantage of a small businessman because I do not feel that any Government official would willfully do so, but we are all subject to mistakes. In this instance woolens were involved. A supplier in St. Louis, a corporation, being unable to purchase woolens direct from the mill, was forced to buy from a broker in New York. That supplier wanted to remain in business and hold his customers, tailors, and so forth, whom he had supplied for many years, and for this reason he paid a price to the New York broker much above what the mills formerly charged him. The goods were purchased in March and delivered in April and then came the decision of the Price Administrator placing a ceiling on cloths and woolens. The amount of woolens purchased from the New York broker was $25,000. The price was $5,000 above which the St. Louis broker could sell the woolens to his customers as he could not sell above the March ceiling price or he would violate the law. The St. Louis supplier had not paid for the woolens and dropped in my office on his way to New York where he was to have a conference with the broker. The information I received was that he would have to pay the broker the price agreed upon in March and, at the same time, he would be required to sell at the March ceiling price if he disposed of the goods. Now that does not seem fair to me, although there might be circumstances involved of which I have not as yet been advised that would warrant the Price Administrator taking that position.

I have also heard that wholesale clothing manufacturers are going to be required to sell at the March ceiling price to the retailer despite the fact that the cost of the woolens to them bought direct from the mill will mean a tremendous loss. I do not know how you are going to work this out, but it seems that here is a way to help the small businessman by requiring the mills and the brokers to reduce their price to the supplier and the manufacturer so that they will not lose money on their operations. If one sells at the March ceiling price I think all should.

I admit in comparison with the tremendous number of small businessmen in this country only a small percentage will undoubtedly benefit by this legislation, but it is a step in the right direction.

In closing I want to mention that this legislation undoubtedly is the result of the work of the select committee created by this House to investigate the situation confronting the small businessman and make an honest effort to help him. This legislation is sponsored on the House side by the chairman of that select committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]. It has only been in existence a few months and it is pleasing to me to see that we have before us today some

legislation that extends at least some hope to the small businessmen of this country.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, it is true that some contracts are being negotiated, but not enough so for the small manufacturing shop.

If we want to help small business we do not need to create great additions to our Government in Washington to supply them with a lot of bulletins and cooperation and regulations and rules. Some loans are necessary and desirable. If the procurement agencies will unite in their operations and have one systematic way of buying these materials, and then send production engineers out to put these plants to work on a negotiated-contract basis, it will do more good than by adding Government bureaus in Washington.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, having been for the last few months a member of the House Small Business Committee, my interest has been directed toward the plight and the problem of small business, in intense fashion—more so possibly than it otherwise would have been, regardless of the fact that I happen to be one of the many hundreds of thousands of small-business owners in America. Some weeks ago this House passed a bill which is primarily designed for the purpose of relieving the stress imposed upon small business by certain Government orders in the rationing or freezing or of extraordinary imposition of priorities. It is commonly referred to in this House as the bill to help the automobile dealers. As a matter of fact, it was not a bill to help the automobile dealers any more than it was any other business so affected. That bill had considerable merit. While the injury to small business had already been done, it is only natural to expect a time still exists wherein the Government could save many thousands of small business enterprises from bankruptcy. Giving them relief through the R. F. C. may prolong their life until the post-war period, when by their own energy they might reclaim their right to exist as small business enterprises. Now comes a bill today for which I intend to vote, and for which I presume every Member of this House will vote, that is proclaimed by some to be the answer to the problems of small business. It is not the answer. I doubt if this House or any committee of this House or of the other body has the answer.

Small businesses may as well understand that they are going to suffer unusual and untold hardships during this war. I am not so sure but that in great measure this bill is at least the preliminary funeral oration for much of small business, and while we are sending flowers we are much to late to send the full need which would save them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. Not just at this point. In a moment or two I will.

It was just announced by the War Production Board that a reversion of policy was to be put into effect. Instead of continuing the program of building new plants for the production of war materials and war supplies, the policy of the War Production Board and of the Army and the Navy from here on out was to cancel all projected plans which called for completion of new-plant enterprises after the middle of the year 1943. From here on we enter a new phase of the war production program. Up until now the principal phase of the program has been the construction of facilities for the production of munitions of war. From here on out the new phase of the program would be, not the construction of new facilities for productive purposes, but the intensification of production in the presently built facilities, and that this intensification of production encompassed the use of those facilities every hour of the day and night until the war was won.

We had to come to that phase of the program. We could not go on forever building new plants and never consolidate our position of production. It was imperative that we had to reach it as quickly as possible. I think it is commendable, particularly on the part of the War Production Board and of the Army and the Navy that they have, this early in the war, reached that stage of their program.

Under this bill today there is provided the means of conversion of small manufacturing concerns into the war program. If that conversion requires beyond the middle of the year 1943, not according to law as we write it, but according to the policy of the principal production agency of the Government, that plant cannot be converted.

As a matter of fact this bill really does no more than can be done without. It is not a matter which legislative action at this time can necessarily cure. I am not one who believes in extraneous talk falsely encouraging small business.

Until administrative policy directly devotes effort toward a wider distribution of business to the little concern, it will not get help.

This bill does one thing—it directs the attention of the administration to the desires of the Congress. If by virtue of this, 1 percent of distressed business is benefited then our votes here today have been somewhat worth while.

Please do not be guilty of extending false hope to small business by overstatements on the merits of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, since I have explained the provisions of the bill several gentlemen on the other side have arisen and voiced their approval of the proposed legislation. However, answering the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER], as well as the gentleman from Kansas, I may say it is the easiest thing in the world to criticize and find fault. I recognize there is nothing perfect under the sun. Therefore, even this bill is not perfect, but I think it is about as broad and beneficial legislation as I have ever had the pleasure of advocating and supporting. I think each and every one of us recognizes the great ability of this hard working chairman of the War Production Board, Mr. Nelson, who I am sure deserves not only the confidence but the appreciation of Congress and the country as well for his untiring efforts and splendid services he has so far rendered. In view of the fact that he has been endeavoring to aid small business, I feel that he will continue to use his influence and the power granted him to bring about as much relief and as much aid and assistance as is possible.

I realize that we may not be able to take care of every small manufacturer, but under this bill as it is drafted I do not see how we can go much further. That new corporation will have extremely broad and liberal powers to do most anything in aid of the small businessman. We even provide in the bill that if the small businessman cannot cope with the price of the large manufacturer, notwithstanding that fact he should not be discriminated against, and his price, although a little higher, might be and should be accepted.

In that connection I may say that during the last war many people were under the impression when we appropriated $500,000,000 for the War Finance Corporation, that the Government would sustain a great loss.

To the surprise of most of the Members and the country, when the splendid work of that corporation was accomplished, under the chairmanship of the then Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo, the entire country was aided and the entire $500,000,000 was repaid into the Treasury together with an additional $62,000,000 profit. Therefore, there should be no fear that this bill will cost a tremendous sum of money, notwithstanding the liberal provisions in the bill as inserted by the House committee.

I feel that this legislation will aid a large number of small manufacturers, especially those in sections of the country which have had no opportunity to obtain war contracts because they were not in position to accept them.

I know the administration is extremely anxious, as I have stated, and I know the President is desirous that everything should be done to help the small manufacturer and thereby expedite the production that is needed for the prosecution of the war. In view of that, I feel there will not be any vote cast against the rule making this bill in order, and that the bill will be passed by unanimous vote.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me state to the gentlemen representing the Middle West that I feel confident this legislation will be of tremendous benefit to those small manufacturers who have long sought to cooperate with the Government. Furthermore, with wider distribution of production in the Middle West,

the oil shortage in the East will be relieved.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the resolution by inserting on line 9 after the word "chairman" the words "and the ranking minority member."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

HOUR OF MEETING TUESDAY, MAY 26, 1942, AND PROGRAM

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, and I shall not, will the gentleman advise us what the program is for tomorrow? What conference reports are going to be brought up?

Mr. McCORMACK. One conference report deals with numerous matters affecting the War Department that will probably be brought up tomorrow and disposed of; and, of course, the program for tomorrow will be as already indicated.

On Wednesday we expect to call up the conference report dealing with extra cadets at the Military and Naval Academies and the bill to increase the base pay of the men in the armed forces will come up Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Those are the particular bills in which I am interested.

Mr. McCORMACK. I expect also to ask unanimous consent that we meet on Wednesday at 11 o'clock.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PUBLIC DOCUMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a communication which I have received from General Reybold, containing a letter to Hon. Joseph B. Eastman, Director of Defense Transportation, be made a public document. This is a matter of great concern to the Members of the House and has to do with gasoline. It contains the recommendations of General Reybold, and I hope the Members will read it, because there is a very constructive suggestion contained in this letter of General Reybold's. I may say that the cost will be no greater, so I am informed, or about the same as if it were incorporated in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

PROMOTION OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, this bill is the result of study that was made by one of the select committees of the House. On that committee was the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who introduced a bill which was a companion measure to the one passed by the Senate. The House committee considered the Patman bill along with the Senate bill; and, as reported, the measure now before the House is a substitute for the provisions of the Senate bill because we struck out all after the enacting clause of the Senate bill and inserted the provisions of the Patman bill, as amended by the committee.

It is generally recognized by all that in meeting the unprecedented and stupendous requirements of the war program in which the Nation is engaged, with the necessity and intense desire for expedition there necessarily came about dislocations and maladjustments in the economic life of the country and particularly in connection with industries and concerns utilized in the promotion of the war program. So it happens that many small business concerns have suffered as a result of this program because of the concentration of contracts in the hands of large concerns.

I do not claim the bill now under consideration will afford a complete answer to the problem. The problem is difficult at any time. It is one that has confronted us since the peak of the depression through which the Nation passed, one which has engaged the attention of the Congress and the administration through these years. A great deal has been done. It will be remembered that when the original Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act was submitted to the Congress it was in the nature of a relief measure designed to meet difficulties existing at that time; but that measure as at first proposed afforded direct aid to only a limited number of the larger business concerns of the Nation. As originally proposed it was for the relief of banks, life-insurance companies, and railroads. From time to time since then the act has been amended and its service extended to embrace a larger class of our people, always adhering to the principle upon which it was founded, that it should be a service in the nature of relief. Only recently and in view of the present emergency the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has instructed its agencies throughout the various States to proceed independently and in their own right without consultation with the Washington office to pass upon all loans not in excess of $100,000. Under this new relief policy of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation many institutions have been aided and a large number of loans have been made.

This bill will supplement what has been done heretofore. Those of us who have responsibility in connection with the proposal now before the House believe it does to some extent—not wholly, not completely, perhaps not to the extent that may be desired but certainly to a large extent—afford solution of the problem. The bill provides that the Chairman of the War Production Board, through a deputy to be appointed by him, shall make a survey, utilizing such existing agencies of the Government, as may be desirable, to find and locate private concerns that can be of assistance if brought into the war production program.

The bill authorizes and directs the Chairman of the War Production Board, whenever and to the extent that he determines such action to be necessary, to perform certain duties and exercise certain powers which are, briefly, as follows:

First. To make, or provide for the making of, a complete inventory of all productive facilities which may be used for war production.

Second. To direct the attention of governmental procurement officers to the potential productive capacity of small business concerns.

Third. To obtain information regarding prime contractors with the Government, and to take appropriate action regarding the letting of subcontracts upon fair and equitable terms and in the greatest volume practicable.

Fourth. To take action with a view to granting Government contracts to business concerns operating small plants.

Fifth. To certify to the Smaller War Plants Corporation, established by the act, and to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the funds necessary for the conversion to war production of small plants.

Sixth. To certify as to the competency, with respect to capacity and credit, of small concerns and groups of such concerns, for purposes of performance of Government contracts.

Seventh. To obtain from Government procurement and financing agencies connected with war procurement or production, reports as to the letting of contracts and the making of loans.

Eighth. To make studies as to the means by which small business concerns may be supplied with essential raw materials and receive fair and reasonable treatment from governmental agencies.

The bill provides that where a small business concern or a group of such concerns has been certified by the Chairman of the War Production Board to be a

competent Government contractor, Government procurement agencies shall accept such certification as conclusive, and are authorized to let Government procurement contracts to such concern or group of concerns. This section includes a provision recognizing the necessity for the payment by the Government of higher unit prices for articles produced by small business concerns than is the case where contracts are let to larger concerns.

The bill would establish a corporation under the name "Smaller War Plants Corporation," with a board of directors to be selected by the Chairman of the War Production Board, the members to be selected because of their understanding of and sympathy with the problems of small business. The bill provides the corporation $200,000,000 as a revolving fund to be supplied by the Government. The corporation would be authorized to make loans or advances to enable small business concerns to finance plant construction, conversion, or expansion, or to finance the acquisition of equipment, facilities, machinery, supplies, or materials, or to supply such concerns with capital, to be used in the manufacture of articles, equipment, supplies, or materials for war or essential civilian purposes; and such loans and advances may be made either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions. The corporation is also given supplementary powers necessary and appropriate for carrying out the purposes for which it is established.

The corporation is authorized to contract with the Government and procurement agencies of the Government, under contracts obligating the corporation to furnish articles, equipment, supplies, or materials to the Government, and to arrange for the performance of such contracts by letting subcontracts to small business concerns or others for the manufacture, supply, or assembly of such articles, equipment, supplies, or materials, or servicing or processing in connection therewith, or necessary management services.

The Chairman of the War Production Board would certify to the procurement agencies of the Government such small business concerns as he found could properly be drawn into the production picture, and would certify as to the capacity and credit of such institutions. This certification would have to be accepted by the various procurement officials of the Government. The corporation established under the operation of the bill would be authorized to make contracts with the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission for such construction, enlargements, or expansion of plants and the procument of material and equipment as necessary in bringing small business concerns into the production picture. The Smaller War Plants Corporation is authorized to contract directly with the procurement agencies of the Government to secure the service necessary in the extension of plants, enlargement of plants, the equipment, material, supplies, and things essential to the program. Agreements would, no doubt, be made with the procurement agencies of the Government to require prime contractors to deal with subcontractors.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the Smaller War Plants Corporation would certify to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the names of concerns selected for the purpose of receiving contracts and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would take over such contracts through one of its subsidiary corporations, the Defense Plants Corporation, and carry out the obligations of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. When the job is concluded the cost of operation in carrying out the order of the Smaller War Plants Corporation would be paid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and all moneys in excess of such cost received by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would in turn be paid to the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

The Smaller War Plants Corporation is especially designed to look after the interests of the small business concerns that may be turned into the war production program and to assist in maintaining the concerns for essential civilian purposes.

The capital of $200,000,000 supplied the Smaller War Plants Corporation would be in the nature of an insurance fund. It is not expected that the amount provided in the bill would be sufficient to supply the funds that will be needed by small business concerns. The employment of that fund in the nature of an insurance fund would enable the Smaller War Plants Corporation to bring the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and private lending institutions into the picture to do the necessary work.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I notice the words on the heading of the hearings are "Conversion of Small Business Enterprises to War Production." Does this bill go further than providing for the conversion? Does it provide for the establishment of or for the new construction of a small concern to provide critical war material? I am thinking of the possibility of the establishing of small plants to furnish us vitally needed war material heretofore imported but now cut off.

Mr. STEAGALL. That might happen. The purpose is in a practical way, to bring the smaller business concerns as far as can be done into this picture, not alone for the purpose of accomplishing economically the war program now under way, but it would equip and preserve small concerns for a continuation of their services at the end of the war activities.

This bill would be beneficial not only to the war program but it would preserve something like an equilibrium between the smaller and larger business concerns of the country in the conditions that will confront the Nation after the war.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEAGALL. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not find anything in the bill defining what is little business.

Mr. STEAGALL. No. There is no specific definition of what little business is, but the intelligent administrators of this bill will be sympathetic with small business. When they go into a community or into a particular activity they will by comparison with those who have been taken into the picture, and those who have not but who need aid be able to make decision in each instance as to those who fit into the purposes of this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. O'CONNOR. In other words, it would be purely a discretionary matter under the terms of this bill as to who would fall into the classification of "little business"?

Mr. STEAGALL. It would be a matter of discretion, but would be determined by comparisons between plants or in the same line of business or in the same community. A small concern in one community might properly be treated as a large concern in another community.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to be clear. The House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill. The House bill contains certain amendments. In other words, it is more specific in some respects than the Senate bill. I want to be clear on whether or not the bill contains any relief of any kind for a retail merchant or a wholesale merchant not engaged in the production of war matériel or not capable of being converted into the production of war matériel.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. Chairman, I may say that the primary purpose of this bill is to aid in the war program, and in connection with that fundamental purpose to bring small business concerns into the picture wherever it can be done in the war program, or to aid them in carrying on essential civilian activities. But it is not designed to afford loans to retail or wholesale merchants. That is not contemplated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I hope there will no opposition to this bill. There should be no controversy in respect to its merits. It may be necessary to amend the bill in some minor particulars, but in principle the bill should be passed. It is a reenunciation of the legislative policies which have already been enacted and which are now and have been for some months, perhaps years past, on the statute books.

There is no new authority in this bill in respect to the financing of small industries. There is nothing in this bill of a material nature which is not already contained in existing law. The only justification for the bill is that we will again by the reenactment of these policies call attention to the existence of the

machinery which is already set up to do this job in the hope that the administrative branch of the Government will finally be impressed with the sincerity of the Congress and will do the job in accordance with the spirit of the legislation.

The War Production Board, through a deputy appointed by the Chairman, is directed, but he is only directed whenever and to the extent that he determines such action is necessary, to do what? First, to make and arrange with the Bureau of the Census or such other governmental agency as may be possessed of the necessary personnel and facilities for the making of a complete inventory of all productive facilities in the United States which may be used for war production.

He has this power at the present time.

He is to direct the attention of officers of the Government having procurement powers to the potential productive capacity of plants operated by small business concerns.

He has that power now.

I shall not bother to enumerate them, but all the directions in section 2 in respect to the gathering of information apply to things which can be done under existing law.

We set up a corporation under section 4 of the bill to be known as the Smaller War Plants Corporation, with a capital of $200,000,000, and that capital is subscribed and paid in by the Treasury of the United States. This corporation is authorized to take prime contracts from any of the agencies of the Government with procurement powers. I think it should be made very clear that it is the intent of the Congress, as it was the intent of the Committee on Banking and Currency, that this Corporation will take prime contracts and subcontract production to smaller businesses and industries. I hope the enactment of this bill into law will be considered by the War Production Board as a clear enunciation of the Congress in this respect.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is any limit placed in the bill on the amount of the loan that may be made to any small businessman?

Mr. WOLCOTT. No; there is no limit on the amount of any loan which may be made.

I may say that the gist of this bill, if it is worth anything at all, is not in its making credit available, because with the banks at the present time overflowing with credit, to the point where we have $10,000,000,000 or $12,000,000,000 of excess reserves, there is no small industry today which, if it could get a contract from the Federal Government to produce war materials, would have any trouble at all in getting money to convert its plant and execute its contract. So let us not fool ourselves and small industry that from the enactment of legislation which authorizes loans it will necessarily follow that they will get business. If there is any meat in this coconut at all, it is in the clear intent of the Congress that this corporation shall take prime contracts and subcontract such prime contracts to small industries.

We have no definition of a "smaller war plant." We were told that it is a relative term. I suppose that strictly speaking if General Electric or the U. S. Steel Corporation were to be considered smaller than the Ford Motor Co., it could be classified as a smaller war plant and would be eligible for contracts under this bill, but I think it should be demonstrated before we get through with this debate that there is no question in the mind of any Member of Congress but that this bill is to help the very small industry which is going out of business because it cannot get priorities on materials for civilian production; the concern that has utilized metal in the manufacture of household equipment, gadgets, tools, furniture, shoes, and all the other things which are absolutely essential to the civilian use and comfort; the plant which has had to go out of business because it cannot get priorities.

Machines are lying idle all over the United States in thousands of small plants in thousands of small villages and cities. We should make it very clear that these subcontracts should go to that type of industry and should not be concentrated into one large loan for plant expansion to one of a few large companies.

I have stated that there is nothing new in this bill in respect to the authority to give relief to smaller industries. Under section 5 (d) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act the R. F. C. can set up a corporation to do anything it sees fit to do to expedite national defense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

That is why I say we should make it very clear again that it is the clear intention of this Congress that the administrators of these laws do something about this situation. That is the only justification there is for this bill. Something must be done, and I hope that the administrators of our laws, the administrative branch of this Government now having the power but not doing anything about it, will interpret this as a mandate from the Congress to go out and do something for small business and industry; otherwise, we perhaps will have to get a little more directive in our efforts than we have in this bill. If this bill fails in any particular, it is in that it does not direct the administrators of the bill to do the job we hope they will do by the suggestion which it offers.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. If this bill passes and becomes law, and small businessmen in our districts once more come to their Congressmen with hope eternal in their hearts, what should we tell them to do? No doubt in the committee there has been some discussion about what a small businessman should do to get started under this bill if it becomes a law.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I would say to that small businessman that the President of the United States has been given every bit of power and all the money he has asked for to manufacture the matériel which our soldiers need so badly. He, having this authority, having had it since the fall of 1939, and not having done much about it, I would suggest that the small businessman write the White House; or if he holds the White House in awe, then I would suggest that he write Mr. Jesse Jones. If he holds Jesse Jones in awe, or does not know the gentleman as well as we do, then he can write Donald Nelson. If he does not get any satisfaction from Donald Nelson, he might call the attention of Mr. Stimson or of Mr. Knox to the fact that the machinery has been set up on at least two occasions to give him relief, and the Congress has done absolutely everything it possibly can to bail out small industry.

At the present time, the small businessman and industrialist can go to any of five governmental sources for relief, and with this bill passed they can go to at least seven different sources for relief. They do not have to come to the Congress any more because the Congress will have done everything it possibly can for them; in fact, it has gone beyond what should have been necessary by reenunciating policies and reenacting all of these powers which we felt 1 year and 2 years ago would do the job. Whether small industry can continue in business no longer depends upon what Congress does, but solely upon the manner in which acts of Congress are administered. The destiny of small business and industry in America is in the hands of the administration; it can destroy them or save them. Small business and industry are the hub around which our economic system revolves. If the administration does not save them by sympathetic and judicious exercise of the powers which the Congress has delegated to it, then free enterprise will disintegrate, and democracy will crumble.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

THE SMALL-BUSINESS BILL

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on Small Business, of the House, and the Committee on Small Business, of the Senate, have been working on this legislation ever since December of 1941. The Senate Small Business Committee is composed of Senators MURRAY (chairman), MALONEY, ELLENDER, MEAD, STEWART, CAPPER, and TAFT. The House Small Business Committee is composed of Representatives PATMAN (chairman), BULWINKLE, KELLY of Illinois, FITZGERALD, HALLECK, LEONARD W. HALL, and PLOESER.

I believe it can truthfully be said that this bill is a result of the study and investigation made by these two committees. It is true that the Banking and Currency Committee of the House and the similar committee of the Senate have done lots of work on this bill and, of course, to those committees we owe much credit because they have really formulated the provisions that are now contained in the copy that is before you. It is not the desire of the small-business committees to accept all the credit. They

are not entitled to all the credit, but they are entitled to a fair share of the credit and so are the two committees on Banking and Currency of the House and Senate.

This bill is effective. It is no cure-all and no one claims it will solve all the problems of small business. Notwithstanding the statements that have been made this bill will help small business more than any other bill that has ever passed the Congress.

The question has been asked, What is small business? The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] correctly stated awhile ago that that is a relative term. The chairman of the committee stated that it is a question of comparison. Both statements are correct. In the rubber industry you have large and small manufacturers of rubber. You have no trouble in your own mind determining which is small and which is large. The same is true as to automobiles. The same is true as to any article or commodity that you can name. You have no difficulty whatsoever in determining in your mind that there are small concerns and large concerns. Take oil, for instance. You know the names of the big companies and you know the names of the small ones. So you do not have the least difficulty in the world in determining small business as compared with large business in any business or industry.

SOME THINGS THIS BILL WILL DO

Now let me tell you a few things this bill will do. Our House Committee on Small Business discovered that people were following in one another's footsteps to obtain from a small manufacturer exactly the same information. A small manufacturer would have the equipment to do a job and then the War Production Board would send a man out and he would fill out a long questionnaire. This was absolutely necessary. They needed the information, all about his skill, his ability, his talents, his workmen, his credit, his background, and everything that was necessary for them to have. Then after the War Production Board obtains the information the Maritime Commission comes along and they go to the small fellow and get the same information. Then the Army comes along, following right in the footsteps of the others, and gets the same information. Then the Navy comes along and then the Procurement Division of the Treasury, and the result is that this poor manufacturer has spent weeks and months furnishing information that does not get him any contracts. Why? Because he must not only have the facilities, but he must have the money and credit. Heretofore he could get a contract if he could get the money and he could get the money if he could get a contract, but the two were not together. So he was given the run-around. This bill puts them all in the hands of one person and one board and they can give him not only the contract, but they have the power to give him the money or at least lend him the money along with the contract. Not only that, they can do something else that there is no power on earth existing today that any Government agency has, and that is to furnish him additional facilities to enable him to carry out that contract. Not only that, they can do something that no other existing agency can do today and that is to rehabilitate his plant, if necessary. No other agency has that power today. Furthermore, and the greatest power in this bill, is the power to take a prime contract itself—the Smaller War Plants Corporation—and then allocate it to Tom, Dick, and Harry, all small fellows who can perform that contract. As it is now, a small manufacturer goes to the big man who is his competitor. The big man has a big contract and he wants part of that contract. If the small fellow gets it at all, he does not get it under favorable terms because people are selfish. They are looking after themselves and they are going to keep the cream of that contract and let the little fellow have the odds and ends that pay nothing. This is exactly what has been happening in this country and this measure has for its purpose getting around that.

This Smaller War Plants Corporation is composed of men who believe in small business. They can take that contract themselves, this corporation can, and instead of the little fellow having the odds and ends they can divide it up among the little fellows that are able to do the work and get some of the cream themselves. That is a power that no other governmental agency has today. It is a tremendous power, and when anyone says that this bill supplements existing regulations merely and duplicates existing efforts, they have not given it sufficient consideration, or they would not make that statement. This bill has tremendous power and will do more to help small business than all of the other bills passed by this Congress. The bill not only includes war supplies, but essential civilian supplies. That is another point you do not have in any existing Government agency, essential civilian supplies. There are certain supplies just as essential to our civilian population as war supplies are essential for our service men. We have to keep them both going at the same time, and the object of this is not only to help the manufacturers in war production and materials, but to assist them if engaged in the manufacture of essential war supplies.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I yield to a distinguished member of our House Small Business Committee.

Mr. PLOESER. I think the distinguished chairman of the Small Business Committee of the House should also point out that this is as far as Congress can go, and that beyond that the civilian supply manufacturer has to look to the priorities authorities before he can do anything even with this help.

Mr. PATMAN. This bill gives it power to do that. I expect to offer an amendment that will, I think, be very helpful. It was not offered in committee. We were trying to get the bill out by noon one day. The bill had provoked a little discussion and argument, and rather than have the bill delayed until the next committee meeting I did not offer this amendment, but said that I expected to offer it on the floor. The amendment is on page 21, line 9, after the period, to insert the following:

Page 21, line 9, after the period, insert the following: "In any case in which the Chairman of the War Production Board certifies to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Director of the Procurement Division of the Treasury, or to any other officer of the Government having procurement powers that the Smaller Plants Corporation is competent to perform any specific Government procurement contract to be let by any such officer, it shall be the duty of such officer to let such procurement contract to such corporation upon such terms and conditions as may be specified by the Chairman of the War Production Board."

I hope there will be no objection to that amendment. It will be helpful.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It seems to me that the adoption of that amendment which the gentleman has just read will strengthen this bill more than any other amendment that we could possibly put on it and I certainly hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman. This bill is to coordinate the activities of the different agencies of our Government, not only in connection with war supplies, but also in connection with essential civilian supplies. We do not need further duplication of effort. It is absolutely wrong for us to build up all these separate agencies, every one of them getting exactly the same information and that is what we are doing. Go over the country and you will find offices established for the Maritime Commission, and that Commission will spend months, and use hundreds and thousands of people getting the same information that the War Production Board now has itself. The Army has agents all over the country, and they get up their own information and the Navy does the same thing, as well as the Procurement Division of the Treasury. They are all working separate and distinct. This will coordinate them and bring them together.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS. Does not the gentleman feel that there is considerable merit to the idea of a central procurement agency?

Mr. PATMAN. That is what this is. It puts it under Donald Nelson, the war-production chief, and that is where it should be. That is exactly what this bill is for—to coordinate the efforts of all.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman think this bill will go so far as to take actual procurement away from the Army and the Navy?

Mr. PATMAN. Not arbitrarily, no. There are certain things like machine

guns, where certain specifications must be used which the War Production Board does not know anything about. They will not take a contract like that. But anything they certify they can handle that way is conclusive on all other governmental agencies. So this bill is doing exactly what the gentleman states, as far as we can go.

Mr. CURTIS. Does the gentleman think that as soon as this bill becomes law the War Production Board or any agency created by it will be the one that will request bids and receive them, instead of the Army and the Navy?

Mr. PATMAN. It depends upon the thing that is wanted. If it is a machine gun, of course they will not, but things they can handle they will and should.

Mr. CURTIS. But there will still be four or five procurement agencies.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; but they will be coordinated under one leadership, the leadership of Donald Nelson, Chief of the War Production Board.

Mr. CURTIS. They will be coordinated.

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely.

[H. Rept. 2131, 77th Cong., 2d sess.]

MOBILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS FOR WAR AND ESSENTIAL CIVILIAN PRODUCTION

The Committee on Banking and Currency, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The committee amendment strikes out all of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserts in lieu thereof a substitute which appears in the reported bill in italic type.

NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

The bill here reported, the Murray-Patman bill, is intended to meet the need for a workable plan to provide for the effective mobilization and utilization, for war purposes, of the very substantial productive capacity of small business in the United States, which has not been used advantageously up to the present time.

Extensive hearings were held by the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency on the bill. Full hearings were held by this committee on the bill here reported and its companion bill, H. R. 6975. This bill and H. R. 6975 were based primarily on the findings and factual information developed by the studies and hearings of the Small Business Committee of the Senate and the Small Business Committee of the House.

It is in order to expedite legislative action that the Senate bill, which has already passed the Senate, is being reported to the House rather than H. R. 6975.

We are all aware of the great war production program which is being carried on at the present time, and cognizant of the fact that war production has, within the past few months, been stepped up to tremendous proportions. The demands of war have had to be met, and it has been necessary to use those means which would secure maximum production within the shortest possible time. The great Government procurement agencies have naturally turned first to the big production plants because such concerns could be dealt with as prime contractors, and their plants were already in production or could be readily converted to war production. This phase of our production is progressing rapidly and efficiently.

However, we are now ready to develop and utilize the next great potential source of productive capacity—the smaller manufacturers and business concerns whose plants are not already equipped to serve the Government agencies as prime contractors, or may not be utilized for war production purposes as readily as was the case with the larger production plants. It is important not only from the standpoint of the war production program, but also from the standpoint of the national welfare, that this great potential productive capacity be developed and used as rapidly and efficiently, and on as large a scale, as is possible. The committee substitute has been carefully worked out with a view to accomplishing this objective.

EXPLANATION BY SECTIONS

Section 1 contains two paragraphs, the first of which makes it the duty of the Chairman of the War Production Board, through a deputy to be appointed by him, to mobilize aggressively the productive capacity of all small business concerns, and to determine the means by which such concerns can be most efficiently and effectively utilized to augment war production. The second paragraph authorizes and directs the Chairman of the War Production Board, through the deputy appointed by him, to cooperate to the fullest practicable extent with the Director of Civilian Supply and other appropriate governmental agencies in the issuance of all orders limiting the production of business enterprises, with a view to insuring that small business concerns will be most efficiently and effectively utilized in the production of articles, equipment, supplies, and materials for both war and essential civilian purposes.

Section 2 authorizes and directs the Chairman of the War Production Board, whenever and to the extent that he determines such action to be necessary, to perform certain duties and exercise certain powers which are, briefly, as follows:

1. To make, or provide for the making of, a complete inventory of all productive facilities which may be used for war production.

2 To direct the attention of governmental procurement officers to the potential productive capacity of small business concerns.

3. To obtain information regarding prime contractors with the Government, and to take appropriate action regarding the letting of subcontracts upon fair and equitable terms and in the greatest volume practicable.

4. To take action with a view to granting Government contracts to business concerns operating small plants.

5. To certify to the Smaller War Plants Corporation (established by the act) and to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the funds necessary for the conversion to war production of small plants.

6. To certify as to the competency, with respect to capacity and credit, of small concerns and groups of such concerns, for purposes of performance of Government contracts.

7. To obtain from Government procurement and financing agencies, connected with war procurement or production, reports as to the letting of contracts and the making of loans.

8. To make studies as to the means by which small business concerns may be supplied with essential raw materials and receive fair and reasonable treatment from governmental agencies.

Section 3 provides that where a small business concern or a group of such concerns has been certified by the Chairman of the War Production Board to be a competent Government contractor, Government procurement agencies shall accept such certification as conclusive, and are authorized to let Government procurement contracts to such concern or group of concerns. This section includes a provision recognizing the necessity for the payment by the Government of higher unit prices for articles produced by small business concerns than is the case where contracts are let to larger concerns.

Section 4 creates a corporation to be known as the Smaller War Plants Corporation. The corporation is to have a revolving fund of $200,000,000 and is to be managed by a board of five directors, who are to be persons familiar with the problems of small business, and are to be appointed by the Chairman of the War Production Board. The corporation is not to exist after July 1, 1945, unless its life is extended by act of Congress. The ordinary and usual powers granted to similar governmental corporations are provided for.

For the purpose of aiding in carrying out the purposes of the act, the corporation is authorized to make loans or advances to enable small business concerns to finance plant construction, conversion, or expansion, or to finance the acquisition of equipment, facilities, machinery, supplies, or materials, or to supply such concerns with capital, to be used in the manufacture of articles, equipment, supplies, or materials for war or essential civilian purposes; and such loans and advances may be made either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions. The corporation is also given supplementary powers necessary and appropriate for carrying out the purposes for which it is established.

The corporation is authorized to contract with the Government and procurement agencies of the Government, under contracts obligating the corporation to furnish articles, equipment, supplies, or materials to the Government, and to arrange for the performance of such contracts by letting subcontracts to small business concerns or others for the manufacture, supply, or assembly of such articles, equipment, supplies, or materials, or servicing or processing in connection therewith, or necessary management services.

Appropriate provisions are included prohibiting the overvaluation of securities or the doing of other specified acts which would interfere with the proper functioning of the corporation.

Section 5 requires the Chairman of the War Production Board to make reports to the President and to Congress every 60 days.

Section 6 provides that when the Smaller War Plants Corporation has completed any transaction under clause (1), (2), or (3) of section 4 (g), it shall transfer the loan, advance, plant, equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, or other property resulting from the transaction to the Defense Plants Corporation, and the latter corporation shall service and administer such loan, advance, or property as the agent of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

Section 7 provides that the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission are authorized to make or participate in loans, guaranties, and commitments in accordance with Executive Order No. 9112, and to participate in or guarantee any loan made pursuant to this act when the loan is made with a view to increasing the production of war materials, supplies, or equipment. It is further provided that in taking such action the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission may use any funds heretofore or hereafter made available to them for purposes of procuring war materials, supplies, and equipment, or of expediting the production thereof.

Section 8 amends section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act so as to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to and purchase obligations of business enterprises (including subscriptions to capital stock when requested by the Secretary of Commerce) for any purpose deemed by the Corporation to be advantageous to the national defense. The amended section also authorizes the War Department and the Navy Department to participate in or to guarantee any such loans made by the

Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for such purpose may use funds heretofore or hereafter made available for purposes of procuring war materials, supplies, and equipment.

Section 9 makes all insured banks eligible as depositaries of Government funds when designated for that purpose by the Secretary of the Treasury, and prohibits all Government departments and officials from discriminating between insured banks, by classes, in the deposit of public funds or funds subject to Government control, or from requiring others to so discriminate. The section also broadens the existing deposit insurance protection extended by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to give separate coverage to the deposits of public money of each official custodian of the Government. It also eliminates the necessity of securing deposits of public money to the extent of the insurance protection afforded by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Section 10 provides that nothing in the act shall be construed to modify, or limit in any manner, authority vested in the Chairman of the War Production Board, or the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any of its subsidiaries, by Executive order or act of Congress.

Section 11 provides that whenever the Chairman of the War Production Board certifies to the Attorney General in writing that the doing of any act or the omission to do any act, by one or more specified persons, in compliance with any regulation, order, request, or approval of the said Chairman is requisite to the prosecution of the war, the doing of such act or the omission to do such act shall not be deemed a violation of the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission Act if the Attorney General certifies in writing that such regulation, order, request, or approval is in effect an order or direction requisite to the prosecution of the war and is not an unlawful delegation of discretion to a private group.

CHANGES FROM THE BILL AS PASSED BY THE SENATE

The committee substitute follows closely the bill as it passed the Senate, and also H. R. 6975.

Other than clarifying and perfecting changes, the important changes and additions are as follows:

The Chairman of the War Production Board is not only authorized but is directed to exercise the powers contained in section 2.

The provision in section 3 recognizing that it may be necessary to pay a higher per-unit price in the case of articles produced by small business concerns is new.

The revolving fund provided for the Smaller War Plants Corporation, in section 4, is increased from $100,000,000 to $200,000,000.

The elimination of certain language from section 4 (e) and the addition of a new section 9 covering the same matters clarify the bill insofar as it relates to the matters intended to be covered and also to provide for simplifying the handling of deposits of public funds.

Section 7 has been modified so as to give legislative approval to the exercise of authority under Executive Order No. 9112, and to limit the participation in or guarantee by the War Department, the Navy Department, or the Maritime Commission, of loans made under the act to those loans made with a view to increasing the production of war materials, supplies, or equipment.

Section 11, relating to immunity from the antitrust laws and the Federal Trade Commission Act, under the special circumstances specified in the section, is new.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 2a of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in subparagraph (2) of the fourth paragraph of section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic):

[(2) To make loans to, or, when requested by the Federal Loan Administrator with the approval of the President, purchase the capital stock of, any corporation (a) for the purpose of producing, acquiring, and carrying strategic and critical materials as defined by the President, and (b) for plant construction, expansion and equipment, and working capital, to be used by the corporation in the manufacture of equipment and supplies necessary to the national defense, on such terms and conditions and with such maturities as the Corporation may determine; and]

(2) To make loans to and purchase the obligations of any business enterprise, including, when requested by the Secretary of Commerce, subscription to the capital stock thereof, for any purpose deemed by the Corporation to be advantageous to the national defense. Such loans, purchases, or subscriptions shall be made under such terms and conditions and with such maturities as the Corporation may determine. The War Department and the Navy Department are hereby authorized to participate in or to guarantee any loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to this provision, and, in connection therewith, they may use any funds heretofore or hereafter made available for purposes of procuring war materials, supplies, and equipment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. YOUNGDAHL].

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Chairman, on the cover of the official magazine of the American Federation of Labor for the month of May is found the following quotation:

> Safeguarding our economy at home is the very least our soldiers, sailors, and marines have a right to expect of us civilians.

According to this publication this statement was recently made by the President of the United States.

I thoroughly agree with our Commander in Chief, but if we are to safeguard the bulwark of the system of private enterprise then the small businessman and his employees must be given a better break. We cannot deprive these Americans of all their raw materials and tools of profession and expect our system to continue.

Yes; all Americans want to aid in our war production program, but at the same time let us preserve the very thing the boys abroad are fighting for.

It behooves each and every Member of Congress, as well as our defense agencies, to give serious thought to this problem.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, there are three or four very fundamental things in this bill as I evaluate it.

First, I should like to call the attention of the Members of the House to the statement of Mr. Donald Nelson on page 57, toward the bottom of the page. I think someone has taken the position that the committee, or at least certain members of the committee, were recommending this bill as a panacea for the troubles of small business. Certainly I do not understand it to be such, and Mr. Nelson has put his thoughts to that effect down in very understandable language. I think it would be well for all those who may have occasion to refer to this bill in the future to read exactly what Mr. Nelson has to say.

Secondly, as pointed out, there are two very fundamental activities set up here. One is the creation of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. According to my understanding of the language, when that corporation is brought into operation it will operate somewhat as an operating holding company. Mr. Nelson's thought, as I understand it, is that he will attempt to bring under the Smaller War Plants Corporation, private corporations and whip them into a producing unit, and thereby give private corporations a chance to participate in some production in which they cannot participate from a credit standpoint and from a technical standpoint, without supervision and heading up by some supervising agency similar to the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

A third proposition in this bill is set forth in section 7, page 24 of the bill as submitted by the committee, wherein this bill puts in statutory form Executive Order No. 9112, issued by the President, authorizing the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission to guarantee loans made by commercial banks to business, small, intermediate, and large, engaged in producing goods ordered by those three agencies of government, the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission. Anyone who is interested in this production program and in what I would call high financing, can well afford to study these hearings. I think the committee developed some very pertinent facts pertaining to our whole war economy at the present time.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. What is there in this bill which enables large or small companies, inexperienced in war work, to obtain risk capital to enable them to carry on the new work?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would say that section 7 goes directly to that question, along with Executive Order No. 9112. I might enlarge on that just a little. As the war program unfolded itself the President discovered that there was a shortage of credit for certain types of operation, and certain firms. He issued Executive Order No. 9112, authorizing the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission to use funds appropriated to them by Congress for war production as a basis for guaranteeing loans made to manufacturing companies by commercial banks, the R. F. C., and the Federal Reserve banks. In other words, through Executive Order No. 9112, which is made the law by section 7 of this bill when enacted, it furnishes the risk capital which the lady from Montana has referred to. That is exactly what that capital is, it is risk capital, because if corporation A, for instance, goes to its local commercial bank and says: "I want

to borrow $100,000 to help produce something in which I am inexperienced"—gas masks, for instance, machine guns, tanks, bombs, whatever it might be—the bank does not want to risk its capital because the company is inexperienced. So it can resort to Executive Order No. 9112, and through this machinery which is created, obtain from the Army, the Navy, or the Maritime Commission a guarantee against loss of the risk capital which the bank will furnish to the manufacturing concern making the obligation and new undertaking.

You will find from the hearings where Mr. Clayton, of the Federal Reserve Board, made some statements in answer to questions which Members submitted to him, to the effect that perhaps several billions of dollars would be thus applied for under machinery of Executive Order No. 9112, advanced by the commercial banks to manufacturers under the first year's operations. To give you a rough idea of what this thing may run into, if you will look into the discussion on appropriations for the last week you will find where the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] points out that something like $203,000,000,000, roughly, have been more or less "machined" since July 1, 1940, in connection with this war effort. You will also see from the debate that less than $30,000,000,000 have been actually spent of the $203,000,000,000 up to date.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, we have, let us say, $175,000,000,000 to go which we can see in sight at the present time. We are, insofar as expenditures are concerned, just beginning to get into this program; and as I view the situation directly from the field, making Executive Order 9112 law so that the legal advisers of the banks and the borrowing and lending committees of the banks know what they are doing, it opens up additional credit facilities for the prosecution of war production and actually meets many requirements not otherwise now available.

Now a word as to the Smaller War Plants Corporation which is to be set up by Mr. Donald Nelson and his administrative staff. I started to point out awhile ago that if you will read the references on pages 183, 190, and 191 of the hearings, particularly in connection with the testimony submitted by Major Smith, of the War Department, you will come to the conclusion that Mr. Nelson now has absolute power to do just about as he pleases in this matter of placing orders. If he is not doing what you think he should do in behalf of small industry you had better support the Patman amendment so that when this whole approach is completed into statutory law you will have some reason for saying to the little fellow back home, or the big fellow, that Mr. Nelson not only has the power but there is a law on the books which makes it mandatory that he place these contracts when the Smaller War Plants Corporation is certified as being able to do the job. For these reasons I really think this bill will accomplish something along the line we have been trying to work on here for some time.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman explain just what collateral, or security, a small plant will be required to put up in order to get a loan under this plan?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I will tell you what some of the small companies are now doing: They are with contracts in their hands simply going to the commercial banks and saying: "Here is the contract. You have Executive Order 9112. I want to get a loan." And the loans are going through on the basis of 100-percent guaranties, 90-percent guaranties, 75-percent guaranties, and 66⅔-percent guaranties. The loans are now being made under the Executive order and regulations V issued by the Federal Reserve Board.

Those directly charged with the execution of the war want this bill approved. If it will preserve small enterprise and assist in winning the war let us get along with the job.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I realize that this act is not a panacea for all the ills that beset the small businessman, but I believe it will accomplish a good purpose and I am going to take great pleasure in voting for it.

Under this act, the Chairman of the War Production Board is empowered through a deputy to be appointed by him to mobilize aggressively the productive capacity of all small business concerns, and to determine the means by which such concerns can be most efficiently and effectively utilized to augment war production. It is provided that a complete inventory of all productive facilities in the United States which may be used for war production shall be made by the Bureau of the Census, and that Bureau shall also obtain all other pertinent information. The act provides for the creation of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which shall have capital stock of $200,000,000 subscribed by the Treasury of the United States. Its purpose is to mobilize and marshal the resources of the smaller businesses and to organize them for the purpose of performing war contracts and contracts for essential civilian supplies. The Smaller War Plants Corporation has authority to enter into prime contracts and distribute and reapportion the work and sublet the contracts to various small business concerns.

It is recognized that it may be necessary for the Government to pay a higher per-unit price for such articles to business concerns operating small plants than it pays to business concerns operating large plants. This may entail some loss, but is certainly justified by the result sought to be obtained.

The policy of this corporation, I think we may say, will be controlled by the Chairman of the War Production Board, for he appoints the Board of Directors, who shall be deemed to be familiar with the problems of small business. The corporation has broad powers to make loans to small business, and the War Department and the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission may guarantee all the loans made under this act. These guaranties will support the operations of the banks, the Federal Reserve System, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and other credit agencies. The purpose of the act is not only to increase the productive capacity of the United States by making it possible for small business to enter into the war program, but also saving small business for the useful function it may perform after the war.

However, there is a very great part of the small business concerns that cannot be converted to war work. Mr. Nelson, in his testimony, said there are 1,770,000 retailers, 200,000 wholesalers, 646,000 service concerns, and 184,000 manufacturers, making a total of 2,800,000 small businesses in the United States. Out of this number, Senator MURRAY testified there are 184,000 eligible for war work and only 10,000 have received it. He also testified 56 of the largest corporations have received 75 percent of the war contracts, and the other 9,944 which are eligible have received only 25 percent. What will become of those small industries that are unable to convert to war work no witness would predict. Their preservation is certainly a major problem that deserves the best consideration of the Congress.

Small business made America. It created every hamlet, village, and city in the land. It came with the pioneers and frontiersmen. It was a pioneer. The primitive small businessman set up his store in the clearing in the forests and at the cross trails in the prairie. He built his mill upon the water courses in the wilderness. The primitive small transportation companies, from which have grown the great, made their perilous trips through the lawless and Indian-infested country, through the trackless forests and over the unbridged rivers, to bring the small businessman his goods. The small businessman extended credit to his people. He was paid by the trapper with his pelts and by the farmer with the produce of his soil. The miller was paid his toll in flour and meal. The small businessman extended the time for payment until the farmer had harvested his crop and until his debtors had accumulated enough to pay him either in money or in those things which they had acquired by their labor. He had the confidence of his patrons and they, as a rule, had his confidence. The little frontier store was, as the country store has always been, the meeting place of the people, where they discussed their political affairs, the defense of their homes, and other matters of interest. Small business was here before the trusts and combines and chain stores. It was here before big business. It has survived all the vicissitudes of fortune and all the disasters of the panic years.

It would continue to survive but for rationing priorities and allocations. Big business has always been influential. Big business has always been jealous of its privileges. Its voice has been heard everywhere it might be helpful to its interest. Small business has never been organized. It has not always had the opportunity to speak with unity and authority for its interests and its rights.

The spirit of the Constitution is to protect the rights of the weak against the invasion of the strong, to protect the small businessman against his more powerful competitor, to see that all obtain equal justice under law. The continuation of small business is necessary for the preservation of our democratic institutions and for the maintenance of those fundamental things which we have always held dear. The small businessman takes an interest in his local community. He contributes to its civic and charitable institutions. He is part of it. If we are to preserve our form of government and if we are not to adopt the totalitarian system where no little business survives, but where all business is big business, controlled and regimented by the government, we must preserve little businesses and the little businessman. His character, initiative, and ingenuity are part of the American tradition. The trust he had in the people who patronized him was reciprocated by them and developed a sense of duty and honor that has been highly beneficial in molding the character of the Nation. Little business is more than part of the national economy; it is a part of the soul of America, and if it is destroyed, it can never be supplied. The small plants of America are a reservoir of power and resources that must be utilized to full capacity to win the world conflict. Any destruction of them weakens the war effort. It has been stated that those industries with less than 500 employees account for more than 60 percent of all our industrial workers.

We must retain in the American people the initiative, the independence, the courage, and the self-reliance that the small business developed and fostered. You need not lay the flattering unction to your soul that you have saved small business by the passage of legislation. It is the spirit in which it will be administered that will save or destroy it. The Smaller War Plants Corporation can mobilize and marshal the resources of the smaller war plants and apportion the contracts as it may appear they can be advantageously performed, but there will still be constant temptation and a tendency to give the contracts to the big concerns. This will avoid the multiplicity of detail and the great increase of work involved in apportioning the contracts to many small firms. Big business will be able to exert influence the small man does not possess. Those who administer this act must be adamant against that influence and must steel themselves against succumbing to arguments of representatives of big business. Whether this bill will furnish the relief we hope to afford little business and the small businessman will depend largely upon its administration. The casualty list of small business will necessarily be large, but let us see that that list is reduced as much as favorable legislation can accomplish the purpose, and let us insist on a wise, liberal, and sympathetic administration of this act.

Those who administer this act have a great responsibility and a great opportunity. If the legislative intent is fulfilled, they will be entitled to the gratitude of the people not only for the present but for all time.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KELLY].

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the Banking and Currency Committee is to be congratulated for the fine work they are undertaking this afternoon.

While this bill may not accomplish all it desires, nevertheless, it is a step in the right direction.

As Senator MURRAY has stated:

> As a result of the impact of the gigantic national defense and war programs on our American economy, small business enterprise in the United States is facing bankruptcy and chaos along a wide front. The administrators of these war programs, drawn almost exclusively from the ranks of big business, have signally failed in giving recognition to the small businessman of this country.

It is, I presume, a natural instinct for those men that were appointed to the Office of Production Management—now the War Production Board—to deal with large business rather than with small business. Almost 70 percent of all contracts that have been allocated by the Army, Navy, and Treasury have gone to big business. Most of us can fully understand that, knowing as we do that big business was in a far better position to handle mass production on a large scale. But big business cannot do it all.

In most cases the fact that procurement officers have always been associated with large business has even made the neglect seem deliberate, but in general all of the contract departments have failed to recognize the vital role of small business, with its plant, machinery, managerial ability, and skilled labor, in the winning of this war.

Based upon testimony presented, which is a matter of record before the hearings of the Senate committee, Mr. Floyd Odlum, Director of the Division of Contract Distribution, testified that at least 20,000 more manufacturing plants could be brought into the war program "to a substantial degree," and that "when the smaller metal-working plants are brought in the total may well approximate 45,000 plants." But instead of bringing them in they are further being destroyed.

Unless something is done at once, and I am afraid that, for the majority, a great deal of damage has already been done, many a small factory could be in operation today that had to close its doors because no one on the War Production Board would listen to them when they tried to rearrange or reconvert their plants to meet whatever requirement was made of them that they might stay in operation. Much of their capacity has already disappeared. The need for speedy assistance was stressed by small-business representatives from every section of the Nation in our committee hearings on the Small Businessman's Committee of the House, in January last.

Mr. Odlum also stated:

> Many businesses can hold out if they know that relief is coming.

He further explained:

> But if they know there is no relief coming and can't see any point in holding out, they will close down; and when that happens to a small plant, you cannot revive it.

Remember, 68 percent of all the manufacturers in this Nation come within this category. I do not say they all can be kept in operation, but if an intensive survey were made, and I hope will be made under the authority of this bill, they can, and will, find ways and means to keep the larger percent of these small plants in operation, operation not for civilian uses, but operation for the uses of war implements, where we can utilize all available plants, machinery, and manpower, and go into mass production.

Under the war power, machinery can be requisitioned and moved miles away from its present location, and from the factory where it served its purpose. If this machinery must be removed, and put in operation in some other location, why cannot the material be shipped to where this machinery is located, and at least keep that factory in operation?

We all are anxious to expedite whatever steps be taken to win this war, but we also must protect this Nation for the post-war days that will follow.

If these small concerns are gone, when that day comes, what is going to become of the people that enjoyed home life in these communities and small cities where the owners of these plants, together with the people they employed, had a civic pride in? They are the backbone of American life. The small factory is the backbone of industrial life.

If a great percentage of our American people have to give up their homes and become migrants, traveling from place to place, seeking work, what will become of that home life they enjoyed, what will become of their children? Education will fly out the door. It will be a sad plight in the history of our country if this is not checked, and work is not brought to these cities, and not concentrating industry in just a few locations in America.

Enormous loans have been made to large concerns, and in many cases the Government itself has built plants for companies to operate; but small business has had tremendous difficulty in securing loans of any kind. The report shows that 56 of America's 184,230 manufacturing establishments have been awarded over 75 percent of Army and Navy contracts. The remaining fragment of the defense program is distributed among 6,000 prime contractors. About another 4,000 plants or concerns hold subcontracts. Over 174,000 manufacturing establishments have not been properly surveyed to determine what they can do in the mobilization of the Nation's industrial resources.

While $13,000,000,000 has been spent or allocated for plant expansion in the cre-

ation of new facilities for big business, no consideration has been given to expanding the facilities of little business. Yet the possibilities for expanding little business are very great.

Thousands of towns and rural areas contain large supplies of skilled and unskilled manpower, almost none of which is being used at present for war efforts. In spite of the high peak of production that this country is now engaged in, in many sections unemployment is on the increase.

Mr. Chairman, I hope, for the good of America, that the passage of this bill will at least extend some sound and constructive thought in helping these patriotic business people to receive their share of this war production and help them who take pride in their communities to at least retain the right to remain in business.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. KEAN].

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, like the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], I do not want to hold out too great hope to little businessmen as a result of the passage of this bill.

As he says, it is true that most of the powers granted here could be exercised under legislation now on the books, but I do feel that the restating by Congress of their desire that small business be included in the war program, and our belief that it must be in order to insure the greatest production, should point the way to the executive branch which has the responsibility for administering of this bill. And this bill can only be successful if those charged with its administration are more sympathetic with the problems of small business than those in charge of war production have been in the past.

Also the establishment of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, with someone at its head to whom small businessmen may turn for advice and counsel should be worth while.

Mr. KUNKEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEAN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. In other words, if this problem had received sympathetic consideration from the start, then this bill would probably not be necessary?

Mr. KEAN. In my opinion, the gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. Chairman, small business is the backbone of our country. It is the independent businessman who mans the bulwarks of democracy. It is he who supports the community chests, who is responsible for home defense, who takes an enlightened part in all local civic affairs.

The tendency of the New Deal from its inception—and I am charitable enough to believe that it has been unintentional—has been to build up big business at the expense of the independent businessman.

It has been difficult for the small businessman to stand the strain of the innumerable reports which have been required and to hire the expensive lawyers necessary to explain the mazes of new Federal legislation. Now he is being overwhelmed by taxes and harassed by priorities.

Those who have survived must be encouraged to continue. We must not become a nation of employees with all our destinies decided by corporation presidents in New York and Chicago.

This bill may help the independent businessman to survive, and therefore has my wholehearted support.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, during the period that this bill has been under discussion, Mr. Donald Nelson brought out the fact that he thought there was a no-man's land that could be covered by the operations of this legislation. During the period of preparation for war production in England it was found that there they had to do something to bring together small businesses, and I think the same thing is being discovered here in the United States. It was to that Mr. Nelson referred.

There are many small companies equipped to do one type of civilian business, but they have not sufficient equipment to do a war-production job. Mr. Nelson found that by putting several of these together and forming nucleus plants a war-production job might be undertaken. In consideration of this matter, it came to the minds of several members of the committee that there were dangers inherent in an operation such as this. It is true that the War Powers Act probably gives the President, who, in turn, can give anyone he designates the power to set aside certain laws, but nevertheless the antitrust laws still exist and the Federal Trade Act still exists, and there are plenty of small businessmen who fear running counter to those two laws; they are fearful that sometime in the future, if criminal proceedings are not brought against them, civil proceedings may be brought against them for damages by third parties.

For this reason an amendment was made to the bill as it came from the Senate to the House which was incorporated as section 11 in the bill and which provides that when the Chairman of the War Production Board shall certify to the Attorney General in writing that the doing of any specified act is for the prosecution of the war effort and there is also certification and acceptance by the Attorney General, the operations of the Antitrust Act and the Federal Trade Act are set aside as regards such action. That paragraph now exists in the bill.

Mr. KEAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. May I just complete this statement, then I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, that section was incorporated in the bill as it now is being discussed by the committee, but it seems that certain of the executive departments that would be affected desired to make some change in the wording of this paragraph if not in the meaning. While I offered this paragraph as an amendment to the bill, I am quite ready to have any amendment offered as long as the original protection is maintained. I understand that this will be done. While this paragraph may be passed as it now reads in the bill, when it goes to conference there may be some changes. I will accept any such changes as long as those who are certified and thus permitted to cooperate for the prosecution of this war effort will never be held liable, either criminally or civilly for so doing. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. May I say that I think the gentleman from Illinois deserves a great deal of credit for having suggested this amendment? Before he rose I did not know that he was the author of the amendment. I think it will be of great help to the confidence of the small businessmen who combine to do the job.

Mr. DEWEY. I thank the gentleman. That covers the purpose of the amendment.

In closing may I say there has been a great deal of discussion as to what this bill may do for little business. It offers this opportunity, Mr. Chairman: It offers the opportunity for little business to cooperate. It is mentioned on page 14 of the bill that this may be done both "for war and essential civilian purposes." It may be possible for small companies to get together for the manufacture of shoes, clothing, branded canned goods, and so forth. Certainly these are for war as well as civilian purposes.

This bill is intended, and I believe Mr. Donald Nelson in his operation of the bill will see to it that opportunity is given to the initiative of small business, and it is up to the small businessmen themselves to seize this opportunity to cooperate as they have never been able to legally cooperate before.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. I read a speech of Donald Nelson's the other day, in which he said that up until 6 months ago the concentration had been on the building of new plants, but for the last 6 months, and from now on, the War Production Board is concentrating on utilizing existing facilities. If this policy is continued, it will be directly in line with the policy of this bill. Is not that correct? And it also indicates that Mr. Nelson has the same idea as the gentleman has stated?

Mr. DEWEY. I think that is the expressed intention of Mr. Nelson.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. To be as practical as we can in this matter, suppose the gentleman from Illinois and I each own a plant in Nebraska—good, well-equipped machine shops—would it not be good judgment on our part, in the event this bill becomes law, for us to make ourselves available to the Smaller War Plants Corporation as quickly as possible in the hope that we might qualify from the standpoint of productive ability, capital

structure, and quantity of production, and thus fit ourselves into the general scheme of the Smaller War Plants Corporation; in other words, if we want to get in on the war production or on the essential civilian supply production, would that not be a good move for us to make as quickly as possible?

Mr. DEWEY. I think that would be exactly the move to make. No doubt it will be undertaken in many places throughout this country once this legislation is fully understood.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman from Michigan referred to Nebraska as the result of a conversation I had with him after the gentleman referred to page 15 of the bill, which reads:

> To certify to the Smaller War Plants Corporation established under section 4 of this act

The gentleman from Illinois indicated that small business should cooperate at this time. Following out the statement of the gentleman from Michigan, how will these machine plants in Nebraska cooperate? Would the gentleman suggest that they make an immediate application and be certified under the act?

Mr. DEWEY. I should think that the proper procedure would be for the two companies to get their ideas together. The owners are men who probably have been successful in their own businesses. They would cooperate to see how, united, they could produce something the war effort would need. Having established that, they would then make application to the Chairman of the War Production Board and offer their services.

Mr. STEFAN. I know this is probably true in the gentleman's district as in mine, but in my district practically every business has contacted me and already has sent all the necessary information to the W. P. B. or the O. P. M., which preceded the W. P. B. All of that information is already in the hands of the W. P. B. Would the gentleman now suggest that these plants now send another certification to the W. P. B.?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. Just making certification to the Chairman of the War Production Board that one is ready to do something does not necessarily mean that what he is able to do and willing to do is required by the war effort or civilian supply. Something that is needed must be produced by cooperation. A group of small companies might be able to do something that individually they could not do before.

Mr. STEFAN. Then the burden is on the plant's owner himself?

Mr. DEWEY. The burden of initiative will always be on the manufacturer.

Mr. STEFAN. In spite of the fact that all the information is already here in Washington?

Mr. DEWEY. You cannot legislate initiative. That has to be in the manufacturer.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That brings out the point I was going to develop. If the Government of the United States is the only customer we have to appeal to at the present time in order to get business for our plants, then let us make ourselves available to our Government to sell our company, our policies, our abilities, our capacity, and our willingness to do the job, and get on with the job that is before us. That is the only way to get business anywhere.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. In the hypothetical case the gentleman just mentioned two small businessmen were taken into consideration. Could a group of several small businessmen unite their efforts, as several in Yavapai County in Arizona have suggested to me, and do I correctly understand from the gentleman's proposal that the law will protect them against any action under the antitrust laws?

Mr. DEWEY. The purpose of section 11 is to protect against both criminal and civil proceedings for cooperation and collaboration, those companies that heretofore have been competitors, as long as they are certified by the chairman of the War Production Board as being necessary to the war effort.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman think that several could combine in that way?

Mr. DEWEY. I am very sure that several could do so, and I hope they will.

Mr. MURDOCK. I congratulate the gentleman on proposing that provision.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. KOPPLEMANN].

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us is comparable to one that was passed by the Congress and signed by the President in 1934. I look to this bill for the relief which this country has been seeking over these past 8 years.

I think this measure offers a long needed solution to problems which have harassed little industry for the past 10 years.

I have confidence that the assignment of the law's administration to the W. P. B. will give authority to men who, fully conversant with the operations of small industry, will deal sympathetically with their problems. Moreover, from statements made to the House and Senate committees which conducted the hearings on this measure, I think we can rest assured that the War Production Board will view its task from the long point of view, as well as the immediate one, and that it fully recognizes that the small individual commercial enterprises are vital to our free economic system, and are an integral part of any economy in the democratic sense.

Economically we would lose a great deal if we win this war at the expense of the thousands of small individual manufacturing concerns which will require Government help in order to weather the war years and resume normal operations when the war is over.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, well over a year ago the Temporary National Economic Committee made a special study of the then national defense program. The Temporary National Economic Committee had spent many months studying the business and economic structure of the United States. Its main conclusions were that the basic cause of business ills and economic disturbances is to be found in the concentration of power within a few organizations and corporations, and within a comparatively limited area of our country.

The report on the defense program said in part:

> Far from detracting from the importance of economic reconstruction the events of the past year have served only to emphasize the need for readjustments after the present crisis is over. It is quite conceivable that the democracies might attain military victory over the aggressors only to find themselves under the domination of economic authority far more concentrated and influential than that which existed prior to the war.

Since this report was filed the history of an era has been written. The national defense program has become the war program. The Office of Production Management has become the War Production Board. The necessity for winning the war, regardless of cost, of sacrifice, of hardship, is now recognized by all Americans. Thousands of our young men are marching off to do battle, and our armed forces are fighting in every corner of the globe to preserve the heritage of the free institutions of America.

It would seem, therefore, that the problem which existed a year ago would be well on its way to solution today. It is not in the spirit of criticism that I point out that it not only has not been solved but that it is more acute now than ever. Today, in order to continue in whatever field of activity a small concern may be engaged in, it is necessary to secure priorities, and unless a direct relation to the war program can be shown, it is impossible for a vast majority of these concerns to secure priorities. To show relationship to the war program a contract of some kind is ordinarily necessary, and few small concerns have been granted contracts. Thus it becomes a vicious cycle. All too often representatives of these small organizations have come to Washington to be shoved around from pillar to post to obtain no encouragement, and finally to return to their homes without hope and facing the prospect of bankruptcy.

The Washington Evening Star recently commented editorially:

> There is no doubt that the small businessman in this country is faced with an imminent threat of permanent ruin. It is estimated that there are 169,000 small manufacturing establishments in the country, some 45,000 of which could be utilized in war

work. Before this country entered the war, however, only about 10,000 of these plants had been touched by the military production program, approximately 75 percent of the value of all contracts having been concentrated among 56 big corporations.

Everyone knows that war requires sacrifice, and when the history of this cruel struggle is finally written the sacrifices of countless thousands of our small businessmen will be numbered among the noblest deeds of all. Can you find a better example than the fine patriotic response of the thousands of automobile dealers, tire dealers, typewriter dealers, refrigerator dealers, and others who have literally been forced to close their doors?

I believe that if it were necessary for every small business concern to cease functioning in order for us to win this conflict, no one would raise a voice in protest. But every study that has been made shows that if we properly convert the facilites of small business concerns, rather than deter the war effort, there is every possibility that our production will be increased by leaps and bounds.

There are two methods of utilizing these vast resources. The first is to convert small plants and shops into war production—the making of shells, powder, and so on. The second, and possibly more practical plan, is to let the small concerns devote themselves to essential civilian production and thus enter fields primarily dominated heretofore by the large concerns which are now packed and jammed with war orders and are unable to engage in civilian production.

Can you imagine an America completely dominated by giant corporate organizations controlled from one or two large metropolitan centers? Can you imagine the enterprising, progressive, intelligent businessmen in our communities, both large and small, without a means of livelihood? Such a condition would be the essence of un-Americanism. The small independent concern has been the foundation of our democratic form of government. The men who run these concerns are the leaders in our civic organizations, in our local governments, in our churches, in our schools, and in every worth-while community movement.

To destroy these organizations and the independence of spirit which they represent is to establish in America, by the back door if you will, a system of regimentation which has many of the characteristics of the totalitarianism which we are giving our lives and our treasure to defeat.

The paradoxical thing about the whole matter is that it is our duty to put every man, every machine, every instrument, every facility into the war effort. When we fail to do this, we not only throw every town, village, and hamlet in America into the pall of economic insecurity, but we weaken and threaten our entire war effort.

The bill now before the House will set up in the War Production Board a division of small business production, which will be charged with the responsibility of mobilizing the thousands of small enterprises; with providing adequate supplies of raw materials to these concerns; with working out a plan of subcontracting; and with providing credits and finance so that conversion to war production can be undertaken.

Remember that in saving small business we contribute to the productive capacity of the Nation at a time when every man and every machine must be given a job to do if we are to defeat the menace of Axis slavery and preserve civilization, religion, and democracy.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH].

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the small independent businessman of this country has made a major contribution to making America what it is. For many months now this type of businessman has encountered great difficulty in his efforts to survive. Many barriers have confronted him; he has been told he is too small to do certain types of work, thereby being precluded from becoming a prime contractor. On the other hand, in many instances, he has been unsuccessful in his efforts to obtain subcontracts from prime contractors.

Countless efforts heretofore have been made to place the small businessmen of our Nation in a position to participate in our national war effort. There has been much talk, but little accomplished. It has been my contention that there are two ways to do any job of work—one a practical way, the other an impractical way. It is conceded that if all our small businesses are compelled to fold up, the impractical way will have been pursued by our governmental authorities. Certainly our military front can be little stronger than our home front, and our home front can be no stronger than the businesses and the economy which constitute our home front.

I am glad to say I have on several occasions indicated my extreme interest in trying to do something to assist not alone the individual businesses which are in the district I represent but also small businessmen in general. I might add I appeared before the Patman select committee on small businesses in behalf of the small businessman who is seeking to participate in our war effort.

The businessmen of the district I have the honor to represent have themselves been diligent in their efforts to obtain work. As early as August 1941 a meeting of many machine-shop operators and other little businessmen of east Texas was held at Gladewater, Tex.; I was privileged to address briefly the meeting. I wish at this point to insert in the RECORD certain letters in which are contained statements about small businesses:

DEFENSE CONTRACT SERVICE,
OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT,
Dallas, Tex., August 8, 1941.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Replying to your inquiry of August 1, requesting information regarding the number of prime contractors who had received contracts in this territory, would advise that very often contracts are awarded without our immediate knowledge and in some instances we are not informed until information comes to us through Government reports.

As you are probably aware, the Bureau of Research and Statistics have published a list of the major defense contracts awarded by the War and Navy Departments, copies of which are furnished each of the Defense Contract Service offices and are available for distribution to those who might be interested. Under separate cover we are mailing you a copy of the listings from June 1, 1940 to March 31, 1941, and also the April 1941 supplement. Since that time no records of awards through the Navy Department are being published. These records furnish reports on awards for each Federal Reserve district and from this you can ascertain to whom contracts have been awarded and in what amounts. We have just been advised that this form of report will be discontinued, but will be furnished by States in the future, rather than by Federal Reserve districts.

We are constantly making a check-up here among the prime contractors to determine what portion of their work they are subcontracting, but in the absence of a great number of prime contractors we have not obtained any consequential results in obtaining subcontracts. This, however, is improving very materially recently through the organization of pools, such as were outlined to you in another letter of this date.

You can understand that our records on subcontractors are very incomplete as the concerns receiving prime contracts do not keep us informed, even though we have aided them in the matter. We are quite sure, however, in the course of the next few weeks very substantial reports will be available in connection with our activities along these lines.

Very truly yours,
A. J. LANGFORD,
District Manager.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, August 8, 1941.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Your letter of August 1, requesting information regarding the situation of small businesses in the defense program, has been received.

The Department of Commerce has not compiled any material on this subject, but the number of contractors and the dollar value of contracts awarded are available from Mr. Robert W. Horton, Director, Information Division, Office for Emergency Management. Probably you have already written Mr. Horton, and I am therefore not forwarding your inquiry to him.

The Defense Contracts Service of the Office of Production Management, which was set up for the purpose of facilitating subcontracting by primary contractors to smaller plants, has been studying the various regions of the country with a view to listing the plants available for subcontracting. An inquiry directed to Mr. R. L. Mehornay, Director of that Service, will undoubtedly result in estimates, at least, of the number of such plants available.

There is not, so far as I know, any tabulation or even estimate of the number of small plants which will be obliged to curtail operations as a result of their inability to obtain priority ratings, but I am confident that Mr. Mehornay will be able to shed some light on the subject which will be helpful.

I hope that you will let me know whenever I can be of service to you.

Sincerely yours,
JESSE H. JONES,
Secretary of Commerce.

OFFICE OF PRODUCTION MANAGEMENT,
Washington, D. C., August 19, 1941.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: Mr. Knudsen has referred your letter, accompanied by a copy of a letter from Mr. Ben C. Marable, manager of the Rusk County Chamber of Commerce, Henderson, Tex., to this office for reply, inasmuch as this comes under our province.

In checking through our files, I find that the offer made by the East Texas Machine Shop Pool has been recorded in our offices in Dallas, Houston, and St. Louis. Those offices stand ready to place before the East Texas Machine Shop Pool all of the facilities which we have available, the names of the Army procurement offices, and any lists or bidding dates for contracts in that vicinity.

Our function is to list all facilities in the area with our defense contract service offices in the Federal Reserve and branch-bank cities, and make available to the manufacturers in that area anything of interest that we might have for them to accomplish the securing of contracts. We cannot attempt to secure contracts for individual companies, but do aggressively aid them in getting subcontracts.

In reply to your second question as to what extent prime contractors have farmed out their work, I will say that this is a very difficult question for us to answer, inasmuch as we have no over-all records. In order to give you an idea as to what extent this has progressed, I will quote testimony from a recent Senate investigation in which it was stated that in the year from June 1940 to June 1941 the Ordnance Department let some 1,400 prime contracts, which prime contractors are using by actual count over 21,000 subcontractors, or an average of 15 subcontractors for each prime contractor.

The Army and Navy Munitions Board records, checked through priority checkings—but not exhaustive, show an average of six subcontractors for each prime contractor throughout all contracts.

The United States Army officer, in testifying before a Senate investigation committee, stated that the War Department had a record of some 177,000 subcontractors. He did not state the number of prime contractors.

I feel, however, that subcontracting is becoming more and more prevalent. Reports from our 36 district offices show an increasingly upward trend of prime and subcontractors. These reports are interesting because they represent prime and subcontractors whose participation has been guided by us. The month of June showed $38,000,000; July showed an excess of $42,000,000 for this class of prime and subcontractors.

Most of these contracts are relatively small in dollars and large in numbers. We feel that as the service offered by our field offices becomes more widely known and the manufacturers have utilized the facilities at their disposal that subcontracting will show an increase.

A very large proportion of the prime and subcontracts let never come to our attention—only those which could not find places alone.

I hope that this answers your questions satisfactorily. If it does not, please consider that it is our privilege to be of any further service to you, either through our administrative office in Washington or through either one of our 36 branches, located, as you know, in the Federal Reserve and branch banks throughout the country.

Very sincerely yours,
ROBERT L. MEHORNAY,
Chief, Defense Contract Service.

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, August 20, 1941.
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of August 1, 1941, wherein you request information concerning the distribution of orders for munitions in the present program. The answers to your questions, as indicated by the records of this office, are as follows:

It is estimated that approximately 12,000 contractors have received primary contracts to date.

Approximately 75 percent of the prime contractors are using subcontracts to some extent.

A recent check of defense orders indicated that approximately one-third of the prime contractors normally employ less than 50 persons. It is estimated that fully two-thirds of the subcontractors now engaged in defense work have less than 100 employees.

A total of 488,724 subcontracts have been recorded to date by the Army and Navy Munitions Board. This indicates approximately 20,000 subcontracting firms on defense work, and it is estimated that fully 15,000 of these are small firms.

Based on a recent Nation-wide survey, the National Association of Manufacturers estimated that about 50,000 manufacturers in the United States are qualified for munitions production. Considering 12,000 prime contractors and 20,000 subcontractors now in the program, there are probably about 18,000 suitable firms in the United States not engaged on defense work.

The extent of the defense program cannot be determined at this time, and no estimate can be given as to the total number of firms that will eventually be engaged. It is believed, however, that nearly all of the firms suitable for defense production will eventually find a place in the program.

The Defense Contract Service reports that its 36 field offices are interviewing about 33,000 prospective subcontractors per month. These offices are arranging new contracts between prime contractors and subcontractors for approximately a million dollars' worth of defense work a day.

It is impossible to estimate at this time the number of small plants that will not be able to qualify for munitions orders. A coordinated effort is being made by the War and Navy Departments and the Defense Contract Service to point out to plants threatened with shortages of raw materials munitions items that they can produce with minor correction of their equipment.

Plants that are not suitable for defense work, but require such critical raw materials as aluminum, tin, zinc, and nickel for their normal products, are being urged to use substitute materials or to change their production to new lines.

Trusting that the foregoing information will be of assistance to you in your survey, I am,

Sincerely yours,
ROBERT P. PATTERSON,
Under Secretary of War.

Also, I herewith quote the pertinent portion of a letter I have received from Mr. Labert St. Clair, executive assistant, National Automobile Dealers Association, Washington, D. C. The letter was written January 17, 1942:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 17, 1942.*
Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It was generous of you to take time from your busy days to attend the Small Business Committee meeting on the retail automobile situation. I know the dealers of your district will be pleased with your showing of genuine interest.

Cordially yours,
LABERT ST. CLAIR,
Executive Assistant.

In conclusion I wish to say how very disappointed I have been that no more action has been taken to relieve the plight of our independent and small businessmen. Indeed, I am grateful that the members of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House and the members of the Patman Small Business Committee have been considering this question and have sought to help by legislation small businessmen.

Certainly it is my hope that the small businessman who is now faced with the greatest difficulties ever confronted by him will be permitted to participate in our all-out program of production to the end that delivery of arms, ammunition, and implements of war may be hastened and that President Roosevelt's policy enunciated January 6, 1942, when he delivered a recent message to Congress may be carried out. His words were:

> We must convert every available plant and tool to war production. That goes all the way from the greatest plants to the smallest—from the huge automobile industry to the village machine shop.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time he may desire to use to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES].

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, idle equipment and idle workers are inexcusable in the present crisis. Today we have both. They must be utilized. Idle facilities of every nature must be put to work. Until that is done we are not making an all-out war effort. We must drive home the fact that an all-out war effort must be had to put the implements of war in the hands of the boys at the front. We must drive home again and again the fact that their chance to come back victorious depends on our production.

My friends, there can be, there should be, there must be, greater utilization of our industrial facilities in the war effort. In my State, and in most States, there are many small machine shops, idle factories, and even part-time industries which are readily convertible for the production of war matériel. Practically all of the tools of war are made up of simple parts, some of which can be produced in our small shops and our idle or semi-idle factories. Those parts can be shipped to central points for assembling. In hundreds of instances equipped and partly idle plants are available for handling war contracts where no break-down into component parts will be required.

A short training period will teach thousands of workers not now actively engaged in the war effort to produce war matériel or parts efficiently and economically. When this idle equipment and idle workers are fully engaged in the war effort we shall have gone far to relieve the bottlenecks now holding back production. The bill under consideration,

which has as its aim the mobilization of small business for war and essential civilian production, can help much to achieve the aim of an all-out war effort.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] such time as he may desire.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, it may be that some of us do not yet comprehend the full meaning of total war. In the past wars have been fought with only a fraction of a nation's effort. Not so with this war. True we have not asked for women to arm and fight, but in recent wars, especially this one, we are calling upon women more and more for their definite part in the war, even if it is not for combat service. In our War between the States we called upon banks and rich citizens to lend money to finance the Government, but during the World War we included a larger number of citizens, even selling war stamps to children in financing that war. Today we are broadening the financial support of the present war, just as we are including a larger percent of the population in carrying out the war effort. Total war does not mean 50 percent of effort, nor 60 percent, but 100 percent. Therefore, it is logical that we should not only rely upon big businessmen, but upon many, many more small businessmen, with the big fellows, to carry on total war production.

Of course, we cannot legislate specifically in all necessary detail. Therefore much of the effectiveness of this measure will depend upon the discretion and wisdom of those who administer it. One reason why I asked awhile ago whether the language incorporated in the bill would restrict its application to the conversion of small plants to war production, or whether it also applied to establishment of new plants, if found to be needed and likely effective. Much depends upon whether this applies to new plants.

For instance, there are some things almost as vital to our war effort as are guns and ammunition, but which we have heretofore been importing and now we can no longer import them.

Now, let us take rubber as an illustration. Of course, we are producing synthetic rubber, but it is a process involving big business to do it well under our present processes. However, let us assume that a method of producing rubber were known such as thousands of small businessmen in many States of our Union could produce it with a little encouragement. Would it not be the part of wisdom for this law to be so administered as to give them that encouragement? I am assuming that the language of this bill might properly be interpreted in administering it so as to include establishment of many such small plants.

Now to take another case. What is more needed than burlap fabric? The secretary of the Wool Growers Association in Arizona called on us frantically a short time ago for many thousand burlap bags for the Arizona wool clip. Later a farm organization in Arizona was equally urgent in calling for 350,000 burlap bags to take care of the grain crop. The Army needs burlap bags for sand bags and many other purposes, but we are not importing burlap fabric from India or elsewhere. What is more needed by the Navy than rope, or by the grain farmers than binder twine? Yet have you tried to buy any rope lately? If it could be shown that there is an abundance of fiber suitable for making rope and suitable for burlap fabric growing in about half a dozen States of our Union, and also that there is an economically feasible process of converting this fiber into the needed finished product on a small scale by what would be called small business concerns in many localities, would it not be a part of wisdom, and permissible under this measure, to give such small operators initial encouragement to establish such factories? I believe so, and I further believe that those who may be named to administer this act will feel the same way about it.

In regard to producing rubber I use a hypothetical case, but there is nothing hypothetical about my second illustration, that of hard fiber for rope and soft fiber for burlap fabric. Certainly in the great States of Texas, New Mexico, Arizona, Nevada, and California there are millions of tons of desert growth which might be readily converted to fill these vital war needs. I feel that the language of the bill, as explained by the chairman of the committee, can be logically interpreted by those who administer it so as to make such production possible.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH].

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, Secretary of the Treasury, Hon. Henry Morgenthau, Jr., and tax adviser to the Secretary, Mr. Randolph Paul, appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee in connection with the new tax bill.

The statements of both Secretary Morgenthau and Mr. Paul have been given wide publicity, as evidenced by the correspondence reaching the office of every Congressman. It seems all paragraphs are of interest to some group or other.

Take for instance the suggestions that income taxes be collected at the source. This refers to those incomes paid periodically, including wages, salaries, interest, and dividends.

Really, Mr. Chairman, the burdens being put on business houses are getting to be more onerous all the time. Perhaps with large business concerns the additional clerks required to keep these records will not be such a serious matter, but with the small business firm, the additional overhead will be a real problem. Today the House is considering legislation to help the small businessman. The bill was reported out of our committee unanimously, and I hope the House itself will give it the same approval. If the Treasury Department's idea of collecting taxes at the source is put into effect, it means more bookkeeping grief for the small businessman when he ought to be free to think of production.

The San Francisco Chronicle sets the picture forth very clearly in an editorial entitled "Looks Like a Mystic Maze." The article reads as follows:

LOOKS LIKE A MYSTIC MAZE

The Treasury's plan to collect income taxes in advance through withholding 10 percent at the source may be described, on the one hand, as a method of enforcing foresight on persons not in the habit of providing in advance for taxes and other foreseeable payments; on the other hand, as a method of taking income out of the hands of the population before it can be spent, and so helping to hold down inflation.

Both of these are good purposes. But at once rises the question how this plan can be made to work. Its complexity seems appalling—the amount of petty bookkeeping it would inflict on employers, on the payers of interest and dividends, and, if an attempt is made to cover the field of income as widely as possible, on the payers of rent, of professional fees, and other items that go to make up income, looks to be staggering.

Treasury tax expert, Randolph Paul, declined yesterday to estimate the amount of bookkeeping involved, but guessed that it should not be any more than entailed in social-security collections. This seems to us a thoughtless guess. Social-security collections, which by themselves put a heavy bookkeeping burden on employers, are in fixed percentages. The income-tax withholdings must take into consideration all the exemptions to which the income recipient is entitled. How many children has the employee? What are his contributions? What local taxes does he pay? Payers of interest and dividends, too, will have to have all that information on their books. Before you pay your dentist, will you have to find out how many children under 18 or otherwise incapable of self-support he has? And think of the individual keeping books on these payments and making return to the Government.

There is another side to all this bookkeeping, too—a Government side. How is the individual's income to be estimated in advance and who is to estimate it? How figure the income from wages when the citizen whose 10 percent is withheld for 2 months may then lose his job and have no taxable income for the year? The Government will then owe him money. How estimate an income from dividends before the dividends are known? The Government cannot guarantee them, no matter what they may have been in the past. Who is going to do the withholding from the farmer's income, the people who buy his eggs and cherries at his roadside stand?

One could go on and on with this, but the water is deep enough already.

It is the administration of Government collection of small sums from great numbers of people in diverse circumstances that is always likely to break down of its own weight, or, at best, to cost more than it is worth. The Treasury may have pat answers to all the difficulties, but they are not obvious.

Mr. Chairman, let us give small business a real chance. From information fully developed by our committee, the small businessman surely deserves it. The Nation expects a minimum of office work, a maximum of plant production. S. 2250 is a long step in the right direction.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. RIZLEY].

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Chairman, I expect to support this bill, and I am hopeful that some of the results and benefits for small business will be reached that the members of the Banking and Currency Committee, as well as the Committee on Small

Business, think may be reached. I think, however, we might just as well be practical about the matter. Some gentleman suggested that when this legislation finally becomes the law, then it is up to the individual initiative of each little businessman to come down here to Washington and get a contract. Well, I wish it were that easy. I know a considerable number of small businessmen in my section of the State of Oklahoma who have heretofore converted their little business plants into plants that could manufacture some war products, and they have a lot of initiative. They have spent a lot of money coming here trying to get some contracts, but so far they have not got them. I grew up out in the plains country, the cattle country. I remember one time my father gave me a little maverick calf and told me that if I could raise it I could have it. I had a fine Hereford cow on the place that was giving a lot of milk, and she had one big calf, with plenty of milk for her own as well as the maverick, and so I turned this little maverick over to her. Well, there was plenty of milk for both, but unless I was right there on the job all of the time the maverick never got any of the milk. That is what I am alarmed about now. I am afraid that there is more required than the matter of initiative on the part of the little businessman.

I think this bill will help some. I think it will come nearer helping the little businessman if the amendment of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is put into the bill, and I hope it goes into the bill before we pass it.

Mr. Chairman, what I really got up to talk about just a moment was not this bill, but an entirely different matter, but likewise a matter that vitally affects business, large and small. If the press reports correctly, and the utterances of high Government officials are correct, they say that gasoline is to be rationed in Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, and California, and I think all the other oil-producing States. Now, I do not want to appear as being critical of everything that is done. Something was said here about that this afternoon. I realize that Mr. Ickes and Mr. Nelson have a big job on their hands and I do not want to be too critical of them, but if I understand this picture correctly, there is not any shortage of gasoline. Mr. Ickes has on many occasions clearly stated that there is no shortage of petroleum or its products. Coming from one of the large oil-producing States in this Union, I know that in fact there is a large surplus of gasoline. If I understand their reason for rationing, two things primarily are what they are striking at, and one is the transportation program. Well, if rationing gasoline in Oklahoma and in Texas will help the transportation problem of getting oil to the east coast you may be assured that the people in the Middle West are willing to do that, but a special committee appointed by Mr. Ickes just recently made a survey and released a statement today in which they have specifically found and concluded that rationing gasoline in the Middle West will not solve that problem or be of any material assistance in its solution. Consumer rationing will not add to the number of tank cars available for movement into the East. The refineries and pipe lines are so located in the Middle West that average distances traveled by motor transports are short. If it is transportation rationing that is sought to be accomplished, why not say so, and not jeopardize small refineries and hundreds of employees in the refineries and in the oilfields by a rationing of petroleum products. Now, if it is a matter of a rubber shortage, and, of course, we all know that the rubber situation is critical, why in the world do they not say so? Why do they not say that we are going to ration rubber? There is no one in the Middle West, there is no one anywhere that I know anything about who is not ready and willing, if they want the tires off of their automobiles, to bring them in and turn them over. Why cannot we be frank and honest with the people of this country. Why cannot we tell them the truth? Why all this subterfuge? Mr. Chairman, in my State oil and agriculture are the two principal things upon which we must rely. We have very little manufacturing. We depend upon gross production taxes to maintain State and local government. Our State economy is builded around petroleum and its products, and if this order to ration that of which we have an abundance is made effective it will mean bankruptcy for many of our small refiners and thousands of our citizens.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD].

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, there are just two features of this bill to which I wish to refer, because to me they are the heart and soul of the measure.

The first is the Small War Plants Corporation, which is given authority to accept prime contracts and then directed to parcel these contracts out to numerous small plants.

In spite of what has been said on the floor to the effect that there is nothing new in this bill, I want to state definitely that this Small War Plants Corporation bill is new, and to my way of thinking the most effective section of the bill in the accomplishment of its ultimate and primary objective.

The reason for this belief is this: This corporation can take a large contract and, in addition to parceling it out, is empowered and directed to afford the small plant or plants the necessary finance and facilities to enable the plants to carry out the part of the contract granted to them.

My second reason for believing that this bill will be effective is that in cases where there are great backlogs built up in large concerns this Corporation can and is directed to examine these backlogs and lift out needed articles and place orders for such articles with small plants having idle facilities capable of producing these articles now.

For these two reasons and because of many other excellent features in the bill, I am supporting it wholeheartedly.

It will preserve intact the backbone of our great Nation—small, independent industry.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. JENSEN].

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I think this bill may prove to be one of the most important pieces of legislation that has been brought before Congress for quite some time. It has a farther reaching effect than its title implies. I certainly compliment the House Committee on Banking and Currency for the fine job that they have done. I think that committee has improved the original bill to a great degree. There are, of course, some things in the bill yet that might be a little bit dangerous in the sense that too many people may become obligated to our Government, but nevertheless this bill is going to do a lot of good for the little fellow if it is administered according to the will of Congress. I am especially glad that this bill is receiving favorable consideration of the majority of the House because I feel that one of the big things that we have to do along with winning the war is to save jobs for the boys that come back after they whip the tar out of the Nazis and the Japs. I know that if we do not have jobs for those boys, and there will be millions of them, they are going to be very resentful of what has gone on and what we have done in this country to preserve the kind of country they thought they were fighting for. I know that the Congress, and the American people, are anxious to win the war first and then to win the peace also that comes with victory in order that victory will be complete. So I say this bill, without a question of doubt, has a very far-reaching effect, and I hope that it will be passed unanimously, and as I said before, I hope that it will be administered by the board which is set up by the bill and by Mr. Donald Nelson according to the will of the Congress, and for the little fellow.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. The distinguished gentleman from Iowa has been very much interested in making grain alcohol out of corn and wheat.

Mr. JENSEN. That is correct.

Mr. STEFAN. In his opinion, does the gentleman believe that under this bill businessmen who have factories who wish to convert them into the making of grain alcohol which can be made into butadiene or synthetic rubber, will have some such opportunity?

Mr. JENSEN. I certainly hope that the provisions of this bill will permit loans to such concerns, to people who want to start the manufacture of power alcohol and other goods made from grains. I know the gentleman from Nebraska has also been active and interested in that very necessary program.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, this is one of the most important bills that has come before this Congress. Its importance lies, not only in the fact that it will add tremendously to the war effort of the country but also in that it will enable small business to keep in operation during these troublesome times and, as a result, when the war is over, be able to resume their normal activity and give employment at a time when employment will be badly needed.

The sound economy of the country rests largely upon agriculture and small business. The present administration has by its progressive farm program rendered immeasurable service to the agriculture of the country. No less a service will be rendered to small business by this progressive and forward-looking legislation which is now before us.

This is by no means a relief bill. It is a war measure designed to bring into the area of production the thousands upon thousands of small businesses whose present operations have been or are threatened to be curtailed by the diversion of material from civilian to war use. It seems almost unbelievable that at a time like this, when we are engaged in what is commonly known as a total war, only a small percentage of our total industrial effort is being utilized for war production. The testimony before our committee showed that of 184,230 manufacturing establishments in the United States, 56—I repeat the number—56 have been awarded 75 percent of the Army and Navy contracts. The remaining 25 percent is distributed among 6,000 prime contractors. About 4,000 concerns hold subcontracts, so that actually about 174,000 manufacturing establishments of the country have not turned a wheel, through no fault of theirs, in this so-called total-war effort.

Mr. Chairman, we call ourselves the "arsenal of democracy." What kind of an arsenal are we when more than 90 percent of our available manufacturing facilities are not given the opportunity to engage in war production? We need more than manpower to win this war—we need productive power. We have called upon the manpower of the country without stint, but we have only called upon less than 10 percent of the productive power of the country, although this is a mechanized war.

Let us be frank and open about this matter. There is nothing in this bill that could not be accomplished under existing law, but it is a recognition on the part of Congress that the Departments and Bureaus at Washington have not utilized the full productivity of our industries. It is a further public declaration that the House of Representatives, which is probably closer to the people than ever before in its honored history, is farsighted enough to know that not only should all our available manufacturing resources be utilized in the present war effort, but that we are also looking beyond the termination of the war to the days when small business, viewed in the light of tremendous war contracts, will absorb in employment the men released from our armed forces. Let the people of this country know, and particularly the men in service, that by the passage of this law Congress is looking ahead, not only to the day of victory, but to the days of post-war readjustment when the veterans of this war will be looking for employment. Let the men in the service know, by the passage of this bill, that the Members of this House are deeply concerned with the future welfare of the men in service and that they feel that it is essential to our American way of life that small business, which gives employment to the vast majority of our workers, be preserved.

From the testimony adduced at our committee hearings, I am convinced that the War Department has no confidence in the small business of this country. I might say further that the Navy and Maritime Commission were not of a dissimilar thought, and to that end I quote the testimony of Senator MURRAY before our committee:

> It has shown all through our testimony how prone the procurement officers of the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission are to deal with big concerns. They have confidence in the larger concerns, but they seem to lack faith in the ability of these smaller concerns to do the job. Therefore, they could be justified in a large degree in undertaking to deal with concerns that they knew could do the job; but, in doing that, they were piling up a backlog of contracts in the hands of those big concerns and they were not getting production.

Perhaps the procurement divisions of the Army and Navy should not be judged too severely for the course that they have followed, as it has been their task to get production at the earliest possible moment and with the greatest available efficiency, but in their endeavor to get rapid production they have built up a backlog of orders far beyond the ability of even the large corporations to fill. Hence, even from the production point of view, it is now necessary to get small business into the war effort to lessen the strain upon the overburdened facilities of large business. This bill, if enacted into law and if properly administered with the machinery set up, will accomplish that result.

In the first place, this bill specifically empowers the Chairman of the War Production Board to aggressively mobilize the production capacity of small business concerns to determine how such concerns may be most effectively and efficiently utilized to augment war production. It further places upon the chairman of the War Production Board the duty of exploring into the small-business field as to available concerns and set up the machinery whereby he may certify with respect to their competency, as to capacity and credit, to perform a specific Government procurement contract. Many of these small concerns will require additional help to finance the contracts they obtain, as large outlays of money will have to be made to meet their increased pay rolls and the cost of materials and possible engineering expenditures. This bill provides the means whereby this financial help may be obtained. This bill will definitely break the impasse with which small business is confronted—it has been unable to get contracts because it lacks additional capital and equipment on the one hand, and on the other, it has been unable to get additional capital and equipment because it lacks contracts.

One of the salient features of this bill is that Congress recognizes that small business may not be able to produce at as low a per unit cost as big business and that, therefore, the per unit cost to the Government of an article manufactured by small business may be higher than for similar articles manufactured by business concerns operating large plants. It seems to me that such recognition shows that Congress intends that the full war productivity of the country shall be utilized and that we want the finished product at the earliest time possible and not mere blueprints and designs. I feel that if even, in some instances, the Government may pay a higher unit cost, it will be worth it so long as we can get an earlier full production, for the sooner we get full production the sooner will this war be over.

I think that it should be pointed out that this bill does not decentralize the organization set up by the War Production Board, nor does it limit in any way the authority of its distinguished Chairman, Donald Nelson. Its purpose is to further implement these powers and to better enable him to carry out the intent of Congress that every effort should be made to get small business into war and essential civilian production. To effectuate that purpose, this bill provides for the creation of a corporate body to be known as the Smaller War Plants Corporation, with a capital stock of $200,000,000 to be subscribed by the Government, with the management vested in a board of five directors to be appointed by the Chairman of the War Production Board. The duration of the corporation is not to extend beyond July 1, 1945, unless further extended by act of Congress. The corporation is authorized and empowered, among other things, to enter into contracts with Government agencies and to sublet those contracts to small business concerns. It is further authorized and empowered to make loans and advances to enable small business concerns to finance plant construction, conversion or expansion, and to finance the purchase, by small business concerns, of necessary material and equipment for war and essential civilian production.

Mr. Chairman, I hope that this bill will pass. It will be of incalculable benefit to the war effort of the country and a tremendous boon to small business. In my own district there are many small business concerns, capable of war production, but which are either actually or virtually shut down by reason of their inability to obtain material for their normal business and who, likewise, have been unable to obtain war contracts. They have been unable to get prime contracts from the

Government because they are not in the "big business" class, and the subcontracts have not filtered down to them. In some instances I know that a number of them have endeavored to pool their equipment and financial resources so that as a combination they might get into war work, but unfortunately they have met with no success. I believe their situation is typical of small business throughout the country. This bill, if passed, will give them their opportunity to get into war and essential civilian production and will be the means of keeping free enterprise alive.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, this much-needed and excellent piece of legislation, in my opinion, will go far toward relieving the distressing conditions of small business in this country. The shifting of our great industries from a peacetime basis to wartime production has been miraculous and has challenged the admiration of this country and of the world, but in the shadow of their great accomplishments the business of our small industrial plants is dying. Our small businessmen are as sheep without a shepherd. They have no standing with those in authority. They have not been able to deal at arm's length with the governmental agencies charged with the duty of letting contracts for the production of war materials. The purpose of this bill is to produce supplies for war and to save the small businessmen and to distribute and to decentralize the production of war supplies. For instance, in my district we have numerous stove plants, machine shops, and garages that heretofore have had a large number of skilled workmen on their pay rolls. Those concerns now find it impossible to get contracts for the production of war materials. They are no longer able to obtain strategic materials for the production of those articles which they formerly manufactured for their peacetime customers. This bill proposes to mobilize the small business concerns of the country and to use these small concerns and their facilities for the production of war materials. Where their facilities are inadequate, this bill makes provision to supply them with needed machinery. If they do not have the funds or credits with which to obtain those new machines, then the smaller war plants corporation authorized under this act has the power to loan them the money to enable them to equip their plants and to buy needed materials.

It gives to the corporation authorized to be set up the power to find out who it is that now has or may hereafter have the contracts for the production of war supplies and to force those large contractors who, up to this time, have had the exclusive benefit of our wartime efforts, to sublet large portions of those contracts with the performance of which they are charged, to small business concerns, and in that way bring about a distribution of that work.

In addition to that, it authorizes this corporation and those charged with the administration of this act to find out which of these small concerns is capable of manufacturing war materials. Then when those governmental agencies charged with the performance of this act certify that a concern is qualified to perform a war contract, that certificate is conclusive of the ability of the little business man in question to do that sort of work.

In addition to that, it enables the small business man to get materials, without which he could not perform one of these contracts. It is a far-reaching, comprehensive and well drawn piece of legislation, which gives recognition and standing to the small business man and enables him to deal at arm's length with these governmental agencies that heretofore have spurned his appeals or heard them with deaf ears. In other words, it proposes to break down these great big contracts involving the expenditure of billions of dollars, and carry the benefit of this vast expenditure of money to every section of the country where there is a concern with machinery or with a plant now equipped for the purpose, and with men who are trained in the various branches of the work that is necessary to be performed in connection with the production of war materials.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman have time to yield?

Mr. JENNINGS. I have such little time that I cannot yield to my friend from Nebraska.

In addition to all these provisions, this bill recognizes that the little man many times has to charge a greater price than the big fellow, and it makes it legal for him to get a contract at a price at which he can live. I am heartily in favor of the bill and shall support it.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, the full mobilization and utilization of the entire productive and transportation facilities of the Nation is the crying need of today. It is toward this end that all effort should be directed. To attain this goal, all the skill and ingenuity of government, industry, and labor should be brought into action. That great transformations and wonderful strides have been made in that direction, all agree. Peacetime industries and enterprises are being converted into war production. Production in every line is ahead of the most optimistic predictions. The program has made great progress and all those connected with it are deserving of the highest commendation and praise.

It is thought that S. 2250, the bill under consideration, will encourage and help production and if it will, it should be enacted at once. Until recently, too little, if any, attention has been paid to small business concerns in the production picture. All prime contracts have been let to big business industries and they in turn have sublet very little of the work to small enterprises. The procurement agencies of the Government, War, Navy, Maritime Commission, Treasury Department, and others, have found it easier to deal with one big contractor than with many smaller ones. Small industries may not be properly equipped for the work. They have not been able to get proper financing to improve or expand their plants and acquire new and improved equipment. However, in recent weeks great progress has been made along these lines. In making contracts with larger concerns, they are urged and required to sublet certain parts to small business and arrangements have been made whereby the smaller concerns may be financed.

Under Executive Order 9112, which was issued March 26, 1942, the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission may make loans to, or guarantee loans made to, contractors or subcontractors or any business engaged in operations deemed necessary, appropriate or convenient for the prosecution of the war. This enables anyone to get a contract for war production and on the strength of that contract get a loan from any lending institution, and the loan may be guaranteed 100 percent by the above agencies. Any financial institution with funds to lend should make a loan upon those conditions, and, if not, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Federal Reserve banks are available for that purpose. There is no longer any reason why a small industry that has any equipment and any managerial ability that can be used in war production cannot get a contract and get into the production program, and this is being done more and more all the time.

It may be admitted that there is not much new in this bill. There are no new powers conferred upon the Chairman of the War Production Board. In fact, no new powers can be given him as he already has full, complete, and final authority and say over all matters pertaining to war production. These powers were given him by Executive orders, issued in January of this year. Under those powers, Mr. Donald Nelson has done a splendid job. He thinks this bill will help him in his work. He is entitled to praise for the great work he has done, and we from Missouri are especially proud of the brilliant record made by this distinguished and outstanding Missourian. More glory and praise to him.

There is no claim that this bill is a cure-all or a panacea for the difficulties of all small business concerns during these strenuous times. Everyone recognizes that changes, dislocations, and displacements are taking place and that losses and hardships are occurring that cannot be avoided. These conditions call for sacrifices, and they will be met with courage and fortitude by the people. There are 2,800,000 so-called small businesses in this country. Of these, 1,770,000 are engaged in retail and 200,000 in wholesale business, 646,000 in service industries, and 184,000 in manufacturing, and of those engaged in manufacturing, only 27,800 are engaged in metalworking, and it is in this field that help may be given. From this it is clearly seen that the scope of this bill in its practical effects is very limited so far as the whole field of small business is concerned. This bill is confined to production activities and almost entirely to those engaged in metalwork. But if the bill is helpful, even in this narrow field, it should be passed as soon as possible. The bill is a declaration of policy as to what part Congress thinks small business concerns can and

should play in the war production program.

The bill gives the Chairman of the War Production Board authority to make all necessary surveys to determine the capacity and credit of all small business concerns. He already has those powers and has exercised them. The various procurement agencies of the Government have like powers and they have exercised them. The result has been a great duplication of effort. Business concerns have had to spend a great deal of time in reporting on their equipment, and ability to produce, and credit standing to different agencies of the Government. This bill provides that when the Chairman of the War Production Board certifies to the agencies of the Government having procurement powers as to the credit and capacity of any business concern, that certificate will be conclusive and the agencies are authorized to let the contract without requiring further investigation. This will prevent a duplication of effort and save everyone concerned time and expense.

The really new and most useful thing in this bill is the creation of a new corporation, the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Contrary to most new agencies created by the Government, it will not make more confusion, but as above stated, it will take up a lot of lost motion and simplify administration. This new corporation will have a board of five appointed by the Chairman of the War Production Board, and a capital of $200,000,000. It may make loans to small business concerns for plant expansion, for the acquisition of equipment, and for working capital. It may also purchase land, equipment, or materials and sell or lease the same to small business. In addition to that, the Corporation may enter into contracts with the Government or any agency thereof to furnish supplies, equipment, or materials to the Government and will then sublet the contract to small business concerns to supply the supplies, equipment, or materials to the Government. It will be a kind of clearinghouse for small business concerns where all their equipment may be utilized. Many small concerns could not obtain a contract on their own because of limited capacity or credit. The corporation may take the contract and then farm it out among perhaps a hundred or more, each of which can perform certain parts of it. In that way all their resources, equipment, and facilities may be pooled and the combined effort of all will be very effective.

The act requires the procurement agencies to let a contract to the corporation when the chairman of the War Production Board certifies that it is competent to perform such contract. This act does not in any way divide authority or responsibility for war production. That supreme authority is in the chairman of War Production Board and this bill does not attempt to take any of that power away from him.

This bill plainly and frankly recognizes one evident economic fact in our modern industrial life. Big business, by reason of favorable credit standing, extensive research facilities, efficient technical and engineering staff, favorable location, mass production, and more modern machinery and better equipment, can produce goods at a lower cost per unit than small concerns that are not so favorably situated. There is quite a spread between the low and the high-cost producers in every line of activity. It may be necessary to pay one concern a higher price than is paid another for the production of the same article. If by so doing, it will bring into use our full productive capacity and increase the war output, then it is justified and that procedure may be followed. It may be called a subsidy, but what is added in expense will be gained in time and that is vital now. Whatever is necessary to increase the war output and get production to full capacity must be done and it must be done now. Delay is dangerous and may be fatal. This bill will be helpful and it should be passed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STEVENSON], such time as he may desire.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Chairman, in the Middle West we have what is called small business—it is the backbone of life in America. It is the basis of our American way. Most of the industries in the home town are owned by home folks. Our towns are thriving communities. The men who own the industries in these towns have grown up there and take an active part in the social and civic life of their communities. There is no proletariat. Most of these men own their own homes, and for that reason the community atmosphere is bright. The independent folks in the Middle West cherish their heritage and their freedom.

Unless our present war effort is redirected, and unless the control of big business over war production is modified, thousands of small business enterprises face their ruin. The future of our American ideal of free enterprise is being jeopardized. The rapidly multiplying unfair and unjust economic conditions that have been enveloping small business during the past months are now taking on such dangerous proportions that we, in fairness to our independent businessmen, should pass this bill to save free enterprise in America. War demands economic sacrifices. If it were necessary for the successful prosecution of this war that our independent business enterprise in this country should be forced to the wall, then we would accept that situation as one of the economic casualties of war. But, in my judgment, the mopping up of small business under the present trend is an unnecessary sacrifice. If we allow small business to be throttled in this country, it will seriously cripple our strength, and hamper our all-out war effort. Maximum efficiency demands that we utilize all of our productive facilities immediately; that we make use of big business and small business alike. Our economic system must produce military equipment in the greatest volume and in the shortest time, but it must also yield sufficient goods for the consuming public. An all-out military effort is dependent on an all-out civilian effort; and both are dependent upon a system that will produce the most food, clothing, and military supplies—as well as food, clothing, and other essentials for the great industrial army that is turning out our tanks, planes, guns, and munitions. Our soldiers will be best equipped and encouraged for battle if the civilian workers are adequately sustained by production of consumer goods. That is where all of our smaller plants, factories, and firms can be used to advantage—to turn out military supplies, as well as the necessities for a healthy and happy civilian army of producers. The loss of the essential productive capacity of so-called small business in the United States would be a tragedy.

It seems folly that an attempt would be made to manage every business house in the United States by a centralized bureau of the Federal Government, but that is the inevitable result if small business should be destroyed in this country. Bureaucracy will kill all incentive for efficiency, and such a system may become very expensive as well as inefficient. Free competition, where business is kept within bounds of good management, where efficiency is the goal, will produce more munitions and at the same time sustain our standard of living. We must continue to make it possible for every man and woman who has the ability to be able to assert himself and show what they can do to produce. If we limit the field of original ambition we threaten the success of our war effort. Bureaucratic control, by replacing the brains of millions of men and women with the brains of a few bureaucrats, will take the very heart out of our democratic way of life. We will conquer totalitarianism by matching it with democratic efficiency in America.

We are fighting on all the seas. Production of munitions during the next few months will be much more valuable in the present crisis than production 3 or 4 years hence. A few large corporations in this country have about three-fourths of all the war contracts. The fulfillment of these contracts demands construction of new plants. It takes many months to construct a new plant. Work cannot go ahead on some of these new plants because of shortage of materials. However, we all know that there are thousands of small plants and factories in this country capable of undertaking war contracts at once. There are thousands more that can convert their facilities within a few months for the production of war supplies, if they can get credit and capital to make this conversion. Experts say that there is still about half the productive capacity of the country that is excluded from our war effort. Furthermore, there are thousands of small firms that can be used to sustain our consumer production. These are as vital to our defense effort as those firms actually engaged in war production, because the higher we can keep the level of consumer production the higher will be the morale of our people. Such plants as a rule need only a small portion of our raw materials to continue in business.

Our Federal Government has made little effort to increase production of raw

materials above the amount actually needed for war production. Our sources of raw materials can be greatly expanded if given encouragement by the Government. There should be a development and expansion of our domestic supply of vital minerals. In my State of Wisconsin we have copper, zinc, iron, lead, and other essential metals lying untouched beneath the ground for want of capital and encouragement to our businessmen, who are ready and willing to mine these vital minerals, and thus revitalize business and industry that have been lying dormant in certain communities in our State. We need these metals in our war production. Why not give our businessmen the opportunity and the financial backing to mine the lead and zinc and other minerals that lie beneath the ground in Wisconsin, ready and waiting to be used to win this war. Our businessmen will pay a good price if they can get the necessary metals to carry on their business. The supply of these strategic metals is right at our doorstep. Why not start now to make use of that supply? We have been relying on big business to do this job, but we should no longer neglect the great unused capacity of small business to meet the demands of this war.

The purpose of this bill is to protect small business from threatened destruction, by making use of the facilities of small business in the interests of our successful prosecution of this war. The effect of this bill will be to use all of the industrial effort of our country capable of the production of munitions or war supplies of any nature, and also to preserve the production of the plants and factories that are unfitted for producing war supplies. This legislation aims to preserve small business that cannot be converted into the war effort. It aims to save the thousands of small factories that are now running out of material and inventories which, under the present priority system, cannot be replenished. For many months businessmen from the Middle West have been begging for war contracts. They have paid their own expenses to come to Washington, and they have tried to show that they have machinery that could be used to produce vital war supplies; and that with financial help from the Government they could convert equipment in their factories so that they could turn out munitions for war. Thousands of small businessmen have been living for months in a fog and a maze of bureaucratic priorities. Little financial assistance has been available to the small businessman and factory owner, while millions in war contracts have been doled out to big business. Small firms have been unable to get war contracts because, as they were told, they did not have sufficient capital, and that they could not get sufficient credit. They were unable to get the credit because they could not get contracts—and so, this cycle is throwing the small businessman into bankruptcy.

If our small business of the Middle West can be protected, its facilities can be utilized in the war effort and our smaller factories and firms will contribute tremendously to the productive effort that is necessary to win the war. Small business of this country constitutes the balance of power in our battle of production. By making full use of the small business of this country, we can save our democratic form of government, and will win the war.

The Clerk read as follows:

That in addition to the powers and duties of the Chairman of the War Production Board defined by Executive Order No. 9024 of January 16, 1942, and by Executive Order No. 9040 of January 24, 1942, it shall be the duty of the Chairman of the War Production Board, and he is hereby empowered, through a deputy to be appointed by him to mobilize aggressively the productive capacity of all small business concerns, and to determine the means by which such concerns can be most efficiently and effectively utilized to augment war production.

It shall also be the duty of the Chairman of the War Production Board, and he is hereby empowered through the deputy so appointed by him, to cooperate to the fullest practicable extent with the Director of Civilian Supply and other appropriate governmental agencies in the issuance of all orders limiting the production of business enterprises, with a view to insuring that small business concerns will be most efficiently and effectively utilized in the production of articles, equipment, supplies, and materials for both war and essential civilian purposes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 14, line 14, insert a new section to be designated as section 2, and to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. For the purposes of this act a small business is any enterprise whose average daily pay roll for the calendar year 1941 was not in excess of 250 persons."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I doubt very much whether you can perform a successful job in surgery until you know something about anatomy. I have some doubts whether we are going to achieve very much until we clearly constrict and define the limitations within which this bill is to operate.

I made an effort in February when the $100,000,000 appropriation for the Office of Civilian Defense was on this floor to limit the expenditure of that $100,000,000 to small business enterprises with a pay roll not in excess of 250 persons, on the average, for the calendar year 1941. There were many expressions of sympathy on the floor but not enough votes to adopt the amendment. Now, we ought to stop being hair-splitting metaphysicians and get down to brass tacks. If we are going to do something for small business, let us define it. It may be a mistaken definition, but I would rather have a mistaken definition than to delegate broad discretionary power and then have all the difficulty of interpretation later. How can we adequately aid small business until it is reasonably well defined?

Suppose when this bill gets into operation that one of your plants comes down to Washington, through its representative, and after trying to get a contract somebody down at the other end says, "I am sorry, but you are not a small business enterprise within the contemplation of this bill." You will observe in section 2 that broad discretionary power is conferred upon the deputy chief of the War Production Board. Then will we wash these heartaches and headaches across the floor of Congress and we will rail and assail the bureaucrats like we have always done, and we will not have solved the problem.

It is a rather interesting thing. Do you not think it is about time we really exercised our representative prerogatives and authority and say what we mean in a piece of legislation?

I cite you page 21 of the bill where provision is made that the Smaller War Plants Corporation shall have power to secure the performance of contracts that it gets "through small business plants or others."

That is the language the committee writes in on line 5, page 21:

Through small business plants or others.

Under that phraseology the sky is the limit and this bill then ceases to be a measure designed to aid small-business concerns. There are 184,000 small manufacturing plants in the country. Ninety-seven percent of their pay rolls are less than 250 employees on the average.

This amendment if adopted will scatter the benefits of this bill upon 97 percent of the small enterprises of the country. If I could reach that percentage by the amendment I should be entirely happy.

It is so easy to say: "Maybe it does not include plants of a certain type with a large expenditure from a small pay roll; the law does not take care of them, there is no authority existing at the present time to take care of them." Let us not go to the country now with something indefinite. The Members have taken the floor this afternoon and apologized, saying: "Do not expect too much from this bill." Why pass it if you cannot expect something to come from it? Let us start now by defining it. Let us put some sense and stability into it; let us say: This bill shall apply to concerns that do not have in excess of 250 people on the pay roll as an average for the calendar year 1941; then the business structure of the country and the deputy chief of the War Production Board will know definitely what the Congress had in mind. If some other yardstick is desirable, well and good, but in any event let it be reasonably precise.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman's amendment strike out the words "and others"?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; it adds a new section to provide that a small business concern within the meaning of this act shall be one that has not in excess of 250 persons on the pay roll in the average for the calendar year 1941.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. It would not strike out the words "and others"?

Mr. DIRKSEN. An amendment to strike that phrase could be offered when we get to page 21.

[Here the gavel fell.]

DIRKSEN AMENDMENT OPPOSED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois is mistaken in his reasoning, I believe. Four committees have consid-

ered this very question: Two committees on small business and two committees on banking and currency. These committees have agreed that the phrase "small business" is a relative term. It relates to the particular line of business; it is comparative. In some lines of business 250 employees would make it a big business; in other lines 250 people, or thousands of people represent a small business.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I am sorry, I cannot yield now.

Up at York, Pa., the York Machinery Co. is a small business compared to other manufacturers in that line; yet the York Machinery Co. employs thousands of people. The gentleman's amendment would exclude that small business.

The phrase "small concerns and others"—and I desire to invite the attention of the gentleman from Ohio to this—was deliberately put in the bill. It is possible there will be certain items that only big business concerns can produce. Suppose this Smaller War Plants Corporation takes a prime contract to allocate to small concerns over the country, that they have everything that can be made by the small concern except one necessary item which can be made only by the General Electric Co. or some of the biggest concerns of the country. It would, of course, exclude all these little fellows because they could not effect a completed job. So this phrase "and others" is absolutely necessary. It will possibly be necessary to have big concerns make certain items.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is a ball-and-socket mechanism in the Pratt & Whitney motors. I do not know a small concern anywhere in the United States that could possibly produce this particular mechanism without going into very large financial operations and acquiring patents owned by larger corporations.

Mr. PATMAN. And may I make this observation: Take the oil companies, there are many, many small oil companies having 2,000, 3,000, or 5,000 employees; yet they are small compared to the major oil companies. Or take the tire manufacturing companies: Some have 1,000 or 2,000 employees; yet they are very, very small compared to the big tire manufacturers. There are a few automobile manufacturers who employ two or three thousand or more people; yet they are very small compared to the large ones. If this 250 limitation were placed on the number of employees to determine whether a corporation were small or large many of the comparatively small corporations would be excluded in favor of the big automobile concerns. So I think it is necessary that we leave this phrase "small business" as it is and leave discretion in the Administrator. Let him determine what is a small business and what is not a small business. I have full and complete confidence in Donald Nelson and I believe he will do a good job. I am willing to trust him.

I do not believe that if there were any doubt in the mind of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] as to what is a large or small business in any particular line of business he could immediately determine it for himself. No one questions that. Therefore why involve us in something that we know nothing about? How many concerns would this affect? We do not know. We would cripple the bill. It certainly would not help it any. If it might be harmful, let us not agree to the amendment.

I hope the gentleman will withdraw his amendment. I think it would be the most detrimental thing we could throw into this legislation. I know the gentleman is a friend of small business and wants to aid small business. I plead with him to reconsider his amendment and withdraw it because it would be very damaging to the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not want the gentleman to infer I meant by asking the question awhile ago that I am in favor of striking out those words "or others." I would prefer leaving them in the bill.

Mr. PATMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I asked this question of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] and I would like to ask the gentleman the same question. Did the committee give any consideration to placing a limit on the amount of any loan or contract that could be made with one concern, having in mind that if you gave 20 concerns contracts involving $20,000,000 apiece, you would use up the entire amount provided in this bill and it would therefore narrow the help given to small business.

Mr. PATMAN. We have to trust the administrator. Any law depends upon its administration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, much depends upon whether the administrators of any law are angels or devils. If they are all right the law will be good. If they are bad the law will be bad. We must leave discretion in the hands of someone.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. It was testified before the gentleman's committee that 56 firms got 75 percent of the contracts and 6,000 firms got 25 percent.

Mr. PATMAN. That is what we are trying to stop.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This amendment will take care of those who did not get any contracts.

Mr. PATMAN. It will prevent any of them from getting anything, so you will have a whole lot of nothing if the gentleman's amendment is adopted.

Mr. SPENCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. If we arbitrarily limit the act to those who employ 250 or less, would there not be a constant tendency for men who come almost within the provisions of the act to discharge a few employees?

Mr. PATMAN. It will cripple the act. You could not carry on a major contract. You cannot carry on a major contract as a prime contractor unless you have some concern involved that does employ more than 250 people, and that is the reason it might be necessary to use the biggest kind of business in connection with this thing.

Mr. THOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. A good many towns have only one industry. If a certain town had an industry with 255 workers, it would be excluded from benefits under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. It would absolutely destroy the bill. You might as well not pass it. I hope the amendment will be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk reads as follows:

SEC. 2. The Chairman of the War Production Board shall have power, and he is hereby directed, whenever and to the extent that he determines such action to be necessary—

(1) to make, or arrange with the Bureau of the Census or such other governmental agency as may be possessed of the necessary personnel and facilities for the making of, a complete inventory of all productive facilities in the United States which may be used for war production;

(2) to direct the attention of officers of the Government having procurement powers to the potential productive capacity of plants operated by small business concerns;

(3) to obtain information with respect to the extent and the terms upon which prime contractors with the Government have let subcontracts, and to take such action as he may deem appropriate to bring about the letting by such prime contractors of subcontracts upon fair and equitable terms and in the greatest volume practicable;

(4) to take such action as will result in the granting of such Government contracts to business concerns operating small plants as will provide them with a sufficient incentive to engage in war production and to make such conversion of their plants as may be necessary to engage in war production;

(5) to certify to the Smaller War Plants Corporation established under section 4 of this Act and to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any of its subsidiaries, the amount of funds necessary for the conversion

to war production of any small plant or other plant interested in obtaining from the Smaller War Plants Corporation, or from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any such subsidiary, the capital necessary to provide for such conversion;

(6) to certify to Government procurement officers with respect to the competency, as to capacity and credit, of any small business concern or group of such concerns to perform a specific Government procurement contract;

(7) to obtain from the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Director of the Procurement Division of the Treasury, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and any subsidiary thereof, and any other Federal department, establishment, or agency engaged in war procurement or in the financing of war procurement or production, such reports concerning the letting of contracts and subcontracts and making of loans to business concerns as he may deem pertinent in carrying out his functions under this act; and

(8) to make studies with respect to the means by which small business concerns may be supplied with essential raw materials and receive fair and reasonable treatment from all Government departments and agencies without interfering with the efficiency of the war production program.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOM: On page 14, line 23, after the word "production", insert: "*Provided, however,* That inventories heretofore made by chambers of commerce and like private organizations be utilized if practicable."

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, I think this amendment is self-explanatory. Almost every chamber of commerce in the country has collected from industries within its jurisdiction an inventory of their machinery and plant equipment. I do not see any reason why the Census Bureau should in such cases undertake a new census. We ought to utilize these inventories that have already been made. I hope the committee will accept the amendment.

THOM AMENDMENT OPPOSED

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it will not be necessary, I may state to the gentleman from Ohio, for the Census Bureau to make any additional study or investigation. It is contemplated in this language that existing facilities and existing information will be used. This amendment is absolutely unnecessary because now the War Production Board, through the Contract Distribution Section, confers with every agency that has any information about a manufacturing concern. It is absolutely necessary that the owners of that manufacturing concern be consulted and that they be permitted or at least requested to furnish exhaustive information.

I would not want anything to go into this bill that would look as if we were going to take the reports made by any chamber of commerce. I like chambers of commerce in their place and I like booster clubs. Booster clubs are fine, but we do not need booster clubs to get the information for the War Production Board.

This amendment is absolutely unnecessary. It will do no good and possibly leave the wrong impression. I hope it is defeated.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am very glad we have this bill before us today. In considering and studying the bill, I had under consideration the possibility of offering three different amendments, but I have come to the conclusion that in the case of none of these amendments is the proper approach to it the attempt to write it into the bill.

The first of these amendments would have been one to raise the amount of money available in this bill to $500,000,000. Certainly, if this work is successful, something of that kind will probably be required, but I imagine the reason the committee did not insert a sum that large is that they felt it to be wiser to begin the work, to see how it progressed, and then, if further funds were necessary, to make them available. Probably that is best, and best for one primary reason, namely, that this, after all, is an action of the Congress, and Congress therefore, I hope, will take a particular interest in this Smaller War Plants Corporation, perhaps to a greater extent than has been the case with certain other enterprises.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman no doubt has in mind the operations under Executive Order 9112, which are tied into this bill under section 7, and that implementation, together with the $200,000,000 provided here, should expand just as far as we want to go even up to $50,000,000,000.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the gentleman is correct about the possibilities.

In the second place, it has seemed to me that one of the main reasons for the suffering of small business in this country has been the fact that in certain instances prime contractors have insisted upon adding to their own facilities, and sometimes have been able to add to their own facilities when there were, as a matter of fact, other facilities available in the hands of small manufacturers which were not being made use of but should have been made use of by means of subcontracts.

I would frankly have rather liked to see some definite provision about that matter written into this bill, but I can see that, after all, we are at war, we have given to the War Production Board a perfectly colossal task, and the committee may be right in not attempting to write a rigid requirement of that kind into the bill.

I believe, however, that one of the major purposes of this bill should be to see to it that that sort of thing does not happen, that existing facilities are used, and that every request on the part of a prime contractor for increased facilities of his own should be scrutinized carefully from that standpoint. If that is not done, I think perhaps some action along this line may be appropriate.

In the third place, it has seemed to me that some consideration should be given to the length of time that should be required for prime contractors to finish the amount of contracts they have so that they will not be loaded up with too many contracts which they are unable to discharge expeditiously when smaller manufacturers might be able to do the work.

As a matter of general consideration with regard to this bill, the main reason I am concerned about it is that I am concerned about the future of our country. I do not want to see us come out of this war with huge, monopolistic concerns in complete command of all the business in certain areas. I think we must do everything within our power to prevent that from happening. I hope this will be an effective means, because unless we do it, unless we preserve the opportunity, the existence, even, of small business enterprise, we shall be confronted with an economic and governmental problem at the conclusion of this conflict that will be indeed staggering.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman states that he is apprehensive that some of these large concerns will get too many of these contracts although they have large contracts now. If the gentleman will notice the language in the last part of section 3, he will find that the policy is recognized that it is even all right to pay more to small business if it is necessary to help small business in that way.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. As the gentleman said, himself, a few moments ago, it all depends upon how this is administered. If that directive thought is followed out carefully I agree with the gentleman completely. I just hope it will be and hope, perhaps, my few remarks here may help.

I want to point out another thing that is of tremendous importance. We are concerned about getting 100-percent production. You cannot get it unless these small companies are brought into it, and Mr. Floyd Odlum——

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Floyd Odlum recommended that one field in which small business might be able to operate, and should be helped to operate, was in the field of providing essential consumer needs. Now, certain it is that some of these essential consumer needs—and I am not talking about

luxuries, but basic necessities of life, without which the people cannot effectively function—if that production can be increased by making use of facilities which otherwise would be idle, then the war effort is going to be helped. I know the bill provides for that specifically. I realize that fully. I am trying to speak for the bill. To the extent that increased production of those things can be encouraged in any way, to that extent you will be combating inflation in the most direct and constructive manner in which that can be done.

Now, we are told that there may be a gap of twenty to thirty-five billion dollars between the available supply of consumer goods and the amount of income paid out and available for expenditure. Certain it is that every avenue of approach should be used. You cannot, I believe, expect the Price Administration to do that job alone. I think if they are to do that job they will have to resort to all sorts of methods, some of which we would not like. If this bill can bring small business into the field to produce a certain amount of basic and consumer needs, it will have performed a very useful purpose from that standpoint. The recent order of the War Production Board curtailing the further production of durable-consumer goods will make the impact on small business greater than it is now. Therefore action now is even more incumbent upon the Congress than would otherwise have been the case. I hope that from the standpoint of all of these problems we will continue to be vigilant and that we will try to see that this measure is carried through in the spirit that its proponents have advocated and that we will be ready to take further action if necessary.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, during the last few days I have been from within 60 miles of the southern line of Michigan through the central and western part of the State as far north as Lake Superior. I found that the people are wholeheartedly in favor of doing everything they can to aid in the defeat of our enemies. They are apprehensive, however, that they are going to be taken out of business; that they are going to be unable to pay their taxes. Wherever I went I was met with the question: "Just how are we expected to pay our taxes if we are put out of business?" That question came not only from storekeepers or manufacturer, not only from attendants at gasoline stations, but it was a universal question asked by all classes of people. They all have the idea or the thought, if you are going to destroy us, if we, the little people, are to be destroyed, deprived of our means of earning an income, you are undermining the foundation of the whole country. We, the little folks, are the foundation upon which the whole structure rests. Without us the great corporations cannot function; production will come to an end. They will admit—and they are proud of the fact—that Detroit, Flint, Pontiac, Jackson, Grand Rapids, Kalamazoo, and other large cities in the State are doing a wonderful job in the way of war production. But they insist that centralization can be overdone. They contend that not all war production should be in the large cities.

Last night it was my privilege to talk to one of those men who is in the special service of the Government that has to do with the production of ordnance. He was over in my home district. He said the people generally and the folks at Washington do not realize the situation that prevails in Detroit. I have no knowledge myself of the conditions in Detroit, but there must be several Members here from that vicinity who do know something about it. This gentleman made this statement: That unless the situation is changed the program in Detroit, so far as production is concerned, will defeat itself in the end because of overcrowding by the bringing in of so many people. He said not only will there be more labor trouble, and that if one would make himself familiar with the situation he would find that, notwithstanding the fact that you do not hear much about strikes in Detroit, or very little at least, they have stoppages and slow-downs there week after week.

This gentleman also made the statement—and mind you he is connected with the production program—that soon Detroit would be without housing facilities. He did not say "adequate," but he said Detroit would be without homes for defense workers. What are you going to do about that situation and with the people they are bringing in? Further than that the trouble goes deeper. Where are you going to get the water for the city of Detroit? The gentleman here from Royal Oak knows the answer to that. True, there may be unlimited water supplies in the river and lakes, but the capacity of the pumps and water mains is limited. This gentleman said that practically all of these big industries are getting water from the city of Detroit, and, in his judgment, there is not pressure enough to take care of any fire hazard that might arise at the present time.

Mr. Chairman, all through the State there are small factories that can take part in this war-production program without in any way injuring Detroit or any other city. I assume that that is one of the purposes of this bill—that the small businessman is to be protected; that the smaller cities and towns are to receive aid so that they will not be forced out of existence. Those smaller communities and the farmers pay the taxes and supply the larger cities with materials, with food.

Referring to my own district, the Fourth, over in Chicago, they are making certain ordnance parts. Those parts are being sent up to Milwaukee and into Wisconsin to be machined. This production man suggested that some of that business, without injuring Wisconsin, be sent to Benton Harbor and St. Joe, Mich. Over there we have the 1900 Corporation, which prior to the war was making 1,300 washing machines a day. They were put out of that business. They had a war order amounting to something like $12,000,000, but all at once, and so far as I can learn, without any particular excuse, or any valid reason, that war order was taken from them, and now they are out.

Up in Grand Haven, where the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] used to live, in the district adjoining mine to the north, and now so ably represented by the gentleman from Grand Rapids [Mr. JONKMAN], is another place where they have labor and factory sites. Down in Niles there are at least two concerns that can contribute materially to war production, and over in Sturgis there are two or more large plants which can aid. I asked him about Adrian, whether they had any trouble there, and he said "No," that Adrian was getting along all right and doing a good job. Then talking of my home town, Allegan, and we were sitting there in a prospective factory, he said, "Here is a building which can be made into a factory that will build many of these things we need, if the Government will only decentralize and permit the prime contractors to sublet some of these orders. Why should we not, without in any manner injuring Detroit or other large centers which are overcrowded, bring prosperity to all these smaller cities and towns and at the same time increase and stabilize our war production?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last paragraph. I assure the Chairman that I shall not use the 5 minutes. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] made some misstatements about Detroit. If the gentleman wants to know where we get our water, it is from Lake St. Clair, and that has not only sufficient water to take care of Detroit, but all of Wayne County and all of the adjoining counties, and as far as taking care of all labor coming in, we still have sufficient property up there that will take care of all of them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LESINSKI. No.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. In any case in which a small business concern or group of such concerns has been certified by or under the authority of the Chairman of the War Production Board to be a competent Government contractor with respect to capacity and credit as to a specific Government procurement contract, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Director of the Procurement Division of the Treasury, and all other officers of the Government having procurement powers, are directed to accept such certification as conclusive, and are authorized to let such Government procurement contract to such concern or group of concerns without requiring it to meet any other requirements with respect to capacity and credit. The Congress hereby recognizes the fact that business concerns operating small plants are frequently unable to produce certain articles at as low a per unit cost as business concerns operating large plants and that, as a consequence of such fact, in order to mobilize the Nation's full productive capacity, including both large and small plants, it may be necessary for the

Government to pay a higher per unit price for such articles to business concerns operating small plants than it pays to business concerns operating large plants.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby created a body corporate under the name "Smaller War Plants Corporation" (hereinafter referred to as the "Corporation"). The principal office of the Corporation shall be located in the District of Columbia, but the Corporation may establish such branch offices in other places in the United States as may be determined by the board of directors.

(b) The Corporation shall have capital stock of $200,000,000, subscribed for by the United States through the Secretary of the Treasury, and payment for which shall be subject to call in whole or in part by the board of directors of the Corporation. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $200,000,000 for the purpose of enabling the Secretary of the Treasury to make payment for such capital stock when payment is called by the board of directors. Receipts for payments by the United States for or on account of such capital stock shall be issued by the Corporation to the Secretary of the Treasury and shall be evidence of the stock ownership by the United States.

(c) The management of the Corporation shall be vested in a board of five directors, deemed to be familiar with the problems of small business, to be appointed by the chairman of the War Production Board. The board of directors shall select a chairman and a vice chairman from among the members of the board.

(d) The Corporation shall not have succession, beyond July 1, 1945, except for purposes of liquidation, unless its life is extended beyond such date pursuant to an act of Congress. It shall have power to adopt, alter, and use a corporate seal, which shall be judicially noticed; to make contracts; to lease such real estate as may be necessary for the transaction of its business; to sue and be sued, to complain and to defend, in any court of competent jurisdiction, State or Federal; to select, employ, and fix the compensation of such officers, employees, attorneys, and agents as shall be necessary for the transaction of the business of the Corporation; to define their authority and duties, require bonds of them, and fix the penalties thereof; and to prescribe, amend, and repeal, by its board of directors, bylaws, rules, and regulations governing the manner in which its general business may be conducted and the powers granted to it by law may be exercised and enjoyed. The board of directors of the Corporation shall determine and prescribe the manner in which its obligations shall be incurred and its expenses allowed and paid. The Corporation shall be entitled to the free use of the United States mails in the same manner as the executive departments of the Government. The Corporation, with the consent of any board, commission, independent establishment, or executive department of the Government, including any field service thereof, may avail itself of the use of information, services, facilities, officers, and employees thereof in carrying out the provisions of this act.

(e) All moneys of the Corporation not otherwise employed may be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States subject to check by authority of the Corporation or in any Federal Reserve bank. The Federal Reserve banks are authorized and directed to act as depositaries, custodians, and fiscal agents for the Corporation in the general performance of its powers conferred by this act. All insured banks, when designated by the Secretary of the Treasury, shall act as depositaries, custodians, and financial agents for the Corporation.

(f) The Corporation is empowered (1) to make loans or advances, on such terms and conditions and with such maturities as it may determine, to enable small business concerns to finance plant construction, conversion, or expansion, or to finance the acquisition of equipment, facilities, machinery, supplies, or materials, or to supply such concerns with capital, to be used in the manufacture of articles, equipment, supplies, or materials for war or essential civilian purposes; and such loans or advances may be made or effected either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions through agreements to participate or by the purchase of participations, or otherwise; (2) to purchase or lease such land, to purchase, lease, build, or expand such plants, and to purchase or produce such equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, or supplies, as may be needed to enable the Corporation to provide small business concerns with such land, plants, equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, or supplies as such concerns may require to engage in the production of such articles, equipment, supplies, or materials; (3) to lease, sell, or otherwise dispose of to any small business concern any such land, plants, equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, or supplies; (4) to enter into contracts with the United States Government and any department, agency, or officer thereof having procurement powers obligating the Corporation to furnish articles, equipment, supplies, or materials to the Government; and (5) to arrange for the performance of such contracts by letting subcontracts to small business concerns or others for the manufacture, supply, or assembly of such articles, equipment, supplies, or materials, or parts thereof, or servicing or processing in connection therewith, or such management services as may be necessary to enable the Corporation to perform such contracts. Such subcontracts may be let upon such terms and conditions as the Corporation may deem appropriate in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed under section 201 of the First War Powers Act, 1941.

(g) (1) Whoever makes any statement knowing it to be false, or whoever willfully overvalues any security, for the purpose of obtaining for himself or for any applicant any loan, or extension thereof by renewal, deferment of action, or otherwise, or the acceptance, release, or substitution of security therefor, or for the purpose of influencing in any way the action of the Corporation, or for the purpose of obtaining money, property, or anything of value, under this act, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

(2) Whoever, being connected in any capacity with the Corporation, (1) embezzles, abstracts, purloins, or willfully misapplies any moneys, funds, securities, or other things of value, whether belonging to it or pledged or otherwise entrusted to it, or (2) with intent to defraud the Corporation or any other body politic or corporate, or any individual, or to deceive any officer, auditor, or examiner of the Corporation, makes any false entry in any book, report, or statement of or to the Corporation, or, without being duly authorized, draws any order or issues, puts forth, or assigns any note, debenture, bond, or other obligation, or draft, bill of exchange, mortgage, judgment, or decree thereof, or (3) with intent to defraud participates, shares, receives directly or indirectly any money, profit, property, or benefit through any transaction, loan, commission, contract, or any other act of the Corporation, or (4) gives any unauthorized information concerning any future action or plan of the Corporation which might affect the value of securities, or, having such knowledge, invests or speculates, directly or indirectly, in the securities or property of any company or corporation receiving loans or other assistance from the Corporation, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 5 years, or both.

(3) The provisions of sections 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, and 117 of the Criminal Code of the United States (U. S. C., title 18, ch. 5, secs. 202 to 207, inclusive), insofar as applicable, are extended to apply to contracts or agreements with the Corporation under this act.

SEC. 5. The chairman of the War Production Board shall make a report every 60 days of his operations under this act to the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. Such report shall include the names of the business concerns to whom contracts are let, and for whom financing is arranged, by the Corporation, together with the amounts involved, and such report shall include such other information, and such comments and recommendations, with respect to the relation of small business concerns to the war effort, as the chairman may deem appropriate.

SEC. 6. Whenever the Smaller War Plants Corporation has completed any transaction under clause (1), (2), or (3) of subsection (f) of section 4 of this act, it shall transfer the loan, advance, plant, equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, supplies, leases, or other property resulting from such transaction to the Defense Plants Corporation, and the Defense Plants Corporation shall service and administer such loan, advance, or property, as the agent of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, remitting to the Smaller War Plants Corporation any interest, principal, or other poceeds or collections, after deducting its actual expense of service and administration.

SEC. 7. The War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission are hereby authorized to make or participate in loans, guaranties, and commitments in accordance with Executive Order No. 9112 of March 26, 1942, and to participate in or to guarantee any loans made pursuant to this act with a view to increasing the production of war materials, supplies, or equipment; and in connection therewith they may use any funds heretofore or hereafter made available to them for purposes of procuring war materials, supplies, and equipment, or of expediting the production thereof.

SEC. 8. Subparagraph (2) of the fourth paragraph of section 5d of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(2) To make loans to and purchase the obligations of any business enterprise, including, when requested by the Secretary of Commerce, subscription to the capital stock thereof, for any purpose deemed by the Corporation to be advantageous to the national defense. Such loans, purchases, or subscriptions shall be made under such terms and conditions and with such maturities as the Corporation may determine. The War Department and the Navy Department are hereby authorized to participate in or to guarantee any loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation pursuant to this provision, and, in connection therewith, they may use any funds heretofore or hereafter made available for purposes of procuring war materials, supplies, and equipment."

SEC. 9. All insured banks designated for that purpose by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be depositaries of public money of the United States (including, without being limited to, revenues and funds of the United States, and any funds the deposit of which is subject to the control or regulation of the United States or any of its officers, agents, or employees, and Postal Savings funds), and the Secretary is hereby authorized to deposit public money in such depositaries, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary; and they may also be employed as financial agents of the Government; and they shall perform all such reasonable duties, as depositaries of public money and financial agents of the Government as may be required of them. The Secretary of the Treasury shall require of the insured banks thus designated satisfactory security by the deposit of United States bonds or otherwise, for the safekeeping and prompt payment of public money deposited with them and for the faithful per-

formance of their duties as financial agents of the Government: *Provided*, That no such security shall be required for the safekeeping and prompt payment of such parts of the deposits of the public money in such banks as are insured deposits and each officer, employee, or agent of the United States having official custody of public funds and lawfully depositing the same in an insured bank shall, for the purpose of determining the amount of the insured deposits, be deemed a depositor in such custodial capacity separate and distinct from any other officer, employee, or agent of the United States having official custody of public funds and lawfully depositing the same in the same insured bank in custodial capacity. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no department, board, agency, instrumentality, officer, employee, or agent of the United States shall issue or permit to continue in effect any regulations, rulings, or instructions, or enter into or approve any contracts or perform any other acts having to do with the deposit, disbursement, or expenditure of public funds, or the deposit, custody, or advance of funds subject to the control of the United States as trustee or otherwise which shall discriminate against or prefer national banking associations, State banks members of the Federal Reserve System, or insured banks not members of the Federal Reserve System, by class, or which shall require those enjoying the benefits, directly or indirectly, of disbursed public funds so to discriminate. All acts or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed. The terms "insured bank" and "insured deposit" as used in this act shall be construed according to the definitions of such terms in the act of August 23, 1935 (49 Stat. 684), as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 264).

SEC. 10. Nothing in this act shall be construed to modify or limit in any manner (1) the authority vested in the Chairman of the War Production Board by Executive Order numbered 9024 of January 16, 1942, or Executive Order numbered 9040 of January 24, 1942, or vested in him by any other Executive order or act of Congress; or (2) the authority vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any of its subsidiaries by any Executive order or act of Congress.

SEC. 11. Whenever the Chairman of the War Production Board shall certify to the Attorney General in writing that the doing of any specified act or thing, or the omission to do any specified act or thing, by one or more specified persons (during the period that this act is in effect) in compliance with any written regulation, order, request, or approval of the said Chairman in which it is specifically set forth that such act, thing, or omission is requisite to the prosecution of the war, such specified act, thing, or omission shall not be deemed in violation of the antitrust laws of the United States or of the Federal Trade Commission Act, as amended or supplemented, if the Attorney General shall certify in writing that the regulation, order, request, or approval is in effect an order or a direction requisite to the prosecution of the war, and is not an unlawful delegation of discretion to a private group.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN: On page 21, line 9, after the period, insert the following: "In any case in which the Chairman of the War Production Board certifies to the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Director of the Procurement Division of the Treasury, or to any other officer of the Government having procurement powers that the Smaller War Plants Corporation is competent to perform any specific Government procurement contract to be let by any such officer, it shall be the duty of such officer to let such procurement contract to such corporation upon such terms and conditions as may be specified by the Chairman of the War Production Board."

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, when the Committee on Banking and Currency had finished hearings on this bill, certain amendments were prepared and agreed upon by the sponsors, both in the House and in the Senate, after conferring with officials of the War Production Board. There were about a half a dozen of those amendments which the Committee on Banking and Currency accepted. The reason this amendment, which was part of the group of amendments that were prepared, was not accepted was because it was almost 12 o'clock one morning and we were anxious to get the bill out that day and not be required to come back next morning. When I offered the amendment it provoked some argument and some discussion, and rather than have the bill delayed until next day I withdrew the amendment and gave notice then that I would introduce it on the floor when the bill came up for consideration.

I do not think anyone has a logical reason to oppose the amendment. It compels the kind of cooperation that every one of us is in favor of. In other words, if Mr. Nelson, Chief of the War Production Board, knows that the Army needs certain equipment and that the Smaller War Plants Corporation can furnish it to him quicker than any other concern can furnish it, and it is in the public interest for the Smaller War Plants Corporation to furnish this equipment, Mr. Nelson has the power under this amendment to compel them to let the Smaller War Plants Corporation perform the contract. In other words, the amendment has some teeth in it. At the same time it leaves discretion within the War Production Board Chief, Mr. Nelson. I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, if the Smaller War Plants Corporation is to act as an operating holding company of such other private corporations as may be gathered around its motherhood, and if that Smaller War Plants Corporation is then certified by Mr. Nelson as capable of getting this work out, through its subsidiaries, we will call them, from an operating standpoint, having been so certified, the gentleman's amendment makes it mandatory that the contract be let to the Smaller War Plans Corporation so that it, in turn, can farm out that production to the other corporations which operate under its motherhood?

Mr. PATMAN. That is exactly right. I believe the gentleman agrees that it is a constructive and helpful amendment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not know how the Smaller War Plants Corporation is going to operate effectively unless you do that very thing. I am very much in favor of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think the gentleman's amendment is well taken and I intend to support it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

It is all right to set up machinery to help small businesses, but it is not all right to set up and create a colossal octopus which might reach out and destroy our whole production program. I believe if you would read carefully and studiously the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas and read it in connection with all of the other provisions of the bill, you would come to the conclusion that it would be next to impossible for the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy to let a contract which did not clear through the Smaller War Plants Corporation, thereby hindering, thereby putting the brakes on a lot of contracts, the negotiation of contracts, the letting of contracts under bids by the War Department and the Navy Department to construct matériel to keep our soldiers in the field and our ships afloat.

Now, I hope you know what you are doing before you adopt this amendment, because in our zeal, in our enthusiasm to do something for the small businessman, I hope we will not do anything which is going to slow down the negotiation and the letting of contracts for matériel. The Lord knows it is slow enough now, but we are forging ahead. We are ahead of schedule and we want to keep ahead of schedule. We do not want another bureaucracy set up through which the War Department and the Navy Department have to clear before they can let a contract to any responsible negotiator or bidder.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman know that Mr. Nelson testified that he believed he had that power now? In order to remove any doubt, this amendment is offered so that when the Army, the Navy, or other governmental agencies are told it is necessary for this corporation to have this contract there will be no doubt about it.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am calling the gentleman's attention to the fact that we are doing billions' and billions' worth of war business today. In these two items we are setting up a relatively small corporation as compared to the rest of our war effort, and the gentleman would have all our war contracts cleared through it. If Mr. Nelson has this authority under existing law, I would prefer that he exercise this authority which he now has than to say to the War Department or the Navy Department that they cannot let a contract for a package of pins until it is cleared through the Smaller War Plants Corporation. That absolutely defeats the purpose of this bill.

Mr. PATMAN. No; that is not the effect of my amendment.

Mr. WOLCOTT. And it might defeat our war program or at least so interfere with it as to justify the President's vetoing the bill. Put yourself in the position of the President of the United States, who is responsible for getting arms, munitions, and ships to carry on this war. Would you subordinate the Commander in Chief of the armed forces to

a board or a bureau? You just cannot do that and win a war.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is mistaken about the effect of my amendment, absolutely mistaken.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Do I understand the War Production Board approved this amendment?

Mr. PATMAN. It is my understanding that the official representatives of the War Production Board approved this amendment.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Did the War Department approve this amendment?

Mr. PATMAN. I do not know whether the War Department approved it; I do not care whether they did or not.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. But representatives of the War Production Board approved it?

Mr. PATMAN. I recall there were six of them. I do not mean by this amendment that the War Department or the Navy Department shall clear everything through the War Production Board, but only those contracts that the War Production Board knows can be more rapidly completed through the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Those are the only one that would be affected.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words and rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened with great interest to my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who has worked so hard on this measure. I wish to draw his attention to the duties of the War Production Board, as set forth in a memorandum which appears on page 190 of the hearings. In doing so may I say that I am in full sympathy with small business and I want to see the small manufacturers and business people get all the business they can out of war production. I read the following from a statement signed by Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, and D. M. Nelson, Chairman, War Production Board, which definitely lays down what each one of these departments and bureaus of the Government may do. It states the whole purpose and concept of the War Production Board.

5. In broad terms, the War Production Board gives general direction and supervision to the war supply system, formulates broad policies with respect to that system, makes the basic decisions on the allocation of resources to the various parts of the supply system in accordance with strategic directives and plans, makes provision for materials, services, tools, and facilities needed for the military effort and the civilian economy, and organizes industry for war production. Therefore, specifically, the War Production Board will—

(a) cooperate with the War Department in the formulation and review of supply programs and, in the light of military needs as expressed by the War Department, determine the resources that will be applied to war production and to the civilian economy consistent with war necessity, and aid the War Department in adjusting its program to such determinations.

It sets forth the duty of the War Department in the supply program in the following language:

DUTIES OF THE WAR DEPARTMENT IN THE SUPPLY PROGRAM

6. In broad terms, the War Department, through the Services of Supply and the material command of the Army Air Forces, in accordance and compliance with the policies and directives of the War Production Board, carries on its supply functions of research, design, development, programming, purchase, production, storage, distribution, issue, maintenance, and salvage. Therefore, specifically, the War Department will—

(a) determine military needs and compile requirements for supplies, new facilities, transportation, and communication as to quantity, types, and time, and translate these into requirements for resources, including raw materials, tools, and labor, and keep the War Production Board continually informed of these requirements;

(b) receive from the War Production Board descriptions of plants or industries available for conversion and convert these with the assistance and under the direction of the War Production Board; and

(c) purchase, including the negotiation, placement, and administration of contracts.

I agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] that this Smaller War Plants Corporation cannot take away from the War Department or the Navy Department certain functions that have already been agreed to by the Chairman of the War Production Board and the Under Secretary of War. That is an official document, and therefore I cannot vote for the gentleman's amendment, because I think it upsets an agreement that has already been entered into by these two officials who have so much to do with our war production.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Does not the gentleman believe it might be better and more fully serve the purposes of this legislation to allow the Army and the Navy to transact business with the small business concerns in their own way and then if it is found that this Smaller War Plants Corporation is needed have Congress enact legislation when that need becomes apparent?

Mr. DEWEY. I think the legislation as it stands is excellent and goes forward along the line that may be helpful; but I think that to try to set aside the operations already agreed to in a memorandum signed by these high officials of the Government, to set them aside in an unstudied and undiscussed amendment which the gentleman has already stated never came before the Banking and Currency Committee, might upset our whole war program and give a great deal of embarrassment to both the Army and the Navy.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am anxious to understand this. I would like to ask the gentleman if he states that under this amendment contracts which the Army or the Navy are going to let would be interfered with unless the head of the War Production Board himself acted in the matter? In other words, would he not still retain complete control over the situation?

Mr. DEWEY. Not as I understood the amendment as read. I think it permits the Chairman of the War Production Board to go directly and let any contract, although he has agreed he will cooperate with the War Department.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the Members of the Committee will refer to the interrogations on page 183 which I submitted to Major Smith of the War Department, who appeared on behalf of the War Department in reference to this bill, you will find where Major Smith takes the position that Mr. Nelson received ultimate responsibility for the production program in Executive orders issued by the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

The memorandum referred to by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY], appearing on pages 190, 191, and 192 of the hearings, is an operating memorandum to keep down fights of all kinds between the Army and the War Production Board, of which Mr. Nelson is Chairman. If you will refer to the duties of the War Production Board as set forth in subparagraph (j) of the memorandum signed by Judge Patterson and Mr. Nelson you will find it reads as follows:

Duties of the War Production Board: Determine the plants or industries which should be converted to the production of supply for the War Department and assist the War Department in such conversion.

There is your operating memorandum. We come along here and set up a Smaller War Plants Corporation in this bill to do thus and so. It proceeds to select a company or a group of companies and certifies that that company or group of companies so selected is capable from the standpoint of quantity, quality, credit standing, and managerial responsibility to do a job.

Now you hesitate to make it mandatory on the part of the War Production Board to give the Corporation a contract, or place that contract in that particular channel. If we want to do a lot of shadow boxing, go out here and give a lot of certificates to companies, leading them to believe they are going to get a bowl of soup, just a political gesture, you may say—if that is your wish, leave the amendment out of the bill. On the other hand, if you expect the Smaller War Plants Corporation to function insofar as actually giving contracts to small, intermediate, and larger businesses are concerned I think you had better adopt the amendment. In no way will the amendment interfere with the production of goods on contracts other than those so certified as respects the Smaller War Plants Corporation operations.

I just do not follow that thought at all. As much as I dislike disagreeing with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], my committee boss, I will have to disagree with him.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. It strikes me there is danger as far as kidding the public is concerned in making them think this is mandatory. As I read it, Donald Nelson could continue the executive agreement he has entered into. This does not force him to do anything.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In no way is Mr. Nelson forced to certify anybody or corporation under this bill. If he does not certify the Smaller War Plants Corporation as being capable, through its machinery, of turning out a certain contract, there is no responsibility. If he does not certify as to a given contract, the mandate does not apply.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Let us not let the public think this is mandatory then.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am talking about placing the order after he certifies. It is one thing to certify my plant as being capable of doing a thing, leading me to the depth of going out and changing my financial structure, and then refuse to give me the contract. Why flirt with me? Why trifle with me? Either leave off the certification or give me the business. If you certify me, I want the contract. Do not force me to die a slow death. Leave off the certification or, having certified my firm, then give me the contract.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman will agree with the premise that if the War Production Board certifies as to the competency of this Corporation, in doing that it can control the industrial destiny of this Nation?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Oh, yes; and the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy under the powers that we have already granted, which both Republicans and Democrats voted for, can certainly control our destiny for the duration and until the people of this country recapture those powers. There is no question about that in my mind. Let the control run during the war emergency and then let us recapture those powers for the people.

As has been pointed out on numerous occasions, we survive as a republic, as a government of the people, for the people, and by the people, because when danger arrives, we quickly concentrate enormous powers in the hands of the Chief Executive, and heretofore, thank God, we have had the gumption of recapturing those powers when the danger passed. Let us proceed on that basis and do the big job ahead of us—namely, win this war. If I were momentarily concerned about the powers granted to the President—constitutional and statutory—under the present war conditions, I would not be able to sleep and this because the powers are so great.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should be frank with ourselves and with the public in what we are attempting to do here today. I do not think anyone expects this legislation will accomplish all that may be desired, but we do want it to be effective.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas would put teeth in this bill. It is one thing in the bill that will insure fulfillment of the purposes of the aggregate of this legislation. As I understand, under another provision of the bill, wherever the Chairman of the War Production Board certifies to the competency of a concern to fulfill a contract it would under the specific language of that provision of the bill be the duty of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the agencies of the Government to award the contract accordingly.

We know what has happened heretofore. We know what has brought about the complaints that culminated in the demand for this legislation. I do not say that in criticism of Army officials. I appreciate the difficulties confronting them and the necessity for expedition in going forward with the program of war production. But we know what has happened heretofore. If we want to stop it this is the one provision of this bill that will bring small contractors and small concerns into the war-production activities of the Government.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were—ayes, 72, noes 25.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MUNDT: On page 17, line 24, strike out "$200,000,000" and insert "$300,000,000."

On page 18, line 3, strike out "$200,000,000" and insert "$300,000,000."

On page 21, line 9, after "contracts" add a new paragraph (6) as follows:

"*Provided*, That not less than $100,000,000 of this appropriation shall be used only for the purposes described in paragraphs 2 and 3 of this section for the assistance of small enterprises in cities of less than 100,000 population, according to the 1940 census."

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, this bill is intended to be helpful to the small businessman. The small businessman and the small town are related closely together. I think we would be derelict in our duties as Representatives here today if we did not in some way in this bill do something to assure the fact that the small businessman in the small town gets some assistance in his desire to be helpful in this war effort by converting his peacetime machinery into the production of war supplies.

My amendment simply adds $100,000,000 to the amount of this bill and earmarks that $100,000,000 for the following purposes in conformity with this bill:

To purchase or lease such land, to purchase, lease, build, or expand such plants, and to purchase or produce such equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, or supplies as may be needed to enable the Corporation to provide small business concerns with such land, plants, equipment, facilities, machinery, materials, or supplies as such concerns may require to engage in the production of such articles, equipment, supplies, or materials.

In other words, we have listened to a lot of crocodile tears shed on the floor of this House by various Members about the plight of the automobile dealer, the tire dealer, the oil dealer, and others. This amendment offers you a chance to do something besides shed crocodile tears. It gives you a chance to stop those crocodile tears at their source.

This amendment enables the Smaller War Plants Corporation to do for the Chrysler dealer who employs 10 or 15 men in a town of 30,000 or 40,000 people what the Government is doing for the Chrysler Automobile Corporation employing 100,000 men in a city of several million people. It empowers the Government and insists that the Government expend this extra $100,000,000 for the purpose of helping these small enterprises in the small towns to tool up and equip themselves so that they dare undertake the risk of a war contract.

I have had some experience in helping these small fellows in the small towns of South Dakota who are trying to convert. Inevitably they would run against this hazard: "If I tool up with a lot of new machinery and it proves to be a short war my investment can bankrupt me and force me out of business."

This amendment eliminates that hazard, because it will permit the Government to lease to these small operators a number of machine lathes, a number of turret lathes, and such other pieces of equipment as they need so that they can go out and build a part of a tank, a part of a plane, or a part of a gun, or a bomb, adding to the aggregate war production of this country.

If we are going to help the little fellow in the small town, something of this nature must be incorporated in the bill or it must be exemplified in the administration of this bill, and I submit that the prudent thing to do is to write the stipulation in the bill here and now.

I have added this extra $100,000,000 for that purpose so as not to interfere in the slightest degree with the operation of the bill as reported out by the committee. The $200,000,000 recommended by the committee would be used precisely as they have prescribed. This extra $100,000,000 would be used in towns of 100,000 or less in order to help the small fellows in these communities tool up for war production.

I say to you that this Congress has been getting into a habit of late of straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. You will recall that a week or so ago we approved by unanimous consent the appropriation of $5,000,000,000 for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to help big businesses do precisely what I am asking you now to appropriate $100 000,000 for small businesses in small towns to do.

I think it is important in our war effort that we take full advantage of the vast productive power in the aggregate of the little machine shops, the garages,

and the workers in towns of 100,000 or less in America.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LYNCH. Does the gentleman think that the small business concern in the small town is more entitled to relief than the small business concern in the large city?

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman would continue to permit two-thirds of the new total of $300,000,000, if it gravitates in its normal way, to go to the larger cities. The gentleman also realizes that today there probably is not a single city in America of over 100,000 population which does not now have a war activity in it or war contracts for the smaller enterprises. The larger cities are able to get these contracts, and the smaller concerns within the larger cities are getting many subcontracts from big city giant corporations.

The little fellow in the small town sits out in an economic desert. Nothing has been done to protect him. Unless you act now nothing is going to be made mandatory by this act by this Congress to protect the little fellow in the little town from going broke because of our negligence and indifference to that particular problem.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from South Dakota be permitted to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Is there anything in this bill, to the gentleman's knowledge, that provides that two-thirds of this sum shall be allocated to business in the large cities as against the industries in the small cities?

Mr. MUNDT. There is nothing in the bill about it, but there is a book of records as big as Gone With the Wind from the precedents of Government activities under this Administration which leads me to believe that would be the outcome unless we stipulate now, while we have a chance as legislators, that we actually are forthright and specific in trying to do something for the little fellow in the little town.

Mr. LYNCH. Is it the gentleman's intention to stipulate that two-thirds of all the moneys appropriated for this purpose shall go to the small business concerns in the large cities?

Mr. MUNDT. Not at all; no. But it is my definite purpose to take affirmative action which will add $100,000,000 to this revolving fund and earmark it specifically for the small enterprises in cities and towns of less than 100,000 people. Unless this is done, I very much fear that considerably less than $100,000,000 of direct assistance, parceled out in small allotments, so as to help a great many of those who need help will actually go to the little fellow in the little community as a result of our action here today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think anybody knows exactly what the result of this amendment would be. The fact is these loans will not all be made directly by the Smaller War Plants Corporation. The loans will be made by private institutions and through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and as I attempted to make clear in my statement about the bill this afternoon, the fund in the hands of the Smaller War Plants Corporation is in the nature of an insurance fund and the amendment the gentleman has offered would not accomplish what he has in mind unless the fund is used as contemplated in the way of an insurance fund. When Mr. Nelson, the Chairman of the War Production Board was before the Committee on Banking and Currency, he made the specific statement, which will be found on page 86 of the hearings, that it was not desired and that he did not desire more than $100,000,000 capital for the Smaller War Plants Corporation. Out of our desire to make sure that there could not be any failure to carry a dignified and sufficient sum, we made it $200,000,000 in the bill. I hope the amendment will be voted down.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in accord with the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT]. Certainly, the time is at hand if we are ever going to give consideration to small business. I feel this is certainly one definite, tangible way in which that can be done. An effort was made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] to designate just what was intended by small business. That amendment failed.

This amendment specifically moves money into the small communities, in cities of 100,000 and less. The question has been asked as to whether or not small business in large cities should be deprived of the use of these funds. You must bear in mind this fact. In the larger cities the smaller businesses are close at hand and therefore are the beneficiaries of subcontracts, but in the small communities, towns of 25,000, 35,000, 40,000, or 50,000 population today hardly any of this war effort expenditure is being made.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I yield.

Mr. LYNCH. Is the gentleman acquainted with the fact that of all the industries in the country only 6,000 have received subcontracts and that there is no evidence whatsoever that these 6,000 are located in the larger cities?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I am fully aware of the fact that few cities in the smaller group are receiving war contracts throughout the country. I am heartily in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Of course, it is a fact, however, that in the industrial area north of the Ohio, east of the Mississippi to the Atlantic seaboard, in scores of rather small towns you will find operating branches of some of our very largest corporations in towns of 2,000 or 3,000 population, for instance.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. That is right. However, in the Middle West and in the midcontinent section of this country, far removed from the industrial centers, the great problem that faces many phases of small business is not receiving consideration. Unless some designation is made under this particular bill, there is not any chance in the world that they may be helped and a serious situation is increasing with each succeeding day.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I just want to say after listening to the amendment and the arguments that have been presented, I am heartily in favor of the amendment.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SHORT. We can lend all the money in the world to the small business, but we are not going to help either the small businessman or the great businessman as long as the administrative officers of our Government tell them to spend so much of their time in filling out questionnaires, answering a lot of extraneous questions, instead of devoting all of their time and energy to the production of war material.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. I think the gentleman is correct about that, but the facts are that in many of these small communities there is need of funds in order to put their plans in shape. They must have financial assistance to do this before they have any chance, by any stretch of the imagination, to keep people employed in the smaller communities.

There are many types of small business in towns of 5,000 to 25,000 that will need help if they are to endure; outstanding among these is the auto dealer who today must close his business because of freezing orders. Also many small retail stores, many radio dealers, typewriter, washing machine dealers, and countless others. We must win this war but we must also save the Nation; we must not destroy the small town or the small dealers. They are important factors and stabilize our national economy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Dakota has expired. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn without objection, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any other amendments to section 4?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to talk out of order on section 7.

The CHAIRMAN. We have not yet reached section 7. Are there any other amendments to section 4? If not, to section 5 or section 6? If not, to section 7?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Section 7 on page 24 attempts to confer authority upon the War Department, the Navy Department, and the Maritime Commission to guarantee loans in accordance with Executive Order No. 9112. Executive Order No. 9112 is found in the Federal Register of March 28, 1942, and I doubt very much if very many Members of the House have ever read this order or make it a practice to read Executive orders. I address myself now to the fact that I think it is bad legislative practice to incorporate by mere reference in legislation on the floor of the House an Executive order that has previously been made by the executive branch of the Government.

Recently you have said on this floor that you resent any encroachment of bureaucracy upon the legislative branch of the Government. You say you resent the inroads being made by certain sections of the press, against our institution, the legislative branch of the Government. But in this case are we not laying the foundation for such criticism, in the perspective of the historian, I invite your attention particularly to Executive Order 9112. In the first place, on March 26, when this Executive order was established, the President cited authority for the Executive order of the first War Powers Act of 1941. I looked at title II of this War Powers Act to which he referred which is section 201 of that act, and I find there is not the semblance of authority for the War Department, the Navy Department, or the Maritime Commission to guarantee loans made by the R. F. C. or the Federal Reserve Board. What happened after the President made Executive Order 9112? The War Department appropriation bill had passed the House and was before the Senate for consideration, Mr. Forrestal, the Assistant Secretary of the Navy, wrote to the Senate chairman and suggested among other things that a small paragraph of legislation should be put into that appropriation bill so that Executive Order 9112 could be put into effect, so that the Navy Department could participate in it.

Must you not conclude that this Executive order has been made by the President without any semblance of authority? I have written to the Attorney General about it, and have not yet received a reply. On this recommendation by Mr. Forrestal to the Committee on Appropriations, the Navy Department was given the following language in an appropriation bill, approved April 28:

> Section 202 * * * The appropriations of the Navy Department for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 shall be available to carry out the provisions of Executive Order No. 9112 of March 22, 1942.

Can you not see the poor policy of adopting by reference again in that appropriation bill the language of an Executive order that does not have the semblance of authority and is purely the fiat of the Executive Department? In that same appropriation bill I find the following language was adopted in title I with reference to the Military Establishment:

> And such appropriations—referring to the fiscal years 1940, 1941, and 1942—for the Military Establishment heretofore and herein made shall remain available until June 30, 1943, for the purposes of such appropriations and for carrying out the provisions of Executive Order No. 9112, of March 26, 1942.

There again by legislation adopted on an appropriation bill the House attempted to make legal an Executive order.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I am compelled to object, because there are some other things that must be taken up and the time is short.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words and I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, a complete break-down of this Nation's transportation facilities confronts the people of America at this moment. The failure of our rubber supply threatens to remove from 40 to 50 percent of the private automobiles from use within the next 6 months. As a consequence the one important question before the Nation today which must be answered without more delay is, What are we going to do about it?

We find in Washington various schools of thought regarding the rubber situation. Some rely on crude rubber supplies from South America, others on synthetic rubber from oil, and still others on the guayule rubber from California. Wishful thinking, however, will not produce a new set of tires, and it is idle to hope or expect that any of these prospective sources of rubber will in any event produce sufficient rubber to fulfill all military needs and satisfy even a part of the public's need in less than 2 years or possibly 3. It does not help in any way to guess about the future any more than it does to regret our failure to have established adequate stock piles of rubber, as was urged by Congress. There is only one phase of the rubber situation worth considering, and that is to consider how much rubber is available in the Nation at this moment, how it is being used, and how long will it last. When those questions have been answered it will then be a simple matter to set forth a definite plan to get the maximum beneficial use of all existing tires in the Nation.

The State Railroad Commission of California, of which Mr. Franck Havenner, a former Member of Congress, is a member, has had the foresight to undertake a study of the serious transportation problem in California. The thoroughness of their investigation, the factual data assembled, and the serious conclusions obtained paint a picture which is most alarming indeed. The situation which is revealed in California will be duplicated in every State in the Union to a greater or lesser degree.

To obtain the necessary information over 700 industrial concerns throughout the State of California, employing more than 450,000 workers, were surveyed. These 700 firms are all engaged in producing items which directly affect our war effort. Companies employing from a few workers up to more than 40,000 employees are included in the 700 canvassed. All employees furnished information to the appointed checkers who personally filled out the information cards to insure the accuracy and adequacy of the data assembled.

The results of this survey reveal most astounding factual information concerning the availability of automobile transportation. It is shown that in most plants from 70 to 93 percent of the workers reach the plant in private autos. Where adequate public means of transportation is not available to an industry, invariably 80 percent or more of the workers use automobiles.

The next interesting revelation is that, in spite of the fact the average seating capacity of each private vehicle is 4.4 persons, nevertheless the average use of the individual car is only 1.6 persons, which includes the driver himself. In response to the vital information regarding the condition and life of the cars, the tire situation is most threatening. The compilations indicate that within a period of 3 to 6 months 40 percent of the cars will be out of use; and within 6 to 12 months 75 percent will be out of use; and within 12 to 18 months 85 percent will be out of use. There is the general picture for the State of California.

Even in San Diego where the war industries are located along the shores of San Diego Bay, within a short walking distance of the central business district of the city, the picture portrayed is almost identical with the general picture throughout the State. To ascertain the travel characteristics of the workers in these industries, a survey was made which shows that of this number 29 percent travel by local streetcar or bus, 63 percent by automobile, 6 percent walk, and 2 percent travel by interurban train or bus.

The survey showed that the tires on workers' automobiles—estimated by the owner—have an expectant life as follows:

	Percent
3 months	20
6 months	30
12 months	37
18 months	8
24 months	4
48 months	1
Total	100

These estimates show that by the end of 6 months a maximum of 50 percent of these automobiles will be out of service; at the end of the first year 87 percent will be out of service; and most of the remainder will be out of service by the end of 2 years unless preventive measures are taken.

A Nation-wide survey, taken with the same care and thoroughness, would undoubtedly reveal the same identical situation. With these facts confronting us,

we must answer the question, What are we going to do about it?

First. The conservation of existing tires in use on automobiles must be attained so as to extend their usefulness. Either voluntarily or through compulsion, the passenger load per car must be doubled—this can best be done by the workers taking turns in driving their fellow workers to the plant.

Second. The expansion and greater utilization of mass transportation in public vehicles must be had.

Third. The staggering of work shifts by departments in each industry in order to obtain the greatest usefulness of all available streetcars or busses.

Fourth. The relocation of industrial workers closer to the places of their employment. This can be accomplished either through exchanges of homes or else by the construction of barracks for single workers or temporary defense housing for married workers adjacent to each industry.

Fifth. The extension of rail and bus transportation facilities in order to give more direct, usable service to the workers. This, however, will require the laying of new trackage and the purchase of new coaches and busses, all of which is difficult due to the shortage of critical materials. The cost of such bus and rail extensions, made from the nearest available connecting points, in the Los Angeles area alone would be nearly $10,000,000.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the real heart of the national transportation problem. The movement of workers engaged in war industries to and from their work is most vital. The movements of materials into a factory where there are no hands to fabricate those materials would be idle, indeed. Yet more than idle would it be to have empty freight cars waiting at a factory siding to remove the finished products if there are no workers to do the finishing.

As a temporary aid in the solution of this problem, Nation-wide gasoline rationing becomes essential. Even in Texas, Oklahoma, and California, where oil flows in abundance, gas rationing must be enforced if tires on all vehicles are to be conserved. If necessary in order to provide tires for workers' cars 6 months from now, it might even be desirable or practical to purchase all tires now in use on purely pleasure cars. Steps must be taken, regardless of how drastic those steps may be, to keep our war production rolling. The fighting men have every right to expect a steady stream of war materials to flow into each sphere of action. This can only be done by keeping the wheels of industry turning. This is the direct responsibility of the Office of Defense Transportation. They must determine upon a definite program without further delay, since the situation is critical, as shown by the facts which I have presented. Moreover, that program must be put into action at once. Let it not be said 6 months hence that we were fiddling the while rubber was burning.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Miss SUMNER of Illinois: On page 24, after line 13, add a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 18. Section 5200 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph reading as follows:

"'(10) Obligations shall not be subject, under this section, to any limitation based upon such capital and surplus, to the extent that such obligations are secured or covered by guaranties or by commitments or agreements to take over, or to purchase, made by any Federal Reserve bank, or by the United States or any department, bureau, board, commission, or establishment of the United States, including any corporation wholly owned, directly or indirectly, by the United States.'"

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, living in Washington where customers swarm like bees around places of business and the worry is whether swelling prosperity will not become too inflated, it is difficult to realize that there are tens of thousands of little country towns all over the United States that are deflated to the very lowest depression in their history—their nadir.

The corollary of Portia's famous line is "They are as sick that have too little as they who surfeit with too much."

I look down Main Street of my own little home town. On the corner are three oil stations about to go out of business. Next door and across the street are automobile dealers practically in liquidation. The hardware dealers and plumber have also fallen into desuetude. A drug store and grocery store are selling out because the owners have been caught in the draft. In short, there is practically nothing left of the business of the town except the canning factory and the taverns where men cash their W. P. A. checks and drop salty tears into their beer.

This situation, doubtless, is duplicated in tens of thousands of little towns all over the United States, towns which used to be the pillars of the Nation.

No business in my little town will be qualified to get a penny of the capital floated by this so-called little-business legislation for which we shall gladly cast our votes today. Neither will the majority of your little towns.

The amendment I have submitted will help a tiny little bit, without costing the Government anything.

Section 520 of the National Banking Act prohibits banks lending to any one individual, partnership, or corporation more than 10 percent of their capital and surplus. Most banks in little towns do not have more than $50,000 capital and $10,000 surplus, though they might have several hundred thousand dollars on deposit available for loans. Such banks, therefore, are prevented from lending more than $6,000 to any one individual even though the loan might be guaranteed by the United States Government through the Commodity Credit or some other United States agency.

This section is one of the provisions of existing law which prevents business from locating in little towns. Businessmen do not care to set up industries in a little place if the most they can borrow from the local bank is $6,000. They would rather stay near their source of capital in a big city.

The section should be reformed, now more than ever before. A good loan ought to be allowed to remain in the community and not be sent to swell the coffers of big city banks. The amendment, however, does not go very far. It only permits the banks to lend without such limitation on the loans guaranteed by the United States Government or department or agency thereof. To that extent it will help prevent liquidation of the banking institutions in little country communities which now need their banks more than ever.

The Comptroller of the United States currency has tried to rectify this situation to some extent by a recent ruling which says that the provisions of Section 5200 shall not apply to loans guaranteed by the War and Navy Departments, the R. F. C., and the Federal Reserve bank, and a few others.

The ruling is based, however, on an extremely broad interpretation of his currency powers. The ruling should be clarified and his actions ratified by specific legislation. This amendment will furnish that clarification and ratification. There will be many little towns which will be helped a little if the amendment becomes law. I only wish that it were practicable in this legislation to reform the section so as to permit all good loans which are not guaranteed by the United States Government.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. In the preparation of the amendment did the gentlewoman confer with the Federal Reserve officials or the Secretary of the Treasury?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Indeed I did, and I met with no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. I personally favor the amendment and I hope it is adopted.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. STEAGALL. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Yes; I yield.

Mr. STEAGALL. I desire to say that I regard the amendment as sound fundamentally, and constructive and helpful.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution and acceptance of the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 24, line 3, strike out section 7.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I want to point out that in discussing section 7 there are these considerations which we should have in mind: In the first place, an Executive order is not limited as to time, while appropriations are limited to 1 year.

In the second place, the provisions authorizing the carrying out of this Executive order are permanent in character, although the appropriations are limited as to time. If taken literally, the authorization in the act of April 28 will permit the redelegation of power ad infinitum of the powers attempted to be conferred by the Executive order. The same thing is true with reference to this. I think from that standpoint it is not constitutional.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, will effect of this legislation if those Executive orders were revoked or amended? Would that change the legislation?

Mr. JONES. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I would like to see what the gentlemen of the committee have to say about the amendment of these Executive orders. Do we want to go on record as establishing a policy by reference to an extraneous order that most of you have never read, that might be amended at any time by the President authorizing the War Department, the Navy Department, or the Maritime Commission to guarantee loans. It may, according to the last paragraph of the Executive order, guarantee interest, fees, and other charges of the War Department, the Navy Department, or the Maritime Commission, respectively, in operations pursuant to the terms of this Executive order. This means attorneys' fees can be included. It means that in addition to the appropriations given to the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission, money can be given them to any limit, in any amount that the R. F. C. or the Federal Reserve Board chose to lend them, without having to come to Congress, or without Congress having any control of the amounts that may be spent. Fan dancing could be included. I believe this to be bad legislative policy.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is it not a fact that Executive Order 9112 limits the amount of the guaranty the Army, the Navy, or the Maritime Commission may make to the appropriations Congress has made to these three agencies for the purchase of war goods and materials?

Mr. JONES. The legislative program to this date does not indicate that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Not the legislative program; I am talking about the Executive order.

Mr. JONES. I am talking about the effects or the result of the Executive order. This is the very reason for my amendment. The general practice is to submit justifications for any item appearing in an appropriation bill for the War Department or the Navy Department. The committee should determine what is necessary and should provide every dollar that is to be spent. The House adopted the conference report ratifying the loaning policy of Executive Order 9112, and the result is that nobody will know what we are guaranteeing or where we will end. At best it is sloppy legislative practice. We should stop here and now; and I hope sincerely that this amendment will be adopted. If it is necessary to guarantee these loans, a limit should be stated. This should be done in clear-cut language without reference to any Executive order that might be amended or modified by the Chief Executive.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Suppose the gentleman's amendment is adopted, what amount will be left in this bill as an authorization to carry out its purposes?

Mr. JONES. The amount left in the bill will be exactly where we stand this afternoon with the provisions of the military and naval appropriation bills passed, I believe, on April 28. That will be the language which gives it force and effect, without this qualifying language.

Mr. McCORMACK. But with section 7 stricken out what will be left in the bill by way of authorization of appropriation?

Mr. JONES. I believe the effect of taking this section 7 out will be to withdraw the stamp of approval from the type of legislation that adopts as its substance an Executive order that may later be modified by the Chief Executive.

Mr. McCORMACK. But I cannot understand what appropriation would be authorized with section 7 stricken out.

Mr. JONES. I think that is the whole question and the reason why it should be stricken out.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. All over the United States today throughout Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, New York, and Pennsylvania in particular, the commercial banks are functioning under Executive Order 9112 and regulations issued by the Federal Reserve Board interpreting that Executive order and telling the banks to proceed. It seems to me that if we strike out section 7 by approving this amendment—and I am sure the House is not going to approve this amendment—Congress is serving notice on the industries affected and on all of the commercial banks of this country that it was not willing to go along with the President in the terms of Executive Order 9112 and the Federal Reserve Board regulation (v). I cannot think of any better way to trifle with this war production effort than to pull a stunt like that, and to me it would be a stunt.

Let us look at the business end of it. If the War Department places a contract with Corporation A and Corporation A can deliver the goods but it does not have the credit facilities to get it out, to build up its inventories and to handle the pay roll, and the War Department is not permitted to guarantee that obligation that you as an individual or your local commercial bank makes to Corporation A, then just what is this show all about anyway? The Congress makes the appropriation to the War Department, we will say, for a thousand machine guns. The contract for the machine guns is given to Corporation A. Corporation A can do the job, but does not have the credit facilities. The local commercial bank makes the credit facilities available to Corporation A. The War Department guarantees the contract. That is what Executive Order No. 9112 does. What is wrong with that? You are going to let the War Department have the money. As a matter of fact, it has been the custom here in recent months for the War Department to advance up to 20 or 30 percent on an order to the company direct.

You want the commercial banks to come into this picture and help carry the load of the Treasury. Why not let them carry some of the loans, especially if some of the banks are willing to carry up to 33⅓ percent of the risk, which they are doing?

Mr. JONES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. JONES. This is in answer to the majority leader's question, too. He asked what will be the amount left in this bill. The amount is $200,000,000, by the terms of the bill as mentioned on page 18. Here is what I am arguing about: Is it good legislative policy to adopt an Executive order that can be amended at any time? If it is good policy, if this is a good principle, let us say so forthrightly in original legislation without referring to the Executive order that has questionable authority in the first place.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I may say that it is good policy to make an Executive order statutory law if you want the people of this country to go along with the particular Executive order. I will not quibble about that proposition the least bit. If an order is a good one, why not make it law of the land? Here you ask the commercial banks, some 15,000 of them, to advance their capital and credit, belonging to stockholders and the depositors; for instance, to make loans on war contracts, I am talking about, not peacetime contracts; the machinery is set in motion in the form of an Executive order. Why are you afraid to put that in statutory form? If you want the people of this country to go along in good faith, let us be honest with them. There is not any practice that makes business any better than that of straightforward dealing, with all cards on top of the table. That is the way I like to see things done. You started out with the Price Administration by Executive order and it ran for a year. It did not work. The President asked you to put it in statutory form. You put that in the form of the price-control bill and you are trying to get along with that, doing the best you can under the circumstances. Now comes Executive Order No. 9112. It involves billions of dollars. If you want it to be effective, make it law.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the pending amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: On page 27, beginning in line 13, strike out section 11 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 11 Whenever the Chairman of the War Production Board shall find and so certify in writing that the doing of any act or thing or the omission to do any act or thing, by one or more persons during the period that this act is in effect, in compliance with any request or approval made by him in writing, is requisite to the prosecution of the war, such act, thing, or omission shall not be deemed in violation of the antitrust laws of the United States or the Federal Trade Commission Act. Such finding and certificate may in his discretion be withdrawn at any time by the chairman, whereupon the provisions of this section shall no longer apply to any subsequent act or omission.

"This section shall remain in force until 6 months after the termination of the present war or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate."

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, this proposed amendment and the section of which it is to be amendatory if adopted, confers an extraordinary power upon an executive agency. When you examine the history of our sort of government, the Anglo-Saxon system of government, I speak of it not racially but governmentally, you discover that in emergencies such as we now confront, we have been able to compete with dictatorial governments in speed and strength, and at the same time have ourselves escaped long periods of dictatorship.

Our people seem to have been able instinctively to sense a situation requiring a quicker pick-up and a stronger power than our institutions functioning normally are able to provide, by concentrating emergency power in the Executive to deal with an emergent situation.

To retain in the Parliament, and with us since our independence in the Congress, the power to control, if necessary, that extraordinary power, and the power to recapture and redistribute it when the emergency is over. To that arrangement we owe our strength and efficiency in emergency, our ability to escape conquest by dictatorships which might otherwise grow out of the possession of this extraordinary power.

The provision which has just been read to you is in line with that policy and practice. You will observe that we have attached a provision which enables the two Houses of Congress by concurrent resolution to terminate the existence of these powers. That ought always to be done in connection with these emergency powers as a permanent unchanging policy of government.

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DEWEY. May I ask the gentleman why the wording in the language of the amendment as first suggested, "in consultation with the Attorney General," is left out of his amendment? In that suggestion there is reference to the Attorney General. It is stated that—

Whenever the Chairman of the War Production Board shall, after consultation with the Attorney General, find—

And so forth. In the amendment proposed by the distinguished gentleman from Texas that line, "after consultation with the Attorney General," has been eliminated. I am wondering why.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes. This is a very important amendment and the gentleman is making a very important statement.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I shall make this explanatory statement. Insofar as the language to which the gentleman refers is concerned, "after consultation with the Attorney General," it is such language that I myself was not willing to have it included in an amendment I would offer, because when you come to examine it, without criticism of anybody, you will observe that it does not mean anything. It is only required that the matter be talked over with the Attorney General. Even though he might disapprove the thing, under the language proposed the determination of the Chairman of the War Production Board would be conclusive. The "Attorney General" would be, in the language of the bill, without any power whatever. The Chairman of the War Production Board would have to consult the Attorney General before he could act, but he could act with equal freedom whether the Attorney General approved or disapproved. From the standpoint of power allocation, administrative difficulties, of difficulties of proof in the event of litigation, of legislative duty to embody candor, clarity, and substance in the language of its productions, this language failed to qualify. So we thought we would leave that out.

Mr. DEWEY. May I follow that inquiry one more moment? I should like to ascertain if the gentleman does not think it would be advisable at least to have the Department of Justice put on notice in such a matter as this, where the law for the moment is being suspended under certain conditions.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I think this explanation ought to be made to the House.

This matter has brought about considerable confusion and discussion among the departments. I am going to make a very candid statement. It is contemplated that on a bill having similar provisions hearings will soon be had. It was felt, however, that under the circumstances we would not be justified in striking out section 11. Those in charge of the production of war materials, and I understand the War and Navy Departments, feel that it is a matter with reference to which greater power to determine than is now provided by section 11 of this bill should be left with those agencies of the Government which have the responsibility of providing the equipment for fighting the war. Do I make myself clear?

Mr. DEWEY. Yes. I thank the gentleman for his explanation, particularly knowing that there may be broader legislation covering this subject later.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes. I cannot speak with certainty, but I think that is the attitude of the three agencies having to do with fighting the war and providing material to fight the war. For that reason it was thought better to put in this amendment that the determination of whether or not it is necessary to have various persons act together in production, and so forth, should be left with the head of the War Production Board insofar as this legislation is concerned, with the definite understanding that it is contemplated that the matter will be further considered in the Senate and probably in the House. I think there is a disposition everywhere, and it is a commendable disposition, in the House, in the Senate, and among the agencies having to prepare for this war, to get legislation which will be most effective. There is very little jealousy and very little bickering among them.

Mr. DEWEY. May I interrupt the gentleman 1 more minute to say that I thank him for his explanation, and to say further that I am quite willing to withdraw section 11, which I had some part in placing in the bill.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I thank the gentleman very much, indeed.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Committee on the Judiciary, of which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is chairman, would normally have jurisdiction of this particular part of this bill. I am glad the gentleman has taken the opportunity to offer an amendment that includes clarifying language. I think it is an improvement upon the committee language. Personally I hope the amendment is adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may we ascertain whether we are going to vote on this bill tonight?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I am willing to vote now.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If there is any disposition to object, I do not want the time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I am reserving the right to object for the purpose of asking the minority leader if there is a roll call whether it is expected to have the roll call tonight. I am not going to object to the request of the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. McCORMACK. So far as the majority leader is concerned and I think so far as the minority leader and the committee are concerned, if there is a roll call we will make every effort to have that take place tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Before the distinguished gentleman takes his seat I would like to have it appear as a part of his remarks that the bill introduced by the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, H. R. 6983, and the bill introduced by the chairman of the Senate committee, S. 2431, on the subject of the suspension of the antitrust act, will be the subject of a joint hearing of the Senate and House subcommittees on Thursday next.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes; that is contemplated. I will make this statement and then I shall take my seat. Ordinarily, the Committee on the Judiciary would have contested the jurisdiction of section 11 of this measure, but on account of the war situation my colleagues and myself on the committee do not feel we want to raise that question. We feel that this amendment would help straighten matters out and any further difficulties would be straightened out in the conference between the House and the Senate or in future legislation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to make a few observations and to show, in supporting the pending amendment, the complete manner in which the Congress of the United States has cooperated with the President and the executive branch of the Government in the conduct of the war since the declaration of war on December 8. I want to compliment the distinguished chairman of the Judiciary Committee and I want to compliment the Banking and Currency Committee for bringing this matter to a head. It was only a few days ago that former President Hoover made a speech which received Nation-wide attention. During the course of his remarks he said:

> To win total war President Roosevelt must have dictatorial economic powers. There must be no hesitation in giving them to him and upholding him in them. Moreover, we must expect a steady decrease in economic freedom as the war goes on.

Coming from one with such profound knowledge, his thoughts and uttterances must command great attention and respect. Former President Hoover recognizes the necessity of unity on the part of our people, as well as the necessity of sacrifice, and a willingness on the part of our people to make all necessary sacrifices. There is no question but what the people are united and are willing to sacrifice and undergo all necessary hardships in order to win the war. President Hoover also recognizes the necessity of unified action on the part of the three coordinate branches of our Government, and particularly of the legislative and executive branches of the Government. The former President recognizes that the Congress must give the President, as Commander in Chief, all powers necessary to win the war, and that it is the duty of each branch of the Government to respect the other and to cooperate and maintain the unity which now exists.

The Congress of the United States since December 7 has cooperated with the President. There has been unity existing between the legislative and the executive branches of the Government.

I make this statement to answer what I consider improper criticism, criticism that fails to recognize the true picture and does not give due consideration to what the Congress has accomplished. There has never been a war in which our country has engaged where the Congress of the United States has worked so closely with the President. I am talking about the Congress as a whole and what the Congress has accomplished in connection with the conduct of the war and that, in the main, is what should be our objective.

As a Member of this body and as the majority leader I am proud to be able to take the floor and state that since December 7 this Congress has cooperated in as militant and in as effective a manner as possible in the speedy passage of such legislation deemed necessary to the winning of the war.

Looking fairly and impartially over the record since December 7, this Congress has cooperated with the President more closely, more effectively, more friendly, than any other war Congress in the history of our country.

Former President Hoover said:

> President Roosevelt must have dictatorial economic powers.

This Congress has constitutionally delegated to the President such powers, necessary for the Nation's best interests. We did that weeks ago.

Former President Hoover also said:

> There must be no hesitation in giving them to him and upholding him in them.

This Congress has already done this very thing, and has and will continue to uphold our great President.

I respect the right of others to criticize, and I will defend the rights of all to do so who want to do so. I submit, however, that they should not pick out a few matters and ignore the whole picture. In speaking as I am today I do so impersonally, not to attack or condemn others, because the truth cannot be arrived at in that way, but to call attention to the minds of intellectually honest persons certain indisputable facts that should be considered.

The Congress has admirably cooperated with the President since December 7 and with our military and naval leaders to the fullest extent that could be expected. We have done so in a rapid manner. The declaration of war against Japan took about 10 or 12 minutes of debate; against Germany and Italy, no debate in the House. Every war measure has been acted upon in committee with judgment and speed. Both branches of the Congress have passed such legislation with speed. There certainly has been legislative action.

No one can honestly say that since December 7 there has been obstructionist or dilatory action on the part of Congress. Some Members may have, but Congress as a whole has not. It is only fair that the actions of the Congress as a whole since December 7 should be appraised in the light of what has been accomplished. Unity of thought and action exists between the President and the great majority of the Members of the Congress, and any effort to develop a different feeling is contrary to the record. In the interests of our country it is an unfair and unwise action for some to follow, tending to bring about misunderstanding and division among our people. Fair criticism is always in order, but unfair criticism should in all decency stop.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn, and the question is on the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk is directed to correct the section numbers.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, as amended.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, stated that that Committee had had under consideration the bill S. 2250 and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. The question is on the adoption of the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the passage of the bill be delayed until tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DISNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow after the regular order of business and other special orders I be permitted to speak for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address delivered by Most Rev. Peter L. Ireton, coadjutor bishop of Richmond.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. VORYS of Ohio was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial on interpreting the South Dakota primary.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert a letter I have received from the Petroleum War Council with regard to the gasoline-rationing problem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in connection with my address this afternoon I may include excerpts from letters and executive orders.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY, 1943

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. RABAUT, Mr. KERR, Mr. HARE, Mr. HOUSTON, Mr. BEAM, Mr. CARTER, Mr. STEFAN, and Mr. JONES.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. CULLEN, indefinitely, on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

NO PEACE WITHOUT VICTORY

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the second point in the program adopted by the Republican National Committee in Chicago on April 20, 1942, reads: "We will recognize no peace with those enemies except peace with victory, and we will never entertain any proposals of peace until such victory is won. There shall be no appeasement or compromise."

The full implication of this pledge will become more manifest as the burdens of war weigh upon us. This may be a long struggle. It may prove to be a tough contest which will call upon every national resource in bringing it to a victorious conclusion. The sacrifices and hardships, the inconveniences and dislocations, the restrictions and burdens will be in proportion to the length of the ordeal by battle.

It will mean a reordering and reshaping of our daily living. Rationing is unromantic but a realistic element of victory. For a nation to forego tires and motorcars, gasoline and sugar, and other items which are such a fixed and seemingly indispensable part of a high living standard provokes some mild rebellion of spirit. It is such a natural reaction. Life is, after all, a bundle of habits that have been gradually developed, which, when abruptly bent or broken, inspire a sense of protest even as physical pain or disease provoke an outcry. A new and regimented existence is irksome to a nation where complete and unrestricted freedom to come and go, to buy and sell, to consume and discard is as old as the Republic itself.

As these inconveniences and sacrifices press upon our unfettered souls, it becomes possible to nurture the belief that something should be done to terminate the conflict from whence these dislocations flow.

As the import of the casualty lists presses itself upon the attention of the people and bruised hearts despair over the agonies of war, it is so natural to hope that the slaughter will cease and that other stalwart sons of the Republic will not be offered on the altar of conflict.

As increasing taxes, voluntary or compulsory savings, war bond quotas, and other requirements of the war effort further disturb the free and untrammeled flow of life, it is in the very nature of mankind to wish for a royal road to escape from the restrictions which beset us.

Three avenues to peace lie before us. There is the unthinkable road to defeat at the end of which lies a valley of bitterness and despair too horrible for contemplation. There is the road to victory and peace which imposes upon our country the responsibility for leadership in a frustrated world. Finally, there is the road of appeasement, compromise, and negotiation. To hearts stricken with grief and to souls overlaid with apprehension of the future it could have the allure of an easy road.

It is already in the air. In recent weeks leaflets have come in the mails subtly suggesting that this is the time to end the carnage of war by negotiation. The wish is father to the thought. How quickly the very suggestion can become the nucleus for an organized effort to compromise and offer escape from the burdens and perplexities which beset us.

When conflict becomes wearisome and fatigue cries for relief, any demand for compromise will be a test for the iron in our souls. We shall not be found wanting, for we shall understand the dread implications of that course.

Think of this bleeding world, filled with the maimed and mangled bodies of young men, in which the issue of freedom will not have been resolved. How vain would be the ghastly sacrifice of death and grief.

Think of the nightmare of a stalemate which settled nothing and left the world in darkness and bewilderment.

Think of a document of compromise and negotiation which would be but a momentary interlude in the world's hostilities and left each problem in a state of unsolved confusion.

Think of the engulfing bitterness, the bruised faith, the complete frustration of peace-loving, liberty-loving peoples pledging their lives, their fortunes, and their honor to the achievement of freedom and self-determination, only to find the coveted goal snatched away by the processes of compromise.

Think of the despair of God-fearing men and women everywhere in the world who fiercely stripped away the superfluous observations and arguments about war and saw in all this a supreme contest between the forces of right and wrong, only to discover by the processes of compromise that aggression pays and that righteousness is a mythical ideal.

Such would be the frightful cost of compromise and negotiation. To the very suggestion we pledge with all our power that there cannot be, there must not be, there shall not be a peace without victory, there shall not be appeasement or compromise.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

SUGAR

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the American housewife has come to associate war with a sugar shortage. This is quite natural. She remembers the scarcity of sugar during the first

World War. She is again faced with Government rationing of this essential food product.

What are the facts about our sugar supply? The American public is entitled to know them, and it will be my endeavor to outline briefly the principal factors which have brought about the present sugar emergency.

This is now a very popular subject. In the recent past, however, there have been times when highly important sugar legislation was being considered by Congress and far-reaching Government policies were being formulated and decided, while the general public took little, if any, interest. Perhaps, therefore, our present sugar emergency will accomplish some good if it only stimulates intelligent public consideration of the facts and problems pertaining to the American sugar industry.

In order to present a true picture of the present situation, it will be necessary to refer at times to the history and structure of the American sugar system. Cuba, although a foreign nation, is considered as an integral part of this system in view of the millions of dollars of American capital invested in the Cuban sugar industry and the fact that in ordinary times two-thirds of the island's production is destined for consumption in continental United States.

Unquestionably, the most basic cause of the present sugar shortage is found in the fact that approximately 70 percent of the sugar consumed in continental United States must be shipped from off-shore producing areas. The principal off-shore areas which have furnished this supply and the percentages contributed by each are as follows:

	Percent
Cuba	27.90
Philippine Islands	14.15
Hawaii	14.13
Puerto Rico	12.65

Of course, we no longer obtain any sugar from the Philippines, and it has been apparent for some time that our future supply from these other areas is conditioned upon the availability of shipping bottoms, which are becoming increasingly scarce because many have been sunk and the rest are urgently needed for carrying troops and implements of war. Another factor having a bearing upon the sugar shortage is the tremendous demand upon our sugarcane crops for high-test molasses used in the production of industrial alcohol. This alcohol is an essential ingredient in the manufacture of smokeless powder, antifreeze, plastics, and a wide variety of industrial products which are important to our war effort.

We know, therefore, and should have learned from our experience in the last war that international conflicts of world-wide scope have the immediate effect of increasing sugar consumption in continental United States and decreasing shipping facilities required for transporting sugar from the off-shore producing areas. In the absence of counteracting factors, the inevitable result is a shortage of sugar for ordinary domestic use.

Another demand on our sugar supply comes from the assistance we must render to our Allies in meeting their minimum civilian and military requirements. Such assistance will be given principally to England and Russia. Perhaps the amount required for this purpose will not be as large as in the last war because of England's increased domestic production and Russia's pre-war self-sufficiency, which were stimulated by the lessons they learned in World War No. 1. However, England normally obtains three-fourths of her sugar needs from off-shore sources, and these have been materially curtailed by the war in the Pacific. Moreover, a large part of Russia's beet-producing lands have been lost by the German invasion. It has been unofficially estimated that shipments to Russia during 1942 will be 500,000 tons and that England will receive 1,000,000 tons. However, these estimates may vary considerably from the amounts actually required to be sent.

I fully realize that the consumer's most vital concern at this time is the sugar supply outlook for the immediate future, and I will hazard a prediction on what the sugar situation will be during the coming year, based upon the most reliable information available.

Sugar consumption in the United States for the year 1941 has been estimated to have reached an all-time high of 7,819,725 short tons raw value, which represents a 15-percent increase over the consumption of the previous year. However, sugar consumption in the coming year will not be subject to normal economic forces but will be rationed by the Government. In view of this, it is probably a safe estimate that the consumption of sugar in the United States in 1942 will be at least a million tons less than 1941. As a basis of further discussion, it will be assumed that the United States consumption for 1942 will be in round numbers 6,500,000 tons. There have been a number of varying estimates as to our sugar supply in the forthcoming year. Reliable estimates of the supplies on hand, December 1941, and which can be produced in continental United States during 1942 are as follows:

	Short tons raw value
Refiners' stocks (Dec. 31, 1941)	660,132
Invisible stocks (Dec. 31, 1941)	500,000
Beet sugar processors' stocks (Nov. 30, 1941)	1,162,104
Mainland cane factory stocks (Nov. 30, 1941)	73,283
Importers' direct consumption stocks (Nov. 30, 1941)	75,183
Beet sugar production in 1942	1,008,000
Mainland cane production in 1942	550,000
Total from continental United States	4,028,702

Subtracting this total from the 6,500,000 needed, we see that 2,471,298 tons will have to be brought in by ships. The Caribbean area, which is the nearest sugar-producing, off-shore area, can produce enough sugar to cover this deficit. The estimated production from this area after allowing for local consumption is as follows:

	Short tons raw value
Puerto Rico	1,001,000
Virgin Islands	5,000
Cuba	4,203,000
Total	5,209,000

Moreover, some of the Hawaiian crop, which, it is estimated, will be 600,000 tons, should reach the United States unless the war in the Pacific makes this impossible.

Another estimate of the amount available for the United States market in 1943, coming out of the Sugar Division of the Department of Agriculture, is as follows:

Mainland United States:	
Cane sugar:	*Short tons raw value*
Refiners and importers	100,000
Cane sugar mills	490,000
Beet sugar	1,900,000
Puerto Rico	1,100,000
Virgin Islands	5,000
Cuba (available for the United States after allowance for United Kingdom and Canada)	2,140,000–2,365,000
Hawaii	500,000–1,000,000
Philippine Islands	None
Total	6,235,000–6,960,000
Estimated amount available through reduction in invisible stocks	400,000
Total	6,635,000–7,360,000
Peru	215,000
Total	6,850,000–7,575,000
Possible other sources in Western Hemisphere	250,000
Total	7,100,000–7,825,000
Less estimated shipment to Russia	(?)

The main significance of the foregoing estimates is that there would seem to be an adequate supply of sugar for the ensuing year. However, there are several known factors in the picture which may entirely change this optimistic forecast. We must keep in mind the heavy demand for high-test molasses for producing industrial alcohol. This may be somewhat offset by the utilization of our large surpluses of corn and wheat for this purpose. Our lend-lease commitments must not be overlooked. Farm-labor shortages, particularly in the continental beet areas, may become critical. Mainland beet and cane estimates may be too high if the farmers should plant other crops now highly competitive on the basis of cash returns, and if processing facilities, which are costly and require time to establish, are not adequate to handle the anticipated increase in production. We must, of course, realize that the entire offshore estimate presupposes the all-important matter of ships being available and able to carry the sugar to the continent. If we knew what the future facilities for transportation, both shipping and rail, would be, we could reliably predict our sugar supply for some considerable time ahead.

It is the transportation problem which is the principal unknown quantity in this whole sugar question. There will be no actual sugar shortage in localities near producing areas. There will be no shortage in terms of production. Any acute shortage which may develop will necessarily stem from a lack of the

means of transportation and distribution.

This discussion would add very little to what has already been said on this subject unless the opportunity were here taken to indicate some of the future and post-war problems of our sugar industry, which should be considered now so as to be intelligently met when they arise.

Paradoxically, all of the major problems of the American sugar system during ordinary times are an outgrowth of the system's potentiality for producing sugar far in excess of any available market. During and immediately following World War No. 1, our sugar producers expanded far beyond the requirements of their normal market in order to capitalize on the European shortage, which was created by the war and continued during the reconstruction period. War had laid waste the beet fields of continental Europe, and England had never seriously entered the sugar industry. Cuba particularly went through a period of expansion and prosperity never before nor since enjoyed. However, the first world conflict taught Europe a lesson in sugar economics. Continental Europe and England learned that national self-sufficiency in the matter of sugar is almost indispensable to a nation engaged in modern warfare, and one of the first steps of the European nations was to set about establishing a national sugar industry which would render them independent of foreign sources. Tariffs, bounties, and other forms of protection were invoked to encourage sugar production, and such success was realized that before our producers became aware of it they found themselves with tremendous surpluses on hand and a huge producing capacity for which there was no market.

Disaster followed, and Cuba plunged into the most severe economic and political disturbances in her history, which became so serious that the United States was compelled to come to her assistance if for no other reason than to prevent the infiltration of hostile foreign interests into a country lying so strategically near our own shores. Our own domestic industry was threatened with ruin. Following some stopgap and experimental legislation, Congress in 1934 passed the Jones-Costigan Act, which, because of certain unconstitutional features, was succeeded by the Sugar Act of 1937. This latter act, without material change, constitutes our present sugar legislation. Although this act may not be perfect in many respects, it is by far the best legislative and administrative device known for handling our present and future sugar problems, and I will never understand fully the reasons for the unsuccessful attempts on the part of so-called economy blocs in Congress to strike down at this critical time our entire sugar structure.

The principal elements of Government control adopted by this legislation have their counterpart in the various systems in force throughout most of the sugar-producing nations of the world and are based on the fundamental concept that a prosperous industry is a decided national asset, whereas an industry in trouble because of surpluses and ruinous prices is a cancerous growth in the economic, social, and political life of the nation.

No attempt will be made to discuss the detailed features of the Sugar Act or administrative functions thereof, as these matters are best suited to a lengthy and technical treatise. However, I will call attention to certain outstanding features of the act. Under this legislation the Government, acting through the Secretary of Agriculture, is authorized to control the supply of sugar available to the American market, allot to the various producing areas a share in the production of sugar as provided by the act, and thereby, of course, control the price paid to the producer, the processor, and paid by the consumer. Of course, there are now no restrictions on production. The act requires that minimum wages must be paid, that child labor must not be employed, and that soil improvements and conservation must be carried out as conditions necessary for receiving the benefit payments. Thus the act benefits not only the farmer, but the farm laborer and the soil of the Nation.

What about the price of sugar? That will be controlled both by the Secretary of Agriculture and the Office of Price Administration operating under the Price Control Act, and in my judgment the consumer can reasonably expect not to face the scandalous prices which existed during the last war.

It seems to me that right here and now is an appropriate time to dispel a misconception which has existed concerning this question of price. Misinformed or ill-advised writers and speakers are constantly vaporizing upon the subject that a selfish sugar bloc in Congress has subsidized our American sugar farmers at the expense of the American consumer. They proceed then to prove this statement by a catchy and misleading phrase known as the "world-price" of sugar. Now there is a complete answer to this matter based upon reliable facts and statistics.

In the first place, the term "world-price" is highly misleading. It is apt to be understood as the price paid for sugar by the various consumers throughout the world, and that is exactly what it does not mean. That, however, is what is important to the American consumer. The consumer is interested in how much he is paying for sugar as compared with the price paid by the peoples of other nations. The fact is that the price paid by the American consumer has been and is less than that paid by the people of most of the leading nations of the world. Furthermore, in terms of food value, it is perhaps the cheapest food placed upon the American dinner table. The following table prepared by the Food Stuffs Division of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce shows the retail price of sugar in 38 countries of the world in May 1939:

	Cents per pound
Yugoslavia	15.62
Italy	13.86
Germany	13.64
Bulgaria	12.49
Netherlands	11.19
Hungary	9.60
Turkey	9.44
Portugal	8.49
Finland	8.43
Norway	7.69
France	7.68
Canada	6.30
Union of South Africa	6.27
Australia	6.21
India	6.01
Dominican Republic	6.00
Ireland	5.85
Japan	5.56
Sweden	5.47
United Kingdom	5.36
United States	5.10
Argentina	4.75
Switzerland	4.74
Chile	4.52
Cuba	3.84
Netherland Indies	3.38
Brazil	2.95
Peru	2.40

This so-called world price of sugar was the price which prevailed in the world market when there was one. Anyone having the slightest knowledge of sugar economics knows that the world market was an international dumping ground of surplus sugar, representing less than 10 percent of the world's production. Prices in the world market have no relationship to any real economic values or to the true economic price of sugar in the sense of the price which would prevail under conditions of free trade.

If, while there was a world market, the United States had purchased all of this dumped sugar, it would only have supplied a portion of our domestic requirements, and there is no tenable ground for assuming that the American consumer would have enjoyed any better price than that which has prevailed or prevails today.

No one will dispute that the American sugar producer is entitled to a fair return on his labor and invested capital, and it has been conclusively demonstrated that the domestic price of sugar permitting such a return would still be lower than the price paid by consumers in most of the first-rate nations of the world, many of which have lower labor and living standards than the United States.

I will now consider briefly another important matter which seems to have troubled many people who are not thoroughly conversant with sugar economics. The question is asked, "Why is it that the Government makes benefit payments to sugar-beet farmers when we are now faced with a shortage of sugar?" such a situation, it is pointed out, should afford the farmers an excellent price for their product and render Government aid unnecessary. Under ordinary conditions this is sound economics, and at first blush it would appear exceedingly difficult to answer. But there is a complete, sound, and conclusive answer to this question, which I am confident will convince anyone who will consider the real facts pertaining to the sugar situation.

The Sugar Act provides for the levy of excise taxes against the manufacturer of sugar. In other words, the processor of

sugar pays into the Treasury taxes fixed by law, levied against the finished product. The Treasury each year pays to the grower a benefit payment in accordance with the schedule contained in the act, which payment is in addition to the amount he receives from the processor for his product. Ordinarily, $68,000,000 is collected in excise taxes, and approximately $46,000,000 is paid to the farmers. In the fiscal year 1941, $80,000,000 was paid to the Treasury from taxes collected, and approximately $46,000,000 was paid to the growers, leaving a net for the Treasury of $34,000,000. Under this tax levy and benefit payment system as set up in the Sugar Act, the producer is assured of a fair distribution of the total income received from the sale of sugar. He has no such assurance without the present legislation because of a very unusual condition existing within the sugar industry. Sugar beet farmers are in practically all cases served within their market area by one processor. They must deal with one buyer or not at all, and, of course, in such a noncompetitive market, the grower would be at the mercy of the processor with regard to the question of price paid for his product.

Even this situation might not prevent the grower from obtaining a good price for his product on the present market if the manufacturer were free to sell at the best price obtainable. However, under the price control law, a ceiling has been placed on sugar prices in order to protect the consumer. So, it is not a question of taking advantage of an economic situation created by a demand in excess of supply. If it were, producers could probably obtain at least as good prices as under the benefit payment system. The processor would be in a position to make huge profits, but the consumer would foot the bill in the way of exorbitant prices. As it is, the price of sugar is controlled.

The Sugar Act effects a fair distribution of returns as between the processor, grower, and laborer, and the Public Treasury is the beneficiary of a considerable sum of money each year represented by the difference between the taxes collected from the industry and the payments made to the producers within it. Hence, if it is contended that the sugar industry should be permitted to take advantage of the present economic condition and obtain its income for production upon a market where the demand exceeds supply, in the absence of Government restrictions, it undoubtedly could do so, but the cost to the American public would far exceed what it is now paying for its sugar, including the benefit payments.

You cannot logically contend that benefit payments are unnecessary because of the price possibilities in a market where there is a shortage and, at the same time, place a definite limitation on prices.

In conclusion, it should be said that there is no reason to expect that our sugar industry will not be faced with the same economic disaster following this war as was brought upon it by conditions created in the last war unless the leadership of the Government and the industry are constantly on the alert to prevent this from happening. There is no doubt that because of our sugar legislation we are in a better position to control the economic forces which undermined our industry following the first World War, but new problems will doubtless arise which will require the constant vigilance of the Government and the industry to meet and solve. This will not be so easy to do during the critical times ahead when our thoughts and energies will be directed almost exclusively to the prosecution of the war to a speedy and victorious conclusion.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2202. An act to restore Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on Thursday, May 21, 1942, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6927. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 26, 1942, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMEFCE

The hearings in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be postponed for approximately 2 weeks.

There will be a meeting of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum Investigation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, May 26, 1942.

COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation at 10:30 a. m., Tuesday, May 26, in room 353, House Office Building, to consider H. R. 6904.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10: 30 a. m. on Wednesday, May 27, 1942, for consideration of H. R. 6858, H. R. 7044, H. J. Res. 46, H. R. 3776, H. R. 4800, and H. R. 6370.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1663. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 9, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Bellevue conservancy district, Ohio, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1664. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 3, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination of the Toa Vaca (Jacaguas) River and tributaries, Puerto Rico, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 11, 1939; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1665. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 12, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of the La Plata River and tributaries, Puerto Rico, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 11, 1939; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1666. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $2,250, for the judiciary establishment (H. Doc. No. 732); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1667. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting proposed provisions affecting appropriations for the Navy Department and naval service, as follows: A deficiency estimate for the fiscal year 1941, amounting to $650,000; supplemental estimates for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to $254,355,000 cash and $150,000,000 contract authorization, total cash and contract authorization, $404,355,000; and supplemental estimates for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $209,440,000 (H. Doc. No. 733); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1668. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Prison Industries, Inc., transmitting the annual report of the directors of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1669. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1670. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to $50,000, and a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to an existing appropriation, for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 735); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1671. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of Censorship for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $27,500,000 (H. Doc. No. 736); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MANSFIELD: Committee on Rivers and Harbors. H. R. 6999. A bill to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipe line and a navigable barge channel across Florida, the construction of an inland route from the western terminus of this channel to the present eastern terminus of the Intracoastal Waterway

and by deepening and enlarging the Intracoastal Waterway from its present eastern terminus to the vicinity of the Mexican border; with amendment (Rept. No. 2153). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2404. An act to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered by governments of cobelligerent nations or the other American republics and to create the decorations to be known as the "Legion of Merit," and the "Medal for Merit"; with amendment (Rept. No. 2170). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2446. An act to prescribe the pay and certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training and aviation instruction, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2171). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6702. A bill to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern district of California in order to fill a vacancy in the office of an additional district judge heretofore authorized for such district; without amendment (Rept. No. 2173). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 244. An act for the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2154). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 2037. An act for the relief of Edgar B. Dunlap; without amendment (Rept. No. 2155). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 2251. An act for the relief of Charles Brauch; without amendment (Rept. No. 2156). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Claims. S. 2309. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex; with amendment (Rept. No. 2157). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 2318 An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo; without amendment (Rept. No. 2158). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 2354. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George M. Legg and Loetta Trainer; without amendment (Rept. No. 2159). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 2451. An act for the relief of Anthony W. Livingston; without amendment (Rept. No. 2160). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. S. 2469. An act for the relief of William Edward Fleming; without amendment (Rept. No. 2161). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 180. A bill for the relief of O. T. Travis; with amendment (Rept. No. 2162). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SAUTHOFF: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1675. A bill for the relief of L. W. Collins; with amendment (Rept. No. 2163). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3352. A bill for the relief of Alice W. Miller; with amendment (Rept. No. 2164). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MEYER of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4804. A bill for the relief of Claud R. Johnston; with amendment (Rept. No. 2165). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WEISS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5714. A bill for the relief of William H. Cogswell, Jr.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2166). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5898. A bill for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard Almas; with amendment (Rept. No. 2167). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. JENNINGS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6184. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. E. P. Ball; with amendment (Rept. No. 2168). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RUSSELL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 6410. A bill for the relief of Alex Gamble; with amendment (Rept. No. 2169). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HARTER: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2755. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to reinstate Wallace F. Safford to the position and rank of captain in the Army of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 2172). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 7126. A bill to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941 by defining the term "strategic network of highways" to include the principal highway traffic routes of military importance in Puerto Rico and the Territory of Hawaii; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7127. A bill to codify and enact into absolute law title 17 of the United States Code, entitled "Copyrights"; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. SPRINGER:

H. R. 7128. A bill to prevent the desecration, mutilation, or use of the flag for advertising purposes, and providing penalties therefor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 7129. A bill to create the title of flight officer in the Army air forces, to amend the Army Aviation Cadet Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SAUTHOFF:

H. R. 7130. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to provide that aid by States to dependent children who are mentally incompetent, irrespective of age, be included in computing grants by the United States to such States for aid to dependent children; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 7131. A bill to stimulate the production of tin; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 7137. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to marketing quotas for peanuts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 7138. A bill authorizing the imposition of the death penalty for certain acts of sabotage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 for the training [illegible] on of defense workers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 7132. A bill to extend emergency officers' retirement benefits to Raymond B. Shoemaker; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 7133. A bill for the relief of Franc Natko; his wife Margaret Natko, and their infant child, Margaret Natko; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KING:

H. R. 7134. A bill for the relief of Phyllis Lee; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky:

H. R. 7135. A bill for the relief of Fred C. Miller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THILL:

H. R. 7136. A bill for the relief of John P. L. O'Leary; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2904. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition asking for legislation to protect men in the armed forces from the influence of vice and intoxicating liquors, and for the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2905. By Mr. DWORSHAK: Petition of the Moscow Parent-Teachers Association, Moscow, Idaho, urging the discontinuance of the manufacture of beverage alcohol and the immediate prohibition of traffic in beverage alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war, so that the grain, sugar, and molasses used in the manufacture of these beverages may be utilized in the defense effort and relieve the shortage of these essential foods; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2906. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Westminster Bible Class of the First Presbyterian Church, Beaver Falls, Pa., urging the early passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2907. Also, petition of 43 citizens of Rochester (Beaver County), Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 860, as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2908 Also, petition of 92 members and friends of the Darlington, Pa., congregation of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, urging the early passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2909. Also, petition of 49 residents of Lawrence County, Pa., urging enactment of legislation which will provide the largest possible protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the insidious influences of vice and intoxicating liquors, and especially urging the early passage of the Sheppard bill (S. 860); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2910. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition of Nannie Bramlet, of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Eldorado, Ill., supporting Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2911. Also, petition of George Strange and 20 other residents of Flora, Ill., urging the early passage of Senate bill 860 and such other legislation as may be necessary restricting the sale of liquor and controlling vice conditions for the protection of the men in the service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2912. Also, petition of H. L. Brockett and 63 others, of Norris City and Enfield, Ill., urging the adoption of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to our national defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2913. Also, petition of Betty Payne and sundry other citizens of Eldorado, Ill., supporting Senate bill 860 as a part of the national defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2914. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. D. W. Hopkins, of Metropolis, Ill., urging the adoption of Senate bill 860 and other legislation restricting the sale of liquor and control of vice conditions for the protection of our men in the service; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2915. Also, petition of J. A. Musgrave and 71 others, residents of the community of Harrisburg, Ill., urging the adoption of Senate bill 860, and such other legislation as may be necessary to protect the men in the service against the influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2916. Also, petition of Rev. C. L. Doty, pastor of the First Christian Church of Flora, Ill., and 65 members of said church, urging the enactment of Senate bill 860, or legislation similar thereto, in order to safeguard the health and morals of our military men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2917. By Mr. HOUSTON: Petition signed by 226 residents of McPherson County, Kans., urging that there be no exemption to anyone using religious beliefs as an excuse for exemption from active combat duty in time of war, and requesting repeal of paragraph (g), section 5, Public, No. 783, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2918. By Mr. JONES: Petition of Dora A. States and 117 citizens of Spencerville, Allen County, Ohio, supporting the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2919. By Mr. KRAMER: Petition of the office of the Board of Supervisors of the County of Los Angeles, State of California, requesting that the Work Projects Administration give favorable consideration to transferring or allotting an additional quota of 500 to Work Projects Administration in southern California; and further resolving that future reductions in Work Projects Administration quota in southern California be deferred; to the Committee on Appropriations.

2920. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of H. P. Jacobs and other citizens of Grinnell, Iowa, prohibiting the sale or gift of intoxicating liquors, including beer, to soldiers and sailors in uniform; to bring about the discontinuance of the sale of beer in Government commissaries; to create dry zones around military and navy establishments; to set up dry zones around industrial establishments in which airplanes, ships, tanks, arms, and equipment must be produced with the utmost precision and speed for the support of the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2921. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of Mrs. Walter McDevitt, and others, of Mount Vernon, Ohio, and vicinity, urging the passage of Senate bill 860 as a protection to the men of the United States Army and Navy against the insidious influences of vice and intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2922. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Mr. A. M. Gordon and other citizens of Ainsworth, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2923. Also, petition of Mr. F. B. Hebron and other citizens of North English, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860, providing for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2924. Also, petition of Inez Cross and other citizens of Muscatine, Iowa, urging the passage of House bill 4000 or Senate bill 860, providing for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2925. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Rev. Paul P. Petticord and other members and friends of the First Evangelical Church of Salem, Oreg., urging the President of the United States to exercise his full powers in this time of national emergency, and follow the precedent established in Hawaii, where the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages has been discontinued for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2926. By Mr. RICH: Petition of sundry citizens of Jersey Shore, Pa., supporting Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2927. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Bottlers Local Union, No. 293, of San Francisco, Calif., supporting House bill 6486, a bill to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2928. By Mr. TENEROWICZ: Resolutions of the Michigan Federation of Labor, urging Congress to enact bills curbing excessive profits on war production; also the passage of the war displacement bill; and requesting favorable action on Senate bill 594; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2929. By Mr. WHEAT: Petition of sundry citizens of Decatur, Ill., urging the passage and enforcement of the Sheppard bill, S. 860, at an early date; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2930. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Oconee, Ill., urging the passage of the Sheppard-Johnson bill, S. 860, for the protection and well-being of men in military camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2931. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Tower Hill, Ill., urging the passage of the Sheppard-Johnson bill, S. 860, for the protection and well-being of men in military camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2932. Also, petition of 12 signers from Sidney, Ill., requesting the elimination of prostitution and the use of beer and liquor in and near military camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2933. Also, petition of the members of the Presbyterian Church of Clinton, Ill., requesting the elimination of prostitution and the sale and use of beer and liquor in and near military camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2934. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Decatur, Ill., protesting against the taxation recommendations relative to life insurance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2935. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Dallas Chamber of Commerce, Dallas, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 6999; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2936. Also, petition of A. F. G. E. Lodge, No. 631, B. A. I. employees, Fort Worth, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the plight of Federal employees under the ever increasing cost of living and the difficulties in maintaining a standard of living; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2937. Also, petition of the Propeller Club of the United States, port of New York, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to legislation concerning the New York Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

SENATE

TUESDAY, MAY 26, 1942

The Reverend Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D., minister, All Souls Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, in whose presence we now stand, we come before Thee as they who would do Thy will, as they who would fulfill the behests of this free country. Defend us, we pray Thee, by Thy might; uphold us by Thy power, and by Thy spirit so direct all our efforts and all our labors that, by Thy grace, our days and the days of our children may be even as the days of heaven upon earth. And Thine shall be the glory and the honor, the dominion and the power, now and forevermore. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, May 25, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. RABAUT, Mr. KERR, Mr. HARE, Mr. HOUSTON, Mr. BEAM, Mr. CARTER, Mr. STEFAN, and Mr. JONES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6297. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Dr. Wesley K. Harris;

H. R. 6961. An act to incorporate the United Philippine War Veterans as a body corporate of the District of Columbia;

H. R. 6986. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942;

H. R. 7097. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to extend its present track connection with the United States navy yard so as to provide adequate railroad facilities in connection with the development of Buzzards Point as an industrial area in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1932 (47 Stat. 322), as amended by the act approved June 20, 1939 (53 Stat. 849); and

H. J. Res. 315. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide

Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect of meat-packing establishments engaged in intrastate commerce only, in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat food products by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2202) to restore Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army, and it was signed by the Vice President.

TRIBUTE TO THE MEMORY OF THE LATE SENATOR ALVA B. ADAMS

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, yesterday the Senate conducted memorial services for our departed colleagues, the late Senators Harrison, Adams, Houston, and Lumpkin. A little while ago the Vice President handed me a telegram which he received yesterday from the Governor of Colorado dealing with the memorial services held in memory of the late Senator Adams, of Colorado. I ask unanimous consent that the telegram may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DENVER, COLO., *May 25, 1942.*

Hon. HENRY WALLACE,
President, United States Senate:

Colorado joins the Senate in paying tribute to the memory of the late Alva B. Adams as the first citizen of Colorado and one of the outstanding men to represent this State in your great body. Although he came from one of the smaller States of the Union, we feel that he was recognized as one of the big men in the Senate. He was to us a great man and a real friend. Colorado mourns his passing but feels a measure of comfort in the knowledge that it was honored by such an illustrious son.

RALPH L. CARR,
Governor of Colorado.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Green	Pepper
Austin	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hayden	Rosier
Barbour	Herring	Schwartz
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Holman	Smathers
Bone	Hughes	Smith
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lenger	Truman
Capper	Lee	Tunnell
Caraway	Lucas	Tydings
Chavez	McCarran	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wagner
Connally	Maloney	Walsh
Danaher	Maybank	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	White
Doxey	Murdock	Wiley
Ellender	Norris	Willis
George	Nye	
Gerry	O'Daniel	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained on official business in his State.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are members of the Committee to Investigate National Defense, and are therefore detained on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR and Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent because of illness.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2508. By way of explanation, I may say this is a bill to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not in order at this time. Is there objection to entertaining the motion of the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. BARKLEY. I suppose the motion is not in order, because we have a morning hour.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. It will take only a few moments to dispose of matters in the morning hour. I dare say the Senator from Alabama would not mind waiting until the routine morning business is concluded.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is satisfactory. I thought this would be a suitable time to make the motion.

Mr. MCNARY. Will not the Senator permit us to conclude the routine morning business?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Certainly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to state for the benefit of Senators, that following the disposition of the bill in charge of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], which will follow the disposition of the bill in charge of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], neither of which we expect to take much time, I shall ask that the calendar be called for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection, beginning where we concluded at the time of the last call of the calendar.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. MCNARY:

A petition of sundry citizens of Estacada, Oreg., praying for the enactment of the so-called Sheppard bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. BANKHEAD:

A petition of sundry citizens of Birmingham, Ala., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Pretty Prairie and Smith Center, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a letter from Mrs. Gertrude C. Baldwin, of 218 West Miner Street, West Chester, Pa., enclosing a petition signed by 150 citizens of Chester County, Pa., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, which is now pending on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The letter and petition presented by the Senator from Pennsylvania will be received and lie on the table.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference a petition signed by citizens of Spokane, in the State of Washington, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, the so-called Sheppard bill, which has to do with restricting the sale of liquor to our armed forces.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petition presented by the Senator from Washington will lie on the table.

THE 40-HOUR WEEK—PETITION

Mr. BONE. I also send to the desk petitions signed by a large number of citizens of the State of Washington praying that Congress do not enact legislation concerning the 40-hour-week law. The petitions are signed by members of organized labor.

I ask that the preamble or the fore part of one petition, which appears in print, be printed in the RECORD, and that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and the body of one of the petitions, without the signatures attached, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Members of the United States Congress:

We who build ships feel that the workers of this country are as patriotic as any group of

citizens in the United States. We have relinquished double time for overtime and Saturday work. We have foregone practically every union regulation protecting our trade. We have agreed to work for straight time on Saturdays and Sundays, when not a sixth or seventh consecutive working day. In many instances we have accepted a lower hourly wage scale. We have worked under unsafe and unhealthful conditions because of a shortage of protective devices.

During 20 lean years men were not attracted to this industry. Now older men must spend most of their time teaching instead of producing. Despite this handicap and despite red tape, production records have been made. In view of all these facts, we believe that the Members of Congress should be seeking to protect us against the depression which is bound to come when the shipbuilding boom is over, instead of trying to abolish a basic 40-hour week.

We respectfully call to your attention the fact that the Jap attack on Pearl Harbor united this country; labor baiting can divide it.

Once the workers of the United States begin to suspect that Members of Congress are using the war as a subterfuge for destroying the American standard of living, the wholehearted cooperation that is needed to win this war will vanish.

For all these reasons, we petition all members of your honorable body who truly love their country and sincerely want to win this war and preserve the American standard of living, to oppose all measures designed to spread disunity. We specifically refer to the bills recently introduced by Congressman SMITH of Virginia, Congressman BOREN, and Congressman WICKERSHAM of Oklahoma.

REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HATCH submitted the following reports of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 1034. A bill relating to the sale of public lands granted to or vested in the State of Idaho by the act of July 3, 1890; without amendment (Rept. No. 1397);

S. 1788. A bill to provide for the leasing of certain lands of the United States in the State of North Dakota for the development of oil, gas, and other minerals; with amendments (Rept. No. 1393);

S. 2362. A bill relating to the jurisdiction over certain lands in the Isle Royale National Park; without amendment (Rept. No. 1399);

H. R. 69. A bill to authorize the adjustment of land-ownership lines within the General Grant grove section of the Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., in order to protect equities established by possession arising in conformity with a certain survey, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1400);

H. R. 1595. A bill to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Plumas National Forest, Calif.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1401);

H. R. 2307. A bill validating a certain conveyance, heretofore made by the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way in the town of Indio, in the county of Riverside, State of California, acquired under section 23 of the act of March 3, 1871 (16 Stat. 573); without amendment (Rept. No. 1402);

H. R. 2685. A bill to authorize the disposition of recreational demonstration projects, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1403);

H. R. 3937. A bill to change the designation of the Fort Marion National Monument, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1404);

H. R. 4205. A bill to add to the Cleveland National Forest, Calif., certain contiguous lands of the United States which can be most effectively and economically protected and administered as parts of said national forest; without amendment (Rept. No. 1405);

H. R. 4213. A bill for the relief of persons in connection with the extraction of gold-bearing ore from the Ruck-a-Chucky dam site; without amendment (Rept. No. 1406);

H. R. 4676. A bill to accept the cession by the Commonwealth of Kentucky of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mammoth Cave National Park; to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for the park in accordance with the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 635); to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the development of a proper entrance road to the park; and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1407); and

H. R. 5287. A bill relating to the transfer to the Secretary of War of certain lands owned by the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1408).

REPORT OF BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE COAST GUARD ACADEMY

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Board of Visitors to the Coast Guard Academy, heretofore appointed pursuant to law, has performed its duty in visiting the academy, and has prepared a report, which I herewith submit to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will lie on the table.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Admiral Walter B. Woodson to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years, from June 20, 1942;

Capt. Charles A. Lockwood, Jr., to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 16th day of May 1942; and

Capt. Marc A. Mitscher to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from December 4, 1941.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. REYNOLDS introduced a bill (S. 2555) to authorize the use of certificates by officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, in connection with pay and allowance accounts of military and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction of the War and Navy Departments, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 6297. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Dr. Wesley K. Harris;

H. R. 6961. An act to incorporate the United Philippine War Veterans as a body corporate of the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 6986. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to change the name of Conduit Road in the District of Columbia," approved March 4, 1942; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. J. Res. 315. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect of meat-packing establishments engaged in intrastate commerce only, in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat food products by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

EXTENSION OF POWERS OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BROWN and Mr. BANKHEAD each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (H. R. 7008) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of $5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PALESTINE COMMITTEE DINNER, MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT AND ADDRESSES BY SENATOR McNARY AND SENATOR WAGNER

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a message from the President to the second annual dinner meeting of the American Palestine Committee, in Washington, D. C., March 25, 1942, and addresses delivered by Senator McNARY and Senator WAGNER, which appear in the Appendix.]

LIBERTY UNDER GOD—ADDRESS BY SENATOR KILGORE

[Mr. ROSIER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Liberty Under God," delivered by Senator KILGORE at the commencement exercises at St. Marys High School, St. Marys, W. Va., May 22, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CHALLENGE BEFORE US—ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR McCLOY

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Assistant Secretary of War John J. McCloy, at Amherst College, Amherst, Mass., May 16, 1942, on the subject The Challenge Before Us, which appears in the Appendix.]

HOLY COMMUNION BREAKFAST OF ST. GEORGE ASSOCIATION—ADDRESS BY HON. JAMES A. FARLEY

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. James A. Farley at the Fourth Annual Holy Communion Breakfast of the St. George Association, United States Post Office, New York City, May 24, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRODUCTION OF RUBBER ON MIDWESTERN FARMS—ADDRESS BY DR. LEO M. CHRISTENSEN

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Dr. Leo M. Christensen, of the University of Nebraska chemurgy project, of Lincoln, Nebr., on the subject We'll Ride on Rubber From Midwestern Farms, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRODUCTION OF RUBBER

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the Window Seat, published by W. D. Jamieson, concerning the production of rubber, which appears in the Appendix.]

MASTERS OF BIGOTRY—ADDRESS BY RAYMOND H. GEIST

[Mr. BARBOUR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Masters of Bigotry," delivered by Raymond H. Geist, Chief of the Division of Commercial Affairs, Department of State, before the National Conference of Christians and

Jews, at a luncheon at the Washington Hotel, Washington, D. C., Friday, May 22, 1942, which will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED TRADE AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO — STATEMENT BY FRED BRENCKMAN

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by Mr. Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange, before the Committee on Reciprocity Information, concerning the proposed trade agreement with Mexico, which appears in the Appendix.]

WHERE IS SHANGRI-LA?—POEM BY C. H. GAMBLE

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem by C. H. Gamble, of the Peoria (Ill.) Star, entitled "Where Is Shangri-La?" which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ALASKA HIGHWAY

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, last Thursday, May 21, I secured unanimous consent to submit a resolution providing for the appointment of a committee to be named from among the Members of the Senate to inquire into the location of the Alaska Highway on the so-called C or prairie route, and to determine whether this route would serve a better strategic purpose for the war than either of three other routes, namely, A, B, and D which had been under consideration.

I stated at length my reasons for submitting the resolution. I quoted as one of my principal authorities for the information which I embodied in that address, Mr. Donald MacDonald, who is no doubt the foremost engineering authority in Alaska on the Alaska Highway, and who was Alaskan member of the Alaskan International Highway Commission, 1938–42; reconnaissance engineer for Alaskan Pacific Yukon Highway Commission; chief draftsman and resident and location engineer on the Alaska Railroad, 1914–22; locating or exploratory engineer for the Alaska Road Commission, 1922 to date.

I stressed the fact in my address that Mr. MacDonald had foreseen for quite some time the strategic value of Alaska as an outpost for both offensive and defensive movements against the Japs. As proof of Mr. MacDonald's foresight, I quote the following from an article which he wrote for Liberty magazine, in its July 20, 1940, issue, entitled "Defenseless Alaska—the Ramparts We Don't Watch":

Up in Alaska, where I live, the military problems of the eastern part of the continent seem pretty remote. We assume that the requirements are known and are being taken care of. And I guess the East assumes the same thing about the Northwest, although that's a horse of another color entirely.

I've talked Pacific defenses to people from nearly every State east of the Rockies. Nearly all of them had the same answer: "Oh, there's no danger in the Pacific. It's a wide ocean—and, anyway, we have that big base in the Hawaiians. The Japanese can't get past that."

I don't know who taught those people to place all their reliance on Pearl Harbor, but I do know their blind faith is not shared in Alaska. I don't believe it is shared, either, by our Canadian neighbors, our potential brothers-in-arms, living in Pacific ports like Vancouver, Victoria, or Prince Rupert.

Up in Alaska, you see, we don't have any Pacific Ocean to separate us from the totalitarian powers of Asia. We're only 56 miles—a big Bertha cannon shot—from Soviet Russia; at one point only a little over 700 miles from Japan.

What the Pacific Ocean does separate us from is Pearl Harbor, which is some 3,000 miles away from the key ports on the Alaskan coast.

At this point I anticipate two questions. I know what they are, because I've had to answer them time and again: What does Alaska have to do with the defense of the rest of North America? And why should anybody want to take Alaska when it's only a sparsely settled snow-and-ice wilderness?

Well, the power that controls Alaska controls the North Pacific. Alaska is about the most important strategic place in the world. And who said that? Not just I, but the late Gen. William Mitchell, testifying more than 5 years ago before the House Military Affairs Committee. Mitchell, if you recall, was about the first important American soldier to recognize the importance of aviation in modern warfare. He was a prophet without honor in his own country, but he'd have the last laugh if he were around today.

This article states so succinctly and logically and briefly the importance of Alaska as a military outpost that I shall ask leave to have the entire article, consisting of approximately two magazine pages, printed in the RECORD. It is so illuminating that I believe every Member of this Congress will benefit by a careful reading of it.

Mr. President, at this point in the RECORD I ask to have printed the article which Mr. MacDonald wrote for Liberty magazine, which was published in its issue of July 20, 1940, entitled "Defenseless Alaska—The Ramparts We Don't Watch."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEFENSELESS ALASKA—THE RAMPARTS WE DON'T WATCH—DANGER IN THE NORTH—AN EYE-OPENING LOOK AT A GRAVE BUT UNHEEDED PERIL, AND WHAT CAN BE DONE ABOUT IT

(By Donald MacDonald)

For better or for worse, the defensive frontiers of America have been extended. We are bound now by the pledged word of the White House, as well as by every dictate of common sense, to defend Canada against foreign aggression. This obligation is just as strong as the one we owe to our Latin-American neighbors. And, for the maintenance of our own national defense and our own national economy, it probably is the most vital foreign policy we have.

But could we successfully defend all of Canada against any possible combination of hostile powers?

On the east coast, we probably could. In eastern Canada and the northeastern part of the United States there are highly developed and completely integrated transportation systems. Troops and every type of heavy equipment could be rushed from Boston to Nova Scotia almost overnight. Divisions of reinforcements could be sent all the way from New York to the Gaspé Peninsula before an enemy could get a serious foothold.

But up in Alaska, where I live, the military problems of the eastern part of the continent seem pretty remote.

We assume that the requirements are known and are being taken care of. And I guess the East assumes the same thing about the Northwest, although that's a horse of another color entirely.

I've talked Pacific defenses to people from nearly every State east of the Rockies. Nearly all of them had the same answer, "Oh, there's no danger in the Pacific. It's a wide ocean—and, anyway, we have that big base in the Hawaiians. The Japanese can't get past that."

I don't know who taught those people to place all their reliance on Pearl Harbor, but I do know their blind faith is not shared in Alaska. I don't believe it is shared, either, by our Canadian neighbors, our potential brothers-in-arms, living in Pacific ports like Vancouver, Victoria, or Prince Rupert.

Up in Alaska, you see, we don't have any Pacific Ocean to separate us from the totalitarian powers of Asia. We're only 56 miles—a "Big Bertha" cannon shot—from Soviet Russia. At one point only a little over 700 miles from Japan.

What the Pacific Ocean does separate us from is Pearl Harbor, which is some 3,000 miles away from the key ports on the Alaskan coast.

At this point I anticipate two questions. I know what they are, because I've had to answer them time and again: What does Alaska have to do with the defense of the rest of North America? And why should anybody want to take Alaska when it's only a sparsely settled snow-and-ice wilderness?

Well, the power that controls Alaska controls the North Pacific. Alaska is about the most important strategic place in the world. And who said that? Not just I, but the late Gen. William Mitchell, testifying more than 5 years ago before the House Military Affairs Committee. Mitchell, if you recall, was about the first important American soldier to recognize the importance of aviation in modern warfare. He was a prophet without honor in his own country, but he'd have the last laugh if he were around today.

People in the East shudder when they think of the danger they would be in if a hostile foreign power established an air base on the tip of Nova Scotia, or even in Newfoundland. Yet neither is as close to New York or Washington as parts of Alaska are to Vancouver or Seattle. And to operate successfully out of Newfoundland or Nova Scotia, an enemy would have to cross the broad Atlantic and keep open a dangerously long line of communications. On the other hand, an enemy moving into Alaska from Russia would cross only 56 miles of water—and it would be the counterattacking American Navy that would have a long line of communications to protect.

If such an attack on Alask . were to come tomorrow, there could be no effective opposition immediately. The nearest Army garrison to the Bering Strait frontier is at Chilkoot barracks in southeastern Alaska, about 1,000 miles away. And that garrison numbers only about 300 men. There are a half dozen or so naval planes at Sitka, which also is about 1,000 miles from Bering Strait. The enemy could just walk in. The civilian population hardly could put up a fight, because Alaska has less than 80,000 inhabitants, scattered over an area a good deal bigger than Hitler's enlarged Reich.

Alaska's delegate in Congress, TONY DIMOND, has fought vigorously for years to remedy this situation. And now, finally, some Alaskan air bases have gotten past the blueprint stage and are being constructed.

But does that settle the problem? It does not. There's no real security in having outlying air bases unless we can keep them supplied. In fact, they could become downright liabilities if an enemy could isolate them and starve them out, because the enemy then could turn around and use the same bases against us.

All right, then. We have Alaska. It is the key to control of the North Pacific, and we're going to have airplane protection for the northern terminus of the Alaska Railroad at

Fairbanks. The ocean terminus of the Alaska Railroad is at Seward, and we're going to protect that with planes based on Kodiak Island. The planes at Kodiak also will protect the lower reaches of the Richardson Highway, which stretches from Fairbanks south to Valdez. Alaska's capital, Juneau, and the White Pass and Yukon Railway, which runs over the mountains into Canada's Yukon Territory, presumably will be protected by planes based at Sitka. So far, so good—as long as the United States Navy has undisputed control of the North Pacific.

But suppose—just suppose—that a large part of the United States Navy is engaged in the Atlantic and another large part of it is guarding the Panama Canal, or is over around the Philippines. And suppose that in among the wild, uninhabited fiords that give Alaska a coast line of 15,132 miles an enemy submarine fleet has established temporary bases. That wouldn't be impossible, because many of those fiords aren't visited by human beings for months or years at a time. And thousands of tons of supplies could easily be landed without detection and effectually hidden in the forests that come right down to the water's edge.

Suppose something like that happened. Could the United States keep a steady stream of supplies moving across from 1,000 to 1,500 miles of ocean? Mind you, that's two and a half to nearly four times the distance from Scotland to Norway.

The situation could be complicated further if enemy submarines first laid mines in the narrow Inside Passage, blockading every town on the Panhandle, including Juneau, the capital. And if you don't think that would be a comparatively simple matter, just consult the map.

Bear in mind that Alaska has no coastal guns of any description. Neither has she any arsenals, ammunition dumps, or antiaircraft. She's just 590,000 square miles of unguarded wealth and unused strategic advantage.

Well, what are we going to do about it?

We can't afford to let Alaska remain a naval liability, which is exactly what she will be as long as she has no overland connection with the States. There's no sense to that at all, when Alaska could be converted from a naval liability into a military asset for less than the cost of a single battleship.

A road connecting Alaska with the highway systems of Canada and the United States can be built for $25,000,000. That much I know beyond any shadow of doubt, because highway construction in the north happens to be my business. As locating engineer for the Alaska Road Commission, I have laid down probably as many miles of north country transportation as any man alive.

We can bring Alaska to North America and end its insular status by building 1,200 miles of road from a point north of Hazleton, British Columbia, to a point 183 miles inside Alaska, where the present Alaskan highway system ends.

The specifications on which the $25,000,000 estimate is based call for a hard gravel surface 28 feet wide. This gravel highway would be adequate for heavy military transport. Over it, troops and supplies could be rolled up into the Alaskan interior in jig time, behind the protecting wall formed by the great coastal mountain range. It could be used 52 weeks a year, because snowfall in that valley between the Coast Range and the Rockies is insignificant.

A thousand miles of the new road would lie in Canada. And the opening up of the country would enable Canada to establish flying fields along the route for commercial purposes in time of peace and for military use in event of war. Planes based along the highway would need only to hedge hop over the Coast Range to play havoc with any hostile fleet offshore.

I assume that the United States and Canada would be making common cause in war, because, just as we couldn't let a hostile power get a foothold in Canada, the Canadians couldn't afford to let one get a foothold in Alaska.

As a matter of fact, common sense appears to argue that if we build the highway there never will be any war in the west. Because, by putting a supply line into Alaska, we actually will be taking military control of the territory for the first time. And General Mitchell's dictum that he who controls Alaska controls the North Pacific would then apply. Once we get American armed forces up there, with an overland supply route to the rear, I don't think any foreign power is going to be so rash as to make a challenge. Meanwhile it's just a case of an ounce of prevention being worth millions of tons of cure.

Now, there may be some completely well-meaning persons who doubt the strategic value of Alaska. They probably are the same people who ask scoffingly why anyone should want to take the Territory when it is only "a sparsely settled snow-and-ice wilderness."

I guess that's the fault of the scenic-photograph people, who have circulated millions of pictures of the Columbia Glacier and of the peak of Mount McKinley, and almost none showing the Tanana wheatfields.

People see pictures of Eskimos all bundled up in caribou-skin parkas, but they don't often get a look at swimming-hole scenes, with kids splashing in the Yukon under a blazing sun. That would spoil people's illusions about Alaska; and yet I've seen the mercury touch 97 in the shade in my own back garden at Fairbanks.

The United States does with Alaska a trade of $125,000,000 a year. That's more business than we do with China, where we consider it so vital to maintain the "open door." It's also more business than we do with Australia or the Argentine or Sweden or Soviet Russia or Spain or Colombia or British India.

Alaska's annual production of new wealth is $100,000,000, which means an average production of more than $1,250 a year for each man, woman, and child, including Indians and Eskimos. Only 20,000 of the inhabitants actually figure in wealth production. That means each worker turns up $5,000 in new wealth every year.

On a per capita basis, Alaska is the world's richest market. Potentially it is a huge outlet for surplus American capital and surplus American labor.

However, I'd like to stress that word "potentially." The development of Alaska's great natural wealth waits for extension of transportation.

Here is an illustration of what roads can mean in opening up the North. Alaska, which pushed forward a 2,000-mile highway-construction program in the past 20 years, has had a spectacular parallel expansion in production, exports, and imports. Canadian Yukon Territory, with almost identical natural resources but no highway program, has had a static economy.

A glance back into early American history shows how vital roads are to the development of new country. From 1634 until about 1830, Illinois and northern Indiana were wild areas inhabited only by Indians and fur traders. Around 1830 three crude wagon roads were cleared through the swamps and forests. As soon as this was done, hardy pioneers set out with all their worldly possessions piled on oxcarts. Within 10 years, practically all sections of Indiana and Illinois had been settled.

It is notable, I think, that the migration didn't take place until the roads were in, even though water transportation had been available all along. People like to migrate with their own independent transportation. The knowledge that the means exist to turn back seems to give people courage to push ahead.

It is logical to assume that when there is a road to connect northern British Columbia, Yukon Territory, and Alaska with the rest of America, modern pioneers will use it, and also will use the airports that will flank it. The North is transportation-conscious.

In Fairbanks, for example, despite limited distances to travel, there is one automobile for each three people, and one airplane for each hundred. Alaskans are like that. They make money and they spend it. If only there were a few million more of them, they'd be the answer to American industry's prayer.

To make a long story short, Alaska and the Canadian Northwest are well worth insuring against all possible enemies, and worth developing in the meantime with all our energy.

President Roosevelt said recently that Americans should acquaint themselves with the history and nature of Greenland, because it appears to be more a part of North America than of Europe.

I say Americans should acquaint themselves with the history and nature of Alaska, because it is a part of North America—and a mighty important part, ready to fulfill its rich and adventurous destiny when it gets the transportation.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also have before me a very illuminating front-page article in the Alaska Weekly, dated April 10, 1942, captioned:

Reveal pressure forced United States to adopt Inland Road route.

The subhead is:

Highway work started 2 months before announcement. United States fliers pioneering Army skyway to Alaska jailed in plan to insure Canadian profits.

I shall read the first paragraph of this article:

Inside story of a gigantic "squeeze play," whereby the United States was pressured into financing, building, and maintaining for the duration a network of roads linking Canadian airports, under the label of an "Alaska Highway," for the post-war private profits of Canadian air lines came to light this week.

Mr. President, I ask that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVEAL PRESSURE FORCED UNITED STATES TO ADOPT INLAND-ROAD ROUTE—HIGHWAY WORK STARTED 2 MONTHS BEFORE ANNOUNCEMENT; UNITED STATES FLYERS PIONEERING ARMY SKYWAY TO ALASKA JAILED IN PLAN TO INSURE CANADIAN PROFITS

Inside story of a gigantic "squeeze play" whereby the United States was pressured into financing, building, and maintaining for the duration a network of roads linking Canadian airports under the label of an Alaskan Highway for the post-war private profit of Canadian air lines came to light this week.

More than a year before Pearl Harbor, Northwest Airlines, Inc., of St. Paul, Minn., envisioning the need of a direct air route to Alaska and, eventually, a world route to Asia, made application to the Civil Aeronautics Board in Washington.

Route of their proposed air line from the Twin Cities to Fairbanks is the exact route of what is now called the Alaska Highway.

Immediately, efforts got under way to consolidate Canadian air lines under ownership of the politically powerful Canadian Pacific Railway.

While the application of Northwest Airlines was being kicked around in Washington, the Canadian Government, at the expense of millions of dollars, constructed and improved landing fields along the route proposed by Northwest Airlines.

CANADIANS STALL

Fields were improved and constructed at Fort Nelson, Fort St. John, Grand Prairie, Smithers, Watson Lake, and Whitehorse.

Meanwhile, despite recommendations of joint Canadian-American highway commissions, the Canadian Government continued to stall its decision about the Alaska Highway.

After Pearl Harbor, the United States Army accepted the offer of Northwest Airlines to pioneer as a military route the same course they had originally planned as a commercial skyway.

BLAME AMERICAN

Despite urgent requests of the United States Army, Northwest Airlines could not receive permission to pioneer the route, even for strictly military purposes.

Man responsible for countless delays is C. D. Howe, Canadian Minister of Munitions and Supply and Acting Minister of Transport. Howe, born in Waltham, Mass., educated at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, stands with Premier Mackenzie King as the two strong men of Canada.

This native American, who migrated to Canada and amassed a fortune in grain elevators and pulp mills, steadfastly refused to permit an American commercial air line to have access to a foot of Canadian territory.

Weeks passed—weeks vital to the defense of Alaska. Yet not until the United States had actually put military men and equipment on Canadian soil, not until actual construction of the so-called Alaska Highway had begun, would the Canadian Government permit establishment of an American military air route.

PRESSURE PLAY

Two months before public announcement of the route chosen for the Alaska Highway, 175 10-wheel military trucks, filled with Army engineers and equipment, crossed the Peace River ice.

Meantime, the United States Army, frothing at unnecessary delay, ordered a Northwest Airlines plane to cross the Canadian border and begin establishment of radio equipment and other ground facilities.

On February 28 a Northwest plane, loaded with some 15 technicians, landed at Edmonton, Alberta, and began setting up radio facilities. Occurred then the utmost in pressure.

Canadian authorities inquired of the American technicians, "What installations are you making, and on whose authority?"

Technicians replied, "Radio facilities for the United States Army."

"You'll have to use our facilities."

"Your facilities are inadequate," the Americans pointed out.

"Then we'll impound you until they are adequate," was the reply.

JAIL AMERICANS

Promptly, then, all of the Northwest technicians and pilots were thrown into jail and there they remained for 48 hours.

On March 2 word of their plight reached Senator SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois, who telephoned Under Secretary of War Robert Patterson:

"If the Army doesn't act on this immediately," LUCAS fumed, "I'm going to start a Senate investigation within 24 hours. It's time we knew whether the Canadians are with us or not."

Next morning Senator LUCAS got word from White House Secretary Marvin McIntyre to "hold your horses."

Meanwhile Canadian authorities had forced the Northwest plane to fly back to the United States. In a matter of hours after "word from the White House" the same plane returned to Canada and began setting up ground facilities.

The facilities, however, are not the property of Northwest Airlines. They are United States facilities given to Canada on a lend-lease arrangement.

FOR CANADIAN PROFIT

Northwest Airlines, now ferrying military personnel and planes, is operating without any other authority than "word from the White House." They are doing the job for the Army on a cost-plus basis—pioneering a route to which they will have no post-war rights.

Thus, Canada, at United States expense, gets a road linking airports along the shortest route to the Orient—over Alaska.

In an effort to salvage something from the deal, Northwest Airlines this week had filed papers in Juneau for authorization to do business in Alaska, with a capitalization of $800,000.

They expect to be able to operate between Fairbanks and Whitehorse, taking passengers from Canadian planes flying the route Northwest pioneered and using facilities the American firm installed.

INVESTIGATION OF THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—RUBBER (PT. 7 OF REPT. NO. 480)

Mr. TRUMAN. On behalf of the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], from the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, pursuant to Senate Resolution 71, Seventy-seventh Congress, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report with respect to rubber. It will take me but a few moments to do so. I shall try to get through as expeditiously as possible. I should like to call attention to some sections of the report, a copy of which is now on the desk of every Senator. It covers five different subjects, and it is not complete. There will be further hearings, and another report will be submitted at a later date on the same subject. This committee report covers five major subjects:

First. The present supply, prospects of future increments of the present supply, and prospective needs—needs to be considered in the light of rationing restrictions.

Second. Analysis of the stock pile existing as of the beginning of 1942 and the reasons why this accumulation is not greater.

Third. The prospects of obtaining new rubber from sources other than the Far East, including, (a) synthetic rubber, (b) domestic natural rubber and guayule, (c) rubber from South America, Central America, and Africa, and particularly the prospects with respect to each of the above for the next 3 years.

Fourth. An analysis of the current rubber program from the standpoint of ascertaining its practicality and the ways in which the committee may make suggestions and take other action to facilitate matters.

Fifth. Conservation and full accumulation of available rubber. This includes the questions of rationing, reclaiming of scrap, the rationalization of transport, and kindred subjects.

The purpose of the committee has been primarily fact-finding, and not fault-finding. I wish to say that there has been a subcommittee which has done a tremendous amount of work on this subject. The chairman of the subcommittee the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], is not able to be here today, and he requested me to make this report for him, which I am doing.

I should like to call the attention of the Senate to certain sections of the report which I think it will find extremely interesting on the subject. We have exercised more foresight than our Allies did in the way of a stock pile, or at least we had appropriated funds to do something about a very serious problem. The British stock pile is estimated to be considerably smaller than ours, and, indeed, we must henceforth consider ourselves the chief rubber source for the United Nations. Our stock pile must be used for all our Allies.

One of the reasons why that situation was brought about is the fact that there was a rubber committee controlled by the British and the Dutch, and this rubber committee controlled 97 percent of the rubber production of the whole world. That rubber production was in Malaya, Sumatra, Java, and Ceylon, and it was a most difficult matter for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to negotiate the purchase of a stock pile for this country for the simple reason that it was feared that an accumulation of a large stock pile of rubber in the United States would tend to break the price. That price had been fixed by the British back in the 1920's, and the Dutch were not taken into consideration at that time. As the result of that situation, in 1932 rubber reached an all-time low in price in this country. Finally, however, a belated agreement was made in 1940 by the International Rubber Regulation Committee to raise the production of crude rubber in the Far East to 100 percent, and to allow us to make purchases for a stock pile.

The Government's price for this stock pile was from 18 to 20 cents a pound for first-grade rubber, and yielded a substantial profit to the producers. We were informed that rubber could be produced for about 11 cents a pound, and that there were sections of Sumatra and Ceylon where it could be produced for as low as 3 or 4 cents a pound.

Mr. Jones made this statement to the committee at a hearing at which he appeared:

We were continually after them—

That is, after the International Control Committee in the effort to purchase rubber.

We did not complain about the price because it appeared to us that if we were going to get the rubber, we had better give them a price that would stimulate them and encourage them to get it out, because they were not governmental—they were private people, and they are no different from people in this country. They all want to make a profit.

That was the statement which Mr. Jones made to our committee.

During the year 1941 a total of 1,008,000 tons of rubber was imported, in contrast with 486,000 tons in 1939, but the Office of Production Management permitted consumption for 1941 to reach a

new high of 766,000 tons despite the restrictions placed on automobile production during the second half of that year. If that restriction had not been placed in the second half of 1941, the consumption of rubber would have exceeded 1,200,000 tons.

There were three principal causes behind the partial failure of the stock-pile program, although under the conditions as they were I think a very remarkable job was finally done. The first was the quota restrictions of the International Rubber Regulations Committee. That was the committee made up of the English and the Dutch, who control the production of practically all the rubber in the world. The committee believes that Mr. Jones handled the situation expeditiously and ably.

Secondly, there was a failure to take full advantage of shipping facilities. As fully explained in this report, which I hope all Senators will read, nonstrategic cargoes were carried where strategic ones might have been shipped; ships were routed the long way around the world to the eastern coast of the United States; Dutch rubber had to await shipment in Dutch bottoms. Some, but not all, of the abuses were corrected by the Maritime Commission.

The final, and most important reason, was the fact that industrial consumption was permitted to absorb most of the rubber brought into the country, in quantities far exceeding consumption known up to that time. This occurred during a period when all the Government agencies involved and the rubber industries were fully aware of the threat to the supplies in the Far East and were attempting to devise means to safeguard themselves against it. This loss of vital stocks might have been prevented had there been a centralized authority to deal with the situation, or if the Office of Production Management had curtailed automobile production. But at the very period when it became clear that some action was necessary to conserve rubber the companies indulged in an orgy of consumption, laying in stocks of finished goods at a rate which reached in June of 1941 a new high of over a million tons per annum. The stock pile situation is as good as it possibly can be under the circumstances.

I shall now pass from the stock-pile situation and discuss briefly the conservation of rubber. During the middle of 1941, both the Army and Navy issued directives calling generally for conservation in their requirements. However, until December 7, 1941, neither the Army nor the Navy took any drastic action in this respect, although both studied the subject during 1941, and issued general instructions about the necessity of conservation. Since Pearl Harbor there have been numerous specific instances in which the reduction of rubber has been accomplished in military requirements. An important example is the order to eliminate rubber from tank tracks, which alone will save a very substantial quantity of rubber. Important savings have also been made by changing tire specifications, and eliminating certain entirely unessential uses for mats, foot tubs, and so forth. To a certain extent the use of rubber in various other articles has been reduced or eliminated, but military and lend-lease requirements for 1943 alone have been estimated at a figure approaching our entire annual consumption for civilian use prior to the present war.

As the situation looks today, military requirements are our chief concern, at least with respect to new rubber. It is almost unanimously agreed that there will be no new rubber at all for nonessential civilian use and very little even for essential civilian uses. The civilian problem, therefore, is one of conserving whatever rubber is now available. The military, however, have to date apparently been content to require the elimination of rubber for civilian use and have acted on the assumption that what rubber they need will be available.

Specifications have been altered to reduce rubber requirements, but no over-all far-reaching program drastically reducing the amount of rubber has been put into effect.

On the contrary, despite the reduction of specifications, over-all requirements continue to rise. Although this is a perfectly logical result in view of the ever-increasing size of our armed forces, the necessities of our rubber supply situation will not yield to mere logic.

The best information available in this country is that the German Army was built and has been rolling on less than 200,000 tons of rubber a year. The English have not used any quantities of rubber comparable to those our Army is now seeking. There is no question but that we should supply the men in our fighting line with the very best equipment available. The only issue is whether by failure to face now the fact that rubber may not be available at all in anything like the quantity demanded if the synthetic rubber is not obtained on schedule, the Army and Navy may find themselves without rubber at some future time. It may be that many military specifications are too high in view of the concededly short life of military equipment when it is engaged in battle. The armed forces should exercise the same degree of care that is recommended to civilians to assure conservation of rubber. They should cut out all nonessential use of vehicles and should restrict their speed except where necessary for strictly military purposes. The Army has assured the committee that it will see that this is done. Certainly there must be some approach to the problem which would enable us to equip our armies with a quantity of rubber comparable to the amount with which the Germans have built the most effective mobile force known to date.

The hard facts facing the Office of Defense Transportation must be taken into consideration. Private automobiles run about nine times more passenger-miles a year than do busses and railroads combined.

Mr. Eastman testified before our committee that in the last year for which statistics were available—I think it was either 1940 or 1941—the railroads had 25,000,000,000 passenger-miles, the busses 15,000,000,000, while the passenger-miles traveled by private automobiles were estimated at about 200,000,000,000. So it can be seen that the shortage of rubber will have a serious effect on the transportation problem unless it is handled with the utmost of common sense.

Travel rationing will not meet the situation, although it ought to be tried. Even if the railroads had all the equipment they could possibly obtain at this time it would not be possible for them to haul the passengers necessary to be hauled back and forth to defense plants and works of that sort. It is not practical to use the railroads for such travel. We must find some way to get people back and forth to work. That is one of the great problems now staring us in the face in connection with the rubber situation.

Recently there has been considerable discussion of gasoline rationing. I should like to discuss that subject for a moment.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Does the Senator mean Nation-wide rationing of gasoline?

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes.

Mr. HATCH. I am waiting to obtain the floor. I wish to make some remarks on that subject.

Mr. TRUMAN. I think they ought to be made.

The public has been distracted from this vital program as a result of interest centered on gasoline rationing. Because of the public controversy as to whether drivers would get little or much gasoline, attention has been diverted from the inescapable fact that even if drivers could have all the gasoline their motors could burn, they would still have to reduce driving to a bare minimum in order to conserve rubber. The rubber situation is such that dispute about gasoline should be all but academic. Driving must be curtailed on the basis of the present rubber outlook. Therefore national gasoline rationing on a sensible basis must be given serious consideration.

Among the measures which the committee now understands are being considered for the curtailment of rubber consumption by motorists are:

First. A Federal speed law regulating maximum speed at 40 miles per hour. The President has requested the States to enact 40-mile-an-hour speed laws, but most of these laws could not be enacted until some time next year, and this would be too late.

Second. A law prohibiting the purchase or holding of any tires over five per car.

Third. Over-all gasoline rationing to minimize nonessential driving.

Fourth. Organization of compulsory pick-up systems to obtain maximum utilization of privately owned vehicles.

Fifth. Power to requisition any transportation vehicle, including private automobiles, where it appears that such vehicle is necessary for the purpose of transporting either goods or passengers essential to the war program.

Requisitioning of tires is not a present necessity, although such a measure may become essential before long if shortages develop in specific areas where defense workers must drive comparatively long distances.

However, in considering the question of requisitioning, as well as the question of rationing, we should be sensible. There is no virtue in sacrifice for sacrifice's sake. Automobile tires wear out almost as fast when held in reserve as spare tires. Almost as much rubber will be saved by permitting sensibly restricted necessary driving as by indiscriminately forcing the automobiles off the roads. The latter course would not only be wasteful but it would jeopardize maximum production for the war effort. The problem is one of intelligent restrictions on the part of public officials and care in driving and maintenance on the part of motorists.

Gasoline rationing throughout the country may become necessary, but at best it can be considered only a temporary stop-gap program, adopted for lack of a better and more sensible program.

I say this because it is common knowledge that inflated tires on a car sitting in a garage wear out almost as quickly as if they were driven at sensible speeds for reasonable distances.

If we are really to save the tires on our pleasure cars for use by civilians in essential defense industries, we shall have to provide a means of acquiring the necessary tires, treating them for utmost preservation, and storing them. We do not have such a plan at this time. Even new automobiles continue to be stored on their tires, many of them in vacant lots; and until machinery is worked out for that program any attempt to collect tires would result in huge piles of them over the Nation, on the order of the pots-and-pans collections.

Even the suggestion of collecting tires has some bad effect, in that it leads the people to believe that if they do not use their tires they will be taken from them anyway.

Requisition of tires should be made if necessary, but only after it is clear that voluntary acquisition is impossible. I do not believe that that is clear at this time. Tires might be acquired by voluntary purchase of automobiles in a sensible, well-rounded program whereby the automobiles would be junked to recover valuable strategic materials, and the tires would be carefully preserved for later use in essential industry.

Where gasoline is plentiful I believe that it is much more important rigidly to enforce speed laws and to require regular inspection of cars so as to prevent underinflation of tires and to assure that repairs are given to tires when necessary, and that they are not run to a point where they cannot be retreaded. There is no virtue in sacrifice for sacrifice's sake.

Let me say again that there is no sense in rationing gasoline simply for the purpose of causing somebody to understand that he must make sacrifices for the war. The rubber situation is absolutely vital to the defense program. I think everyone in the United States wants first to win the war. That is the primary object which all have in view. I think if the rubber situation is thoroughly and completely understood, and the facts as they now exist are repeatedly brought home to the people, they will be perfectly willing to meet the situation on a commonsense basis. I cannot see any sense in gasoline rationing where gasoline is now being virtually thrown away because there is no place to store it.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. Does the Senator see any sense in gasoline rationing in a State which has more production than can possibly be used, where production is curtailed, and refineries are shut down?

Mr. TRUMAN. No; there is no sense in that. The transportation situation has caused that condition to exist.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I have heard a great deal about gasoline being destroyed. I wonder if the Senator can tell me where gasoline is being destroyed today?

Mr. TRUMAN. No; I cannot. However, I know that there are three large refineries at Kansas City, Mo., and that their storage capacity is full and running over. They have stopped making gasoline.

Mr. AIKEN. I have understood that there may be places in the rationing area in the Northeast where gasoline was being disposed of for practically nothing a day or two before the order went into effect, because the owners had no place to put it and could no longer afford to pay demurrage on the cars.

Mr. TRUMAN. I do not know anything about that. I do not think anyone would destroy it. I think some was practically given away.

There are other sources of supply for rubber which need to be considered and surveyed. We have gone into some of them to a certain extent. One of them is guayule.

However, guayule rubber is in the far-distant future. The best information we can get is that there is no possibility of having any substantial amount of rubber from guayule for at least 2 or 3 years. I was informed by a man who knows the situation in Mexico that it is proposed to create about 7,000 tons of guayule rubber in Mexico; that plants are to be erected to take care of it for their own domestic consumption, and that in the long run there will be only about 2,000 tons available from that source for export to this country.

A similar situation exists in South America. South America never produced any great quantity of rubber. The amount now being produced in South America is being substantially used at home, and we can depend on very little rubber from South America.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. A man named Simpson, from New York, as I recall, appeared before the Senator's committee, and also issued several statements to the press.

Mr. TRUMAN. He did not appear before our committee.

Mr. HILL. Did the committee investigate the claims which he made? He claimed that all the rubber we might need is available to us in South America.

Mr. TRUMAN. The statement he made was that there was probably enough rubber in South America to meet our needs. That may be true; but that rubber is still in the jungle, and it is not accessible. In times past rubber from the South American jungle cost as much as $3 a pound. Our principal source of supply will be synthetic and scrap rubber. They are the two most important sources from which we shall obtain the rubber we shall need.

Mr. HILL. Even if we were prepared to pay $3 a pound for natural rubber obtained from the South American jungles, we could not get it. Is that correct?

Mr. TRUMAN. Yes; even at that price we could not get it, for it could not be brought out from the jungles.

Mr. HILL. That is because of pestilence and disease and the high death rate among those working in the jungles, is it not?

Mr. TRUMAN. That is true.

One of the most important sources of supply to be considered is scrap rubber. Thousands upon thousands of rubber tires have been thrown away, and hundreds of thousands of rubber tires on automobiles are just on the point of becoming worn out. Such tires should be conserved and saved, and the tires which are now on cars which are being used in essential services should be inspected and should be recapped at the earliest possible date, if we are really going to conserve rubber, and it must be conserved if we are to meet this situation.

Our best chance to obtain rubber lies in the production of synthetic rubber. I desire to say only a word or two about synthetic rubber. I shall not take the time to read the portion of the report dealing with synthetic rubber, for it goes very thoroughly into the whole synthetic rubber situation, but I sincerely hope that every Member of the Senate will read the paragraphs of the report dealing with synthetic rubber.

Germany and Russia have developed a synthetic rubber program to some extent. We were informed from a source which we consider reliable that at the beginning of the war Germany had been able to make as much as 70,000 tons of synthetic rubber in 1 year, and that Russia had made as much as 50,000 tons of synthetic rubber.

The synthetic rubber situation in this country had been complicated to a very serious extent by the patent situation, which was brought about by a deal in patents between the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and the I. G. Farben Industrie, a company which controls all the industries of Germany.

The Goodrich Rubber Co. had created a synthetic rubber on their own account, which they call Ameripol. They have tried it on several thousand tires in conjunction with a mixture of natural rubber, and they claim it is of excellent quality and has been giving good service.

The du Pont Co. has worked out a synthetic rubber called Neoprene, I believe, which was used for mats, rugs, hose, and things of that sort, and which has been found to be very efficient for such purposes but extremely costly to make.

The Standard Oil Co., in its dealings with the German company, had obtained the right to the use of the German patents which control the fabrica-

tion of synthetic rubber. Synthetic rubber can be most economically made from oil products. It is also possible to make synthetic rubber from alcohol produced from grain; but the most economical program as yet presented to the committee has been the program to make it out of butadiene, which is a product of oil. I do not know anything about it, because I am not a chemist or a scientist, but I am told that butadiene and high-octane gasoline are products which come off the oil-cracking process at about the same place, and that both of them can be economically made at the same plant. I do not know whether that is true, but we have been so informed.

The Standard Oil Co. has a patent on a butyl rubber which has not been turned into the patent pool, and which we believe is the most promising opportunity which we have to make rubber in sufficient quantity so that the whole country may receive some benefit from it. Butyl rubber, so I am informed, can be made on a basis which in the long run will enable it to compete with natural rubber at the prices which we have had to pay for it in the Indies. A little later on I shall discuss to some extent the alcohol-rubber program as outlined by the able and distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], who is the head of a subcommittee which has been considering that subject, I think, to some extent. We did not go into that matter as fully as we would have done, because the Senator from Iowa is working on it.

I am trying to complete my report on these matters as rapidly as I can. I wish I had time to read to the Senate the section of the report dealing with the synthetic rubber program of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and its dealings with the I. G. Farben Co. in Germany, as that subject has been gone into very completely.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is the report too lengthy to be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD immediately following the remarks of the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. TRUMAN. No; it is not.

Mr. HILL. I hope the Senator will ask to have it printed in the RECORD immediately following the conclusion of his remarks.

Mr. TRUMAN. I shall do so at once. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the last section of the report, on the subject Synthetic Rubber, be printed in the RECORD at this point in my remarks. This is where it belongs. It begins on page 27 and ends at the center of page 42.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the portion of the report referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SYNTHETIC RUBBER—PRIVATELY SPONSORED DEVELOPMENT

On October 8, 1939, the Army and Navy Munitions Board plan for rubber included a recommendation for the development and use of rubber substitutes. As early as 1931 studies were made for the Navy on synthetic rubber at the Mare Island Navy Yard. During 1939 the Munitions Board had a series of meetings with synthetic rubber producers concerning the development of the industry in the United States. Although the Board had no appropriation to finance such development, it agreed to recommend Government financing of synthetic rubber under emergency conditions.

That Government financing would be needed for any large-scale development was clearly evident from the course synthetic rubber production had taken in this country

The rubber shortage in the first World War started experiments in laboratories all over the world. Germany developed an inferior product called methyl rubber, but abandoned it in the 1920's when early forms of buna rubber were discovered. The first large-scale German commercial plant for buna rubber was completed in 1939, and one other plant was being built when the war commenced in the fall of 1939. These developments were achieved by means of a Government subsidy, which took the form of a tax on all imports of crude rubber. Germany's normal, annual peacetime rubber consumption was in the neighborhood of 75,000 tons, and the development of the buna-s synthetic was for general use.

From the little information available, Russian production of synthetic rubber is estimated at approximately 50,000 tons. This rubber seems to be of the buna type for general use in tires and tubes, and it is made from agricultural alcohol. It is believed that a similar type of synthetic development was planned in Poland.

In the United States synthetic rubber was developed for certain special purposes for which the new product was superior to crude. As long as crude rubber was readily obtainable from Far Eastern sources there was no commercial market in this country for general purpose synthetics. The market for specialty rubbers, especially of the oil resistant type, grew from about 2,500 tons in 1939 to 4,500 tons in 1940 and to 9,000 tons in 1941. At the end of 1941 production capacity had expanded to almost 20,000 tons. The new uses to which these rubbers were put included self-sealing gasoline tanks, hose, tubes, insulation, and gas masks.

Neoprene, developed by the du Pont Co., is one of the outstanding specialty rubbers; Thiokol, of the Dow Chemical Co.; Koroseal, of Goodrich; and Vistanex, of Standard Oil, are others. The only general-purpose tire rubber which had been brought into small commercial production by 1940 was Ameripol, another Goodrich product. In the summer of 1940 Goodrich placed Ameripol tires on the market at a 30-percent price mark-up over crude-rubber tires, and recent reports on the performance of these tires seem to indicate that Ameripol was equal, or possibly superior, in durability and service to the crude-rubber product.

Experimental work was being undertaken on a small scale by the various companies, but no one company felt justified in going into large-scale commercial production on any general-purpose synthetic rubber. There is substantial evidence that the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey (hereinafter referred to as Standard) believed that a general-purpose rubber it had developed, butyl rubber, might eventually be suitable for large-scale production, since the production cost compared favorably with the price of crude from the Far East. However, Standard has not yet succeeded in attaining this objective. Standard continued its development work, and at no time stopped its efforts to improve the product, but did not make butyl rubber available for study by others until 1940.

There is considerable evidence that the development of buna-s type rubber, which is regarded as the best type of synthetic rubber in the United States, was seriously retarded as a result of the 1929 agreement between I. G. Farben and Standard and the action taken pursuant thereto. By their joint action I. G. Farben and Standard were able to discourage independent rubber companies from entering into the independent development and production of synthetic rubber, they preferring that whatever development of synthetic rubber took place in the United States be done under licenses from them.

This story is sufficiently important that the committee believes it should be discussed in this report in some detail.

At the outset it should be stated that there is no question of moral turpitude or of subjective unpatriotic motive on the part of Standard, or of any of its officials. On the other hand, the relationship created by the agreement between Standard and the I. G. Farben created a situation where Standard had to choose between fulfilling its obligation to I. G. Farben and what it might otherwise have regarded as its patriotic duty as an American business. As a result, Standard was repeatedly forced into situations which, taken individually and outside of the general pattern of this arrangement, can be construed only as most compromising.

In a complete judgment of the situation described in the succeeding pages, it should be borne in mind that it would be unfair to view the individual actions except as part of a general picture of big business playing the game according to the rules as the Standard construed them, viewing patents not only as an offensive weapon by which to better its own commercial position but also a defensive weapon to resist the efforts of other companies to better their relative position in industry. Unless a company in the position of Standard took careful and calculated action to arm itself with the strongest patent structure it could acquire, it would have been apt to find itself either paying an enormous tribute to other companies or being excluded entirely from various fields in which it was legitimately interested. To obtain such a patent structure Standard paid a heavy price which, as in the case of other companies creating such patent structures, has had to be borne by the entire Nation. The committee believes that if the Senate Patents Committee can find a legislative solution by which the discoveries of American inventive genius can be made available on fair terms to all who desire to exploit them, that companies like Standard will in the long run find it just as advantageous to compete freely and openly on this basis as to create a patent structure which is an offensive and defensive weapon of industrial warfare.

Testifying before the committee on March 26 and 27, 1942, Assistant Attorney General Thurman Arnold presented documentary evidence which the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice had collected for its case against Standard, which culminated in the filing of an information against Standard, and in a consent decree entered on March 25, 1942. In three subsequent hearings, on March 31, April 1, and April 2, the committee reviewed this evidence with Mr. W. S. Farish, president of Standard, and Mr. Frank A. Howard, vice president of Standard, and president of Standard Oil Development Co. At these hearings Standard was given and availed itself of the opportunity to present its side of the picture in full. Another hearing was devoted to testimony by officials of the Departments of State, Commerce, and the Treasury, on points brought up at previous hearings.

There was unfolded on those days one of the most dramatic stories ever heard by the committee. Through the testimony, a network of international relationships was revealed, which over the years have affected the most crucial sections of our national production.

In general, the agreements between American and German companies were made to

minimize competition between two giants, each of which was strong enough to deal the other heavy blows, by dividing the world into fields wherein each could maintain its position without getting into a conflict with the other. Each company would then be in such a position in its field that it could effectively retain the position which it had. Characteristic of the cartel pattern is the companies' claim that they entered into such agreements in order to avoid "ruinous" competition, while at the same time they stoutly broadcast their faith in "free enterprise" and "healthy competition."

After several years of alliance for technical cooperation between the two companies, culminated by many discussions over the division of business, a written agreement was entered into on November 9, 1929. By the agreement, I. G. Farben retained supremacy in the chemicals field all over the world, including the United States, and turned over to Standard its patent rights in the oil field, for use anywhere in the world except in Germany. The spheres of influence, oil and chemicals, were defined in terms of end products rather than of raw materials, because it would be possible to work with raw materials in either field to get an end product in the other field. The oil patent rights, mainly for synthetic gasoline, hydrogenation, and preliminary work on toluol, were to be held and administered by the Standard-I. G. Co., of which the stock was owned 80 percent by Standard Oil and 20 percent by I. G. Farben. Royalties accruing from these patents were to be divided 80 percent to Standard Oil and 20 percent to I. G. Farben. A few products which were considered to be border-line ones were in 1930 turned over to another company, Jasco. This company held, among other patents, those on synthetic rubber developments. The stock of the company was divided equally between the parties. Control over the buna types of synthetic rubber patents remained in the hands of I. G. Farben as their originator, under an agreement which provided that control over the development of any patent held by Jasco would be in the hands of its originator.

As shown in some of Standard's own memoranda, Standard's officials were aware that future developments in the oil field would produce important discoveries in the chemical field; but Standard believed that it was so advantageous to secure its position in the oil field, as currently defined, that it was willing to risk the possibility that I. G. Farben would stifle independent American research and exploitation of synthetic rubber and other chemicals by refusing to license and neglecting to develop synthetic rubber.

It should be noted that I. G. Farben took no such risk. In the oil field Standard's domination of the oil field was limited to exclude Germany in striking contrast to I. G.'s retention of its position in the chemical field within the United States. This failure of the mutual obligation to dovetail is perhaps the key to all of the difficulties which have resulted from the 1929 agreement. While Standard was not in a position to prevent the development in Germany of discoveries in the oil field, it permitted I. G. Farben to obtain a position in the chemical field in the United States whereby it could actually prevent development and exploitation by American companies. This was a heavy price to pay I. G. Farben for relinquishing its competitive position in the oil field. But Standard could reasonably anticipate that the price would be paid by American industry in general, and that any losses to Standard would be made up when I. G. Farben was willing to release its patents for exploitation in the United States.

The 1929 agreement provided for mutual exchanges of information and for full and loyal cooperation. In the event that any legal or governmental force should disturb or impair the relationship so consummated, it was agreed that "the parties should enter into new negotiations in the spirit of the present agreements and endeavor to adapt their relations to the changed conditions which have so arisen."

In September 1939, after the commencement of hostilities between England and Germany, the parties took steps to adapt their relationships to the war, even in the event that the United States should become a party to the conflict. At this time Mr. Howard met representatives of I. G. Farben at The Hague, and held a series of conversations which were embodied in a document known as The Hague memorandum. It was agreed that the rights in the United States and the French and British Empires to the synthetic rubber and some similar patents involved in their agreements should be turned over to Standard. Those rights in the rest of the world were to become the sole property of I. G. Farben. According to Mr. Farish, Standard received legal title to about 2,000 patents, in which it was jointly interested with I. G. Farben, most of these being the oil patents in which Standard already had an 80 percent net interest, and in consideration for this turned over to I. G. Farben, Standard's minority interests in the synthetic rubber and some similar chemical patents in the countries other than England, France, and the United States, and "a small sum of money."

The Standard officials testified positively that Standard had acquired title to these 2,000 patents without any strings attached. This statement as to title was not applicable to the financial arrangement between the parties. I. G. Farben still retained their 20-percent financial interest in the oil patents, and other strings were attached. The Hague memorandum stated:

"If it shall appear from * * * reports that the division of territory of exclusive ownership between the parties as herein effected have not been equitable in its financial results as judged by the agreement of September 30, 1930 (which was based on the 1929 agreement), then the parties shall correct the inequity in such manner as may seem most fair and advantageous at the time.

"Pursuant to the foregoing, I. G., the Standard Oil Development Co., and Jasco shall make or cause to be made any formal assignments or execute any further instruments necessary to put into effect the present readjustment and any required future readjustment of the rights and interests of the parties to the agreement of September 30, 1930."

With respect to this arrangement, Mr. Howard testified before the committee on April 2:

"The CHAIRMAN. Is there any equitable arrangement which has to be met after the war with regard to these 2,000 patents?

"Mr. HOWARD. The only arrangement which has to be met, Senator, is a simple matter of money payments. The I. G. could claim after the war, if the contracts were still running, an accounting, and say, 'You made so and so much money out of these patents in these three countries. We made so and so much in the other countries. Under the original contract which you traded us out of in 1939, we would be entitled to a greater sum than we got. That trade you made with us in 1939 wasn't fair and you have to pay us so and so much money.'

"That is the position that the I. G. were in, and it can't be helped. That claim cannot be made during the war, for obvious reasons, and if it were made, it would be subject to the control of the Alien Property Custodian. If made after the war, Senator, I don't know what the facts would be as to it. Of course, you realize, gentlemen, that under the consent decree which we have just accepted we have no right to do anything of that kind. The contract is set aside and all future observance of it is restrained.

"The CHAIRMAN. I just wanted to be sure that the Standard felt that that decree was really in force.

"Mr. HOWARD. We certainly do, Senator."

To the extent that this 1937 contract was a financial arrangement it appears to be at least incidentally a method whereby Standard assumed to act as an intermediary between I. G. Farben and the Alien Property Custodian if the United States should enter the war. Despite the agreement between the two companies that they would maintain the spirit of the agreement regardless of any governmental action which might be taken, it now appears that the Standard officials are willing to consider all agreements abrogated by the consent decree without any reservations whatsoever.

"Senator O'MAHONEY. Then we can say that this arrangement is not merely suspended during the war.

"Mr. HOWARD. We should be very glad to file a consent decree under which all relations with the I. G. under those contracts are brought to an end. I have forgotten the terms, but that is the substance of it. They are all terminated. Every obligation of either party to the other in the agreements in question has been terminated.

"The CHAIRMAN. That decree has already been made a part of the record.

"Senator O'MAHONEY. Then you do not feel yourself to be under any obligation by reason of the contract of 1929 or The Hague agreement of 1939, to make readjustments after the war?

"Mr. HOWARD. No, sir; we do not."

In this respect it should be pointed out that Standard has now placed itself in a position where after the war is over and more obvious patriotic motives disappear, it will have to choose between its word given to the I. G. Farben and its word given to the Government of the United States under what might be called the pressure of legal processes.

According to Mr. Farish, the transfer of patents was accomplished "to avoid confusing the German interests with our own." According to Mr. Howard, who conducted the negotiation, he succeeded in working out "complete plans for a modus vivendi which would operate through the term of the war whether or not the United States came in." Only the interposing of the antitrust prosecution diverted Standard from carrying out these plans.

As early as 1932 Standard operating under its agreement with I. G. Farben did not prevent and did not seek to prevent I. G. Farben from discouraging independent rubber companies from entering into the production of synthetic rubber. Between 1932 and 1934 four rubber companies and one chemical company attempted to negotiate for licenses to manufacture synthetic rubber.

The terms of the licenses offered, under supervision of I. G. Farben, were so onerous and so restrictive that the offer did not seem attractive to at least several of the companies. As early as 1935 Standard was aware that the German Government had entered into the picture and that I. G. Farben was withholding some information about buna developments from Jasco, giving as its excuse that the research work was being conducted at Government expense. However, the Standard officials testified, the Germans themselves were, up to 1936 or 1937, discouraged about their buna development and were interested in arranging a license from du Pont to make neoprene. The license was never taken out, and I. G. Farben continued its work on buna rubber and made rapid strides. When the war started, one large-scale commercial plant had just been completed in Germany and another was being built. I. G. Farben, when finally asked by Standard in 1939, refused "because of military expediency" to make available to Standard the designs and information for a commercial plant, and from Standard's memoranda it is clear that I. G. Farben was unable in 1938 for the same reasons to obtain the permission of the German Government to develop synthetic rubber in the United States.

Despite this difficult situation—and Standard was becoming restive about independent developments which had succeeded in bringing out "some very interesting-looking products"—Standard decided that there was absolutely nothing they could do, and that they must "loyally preserve the restrictions" put upon them.

In a memorandum of the executive committee of Standard's board of directors, written in 1938, it was stated:

"Mr. Howard deplored the fact that the German Government's restrictions on I. G.'s freedom of action have prevented our (Standard) making material progress in the American field, particularly as there is some indication that the American rubber companies are making independent progress."

Standard was faced with two difficulties—it desired to conform to its contract with I. G. Farben, and wait for permission to deal with the American companies on I. G.'s terms; and it was afraid that the American rubber companies might develop their own synthetic rubber business and free themselves from the domination of I. G. Farben and Standard. On April 20, 1938, Mr. Howard wrote:

"Until we have this permission however, there is absolutely nothing we can do, and we must be especially careful not to make any move whatever even on a purely informal, personal, or friendly basis, without the consent of our friends. We know some of the difficulties they have, both from business complication and interrelations with the rubber and chemical trades in the United States, and from a national standpoint in Germany, but we do not know the whole situation—and since under the agreement they have full control over the exploitation of this process, the only thing we can do is to continue to press for authority to act, but in the meantime loyally preserve the restrictions they have put on us."

On April 14, 1938, Mr. Howard wrote:

"Our primary objective in our talk with the Goodyear and Dow people was to convince them of our good faith and our willingness to cooperate with them in order to avoid having them proceed prematurely with an independent development which would make it impossible to bring them into any general plan later. * * *

"The thing that is really holding us up, however, is not the lack of a plan either from Goodyear or ourselves, but the inability of our partners—that is, the Germans—to obtain permission of their Government to proceed with the development in the United States."

Mr. Howard testified:

"Mr. HOWARD. * * * the I. G. reported to us in 1938 that without the consent of the Government they could not undertake the commercial development of synthetic rubber in the United States but that they hoped soon to obtain that consent.

* * * * * *

"Mr. HOWARD. Yes, sir. Our friends, the I. G. at that time, were promising that they would obtain as quickly as possible the permission of their Government to proceed to the United States. That permission they obtained before the end of the year 1938, and at the end of that year their representative came here and interviewed the leading rubber companies and arranged with them to send samples of the material and an expert over, to see whether they would become interested in undertaking a commercial development in the United States. * * *

"Mr. FULTON. When, if ever, did you impart the information as to the manufacture?

"Mr. HOWARD. As soon as we could issue the license under our patents here.

"Mr. FULTON. When was that?

"Mr. HOWARD. As soon as we acquired the patents, within 2 or 3 months after, at the end of '39 or the first months of 1940.

"Mr. FULTON. And in the first months of 1940 you imparted the information of the I. G. as to the commercial manufacture of rubber to what company?

"Mr. HOWARD. Such information as we had to Firestone Tire & Rubber Co., and that information——

"Mr. FULTON (interposing). I asked you whether you imparted the German commercial manufacturing experience.

"Mr. HOWARD. We did not have at that time the German commercial manufacturing experience. The war in Germany intervened before we were able to get the commercial designs from Germany. After the war they were unable to furnish any information whatever on German industrial processes.

* * * * * *

"Senator O'MAHONEY. Then is it not a fact that you saw this advance of the rubber companies in the United States over which you had no control, and then you conveyed that knowledge to I. G. and said, 'Now, you have got to do this. You have got to give us this information or we will lose the field,' in effect?

"Mr. HOWARD. Senator, it was not a question of their giving us information. What we asked of the I. G. in 1938, and what they said they couldn't give us without the permission of the Government, was the beginning of actual plans for a commercial development of synthetic rubber in the United States.

"Senator O'MAHONEY. Whatever it was, you argued with them to give it to you, did you not?

"Mr. HOWARD. We were arguing with them to start their commercial development in the United States by some method, we didn't care what—to start it.

"Senator O'MAHONEY. And was it not your purpose primarily to make sure that Standard and I. G. would beat the rubber companies to it and gain control of the field? Now, understand, you and I. G. had the patents, and I can see that it would be a perfectly normal thing for you to do, to try to make those patents stand up. Isn't that what you were trying to do?

"Mr. HOWARD. Yes, sir; we certainly wished to do that, Senator."

After Standard received title to the patents—but not the desired technical commercial information—from I. G. Farben in 1939 it proceeded apparently on its own initiative to negotiate with rubber companies and to offer a license which would be highly restrictive and would discourage developments of rubber for use in automobile tires. It was designed as a stop-gap, necessary according to Mr. Howard, because Standard knew that if it did not grant some license the American rubber companies would disregard Standard's patent claims, and because Standard wanted to make provision for immediate production of specialty rubber.

The licenses offered in the early part of 1940 fixed a high royalty rate so as to make operation impracticable except for relatively high-cost specialty rubbers. It required the rubber companies to license back their improvements to Standard. It required the rubber companies to produce only for consumption in their own products and prohibited them from selling any of their rubber to others. It gave Standard an option to buy one-fourth of the licensees' capacity for distribution to the trade generally. Standard's memoranda state that: "the licenses offered may be considered as a stop-gap arrangement to permit the rubber companies to get into quick production of Perbunan for specialty use if they so desire. Beyond this, there has been no decision as to how the development will be advanced.

* * * * * *

"Of the four companies to whom these proposals have been made, only Goodrich and Goodyear have been active in following them up. Discussions with these companies indicate that to the extent we meet their wishes for the liberalization of the licensing contracts we shall cut away the foundations upon which our own plans would have to rest. While we have told them that in general it is our hope to work out some joint project ultimately, we have assumed no commitment to do so and therefore at the present time they are looking at the license contract we are offering to them as though it were the only thing they would ever receive from us. One cannot blame them for being critical of many of its provisions under these conditions."

In a letter to Goodrich Rubber Co., dated January 10, 1940, a representative of Standard wrote:

"The draft of agreement which I left with you was intended to permit you to manufacture synthetic rubber for specialty purposes and leave you free to participate in a common manufacturing company or not, as you may wish, when and if such a company can be organized. Quite frankly, it was our intention that the license would not be a suitable one under which to operate if the licensees expected to go beyond producing a relatively high cost specialty product."

Hence the type of license offered by the Standard in early 1940 did not differ substantially from the type of license offered under the supervision of I. G. Farben in 1932. Whatever the motives for offering it, the actual effect of this use of patents was completely in line with the whole cartel position. Plans for large-scale production of general purpose rubber by private industry actually were never worked out, and the patents were used by Standard to consolidate its own position.

The company's own patent lawyer summarized succinctly the effect of the licensing agreement:

"The agreement as it is now drafted will lead to the centering of all patent rights of licensees in the hands of licensor, with no outflow of those rights except to customers of licensor (and on two minor phases of patents to licensors' licensees).

"All manufacturing patent license of licensees will help to build up licensors' dominating position, but no licensee will get the benefit of any other licensees' manufacturing patent rights. In other words, this is not a cross-licensing agreement, but one in which patents are piled on patents in the hands of one centralizing company."

The motives of Standard in offering such a license were explained by officials of the company before the committee as a natural desire on the part of the company to retain a monopoly position in the specialty field, as all other companies which developed other types of rubber had done. They claimed that they were actually promoting a break in their own monopoly since they allowed the companies to manufacture rubber for their own use.

Standard officials explained at the hearings that development of buna-s rubber for general tire purposes was being delayed because Standard believed that it could be accomplished successfully only by joint efforts of the rubber companies as contrasted with a competitive effort. This was Standard's own view of the matter, it never explored the possibilities of development in any other way except through Government subsidy, nor did it ever go ahead with any proposal for joint development except to obtain the opinion of its own lawyers that the scheme proposed would be in violation of the antitrust laws. It at no time presented its plan to the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice for approval which it might have done since it considered the plan to be an entirely necessary patriotic move, nor did it attempt to develop a plan which even its own lawyers

would consider lawful under the duly enacted laws of the United States.

Some companies refused to accept Standard's offer of a highly restrictive license and attempted to produce buna-s type rubber under their own patents. Standard late in 1940 offered these companies an unrestricted license after the National Defense Advisory Council had indicated that the Government would proceed with its own plan for synthetic rubber. Standard filed infringement suits against one of them during 1941 at the very time that the United States was attempting through the Defense Plant Corporation to get plants built and into operation under any patents available.

On Standard's side it should be pointed out that from the time that the Government began to take steps in sponsoring synthetic rubber developments, Standard actively participated in conferences, made numerous helpful suggestions, and generally cooperated to the extent that other companies cooperated. There was, however, one very great difference: Standard contended that its German patents were basic in the buna-type synthetic rubber field and that all producers should be licensed under it. That position cannot be ascribed to lack of patriotism, and was probably due to the mere performance by the officers and directors of what they conceived to be their duty to the stockholders, but it did hamper the Government program.

Throughout the negotiations that the Government conducted on synthetic rubber there was always in the background the outstanding fact that Standard demanded that all companies pay a royalty despite the fact that some companies which had their own patents contended that their processes were entirely independent of Standard's. The Rubber Reserve Co. eventually worked out an agreement with the rubber producing companies, whereby all the companies agreed to pay royalties to Standard, after the Rubber Reserve Co. had indicated that if they did not it would itself enter into an agreement with Standard. Even then the officials of at least one large and responsible company insisted to the committee that they had agreed to pay royalties only because they thought that if they did not the program would not get under way.

Summarizing Standard's activities with reference to buna-s rubber up to Pearl Harbor, it is quite clear that in effect the cartel arrangement with I. G. Farben plus the cartel philosophy which remained even after I. G. Farben stepped out of the picture, seriously impeded developments of buna-s rubber. On the other hand, Standard has not been backward in offering plans for large plants for raw materials and rubber to be built under Government auspices for it and others. Much of its advice in that respect was sound and should have been followed, with, however, proper safeguards to prevent it from unduly exploiting the need for rubber for its own benefit.

During this period when plans for the development of buna-s rubber in the United States were never adequately worked out, Standard developed a new rubber called butyl from vistanex, a specialty rubber with limited uses invented by I. G. Farben. Butyl had, even at the beginning, the most interesting possibilities of any variety in the United States. According to Standard's descriptions of the rubber, Standard knew as far back as 1937 that the raw materials could be supplied at only a fraction of the cost of the buna-s raw materials, and that the capitalization required to build butyl plants would be considerably less than for buna-s, because isobutylene, the major ingredient of butyl, is a normal refinery by-product present in large quantities which is usually allowed to become a part of gasoline. Butadiene, the major ingredient of buna, is a high cost specialty product. Moreover, Standard knew that butyl was very promising for inner tubes, since tests had shown it to be more impermeable to air than either natural or buna rubber; and further that an all synthetic tire (of rather poor quality) could be made from butyl. On the other hand butyl deteriorated under heat and had low resistance to abrasion. It was therefore not suitable for a heavy duty tire. Such difficulties could be overcome only by engaging or permitting others to engage in extended development work.

Although butyl rubber seemed to be promising, especially for large-scale production, Standard at first failed and later refused to issue licenses for the manufacture of butyl rubber, and until the hearings before the committee, did not provide samples to the rubber industry as a whole on which the industry might experiment so as to familiarize itself with the new techniques necessary to turn butyl into manufactured goods. This deprived Standard of the benefit of tests run by experienced rubber handlers. Although Standard itself had no facilities for trying out its product such as the major rubber companies offered, it built in 1940 a pilot plant with capacity sufficient only to supply small samples to two rubber companies, and a few favored specialty companies. This was done after the Army and Navy Munitions Board, whom Standard had sought to interest in use of the product, urgently requested it, and after Standard had indicated that it did not have enough butyl to distribute, despite the fact that it had accumulated several tons and that tests could be made with 500 to 1,000 pounds.

Early in 1939 Standard first approached the Army and Navy Munitions Board with samples and information about using but not manufacturing both buna and butyl rubber. The uses to which these rubbers might be put were discussed, and the Board showed particular interest in butyl. A representative of the Navy's Bureau of Construction and Repair after the outbreak of the war in 1939, visited Standard's laboratories; but when he showed interest in the manufacturing processes for butyl, an official of Standard made sure that the Navy's representative was steered away from anything which would reveal the manufacturing technique. Standard wanted to extend the marketing possibilities of its product, while retaining a complete monopoly on the manufacture of it.

Previous to this, Standard had furnished full information and samples to I. G. Farben. Indeed, according to the 1929 and 1930 agreements Standard was obligated to do so. Standard explained its furnishing information to I. G. Farben as a necessity under its agreements; minimizing the importance of such action by saying that butyl rubber required large quantities of isobutylene, which Germany did not possess. However, at the very time Standard was furnishing this information on butyl to I. G. Farben, I. G. Farben was giving only incomplete information on buna to Standard because of the objections of the German Government. During this period also, Standard refused to license an English company to produce butyl rubber. It explained this by saying that the particular company which had applied for the license was not acceptable to it. Standard also explained its failure to show the butyl processes to the United States Navy representative by saying that he was a civilian employee, who because of a personal professional interest was considered by Standard to be going beyond the scope of his duties, and that it was the first time that any such request had been made. Standard also pointed out that the patent applications filed by it in 1937-38 described the process. Of course, patent applications do not disclose operation developments or know-how. Thus, everything is sought to be explained, but the conclusion remains that whether or not Standard so wished, it put itself in the position of furnishing information to the German company, through which it would be available to the German Government, while withholding the same information from the United States. This was done after it had become apparent that this country might be in desperate straits for lack of natural rubber, and that the synthetic rubber program would be retarded by the withholding of patents or the maintenance of high royalty rates.

At the time that the committee commenced its investigation, neither the patents nor the information on butyl rubber had been included in the Government's pool of rubber patents and know-how formed last December, January, and February. Standard resisted, to the very end of the negotiations on the consent decree, the inclusion of a provision requiring that the right to manufacture under the butyl patents be made available to others during the war. Finally, such a provision was written into the decree, which was entered March 25, 1942, just prior to public hearings before the committee and subsequent to private hearings by the committee on the subject. The Government still has no check on whether Standard will furnish full technical information on butyl, since it has always maintained, and continues to maintain, that the privacy of its laboratories is inviolable. At present Standard is the only company with a butyl contract from the Government.

It is clear that the handling of butyl rubber by Standard from its inception up to the time of the consent decree was prompted by a desire to develop fully its controls over the product, as well as to develop production of the rubber itself. The control of samples and information was used for this purpose, as is seen by one of Standard's own memorandums:

"It has been decided that it is not wise for us to put out our samples before September 15. This is for the purpose of giving our company, in association with Firestone and United States Rubber, a further opportunity to protect ourselves patentwise.

"There is no doubt that when butyl rubber samples are released there will be a flood of patent applications by independent persons seeking to cover various methods of compounding and using butyl rubber. These patents are going to be a nuisance and a burden to us, and we would like to minimize this as far as possible."

As late as October 7, 1940, after participating for over 3 months in conferences with the National Defense Advisory Council for the purpose of organizing synthetic rubber production for national defense, Standard wrote the following:

"While the butyl rubber at its present stage of development has been accepted by qualified rubber manufacturers as satisfactory for most miscellaneous rubber requirements, and as probably superior to natural rubber or any other synthetic product for certain special and essential uses, such as the manufacture of gas masks and of electrical insulation, the development of its use in tire compounds is still in the experimental stage. It is our feeling that in view of the limited size of the present contemplated synthetic rubber manufacturing program, no projects should be included in it which have not demonstrated capacity to turn out rubber of fully established record of reliability and adaptability in the manufacture of tires."

At this time Standard, therefore, withdrew the offer it had made to produce 30,000 tons capacity of butyl rubber. It did, however, get other companies to substitute more than this tonnage of buna-s.

At this time Standard knew that butyl was exceptionally good for inner tubes and would make a tire that would certainly have been useful for light service and which offered the greatest possibilities for large-scale production in a limited time because of the

low cost and ready availability of the raw materials of which it is made.

In testimony before the committee, Standard claimed that it had kept the State Department "fully informed" of any transactions which might be of concern. In 1939, at the time of the Hague memorandum and transfer of the legal title of about 2,000 patents from I. G. Farben to Standard Oil, Standard Oil furnished the State Department a chart purporting to show the working relationship between Standard Oil and I. G. Farben. The chart showed Standard to be in control of the oil products, but entirely omitted any reference to I. G. Farben's dominance in the chemical field. On the contary, it falsely indicated that I. G. Farben had a minority and that Standard had a controlling interest in synthetic rubber. The true worth of the chart was demonstrated in subsequent cross-examination:

"Mr. FULTON. * * * Is that chart correct, particularly where it describes the interest of the I. G. Farben * * *.

"Mr. HOWARD. The chart is so complicated; I am sorry, I don't see what you are referring to.

"Mr. FULTON. Are you having difficulty understanding it? Would the State Department understand it?

"Mr. HOWARD. Well, it took about 2 hours to review it with them.

* * * * *

"Mr. FULTON. Where was the part that the Germans retained for themselves referred to under I. G. Farben? I am particularly talking of synthetic rubber and chemicals.

"Mr. HOWARD. That wasn't in Standard-I. G. Co. at any time, Mr. Fulton.

"Mr. FULTON. That was still in I. G. Farben?

"Mr. HOWARD. That was in Jasco.

"Mr. FULTON. And where is Jasco on this chart?

"Mr. HOWARD. Jasco is not shown on the chart.

* * * * *

"Mr. FULTON. Why was that left out?

"Mr. HOWARD. Why, I assume because the chart was already so complicated that neither you nor I can easily see what it means now.

"Mr. FULTON. Yet in handing it to the State Department I believe you said, and I am quoting, 'It is believed that the chart will be found to be largely self-explanatory * * *.'"

Another example of how Standard sometimes kept to the letter in its relationship with this Government but not to the spirit can be found in the instance of the contract between the Brazilian subsidiary and Condor, a German air line operating out of Brazil. Standard was asked in 1940 to refrain from making shipments of aviation gasoline to either the Italian or the German air line in South America, since notorious German agents, propaganda material, and strategic war materials for Germany were carried on these lines from Europe to South America and back, thus breaking the British blockade. Standard itself complied, but continued through its Brazilian subsidiary and under the supervision of the American Ambassador at Rio to make limited deliveries of the gasoline under a contract with Condor. In October 1941 Standard notified the State Department that unless the United States Government was willing to protect and indemnify its subsidiary against a possible lawsuit and fine, the contract would have to be fulfilled. The State Department was forced to threaten to blacklist Standard's Brazilian subsidiary in order to stop the deliveries. Deliveries of gasoline by Standard's Brazilian subsidiary were, however, continued under direction of the American Ambassador to Brazil until a substitute service could be established. An overwhelming majority of the companies asked by the State Department to refrain from doing business with German companies in South America had complied immediately and had taken whatever losses accrued from it.

The world-wide business of Standard and the impact of this business upon the Government's interest, has led Standard into questionable positions on specific issues. The executive committee's minutes of February 17, 1941, indicate that although Secretary of State Hull had advised Standard that he hoped shipments would not be made from any place in the Western Hemisphere to the Italian air line, Ali Littoria, Standard decided to supply this air line for 6 months from stocks of the Standard Oil Co. of Brazil. The question was raised before the executive committee of Standard's board of directors:

"Whether the State Department should be informed of all of the current developments in this situation. The committee was not inclined to feel this was necessary."

In 1941, Standard was considering the exploitation of hydrogenation patents in occupied France. In an executive committee memorandum Standard expressed its point of view:

"Although Shell to date has seemed reluctant, or perhaps under pressure of the British Government—we might have some trouble in all the democracies of this kind—has been unable to entertain favorably this proposal to the extent that their interest in International Hydro patents is affected. Mr. Howard said he believed matters had reached the point where they now may yield."

This never went through.

The question of good faith, although an intangible, is of major importance, not only in interpreting past action, but in forming a judgment as to the future.

By the consent decree Standard has now released royalty free for the duration of the war, for general use, and for any purpose, all of its rubber patents. After the war Standard will receive a reasonable royalty on its patents, to be determined at that time.

The committee has the assurance of responsible Standard officials that, despite passages in the 1929 agreements, its understanding with I. G. Farben is now dissolved, and that Standard has no obligation, moral or otherwise, to resume the relationship. It has the further assurance from these officials that it has entered wholeheartedly into the rubber program, and will not withhold its know-how or its information from the Government.

In any new venture such as synthetic rubber, the patents do not contain every technical particular in respect to the manufacture of the product. In most instances the quality of product depends mainly on the fund of information outside the patents, the know-how, and unless the companies who hold the patents are willing to cooperate fully and freely with each other and with the Government, the program will be much hampered.

The documentary evidence out of Standard's own files requires the conclusion that Standard, as a result of its cartel arrangements with the I. G. Farben, and as a result of its general business philosophy, did hamper the development of synthetic rubber in the United States and did place itself in a position where its officials, although personally patriotic men, engaged in activities helpful to the Axis Nations and harmful to the United Nations. Standard vehemently denies this, and asserts that it has aided the development of synthetic rubber. Standard's answer primarily established the fact that its actions were the inevitable result of its business policy, rather than the result of improper personal motives on the part of any individual.

The principal justification offered by Standard for this business policy has been that it was necessary to enter into the cartel arrangement in order to obtain the fruits of German inventive genius, and that if Standard had not made a deal to get German synthetic rubber, the United States would not have had it at all.

This assertion misses the point that in order to protect their deal I. G. Farben and Standard discouraged other companies from embarking on independent development. We were simply playing foreign inventors while keeping our technicians out of the field. Despite these actions, American initiative was not stifled, and some companies, particularly Goodrich and Goodyear, did proceed to develop synthetic rubber independently of any cartel arrangements. Had others not been discouraged, we might be far ahead today. All that we ever received from Germany with respect to synthetic rubber was the information contained in their patents. Mr. Howard made it perfectly clear that we never did get the technical information with reference to commercial use of these patents. The patents had to be and were filed in this country in order to obtain patent rights here. This obviously would have been done whether or not Standard entered into any agreements with I. G. Farben. Thus, America would in any event have had the benefit of the German patents, and as a result of Standard's agreements we gained nothing in this respect but were hampered in our efforts to develop the processes disclosed in the patents.

As a further justification for entering into the restrictive agreements with I. G. Farben, Standard has pointed out that by such agreements it obtained the basic understanding of hydrogenation processes through the use and development of which it was later able to produce 100-octane gasoline and synthetic toluol, both of which have been of major importance to the war effort. However, it appears that Standard had obtained the right to the hydrogenation processes under an agreement with I. G. Farben antedating the so-called division of fields agreement of 1929, so that Standard did not have to accept the restrictions of the division of fields agreement, particularly those relating to chemicals and synthetic rubber, in order to obtain the basic process of hydrogenation which later enabled Standard to produce 100-octane gasoline. The major consideration to Standard for the division of fields agreement was I. G. Farben's agreement to refrain from competition in the oil field, and not the turning over of the hydrogenation processes, although the 1929 agreement did permit Standard to license other companies to use the hydrogenation process, which it could not have done under the earlier agreement without the consent of I. G. Farben. Moreover, it should be emphasized that both 100-octane gasoline and synthetic toluol were perfected by Standard and not by I. G. Farben, and that Standard's very valuable discoveries with respect to 100-octane gasoline were required to be and were passed on to I. G. Farben. Standard seeks to minimize this by asserting that the discoveries were unimportant to Germany by reason of its lack of oil. The committee is in no position to determine the extent to which Germany has benefited or will benefit from such discoveries.

It is significant that the statement submitted by Standard replying to the charges presented by Mr. Arnold failed even to refer to, and much less to answer, many of the most important documents taken from the files of Standard and presented to the committee by Mr. Arnold.

On the other hand, in fairness to Standard, there is the fact, heretofore referred to, that the present patent system, enabling both foreign and domestic corporations to build a patent wall around a large corporation with the attendant possibility of very great detriment to its business, provides a strong incentive for such a corporation to use patents as an offensive and also a defensive weapon to enable it to retain a dominant position in its industry. Had Standard not entered into its agreement with I. G. Farben, it might have itself been a victim of the

cartel practices. It should also be noted that the principal agreements between Standard and I. G. Farben were made in the 1920's at a time when the possibility of another war was not seriously considered, and at a time when the Government had not taken any position with respect to such arrangements with foreign companies.

Standard is only one of a group of companies producing critical materials which, by cartel agreements and by the subsequent control of patents, have sought to restrict and control production. This has constituted one of the greatest menaces to our war effort. The committee has already investigated many of these, and intends to probe into the others whenever necessary.

It has found that such arrangements are harmful in peacetime, but disastrous in time of war. They cannot be allowed to flourish and choke the great war machine the United States is building. They must be stamped out quickly and completely. A study of the legislative changes necessary or desirable to correct these evils is now being made by the Senate Patents Committee.

The committee believes that future arrangements whereby foreign business interests dominated by hostile governments can create bottlenecks in our industrial machinery can be prevented. In the first place, their existence can be made known by requiring that all contracts entered into with foreign interests be registered In the second place, as has been indicated above, it may be possible for the Senate Patents Committee to find a legislative solution whereby all inventions given protection under the laws of the United States must be made available on fair terms to all who desire to participate therein. The committee understands that the Senate Patents Committee is now considering the possibility of drafting such legislation.

Mr. TRUMAN. The portion of the report printed in the RECORD will give every Senator an opportunity to read about the whole development as it took place. It is very interesting.

At the conclusion of the examination which we made, and of the study of the situation which developed as the result of the control of these patents, the committee believes that future arrangements whereby foreign business interests dominated by hostile governments can create bottlenecks in our industrial machinery can be prevented. In the first place, their existence can be made known by requiring that all contracts entered into with foreign interests be registered. In the second place, as has been indicated above, it may be possible for the Senate Patents Committee to find a legislative solution whereby all inventions given protection under the laws of the United States must be made available on fair terms to all who desire to participate therein. The committee understands that the Senate Patents Committee is now considering the possibility of drafting such legislation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Since the Senator has mentioned these two subjects, namely, first, the registration of foreign agreements; and, second, the regulation of patents—it is only proper to say that the Senate Committee on Patents, over which the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] presides as chairman, is now studying two propositions which deal with the patent problem from every angle.

Mr. TRUMAN. I hoped he would be here at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. There are two bills, one of which would provide a remedy for war conditions, in that it would make available to the Government and to all engaged in war industries all existing patents, while at the same time protecting the rights of the owners of the patents to a reasonable and proper royalty.

The second bill embodies substantially the recommendations which were made by the Temporary National Economic Committee. One of the provisions of that bill is to the effect that if after 3 years it is made to appear that any particular patent is not being utilized—that is to say, that it is being suppressed—and there is no reasonable explanation therefor, authority may be granted to compel a license. This is not, I may say, the so-called compulsory licensing system, but it is similar to systems which are employed in practically all other countries. Only in the United States has the patent law been so loose that great concentrations of economic power and great cartel associations, combinations of the monopolies of two or three countries, have been enabled to use an advantage granted by a law enacted by Congress to suppress the development of science and to exploit the economy of all the people.

I am hopeful that the committee may in the near future favorably report these measures.

Mr. TRUMAN. I hope so, too. The Senator knows that we were very highly pleased that he sat with the committee of which I happen to be chairman at the time when we were examining the Standard Oil Co. and the ramifications of its patent dealings in connection with the synthetic rubber program; and as the Senator very well remembers, the pooling of those patents for the benefit of the United States Government was not reached by the Standard Oil Co. or the Office of Production Management until this committee started the investigation of rubber. Then the Standard Oil Co. went into court in New York and confessed judgment, and turned over to the Government pool all the patents but one, and that is the butyl rubber patent.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think I may be permitted to say that every Member of the Senate recognizes the invaluable service which has been rendered by the committee over which the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] presides; and the country is indebted to him and to his committee for the factual material which is has presented.

I desire to add in this connection that there is pending before the Committee on the Judiciary a measure which would require the registration with the Government of all foreign agreements such as that into which the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey entered with I. G. Farbinindustrie. The facts need but to be stated in order to make it clear that a remedy is needed.

Mr. TRUMAN. I think the Senator is absolutely correct, as I think the report I am presenting will prove.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. When an organization of such tremendous size as the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey, with assets greater than those of half the States of the Union, is enabled to enter into a commercial treaty with monopolies in foreign countries, and to make such commercial treaty effective without regard to the international policy or the domestic policy of the United States, it is simply amazing that nothing has been done by the people of the United States to prevent such a condition.

Mr. TRUMAN. I thank the Senator.

Since Pearl Harbor the synthetic rubber program has been expanded to meet the long-foreseen and now acute emergency. First the four plants originally authorized by the Defense Supplies Corporation were increased to a total of 120,000 tons. Additional facilities were later proposed to make a grand total, first, of 400,000 tons per year, later 600,000 tons per year, and then 800,000 tons per year—700,000 tons buna–s, 60,000 tons butyl, and 40,000 tons neoprene.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a brief statement?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. In the listing of the increased estimates of need to which the Senator from Missouri has just referred, Secretary Jones, before the subcommittee to which the Senator was kind enough to refer a moment ago, made an estimate Friday of a million tons, and another witness from one of the governmental agencies estimated 1,200,000 tons. They are "upping" it very rapidly.

If the Senator will bear with me one moment further in connection with the statement as to the possibility of destroying gasoline, we had before the committee the Assistant Coordinator of petroleum and gasoline, who stated that one of the reasons why $650,000,000 had been allocated to the production of synthetic rubber from petroleum sources and not from agricultural sources was that gasoline was being produced so fast in some sections of the country that it had to be destroyed; they were faced with the necessity of destroying it if they could not find some use for it.

Mr. TRUMAN. I may say to the Senator that automobile gasoline is one of the byproducts of butadiene; so that argument will not hold water. The reason that they did not use agricultural products, as I understand—and I had an interview with the Secretary of Agriculture and with the Vice President on the subject—was because the only way they could economically use them in conjunction with the present situation was to have the Government donate millions of bushels of surplus grain, then turn it into alcohol for butadiene, and, to do that, it would be necessary to erect new plants for that purpose or take over whisky plants, which has now been done. That was one of the things that held up the use of alcohol for butadiene purposes.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, just a brief further statement. The subcom-

mittee to which the Senator referred has been doing some work along the specific channel the work of the Senator's committee had indicated to us. His committee laid the ground work, and we are just going into that one channel.

Mr. TRUMAN. We did not go into it because the Senator's committee was going into it.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am very glad to report that a statement from the Chemical Division of the War Production Board this morning before the committee was that within the last 24 hours they had enlarged the program of the use of grain alcohol from nothing to 240,000,000 gallons.

Mr. TRUMAN. I think that is true. The authorization for 400,000 or 600,000 or 1,200,000 tons is easy enough, but the difficult task is to get the job done.

The committee is informed that this program is being pushed by the War Production Board, on behalf of which Mr. Batt assumed before the committee full responsibility for the entire program, and by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator. At the present time it appears that the principal difficulties probably result from a lack of centralized and sole responsibility. The committee intends to hold further hearings at a later date to determine what progress has been made. The committee has checked with the companies themselves to ascertain when the contracts were actually agreed upon, whether engineering plans are completed, the status of construction, and the expected times when production will start and when it will reach a maximum. The committee has also asked the War Production Board to make a study of these questions for its own use and to furnish the committee with a copy. The committee believes that an inordinate amount of time was wasted in negotiation as distinct from engineering and construction.

The synthetic program must succeed. Uncontradicted and fully convincing evidence before the committee, as well as the unanimous information received from well-advised sources, has convinced the committee that the rubber shortage is both extremely acute and likely to continue for the duration of the war. The most we reasonably can expect, even from a successful synthetic-rubber program, is to supply military needs and essential civilian requirements. Essential civilian requirements will include getting defense workers to their places of business and supplying our civilian population with the absolute necessities. That also includes getting farm products back and forth from the farm.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. BROWN. I was struck by one sentence in the report on that very point, and that is that the Martin bomber plant, northeast of Baltimore, is, as we all know, on the main line of the Pennsylvania Railroad, and that, out of a very large number of workers—I have forgotten how many—only 350 reach the plant by methods other than by automobile transportation. Why is it that some arrangement cannot be made by the Transportation Coordinator to require the railroad to service that bomber plant?

Mr. TRUMAN. I think I can answer the Senator's question, for we have given it a great deal of thought. The difficulty is just as great to get the workers to a point on the railroad to enable them to reach the bomber plant as it is to get them from where they live to the bomber plant.

Mr. BROWN. That is not true with respect to another situation which is very similar. I refer to the situation at Dearborn and Ypsilanti, in Michigan, with respect to the Ford bomber plant. The Senator from Missouri and myself were both there a short time ago. I understand the Senator was there yesterday.

Mr. TRUMAN. I did not go to the plant, but I was in Detroit yesterday for the purpose of inspecting the Chrysler tank plant and the Ford tractor for farm use.

Mr. BROWN. There again we have the Michigan Central Railroad, with double tracks of the highest type, which runs right through the heart of Dearborn, where the Ford workers now live, and where they have excellent housing facilities. Some 16 or 19 miles away is the Willow Run plant, the Ford bomber plant, where there are going to be 100,000 people employed; but I cannot get anyone downtown interested in requiring the railroad officials to extend the railroad facilities and to acquire cars in order to enable the railroad to transport the workers to the Willow Run plant.

Mr. TRUMAN. The trouble is that the railroads are not equipped to do the suburban hauling, and I understand that, in order to equip them, it will require steel and materials of that sort which are absolutely necessary for the tank and gun program. The transportation program is confronting us now. It is going to take the best brains we have to work it out on such a basis as that it will not in any way hamper the war program. That is the job we are up against now—the transportation program, and the transportation program hinges on this rubber program.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. I listened quite attentively to everything said by the distinguished Senator, but, so far as I heard, he said nothing definite as to when we could expect to get into butyl or synthetic-rubber production.

Mr. TRUMAN. The committee has sought to explore every possibility of assuring the public of, at least, a little rubber within the next 2 years. It has investigated every possible source and has attempted to encourage experimentation with every type of synthetic rubber that has held promise of large-scale production over and above the absolute necessities. This question is discussed more fully a little later on in the report. It is only fair to the American people to say that no reasonable assurance has been found anywhere that individuals will have rubber for private, as distinct from defense, uses within the next 3 years.

The committee believes that we are approaching the limit of new plant construction and has privately been recommending to the War Production Board that the whole war program should be reviewed in the light of present knowledge of where, when, and how we will have to fight, so that we can make maximum use of our resources. The committee recommended this because we are now beginning to suffer the results of the inefficiency of the Office of Production Management and its refusal to admit the prospect of shortages in strategic materials and to force soon enough plans for increased production thereof and for curtailment in the use thereof irrespective of the effect on the financial and competitive positions of large industry. The War Production Board is not responsible for these defects, but it must be ready ruthlessly to review the entire program even to the extent of ordering the cessation of construction on plants already started where there is no present prospect of being able to furnish sufficient materials to operate the plants or where there is greater need to finish or operate other plants. The size and extent of the rubber and butadiene program has made this problem more acute than it otherwise would have been, and it is clear that we must not waste materials to build synthetic rubber capacity for military uses that could be pruned or for civilian use that is not essential.

This statement, which has been with the War Production Board for several days, was given out to the newspapers, and taken by them as an indication that we were approaching the end of the war. That was not the intention at all. The intention was to impress upon the military services that they should use only those essentials which are necessary in order to win this war, and that it is idle to build a lot of plants and accumulate a mass of production for which we have no use, either in the war or afterward. That is the reason for this resurvey, and the War Production Board is making the resurvey now with a view to using only those things which are essential, for the shortage in copper, lead, zinc, and steel is just as acute as in rubber, although rubber is the most vital thing at the present time.

It may be necessary to supplement the program with less economical ways of producing. One possibility now being investigated by the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator is the utilization of some small refineries which would be forced to shut down due to the gasoline-rationing program. There is no reason why those little refineries could not be used to make butadiene. The same applies to the alcohol program.

Expensive butadiene is better than none. It costs a good deal of money under present conditions, but let us get it. We must have it, because the transportation program depends entirely on the solution of the rubber problem.

Apparently the idea of obtaining butadiene from alcohol distilled from grain

originally was discarded as too expensive. But it is being given consideration. As the able Senator from Iowa has just informed us, some 200,000,000 gallons for this purpose are to be made.

The other program which has a possibility of success is that looking to the production of butyl rubber, the cheap product of the Standard Oil Co. I think that should be given every possible consideration, and every effort should be made to improve the process. I am just as sure as that I am standing here that if we go into the synthetic-rubber program as we should, and use all the brains which this country is capable of producing, when we come out of the program we will have synthetic rubber which will be on such a basis that it will forever compete with natural rubber.

One of the things which caused trouble with the rubber program when it was being started was that it was administered by too many people. In 1940 the National Defense Advisory Council attempted to formulate a synthetic rubber program, but found that it could not deal successfully with businessmen, who had then to turn to the R. F. C. for execution of the plan. We found that everyone had a finger in the pie. What we have been contending for—and what we hope finally to get—is someone with the responsibility to say, "Go ahead and let us get the job done."

This situation was called to the attention of Mr. Nelson, and Mr. Nelson appointed Mr. Arthur Newhall, of the War Production Board, as Coordinator of Rubber. Mr. Newhall has been given full responsibility within the War Production Board, subject to the direction of Mr. Nelson. I think there is a possibility that we may eventually arrive at a successful conclusion.

The report which I have just submitted is not complete. We expect to hold further hearings; we expect to get more facts and present them to the Senate; but, with conditions as they are, it was the sense of the whole committee that this statement should be made to the Senate for the benefit of the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be printed.

Mr. TRUMAN subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to call attention to the fact that the New York Times has been sold a bill of goods by the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey. I have just found in today's issue of that great newspaper an editorial entitled "Rubber Hope," in which they go with some detail into the manufacture of butadiene. Butadiene, of course, is the fundamental chemical which is required to be made, and it involves a great deal of machinery, large costs, and delay in making rubber; but the Standard Oil butyl rubber, as I understand, can be made without going to all that expense, and it is the rubber we are trying to get the Standard Oil Co. to make and the rubber they want to tell the New York Times they want to make; but, so far, it has not been possible to persuade them to go ahead and make butyl rubber. They are only authorized, so far, to make 60,000 tons.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, may I inquire of the Senator what is butyl rubber?

Mr. TRUMAN. It is rubber which, I think, will, in the long run, be competitive with natural rubber, and the Standard Oil Co. has certain interests they do not want to jeopardize in that direction.

Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the New York Times, to which I have referred, may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RUBBER HOPE

The Department of Justice recently charged that the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey had entered into patent cross-licensing agreements with a German cartel and paid many millions for which it received no technical information of importance on the synthesis of rubber from petroleum derivatives. We were left to infer that gullible businessmen and technicians had spent their money for nothing and that the Germans alone knew how to make rubber out of refinery gases. Now comes the Standard Oil Co. with the announcement that not only does it know how to make rubber out of butadiene derived from petroleum, but that it can at the same time vastly increase the output of 100-octane gasoline, which our air force will need in enormous amounts.

Especially important is the scale on which the new process can be carried out—important in view of the varying estimates of our rubber needs that have come out of Washington. The Standard Oil Co. speaks confidently of 1,440,000 tons a year, and promises these tons soon. Already 34 plants of its design are under construction, with a total capacity of 578,000 tons, and these should be in operation in less than a year. Yet so recently as May 12, Arthur B. Newhall, the War Production Board's rubber coordinator, told the Senate Agricultural Committee that "it would be a miracle if 1943 synthetic rubber production exceeds 350,000 tons." The pessimism that has tinged the testimony of those who have appeared before congressional committees may be attributable to ignorance of developments published only in the last week.

Butadiene, the raw material from which synthetic rubber is made, can be obtained from alcohol as well as from petroleum and acetylene. Hence the agitation for the distillation of the alcohol from grain and other crops. Is this diversion of grain now necessary? We shall need all that we can harvest and store to feed the starving peoples of Europe after the war as well as for explosives. Though there is every reason for using good grain to make rubber, for lack of other suitable raw material, it seems as if petroleum research chemists had made it unnecessary to take that step. Petroleum is plentiful. Its conversion into aviation gasoline and rubber simultaneously involves no waste. If the Standard Oil Co.'s prediction is fulfilled, even to the extent of only 500,000 tons of synthetic rubber in less than a year, it will make a substantial difference in the present situation.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4476) providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment.

RATIONING OF GASOLINE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] for the very able report of the committee which he heads, and I wish to say that while I shall comment briefly about some of the subjects he has mentioned, there is no controversy between the chairman of the committee and myself.

I wish to mention this morning some matters I have read in the newspapers concerning a Nation-wide rationing of gasoline. I do not recall ever taking the floor of the Senate to discuss a matter which might be peculiar to my own State, but this morning I shall discuss the rationing of gasoline merely from the standpoint of New Mexico.

I do not want anyone to say, when I protest, feebly, as I may protest, against the rationing of gasoline in my State, that the citizens of New Mexico are not patriotic, that they are not loyal, that they are not willing to bear and make the same sacrifices which the citizens throughout the Nation undergo. The fact is—and I say it with some degree of pride—that New Mexico has already made her contribution to the war. We have not perhaps made it in money, in the purchase of bonds, because we are not a rich State, but we made it in the fight for liberty and in the lives of our sons. The New Mexico National Guard was sent to the Philippines. They went gladly. According to population, I think perhaps a greater percentage of men from New Mexico than from any other State in the Union was sent to the Philippines, and they fought gallantly and bravely. Some of them gave their lives. Some we know about, some we do not know about.

Some 200 boys from my own county, which has a population of about twelve or thirteen thousand people, boys whom I have known since babyhood, are somewhere on the Bataan Peninsula today; and what I say about my own county applies to all other counties of New Mexico. We have made our contribution, and I do not want anyone to say that the citizens of New Mexico are not loyal and are not willing to make whatever sacrizens of New Mexico are not loyal and when I say "may be required," I mean just that.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, may I interrupt my colleague in connection with the question of sacrifice?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Some time ago I called the attention of the Senate to the fact that I saw a little old lady in Deming, N. Mex., whose only consolation was three burning candles, one for each of her sons. What has been so well stated by my colleague recalls her comment. She said, "I could not buy a 10-cent stamp, and I could not pledge myself to a dollar, but if it takes my three sons to carry on, I am willing to make the sacrifice."

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator. I think that well illustrates and exemplifies the feeling of the people of my State, so I do not want to hear anyone say they are not loyal and are not willing to make sacrifices.

I wish to discuss the question of the rationing of gasoline, because I do not understand what is being done. It simply does not make any sense whatever to me to say to the people of New Mexico, "You must ration your gasoline." Why do I say that? In the first place, we have oil in New Mexico, much oil, so much oil that we are not allowed to produce what we are capable of producing. We have in different counties of New Mexico wells the production of which has been cut down—I had started to say a hundred percent, but that is probably too great a percentage. However, we are limited now to less than 40 barrels a day to every 40 acres.

The wells are capable of producing from 25 to 10,000 barrels of oil a day, but under the allowance which now exists we cannot produce 40 barrels a day. I do not want to exaggerate, but I am sure that is about the figure.

By the way, the program is very wise, and in it New Mexico has always cooperated. We have been perfectly willing to conserve our oil resources and to work with the National Government in every way possible in order to conserve them; but now not only has our production been cut down but actually our refineries have been closed down or their operations curtailed. We cannot refine even the small amount of oil which we are allowed to produce, and now we are told that we cannot use even a small part of that which has not already been cut off.

I think it was in the Ancient Mariner, was it not, that it was said:

> Water, water, everywhere,
> Nor any drop to drink.

We have in New Mexico "oil, oil," not everywhere, but more than we need; we have it in abundance, but not a drop to burn in our automobiles, in our trucks, and in the tractors on the farms. At least, I suppose there will be regulations to that effect. I say that I suppose so because all I know is what I read in the newspapers. I think about all any Senator knows is what he reads in the newspapers, and sometimes I am inclined to agree with what the Senator from Wyoming said yesterday. According to the newspapers—and again I quote the press—he said something about Congress having delegated too much power. What was the statement the Senator made?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, my attention was called to the prospective rationing of gasoline throughout the country, and it came at a time when, like other Senators from Western States, I had been discussing the recently promulgated regulations with respect to motor transport in the West. One of the directives, for example, provided that no motortruck should make any trip unless arrangements were made for a full load on the way back.

Mr. HATCH. Yes; I know of that very well.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course, that meant that in the Senator's State and in every other State no rancher or farmer could deliver his wool, or his products of any kind, for shipment to places where they would be needed in the war effort, because there was no shipment of material going back to the farm or to the ranch. So I said that that regulation, like many other regulations, was issued without consideration of the conditions which existed in the territory to be affected. From that I made the general comment that perhaps Congress had surrendered too much of its authority to persons who do not understand the conditions which exist.

I was reminded of the fact that a day or so before that I was listening to a radio commentator who, rather unusually, was not criticizing Congress, but commenting upon the conditions which exist in the country as a whole and particularly with respect to the problem of transportation. He said—and I thought it was a very good sentence, one which is very appropriate—that in all probability we were being kicked around by authority rather than by intelligence. The application of intelligence——

Mr. HATCH. That is too severe a test.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The application of intelligence to the exercise of authority is something which is very much to be desired.

But, of course, Mr. President, what is happening is only the natural result, perhaps we should say, of the concentration of power. It is perfectly impossible for any group, whether in government or out of government, to exercise intelligent authority over the lives of 130,000,000 people. That is why from the earliest times in this country we have believed in local authority and in local self-government. Now we have the people of every State, of every county, of every community, looking to Washington for the rules which shall govern their daily activity, and the pity of it all is that the people in New Mexico, in Wyoming, in Colorado, in New England, wherever they may be, want to surrender their own comfort, they are willing to surrender profit, they are willing to cooperate and to contribute to the war effort, but day after day they are being asked to do things for which no necessity is demonstrated.

The cause of it all, in my judgment, is that most of those who are making the regulations, which are really legislative, and which should be made here, do not come from the sections of the country which are affected. They come primarily from the most thickly populated centers. I see the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] sitting here listening with great attention to the Senator from New Mexico, and I say to him that New York has greater power in the Government of this country than has any other State. Those experts——

Mr. WHEELER. New York not only has greater power than any other State, but than any other dozen States have.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was speaking and did not hear the Senator.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I think the remarks of the Senator from Montana were very appropriate. He said New York has greater power than—not any other State, but any other dozen States.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I accept the amendment. I was about to remark that the experience and training of most of the individuals who are in charge of these programs have been chiefly in the large centers of population. They are educators, they are economists, they are philanthropists, or else they were the employees of philanthropists, and they do not understand the common, ordinary citizen who works his own way and makes his own living. It is only natural that when they lay down theoretical rules the gears are constantly clashing. That is particularly true, of course, with respect to the petroleum situation, with which the Senator from New Mexico is so familiar. The public-land States, of which New Mexico is one, and Wyoming another, produce great quantities of petroleum. Japan has invaded the oil fields of the Dutch Indies, and has taken over those sources of oil. Germany is hammering at the gates of the Caucasus in search of oil. It requires no expert to tell us that petroleum is one of the most necessary of all the materials to be used in the prosecution of the war. We have great deposits of it in the United States, and, as the Senator from New Mexico says, we are curtailing its production.

Mr. HATCH. We are curtailing the production of oil, we are curtailing the operations of the refineries in my State, and now we propose to curtail the use of oil. I simply wish to make one observation at this point. I invited comment by the Senator from Wyoming because I know how he thinks. He thinks, generally, as I think, and therefore I think he is a very smart man. If the present policies of curtailing the use of oil, the production of oil, and the exploration of lands for oil and gas are continued, and if the war shall last for a long period of time, as some say it will, some of these days we shall wake up and find that we have been as short-sighted with respect to oil as we were with respect to rubber.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Is it not a fact that by the curtailment of the operations of the oil industry, particularly by cutting off the opportunity for the independent operators, we are destroying the root from which this industry will grow?

Mr. HATCH. Absolutely. That is one of the things I wanted to mention. The independent oil operator is the man who goes out and wildcats, spends his money, and develops the new fields. I say that without fear of any contradiction whatsoever.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWARTZ in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. It is the little fellow who goes out and discovers oil, but it is the big oil company which comes in and grabs it away from him.

Mr. HATCH. I shall tell the Senate what will happen if the plan continues. I shall tell the Senate what has already been done in my State. By curtailing the production, by the pipe lines refusing to take even the small amount allowable for production, they are already forcing certain of the independent operators who pledged their money and their credit to the banks, to the point where they will soon have to go into bankruptcy. Then what will happen? Who steps in and takes over the independent when he goes broke? It is the majors, the large companies, that get it every time. I do not say that with any disrespect. I have a very high regard for any man—and also for associations or companies—who can go out and by his own efforts, his own judgment, take advantage of whatever situation exists, and profit himself. That is a part of our system. But I shall make the prediction, that if the present plan continues in operation the major oil companies are going to own practically all the lands which have been explored and developed by the independents; they are going to own those lands at a price of their own fixing, and they will make far more, Mr. President, than they ever paid the Government in income taxes or otherwise. I had really not intended to discuss that question.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it is a subject which is well worthy of discussion, because the process which the Senator has mentioned——

Mr. HATCH. It is going on now.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Yes; but it will be carried another step, and that, Mr. President, is equally appalling, because when the major oil companies have succeeded in obtaining complete control of all our resources of oil, and the independent has been driven out, then we shall be confronted with the demand that the Government step in to take the place of the big monopoly. That is happening not only in the case of oil, it is happening in other fields as well. We are to discuss here presently, when the Senate takes up the bill which it has been agreed shall be considered today, a measure reported by the Banking and Currency Committee to authorize the R. F. C. to subsidize practically every industry in the country. That means that the authors of that bill see what the Senator from New Mexico sees in the case of oil—the destruction of the little business of this country, the destruction of the root of our economy by which it has been maintained free and independent.

Mr. President, I venture to say that there are gentlemen in the executive branch of the Government who understand the old socialist theory which welcomed the growth of monopoly, because those who held that theory believed that when finally monopoly became so big that it controlled all the activities of the people, then the Government would step in and take over the monopoly.

There, Mr. President, we have the growth from private arbitrary control over the welfare of the people into public arbitrary control, or, to use the current words, fascism against communism. National socialism, of which Hitler is the chief protagonist, is the culmination of the steady expansion of private arbitrary power, and we are permitting this process to go on under our very noses.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The investigation which we have carried on with reference to rubber through the so-called Gillette committee indicates quite clearly that not only are we to have a monopoly of oil and oil products, but the big oil companies and those who are associated with them are to come out of the war with an absolute, complete monopoly on rubber in the United States.

Who are the 8 or 10 men who are at present in charge of saying who shall manufacture rubber? Check them over. The man at the head of the Rubber Division of the R. F. C. comes from the Mellon Institute. The Mellon Institute is dominated by Mr. Mellon's group, which is interested in oil. The Carbon and Carbide Co. uses the oil process for the manufacture of rubber. The Government is turning over to the large oil companies the manufacture of rubber. So after the war is over they will not only control oil, gasoline, and other petroleum products, but they will likewise have a monopoly upon all the rubber produced in the United States.

I am reliably informed, by persons who ought to know, that, as a matter of fact, the oil process has not been completely proved. It is not definitely known whether it can be used on a large scale for the manufacture of rubber. There is no certainty about it. We hear much talk about producing rubber from gasoline, by turning gasoline into alcohol and then producing butadiene. It is not at all certain that rubber can be so produced on a large scale, although it is hoped that it can be done. Witnesses before the committee have testified that rubber can be produced from grain alcohol.

The Government could set up small plants operated by small independent concerns, without putting its eggs all in one basket. Go down the line of the men in the War Production Board and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Every single one of them is either connected with an oil company or with some large rubber company which is tied up in some way with the great oil companies.

We hear much talk about little businessmen, and enacting legislation to help the little businessmen. Everything we are doing tends in the direction of turning industry over to the big interests of the country, which will, unless something is done about it, have complete control of the industries in the United States when the war is over.

Mr. HATCH. I am afraid the Senator from Montana is correct. The remarks which he has made are in line with what the Senator from Wyoming has said, and with what I believe. While I did not intend to bring up this subject, that is the result of what is going on in my State, in connection with rationing and curtailment of the uses of gasoline.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me trespass on the Senator's time to add another comment in which I know he and other Senators who are listening will be very much interested.

Several weeks ago this body passed a bill which was recommended by the Banking and Currency Committee, after studies by the so-called Little Business Committee, of which the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is chairman. That measure was designed to provide aid for little business. When the measure was under consideration in the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives an amendment was offered dealing with a subject matter which had been under study by the Judiciary Committee of the House and the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, namely, the request of the War and Navy Departments that the antitrust laws be suspended, as it were, with respect to all war contracts. In substance, that was the request of the War Department and the Navy Department.

The distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], chairman of the Judiciary Committee, and the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee, Hon. HATTON SUMNERS, introduced practically identical bills, the purpose of which was to grant this exemption, but at the same time to preserve the authority of the Department of Justice, which is clothed with the responsibility and duty of enforcing the antitrust laws.

To the little-business bill, intended to protect and shield little business, in the other Chamber there has been added, without any protection for the Department of Justice, the bill which has been suggested by the War Department and the Navy Department to protect big business. Presently that measure will pass the House and will come to the Senate.

Before the House had acted, the Senate Committee on the Judiciary had already decided to hold hearings upon this proposal in order that there might be made to the Congress a report as to what the effect would be upon the antitrust laws and upon little businesses, which, we hope, are to be protected by the antitrust laws. Those hearings will begin on Thursday morning, and the Attorney General has indicated that he will appear to testify. He was requested to appear.

In connection with what the Senator from New Mexico has said, and what has been said by the Senator from Montana, it seems to me to be of striking significance that upon a measure which was initiated in Congress for the protection of little business there has been engrafted, without public hearings, an amendment the sole purpose of which is to protect big business and to preserve monopoly from the effects of the antitrust laws.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Wyoming. I am not at all suprised that this amendment has been grafted onto the bill, as he mentioned. Big business is ably represented in Washington. The only voice which little business has is the voice of Mem-

bers of Congress. Some of us who happen to believe that the welfare of the country is better served by serving the greater number of citizens are the only protection which little business has.

A while ago the Senator from Wyoming said something about the intelligence of those in some of the departments who make the rules and regulations which we authorize them to make. I am reminded of an actual instance which occurred in 1934 or 1935, at the time of the great drought in the West. Our cattle were dying. We had no grass, and there was nothing for them to eat. A cattle-killing program was inaugurated. It seemed very unwise, but nevertheless it saved the cattlemen in my section of the country. In the very first days of that program we in New Mexico were required to ship our cattle to Kansas City and elsewhere to be slaughtered. I went to the Department to protest against it, because when our poor old cows, consisting of nothing but skin and bones, reached the point where they were to be slaughtered they did not bring enough to pay the freight.

I was trying to outline the situation to the gentleman in charge. Suddenly he said, "Senator, that proves to me a thing for which I have long contended." I did not know just what it was. However, I was polite, and said, "What is it?" He said, "You people in the West raise your cattle too far from the market." I almost fell over. That was an actual occurrence. He said, "You people in the West raise your cattle too far from the market." I was still trying to be very polite and courteous. I happened to think of what was said in 1932, that if a Democratic administration should be elected grass would grow in the city streets. I said "You are entirely correct. We do raise our cattle too far from the market. Whenever you start grass growing in the city streets we shall bring our cattle to the cities to graze them."

That is only an example, Mr. President.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I should like to bring another example to the Senator's attention. It affects his State, as well as the States of Wyoming, Colorado, and other western States.

The Office of Defense Transportation issued an order to the effect that when trucks go out to make deliveries they must return loaded. So far as cities in Montana, New Mexico, Wyoming, and other Western States are concerned, of course, that is impossible. Trucks go out from small distributing centers, such as Butte, Billings, Albuquerque, and Cheyenne, to distribute goods to the smaller communities. There is nothing they can bring back. If that order were put into effect the result would be that the small distributing points and the little truckers would be put out of business. I cite that as an example, because it shows how the officials in Washington make such orders. They make them because of the fact that they are thinking of New York City, Chicago, Boston, and other larger centers; but apparently they have no conception of how business is carried on in small communities in the Middle West and the West, and probably in most of the southern States. If such regulations were generally put into effect the whole transportation and distribution system of the country would be completely upset.

After the matter was called to the attention of the administration I understand that arrangements were made for hearings; and, of course, it will be found that it is an absolute impossibility to enforce any order of that kind.

Mr. HATCH. On the point about which the Senator is speaking, officials are sent out to hold hearings and develop testimony about things which any lad should know.

Mr. WHEELER. Exactly.

Mr. HATCH. Any lad should know them if he studies his geography and knows anything at all about distances; but the departments have to send persons to hold hearings; someone is given a job to develop that information.

Fort Sumner, N. Mex., is the county seat of De Baca County. I do not know what the population is; it is not very large. A man who lives there and runs a grocery store there wrote me a letter a few days ago about this matter. He said:

> All our groceries now come from the distributing center by truck. That is the way we buy them.

I suppose they could be shipped by rail; but, anyway, the most convenient and economical way is to use trucks.

He further said:

> They say that before this truck can bring a load of groceries from Amarillo or Albuquerque or Clovis to Fort Sumner that truck must be promised a load of something to go back to Amarillo or Albuquerque or Clovis.

Fort Sumner does not have anything to load and send back. I suppose the people in Fort Sumner should do without groceries because they do not have anything to send back in the trucks. Oh, Mr. President, that is an impossible situation.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It is only fair to add, after the preceding discussion, that the Office of Defense Transportation and the Motortruck Division have indicated to me—and, I am sure, to other Senators—their willingness to alter the regulations. I think it is only necessary to call the situation to the attention of the officials in order to make clear the necessity for an amendment; and I have every reason to believe that a change will be formally made within a few days.

Last week I telegraphed those who had sent inquiries to me from Wyoming and said that, upon the basis of the assurances I had received, I was confident that such a modification would be made and that trucks would be permitted to make deliveries and go back empty if goods could not be found for them to transport on the return trip.

Mr. HATCH. I thank the Senator from Wyoming. I think he is exactly correct. I have not found the departments at all unreasonable when such things are called to their attention. I have found them quite willing to do whatever is necessary and proper.

That is what I am doing today. So far as rationing of gasoline is concerned, I am trying to call the attention of the departments to the unreasonableness of imposing restrictions in States in which there is an abundance of gasoline. I not only want to call their attention to the unreasonableness of their position, but to the danger it involves to the development and production of oil and gasoline. I wish to call their attention to the fact that if they continue to drive out the independent producer, destroy him financially, and let the major companies take over all the oil lands, some day we shall confront as serious a shortage in oil as that which we now have in rubber. I wish to call their attention to the further fact that when they talk about the potentials of oil they do not know what they are talking about. They tell us, "Oh, we have many billions of barrels of oil stored under ground." How do they know that? They say, "The fields have been proved." Do Senators know what proves an oil field? Only one thing proves it, and that is a bit going down. We may talk about "potentials," but we do not know until we obtain actual production. I have had a little experience in such matters.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. HATCH. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Let me ask the Senator if it is not a fact that the proof of which he has spoken is not infallible? Is it not a fact that often when they drill into oil, the oil spurts forth from the ground, and they say they have a thousand-barrel well; a 5,000-barrel well, or some other sized well, when the facts may be that, first, the field may be very small, and, second, it may be very shallow. It may have a superabundance of gas which may give all the appearance of the existence of a great oil pool, when in a few days it may be gone.

Mr. HATCH. Of course, the Senator is correct; and he knows, because he comes from an oil-producing State. My impression is that that oil is rapidly disappearing.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. There is no doubt of it.

Mr. HATCH. When Government officials speak of "potentials," they do not know what they are talking about.

Let me give another illustration from my personal experience. Several years ago a few of us went to Archer County, Tex., and bought 40 acres of land which were completely surrounded by producing wells. We were going to drill an oil well, and we wanted to obtain a location where there was no doubt at all about our obtaining production. So we drilled. I was on my way back to Washington, and I missed this experience; but we received a telegram saying that they had touched the sand. The casing was set and cemented, and everything was done to bring in an oil well. The story afterward told to me was that when the sand was tapped there was about a gallon of oil in the well. The casing was set, and all

the men who were interested came there to see the well brought in. The drill immediately went into salt water. The gallon of oil they had when they first touched the sand was all they got.

That is what I mean when I say that it is impossible to tell anything about "potentials." It is said that there are worlds of oil in east Texas. However, I venture the assertion that east Texas is today producing all the oil it can safely produce; and if those wells were opened to full capacity the salt water would soon encroach, and the field would be gone.

I want to have the departments use reason and intelligence, if possible. I want the people of my State to have the privilege of producing as much oil as they can reasonably and safely produce. I want them to have the privilege of consuming as much gasoline as they may find it necessary to consume, and yet not be in conflict with the defense program or anything that is necessary in order to carry on the defense program, whether it be the saving of rubber or anything else. If it is proper, well and good; we shall agree to it. It does not make any difference what the requirements may be, if they are necessary. All I ask is that only necessary regulations be imposed. If they are not necessary, I do not want my people to have someone in Washington teaching them how to save, or forcing them into any position which they would not otherwise occupy.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks there may be printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a letter received by me from the Honorable John E. Miles, Governor of New Mexico, and also a telegram, a newspaper article, and sundry editorials.

There being no objection, the letter and other matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
Santa Fe, May 20, 1942.

Hon CARL A. HATCH
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: Regarding press reports of a proposed Nation-wide rationing of gasoline:

Serious and irreparable damage to New Mexico's economy may result. Loss in employment, in State revenues, in business generally may pauperize New Mexico.

If the tire situation is so critical that it must be controlled through controlling gasoline sales, then such control should be based on the degree of need for tire conservation. Any rationing program undertaken should be determined upon the basis of effecting a balance between gasoline sales and available rubber.

If that is done, there should be no complaint. But careful and detailed investigation, not estimates and guess work, should determine the balance between available rubber and possible gasoline sales over a period of time.

New Mexico is faced with the loss of $30,000,000 worth of tourist business a year as only one factor in gasoline rationing. We are willing to make that sacrifice if it aids the war effort. The war effort must come first, and we need only the assurance that any measures taken are vitally necessary to the war effort.

Aside from the loss of revenue to New Mexico business, the State government faces a tremendous loss of gasoline taxes, in severance taxes, in income taxes. Our oil fields will practically close down, throwing men out of employment all along the line. Businesses will close up, resulting not only in unemployment but likewise a tremendous decrease in war-bond purchases.

All of these matters should be taken into consideration and weighed carefully in any plans for Nation-wide gasoline rationing that is not devised on a scientific basis to effect a balance between gasoline sales and available rubber.

We realize that when the rubber supply is exhausted we will face a situation where there is no need for gasoline. We don't want to invite that condition either. There must be, therefore, a scientific and happy medium whereby we can continue to operate our automobiles on a reduced scale that will further the war effort without completely disrupting our economy.

Yours very sincerely,
JOHN E. MILES,
Governor.

ALBUQUERQUE, N. MEX., *May 26, 1942.*

Senator CARL HATCH:

We, the undersigned Albuquerque businessmen, beg you to do everything possible to forestall any drastic gas rationing in New Mexico. Eastern seaboard gallonage plan will be nothing short of disaster, we feel, for Western States.

H. E. LEONARD.
CARMON NAWL.
G. L. CRISTWELL.
E. P. ROBINSON.
O. C. HISEY.

[From the Albuquerque (N. Mex.) Journal of May 22, 1942]

IF NECESSARY, YES

Of course, as loyal Americans, we must make every necessary sacrifice to win the war. We are glad to do that.

However, just as some citizens can serve best in the armed forces, some in the industries producing war munitions, and some in strictly civil capacities, so it is with the various sections of the Nation.

Some parts of the country are best adapted by geographical and other conditions to produce foods and meats and the raw materials for clothing, machinery, and fuel. Others are best equipped to deliver the manufactured things that will win the war in the battle areas and supply the needs of the home front.

It is the same in the matter of sacrifices of necessities and luxuries. Because of geographical, transportation, and other factors, some parts of the Nation may of necessity be required to give up things that are available in plenty in other areas. And the situation doubtless is reversed as to other articles.

In its rationing and priorities system, the Government should take note of these factors. It should impose sacrifices where there is necessity, but not require them in localities where there is no such necessity. It should take note of compensating factors. Industrial areas enjoying booming war manufacturing pay rolls can more easily get along on reduced gasoline rations, doubtless, than sparsely settled places whose chief incomes are derived from the oil industry, farms, and ranches, and where transportation between town and country is a factor that cannot be overlooked.

Governor Miles was correct in asking our delegation in Congress to insist on a thorough study of the need for gasoline rationing in New Mexico and States similarly situated and where motor fuel is easily obtained, before it is clamped on.

West Texas is with Governor Miles and other New Mexicans in questioning the necessity for gasoline rationing in this part of the Nation. The Amarillo News, doubtless speaking the views of thousands of west Texans, says in part:

"Our contention is that such rationing is unnecessary. We have the oil and the refineries right in our own back yard, and since the problem of long-haul transportation alone is responsible for rationing in the East, we can't understand why we should have to submit to sympathy rationing here.

"But, say our critics, such rationing—if it is decided upon—would be instituted as a means of Nation-wide rubber saving. We are going blithely about our business as usual, wearing out tires in the fond belief that everything will turn out for the best, they say. We replied that many other restrictions are being established to cut down tire mileage, and that the sudden shutting down of the great gasoline industry would do more harm than good to the war effort."

Then, to be fair about the matter, The News prints "the other side" as set forth by the Office for Emergency Management, quoting arguments for rationing that have been published also in New Mexico.

[From the Roswell (N. Mex.) Morning Dispatch]

GASOLINE RATIONING

Announcement that gasoline rationing may be extended to all parts of the United States was not unexpected but will be met by a questioning public. Chief question will be, "Why extend the rationing to areas where it is not essential?" And we consider it only fair to inquire.

Governmental officials in announcing this possibility advanced two reasons for it: First, to conserve rubber, which they state is wearing away at the rate of 250,000 pounds per day and is irreplaceable; and, second, to conserve the shipping facilities of the Nation for the movement of gasoline and oil to the Eastern States, where the shortage has already reached the acute state, necessitating rationing in 17 eastern seaboard States.

It was readily admitted that, insofar as the country as a whole is concerned, there is no shortage of either gasoline or oil. Those who have seen the steady curtailment of production in the oil fields of the Southwest realize that we have more than an adequate supply for this Nation.

Throughout the Southwest there are areas, fed by established pipe lines, where transportation is today not a problem. In fact, the entire midcontinent area can be supplied without any serious transportation difficulties.

Too many stories have been told of the gasoline shortage in the East for us to draw any concrete conclusions at the present time. It should be remembered, however, that when some 50 tankers were transferred to Britain a false shortage loomed—and was met by railroad transportation. The railroads announced that they were ready to do the job, with plenty of tank cars available at that time. The trouble, it was contended, was a lack of facilities for handling the oil after it arrived in the East, as practically all had been water borne before that time.

There has been a serious loss of shipping since that date. How serious we don't know, but oil men readily admit that ocean transportation is practically a thing of the past at the present time. For that reason rationing is probably a necessity on the east coast. For the rest of the country, we believe that normal needs can be met.

Unless there is some plan for reclaiming the present "rolling stock" of rubber which is being exhausted so rapidly, there is little percentage in conserving it through this plan. Tire men have claimed that stocks of rubber deteriorate after about 3 years, and claim that there are on hand today enough tires already manufactured to supply the needs of this country for several years to come, with conservative use.

Is this stock of tires to be reclaimed for the use of the armed forces? If so, well and good. We will gladly give our own bald-headed tires to the cause, and so will most other residents of this area. But if nonessential activities are to continue; if the manufactured tires are to be allowed to deteriorate in the warehouses of the Nation, why should the oil business be penalized?

And penalized it will be. We of New Mexico, Texas, and Oklahoma have watched with growing alarm the steadily diminishing production allowable in our own oil fields. Prospects are that the present low production levels will be cut in half in the immediate future.

The oil business will play an important part in the victory in this war. Oil and gasoline are needed by our armed forces and production must be continued. The inevitable result of the present situation, if the rationing plan is carried out, is Government subsidy of oil production and refining. That is one result that has been constantly feared not only by the producers and refiners themselves but by the States, which have a vital stake in the oil business. It could easily lead to the end of private enterprise in this field unless care is exercised.

Frankly, all citizens of this part of the country want to do their part. But, come what may, they should seek to protect their industry in the future.

[From the Roswell (N. Mex.) Daily Record of May 19, 1942]

That gasoline rationing in the Eastern States may work to the advantage of the Western States, where there is gasoline in plenty and where the chief problem is finding markets and transportation for the products of the oil wells and oil refineries. Dwindling markets, because of lack of transportation, already has hit the western oil areas, and there seems to be a demand among short-sighted people in the East to apply gasoline rationing even where there is plenty of gasoline and where such rationing would not only work a needless hardship but actually would greatly damage oil men uselessly and also would seriously curtail the ability of the oil areas to contribute effectively to the war program.

But here is how it might aid the oil areas and the vacation States in the areas where gasoline is plentiful: Reports from the rationed areas are that those taking vacations are now heading westward for the areas where gasoline is to be had in unlimited quantities. That might bring a flood of vacationers to the West to balance some of the losses coming from the various rationing programs and war restrictions imposed and in process of being imposed.

One of our advantages in New Mexico is that we live in a great vacation land, the full scope of which few of us really realize at present. The entire State is a great vacation area, with many unique features to be obtained in no other part of our country.

We have beautiful mountains and valleys, broad plains, and fertile farm lands, but many other States have these. We in New Mexico, however, have an ancient civilization here that is found in such profusion in no other section of the country. We have the oldest city in the country; we have a dead people found in our ancient ruins that attract many; we have vast canyons and the deep Carlsbad Cavern; we have vast lava fields and dead volcanoes, petrified forests, wonderful fishing and hunting in season—a vast multitude of natural wonders and scenic features to be found in no other part of the country.

All of these things have brought us a host of tourists from year to year, increasing in numbers with each year and now affected by the war. Just how much this will cut the flow of visitors to our State remains to be seen, but there is the possibility that is shown in eastern reports, that the gas rationing may head vacation seekers this way, always keeping in mind the serious shortage in rubber that eventually will greatly affect all owners and users of automobiles.

NO GAS RATIONING HERE

The idea of imposing rationing of gasoline here where the problem is not scarcity of gasoline but enough market for it to keep oil wells and refineries going is regarded locally as pure lunacy. If imposed it will not save rubber and it will hamper the war program.

A recent editorial in the Amarillo News speaks to the point about this and we quote only a few brief paragraphs from it:

"But we do know there is no logical reason for rationing in this part of the country. In fact, rationing here would actually interfere with the war effort. There is no general shortage of gasoline. Our supplies are greater today, after 5 months of war, than they were last year.

"It is reported that some refineries already are closing down. Others are restricting production drastically. Many refineries in the Southwest turn out high-octane gasoline for aviation, and to restrict dangerously the normal operations of these plants might interfere with the production of essential fuels for the war effort.

"One cause for rationing in the Southwest is that tires must be conserved. That, it seems to us, already is taken care of. We just can't buy any more of them. One minor official went so far as to say that such rationing would help discipline the public for the war effort.

"Hasn't it been made clear by now that the public is willing, even eager, to go the limit in sacrificing for the war, as long as the sacrifice is sensible and reasonable? We don't need discipline. It's silly to throw out of gear an industry needed in the war effort merely to give the public an unnecessary lesson in sacrifice.

"If Washington wants to know how we feel about the prospect, let's tell them—loudly and frequently."

[From the Roswell (N. Mex.) Daily Record of May 22, 1942]

Gasoline rationing in New Mexico, where there is no gasoline problem, would threaten the State highway program very seriously, not merely the construction which can be delayed but the maintenance of the State's highways, which might be vitally necessary in the war and also, perhaps, the payment of the State's highway debentures.

Word from State officials shows that they are seriously disturbed over this proposed rationing of gasoline where it is not needed, but where it is proposed to place it into effect.

New Mexico's problems from proposed moves in the national war program are many and serious, aside from the proposed rationing of gasoline.

New Mexico is a vacation land, and the revenue left in the State each year by tourists has been estimated to run from sixty to eighty million dollars. That is likely to be heavily cut into by gasoline rationing, and if this rationing is made Nation-wide, including areas where there is no scarcity of gasoline, this State's tourist revenue will be heavily reduced.

Another place where we will be injured by the proposed war program is in reduced sales-tax revenues, coming about from restrictions placed upon retail trade, much of it necessary but some of it seemingly unnecessary and useless as a war measure. Our public schools are largely supported by this sales tax, and a drop in revenue there would do them great injury, something that is unthinkably bad.

The decrease in sales of oil and gasoline in the State might easily break many of the oil operators and refiners, and all to very little effect upon the Nation's war program.

If it is necessary to save rubber to the extent that the Federal officials claim, then the best way to do it would be to take over, by purchase, of course, all of the rubber stocks, the tires, and as much as could be spared from auto transportation. That would mean that millions of motorists would be obliged to lay up their cars or to dispose of them to the Government. That would be better than simply closing up the oil and refining industries in various sections of the country, including New Mexico.

The American people are anxious to make all necessary sacrifices to win the war, but they do not want to be pushed around unnecessarily.

[From the Roswell (N. Mex.) Daily Record of May 17, 1942]

In the Eastern States where gasoline and oil have to be transported by sea, rail, or truck, rationing has been imposed, because of a scarcity of transportation facilities due to the war. They don't like it at all, that much is evident already.

And now comes the proposal that a general rationing plan be imposed all over the country, even where there is oil and gasoline in abundance and no scarcity at all. What would this do to eastern New Mexico?

Well, here is what it would do. Already the oil-producing areas here have been heavily hit, the producers, the State through falling tax receipts, and the wage earners because of dwindling employment in the oil industry. There is no scarcity of oil or gasoline here, for no transportation problem is involved. We are already badly hurt in the industry by the lack of markets for the products of the wells and of the refineries.

Cutting down on local consumption would not help the war effort in the slightest way, but rather it would injure it. It would make thousands less able to pay taxes for the war effort; it would hurt the State and county revenues, and would uselessly injure local business.

Rationing of gasoline and oil for the motorists in the East may annoy them, but it does not injure them in the way it does the areas where oil men and refineries have been cut off from their usual markets. For instance, New Mexico has been cut to 73,000 barrels of oil daily, when it can produce many millions of barrels daily.

Imposing rationing of gasoline where there is plenty of it would do great local harm. Only one benefit can be seen in it, the possible saving of rubber, and that only in the event that the Federal authorities take over the tires and tubes now being used by motorists.

Gasoline rationing in New York and in other States where there is a scarcity of gasoline may be annoying to the people there, but it is far less harmful to them then it is to the people of the areas where there is plenty of gasoline and oil.

[From the El Paso (Tex.) Times]

WE HAVE GASOLINE

While the determination seems to be growing in Washington to force rationing of gasoline on the entire Nation, regardless of whether or not it is necessary, residents of this section of the country are justified in taking a look around to see what the situation is out here.

All of us sympathize with residents of district No. 1, comprising the east coast. They have been rationed on gasoline because it has not been possible to get enough to them because of war conditions.

But is that any reason to ration us?

In district No. 3, which comprises New Mexico, Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Oklahoma, there is no

need for rationing of gasoline, because a sufficient supply is in storage tanks, and can be made, to meet our needs.

Refineries are hard pushed to make enough fuel oil for the railroads; and whenever fuel oil is made, gasoline has to be made, too. As a consequence, it would mean that storage would be full of gasoline which would have to be disposed of in some manner if gasoline rationing were put into effect.

We also have sufficient transportation facilities to take care of our delivery needs without the use of tank cars, and we have been releasing tank cars to haul products to the east coast.

The eastern people are using the excuse that it would save tires by rationing gasoline. That may be true to a certain extent, but a far better plan than laying up a car would be to use it moderately at moderate speeds, which would keep the tires alive. Tires which have been used and then are laid up deteriorate very rapidly.

Taking everything into consideration, and figuring that the producers are having the proration of crude cut back in this district, the fact that we have long distances to travel, and not so many means of transportation that they have on the east coast, there can be no real reason for rationing of gasoline in District No. 3.

Harold Ickes has been quoted as saying that gasoline may be rationed out here as a means of impressing upon the public the fact that we are engaged in a tough war. Most of us know that already, and there is no reason to cripple our means of transportation any more than absolutely necessary.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Times-Herald of May 26, 1942]

NATION-WIDE GAS RATION PLAN DRAWS PROTESTS IN SENATE—BOARD MEETING TO DECIDE ISSUE TODAY; JUNE 1 CURTAILMENTS FOR OREGON DROPPED

(By Hal Foust)

Senator CHARLES L. MCNARY (Republican), of Oregon, said yesterday he was informed by the Office of Petroleum Coordinator Harold Ickes that plans have been dropped to ration gasoline in Oregon effective June 1.

His announcement added to confusion on the eve of today's meeting of the War Production Board to decide on a Nation-wide gas ration program, effective probably on July 1.

WOULD BE ADDED JUNE 1

Two weeks ago, the Office of Price Administration announced Oregon and Washington would be added on June 1 to the 17 Atlantic seaboard States and the District of Columbia where motor fuel consumption has been curtailed since May 15.

MCNARY said he did not know whether the reason for the change in the plan as far as his State is concerned was due to an improvement in local petroleum supplies or to the imminence of a Nation-wide gas ration as a rubber conservation measure.

Meanwhile Democratic and Republican Senators joined yesterday in protests against a proposed Nation-wide rationing of gasoline as a rubber conservation measure. There was an apparent consensus that the public, due mainly to conflicting utterances by the bureaucrats, was not convinced of the necessity for the hardship.

Even in the 17 Eastern States, where the shortage of gasoline is generally appreciated, there has been grumbling from the present regional restrictions on motor-fuel consumption.

WILL MEET TODAY

The voices from the Senate were heard as the War Production Board was prepared to meet today to decide on a Nation-wide gasoline rationing. The program is being developed by Joseph B. Eastman, head of the Office of Defense Transportation, on War Production Board advice the military will require all available rubber supplies for the next 2 years.

"We will make any sacrifice necessary to win the war," said Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG (Republican), of Michigan, in a telegram to Price Administrator Leon Henderson, the ration boss, "but we are entitled to know indisputably that the sacrifice is indispensable and unavoidable."

ONE THING, THEN ANOTHER

"You can't expect them to cooperate," said Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK (Democrat), of South Carolina, "when the War Production Board says one thing, the Petroleum Coordinator says another, and Jesse Jones still another."

"It will be hard to convince people in the oil-producing States they can't have gasoline," said Senator EDWIN C. JOHNSON (Democrat) of Colorado. "Furthermore, the ration proponents shouldn't overlook the fact an idle tire deteriorates about as rapidly as one that is used moderately."

"Perhaps the principal source of this trouble," said Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY (Democrat), of Wyoming, "is that Congress has delegated too much of its authority to executives who don't understand conditions in the country."

$400,000,000 INDUSTRY

VANDENBERG said the proposed gasoline rationing would wreck the $400,000,000-a-year tourist industry in his State. Wisconsin's revenue from recreational motoring is approximately as large as Michigan's.

"A reasonable rationing of vacations," said the Michigan Senator, "would be preferable to their elimination through the gasoline restriction."

VANDENBERG urged other conservation measures—such as strict speed limits and the pooling of car usage—should be explored before gas rationing jeopardizes transportation.

Mr. HATCH subsequently said: Mr. President, after I had concluded the remarks I made earlier in the day on the oil situation, I returned to my office and found a letter which enclosed a clipping from the Daily Oklahoman, to the effect that the R. F. C. is now making oil loans to producers. I ask that the clipping be incorporated in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

I wish to say further that I was familiar with the policy which has been adopted by the R. F. C., of making loans on banking collateral. In my opinion it is an improvement on the policy which has heretofore been adopted by the R. F. C., but it does not at all meet the situation which I attempted to discuss earlier in the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

There being no objection, the clipping was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION OIL LOANS

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation stands ready to lend money to oil producers who have good collateral, Jesse Jones, Reconstruction Finance Corporation chairman told National Petroleum News.

"The Reconstruction Finance Corporation does not usually make loans to oil producers, but these are unusual times and we are now prepared to make such loans, if the producer has good collateral," Jones said:

Asked if legislation were needed to aid such program, Jones replied:

"No; all that a producer has to do is go into any Reconstruction Finance Corporation office and apply for a loan. And if he has good collateral, he'll get it."

Mr. ELLENDER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD following the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] a timely editorial from the Times-Picayune, published in the city of New Orleans, of date May 21, 1942, entitled "Let Us Have Rational Rationing."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S HAVE RATIONAL RATIONING

Submarine destruction of tankers has sharply reduced oil and gasoline transport to the Atlantic seaboard. Gasoline stocks have declined so sharply in consequence that gasoline has been rationed there. "Misery," we long have been told, "loves company"—and perhaps that explains the suggestion of drastic gasoline rationing on the Nation-wide scale. The tentative forecast, put out to test the public reaction, suggests July 1 as the possible date of the Nation-wide clampdown.

Americans in vast majority are cheerfully willing to make whatever sacrifices are needed in this war emergency. With the exception of a few groups all have responded to every sound and justified appeal made to them thus far. Because of their patriotic readiness to do what is necessary for the war effort, they should not be imposed upon by demands for needless sacrifices. Rationing therefore should be thoroughly rational whenever and wherever invoked. And that goes, of course, for gasoline rationing present and proposed.

Drastic rationing of gasoline in areas where supplies are so abundant as to overtax available storage facilities, merely because the destruction of tankers has cut gasoline stocks in other areas pending restoration of transport facilities, would not in our judgment consist with common sense nor promote the common good. So proponents of Nation-wide rationing, unable to base it upon shortage of national supply, advocate it merely as a way to have tires. If that is the sole objective and conditions require it, the simple, direct, efficient way is to forbid the use of the tires or requisition them for national use.

If that is necessary, Americans will face the fact and make the required sacrifice. But the case for Nation-wide rationing of gasoline is weakened rather than strengthened by basing it solely upon the suggestion that gasoline rationing is a roundabout way of saving tires.

AMENDMENTS TO EMERGENCY FARM MORTGAGE ACT OF 1933

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2508.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2508) to amend the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; to amend the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended; to amend the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended; and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, by way of explanation, let me say that this

is a very brief bill for the purpose of extending the term of the Land Bank Commissioner. Under the terms of the law that position expires and the authority to make loans now made by the Land Bank Commissioner expires on the 1st of June, just a week from now. The work which the Commissioner does is very important. Hearings were held before the Committee on Banking and Currency. The measure was presented and supported by the administration. It is very desirable that it be passed, and in the Committee on Banking and Currency there was no objection to the passage of the bill. Quick action is necessary.

The bill would extend for 4 years the term and authority of the Land Bank Commissioner, and would increase his power as to the size of loans he may make, so that such loans may be equal in amount to loans made by the Federal land bank.

It may be appropriate to say that nearly 90 percent of the business of that system is now being transacted with the Land Bank Commissioner; and at this time there are thousands of applications for loans which would be suspended and ended unless the bill extending the power of the Land Bank Commissioner were enacted into law.

I have consulted with both the majority leader and the minority leader about calling up the bill. It is agreeable to both of them. So unless there is something further to be said regarding it, I am ready for a vote.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] was interested in the bill. He asked to be notified when it came up. I do not know what he intended to ask the Senator from Alabama. I sent for him when the discussion began.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator from Ohio was present in the committee when the bill was acted upon.

Mr. TAFT entered the Chamber.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that I have no objection to having the bill taken up. I joined in the report recommending its passage.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The bill has been taken up.

Mr. TAFT. I have no desire to speak on it.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the committee.

The CHIEF CLERK. The first amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency was, on page 1, after the enacting clause, to strike out:

That this act may be cited as the "Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act of 1942."

SEC. 2. The first paragraph of section 4 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (title 12, U. S. C. 672), is further amended by striking out the following: "Subject to the approval of the Federal Farm Loan Board and under such conditions as it may prescribe, the provisions of this act are extended to the island of Puerto Rico and the Territory of Alaska; and the Federal Farm Loan Board shall designate a Federal land bank, which is hereby authorized to establish a branch bank in Puerto Rico, and a Federal land bank, which is hereby authorized to establish a branch bank in the Territory of Alaska. Loans made by each such branch bank shall not exceed the sum of $25,000 to any one borrower and shall be subject to the restrictions and provisions of this act (U. S. C., title 12, ch. 7), except that each such branch bank may loan direct to borrowers, and, subject to such regulations as the Federal Farm Loan Board may prescribe, the rate charged borrowers may be 1½ percent in excess of the rate borne by the last preceding issue of farm-loan bonds of the Federal land bank with which such branch bank is connected: *Provided*, That no loan shall be made in Puerto Rico or Alaska by such branch bank for a longer term than 20 years," and substituting in lieu thereof the following: "Subject to the approval of the Farm Credit Administration and under such conditions as it may prescribe, the provisions of title II of this act, the Farm Credit Act of 1933, and any act amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto are extended to the island of Puerto Rico and to the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii."

SEC. 3. The act approved March 10, 1924, as amended (43 Stat. 17; title 12, U. S. C. 672), is further amended by striking out section 2 thereof.

SEC. 4. Section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (title 12, U. S. C. 781), is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new paragraph reading as follows:

"Nineteenth. To make available services, facilities, and personnel to the Land Bank Commissioner and/or the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation to aid in making loans and in servicing loans, real estate, or other assets situated in the continental United States exclusive of Alaska, or in the island of Puerto Rico."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, at the beginning of line 13, to strike out "Sec. 5. (a) The" and insert "That the", so as to read:

That the second sentence of section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended (title 12, U. S. C. 1016 (b)), is further amended by striking out the semicolon in said sentence and the following: "nor shall a loan in excess of $7,500 be made to any one farmer." and inserting in lieu thereof a period and the following: "The amount of loans to any one borrower shall in no case exceed a maximum of $50,000, but loans to any one borrower shall not exceed $25,000 unless specially approved by the Land Bank Commissioner, nor shall any one loan be for a less sum than $100, but preference shall be given to applications for loans of $10,000 and under."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 3, to strike out:

(b) The tenth sentence of said section 32, as amended (title 12, U. S. C. 1016 (g), is further amended by striking out the following: "Until June 1, 1942, the" and inserting in lieu thereof "The"; and by striking out the semicolon in said sentence and the following: "but no such loans shall be made by him after June 1, 1942, except for the purpose of refinancing loans previously made by him under this section."

And insert:

SEC. 2. The tenth sentence of such section 32, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 1, 1942" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1946."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 14, to strike out:

SEC. 6. Section 4 (b) of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, as amended (title 12, U. S. C. 1020d), is further amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"The Corporation is authorized and directed, upon the request of the Federal Land Bank of Baltimore made with the approval of the Farm Credit Administration, to purchase from said bank all its mortgages secured by real estate situated in the island of Puerto Rico and other securities for loans on such real estate, contracts for the sale of real estate and real estate situated in said island, and all other assets of every description of said bank situated in said island and pertaining to the business of the Puerto Rico branch of said bank, except cash, at a price agreed upon by the bank and the Corporation subject to approval by said Administration."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortage Act of 1933, as amended."

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. TAFT. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Green	Pepper
Austin	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hayden	Rosier
Barbour	Herring	Schwartz
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Holman	Smathers
Bone	Hughes	Smith
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Langer	Truman
Capper	Lee	Tunnell
Caraway	Lucas	Tydings
Chavez	McCarran	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wagner
Connally	Maloney	Walsh
Danaher	Maybank	Wheeler
Davis	Millikin	White
Doxey	Murdock	Wiley
Ellender	Norris	Willis
George	Nye	
Gerry	O'Daniel	

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDREWS in the chair). Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

EXTENSION OF POWERS OF THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7008, a bill to expand the powers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7008) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of $5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority, which had been reported from

the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I think it would be well for me to make a short general statement as to what the bill provides before we have the amendments stated.

The bill passed the House of Representatives in simple form—merely containing an authorization for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to add $5,000,000,000 to its outstanding indebtedness. Of course, in this day we deal in tremendous sums, and I want the Senate to know that in the consideration of the bill now before us we are dealing with a tremendous sum of money—$5,000,000,000 for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and $1,000,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation, a total of $6,000,000,000.

Ordinarily when we authorize the appropriation of money for these corporations it is expected that the money will be used for the purpose of making loans, and the major part of the money provided by the pending bill will be used for that purpose; but in the bill we are embarking on a program which will mean that a considerable part of the money will probably not be repaid to the Government of the United States and will be lost to the taxpayers.

I shall state the three principal provisions in the bill and then proceed to a brief explanation of them.

Section 1 provides $5,000,000,000 for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Section 3 provides $1,000,000,000 for the Commodity Credit Corporation. Section 2 authorizes the R. F. C. to engage in a rather new enterprise. The pending measure is a part of the price-control plan.

The situation which has arisen requires some explanation. By the general price order which became effective a few days ago a top limitation on prices was fixed by the Administration. That limitation, as is quite generally well known, is the highest price that was charged by any merchant during the month of March.

It has been discovered that it will be necessary to do one of two things, either to revise some of the price limitations or to assist some business enterprises which otherwise would be ruined by the operation of the law.

When it was discovered that this situation had arisen, and would arise again in other cases, the Administrator and his staff studied the plan which was adopted in Canada, as well as the plan adopted in England, to meet a similar situation. The administrators from both those countries stated that such a situation would arise here; and it has arisen. They strongly advised that in the operation of our law we retain the limitations which we had placed upon prices, and that we prevent a rise in prices, if that be possible. I think Mr. Henderson acquiesced in the views of the Canadian administrator when he said, "The greatest mistake you can make is to permit a puncturing of the ceiling."

We are not talking about small changes, and we do not intend in any way to subsidize merchants, or wholesalers, or others interested in the price structure, when the changes are slight and are due to inefficiency or kindred matters, but what we want to do, and what we propose to do by this bill, is to take care of losses which would be incurred and which have occurred by reason of extraordinary changes in costs due largely to the war and the efforts connected with the war.

The best example I can give is the coal situation. When the price order was under contemplation, coal was pretty largely carried from the coal fields to tidewater, we will say to Norfolk, Va., and from there hauled by water to the New England area. Likewise, as is well known, gasoline was to a large extent transported by tankers from Texas and Louisiana, from Gulf ports, and carried to Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, Boston, and other Atlantic seaboard points.

Because of the submarine menace and the unfortunate success the submarines have had, it is very difficult to transport gasoline and coal by water from the points of production to the points of consumption. The result has been, in the case of gasoline, for example, that a 20-cents-a-barrel freight rate by water is replaced by a $1.20 freight rate by rail. The railroads do not want the business; they would feel much better if they did not have it; but, of course, the only way in which we can safely get gasoline and coal from the producing areas to the consuming areas is by rail.

The question which presented itself to the Price Control Administration was, "Shall we permit rises in the prices, as is fully justified, of the products of the factories of New England which buy this coal and have to pay a dollar a ton more freight than they paid previously, or shall we as a Government assume that burden and pay the difference between the rail and the water rate?"

As I stated a few moments ago, a great deal of study was given to the subject. Consideration was given to the Canadian and British experience. Permitting the prices of the products of the coal-consuming plants of New England to go up of course would have two results. First, they are in competition with plants at Norfolk, Va.; in Pennsylvania, in West Virginia, in all the coal-producing areas, and the plants so located would have a much greater advantage than they now have over the New England plants, and plants in other sections of the country where coal is not produced. That would be the first result; there would be a very unfair competitive situation.

Secondly, if we permitted the prices to go up, there would be, as is well known to those of us who have studied somewhat intensively the price-control situation, a tendency to pyramid the increase. There would be a pyramiding, even a multiplication, of costs, which we think would have a much greater tendency toward inflation of prices, because the price of coal permeates the costs of practically all manufactured products.

Therefore, it was felt that it would be much better for the people as a whole to assume this additional burden, which is not the fault of the New England manufacturer, and not the fault of the midwestern manufacturer, but a condition brought about through the ravages of the common enemy of the country.

Mr. McNARY and Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield, and, if so, to whom?

Mr. BROWN. I think the Senator from Oregon rose first.

Mr. McNARY. I shall be glad indeed to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. McNARY. I returned to the Chamber but a moment ago, and I do not know whether the Senator from Michigan is discussing the Commodity Credit section or not.

Mr. BROWN. No; I had not reached that point yet.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. I shall not obtrude my views at this time, or the questions I wish to ask until the Senator reaches that point.

Mr. BROWN. Very well.

Mr. McNARY. I am very much interested in that section of the bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to hear the Senator discuss this phase of the matter: It seems to me that until we have a total price control, which includes wages, if we initiate subsidies to overcome differences in cost of production, we have virtually created such a situation that all wage increases can be charged to the Government through subsidies.

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator that it is not in the contemplation of any who are responsible for the proposed legislation that any subsidies should be paid because of the reasons to which the Senator has alluded.

Mr. VANDENBERG. There is not anything in the bill which would prevent it, is there?

Mr. BROWN. No; I think not, and I think it would be most difficult if we tried to spell out in detail each item which the R. F. C. or the Commodity Credit Corporation could cover by the operations contemplated by the bill. I think it is a matter we must leave to the administrative authorities. I am sure that if we were to spell out in the bill those items to be subsidized, it would be an invitation to a great many people who may come within the purview of the contemplated statute to ask for a subsidy. We want to hold the number to the lowest possible minimum, and it is the intent of the committee—and the testimony bears me out in the statement—that there should be subsidies only in cases where the necessity is attributable to the war and the conditions surrounding it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course, it seems to me, if the Senator will allow me to say so, that we once more confront another of those difficulties which arise when we attempt price control without also controlling wages, for certainly wages are a major factor in the costs of production to which the Senator has re-

ferred. Let us suppose, for the sake of the argument, that railroad rates, which the Senator is proposing to equalize by subsidies, would have to be increased because of a tremendous increase in railroad wages. Under his statement, as I understand it, that situation would be eligible for subsidy treatment under the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWN. I think it would be eligible, strictly speaking, under the language of the bill. In other words, it would be legal. But it is not within the contemplation of any of us that that kind of a cost should be subsidized. I, of course, have always taken the position, though there do not seem to be many who believe with me, that section 1 of the price-control bill, directing the War Labor Board to stabilize wages, is just as vital, just as potent in its direction to the Board as is section 2 in its direction to the Price Control Administrator to fix prices. I think the administrative authorities have failed fully to use the power and the policy and the direction given the War Labor Board by section 1 of the price-control bill, which is designed, in effect, to stabilize wages substantially as of the time when prices are stabilized. I think the President has from time to time intimated that that should be done, and I understand from the newspapers that such a proposal is in contemplation; but I have not seen from any recognized administrative authority a direct reference to section 1 of the price-control bill, which I think is powerful, potent, and sufficient to cover the wage situation.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Of course, the Senator leaves me in somewhat of a dilemma. I think his bill is perfectly sound, provided we have all-out Government control over all the factors entering into the cost of production. When I bring that to the Senator's attention, and suggest to him that the failure to control wages in connection with the other controls leaves that back door open, and leaves it open to subsidies under the bill, he tells me that I must rely upon the administrators, because I cannot rely upon the text of the law. I do not like to rely upon the administrators that much.

Mr. BROWN. I suppose I should not speak for anyone else, but I do not know of any member of the Banking and Currency Committee, including our experts, who can take the Price Control Act, as it is, and write into this amendment of the Price Control Act a provision which would spell out in detail just those costs which we might subsidize and those which we might not subsidize. I think that is not a task for a legislative body. I think it is one we must leave to the administrative authorities. I have misgivings about it; I have misgivings about the whole subject of subsidies; but I am confronted by this situation: Considering the unfortunate economic condition in which we find ourselves, is it better to adopt the subsidy plan—and everyone in the Government department says, "Do not use the word 'subsidy,'" but we have got to use it because that is what it is—or is it better to let the price-control ceiling go? We are caught in that dilemma, and while, as I have said, I have misgivings about the subsidy plan, I think it would be less damaging, since it would spread the cost on all the people of the country, than it would be to let prices go up.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I would agree with my colleague completely, provided the price control was an all-out and total control. I think that is the basis of our difficulty from start to finish.

Mr. BROWN. Of course, the Senator realizes that many of us had somewhat the same views the Senator implies he now has, but we were unable to get that kind of a price-control bill, and I have to use the tools I have, and perhaps not the tools I wish I had to meet this situation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I desire to submit to the Senator a case and have his answer so that I may better understand the application of this provision. In Pueblo, Colo., we had a very well equipped packing plant, and when the price-control ceiling was announced, that packing plant was forced to close its doors and lay off over 400 persons who were working for it. Under the bill the Senator is sponsoring, could such a business receive the so-called subsidy, or relief, or assistance, or help? Could it qualify under the language of the bill for assistance?

Mr. BROWN. If the principles which are contained in General Order No. 1 under the Price Control Act are applied, I fail to see how that concern could be injured as the Senator states it was, because it is permitted to charge the highest price it charged for its product during the month of March, which price is probably a little lower than the price, say, of April 15, or May 15, but, nevertheless, is supposed to be a price which it thought, with operating conditions as they then were, would enable it to continue its business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; that may be what it thought, but when it tried to operate under the price-control ceiling it discovered that it was losing $2.50 on each hog carcass it handled and about $10 on each beef carcass, and, of course, it simply had to close its doors. I was wondering whether this bill would provide any relief whatsoever to such a business.

Mr. BROWN. Unless the costs were costs which did not exist during the month of March, and which cannot be attributable to extraordinary conditions such as I have illustrated with respect to freight rates by water and by rail, I should say that the company could be provided no relief by this bill. If it is an ordinary business casualty, the loss being attributable perhaps, in some measure to price control, I do not think the Administrator should under the provisions of the bill give assistance to such corporation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The only new condition being, of course, the ceiling on prices.

Mr. BROWN. I should not think that would justify a subsidy.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. With respect to one matter with which the Senator dealt, I think there should be a correction. The Senator, I think, gave the impression that this subsidy would only be used in cases where the war interferes, as in the case of shipments of gasoline and coal. My understanding of Mr. Henderson's testimony is that he proposes that the subsidy may be used in any case in which he finds that the margin between the retail price he has fixed and the costs is too small for any distributor to operate within. I should think, therefore, it would cover just such a case as that of which the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] spoke, in which costs are increased because of some permitted increase of wages or increase in the cost of raw materials.

For instance, if the price of wheat should go up 15 cents, or even if it should not go up at all, Mr. Henderson might find it necessary, if he wants to hold the price of bread where it is, to subsidize millers so that flour might be sold to bakers at a price which would enable them to deliver bread at the price he has fixed. Mr. Henderson's testimony on pages 39 and 40 shows very clearly that there is a much broader purpose in his mind than merely dealing with special war conditions brought about by the submarine menace. I do not know whether the Senator meant to give that impression, but I think Mr. Henderson has a much broader idea in his mind.

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator that I tried to point out two causes. One is direct war damage, such as the destruction of tankers on the Atlantic Ocean. The other is costs which arise, as I think I phrased it, as a result of the war effort. I do not think those two phrases exclude an extraordinary rise in the price of wheat, which might be due, we will say, to a crop failure or some condition of that kind. That is an extraordinary situation, one which is not in the contemplation of those of us in charge of the bill at the present time; but if such a situation should arise I think there could be a subsidy.

My own view is that this power must be used very sparingly. I think Mr. Henderson used language to that effect. I certainly do not think that a case such as the one mentioned by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] would come within the intent of those who are proposing this amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to ask the Senator what standard appears in the bill to govern the discretion of the Administrator? The Senator has just said, in response to the inquiry of the Senator from Ohio, that in his testimony Mr. Henderson used language to support the interpretation which the Senator gives to the Senate. Is there any language in the bill which would control the discretion of Mr. Henderson or of his successor?

Mr. BROWN. I think so.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Will the Senator be good enough to point it out?

Mr. BROWN. The answer is one which the Senator must give me a little time to

develop, because the question cannot be answered in a sentence.

The bill is based upon the first sentence in section 5i—

In order fully to effectuate the purposes of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942—

That is a very strong limitation. The main purpose is to prevent inflation, to prevent an extraordinary, unwarranted rise in prices. Therefore, everything the Price Administrator, the Secretary of Commerce, who is the loan administrator, or the Secretary of Agriculture, who handles the agricultural section, may do is based upon the Price Control Act. The Senator from Wyoming will remember that in the Price Control Act a very large number of objectives are laid down. I shall not take the time to read them, but they may be found in section 1 (a) of the act. They are all limitations upon the power of the Administrator.

Second, in lines 12 to 18 on page 2 of the bill is set forth language empowering the Price Administrator and the Secretary of Commerce to do certain things when deemed necessary—

to increase or maintain production or distribution of such articles or commodities.

The Price Control Act itself gives authority to do some, though not all, of these things for the purpose of maintaining production. This bill goes a step further and permits such things to be done for the purpose of distributing production to the people.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the production of a particular article or commodity were cut down by reason of an increase in wages, because higher wages increased the cost so as to meet the ceiling, and the producers were no longer able to operate, would not the new provision apply? Would it not be possible for the Price Administrator to grant a subsidy, and would he not be compelled to grant a subsidy, or else permit the operator to go out of business because the price ceiling, which the Administrator has fixed, and the rising costs, which he has not fixed, crush the operator between them?

Mr. BROWN. The Senator uses the word "possible." As I told my colleagues, I have no doubt that it would be possible for the Price Administrator to do so. But, is the Senator from Michigan made responsible by the Banking and Currency Committee for the interpretation of the bill on the floor of the Senate? I wish to resist as strongly as I can any widening of authority which might be placed upon what we say here in debate as to what the Price Administrator may do. I think it would be most unfortunate if as a result of the debate on the floor of the Senate the minds of labor, or any other factor in the make-up of cost, should become imbued with the idea that we are providing a method by which wages or other costs may go up, and that the Government will assume the burden of the extra cost. I do not say that such a thing as the Senator points out might not be justified in some cases; but primarily the purpose of the bill is to take care of the extraordinary rises in costs which are due to the war itself or to the effort connected with the preparation for our defense and our offense.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I recognize exactly the position in which the Senator finds himself. I know, of course, that it is his intention to keep this power within minimum bounds; and in this debate he is probably endeavoring to make a legislative record which will have that effect.

Mr. BROWN. I am.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A moment ago the Senator said that in his testimony Mr. Henderson used certain language which sustains the interpretation which the Senator has given.

Mr. BROWN. I shall find it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If the Senator will find that language I should like to read it.

Mr. BROWN. I shall find it and read it into the RECORD. I know it exists, but I cannot lay my hands on it at the moment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I was about to ask another question dealing with the same subject. The Senator says that it is the purpose to deal only with extraordinary cases; and I have no doubt that that is what the committee had in mind; but some of us who have watched the operation of the Price Control Act fear that it is like a progressive disease, and that in a short time every case will be extraordinary. A moment ago the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] cited an instance. Many others might be cited. Daily there comes to my desk a stream of letters, complaints, and information from small businesses, indicating that they are being crushed. Yesterday morning in the Washington Post there was a news report which well deserves careful reading by everyone who is interested in the pending bill. The report dealt with the development of a so-called black market in New York, because businesses lacking materials are patronizing those who, by bootlegging operations, are ready to furnish such materials. Every business which is threatened with destruction by reason of the operation of a law which does not take into consideration all the factors is being driven by that very circumstance to evade the law. My own feeling has been that it was one of the great defects of the Price Control Act that it did not undertake to control all the factors which enter into the making of costs; and because we did not do so when the law was first enacted we are now confronted with this effort to broaden the power of the Executive to subsidize industry.

I have read the bill carefully. I find nowhere in the bill any language which would control the discretion of the agency which we are creating in the distribution of the subsidy. Of course, nobody is more ready than I am to acknowledge that those who are administering the act and the war powers are men of good will and good intentions; but, on the other hand, there can be no doubt that we are creating the most gigantic power and placing it in their hands without any qualification or restraint.

A moment ago, in response to an inquiry by his colleague, the Senator from Michigan spoke of the provision of section 1 of the Price Control Act as a measure which should control wages. When the Senator brought in the price-control bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency in the first place—the bill which is now the Price Control Act—he made that statement upon the floor. He made his legislative history then, saying that the bill provided sufficient authority to control such costs; but now we know that in the face of that legislative history, as he himself has now testified, nothing has been done.

Let me read the provisions of section 1 to which the Senator referred. I read the last sentence of section 1 (a) of the act of January 30, 1942:

It shall be the policy of those departments and agencies of the Government dealing with wages (including the Department of Labor and its various bureaus, the War Department, the Navy Department, the War Production Board, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, the National War Labor Board, and others heretofore or hereafter created), within the limits of their authority and jurisdiction, to work toward a stabilization of prices, fair and equitable wages, and cost of production.

The Senator says that it is not a legislative task to provide such stabilization of wages; and yet this very sentence would require a convention of executive agencies to draft rules and regulations by which it would be carried out. I do not see how the Senator can place any reliance at all upon a provision of law which calls upon so many and such diverse agencies to cooperate in carrying out an objective which is set forth in such general words as—

It shall be the policy of those departments and agencies, * * * within the limits of their authority and jurisdiction, to work toward a stabilization of prices, fair and equitable wages, and cost of production.

Mr. President, I think that part of the Senator's misgiving to which he so frankly confessed probably was due to the fact that this expression of a hope that a policy might be adopted by the executive agencies is a confession that we here have not declared the policy and have not made it effective.

Mr. BROWN. I should not want to take the time of the Senate to repeat the arguments I have many times made upon that subject matter. Two weeks ago Monday night I made a speech on the National Radio Forum, a considerable portion of which I devoted to a discussion of that subject. The speech was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I commend it to the Senator from Wyoming as a studied expression of my views upon the matter. We cannot pick out one sentence from section 1 of the bill and read it without contemplation of the other section of the bill, section 2, which is the direction to a Price Administrator to stabilize prices.

In framing this section, which was rather largely the work of the Senator from Ohio, with some assistance from the Senator who is now speaking, it was our intention—and I think it is fairly expressed, and in good language—to tie the

stabilization of prices, direction for which is given in section 2 to the Price Administrator, to a stabilization of wages by the existing Wage Stabilization Board, as set forth in detail in section 1 of the bill. The two must operate together. When Mr. Henderson fixes a ceiling upon prices, then comes the time when the War Labor Board and the other agencies shall, in relationship to such price ceiling, fix and stabilize wages. It is my judgment that that is the substance of the direction which the President is giving to the War Labor Board.

Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. BALL addressed the Chair.

Mr. BROWN. From the beginning my one contention in that respect was that the job of wage stabilization was too big a one to place upon the Price Administrator and his staff, which I understand is growing to enormous proportions, and that with the other responsibilities he has he should not be charged with the job of stabilizing wages.

However, by this bill in definite language we do direct the existing agencies which have control over wages to stabilize wages in relationship to the prices which are fixed by the Price Administrator.

Before yielding to the Senator from Minnesota I ask him to permit me to yield first to the Senator from Maine, who was on his feet before the Senator from Minnesota addressed the Chair.

Mr. BALL. Certainly.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, of course those of us who have had no part in framing this proposed legislation can know its purpose only as we gather it from the language actually employed. I should like to state a case—and I think there must be thousands upon thousands of similar cases over the country—and to have the Senator's opinion as to the application of the proposed legislation to such a set of facts.

Let us assume that in February a Milwaukee shoe manufacturer entered into a contract to make 100,000 pairs of shoes at $3 a pair, and that as a part of the contract there was included a provision that if there should be a wage increase which the manufacturer had to meet, the purchaser of the shoes would assume and pay the additional price entailed by the wage increase. Let us assume that in April, while the shoes were in process of manufacture, there was an increase of 10 percent or 15 percent or any other percent in wages. In March, Mr. Henderson froze prices.

In such circumstances, when the Milwaukee manufacturer approaches the purchaser and says to him, "The cost of these shoes has been increased by an increase of 15 percent in the price of wages, and you have agreed to assume and pay that additional burden," I should like to know if the manufacturer can require the purchaser to take care of the increased cost, or whether, as I am afraid is the case, the manufacturer is bound by the ceiling which was put on in March by the Price Administrator.

In such a situation someone must lose; either the manufacturer must assume and bear the burden of the entire difference between the original contract price and the cost of the shoes, as that price has been increased by the wage increase, or there must be a change in Mr. Henderson's price ceiling, or someone else must assume that burden. I am wondering if under this section, as it is now framed, it would be within the authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to subsidize the manufacturer to the extent of such a wage increase, or whether the Price Administrator has that authority. Is it contemplated that in such a case as that which I have pointed out the Reconstruction Finance Corporation would assume that burden and place upon the Government the loss, instead of letting it rest on the manufacturer? I think there must be thousands upon thousands of such cases.

Mr. BROWN. I think the case the Senator cites is one which could be handled by the Price Administrator in one of two ways. In my opinion, under the law, he could fairly do either, and which of the two would be done would undoubtedly depend upon his views as to the effect on the general price structure.

I should say that if the article were not shoes, which are a specialized product and which differ because of their manufacture or trade-mark, and so on and so forth, but if it were a product such as wheat or corn or some underlying basic commodity—not in the sense used in our Agricultural Adjustment Act but in a general sense—it would be better for the Price Administrator to subsidize, rather than to let the price generally go up.

Mr. WHITE. My specific question is whether under this specific legislation he would be authorized to subsidize.

Mr. BROWN. Yes; I am coming to that point, and the point as to whether it would generally be the better thing to do.

In the case the Senator has cited I think the Price Administrator would have legal authority to subsidize; because I assume, of course, that the contract would be found to be fair, and not made with the purpose of circumventing the price-control law. The Senator states an absolutely fair case; I think it is a very common case, and I know that such instances have arisen.

In the case the Senator cites I think it probably would be better to have a slight readjustment of the price of a particular commodity which is only a small factor in the general picture; but I say that under this proposed law, in my judgment, the Price Administrator could handle the matter either way. We are not afraid of small changes in the price structure. We are afraid of great changes which would have an enormous effect upon the cost of other commodities.

Mr. ELLENDER and Mr. BALL addressed the Chair.

Mr. BROWN. I yield first to the Senator from Louisiana, and then I will yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been very much interested in the discussion of the pending measure so far. As I understand, this proposed corporation will have a good deal of discretion as to whom to pay the various subsidies and as to which commodities shall be affected. The Senator stated a while ago that he did not think it was necessary or practical to spell out the various commodities that would be affected. With that in view, I am wondering why it was that the committee saw fit to insert this language in the bill, appearing at page 2, lines 17 and 18:

> Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to any agricultural commodity.

If such discretion as the Senator has previously stated is going to be exercised by those in charge, why was that language inserted in the bill?

Mr. BROWN. That does not mean, I think, what the Senator considers it to mean. The words the Senator has read in lines 17 and 18 occur in section 2, which relates to the R. F. C., and the provision in question prevents that Corporation carrying on operations with respect to agricultural commodities.

In the next section, however, the Commodity Credit Corporation is given authority to do, relative to agricultural commodities, the same thing the R. F. C. is given authority to do with respect to other commodities.

Mr. ELLENDER. But under the Corporation the bill authorizes to be created——

Mr. BROWN. No; under the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. ELLENDER. Where will the Commodity Credit Corporation obtain its funds?

Mr. BROWN. The bill provides for the Commodity Corporation a billion dollars, which the Senator from Ohio and some other Senators think is altogether too much.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then the Commodity Credit Corporation obtains its funds from the corporation that is to be created under this bill?

Mr. BROWN. No corporation is created under this bill; but it is proposed to utilize the two existing Corporations, the R. F. C. and the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may have misread the section, but the R. F. C. "is authorized, acting directly or through any corporation created or organized by the Corporation pursuant to section 5d of this act."

Mr. BROWN. That refers to the Defense Plants Corporation, the Defense Homes Corporation, and other such agencies; but the Commodity Credit Corporation is given the right to create no corporation so far as agricultural commodities are concerned.

Mr. ELLENDER. I see. Would the Reconstruction Finance Corporation have the right, under the provision just quoted, to create such a corporation?

Mr. BROWN. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was given authority by the Congress to issue charters for Government corporations.

Mr. ELLENDER. Assuming that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should issue such a charter or should act itself, would the Commodity Credit Corporation, then, under the language of the bill, be obliged to apply to it for funds

in order to subsidize agricultural commodities?

Mr. BROWN. The Commodity Credit Corporation obtains its money by sale of its own obligations, usually to the Treasury.

Mr. ELLENDER. So that the Commodity Credit Corporation could only pay subsidies out of such moneys as it has on hand or as it may be able to borrow under the authority herein given to it.

Mr. BROWN. I will give to the Senator a little later the amount of money the Commodity Credit Corporation will have available, but I will say that no one thinks that a billion dollars or any amount approximating that sum will be required for this purpose.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me ask one further question.

Mr. BROWN. I wish to say to the Senator now that the billion dollars represents a general increase which it was felt necessary, in order to supply funds for other purchases which the Commodity Credit Corporation will have to make, such as for foreign agricultural commodities which are not in competition with domestic commodities, including coffee and commodities of that character.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator cited two factors that would probably be a guide for the payment of these subsidies. One of them was——

Mr. BROWN. Direct losses.

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes; direct losses—one of them, increased costs due to losses of tankers and the other an increase in cost attributable to the war effort. Will the Senator be a little more specific?

Mr. BROWN. That is a very difficult matter to define. I think the instance given by the Senator from Maine is a typical example.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can well understand that.

Mr. BROWN. I desire to refrain from approving any cost which would allow the subsidies to be used as a basis for wage increases or increases in other costs. The Administrator and those of us who have been instrumental in bringing this bill in its present form before the Senate are most anxious to confine its operations as narrowly as possible.

Mr. ELLENDER. I can see the wisdom of such a position, but insofar as the Senate is concerned, it strikes me that if we give such power to someone else to exercise we ought to let that someone else know what we in the Senate have in mind. I am posing the questions to the Senator from Michigan, so that he, who has made a study of this bill, will tell this body how far, in his opinion, this Corporation may go toward subsidizing and what will be the yardstick which it can utilize in administering this measure. It strikes me that it might be beneficial to the Senate if the Senator would go into that in detail.

Mr. BROWN. I have endeavored to make such a statement in general terms. It is impossible for the committee from the testimony, to name, in detail, all the things that might happen in the future which would come under the definition of extraordinary costs due to the war effort. We simply have such a situation as that we know such things are going to happen, and in my judgment, within the limitations I have stated in my answer to the Senator from Wyoming, we must leave the determination to the administrative authority in order to effectuate the general purposes of the Price Control Act. There are a great many things set forth in section 1 of that act as to what its purposes and objectives are. There are limitations upon the power of the Administrator to make purchases and make subsidy payments; but just now in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation legislation we have taken the bars all down relative to the class of security. I remember that the distinguished chairman of the House committee, who is now present in the Senate Chamber, together with the Senator from Michigan, when I was a member of his committee, strove mightily to lay down standards according to which the R. F. C. would make its loans; but, as the years have passed, during the last 8 or 9 years, the Congress has chiseled away here and chiseled away there until now the Corporation can make loans which no one expects will ever be repaid. So we have let the bars down there.

In the condition in which we now are we know that various business enterprises are going to suffer losses which cannot be more than contemplated; they simply cannot be detailed; and we merely provide by this bill that, in the discretion of the Price Administrator, of the Secretary of Commerce, who is now the Loan Administrator, and the Secretary of Agriculture, and the President, I assume, or the board of directors of the Commodity Credit Corporation, subject to rules and regulations which are required by this bill to be laid down by the President—subject to all those safeguards, we give a very wide authority to these administrative agencies. I confess I do not know how else we can meet the difficult problem.

Mr. ELLENDER. But there are no rules or limitations as to what the President may do, as I read this bill.

Mr. BROWN. That is true.

Mr. ELLENDER. The bill states specifically in line 12, page 2, that payments shall be—

> in such amounts or quantities, in such manner, and upon such terms and conditions, as may be determined to be necessary to increase or maintain production or distribution of such articles or commodities.

In other words, the bars are down, and the agencies referred to in the bill, as I understand, will have carte blanche to do as they will. That was the reason I asked the Senator the question.

Mr. BROWN. As I recall, the Senator from Louisiana voted for the price-control bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. I did so reluctantly. Many rules and regulations are now being made by the Price Administrator which the Senate never contemplated, and my fear is that if we leave the bars down without some limitations or understanding of what this is all about, we will find ourselves deep in a morass of rules and regulations that none of us on this floor ever dreamed of.

Mr. BROWN. The same power with respect to production is contained in the price-control bill, and it is not proposed in this instance to do anything more than open the way to subsidies for the distribution and processing of commodities.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota, and ask his pardon for not yielding sooner.

Mr. BALL. A few moments ago the Senator stated that the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Congress find themselves on the horns of a dilemma; but is it not a fact that we are in that situation because the Office of Price Administration is now operating under a theory of price control which was not contemplated at the time the Price Control Act was passed?

If I may explain briefly, it seemed to me the theory of the Price Control Act was selective control and stabilization of commodity prices. There was no thought of fixing a price that was below cost of production, and holding to it. There was no thought of subsidies, except to bring out marginal high-cost production of critical material. The House committee at least specifically turned down the so-called ceiling-freezing Baruch plan, which would freeze prices and wages clear across the board.

It seemed to me that in the order of April 28 the Price Administrator reverted to the Baruch plan, except that he left out wages. He has now frozen prices, and he does not intend to make any substantial adjustments to meet war costs of production or distribution, but he wants to adopt the Canadian plan of subsidizing, in order to hold a rigid price ceiling on commodities affecting the cost of living. I think the Senate should understand that the amendment we are discussing makes a very radical change in the whole theory of price control as it underlies the original Price Control Act.

Mr. BROWN. Was the Senator in the Chamber when I began my statement?

Mr. BALL. I was present.

Mr. BROWN. I think I used almost the same language, certainly the same ideas, the Senator from Minnesota has now enunciated. I made it very plain that we were embarking upon a policy which was somewhat different from the policy we had in mind when price control first came along, and I instanced the fact that we were met with this issue: Shall we permit the price ceilings to be punctured, or shall we in the main take care of extraordinary situations by bearing, as a government, extraordinary costs? I also stated that the administration had been advised by both the Canadian and British authorities that it was dangerous to permit a general rise in prices, and the puncturing of the price ceiling, and that it was safer to handle the matter by subsidies. But I should not want the Senate to think that the origi-

nal price-control bill had no contemplation of subsidies, because in section 2 it was very clearly provided—and I know that in our hearings we contemplated—that subsidies should be made to domestic producers when it was necessary to insure production; and we had particularly in mind the agricultural situation.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. I have been listening with a great deal of interest to the very frank explanation of the bill by the Senator from Michigan, and I realize the difficulties which are faced in connection with the bill. I wonder whether the Senator does not think that a bill granting such great powers, and which is based on a war emergency, should not have a time limitation in it, or some limitation when the powers conferred shall cease, at the expiration of the war, for instance. I do not find any such provision in the bill.

Mr. BROWN. I think the Senator makes a very good point. I should not object—and I am sure I speak the views of the committee—to having a time limit placed in the bill. The Price Control Act itself will expire on June 30, 1943, as I recall, and I think we could place the same limitation upon the pending proposal, insofar as it is in addition to the powers contained in the price-control law.

If the Senator wishes to offer an amendment to that effect, when the proper time comes, I shall be glad to consider it. I may say that, of course, it is contemplated that the Price Control Act will be renewed, and I may say further that price control, to be effective, must last for some period of time after the war shall have ended. The marked rise in the prices of commodities at the time of the first World War occurred after the war was over. Prices were kept fairly well in line up to the time of the treaty of peace, and it was after that, as the Senator will recall, that they skyrocketed. I think it was as late as 1921. I have no objection to the inclusion of the same limitation of time that is found in the Price Control Act of 1942, and I think it would be a good thing to have such a limitation.

Mr. GERRY. I shall be glad to offer the amendment now, if the Senator thinks it is in order.

Mr. BROWN. Let me ask the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] a question. My recollection is that the powers under the Price Control Act will expire on June 30, 1943. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. The Price Control Act contained an expiration date, and I should think this proposed law should fix the same date.

Mr. BROWN. I agree.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield for a question?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. O'DANIEL. It is my understanding that the contemplated subsidy is to take care of any unfortunate individual, or corporation, who might be squeezed in between the high cost of production and the ceiling of retail prices at which he must sell his products, that is, to take care of any loss he might sustain on account of that condition. Is that one of the objects of the bill?

Mr. BROWN. I think the Senator states it somewhat too broadly. I shall stick to my original statement, that it is to take care of those extraordinary costs which were not in contemplation at the time the price order was issued—and it is the intention to hold to that price order if possible—which are due either to losses directly connected with the war, or to increased costs accruing as a result of the effort we are making to build up our armament and carry on the war.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That is the understanding I had. The Senator from Michigan made the statement a few moments ago that he knew of no other way of handling matters of this nature. I desire to ask him whether he had overlooked the fact that we have a Committee on Claims, before which individuals and corporations in the United States who feel that they have just claims against the Government may submit their claims. Would not that take care of the situation?

Mr. BROWN. I do not think it is adequate to take care of it. Both the Senator and I are members of the Committee on Claims, and my experience leads me to the conclusion that presenting a claim to Congress is not an efficient and prompt remedy such as is provided in the pending bill.

Many of the actions of the Farm Board, many of the actions of Mr. Hoover and his representatives, are still the subject of controversy in the Committee on Claims and have not as yet been settled. The North Dakota case is one, and the Washington wheat case is another. I think that is not a sufficient answer to this problem, but it is a possible answer.

Mr. O'DANIEL. That merely illustrates the point I wish to make, that if the pending bill shall be enacted it will further open up the Pandora box, so that cases might be invited and created wherein subsidies will be paid which would be entirely unjustified and wholly different from just cases which would come about through the transaction of business, which could later be handled by the filing of claims with the Claims Committee to be acted on by the Congress.

Mr. BROWN. I should prefer to use the judgment of the price authorities now, when they are face to face with the situation, than to leave to a citizen the somewhat uncertain remedy which is provided by offering a bill in Congress to take care of a matter, after the facts have pretty well passed out of the contemplation of the Government officials who should be the defenders of the position of the Government of the United States. That is my feeling about it.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. My attention has been called to instances of various kinds where wage increases have been allowed voluntarily by corporations since the date on which the price freezing took effect.

I have had some correspondence with local ice manufacturers who manufacture and supply communities with ice, which, of course, is not a product that is kept in storage in any large quantities. The manufacturer makes a supply and distributes it. In some cases wages had been increased 10 percent, and in a few cases I think 15 percent, in an attempt to absorb what we all realize has been an increase in the cost of living since the beginning of the war. Of course, if the price of ice particularly, we will say, is frozen as of a date in March and these increases in wages still continue, it will result in severe loss, if not in the failure of such a concern to be able to transact business. Is it contemplated that each corporation's situation shall be dealt with on its own merits, or that there will be any general adjustment as to a particular type of business independent of and regardless of the situation in which an individual corporation may find itself.

Mr. BROWN. My understanding of the attitude of the administrative authorities is that the order should be of general application, and would not apply to individual corporations except—and I think it is one of those cases as to which there must be an exception—in extraordinary cases which come within the two tests I have laid down. Certainly if by reason of the war there were damage to a plant, or some similar condition made it impossible for the corporation to carry out a contract, or remain under the price ceilings as fixed by general order No. 1, I think under such circumstances the corporation could be aided.

But it is not contemplated to take care of the inefficient corporation, because it may suffer a loss, whereas a similar corporation in the ordinary course of business comes out either even or to the good and makes a profit.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, I do not suppose anyone would contemplate that the Government would subsidize an inefficient corporation for losses which might occur under any circumstances; but where there have been increases in wages taking effect subsequent to the freezing date of the order affecting any given commodity, it would be very difficult, if not impossible, for the corporation which had voluntarily increased wages to go back to the wage which existed as of the time the price was frozen. I do not know how widespread the cases may be, but I imagine there are a good many of them, especially those of distributors of some local necessity. I am wondering whether each corporation of that sort which has increased wages and cannot reduce them, and which may have increased its prices to absorb the increase in wages and must reduce the prices to those of a previous date, would be entitled to the benefits of the remedies here proposed on the merits of its own situation, or whether it would have to bring itself within a general readjustment contemplated, independent of the particular situation in regard to any corporation. For instance, there

might be a similar corporation in a neighboring community, 25 or 30 or 50 miles away, or across a State line, which had not increased wages since the date in March. Therefore it would be practically in statu quo. Would they both come in under the same level, or could the Administrator deal independently with the corporation in the community which has been caught between the upper and nether millstones?

Mr. BROWN. I think in the case the Senator outlines there is authority in the bill to assist in either way—that is, by subsidy or by an increase in price. There is, in my judgment, little doubt that the Administrator in the ice case to which the Senator from Kentucky referred—a local case—would permit an increase in price to take care of such a situation, which did not affect the entire price structure. I gave what to me is the best instance of all—the freight rate on coal. There a subsidy is best because the prices of the products of all mill operators who burn the coal are affected. In that case it is better to have a subsidy. But where a completed product, such as manufactured ice, confronts an extraordinary cost situation, I think the burden should be placed upon the immediate consumer of the ice in the community. I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that there is authority to do the thing the other way.

Mr. BARKLEY. From a practical viewpoint it seems to me it would be better, after the Administrator is satisfied that there has been a squeeze such as I have described, to adjust the price than to thresh out the question of subsidy.

Mr. BROWN. Yes. There is no question that that is the policy of the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. President, we now approach the agricultural section of the bill. Before I do so I wish in this public forum to call attention to the price situation as it is. As every Senator knows, I was not one of those identified with the so-called farm bloc, and some of the amendments it proposed were adopted against my judgment. I know that my good friend to my left, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], disagreed rather strongly with my views upon that subject matter.

There arose throughout the country in the daily newspapers and in the national magazines general condemnation of the attitude of the so-called farm bloc.

I wish to call attention to the actual price structure as it is today, to show the country that the general average of prices is still a long way below parity, and below 110 percent of parity, and below the 121 percent of parity which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] wanted in the law. I think public notice should be taken of the fact that farm prices have not risen to any such degree as many people at that time feared they would.

In a list of 25 representative farm commodities, including rice, wheat, corn, oats, barley, buckwheat, flaxseed, cotton, potatoes—all the principal farm commodities—there are only 5 commodities which are above the ceilings established in the price-control law. Those particular commodities are hogs, beef, veal, wool, and rice. Every other farm commodity—and there are 20 more of them—is still materially below the ceilings fixed in the price-control law. There are only 9 commodities out of the 25 which are above the parity price—that is, 100 percent of parity—at the present time. Those commodities are rice——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I am curious to know what the commodities are which are now above parity and yet under 110 percent of parity.

Mr. BROWN. I shall name them. The Senator heard the five I mentioned a short time ago?

Mr. McNARY. Oh, yes.

Mr. BROWN. I am now about to name the additional commodities which are above parity and below the standards fixed in this bill. One is rice, the price of which for some reason unknown to me is far above parity. The price of rice is $1.78 per bushel, and the ceiling in the bill is $1.43.

In the case of cotton the parity price is 18.72, and the actual price 19.03. That is the farm price, as I understand. The ceiling limitation is 21.4.

In the case of potatoes the actual price is $1.162, and the ceiling price is $1.241.

In the case of cottonseed the actual price is $43.90 a ton, and the highest limitation in the bill $44.65 per ton.

In the case of chickens the actual price is 18.4 cents per pound, and the limitation in the bill 21.1 cents.

All those prices are slightly higher than parity.

I will say to the Senator from Oregon that a copy of this statement, which I have in my hand, will be placed in the RECORD. I now ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD. I may describe it by saying that it is a document from the Office of Price Administration, dated April 29, 1942.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Minimum price ceilings for selected agricultural commodities

Commodity and unit	Actual price, Apr. 15, 1942	Parity price, Apr. 15, 1942	Minimum price ceiling [1]			Percent which actual price would have to increase to reach—	
			110 percent of parity price, Apr. 15, 1942	Average price, July 1919 to June 1929	Actual price, Dec. 15, 1941	Ceiling under present act	Parity price
Rice, per bushel, cents	178.1	122.8	135.1	126.0	*143.9*	−19.2	−31.0
Wheat, per bushel, cents	99.7	133.5	*146.8*	132.5	102.2	47.2	33.9
Corn, per bushel, cents	79.7	96.9	*106.6*	88.9	66.9	33.8	21.6
Oats, per bushel, cents	51.8	60.2	*66.2*	47.4	45.2	27.8	16.2
Barley, per bushel, cents	61.5	93.5	*102.8*	69.3	58.1	67.2	52.0
Rye, per bushel, cents	60.7	108.7	*119.6*	94.7	57.8	97.0	79.1
Buckwheat, per bushel, cents	80.7	110.2	*121.2*	105.6	64.9	50.2	36.6
Flaxseed, per bushel, dollars	2.41	2.55	*2.80*	2.34	1.78	16.2	5.8
Cotton, per pound, cents	19.03	18.72	20.59	*21.4*	16.23	12.5	−1.6
Cottonseed, per ton, dollars	43.90	34.05	31.46	36.17	*44.65*	1.7	−22.4
Potatoes, per bushel, cents	116.2	107.0	117.7	*124.1*	82.7	6.8	−7.9
Sweetpotatoes, per bushel, cents	102.4	132.6	*145.9*	134.4	86.6	42.5	29.5
Hay, per ton, dollars	11.13	17.92	*19.71*	13.53	9.43	77.1	61.0
Peanuts, per pound, cents	6.25	7.25	7.98	5.83	4.79	27.7	16.0
Apples, per bushel, dollars	1.41	1.45	*1.60*	1.46	1.09	13.5	2.8
Hogs, per 100 pounds, dollars [2]	13.48	10.98	*12.08*	10.99	10.32	−10.4	−18.5
Beef cattle, per 100 pounds, dollars [2]	10.71	8.18	9.00	8.16	*9.34*	−12.8	−23.6
Veal calves, per 100 pounds, dollars [2]	12.22	10.19	*11.21*	10.77	11.18	−8.3	−16.6
Lambs, per 100 pounds, dollars [2]	10.83	8.88	9.77	*12.25*	10.13	13.1	−18.0
Butterfat, per pound, cents [2]	37.0	39.6	43.6	*44.0*	36.0	18.9	7.0
Chickens, live, per pound, cents	18.4	17.2	18.9	*21.1*	15.8	14.7	−6.5
Turkeys, live, per pound, cents	19.8	21.7	23.9	*28.8*	20.9	45.5	9.6
Eggs, per dozen, cents [2]	25.6	26.6	29.3	33.2	*34.1*	33.2	3.9
Wool, per pound, cents	39.2	27.6	30.4	34.1	*37.1*	−5.4	−29.6
Beans, per 100 pounds, dollars	4.45	5.09	5.60	5.77	4.93	29.7	14.4

[1] Minimum price ceiling in italic figures.
[2] Revised.
[3] Seasonally adjusted.
Source: U. S. Department of Agriculture. Office of Price Administration, Division of Research, Apr. 29, 1942.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. What period or periods of time were used in the calculation of parity?

Mr. BROWN. In this document parity is calculated as of April 15, 1942. The actual price is as of the same date. That was the then market price. The other limitations, 110 percent of the parity prices April 15, 1942, the average prices from July 1919 to June 1929, and the actual prices of December 15, 1941, are also given, so that each ceiling is clearly identifiable from the statement.

Mr. McNARY. That statement is very clarifying and probably satisfying.

Unless the Senator wishes to make a formal statement, I should like to propound some questions to him.

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I have had only a few minutes to review the hearings. Who appeared before the Banking and Currency Committee and urged section 3?

Mr. BROWN. That is the section relating to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. McNARY. It is the section which the Senator is now discussing.

Mr. BROWN. After the bill passed the House the Board of Economic War-

fare issued an order, which I shall place in the RECORD, placing upon the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation the duty of making all purchases of agricultural commodities, either domestic or foreign.

My attention was called to that order by Secretary Wickard and Mr. J. B. Hutson, President of the Commodity Credit Corporation. I at once brought the matter up in the Banking and Currency Committee's session and called it to the attention of Mr. Henderson and Secretary Jones, and asked them if it were not desirable to amend the law to conform to that order. They stated that it was the Administration's viewpoint that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation should no longer be concerned in the purchase of agricultural commodities, but that that work should be turned over entirely to the Department of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation. So, upon being assured by the three Government agencies primarily interested—the Price Control Administration, the Department of Agriculture, and the Federal Loan Administrator—that that was in line with their policy, we amended the bill as it is now presented.

Mr. McNARY. Then this movement was initiated by the distinguished Senator from Michigan?

Mr. BROWN. It was initiated by the Department of Agriculture, but I brought it to the attention of the committee.

Mr. McNARY. The Department of Agriculture does not seem to have been represented at the hearings. I have before me volumes 1 and 2 of the hearings, and it seems that no one appeared but Mr. Henderson and his lawyer, Mr. Ginsburg. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. Jones was present.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. Jones confined his remarks largely to section 1, which refers to the R. F. C.'s enlarged authority to issue bonds and debentures to a total of $5,000,000,000. I am speaking with reference to agricultural commodities and the power proposed to be granted to the Commodity Credit Corporation in conjunction with the Price Administrator, the Department of Agriculture, and the President to purchase agricultural commodities.

It is proposed to constitute four authorities to buy such commodities, whether domestic or imported. I thought we were trying to centralize authority and power, but I notice that the Commodity Credit Corporation, in cooperation with the A. A. A. and the Price Administrator, and subject to the approval of the President, is to be authorized to buy pears, we will say, from Argentina. I am not saying that in a critical sense, but it seems to me that it is vital to the agricultural interests of the country whether they are to have the price level fixed at the market price, which they will eventually reach during the period of inflation, rather than at a fixed price, the difference between the fixed price and parity to be made up by drafts upon the Treasury of the United States. In my opinion a very great principle is involved.

I did not know about this bill until late this afternoon, when some of the national farm organizations, which have large memberships, called my attention to this particular section. Out of curiosity I examined the hearings to ascertain who was present. I find that Mr. Henderson and Mr. Ginsburg, very able and worthy gentlemen, were present advocating the bill. I do not find the Department of Agriculture represented. I do not find any farm organization represented. In the long run the farmers are the ones who must suffer or profit by the administration of the law. I was curious, and my curiosity ripened into an inquiry. How did this provision happen to arise?

I am further informed that the Committee on Banking and Currency in the House had this proposal before it and frowned on it. The proposal is initiated here either by the very distinguished Senator from Michigan or by Mr. Henderson. I am merely trying to fix responsibility.

That is all I care to say at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think the remarks of the Senator from Oregon should be supplemented, particularly in view of the table which the Senator from Michigan has placed in the RECORD.

The Senator was quite accurate when he said that the passage of the price control bill last January was followed by country-wide condemnation of Senators who dared to stand upon this floor and defend agriculture as an industry. The Senator ventures now to criticize, by implication, at least, the position which some of us took.

Mr. BROWN. No; the Senator entirely misunderstood me. I was calling attention to the fact that the newspapers and weekly periodicals which so strongly condemned the so-called farm bloc for endeavoring to obtain higher agricultural prices were entirely wrong, because at the present time very few agricultural prices are even up to parity. I must have misspoken myself if the Senator thought I was condemning the farm bloc. I was trying to pin a bouquet on the Senator from Wyoming, the Senator from Iowa, and other Senators who took that position. Farm prices are a long way from the parity level which has generally been accepted as being fair as between the various economic groups of the country. I thank the Senator for misunderstanding me so as to enable me to make this plain statement.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am sorry I misunderstood the Senator. I wish to emphasize the point which he has just made. In passing let me remark that the Senator has referred to the members of the farm bloc as having engaged in an endeavor to bring about an increase in farm prices. So far as I know, that was not the purpose of any Senator. The purpose of the farm bloc was to prevent what was the apparent intention of those who were to administer the Price Control Act to depress farm prices. That is demonstrated by the fact that when Mr. Henderson and Mr. Ginsburg, whose testimony appears in the hearings, presented the first price control bill to the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, they asked for authority to fix ceilings at 80 percent of parity.

To the credit of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House of Representatives and to the credit of the House itself, let it be said that they refused to allow this agency to depress the prices of farm commodities. Those of us who were opposing the power to reduce agricultural prices knew that if that power were exercised and such prices were depressed, the inevitable result would be the demand to subsidize the production of agricultural commodities out of the Treasury. We were fighting against a Federal subsidy. We were fighting for the establishment of agriculture upon its own self-sustaining foundation. We were condemned as wanting to raid the Treasury; but, Mr. President, the raid is now being made upon the Treasury by the presentation of this measure, which undertakes to create a fund of $5,000,000,000 out of which subsidies will be paid, not to agriculture, but to all producers in the United States.

So, Mr. President, I wish to make it clear that the members of the farm bloc were never in the position of fighting to increase costs. They were fighting to preserve our system of free enterprise upon the farm. I feel that the time has come when some Senator should rise in his place in the Senate in an effort to preserve the system of free enterprise in agriculture.

To revert to the point for which I rose, with the Senator's table in my hand, and bearing out what he himself has just now stated, let me say that the table demonstrates that in most instances the prices of agricultural commodities are still below parity. To supplement the remarks of the Senator from Oregon, I wish to read the list of farm commodities the prices of which were below parity on April 15, 1942. This is the list presented by the Senator from Michigan:

Wheat, corn, oats, barley, rye, buckwheat, flaxseed, sweetpotatoes, hay, peanuts, apples, butterfat, turkeys, eggs, and beans.

I ask the Senator if I have not correctly interpreted the statement. He was following it as I was reading it.

Mr. BROWN. Yes; the Senator has done so; but it seems to me that by his treatment and attitude he is implying that I did not say the same thing.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Oh, no.

Mr. BROWN. I sent to the Senator the table which he now has, because I thought it would give him considerable comfort; and I was trying from the other side of the controversy we have had to point out that the farm bloc was not quite so bad as it was painted in some of the periodicals and newspapers of the country.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I now understand the Senator's position.

Mr. BROWN. Of course, the Senator read the statement accurately as it is, but I thought that I myself had done the same job but a few moments ago. I wanted to call attention to the fact that the prices of many important agricultural commodities are still below parity, and I wanted to do so in a spirit of absolute fairness toward those whom on occasion I oppose.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, every Senator on this floor who has had any dealing with the Senator from Michigan, in committee or on the floor, will join me, I am sure, in testifying that he is always completely fair. I have never yet known him to present a matter upon the floor without being completely frank and without disclosing any information he may have had. I am sorry I misunderstood his original statement; but I desire to assure him, and make it absolutely clear in the RECORD that I now understand that he was defending the "greedy" farm bloc. For that accession to our ranks I am certainly very grateful. [Laughter.]

Mr. BROWN. I have not wholly joined, I will say to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. GILLETTE. A few days ago when we were discussing the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill I took occasion to pay a compliment to the distinguished Senator from Michigan and to the Committee on Banking and Currency for the protection which was given in the bill in connection with price levels of agricultural commodities. I know the distinguished Senator's views because I have discussed them with him; but for the purpose of the RECORD let me propound three questions to him, if that is agreeable.

Mr. BROWN. Certainly.

Mr. GILLETTE. Under the provisions of the pending bill the Reconstruction Finance Corporation can utilize $5,000,000,000 for the purpose of purchasing, acquiring, carrying, selling, and otherwise dealing in any article or commodity other than agricultural commodities.

Mr. BROWN. That is correct.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me for a moment, let me say that it might be that the R. F. C. could use that amount of money; but Mr. Jones testified that $5,000,000,000 is already committed for the construction of war plants, and that while all of it may not be used, that is the purpose for which the provision is contained in the bill. In fact, the bill was passed by the House without that provision, without section 2. So it is not strictly correct to say that any of the $5,000,000,000 will be available for subsidies.

Mr. GILLETTE. It will be available for two purposes: First, to make subsidy payments in conjunction with the production, processing, or distribution of any article or commodity other than agricultural commodities; and, second, to purchase, acquire, carry, sell, or otherwise deal in any article or commodity. That is true, is it not?

Mr. BROWN. Other than agricultural commodities.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes; other than agricultural commodities.

Section 3, which deals with the Commodity Credit Corporation, authorizes that Corporation to issue and have outstanding its debentures in the amount of $1,000,000,000 for one of these purposes alone. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWN. No; the Senator is not quite correct about that. The $1,000,000,000 worth of notes, bonds, debentures, and other obligations is an additional amount the issuance of which the Commodity Credit Corporation feels is necessary to be authorized in order to carry out the general purposes for which the Corporation was created, including the purpose set forth in this bill.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes.

Mr. BROWN. But not exclusively for that purpose.

Mr. GILLETTE. Yes; I think that is a proper correction. But section 3 provides that——

the Commodity Credit Corporation, notwithstanding any other provision of law, is authorized—

Under the same limitations with respect to the Price Administrator, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the President——

to exercise with respect to agricultural commodities the powers specified in section 2.

Mr. BROWN. That is correct.

Mr. GILLETTE. But not the power specified in section 1, which is the payment of subsidies.

Mr. BROWN. No; that means in section 2.

Mr. GILLETTE. "Section 2 of this act."

Mr. BROWN. That is a subsection.

Mr. GILLETTE. It clothes the Corporation with the power to pay subsidies.

Mr. BROWN. Yes; and to purchase and acquire commodities. The principal purpose of that provision is, chiefly, to take care of sugar, coffee, and other commodities which are not domestically produced.

Mr. GILLETTE. Very well.

Now I come to the second question. Section 5, for which I commend the subcommittee, provides that—

No agricultural commodity acquired pursuant to this act shall be sold within the United States by the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency at a price below the price limitations imposed by section 3 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 with respect to such commodity.

Section 3 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act does not impose any price limitations. It sets out four alternative levels below which the Price Administrator may not impose a ceiling.

I know that the Senator understands the word "impose," so used, to mean that it is the intention of his committee that the Commodity Credit Corporation or other governmental agency cannot bring in foreign agricultural supplies and sell them below any of the four alternative levels set out in that particular section. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; I think the Senator accurately states the intention.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Senator's statement limits the provision to foreign imports.

Mr. BROWN. But the law also applies to commodities produced domestically.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is what I was going to point out. It applies to all agricultural commodities.

Mr. GILLETTE. I was going to discuss that matter with the Senator; and, notwithstanding the possibility of another construction, I wanted him to make that statement.

My third question is as follows—and then I shall not bother the Senator any longer: Section 3 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act fixes four alternative price levels below which the Price Administrator may not fix a price.

Mr. BROWN. Yes; he may not fix it below the highest of those four levels.

Mr. GILLETTE. He may not fix it below the highest of those four. He may fix it at any point above them.

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. GILLETTE. For the purpose of argument, let us assume that, due to the exigencies of the war situation, a wheat parity price of $1.33 was the level under section 3 below which the Price Administrator could not fix a price ceiling. Let us assume $1.33 to be the highest of the four alternative levels, and that he fixes the price at $1.50.

Mr. BROWN. He may not do that, under section 4 of the bill.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am speaking of the Price Control Act. Under section 3 (a) of the Price Control Act, which provides that he shall not fix a price ceiling for agricultural commodities below the highest of those four, let us say that for wheat the highest of the four alternatives is $1.33. As the Senator has said, he may fix it above that.

Mr. BROWN. Yes; he may do so under the provisions of the Price Control Act.

Mr. GILLETTE. Very well; let us say that he has fixed the price of wheat at $1.50. Under the provisions of the pending bill he may bring in foreign wheat and sell it below $1.50, provided he does not sell it below $1.33; can he not?

Mr. BROWN. By the terms of section 4, such sales may not be made above the maximum price fixed by order of the Price Administrator under the Emergency Price Control Act. Under section 5 of the pending bill he may not sell any commodity he buys below the limitations imposed by section 3 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act.

The Senator's point is that if he were to fix the price higher than the price according to these limitations, he could subsequently buy in the foreign market and could sell at some price between the price fixed by his order and the price fixed by the limitations contained in this bill.

Mr. GILLETTE. That is the basis of my question.

Mr. BROWN. That situation is one which was not in the contemplation of any of us, because, of course, it is not at all likely to occur. It would seem to me that such an arrangement by the Price Control Administrator would be rather beyond the contemplation of reason. He is interested in stabilizing prices; he is interested in increasing prices whenever it may be necessary to do so in order to bring about a greater production of any particular commodity. Under all the circumstances it appears to me that it would be quite beyond the probabilities of

the case to think that he would make such an arrangement. In my judgment, however, the Senator from Iowa is logical in saying that that could be done. I do not say that it would be an unfortunate thing, but I say it would be a most unlikely and improbable thing. I do not see why any complaint should be made about it, and I do not understand that the Senator from Iowa is complaining about that situation, but he calls attention to a condition which could exist.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President——

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Michigan to the concluding words of section 5i, which reads:

> Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to any agricultural commodity.

As I recall, on a bill heretofore debated in the Senate some discussion occurred concerning the definition of an "agricultural commodity." I am wondering whether there is any legislation which has been passed heretofore which defines the term "agricultural commodity"?

Mr. BROWN. The Senator from Illinois is a far better authority to answer that question than am I. However, I may say that we contemplate amending section 5, line 16, if the Senator will turn to that point.

Mr. LUCAS. I have it before me.

Mr. BROWN. After the words "agricultural commodity" we propose to add in this section, which protects and maintains the agricultural position "as is," this language:

> Or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity.

So that there will be no doubt that this limitation applies to grapefruit juice and orange juice and commodities of that character.

Mr. LUCAS. That answers my question. I think the amendment is a proper one, and will go far perhaps to relieve——

Mr. BROWN. I have already placed the amendment on the desk.

Mr. LUCAS. I think it will go far to relieve any confusion that might exist as between the departments as to what is an "agricultural commodity."

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The question I desire to ask is based upon the conviction I hold that this bill, if enacted, will abrogate the existing price-control law and will set up a new price-control system which will be controlled through subsidies. I desire to ask the distinguished author of this amendment why the necessity for this bill with respect to sections 2, 3, and 4. Is not the Department satisfied with its present power to control prices?

Mr. BROWN. The principal reason for the system of subsidy and subsidization, I stated at the beginning of my remarks. It was felt that it would be better to subsidize such an item, for example, as freight on coffee from Brazil, the rates on which have risen tremendously, and also the freight on Cuban sugar, on which the rates have, of course, risen to an almost prohibitive figure, than it was to let the price ceiling go up to take care of such situations. There is no intent to enter upon any general policy of subsidizing agriculture or industry, but, upon advice to the price authorities from both the English and Canadian administrators, it was quite generally the feeling not only of the witnesses who represented the Government administrative agencies in Washington, but it was also the unanimous opinion of the Banking and Currency Committee that it would be better to adopt some subsidy system than to permit prices themselves to rise.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to a further question?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It is a fact, is it not, that prices are lower now than they were 2 or 3 weeks ago? In other words, instead of prices increasing, they are either being held in status quo or are decreasing. Is not that a fact?

Mr. BROWN. I think there was, due to the price-control law, a very slight falling off in retail prices from April to May, but, of course, the prices in the stores are supposed to be identical with the highest price of March of this year.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I think the RECORD should show at this point, if the Senator will permit, that the general price level is lower now than it was a month ago.

Mr. BROWN. I think that is probably true.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The price level of some 900 commodities that go to make up the general price level recognized by the Government Bureau of Labor Statistics stands today, or, I will say, it stood last Thursday, at 98.6, which meant that the general price level on Thursday last was 1.4 below a hundred, which for 20 years or so has been taken as the standard. From my viewpoint, Mr. President, until the price level rises to 100 the country will still be in deflation as the country understands deflation; but, inasmuch as the administration of the present price-control law has resulted in checking the increase on prices and, in effect, reducing them, taking the whole list as an entity, I cannot understand the necessity of these 3 new sections.

It seems to me that it changes the present policy of price control from one of selection and of fixing to one of subsidy and the adoption of a system which obviously will cost the Treasury, which means the taxpayers, a very large sum of money. Let me ask a further question before I take my seat.

Mr. BROWN. Let me say that that has consistently been the position of the Senator from Oklahoma all through the debates on the price-control question.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I adhere to my position.

Is it not a fact that Mr. Henderson is asking from Congress the modest sum of only $200,000,000 to defray the expenses of his organization?

Mr. BROWN. I do not know anything about that; I am not on the Appropriations Committee; but I have read something to that effect in the newspapers.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I shall have some amendments to submit, but, of course, I do not desire to take the Senator's time now to propose them.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, we come now to the final section of the bill, which is section 5. The intent and purpose of that section is to leave "as is" the farm protection provided by sections 2 and 3 of the Price Control Act.

In effect, it rewrites in the proposed law section 3 (a) of the price-control law, and section 2 of the price-control law will be added by an amendment which the Senator from Alabama will offer.

I may say that after the pending measure was reported to the Senate the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], and myself felt that perhaps unintentionally—I am satisfied it is unintentional—the language of the bill might be so construed as to permit the circumvention of the agricultural protection afforded by the Price Control Act. So the chairman of the committee called a second meeting, and this question was put to Mr. Henderson, the Price Administrator:

> Is there any intention on the part of the administration in any way to get around the provisions of section 3 of the price-control law, and other provisions which were enacted by the Congress as a protection to agriculture?

He answered my question this way:

> We have no desire, and we want to make it quite explicit, that the additional authorities and grants here shall not be used for deviating or upsetting or bypassing in any way section 3 (a) of the Price Control Act.

So, with the Senator from Alabama, who represents the farm view on the Committee on Banking and Currency, and in conjunction with other Senators who are interested in that feature of the bill, we drafted section 5, which is very simple. It repeats a part of section 2 of the price-control law by saying:

> No power conferred by this act shall be construed to authorize any action contrary to the provisions and purposes of section 3 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and no agricultural commodity—

There is an amendment on the desk to which I think there will be no objection, which will make the language read:

> No agricultural commodity, or any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity, acquired pursuant to this act shall be sold within the United States by the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency at a price below the price limitations imposed by section 3 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 with respect to such commodity.

Mr. President, we wrote this section in language as plain as we could make it, with the assistance of the legislative counsel, and with the assistance of Senators who are interested in this protection of agriculture, and in my judgment it leaves agriculture in statu quo with reference to the Price Control Act. It gives agriculture no greater benefits and it takes from it none of the benefits which were given it under the provisions of the Price Control Act.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to state certain facts and then ask the Senator whether the amendment which is now proposed will have any bearing upon those facts.

In the last few days I have been brought into very proximate contact with a problem which has been presented to the citrus industry, not only in my State, but in Texas, Arizona, and California. To our astonishment the Price Administrator's office apparently is discovering that one parity exists for grapefruit which finds its way into cans and becomes canned grapefruit, and another for raw grapefruit which goes to the table, or is used for edible purposes.

By a technical application of the principles of parity, they have been able to whittle away the total protection which Section 3a was intended to give to citrus fruit, an agricultural commodity. They come to the monstrous conclusion that parity for raw grapefruit which finds its way into edible channels is $1.49 a box, and parity for grapefruit which is canned is 49 cents a box, a difference of a dollar a box, when it would not be possible to find a discrepancy of 10 cents a box in the actual market. We have been astonished, of course, that this effort should apparently be acquiesced in, or initiated, to deprive this commodity of the benefit it was intended to receive from the beneficent provisions of section 3a of the Price Control Act.

The difficulty, of course, arises from the fact that the principles of parity, as they are described in section 3a of the Price Control Act, relate to bases neither of which is strictly or properly applicable to this commodity, and that gives the Office of Price Administration the opportunity to make this unhappy interpretation of the law, and to apply it in this very objectionable way to this commodity.

For example, one of the four criteria defined in section 3a is the period between 1909 and 1914. At that time grapefruit was not being canned, there was not any grapefruit juice going into cans so that base is not properly applicable in a determination of parity.

Then under the parity law they are given permission to resort to another period, if the 1909 to 1914 period is inappropriate, and the period resorted to by the Administration is the period from 1919 to 1929. There was hardly any grapefruit going into cans at that time, and the grapefruit going into cans was only culls and an inferior grade of fruit. At that time the canning industry had not developed to the extent of using good quality of fruit for canning purposes. So, of course, that period is not really a fair one.

The third base referred to in section 3 (a) is October 1, 1941. October is too early for canning to begin, and consequently that period is not appropriate in the determination of parity.

The fourth base is December 15, 1941, and not 2 percent of the fruit is in the cans by that time, so that the volume is not sufficiently large at that time to justify that base being used.

Mr. BROWN. How about 110 percent of parity?

Mr. PEPPER. The point is we never get the benefit of 110 percent of parity. So, out of all those four criteria, the one they say has any applicability at all, and therefore the one to which they must resort, is the 1919 to 1929 period, when canning had not become an institution. Therefore, because that is the only one which technically can be said to apply at all, we are victimized by an inadequacy in the definitions. So I am afraid that in order to hold the price of the commodity down, they have readily taken advantage of that deficiency in the definition, and have said, "Well, there is one period for fruit that goes into a can and one period for fruit that goes on to the table." As I have said, the parity for the box of fruit which goes into the can they have determined to be 49 cents a box, and for the box which goes on to the table, $1.49, and they admit that is a monstrous conclusion, but under a technical application of the law they find themselves, so far as the decision goes at the present time, without any authority to do otherwise.

We pointed out the hearings and have referred to the testimony before the Committee on Banking and Currency to show that no one ever had an idea that if there were not a practical difference between the commodities there should not be any difference in the way they were treated by the Office of Price Administration.

The farmer sells his fruit on the tree. The man who comes to buy it of him does not tell him what use is to be made of the fruit. In my State 54 percent of the total output of our groves goes into cans. Therefore the can price fixes the raw fruit price. The cash buyer, and every kind of buyer, buys the fruit on the tree. The farmer does not know and does not care what use is to be made of it. Yet he is being cut from a price that had gotten to $1.05 a box, when this price limitation was announced, and he is going to be cut back down to a maximum of 60 cents a box it seems, even if we get a fair interpretation.

They have proposed to put the fruit which goes into the can under price control and fix the ceiling of March 1942, for the canned article, but they are leaving the raw fruit out from under the price limitation. So we have the anomalous situation of finding that for fruits that must go into cans, not over 60 cents will be paid.

If it is fortunate enough to find itself put on somebody's table, if anyone will buy it and pay for it, the grower gets $1.49 a box. That is a monstrous result.

They bring up the case of peanuts. No doubt there are Senators on the floor who are interested in that commodity. They say that they are treating peanuts which go into oil and peanuts which are used for edible purposes in two different categories, that there is a different parity for each category. Therefore the incidence of the difference will have to be reflected in the price administration.

For a long time they would not admit that agricultural commodities were really to get the whole benefit of section 3 (a), and I am afraid there was an obvious and a definite attempt to whittle down section 3 (a) in any technical way that might be possible.

We had under consideration, for example, the question of turpentine and naval stores, and Senators who are present on the floor will recall that at least at three different times a naval stores operation, in such a case as that of gum, which comes out of the tree, has been defined by Congress as a farm operation. It actually is, as the able senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] who is now on the floor, and many other Senators, well know, a bona fide agricultural operation. The growers plant the trees, cultivate the trees, and take a material out of the trees at seasonal periods.

Mr. Ginsburg, the general counsel for the Office of Price Administration, had the temerity to refer the junior Senator from Florida, and perhaps the able Senator from Georgia, and others who made inquiry, to an ex parte opinion delivered by the Attorney General of the United States in 1931, prior to the three statutory definitions which have been adopted in the interim by the United States Congress. So, as our great martyred President said, "With malice toward none; with charity for all," I am afraid it is difficult for me to escape the impression that these officials are not averse to finding technical opportunities with which to cut down what the Congress has laid down as a policy in section 3 (a) of the Price Control Act. Congress took that responsibility, and it became subject to a great deal of criticism from certain people in the country for taking it, but it has not changed its mind, and I venture to say it does not intend to change its mind, and that 110 percent, as defined in section 3 (a), has become, for the time being at least, the policy of the country. That policy ought to be effectuated in good will and good spirit.

I did not mean to take so much of the time of the kind and able Senator from Michigan, but I wish to say that one cooperative in Florida, whose representatives have been here repeatedly to confer with our administrative friends, told them in my presence that their action meant that the cooperative would go broke, and would have a loss of at least $250,000. Producers who sold on the cash market sold at a rising price, but those who took advantage of the cooperative system, which we have tried to stimulate in the citrus industry, for example, have their fruit lying in the packing houses, and, instead of being able to sell it at 80 cents, or 90 cents, or $1, or $1.05 a box, which was the selling price

when the announcement came from the Office of Price Administration, now find that they cannot sell the fruit for more than 60 cents a box, which will ruin the cooperative citrus industry in my State.

Naturally the producers are going to make sales for cash to whom they can. They are not going to take the chance of the cooperatives giving them the best results. I think it is contrary to public policy and to private interest to throttle cooperatives in such a way.

Again, Mr. President—and I ask the pardon of the distinguished Senator from Michigan—is there anything in the amendment to which the able Senator has just referred and read which would prevent such anomalous and very burdensome situations from developing in important phases of agriculture?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I have had some discussion with the junior Senator from Florida upon that subject matter, and I took the liberty because, as I told him, the Michigan producers had mentioned the same situation to me, of taking the matter up with the general counsel for the Price Control Administration. I called his attention to subsection (c) of section 3 of the Price Control Act, which very clearly applied these limitations not only to agricultural commodities but to "any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity." Although I think the matter has not come before him formally, the general counsel advised me that, in his judgment, order No. 1 was beyond the authority of the Price Control Administration insofar as it applied to grapefruit juice and orange juice.

Mr. President, directly answering the Senator, I will say that, insofar as the pending bill is concerned, I do not think it will affect the situation one way or the other, except for the possibility of subsidization, which I do not like in that connection. But by the amendment to which I have referred, there will be included in the bill not only agricultural commodities, but commodities "processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from an agricultural commodity."

I wish to state to the Senator from Florida, as I told him before, that I am firmly of the opinion there is no excuse whatsoever for fixing a price limitation below at least 110 percent of the parity price of the commodity.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a further question?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like also to attract the attention of the able Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]. Was there ever any intention on the part of committees of the Congress dealing with agricultural commodities in the price-control measure that there should be such an anomalous situation as that which I have just described; for example, one parity for the fruit which goes into a can, and another parity for the fruit which goes into the edible channel, if in fact and in substance, according to actuality, there is not a perceptible difference in the way those commodities are handled in the open market?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I think I can say, probably with the concurrence of all the members of the conference committee, that certainly no distinction of that sort was at any time discussed, or mentioned, or considered, but on the contrary, in the other House, a provision was inserted in section 3 (a) of the bill, which provision came to the Senate, was adopted by the Senate, and retained by the conference committee, providing in substance—I do not have the language before me—substantially the words of the amendment which the Senator from Michigan proposes to offer. He is submitting his amendment in line with the previous legislation that the mere changing of the form of the raw commodity into the processed commodity, by manufacture or otherwise, should not permit the fixing of the price on the changed form so as to upset unduly or improperly the price permitted for the raw commodity. That is not the exact language, but that is the thought. If Senators had the Price Control Act before them they would see that that was the intention of the framers of the act. That is as I understood it to be. I think the Senator from Michigan will agree with me, that the mere changing of the form of the raw commodity into the processed commodity will not permit fixing of the price on the changed form so as to upset the maximum price permitted for the raw commodity. I will ask the Senator from Michigan if that statement is not correct?

Mr. BROWN. The Senator understands it as I did, and I am sure the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Connecticut were both present.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I think it was universally agreed to.

Mr. BROWN. I did not read quite all of the language. The exact language is in subsection (c) of section 3 and is as follows:

> No maximum price shall be established or maintained for any commodity processed or manufactured in whole or substantial part from any agricultural commodity below a price which will reflect to producers of such agricultural commodity a price for such commodity equal to the highest price therefor specified in section (a).

That is 110 percent of parity, and these other limitations.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am totally unable to see how the Price Administrator or anyone acting for him has authority under the law to do the things the Senator from Florida has described.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I very much appreciate that statement. Obviously it was an unhappy application of the technicalities of the price-control law, because for several years there has been an almost identical market price for the fruit that goes into the can and the fruit that goes into the edible channels.

Mr. BROWN. I will say to the Senator from Florida that I do not see a technical justification for the position the Senator asserts is taken by the Price Administration. I do not see any justification for it whatsoever under the exact language or under the intent of section 3 of the law.

Mr. PEPPER. The able Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] has just returned from a conference. I will say to him that we are talking about the citrus fruit question, and I was pointing out the unhappy application the price-control authorities were making, the effect of which was to emasculate section 3 (a) and to deny the benefits of it to grapefruit which goes into cans.

Mr. BROWN. May I ask the Senator from Florida a question? Has he discussed this situation with the authorities since my discussion of the point with the general counsel for the Price Administration?

Mr. PEPPER. I will have to state to the able Senator from Michigan that my discussion was as late as yesterday afternoon, and the officials of the O. P. A. are taking the position that because in the period from 1919 to 1929 fruit which went into cans and that which went into edible channels did not bring the same price on the market, and since that is the base period they must use, therefore they must establish different parity prices. For several years those disparities have ceased to exist. For several years the fruit sold by the farmer is sold on the tree. He does not know where it is going, he does not care, and it all brings the same price. No one ever dreamed that there would be any effort made to take into consideration an ancient difference in parity, when poor grades of fruits and culls went into cans, and reflect that back upon the price of the raw commodity at the present time.

Mr. BROWN. From what the Senator says I can see a possibility that he may be caught between the Price Administration and the Department of Agriculture. Under those circumstances, I should say that under the A. A. A. Act it is the duty of the Department of Agriculture to establish a comparable parity for those particular citrus-fruit products. I think the Senator's criticism is well-founded. A very technical position is taken, which I do not think is justified even by a technical construction of the language of the law. I urge the Senator to ask the Department of Agriculture to establish a parity price for those particular commodities if it has not done so.

Mr. PEPPER. I am anxious to have the RECORD show that it was not in the minds of the committee, in proposing the price-control law, to cause a disparity in the prices fixed for those commodities when there is not an actual difference in the market price of the same variety of fruit, whether it goes into cans or into the fresh-fruit market.

I thank the Senator very much.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to return to section 2 of the bill, which contains the provision:

> Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to any agricultural commodity.

Under the terms of the amendment proposed by the Senator from Michigan,

that provision would include any agricultural commodity or any byproduct thereof, or any product which is processed from an agricultural commodity.

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. So as to state definitely in section 5i, in connection with the subsidy payments, that:

> Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to any agricultural commodity or any byproduct thereof or any commodity which is processed from an agricultural commodity.

What would it apply to if it did not apply to any of those things?

Mr. BROWN. Is the Senator referring to the R. F. C. powers?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes. What could be done in the way of buying and selling commodities?

Mr. BROWN. The section would apply to coal, petroleum products, and a vast range of products which are not agricultural commodities.

Mr. LUCAS. In this country?.

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Would it apply to agricultural commodities outside the United States?

Mr. BROWN. Section 3 would be effective as to agricultural commodities outside the United States. Section 2 would be effective as to nonagricultural commodities outside the United States.

Mr. LUCAS. Take the example of coffee, which I think the Senator used in his discussion. Am I to understand that the Commodity Credit Corporation, or some other corporation which the R. F. C. may designate or set up under the powers contained in the bill, may be able to subsidize the surplus crop of coffee in Brazil, bring it to this country, and control it?

Mr. BROWN. I answer "yes," with the qualification that under no circumstances would the R. F. C. or any corporation it might create do that. That job must be done by the Commodity Credit Corporation under section 3 of the bill; but it could be done.

Mr. LUCAS. It could be done under section 3?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Would the Commodity Credit Corporation, which might subsidize the coffee crop of Brazil and bring it to the United States and control it, have full power and authority to dispose of the coffee crop of which it would have control to any individual or corporation in this country which might seek to buy it, at any price at which the Corporation might wish to sell it?

Mr. BROWN. No. As to the sale price it would be limited by both sections 4 and 5 of the bill. I assume section 5 would not be of any particular effect. The coffee could not be sold in excess of the maximums fixed by an order made under the Emergency Price Control Act. It could not be sold above that level. It could be sold at as low a price as the Corporation might wish to sell it, because that particular commodity is not in competition with any domestic commodity.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the point I made. Under the subsidy plan provided by the bill any foreign agricultural commodity, whether it be sugar, coffee, or something else, might be brought to the United States; and the power and authority granted to the Corporation would simply mean that it could make disposition of whatever amount of coffee or sugar or other commodity it might have, to anyone to whom it wished to sell, at any price it might deem proper.

Mr. BROWN. Yes; I think the Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me ask the able Senator a further question. The bill came to the Senate from the House on May 15, 1942. Were these proposals submitted to the House of Representatives before the bill came to the Senate for consideration?

Mr. BROWN. I am not sufficiently well informed upon that subject to give the Senator an unequivocal answer. I think they were briefly referred to, but I do not believe that a full presentation of the matter was made to the House.

Mr. LUCAS. What does the evidence disclose as to why the R. F. C. suddenly desires the power to do the things set forth in the bill? Has some emergency arisen overnight?

Mr. BROWN. I am sure the Senator did not hear the early portion of my remarks.

It is necessary to take care of the extraordinary costs entering into such commodities as coal, gasoline, and other heavy, bulky commodities which can no longer be carried by salt-water freight. It was felt—and I think the committee was unanimous in its view—that it would be better for the Government to take the loss of a dollar a barrel on gasoline shipped by rail freight instead of by tanker, than to place the additional cost upon the consuming public. It was felt that the great difference between the rail freight on the one hand, and the freight by barge on the other, which is the usual means of carrying coal along the Atlantic seaboard, should be borne by the Government rather than placed upon the mill operators of New England, either forcing them out of business or forcing the price ceiling up.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, that is the real reason for the legislation.

Mr. BROWN. That is the fundamental purpose.

Mr. LUCAS. If it were not for that condition, we probably should not be discussing the agricultural situation at all.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator states the matter accurately.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I cannot for the life of me understand why the Government should subsidize an oil company or pay the difference in cost to the consumer in the East. Gasoline has been selling more cheaply on the Atlantic seaboard than it has been selling in Montana, where oil is produced. So the cost of transportation has very little to do with the price of gasoline in the East.

The price of gasoline is fixed by the oil companies at whatever level they choose to fix it. The big oil companies definitely and absolutely fix the price of gasoline all over the United States. They fix the price of gasoline in Montana, in the towns where oil is refined, at a higher level than the price in the city of Washington.

Why do they do that? In Montana, notwithstanding the fact that oil is produced in that State, they fix the price at the Oklahoma price plus the freight to Montana.

Mr. BROWN. That is the so-called Pittsburgh-plus plan.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes. The same thing is true with respect to many other products. In order to keep the price of gasoline down in the East, is the Government to step in and say to the oil companies, "We will pay you a subsidy out of the Public Treasury"? To me it is one of the most absurd things I have ever heard proposed. The oil companies definitely fix the price of gasoline from one end of the United States to the other. The independent oil companies must comply, and do comply, with the prices fixed by the Standard Oil Co. and other large oil companies. It seems to me that there can be no excuse for the Government stepping in and paying a subsidy to an oil company in order to maintain the present price of gasoline. If the people in the East want to use gasoline in their automobiles, and the gasoline costs them more in the East because of the fact that it must be shipped by freight, the automobile users should pay the cost. It ought not to come out of the pockets of the people of the country who cannot afford automobiles and do not use them. It is proposed to tax all the people in the United States, including the poor farmer and the worker who cannot afford an automobile, in order to keep down the price of gasoline to the man who can afford an automobile, or two automobiles.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, it is always a matter of regret to have a Senator make a point like that after hours have been spent by the Senator in charge of the bill explaining the necessity for such legislation. The bill does not involve gasoline alone. It involves a great many other commodities, as I stated at the beginning of my remarks. I am very sorry to have to state again—because this is about the fifth time I have done so—that if, for example, we were to place upon those who buy coal the additional cost necessitated because of the submarine menace off the Atlantic seaboard—I do not know how much a ton the additional cost would be; let us say a dollar a ton in the New England area—and if we were to permit that increased price to go into the price structure which has been built up, which is limited by the price-control law, there would be an inflationary tendency. In the judgment of the Senator from Michigan and the unanimous judgment of the Banking and Currency Committee, which made a study of this question—of course, it is not the judgment of the Senator from Montana—it would be better to have the general public stand that loss than to place it on the manufacturer or other persons who may be unfortunately situated at the present time.

Mr. WHEELER. It certainly is not my judgment, I must confess; and I am glad it is not my judgment, if all the people of the country are to be required to pay a tax because it is desired to provide cheaper coal and cheaper gasoline to the people living in the East.

Mr. BROWN. No; we want to maintain the price.

Mr. WHEELER. Very well. The Senator wants to maintain the price; but he is talking about increased cost, and the danger of inflation because coal may cost more. How much does the Senator from Michigan or anyone else believe that an increase in the price of coal would increase the cost of boots and shoes, textiles, or any other manufactured product? The increase would be infinitesimal.

Mr. BROWN. No; the testimony before the committee was that it would be very considerable. The experience of countries which are in a situation similar to ours is that to let the price ceilings go up is most unfortunate. Both the Canadian experience and the British experience—the British experience is much longer than the Canadian or ours—are that it is much better to have the general public carry the burden of extraordinary prices due to the war than to place them upon the consumers of the particular commodities. Because of the pyramiding which occurs, about which the Senator well knows, prices would go beyond what is fair and reasonable, and we should have the inflationary tendency which we are striving to avoid.

Mr. WHEELER. There is no question about it. When we are striving to avoid inflationary tendencies, of course I entirely agree with the Government's position in trying to keep down the prices of such articles; but Mr. Henderson and his organization can very easily figure out how much will be the increased cost of coal and the increased cost of production of articles used by the general public. They can very easily determine that without going to the necessity of taxing all the people because the people in the East may have to pay a little more.

In the case of products used by the people in the Middle West and the West outside the manufacturing centers the people in those areas must pay a much higher price for those products because of the fact that they live in the western part of the country or in the Middle West.

Mr. BROWN. How about the coal consumer in West Virginia and in Philadelphia? He is not affected in the slightest by the submarine menace, but the mill operator in New England is. It is not a matter in which I have any selfish interest, because we in Michigan are not affected in the slightest.

Mr. WHEELER. I understand that.

Mr. BROWN. I am proposing that an extra cost be put upon the people of my State, and I think it is a fair thing to do, just as we did in the insurance provisions which were enacted into law a short time ago. We placed the cost of the losses which occur on salt water upon the people as a whole, and not upon those who happen to be the owners of ships.

Mr. WHEELER. If the Government starts subsidizing various industries I predict that before we get through we shall have an extremely bad situation in the United States. When we start to subsidize one part of the country and take the money from all the taxpayers it is a dangerous step.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not know that I am prepared to subscribe to the doctrine regarding subsidization, because I have not studied it sufficiently; but I understand that the theory of those who propose the subsidy is as follows: Taking oil as an example, most of the seaboard trade on the Atlantic coast was transported in tankers; but by reason of the war, the tankers have either been taken away or have been sunk. As I understand the theory of those who propose the subsidy, it is that they say that such a condition is caused, in effect, by the Government. It is national, and therefore the burden should be borne by all the people, rather than by the ones who are particularly affected adversely. Is that correct?

Mr. BROWN. The Senator is correct. That is the theory underlying the bill.

Mr. CONNALLY. Just as we have organized a national insurance agency under the R. F. C., I believe.

Mr. BROWN. Yes; it is under the R. F. C.

Mr. CONNALLY. If some one is bombed by an enemy airplane, the resultant loss is to be borne by the Government, because the loss was incurred by an attack on the Government rather than on the individual. Is that correct? Is that the theory?

Mr. BROWN. That is quite correct. That is the fundamental theory underlying the bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator has been very kind in permitting interruptions this afternoon, and in answering as fully and as frankly as he has the innumerable questions which have been propounded to him.

However, earlier in the day he indicated that it was his intention to make a legislative record which would constitute in a measure a limitation upon the discretion of the executives administering the act, a limitation which is not to be found in the bill. He said that there was some testimony before the committee which he would later check and put in the RECORD. I suppose he will do so a little later, after we have ceased to bother him.

During the course of this debate I have been examining the hearings, trying to find the language to which the Senator alluded. I have not been able to find it; and the only testimony I have been able to find seems to me to broaden the effect and scope of the act rather than to limit it. It makes it clear that the power of subsidization is not intended merely to take care of coal and petroleum products, but that, as the language of the bill itself indicates, the power would extend to any commodity.

On page 39 of part 2 of the hearings of May 19, I find the following statement by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]:

> Senator BALL. I would appreciate it if Mr. Henderson could give us some idea of how he expects this thing to work. For instance, I have had several letters from bakeries because the Price Control Administration has frozen, but labor costs have gone up in some cases since March to virtually absorb any profit there would be; and, in addition, the price of flour has not been frozen. How is that going to work in that specific case? What do you plan to do?

Mr. Henderson responded as follows:

> Mr. HENDERSON. In the first place, we are taking each one of the broad classes of commodities on which there is a complaint of rising costs that make it impossible for one level in production or distribution to absorb what is usually called the squeeze. We are examining every one of those; first, to see whether or not the increases are absorbable; second, if they are not absorbable at, say, the retail level, to see whether or not a reduction in the prices to him can be negotiated.

Mr. President, that seems to me clearly to indicate that the intention of the Administrator was to apply the subsidy authority to every commodity in all the broad classes. Unless we place some limitation in the act there will be no limitation. To say, as the Senator from Texas said a moment ago, that because of the unusual conditions which exist as a result of the removal of tankers from the service of transporting oil, this bill should pass without qualification or limitation, is to miss the point; because oil is only one commodity, whereas the power and authority would extend to all commodities.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me for a moment, let me say that I agree largely with what the Senator from Wyoming has said. I think the bill gives such authority and is intended to give it. I do not think Mr. Henderson at the present time intends to apply the subsidy theory to any considerable number of commodities, but he hopes to be able to reduce distribution costs, as he says, and to find other methods by which a subsidy may be avoided. I think the Senator is entirely correct in saying that the policy of the bill is a general policy of subsidization of any and all commodities, if that becomes necessary, in order to maintain retail prices and yet not put a great many persons out of business.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator; I cannot read it otherwise.

Mr. BROWN. I advert to what I originally said. It is my desire to hold down subsidies to the lowest possible point consistent with the purposes of the Price Control Act.

I still say that subsidies should ge given only in those cases where the war itself causes extraordinary costs, or where the war effort, our production of armaments, and kindred things, has the same result.

Mr. Henderson made a statement with respect to that, as appears on page 40 of the hearings. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL] said:

> You will probably have to subsidize.

And they had given a number of instances.

> Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, but it is amazing, Senator BALL, what economies are being effected by the bakery industry already.

Which they had been discussing.

The matter of having several deliveries a day in order to supply fresh bread always and the matter of returns by limiting the amount of returns that a retailer can have are economies that have already been effected.

Then he proceeded to mention economies and said:

Naturally, before we would think of recommending a subsidy, we would want to make sure that every effort had been made by the production and distribution system of any commodity or group of commodities to take advantage of the possibilities of absorption and economies itself; but failing in that, we would like to have the authority to recommend that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the Commodity Credit Corporation take care of the thing.

In other words, it is their purpose to use every other method first, and if every other method fails, then, if the conditions to which I have referred—those involved in the war effort—require a subsidy, it would be given. I think the difference is a matter of degree.

If I may have the attention of the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], I may say that I agree with much he says; I want to avoid giving subsidies just as much as it is possible to do so, and I do not want to see the subsidy system used except in cases where there is no other way out, but I would use it where it is preferable to permitting a general rise in the prices of commodities.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, may I interrupt at that point?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Would not the wise way to bring that about be to authorize the use of the subsidy in those industries which we know are affected, instead of giving a broad discretion to apply the subsidy to any industry and any commodity?

Mr. BROWN. That is what I was about to call to the attention of the Senate. I read from the hearings:

Senator BALL. You do not plan on taking care of individual concerns?

Mr. HENDERSON. No, sir.

Senator BALL. You plan to proceed by lines or industries?

Mr. HENDERSON. Yes, sir.

The idea is not to take one particular company, and, because its costs are high, subsidize it, but when a whole industry is affected, as I have said—and I think, despite the views of the Senator from Montana, the coal and gasoline situations are excellent examples—when a whole industry is affected by the war, as industries are, the fair thing to do is to take care of their loss; but not of individual companies which might be affected by this or that.

Mr. WHEELER. When the Senator takes the oil industry as a classic example, I think I may say I know something about that industry, since I know how it is operated in my own State and throughout the West. When you say you are going to subsidize the big oil companies of this country——

Mr. BROWN. I think the Senator puts that a little unfairly. I am not proposing to subsidize the big oil companies of this country, and I think the Senator unintentionally puts me in a bad light by such a statement.

Mr. WHEELER. I am not intentionally trying to put the Senator in a bad light. I would not do that for the world, because I have too high a regard for him, and I am sure he appreciates that I do.

Mr. BROWN. Certainly; and I said it was unintentional.

Mr. WHEELER. In the illustration the Senator spoke of the big oil companies. If we are to subsidize the oil companies it will mean the big ones, because they do fix the price of gasoline in this country today, and any independent operator will state that he has to abide by the prices fixed, and independent stations have to fix the price at which they sell their gasoline at the dictation of the big oil companies of the country. When they can fix the price of gasoline where it is produced, and right at the refinery, I say it is a bad example to pick out those companies for subsidies. I think the Senator has a much better case when he takes coal than when he takes oil.

Mr. BROWN. I have to use the examples I have.

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly; and the Senator has some bad examples. In the case of coal there is competition, very keen competition. There is competition not only in the coal industry as between the different coal fields, but there is likewise competition between oil and coal, gas and coal, and various other things and coal. In other words, coal is not controlled by a monopoly, and the price is not fixed by a monopoly, as in the case of oil, and, as the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] pointed out, under the language of the bill not only could coal be subsidized, but any steel company or any other company could be subsidized, since they could simply say that labor had gone up, that wages had risen, and that the price of the manufactured article had risen.

Mr. BROWN. Of course, I do not want that brought about.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course not, but they could use the war as an excuse, and practically every industry in the United States could be subsidized.

Mr. BROWN. That is what I am trying to avoid.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator and I know the pressure that will be put on every Senator from all over the country, because every company will be coming here and saying, "The cost of this article has gone up so much, and wages have gone up so much, that we have to charge more, and we have to have a subsidy." There might be some instances in which paying a subsidy would be a good thing, but I say to the Senator in all seriousness that if we start in with that practice, it will be a very dangerous policy to follow in the United States.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, referring to the discussion a few moments ago by the Senator from Florida, with reference to grapefruit, I should like to inquire whether, if an injustice were done fruit growers in the setting of prices within the limits of the law and the authority granted to the Administrator, the enactment of the bill now under consideration would enable the Administrator to pay a subsidy to those who had been mistreated by that ruling?

Mr. BROWN. That raises the question whether the proposed law would be retroactive. I should say it would not be. I should say that if this situation arose after the bill became effective, the power to make the adjustment would exist. The wisdom of the policy is another matter.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Would the power exist in view of lines 17 and 18 on page 2, reading as follows: "Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to any agricultural commodity"? Is that language still in the bill?

Mr. BROWN. It is still in the bill, but I say I do not believe the bill would permit the R. F. C. or the Commodity Credit Corporation to take care of transactions which were completed before the enactment of the bill.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I refer to those which would be completed after the enactment of the bill.

Mr. BROWN. I think the power to take care of such a situation would exist.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I am glad that our farmers will thus be protected. I know the next section is supposed to protect them, but I just wanted the Senator's assurance that lines 17 and 18 on page 2 did not exclude our farms from the subsidy if other lines of industry are to receive subsidies.

Mr. BROWN. The provision reads:

Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to any agricultural commodity.

The Senator knows that section 3 gives the power to the Commodity Credit Corporation to do for agriculture just what section 2 gives the R. F. C. the power to do for other industry.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, with regard to the billion dollars additional given to the Commodity Credit Corporation, I wondered whether the Senator had put into the RECORD, or would be willing, if he has not already done so, to put into the RECORD, the statement and the letter from the Commodity Credit Corporation, which do not appear in the hearings, but which I think should be a part of the record of the debates here.

Mr. BROWN. I had made up my mind to put in the letter from the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and I ask unanimous consent that that be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOXEY in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION,
Washington, D. C., May 25, 1942.

Hon. PRENTISS M. BROWN,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR BROWN: This is with respect to the increase of $1,000,000,000 in the bor-

rowing power of Commodity Credit Corporation provided in H. R. 7008.

The resources of Commodity Credit Corporation total $2,750,000,000, consisting of an authorized borrowing power of $2,650,000,000 and a capital stock of $100,000,000. It is estimated that as of June 30, 1942, the Corporation will have about $1,400,000,000 invested in commodities owned by the Corporation or held as collateral for loans, and that outstanding commitments will total nearly $1,000,000,000.

The amount of funds that Commodity Credit Corporation will have available as of June 30, 1942, for new commitments or increases in existing commitments is estimated to be about $400,000,000. This is approximately the amount that will be needed in connection with the loan programs with respect to the 1942 crops of cotton and corn. During the remainder of this calendar year operations through the sale of owned commodities and loan redemptions probably will release between $250,000,000 and $300,000,000.

New programs are being developed because of the war and the available funds will be insufficient to meet the needs of these programs. So far as specific programs can now be foreseen, it appears that an increase in the borrowing power by $1,000,000,000 will provide sufficient funds.

The new programs requiring the additional funds are of three kinds:

First, the increased agricultural production is raising new problems in the domestic field. The marked increase in the production of soybeans and peanuts may make it necessary for Commodity Credit Corporation to be prepared to purchase all or a substantial part of the output of soybean, peanut, and possibly cottonseed meal. The supplies of protein meal will be exceedingly large this fall, and in order to prevent a drastic break in prices it may be necessary to purchase a substantial part of the output or underwrite the price for the entire output until the market is ready to absorb it. A proposal is also pending for the purchase of the 1942 domestic wool clip. As the harvesting season approaches for the larger agricultural production, many new problems will have to be met.

Second, pursuant to directives from the Board of Economic Warfare under Executive Order No. 9128, foreign purchases of agricultural commodities will be necessary. The principal foreign purchases will include fats, oils, and oil-bearing materials, cotton, flax, miscellaneous fibers, sugar, and possibly coffee and cocoa beans.

Third, a substantial sum will be necessary for carrying out the provisions of H. R. 7008 in order that the price ceilings may be maintained without depressing the prices of farm commodities. The amounts that will be obligated under the provisions of this bill are dependent upon the nature and the extent of the requests that are made by the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration.

This reserve borrowing power will of course be used only as actual needs develop and until utilized will involve no cost to the Government. It should be pointed out further that payments and losses under the provisions of this act should constitute only a small part of the total amount of funds used, since in most instances the funds will be used for the purchase of commodities and these commodities will be resold at a price which will recover all or a major part of the amount invested.

Sincerely yours,

J. B. HUTSON, *President.*

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the statement made by the Commodity Credit Corporation is a long and complicated one. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and I have agreed that a part of it may be printed in the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement prepared by the Commodity Credit Corporation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

U. S. Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation—Summary of estimated resources and obligations, fiscal year 1942

Gross funds available Apr. 30, 1942:	
Cash and accrued interest	$27,047,231.03
Authorized borrowing power	2,650,000,000.00
Less: Notes payable outstanding	941,054,000.00
Total	1,708,946,000.00
Estimated liquidations (cash and obligations to purchase) through June 30, 1942 (schedule No. 1 and 1A):	
Cotton	119,000,000.00
Corn	26,000,000.00
Wheat	12,000,000.00
Tobacco	4,000,000.00
Other crops	3,000,000.00
Total	164,000,000.00
Total, actual and estimated resources available for loans and expenses	1,899,993,231.03
Obligations to purchase guaranteed loans held by private lending agencies as of Apr. 30, 1942:	
Face of notes	191,682,233.41
Interest accrued	1,553,957.70
Storage charges	5,514,409.15
Total	198,750,600.26
Unobligated commitments on loans and purchases authorized (schedule No. 2)	$535,581,702.09
Estimated commitments to be made through June 30, 1942 (schedule No. 3)	460,000,000.00
Commitment for other commodities purchase program	150,000,000.00
Commitment for agricultural supplies purchase program	100,000,000.00
Carrying charges and operating expenses accrued through Apr. 30, 1942:	
Storage charges	29,656,572.29
Insurance charges	89,240.44
Administrative expenses	227,445.10
Nonadministrative (custodian) expenses	400,000.00
Interest on Corporation notes	1,199,733.89
Total	31,572,991.72
Estimated obligations for carrying charges and operating expenses, Apr. 30, 1942, through June 30, 1942 (schedule No. 4):	
Storage charges	$11,792,000.00
Insurance charges	7,000.00
Interest guaranteed to private lending agencies	321,000.00
Administrative expense	677,322.00
Nonadministrative (custodian) expense	400,000.00
Interest payable on Corporation notes	1,583,557.00
Total	14,780,879.00
Refunds to holders of 1941 cotton-loan certificates	41,000,000.00
Total deductions	1,531,686,173.07
Balance available for new, or increases in, loan commitments	[1] 368,307,057.96

[1] This amount will cover commitments to be made on the 1942 corn and cotton loan programs only.

SCHEDULE No. 2

U. S. Department of Agriculture, Commodity Credit Corporation—Unobligated Commitments on loans and purchases authorized as of Apr. 30, 1942

	Commitments	Commodity Credit Corporation disbursements	Bank loans outstanding	Unobligated balance
1941 Austrian peas and hairy vetch	$3,000,000	$234,611.14		$2,765,388.86
1941 corn	225,000,000	907,623.07	$77,991,048.42	146,101,328.51
1941 cotton	455,000,000	126,342,971.18	15,995,723.53	312,661,305.29
1941 crimson clover	400,000	65,127.13		334,872.87
1941 lespedeza	5,000,000			5,000,000.00
1941 peanuts	20,000,000			20,000,000.00
1941 flue-cured tobacco	53,000,000	32,677,586.20		20,322,413.80
1941 dark tobacco	20,000,000	3,303,607.24		16,696,392.76
1942 turpentine and rosin	9,000,000			9,000,000.00
1942 flaxseed	15,000,000			15,000,000.00
1942 barley, rye, and grain sorghums	12,000,000			12,000,000.00
1942 wheat	475,000,000			475,000,000.00
Cotton-purchase program	8,000,000			8,000,000.00
Reserve feed program	500,000			500,000.00
Loans to Agricultural Adjustment Administration as required by act of July 2, 1940	50,000,000	45,000,000.00		5,000,000.00
Total	1,350,900,000	208,531,525.96	[1] 93,986,771.95	1,048,381,702.09
Less: Estimated cancelations of unused commitments				[2] 512,800,000.00
Total unobligated balance				535,581,702.09

[1] In addition bank loans outstanding on which commitments have been closed were as follows on Apr. 30, 1942:

1941 barley	$1,632,266.89
1940 corn	25,371,769.90
1941 flaxseed	554,376.94
1941 grain sorghums	83,812.04
1941 rye	741,954.26
1941 soybeans	112,217.32
1941 wheat	69,199,064.11
Total	97,695,461.46

[2] Estimated cancelation of unused commitments:

1941 Austrian peas and hairy vetch	$2,500,000.00
1941 corn	140,000,000.00
1941 cotton	310,000,000.00
1941 crimson clover	300,000.00
1941 lespedeza	5,000,000.00
1941 peanuts	20,000,000.00
1941 flue-cured tobacco	20,000,000.00
1941 dark tobacco	15,000,000.00
Total	512,800,000.00

SCHEDULE No. 3

Estimated commitments to be made through June 30, 1942

Commodity:	Amount
Other commodities purchase program (supplemental)	$450,000,000
Estimated payment to Treasury of the United States due to appreciation of assets	10,000,000
Total	460,000,000

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Michigan is agreeable to suspending consideration of the pending measure at this point?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; I am.

SUNDRY MATTERS AFFECTING THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REYNOLDS submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the

amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4476) providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same.

ROBERT REYNOLDS,
JOSH LEE,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 27, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MAY 26, 1942

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rabbi Bernard Bergman, of the Home of the Sons and Daughters of Israel, New York City, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father of the Universe!

We beseech Thee, bless our Chief Executive and prosper the enterprises of the august Members of this assembly, the chosen representatives of the great American people, gathered here in solemn deliberation in this supreme moment of their Nation's need. Merciful God, grant them light and guidance in this perilous hour of humanity's agony. Grant them wisdom and foresight to navigate the ship of state amidst the sundry obstructions and obstacles besetting our course, and guard them against those who seek to paralyze the arms of the brave defenders of our liberties who are now engaged in Thy forces, even as they are waging humanity's struggle on the battlefields of many continents and distant lands.

We beseech Thee, O Lord, look down from Thy throne of mercy upon Thy children of this liberty-loving Nation. Bless our brave effort and send glorious victory to our banners. Grant us, O Lord, Thy blessing, so that "the earth shall be filled again with the knowledge of the Lord as the waters cover the sea." Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Post Office Department.
3. Department of War.
4. Maritime Commission.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolutions:

Senate Resolution 254

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
May 25, 1942.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. PAT HARRISON, late a Senator from the State of Mississippi.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

Senate Resolution 255

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
May 25, 1942.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ALVA B. ADAMS, late a Senator from the State of Colorado.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

Senate Resolution 256

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
May 25, 1942.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON, late a Senator from the State of Texas.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

Senate Resolution 257

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
May 25, 1942.

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. ALVA M. LUMPKIN, late a Senator from the State of South Carolina.

Resolved, That as a mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the business of the Senate be now suspended to enable his associates to pay tribute to his high character and distinguished public service.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to his memory the Senate at the conclusion of these exercises shall stand adjourned.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a patriotic essay by a young man from my home city.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short article from the Washington Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PROHIBITION AGAIN REARS ITS UGLY HEAD

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a group of 30 sincere Representatives recently gathered to plan restriction of liquor to men in our armed forces.

These gentlemen are as well intentioned as they are enthusiastically misguided.

Let them recall that prohibition is hardly dead and buried. They now wish to resurrect it. What a calamity that would be. As one who was constantly in the vanguard fighting prohibition from 1922 to 1932 in and out of the House, I can easily testify to prohibition's horrors—its chicanery, deceit, falsifying, bribery, bootlegging, violence, blackjacking, drunkenness, kidnaping, gangsterdom.

I say to these new prohibitionists, Do not let America again go off the deep end. For goodness sake they should think twice. We must prevent at all hazards a second plunge into the deep depths of iniquity.

These new prohibitionists want "legislation to protect the boys from undue temptation, especially youths away from home for the first time."

I hope nothing more than oratory will come out of this effort. These Representatives practically in effect say, "You young soldiers, you selectees, you are old enough to die for your country; you are old enough to be trusted with your country's safety, but we cannot trust you with a glass of beer; we cannot trust you off duty because you might be tempted to sip a bit of California wine, or imbibe a glass of Kentucky bourbon, or Pennsylvania or Maryland rye. Maybe a cocktail would perk you up after a day's work of drilling and maneuvers, but you are not mature enough. All outside Army ranks can have all they want, but not you soldiers."

Stop legal sale of wines, beer, and liquor to soldiers and you instantly make bootlegging a most profitable business around every camp and cantonment.

No. Be careful, you new prohibitionists. I remind you that the monster pro-

hibition first reared his ugly head with a bill for dryness around Army camps.

I warn the Nation to be on the alert. I warn the beer, wine, and liquor interests—who pay more taxes than any other group—to be on the job. An ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Get busy. Checkmate these efforts at national abstinence. Be on guard. Take no chances.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. MASON and Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a letter from a small business man.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

MONTANA AND COLORADO BOYS IN THE RAID ON TOKYO

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, with exultant pride I quote from an Associated Press dispatch, with a Washington date line, which appeared in one of my hometown papers in Montana:

PARTICIPATE IN RAID ON TOKYO

WASHINGTON, May 19.—Fliers from Billings, Mont., Colorado Springs, Colo., and Denver were among those who raided Tokyo.

As made public by the War Department, with next of kin, they were:

Corp. David J. Thatcher, Mr. and Mrs. Joseph H. Thatcher, Box 307, Billings.

Lt. Harry C. McCool, Mrs. O. S. McCool, mother, 2520 West Pikes Peak Avenue, Colorado Springs.

Staff Sgt. P. J. Leonard, Mrs. P. J. Leonard, 3034 Race Street, Denver.

Another Montanan with the raiders was Sgt. Edward J. Saylor, of Brusett, Garfield County.

I believe there are not more than a thousand people in Garfield County, yet one of the participants in that remarkable exploit came from that county. These two young men from the district in Montana which I have the honor to represent, in participating in one of the most daring and unprecedented raids of this war, typify the manhood of my State. My people did not want war; but once in, they will be there at the finish, fighting with their all.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two subjects; in one, to include a resolution on the celebration of Thomas Jefferson's birthday; and in the other, to include one paragraph from a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes tomorrow after disposition of all matters on the Speaker's desk and at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include part of my own news letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a short newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

FREE LIFE INSURANCE TO SERVICE MEN

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, on February 2 last I called to the attention of the House the fact that I had introduced legislation which would give to all of the men and women in the armed services $5,000 of Government life insurance without cost to them. I am delighted at this time to be able to compliment the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate upon the fact that it has favorably reported today legislation of this type.

That committee has approved a new provision in the soldiers' allotment and allowance bill which makes war-risk insurance compulsory. All men and women in our armed forces would be required to have $10,000 of Government insurance. The service man or woman would pay 35 cents per month on each $1,000 of insurance and the Government would pay the balance. For $10,000 this would amount to about $3.50 for the service man or woman and $3 for the Government.

I have several times addressed the House urging that automatic compulsory insurance blanket every person entering our armed forces as soon as he or she is sworn in. I have urged that $5,000 of this insurance be furnished free by the taxpayers of America in grateful recognition in a small way of the great unselfish service rendered our Nation by these young men at the fighting fronts.

May I urge upon the House Military Affairs Committee that it accept this provision for compulsory automatic insurance. Such action will save untold heartaches in the future. Soldiers will give just a little bit more, if possible, of fighting energy for our United States of America knowing that their wives, children, and dear ones back home are protected against want if the supreme sacrifice is asked of them.

If possible, Mr. Speaker, I shall offer this provision as an amendment to the House soldiers' allotment and allowance bill. I plead with you, Members of the House, to aid in this expression of fairness to the service men and women of today.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a paper on farm problems delivered recently by Dr. Young, of Purdue University.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article in the Times-Herald regarding the valor of the nurses at Corregidor. One of those nurses was a constituent of mine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after disposition of business on the Speaker's desk and following any previous orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PROMOTION OF SMALL BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is the passage of the bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productiv facilities of small business in the interest of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. STEAGALL) there were—ayes 96, noes 0.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas, 346, nays 0, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 57]

YEAS—346

Allen, Ill.	Faddis	Lesinski
Allen, La.	Fellows	Lewis
Andersen, H. Carl	Fenton	Ludlow
Anderson, Calif.	Fitzgerald	McCormack
Anderson, N. Mex.	Flaherty	McGehee
Andresen, August H.	Flannagan	McGranery
Andrews	Fogarty	McGregor
Angell	Folger	McKeough
Arends	Forand	McLaughlin
Arnold	Ford, Leland M.	McLean
Baldwin	Ford, Thomas F.	McMillan
Barden	Fulmer	Maas
Barnes	Gale	Maciora
Bates, Ky.	Gamble	Mahon
Bates, Mass.	Gathings	Manasco
Baumhart	Gavagan	Mansfield
Beckworth	Gearhart	Martin, Iowa
Beiter	Gehrmann	Martin, Mass.
Bender	Gerlach	Mason
Bishop	Gillette	May
Bland	Gillie	Merritt
Bloom	Gore	Meyer, Md.
Boehne	Gossett	Michener
Boggs	Graham	Mills, Ark.
Boren	Grant, Ala.	Mills, La.
Boykin	Gregory	Mitchell
Bradley, Mich.	Haines	Mott
Brooks	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mundt
Brown, Ga.	Hall, Leonard W.	Murdock
Brown, Ohio	Halleck	Murray
Bryson	Hancock	Myers, Pa.
Buck	Hare	Nelson
Bulwinkle	Harness	Norrell
Burch	Harris, Ark.	Norton
Burdick	Harris, Va.	O'Brien, Mich.
Burgin	Hart	O'Brien, N. Y.
Butler	Harter	O'Connor
Byrne	Hartley	O'Hara
Camp	Healey	O'Leary
Canfield	Hébert	Oliver
Cannon, Fla.	Heffernan	O'Neal
Cannon, Mo.	Heidinger	O'Toole
Capozzoli	Hess	Pace
Carter	Hill, Colo.	Paddock
Cartwright	Hill, Wash.	Patman
Case, S. Dak.	Hobbs	Patton
Celler	Hoffman	Pearson
Chenoweth	Holbrock	Peterson, Ga.
Chiperfield	Holmes	Pfeiffer, William T.
Claypool	Hook	Pierce
Clevenger	Hope	Pittenger
Cochran	Houston	Ploeser
Coffee, Nebr.	Howell	Poage
Coffee, Wash.	Hull	Powers
Cole, N. Y.	Hunter	Priest
Colmer	Imhoff	Rabaut
Cooley	Izac	Ramsay
Cooper	Jackson	Ramspeck
Copeland	Jacobsen	Randolph
Costello	Jarman	Rankin, Miss.
Courtney	Jenkins, Ohio	Rankin, Mont.
Cox	Jenks, N. H.	Reed, Ill.
Cravens	Jennings	Reed, N. Y.
Crawford	Jensen	Rich
Creal	Johnson, Calif.	Richards
Crosser	Johnson, Luther A.	Rivers
Crowther	Johnson, Okla.	Rizley
Culkin	Johnson, W. Va	Robertson, N. Dak.
Cunningham	Jones	Robertson, Va.
Curtis	Jonkman	Robinson, Utah
D'Alesandro	Kean	Robsion, Ky.
Davis, Ohio	Kee	Rockefeller
Davis, Tenn.	Keefe	Rockwell
Day	Kefauver	Rodgers, Pa.
Delaney	Kelley, Pa.	Rogers, Mass.
Dewey	Kelly, Ill.	Rogers, Okla.
Dickstein	Kennedy, Martin J.	Rolph
Dingell	Kennedy, Michael J.	Romjue
Dirksen	Keogh	Russell
Disney	Kilday	Sabath
Domengeaux	Kinzer	Sacks
Dondero	Kirwan	Sanders
Doughton	Kleberg	Satterfield
Downs	Klein	Sauthoff
Drewry	Knutson	Scanlon
Duncan	Kunkel	Schulte
Durham	Landis	Scott
Dworshak	Lane	Secrest
Eaton	Lanham	Shafer, Mich.
Eberharter	Larrabee	Shanley
Edmiston	Lea	Short
Elliot, Mass.	Leavy	Sikes
Elliott, Calif.	LeCompte	Simpson
Elston	Lemke	Smith, Maine
Engel	Lesinski	Smith, Ohio
Englebright	Lewis	Smith, Va.
Smith, Wash.	Tarver	Wene
Smith, W. Va.	Tenerowicz	West
Snyder	Thill	Wheat
Somers, N. Y.	Thom	Whelchel
South	Thomas, N. J.	White
Sparkman	Thomason	Whittington
Spence	Tibbott	Wickersham
Springer	Tolan	Wigglesworth
Starnes, Ala.	Traynor	Williams
Steagall	Treadway	Wilson
Stearns, N. H.	Van Zandt	Wolcott
Stefan	Vincent, Ky.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Stevenson	Vinson, Ga.	Wolverton, N. J.
Stratton	Voorhis, Calif.	Woodruff, Mich.
Sullivan	Vorys, Ohio	Woodrum, Va.
Sumners, Tex.	Wadsworth	Wright
Sutphin	Ward	Young
Sweeney	Wasielewski	Youngdahl
Taber	Weaver	Zimmerman
Talle	Weiss	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—84

Barry	Granger	Patrick
Beam	Grant, Ind.	Peterson, Fla.
Bell	Green	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Bennett	Guyer	Plauché
Blackney	Gwynne	Plumley
Bolton	Harrington	Reece, Tenn.
Bonner	Hendricks	Rees, Kans.
Bradley, Pa.	Hinshaw	Sasscer
Buckler, Minn.	Jarrett	Schaefer, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.	Johns	Schuetz
Byron	Johnson, Ill.	Scrugham
Carlson	Johnson, Ind.	Shannon
Casey, Mass.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sheppard
Chapman	Kerr	Sheridan
Clark	Kilburn	Smith, Pa.
Clason	Kocialkowski	Smith, Wis.
Cluett	Kopplemann	Sumner, Ill.
Cole, Md.	Kramer	Talbot
Collins	Lambertson	Terry
Cullen	McIntyre	Thomas, Tex.
Dies	Maciejewski	Tinkham
Ditter	Magnuson	Vreeland
Douglas	Marcantonio	Walter
Ellis	Monroney	Welch
Fitzpatrick	Moser	Whitten
Ford, Miss.	Nichols	Winter
Gibson	O'Day	Worley
Gifford	Osmers	
Gilchrist		

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Clark with Mr. Bennett.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Carlson.

Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Rees of Kansas.

Mr. Cullen with Mr. Ditter.

Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Gilchrist.

Mr. Monroney with Mr. Johns.

Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Grant of Indiana.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Terry with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Patrick with Mr. Lambertson.

Mr. Chapman with Mr. Cluett.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Collins with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Gwynne.

Mr. Granger with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Guyer.

Mr. McIntyre with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Green with Mr. Clason.

Mr. Gibson with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Johnson of Illinois.

Mr. Dies with Mr Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Barry with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Harrington with Miss Sumner of Illinois.

Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Tinkham.

Mr. Plauché with Mr. Jarrett.

Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

Mr. Beam with Mr. Marcantonio.

Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Maciejewski.

Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Magnuson.

Mr. Kramer with Mrs. Byron.

Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Kopplemann.

Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania with Mr. Worley.

Mr. Kocialkowski with Mr. Casey of Massachusetts.

Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Moser.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs may have the privilege of sitting during the sessions of the House for the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

SUNDRY MATTERS AFFECTING THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 4476) providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4476) providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and agree to the same.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. EWING THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
Managers on the part of the House.

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
JOSH LEE,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4476) providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed

upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

This bill relates to a number of matters which are largely of an administrative nature. It was passed by the House several months before war was declared. The Senate amendments make changes which are chiefly necessary by reason of the different conditions which exist now that this country is engaged in war. The conferees recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendments.

Amendments Nos. 1, 2, 6, 8, 17, 25, 27, 30, 36, 38, 41, 45, 47, 49, and 53: These amendments strike out provisions in different sections of the House bill which limited the period during which such sections were to remain in effect to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942. In lieu of these limitations, Senate amendment No. 55 provides that the act shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months thereafter, or until such earlier time as the Congress or the President may designate.

Amendments Nos. 3, 4, 7, 16, 18, 24, 26, 29, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 46, 48, 51, and 52: These amendments correct section numbers and make other clerical and clarifying changes.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6 suspend the limitation as to the number of Army officers who may participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights.

Amendments Nos. 9, 10, and 12 provide that places in Alaska shall be treated as outside the continental United States for the purposes of section 3, relating to appointment and transfer of personnel.

Amendments Nos. 11 and 13 strike out language which is made unnecessary by reason of amendments 14 and 15.

Amendment No. 14 provides that when civilian employees are on duty within zones from which their dependents should be evacuated, or are sent to places where their dependents cannot accompany them for military reasons, their dependents and household effects may be moved at Government expense.

Amendment No. 15 provides that in certain cases where civilian employees are assigned to temporary duty away from their permanent stations their dependents and household effects may be moved at Government expense.

Amendment No. 19 provides that funds available for paying travel allowances shall be available for paying allowances authorized for dependents of Army personnel without regard to whether such personnel is ordered to active duty for periods in excess of 15 days, and for the payment of allowances for travel from home to first station, and from last station to home, when ordered to or relieved from active duty.

Amendments Nos. 20 and 21 contain the same provisions with respect to military personnel as are contained in amendments 14 and 15, respectively, with respect to civilian employees.

Amendment No. 22 provides that military personnel for whom transportation of household effects is authorized may elect to have such household effects moved at Government expense to any place in the United States, for storage at their own expense for the duration of the war.

Amendment No. 23 strikes out language relating to matters which are covered by section 4 of the bill, as amended by the Senate.

Amendment No. 28 makes the provisions of section 6 applicable to the War Shipping Administration, which has been created since the bill passed the House.

Amendment No. 50 strikes out section 15 of the House bill, as the subject matter is now covered by the First and Second War Powers Acts.

Amendment No. 54 is a saving provision with regard to the First and Second War Power Acts.

Amendment No. 55 is the provision limiting the effective period of the act which was referred to above.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
W. G. ANDREWS,
DOW W. HARTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I believe a very brief explanation of this report will be sufficient to satisfy the Members of the House.

This bill was passed by the House in April 1941. It went to the Senate and was not considered there until the month of May 1942, a little more than a year after it was passed by the House.

The bill relates to numerous matters affecting the military operations of the War Department and the military forces and, of course, authorizes appropriations for fiscal years. The War Department has found that due to conditions which have arisen since the declaration of war and since the country has been involved in actual military operations around the world, it is necessary not only to move troops from one place to another but to evacuate the families of soldiers in many parts of the world from one area to another. Because of this the War Department has been very much limited in the expenditure of funds by reason of the fiscal year limitation.

The Senate placed 55 amendments in the bill, and they are divided into 3 groups. The amendment relating to the removal of the fiscal year limitations is dealt with in about 10 different amendments. The others are merely clarifying so as to conform the other provisions of the bill to that provision.

The provisions in another group are those which make it possible for the Army to use any funds they have on hand, regardless of the fiscal year for which they were appropriated, in transporting men from one place to another.

Another provision is that where the men's household goods have to be moved, say from Camp Belvoir to Camp Meade, the Army finds that it is cheaper to provide storage for these goods and transport the men, where they have families, without transporting the household goods. Then, in some instances, where the families have to go back to the civilian communities, they can remove them to a place in their own State or in their own community, where they are provided with accommodations and assistance from relatives and friends.

All this report does is to make more convenient the conduct of the military operations, and provides more expeditious use of the funds.

Mr. SECREST. Is this limited to the duration of the war?

Mr. MAY. It is limited to the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter. If there are no questions, and no one cares to speak upon any provision of the bill, I move the previous question upon the report.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TRAINING AND EDUCATION OF DEFENSE WORKERS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 316) making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 for the training and education of defense workers; and, pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that the time be equally divided between the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. BOREN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is there a limitation on the time for debate?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman did not include any limitation of time in his request.

Mr. TABER. The time consumed will not be over 10 minutes, probably.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It may take more than that, but the matter will be disposed of very quickly.

Mr. BOREN. There is no desire to set any length of time, then.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 316, with Mr. RAMSPECK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we are engaged in the greatest war—extending over the widest area—affecting the largest number of people—involving the most vital issues—fraught with the gravest consequences—and waged with the most destructive weapons in the annals of mankind.

In this struggle the merits of our form of government, the efficiency of our economic system, our capacity for production, and the temper and spirit of the American people are being tested as never before. More is at stake than in any previous war. At Yorktown, at New Orleans, and at Gettysburg only our own destiny hung in the balance. Had we lost, we could have looked forward to another field and another day. But today we defend the last citadel of freedom on earth. If America fails, democracy fails, self-government perishes, and the clock of time marking the progress of human rights is set back a thousand years.

How significant, then, is the dawning realization that we are winning the war. Slowly, painfully, at staggering cost and mounting sacrifice, we are moving at last, from defeat toward victory. At last we are reaching comparable mobilization and production.

The flood of weapons and munitions pouring from American factories, and now on its way to our Allies and our own forces at the front, exceeds all estimates,

and it is just beginning. By 1943, when we reach full production, it will dwarf into insignificance all former military and industrial achievements.

In March we put, in round numbers, $3,000,000,000 worth of war material on the line; in April, three and a half billion; this month it will be four billion; this fall, $5,000,000,000 per month; next spring $6,000,000,000; a year from today, $7,000,000,000 per month. And that does not mean the mere expenditure of dollars. It means that amount in the latest, most efficient, most effective tanks, planes, and guns in the largest quantities produced anywhere in the world.

Already we are taking command of the air, the first step toward supremacy in modern warfare. On the ground, our tanks are meeting every test on Russian, African, and Australian fronts. And our under-water craft, now giving an account of itself in every quarter of the globe, is being augmented at a rate unprecedented in naval construction.

Our mobilization of manpower is just as impressive. With a standing army so small a year ago as to be inconsequential, men are being steadily called to the colors and inducted into the service at a rate which envisions 3,600,000 under arms by the opening of 1943 and an eventual minimum of 8,000,000 men as they are needed. Mobilization is proceeding in an orderly way with a notable lack of the scandals which attended the raising of the comparatively insignificant force of 1898 and the lack of facilities and equipment of 1917. Notwithstanding the speed with which this number of men is being mustered in, there have been no epidemics, no complications in commissary and ordnance departments, and our forces today are the best fed, best clothed, best equipped, with the smallest percentage of hospitalization ever enlisted under the American flag or any other flag in any war.

Never before has a nation been changed from peacetime basis to war status or has industry been converted from civil to military production so completely and in so short a time. The speed and skill with which the transition has been effected border on the miraculous.

Through what agency have the American people effected this remarkable transformation? Primarily through the American Congress, representing them, acting for them, raising the money, appropriating the funds, auditing the expenditures, and shaping the legislation which has transformed the velvet glove and armed the mailed fist that is protecting American institutions and shaking the foundations of despotism throughout the world.

It is true that the immediate direction of the war is under the executive branch of the Government. But only Congress can declare war, can approve major appointments and commissions, can provide money, ships, planes, armament, and the sinues of war, without which the Executive power is impotent. In the last analysis it is Congress, representing the Nation by direct commission at the polls, which makes war, supports the war, and brings the war to a successful conclusion. And no Congress has more competently exercised its functions or better performed its duties in that respect than the Seventy-seventh Congress. The Continental Congress at times all but abandoned Washington and his ragged regiments. The Civil War Congress, torn by internal dissension, was frequently a handicap rather than a help to Lincoln in his efforts to preserve the Union. The Spanish War Congress reeked with embalmed-beef scandals and delinquencies in fever-racked camps that took a greater toll of American soldiers than the enemy. Even the World War Congress moved with such confusion and delay that not a single American plane or piece of American artillery ever reached the battle line. What a contrast presented by the Seventy-seventh Congress in its prompt and adequate provision for every need and contingency of a vastly greater theater of action. Its record is without parallel. It is writing in the conduct of this war one of the brightest chapters in American history.

In view of this remarkable record, you would naturally expect to see daily throughout the Nation editorial columns aflame with the commendation of the Congress, of its work, and the results secured.

What, then, is our astonishment to read in papers with national circulation such comments as this:

> For collective brains, guts, vision, and leadership, the Seventy-seventh would rank close to the bottom of any of the 77 Congresses that have assembled biannually since 1789.

This quotation is not from German sources but was carried in an American magazine, and later incorporated in a vivid motion-picture dramatization that appeared on the screen in every city of importance in the country. It was also widely quoted over the major radio networks.

In the same article was this statement:

> Not one thing that is worth a tinker's damn comes out of Washington.

That astonishing statement, of course, includes all activities of the Government—legislative, executive, and judicial. Nothing from the President, the Army, the Navy, the Congress, or the Supreme Court that is worth a damn.

But the gifted author of the article and the patriotic magazine which published it seems to have Congress particularly in mind, and adds:

> This Congress contains no Websters, Clays, or Calhouns. * * * It contains an overflowing measure of hacks, demagogues, and timeservers.

Evidently the magazine considers the growth and progress of our people and our Government for the last hundred and seventeen years as negligible, for neither Webster, Clay, nor Calhoun have served in Congress since the Nineteenth Congress.

The article continues:

> The case against the collective membership of the Seventy-seventh Congress is as clear as that which Thomas Jefferson made against George 3d in the Declaration of Independence.

It is to be noted that the author does not signal out any particular Member of the House or Senate. His indictment is sweeping and condemns without benefit of clergy the entire membership of both bodies collectively and individually. To his jaundiced eye all are vile. Only he and his magazine are holy. All wisdom dieth with him.

Here is a further comment over a Nation-wide hook-up by another phylacteried commentator, quoted with commendation by another purveyor of jaundiced journalism:

> Congress has remained a collection of 2-cent politicians * * * the ignorance and provincialism of Congress renders it incapable of meeting the needs of modern government. People don't give a damn what the average Senator or Congressman says * * * they know it is 99 percent tripe, ignorance, and demogoguery and not to be relied on.

But even these prescient gentlemen, with all their monopoly of the wisdom, virtue, and patriotism of the Nation, occasionally let their foot slip and one of them closes his phillipic with the admonition:

> Warning: Don't forget the primaries. In the 1942 elections the people must choose better Congressmen.

A number of States have held their primaries and others have passed the date of filing since the enunciation of this stern call to duty and it would be taken for granted that there would already be in evidence indications of a tidal wave of outraged citizenry sweeping to the polls to turn out these arrant "liars," "incompetents," "demagogs," "grafters," and "traitors," comprising the Seventy-seventh Congress.

As a matter of fact in practically every State in which the will and intent of the electorate has been evidenced up to this time, the sitting Member has been endorsed for return to the Seventy-eighth Congress. Only in a few isolated instances, in which there were special issues, has there been any indication of more than the normal turnover due at the close of every 2-years' session.

So we give little heed to these self-anointed critics or their malicious slander of men who are as much a part of the American forces as the Army or the Navy, and who are working long hours far into the night exerting every effort within their power to bring victory to the American Army and safety to the American people. They have abused and vilified every Congress and every man in public life from Washington to Roosevelt. It is apparent at first glance that they are primarily interested in the circulation or box-office receipts rather than the welfare of the people or the success of the war.

But it must not be overlooked that their indictment of the legislative branch of the American Government is an indictment of the American people. Congress is a cross section of the Nation. Every Member of Congress has attained his seat against strenuous opposition and after desperate fighting. In every congressional district there are 500 men who would like to come to Congress and are perennially potential candidates for election.

In the covert battles, waged continuously and without respite in every congressional district, only the strongest and

ablest and sincerest win. It is a survival of the fittest. There is little opportunity for dissimulation or deception. Every candidate lives in a glass house, and the voters know him for what he is. That is especially true of the sitting Member. He cannot escape commitment. His opinions and decisions and his votes are constantly before the people in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the newspapers. Reporters and commentators search out every foible and weakness and pillory every delinquency, and he is elected or reelected only because he is representative of the people of his district because of his reflection of their point of view, because of his ability to champion their interests and aspirations. He is one of them and typical of the composite citizen voter of his section and State. And any criticism which can justly be made of him, his character, his ability, or his patriotism can as justly be made against the character, ability, and patriotism of the people who send him to Washington to represent them. Any reflection on him is a reflection on the people and the State from which he comes.

And yet I would not circumscribe by one word the flow of malodorous and unreasoning criticism that is the daily lot of every Congressman individually and collectively. It is a tribute to the glory and success of our form of government. No citizen of the Reich ever utters a word of such comment or criticism against the German Reichstag or the Norwegian Risndag or the French Chamber of Deputies or the Italian Parliament. Only in the democracies is such criticism permitted. And so I thank God that here in America any citizen, responsible or otherwise, may still throw brickbats and custard pies, actually or verbally, at any official of the Government, including his own Representatives, his only safeguard against autocracy and despotism.

I trust the day will never come when it will be otherwise, for until that day does come men may still call their souls their own. Men will still be free—free to come and go, to speak and to worship, to live in security and happiness, under their own government, beneath their own vine and fig tree.

Too frequently there is a studied method in these criticisms of Congress, and they are part of a carefully devised program of derogation by those who seek to discredit representative government in order to serve their own interests. Congress is the bulwark of the people against economic and political as well as military dictatorship. Preservation of constitutional government depends on the maintenance of the National Legislature and its freedom of action. When Congress is destroyed the American Government is destroyed and as long as Congress survives and functions as it is functioning in this national emergency there need be no apprehension.

Let me reiterate. We are winning the war. Slowly but surely we are driving back the invaders, defending our frontiers, preserving our liberties and the freedom of the world. This Congress is meeting its obligations and discharging its duties as no Congress has met its obligations and discharged its duties from the First Congress, under the Speakership of Speaker Muhlenburg, to the Seventy-seventh Congress, under the Speakership of Speaker RAYBURN.

It is true, as the columnist says, Daniel Webster is not a Member of this Congress. His measured perorations would be out of place in the work-a-day atmosphere of these mass-production sessions where only facts and figures count. And unquestionably he could drink under the table any of the 435 Members of this House. But it has been my privilege, perhaps more than any other one man, with the possible exception of Asher Hinds, to read attentively what is available of the proceedings of the Congresses in which he served and the proceedings of the succeeding Congresses down to the present time. And on the basis of a careful study of the records of these past Congresses, and the observations of the more than 30 years I have spent in various capacities on this floor, it is my conviction that in no previous Congress have the proceedings and debate attained a higher plane or evinced a higher degree of statesmanship than in this Congress. And certainly the present Congress has transacted vastly more business, and has handled it more expeditiously and efficiently, than has been transacted in any previous Congress. The transcript of the RECORD and the printed hearings and reports of committees demonstrate that beyond the possibility of contradiction.

I congratulate the Seventy-seventh Congress, its leadership, its committees, and its loyal rank and file, on the remarkable success of its conduct of the war. No criticism or calumny can detract from that record. Judged by actual accomplishments, which cannot be ignored or denied, the remarkable fidelity and success with which Congress has discharged its duties in this war is without precedent in American history.

In continuation of this record of efficiency, the Committee on Appropriations reports today a joint resolution providing additional funds for the training and education of defense workers.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my distinguished friend from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. First, let me congratulate the gentleman on his remarkable presentation of the record. His was not a defense of Congress, as this Congress needs no defense because the record speaks for itself. The indictment which is wrongfully placed by no disinterested parties against the Seventy-seventh Congress, according to the gentleman's preceding statement, has been carried somewhat to preceding Congresses. These other charges are equally groundless, regardless of the motives back of them. For instance, I saw in a movie the headline that the outbreak of the war in Europe in 1939 found Congress, as well as the entire Government, unprepared. I would like to ask the gentleman, is it not true that in the spring of 1938 we passed the largest regular peacetime Navy and Army appropriation bills in our history up to that date? Did not Congress pass an authorization bill for a two-ocean Navy which was without precedent at that date, and that was in the Seventy-fifth Congress. The Seventy-sixth Congress, following farseeing leadership, took wise and necessary steps in preparation for this crisis.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Our Nation is a peace-loving nation. Its institutions are founded upon an expectation of enduring peace. For many years we have proceeded under the universal impression that the Nation would never again be engaged in war. In view of that fact, the timely provision to which the gentleman refers was all the more remarkable in its forward looking policy.

The pending resolution provides for an appropriation of additional funds to complete the program for the education of defense workers. We are having a great demand for skilled workers. There is not a plant or factory in the Nation that is not short-handed. All need men, skilled men, and this work under the Bureau of Education, handled through the educational facilities of the States, is training young men in courses which fit them to go into the factories where war work is in progress and at once take up duties without loss of time or effort. For this work $52,400,000 was provided in the last session, but on estimates made prior to Pearl Harbor, and, of course, prior to the declaration of war, and the increase in activity in industry, make it necessary to provide for more students and additional courses, and the appropriation of $9,500,000 is expected to carry on the work for the remainder of the fiscal year.

If there are no further questions, I yield now to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself about 3 minutes. I am glad that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has taken this time to tell the American people the facts with reference to the situation here in Congress, with reference to the work that the committees of Congress do, the character of the debates here on the floor, and the devotion that is given by the Members of the House to their duties and the ability that is displayed. Personally I do not think that any responsible American source is going to challenge the ability of Congress. That attack upon the ability of Congress comes from a foreign reactionary source which has no real conception of the spirit and character which have builded America and which have carried us to the heights which we have attained.

This particular measure we have before us here today is to provide $9,500,000 to continue to carry on the work of vocational training for defense workers, in the hands of local boards of education, according to the program that has already been carried for ten and a half months of this fiscal year. It is a program that is needed to increase the supply of those workers, not only for the defense factories but for such things as the president of Airacobra spoke about yesterday in connection with airplanes, that we may have proper ground mechanics to keep the airplanes in the air and keep them flying. I believe this money necessary to round out about $67,000,000 that

is going to be spent on that supplementary vocational program in this fiscal year. Nearly 2,000,000 men are being trained and given refresher courses in all these programs, and I believe that it is necessary that this resolution be passed at this time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN].

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of this discussion I made inquiry as to the limitation of time under the plan to be pursued. Gentlemen on both sides of the aisle felt that about 10 minutes would be sufficient to dispose of this matter, and I presume that optimism is based on their long experience in putting through appropriations; but in checking this resolution I find that we have appropriated $52,400,000 for this purpose, and they now come back for this $9,500,000, to be dispensed with in 10 minutes, or a million a minute. I was interested in the comment that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] made that the committee had carefully audited these appropriations, and I just want to raise a few points and questions. In the first place, the program of training workers is in about the same shape as the program for housing facilities in the Nation was a short time ago, when there was a score of agencies duplicating activities.

The National Youth Administration has a worker-training program. The W. P. A. has a worker-training program. How many other agencies, I am uncertain, but they are numerous. I am willing to appropriate whatever is necessary for this purpose, but I believe it should be centralized under a specific program, all going through one channel, so that we can put our finger on its utilization.

I notice the report is given that in Oklahoma there are 30 cities with 50 schools in operation under this program that have trained some 4,000 workers. I believe that this money should be spent in such institutions as mechanical colleges and technological colleges, where the training is actually prepared for, but I do not know of any 50 schools in 30 cities in Oklahoma where such institutions exist. In fact, I know that they do not exist. So for what purpose are they using the money in these other places?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I am, of course, in favor of this appropriation, but I should like to say to the gentleman from Oklahoma that I share very strongly his sentiments about the great number of training courses now available under this or that Government agency.

I call attention to the fact that at page 49 of the hearings on the sixth supplemental national defense appropriation bill there will be found a detailed statement indicating that there are about 17 of these courses in the general field of training.

I feel with the gentleman that there should be some sort of over-all, authoritative coordination of the entire training picture. It should not be necessary to make so many appropriations for different courses, which may well overlap or duplicate each other.

Mr. BOREN. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution. My remark in that connection was not directed as an attack on this particular appropriation, but I hope it is a constructive suggestion to the Appropriations Committee and to pass on to the executive department.

I want to point out that this program as provided in this legislation spends $300 per person for training each of the men it claims to have under training. No doubt a good portion of that is wisely spent, but I have good reason to believe, from the figures given of 50 schools in 30 cities in my State, and comparable figures for every State of the Union, that there is a percentage of it, in my judgment equal to the amount of deficiency that they ask, that is not wisely spent.

I feel we should put a warning in the hands of such agencies as are engaged in these various purposes that they need not come back for deficiencies until they can show definitely, specifically, and absolutely the wisdom of each dollar that they have spent.

I hope that the Committee on Appropriations will carefully audit each dollar in the future.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOREN. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know where the gentleman gets his figures, but we were told that the cost of this training program was about $50 per person. That is on the preemployment trainees. On the so-called refresher courses, or part time course, about $25 per person. I do not know how the gentleman arrived at his $300 figure, but that is not the information that was given to the committee, and we do not believe that is correct.

Mr. BOREN. The figure that I took was the total number of people listed in the hearings that have been under training. I simply divided the total appropriation by that total number of trainees, and in simple mathematics it makes $300 per person. Of course, if they are spending $50 per person for training and $250 for administration, that is something worth looking into.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes. I want to get this clear.

I want to call the gentleman's attention to the fact that while the total cost of this program is $66,000,000, the number that they told us would be trained under it was over 500,000. That means $130 each. That is quite different from $300. It is being done under the boards of education of the different local communities and not from Washington. The overhead in Washington is extremely small.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. BOREN. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman will see from the table on page 2 of the committee report that it runs up to 2,000,000 instead of 500,000, the total number to be ultimately trained.

Mr. TABER. That would divide it down to less than $40 each.

Mr. BOREN. The divergence in figures offered by the 2 members of this committee indicates uncertainty on the amount spent but I hope the lowest figures that have been brought out here are correct, and I am glad to have this additional information. It may be, of course, that there is an error in my calculation. I am willing to spend whatever money is necessary to adequately train a worker, but I again call to the attention of the committee the fact that there are not 50 schools in 30 cities in Oklahoma that have technological or mechanical organizations set up to train men for the purpose that we are training them for.

I want to say again that the point of my rising is that these many agencies for training should be consolidated so that we can put our finger on what we are spending and how it is being spent. There is great duplication in these various agencies.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I shall support this resolution today because I have concrete evidence of the fine job that is being done by the United States Department of Education, the State departments of education, and by the local communities in the training of young men for the defense industries of this country.

In 1937 I sponsored and had passed in this House the apprenticeship bill. During the debate on that bill I stated on the floor of this House that if the day ever came that this country was at war, industries would cry for trained mechanics. That day has arrived, and all over this country all the defense industries are crying for trained men and trained women. I stated upon the floor of this House a year ago that we should consider, and consider very well, the training of the women of this country in the defense industries; and that day, too, has arrived.

In my district there are several of these schools training the youth of the country, both under the Department of Education and the National Youth Administration. I know that in my home town during the last 2 years over 1,000 youths of the district were trained and placed in defense industries—in the building of submarines, airplanes, guns; in fact, practically everything having to do with the defense of this country.

I agree with the gentleman from Oklahoma that possibly there should be a coordination of all these training programs into one. A great deal has been said about the National Youth Administration. Let me tell you what the N. Y. A. has done for the boys of several States in this country who received their preliminary training in their own State and then came to Connecticut to receive their final training and be placed in defense industries. Listen to these figures: From New York City 233 came to Connecticut and received their final training and were placed in war industries; Pennsylvania, 238; West Virginia, 310; Missis-

sippi, 495; Arkansas, 139; Kentucky, 294; Oklahoma, 210; Tennessee, 42; Kansas, 76; Maine, 50; New Hampshire, 6; Missouri, 25. These boys received their preliminary training in their own States and their final training in Connecticut. They were immediately placed in industries making implements for defense.

Only last week the Governor of Connecticut issued a statement to the effect that we are still short several thousand trained workers for the war industries of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I say this is one of the greatest things this country has ever done. It is something that must be done. More attention has got to be paid to the training of the mechanic of the future.

Under the bill that was passed in 1937 45 States adopted the plan, together with Hawaii and Puerto Rico. It was one of the soundest plans ever adopted for the training of the youth of this country. Had we then had the foresight to go into that program extensively and appropriate money to put the program into full effect, today we would not be so short of trained mechanics.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I should like to ask the gentleman this for the RECORD: Do these young people who are trained by the National Youth Administration under this program receive similar compensation to that paid other workers doing the same work in the defense plants?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think they do.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is the gentleman sure about it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I know some of these industries are paying these youngsters for being trained, paying them while they are going to school.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. But my question is whether these industries are paying these young people comparable compensation to that paid others doing similar work.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes, I understand they are.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to legislation which will be brought before us for consideration in a very short time which will have for its purpose making it possible for our soldier boys wherever they may be located to have the opportunity of voting in the coming elections. Many Members here present will doubtless remember the difficulty we had during the first World War to secure any ballots to send to the men who were in the service. There was a great deal of dissatisfaction on their part, as important legislation was enacted during their absence in which they had no opportunity to express their views.

I hope it will be possible that legislation will be enacted, between now and the time for filing primary papers, whereby the boys in the service may be recorded. I do not think a better present or a better recognition of their services would be possible than to carry out just that idea.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman has done a service in calling attention to this matter. Does not the gentleman think it is necessary that this legislation be passed very promptly so that there may be time enough to put the machinery in motion in order to have it effective?

Mr. TREADWAY. I suppose there will be great difficulty in reaching portions of our troops, but, nevertheless, every effort should be made on the part of the Government and on the part of the Governors of the States to reach every man to give him the right to vote, certainly at election time, and, if possible, in the primaries of those States where primaries have not yet been held. I agree with the suggestion of the gentleman from New York that this legislation is of primary importance and should be speedily enacted by Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may require to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to unduly delay consideration and action on this bill. I feel it is a very important measure and one that should have no opposition from any Member of this body. The proposed deficiency of $9,000,000 is not a part of the regular appropriation, for the vocational agricultural program with which all of us are, of course, familiar. None of these funds are for the purpose of carrying on that popular worth-while program. The funds asked for in the pending bill do involve training for industry and for that part of industry engaged in the war program.

I deeply regret that I cannot agree in this instance with my colleague from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN], with whom I am pleased to say I usually agree and for whom I have much respect and admiration. The information I have is that Dr. Studebaker has a most excellent vocational education program in Oklahoma. May I just say here that I have known Mr. J. B. Perky, State supervisor of the Bureau of Vocational Education in Oklahoma, for many years and am familiar with his program. He has done an outstanding job. His program is a real credit to our State, and he has a very splendid loyal organization.

I do not doubt the figures Dr. Studebaker gave our committee with reference to the 50 schools in Oklahoma where youth is now receiving training for defense jobs. Such trained youth are really getting those jobs too.

I cannot overemphasize the importance of this part of the defense program. Dr. Studebaker appeared before our committee, and I am sure members were much impressed by his testimony. He made it plain that he is not trying to take over the N. Y. A., the W. P. A., or any other New Deal agency, as some have suspected. He also gave some information and figures that speak for themselves. He stated that during World War No. 1 they trained only 60,000 boys and girls altogether for defense jobs. During the present emergency, however, we find that they are training more people in a month now than they trained during all of World War No. 1.

Here are some of the figures he gave the committee: His organization is now training 231,000 plus in trades and industry schools; 179,000 youth are attending evening schools; 240,000 adults are receiving training for defense jobs, so important to speeding up production, which, of course, means the speeding up to the successful conclusion of this war for the very existence of the American way of life.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The table at the back of the report indicates that the current year's production will be nearly 2,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Nearly 2,000,000 altogether. Those figures are impressive and speak for themselves. I am delighted that the gentleman from New York and I agree for once. Seriously this is a very important program, and I hope the pending bill will pass without a single objection from any Member on either side of the aisle of this House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, this resolution making an appropriation of $9,500,000 to accelerate the program of training of workers for war industries is fully justified in the hearings before the Appropriations Committee. The vocational service training program has done a fine job. It rightfully deserves recognition for the part it has played in helping bring about the great increase in our production of munitions of war. No nation, during times of war or peace, can have a better asset than an abundance of competently trained skilled workers. In my State we are very proud of the program that is being fostered by the Office of Education. Twenty-one cities have vocational training programs which are operated through 24 schools. The program in Tennessee has been successful. I wish that it could be greatly enlarged. I am glad the Appropriations Committee and Congress are so enthusiastically supporting the vocational training program for defense workers. I know that it may be possible at this time, but after the war I hope that the program will not only be continued but that it will be accelerated so that eventually we will have provisions for vocational training in the larger high schools and elementary schools throughout the country.

Experience during recent years indicates that we need increased vocational facilities for the school children of America. The tendency is to specialize in some kind of trade or a vocation. This is a necessary result of the mechanical progress of our Nation. I do not mean to

disparage the value of an ordinary high-school or college education, but I do think that more emphasis should be put upon vocational training. Many boys who have graduated from high school and college would be better off if part of their education had consisted of becoming a skilled technician in some trade or avocation.

This program is requiring the assimilation of much equipment and facilities. The question arises as to what will be done with this equipment when the war is over. I am glad the staff of the Department of Education is giving study to this matter. I hope that they will conclude that provisions should be made for the use of the equipment in elementary and high schools, and that Congress will sustain a continuation of the program by making appropriations so that the equipment in these schools may be put to good use.

I am heartily in favor of the resolution, and I hope that it may be passed without a dissenting vote.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I realize that vocational education is doing a great good. It is being operated by the Federal Government in conjunction with the States, and in that way we have a dual control over its operations. I believe that the money being spent at this time for the education of the youth of this country is probably money wisely spent. If we do not take much time on many of these bills that come in here, it is because there is unanimity of opinion, and therefore it is not necessary to take time.

However, there are other bills that are being fostered along the line of education that I am not so sure are in that same category, and I believe attention should be called to them before their consideration on the floor of the House. When I read the statement of the Treasury of May 22, I find that we have gone in the red $16,801,000,000. We have got to put the brakes on some of the spending of this Congress, because we have spent money too lavishly and too freely, and we will find that it will be difficult to put taxes enough on the people to bear the burden.

I call attention to the fact that I am approving the spending of the nine and one-half million dollars provided in this bill, knowing that the results obtained from this program will warrant the expense. But in the very near future we are going to be asked to appropriate more money for the National Youth Administration. The National Youth Administration is spending too much money when compared with the results attained, and that is the point I want to bring to the attention of the House right now.

I know of instances where money has been spent in fabulous sums, and the good obtained from the expenditure of those vast sums of money was not justified. When that bill comes before the House, we want to begin to put the ax on it. We want to know where every dollar of that money will be spent, and we want the results to be in proportion to the amount of money spent.

I am satisfied that the money involved in this bill is the most economical way we can develop the youth of this country for the industries in which they will, no doubt, get jobs.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What overlapping is there, if any, between the appropriation and activities covered by this bill and the National Youth Administration?

Mr. RICH. I do not think there is any whatever. I do not think there is any overlapping. One has nothing to do with the other. But the National Youth Administration will come in here asking for money, and I want you to put your finger on every penny of it and know it is going to do the good that somebody will tell us about.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the program in this bill is carried out, why should there be any money appropriated for the National Youth Administration?

Mr. RICH. I do not think so.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Neither do I.

Mr. RICH. I think we should eliminate the National Youth Administration altogether and put the money in here where the Federal Board of Education, under Dr. Studebaker and the heads of the educational departments of the various States, will look after it. We will know then that we will get 100 cents value in return to the Federal Government for every dollar we spend.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with the gentleman on that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. LYNCH].

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Chairman, I am wholeheartedly in favor of this joint resolution now before us which appropriates the sum of $9,500,000 for the continuance of vocational training for our youths and refresher and supplementary courses for older men. The Appropriations Committee and its distinguished chairman [Mr. CANNON of Missouri] are to be congratulated on their wisdom and foresight in recognizing the necessity for training workers in national defense.

It is particularly gratifying to know that a large part of this appropriation will be expended on refresher and supplementary courses for older men, enabling them to get back into their old trades or making them, by reason of their already acquired mechanical skill, readily adaptable to new trades or new methods.

This resolution is in line with H. R. 4958, introduced by me on June 4, 1941, which would authorize an appropriation for $10,000,000 for refresher courses in recognized vocational and trade schools for mechanics engaged in trades necessary for national defense.

In this total war there is as great need for trained mechanics as there is for trained soldiers. Congress has not been slow in recognizing that fact. The precision with which this Congress is working and the intelligence and wisdom which it has displayed in the entire war effort are strikingly exemplified by the fact that this morning we passed the Smaller War Plants Corporation bill which has for its purpose the mobilization and utilization of small business concerns for war and essential civilian production and only a few hours thereafter we have before us this present legislation, House Joint Resolution 316, which will, in part, provide the workers for the small business concerns which we hope will get into war production through the medium of the bill we passed earlier in the day.

If this bill passes, as I expect it will, it will be the means of increasing our war production by increasing the number of skilled mechanics available for such work.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, as a school man who has been practically all of his mature life in the classroom or in an administrative capacity in connection with schools, I ought to say something in regard to this appropriation. Like the gentleman from Oklahoma who first spoke here today, I understand the need of restricting overlapping and in safeguarding the expenditure of money even in this splendid cause, but as all of you know, I have many, many times taken the floor of this Chamber to speak in behalf of appropriations for the National Youth Administration and other such educational work.

Now we have before us an appropriation to be used through the Office of Education for this vital war training. I believe that any overlapping has been largely eliminated by voluntary cooperation between the administrators of these agencies. If any still exists, let us deal with it.

I know what has been done in vocational education. Someone has already pointed out here that this is done in connection with local school boards. That I think is the especial merit of this particular plan. The Office of Education has carried on already a splendid piece of work, cooperating as it does with State and local agencies, it reaches into every State and motivates, helps, finances, and actuates the training facilities in almost every school of any importance. It is true in my State, and I am sure it is true in the 47 other States in this Union.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. I understand that under the vocational-training program the vocational training for agriculture has reached into practically every school district of the country, but the appropriation under consideration here today is primarily for training men in mechanical work for industry, for defense activities. I wonder whether or not the vocational-training program under the George-Dean Act for training young men in mechanics has reached into every school district of the States.

Mr. MURDOCK. Perhaps it has not reached as far as we should like. I may say that ever since 1916, when the Smith-Hughes Act was passed and appropria-

tions were made under it, there has been cooperation in industrial training. It has been greatly expanded in defense training in recent months. Of course, it takes certain facilities for this training—machine shops and similar specialized equipment and a highly specialized teaching force. This is one reason I do not think we ought to permit duplication in this great training program. One reason I am so solidly 100 percent for the particular work we are supporting here today is that it avails itself of the machine shops and other facilities and trained teaching staffs which have been built up throughout the country since 1916.

Mr. HARE. My inquiry was not for the purpose of offering any criticism, because I am sympathetic with this appropriation, but the point I make is that there is a necessity for the enlargement of the program under the vocational-training program to reach every community in the States, because I know that in my State only two communities have been reached so far.

Mr. MURDOCK. I will gladly join with the gentleman in extending the benefits of this training. However, one of the reasons why I asked for this time is to express my personal satisfaction with the superb address of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in his opening statement on this bill. It is plainly evident that the gentleman from Missouri feels deeply the pernicious and unwarranted attacks upon Congress which have lately been poisoning the public mind. The gentleman from Missouri, in reviewing the timely and worthy acts of the Congress in furthering our preparedness effort, has used the most superlative degree in his descriptive terms. And well may he use superlatives in connection with this greatest of all struggles for survival, for it is the greatest our Nation or the world has ever faced.

No doubt participants in every conflict feel that their struggle is most significant, but even so, one does not need the perspective of history nor the astronomical calculations of mathematics to realize that this is the greatest of all human conflicts and that its outcome for good or bad will reach to the entire world and for uncounted centuries in the future. Therefore, when we discuss it we must use superlative expressions and when we consider the patriotic and worthy efforts of our Government in its attempt to cope properly with a most critical situation, we must use superlative adjectives, because all others fall short. Also if we point out the unpatriotic and pernicious efforts of those who wrongfully belittle Congress and the chosen representatives of the people, we are again called upon to use superlative terms to denounce them.

The gentleman from Missouri is a great student of constitutional liberty and he very rightfully recalls the keystone position which freedom of speech and of the press hold in our Bill of Rights and in our constitutional framework of liberty. Because of this realization he is all the more competent to denounce the abuse of that freedom by anyone under the pretext of freedom of speech and of the press. As was once said by a noble spirit, "Oh, liberty, what crimes are committed in Thy name!" So we might properly say today, "Oh, freedom of speech and of the press, what license is committed in thy name!"

As for the proper attitude of the American people toward those agencies now influencing the public mind, whenever they wrongfully strive with diabolical cunning to distort facts so as to belittle Congress and so poison the minds of the people against their chosen representatives, undoubtedly it may safely be assumed that "their sins will find them out." One time in my boyhood in a distant community a minister of the Gospel said concerning a disreputable lawyer:

> He has become so bad even his disreputable colleagues were forced to disbar him.

From that remark I assumed that this scoundrel had overplayed his hand among even those of his own kind. Of course, he would have been disbarred much earlier from a bar association of high-minded lawyers. What about these agencies of public expression which, by words through radio or by the printed page, deliberately distort the truth? I think it may safely be assumed, in spite of the fact that so many persons believe firmly every word spoken over radio or appearing in print must be the absolute truth, that enlightened citizens of our country will ultimately see the falsity where it exists.

I believe there are several different kinds of statesmen here in the Nation's Capital, although most of us sent here cannot lay claim to that title. Some are official statesmen, chosen by the people of the various congressional districts or States to represent the people and to speak for the people. Other individuals of this select group are unofficial statesmen, if they properly qualify at all as such, and they may represent even larger constituencies in some cases than do the Members of this body. They may or may not be chosen by their constituents through an election.

I have in mind now certain leaders of large groups of our citizens who are here in Washington to counsel with us duly elected officials toward the proper determination of wise policy in governing the Nation. Among these unofficial statesmen I would classify some outstanding newspaper editors, whether here or at their desks elsewhere, or leading columnists, or widely heard radio commentators, who may not have been chosen by any constituency, but nevertheless represent a more numerous constituency than any Congressman or Senator. Such individuals just mentioned are like watchmen upon a tower. Their responsibility to the people is just as great or even greater than that of any legislative or administrative official.

These unique leaders of thought whom I have called unofficial statesmen may not have taken an oath such as each of us took on assuming our duties here to uphold and support the Constitution of the United States. They may not have subscribed publicly to any code of ethics of which their profession boasts, but their obligation is measured only by their potential influence. If some of them play "petty politics" or stoop to mean and personal privileges for temporary gain, not only will their decent fellows find them out, but their influence upon their millions of followers will quickly wane. It seems to me that any delegated or self-appointed spokesman stationed in this strategic place who distorts the truth, who belittles the effort of his Government in our greatest hour of trial, is not only crumbling the sand under his own feet, but playing false to his country. We Members of Congress are only a few of those here in a strategic position who need to realize the solemn obligation resting upon us and who need to know that we will be measured now and hereafter accordingly as we measure up to that obligation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the record should be clear as to exactly what this program does. I would judge from the remarks of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] that there is perhaps some misunderstanding as to the scope and character of the program this appropriation is intended to implement.

To begin with, there is nothing in common between the program of the National Youth Administration and the program provided under the appropriation which this $9,500,000 appropriation supplements. I have been asked repeatedly by men on the floor whether or not this is in addition to or in connection with the National Youth Administration. They are entirely separate and distinct programs.

I think the gentleman from Arizona correctly expressed the situation by indicating that we have spent hundreds of millions of dollars since 1916 in the development through Federal aids of a great Nation-wide system of vocational education. The Federal Government has provided funds to aid in the development of vocational educational institutions in the various States. The States that have availed themselves of the provisions of that law have developed modern, fine vocational-training centers operated by State directors of vocational training in connection with the regularly established school programs in the various States.

When the need for the preemployment training and refresher training of men necessary and vital to the war industry became so apparent there was set up in the Office of Education a defense program that was superimposed upon the vocational program of this country. The Congress appropriated fifty-four-million-odd dollars to enable the Office of Education to utilize the facilities of the vocational-school systems of this country.

You would be interested to know that the evidence before our subcommittee in relation to the forthcoming appropriation bill for the Federal Security Agency discloses that in practically all of the communities of the United States where

there are vocational school facilities those facilities are now being operated 24 hours a day training men who come there for refresher courses and training men who come for preemployment courses. This fund is designed to supplement the funds provided in the defense vocational training program by allowing the hiring of teachers and instructors to continue this defense vocational training program on a 24-hour basis. Instead of training just a few hundred thousand people, the program contemplates training under this very appropriation which this joint resolution supplements, over 2,000,000. Now they have no connection whatever with N. Y. A., and while there may be some duplication of service in certain communities and while there may be some overlapping, perhaps, you will have an opportunity to view the program of the N. Y. A. when that bill comes before the Congress. To those people who are interested may I state that all you have to do is to read the Budget message of the President submitting the appropriation for N. Y. A., and you will see that the ax has been administered to that agency very, very radically and materially by the President, and it has been reduced now to a program that is definitely associated with the war effort. Mr. Chairman, I earnestly support this legislation as a very great contribution to the war effort.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, the work that has been carried on through money previously appropriated for vocational training has, in my opinion, been about the best-spent money we have had the privilege of appropriating. I think one of the indictments, and probably one of the worst indictments, that has been brought against the educational authorities and the people engaged in the education of the youth of this land is that they have given a little too much of their time to promoting what might be termed "higher education" for the small minority of the youth of this land. The great majority of the young men and women do not have an opportunity to go to college and I have never regarded a man or woman as being educated until they knew how to earn a living.

In my State of North Carolina I have never had to explain, apologize, or even experience one moment of embarrassment over the money spent in this program. One of the outstanding examples of the work being carried on under this program is within a few miles of my home. I have visited it frequently at Newport, N. C. These young men and young women become very much interested in the work and they soon get a vision of being able to do a good job in the particular calling or in the particular field which they select. There is one thing, however, that the States and the Federal Government, in my opinion, must do something about, and that is with respect to the equipment in these shops. As it is at present they have to get their equipment the best way they can, and I dare say 95 percent of the shops are short on equipment. This means that the students are unable to give the time they would like to give to a particular machine. It further means that they limit their enrollment. But in making this criticism or suggestion, I do so not with any idea of removing any of the laurels already won. I do so realizing that we cannot have everything that we might desire in the shop, but at the same time when we need the skilled worker, if there were some way we could set up the equipment in the shops, we would, at the same time, step up the output of trained men. Just how this can be worked out I would not attempt to give the details, but after visiting many of these shops I find that this is the only criticism expressed.

Of course, we need skilled men, we need trained workmen, and there are private schools over the country now training welders and mechanics of various kinds. They pay quite a bit in tuition and there is work and plenty of material for these private schools.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this program will continue and the enrollment increase in number.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk may read the joint resolution for amendment.

The Clerk read House Joint Resolution 316, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the purposes herein set forth, the sum specified, as follows:

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY

OFFICE OF EDUCATION

Education and training, defense workers (national defense): For an additional amount for payments to States, etc. (national defense), fiscal year 1942, for the cost of vocational courses of less than college grade, as provided in paragraph (1) under this caption in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1942, as amended by the second paragraph under the same caption in title III of the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942 (Public Law 528), approved April 28, 1942, $9,500,000.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, I wish to commend the Committee on Appropriations for bringing to us the resolution now before us to add $9,500,000 to the $52,400,000 heretofore voted by the Congress to give vocational training to young men and women to equip them for service in our defense plants.

We are now engaged in a great and total war. The facilities of every factory, plant, shop, and mill, and the brains and the hands of all Americans necessary, should be utilized in producing more and more ships, planes, bombers, tanks, guns, shells, clothing, and other supplies and equipment for our armed forces, so that our country and those associated with us may in the near future have complete superiority over the Axis Powers on land and sea and in the air, in order that victory may come at the earliest moment possible and with the least loss of human life.

Some very effective work has been done along these lines already. I have always looked with favor on vocational training. The hands should be trained as well as the mind.

Our distinguished colleague the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN] said that a young man or a young woman is not fully and completely educated unless they have been so trained that they can earn an honest livelihood for themselves. I have long entertained the same views.

In the year 1919 or 1920, I do not recall which, when the Republicans were in control in the House and Senate, I was a member of the Committee on Education and that committee, under the able leadership of Dr. Fess of Ohio, reported a bill, providing for vocational training for those physically handicapped. Its purpose was to take these physically handicapped citizens off of the human scrap heap and train them and make them self-supporting citizens. In an able speech by a certain distinguished Member of the House, the constitutionality of the measure was seriously challenged and the advisability of entering upon such a policy was seriously questioned. It was my pleasure to meet that challenge on the floor. The measure was adopted by the House and later by the Senate and we set out on the policy of vocational training for the physically handicapped throughout the Nation. This policy has been continued through the years and I am happy to say with splendid results. Thousands of boys and girls, men and women, physically handicapped, have been reclaimed and have been and are now self-supporting, self-respected citizens.

The measure before us is strictly a war measure. I have no doubt but what it will greatly contribute to the winning of the war and it affords me real pleasure to give it my whole-hearted support.

I think the resolution should be adopted without a dissenting vote.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this joint resolution close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. I would like to have time to ask one question of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, which will take not over 2 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield half a minute to the gentleman from New York for that purpose.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I shall endeavor to propound the question in half a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York reserves the right to object?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Yes; I am reserving the right to object. I am wondering if the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations can throw any light on this subject.

I am informed that last January a conference was held at Baltimore under the aegis of the National Committee on Education and Defense of the United States, Office of Education, which was attended by representatives of many of our leading universities and colleges, and the

topic under discussion was the matter of keeping up an educational program in the colleges during the summer so as to accelerate the education of those students who desire to attend summer school but are financially unable to do so; that the discussion centered around a proposed program of Federal grants-in-aid of those students, both in the fields of vocational and nonvocational education. Mind you, I am 100 percent for this resolution and the only reason I have taken the floor is because of my feeling that we should go further afield. Therefore, I am interested to learn whether any legislation has been proposed or presented to the Committee on Appropriations by the Office of Education in conjunction with the Federal Security Agency for implementing the program tentatively decided on at the Baltimore meeting. I consider this a timely inquiry because the summer sessions of our universities and colleges will be getting under way by the first week in June, and if that aid is to be available, it should come quickly. In my judgment, the accelerating of the education of college students and the utilizing of the splendid facilities of our colleges and universities on a year-around basis would be a real and valuable contribution to our all-out war effort.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I think the gentleman agrees with me that that discussion would properly come under the N. Y. A., which will be before the House shortly, and it is probable that the gentleman will be recognized for 5 minutes, and the chairman in charge of that bill might throw some light on the matter he has in mind. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this resolution close in 5 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, I have not withdrawn my reservation of objection. I would like some explanation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is nothing at all before our committee and nothing in the shape of legislation before the House on the subject, but there will be legislation before the House later on.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York has reserved the right to object. Until someone demands the regular order, he may continue.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I do not believe I am violating any confidence when I say that I have discussed this question rather fully with key officials of the Office of Education and also with the Federal Security Agency. They both assure me that no effort is being spared to implement the plan for lending a financial helping hand to deserving students who otherwise would be unable to pursue their college educations during the summer months.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am just as interested in the matter as is the gentleman, but it is not germane to this subject or to this bill. I have no doubt the gentleman would like to have it discussed at the time when we have legislation before the House.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I think it is quite germane, but I am perfectly content to let the matter rest at this point, in the light of the gentleman's assurances.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of making only one observation. That is that for the past several months many of us have been greatly concerned about training young men for entrance into industrial activities and defense industries.

A number of agencies of the Government are training young men for this purpose. I would not have time to go into any great detail. I think probably they are making a very valuable contribution to our defense activities in training young men before actually going to work. However, what I would like to bring to the attention of the House is this: It is extremely important that we have machines, that we have tanks, that we have airplanes of different types, observation, fighting, and bombing planes of every type. It is not only necessary to have these but it is highly important we have someone to operate them and to operate them in the most effective way possible. Being able to handle a plane properly in combat is just as essential as being able to handle efficiently a machine gun or any other implement of war. My thought is that, in addition to the training young men will receive in actually operating planes, there should be a training prior thereto which would enable them to know thoroughly the conditions under which the planes are to be operated; weather conditions; atmospheric conditions; the manner in which different sizes and types of planes will behave under different circumstances and conditions at different heights; aviation mathematics, physics, chemistry, and other matters highly essential for an Army pilot. Of course, practice in flying finally makes the expert, but basic training to begin with would be most valuable, and such information can be obtained before actually going into the Air Corps and prior to entering the pilot-training schools. When young men go into combat they will be compelled to make decisions immediately, and they will want to know their business like knowing the alphabet, because without this they will not be experts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the joint resolution back to the House without amendment, with the recommendation that it do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. RAMSPECK, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration House Joint Resolution 316 and directed him to report the same back to the House without amendment, with the recommendation that the joint resolution be agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the joint resolution to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the disposition of the legislative business of the day, I may be permitted to proceed for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all who have spoken on the joint resolution just passed may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow after the disposition of the legislative business for the day and other special orders I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. SMITH of Ohio and Mr. DELANEY asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

INTEREST RATE ON LAND BANK AND COMMISSIONER LOANS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 485.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6315) to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Agriculture, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous order shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN], and yield myself 5 minutes at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, 23 years ago last week I came to Congress and entered upon my duties in this body in a special session which had been called by President Wilson. Since that time I have voted for every agriculture bill except during the years I was not a Member of the House. Never, though, have I voted for a measure more far-reaching in its importance or which promised to do more for agriculture and the country as a whole than the bill this rule seeks to make in order. Three times this House has expressed itself on this proposition. Those were peacetimes. How much more important is it now that we are at war that we again make possible this aid not only to agriculture but to our country as a whole.

It is not my belief that it is necessary to take any considerable time in calling attention to this rule, nor shall I do so. I do, however, want, Mr. Speaker, to pay a deserved tribute to the author of this bill, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE], who, during all the years I served with him on the Committee on Agriculture, has rendered such splendid service not only to agriculture but to the country as a whole.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. NELSON. It is with pleasure that I yield to the able Member from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. In that connection let me say to the gentleman from Missouri that no man has done more to further rural electrification for the farmers than has the distinguished gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. NELSON. I thank my Mississippi friend, who has for so long been in the forefront of the fight for Rural Electrification Administration. I wish also to express my appreciation of the work of the chairman of this committee, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER], who has been instrumental in bringing out this legislation.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NELSON. I yield, with pleasure, to my friend and fellow member on the Rules Committee.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. We on this side have no disposition to fight either the rule or the bill. The bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture, was it not?

Mr. NELSON. That is true. I was about to make the statement that the bill has the unanimous support of both sides of the aisle; and, thank God, we have no politics when it comes to getting this war job done; this is a part of the war job.

A little while ago I walked over to the Capitol with the chief of the bureau which has to do with the purchasing of all the meat we shall need for our Army. He stressed the importance of the part agriculture must play at this time. Last week I was back in my home State, and there I found farmers, men and women past the years when they ordinarily work so hard, going on the job with most indomitable enterprise. The farmers of the country, handicapped as they are by the lack of sufficient help and machinery, need to produce all we must have and are going to produce what we need for our boys on the fighting front and what they are going to need after the war is over. This is bound to mean increased cost of production. The seriousness of the situation all the more justifies such legislation as the pending rule seeks to make in order.

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and I understand the gentleman from Illinois has no request. So, Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my 30 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, it is very apparent there is no opposition to this bill, and in order to expedite the matter I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first sentence of paragraph "Twelfth" of section 12 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (relating to the 3½-percent-interest rate on Federal land bank loans), is amended by striking out "occurring within a period of 7 years commencing July 1, 1935," and inserting in lieu thereof "occurring within a period of 9 years commencing July 1, 1935."

(b) The fourth sentence of such paragraph "Twelfth" (relating to the time limit on payments made by the United States to land banks on account of such interest reduction) is amended to read as follows: "No payments shall be made to a bank with respect to any period after June 30, 1944."

SEC. 2. The last paragraph of section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act, as amended (relating to reduction in the interest rate on loans by the Land Bank Commissioner), is amended to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the rate of interest on loans made under this section shall not exceed 4 percent per annum for all interest payable on installment dates occurring on or after July 22, 1937, and prior to July 1, 1940, and shall not exceed 3½ percent per annum for all interest payable on installment dates occurring on or after July 1, 1940, and prior to July 1, 1944."

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, for some time the Committee on Agriculture has been considering legislation, having in mind amending the original act in several instances. However, we finally reported H. R. 7091 at which time we also reported this bill. On account of the emergency it is the unanimous opinion of the members of the committee that we should pass this bill at this time which has for its purpose the extending of the 3½ percent interest rate for 2 additional years.

Mr. ROMJUE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. ROMJUE. The provisions of this bill extends the rate of interest that has been given to this class of loans heretofore, with which I am in entire accord. Personally I think it ought to be permanent legislation but I realize that the chairman is just as much interested in the farming class of people as I am and no one has devoted more interest and time trying to help this class of people than the chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina. I want to compliment him on the fine service he has rendered to farmers of this Nation. His judgment on this legislation is entirely in accord with my own.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is correct as to the provisions of the bill and I want to thank him for the very kind remarks and would like to add that I do not know of any Member of Congress who has served all these years with me that has been more deeply interested in farm legislation and who has rendered more real service in connection with the passage of the many bills that we have considered in behalf of the farmer.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Speaker, in 1933 we passed the original bill fixing lower interest on farm mortgages held by Federal farm agencies. This was renewed in 1935, again in 1937, and in 1939. The law expires on the 30th of June of this year, except for the Commissioner's loan provision, which expires May 30.

The interest rates on notes and mortgages given by the farmers to the various farm agencies of the Federal Government will automatically return to the interest specified in the notes and mortgages, unless the bill passes. They have been paying 3½ percent for 8 years, and this bill renews that interest rate for a period of 2 years.

I think the bill should pass as it is written. It is simply a continuation of the present law. The farmers have suffered severely by reason of the war, especially in labor shortage and costs. Their boys have volunteered and have gone to war. It is natural for a farm boy to go to the defense of his country, and I think they are now forming the backbone of the companies and regiments that are today close to the front lines.

There is a further reason for the passage of this measure. The farmers have been paying this rate of interest, and this is no time to raise the interest rate. It will automatically go up unless we pass this bill. I was farming when the other war was on. Farm products were sold in the market for what we could get. We then had a free market. We now have a controlled market, as we have passed a price-control bill. Therefore the farmers are raising their products at fixed prices, but it is costing them more to raise crops by reason of higher prices on everything they need, including labor.

A further reason this bill should pass at the present time is that one of the things which must come out of this war is lower interest rates. We are not going to be able to carry the immense national debt at present rates. It is plain to be

seen that we can carry $100,000,000,000 at 1½ percent as easily as we could carry $50,000,000,000 at 3 percent. So there are going to be lower interest rates, and the farmer should now have the advantage of those lower rates.

If the farm-credit agencies could today borrow the money on the market and pay the rates that are now charged, there would be no cost to the Treasury in continuing this law. Some years ago a large number of their bonds were sold at high interest rates. Most of them are not callable until after 1946. The farmers must not pay the penalty.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should pass.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I take this occasion to compliment the gentleman on the matchless service he has rendered the American farmer as a Member of this House. I do not know any Member of the House who has been more faithful to the interests of the poor man and the farmer, regardless of what he has been producing, than the distinguished gentleman from Oregon. We in Montana as well as the people in the gentleman's State are to be congratulated that we have the benefit of his splendid service.

Mr. PIERCE. I thank the gentleman for his kind words. I have written out a statement on this bill and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks to include that statement and the committee report on the bill.

FEDERAL FARM LOAN INTEREST RATES

The bill under consideration, H. R. 6315, extends for 2 additional years interest-rate provisions of the present act which expires July 1, 1942. That act provides that all who have obtained loans through the Federal land banks, or through the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, these latter known as Land Bank Commissioner's loans, are given the continued privilege of paying 3½ percent upon the principal, instead of the interest rates specified in the mortgages. These notes and mortgages bear from 4 to 6, and even 6½ percent.

This law has been on the statute books since 1933 when it was first passed by the Congress, and signed by the President. It then provided for a 4½ percent interest rate. It was designed to help the farmers of this country, not only in fixing a reduced amount of interest they were paying to the Federal Farm Credit agencies, but also in establishing a standard which would make impossible the excessively high farm mortgage interest rates which have been charged, in the past, by some private lending institutions.

After 2 years of operation, the law was reenacted by the Congress, in 1935, and provided for a 3½ percent interest rate. In 1937, a bill to continue the 3½-percent rate was vetoed by the President. Congress passed the bill over the veto. This was repeated in 1938, when Congress again renewed the act over a Presidential veto. In 1940, the law was renewed for 2 years, with the President's approval. When the Congress passes this bill, H. R. 6315, I believe the President will willingly sign it.

NO TIME TO RAISE FARM INTEREST RATES

It is no time to raise farm interest rates. A country at war must rely upon the farmer for dependable and increased production of the foods and fibers to sustain, not only its own nation and its armies on the battle fronts, but to assure adequate supplies for its allies. The country is banking on the certainty of the contribution of American farmers. This is an important factor in maintaining hope and strength among the United Nations at war with the Axis. All the democracies are expecting much of American farmers and they will not be disappointed.

No group of producers in the United States has suffered more severely by reason of the Selective Service than have the farmers and stockmen. Their skilled and dependable working forces have been depleted. It is just natural for the strong, sturdy, responsible boy reared on a farm or stock ranch to volunteer for the armed forces of the country. He is inured to hardship. He knows what it is to get up early in the morning and work till late at night, battling with the elements and facing the storms. He loves the land and rushes to the defense of his country and all that he holds dear. Farm volunteers form the backbone of many of the regiments and companies which are today holding the exposed front lines.

Thousands of farmers have written Congressmen about the desperate conditions because the skilled farm workers have gone into the service, or into the war industries where they are earning higher wages than could possibly be paid on the farms. The trained, experienced labor essential to successful production has been drawn off and cannot be easily replaced. It requires experience and skill to produce farm crops. It requires long hours of hard work every day. Dairy farmers have been especially hard hit. Many of them have been forced to dispose of herds, to their own great loss and to the detriment of the food supply of the country. Farmers and their wives are working like slaves, and quite a percentage of farm labor will be done this year by girls and women who do not have the physical strength for the tasks. They will drive the tractors, they will watch the herds, they will milk the cows, they will do their level best.

Farmers have to carry a load of greatly increased operating costs. They spend hours of fruitless effort trying to get equipment and materials for farm machinery and farm storage. Their greatest problem is to meet the excessively high wages which must now be paid for farm labor, in spite of the fact that the Government rigidly fixes ceiling prices for farm produce. A dairy farmer writes me about paying $90 a month, and board, for a man to milk cows. Think of it. Paying a man on a farm as much as college-trained school teachers are paid, then clamping down on the prices to be paid for the products.

In the face of these facts on farm-labor scarcity and cost and on farm price restrictions, can we hazard permitting an increase in farm interest rates? Farmers are not expecting to make more money from increased production and parity price maintenance. The Secretary of Agriculture has asked them to produce more milk, butter, eggs, hogs, cows, chickens, more fruit and vegetables, and the farmers are responding. They are courageously facing the rapidly multiplying difficulties and problems of production and marketing. Farm problems and crops are so varied that each section has its own peculiar and pressing problems. Those growing fruit and vegetables for canning are dependent upon supplies of scare materials like tin and sugar. The delays and uncertainties add to production costs.

PARITY PRICES

It is often stated in the press that farmers are enjoying an era of great financial prosperity and of assured income. It is true that times are better than when this administration came into power in 1933—and what a struggle we have had to bring about improved conditions. We have fixed minimum prices for cotton, wheat, peanuts, corn, and tobacco. These prices are controlled by Government-loan values, which have also been construed to be maximum values. It was right and proper that we should provide Government loans on basic commodities, to the amount of a stipulated percentage of parity. It was the hope of those who supported such legislation that the prices would not be considered maximum prices, but that hope has been dispelled by experience. Rarely are sales made above the loan values provided by law.

The congressional debates and public discussions of parity and the formulas for arriving at and maintaining parity prices have not yet resulted in any clear and just procedure. We have passed a price-control bill, which has immensely complicated the farm-price situation. Congressmen from farm districts have quite generally supported the price-control legislation, but with many misgivings as to the effect of these price ceilings on farmers. It is doubtful if producers will, during this war period, receive in the central markets $20 for live hogs, though I sold them as high as $22.50 during World War No. 1. Wheat will never bring $2.25 a bushel, as it then did. Why? Because there is a ceiling on prices and a rigid price control.

FARM DEBTS NOT YET PAID

In the face of these unalterable facts, can we afford to raise farm interest rates? Is it just and fair? Farmers have not yet been able to pay the debts contracted during the great depression. They are just beginning to emerge from the difficulties of those years. We must not place impossible financial burdens on their shoulders. The passage of this bill will assure continued interest rates which the farmers can meet and pay to the Government and to the banks. Those who would oppose this bill cannot shield themselves behind any true statements about the great farm prosperity assured because of legislated prices for basic commodities, with ceiling prices set for the numerous other farm products. It is true that the lower interest rates have been enjoyed for 8 years now, but the time has not arrived for placing other burdens on farmers.

The present law expires July 1, 1942. Failure to reenact this would cost the American farmers many millions of dollars in higher interest rates to be collected from them by the Federal land banks. It would also enable the insurance companies and investment bankers, which are the most numerous agencies extending farm credit, to collect many more millions than they would have collected had the Government maintained its interest standard.

Less than one-half the loans on farming lands are made through Federal lending agencies. The greater percentage is made by investment bankers, insurance companies, and private lenders. The Federal Government must fix the standard in order to hold high the morale of the farming world. No single act will now be a greater contribution than continuation of the present existing law, fixing at 3½ percent the interest rates the Federal land banks collect on their farm loans.

WHAT DOES THE PRESENT LAW COST THE TREASURY?

The existing law gives the farmer the right to pay 3½ percent interest in lieu of any amount fixed in the notes and mortgages which he gave to the Federal Farm Credit agencies. Estimating the cost of this adjustment is largely a matter of bookkeeping, and transferring of funds. Eight years ago, when we passed the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act which provided for Commissioner's loans and amended the Farm Loan Act, it became necessary to sell some millions of dollars of bonds at a high rate of interest. These bonds are still outstanding and are not all callable until 1946. It is a pity they could not have been refunded. Farmers should not be called upon to pay the high

price of official errors or bad judgment, and of world-wide financial changes.

If the Government could today take up all outstanding bonds and refinance them at present interest rates the passage of the act would entail no cost to the Treasury. Owing to the fact that the Federal land banks have these high-interest-rate bonds outstanding, there is an apparent deficit, which, under the present law, is made up from the Treasury of the United States. A recent statement given me by the Farm Credit Administration is to the effect that the passage of this bill will make certain payments necessary. In 1943, the amounts will be $25,213,000 to the Federal land banks and $8,990,000 to the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, a total of $34,203,000. In 1944, the probable transfer will be $23,860,000 to the Federal land banks, and $8,384,000 to the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, a total of $32,244,000.

FUTURE LOWER INTEREST RATES

Students of finance suggest that interest rates will drop still lower because of the necessity of carrying the huge loans piling up to finance the war. It is clear that we can carry $100,000,000,000 of debt with 1½ percent interest as easily as we could carry $50,000,000,000 of debt with 3 percent interest. Some say, "Money is like any other commodity, and interest rates depend upon supply and demand." We must admit that the old economic law of supply and demand has been suspended by Executive decree, legislative act, and world-wide upheaval. It no longer affects the prices of wheat, corn, or cotton, and neither will it determine in the days to come the rates of interest which can be charged and collected.

The Federal land banks should certainly sell only short-term bonds, or bonds callable after a short period, in order to protect their borrowers under changed conditions and probable lower interest rates in the future. Facing unalterable facts, our theories will be thrown to the winds. Interest rates will go lower, even if we must again reduce the number of grains of gold in the gold dollar.

At this time when labor is so difficult to obtain and so greatly increased in cost, when every factor entering into farm production results in higher charges, when ceilings have been fixed so costs and returns cannot be balanced, it behooves us to hold farm interest rates on Federal loans through Federal agencies at the present figure.

Undoubtedly the whole Federal Farm Loan Act should be rewritten. Many changes should be made in order to modernize this Federal lending agency. For 2 years the House Committee on Agriculture has held extensive hearings and taken much testimony on the proposed changes. It now appears that we cannot pass a comprehensive bill before July 1, when the present interest rate section expires. I therefore concluded that it would be wise to introduce and press to immediate passage a brief and simple bill extending for 2 years the present provisions on interest rates. This is the bill before us today, H. R. 6315, on which I request your favorable action in order to sustain the courage and assure the financial stability of farmer-borrowers of the Federal system.

[H. Rept. 2133, 77th Cong., 2d sess.]

INTEREST RATE ON LAND-BANK AND COMMISSIONER LOANS

The Committee on Agriculture, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6315) to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land-bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass.

STATEMENT

Under existing law, a maximum interest rate of 3½ percent is in effect on farm mortgages made by Federal land banks through national farm-loan associations, or agents, or purchased from joint-stock land banks by Federal land banks if such mortgages were outstanding in the hands of a Federal land bank on May 12, 1933 (the date of enactment of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933). The same rate applies to loans made by the banks through farm-loan associations since then. Under existing law, that reduced rate terminates on all such mortgages on July 1, 1942. Similarly, under existing law, the so-called Land Bank Commissioner's loans are subject to a maximum 3½ percent interest rate, which expires July 1, 1942.

The Congress has on three previous occasions provided for the extension of the provision for reduced rates above referred to, the last act being Public, 672 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 29, 1940. The purpose of the reported bill is simply to extend the provisions of that act for 2 additional years, or until July 1, 1944.

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with paragraph 2a of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, changes in existing law made by the bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, section 12, paragraph "Twelfth", first four sentences:

"Twelfth. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph "Second", the rate of interest on any loans on mortgages made through national farm-loan associations or through agents as provided in section 15, or purchased from joint-stock land banks, by any Federal land bank, outstanding on the date this paragraph takes effect or made through national farm-loan associations after such date, shall not exceed 3½ per centum per annum for all interest payable on installment dates [occurring within a period of seven years commencing July 1, 1935] *occurring within a period of nine years commencing July 1, 1935*; and no payment of the principal portion of any installment of any such loan outstanding on the date of the enactment of the Farm Credit Act of 1935 shall be required prior to July 1, 1938, if the borrower shall not be in default with respect to any other condition or covenant of his mortgage. The foregoing provisions shall apply to loans made by Federal land banks through branches, except that the rates of interest paid for the respective periods above specified shall be one-half of 1 per centum per annum in excess of the rates of interest paid during the corresponding periods by borrowers on mortgage loans made through national farm-loan associations. The Secretary of the Treasury shall pay each Federal land bank, as soon as practicable after October 1, 1933, and after the end of each quarter thereafter, such amount as the Land Bank Commissioner certifies to the Secretary of the Treasury is equal to the amount by which interest payments, on mortgages held by such bank have been reduced, during the preceding quarter, by reason of this paragraph; but in any case in which the Land Bank Commissioner finds that the amount of interest payable by such bank during any quarter has been reduced by reason of the refinancing of bonds under section 32 of this Act, the amount of the reduction so found shall be deducted from the amount payable to such bank under this paragraph. No payments shall be made to a bank with respect to any period after June 30, [1942] *1944*."

Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933:

"REDUCTION OF DEBTS AND REDEMPTION OF FORECLOSED FARMS

"SEC. 32. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to allocate and make available to the Land Bank Commissioner the sum of $200,000,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be used for the purpose of making loans as hereinafter provided to any farmer, secured by a first or second mortgage upon the whole or any part of the farm property, real or personal, including crops, of the farmer. The amount of the mortgage given by any farmer, together with all prior mortgages or other evidences of indebtedness secured by such farm property of the farmer, shall not exceed 75 per centum of the normal value thereof, as determined upon an appraisal made pursuant to the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended; nor shall a loan in excess of $7,500 be made to any one farmer. For the purposes of this section, farm property may be valued at an amount representing a prudent investment, consistent with community standards and rentals, if (1) the person occupying the property is not entirely dependent upon farm income for his livelihood but receives a part of his income from other dependable sources, and (2) the farm income from the property, together with earnings from other dependable sources ordinarily available in the community to a person operating such property, would be sufficient to support his family, to pay operating expenses and fixed charges, and to discharge the interest and amortization payments on the loan. Every mortgage made under this section shall contain an agreement providing for the repayment of the loan on an amortization plan by means of a fixed number of annual or semiannual installments, sufficient to cover (1) interest on unpaid principal at a rate not to exceed 5 per centum per annum and (2) such payments equal in amount to be applied on principal as will extinguish the debt within an agreed period of not more than ten years, or, in the case of a first or second mortgage secured wholly by real property within an agreed period no greater than that for which loans may be made under the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, from the date the first payment on principal is due: *Provided*, That when in the judgment of the Land Bank Commissioner conditions justify it, any mortgage made under this section may provide that during the first three years the loan is in effect payments of interest only may be required if the borrower shall not be in default with respect to any other condition or covenant of his mortgage. No loan shall be made under this section unless the holder of any prior mortgage or instrument of indebtedness secured by such farm property arranges to the satisfaction of the Land Bank Commissioner to limit his right to proceed against the farmer and such farm property for default in payment of principal. Loans may be made under this section for any of the purposes for which Federal land banks are authorized by law to make loans, and for the following additional purpose, and none other: Refinancing, in connection with proceedings under chapter VIII of the Bankruptcy Act of July 1, 1898, as amended, any indebtedness, secured or unsecured, of the farmer, or which is secured by a lien on all or any part of the farm property accepted as security for the loan. The provisions of paragraph "Ninth" of section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (relating to charges to applicants for loans and borrowers from the Federal land banks), shall, so far as practicable, apply to loans made under this section. As used in this section, (1) the term "farmer" means any person who is at the time, or shortly to become, bona fide engaged in farming operations, either personally or through an agent or tenant, or the principal part of whose income is derived from farming operations or livestock raising, and includes a personal representative of a deceased farmer; (2) the term "person" includes an individual or a corporation engaged in the raising of livestock; and (3) the term "corporation" includes any incorporated association; but no such loan shall be made to a corporation (A) unless all the stock of the corporation is owned by individuals themselves person-

ally actually engaged in the raising of livestock on the land to be mortgaged as security for the loan, except in a case where the Land Bank Commissioner permits the loan if at least 75 per centum in value and number of shares of the stock of the corporation is owned by the individuals personally actually so engaged, and (B) unless the owners of at least 75 per centum in value and number of shares of the stock of the corporation assume personal liability for the loan. No loan shall be made to any corporation which is a subsidiary of, or affiliated (either directly or through substantial identity of stock ownership) with a corporation ineligible to procure a loan in the amount applied for. Until June 1, 1942, the Land Bank Commissioner shall, in his name, make loans under this section on behalf of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, and may make such loans in cash or in bonds of the corporation, or if acceptable to the borrower, in consolidated farm loan bonds; but no such loans shall be made by him after June 1, 1942, except for the purpose of refinancing loans previously made by him under this section. As much as may be necessary of the assets of the corporation, including the bonds (and proceeds thereof) issued under section 4 of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation Act, may be used for the purposes of this section. Any Federal land bank, when duly authorized by the Land Bank Commissioner and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, shall have the power to execute any instrument relating to any mortgage taken to secure a loan made or to be made under this section, or relating to any property included in any such mortgage, or relating to any property acquired by the Land Bank Commissioner and/or the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. Any such instrument heretofore or hereafter executed on behalf of the Land Bank Commissioner and/or the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation by a Federal land bank, through its duly authorized officers, shall be conclusively presumed to have been duly authorized by the Land Bank Commissioner and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation.

Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the rate of interest on loans made under this section shall not exceed 4 per centum per annum for all interest payable on installment dates occurring on or after July 22, 1937, and prior to July 1, 1940, and shall not exceed 3½ per centum per annum for all interest payable on installment dates occurring on or after July 1, 1940, and prior to July 1, [1942.] *1944.*

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike the last 2 words.

Mr. Speaker, I believe I am correct in stating that at least 80 percent of the farms throughout the Middle West have mortgages on them. Today, although the prices of farm products must remain where they were last year because of having ceilings placed upon them, farm labor has gone up in cost at least 25 percent. Consequently, it is very important that we do not at this time raise the existing rate of interest. The farmer wants to do his part to help win this war, but Congress must help him with a low interest rate, just as Congress has aided industry of all kinds. There surely will be no opposition to this very essential legislation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I am for this bill and will vote for its passage. I recall very distinctly that in years past the farmer was required to pay from 6 to 7 and sometimes as high as 8 percent interest, besides a cash commission, to the loan sharks of this country with the result that the farmer lost his farm and the loaning companies became the landlords of the country. If there is any one thing this Congress has done for which the country generally and the farmer in particular ought to be grateful, it is causing the reduced rate of interest to the farmers to the point where they are almost able to get along, providing he gets decent prices for his products.

As far as my experience has gone, I do not believe the farmer can really afford to pay 3½ percent. His cost of living has gone up, his taxes are going up, the cost of his help is going up when he can get any, and the price of everything he is required to buy in the form of machinery is going up.

Further, when the farmer brings to town a product he has to sell, he has to take the other fellow's price for it. He cannot say what he wants. He has to take what he gets, but when he buys a suit of clothes or a piece of machinery he has to pay the other fellow's price for it.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I personally would be willing to vote for even a lower rate of interest to the farmer. I know that in my section of the country the farmers, working under the terms of this particular statute, meet their obligations and pay them. These loans are uniformly retired. I do not have the figures regarding the whole country, but I do know that in the State of Louisiana the farmers meet these obligations and meet them with reasonable promptness and satisfaction.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman.

In the short time I have, I wish to supplement what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] said a few moments ago about the farmers furnishing many of the soldiers of this country. They are doing this at the cost of their own women going out and doing the work. In my own district I hear from many of them, and their wives and daughters are in the fields working, taking the places of the boys gone overseas.

I read this morning to the House that a young man from a little county in Montana of less than 1,000 population, a county of the State of Montana that is almost unknown, was one of the 80 intrepid men who bombed Tokyo, which did more to shock the Japs and bring war home to them than anything that has happened. That is the class of people we have on the farms. They are patriotic. They will make any kind of sacrifice necessary to win this war now that we are in it.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. First, let me congratulate the gentleman. I have observed the gentleman in my experience here to be always interested in the farmers. He has always advocated a low rate of interest for farmers. I believe in giving a man flowers while he lives.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana. I support this bill. Certainly this piece of legislation is far-sighted. I hold that the 3½ percent rate of interest might well be reduced.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It might even be dropped to 2 percent. The big merchants of the country get their money from the big banks at a rate as low as 1½ or even 1 percent. There is no doubt but what land is the best security for the repayment of money that we have. There has been very little loss incurred by the Federal land banks in connection with our loans to farmers. No doubt this is true largely because of the rate of interest the farmers are now paying. Thanks to the Congress that the big eastern newspapers and periodicals are belittling and defaming.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Speaker, I find it very easy to support this bill because I have introduced and urged the enactment of similar bills at each regular session of the Congress since I began my service in the House. In fact, my first speech in this chamber was in support of a bill of this character.

The bill which I introduced at the start of the present session—H. R. 6347—proposes—

To extend for 5 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land-bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans.

My bill and the bill now under consideration are identical except that mine proposes to extend the time for 5 years instead of 2 years. There is something to be said for the longer period.

As I have stated on other occasions, the business of farming involves many fixed expenses. Taxes are a fixed charge; insurance is another; depreciation is a third. In addition interest on loans is a cost which hangs over the head of many a farmer.

These costs go on from day to day; they accumulate when the farmer works and when he sleeps, whether his crops are good or poor. To pay these expenses from year to year and other operating expenses as well is no small responsibility for the man who tills the soil. The risks attendant upon farming are great. Whatever relief the farmer can get from the uncertainties of his business will remove some wrinkles from his brow. The 5-year period would enable him to make relatively long-term plans insofar as his interest cost is concerned.

But, Mr. Speaker, I shall support this bill. And, in doing so, I do not maintain that the enactment of this measure will solve the problems of agriculture. I do contend, however, that it will contribute something to the solution.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this measure. As I understand, it extends the time for 2 years for which no more than 3½ percent interest can be charged on the Federal land-bank loans and the

Land Commission loans. Is not that right, Governor PIERCE?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes; on both groups of loans.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. It has been very well said here that perhaps the farmers of this country will be hit by the war harder than almost any other group. Their sons are being taken from the farms to enter the armed forces of this country in great numbers, the cost of labor has greatly increased, and the cost of things they must buy have increased. They will receive much less for their wheat, corn, hogs, beef, and other products than they received in the last war. Not only the fathers, but the mothers and the sisters, must join in this great production effort in order to produce enough food to feed the country and our armed forces. They must rise early in the morning and work until late at night. It is a big job and a hard task.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to our distinguished minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. May I say that I am in favor of this legislation? I have always been in favor of low interest rates to the farmer, because I believe that is one way by which we can make a real contribution to his welfare. While I have the floor I want to compliment the gentleman from Kentucky not only for his splendid and effective service to the farmers, but also his able service to our country as well. I believe in so doing I voice the sentiments of everyone in this House.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I thank my friend for his words of commendation. I am pleased to know that our distinguished leader on the minority side is heartily in favor of this desirable legislation. I have always found our leader working for the best interests of the farmer and the common people and for those measures which will best serve, in his honest opinion, the welfare of our country.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to my friend from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think the gentleman from Kentucky might point out, in mentioning the effort being put forth by the farmers of America to help win this war, that the farmers of our section of the United States are actually working about 80 hours a week. A survey shows that the average number of hours put in each week by the average farmer in the Middle West is 80.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Yes; that is true, and we must encourage them and help them to carry the tremendous load they are now carrying and will continue to carry throughout the war.

The farmers of my district and my State, Republicans and Democrats, and farm organizations, have urged me to support this bill. I have not received a single word of opposition to it, and I am very happy to stand here and urge, as I believe it will, the unanimous approval of the House.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last four words.

Mr. Speaker, we now have under consideration H. R. 6315, the laudable purpose of which is to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land-bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans. I shall support this measure because I think it is in the interest of national defense and in furtherance of our war efforts and as a matter of justice to the farmers of this country. Many of those who will be benefited, in fact, most of those who will be benefited by this measure, already have loans on their farms, and unless this measure is passed the increased rate on those loans may be advanced beyond the 3½ percent that they now carry.

This is no time to put an additional financial burden upon the farmers. Down in my country they have this expression with respect to the hours that a farmer works—he works from "can't till can't"—from before daylight until after dark. He gets up before day and he begins his day's work before the day is begun, and his work is not finished until the sun has gone down and the shades of night have enveloped him, his farm, and his home. He never quits. He goes on in his partnership with the forces of Nature and his efforts are as unbroken and unceasing as is the procession of the seasons and the equinoxes, and therefore we ought to do all we can to encourage him in this all-out effort that he has not only heretofore made, but is now making. In addition to this, he is presented with a labor problem that has no solution, because I see from reading the pronouncements of the authorities that there is to be no special deferment of the farm boys. They are being inducted into the Army just as other boys. I know that they are being inducted at such a rate as makes it very difficult for the farmer to carry on his work. All this talk about just picking up labor here and there and putting it out on the farm is just a lot of hooey. Unless a boy is raised on the farm and knows which end of a mule to hook to the plow or a harrow or any other agricultural, horse-drawn vehicle, he is not of much benefit to a farmer. He would be as apt to hitch the head of the horse to the plow as the proper end of the horse, as the case may be. Not only that, but the farmer has additional hazards, he is up against the hazard of dry weather and of too much rain, so that we ought to do all we can for him, and I am glad to range myself with the membership of this House in support of this necessary and proper piece of legislation.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, there are at least three very important reasons why the prevailing 3½ percent interest rate for farm loans should be renewed for the 2-year period asked in the present bill.

First. Three and one-half percent interest is most assuredly a high enough rate of interest as long as banks pay but 1 to 2 percent on savings deposits. Land is the basis of all wealth and the reason the United States is a great country is because it has a large area of rich, productive fertile land which is the foundation of the wealth of the country.

Second. The President has asked that a ceiling of parity be established for farm products. There can then be no valid reason for raising the farmers' costs of production by raising his interest rate at this time.

Third. The continuation of the 3½ percent interest rate will indicate to the farmer that no attempt is being made to disturb his production costs by causing him to pay larger interest rates. In other words, it will create a much better feeling in the country if we maintain the present interest rates than it would if we used the war as an excuse for raising these interest rates. I think, then, from the administration's own standpoint, it would be most desirable to extend the prevailing rate for the 2 years.

During the present session, we have had very extensive hearings on the administration's proposal to enact rather comprehensive Federal loan legislation. In the main, it should be acceptable to the farmers and for the public welfare but it is doubtful if this is the opportune time to bring out such controversial legislation. If the proposed administration legislation was passed as presented with its proposed increased interest rates, I doubt if we would be making any contribution to unity or to the public welfare at this time. There is not any valid reason why we should not adopt a revised Federal loan program. It should be one that would give the borrower the advantage of a long-term agreement. We would not have this question of interest rates coming up every year or two. This, however, does not seem to be the desirable time for this action.

While it was rumored in the Committee that the President would veto this bill, I call your attention to the fact that he did not veto similar legislation 2 years ago. I have enough confidence in the President to feel that he appreciates the agricultural situation sufficiently to support the present bill.

There should be no politics to this legislation and none should be injected. I hope some of our friends will be more considerate of this fact in the future than they have in the past.

In conclusion, let me repeat that, purely from the administration viewpoint, I sincerely think it is for the best interest of our country, the public, and the farmers, that this bill be passed without a dissenting voice.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Unless this bill is passed before June 30, would not the interest rate automatically increase from 3½ percent to what figure?

Mr. MURRAY. As I understand it, the Commissioner loans would increase on June 1 and would go to 5 percent normally, and some of the Federal loans would go as high as 6 percent—old loans.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The enactment of this bill before June 1 holds all loans, both commissioner and regular loans, first mortgage loans, at 3½ percent?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman know any reason on earth why the American farmer should pay a higher rate of interest for the money that he uses in his capital structure than American industry is forced to pay for the use of credit and money used in its capital structure?

Mr. MURRAY. Coming from a rural section, perhaps I am somewhat prejudiced in that respect. Of course, what makes this a great country is that we have a large area of rich, fertile, productive land. That provides the safest place in the world to invest money, and the farmer is entitled to money as cheaply as any other group.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think we can set aside all points of patriotism and all points of long hours of labor, and put it on the sole proposition that the American farmer is entitled to credit at as low a cost in the form of interest as any other part of American industry, and that is where I stand on this thing first, last, and all the time.

Mr. MURRAY. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, if I remember correctly, the Farm Tenant Act enables the tenant farmer to buy farms provided that loans be made at 1½ percent interest, did it not?

Mr. MURRAY. I think that is something we might very well take up after the emergency. It is 3 percent. We have had 100-percent loans at 3 percent, and there have been 75-percent loans at 4 percent, and 50-percent loans at 3½. At some future time this whole problem should be solved.

Mr. ENGEL. And what interest do the banks demand on loans to T. V. A.?

Mr. MURRAY. I think the gentleman ought to be able to answer that himself. He has made an exhaustive study of these expenses as a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ENGEL. I am not an authority on that.

Mr. MURRAY. I will answer the question by saying that there are 100-percent loans at 3 percent and 75-percent loans at 4 percent, and 50-percent loans at 3½ percent. The amount of this money used on these tenant loans is so small in comparison to the total volume of farm mortgages that it is of little consequence because we have never appropriated very much money for that purpose.

I do think that fundamental changes in Federal farm loans should be made, but I think it should come when we have more time to consider it than we have at this time.

Mr. ENGEL. I am not arguing that the interest rate on the tenant farms should be increased, but I am arguing that reducing this rate to 3½ percent is not unreasonable.

Mr. MURRAY. I think everyone will admit that they should be the same.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does not this bill do the same as a bill passed in the Seventy-fifth Congress and in the Seventy-sixth Congress, holding the rate to 3½ percent?

Mr. MURRAY. Yes. This is the fourth time it has been extended—1937, 1938, 1940, and 1942.

Mr. MURDOCK. In view of the fact that Congress, by a large majority, has passed this legislation, and even passed it over a veto, does not the gentleman think that in time of war there is all the more reason for it?

Mr. MURRAY. I should think so.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and include therein a speech made by Lt. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell at the Pennsylvania Military College, Chester, Pa., on May 14, 1942, when General Somervell was awarded the honorary degree of doctor of military science.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, this bill, or one of the same purpose, has been passed at four previous sessions of Congress. Two years ago it was vetoed by the President, but it was passed over the veto. Through these measures Congress has declared a policy of fair play to the farmers in the matter of interest rates. That declaration has been, and still is, that agriculture shall not pay the previous high rates on land bank and Commissioner loans while business and industry, as well as the Government, are obtaining loans in billions at the lowest rates in history.

Recently there has been passed by Congress a measure authorizing an increase of loans by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by $5,000,000,000. There have been loaned and expended by that corporation more than $12,000,000,000. Billions have been loaned to South American and other countries to bring them into alinement on a program against the Axis Powers. The total of land bank and Land Commissioner loans is even less than the loans to foreign countries.

There is every justification for this measure. It merely continues the declared policy of Congress by preventing an increase of interest rates on farm loans. It serves to bring some encouragement to farmers who are engaged in the greatest task ever imposed upon the agriculture of any country—that of food and fiber production, which is essential to winning the war. The response of the farmers to that demand has been prompt and patriotic. Now our farmers are feeding our own and millions of people in our Allied nations, and adding to their production from day to day. "Food will win the war," and our agriculture battle line is being augmented daily.

The draw-backs under which the farmers are laboring can scarcely be estimated by those who are not from farming communities. In the short space of 18 months there have gone from the farms over 750,000 young men to serve in the Army and Navy. Many of them now are on foreign battle fronts, while those of their farm homes take over their work and carry on in their absence. More than 2,000,000 farm people have been called into war industries. More young men are going into our armed forces day by day as the war program calls for still larger numbers for munition and equipment factories. Daily the burdens of the farm become more difficult as the shortage of labor and lack of facilities grow more acute.

A recent survey in Wisconsin reveals that the farmers there are working an average of over 13 hours per day, or from 80 to 90 hours per week. There is no rest, no let-up, no sit-down strikes on the farm. The increased production for our own population and that of Europe and China is evidenced by daily reports. Our farmers are feeding our fighting forces at home and abroad, and not a complaint comes as to quantity and quality.

There are many aspects of the agriculture situation which are not under consideration in the discussion of this measure. There are other problems to be taken up and solved. But a unanimous vote on this bill will bring encouragement to those on the farms who work as they wait that Congress is not unmindful of what they are doing to win the war.

Mr. ROBERTSON of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of the Members to the fact that North Dakota is primarily an agricultural State, which consists of 73,897 farms with total value of $489,973,948, according to the 1940 census. The crop harvested and marketed for 1940 was valued at $127,675,000.

Since the administration seems set on keeping the price of wheat below parity, I think it would be very unwise for the administration to enact any legislation that would require the farmers of my State to pay a higher interest rate. We have suffered for several years from low agricultural prices as well as drought, and our farmers are just beginning to get on their feet.

I am very much in favor of this legislation to continue the 3½ percent interest rate on farm loans for another 2 years. In checking over the old CONGRESSIONAL RECORDS, I find that this is the fourth time that this extension has been presented to Congress. I was pleased to note that during the times that the interest-rate question has been considered that only four Republicans opposed the extension the first year and only two Republicans the second year, and none the last time. As long as the banks are only paying 1 to 2 percent on savings deposits, I am sure that a 3½ percent interest rate is sufficiently high, and I hope that this bill can be passed unanimously.

Mr. HEALEY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an address by the majority leader, Hon.

JOHN W. MCCORMACK, at the commencement exercises of Staley College in Boston.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this bill to continue the 3½ percent interest rate for the next 2 years, although I realize that there is some question about it receiving final approval by the President.

All of us who are members of the Committee on Agriculture realize the importance and necessity of securing some permanent legislation that will strengthen the Federal land-bank associations and increase the efficiency of the cooperative Federal Land Bank System. I am anxious to see it placed on a sound self-sustaining basis so that it will be able to serve the agricultural credit needs of the country with interest rates comparable to those accorded other industries. Federal subsidies cannot be expected to continue indefinitely and it is hoped that some agreement can be reached soon that will establish a permanent policy with respect to the operation of the Federal Land Bank System. Our Committee on Agriculture has spent many months during the last 2 years in an effort to reach some agreement on this very controversial subject. Because of the lack of accord on permanent legislation, this continuing revolution is necessary until some agreement can be reached on the fundamental issues involved in the permanent legislation.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. There was no controversy, however, in the committee in regard to this bill? It was a unanimous report on this bill?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. The gentleman is correct on that. We would like to have this rate continued. But within the next 2 years it is necessary to work out some permanent legislation pertaining to the Federal Land Bank System.

The committee, in general, has agreed on the principle that the interest rate charged should be 1½ percent above the cost of money, which would be sufficient to cover costs of operation.

We are in disagreement on the proposal to eliminate the stock ownership which many feel would destroy the cooperate features of the Federal Land Bank System.

Just a word about the $500,000,000 of high-interest-rate Federal land-bank bonds that are held by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. I think it is highly desirable that these bonds be refinanced so that the savings of approximately $30,000,000 can be passed on to the Federal land banks. If those savings are passed on to the Federal land banks they may be reflected in reduction of interest to the borrowers or in dividends.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not true that there has been very little loss, if any, on the part of loans that have been made to the farmers throughout the country, either by the Federal land bank or through the Commissioner loans?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. The Federal Land Bank System has a very good record as a loaning institution, considering the plight of its borrowers during the depression.

I believe the cost of operation on the Federal land-bank loans run between 1 and 1½ percent. On the Land Bank Commissioner loans the cost of operation and the losses sustained are relatively higher because in these cases loans are made up to 75 percent of the value; whereas Federal land-bank loans are 50 percent of the value of the land.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not think there should be any misunderstanding. The payments have picked up with the increase in the income of the farmers the past year. Prior to that time there were a good many delinquencies.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. The gentleman is correct. The farm borrowers of this country will pay their debts if they are able to do so. The prices they are now receiving for their products are sufficient to enable them to pay their interest.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is very encouraging to we folks from Iowa and the other great agricultural States to see so much harmony in favor of the continuance of a 3½-percent interest rate on Federal farm loans, and to know there has not been a dissenting speech made against this bill. I know it will also be most encouraging to the farmers who have these loans, who number thousands upon thousands all over this great land. Will say here that I have not received a single letter in opposition to this bill.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JENSEN. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it not true that many farmers of Iowa and the Middle West will lose their farms if this bill is not passed, thereby being forced back to the old high interest rate on farm loans?

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman from Iowa is right; naturally sooner or later that is exactly what would happen; it did happen in thousands of cases a few years back. Right now, of course, they are getting along pretty well, although everything they buy is up, and their prices are held down by the ceilings placed on farm products, the farmers' sons are leaving to serve their country, and they are losing a lot of their good hired help which means they have to hire replacement help at increased wages and often less efficient. Farming is an art these days, you must know the game to make it go. Again I say I am pleased at the reception this bill is receiving by Representatives from every section of the United States of America, and I know the people of the agricultural States, and the people of the greatest agricultural State—Iowa—will be highly pleased to know that such harmony exists in the House of Representatives in their favor on this bill to continue the present interest rate on Federal farm loans.

I thank you, my colleagues, in behalf of the farmers and the people of my district and State.

(Mr. GRANT of Alabama asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Lafayette Advertiser.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial appearing in a Rockland County newspaper in reference to our former Postmaster General, Jim Farley.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE WIRE-TAPPING BILL

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 487.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 310) to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department in the conduct of certain investigations in the interest of the prosecution of the war, to make use of intercepted communications without regard to the limitations contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103), and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the joint resolution and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary, the joint resolution shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the joint resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous order shall be considered as ordered on the joint resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, this rule makes in order the so-called wire-tap-

ping bill. We just passed a Treasury-tapping bill, but this is a wire-tapping bill.

The bill is approved and asked for by the Attorney General, the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy. I am very pleased to follow the recommendations of the Attorney General whom I regard as one of the best and most efficient officials that has served the Government during my long service. I feel that during the short period that he has been in office he has proven himself a man of exceptional ability and is rendering a real, valuable service to the country. Mr. Speaker, there is no opposition to the bill on the part of the labor organizations as there was last year on a similar bill. I believe there is no opposition on the part of anyone, because the Judiciary Committee reported the bill unanimously and there is a general demand for the early passage of the legislation. I will not, therefore, take any more time with this exception. I cannot resist calling attention to some of the speeches made on the bill just passed, a bill which by the way again aids the farmers by enabling them to obtain money at 3½ percent interest, whereas formerly they were obliged to pay 6, 7, and 8 percent. Some gentlemen stated that farmers are patriotic, that they enlist. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that the people in the cities are also patriotic. And why should not everyone be patriotic and do everything in his power to aid the cause of our great Nation; the greatest country, the best country in the world? So they are not entitled to any special credit. I believe every American should do his part at this time, and I hope to God they will continue to do as many have done in the past.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Will the gentleman yield for a question about the bill?

Mr. SABATH. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If I understand the bill correctly, it limits the operation for the period of the war.

Mr. SABATH. That is all, and 6 months after the war. The committee has eliminated some of the objectionable features that were in the bills previously submitted by that committee.

So, having expressed my views as to the loyalty and patriotism of the farmers, I hope they will also appreciate and recognize what has been done for them in the last 10 years, and that they will continue to appreciate it. I want to congratulate them upon voting solidly for the last bill. I know they will do likewise on this patriotic measure.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I now yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, while we are congratulating, I want to congratulate the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee on his change of heart with reference to this wire-tapping proposal which he now designates as a patriotic bill. I call attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 30, 1941, when this same subject matter was before the House. When we are talking about votes back yonder and votes today, and when we are making comparisons, may I express the hope that those who are making the comparison will inspect that RECORD of June 30, 1941, with reference to the wire-tapping bill which the President of the United States and the Attorney General of the United States at that time sponsored and demanded as an emergency defense measure. I think the President called it an unlimited emergency at that time.

I was one of those who went down to defeat fighting for that bill which the President of the United States and the Attorney General said was necessary in the national defense effort. This bill is just belated, but why talk about that? There was honest difference of opinion then, just the same as there was on other matters of policy. There is not room for such differences now. Our war policy is fixed and definite. I call attention also to the report of the committee filed with this bill. It is a splendid report. It is clear, it is concise, it goes further than most reports, and I want to congratulate the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], its author. In a few words it tells of the necessity for the bill, and it explains fully the operation of the bill.

This report should be a part of the record of this debate, and I quote from it as follows:

This measure is in general essence a war measure—effective only until 6 months after the termination of the war or until sooner terminated by the President or by Congress. It does not diminish the present power of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Military and Naval Intelligence services to intercept communications. It is intended to make admissible in evidence information with respect to the offenses referred to which may be obtained by wire tapping, notwithstanding the provisions of section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934. That section provides that no person not being authorized by the sender shall intercept any communication and divulge or publish the same.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL

The resolution authorizes the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Military Intelligence Division, and the Office of Naval Intelligence, in the conduct of investigations, to ascertain, prevent, or frustrate any interference or any attempts or plans for interference with the national security and defense by treason, sabotage, espionage, seditious conspiracy, violations of neutrality laws, violations of the act requiring the registration of agents of foreign principals, violations of the act requiring the registration of organizations carrying on certain activities within the United States, or in any other manner, to require that telegrams, cablegrams, radiograms, or other wire or radio communications and copies or records thereof be disclosed and delivered to any authorized agent of such agencies, without regard to the limitations contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103).

Telegrams, cablegrams, radiograms, or other wire or radio communications or copies or records thereof may only be required where the agency secures approval of the head of the agency or the officers or official designated by him. Approval may be given only when there is reasonable ground to believe that a violation of a law referred to in the resolution may have been committed, is being committed, or may be about to be committed or the national safety is otherwise threatened.

Section 2 requires compliance with the request of a duly authorized person for the disclosure and surrender of a telegram, cablegram, radiogram, or other wire or radio communication.

Section 3 prohibits divulging, publishing, or using information obtained under the resolution except for the specified purposes.

Section 4 makes admissible in evidence in prosecutions for the offenses mentioned in the resolution, and only therein, information obtained by intercepting, listening in on, or recording communications.

Section 5 prescribes the penalty for a violation of any of the provisions, of a fine of not more than $10,000 or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

Section 6 is the usual separability provision and section 7 defines "person."

Section 8 provides for the effective period, during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress, by concurrent resolution, or the President, may designate.

REPORT CONCERNING PEARL HARBOR

Authority to require disclosure and delivery of telegrams, cablegrams, radiograms, or other wire or radio communications was referred to in the report on the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor filed by the Commission headed by Justice Owen J. Roberts. The report contained the following finding of fact:

"It was believed that the center of Japanese espionage in Hawaii was the Japanese consulate at Honolulu. It has been discovered that the Japanese consul sent to and received from Tokyo in his own and other names many messages on commercial radio circuits. This activity greatly increased toward December 7, 1941. The contents of these messages, if it could have been learned, might have furnished valuable information. In view of the peaceful relations with Japan, and the consequent restrictions on the activities of the investigation agencies, they were unable prior to December 7 to obtain and examine messages transmitted through commercial channels by the Japanese consul, or by persons acting for him."

SUPREME COURT DECISIONS

The Supreme Court in *Olmstead* v. *United States* (277 U. S. 438), held in 1928 that the tapping of telephone and telegraph wires by law-enforcement officers was not violative of the provisions of the fourth amendment relating to searches and seizures, in view of the fact that it did not involve a physical invasion of anyone's premises.

In *Nardone* v. *United States* (302 U. S. 379), the Supreme Court held that the Government's introduction of transcripts and recordings of intercepted interstate messages in the trial of a criminal case constituted a divulgence of such messages contrary to the terms of section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934.

In *Weiss* v. *United States* (308 U. S. 321), intrastate telephone communications were intercepted by Federal agents, their contents were divulged to certain of the defendants, and, as a result, these defendants confessed and agreed to turn State's evidence. They were permitted to testify to the contents of the messages. The Court held that the interdiction of the statute extended to the interception and divulgence of intrastate as well as interstate messages. It denied the Government's claim that the witnesses' testifying to the contents of the messages amounted to an authorization by them, as senders, of the divulgence of the communications within the meaning of the statute.

It was claimed in the second Nardone case, *Nardone* v. *United States* (308 U. S. 338), that unlawfully intercepted messages had been used to obtain evidence against the senders, and that such use, and the introduction of the evidence so obtained, over the objection

of the senders, who were defendants, constituted a violation of the purpose and policy of the statute. The Court held that if the facts sustained the claim the evidence should have been excluded.

On April 27, 1942, the Supreme Court rendered two decisions bearing upon section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934:

Goldman against United States involved a conviction for conspiracy to violate section 29 (b) (5) of the Bankruptcy Act by receiving, or attempting to obtain, money for acting, or forbearing to act, in a bankruptcy proceeding. At night access was obtained to the office of one Shulman and to an adjoining room, and a dictaphone was installed in a small aperture in the partition wall with a wire to be attached to earphones extending into the adjoining office. The dictaphone would not work but the investigators had with them a detectaphone having a receiver so delicate as, when placed against the partition wall, to pick up sound waves originating in Shulman's office, and means for amplifying and hearing them. With this apparatus the Federal agents overheard, and the stenographer transcribed, portions of conversations, and also heard what Shulman said when talking over the telephone from his office. Objection was made to the evidence that its receipt violated the fourth amendment of the Constitution and, as respects Shulman's talk into the telephone receiver, violated also section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934.

The Court held (1) that the overhearing and divulgence of what Shulman said into a telephone receiver was not a violation of section 605:

"The listening in the next room to the words of Shulman as he talked into the telephone receiver was no more the interception of a wire communication, within the meaning of the act, than would have been the overhearing of the conversation by one sitting in the same room, (2) that what was heard by the use of the detectaphone was not made illegal by trespass or unlawful entry, and (3) that the use of the detectaphone by Government agents was not a violation of the fourth amendment."

On this latter point the Court said relative to drawing a distinction between the Olmstead case and the present one:

"We think, however, the distinction is too nice for practical application of the constitutional guarantee and no reasonable or logical distinction can be drawn between what Federal agents did in the present case and State officers did in the Olmstead case."

The Court expressly declined to overrule the Olmstead case.

Goldstein et al. v. United States involved the alleged violation of section 605 of the Communications Act by the admission of testimony in a Federal criminal trial. Petitioners and others were indicted under the mail fraud and conspiracy statutes. The alleged scheme was to defraud insurance companies by presenting false claims for disability benefits. The principal subject of contention was the prospective testimony of Messman and Garrow, alleged coconspirators who, the petitioners asserted, had confessed and turned State's evidence because they had been confronted with intercepted telephone messages. Messman and Garrow were parties to these messages, or some of them, but the petitioners were not.

The Court stated the principal question:

"Assuming the witnesses' testimony was induced by divulging to them the contents of intercepted telephone messages, was the admission of this testimony erroneous? We hold that it was not."

The Court also stated:

"The question now to be decided is whether we shall extend the sanction for violation of the Communications Act so as to make available to one not a party to the intercepted communication the objection that its use outside the courtroom, and prior to the trial, induced evidence which, except for that use, would be admissible.

"No court has ever gone so far in applying the implied sanction for violation of the fourth amendment. While this Court has never been called upon to decide the point, the Federal courts in numerous cases, and with unanimity, have denied standing to one not the victim of an unconstitutional search and seizure to object to the introduction in evidence of that which was seized. A fortiori the same rule should apply to the introduction of evidence induced by the use or disclosure thereof to a witness other than the victim of the seizure. We think no broader sanction should be imposed upon the Government in respect of violations of the Communications Act. The court below was of the view that a divulgence of the intercepted messages might lawfully be made with the consent of the sender, and we agree. The court further thought that, as the sender might make such divulgence lawful by his consent, none but he was intended to be protected against divulgence by the statute. Again we agree.

"The petitioners, however, point out that the statute also forbids the use of an unlawfully intercepted message, or any information therein contained, by any person for his own benefit or the benefit of another not entitled thereto; and they say that the Government officials violated the act by using the messages and the information they contained, to induce the senders' confessions and testimony. They urge that such use is forbidden by the act and that they have standing to object to the introduction of the evidence thus obtained. The Government answers that this provision of the act was not intended to reach the use of the contents of the messages by Federal officers for obtaining evidence but was meant to prevent use for the personal advantage or benefit of the user. We have no occasion to determine the soundness of the Government's argument.

"We are of opinion that even though the use made of the communications by the prosecuting officers to induce the parties to them to testify were held a violation of the statute, this would not render the testimony so procured inadmissible against a person not a party to the message. This is the settled common-law rule. There was no use at the trial of the intercepted communications, or of any information they contained as such. If such use as occurred here is a violation of the act, the statute itself imposes a sanction."

None of us favor wire tapping as a general practice and on all occasions. I expressed my views in this particular in the debate on June 30 last, and I shall not repeat. On that occasion I was severely criticized because I gave, as one of my reasons for supporting the bill, the fact that it was demanded by the President of the United States, by the Attorney General of the United States, and by J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, as an emergency measure in the preparation and safeguarding of our national defense. I supported the bill then because the reasons for its enactment were just as cogent as they are today.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman, I presume, received letters in opposition to the former wire-tapping bill from certain labor-union leaders and from the Communists, did he not? They were both opposed to that bill?

Mr. MICHENER. We went further. The Committee on the Judiciary held very extensive hearings. I show you the volume—hundreds of pages. We heard all those people for and against the wire-tapping bill at that time. We have held additional hearings. The subcommittee has held additional hearings on the present bill and the opposition that largely predominated at that time does not obtain today.

All of the liberal groups that opposed the bill at that time realize that this is a war measure and that we are at war. It does not make any difference whose war it was, it is our war now, and it is the duty of every patriotic American citizen to place his shoulder to the wheel and do everything within his power to bring this war to the earliest successful conclusion with the least sacrifice of blood and treasure possible.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOTT. At the time the former wire-tapping bill was up for consideration, and it was opposed by the Communists and certain labor unions, was not the purpose of it at that time to try to overcome subversive activities that were in operation for the purpose of stopping our war preparation effort then?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; but I will not discuss that. That is water over the dam. Today we are faced with a different condition.

None of us want to give up any of his cherished liberties and freedoms, enjoyed because we are a free people. In the present type of war, however, we must think in prospect. It is necessary that we yield power to the President, that we forego privileges, and that we surrender rights momentarily in order that we may enjoy these same things in perpetuity after peace comes to us again. The big job we have today is to win this war, and that will be followed by the big job of regaining these freedoms after the necessity for yielding them up has ceased. I cannot imagine a Member of the House taking the floor and opposing this bill. It just will not happen. Quite a contrast from June 30, 1941. Yet some of these same persons who were opposing the President's demand for emergency defense legislation then are now wont to criticize others for not going along with the things they wanted, and which the President also desired, before Pearl Harbor.

Comparisons are usually odious. It little behooves any of us to harp on what happened before Pearl Harbor. In the wire-tapping instance I was an ardent supporter of what the President wanted because I believed, and we now know, that his demand at that time was essential. The majority of the House, however, felt otherwise, and many of those who had ardently supported the President in some other demand violently opposed him in this matter. Undoubtedly all acted in good faith. All used their own best judgment in behalf of what they thought was for the best interest of the country. Someone was wrong, but criticism and fault finding will not help win the war at this time. When war was declared we started from there and undoubtedly there

is general unity of purpose. This war is our joint venture and will only be successfully terminated by joint, unhampered, and cooperative action. The I-told-you-so attitude hinders rather than helps the war effort, and the sooner our people cease talking about what has been and devote all their time and effort to what is going to be and what must be the sooner will this dreadful scourge of war pass from us.

The committee report, which I have quoted, explains just what this bill does. It is some different than the bill which was defeated on June 30. That bill extended the right to tap wires where espionage, sabotage, kidnaping, and extortion were involved. In no other instance did that bill permit wire tapping and the use of the evidence obtained thereby. The bill before us is broader, more far-reaching, and covers much more territory than the defeated bill. It authorizes the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Military Intelligence Division, and the Office of Naval Intelligence to use wire tapping in the detection of treason, sabotage, espionage, seditious conspiracy, and in numerous other instances where the national defense is concerned. It would be a very drastic law under any excepting war conditions. Be it remembered, however, that this is purely a war measure, and can be terminated at any time by Presidential proclamation, provided, however, that if the President does not issue a repealing proclamation within 6 months after peace is declared, then the Congress by concurrent resolution can wipe this whole statute off the books.

There is not a patriotic soul among us who can find any fault with the authority granted in this bill. It is true that the bill does not include kidnaping and extortion. For my part, I should like to see the law made permanent so far as kidnaping and extortion are concerned. It was wire tapping that made it possible for the F. B. I. to solve several important kidnaping and extortion cases. This is the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover before the Judiciary Committee. Yet no one's civil rights were materially impinged upon. We have too many so-called liberals in the country who are eternally fretting about yielding up their individual privileges in behalf of the common good. With this group I have no patience.

In conclusion may I say that I have not changed my position at all since I advocated granting the President this emergency power in 1941. The necessities of the occasion are even greater today, and it is gratifying to know that this view is universally appreciated by the Members. Just another evidence of unity when our national life is at stake. It is this type of thing that is bound to win this war.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman thinks the elements who opposed it then have now seen the light of day and have become more patriotic?

Mr. MICHENER. In peacetimes we quarrel about our internal affairs. In wartimes we forget our differences of opinion and fight the common enemy.

Mr. MOTT. Of course, we do that.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I am very glad to have the gentleman refer back to about a year ago, when we had a similar bill before this House, because I recall that while that bill was under consideration in the gentleman's committee I was told by the head of the F. B. I. personally that due to their previous habit of tapping wires, telephone conversations, and so on, they had been following and keeping their fingers on the activities of several thousand known foreign agents in this country who have since become enemy aliens. I presume some such testimony was offered before the gentleman's committee. It seems to me very strange that this House a year ago did not pass this bill as requested by the President and by those bodies.

Mr. MICHENER. That is gone now; but may I say to the gentleman that practically every one of those agencies appeared before the committee last year opposing this bill. They called themselves liberal. They were opposed to this type of legislation.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Not the agencies of the Government who were charged with following up these enemy agents?

Mr. MICHENER. No. This bill was sponsored by the Attorney General of the United States and by the President of the United States, and was defeated in this House by a vote of 153 to 146 on a roll-call vote on June 30, 1941.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill will pass unanimously.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan is very eloquent in defending this measure and in appealing to those who opposed any other measures having to do with wire tapping not to vote against this measure at this time, and finally asking the House as a whole to give this power to the President.

Without looking at the record, I think I was one who opposed the so-called Hobbs wire-tapping bill, but this is not the Hobbs bill by any means. The gentleman knows that just as well as I know it.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman point out the difference?

Mr. COCHRAN. I will point it out later in the debate.

The gentleman tells us the President should have this power. Why does not the gentleman from Michigan look at his own record and see how much power he has voted to give the President when the President appeal to this House for power prior to December 7?

Those of us who opposed the Hobbs bill had reason to oppose it. This bill confines itself to certain things which the gentleman mentioned. Of course, no one is going to oppose this kind of a measure, especially during wartime. But the gentleman should not indirectly criticize those who during peacetime thought it was not proper to let every wire in the United States be tapped by Government officials who wanted to tap it.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The bill before the House last year provided that no wire could be tapped unless the permission of the Attorney General was given in writing.

Mr. COCHRAN. I know that. This bill is a great deal different and is a war measure.

Mr. MICHENER. I may say in that connection that the open hearings recently held developed that on the 2d day of September 1941 the F. B. I. in Honolulu asked Mr. Hoover to get permission to tap the wire between Honolulu and Tokyo. Mr. Hoover made the application to the Attorney General, and the permission was given on October 22.

Mr. COCHRAN. That permission was given, I presume?

Mr. MICHENER. There was no wire tapping without the permission of the Attorney General.

Mr. COCHRAN. They got the permission?

Mr. MICHENER. On October 22.

Mr. COCHRAN. Did they learn that the Japs were going to visit Pearl Harbor on December 7?

Mr. MICHENER. I do not know what the information was.

Mr. COCHRAN. Japan did not talk about attacking us over the telephone.

What I am talking about is that the gentleman from Michigan who, time and again, has stood on this floor and criticized those who wanted to give the President power, is now standing here criticizing some of us who did not care to vote for a wire-tapping bill before the emergency arose. That is what I am talking about.

Now, as to the bill we defeated last year, it provided that only the Bureau of Investigation could tap wires, and then only when granted permission by the Attorney General. It not only included espionage, sabotage, but also kidnaping and extortion cases. This bill, very properly, as a wartime measure, extends the power to not only the F. B. I. but also to the Intelligence Division of the War Department and the Office of Naval Intelligence in the conduct of investigations in the interest of prosecution of the war. There is a vast difference between the two bills.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 o'clock a. m.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

THE WIRE-TAPPING BILL

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the

Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 310.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 310, with Mr. DAVIS of Ohio in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER].

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the kindly expressions of opinion concerning me made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. I may say I know of no more tireless, able, or painstaking Member of this House than the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. Chairman, it must be understood that this bill, House Joint Resolution 310, is strictly a war measure and is confined to war crimes. Its duration shall be only until 6 months after peace, or the President by order, or the Congress by concurrent resolution, shall determine by way of sooner determination or termination of the effective powers of the bill.

Specifically, the bill makes admissible in evidence information obtained by wire tapping in cases involving so-called war crimes like treason, sabotage, espionage, seditious conspiracy, and so forth, and the wire tapping, plus the use of evidence obtained by wire tapping is limited to those purposes enumerated in the bill.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. This bill does carry other limitations than those included in the bill that was voted on last June.

Mr. CELLER. Yes; it does.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. A considerable number of new limitations have been written into the bill.

Mr. CELLER. Yes; and, primarily, those limitations are that this is strictly a war measure for the duration of the war and it does not include so-called domestic crimes like kidnaping, and so forth.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. And the other bill did include domestic crimes?

Mr. CELLER. Yes; it did include domestic crimes.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. So this is not the same measure voted on last June?

Mr. CELLER. It is not, in that sense.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MOTT. On account of the gentleman's special knowledge of this bill I wish he would clear up that point. I recall the provisions of the former bill which I supported, as I intend to support this bill, and it is my recollection that the former Hobbs bill was limited in duration to the emergency and that it was limited in scope to crimes which the gentleman has just designated as war crimes. If that is the case I think the gentleman should clear it up so that there will not be any misunderstanding.

Mr. CELLER. At the time of the discussion of the Hobbs bill I was home ill, but if my memory serves me rightly from a reading of the debate, the bill went further in that regard than the instant bill. As I have stated, this bill is strictly limited to these war crimes beyond peradventure of a doubt. The gentleman can read them very carefully.

Mr. MOTT. I think the former Hobbs bill did include kidnaping, but outside of that I think it was entirely directed toward what the gentleman has described as war crimes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I will ask the gentleman if the former bill, known as the Hobbs bill, did not also include espionage?

Mr. CELLER. I think that is correct.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. It also included extortion and it was not limited as to time, but was designed as permanent policy.

Mr. CELLER. As first drawn it was to be permanent law.

Mr. O'HARA. Oh, no.

Mr. CELLER. If I am wrong about that, I would like to be corrected.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA. If the gentleman will refer back to the RECORD, he will find that I offered an amendment to limit it to 2 years.

Mr. CELLER. I am sorry. I did not recall.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. The RECORD of June 30, 1941, at page 5793, shows that this amendment was offered on a motion to recommit:

> On page 2, line 2, after the words "United States" insert "without delegating his authority except to the Acting Attorney General in his absence"; and on page 3, after line 23, insert "This section shall remain in force and effect for a period of 2 years after its passage."

Mr. CELLER. Regardless of the differences, I think we can all agree that this particular bill has certain specific limitations not in the previous bill and this bill is applicable primarily to the war effort.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Without regard to what happened when the bill was up last time—and I voted for its passage—the fact is that we need this legislation now, and the fact is that the declaration of war has taken place since the consideration of the last bill and the present time. Those are facts that are indisputable, and the necessity of winning the war demands the passage of this legislation, because the legislation is such that it may add to the winning of the war.

Mr. CELLER. I thank the gentleman. Nobody appeared specifically in opposition to the general principles underlying this bill. As a matter of fact, a representative of the office of American Federation of Labor had this to say:

> I am authorized to say for the American Federation of Labor that, notwithstanding our previous well-known attitude toward this type of legislation, we shall not now oppose this legislation, provided it is made perfectly clear that the legislation is for the duration only.

Mr. Philip Murray, president of the Congress for Industrial Organizations, stated likewise that his organization favored the bill, but said that the suspension of the wire-tapping prohibitions should be limited in time to the duration of the war. That is in the bill. Also he said that the suspension should be severely limited in scope to the detection and apprehension of violators of laws designed to promote the national war effort. That is in the bill. Also that severe criminal penalties should be provided for any person using the power to tap wires, or any information so secured, for any purpose other than as evidence in connection with the prosecution for one of the described offenses. That is in the bill. Then he added a fourth provision that a specific declaration should be included to prevent the use of the wire-tapping power in any manner to destroy or interfere with the rights of organized labor.

That last provision we could not possibly and specifically comply with. Assuredly no effort will be made to hunt or hound labor. My record on labor is unassailable. I am a strong champion and friend of labor. If I thought for one moment labor would be hurt by this measure, I would oppose it. I shall be alert and ready to denounce anyone who would attempt to hurt labor by the provisions of this bill. Aside from that fourth condition, all of the conditions that he adverted to are covered by the language of the bill.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I understand that the Federal Lawyers' Association considered the matter and approved the bill with the provision that it be confined to the duration of the war.

Mr. CELLER. Most of the bar associations writing to us approved the bill on the condition that it be limited to the duration of the war. We think we have a bill here that should meet every possible contingency and every possible objection. Severe penalties are pre-

scribed for unauthorized uses of the evidence that might be obtained by wire tapping. There is a penalty provided of $10,000 and/or 2 years in jail; no permission to tap wires can be given unless the national safety is threatened, or one of the prescribed crimes designated in the statutes is about to be committed. Unauthorized demands for copies of telegrams or communications are punishable by a fine, and unauthorized publication or use of communications is punishable. Evidence obtained in any unauthorized way cannot be used and it only can be used in the manner prescribed by the statute specifically and cannot otherwise be used.

We could not conjure up any other limitations. We put every possible safeguard in the bill to protect the rights of all parties, all citizens anywhere, everywhere in the United States. We feel that in the interest of the war effort, we should have this legislation. My State of New York, for example, has in its constitution the right to tap wires, and to use the evidence obtained in the detection of crimes. If we do not pass this legislation, we will have an anomalous situation. For example, a New York City policeman could tap a wire, whereas an F. B. I. agent could not, and in addition use the evidence obtained thereby. That is a ridiculous situation and we must cure that

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. Yes.

Mr. O'HARA. Will the gentleman state for the purpose of the record whether or not the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Military Intelligence and the Naval Intelligence may now act in the matter of tapping wires without getting anyone's consent to work separately or together as they see fit? Is not that true?

Mr. CELLER. I am glad that the gentleman asked that question. I had overlooked it. That is correct. The Army and the Naval Intelligence Divisions may act independently without getting any clearance from the Attorney General's office.

If we do not pass this bill, our treacherous alien enemies and spies residing in our midst will have the untrammeled and safe use of the channels of wire and wireless, but our Army, Navy, and Department of Justice will not.

Assuredly, the present wire-tapping prohibitions are not being observed by alien spies and espionage agents. Federal officials must obey the prohibitions. Army and Navy Intelligence officers cannot listen in, but Nazi, Fascist, and Japanese saboteurs can. Such a situation is woefully ridiculous.

In conclusion, I am deeply sensible of and thankful for the able assistance of my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK], and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]. I am especially grateful to Mr. Frank Connell, clerk of the Judiciary Committee, for his painstaking research and studious inquiry. He was ever at my elbow aiding and advising me.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has again expired.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the court and the jury are favorable, I think it would be foolish for me to indulge in any extended argument. Many a man has talked himself out of court when the judge was with him at the outset.

I am thoroughly familiar with this legislation. I discussed a similar bill 2 years ago and again last year, and I am perfectly ready to discuss it today if anybody desires to hear my views.

I hope there will be no opposition. Everyone must realize that we are engaged in warfare and that this is a war measure. When we know the land is filled with saboteurs, spies, and traitors, it is utter folly to deny to our intelligence departments of the Army and the Navy and the F. B. I. the usual weapons which are used all over the world to track down these desperate criminals, who are more dangerous to us than enemy troops in uniform.

The language of this bill is not satisfactory to everybody concerned with its preparation. It has been written and rewritten half a dozen times. The final version as you have it before you today represents the best efforts of the Judiciary Committee to compose our differences. I could go into detail and describe for you the reason for every word and phrase in it because I happened to be one of a subcommittee, together with my good friend from New York [Mr. CELLER], and my good friend from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS], who drafted the bill in its final form. If you wish to know the contents of the bill, the background of it and the explanation of it, I suggest that you read the report carefully.

I compliment the gentlemen from New York [Mr. CELLER], author of the bill, for his excellent work. I also compliment the very able and efficient clerk of the committee, Mr. Frank Connell, who actually drafted the report and was most helpful all through the consideration of the bill.

I will be pleased to answer any questions. I hope there will be none. I hope the debate will not be extended. I hope the bill will be passed unanimously. The President is for it. The Department of Justice is for it; the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy are for it. Everyone who opposed it a year ago, so far as I know, approves of it today. It is an essential measure. It should have been passed months ago.

I will not delay the passage of the bill today by taking any more time.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS].

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, there would have been no Pearl Harbor attack had this bill been the law of the land before December 7, 1941. I make that statement unequivocally. I make it solemnly. I make it upon my own initiative and upon my own responsibility. It is true, as every member of the Judiciary Committee who heard the testimony given in our executive session knows. We know whereof we speak, although we cannot take the Congress into our confidence.

This bill may yet prove essential. It differs from its precursors in several respects, but it is, on the whole, improved. It has been weakened materially in only one respect. Its life is limited to the war emergency as usually defined. We all wish that it had been the law and that the awful loss of life and the weakening of our Navy which occurred at Pearl Harbor might have been averted. But it is not too late to help win the war. It still can serve a useful purpose. Personally I think it ought to be permanent legislation, but I waive that and bow respectfully to the wisdom of my conferees on the committee.

Nor can I close these brief remarks without paying sincere tribute to the leadership of the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] throughout its long and hard progress; and also to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK], whose diligent and able work on the subcommittee was invaluable.

I also wish to pay tribute to Frank Connell, who has been more than helpful in every one of the many meetings we have had on this subject and in a hundred ways.

This bill should pass. It will pass. It must pass if we are to do our duty in behalf of America's war effort.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT].

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I agree, of course, with the majority leader in saying that we should consider this as a war measure, devoted to war crimes, limited to the duration of the war, without too much regard for ancient history.

For the purpose of putting the record straight, I feel I must comment on the defeat of the wire-tapping bill last June, and the effect of that defeat upon the events at Pearl Harbor. Existing law, as interpreted by the Attorney General and his predecessors, permits Government wire tapping. It does not permit the use of evidence gained thereby in prosecutions. In other words, the defeat of the Hobbs bill last June did not prevent wire tapping at Pearl Harbor.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Yes; I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Is it not true that the Attorney General made a regulation that there should be no wire tapping by the F. B. I., Mr. Hoover's organization, without express permission of the Attorney General, and that Mr. Hoover and the F. B. I. made a personal request of the Attorney General for permission to tap wires on the 2d day of September 1941, and he did not get the permission until the 22d or the 27th day of October?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I believe that is correct.

Even if the Hobbs bill had passed the same condition would have obtained; the Attorney General would have had to give

his permission. Furthermore, as the gentleman's very statement points out, the F. B. I. got the authority from the Attorney General to tap wires at Pearl Harbor some 6 or 7 weeks before the disaster occurred. The point I am making is simply that it was not through any adverse vote in this House that the Government failed to utilize the power it already had at the time of Pearl Harbor.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I want to compare for the benefit of the Members of the House, in just a few instances, the bill which was before the House on June 30, 1941, and the present bill. I believe this will be helpful to the Committee in determining its policy respecting this legislation.

As has been said, just a few moments ago, the bill which was before the House, known as the Hobbs bill and which was under consideration on June 30, 1941, contained the provision that if the wires were to be tapped and the evidence were to be used in the prosecution of any case it must first go through the hands of the Attorney General of the United States. Everyone on the floor of the House this afternoon who was present during that particular debate will recall the reference made to the possible obstructions which might come in securing permission from the Attorney General, or a certificate from the Attorney General, for the purpose of tapping wires which would then make possible the use of that evidence in prosecutions.

The bill now before the House gives three agencies the power which in the Hobbs bill was delegated to the Attorney General: First, the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice; second, the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department; and, third, the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department. And the crimes involved are treason, sabotage, espionage, seditious conspiracy, violations of neutrality laws, and violations of the act requiring registration of agents of foreign principals. These are the sole agencies which will have the power to direct the tapping of wires, and the crimes above recited are the crimes for which the authority may be extended to tap wires for the purpose of obtaining evidence. The Hobbs bill embraced domestic crimes, such as kidnaping and extortion. This bill does not contain any domestic crimes as a basis for wire tapping.

In this connection I want to call the attention of the membership, if I may, to the statement which was made by J. Edgar Hoover before the committee with reference to this particular bill now before us. I quote from the hearings:

> Coming to the matter of this legislation, I think I should indicate what the procedure is in the Federal Bureau of Investigation today in connection with wire tapping.
>
> The procedure that the Federal Bureau of Investigation follows today in regard to wire tapping is this: No agent in charge of any of the 56 field offices of the Bureau is authorized to tap a telephone wire. I myself am not authorized to tap a telephone wire. If an agent in charge of any of the 56 field offices of the Bureau decides an investigation warrants the tapping of a telephone wire, he communicates with me here in Washington and I in turn transmit that request by memorandum to the Attorney General in accord with his instructions.

So if the pending bill should be passed the three agencies I have just mentioned; namely, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department would be the sole agencies which would have the power to authorize the tapping of wires, and this would be, only, to secure our national defense and security. The Hobbs bill was voted upon before we were attacked by Japan. Since December 7, 1941, great changes have occurred. We are not at peace now.

We must remember that we are in war; this is a war measure; this is an emergency measure, and under the express provisions of the bill itself this law will continue in force until the expiration of 6 months after the termination of the present war. We must win this war, and we must not leave anything undone which may contribute to our ultimate victory. The necessity of tapping wires in order to obtain evidence of treason, sabotage, espionage, seditious conspiracy, violations of neutrality laws, and violations of the act requiring the registration of foreign principals may become highly important at any time. The failure to pass this bill today might be the direct cause of great loss of property, or the commission of acts of treason whereby our Nation might suffer great and irreparable injury. Every American is vitally interested in this legislation; it is needed, and may I say that certain confidential communications given to the Judiciary Committee of the House of Representatives, by J. Edgar Hoover, of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which the members of the committee cannot disclose, make certain the fact that this legislation is entirely justified as a war measure.

Mr. Chairman, before I conclude my remarks I desire to express to my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] my congratulations upon the presentation of this bill. It is purely a defense measure. We must extend our all-out effort to win this war to those protective measures which will make secure our Nation, and our people. This bill will do just that, and no more. The gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] has given much time and effort to this measure, and he is to be commended by the Members of the House, and by the country, for presenting this protective legislation.

I desire, also, to add my tribute to that fine and distinguished secretary of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. Frank Connell, who has labored long and faithfully in the preparation of this bill. His efforts respecting this measure should be applauded by all. He is a faithful and loyal coworker of our great committee.

Mr. Chairman, as we approach the end of the debate on this war measure—a measure which is protective, only in its character—and which will throw the arm of security about every American—our factories, shops, and mills will be made secure, and the American workers will find their machine and bench ready for them each day when the whistle blows; their opportunity to work will not be destroyed by the saboteur, and the people will be made safe and secure by this piece of legislation.

I hope, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that this bill will pass without a dissenting vote in the House of Representatives. Let us say to the world that we will protect our people and our country, insofar as possible.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to add to the very able and informative explanations which have been made with reference to this bill. I want to direct attention to the fact that the attitude toward this bill as it is now presented is a fine indication and a fine example. During ordinary times—during peacetimes—Members divide; they have different attitudes; sometimes this aisle between Democrats and Republicans divides everybody; but it is a fine thing—it is a heartening thing—to observe that when your country faces danger—and unquestionably we face danger—party lines cease to obtain, and Members of this Congress, whether Democrats or Republicans, stand united for the defense of their common country. There is no solidifying, unifying, vitalizing, strengthening, protective thing for a people imperiled as we are comparable in its efficency to a realization of a great common danger. During the past 2 or 3 weeks there seems to be a tendency to minimize our dangers, to stir up optimism, to magnify things in our favor and minimize those against us. Nothing could be more dangerous to the security of this country than that. That sort of thing breeds incaution and incaution results in such things as happened at Pearl Harbor. That does not help our morale. The people want the facts. They can take them raw. They have got the right to have them. There is not the slightest doubt that our country now faces the supreme danger in its existence.

We have had a very foolish notion in America that in some sort of way we were going to escape the test and the perils which other countries have faced. We have got over that notion now. The ease-loving, soft, self-centered, unfit people of yesterday, as if by magic almost, are coming to be virile people fit to win. It is for us to forget partisanship and personal ambition and to be fit servants of such a people. Tell them the truth. The truth is that we have not been winning this war, not yet. Everything we have is involved. Regardless of the past, we of this House must face the present and the future as we face this bill unitedly in this war situation.

There is no more solidifying influence that can be exerted among the people than the consciousness of a common

danger. The unanimity of the House toward this very identical piece of legislation is an evidence to the country that we believe we do face that character of danger which requires us to stand as a united people, with just one object, and that is to make this country secure. We have got to turn the tide of this war before we can win. It is running against us. We are not going to get ourselves in shape to do it by trying to deceive ourselves as to the seriousness of our danger. We are watchmen on the tower for our people. We do not have to hide things from them. They are as grown as we are. They are not jittery one bit. They know we are in danger. Nothing could do a greater hurt to our morale, to the confidence and trust between the people and their public officials and civilians in positions of leadership than for the impression to get abroad that things affecting the public security are being hidden from them, or our dangers minimized in our reports to them.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA].

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, I assume that the passage of this bill will be unanimous today; at least I sincerely hope so, because the House has been fiddling and shadow boxing with this wire-tapping bill for some time. The gentleman from Alabama has well said that the tragedy of Pearl Harbor might have been avoided had this bill been the law prior to December 7, 1941.

I do want to compliment the author of the bill and the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee that did a great deal of work upon it. Perhaps there are some in the Congress and some in the departments of our Government who have a very high sensitivity in reference to the proposition of wire tapping. As far as I am concerned, wire tapping ought to be permitted in the case of the violation of any Federal felony and not limited as it is limited by this bill. However, and with due respect to those who opposed the Hobbs bill on June 30, 1941, there is and has been the imperative need of this exceedingly important legislation with our country at war.

Mr. Chairman, while I am speaking, I would like also to pay high compliment to Mr. Connell, clerk of the committee. It is always a pleasure to go to him and ask for information, because he is always gracious and willing and tries to aid any member of the committee who comes to him. It is my hope that the Judiciary Committee will long have Mr. Connell as its clerk.

Mr. Chairman, I hope this bill will be rapidly acted upon by the Senate, because all you have to do to realize the importance of it is to read the report, and particularly page 29 of the last printed hearings on the bill. I am not only happy to have supported the previous measure, the so-called Hobbs bill, but I am equally happy to support this bill and to urge its passage.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, this is second-guessing day. On this bill on which we are now so unanimous, we are divided between the "I told you so's" and the "alibis." I happen to be one of those who supported this bill when it was up last summer, and I got a good bit of scolding for it.

This bill has considerable historic importance as applied to the Pacific situation and to Pearl Harbor. Let me carry you back, while we are "second guessing" a little bit, to a document found on page 2657 of the Appendix of the RECORD of June 16, 1939, being the minority report of the Foreign Affairs Committee on the so-called neutrality bill, House Joint Resolution 306, the Bloom bill. During the hearings on our foreign policy leading up to that bill, we had heard many witnesses urging embargoes against Japan. I made a motion to consider the Japanese embargo bills which were pending before our committee, but my motion was tabled without even permitting me to speak.

With that background in mind, our minority report on the Bloom bill said:

THE PACIFIC SITUATION

We have attempted, without success, to secure consideration and action by our committee on the situation in the Orient. We feel that it is a mistake to try to determine our possible conduct as to future wars in Europe before we determine our conduct as to an existing war. We have let our excitement about what may happen to our remote interests in Europe blind us to what is now happening to our immediate interests in the Pacific, where our treaty rights are being violated and our national interests threatened every day. We feel certain that if we had solved this immediate far-eastern problem first it would have gone far toward solving the rest of our international problems.

If our country had carried out this minority proposal 3 years ago and had stopped arming Japan, Pearl Harbor might have been prevented.

Why bring that up? Not just to say "I told you so," but to remind us all to go carefully when we are all of one mind. There is a lot of talk here today about the need for unanimity. I think the need for being right is more important than the need for unanimity. I happen to be an "I told you so" man today on this bill, but there are many men whose judgment I respect who did not support this bill before, for this is a terrible power to give to the Government, in peace or war, the power that Justice Holmes has described as "a dirty business," eavesdropping on private conversations. I thought it was necessary under the circumstances last summer, and I think it is necessary now, but let those who do not feel that way now have the courage to state their views here. In the interest of unanimity we do not want to be stampeded into doing the wrong thing. We want to continue to be a deliberative body.

I am one of those who always view with some suspicion a unanimous vote, because I know that, human nature being what it is, a divided vote means that in all probability the measure received more careful consideration than one which was passed unanimously.

To those who are in the minority on votes we take today I say, be of good cheer. Often those who were in the minority in the past, as on this bill, or as some of us were in 1939 on the Pacific problem, come into the majority when the matter comes up for a second guess. On the other hand, when those of us who were in the minority find that time has brought the majority around to our views on a certain measure, let us not crow too much, let us not say too much about "I told you so"; we may be the ones who are proven wrong next time. Rather, let us try to continue to debate measures on their merits, without being stampeded, without recriminations, seeking to be right rather than unanimous.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Since I took the floor a few minutes ago to answer the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] I have looked over this bill and compared it with the bill on which we voted a year ago. In the first place, we were not at war at the time we voted on that bill. In the second place, we gave the entire power to one man. We extended that power solely to the Attorney General in the original bill. Is not that correct?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I think there are differences between this and the Hobbs bill and differences between the situation then and now which would justify a change in a man's vote. For myself, the fact that this bill does not include kidnapers and extortionists, as the Hobbs bill did, does not make this bill better. I concede that there are differences. Although in my judgment the two bills are substantially the same and the purpose that they seek to achieve is the same, I respect the judgment of those of my colleagues who feel that the differences are important enough for them to have voted the other way last time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is it not a fact also that the Hobbs bill considered last year never mentioned the Army or the Navy Intelligence Sections?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I rise to make just one observation. These gentlemen are concerned about how Members voted last year, or whenever it was. One time I was running for office and a man was accusing me of having cast a bad vote. I replied that I thought he was probably making a mistake about that particular vote, that I thought that was probably a very good vote, but if he wanted some campaign thunder and would come around to me I would show him some votes that I knew were wrong. Then I said, "Of course, I try to profit by my mistakes." Then I said to the audience, "All you fellows who never made any mistakes, vote for this other bird, and the rest of you vote for me, and I will count noses with him." I never

heard anything more about that particular vote.

I think that is about the situation with regard to how Members voted last year on this bill. Of course, stable people do not change often, but the only consistency anybody ought to aspire to is that each time he acts he uses then his latest and best judgment. The fine thing about it is that we are all standing together now voting for this bill as we must stand together generally for what we believe is in the interest of our country that is now engaged in war, facing the greatest fighting machine of all time, with everything we have or can hope for in the gravest sort of peril. Let the dead past bury its dead while we unitedly, with but one ambition, seek to be servants of a great democracy in this hour of its supreme peril.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department are authorized, in the conduct of investigations, to ascertain, prevent, or frustrate any interference or any attempts or plans for interference with the national security and defense by treason, sabotage, espionage, seditious conspiracy, violations of neutrality laws, violations of the act requiring the registration of agents of foreign principals (act of June 8, 1938, as amended (52 Stat. 631)), violations of the act requiring the registration of organizations carrying on certain activities within the United States (act of October 17, 1940 (54 Stat. 1201)), or in any other manner, to require that telegrams, cablegrams, radiograms, or other wire or radio communications and copies or records thereof be disclosed and delivered to any authorized agent of any one of said investigatorial agencies, without regard to the limitations contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103): *Provided*, That no demand for the disclosure and delivery of telegrams, cablegrams, radiograms, or other wire or radio communications, or copies or records thereof, shall be made by any agency specified in this section unless and until such agency has received the approval of the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the head of the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the head of the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department, as the case may be, or by such officer or official as may be designated by him. Such approval shall be given only when there is reasonable ground to believe that a violation of a law referred to in this section may have been committed, is being committed, or may be about to be committed, or the national safety is otherwise threatened. The information thus obtained shall be admissible in evidence.

SEC. 2. No person shall fail to comply forthwith with the request of any duly authorized person, pursuant to this joint resolution, for the disclosure and surrender of any telegram, cablegram, radiogram, or other wire or radio communication, or copies or records thereof in his possession or under his control.

SEC. 3. No person shall divulge, publish, or use the existence, contents, substance, purport, or meaning of any information obtained pursuant to the provisions of this joint resolution otherwise than for the purposes hereinbefore enumerated.

SEC. 4. Any information obtained by any one of the three investigatorial agencies above named in the conduct of any investigation referred to in this resolution by means of intercepting, listening in on, or recording telephone, telegraph, cable, radio, and any other similar messages or communications, shall be admissible in evidence in any prosecution for any offense mentioned in this resolution, but not otherwise.

SEC. 5. Any person who willfully and knowingly violates any provision of this joint resolution shall be guilty of a felony and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $10,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this resolution authorizes the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department in the conduct of certain investigations in the interest of the prosecution of the war to make use of intercepted communications without regard to the limitations contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934.

We are all agreed that any agents of these branches of the Government enumerated in this act may, without violation of law, intercept messages sent by wire by those who are about to commit a crime, but they cannot use these intercepted messages in evidence against those who are committing or are about to commit the crimes of treason, sabotage, espionage, seditious conspiracy, violations of neutrality laws, and other offenses against the security of this country.

At this time this Nation is engaged in a war for its national existence, and in the prosecution of this war we have builded into an army of defense and offense more than 2,000,000 of our young men; and before our war effort shall have ceased, in all human probability, we will have marshaled under the flag of this country as many as 10,000,000 of our finest, strongest, and best young men. There must be no fifth column in the rear of these men. We do know that those who would commit treason, sabotage, or any other crime interfering with the successful prosecution of the war may resort to, and have resorted to, the use of telegraph wires and telephone wires. If we refuse to enact this measure we say to those who are guilty of treason in this country, those who are guilty of sabotage, those who conspire to defeat our war efforts and bring death to our armed forces and defeat to our armies and our Navy, "You may go ahead and use with impunity these far-flung lines of communication which are calculated, if properly used, to make successful your efforts against your country." Yet we say to the Army and to the Navy and to the F. B. I., "You cannot listen in and use against these traitors, these saboteurs, those who are undertaking to defeat our war efforts, what they have said or what they have done in the use of these instrumentalities." Such a thing is monstrous and is an insult to the intelligence of everybody, and it is for these reasons that I shall support this measure and arm our F. B. I. and our Army and our Navy officials with the power to listen in and get the conversations of these traitors, these saboteurs, and these people who are undertaking to hamstring and defeat the efforts of this country in maintaining our national existence. I voted for a measure similar to this one during the first session of this Congress. It was defeated by a vote of this House. I am reliably informed that if that measure had become a law and if the F. B. I., the intelligence departments of the Army and Navy had been permitted to listen in on the Japs at Honolulu, Pearl Harbor could not have been attacked and our fleet destroyed and our boys butchered on December 7, 1941.

The clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. If any provision of this joint resolution or the application of such provision to any circumstance shall be held invalid, the validity of the remainder of this joint resolution and the applicability of such provision to other circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

SEC. 7. For purposes of this joint resolution the term "person" shall include any individual, partnership, association, business trust, corporation, or any organized group of persons, whether incorporated or not.

SEC. 8. This joint resolution shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for six months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress, by concurrent resolution, or the President, may designate.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. DAVIS of Ohio, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 310, pursuant to House Resolution 487, he reported the same back to the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OVERPAYMENTS ON TRANSPORTATION ACCOUNTS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2305) to relieve disbursing and certifying officers of the United States of responsibility for overpayments made on transportation accounts under certain circumstances.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill has a unanimous report from the committee, the Army, the Navy, the Bureau of the Budget, and the Comptroller General. They not only wrote letters asking for its immediate enactment, but sent

representatives before the committee at a hearing. I spoke to the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], this morning and also to the members of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments who were present—the minority members. There is no objection to its immediate consideration.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that this bill provides for the military the same rules that are applicable to the civilian departments or bureaus?

Mr. COCHRAN. Absolutely, and the Government is fully protected in every way from loss. There is no doubt about that as the Comptroller General says.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter no disbursing or certifying officer of the United States shall be held liable for overpayments made for transportation furnished on Government bills of lading or transportation requests when said overpayments are due to the use of improper transportation rates, classifications, or the failure to deduct the proper amount under land-grant laws or equalization and other agreements.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2508. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an article by Robert L. Norton, in the Boston Post of Wednesday, May 22, 1942. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an editorial entitled "Irving Cobb's Philosophy," from the Indianapolis Star of May 22, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time I have today be transferred to Tuesday next, after the disposition of business and other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. DISNEY] who had a special order for today has relinquished that time.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2508. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 27, 1942, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The hearings in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be postponed for approximately 2 weeks.

There will be a meeting of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum Investigation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Wednesday, May 27, 1942.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, May 27, 1942, for consideration of H. R. 6858, H. R. 7044, House Joint Resolution 46, H. R. 3776, H. R. 4800, and H. R. 6370.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1672. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Federal Security Agency in the amount of $103,000, for the fiscal year 1942 (H. Doc. No. 737); to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

1673. A letter from the Chairman, National Park and Planning Commission, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Secretary of the Interior to make exchanges with the Defense Homes Corporation of certain lands in northwest Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1674. A letter from the Director of Censorship, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941, by extending the authority to censor communications to include communications between the continental United States and any Territory or possession, and any other Territory or possession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1675. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the use of certificates by officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, in connection with pay and allowance accounts of military and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction of the War and Navy Departments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1676. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 12, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and illustrations, on a review of reports on the James River, Va., with a view to determining if any modification of the existing project is advisable, and particularly with a view to the improvement of Richmond Harbor by means of contraction works, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on January 24, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 738); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 for the training and education of defense workers; without amendment (Rept. No. 2174). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Patents. S. 2427. An act to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2175). Referred to the House Calendar.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII.

Mr. HARTER introduced a bill (H. R. 7139) for the relief of Carl Oplinger, a minor, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2938. By Mr. LYNCH: Petition of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, supporting the economic program of the President; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2939. Also, petition of the International Ladies' Garment Workers' Union, supporting the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2940. By Mr. OLIVER: Petition of sundry citizens of Eliot, Maine, supporting Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2941. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Window Cleaners' Union, Local No. 44, San Francisco, Calif., supporting House bill 6486, a bill to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2942. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Townsend Club, No. 1, Ukiale, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2943. Also, petition of the General Welfare Association of Elgin, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 1410, relative to the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 1942

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 26, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend Clarence E. Wise, D. D., minister of the Wesley Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we pause upon the threshold of our assembly this day to ask that Thy divine blessing may rest upon us. We are Thy servants, to whom Thou hast committed great trust and responsibility. In our deliberations and decisions we are deeply conscious of our need of Thy wisdom and Thy grace in these crucial days through which we are passing. We pray Thee, gracious Father, therefore, to accept us and our service. And in the performance of our public duty, crown us with courageous perseverance in the doing of that which is right in Thy sight, that we may seek the everlasting good of our Republic and merit the esteem of our fellow countrymen. These favors we ask in the name of our great Elder Brother, even Jesus Christ the Righteous. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar Tuesday, May 26, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2305) to relieve disbursing and certifying officers of the United States of responsibility for overpayments made on transportation accounts under certain circumstances.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6315. An act to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans;

H. J. Res. 310. Joint resolution to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department in the conduct of certain investigations in the interest of prosecution of the war, to make use of intercepted communications without regard to the limitations contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103), and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 for the training and education of defense workers.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Andrews	Glass	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Pepper
Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hayden	Rosier
Barbour	Herring	Schwartz
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Holman	Smathers
Bone	Hughes	Smith
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	La Follette	Truman
Capper	Langer	Tunnell
Caraway	Lucas	Tydings
Chavez	McCarran	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wagner
Connally	Maloney	Walsh
Danaher	Maybank	Wheeler
Davis	Mead	White
Doxey	Millikin	Wiley
Ellender	Murdock	Willis
George	Norris	
Gerry	Nye	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained on official business in his State.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senators from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR and Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION AND THE USE OF AUTOMOBILES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, when report was made to the Senate as to the number of automobiles in use by the Government departments the Federal Trade Commission was, by error, included with the Commerce Department. I have received a letter from Mr. W. A. Ayres, Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, in which he states that the Commission does not own a single passenger automobile and that whenever any member of the Commission has seen fit to attend any meeting he has either ridden in an automobile owned by a member of the Commisison or the staff, or in a taxicab, and has paid his own fare. I desire to commend the Commission for their attitude, and ask permission to insert in the body of my remarks the letter I have received from Mr. Ayres.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION,
Washington, May 21, 1942.

Hon. HARRY F. BYRD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 15, 1942, at page 4252, there appears a table giving the various agencies or departments of the Government having passenger automobiles, in which the Federal Trade Commission is listed as Federal Trade Commission (included in Commerce Department). The Commerce Department table shows 312 passenger automobiles.

I can see no reason why the Federal Trade Commission should be included with the Commerce Department, as it is in no way connected with it more than with any other Department in the city, being an absolutely independent agency.

I wish to state further that the Federal Trade Commission has not at the present time and never has had a single passenger automobile assigned to it or to any member of the Commission. Any time we have seen fit to attend any meeting we have either ridden in an automobile owned by some member of the Commission or the staff or in a taxicab and paid our own fares.

In fairness to the Federal Trade Commission, I hope that this correction will be made.

Very sincerely,
W. A. AYRES, *Chairman.*

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT OF FEDERAL PRISON INDUSTRIES, INC.

A letter from the secretary of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the directors of the Federal Prison Industries, Inc., for the fiscal year 1941 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Two letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, War, four; and of the Interior, three; Civil Service Commission, Federal Works Agency, War Production Board, and The National Archives, two; which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A letter in the nature of a petition from Mrs. C. E. Tracy, of Ontario, Calif., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A petition of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerously signed, of the pastor and members of the Methodist Church of La Cygne, members of the First Methodist Church of Great Bend, and sundry citizens of Greensburg, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GLASS, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. J. Res. 314. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the marine and war-risk insurance fund; without amendment (Rept. No. 1409).

By Mr. BILBO, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2403. A bill to provide for use of net weights in interstate commerce transactions in cotton, to provide for the standardization of bale covering for cotton, and for other purposes; without recommendation.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. R. 6496. A bill to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1410).

By Mr. BROWN (for Mr. BREWSTER), from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 4999. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by the Columbia Boat & Barge System, Inc.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1412); and

H. R. 5619. A bill for the relief of certain clerks in the post office at Detroit, Mich.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1411).

By Mr. ROSIER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 2506. A bill for the relief of Angela Skeoch; without amendment (Rept. No. 1413);

H. R. 2424. A bill for the relief of Clarence J. Meteyer, Lester W. Engels, and Dorothy B. Engels; with amendments (Rept. No. 1415); and

H. R. 5385. A bill for the relief of Charles E. Yates and the Motor Facts Sales Co.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1414).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1353. A bill for the relief of the Rock Hill Stone & Gravel Co., of St. Louis, Mo.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1416);

S. 2264. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of James H. Lane; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1420);

H. R. 2730. A bill for the relief of Dorothy Silva; without amendment (Rept. No. 1417);

H. R. 3398. A bill for the relief of Gerhard R. Fisher; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1421);

H. R. 5438. A bill for the relief of the San Diego Gas & Electric Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1418); and

H. R. 5778. A bill for the relief of Luther Herbert Tench and Mrs. Mildred Farmer Tench; without amendment (Rept. No. 1419).

REPORT ON INVESTIGATION OF THE FIRE AND CAPSIZING OF THE U. S. S. "LAFAYETTE" ("NORMANDIE") (REPT. NO. 1422)

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, submitted a report, pursuant to Senate Resolution 225, Seventy-seventh Congress, in relation to the facts and circumstances with respect to the fire which severely damaged the U. S. S. *Lafayette* (*Normandie*) and resulted in her being capsized, which was ordered to be printed.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on May 26, 1942, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 2202) to restore Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following joint resolutions were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. J. Res. 310. Joint resolution to authorize the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, and the Office of Naval Intelligence of the Navy Department in the conduct of certain investigations in the interest of prosecution of the war, to make use of intercepted communications without regard to the limitations contained in section 605 of the Communications Act of 1934 (48 Stat. 1103), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 for the training and education of defense workers; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SALLIE H. PHILLIPS

Mr. BARKLEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 258), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Sallie H. Phillips, widow of ZeBarney T. Phillips, late the Chaplain of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

THE TRUMAN COMMITTEE—EDITORIAL FROM MONTANA STANDARD

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Montana Standard, one of the leading Democratic newspapers of my State, entitled "The Truman Committee." This editorial pays a fitting tribute to the Truman committee. It says in part:

The Truman committee, which has been investigating the national defense program during the past year, has established a reputation for Senate investigating committees. It has been saving the taxpayers some money. The committee's investigation into Army camp construction projects saved the Government more than $200,000,000, and the committee's expenses to date have been less than the $100,000 originally appropriated.

I am glad to find this editorial in one of Montana's leading newspapers, and I think it is due the committee that I have it placed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TRUMAN COMMITTEE

The Truman committee, which has been investigating the national defense program during the past year, has established a reputation for Senate investigating committees. It has been saving the taxpayers some money. The committee's investigation into Army camp construction projects saved the Government more than $200,000,000, and the committee's expenses to date have been less than the $100,000 originally appropriated.

Another inquiry conducted by the Truman committee resulted in the abolishment of the Office of Production Management and the placing of Donald M. Nelson on the throne as war-production czar. The committee also has, inquired into strategic materials, defense housing, labor, international cartel agreements, and lobbying. In all it has called 302 witnesses and a transcript of the testimony heard fills 4,000 typewritten pages.

The committee began its investigations quietly a little over a year ago by questioning the heads of all departments of the national defense program. From these men the committee merely obtained a background upon which to base its probings.

The Truman committee has not followed the usual procedure of congressional committee investigations. Its objective was that of finding out facts. Other committees have been bent upon smearing individuals and groups The committee is to be congratulated and a good many people will hope that other congressional investigating committees base their procedure on that of the Truman committee.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR GREEN BEFORE BLACKSTONE VALLEY POLISH RELIEF COMMITTEE

[Mr. TUNNELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator GREEN at a banquet given by the Blackstone Valley Polish Relief Committee, in honor of Sylwin Strakacz, Minister of the Republic of Poland, at Central Falls, R. I., on May 17, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

REPORT OF FORMER SENATOR GORE TO THE PEOPLE OF OKLAHOMA

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a column from the Oklahoma City Times of April 13, 1942, containing a report by former Senator Gore to the people of Oklahoma, which appears in the Appendix.]

"HOW TO WIN THE WAR—AS A BLIND MAN SEES IT"—ARTICLE BY FORMER SENATOR GORE

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Washington Daily News of May 15, 1942, written by former Senator Thomas P. Gore, entitled "How To Win the War—As a Blind Man Sees It," which appears in the Appendix.]

GASOLINE RATIONING AND THE RUBBER PROBLEM—EDITORIAL FROM WATERTOWN (N. Y.) DAILY TIMES

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Watertown (N. Y.) Daily Times on the subject of gasoline rationing, which appears in the Appendix.]

EDITORIALS FROM TERRE HAUTE (IND.) SATURDAY SPECTATOR

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two editorials from the Terre Haute (Ind.) Spectator of March 14, 1942, and May 9, 1942, respectively, which appear in the Appendix.]

ALASKA HIGHWAY—LETTER FROM JOHN UTTERSTROM

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by John Utterstrom, of Seattle, Wash., on the subject of the Alaska Military Highway, which appears in the Appendix.]

GASOLINE AND RUBBER RATIONING

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, some time ago Mr. Paul Litchfield, chairman of the board of the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., gave out a statement about the mythical rubber shortage. Mr. Elliot E. Simpson, with the L. Drexsage Co., of New York City, who is also in the rubber business, has written a letter to the editors of the country, in which he takes Mr. Litchfield to task, and makes an exposé of the untruthfulness of the assertions contained in Litchfield's public statement. I wish to read to the Senate all or a part of the letter from Mr. Simpson, because it goes to the very heart of the question of gasoline and rubber rationing which confronts the Nation at this time. I think we may obtain a little inspiration as to how this question is to be settled, for I understand Mr. Simpson is a very reliable person. His letter reads:

The propaganda sent to the editors of the Nation by Mr. Paul W. Litchfield, chairman of the board of Goodyear Tire & Rubber Co., is astonishing. Statements made are contrary to fact. The figure of 700,000 tons is the amount we had on hand at the time of Pearl Harbor. Hundreds of thousands of tons have been added to that supply. He utterly disregards rubber found in Brazil, Peru, Venezuela, Bolivia, Colombia, Ecuador, the Central American nations, Mexico, and Africa, and overlooks to call the attention of the people to the fact that, while we purchase 95 percent of our requirements in the Far East, there is more rubber now in the trees in the Western Hemisphere than ever grew in the plantations in the Far East.

He neglects to tell the people that hundreds of thousands of tons should be on their way to this country, and that if proper methods are used we can get more than enough for our requirements of crude rubber from the Western Hemisphere.

Here is the meat in the coconut:

He neglects to tell the people that there is a minimum of 10,000,000 tons of all kinds of scrap rubber lying all over the country; that if additional reclaiming plants were immediately installed with equipment from the second-hand dealers of the Nation, we could overnight supply every civilian requirement and see that not only would the defense workers have tires but every civilian, to help them support the war effort.

We know from our every-day experience and contacts that there is some truth in the statement that there are 10,000,000 tons of scrap rubber in the possession of the people of the United States today. If we can solve the shortage of rubber, we will not hear any more about a national rationing program as to gasoline, which I think is unwise. I do not like to take issue with those in authority, but they say their excuse for a national rationing of gasoline is their desire to conserve rubber. If we have 10,000,000 tons of scrap rubber in the country, which can be easily collected and easily reclaimed and made into tires and tubes, so as to keep the American people rolling on, there is no reason why the authorities should not put on a "pig tight" campaign and see that it is done immediately.

Mr. Simpson develops another fact which is astonishing to me:

He neglects to tell the editors that if $500,000,000 were spent to take rubber out of the Western Hemisphere instead of putting it into brick and mortar to produce synthetic rubber, which we still do not know enough about, we could get more than enough crude rubber to meet the requirements of our war machine, the Government, and civilians.

He neglects to tell the editors that $40,000,000 would put up enough plants to reclaim 2,000,000 tons of scrap rubber to meet every war need and civilian need.

Mr. President, that is the crying need, the installation of reclaiming plants, which could utilize this scrap rubber if the Government would undertake the job of collecting it. I am sure the American people have been so thoroughly frightened over the rationing of gasoline, looking to the day when they will be walking instead of riding, that they would join wholeheartedly in a campaign to gather up this scrap rubber.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have substantial sympathy with the Senator's viewpoint that the campaign to reclaim rubber has been very inadequate, and that there is open a wide field of action. Where, in the Senator's view, does the responsibility lie, first, for not having initiated such a campaign heretofore, or, forgetting ancient history, where is the responsibility for proceeding now in the direction the Senator indicates?

Mr. BILBO. I am happy the Senator has asked the question. With the help of Mr. Simpson, I shall answer it fully. Mr. Simpson says further:

He neglects to tell you that Germany has practically no rubber, yet they have built the greatest war machine in history—mechanized and swift—doing it principally out of their scrap pile, which is reclaimed over and over again.

Rubber can be used 2 or 3 times. The Germans have used only a comparatively small quantity of rubber. One of the radio analysts brought out the fact only yesterday that Germany had her entire war machine of 9,000,000 men moving on rubber, and yet they use a very small quantity of rubber.

Mr. Simpson says further:

What he does say is that the 30,000,000 privately owned automobiles have on their wheels the rubber of the Nation. I would like to ask Mr. Litchfield that if, with the hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of defense contracts his company has taken, whether he has room to manufacture the needs of the civilians.

Here is the nigger in the woodpile; the dead cat on the line—

I would like Mr. Litchfield to advise the people whether we could not speed our war effort if those hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of contracts which he has were spread over the five or six hundred other rubber manufacturers; whether we could not, in one-quarter of the time, deliver the goods he has sold the Nation.

In other words, there are now in the United States between 500 and 600 rubber manufacturing concerns, and all these companies would be glad to get some of the contracts which have been awarded to about 5 companies by the War Department. Of course, in due time the big companies will execute the contracts and deliver the rubber to the Government for the war effort, but in the meantime the American people are persecuted, and are being rationed on gasoline, all for the sake of saving rubber, when we have 10,000,000 tons in this country which could be utilized in 90 days.

I read further from Mr. Simpson's letter:

I would like to ask him whether the other three and one-half members of his group in the rubber industry who have collectively billions of dollars worth of war and defense contracts have any room to take on civilian business, and whether or not they could not boost the war effort by dividing their contracts with five or six hundred other rubber manufacturers, with their same facilities, enabling deliveries to be made in 90 days, and not over the period of a year.

I would like to ask Mr. Litchfield, also, whether it wouldn't be an unfortunate situation for his company, as well as the 3½ others, if the five or six hundred companies made all of the civilian goods during the war and he made, as he is doing now, only rubber goods for defense, whether he wouldn't feel badly should the war end and the 500 or 600 have all of the civilian business. I wonder whether that might not, in some way, be what is throwing the mist across the trail.

Mr. President, that is the nigger in the woodpile. The 4 or 5 big companies, which have captured all the Government contracts from the War Department for the manufacture of rubber goods for the war effort, are not interested in taking care of the civilian population, they are not interested in reworking the 10,000,000 tons of scrap rubber in the United States for the benefit of the American people, so that they can continue to operate their automobiles and trucks and their businesses, because these companies realize that when the war shall have ended the 500 or 600 smaller manufacturers of rubber goods would have the civilian business, and the big companies would have some real com-

petition, whereas, under the present circumstances, they have a real monopoly, and are putting the small concerns out of business, because the small concerns have not any crude rubber, and have not access to the rubber.

Mr. Simpson further states in his letter:

Mr. Litchfield wants the people to realize that there can't be any relaxation of existing restrictions on rubber for civilian use until we whip the enemy.

Yet the War Department, through its agencies, is telling the American people that beginning in July the entire Nation is to be rationed on gasoline. Their only excuse for the rationing is to conserve rubber for the American people and for the war effort. If we take care of the civilian needs there will be no need for rationing gasoline.

Mr. Simpson's letter continues:

I would agree with that completely, if we did not have the scrap rubber available, and if we did not have the crude rubber available. Mr. Litchfield knows that you can, by taking one rubber hot water bottle that is torn, reclaim that over again and deliver another hot water bottle. He knows that you can get enough reclaimed rubber out of a tire to supply enough camel back sufficient to retread two and one-half tires. He knows that practically every rubber product needed by civilians can be made out of their own scrap rubber, perhaps not as durable as if made out of crude rubber, but which will serve their purpose.

Why, then, does he want the people not to have the things they require? Does he find himself in a position to make only defense and war contract commitments, and not the peoples' requirements? Is he fearful that possibly his competitors, the five or six hundred smaller manufacturers, can supply these people and this market would be lost to him should the war end quickly?

That is the nigger in the woodpile. The large companies do not want the 500 or 600 small manufacturers of rubber to have this business, to take care of the needs of civilians, although we have 10,000,000 tons of scrap rubber here and it can be reclaimed in a few months with a little Government help. They do not want that done because when the war is over they would have so many competitors in providing rubber goods for the civilians of America.

I also want America's leading editors to turn their attention toward this situation more aggressively. When 4½ large companies out of 755 get the bulk of the war business and can't make anything for civilians, they should be stopped from their attempt to see that the civilians are denied these things necessary to help the war effort. I want the editors to know that if the business these companies have in war and defense contracts was divided between those other factories which have equal facilities, that the war effort would be speeded and victory aided.

I want the editors to know that practically all of the competitors of the big 4¼ rubber companies are either out of business or going out of business, leaving the field to them alone, and thus our war effort is being impeded.

Mr. President, not only are the competing companies being destroyed for the present advantage of the large companies, but for future gains on the part of the few large companies which have monopolized the rubber business of the United States in connection with the rubber committees of the Far East, as was brought out in the committee report submitted yesterday.

American victory is held back. The people are being persecuted. For out of their own scrap rubber they can have the materials they need to help us win the victory and they are being denied it.

Very truly yours,

ELLIOT E. SIMPSON,
L. DREXSAGE CO.,
New York City.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BILBO. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. From the letter I can understand the theory that the large rubber companies might have an interest in monopolizing the present situation for the sake of its subsequent postwar control, but I cannot understand why a Government rubber administration would be similarly inspired, and what I am asking the Senator from Mississippi is where in the Government we ought to turn to put the finger of responsibility for not reclaiming the rubber, which, according to the Senator's thesis, is adequate to serve the American people.

Mr. BILBO. I have my suspicions.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to hear what they are.

Mr. BILBO. I have ideas about the matter but I am not in a position to commence name calling at this time. My suspicion is not only in connection with the shortage of rubber, but in connection with the shortage of some other materials connected with the war effort, and it is that the trouble lies with some of the dollar-a-year men in the War Production Board. They are getting a dollar a year from the Government and drawing handsome salaries from their companies back home. Mr. President, human nature is human nature. They will naturally want to conserve the interests of their companies. They will naturally be inclined to do things, and shape and direct policies so as to conserve the interests of those who are paying them their salaries. They do not think that is unpatriotic. They console themselves and make themselves believe that they are performing a patriotic duty. I do not say that they are traitors to our country, but whether they are or not, the thing is being done, and we are permitting the machinery to run in such a way as to build up many monopolies in this country, and when the war is over we shall have to fight another war to get rid of them for the sake of the American people.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield to me?

Mr. BROWN. Does the Senator desire to ask a question of the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes; I do.

Mr. BROWN. I yield for that purpose.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator. Does the Senator from Mississippi not see a very great deal of confusion in public utterances from those in high places with reference to this situation? Let me point to——

Mr. BILBO. Let me answer the first question before the Senator goes to another one.

Mr. DANAHER. Certainly.

Mr. BILBO. I will say in answer to the Senator's question that I do; but not one-tenth as much confusion as we shall have when gasoline is taken away from the American people and they are made to stay at home, and to sacrifice their businesses throughout the Nation. If we can start to work some manufacturers whose efforts will bring about the recapture of the 10,000,000 tons of scrap rubber in America, and permit the American people to continue rolling on rubber to their businesses, I think we shall be doing something very useful.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield further?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to call to the attention of the Senator from Mississippi that Mayor Edward J. Jeffries, of Detroit, wrote to the President asking him for a clarification of the rubber situation. This morning's Washington Post reveals that the President replied as follows:

The outlook is not a pleasant one, for it appears that virtually no rubber can be made available for any purposes which are not directly connected with the war effort.

I hope——

The President continues, that this—

will serve to diminish greatly any skepticism that may be entertained in any quarters as to the seriousness of the rubber shortage.

But at the very same time the letter to the mayor of Detroit was being released in Detroit, the President was holding a press conference yesterday, and the Baltimore Sun says that the President told the press correspondents there was a definite hope for a solution of the situation, and that certain substitutes will be developed before the present tires wear out.

The Baltimore Sun continues:

He said he did not see too much to be alarmed about in the present situation and that technicians are working on two or three types of rubber substitutes.

The Chief Executive held out the hope that these will result in tires capable of use at speeds not in excess of 30 to 35 miles an hour.

Mr. President, with the two statements from the President himself on the same day appearing in the press, with the administration officials and W. P. B. telling us that the outlook is dark, and that there is to be no rubber, with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] pointing out testimony to the effect that there is scrap rubber subject to reclamation which can adequately meet the needs of the American people, I submit that the confusion of utterances by persons in high places is doing the country no good.

Mr. BILBO. I do not want to intimate that the President anticipated my statement today, but that thing is happening now which he had in mind, that there will be something done about the situation, and the situation will not be so bad.

I wish to say in this connection that there has been a great deal of hardship and a great deal of persecution and a great deal of abuse as the result of the rationing of gasoline on the Atlantic seaboard. That was brought about by the

same influences that are controlling the rubber situation. We would have had a pipe line, and we should have had all the oil needed for the Atlantic coast, if it had not been for someone indulging in monkey business when we were trying to solve this problem some months ago.

MOBILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS FOR WAR PRODUCTION

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

Mr. WAGNER. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, before the motion is disposed of, I should like to say a few words. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] pointed out yesterday—and I am making my statement on the basis of his statement—that there has been attached to this bill, which is designed to help small business, an amendment providing for a suspension of the antitrust laws of the country. As the Senator pointed out, such legislation is already under consideration by the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, and, as I understand, a companion bill is under consideration by the Judiciary Committee of the other House. My information is that there were no hearings held on this proposal, which is sweeping and drastic in character, and that it was put upon the bill without an opportunity for the interested departments to be heard.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose to move to instruct the conferees on the part of the Senate, which I would have a perfect right to do after the pending motion of the Senator from New York is agreed to and before the conferees are appointed, because I do not want to restrict the conferees on the part of the Senate, but I do want to urge upon the conferees who are to be appointed that this is no place for sweeping legislation affecting the antitrust laws and the policies of the Government with respect thereto in wartime. If any Senators have any doubt of that, they should read the hearings and the testimony which has been taken before the Patents Committee.

So I wish to appeal to the Senate conferees to take cognizance of the fact that proposed legislation is under consideration affecting the question of the policy of the Government toward the antitrust laws in wartime; that a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee is about to hold hearings—I think they will start tomorrow—with the Attorney General being present; and I further emphasize the fact that the proposed legislation, which is and can be of benefit only to big business, has no right and no place, under the circumstances, on a bill designed to assist small business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New York.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. TAFT conferees on the part of the Senate.

TRANSPORTATION OF FARM PRODUCTS BY TRUCK

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, I wish to make a few observations with regard to the regulations having to do with the transportation of farm products by truck. I do not intend to cover in detail the various orders which have been issued affecting other kinds of transportation.

From day to day we have listened to considerable discussion about the rubber situation. I think if Senators who are not members of the Military Affairs Committee had been present and had listened to Under Secretary of War Patterson and other informed persons, they would realize how serious the rubber situation is. That is also the view which the President gets from informed persons in the executive departments. If we do not wish to accept the Executive view, we have a special committee of the Senate known as the Truman committee, which reported yesterday on the rubber situation.

I realize, of course, that every effort made to produce rubber of one kind or another is being criticized. We are criticizing everybody; but I am inclined to stand on what the Truman committee says and what the War Department believes. I believe that the rubber situation is especially acute, and that something must be done about it.

The President, realizing the seriousness of the matter, has set up a special organization called the Office of Defense Transportation. He has placed in charge of it Mr. Joseph B. Eastman, of the Interstate Commerce Commission. It seems to me only fair to say that if anyone in the United States is informed about truck transportation and railroad transportation, it is Mr. Eastman, who has had many years of experience in those fields. There may be someone better qualified, but I do not know where he could be found. Fortunately we find Mr. Eastman in charge of this particular organization.

In the performance of his duties he has issued certain orders. Among others are orders relating to contract carriers, interstate carriers, and private carriers. I have them all before me. I do not intend to introduce them all into the RECORD, but I wish to refer more particularly to private carriers.

Reference was made yesterday to our ranchers and farmers. In Wyoming some of them are 75 miles from a railroad. At this time of year they are required to transport their wool, livestock, and grain to the railroad in order to market them. Provision has been made in the orders and regulation to accomplish that very purpose.

I wish to read a paragraph which is contained in the regulations with respect to private carriers, contract carriers, and interstate carriers, in reference to round-trip loads, and the necessity of coming back with loads. I read it from the regulations relating to private carriers, because that is the class which I wish to discuss. It is the same in the orders with respect to the other classes. After I read it, I will point out that it does not apply to farmers. The paragraph reads:

501.26. Loading and operating requirements. On and after the effective date specified herein, no private carrier shall: * * *

(b) Operate a motortruck in over-the-road service unless such truck is loaded to capacity at origin point, and will be loaded to not less than 75 percent of capacity on the return trip; or unless loaded to 75 percent of capacity at origin point, and will be loaded to capacity on the return trip: *Provided, however,* That no intermediate point at which a portion of a load has been discharged shall be deemed to be a point of origin, but the point at which the last portion of a load has been discharged shall be deemed to be the point of the beginning of a return trip.

Let us see how that applies to farmers. Under the head of "Exemptions" in the regulations we find the following:

The provisions of subsection 501.26 (b) of this order shall not apply to or include the following: * * *

(b) A motortruck controlled and operated by any person or persons principally engaged in farming, when used in the transportation of agricultural commodities and products thereof, from a farm or farms, or in the transportation of farm supplies to a farm or farms.

All who come within that classification are not subjected to the return-load requirement which applies to certain other private carriers.

Of course, there are private carriers which are not engaged, as are farmers and ranchers, in transporting agricultural products. There is a provision in the orders applying to contract carriers and private carriers under which, in cases of hardship, they may make application to one of the division headquarters throughout the country and ask for relief. On a proper showing, relief may be granted.

I can imagine the situation of a wholesale grocery house which is transporting grocery products to stores which are not located on railroads and are not otherwise accessible to transportation. When a truck from such a concern reaches the last point on its route, under the general regulations, unless an application is made for relief, the truck would be required to have some kind of a load on the return trip. However, there is a provision under which hardship cases may be taken care of.

It has been stated that we are trying to run this whole trucking business from Washington. It is not being run from Washington at all. The regulations are being administered locally, by division headquarters. Speaking more particularly about the section of the country in which I am especially interested, there is now a division director at Denver, Colo., in the Denver Building. His name is E. Robert Baker. Richard W. Candland is division director at Salt Lake, with offices at 1202 Continental Bank Building. At Phoenix, Ariz., William M. Cox is division director, with offices in 305

Security Building. There are two division headquarters in California, one in Portland, Oreg., one in Seattle, and one in Spokane. Another is to be established to serve operators in Montana, Wyoming, and portions of the Dakotas. There are many other offices in other parts of the Nation.

By applying on printed forms for relief in hardship cases, those who suffer hardship may be granted relief. Such relief may or may not be granted, but in a meritorious case, of course, it would be granted.

I think that covers the situation. I wished to speak more particularly about the situation of the farmers. I hope Senators will realize that the general organization for the control of transportation has been set up only within the past few weeks. It is utterly impossible that it should this soon be working to perfection. However, the regulations do provide for exemptions in meritorious cases. In any event, the regulations to which I have referred do not apply to farmers transporting their products or to transportation used in carrying supplies to them. Of course, a farmer who is a private carrier may, if he so desires, arrange to take on other forms of transportation and assume a broader responsibility. In that event, he would bring himself into the category of contract carriers.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks the order relating to private carriers and the form of application which all carriers must make for relief.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPTER II. OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION (GENERAL ORDER O. D. T. NO. 5)

PART 501. CONSERVATION OF MOTOR EQUIPMENT

Private carriers of property

By virtue of the authority vested in me by Executive Order No. 8989, dated December 18, 1941, and in order to conserve and providently utilize transportation facilities and equipment, including rubber tires, of private carriers by motor vehicle; to prevent shortages in motortruck equipment necessary for the prompt and continuous movement of necessary traffic; and to provide for the conservation of vital equipment, material, and supplies, including rubber, the attainment of which purposes is essential to the successful prosecution of the war:

It is hereby ordered, That—

501.24. Definitions.
501.25. Elimination of waste.
501.26. Loading and operating requirements.
501.27. Operations when empty.
501.28. Exemptions.
501.29. Operations by special authority.
501.30. Records and reports.

Authority: Sections 501.24 to 501.30, inclusive, issued under Executive Order 8989, 6 Federal Register 6725.

SEC. 501.24. Definitions: As used herein—

(a) The term "property" means all material, equipment, and supplies of every kind capable of being transported by motortruck.

(b) The term "motortruck" means either (1) a straight truck, (2) a combination truck-tractor and semitrailer, (3) a full trailer, or (4) any combination thereof.

(c) The term "private carrier" means every person other than a common carrier or a contract carrier as defined in General Orders O. D. T. No. 3 and O. D. T. No. 4,[1] who transports property by motortruck in over-the-road service.

(d) The term "capacity" means the rated load-carrying ability of the tires on the motortruck (as shown in appendix No. 1 attached hereto). Where the commodity is of light density the total space available for a load shall be the measure of capacity.

(e) The term "special equipment" means any motortruck the primary carrying capacity of which is occupied by mounted machinery or by a mounted tank or tanks designed to carry bulk liquids; low-bed motortrucks, pole trailers, or pipe dollies.

(f) The term "over-the-road" service means all operations except those wholly within any municipality or urban community, or between contiguous municipalities or urban communities, or within a zone adjacent to and commercially a part of any such municipality or municipalities or urban communities, or except hauls not more than 15 miles in length.

(g) The term "circuitous route" means any route or routes or combination thereof which exceeds the most direct highway route by 10 percent.

(h) The term "person" means any individual, firm, copartnership, corporation, company, association, including a farm cooperative association as defined in the Agricultural Marketing Act, approved June 15, 1929, as amended, joint-stock association, or Government or governmental agency, and includes any trustee, receiver, assignee, or personal representative thereof.

SEC. 501.25. Elimination of waste: On and after the effective date specified herein, every private carrier shall:

(a) Eliminate waste in operations and conserve and properly maintain tires, motortruck equipment, and other facilities necessary in conducting the transportation by the carrier, and curtail schedules to the extent necessary to carry out the purposes of this order.

SEC. 501.26. Loading and operating requirements: On and after the effective date specified herein, no private carrier shall:

(a) Operate a motortruck transporting a gross load which exceeds by more than 20 percent its capacity as defined herein.

(b) Operate a motortruck in over-the-road service unless such truck is loaded to capacity at origin point and will be loaded to not less than 75 percent of capacity on the return trip; or unless loaded to 75 percent of capacity at origin point and will be loaded to capacity on the return trip: *Provided, however*, That no intermediate point at which a portion of a load has been discharged shall be deemed to be a point of origin, but the point at which the last portion of a load has been discharged shall be deemed to be the point of the beginning of a return trip.

(c) Use a circuitous route in any transportation movement, except when no carrier capable of performing the service over a direct route is available.

SEC. 501.27. Operations when empty: Nothing contained in subsection 501.26 (b) of this order shall prevent a motortruck from moving empty from the point of final discharge of lading to a nearby point where traffic is available for loading, if such traffic cannot be transported by any carrier under any of the conditions set out in said subsection 501.26 (b).

SEC. 501.28. Exemptions: The provisions of subsection 501.26 (b) of this order shall not apply to or include the following:

(a) A motortruck exclusively containing explosives or dangerous articles, as the latter are defined in Eighteen United States Code Three Hundred and Eighty-three.

(b) A motortruck controlled and operated by any person or persons principally engaged in farming when used in the transportation of agricultural commodities and products thereof, from a farm or farms, or in the transportation of farm supplies to a farm or farms.

(c) Any motortruck used exclusively in the maintenance of any public utility.

(d) Any motortruck operated exclusively in the furtherance of public health and safety.

(e) Any motortruck coming within the definition of special equipment.

(f) Any motortruck owned, controlled, or operated by the armed forces of the Federal or a State Government.

SEC. 501.29. Operations by special authority: The provisions of this order shall not apply to any motortruck which is engaged in a movement that is authorized by special or general permit of this Office.

SEC. 501.30. Records and reports: Every private carrier shall prepare and maintain such records, and make such reports, as this Office may hereafter require for the purpose of this order, and keep such records available and open for inspection at all reasonable times for investigation by this Office.

This order shall become effective June 1, 1942.

Witness my hand this 20th day of April 1942.

JOSEPH B. EASTMAN,
Director of Defense Transportation.

APPENDIX NO. 1

The capacity of any motortruck shall be determined by multiplying the number of tires, of the size and description, mounted on the running wheels of such motortruck by the number of pounds of rated load-carrying ability of such tires as designated in this appendix; from the result of this computation there shall be deducted the unladen weight of the motortruck; the remaining balance for the purposes of this order shall be the capacity of such motortruck as defined herein.

Formula: Tires×carrying ability of tires, deduct unladen weight of vehicle. Result gives load to be carried.

Example:
tires 9.00x20
10×3,450 pounds=34,500 pounds.
14,500 pounds unladen weight.
20,000 load to be carried.

Description of tire		Rated load carrying ability in pounds per tire
Size, inches	Number of plies	
15	6	1,500
15	8	1,700
6.00-16	6	1,130
6.00-17	6	1,250
6.00-20	6	1,400
6.00-20/30 x 5	8	1,700
6.50-16	6	1,290
6.50-17	6	1,500
6.50-18	6	1,575
6.50-20	6	1,700
6.50-20/32 x 6	8	1,950
7.00-15	6	1,415

[1] The term "common carrier" means any person which holds itself out to the general public to engage in the transportation of property in over-the-road service by motortruck for compensation, regardless of the designation of such person under any Federal or State statute.

The term "contract carrier" means any person other than a common carrier, as defined above, which engages in transportation of property in over-the-road service for compensation.

Description of tire		Rated load carrying ability in pounds per tire
Size, inches	Number of plies	
7.00-15	8	1,575
7.00-16	6	1,485
7.00-16	8	1,650
7.00-17	6	1,550
7.00-17	8	1,725
7.00-18	8	1,800
7.00-20	8	1,950
7.00-20/32 x 6	10	2,250
7.00-24/36 x 6	10	2,575
7.50-15	8	1,825
7.50-15	10	2,225
7.50-16	6	1,660
7.50-16	8	1,850
7.50-17	8	2,000
7.50-18	8	2,100
7.50-18/32 x 7	10	2,500
7.50-20	8	2,250
7.50-20/34 x 7	10	2,700
7.50-24	8	2,550
7.50-24/38 x 7	10	3,100
8.25-15	10	2,275
8.25-15	12	2,600
8.25-18	10	2,550
8.25-18	12	2,925
8.25-20	10	2,750
8.25-20	12	3,150
8.25-22	10	2,950
8.25-24	10	3,125
8.25-24	12	3,600
9.00-15	10	2,875
9.00-15	12	3,300
9.00-18	10	3,225
9.00-18	12	3,600
9.00-20	10	3,450
9.00-20/36 x 8	12	3,850
9.00-22	10	3,675
9.00-24	10	3,925
9.00-24/40 x 8	12	4,375
10.00-15 (9.75-15)	12	3,375
10.00-18 (9.75-18)	12	3,775
10.00-20 (9.75-20)	12	4,000
10.00-20/38 x 9	14	4,350
10.00-22 (9.75-22)	12	4,275
10.00-24 (9.75-24)	12	4,550
10.00-24/42 x 9	14	4,925
11.00-18 (10.50-18)	12	4,200
11.00-20 (10.50-20)	12	4,500
11.00-20 (10.50-20)	14	4,850
11.00-22 (10.50-22)	12	4,750
11.00-24 (10.50-24)	12	5,000
11.00-24 (10.50-24)	14	5,400
12.00-18 (11.25-18)	14	5,125
12.00-20 (11.25-20)	14	5,475
12.00-20/40 x 10	16	5,875
12.00-22	14	5,800
12.00-24 (11.25-24)	14	6,150
12.00-24/44 x 10	16	6,600
13.00-20 (12.75-20)	16	6,750
13.00-24 (12.75-24)	16	7,575
14.00-20 (13.50-20)	16	8,200
14.00-20 (13.50-20)	18	8,700
14.00-24 (13.50-20)	16	9,150
14.00-24 (13.50-24)	18	9,700
No. 10	6	1,100
No. 11	6	1,100
No. 12	6	1,200
No. 13	6	1,300
No. 14	6	1,400
No. 15	6	1,500
No. 16	6	1,600
No. 17	8	1,700
No. 18	8	1,800
No. 19	8	1,900
No. 20	10	2,000
No. 22	10	2,200
No. 28	10	2,800
No. 34	10	3,400
No. 40	12	4,000
No. 42	12	4,200
No. 44	12	4,400
No. 48	12	4,800
No. 50	12	5,000
No. 52	12	5,200

OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT TO ACCOMPANY GENERAL ORDERS O. D. T. NOS. 3, 4, AND 5

To All Common, Contract, and Private Carriers by Motortruck:

Present forecasts of the traffic which must be carried by our motortruck transportation facilities during 1942 and succeeding years indicate that unless we take immediate action to conserve and providently utilize transportation facilities and equipment, including rubber tires, the movement of essential military traffic and foodstuffs may be impeded.

In 1941 approximately 700,000 new trucks were put in service in the United States. For the 2-year period—1942 and 1943—there are available for all purposes only about 150,000 new trucks.

The normal rate of depletion removes approximately 420,000 motortrucks from service each year. Considering the rate of depletion, along with the limited number of trucks available for replacement, it is obvious that we are faced with an ever-diminishing amount of motortruck equipment. At the same time we have the problem of transporting an ever-increasing volume of traffic.

The best information available indicates that there will be less than one-third of the number of motortruck tires available for rationing during the year 1942 than were sold during the year 1941. This will result in many trucks going out of service, due to the shortage of new tires and materials for retreading present tires.

The responsibility of this Office to insure the continuous and expeditious movement of war traffic requires immediate action to eliminate methods of operation and duplication of parallel services which result in the wasteful use of motortrucks.

Each motor carrier knows best where most of the mileage reductions can be made in its own operations. We ask that each carrier thoroughly study its own operations, in order to accomplish the maximum results intended by this order.

We ask further that each carrier adjust its services to comply with the spirit of the order, and we are confident all carriers involved will cooperate in attaining the required objective. Relying upon this belief, the order is much less rigid in its requirements than would otherwise be the case.

The attainment of full loads at all times is the objective of the order. We realize that this cannot be accomplished to perfection. Nevertheless, we must strive toward such a goal in order to accomplish the maximum results.

We have established the tire carrying ability of the vehicle as a basis of computing the gross load. By merely deducting the unladen weight of the vehicle from the gross permissible weight, we arrive at the net payload. (See appendix 1.) Normally, many vehicles are loaded much in excess of their tire capacity. We are asking each carrier not to overload beyond 20 percent. Tires will give maximum mileage if properly cared for and if not overloaded beyond 20 percent. Tires are very vital in our war effort; it's almost a sacred duty to protect them properly.

A forthcoming amendment to the tire-rationing regulations, effective June 1, 1942, to be issued by the Office of Price Administration, provides that local rationing boards shall refuse to grant certificates to applicants when the tire to be replaced has been rendered useless and nonrecappable through deliberate neglect. Should any list A applicant deliberately drive his tires beyond the point at which they could be recapped, he will be denied a certificate. For the same reason, a list B applicant will be denied a certificate. Also, applicants who have ruined their tires by overloading will be denied certificates.

From the above formula, carriers will, in most instances, load close to 120 percent of rated tire capacity in one direction. When hauling in the opposite direction, carriers are required to load as a minimum to 62½ percent of maximum capacity, or 75 percent of the established capacity. We believe these loadings can be attained. The successful prosecution of the war requires it. Numerous pieces of equipment may become idle, but bear in mind that during the balance of 1942 and 1943 less than 150 motor trucks of all sizes will be rationed, when normally more than a million new units would be placed in service.

We have reasons to believe that considerable freight is being carried over circuitous routes which results in wasteful mileage. The elimination of such waste will require shippers to change routings in many instances but we believe they will not hesitate to cooperate.

Common carriers are the servants of the public by law. Accordingly, such carriers are given more flexibility in order that they may render required common-carrier services. We have asked the common carriers to do things not asked of contract and private carriers. For example, they are required to divert freight to some other carrier when such freight has been in their possession at a terminal for more than 36 hours; and, further, they are required to accept diversions from other carriers. In this manner we hope to keep the flow of all traffic liquid. Common carriers may at times run partially loaded or empty, but not until they are certain there is no freight available to be transported in the direction of the movement of the empty vehicle. To do this effectively we visualize the establishment by common carriers of numerous dispatching offices or clearinghouses.

Private carriers might violate the Interstate Commerce Act if they undertook to pool their shipments. They most likely would become carriers for hire under such circumstances, and would be subject to regulation by the Interstate Commerce Commission or other regulatory bodies.

Contract carriers may pool in a limited way, and in many instances can reduce schedules and jointly load trucks to save mileage.

We have permitted all three types of carriers to move their trucks empty to a nearby point for the purpose of picking up another load. This practice may be entered into only when to do so would be in the furtherance of the spirit of these orders.

These orders suggest a number of ways by which carriers may conserve motor equipment through joint action. Common and contract carriers may formulate plans for joint action, but such plans must be submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission, the State regulatory body having jurisdiction over such traffic, or this office for consideration. However, in order to avoid violations of the antitrust laws, no such joint action shall be taken until the carriers have been ordered so to do by the appropriate regulatory body or by this office.

We are not unmindful that the effects of these orders may, in some instances, cause inconvenience to the carriers involved. They were framed to avoid such injuries as far as possible, but because of the effect which the orders may have upon shippers' service generally, the carriers will be expected to give adequate publicity to both general and specific arrangements for their revised services.

On the other hand, the war emergency requires that individual rights or interests of all our citizens be subordinated wherever necessary to the common good. We rely upon the patriotism of the carriers and shippers who will be affected by these orders to cooperate in the highest possible degree in making them effective even though they appear to affect them adversely.

Address all communications regarding these orders to John L. Rogers, Director, Division of Motor Transport, room 4211, Interstate Commerce Commission Building, Washington, D. C.

OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF MOTOR TRANSPORT
Application for special permit under General Orders O. D. T. Nos. 3, 4, and 5

I. Name _____
(if an individual) (last) (first) (middle)
D/B/A _____
Individual___ Copartnership___ Corporation_____
Other specify_____
Address _____
(number) (street or R. F. D.) (county)
_____
(town) (State)
II. Authority is requested for special permit as a common carrier____, contract carrier____, private carrier____
III. Special or general commodities to be transported.
Outbound _____
Inbound _____
IV. Between _____ and _____
(describe in detail)
V. Priority rating, if any_____
VI. Are regular routes used by you in performing service between the same points? Yes_____ No_____
VII. Route of travel_____
_____
(by highway numbers—show in same sequence as operations would be conducted)
VIII. Number of trips to each point per week_____
IX AND X TO BE ANSWERED BY PRIVATE CARRIERS ONLY
IX. Are one or more competitors serving the same points? Yes_____ No_____ If answer is "Yes" check the following: How do your competitors make their deliveries? By own truck_____ contract carrier by motortruck_____, common carrier by motortruck_____, rail_____, water_____, otherwise_____
X. Are there other private carriers operating motortrucks in the same direction as you are? Yes ____ No _____ Are they returning loaded _____, partially loaded _____, empty _____? Give details _____
How can they eliminate empty miles? _____
XI. Do any of your competitors move loaded motortrucks in the same direction you seek authority to move empty or partially loaded motortrucks? Yes _____ No _____ If the answer is "Yes" name them _____
XII. Is any transportation service available by—common carrier by motortruck? Yes _____ No _____; contract carrier by motortruck? Yes _____ No _____; rail? Yes _____ No _____; water? Yes _____ No _____ If the answer is "Yes" name each and every carrier performing such service and describe in detail why such service cannot be utilized by you in performing your deliveries. (Attach answer and mark Exhibit XII.)
XIII. What effort has been made by you to get each of the above to perform this service for you? _____
XIV. What have you done to reduce mileage? (explain fully) _____
XV. What usage will be made of your motor equipment if this application is not granted? _____
XVI. Number of motortrucks that would be taken out of service if this application is not granted. Straight trucks _____, truck tractors _____, semitrailers _____, full trailers? _____
XVII. Is the movement for which special authority is sought seasonal. Yes _____ No _____ Describe _____
XVIII. Period over which permit would be needed _____
XIX. If this application is granted what would be the effect in the saving of other transportation facilities? Explain fully _____
XX. In event you are unable to procure tires or other essential parts or materials how would the traffic you transport move after your present motor trucks are no longer usable_____

OATH

STATE OF _____
County of _____, *ss:*
_____ makes oath and says that he is
(name of affiant)
the_____ of the_____; that he
(title of affiant) (name of applicant)
is authorized on the part of said applicant to verify and file with the Office of Defense Transportation this application and exhibits attached thereto; that he has carefully examined all of the statements contained in such application and the exhibits attached thereto and made a part thereof; that he has knowledge of the matters set forth therein and that all such statements made and matters set forth therein are true and correct to the best of his knowledge, information, and belief; affiant further says that the applicant makes this application in good faith and represents that every effort has been made to get the transportation conducted without the waste now prevalent in the operation for which special authority is hereby sought.

Subscribed and sworn to before me, a_____ in and for the State and County above named, this_____ day of_____, 194_____.

[SEAL] _____
My commission expires_____

LXXXVIII——291

THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, recently I spent several weeks in Wisconsin. During that time I visited shipyards and many defense projects in various portions of the State. I had occasion to talk to a great many persons in almost every stratum of life and representing almost every kind of interest.

Wherever I went, I found that people had certain questions in mind. I tabulated those questions during my trip, and I should like briefly to present them at this time. They are the same questions which are asked in the daily mail of every Member of Congress; but it may serve some constructive purpose, however, to briefly review them for the record.

First. The first question which folks back home are asking is, How long will the war last? The people recall that in the last World War we required about a year and one-half after our entry into the war to win it. They want to know whether this war will take more time or less time. They feel very keenly that there have been too many conflicting statements in this connection.

Second. What will the tax load be? Why is there so much delay in presenting the tax bill? This makes it very difficult for the average person to arrange his financial affairs in anticipation of tax demands which will be made of him.

Third. When will there be a decisive, clearly defined labor policy so that both management and labor will know precisely where they stand?

Fourth. Are we definitely achieving our production goals? If not, where are the bottlenecks and how can they be corrected?

Fifth. Are we getting all the news concerning the war—good and bad news alike—or is there a tendency in official circles to place the emphasis all one way?

Sixth. When is Government going to cut nonwar expenditures to the bone? And I might add that we cannot answer that question too soon.

Seventh. What will the future draft policy be? Statements from the Washington headquarters of the National Security Service System vary widely in their interpretation, and the people are vehement about the need for a clearly defined policy. They object to conflicting statements being published by Washington officials in this connection.

Eighth. What commodities will be included and what will be the extent of any future pattern of rationing? Here again people object to the uncertainty and the conflicting statements which have been made. People who present this question invariably accompany it with a statement to the effect that they are perfectly willing to make sacrifices, but they want a clearly defined statement of what sacrifices they are to make rather than a number of confusing and contradictory statements. Also, they want to be certain that sacrifices are applied uniformly.

Ninth. Are the military authorities rigidly enforcing existing laws and regulations relating to camp morality? Is there a need for further legislation in this connection?

Tenth. What plans are being made for the post-war period? What safeguards are being considered to prevent a repetition of the farmers' plight after the last World War? What steps are being taken to prevent widespread unemployment after this war? How will we pay the freight?

Eleventh. Is anything being done to bolster up the financial positions of our agencies of transportation?

Twelfth. Will the new revenue bill safeguard contractual obligations incurred prior to the war?

Thirteenth. What justification is there for the suggested gas rationing in the Middle West?

Fourteenth. How can we help?

I desire to discuss one of these questions at this point. It happens to be question numbered 13: "What justification is there for the suggested gas rationing in the Middle West?"

Yesterday I listened very attentively to the discussion by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], and I was impressed with two conclusions: First, that there is a tremendous amount of gasoline in this country which is not being distributed because of lack of transportation facilities; secondly, I was impressed with the conclusion that tires deteriorate practically as much with nonuse as they do with use, if the use is reasonable. The President says we shall soon have ersatz tires.

In my State we have seven or eight thousand lakes. One of our great industries is taking care of tourists.

This year we have been hit in many centers.

I have received a number of telegrams and letters saying that we have plenty of gasoline in the State of Wisconsin. If the gasoline which we have is not needed in the war effort—and there has been no showing that it is so needed in the Middle West—then it would appear that what is needed above everything else is taxes, which might be unnecessarily reduced in our area by a gasoline restriction order. We must think of the necessity of keeping up the morale on the home front. When hundreds of thousands of persons are deprived—without a vital reason—of an opportunity to earn, their morale is affected. So I say that we should think twice before attempting to do anything drastic with respect to rationing gasoline in those areas in which gasoline is plentiful and is available and is not needed in the war effort. Why this constant scaring the people to death with unnecessary threats that affect their business and standard of living?

I should like to point out in passing that one common thread runs through all the questions I have enumerated. That is the desire of the people to be told a straightforward story by Government, free of confusion and uncertainty. I have particularly in mind in this matter the tremendous appropriations which

we are making. The people are confused because they do not comprehend the difference between what we pay out and what we appropriate. It is said that it is probable that this next fiscal year—July 1942 to July 1943—we shall raise by taxation some $21,000,000,000 or $22,000,000,000, and probably we shall spend $60,000,000,000. That would leave a deficit of approximately $40,000,000,000. Of course, those figures are not exact. If we add that $40,000,000,000 to our present indebtedness, we shall have a total indebtedness of approximately $100,000,000,000 or more. When the average citizen learns that we are appropriating tremendous sums, he does not realize that the spending of the money will continue over months and perhaps years. I should like to see the picture depicted graphically so that the average mind may grasp it. If that were done, we should see, I am sure, a greater response in the buying of Government bonds.

Another thing which is not stated in the questions I have set forth is the suggestion that the time must come, and come soon, when the Government will determine a policy in relation to bonds, a new kind of bond, bonds running probably 3, 5, or 10 years, so that a tremendous load will not be thrown upon the Government when people start to cash in the bonds. It was suggested that perhaps one might be able to buy one of the $100 present bonds provided he bought $1,000 worth of period bonds.

I make these suggestions simply because I think there is value and vitality in them. The people back home are thinking things through. They are asking, "What are you going to do when these billions of bonds are suddenly thrown upon the Treasury and demand is made?" As the bonds are at present, in 90 days anyone can receive his money; that is the idea.

With all our various public-relations activities, it may be that we are suffering from a lack of a single clearing house for public information. I repeat that we have all these public information centers, all these public-relations activities, and yet there is no single clearing house from which the public may receive the information which is needed. It may be that there are too many public officials making statements concerning policies over which they have no direct responsibility. If public statements were limited to the individual directly responsible for the particular activity, we might eliminate some of the confusion which originates when many persons undertake to speak with authority on the same problem. I think that situation was well illustrated in the recent discussion concerning gasoline rationing.

I thank the Senator from Michigan for yielding to me.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6979) to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength.

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7008) to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of $5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I shall be able to conclude my remarks in a very short time if I may proceed without interruption. As soon as I finish a short statement I shall be glad to yield for any questions which any Senators may wish to ask, although I think we went rather thoroughly into various phases of the bill yesterday.

Yesterday we discussed, to some extent, the fundamental reasons for the bill, and I think they are fairly well understood. I did not state the reasons why the Reconstruction Finance Corporation needs the proposed additional $5,000,000,000.

The present status of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is about as follows: It has a borrowing power of $9,130,000,000. It has borrowed and has obligations outstanding at the present time in the amount of $3,270,000,000. Therefore, it has on hand a loaning capacity of approximately $6,000,000,000, or, to be exact, $5,860,000,000. It has outstanding commitments of $11,000,000,000, which are largely in connection with the war program.

So Mr. Jones feels that an additional $5,000,000,000 should be authorized in order to cover the R. F. C.'s necessary commitments. It is believed that such a sum will fairly well cover the needs which will occur if the pending bill becomes law—needs which, of course, will require the expenditure of only a very small portion of the $5,000,000,000. Of course, the fund is a revolving fund.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I did not understand the Senator's last remark.

Mr. BROWN. I say that Mr. Jones, the Federal Loan Administrator, believes that an additional $5,000,000,000 is needed.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that.

Mr. BROWN. A very small part of it would be used in connection with the subsidy proposal contained in the pending bill.

Mr. McNARY. That is very important. Of the $5,000,000,000 which the R. F. C. now seeks, most of it would be used for commitments heretofore made; is that correct?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; I think the major part of it would be so used.

Mr. McNARY. What proportion is it expected the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will use under the provisions of this bill if it should become law?

Mr. BROWN. Insofar as the subsidy provisions of the bill are concerned, I believe that about 10 percent of this request—or $500,000,000—should be sufficient. I discussed that matter this morning, after consideration of the matters which were brought to light yesterday by various Members of the Senate; and in behalf of the committee I am offering an amendment which would limit to $500,000,000 the amount which might be used for subsidy payments. That is 10 percent of the total amount which is asked for in the bill insofar as the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is concerned.

Mr. McNARY. Then I understand that the entire $5,000,000,000 asked for in the bill is not to be used for the purpose of making loans, but that a proportion of it—10 percent—is to be used for the purpose of the payment of subsidies; is that correct?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; not more than that.

Mr. McNARY. That is all that is to be used for the payment of subsidies; is that correct?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. Of course, such subsidies——

Mr. BROWN. If the Senator will pardon me, let me say that the last answer I made is not entirely accurate. When the R. F. C. finds it necessary to buy rubber from Brazil, or to buy any other strategic materials or metals, such purchases are empowered under the provisions of the bill, and the money would be used for that purpose.

Mr. McNARY. Has the Senator a complete list setting forth the commodities which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation desires to purchase, their nature, and whether they are domestically produced or are imported from foreign countries?

Mr. BROWN. No; I do not; but in the hearings Mr. Jones detailed the commodities at some length. In the hearings there is set forth a considerable list of the commodities which the Secretary of Commerce intends to buy under authority of the powers provided in the bill. The report does not show all the items, but the hearings do so to a very considerable extent.

Mr. McNARY. Can the Senator refer to the page of the hearings on which that information may be found?

Mr. BROWN. I believe that pages 4 and 5 of the first issue, the hearings of May 8 and 12, give in detail a considerable number of items which are to be purchased—for instance, $1,567,000,000 for rubber, including the synthetic rubber program, and a grand total which has been or will be loaned, although not all at any one time, of a little more than $14,000,000,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I shall yield in a moment. They estimate that they are paying out from $10,000,000 to $12,000,000 a day in line with that program.

Now I yield to my colleague.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, if the Senator will defer to me for a moment, I should like to have a more direct citation of the reference to the hearings.

Mr. BROWN. Page 5 of the hearings of May 8 and 12. The Senator will find the list commencing at the upper third of the page.

Mr. McNARY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. VANDENBERG. As I understand, the able Senator from Michigan now proposes a limitation in money upon the extent to which this proposed legislation shall apply. I very respectfully suggest to him again that my feeling is that the limitation necessary is in language rather than money, because it seems to me, as the bill now stands, baldly and unequivocally and without limitation providing—

To make subsidy payments in conjunction with the production, processing, or distribution of any article or commodity; and

(2) To purchase, acquire, carry, sell, or otherwise deal in any article or commodity—

It means, so far as the public is concerned, that every pressure upon the price ceiling, from whatever source arising, will be a pressure upon this fund for reimbursement.

Mr. BROWN. I share the apprehensions of my colleague in that respect. I took the matter up with the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] last night, and we again endeavored to find some rule which could be provided, some yardstick by which we could make such a limitation. I think I am safe in saying that we both came to the conclusion that the best we could do would be to place in the bill a money limitation, which is a comparatively modest sum.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me, I think the money limitation is out of harmony with the remainder of the bill, for I think, as the bill reads, the money limitation is perfectly ridiculous, because it falls so utterly short of the promise which is inherent in the text of the proposed legislation.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator knows that I have striven for a day, or, at least, an afternoon, to limit the scope of these subsidies to the greatest possible extent.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator has done so.

Mr. BROWN. I have done so by statements here which should be the basis for the construction of this bill by those having its administration in charge.

I have not quite finished my statement.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sorry if I interrupted the Senator.

Mr. BROWN. I feel if we place this limitation of $500,000,000 in connection with the amount for the R. F. C., and a limitation of $250,000,000—I have not yet alluded to that, but such an amendment will also be offered as a committee amendment—on the Commodity Credit Corporation that there would then be a definite amount which the Price Administrator and the Loan Administrator and the Secretary of Agriculture could have in mind when they met with the problem to which my colleague alludes, and that that would be a deterrent factor.

Secondly, if we would permit this proposed law to operate for a period of a few months, experience could be gained, for this is a matter with which our Government has had little or no experience—and, in the light of such experience, we could then amend this bill somewhat along the line I know my colleague wants to have it amended, and along the line I myself should like to have it amended.

I answer him further by saying that, so far as subsidies are concerned, we have considerable of a brake upon the Price Administration.

First, rules and regulations are to be established by the administrative authority; that is, by the President, as is directly stated in the bill.

Second, the Price Control Administrator must come to the conclusion that a subsidy rather than a rise in prices is necessary to cover the particular situation before him; and

Third, then there must be acquiescence by the loaning authority, who, in the case of nonagricultural commodities, is Mr. Jones, the Secretary of Commerce, and in the case of agricultural commodities the Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Wickard. No such brake occurs with respect to purchasing power of the Commodity Credit Corporation or the purchasing power of the R. F. C., but it is in the bill with respect to the subsidy power. So I say to my colleague that that is the best we can do under the circumstances.

I should like to add a statement which I think is apropos to this argument, namely, that perhaps in some of the things which were said yesterday—I do not think the Senator from Michigan can be charged with it—there was indicated a feeling that subsidization was the main principle which was to be used to readjust unfair economic relationships or economic injuries.

That, in my judgment, though there may be some disagreement with me, is not the purpose of the pending bill. The purpose of the bill is to enable the Price Administrator to have a choice between two things when he is confronted by a situation where it is impossible for a manufacturer, a retailer, or a farmer, or anyone else to produce his goods because of excessive costs which occur by reason of the war or the war effort, costs which were unanticipated, and which make it impossible for him to live within the price limitation. When such a situation is presented to the Price Administrator we want him to have the choice of subsidizing or of permitting the price to go up. In the great majority of individual cases, such as the one the Senator from Kentucky pointed out yesterday of a concern in a certain locality, such as a public ice plant, which faces an unusual situation and finds it impossible to operate, I think the price should be permitted to go up. In such a case as I gave yesterday, involving the use of coal, the freight rate on coal having greatly increased due to the impossibility of carrying coal from the coal fields and the tidewater ports, such as Norfolk to New England, the increased cost having general effect, and the price of coal affecting the price of every commodity which is produced by the mill operators in the New England area, I think it would be better to subsidize. This bill gives the Price Administrator clear authority to make a choice in such situations, and my effort here, so far as I can, as the Senator responsible for handling the bill, is to hold down the subsidization, and along that line we have added the limitations to which I referred this morning.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I know it is the Senator's anxiety to hold down the subsidies to the utmost limit, and, on the basis of the Senator's explanation of this bill, I would have no objection to it whatever, but it seems to me, in the light of our experience with some of our bureaucratic brethren down the street, we are scarcely any longer justified in relying upon the administrative discretion for the protection which we think ought to be in the text of the statute itself. My able colleague has been so specific in stating the limitations under which subsidies are to be granted that I am unable to believe that he could not put them into a textual amendment to this bill.

The only issue between us is that I am perfectly willing to trust my colleague, but I do not think my colleague is entitled to ask the Congress and the country to trust the Office of Price Administration, in spite of its very able Administrator, with a total unlimited power to commit us to the subsidization of all the production, all the processing, and all the distribution of all the articles and commodities in all the commerce of the United States. I think that is putting too big a strain on faith, hope, and charity.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Michigan yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. In connection with the Senator's further explanation of the pending measure, will he not tell us why is it necessary for the Administrator to be authorized "to purchase, acquire, carry, sell, or otherwise deal in any article or commodity"?

The Senator has well said that the purpose of the bill—and I have understood it to be the purpose of the bill—is merely to subsidize manufacturers and others because of war conditions; because of additional expenses they are put to due to the war. Bearing that in mind, I cannot see why it is necessary to give the Administrator the additional power of purchasing, acquiring, and selling these commodities. Without in any manner advocating a subsidy, would it not simplify the administration of the bill if we were to give merely the power to subsidize and eliminate the power to purchase and sell?

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Will not the Senator from Michigan go into a little more detail about that phase of the pending measure before yielding to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TAFT. Perhaps I can answer the question.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have been much confused in the last half hour as a result of the colloquy which took place among Senators.

Mr. TAFT. Perhaps I can answer the question by referring to Mr. Jones' testimony. He said:

The President has asked us to break the fall on a lot of these materials, to absorb extraordinary freight and transportation

charges, to sell things at the ceiling price fixed by the Administrator, although we may have had to pay substantially more for them when we purchased them, particularly imported materials.

I explained to you before that the War Production Board had asked us to do a number of things, including the purchasing of partly fabricated materials and reducing them to their original state, and gathering up materials and selling them, still making them available at the ceiling price.

As I explained to you at that time, that particular program will probably entail an estimated loss to us of $320,000,000. The materials are absolutely vital, we must have them. Therefore, there is no question about the advisability of doing it.

We are gathering up scrap—metals, rubber, and other things.

Under those conditions the Senator will see they have to buy and sell. They buy the commodities and then they sell them. He refers specifically ton the number of things they have bought:

We will probably take a forty or fifty million dollar loss in the transportation of sugar. We bought sugar from Cuba, and the ceiling prices were made on the basis of normal shipping conditions. Now it is many times that.

The CHAIRMAN Many times what?

Mr. JONES. The transportation cost is many times what it was. We will probably take a twenty or twenty-five million dollar loss on molasses, which goes into making alcohol, which we sell at 50 cents a gallon, though it will probably cost us that much more.

I answer the Senator's inquiry by saying that the process of buying and selling is a very useful one. I would question far more the subsidy power than the buying and selling power. But I think the Senator from Michigan has not made clear that the difficulty in writing the subsidy clause, and cutting it down in extent, is that there are at least three different purposes for which a subsidy may be used. It may be used for the purpose of subsidizing the low-cost producer. That was the first purpose for which we were asked to legislate price control. The Government for months has been in effect subsidizing the high-cost producer of copper, so that he gets 17 cents, whereas the large copper companies are getting 12 cents, and so the Price Administrator held the price down to 12 cents.

Mr. ELLENDER. Could not the Price Administrator do that very thing under the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act?

Mr. TAFT. As a matter of fact, I think practically everything that could be done under the pending bill could be done under the Price Control Act. There are a few respects in which the Administrator could act with greater convenience. As a matter of fact, when we come to the second subsidy ground, which was that stated yesterday with regard to excessive transportation of oil and coal, we find that under the price-control law the Price Administrator has already subsidized coal. I question somewhat whether it could be done in the way in which he has asked that it be done under the Price Control Act, but I think he could find a way under the Price Control Act to do it.

The third ground of subsidy is that it be used to assist in enforcing the new price-control policy of the Administrator, holding retail prices exactly where they are. If that is to be brought about, there is no way of doing it, if they are not to drive everybody out of business, unless they subsidize the people in between. Personally, I disapprove the policy of price control, and if Senators want to tell the Administrator they disapprove of it, if they think it violates the object of the Price Control Act, they may say so, but it seems to me the subsidy is a rather necessary incident to that policy if we are not to drive four-fifths of the smaller retailers and wholesalers entirely out of business.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I notice in that portion of the bill that deals with the resale of all commodities purchased, three separate provisions which, to my mind, conflict with each other. I read from page 2, beginning with line 10:

To purchase, acquire, carry, sell, or otherwise deal in any article or commodity; in such amounts or quantities, in such manner, and upon such terms and conditions, as may be determined to be necessary to increase or maintain production or distribution of such articles or commodities—

Now, listen, Senators—

except that any article or commodity so purchased may be sold at a price below the purchase price therefor.

I repeat, the language dealing with the sale of commodities, I quote "except that any article or commodity so purchased may be sold at a price below the purchase price therefor."

Now let us turn to page 3, beginning with line 9, we find this qualification as to the sale of any commodities purchased:

SEC. 4. No article or commodity purchased pursuant to section 2 or section 3 of this act shall be sold at a price in excess of any maximum price established therefor pursuant to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942

Which formula will the Administrator follow? I am certain Senators see the conflict at a glance and no further explanation is necessary.

That is not all; there is still another yardstick as to how some of the commodities are to be sold. Section 5—which affects only agricultural commodities—reads as follows:

SEC. 5. No power conferred by this act shall be construed to authorize any action contrary to the provisions and purposes of section 3 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, and no agricultural commodity acquired pursuant to this act shall be sold within the United States by the Commodity Credit Corporation or any other governmental agency at a price below the price limitations imposed by section 3 (a) of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 with respect to such commodity.

Again we are confronted with a formula indicating how agricultural commodities are to be sold, notwithstanding the language contained in sections 1 and 2 just quoted. I am sure Senators see the conflict of language in the three references I have read, and what bothers me is, Which of the three formulas will the Administrator use as a yardstick?

Mr. President, it strikes me that section 4 certainly should come out of the bill and the language dealing with resale appearing in section 2 should be made to apply to all transactions of the R. F. C. and the language in section 5 should be made to apply to all transactions of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. BROWN. I myself think that section 4 is not a necessary part of the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Now——

Mr. BROWN. Will not the Senator permit me to say a word in my own time? I cannot answer his questions if he does not. I do not wish to be impatient, but I have been on my feet for some time. I intend to move to strike section 4 from the bill. If that is of interest to the Senator, very well.

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire to thank the Senator. If the Senator will further indulge me I would like to ask a further question. In answer to the question I asked the Senator from Michigan a moment ago, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] stated that he was of opinion that the Administrator has enough power under the Emergency Price Control Act to handle the situation.

Mr. BROWN. I do not think the Senator from Ohio said that.

Mr. ELLENDER. I understood him to so state, and I feel confident that the RECORD will so indicate.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator from Ohio said he thought the Administrator was somewhat too circumscribed by section 2 of the Price Control Act, and that it was probably necessary to let him go into the question of distribution, which involves transportation costs, as well as production. He is confined to production by section 2 of the Price Control Act.

Mr. ELLENDER. It seems to me that we could well strike from the bill—and at the same time carry out what the Senator has in mind—lines 10 and 11 on page 2, which provision gives the Administrator the power "to purchase, acquire, carry, sell, or otherwise deal in any article or commodity." I think it would result in a better bill if the language I have just indicated were deleted.

Mr. BROWN. That is power in the R. F. C.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why repeat it? Has not the R. F. C. such powers at present or could it not be delegated under the War Powers Act?

Mr. BROWN. It is a power given the R. F. C. for the purpose of enabling them to effectuate the Price Control Act. There is the question, for example, of buying coffee from Brazil. With the transportation charges probably very excessive, the Corporation has the right to buy Brazilian coffee and sell it at a loss in the United States, so that the American people may have it without exorbitant charges.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand the bill, the same provision would also apply to the Commodity Credit Corporation. Am I correct?

Mr. BROWN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then why give the Commodity Credit Corporation the right

to purchase, acquire, sell, and otherwise deal in any article or commodity?

Mr. BROWN. Because the administrative authority headed by the President of the Senate, the Vice President of the United States, have by executive order, under the War Powers Act, placed upon the Commodity Credit Corporation the task of buying all foreign agricultural commodities which are needed in the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. Then are we to understand that the provision is not to apply to domestic commodities?

Mr. BROWN. I did not say that.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator would intimate it from his answer.

Mr. BROWN. No; I say they have been given the power, and they have to have some money for the job, and they must do what is provided, because under the War Powers Act they are legally required to do it, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is no longer to be concerned in the purchase of agricultural commodities. The Commodity Credit Corporation, as the Senator knows, has long engaged in the task of purchasing domestic commodities to assist farmers to obtain parity prices, and I do not see any difference between that and what is contained in the bill.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, the committee amendments proposed are far-reaching and I feel that more study should be made of this intricate problem. I shall, in my own time, further discuss these amendments.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GILLETTE in the chair). Does the Senator from Michigan yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I have only one suggestion to offer. We have considered section 2 quite apart from section 3. They involve different purposes and different agencies of the Government. The Senator was discussing the subsidy limitation, applicable only to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation's use of the $5,000,000,000, when he was interrupted. Am I correct?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; but the Senator understands that there is to be a limitation on the Commodity Credit Corporation also.

Mr. McNARY. Let us take one at a time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt for a question?

Mr. McNARY. Certainly.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I dare to trespass upon the time of the Senator from Michigan and the Senator from Oregon because the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations handling District of Columbia appropriations will meet again at 2 o'clock, and I am extremely interested in the pending bill, so I desire to notify the Senator from Michigan and the Senate that it is my purpose to make a motion to recommit the bill. If I may do so, Mr. President, I should like to make the motion now, if the Senator from Michigan will yield for that purpose.

Mr. BROWN. I should not like to have the Senator argue that at this time.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I do not intend to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan yield for the purpose of enabling the Senator from Wyoming to make the motion?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I now move that the bill be recommitted to the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. I do that at this time because it will be necessary for me to leave the floor at 2 o'clock to continue committee hearings, and I wish very much to have the opportunity of laying before the Senate the reasons why I believe that the sound objectives which the Senator from Michigan seeks to attain can better be reached by the action of the committee than by a prolongation of the discussion here. I thank the Senator from Michigan very much for permitting me to make that statement.

Mr. McNARY Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I do not wish to interfere with the presentation being made by the able Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN. I was about through.

Mr. McNARY. On the question of subsidies, I agree with the Senator in charge of the bill that limiting to $500,000,000 the amount which could be devoted from the $5,000,000,000 to subsidies would be a deterrent, and be a signboard to which the Corporation could point to all those who had claims and schemes and proposals and propositions to offer. I would prefer direct language, but I do not believe language could be framed to meet this situation, if it is proposed to meet it at all. So I am rather in accord with the Senator's view that there should be a limitation on the amount which could be used for subsidies, much as I dislike them, and I do not think they are altogether necessary to carry on the objectives to which the Senator refers in this bill. But I do commend him for the proposition he is going to offer.

Mr. President, I have on my desk the Emergency Price Control Act which the able Senator from Michigan fathered and guided through the Senate. I refer to subsection (e) of section 2, with which the Senator is very conversant. It is to be found on page 4 of the act. That seems to give to the Price Administrator all the power which is now attempted to be given in sections 2 and 3 of the pending bill. Subsection (e) of section 2 clothes the Administrator with plenary power to do about anything that is necessary to stabilize prices, to promote and increase production, and to render more speedy the distribution of products, and even to pay subsidies.

Mr. BROWN. I may state to the Senator at this point that he will find in the hearings that I took the same position the Senator from Oregon is now taking in questions I asked of the Government representative, and that I then thought all they needed was some money to carry out the provisions of subsection (e). The only real difference, in my estimation, between subsection (e) and the language of the pending bill is that under the Price Control Act we confine action to encouragement of production. It was felt that there was a distribution problem involved—freight prices, for example—that is the best example we had before us—and that there should be authority to "pay the freight," as one might say, where necessary. In my judgment, that is the only real difference between subsection (e) and the language of the pending bill.

Mr. McNARY. That answers the very inquiry the Senator made before his committee. If that is what is wanted, why not put it into the language of the bill? But in the bill now before the Senate its sponsors go into production, and processing, and distribution, which is wholly covered by subsection (e) of the Emergency Price Control Act. That gives the Price Administrator the right to buy any agricultural commodity he wants, or any other commodity, nonagricultural, and to process or distribute it.

Mr. President, it seems to me there will be in that regard a multiplication of statutes. I have great objection to the philosophy of creating too many agencies and dividing authority and power. There ought to be centralization. We have talked about a dictator in a democracy, which I do favor in times of great emergency in connection with a global war. But what have we under subsection (e)? In the purchasing of a can of tomatoes we have the Surplus Marketing Corporation, we have also the Price Control Administrator, and now an attempt is being made to confer such authority on the Commodity Credit Corporation. All three, with Government funds, will be out to deal with the poor farmers over some of the products of the soil, and they will be so confused that they will run in fear and doubt. That is one objection.

Secondly, what is proposed by the pending bill? It is proposed that the Commodity Credit Corporation may buy these various articles, whether they be tomatoes, or pears, or prunes, or cotton, or wheat, or what not, but the request must come from the Price Administrator. Then he must talk to the Secretary of Agriculture. If the Secretary of Agriculture does not veto it, then he must see the President, and have the President make a ruling. So there will be four agencies dealing with the matter, multiplied by the three agencies now existing under statutory law—all dealing possibly with a can of bean soup. That is the objection I have.

One of the difficulties facing one in public life or the people living in the country today is the inability to find the man responsible for any one particular action necessary to sustain the war and to carry on our domestic activities. I think by this bill we shall further be dividing and subdividing responsibility and authority, until I do not know what a poor fellow living in the country will do, or what a Representative in Congress will do, or what the man on the street will do, or, for that matter, any living citizen.

This bill will add to the difficulties and the embarrassment and the confusion of a confused situation. That is why I object to the philosophy underlying the bill, and shall vote for the motion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY]. I do not wish to take the Senator's time further. I shall probably say something more a little later.

Mr. BROWN. I wish the Senator from Oregon had made that very moving speech at the time of the submission of the Bankhead amendment to the price-control bill. Those in charge of the legislation felt that the authority should be centralized in one man, but the Senator from Oregon and many other Senators—in fact, the majority of Senators—joined in insisting that there should be a dual control in the Secretary of Agriculture and the Price Administrator, as well as the President.

Mr. MCNARY. Exactly. I wanted all matters appertaining to the farm, to the soil, to the farmer to be regulated by a farm organization—by the Department of Agriculture—and not by a new man coming in on the scene; and I stand on that.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. I feel like apologizing to the Senator from Michigan for taking up his time, but I wish to call attention to the subject of coal. The Senator spoke about "paying the freight." What has happened in respect to the increase in freight rates is this: The railroad brotherhoods asked for an increase in wages, and received the increase. I had no objection to that because I think possibly they were entitled to it, although I did not go into the facts. Immediately thereafter the railroads applied to the Interstate Commerce Commission for an increase in freight rates, and the Interstate Commerce Commission allowed an increase.

The Senator from Michigan talked about "paying the freight." As I understand, freight rates, on the whole, to New England are being raised, not because of the war, but because the Interstate Commerce Commission increased freight rates on the railroads at the time the railroad brotherhoods received their increase in wages. I never felt that the railroads needed so great an increase in freight rates as they received.

A couple of years ago representatives of the railroads and the railroad brotherhoods came to me and met jointly with me, as chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, and suggested that the Government subsidize the railroads, and said that that was the solution of the railroad problem. I immediately said that, so far as I was concerned, I was opposed to it, and that I would fight any subsidies being paid to the railroads by the Government because I did not think it was proper for the Government to do so; that I thought it was the wrong policy to pursue, and I said to them then that if the Government were to begin the policy of subsidizing the railroads the result would be that every industry in the United States would come to Washington and bring pressure on the Government to subsidize this, that, and the other industry.

The other day the Interstate Commerce Committee held hearings upon the question of whether there should be a consolidation of the Western Union and the Postal Telegraph companies.

A couple of years ago I introduced a resolution for the purpose of investigating the question of whether there should be a consolidation of the Western Union and Postal companies. The subcommittee held hearings, and subsequently a bill was introduced. Hearings are now being held.

At that time some of the labor representatives were in favor of a consolidation. The other day they came in and said they were opposed to the consolidation of the Postal and Western Union, but that what they wanted was to have the Government subsidize the Postal Telegraph Co.

If this bill should be enacted into law every single industry in the country would say, "Because we have had to increase wages the Government should subsidize our particular industry." The bill would give more power to any one man or group of men than any man or group of men in the United States should have, in that it would enable the one in authority to say what industry should be subsidized and what should not be subsidized. There would be inequalities. In my judgment, to start subsidizing various industries, would be one of the most dangerous policies the Government has ever adopted. It is beyond my comprehension that we should say that Mr. Henderson, Mr. Jones, or any other man should have such power at this time. I repeat, it would be one of the most dangerous policies the Government has ever adopted.

When representatives of the railroads came asking for a subsidy I said to them, "If you come asking for a subsidy, what you will get will be Government ownership of railroads." If we start subsidizing industry, sooner or later the great mass of the people of the country, the taxpayers, will say, "We are not going to subsidize these industries. We are going to take them over."

That would be much more logical than to have all the taxpayers of the country pay taxes in order to subsidize some particular industry, especially when we consider the oil industry. What does the Senator think the workingman who is to be taxed will say? The single man is to be taxed down to $500 of his income, and the married man down to $750? What does the Senator think the poor fellow on the farm and the worker in the factory will say when they find that the oil companies of the country are being subsidized to help one section of the country when they know, as everyone else knows, that the oil companies fix the price of gasoline from one end of the country to the other in peacetime or any other time. I cannot comprehend a thing of this kind being started at this time.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, the Senator said all that yesterday. I thought we went into the question thoroughly. The Senator does not state his premises fairly at all. There is no intention to subsidize railroads. There is no intention to subsidize oil companies. I so stated very distinctly to the Senator yesterday. He does not at all refer to the fact that payments are to be made to take care of the difference between the rail freight rate from Norfolk, Va., we will say, to Boston, and the water-freight rate from Norfolk to Boston. Because our barges and tankers are unable to operate on the Atlantic Ocean there has been an enormous increase in freight charges. The railroads do not want that business. They have all the business they can handle at the present time.

Mr. WHEELER. I know something about the railroads——

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I have the floor. I was very kind to the Senator, and yielded to him for some time. I wish he would let me make my statement, and then I shall be glad to yield to him again.

In the committee we were informed that the railroads did not want that business because they are not equipped to carry that particular type of freight from Norfolk to Boston. It has always been carried upon the ocean.

I can give the Senator another example. As he well knows, the railroads could not possibly handle the ore trade from the Duluth region and the Michigan ranges to the Lake Erie ports and the Pittsburgh and Youngstown areas. They have not the cars or the equipment with which to do it. It is a water transportation problem, for which facilities have been built up. If that transportation were suddenly menaced by submarines or airplanes—it is difficult to imagine that such a thing could happen on the Great Lakes—or if the Soo Canal were blocked, we should have such a situation that the railroads could not possibly handle the ore trade. They never have handled it. They are unable to handle it. Likewise, they have not the facilities, without tremendously straining their present equipment, to carry coal from West Virginia and Pennsylvania to New England.

Therefore the theory of the bill is to provide the additional cost through the Public Treasury and the R. F. C. rather than to have that cost put upon the products of manufacturing establishments.

On that point let me read to the Senate the testimony of Mr. Henderson.

> We had been studying very carefully the Canadian experience with the general freezing that they put into operation last December.

That is, the freezing of prices.

> We have had our men in Ottawa constantly, and they have had a representative here, and we have been exchanging our experience. It was evident that some base period had to be chosen as the date of the stabilization of prices and that every effort needed to be made to hold that thing rigidly to the line.
>
> The one outstanding piece of advice that I got from Donald Gordon, who is my opposite number in the Canadian experience, was this: The only big mistakes that they made have been to puncture the ceiling—

that is, to raise the price of any commodity at the retail line.

Senator BROWN. Have you done that?

Mr. HENDERSON. No; I say the Canadians did.

Senator BROWN. You say that that is the mistake they made?

Mr. HENDERSON. Mr. Gordon told me that the only big mistake that he made was, when under pressure and there seemed to be no other way to go, to allow a price increase, the effect on the holding of the price structure being so pronounced that he said every effort ought to be made to hold the price structure intact and to make the adjustments by other means.

The Canadian price control authority, as the committee knows, derives from an order in council, and there is a very close relation between Mr. Gordon, as the head of the Wartime Price and Trade Board, and the Minister of Finance.

* * * * *

The Canadian experience as well as the English experience in the matter of maintaining firmness of the price ceilings by means of appropriate arrangements and subsidies is so convincing and has been so convincing to us that we have felt the necessity for some similar arrangement here.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator says that it is proposed to pay the difference between the cost of shipping by water and the cost of shipping by rail.

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. WHEELER. Let us stop and analyze that proposal. The Senator says that the railroads cannot handle certain business. The railroads will be compelled to handle it.

Mr. BROWN. I said they could not handle it without a great strain on their facilities.

Mr. WHEELER. They will be compelled to handle it. There is no other way to handle it. If the people of New England and the East want gasoline, why should they not be willing to pay the extra cost of shipping it by rail, as do the people of Montana and other sections of the country where the only means of transportation is by railroad or pipe line? If we are to subsidize the railroads, we shall simply say, "Because this pipe line is broken and cannot be used, and it is necessary to ship by rail, we will pay the difference between the cost of transportation by pipe line and the cost of transportation by rail."

The Senator says that the railroads do not want the business. Let me say to the Senator that he did not consult the railroad executives and get that statement from them. They do want the business. In the past such traffic has resorted to tankers, and the railroads have complained because of the fact that other forms of transportation were taking their business away from them. The railroads wanted a subsidy because, as they said, "We have to have it in order to exist, because other forms of transportation are taking our business away." Railroad representatives even proposed to me that a subsidy or loan of $1,000,000,000 be granted, and that a 5-percent tax be put on all other forms of transportation to pay back the $1,000,000,000 loan. I said, "That is perfectly absurd; the other forms of transportation will not stand for it."

In great areas of this country, including Michigan, oil must be obtained either by pipe line or by railroad in tank cars. Why should we say to the people in one section, "We will pay a part of the freight which you have to pay, and will make the people in some other section who have to get their gasoline by freight help to pay your freight bill in order that you may get gasoline cheaper"? In my judgment, the proposal does not make sense. It would be a dangerous policy for the Government to inaugurate. If the proposal were to build more tankers to bring in the gasoline, and to protect them, I should agree.

Mr. BROWN. Of course, we are doing so.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, we are doing so. But when it is said that merely because such traffic must resort to freight cars and be hauled by rail, as against tankers, for the reason the tankers cannot haul it at the present time, that is simply saying to one segment of the people of the United States, "You will have to pay the extra freight, because these other people cannot do so."

Mr. BROWN. The Senator recognizes that that dislodgment is due to the war, does he not?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; that particular dislodgment is due to the war; but the increase in freight rates was not due to the war.

Mr. BROWN. We are not proposing a subsidy for that purpose.

Mr. WHEELER. There is no limitation in the bill. Under the terms of the bill a subsidy might be given to anybody for any reason. The reason might be that there is an increase in wages due to the war. A subsidy might be granted on that ground. Anything that happens anywhere in the world within the next 6 months may be said to be due to the war. Either directly or indirectly, it will be due to the war. That condition might be urged as a ground for granting a subsidy to many industries.

I apologize to the Senator for taking so much time. I have no objection—and I do not think anyone else has—to the first paragraph in the bill, granting an increase of $5,000,000,000 to the R. F. C. I am perfectly willing to grant whatever is felt to be necessary for that purpose; but as to its other provisions, I shall vote either to reject the committee amendments or to recommit the bill.

Mr. BROWN. I said on several occasions yesterday, when many Senators who are now present were not in the Chamber, that we are faced with the necessity of determining whether it is best to let the price ceiling go up.

Mr. WHEELER. Not entirely.

Mr. BROWN. Is it best to let it go up—to "puncture the ceiling," as the expression was used in the hearings—or is it best to subsidize? I say that discretion must be lodged somewhere; and I do not know where to put it other than in the President of the United States, through his agents, under rules and regulations which he is to establish. We must give to someone authority to do whichever of the two is best under all the circumstances. That is all the pending bill proposes.

True, we limit the amount. We want to have a little experience along this line. The Senator from Michigan has no personal interest at all in this matter. I did not introduce the bill; I was not even a member of the subcommittee which handled the bill; but because I had handled the price-control bill in the Senate, the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] asked me to handle the pending bill. I became convinced, the Price Administrator was convinced, Mr. Jones—who has had more experience in handling matters of this kind than has any other officer of the Government—was convinced, and the President was convinced that we should provide the proposed authority in order to prevent greater economic readjustment and changes, and that we should vest in someone the authority to do one or the other, whichever might be best.

As I have said many times, in a great many instances it will be better to let prices go up a little. Undoubtedly, in other instances, such as in the case of coal, it will be better to "pay the freight"—the difference between the rail freight and water freight—in order to prevent the immense adjustments which otherwise would be necessary in the price structure.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that all the coal transported to New England has not gone by boat, of course.

Mr. BROWN. No; but the major part of it has gone by boat.

Mr. WHEELER. Some of the coal from Pennsylvania goes into New England by rail.

Mr. BROWN. That is true.

Mr. WHEELER. Some of the coal going to New England has moved from Norfolk by boat. We would confront the question of discrimination, for one group would say, "We are getting our coal by rail from Pennsylvania, and it is going into all sections of New England, and another grade of coal is coming in by boat."

Mr. BROWN. Certainly; Congress could not settle the question of freight rates.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course not; but it should be done.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator has been one of the chief advocates of giving the Interstate Commerce Commission proper authority along that line, and it was proper that we should do so.

In the pending bill we seek to give someone the authority to decide when it is best to subsidize and when it is best to let the price ceilings go up.

Mr. WHEELER. The only thing the Senator from Montana has been advocating with reference to the Interstate Commerce Commission is giving them power, under certain definite rules and prescriptions laid down by the Congress of the United States, to regulate freight rates both upon the sea and upon the

rails. I have never advocated turning over to the Interstate Commerce Commission, or to any other agency, unlimited power to do almost everything under the sun, as this bill proposes.

So long as I am a Member of the Senate I hope I shall never come before the Senate and advocate granting unlimited power to Mr. Henderson or to anyone else to subsidize any and every industry in the United States which he may see fit to subsidize.

Mr. BROWN. Of course, the Senator knows that we have repeatedly stated the many limitations which are placed upon the Price Administrator by existing law; and I shall not consume the time of the Senate to restate them.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to make an inquiry of the Senator from Michigan; and I know he will be indulgent with me, because I have been patient with the theory of the pending bill.

Mr. BROWN. I know the Senator has been patient.

Mr. GEORGE. The difficulty, as I see it, is that the bill proposes no standards by which there can be a determination as to when an industry is entitled to a subsidy and when it is not; that is, when, by virtue of a price ceiling, an industry stands to lose unless it receives something in the form of a subsidy to tide it over. The bill proposes no standard save the unlimited, uncontrolled, undirected discretion of the Price Administrator, the Commodity Credit Corporation, or the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

That seems to me to be the weakness of the program and of the proposal. After a very careful and sympathetic consideration of the whole matter, I am unable to understand how we can ever pay subsidies to one industry and ultimately avoid the payment of subsidies to every other industry which may come before us and say, "By virtue of the price ceilings we have lost money or we are losing it. We cannot live under the price ceilings."

The Senator properly says that in certain instances it would be better to let the prices rise and in others it would be better to subsidize. I do not quarrel with that theory; I think probably his statement is correct.

However, the bill provides no standard by which to determine which would apply. The bill simply provides broad power to subsidize the producer, the processor, or the distributor. I do not believe—and in my opinion experience will show nothing to the contrary—that we can grant relief by way of subsidy to one industry without ultimately being compelled to grant it to all other industries. I do not think we get around that difficulty by mere money limitations; because I have seen appropriations increased time after time, and parity or subsidy appropriations constantly mount. In my opinion, that is what we shall see again if the pending bill becomes law.

I think I fully appreciate the danger inherent in rapidly spiraling prices. I doubt if a great many officers of the Government today have properly evaluated the offsetting factors as applied to any abnormal increases in costs.

There are all kinds of offsetting factors which militate against prices going entirely out of reason at this time. Six or 8 months from now, when consumers' goods will have been taken off the shelves and consumed, and will not be replaced or replaceable, we may see a quite serious situation; but I do think there is always enough possibility of a rapidly rising price level to justify every proper step which can be taken to hold down prices.

I am submitting to the Senator, because he is open-minded and fair-minded about all legislative proposals, the objection which seems to me to be obvious in connection with the pending bill; namely, that once we pay a subsidy to any producer, distributor, or processor who may be adversely affected by the price ceiling, we shall not be able to deny it to others and still others, until we shall have taken in practically all producers, distributors, and processors in the entire country. That would be as bad, I fear, as some inflation or some increase in living costs. That is what I fear.

In the pending bill it is proposed to give this vast power without any direction as to when it shall be used and how it shall be used; and, therefore, I know that in almost every case pressure will be brought on the Price Administrator and the Commodity Credit Corporation to grant subsidies. In almost every instance a case can be made out to show that the particular person, firm, or industry concerned cannot make any money, but will lose money—and some of them will lose money—because of the price limitations which will be fixed. That, we must admit, is so when wages, the great factor in the cost of production, are not controlled. It may be that efforts are being made to adjust wages and to stabilize them, but that is far from controlling them. Day by day and hour by hour we see the wage scale advancing.

I fear that in our anxiety to prevent a rapidly rising price level we may give such broad discretion, without direction or control, that the remedy will be about as bad as if we simply ignored the remedy and took the consequences.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Senator. I believe that by the general price order we have fairly well prevented inflation. A great task of the Administration is to maintain that general order. It is a situation which, as the Senator from Georgia points out, presents a dilemma with respect to which it is most difficult to legislate.

I recognize the force of the argument that a vast amount of power has been given to the Administrator and that an additional amount is being given by this bill; but I know of no way to avoid it. I could give a great many instances with which Senators are familiar of similar grants having been made. I do not know of any grant which has ever been made by a legislative body which exceeded that conferred by the second war powers act which was sponsored by the Senator from Wyoming. There is not a commodity which we know anything about which could not be withheld from the public under the provisions of the second war powers act.

What is the experience in Canada? What is the experience in England? I did not know until the hearings, that the Canadian Parliament never passed a price-control bill; there was no legislation whatsoever upon the subject; but because the ministry was given authority by what is known as orders in council to do a great number of things, the Ministry issued orders which were tantamount to our price-control bill. That was the source of the Canadian price-control law. Likewise, I understand—I am not so familiar with this situation—it is the case of England itself with respect to price control. We have simply come into a dictatorship economy with regard to our business affairs, and I do not know how we can avoid it.

Like the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], my colleague, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and many other Senators, I should like to chart the course, so far as we can do so, by statutory enactment which the Price Administrator will take with respect to this matter; and we strove in committee to do so.

I feel that there are more limitations than Senators generally are aware of, because this bill is tied into the Price Control Act by the first sentence in section 5i which reads:

> In order fully to effectuate the purposes of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942—

And so forth. There are many limitations in the Price Control Act with which Senators are familiar.

So far as I can see, the only way to handle this situation is to limit the amount of money, as will be done by amendment, which may be used for the purposes contemplated by the bill, and to have an experience of 4 or 5 months, and, then, based upon such experience, when we appropriate larger amounts, if larger amounts be found necessary, chart a more definite course and lay down more definite limitations.

I find such Senators as my colleague and the Senator from Georgia saying that we should write the limitations into the bill; but, in the entire 2 days I have stood on my feet and argued this question, I have not heard any Senator suggest one limitation that could be placed in the statute to direct the Price Control Administrator or the Federal Loan Administrator or the Secretary of Agriculture in this respect.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator has not been listening carefully to himself. I have heard one Senator define the precise limitations I want to see in this bill, and they were enunciated clearly and distinctly and unequivocally by the junior Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN. I thank my colleague for his statement. I assume he refers to the statement I made that the operations of the bill should be confined to

such dislodgments as were caused by the war or in connection with the war effort, but I feel that that limitation is contained in the first sentence of the bill.

In order fully to effectuate the purposes of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942—

And so forth. The price-control law is, of course, an emergency measure; it is based upon the situation in which we find ourselves due to the war. My opinion is that that limitation I have indicated is already in the bill, but I have striven all along to give my own construction of what ought to guide the Price Administrator by my statements in this debate, and, in addition, there are the statements of my colleague [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and other Senators who have discussed it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield again?

Mr. BROWN. It is possible that if we should follow the course suggested by the Senator from Wyoming that something might be worked out along that line, but I am by no means sure that I would not very much prefer to limit the amount that could be used and to have the experience of a couple of months or 4 months and then legislate further on this tremendous program. I will yield to my colleague in a moment, and then I hope to conclude, but there is one further thought I desire to leave with the Senate. I feel both methods must be used, namely, an increase in prices when necessary and subsidies when necessary, and I want to give someone the authority who can intelligently decide that question. I now yield to my colleague.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In addition to the limitation which the Senator has just quoted himself as previously asserting, I remind him that he also said—and he had Mr. Henderson's word as further authority for it—that the purpose of the bill is to meet situations which arise in industry.

Mr. BROWN. As a whole.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes; in industry as a whole, instead of in respect to individual difficulties that may arise.

Mr. BROWN. Yes; I think that is true.

Mr. VANDENBERG. That is another limitation which is totally lacking in the text of the bill itself, and certainly it is lacking in the original price-control bill. So, it seems to me that the Senator's candor—and he has been wholly frank with us in dealing with this question—indicates the wisdom of adopting the motion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] so as to give the Banking and Currency Committee an opportunity to make one further effort to make the bill say what my able colleague says it is intended to mean.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I have occupied all the time I care to take upon the bill itself. I understand various amendments will be offered, and I shall have something to say when they are presented. I hope the Senate will now listen to the Senator from Ohio, who has been with me in making a thorough study of the entire subject of price control, and who, I know, will make a very valuable contribution to this debate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will recognize the Senator from Ohio just as soon as he states the question. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] to recommit House bill 7008, Calendar No. 1404, to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I yielded on the understanding—and I thought I so stated distinctly—that we would first go through with the bill and amend it, and then take up the motion of the Senator from Wyoming. I so stated to him, and I thought he understood the matter in that way. If that is not the case, I ask unanimous consent that the parliamentary status be as follows: That the Senate consider the bill and the amendments thereto, and then vote on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming, if it be in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Andrews	Glass	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Pepper
Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hayden	Rosier
Barbour	Herring	Schwartz
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Holman	Smathers
Bone	Hughes	Smith
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	La Follette	Truman
Capper	Langer	Tunnell
Caraway	Lucas	Tydings
Chavez	McCarran	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wagner
Connally	Maloney	Walsh
Danaher	Maybank	Wheeler
Davis	Mead	White
Doxey	Millikin	Wiley
Ellender	Murdock	Willis
George	Norris	
Gerry	Nye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I am advised by the parliamentarian that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] would have a right to make the motion to recommit at any time during the proceedings. Under those circumstances, I withdraw my request for unanimous consent.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the pending bill as it passed the House of Representatives merely included the provision to increase the borrowing power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by $5,000,000,000. I think there is no question about the need for that sum. Mr. Jones testified that he already had committed that amount for war purposes. It is interesting to note that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation commitments for the war to date total about $14,000,000,000, and form a very important addition to the Budget and the appropriations which we have been making for war purposes.

Section 2 was proposed by the committee. I did not have any great objection to section 2, and I have only tried to work out proper provisions in the section. It did not seem to me to add anything to the subsidy principle already established in the Price Control Act. It makes it a little clearer as to what the powers are and how they may be exercised, but the Price Control Act itself authorized the Administrator to buy or sell any commodity and sell at a loss, and to make subsidy payments to domestic producers of such commodities in such amount as he might deem necessary to secure the necessary production thereof.

That power he has apparently already exercised, because on May 20 he issued an order which provides for a subsidy for coal going to New England. He apparently issued that order under the provisions of the Price Control Act, although I think it is somewhat doubtful whether it can in fact be justified by that act, because it seems to be in form a subsidy to distributors instead of a subsidy to producers. However, this coal subsidy might have been given directly to the mines. They could be given a subsidy for all coal sold for delivery in New England, and I should think the same purpose might be accomplished within the terms of the Price Control Act, though not quite so conveniently.

Under the Price Control Act the Administrator may, with the President's authority, at least, transfer any of his power to the R. F. C., or any of its subsidiaries. Those powers may be transferred to the Commodity Credit Corporation under the Overman Act, which we reenacted. So that I see nothing which would really make it necessary to enact another law.

It seemed to me, however, that there was some advantage, if that power was a recognized power, and Congress was going to grant it, in making it perfectly clear that the powers were all-extensive, and that the Administrator could exercise them in the most convenient way. It may be more convenient in this setup, if we are to subsidize, to subsidize the distributor, instead of always going back to the producer. These alterations are minor, in my opinion, and do not change the policy of the Price Control Act.

As I understand, there are three different purposes for which the Administrator now intends to use the principle of subsidy payments. In the first place, as he told us before we enacted the Price Control Act, he has been subsidizing high-cost producers, of copper, for instance, paying 17 cents to some producers of copper, while the large producers are required to hold their selling price down to 12 cents. There is no doubt that through that operation, rather than letting the price go to 17 cents and paying everyone 17 cents, he has saved large sums to the Government of the United States. There is no question that our copper, practically all of which is consumed by the Government, is obtained by the Government at a much lower price.

The second proposed method of subsidizing has to do with extraordinary freight situations, such as are produced by the submarine campaigns on the Atlantic seaboard, and the fact that that is imposing an especially heavy burden on eastern consumers of coal and oil, whom we may wish to relieve. Mr. Henderson desires to relieve them, not for the sake of the consumers in the Eastern States but in order to prevent a general rise in the prices of coal and oil throughout the East and the inflationary effect which that might have.

I somewhat question whether that is wise. It is certainly a tremendously expensive policy. The coal order which has been issued was stated in the first instance to contemplate the expenditure during the year of $40,000,000 in the matter of coal alone. If we undertook to subsidize gasoline at anything like a dollar a barrel, it would run into a perfectly tremendous cost, something like a million dollars a day. I am not familiar with the figures, but a dollar a barrel was mentioned here yesterday. However, you may wish to pay such a subsidy.

The third method is a general subsidy in connection with the price-control system which Mr. Henderson has announced in his general freeze order. I wish to talk today principally about the question whether Congress approves of that method of fixing prices or not, because it seems to me that this general subsidy power—and it is pretty hard to restrict the purpose of the subsidy in any way—is probably a necessary incident to the price-control system which Mr. Henderson has adopted. I think the adoption of that system is absolutely contrary to the whole theory of the Price Control Act. It is contrary to the system that Mr. Henderson told us he was going to put into effect when he was before us in connection with the hearings on price control. Yet it is a popular system. We have heard over and over again about the desirability of a universal ceiling. It has apparently succeeded in Canada, or is said to have succeeded in Canada, and it may be that that system is correct. Personally I do not agree with it. I think really the question before the Senate is more whether the Senate thinks that system should be improved and implemented, or whether it is going to say, "No; we think that is an impossible system to carry out."

In the first place, the new system entirely departs from the theory of the Price Control Act. That act was based on the theory of commodity control. It was based on the theory that the Administrator would determine the price of the basic commodity in the hands of the producer or in the central market; that he would fix that price on those things that are of the most importance in our economy and leave most of the other questions alone. That he would fix that price; then he would determine what the manufacturer's cost should be and add a reasonable margin, and then perhaps add a margin for the wholesaler, and then, if necessary, for the retailer, but it was generally agreed in our committee discussion that it would be unfortunate to have to go on and regulate retail prices.

It was felt that we could enforce them by a general insistence that retailers not profiteer, and that very likely there would be no profiteering; that if the basic price were controlled, that would be sufficient. In my opinion price control can be had only if we can control the basic price.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I noticed in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a table of 20 commodities or agricultural products which are below parity, and 5 which are at parity or above parity. Was there any discussion in the committee about a subsidy for agricultural products which are below parity?

Mr. TAFT. I think it is contemplated that there might be such a subsidy. There was some discussion, for instance, of the question of bakers; how we are going to deal with the situation of bakers. Bakers say today that they are unable to operate within the price limit on bread, because of the cost of flour. Mr. Henderson said he could make millers sell flour at a low price and subsidize the millers to that extent. I do not think there was any proposal of a direct subsidy to the farmer, except in the case of sugar. We know that sugar and molasses from Cuba are being subsidized, I believe, in order to provide reasonably cheap sugar.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. But was there any discussion of subsidizing the low prices of agriculture? I notice that wheat is selling at about the same price that it was in 1896 and 1897. Bread, of course, is very much higher. I am interested in the raw products produced by the farmer which are selling at below parity by reason of the high cost of labor, of machinery, and of high taxes.

Mr. TAFT. What we did here the other day is in effect a subsidy to the corn producer, because we adopted a provision which will in effect hold the price of corn down to 82 cents, and then we adopted a parity provision providing that we are going to pay the farmer the difference between 82 cents and about 97 cents. So we have a subsidy on corn in the agricultural appropriation bill.

I think there would be nothing to prohibit the Administrator under this measure from doing something of the same sort for some other product. I do not know that it has been proposed.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I think it should be provided for, because farmers cannot live on corn alone.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is provided for, but whether the Administrator will do it I cannot say.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I think the motion of the Senator from Wyoming to recommit the bill to the committee should prevail. In my opinion, it is too complicated to work out on the floor of the Senate, even with the aid of the discussion and explanation by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN].

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, this measure, I say, departs entirely from the theory of price control which was put in the Price Control Act. In the first place, the Administrator for some reason, and I do not know why, did not fix the basic price of many commodities. Whether he was discouraged by the action of the Senate in fixing higher farm prices than he thought were right I do not know. The price of hogs today is above parity. It could be fixed by the Administrator. He did not do so, and he does not intend to do so, apparently, although he has fixed the price of all the products sold by the pork packers, and he has fixed the price of lard. I myself do not believe that prices can properly be controlled in that way. I do not think the basic prices can be controlled simply by putting a ceiling on retail prices. But that is what the Administrator has done.

Instead of proceeding immediately when the Price Control Act was passed, and fixing the price of basic products, and then waiting perhaps a month or 2 months and fixing the margin of the processor, and then waiting another month or so and fixing the margin of the wholesaler, the Administrator failed to fix the basic price, and prices began to get out of hand, they began to go up much faster than they had gone up. Then he put in this over-all ceiling, this provision that no man shall from now henceforth sell any product at a higher price than he sold it at in March. Of course, many persons have had their costs raised since March, many retailers have to pay more for their products today than they were paying in March. The result is that those who were not profiteering, who were selling their goods on the basis of what they had paid for them perhaps back in January, are now squeezed so that they have to pay more for the products they are buying, and yet they cannot raise the price of the things they are selling. That system is in itself unfair. It is also very awkward, because it results in one retailer on one side of the street having to sell the product at one price and the retailer on the other side of the street having to sell it at a lower price. The man who profiteered in March is able to get more for his goods, and go on profiteering, or at least is now getting a reasonable return, whereas the one who was conscientious and held his prices down is forever held to those lower prices.

Mr. President, I think the system is unscientific, and I believe, unless some adjustment is made, it will result in practically driving out of business a large number of retailers and wholesalers.

There are other instances in which production is absolutely going to be stopped. Take the case of the three oils—soybean oil, cottonseed oil, and lard. The price was all fixed, and has been fixed at something in the neighborhood of 12 cents a pound. Today a man cannot go out and buy soybeans at the prevailing price and turn them into soybean oil and soybean meal and do better than lose 10 cents a bushel. Today no soybean mill in the United States is able to buy soybeans, and the processing of soybeans is stopped. The situation is almost as bad in the case of cottonseed. Fortunately, it is not the time of the year when cottonseed is ordinarily processed, but the price of cottonseed could be fixed

today at $50 a ton and, at that price, it might be necessary to raise a little the price of oil, but not a great deal. But, unless some change is made in that situation, cottonseed mills are simply not going to be able to buy at the prevailing price.

Mr. President, I do not understand why the prices of basic products are not fixed first and then a proper margin given to the distributor. Furthermore, I do not believe this kind of a rigid system has ever worked out, and I do not believe it can work. Mr. Henderson said:

> We are going to hold retail prices where they are, and if I am convinced that a retailer is absolutely going to be ruined, then I shall go back to the wholesaler and say, "I am going to reduce your March price. You can no longer sell at the March price, but you must reduce it so that the retailer can get more money." Then, if the wholesaler cannot absorb that reduction, I will go back to the manufacturer and say, "You have got to sell to the wholesaler at a lower price."

There are two results which will flow from that. When we asked him about the price of hogs he said:

> Well, it is not necessary to fix the price of hogs because fixing the price of the products would fix the price of hogs. No packer would be able to pay more than a certain price for hogs.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. The chief independent packing plant in Colorado has closed under the operation of the theory the Senator is discussing.

Mr. TAFT. Packing plants in Ohio have closed down because they cannot possibly buy hogs at the present price and sell them at the price the Administrator has fixed on products of pork. The Administrator said this will force down the price of hogs. When I asked him distinctly if it was the idea to control all products, and gradually push down the price of basic products, agricultural and otherwise, below perhaps the ceiling we have fixed in some cases, at least below that ceiling, then, of course, he strenuously denied that that was his purpose. I do not believe he would be able to do it very effectively anyway.

However, that seems to be the only rational theory on which I can interpret the policy. The only other theory is that the manufacturers are all to be subsidized. Having forced the price back to the manufacturers, it being perfectly apparent that under the act the manufacturer is entitled to a fair price, instead of giving him that increase, it is perfectly possible to subsidize him instead, and that seems to be the policy Mr. Henderson is adopting. That is what he wants the money for.

Frankly, if we are to adhere to a rigid price policy, I do not see any other result. Mr. Henderson wants us to say that we will not let retail prices go up one cent. He said the Canadian administrator told him that one of the mistakes they had made was to raise prices somewhere—"puncture the ceiling," as he said. If we are to adhere to a rigid price policy, extensive subsidy seems to me to be probably necessary.

I do not think the policy is wise. I do not think it is fair. I do not think it is in accord with the policy which the Congress set out in the Price-Control Act. We said then that we did not want agricultural prices below 110 percent of parity. That may have been right or may have been wrong. Certainly the idea was that we thought that any prices which were subnormal—and we thought agricultural prices were subnormal—should be allowed to come up to the general level of prices. It was the same in the wage field. The theory has been that wages should be allowed to go up in places where there were subnormal wages or where the cost of living had gone up.

I think that policy of stabilization could be successful. It is different from the rigid policy. It goes on the theory that we are to back up gradually. We may have a 12 or 15 percent increase in prices the first year. Then we can gradually slow down the increase. We do not propose to give anybody quite the raise which corresponds to the raise in wages. We do not propose to give anybody a raise which quite corresponds to the increase in the cost of living. The plan is to slow the thing up until we stabilize conditions, perhaps after 2 years.

I do not think there is any great harm in an increase of 20 to 25 percent in prices. What I am concerned about is prices getting away from us entirely. I am concerned about a possible increase in prices of 100 percent or 120 percent such as we had during the World War, or 200 or 300 percent such as occurred in many European countries. I think it is better to make the adjustments which ought to be made and to let prices go up a little, and then try to even out the whole thing and gradually slow it up.

That seemed to be the theory of the Congress in fixing minimum agricultural prices well above where they were at the time we fixed those prices. We certainly contemplated the possibility of some price increases which would be reflected in food, and might be reflected to some extent in wages.

Again, I do not believe that the rigid theory will work unless we fix wages. Take the shipyard decision the other day. The men said, "We will not insist on a flat increase in accordance with the contract, to equal the percentage increase in the cost of living." However, they obtained half of that increase. They obtained a substantial increase in wages. I think it was about 8 percent. In that instance we certainly have punctured the ceiling, and increased the cost of ships. Again we have the effect of some increase in prices. Somebody is squeezed somewhere when we permit such an increase.

I do not believe that we should hold wages absolutely where they are. I think there should have been some leeway. However, certainly if we are to make the rigid system a success, we shall have to fix wages. Today there is no provision of any sort for fixing wages, or giving anybody the power to do so. All we have is a sentence contained in the President's broadcast to the Nation, in which he said that wages should not be increased. He implied that they should not be increased even to meet any cost-of-living increases. However, there is no direction to anyone. He has not directed the War Production Board to follow that policy. It has given some indication that it intends to follow it when it pleases, but it has no orders to do so.

There is no law affecting voluntary increases. Many employers may prefer to give a voluntary increase rather than to go before the War Labor Board and fight out the questions of the closed shop, and many other questions which arise in any controverted case.

For months we have had before our Committee on Education and Labor the bill of the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], providing for the fixing of wages. The bill provides that the War Labor Board shall not increase wages, with certain exceptions. It provides that no agreement with employees affecting more than 50 employees shall put into effect any increase at all unless it is passed upon by the War Labor Board.

It seems to me that if we are to go through with the theory of a rigid ceiling we shall have to go through with the Ball bill, providing a rigid ceiling on wages, if we hope to have that plan effective.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Notwithstanding the speeches being made about prices skyrocketing and wages going up, is it not a fact that during recent weeks prices have not gone up?

Mr. TAFT. It is difficult to obtain very recent prices. The Bureau of Labor Statistics is approximately 2 months behind; and I think Mr. Henderson stated that prices had gone up about 2 percent in the 30 days before he appeared before our committee, and that that rate represented an increase in the rate of rise.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. With the Senator's permission I should like to call his attention to some facts and figures from the Department of Labor, which, as I construe them, are strictly complimentary to the manager of our price-control system, Mr. Henderson.

The act giving Mr. Henderson this authority was approved on the 30th of January. At that time the price level, as shown by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, stood at 95.9. That price level is the average price of some 900 commodities, figured over a period of time. As I have stated, when the law became effective on January 30 the price level stood at 95.9. Since that time the price level has gone up, until on last Thursday it stood at 96.6, which is an increase of only two or three points since the law became effective.

I may observe further that during the past 6 weeks, taking April 16 as the date of beginning, and May 21, which was last Thursday, as the date of ending, the price levels increased only from 98.1 to 98.6, or one-half of 1 percent increase in the general price level in the past 6 weeks. During some of those weeks, instead of the price level increasing a fraction of a point, it actually decreased a fraction of a point.

Mr. TAFT. I agree with the Senator. I think that Mr. Henderson was panic-stricken by facts which did not justify any such panic.

I think I am correct in saying that the act did not contemplate any such rigid system as Mr. Henderson has imposed. Look at the provisions of section 2 (a) of the Price Control Act:

> So far as practicable, in establishing any maximum price, the Administrator shall ascertain and give due consideration to the prices prevailing between October 1 and October 15, 1941 (or if, in the case of any commodity, there are no prevailing prices between such dates, or the prevailing prices between such dates are not generally representative because of abnormal or seasonal market conditions or other cause, then to the prices prevailing during the nearest 2-week period in which, in the judgment of the Administrator, the prices for such commodity are generally representative), for the commodity or commodities included under such regulation or order, and shall make adjustments for such relevant factors as he may determine and deem to be of general applicability, including the following: Speculative fluctuations, general increases or decreases in costs of production, distribution, and transportation, and general increases or decreases in profits earned by sellers of the commodity or commodities, during and subsequent to the year ended October 1, 1941.

In this order the Administrator has not given the slightest consideration to the prices between October 1 and October 15. He has not paid any attention whatever to the provisions of the Price Control Act. He has not given any effect whatever to the increases in costs between October and March. The act says that if the prevailing prices between such dates are not generally representative because of abnormal or seasonal market conditions, or other causes, then he shall follow the prices prevailing during the nearest 2-week period in which, in the judgment of the Administrator, prices are generally representative. Even assuming that he could get away from the October date under that clause—which I do not think he can—it provides a 2-week period and not a 4-week period such as he has actually accepted in this order. When that was pointed out to him he said, "All the act says is that, so far as practicable, in establishing maximum prices the Administrator shall use the October date."

Of course, Congress is to blame. When we say "so far as practicable," in effect we nullify what we say. We have repeated instances of that kind of legislation. I trust this may be a warning to us to be more careful in our choice of language.

In any event, as I see it, the Administrator has not followed the Price Control Act, and I do not believe his theory is going to work. I do not think it will work unless it is extended definitely to wages. If we want to support that theory—and it has responsible support—then we ought to pass a wage-control act.

Furthermore, it certainly will not work unless we adopt a more sound fiscal policy. No possible price-control system ever will work unless the fiscal policy underlying the system is sound. Today I do not know what the Treasury is going to do. I do not know what its plan is. Certainly its plans are incomplete.

It is said that we face a Government expenditure next year of $77,000,000,000. The forthcoming tax bill will provide about $25,000,000,000 from taxes, leaving a deficit of more than $50,000,000,000. The only bond program I know of contemplates the sale of about $15,000,000,000 of bonds to the people. That is Mr. Morgenthau's goal. That leaves a gap of $35,000,000,000—or probably $30,000,000,000, because there are some other outlets for the sale of bonds—to be sold to the banks. In other words, unless some new policy is adopted, we are to create $30,000,000,000 of purchasing power out of thin air, and it will beat against this price structure. Certainly a rigid structure of this kind will collapse under any such practice. Already we begin to hear about "black markets" in this country, as they have occurred in Germany and in England. Bootlegging is just as easy in regard to any other product as it was with regard to liquor.

Certainly we must have some plan of selling the bonds but there is none. Today the total program for the fiscal year 1943 is to sell approximately $17,00,000,000 of bonds. That would leave the commercial banks to take approximately $30,000,000,000 worth of bonds. The sale of savings bonds certainly is not keeping up with that schedule. A billion dollars' worth of savings bonds was sold in January, $703,000,000 worth in February, and only $557,000,000 worth in March, in the Savings-bond program which contemplated the sale of at least $1,000,000,000 a month during the year 1942.

I may add that the figures show that in the last 6 months there has been a substantial inflation of bank credit; between April 1 and May 13 the public debt increased $3,700,000,000. Since May 13, which was only 10 days ago, it has further increased to the extent of $1,700,000,000. So since the 1st of April there has been an increase of approximately $5,400,000,000. At the same time banks' holdings of Governments during the 6 weeks from April 1 to May 13 have increased by $2,000,000,000, with an inflationary effect at least equal to the whole payment of the bonus back in 1936, if that was the year of its payment. The commercial deposits have increased nearly $3,000,000,000 in 6 weeks. That is the most rapid increase which we have seen at any time during the past few years, and it simply shows that today we are practically printing paper money. We are creating purchasing power, as I say, out of thin air; and if we have anything like $2,000,000,000 or $3,000,000,000 of purchasing power beating against the proposed rigid price structure, it will collapse with a crash. So we certainly cannot hope to have this kind of system operate successfully unless we change our fiscal policy.

The proposed method also is infinitely complicated and infinitely expensive. I shudder when I read of the request of Mr. Henderson for $200,000,000 in order to pay the wages of 100,000 employees for the enforcement of this kind of a price-fixing system. I do not know whether there is any significance in the fact that the proposal for the employment of 100,000 persons was made the same day we were told that probably 100,000 persons could be cut off the W. P. A. I do not know whether the W. P. A. force is to be transferred to the Office of Price Administration in whole or in part; but at least it seemed to me a rather strange coincidence.

I do not believe we need 100,000 employees in order to enforce a reasonable price control system. However, if we do intend to fix and to control the price of every lady's hat, of every shoelace in the United States, perhaps 100,000 employees will be necessary.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If, in addition to that, it is proposed to subsidize every operator in this country, from the operator of a peanut stand to the operator of a major corporation, another 100,000 employees would be needed, would they not, in order to enforce such a program?

Mr. TAFT. I should hope that the subsidy business would be confined to a limited number of articles and a limited number of processers. However, of course, I agree with the Senator. I hoped that the program of the Price Control Act also would be confined to the control of a few persons at the source, and that there should not be any attempt to deal with every retailer in the United States.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator finds no such limitations in the text of the pending bill; does he?

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not. If the amount is limited, I think it will be a considerable deterrent to any such proposal.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit me again to interrupt him, let me say that I remember he said a short time ago, while my colleague was speaking, that except as there was a subsidy system, the rigid price-control method would ruin four-fifths of the small business men of the country. Did not the Senator say that?

Mr. TAFT. I did. Mr. Henderson, however, takes the position that there are other things which can be done, that he can standardize products, that he can reduce certain costs of distribution, that he can bring about certain reforms and changes in the system, which will enable him to hold down prices without ruining the smaller distributors, or subsidizing.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am speaking about the Senator's theory. The Senator says that such a limitation of the appropriation, holding the appropriation for subsidy purposes down to $500,000,000. will be an effective limitation upon the use of the subsidy. Yet in the next breath the Senator says that it will be necessary to have sufficient subsidy to save four-fifths of the businesses of the United States. So either the Senator is saying that the limitation is impractical or else he is saying that it will not work at all.

Mr. TAFT. I am saying that if Mr. Henderson can do the subsidy job with half a billion dollars, and if that will en-

able the system to succeed, I do not greatly object to letting him have the $500,000,000. However, I think that a general subsidy, if we have to go to a general subsidy system, would be just as inflationary as to permit a rise in prices. If Mr. Henderson could not get along with $500,000,000, I should say that the plan would be a failure and could not be made to work, and that I would be entirely right, and that he would be entirely wrong. However, he says I am wrong.

I am telling the Senator what I think would happen, and what I think the situation is. Mr. Henderson says I am wrong; he says he will not have to increase the number who would have to be subsidized, that he can squeeze them down, and that they are not going to go out of business.

I do not agree with him. I do not think he is going to let them go out of business, because, in my judgment, public opinion will be so strong that it will break his ceilings loose before that happens. However, if by a subsidy plan involving the expenditure of $500,000,000 he thinks he can hold rigid the price system, and if we provide a proper fiscal system and control wages, I am not unwilling to give him a chance to try it out and to make a success of it if he can. After all, Mr. Baruch and the Canadians all say it can be done. I am not expert on the question, and I may be wrong.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The only time when I fail to find the Senator as lucid and as consistent as he usually is is when he says, as he has to, that the authority contained in the pending bill is unlimited, by embracing and covering every business operation in this land; and yet he says it can be effectively limited by a little amendment in the mathematics which would confine the commitment to $500,000,000. Either the limitation is a false pretense or else the Senator is wrong.

Mr. TAFT. No; I do not think so necessarily. For instance, a great many things could have been subsidized, but at first we subsidized only copper. For a small sum we succeeded in saving a great deal of money.

If the proposal is to extend the subsidy system to all commodities and articles, if it is necessary to extend it, as I am afraid it will be, it would require billions of dollars, and it would not prevent inflation; it would be just as inflationary as the other process, because the Government would have to borrow that much more money in order to pay the subsidies.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Now, the Senator has arrived at exactly the point at which I started; and we are in agreement.

Mr. TAFT. In the first place, the act already gives the power. In the second place, Mr. Henderson thinks he can do it without spending more than $500,000,000. If he can, I think that is not too much to pay. But that will not enable any general subsidy system to be put into effect. He would have to confine it to a limited number of essential products the prices of which he thinks it is important to control and to hold down.

At the same time I call attention to the 100,000 employees, I desire to call attention to the forms which Mr. Henderson is sending, apparently, to every manufacturer in the United States. I have in my hand a form "A," entitled "Annual Financial Report," comprising some 26 pages, and an interim financial report comprising 12 pages, which, according to the information I have, will take an accountant for a medium-sized company about a week to make out in order to provide the information. I do not believe that kind of thing was contemplated by the Price Control Act. I do not believe it would be necessary for the kind of price-control system we started to inaugurate during the World War. I do not believe it is essential to a reasonable system of price control, and I think it simply imposes an additional burden on every businessman who can hardly carry on with the margins which are now prescribed.

Mr. President, the only reason I favor any system is that I believe that the inflation of prices in large percentage, the failure to control prices, is one of the worst things that can happen to the country. It certainly penalizes wage earners, and, even more, it penalizes people with small salaries. It destroys the value of savings and life insurance which people have spent their whole lives in building up. It increases the cost of the war. It creates unlimited dissatisfaction and disunity in the United States; and, finally, if we permit prices to go up in that way, it will make it much more difficult to get back to the normal free-enterprise system after the war. The adjustments which will have to be made will be so great and the effect of Government control which will be necessary will be so great that I doubt very much whether we can successfully get back to a free-enterprise system if we permit inflation of two or three hundred percent to occur. So I am willing to go a long way in giving power.

Only the other day Herbert Hoover, the former Food Administrator and President of the United States, said that in time of war he felt that the Executive should be given dictatorial powers in economic questions, including control of commodities and prices, simply because the subject is so complicated, the different kinds of remedies are so numerous, the agencies that must be used are of such varied character, that it is almost impossible to legislate; and when the Administrator comes and asks for those powers, I am inclined to give them to him, if he can make out any kind of a reasonable case indicating that he can use them successfully.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I heard the Senator's reference to the post-war return to a system of free enterprise. I do not know how much of his present thinking is geared to that particular objective. Did the Senator see the report in today's press indicating that Mr. Henderson yesterday, testifying before a House committee, said that price controls must be continued after the war?

Mr. TAFT. I did, and I disagree with Mr. Henderson, although I think that depends upon how much prices shall have gone up. If they are entirely normal when the war ends, if we have succeeded in holding them down, I should say there will be no necessity of continuing price control for long. On the other hand, if prices have gone up 100 percent, it will certainly be necessary to continue price control. Fortunately, that question rests entirely with the Congress, because the present Price Control Act will expire on the 1st of July 1943, and unless Congress sees fit to continue it, it cannot be continued.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN. I wanted to state two things: First, that the experience of the World War, which we hope will not be repeated following the present war because of present controls which are much more effective than those during the World War, was that the great rise in prices occurred a year and a half, or 18 months, after the signing of the Armistice.

As I have said on other occasions, and, as the Senator from Ohio intimates, if the condition prevails that we shall have abnormally high prices at the end of present hostilities. I think price control might be necessary, but if we maintain the prices as we have done, it seems to me it will be unnecessary.

When I rose before the Senator from Ohio had finished his statement, I did so for the purpose of pointing out that the continuation of price control is entirely up to the Congress, because the Price Control Act will expire on June 30, 1943, as the Senator from Connecticut well knows, and how far we may then have to extend it is up to Congress and not to the administrative authorities.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield further?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, it was with some reluctance, I most freely confess, that I was willing to vote to report the pending bill from the committee. I do not know whether or not the Senator from Ohio will consider it a fair and proper inquiry for me to suggest to him at this time. I am wondering, if he so chooses, whether or not he would comment on how far we could operate to attain proper results, were we to revert to the Senate bill rather than to take the House bill as amended which is now before the Senate?

Let me recall to the Senate that as the matter first came to us as Senate bill 2485 it was provided simply—

That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is

authorized to issue and have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by $5,000,000,000.

Would the Senator choose to comment as to how far he believes reverting to the Senate bill would be effective in obtaining the objectives claimed for the House bill as amended?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, neither the House bill nor the Senate bill contained section 2. That section was put in by the committee as an amendment to the House bill. Of course, I have been discussing that amendment. I myself think, as I said when I began my remarks, that section 2 is not very important, because, as I see it, every power given in the bill can now be exercised under the Price Control Act itself.

So it does not make very much difference, to my mind, whether we pass the bill as amended or do not pass it; but I do think it is important that the Senate realize, if they are going to put their O. K., so to speak, on the subsidy policy, that it is not going to work unless much more is done by way of changing the fiscal system, and including wages in the set-up. Personally, so far as I am concerned, if the Senate wants to disapprove Mr. Henderson's new price fixing theory, I would vote for that, too, but if we are going to let him go on, I shall raise no objection to this bill, and I am rather inclined to give him the slight additional authority given by section 2.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator will recall that in the Price Control Act we did authorize subsidy payments to R. F. C. creature corporations dealing in critical and strategic materials, but we also limited marginal payments authorized in section 3 to the purposes therein stated.

Now, if we were to implement the R. F. C. by granting it additional borrowing power, the use of the fund of $5,000,000,000 would, at least, be limited to the purposes expressly stated in the original emergency Price Control Act, would they not?

Mr. TAFT. I think the purposes originally stated in the Emergency Price Control Act are broad enough to enable the Administrator to do any of the things we are now again proposing to authorize him to do. The Overman Act permits the President to transfer administrative powers to the R. F. C. and the Commodity Credit Corporation or to anyone else.

I asked Mr. Jones why he wanted this bill. He asked for the bill; Mr. Henderson did not. Mr. Jones appeared before our committee and wanted the bill. He was not satisfied with the exact powers of the Price Control Act, and wanted it clarified somewhat and direct power given to the R. F. C. I asked him why he wanted it, and it did not seem to me his answer was very convincing. This bill would make it a little clearer; it would make the law a little more definite; and he would not have to meet so many legal objections, but there are very few people in the administration who seem to be bothered by difficulties of legal construction.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield further to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. DANAHER. I pursue the subject only a moment. I am not so certain that I agree altogether with the last answer given by the Senator from Ohio, particularly in the light of a comment by Mr. Hamilton, general counsel of the R. F. C., who pointed out—and I quote from page 24 of part I of the hearings—

These defense corporations have a right to buy and sell strategic materials at a loss. But this language would go beyond that. Furthermore—

And this is what is significant, it seems to me—

Furthermore, it contemplates assistance where the purpose is not strictly the stimulation of production.

So that were we to revert solely to the powers and purposes, particularly the purposes stated in section 3 of the Emergency Price Control Act, plus the authorization of the subsidy to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation creature corporations, we would be going, I think, as far as properly we should go in this direction.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I conclude what I have to say. I do not think section 2 is of great importance. I am inclined to go along with the committee and support it because I think the bill makes Mr. Henderson's powers a little clearer. But if we do go through with it, we ought to be particularly careful that we are not supporting, or giving moral support, at least, to a new rigid system of price fixing. We are obligated, if we do that, to go on, first, to the fixing of wages, so that the whole rigid theory may be carried through; and, second, we are obligated to go on in some way to try to reduce the pressure on prices by adopting a reasonable taxation and bond-selling program, which will not load the commercial banks with an unlimited amount, say, $30,000,000,000 a year, of Government bonds, with the resulting increase in deposits and the resulting increase in purchasing power. We ought to go all one way or we ought to go all the other. For the present, if the Senate wants to disapprove the whole Henderson theory, then, I think section 2 ought to be eliminated.

Mr. TAFT subsequently said: Mr. President, coincident with and in connection with my remarks earlier this afternoon in regard to the fixing of prices, I was just called to the telephone and talked to a member of the Schlachter Co., small packers of Cincinnati. He told me that at the present price of beef in Cincinnati, which is 22 cents a pound, his company, under the price ceiling set by the Price Administration for beef products, loses on every head of cattle it buys to slaughter. He advised me that this week he bought 26 cattle, whereas he usually buys about three times that number, simply to try to hold on to his trade, but at a loss on every head of cattle he has purchased. One of the other smaller packers of Cincinnati has gone out of business.

The method of fixing prices of products does not hold down the price of raw materials. The larger packers are willing to pay a little more; they will have to pay their profits mostly in taxes anyway, and they are able to carry on through this period, but unless something is done to adjust the situation in the packing industry, as in many other industries, all the smaller units will simply be forced out of business.

It seems to me essential that the Price Administrator proceed in accordance with the rules laid down in the price-control bill, and that he either raise the prices of products or that he fix the price of raw materials. The price of beef is today 22 cents in Cincinnati whereas the ceiling price on beef products under the price-control bill was fixed at 9.38 cents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] that the bill be recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I desire to make a statement, but I should like to have the Senator from Wyoming present.

Mr. BROWN. I have sent for the Senator from Wyoming, and he will no doubt be in the Chamber within a short time.

Mr. BARKLEY. I desire to make a brief observation which may determine the course of the pending legislation in the immediate future.

The bill which is before the Senate is a House bill, which would merely increase the borrowing power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. As has already been stated, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has made commitments which would almost absorb the $5,000,000,000 by which we are asked to increase its lending power.

When the bill came to the Senate and was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, the other matters which now appear in the bill were brought before the committee as amendments. They have no direct relationship to the original bill, which merely increased the lending power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. They really affect the Price Control Act more than they affect the authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. There was controversy in the committee over the amendments, and on them hearings were held—not lengthy, but I think rather good hearings.

The only controversy over the bill revolves around the committee amendments affecting the Price Control Act, the subsidies, and other things which have relation thereto. As the debate has proceeded, it has become obvious that there is some confusion, and a considerable amount of controversy, over the committee amendments, and the effect they would have upon the Price Control Act with respect to the subsidizing of businesses of various kinds which might be injured by the administration of the Price Control Act inevitably and unavoidably.

In view of all that, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] has made a

motion to recommit the whole bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and my canvass of the situation in the Senate leads me to the conclusion that the motion will prevail if voted on as the bill stands.

I am sure that no one wishes to delay the enactment of that part of the bill which increases the borrowing power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and for that reason I should regret to see the whole bill recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and any delay incurred in the passage of that portion of the bill, or of the remainder of it, for that matter, as delay would occur if the Committee on Banking and Currency must again go into the whole matter.

For these reasons I have suggested to the Senator from Wyoming and to the Senator from Michigan that we eliminate the committee amendments and act upon the bill as it passed the House, increasing the borrowing power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and let the Committee on Banking and Currency give further consideration, and if necessary hold further hearings, on the other aspects of the bill which are not directly related to the bill as it came originally from the House.

I myself think that would be better than to have the whole bill recommitted, and that part of it which is so essential and upon which commitments have already been made delayed while we are threshing out the other controversial features of the proposed legislation.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I am in accord with the views expressed by the able leader of the Senate. I am sure there would be votes in sufficient number to recommit the bill. I certainly should support that action. But I believe that, with the elimination of the committee amendments, the bill should pass, and that it would pass if presented in that form. I rose to ask this question: Would the proposed action merely mean that we would disagree to the committee amendments and pass the bill as it came from the House?

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes. I believe it would be better for all interests concerned to do that, rather than have the entire bill recommitted, including that portion of it to which there is no serious objection, that it would be better to reject the committee amendments, about which there is controversy, and pass the bill as it came from the House, providing an increase in the authority of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, because if the bill goes back to the committee, it would all have to be reconsidered anyway, and those who are interested in the proposals embodied in the amendments would be no worse off by their elimination now than they would be if the whole bill were recommitted to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I should like to have the reaction of the Senator from Michigan. I stated a moment ago that I had conferred with him on the subject, as well as with the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I wish to say to the Senator from Kentucky, and to the Senate, that I am satisfied, from a canvass of the Senate, that the motion made by the Senator from Wyoming would prevail, and I think it would be unfortunate, as has been stated by both the majority and minority leaders, to defer further the question of the $5,000,000,000 increase in funds available to the R. F. C., an authorization which is badly needed.

If the Senator from Wyoming is willing to withdraw his motion, after consultation with the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], I am agreeable to making a motion to reject the committee amendments and to pass the bill as it came from the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should have said, but I did not do so because I overlooked it, that I had conferred with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency. The simple way to arrive at what seems to be the better policy is merely to reject the committee amendments when they are presented to the Senate, and then pass the bill as it was passed by the House.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the position taken now by the able Senator from Michigan, and the distinguished majority leader is that they will both ask the Senate to reject the amendments, and to pass the bill without any of the amendments, recommended by the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is the substance of the suggestion which I made, and which seems to be agreeable.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am altogether in accord with that request. My purpose in offering the motion to recommit was solely to provide a greater opportunity for the committee to study the amendments which were added by the Committee on Banking and Currency. My motion was not at all directed against the bill as it passed the House. Therefore, Mr. President, with that understanding, I withdraw my motion to recommit.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say also that the action which is now being suggested does not prejudge in any way the merits of the amendments which were presented by the committee.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of course not.

Mr. BARKLEY. It merely means they will be given a restudy by the committee, in view of the situation which has developed since they were reported.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me say in that connection that I made the motion in the first instance, after having said to the Senator from Michigan, that we all recognized the diligent study which he had given to this matter. I felt that there were objectives in the amendments which it might be desirable to attain. I felt that the amendments had not been sufficiently considered, because so many suggestions for altering the provisions had been made from the floor. I wish to make it clear that I am not attempting to prejudge the question upon its merits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] withdraws his motion to recommit the bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The question now reverts to the amendment of the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 7008) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The amendment to the title was rejected.

E. P. CORLEY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BROWN submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4092) for the relief of E. P. Corley, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "$500" insert "$750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
JOSEPH ROSIER,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
THOMAS D. WINTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

REDUCED RATES OF INTEREST ON AGRICULTURAL LOANS

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I desire to have the Senate proceed to the consideration of a bill in which there is general interest, to extend the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans. We have passed measures similar to this from time to time. The House passed a similar bill yesterday, and it is now on the desk. I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the bill passed by the House yesterday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives.

The bill (H. R. 6315) to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans was read twice by title.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill just laid before the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, I move to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to substitute Senate bill 2544.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) the first sentence of paragraph twelfth of section 12 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended (relating to the 3½-percent interest rate on

Federal land bank loans), is amended by striking out "occurring within a period of 7 years commencing July 1, 1935," and inserting in lieu thereof "occurring within a period of 9 years commencing July 1, 1935."

(b) Said paragraph Twelfth, as amended, is further amended by inserting immediately following the second sentence of said paragraph the following: "The foregoing provisions shall also apply to interest on so-called purchase-money mortgages and on real-estate-sales contracts taken by the Federal land banks which is payable on installment dates occurring after June 30, 1942, except that in the case of such mortgages and contracts the rate of interest shall be one-half of 1 percent per annum in excess of the rate paid by borrowers on mortgage loans made through national farm loan associations."

(c) The fourth sentence of said paragraph Twelfth (relating to the 1942 time limit on payments made by the United States to land banks on account of such interest reduction), is amended to read as follows: "No payments shall be made to a bank with respect to any period after June 30, 1944."

SEC. 2. The last paragraph of section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended (relating to reduction in the interest rate on loans by the Land Bank Commissioner), is amended to read as follows: "Notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the rate of interest on loans made under this section shall not exceed 4 percent per annum for all interest payable on installment dates occurring on or after July 22, 1937, and prior to July 1, 1940, and shall not exceed 3½ percent per annum for all interest payable on installment dates occurring on or after July 1, 1940, and prior to July 1, 1944. Notwithstanding the interest rate provided for in so-called purchase-money mortgages and real-estate-sales contracts taken by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, the rate of interest payable on such mortgages and contracts shall not exceed 4 percent per annum for all interest on installment dates occurring on and after July 1, 1942, and prior to July 1, 1944."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6315) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I move that the Senate insist on its amendment, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. HERRING, Mr. CLARK of Idaho, Mr. DANAHER, and Mr. BALL conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. BANKHEAD. I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 2544 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. STEAGALL, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. WOLCOTT, and Mr. CRAWFORD were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

CELEBRATION OF TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Library, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate bill 2330, which is intended to enable the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans. A few weeks ago we passed a House bill which was thought to effect the purposes sought in the Senate bill, but it turns out that that was the wrong bill, and that the Senate bill is the correct bill. I ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two-hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson, established by the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution to establish a commission for the celebration of the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson", approved September 24, 1940 (hereinafter referred to as "the Commission"), is authorized and directed to prepare as a congressional memorial to Thomas Jefferson a new edition of the writings of Thomas Jefferson, including additional material and unpublished manuscripts preserved in the Library of Congress and elsewhere, at a cost not to exceed $15,000 for the preparation of the manuscript.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission is authorized and directed to—

(1) arrange for memorial meetings and exercises in the year 1943 in the city of Washington and other cities and places in the United States particularly associated with the memory of Thomas Jefferson, and in universities, schools, and colleges throughout the United States; to carry out and give effect to the approved plan and program heretofore submitted to the Congress, at a cost not to exceed $10,000;

(2) to prepare and produce for use at such memorial meetings and exercises a motion picture of the main events in the life of Thomas Jefferson at a cost not to exceed $10,000;

(b) to carry out the provisions of this section only the Commission is authorized to have printing, binding, lithographing, and other work done at establishments other than the Government Printing Office.

SEC. 3. The Commission is authorized to employ, without regard to the civil-service laws, and without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to fix the compensation of an historian, an executive secretary, and such assistants as may be needed for stenographic, clerical, and expert service within the appropriations made by Congress from time to time for such purposes, which appropriations are hereby authorized.

SEC. 4. In carrying out the provisions of this or any other act relating to the celebration of the two-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson, the Commission is authorized to procure advice and assistance from any governmental agency, including the services of technical and other personnel in the executive departments and independent establishments, and to procure advice and assistance from and to cooperate with individuals and agencies, public or private. The Superintendent of Documents shall make available to the Commission the facilities of his office for the distribution of the portraits herein authorized.

SEC. 5. The members and employees of the Commission shall be allowed actual traveling, subsistence, and other expenses incurred in the discharge of their duties. All expenses of the Commission shall be paid by the disbursing officer of the Commission upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the executive committee of the Commission.

SEC. 6. Unexpended balances of appropriations authorized under the provisions of this act shall remain available until expended.

SEC. 7. The United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two-Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson may hereafter be referred to as the "Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission."

ANTITRUST LAWS—NOTICE OF HEARING OF SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, earlier in the day the distinguished senior Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] asked for the appointment of conferees on the so-called little-business bill, Senate bill 2250. I made mention of the fact yesterday that while this measure was under consideration in the House an amendment was added the purpose of which is to exempt from the antitrust laws certain corporations and individuals who may be engaged upon war contracts. The substance of that provision was under consideration in the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, a subcommittee having been appointed and having had several conferences with the Department of Justice.

I desire to announce in the presence of the Senator from New York that the subcommittee is to hold a hearing tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock in the Judiciary Committee room, at which will appear the Attorney General, Mr. Biddle, and the Under Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson. I think it would be helpful if the Senate conferees on the little-business bill, or at least one or more of them, appear at that hearing. What may be developed, of course, I have no means of knowing. It is quite conceivable that the Committee on the Judiciary might desire to make recommendations to the conferees. It might indeed be desirable to ask the conferees on the part of the Senate to reject the amendment which was added in the House. I do not suggest now that that request will be made, but I think it would be helpful to the full consideration of this measure if the conferees should be present, because they might feel that it may be a happy solution if the recommendation of the Judiciary Committee be adopted by the Senate conferees instead of precipitating a disagreement.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, with reference to the matter to which the Senator is speaking, the members of the subcommittee, of which I appear to be the chairman, and of which the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are members, will attend the hearing tomorrow morning, and I announce

to the other members that this will be notice to them that the Senate conferees will attend the hearing to be held in the Judiciary Committee room.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I thank the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. WAGNER. The Senator from New York certainly will be present.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of bills on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1353, at which point we ended consideration of bills at the last call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to state the bills on the calendar, beginning with Calendar No. 1353, on page 7.

HAROLD W. BURCH AND LUCILLE M. BURCH

The bill (H. R. 5955) for the relief of Harold W. Burch and Lucille M. Burch was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANCIS CORWIN CIRCLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5070) for the relief of Francis Corwin Circle, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$7,500", and to insert "$4,110.85."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RUTH D. AND HENRY L. BRITTINGHAM

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2273) for the relief of Ruth D. and Henry L. Brittingham, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$7,349.20" and to insert "$5,499.20", and in line 8, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$4,500" and to insert "$3,084.40", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ruth D. Brittingham, of Washington, D. C., the sum of $5,499.20 and to Henry L. Brittingham, of Washington, D. C., the sum of $3,084.40, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries and property damage sustained by them when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a United States Army truck on August 2, 1941, while traveling along United States Highway No. 113, near Dover, Del.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

OWYHEE RECLAMATION PROJECT, OREGON

The bill (H. R. 5142) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the claims of any landowner or water user on the Owyhee reclamation project, Oregon, arising in 1940 by reason of a break in the North Canal of such project, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RELATIVE RANK OF MEMBERS OF NAVY NURSE CORPS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2454) to prescribe the relative rank of members of the Navy Nurse Corps in relation to commissioned officers of the Navy, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an amendment on page 1, line 7, after the word "superintendent", to insert "not to exceed 1 for each 300 members of the Navy Nurse Corps", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter the members of the Navy Nurse Corps shall have relative rank as follows:

(a) The superintendent, the relative rank of lieutenant commander.

(b) The assistant superintendents, not to exceed 1 for each 300 members of the Navy Nurse Corps, the relative rank of lieutenant.

(c) Chief nurses, the relative rank of lieutenant (junior grade).

(d) Nurses, the relative rank of ensign.

SEC. 2. As regards medical and sanitary matters and all other work within the line of their professional duties, the members of the Navy Nurse Corps shall have authority in and about naval hospitals and other medical activities next after the commissioned officers of the Medical Corps and Dental Corps of the Navy. The Secretary of the Navy shall make the necessary regulations prescribing the rights and privileges conferred by such relative rank.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy shall fix the money value of the uniforms which members of the Navy Nurse Corps are required to have upon their first appointment in the Navy: *Provided*, That he may authorize such uniforms to be issued in kind or, in lieu thereof, that payment in cash of the money value fixed in accordance with the foregoing be made to members so appointed, for the purchase of such uniforms;

SEC. 4. In time of war or when the Secretary of the Navy shall direct the wearing of uniforms at all times, he may fix the money value of additional outdoor uniforms which may be issued in kind to all members of the Navy Nurse Corps, or authorize payment in cash in lieu thereof for the purchase of such outdoor uniforms as may be prescribed by the United States Navy Uniform Regulations: *Provided*, That but one complete uniform outfit may be furnished to a member of the Navy Nurse Corps.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WALSH subsequently said: Mr. President, in view of the fact that there is special interest in Calendar No. 1357, Senate bill 2454, to prescribe the relative rank of members of the Navy Nurse Corps in relation to commissioned officers of the Navy, and for other purposes, I ask that the report of the committee be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report (No. 1316) is as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2454) to prescribe the relative rank of members of the Navy Nurse Corps in relation to commissioned officers of the Navy, and for other purposes, having considered the same report favorably thereon with an amendment, and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

Amend the bill as follows:

Page 1, line 7, after the comma following the word "superintendents" insert the following: "not to exceed one for each 300 members of the Navy Nurse Corps,".

The purpose of the bill is to prescribe the relative rank of members of the Navy Nurse Corps, and to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to fix the money value of the required uniforms which may be issued in kind, or authorize payment in cash in lieu thereof, for the purchase of such uniforms, to members of the Navy Nurse Corps.

The Navy Nurse Corps was established by the act of May 13, 1908 (35 Stat. 146), which provides in part that "the superintendent, chief nurses, and nurses shall respectively receive the same pay, allowances, emoluments, and privileges as are now or may hereafter be provided by or in pursuance of law for the nurse corps (female) of the Army." The Navy Nurse Corps is composed of graduate trained nurses within the Medical Corps of the Navy. They are appointed from the graduates of hospital training schools subject to an examination as to their professional, moral, mental, and physical fitness. They perform duty in naval hospitals, aboard hospital and ambulance ships, and in such other places as deemed necessary by the Surgeon General of the Navy.

The status of the Navy Nurse Corps at the present time is most unsatisfactory and confused. The status of its members, with relative rank appropriate to the different grades, has never been admitted or recognized in a legal manner. Consequently, each new question regarding the status of the Navy Nurse Corps has to be decided as it arises. This results in confusion and uncertainty.

By granting members of the Navy Nurse Corps relative rank, as is the case in the Army, all vexing questions which arise from time to time about their status would be answered automatically. The Navy Department is of the opinion that granting members of the Navy Nurse Corps relative rank would be in the best interests of the Navy and would tend to increase efficiency in the performance of their professional duties.

THE COMMITTEE AMENDMENT

The committee amended the bill to limit the number of assistant superintendents, with the relative rank of lieutenant, to 1 for each 300 members of the Navy Nurse Corps. It will be noted that only 1 superintendent, with relative rank of lieutenant commander, is authorized.

The bill was introduced at the request of the Navy Department and has been cleared by the Bureau of the Budget.

AMENDMENT OF COAST GUARD AUXILIARY AND RESERVE ACT OF 1941

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2490) to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941 (Public Law 8, 77th Cong.), as amended by section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1941 (Public Law 166, 77th Cong.), which had been reported from the Committee on Naval

Affairs with amendments, on page 2, line 3, after the word "section", to strike out "3" and insert "8"; and on page 3, line 14, after the word "pay", to insert "and without regard to age", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, approved February 19, 1941 (Public Law 8, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), as amended by section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1941 (Public Law, 166, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), is hereby further amended as follows:

(1) Section 8. In the second sentence thereof, delete the words "upon investigation by a board of not less than three commissioned officers of the regular Coast Guard"; and insert after the word "determined" in the fifth full line of said second sentence the words "under regulations prescribed by the Commandant", so that said second sentence as amended shall read as follows: "The term 'actual necessary expenses of operation', as used herein shall include fuel, oil, water, supplies, provisions, and any replacement or repair of equipment or any repair of the motorboat or yacht, where it is determined under regulations prescribed by the Commandant that responsibility for the loss or damage necessitating such replacement or repair of equipment or such repair of the motorboat or yacht rests with the Coast Guard."

(2) Section 203. Delete the entire section and substitute therefor the following:

"SEC. 203. The ranks, grades, and ratings, including cadets, in the Reserve shall be the various ranks, grades, and ratings not above captain, prescribed by law for the Coast Guard: *Provided*, That no officer shall be initially appointed in the Coast Guard Reserve in the grade or rank of captain or commander."

(3) Section 206. Delete the period at the end of the first sentence, insert in lieu thereof a semicolon, and add the words "pay and allowances of cadets of the Reserve shall under the same conditions, for the same purposes, and in the same manner, be assimilated to the pay and allowances of midshipmen of the Naval Reserve."

(4) Section 207. Delete the entire section and substitute therefor the following:

"SEC. 207. The Commandant, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury or of the Secretary of the Navy, while the Coast Guard is operating as a part of the Navy, is hereby authorized to enroll as temporary members of the Reserve, for duty under such conditions as he may prescribe, including but not limited to part-time and intermittent active duty with or without pay, and without regard to age, members of the Auxiliary, such officers and members of the crew of any motorboat or yacht placed at the disposal of the Coast Guard, and such men who by reason of their special training and experience are deemed by the Commandant to be qualified for such duty, as are citizens of the United States or of its Territories or possessions, except the Philippine Islands, to define their powers and duties, and to confer upon them, appropriate to their qualifications and experience, the same ranks, grades, and ratings as are provided for the personnel of the regular Coast Guard Reserve. When performing active duty with pay, as herein authorized, temporary members of the Reserve shall be entitled to receive the pay and allowances of their respective ranks, grades, or ratings, as may be authorized for members of the regular Coast Guard Reserve."

(5) Section 210. (a) At the end of the first sentence change the period to a colon and add the following: "*And provided further*, That notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the Commandant may prescribe a lesser amount as a uniform allowance to such commissioned and warrant officers of the Reserve as are not required to purchase or have in their possession the complete outfit of uniform clothing which is prescribed for other commissioned and warrant officers of the Reserve."

(b) At the beginning of the second sentence insert the words "Cadets and" so that the second sentence, exclusive of provisos, shall read: "Cadets and enlisted men of the Reserve may be allowed the cost of, or issued such items of uniform, bedding, and equipment as may be prescribed by the Commandant:".

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONSTRUCTION OR ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL NAVAL AIRCRAFT—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2496) to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to acquire or construct nonrigid lighter-than-air craft, and spare parts and equipment, as may be necessary to provide and maintain the number of useful nonrigid lighter-than-air craft at a total of 72: *Provided*, That if, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, the total number of nonrigid lighter-than-air craft authorized herein is not sufficient to meet the needs of the national defense, he may, with the approval of the President, make such plans for procurement as the situation may demand.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, with reference to Senate bill 2496, is the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee or any member of the committee present, who might explain the purpose of this proposal?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator wish to have the vote by which the bill was passed reconsidered?

Mr. DANAHER. Yes, Mr. President; I do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to reconsideration of the vote by which Senate bill 2496 was passed? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I simply wish to have the RECORD show some explanation from some member of the Committee on Naval Affairs as to what is contemplated by this particular bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs [Mr. WALSH] is now present.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to authorize the acquisition or construction of additional nonrigid lighter-than-air craft. The act approved June 15, 1940, authorized the acquisition or construction and the maintenance of the number of useful naval airplanes at a total of not more than 10,000 and the number of useful nonrigid lighter-than-air craft at a total of not more than 48.

The pending bill increases the number of useful nonrigid lighter-than-air craft from 48 to 72. It also provides the same flexibility for the procurement of nonrigid lighter-than-air craft as is provided for airplanes by section 8 of the act of July 19, 1940.

The Navy Department considers it essential at this time to procure 24 additional aircraft of this type in order to improve the security of coastal shipping and aid in current plans for intensification of antisubmarine warfare.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, I anticipated as much as has been said by the Senator from Massachusetts after reading the report in the file, but I ask the Senator from Massachusetts if the authorization to expand the plans has not always been present in the law since the act of July 1940?

Mr. WALSH. It was present for aircraft, but not for nonrigid aircraft.

Mr. DANAHER. So that irrespective of the number of rigid aircraft, for example, which might have been in existence in July 1940, it always has lain within the power of the Secretary of the Navy to decide how many more he might wish to build.

Mr. WALSH. For airplanes.

Mr. DANAHER. For airplanes?

Mr. WALSH. But not for nonrigid craft. It gives him the same authority for nonrigid craft.

Mr. DANAHER. But does not the bill in line 7, on page 1, limit the maximum of nonrigid lighter-than-air craft to 72?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. DANAHER. Why should that limitation be placed upon the Secretary of the Navy?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, although authority is given to increase the number, it is expected that when the Navy decides to increase the number it will come to Congress for approval, so that the Committee on Naval Affairs and the Appropriations Committee will have some knowledge of the extent of the expansion.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa was in the chair and did not have an opportunity to object to the consideration of the bill. I hope to offer an amendment to the bill, which will probably be of a controversial nature. Therefore, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). The bill will be passed over.

Mr. WALSH subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate recur to the consideration of Calendar No. 1359, Senate bill 2496, to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2496) to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] objected

to this bill when it was under consideration previously. There has been a difference of opinion in the Senate committee as to whether the provisions in line 7, page 1, to the end of line 2 on page 2 should be retained in the bill. That provision reads as follows:

Provided, That if, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, the total number of nonrigid lighter-than-air craft authorized herein is not sufficient to meet the needs of national defense, he may, with the approval of the President, make such plans for procurement as the situation may demand.

There is a feeling that that might deprive the Committee on Naval Affairs of the right to control the authorization of nonrigid aircraft. Therefore I am content that the bill be amended by striking out the proviso and that it be enacted in a form simply making provision for the acquisition of a total of 72 nonrigid aircraft.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] had asked that the bill go over.

Mr. WALSH. I understand that; but I have conferred with the Senator from Iowa, and, if the amendment I have suggested be adopted, it is agreeable to him that the bill should be passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Massachusetts will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 7, it is proposed to strike out the following proviso: "*Provided*, That if, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Navy, the total number of nonrigid lighter-than-air craft authorized herein is not sufficient to meet the needs of the national defense, he may, with the approval of the President, make such plans for procurement as the situation may demand."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to acquire or construct nonrigid lighter-than-air craft, and spare parts and equipment, as may be necessary to provide and maintain the number of useful nonrigid lighter-than-air craft at a total of 72.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

EDWIN L. WADE

The bill (H. R. 5687) for the relief of Edwin L. Wade, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONAL APPOINTMENTS TO UNITED STATES NAVAL ACADEMY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2254) providing for certain additional appointments to the United States Military Academy and the United States Naval Academy, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the number of midshipmen authorized by law at the United States Naval Academy is hereby increased by 10, and the appointments of such additional midshipmen shall be made annually by the President from qualified candidates who are sons of members of the naval forces of the United States who have been awarded either the Congressional Medal of Honor, the Navy Cross, or the Distinguished Service Medal. All appointments of such candidates shall be made in the order of merit after they have, in competition with each other, passed the mental examination now or hereafter required by law for entrance to the Naval Academy, and have passed the required physical examination for such entrance.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill providing for certain additional appointments to the United States Naval Academy."

JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 8), proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting equal rights to men and women, was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be passed over.

CARE AND CUSTODY OF INSANE RESIDENTS OF ALASKA

The bill (S. 2248) to amend the law relating to the care and custody of insane residents of Alaska and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That when used in this act unless otherwise expressly stated or unless the context or subject matter requires—

(a) "Secretary" means Secretary of the Interior;

(b) "Alaska" means the Territory of Alaska;

(c) "Mental institution" means any asylum, sanitarium, or hospital under contract with the Department of the Interior or otherwise authorized by law to have the care, treatment, or custody of patients;

(d) "Resident" means a person who has his legal residence in Alaska;

(e) "Patient" means a resident of or person in Alaska who has been legally adjudged insane and committed to a mental institution;

(f) "Medical officer" means the Federal medical officer supervising the psychiatric care and treatment of patients at any medical institution.

SEC. 2. That portion of section 7 of the act entitled "An act relating to affairs in the Territories", approved February 6, 1909 (35 Stat. 600, 601), which reads as follows:

"That the Secretary of the Interior shall hereafter, as in his judgment may be deemed advisable, advertise for and receive bids for the care and custody of persons legally adjudged insane in the district of Alaska and in behalf of the United States shall contract, for 1 or more years, as may be deemed best, with a responsible asylum or sanitarium west of the main range of the Rocky Mountains, submitting the lowest and best responsible bid for the care and custody of persons legally adjudged insane in said district of Alaska, the cost of advertising for bids, executing the contract and caring for the insane to be paid from appropriations to be made for such service upon estimates to be submitted to Congress annually", is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary in behalf of the United States is authorized to contract, for 1 or more years, with a responsible asylum, sanitarium, or hospital west of the main range of the Rocky Mountains submitting the lowest responsible bid for the care, treatment, and custody of patients. The cost of advertising for bids, executing the contract, and caring for the insane shall be paid from appropriations to be made for such service upon estimates to be submitted to Congress annually."

SEC. 3. The superintendent or other proper officer of any mental institution shall, upon admission of a patient to such institution, be entitled to the temporary and immediate custody of the moneys and personal property on the person of the patient and shall keep a proper account thereof. Such moneys may be used from time to time for the benefit of a patient if the patient so requests. Upon parole or discharge of any patient from such institution, all moneys and personal property remaining to the credit of the patient shall be returned to him or his legal representatives.

SEC. 4. Section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of moneys of the legally adjudged insane of Alaska who have been cared for by the Secretary of the Interior," approved April 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 322), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"All articles of personal property belonging to a patient who has died prior to his parole or discharge from a mental institution or has eloped therefrom, and remaining in the custody of the superintendent or other proper officer of such institution, shall, if unclaimed by such patient, or his legal heirs or representatives, within the period of 5 years after the decease of such patient or the date of leaving the institution, be disposed of in such manner as the Secretary may prescribe, and any proceeds resulting therefrom shall be covered into the Treasury by the Secretary. Any moneys remaining to the credit of such patient, if unclaimed by his legal heirs or representatives or such patient within the period of 5 years after the decease of such patient or the date of the leaving of such institution, shall be covered into the Treasury by the Secretary."

SEC. 5. Section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of moneys of the legally adjudged insane of Alaska who have been cared for by the Secretary of the Interior," approved April 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 322), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The Secretary shall cause diligent inquiry to be made, in every instance after death or elopement of any patient, to ascertain his whereabouts or that of his legal heirs or representatives and shall turn over to the proper party or parties any moneys or articles of personal property in the custody of the superintendent of the institution to the credit of such person. Claims to such moneys or articles of personal property may be presented to the Secretary at any time. In the event a claim is established by competent proof more than 5 years after the death or elopement of a patient, it shall be certified to Congress for consideration."

SEC. 6. The superintendent of any mental institution shall discharge any patient, except one held on order of a court or judge having criminal jurisdiction in any action or proceeding arising out of a criminal offense, as follows:

(1) Upon the written certification by the medical officer that such patient is considered to be recovered.

(2) Upon the written certification by the medical officer that such patient, while not recovered, is considered in remission and is not deemed dangerous to himself or others and is able to support himself.

(3) Upon the return of such patient, if a nonresident of Alaska, to his legal residence or upon transfer of such patient to a United States Veterans' Bureau facility.

(4) Upon order by a court or judge having jurisdiction.

(5) After the continuous absence on leave of such patient from such mental institution for more than 12 months unless, in the judgment of the medical officer, such

discharge would not be in the best interests of the public and the patient.

(b) The superintendent of any mental institution may permit absence on leave to any patient, who is not recovered, under conditions that are satisfactory to the medical officer and when, in the judgment of the medical officer, absence on leave will not be detrimental to the public welfare and will be of benefit to such patient: *Provided*, That the superintendent shall satisfy himself, by sufficient proof, that such patient is able to support himself or that the friends or relatives of such patient are willing and financially able to receive and care for such patient: *And provided further*, That the order committing such patient to such institution shall continue in force and effect until he is discharged as herein provided. A mental institution shall not be liable for the expense or support of a patient while he is on leave of absence. The superintendent of a mental institution from which a patient is absent on leave shall terminate the leave and authorize and direct the actual return of such patient to such institution when, in the judgment of the medical officer, the return of the patient to the institution would be in the best interests of the public and the patient. Any patient who is absent on leave or escapes from a mental institution to which he has been committed, may, upon the direction of the superintendent of such institution, be returned thereto by a peace officer or any officer or employee of such institution.

(c) No patient shall be discharged or granted absence on leave from a mental institution without suitable clothing and the Secretary may furnish the same, and such amount of money, not exceeding $25, as the medical officer may consider necessary. The Secretary may also furnish to any patient, who has been discharged or granted absence on leave, transportation to his legal residence or to such other place as the Secretary may deem appropriate, provided that the cost of such transportation shall not exceed the cost of transporting such patient to his legal residence.

SEC. 7. (a) The superintendent of any mental institution may place at board in a suitable family in a place in Alaska or elsewhere any patient who is considered by the medical officer to be a suitable person for boarding out. Such boarder shall be deemed to be a patient of the institution. The cost to the United States of the board of such patient shall not exceed the amount specified by the Secretary.

(b) The superintendent of the institution shall cause all patients placed at board by such institution in families at the expense of the United States to be inspected at suitable intervals by a representative of the institution.

(c) The superintendent of the institution may at any time remove to another boarding place, or back to the institution whence the boarded-out patient came, any or all such patients in accordance with the judgment of the medical officer of what will be most beneficial to them. Not more than four patients shall be boarded out at the same time at any one home or family.

SEC. 8. The commitment papers of any person adjudged insane in Alaska shall include a statement by the committing authority as to the legal residence of such person. The Secretary shall, as soon as practicable, return to the State or country to which they have a legal residence all patients who are not residents of Alaska. For the purpose of facilitating the return of such persons, the Secretary may enter into a reciprocal agreement with any State or political subdivision thereof for prompt return under proper supervision of residents of such State or Alaska who have been legally adjudged insane. Residents of Alaska who have been legally adjudged insane outside of Alaska shall, with the approval of the Secretary, be transferred to a mental institution. All expenses incurred in returning to their legal residence patients who are nonresidents of Alaska may be paid from applicable appropriations for the care and custody of the insane of Alaska, but the expense of transferring residents of Alaska who have been legally adjudged insane outside of Alaska shall be borne by the State making the transfer.

SEC. 9. It shall be the duty of a patient, or his legal representative, spouse, parents, adult children, in that sequence, to pay or contribute to the payment of the charges for the care or treatment of such patient in such manner and proportion as the Secretary may find to be within their ability to pay: *Provided*, That such charges shall in no case exceed the actual cost of such care and treatment. The order of the Secretary relating to the payment of charges by persons other than the patient, or his legal representative shall be prospective in effect and shall relate only to charges to be incurred subsequent to the order: *Provided, however*, That if any of the above-named persons willfully conceal their ability to pay, such persons shall be ordered to pay, to the extent of their ability, charges accruing during the period of such concealment. The Secretary may cause to be made such investigations as may be necessary to determine such ability to pay, including the requirement of sworn statements of income by such persons.

SEC. 10. Any acts, or parts thereof, in conflict with the provisions hereof are hereby repealed.

ISABELLE FULLER

The bill (S. 2420) for the relief of Isabelle Fuller was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Isabelle Fuller, Orlando, Fla., the sum of $500, in full satisfaction of her claims against the United States for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by her and for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her as the result of the automobile driven by her husband, H. H. Fuller, and in which she was riding as a passenger, having been struck by a United States Army truck in Orlando, Fla., on December 13, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

COMMANDER CATO D. GLOVER

The bill (H. R. 6365) for the relief of Commander Cato D. Glover was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRED FARNER AND DORIS M. SCHROEDER

The bill (H. R. 6748) for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. C. LEMON, LOUIS McCOY, AND PATRICIA McCOY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4941) for the relief of J. C. Lemon, Louis McCoy, and Patricia McCoy, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 2, line 7, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$5,954.66" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

WILLIAM TIPTON, MRS. WILLIAM TIPTON, AND MRS. EULA NELSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6033) for the relief of William Tipton, Mrs. William Tipton, and Mrs. Eula Nelson, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,000"; and in line 7, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$3,500" and insert "$3,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

REITA M. LARY

The bill (S. 2099) for the relief of Mrs. Reita M. Lary was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Reita M. Lary, of Denver, Colo., the sum of $1,266.16, representing compensation for the accrued leave due her husband, Howard N. Lary, who died on August 6, 1941, while he was an employee of the Securities and Exchange Commission in its regional office at Denver, Colo.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

GEORGE P. CRAWFORD

The bill (H. R. 2427) for the relief of George P. Crawford was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

L. H. MARTIN

The bill (H. R. 2934) for the relief of L. H. Martin was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARL L. JONES

The bill (H. R. 2014) for the relief of Carl L. Jones was announced as next in order.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, there is a committee amendment to this bill, and I am presuming to express the hope that the Senate will reject the committee amendment and allow the bill to be passed in the amount approved by the House.

Let me very briefly state the circumstances. Carl L. Jones was injured in a collision with a Government car, he being in an automobile driven by another person. There is no question in the mind of anyone as to the responsibility for the

accident. The War Department agrees on the question of responsibility. It seems to me that the $5,000 which the House approved for this injured man and his family is not extravagant.

The man is about 32 years of age, with his life before him. He has a wife and four small children, the eldest of whom I think is 11 years of age. He has been permanently injured. The medical testimony places an impairment of his earning capacity to the extent of between 40 and 75 percent. The injury has affected his left arm, destroyed the power of rotation of the elbow, and made it impossible for him to close his hand. He is a workingman.

It seems to me that under those circumstances, with a wife and four small children dependent upon him, and with his earning capacity impaired to the extent indicated, it would be appropriate for the Senate to accept the judgment of the House and pass the bill in the amount approved by the House.

I hope the committee amendment will be rejected.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], who was chairman of the subcommittee which considered the bill, is not present. I ask that the bill go over until he can be present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

L. W. MAREK, JR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2646) for the relief of L. W. Marek, Jr., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$3,500" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

G. C. BARCO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1220) for the relief of G. C. Barco, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Attorney General of the United States is hereby authorized and directed to cancel the judgment in favor of the United States against G. C. Barco and W. G. Knowles, of West Palm Beach, Fla., as sureties on a forfeited bail bond in a criminal proceeding against Courtney Hardin in the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of G. C. Barco and W. G. Knowles."

WALTER B. WILLIAMS, JR.

The bill (H. R. 3201) for the relief of Walter B. Williams, Jr., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSEPH DONATELLI AND ROSE DONATELLI

The bill (H. R. 4526) for the relief of Joseph Donatelli and Rose Donatelli was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GERNEY M. CLAIBORNE

The bill (H. R. 5527) for the relief of Gerney M. Claiborne was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

E. A. WILLIAMS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5920) for the relief of E. A. Williams, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$5,540" and insert in lieu thereof "$4,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

WILEY W. WATKINS

The bill (H. R. 2925) for the relief of Wiley W. Watkins was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMIL LASSILA, MARTHA LASSILA, ELLEN HUHTA, AND SYLVIA HUHTA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4953) for the relief of Emil Lassila, Martha Lassila, Ellen Huhta, and Sylvia Huhta, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$929.25" and insert in lieu thereof "$361.25"; at the beginning of line 8, to strike out "$1,057.65" and insert in lieu thereof "$557.65"; in line 9, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$3,300.65" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,100.65"; and in line 11, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,557.85" and insert in lieu thereof "$557.85."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JAMES GILMORE AND MARIAN E. GILMORE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6557) for the relief of James Gilmore and Marian E. Gilmore, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, in line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$2,362.23" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,000"; and at the beginning of line 8 to strike out "$1,479.31" and insert in lieu thereof "$1,000."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

MRS. LILA A. WEMP

The bill (S. 2165) for the relief of Mrs. Lila A. Wemp was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, this is an interesting bill, providing for legislative interposition in the administration of the National Service Life Insurance Act. I do not know how this particular bill reached the Committee on Claims, since all such matters normally are referred to the Committee on Finance. I should like to ask the sponsor of the bill the reason for referring the bill to the Committee on Claims.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is informed by the clerk that the bill came to the desk with a notation to the effect that it should be referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I have no recollection of the bill. I shall be glad to have it go over until Monday, so that I may find out what there is to it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the bill should be referred to the Committee on Finance, because it provides for payment to a beneficiary under exactly the same conditions under which nonpayment has resulted to other beneficiaries standing precisely in the same place. It is therefore most unfortunate to have the jurisdiction split on matters of this kind. In one case relief may be given or insurance benefits may be paid, and in another case, standing upon the same moral basis and upon the same general factual basis, such benefits may be denied. This bill should be referred to the Finance Committee for consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator make such a motion?

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I have no personal knowledge or recollection of this measure, but I notice, on looking it over, that it is a bill which should go to the Finance Committee. Evidently the report from the Government agency was written by Mr. Hines, Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. The Claims Committee does not, as a general thing, entertain jurisdiction of claims of this character. Therefore I am agreeable that the bill should be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be referred to the Finance Committee.

EILEEN COLLINS TREACY

The bill (S. 2470) for the relief of Eileen Collins Treacy, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to Eileen Collins Treacy, widow of Hubert John Treacy, Jr., a special agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, who was killed in Abingdon, Va., on March 13, 1942, in the line of his official duty: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

ESTATE OF TOM GENTRY

The bill (H. R. 6797) for the relief of the estate of Tom Gentry, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION LOANS ON COTTON, CORN, AND WHEAT

The bill (S. 2495) extending the maturity date of loans made or arranged for by the Commodity Credit Corporation on cotton, corn, and wheat of the 1941 crop, was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. SMITH. The bill simply provides an extension of the loans on the commodities mentioned in the title. Under the present law the Government has the option. The notes are called demand notes, and it is desired to give the farmers the benefit of an extension of a year in order that they may have the benefit of any rise in prices, whatever it may be.

Mr. DANAHER. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. Granted the bill passes, will not the Commodity Credit Corporation be forbidden to sell or otherwise dispose of any of the crops pledged against the notes?

Mr. SMITH. Except when the man who made the note and furnished the collateral indicates that he wants that done. I think that is perfectly clear.

Mr. DANAHER. Is there anything in the present law which makes such a prohibition legislative?

Mr. SMITH. Under the present law, the loans expire some time in June.

Mr. DANAHER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH. Thereafter, the Government can take them over if it should see fit to do so. I simply want to have the notes extended for a year.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Let me ask whether the note maker would have to pay any additional carrying charges during the year, or would it all be carried over?

Mr. SMITH. It would all be carried over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill, S. 2495, was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commodity Credit Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to provide for the extension of the maturity date of all notes evidencing a loan made or arranged for by the Corporation on cotton, corn, and wheat of the 1941 crop. Such extension shall be for a period which expires 1 year after the date of enactment of this act. During the period of such extension, the Corporation shall not sell or otherwise dispose of any cotton, corn, or wheat of the 1941 crop with respect to which any such note is outstanding except upon request of the person liable on the note.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2471) to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, with respect to its application to officers and employees of educational, religious, eleemosynary, philanthropic, and cultural institutions, establishments, and agencies, commonly known as the Hatch Act, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HOLMAN. I request that the bill go over until I have a chance to study it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ROY CHANDLER

The bill (S. 2310) for the relief of Roy Chandler was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers Roy Chandler, late private, Company G, Thirty-ninth Regiment United States Infantry, shall be held and considered to have been honorably discharged from the military service of the United States as a member of said organization on August 17, 1918: *Provided*, That no back pay, pension, bounty, or other emolument shall accrue prior to the passage of this act.

ELIMINATION OF MONTHLY REPORT OF NUMBER OF MEN IN TRAINING AND SERVICE

The bill (S. 2437) to amend section 9 of the act of August 18, 1941 (Public Law 213, 77th Cong.), by striking out the proviso thereto which requires a monthly report by the Secretary of War to the Congress of the number of men in active training and service, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 of the act of August 18, 1941 (Public Law 213, 77th Cong.), be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the proviso thereto, so that the said section, as amended, shall read:

"SEC. 9. During the existence of the authority conferred by section 2 of this joint resolution and for 6 months thereafter the limitation on the number of men who may be in active training and service at any one time under section 3 (b) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is hereby suspended."

EXCHANGE OF LANDS IN PHILADELPHIA

The bill (S. 2488) to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War is hereby authorized to convey to the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to a triangular parcel of land containing 13,715.84 square feet, more or less, situated at the northeast corner of and comprising a portion of the Philadelphia Quartermaster Depot, Pennsylvania, and fronting on Oregon Avenue east of Twenty-first Street in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., and to accept in exchange therefor the fee-simple title to a strip of land containing 9,819.75 square feet, more or less, and being the northern portion of what was formerly Johnston Street west of Twentieth Street in the City of Philadelphia, Pa., the exchange herein authorized to be made under such terms and conditions as the Secretary of War may prescribe.

ACQUISITION OF INDIAN LANDS

The bill (S. 2369) for the acquisition of Indian lands required in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of electric transmission lines and other works, Parker Dam power project, Arizona-California, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in aid of the construction of the Parker Dam power project, there is hereby granted to the United States, subject to the provisions of this act, such right, title, and interest of the Indians as may be required in and to such tribal and allotted lands as may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior from time to time for the construction, operation, and maintenance of electric transmission lines and other works of the project or for the relocation or reconstruction of properties made necessary by the construction of the project.

SEC. 2. As lands or interests in lands are designated from time to time under this act, the Secretary of the Interior shall determine the amount of money to be paid to the Indians as just and equitable compensation therefor. The amounts due the tribe and the individual allottees or their heirs or devisees shall be paid from funds now or hereafter made available for the Parker Dam power project to the superintendent of the appropriate Indian agency, or such other officer as may be designated by the Secretary of the Interior, for credit on the books of such agency to the accounts of the tribe and the individuals concerned.

SEC. 3. Funds deposited to the credit of allottees, their heirs, or devisees, may be used, in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, for the acquisition of other lands and improvements, or the relocation of existing improvements or construction of new improvements on the lands so acquired for the allottees or heirs whose lands and improvements are acquired under the provisions of this act. Lands so acquired shall be held in the same status as those from which the funds were derived, and shall be nontaxable until otherwise provided by Congress.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to perform any and all acts and to prescribe such regulations as he may deem appropriate to carry out the provisions of this act.

DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY OF INDIANS DYING INTESTATE WITHOUT HEIRS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4533) to provide for the disposition of trust or restricted estates of Indians dying intestate without heirs, which had been reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs, with amendments, on page 2, in line 1, after the word "estate", to insert "and subject to all valid existing agricultural, surface, and mineral leases and the rights of any person thereunder"; in line 16, after the word "sold" and the comma, to insert "subject to all valid existing agricultural, surface, and mineral leases and the rights of any person thereunder"; on page 3, in line 1, after the words "United States" and the comma, to insert "subject to all valid existing agricultural, surface, and mineral leases and the rights of any person thereunder"; in line 16, after the word "designate" and the comma, to insert "subject to all valid existing agricultural, surface, and mineral leases and the rights of any person thereunder"; after line 18, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall not apply to the Indians of the Five Civilized Tribes or the Osage Reservation, in Oklahoma.

On page 3, in line 22, after the word "Sec.", to strike out the numeral "3" and insert "4."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

TLINGIT AND HAIDA INDIANS OF ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 5484) for the relief of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF PHILADELPHIA, BALTIMORE & WASHINGTON RAILROAD CO. TRACK, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The bill (S. 2526) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to extend its present track connection with the United States Navy Yard was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair lays before the Senate a bill coming over from the House of Representatives which is identical with the Senate bill and deals with the same subject matter.

The bill (H. R. 7097) to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to extend its present track connection with the United States navy yard so as to provide adequate railroad facilities in connection with the development of Buzzards Point as an industrial area in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1932 (47 Stat. 322), as amended by the act approved June 20, 1939 (53 Stat. 849), was read twice by title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection the bill just laid before the Senate will be substituted for Senate bill 2526. Is there objection to proceeding to consider House bill 7097?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2526 will be indefinitely postponed.

ACCEPTANCE OF CERTAIN DECORATIONS BY HUGH S. CUMMING

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 140) granting permission to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General (retired) of the United States Public Health Service, to accept certain decorations bestowed upon him by the Republics of Colombia, Haiti, and Chile, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General (retired) of the United States Public Health Service, be authorized to accept and wear the decoration of "Order of Boyacá" tendered by His Excellency, the Ambassador from Colombia, in the name of the Republic of Colombia; the decoration of "Honneur et Mérito" (grade of commander), tendered by His Excellency, the Minister from Haiti, in the name of the Republic of Haiti; and the decoration "El Merito," tendered by His Excellency, the Ambassador from Chile, in the name of the Republic of Chile, all of which decorations have been conferred upon Surg. Gen Hugh S. Cumming (retired), by the Republics mentioned, for scientific service, and that the Department of State is hereby authorized and permitted to deliver the above-mentioned decorations to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General (retired) of the United States Public Health Service.

SETTLEMENT OF AGRICULTURAL ADJUSTMENT ACCOUNTS

The bill (H. R. 5636) to expedite the settlement of claims and accounts incident to certain agricultural adjustment programs, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALFRED SMITH

The bill (H. R. 4629) for the relief of Alfred Smith was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

J. J. McINTOSH

The bill (H. R. 5329) for the relief of J. J. McIntosh, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GLENN A. HOSS

The bill (H. R. 5772) for the relief of Glenn A. Hoss was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. JULIA CAMPBELL

The bill (H. R. 5847) for the relief of Mrs. Julia Campbell was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CECILE McLAUGHLIN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5496) for the relief of Cecile McLaughlin, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of" to strike out "$2,000" and insert "$1,090."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

KATHRYN O. SWEENEY AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 488) for the relief of Kathryn O. Sweeney and others, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LILLIAN LAST

The bill (H. R. 1736) for the relief of Lillian Last was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DAVID CARON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5454) for the relief of David Caron, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,500" and insert "$2,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

HENRY DALEY, GUARDIAN FOR JAMES RAY DALEY AND NORMAN FRANKLIN DALEY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5499) for the relief of Henry Daley, guardian for James Ray Daley and Norman Franklin Daley, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 7, to strike out "$3,000" and insert "$1,800"; and at the beginning of line 8 to strike out "$1,500" and insert "$500."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2186) for the relief of Viola Dale was announced as next in order.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, at the request of the junior Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], who is not present, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

JAMES D. G. ALEXANDER

The bill (H. R. 1757) for the relief of James D. G. Alexander, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5794) for the relief of Mrs. Julia Johnson was announced as next in order.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, is there anything in the report of the committees, let me ask the member of the Claims Committee who is in charge of the bill, to indicate how old the victim of the accident is or was?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who reported the bill, is not now in the Chamber.

Mr. DANAHER. I do not wish to object to the bill or have consideration postponed until the Senator's return; but I ask that it be temporarily passed over so that I may examine the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill will be temporarily passed over.

Mr. DANAHER subsequently said: Mr. President, the present occupant of the chair will doubtless recall that I asked to have Calendar No. 1416, House bill 5794, for the relief of Mrs. Julia Johnson, passed over. The bill would authorize an appropriation in behalf of Mrs. Julia Johnson, mother of Roy Owen, deceased. Examination of the report does not indicate how old the deceased was; it does not indicate Mrs. Johnson is, in fact, the mother, but rather indicates she is the stepmother of the deceased, and it hence does not become apparent that she is the person solely entitled to the avails of the fund to be appropriated. I therefore believe that the RECORD should show that the payment, in fact, is to be to this particular person, as guardian of a minor son, or in some conclusively representative capacity, and on that account, until such

fact be made apparent, I shall ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill has been passed over.

JAMES B. SHULER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1953) for the relief of James B. Shuler, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment, as if the United States were suable in tort, upon the claim of James B. Shuler, of McClellanville, S. C., in his individual capacity and as husband and legal representative of the estate of Elise Morrison Shuler, deceased, and as father of Ellie S. Shuler, deceased, against the United States of America for alleged damages as the result of a collision between the automobile of James B. Shuler and a Civilian Conservation Corps truck on United States Highway No. 17, about 1½ miles north of McClellanville, S. C., on August 7, 1938, in which Elise Morrison Shuler, wife of James B. Shuler, and Ellie S. Shuler, son of James B. Shuler, were fatally injured, and James B. Shuler was injured.

SEC. 2. In determination of such claims, the United States shall be held liable for the acts of its officers and employees to the same extent as if it were a private person, except that any judgment rendered on each claim shall not exceed $5,000.

SEC. 3. Suits upon such claims may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the date of enactment of this act, notwithstanding lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claims and appeals from and payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph "Twentieth" of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of James B. Shuler in his individual capacity and as husband and legal representative of the estate of Elise Morrison Shuler, deceased, and as father of Ellie S. Shuler, deceased."

GEORGE W. LYLE

The bill (H. R. 5713) for the relief of George W. Lyle under the jurisdiction of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHARLES L. LAIR

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4370) for the relief of Charles L. Lair, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,500" and insert "$2,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ESTATES OF JULIAN B. WIGGINS AND R. E. THOMPSON

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4554) for the relief of the estate of Julian B. Wiggins, deceased, and the estate of R. E. Thompson, deceased, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, in line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$4,000", and insert "$2,500".

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BAYARD M. ATWOOD

The bill (S. 2203) for the relief of Bayard M. Atwood was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limitations of time in sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Bayard M. Atwood, of Phoenix, Ariz., and the Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized and directed to receive and consider his claim if filed within 6 months of the approval of this act for disability alleged to have been sustained in the performance of his duties as United States soil conservation service camp superintendent at Safford, Ariz., in March 1940.

CLARA WROBLISKI

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2191) for the relief of Clara Wrobliski, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,584.20" and insert "$2,334.20", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Clara Wrobliski, of Salem, Oreg., the sum of $2,334.20, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained on July 27, 1941, when the car which she was driving struck a partially open traffic-control gate in the Siuslaw National Forest, State of Oregon: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES P. CRAWFORD

The bill (H. R. 5013) for the relief of James P. Crawford was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

E. M. CONROY

The bill (H. R. 5210) for the relief of E. M. Conroy was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES M. HAYS

The bill (H. R. 5680) for the relief of James M. Hays was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNA DANIELSON AND BETTY TIEDEMAN

The bill (H. R. 5723) for the relief of Anna Danielson and Betty Tiedeman, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF RUDOLPH TREIBER, JR.

The bill (H. R. 5910) for the relief of the legal guardian of Rudolph Treiber, Jr., a minor, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This is the Interior Department Appropriation bill and will be passed over.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, it is intended that the Department of the Interior appropriation bill shall be taken up for consideration tomorrow. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that following the conclusion of the call of the calendar the bill be taken up, with the understanding that it will not be considered until tomorrow, but will be made the unfinished business today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

USE OF PUBLIC LANDS IN CONNECTION WITH MANUFACTURE OF MUNITIONS OF WAR

The bill (S. 1818) to authorize the lease or sale of public lands for use in connection with the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar No. 1430, House bill 5394, is an identical bill. Without objection, the House bill will be substituted for the Senate bill and will be considered at this time.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5394) to authorize the lease or sale of public lands for use in connection with the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and for other purposes, which was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 1818 will be indefinitely postponed.

HENRY MARTIN COFFMAN

The bill (H. R. 1162) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the final homestead proof submitted by Henry Martin Coffman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF CERTAIN PUBLIC LANDS IN ALASKA

The bill (H. R. 4347) to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the North Pacific Union Conference Association of Seventh-day Adventists was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITIONS TO BOISE, SALMON, AND TARGHEE NATIONAL FORESTS, IDAHO

The bill (H. R. 4733) to add certain land to the Boise National Forest, the Salmon National Forest, and the Targhee National Forest in the State of Idaho, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

POLICE JURISDICTION OVER SHENANDOAH NATIONAL PARK

The bill (H. R. 5016) to amend section 1 of the act approved August 19, 1937, entitled "An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to notify the State of Virginia that the United States assumes police jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Shenandoah National Park," was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

QUITCLAIM TO LANDS OF GOOSE LAKE IN OREGON AND CALIFORNIA

The bill (H. R. 5490) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim to the States of Oregon and California, respectively, all rights, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands of Goose Lake in Oregon and California, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CLAIM OF AUGUSTUS DOMINIQUE TUREAND TO LANDS IN LOUISIANA

The bill (H. R. 6102) confirming the claim of Augustus Dominique Tureand, for the Church of St. Jacques to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, parish of St. James, said claim being listed as No. 392, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION OF NEW MEXICO

The bill (H. R. 6625) granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the constitution of the State of New Mexico, providing a method for executing leases for grazing and agricultural purposes on lands granted or confirmed to the State of New Mexico, by the act of Congress approved June 20, 1910, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LEMUEL T. ROOT, JR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 925) for the relief of Lemuel T. Root, Jr., which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the claim of Lemuel T. Root, Jr., of Hoquiam, Wash., is hereby transferred to the United States Court of Claims for any relief that he may be able to prove to be due him.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITION TO SEQUOIA NATIONAL FOREST

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4975) to add certain lands to the Sequoia National Forest, Calif., which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with an amendment, on page 1, line 3, to strike out "That, subject to existing valid claims, the following described lands be, and the same are hereby, added to the Sequoia National Forest, Calif., and made subject to all laws and regulations relating to said national forest," and to insert "That, subject to existing valid claims, the boundaries of the Sequoia National Forest, Calif., be, and they are hereby, extended to include the following described lands, which shall hereafter be subject to the laws, rules, and regulations relating to said national forest."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

GRANTING OF PREFERENCE TO CERTAIN OIL AND GAS LESSEES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6071) to grant a preference to certain oil and gas lessees, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with an amendment, on page 2, after line 5, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to make a compromise settlement of any claim for accrued rental under a lease issued pursuant to the provisions of section 13 of such act of February 25, 1920, as amended, in any case in which he determines that it would be financially beneficial to the United States to make such a compromise settlement or in any case in which he determines that collection of the full amount of such accrued rental from the lessee is inadvisable because of the lessee's financial resources being limited.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DISPOSITION OF RECREATIONAL DEMONSTRATION PROJECTS

The bill (H. R. 2685) to authorize the disposition of recreational demonstration projects, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTRACTION OF GOLD-BEARING ORE FROM RUCK-A-CHUCKY DAM SITE

The bill (H. R. 4213) for the relief of persons in connection with the extraction of gold-bearing ore from Ruck-a-Chucky Dam site was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DEVELOPMENT OF MINERALS IN NORTH DAKOTA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1788) to provide for the leasing of certain lands of the United States in the State of North Dakota for the development of oil, gas, and other minerals, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after "Secretary of the Interior", to strike out "with the consent and approval of the Secretary of Agriculture,"; on page 2, line 5, after the word "acquired", to strike out ": *Provided further*, That any applications for oil and gas leases under said act of February 25, 1920, as amended, now pending before the Department of the Interior shall be considered as entitling the applicants thereunder, if otherwise qualified, to a preference right to a lease or leases under this act: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, waive the acreage limitations of said act of February 25, 1920, as amended, as to said lands or deposits,"; and on page 2, after line 13, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. That title to the lands in North Dakota purchased for Indian use, the administrative control over which was transferred to the Secretary of the Interior by Executive Order No. 7868 of April 15, 1938, be, and is hereby recognized to be, in the United States, in trust for the Indian tribe or tribes for which the lands were purchased, and such lands shall be subject to lease for mining purposes in accordance with the laws and regulations affecting Indian tribal lands.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to lease lands in the State of North Dakota, title to the minerals under which have been acquired by the United States by purchase under the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, approved April 8, 1935 (49 Stat. 118), as amended, for the development and production of oil, gas, and other minerals under the act of February 25, 1920 (41 Stat. 437), as amended, and regulations thereunder: *Provided, however*, That the Secretary of Agriculture shall first determine that the leasing of such lands or deposits shall not interfere with the purpose for which said lands or deposits were acquired.

SEC. 2. That title to the lands in North Dakota purchased for Indian use, the administrative control over which was transferred to the Secretary of the Interior by Executive Order No. 7868 of April 15, 1938, be, and is hereby recognized to be, in the United States, in trust for the Indian tribe or tribes for which the lands were purchased, and such lands shall be subject to lease for mining purposes in accordance with the laws and regulations affecting Indian tribal lands.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALE OF PUBLIC LANDS IN IDAHO

The bill (S. 1034) relating to the sale of public lands granted to or vested in the State of Idaho by the act of July 3, 1890, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That so much of section 8 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the admission of the State of Idaho into the Union," approved July 3, 1890, as reads "none of said lands shall be sold for less than $10 per acre" is amended to read as follows: "none of said lands shall be sold for less than $5 per acre."

SEC. 2. The last sentence of section 11 of such act is amended to read as follows: "None of the lands granted by this act shall be sold for less than $5 an acre."

VALIDATION OF CONVEYANCE MADE BY SOUTHERN PACIFIC RAILROAD CO.

The bill (H. R. 2307) validating a certain conveyance, heretofore made by the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way in the town of Indio, in the county of Riverside, State of California, acquired under section 23 of the act of March 3, 1871 (16 Stat. 573), was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TRANSFER TO SECRETARY OF WAR OF CERTAIN LANDS

The bill (H. R. 5287) relating to the transfer to the Secretary of War of certain lands owned by the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JURISDICTION OVER CERTAIN LANDS IN ISLE ROYALE NATIONAL PARK

The bill (S. 2362) relating to the jurisdiction over certain lands in the Isle Royale National Park, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide for the addition of certain lands to the Isle Royale National Park, in the State of Michigan, and for other purposes," approved March 6, 1942, is hereby amended by striking out the words "Secretary of the Treasury", wherever they appear in such act, and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Secretary of the Navy."

ADDITION TO PLUMAS NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.

The bill (H. R. 1595) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Plumas National Forest, Calif., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

KINGS CANYON NATIONAL PARK, CALIF.

The bill (H. R. 69) to authorize the adjustment of land ownership lines within the General Grant grove section of the Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., in order to protect equities established by possession arising in conformity with a certain survey, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LANDS WITHIN MAMMOTH CAVE NATIONAL PARK, KY.

The bill (H. R. 4676) to accept the cession by the Commonwealth of Kentucky of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mammoth Cave National Park; to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for the park in accordance with the act of May 25, 1926, (44 Stat. 635); to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the development of a proper entrance road to the park; and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ADDITION TO CLEVELAND NATIONAL FOREST, CALIF.

The bill (H. R. 4205) to add to the Cleveland National Forest, Calif., certain contiguous lands of the United States, which can be most effectively and economically protected and administered as parts of said national forest, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHANGE OF NAME OF FORT MARION NATIONAL MONUMENT, FLA.

The bill (H. R. 3937) to change the designation of the Fort Marion National Monument in the State of Florida and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The calendar having been completed, under the order of the Senate, entered at the request of the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] earlier today, the Chair lays before the Senate House bill 6845, the Department of the Interior appropriation bill.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the order previously entered, the bill will go over until tomorrow.

HOUSING FACILITIES FOR WORKERS IN WAR PRODUCTION AREAS (H. DOC. NO. 743)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor:

To the Congress of the United States:

From time to time I have indicated to the Congress the need for adequate housing facilities for the workers moving in vast numbers into areas of expanding war production.

This war involves a total national effort and industrial mobilization. Industry cannot effectively mobilize and plants cannot expand with sufficient rapidity unless there are enough houses to bring the worker to the job, keep him on the job, and maintain his efficiency and morale. More than ever before in our history, we need houses to help win the war.

Thus far, Congress has shown a full appreciation of this need, and has made $1,020,000,000 in appropriations available for the construction of war housing. This figure reduces to its true perspective when we realize that it is less than one percent of the funds made available for war purposes. The allocation of war funds for the shelter of the men and women leaving their homes to serve our war industries is a wise and established national policy.

That policy should continue. War production is now increasing in geometric ratio. Plant capacities are expanding faster and faster. Consistent reports from all over the country indicate a rising need for housing, running far ahead of the supply and threatening seriously to reduce the effective use of these plants unless remedied at once.

It is clear that the increase in employment in war industries, during the fiscal year 1943, will amount to several million workers. To reduce the amount of new housing required by this expansion, all reasonable recourses are being earnestly pursued. These include conversion of local plants to war purposes, transfers of local workers to war jobs, and drawing upon new sources of local labor supply. While in some cases adequate housing should be provided to keep families together, particularly where there are small children or where the breadwinner cannot afford to maintain two separate living units, there are other cases where workers may find it feasible not to move their families to the locality of their war jobs. It is estimated that the volume of war workers migrating to centers of war activity will be kept down to about 1,600,000 during the fiscal year 1943.

These 1,600,000 war workers need housing. Existing structures are being counted upon to absorb a large portion of them, despite present overcrowding in many industrial areas. Private enterprise is being relied upon to serve a large proportion of the remaining need, and toward this end Federal legislation has recently been enacted. But beyond these methods, there remains the irreducible requirement for a volume of new public construction, largely temporary in nature and designed to serve the lower income brackets of war workers.

The main vehicle for such public housing construction has been the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, known as the Lanham Act. The funds under this act, and under other acts to provide war housing, are practically all committed. They are being relied upon to meet needs arising before the end of the current fiscal year, and also to meet a part of the need for the fiscal year 1943.

To meet the minimum needs of the 1,600,000 war workers migrating to war centers during the fiscal year 1943, I am suggesting to the Congress the enactment of legislation providing an increase of $600,000,000 in the authorization contained in the Lanham Act, as amended. A large portion of these funds will be returned to the Government in the form of rents during the national emergency and through sales thereafter.

There is, of necessity, a period of several months between the authorization of funds for housing and the completion of living quarters. In view of the urgency of the need, which is a matter of common knowledge, I suggest that this proposed legislation receive the early consideration of the Congress.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 27, 1942.*

PAUL A. LARNED—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 208)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which

was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 2202, "An act to reinstate Paul A. Larned, a major, United States Army, retired, to the active list of Regular Army."

The bill would authorize the President to transfer Maj. Paul A. Larned, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Army in the grade of lieutenant colonel, provided he be found physically qualified for active service in the Regular Army.

Major Larned was retired June 18, 1920, on account of physical disability resulting from valvular heart disease. He was immediately assigned to limited active duty from the date of his retirement until September 1, 1924. He was relieved from duty and remained in a retirement status from September 1, 1924, to November 18, 1941, on which latter date he was again assigned to limited active duty not requiring physical exertion. The first tour of duty, from June 18, 1920, to September 1, 1942, was as an associate professor of military science and tactics at the University of Vermont and State Agricultural College, with the exception of a brief tour of recruiting duty. His present assignment began November 24, 1941, and is with the historical section, Army War College.

Under existing law retired officers are assigned to active duty as retired officers, and may be given temporary promotion when their assignment warrants. The War Department under the existing authority is now fully utilizing the services of retired officers, and many of them who were retired for physical disability are now assigned to active duty in positions where physical disability does not handicap the performance of such duty. It is apparent, therefore, that the proposal to transfer this retired officer to the active list is not predicated on any need of the service.

There are serious objections to this proposed legislation from a standpoint of the good of the military service. Major Larned, who is now 57 years of age, has been separated from active military duties for more than 17 years during which period there have been major military developments, and any improvement in his physical condition can hardly be said to make up for the professional experience he has lost during the many years that he was on the retired list. I find, moreover, little justification for singling out this one retired officer, from among other retired officers in the same category, for restoration to the active list of the Army, and still less justification for the concomitant proposal to advance him to the grade of lieutenant colonel.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 27, 1942.*

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, submitted the following favorable reports of nominations:

Capt. Charles M. Cooke, Jr., to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from November 29, 1941;

Capt. John W. Reeves, Jr., to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from May 2, 1942; and

Several temporary officers for appointment as officers, and sundry citizens to be second lieutenants, all in the Marine Corps.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE NAVY—NOMINATION OF ADOLPHUS ANDREWS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Adolphus Andrews to be vice admiral, for temporary service.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, a few days ago, when the Navy nominations were called in the Senate, it was asked that they be deferred until the report from the Committee on Naval Affairs concerning the steamship *Normandie* could be available. The interest which was aroused by the tremendous disaster to the *Normandie* extended throughout the country, of course, but particularly did it exist on the eastern seacoast, after some word had reached the public, through the press, to the effect that Admiral Adolphus Andrews was to be put in charge of the eastern seaboard defenses. Many bitter expressions of criticism were voiced as to Admiral Andrews, some taking the turn, to paraphrase, how could he be expected to defend the eastern seaboard against the ravages of submarine attack when he lost the *Normandie* while she was tied up at a dock in East River? That, of course, shows the extremes to which people's minds can go in these fearsome days.

In my opinion, the criticism of Admiral Andrews was unjust. I believe that he was not responsible for the loss of the *Normandie*, and I wished to have available the report of the investigation conducted under the auspices of our own Naval Affairs Committee, acting by direction of the Senate, so that, the report being available, the facts would also be apparent, and thereupon the confirmation of Admiral Andrews could be proceeded with without the slightest injustice to him, or to those who would sustain the nomination and ratify the promotion.

Nonetheless, there are many questions remaining with reference to the *Normandie* situation. I noticed in last night's New York Evening Sun, for example, an article entitled "*Normandie* an Unrecognizable Mess to Ship News Reporters." In a byline story by Mr. Robert Wilder it is stated:

> Responsible authorities have estimated that it will take at least 18 months to prepare the vessel for refloating and another year to clean her up and be ready for the sea.

Eighteen months to prepare the vessel for refloating, and another year thereafter, understand, to clean her up.

A Navy commander took the ship reporters over the hulk of the *Normandie*, and he apparently stated to the press that the estimate submitted by the responsible authorities cited by Mr. Wilder was correct, for Commander Sullivan said that 12 months "was the minimum time the Navy had set and that that would only bring the operations up to where the pumps could go to work."

The article continues:

> There has never been a salvage job of such magnitude undertaken before. The *Paris*, another ship of the French Line which caught fire and burned at her pier at Le Havre, was in a similar position but the company abandoned any idea of righting her and she was not half the size of the *Normandie*. Dismissing the technicalities, which are apparently limitless, the broad plan of salvage is to seal the ship up, pump her dry, flood the starboard ballast tanks and roll her back into place.

The question is suggested, of course, as to what possible use can be made of the *Normandie* after the vast expenditure of millions, not to mention the use of materials, and the time of men for a period of some two and a half years, to right the ship and fit her for the sea.

In trying to analyze the possible value of this operation, we are forced to an examination of the hearings, the report of which was submitted by the Committee on Naval Affairs. We find there that the Navy itself, through very considerable investigation, did not know, when they took her over, to what use they were going to devote her. The former captain of the *Normandie* said that she at no time was fit for use as a troop ship, nor could she be so used, and the report to the Senate submitted by the Committee on Naval Affairs indicates that at one time, I believe about the 9th of January 1942, the ship was offered to the Army, which accepted her tentatively, went aboard with naval architects and engineers, but even our Army authorities returned the ship to the Navy at the end of some 3 weeks.

The report makes further point of the fact that the French Line, in the building of the *Normandie*, unlike the British companies producing large trans-Atlantic liners, did not turn her out with a view, or design her with the idea, of her being devoted to war purposes.

Therefore, not only are we put on inquiry as to the future possible use of the ship, and hence the expediency of going into the enormous operation which lies ahead of us, but we also well may question, it seems to me, the decision, and the source of the decision, under which

operations were commenced upon the *Normandie* in December 1941.

Remember, I absolve Admiral Adolphus Andrews entirely from responsibility for her loss. The fact remains, however, that on the night of December 24, 1941, according to the report, he receipted for the ship and took her over in his capacity as commandant of the Third Naval District. But examination of the Navy Regulations on the point would indicate that the responsibility for the organization and efficient operation of all administrative units within a naval district rests with the officer in direct command of such units.

Reading from article 1482 of the Navy Regulations, section 1, we find:

> In the administration of affairs in the district the commandant shall not personally supervise the details of work or administration of the several groups or units, but will transact necessary business with the officer commanding the group or unit. These groups or units will coordinate, and every effort will be made to develop complete intercommunication and cooperation among the several groups and units in regard to all matters requiring joint action.
>
> In the administration of affairs within his district the commandant shall not direct nor shall he be responsible for the technical work being carried on by any of the various organizations, but the head of each administrative unit will keep him informed regarding the general nature and scope of the work carried on, and supply him with all information that will be of value in formulating plans for the coordination of all naval activities within the district.

Mr. President, Admiral Andrews never boarded the *Normandie* at any time while she was tied up at the dock in New York, never inspected her in any way until after the fire had broken out. That is a very singular situation. Certainly it was sufficient to impel the Senate to order an investigation, as we did. Certainly it called for the Senate Naval Affairs Committee to go into the matters with extreme care, and my examination of the report, during the brief time in which it has been available to us, which has been only a couple of hours, indicates that a very real degree of care has been devoted to the preparation of the report.

I read from the report:

> The Robins Dry Dock & Repair Co. commenced the work of converting the *LaFayette* from a luxury liner into a troop ship capable of carrying 15,000 or more soldiers, on December 24, 1941. Contrary to Navy regulations and customs, no receipt whereby responsibility for the naval vessel is established was given by the contractors to the Navy Department for this vessel.

At that point I may say that it certainly seems that right at the outset someone should have been in charge, seeing to it that the proper receipt was given, notwithstanding the fact that in the contract, an excerpt from which appears on page 16 of the report, it is provided that the contractor shall exercise the highest possible degree of care to protect the vessel from fire.

In that particular, apparently the contractor did his very best to make adequate protection against the destruction of the vessel by fire. He engaged fire watchers, he engaged inspectors of fire watchers. But the report, significantly, without mention of any name, says that

> "The Bureau of Ships"—it defines it merely as "The Bureau of Ships"—ordered the authorities in charge of the vessel's conversion to complete her and have her ready to sail from New York on or about the 14th of February—

notwithstanding the fact that whoever was in charge of giving that order was not acquainted with the conditions aboard the ship, was not acquainted with the obstacles attendant upon the conversion of the ship, and the order was entered over the protest of the captain in charge of the work.

It is interesting to perceive, pursuant to the extraordinary demand from Washington from some unidentified person in the Bureau of Ships that the ship be made ready to sail in the face of what looked like a physical impossibility to prepare her within the time fixed, the contractor sent all over New York and got welders off jobs, hired them from other contractors, put them to work at night, and had more than 200 acetylene welding jobs going on in that vessel at one time.

Obviously, Mr. President, thus pressed by the demands in Washington for haste, the contractor was obliged to get fire watchers from whatever nook and cranny he could find them, and many of them were wholly inexperienced, and had had no training whatever. It is not to be wondered at then, that when, on the day before the fire broke out, someone other than anyone to whom I have previously referred, ordered four steel stanchions cut out of the promenade room, the kapok cushions covered with burlap were in the immediate vicinity where the fire took place. As a matter of fact they were stored in this spot only because no "burning" operations were scheduled there.

According to the story about the fire itself, the burning or cutting by acetylene torches of the four stanchions proceeded without event all during the forenoon of the day of the fire. Three of them were removed entirely and the fourth was cut partly through when within a few minutes prior to the time the fire was discovered an inspector of the Navy passing along a passageway right alongside where the cutting operation was taking place stopped and looked in and saw these acetylene-torch workers surrounded within arm's length by piles of kapok cushions covered with burlap. He asked about the progress of the work, saw that only an inch or so remained to be cut, and he said in effect, "Well, down with the old apple tree," and with some such exclamation from him he passed along. There were so many things that could have been done. And still there was no effort on his part to remove the possible fire hazard so perfectly apparent to anyone who ever saw an acetylene torch in operation.

Aboard also, Mr. President, were at least 200 men of the Coast Guard under command of the Coast Guard officer. Technically, it is said in the report they, when the ship is at a dock, are charged with her safety and protection, but the Coast Guard was not in charge of this job. Whoever inspected the vessel when the Government took her over found that more than half of the fire extinguishers were unusable. Over the period that the Navy had her she was not adequately connected with the New York City fire hydrants or other sources of water supply. When the fire actually got under way certain of what the report calls the "Scotch boilers" had to be secured. The ship was in darkness. There was no pump working. It was impossible to maintain pressure.

Mr. President, the degree of confusion which prior to the fire existed in the management and control of the ship itself merely prefaced the bewilderment which overtook everyone when the catastrophe was at its height. There was no one there who could even command the curtailing of the supply of water that was pumped into the ship, and long after it was desired that the force of the water, which ultimately capsized the ship, be cut off there seemed to be no one in control with power and authority sufficient to order the water supply cut off.

Mr. President, there is revealed, it seems to me, as we examine that report, a disgraceful state of lack of responsibility for that great ship. I make the statement on the basis of the evidence contained in the report to the Senate submitted to us by the Committee on Naval Affairs, clearly demonstrating irresponsibility, confusion, lack of authority, lack of centralization of control somewhere, in somebody. The disaster reflects the same condition, apparently, that existed at Pearl Harbor, if we are to take the report of Mr. Justice Roberts and his associates.

How many more times must this go on? What are we going to find with reference to Admiral Andrews' control over the eastern seaboard defenses, Mr. President? Is he to be handicapped further in his command of our defenses on the eastern seaboard where, in 5 months, we have already lost more than 200 merchant ships within 50 miles of the American coast, or are we going, somehow, somewhere, to demand that the recommendations of this committee, submitted through its report, be given prompt priority on the legislative calendar to the end that appropriate steps be taken for the adequate protection of the country? In times when decisions are necessary, when someone must make them, there must be control.

I have prefaced our approach to these pending nominations on the Executive Calendar with a discussion of this situation, so that the record would be perfectly clear, not only as to the facts as reported to us but to the background on which up to now I have asked that the nomination of Admiral Andrews go over. Because the report clearly absolves him, because no fair-minded man could hold him personally responsible for the disaster, I wanted not only the facts to appear as a matter of record here but also to reflect the exculpation of Admiral Andrews at the same time.

Mr. President, just the same, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs whether or not it is contemplated that some steps will be taken to carry into effect the recommen-

dations contained in this report? Since I am not on the committee, I should like to know whether or not the Committee on Naval Affairs intends to go further and find out who it was in the Bureau of Ships that was giving such orders as were protested by Captain Simmers, who was on the ship and who knew that the orders could not be executed, and who was sending his objections to his superiors, no doubt with some embarrassment to himself? At all times, so far as the record shows, Captain Simmers was being disregarded by somebody here in Washington.

Who was that? The report is silent. Who was responsible then for that haste, that impetus which led to what ultimately developed to be an act of sheer negligence, out of which this disaster not only arose with reference to the *Normandie* in the past but because of which the Government is going to be put to the expense of millions of dollars in the future?

Finally, it seems to me, Mr. President, that the Committee on Naval Affairs might very properly inquire from somebody in authority as to whether or not it is expedient that the task of restoring the *Normandie* be proceeded with, and whether or not justly we should not propose to get her out of there, which itself is a considerable task. Perhaps we should proceed no further with any attempt to salvage her or recondition her for a service for which she is said to be unsuited and which was so uncertain that the Army turned her back, the Navy once thought they were going to use her for an aircraft carrier, and again that they could use her for a supply ship.

Mr. President, with all the indecision and confusion, so far, upon the record, there is nothing tangible to indicate a future course with reference to her.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. I am interested to know who issued the order that repairs had to be completed by February 14. From the Senator's statement I understand that the Senator does not know.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator's understanding is correct. I do not know.

Mr. HOLMAN. Should not that question be persevered in? Someone in high authority must have issued the order.

Mr. DANAHER. The Senator is drawing a conclusion which seems to me not unsupported by the facts and the logic applicable to them. Certainly somebody in authority should know, but the report does not tell who it is. The report gives no indication whatever as to who it was that gave the orders that that ship be prepared in what Captain Simmers said was an incredibly short and inadequate period. So I am unable to answer the Senator. But certainly the man who was there on the job and most familiar with it, it seems to me, should have been regarded. But he was not.

Mr. President, I think I have said enough to indicate the thoughts which have pervaded my mind ever since Admiral Andrews' nomination came before us. We will not soon forget the *Normandie*. Equally, I hope, that from her loss we can draw a lesson, and that someone downtown can be found and perhaps ultimately named by the Committee on Naval Affairs upon whom the responsibility for this matter should be caused to rest, to the end that we may have a proper measure of such people now in command.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am gratified to note that the Senator from Connecticut, after studying with his usual diligence the report of the committee, exonerates Admiral Andrews from any responsibility in connection with the *Normandie* disaster. Three boards of inquiry have examined into it, the Naval Board of Inquiry, the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House, and, by order of the Senate, the Naval Affairs Committee of the Senate. All three agreed that Admiral Andrews can be in no way held responsible for the disaster. I repeat, every committee and every person investigating the reports of the tribunals which have conducted investigations find nothing to associate responsibility upon the part of Admiral Andrews. That is the only issue before the Senate.

I should like, for the sake of the record, however, to read from Admiral Andrews' own testimony, which is not disputed, in reference to his connection with this matter:

> There are no regulations regarding the duties or responsibilities of a district commandant pertaining to naval vessels out of commission berthed within the geographical limits of the district. Such a vessel, without crew and out of commission, normally would be sent to the navy yard where she would be under the responsibility of the commandant of the navy yard, or sent to a private shipyard where she would be under the responsibility of the shipyard. In the case of the *Lafayette* I considered pier 88 as an extension of the Robins Drydock & Repair Co. shipyard.
>
> The Navy regulations require that: "In the administration of affairs in the district the commandant shall not personally supervise the details of work or administration of the several groups or units, but will transact necessary business with the officer commanding the group or unit."
>
> Further:
>
> "In the administration of affairs within his district the commandant shall not direct nor shall he be responsible for the technical work being carried on by any of the various organizations, but the head of each administrative unit will keep him informed regarding the general nature and scope of the work carried on, and supply him with all information that will be of value in formulating plans (1) for the coordination of all naval activities within the district and (2) for the operation and defense of the district in the event of war.
>
> "Communications relating entirely to the technical work of any of the establishments referred to in the above paragraphs shall be carried on direct with the bureau or station concerned."
>
> And to further quote Navy regulations:
>
> "The district shall be organized into units or groups according to the character of their activities and situation, each group or unit under the command of an officer responsible for all activities within the group or unit."
>
> The Third Naval District has been organized and has been administered in accordance with these regulations. Under the commandant there is assigned a district matériel officer, Capt. C. M. Simmers, United States Navy, with the following duties:
>
> "(1) The district matériel officer inspects, supervises, and coordinates all matériel activities within the district not assigned to the district supply officer or to the district public works officer, including all activities connected with conversion and repair of ships, and all operations within the district."
>
> * * * * *
>
> By reason of this tremendous work load it was found necessary for the Bureau of Ships—
>
> Not referring to the work load of his position—
>
> To handle contracts and repair work on ships other than at Brooklyn Navy Yard, direct to Captain Simmers, and to keep in constant communication with him—
>
> He was the matériel officer in charge of the ship—
>
> Practically the same as is done with the commandant of the Brooklyn Navy Yard.
>
> Note this:
>
> All correspondence having to do with conversion and repair of ships, contracts, and so forth, was handled directly between Bureau of Ships and Captain Simmers. Daily conversations and orders were issued to him by Bureau of Ships over the telephone.
>
> Again:
>
> Captain Simmers' organization operated in practically the same independent way that the navy yard operates direct with the Navy Department. I considered that the responsibility of this unit and the operation of same rested with the matériel officer in charge of this unit under direct orders from Bureau of Ships.
>
> * * * * *
>
> On December 23, Chief of Bureau of Ships addressed a letter to commandant, Third Naval District, which letter went direct to district matériel officer, on the subject of the conversion of the *Normandie*. Paragraph 1 stated:
>
> "Confirming telephone conversation of December 23, 1941, when the S. S. *Normandie* has been taken over in accordance with authorization received from CNO, you are hereby authorized to convert her to a troop transport in accordance with details of instruction to be dispatched to the district matériel officer."

I might continue quotations from the various reports, all leading to the same conclusion, which conclusion I assume the Senate will accept, that Admiral Andrews is not in any way chargeable with responsibility for this disaster.

The Senator from Connecticut has very properly discussed certain features of the report made by the Naval Affairs Committee, and I note that much he has approvingly quoted from the report consists of comments and criticisms made by the committee. In due time the report will be before the Senate for discussion and consideration of the legislative proposals and recommendations.

The conclusion which I have reached, and which is embodied in the report, is that the disaster to the *Normandie* was due largely—perhaps primarily—to the desire to speed up as quickly as possible the repair job on that ship in order to make it ready to transport troops. Who can question that? Who can criticize, in the midst of a war, when we are short of ships of every kind and character, a

driving, pushing, force to have the ships repaired and be put on the seas? Our committee had to consider the natural tendency and desire of the Government to repair ships as quickly as possible and place them into commission so as to transport our troops to places where they are needed. I, for one, have felt that in considering the disaster to the *Normandie* and the possible criticism, we should bear in mind the force, the desire, and the compelling need of repairing vessels as quickly as possible. I think the Bureau of Ships went too far. It insisted that the ship be ready by a certain time to take troops to one of the war zones. It did so over the protest of the matériel officer.

Mr. DANAHER rose.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I do not want to spend time discussing the report, because I assume it must be gone over again. I merely wished to say a brief word about the report.

The matériel officer protested. The result was that with the desire to speed up a tremendous number of employees were put on the ship. I think the number was 2,400. The whole city of New York was canvassed to find workers in different trades—good, bad, and indifferent—to work on the ship for the purpose of putting it in condition to sail the seas. That resulted in carelessness in the use of the torch in the presence of combustible material, which finally led to the fire.

That is the whole story. The Navy Department itself, in its own report, has found Lieutenant Commander Scott, the representative of the District Matériel Officer on board the vessel and the Officer in Charge of the Coast Guard Detail on the ship had some responsibility, and the Department has deferred taking action in the cases of those officers until later, but it admits that there was a responsibility which should be looked into further and considered at greater length.

Mr. President, there is much more I could say, but it is unnecessary for me to do so. We shall have an opportunity to discuss the report later, and I do not want now to go into it in detail.

The issue is, Is Admiral Andrews responsible, and should he be denied the promotion for which he has been nominated? I see no responsibility on his part. I repeat, the slate is clean, and there is nothing whatever in the record as a basis for charging Admiral Andrews with responsibility.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I am very much gratified to hear the remarks of the Senator from Connecticut in which he absolves Admiral Andrews of any culpability because of the sinking of the *Normandie;* and, of course, I am immensely pleased that the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, after a thorough and a most painstaking investigation, has come to the same conclusion.

I have known Admiral Andrews for many years. I recall when he was appointed to the Naval Academy as a cadet. He has had a long and distinguished career in the Navy. He has had a tour of duty in Washington. I am sure many Senators knew him personally when he was here. It is immensely pleasing to his friends and to all who know him to have his record absolutely cleared of any stain whatever with respect to the *Normandie* disaster.

I am sure all Senators will realize that men in high and responsible positions such as he occupied cannot personally supervise and know about every activity proceeding under their command. I am sure that he took every reasonable precaution and every wise step toward conserving the property which was within his care, and toward carrying out the duties which pertained to his high and responsible position. I know him intimately, and I wish to express my great sense of satisfaction that the three investigations which have been made of this incident all wholly and thoroughly acquit him of any blame whatever with respect to the unfortunate incident of the sinking of the *Normandie.*

I do not care to discuss the larger question about what shall be done with the *Normandie.* I assume we shall take up that question when the report of the committee comes before the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. That is correct.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, the Senator from Massachusetts asked who can criticize the provisional conversion of the *Normandie* into a troop ship. Lest even by implication that rhetorical question be applied to me, I will answer specifically that the committee criticizes on that ground.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. If I remember correctly, I asked who can criticize the urge, the push, and the drive to have the ship repaired so as to put it in use in time of war?

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator for that observation. With that limitation in the exact use of his words I concur.

Mr. WALSH. I had no intention of referring to the Senator.

Mr. DANAHER. I do not think the Senator did. I will not let the record stand with any possibility of it.

Let me say to the Senator from Massachusetts that on page 5 of the report of the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs we find this statement:

> The committee finds with further regard to the capsizing that the acquisition of this French luxury liner *Normandie* by the United States Government for ultimate conversion into a troop ship evidently was done without making an adequate study and survey to determine just what practical use the vessel might serve in our war effort. There is prima facie evidence to give rise to the thought that the ship's construction, lack of compartmentation, and known instability made it inadvisable to use the vessel for a transport upon which the lives and safety of 15,000 American boys on any voyage were dependent. Obviously, the Navy Department entertained some doubts on this point, as evidenced by the fact that first plans called for the use of the ship as an airplane carrier, then a boxed-plane cargo ship, and finally a troop ship. The capsizing of the vessel under the weight of trapped water confirms the belief that many men in the shipping business have held with regard to this vessel's stability.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. DANAHER. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. That does not refer to the fire.

Mr. DANAHER. No.

Mr. WALSH. That refers to the judgment of the Navy Department originally in purchasing the *Normandie* and trying to convert it for troop-carrying purposes.

Mr. DANAHER. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. On that question there is a substantial difference of opinion. In my opinion, as the report shows, there is a serious doubt whether it ever was suitable for troop-transporting purposes; but there is a difference of opinion about it, and the committee felt that that fact ought to be recalled for guidance in the future in whatever use might be made of the ship.

Mr. DANAHER. I thank the Senator. Let me read from page 20 of the report, in the summary of conclusions drawn by the committee from the facts developed in the several investigations:

> 3. The work was unduly accelerated through decisions made by the United States Navy Bureau of Ships in Washington by persons in authority who were not on the scene, who had no personal knowledge of the work entailed, yet placed unreasonable time limitations on those charged with the actual burden of doing the work—and in the face of advice to the contrary by subordinate Navy officers who were on the scene and fully acquainted with the difficulties involved.

Somewhere we have heard of those who have "a passion for anonymity." The anonymous persons who are in the background of conclusion 3, stated on page 20 of the committee report, may perhaps yield some cogent, tangible evidence as to where the real responsibility lies. I believe we should fix it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Adolphus Andrews to be vice admiral, for temporary service? Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

JOHN W. GREENSLADE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John W. Greenslade to be vice admiral, for temporary service, to rank from May 1, 1942, and to continue during his assignment as commander, western sea frontier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

ROBERT H. ENGLISH

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Robert H. English to be rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from May 8, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DONALD B. BEARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Donald B. Beary to be rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from December 1, 1941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of registers of land offices.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

EXTRADITION TREATY BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Executive C, an extradition treaty between the United States and Canada, signed at Washington, D. C., April 29, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the treaty, Executive C (77th Cong., 2d sess.), an extradition treaty between the United States of America and Canada, signed at Washington on April 29, 1942, which was read the second time as follows:

The President of the United States of America; and

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland and the British dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, in respect of Canada,

Desiring to promote the cause of justice, have resolved to conclude a treaty for the extradition of fugitives from justice between the two countries and have named for that purpose as their respective plenipotentiaries:

The President of the United States of America:

Mr. Cordell Hull, Secretary of State of the United States of America; and

His Majesty the King of Great Britain, Ireland, and the British dominions beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, for Canada:

Mr. Leighton McCarthy, K. C., Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Canada at Washington;

Who, having communicated to each other their full powers, found in good and due form, have agreed as follows:

ARTICLE I

The high contracting parties engage to deliver up to each other, under the circumstances and conditions stated in the present treaty, those persons who, being accused or convicted of any of the crimes or offenses enumerated in article III, committed within the territory of the one party, shall be found within the territory of the other party.

ARTICLE II

For the purposes of the present treaty:

(a) the territory of Canada shall be deemed to be all territory wherever situated under its exclusive administration and control;

(b) the territory of the United States of America shall be deemed to be all territory wherever situated belonging to the United States of America including its dependencies and all other territories under its exclusive administration or control;

(c) the word "territory" shall be deemed to include territorial waters, merchant vessels on and aircraft over the high seas, and men of war wherever situated;

(d) "requesting country" shall be deemed to mean that country on behalf of which a competent authority requests the surrender of an accused or convicted person;

(e) "requested country" shall be deemed to mean that country from which the surrender of an accused or convicted person is requested by a competent authority of the other country.

ARTICLE III

Extradition shall be reciprocally granted for the following crimes or offenses:

1. Murder (including crimes designated by the terms assassination, parricide, poisoning, and infanticide); manslaughter.

2. Malicious wounding; inflicting grievous bodily harm.

3. Rape, abortion, carnal knowledge of children under the age of 16 years; indecent assault or incest provided such crime or offense is punishable by the laws of both countries.

4. Procuration; abduction, or detention of women or girls for immoral purposes.

5. Bigamy.

6. Arson.

7. Wilful and unlawful destruction or obstruction of railroads, highways, docks, channels, beacons and buoys, airdromes, and other transportation facilities.

8. Crimes committed on the high seas, in the territorial seas or inland waters as follows:

(a) Piracy, as commonly known and defined by the law of nations, or by statutes;

(b) Wrongfully sinking or destroying a vessel or attempting to do so;

(c) Mutiny or conspiracy by two or more members of the crew or other persons on board of a vessel, for the purpose of rebelling against the authority of the captain or commander of such vessel, or by fraud or violence taking possession of such vessel;

(d) Assault on board ship with intent to do bodily harm.

9. Burglary, shop-breaking, and housebreaking.

10. The act of breaking into and entering the offices of government and public authorities, or any buildings not dwellings with intent to commit a crime or offense therein.

11. Robbery.

12. Forgery or uttering what is forged.

13. The forgery or falsification of the official documents or acts of the government or public authority, including courts of justice, or the uttering or fraudulent use of any of the same.

14. The fabrication of counterfeit money, whether coin or paper, counterfeit titles or coupons of public debt, created by national, state, provincial, territorial, local or municipal governments, bank notes or other instruments of public credit, counterfeit seals, stamps, dies and marks of state or public administrations, and the utterance, circulation or fraudulent use of the above-mentioned objects; knowingly and without lawful authority making or having in possession any instrument, tool or engine adapted and intended for the counterfeiting of any of the above-mentioned objects.

15. Embezzlement.

16. Kidnapping or false imprisonment of minors or adults.

17. Larceny or theft.

18. Obtaining any property, including money or valuable securities, by false pretenses, or receiving any property, including money or valuable securities, knowing the same to have been unlawfully obtained.

19. Perjury or subornation of perjury.

20. Fraud, or breach of trust by a bailee, banker, agent, factor, trustee, executor, administrator, guardian, or by a director or officer of any company or corporation, or by any one in any fiduciary position; fraudulent conversion.

21. Crimes and offenses against the laws for the suppression of slavery and slave trading.

22. Wilful desertion or wilful non-support of minor or dependent children.

23. Bribery, defined to be the offering, giving or receiving of bribes.

24. Crimes or offenses against the bankruptcy laws.

25. Crimes or offenses against the laws for the suppression of traffic in narcotics.

26. Using the mails to defraud.

27. Extortion, or threats with intent to extort money or other things of value.

28. Malicious injury to property.

29. Use of explosives so as to endanger human life or property.

30. Smuggling, defined to be the act of wilfully and knowingly violating the customs laws.

31. Crimes or offenses against the laws for the prevention of fraud in the sale or purchase of securities.

32. Crimes or offenses, if indictable, against the laws regulating

(a) public securities markets, or activities affecting such markets;

(b) registration or licensing of securities or of persons or companies doing business in securities, or giving advice with respect thereto;

(c) investment or public utility companies.

33. Extradition shall also take place for participation or conspiracy in any of the crimes or offenses before mentioned or in any attempt to commit any of such crimes or offenses.

ARTICLE IV

An accused person shall not be surrendered if the crime or offense for which his surrender is requested is one of a political character, or if he proves that the requisition for his surrender has, in fact, been made with a view to try to punish him for a crime or offense of a political character, provided that in no case shall murder, assassination or poisoning, either consummated or attempted, be deemed a crime or offense of a political character.

ARTICLE V

An accused person shall not be surrendered under the provisions hereof, when, from lapse of time or other lawful cause according to the laws of the requesting country, he is exempt from prosecution or punishment for the crime or offense for which the surrender is asked.

ARTICLE VI

Extradition shall not take place if the person claimed has already been tried and discharged or punished, or is being punished, or is still under trial in the territories of the requested country, for the crime or offense for which his extradition is requested.

If the accused person be actually under prosecution, out on bail or in custody, for a crime or offense committed in the requested country, or shall have been convicted thereof, his extradition may be deferred until such proceedings be ended, and until he shall have been set at liberty in due course of law.

ARTICLE VII

No person shall be tried for any crime or offense committed prior to his extradition, other than that for which he was surrendered, unless for one month after trial or, in case of

conviction, for one month after having suffered his punishment, or having been pardoned, he has been at liberty to leave the country.

ARTICLE VIII

The arrest and extradition of persons under the provisions of this treaty shall be carried out in the United States of America and in Canada, respectively, in conformity with the laws regulating extradition for the time being in force in the requested country.

Pertinent statutes of the requesting country shall be regarded as sufficiently proved for the purposes of extradition if they are certified by a principal law officer of such country or a sub-division thereof.

Requisition for the surrender of accused persons shall be made by the diplomatic agent of the requesting country. In the event of the absence of such agent from the country, requisition may be made by a consular officer.

ARTICLE IX

Extradition shall take place if the evidence be found sufficient to justify committal for trial for a crime or offense against the laws of the requesting country. In determining the sufficiency of such evidence, the courts of the requested country may apply the laws of the requested country with regard to the sufficiency of evidence to justify committal for trial in criminal causes. It shall not be essential to produce evidence sufficient to convict the accused person of the crime or offense charged were he placed on trial therefor, and it shall not be essential to establish that the crime or offense would be a crime or offense under the laws of the requested country.

If the person claimed shall have been convicted of the crime or offense for which his surrender is asked, it shall be sufficient to prove that he is the identical person so convicted in the courts of the requesting country and to produce a duly authenticated copy of the sentence of the court before which such conviction took place.

ARTICLE X

If the person claimed by one of the high contracting parties pursuant to the stipulations of this treaty shall also be claimed by one or more other countries on account of crimes or offenses committed within their jurisdiction, such person shall be delivered to that country whose claim is first received unless such claim is waived.

ARTICLE XI

Either Government may ask for the provisional apprehension and detention of a person, if it indicates at the same time its intention to request his extradition. During the period of provisional arrest of a person, whether pursuant to a formal request or otherwise, for the purpose of extradition hereunder, the legal officers of the requested country shall oppose the release on bail of such accused or convicted person, except in cases in which the denial of bail would, in their opinion, cause injustice.

Any fugitive provisionally arrested shall be released unless within two months from the date of arrest, or within such further time as a proper authority of the requested country shall direct, the formal requisition for surrender is made by the appropriate representative of the requesting country and within that time the documentary proofs in support of the requisition are produced before the appropriate judge or magistrate.

If, at any time prior to committal for trial, the accused or convicted person shall signify his willingness to return to the requesting country he shall, subject to the consent of the competent authorities of the requested country, be delivered to the proper officials of the requesting country for return thereto.

ARTICLE XII

All articles which were in the possession of the person to be surrendered at the time of his apprehension, and any articles that may serve as a proof of the crime or offense, shall be given up when the extradition takes place, in so far as this may be permitted by the law of the requested country.

ARTICLE XIII

All expenses connected with the extradition shall be borne by the requesting country. However, the appropriate legal officers of the requested country where the proceedings of extradition are had, shall, consistently with the discharge of their duties and without charge, cooperate with the officers of the requesting country before the respective judges and magistrates.

ARTICLE XIV

The present treaty shall be ratified by the high contracting parties in accordance with their respective constitutional methods and shall take effect ten days after the exchange of ratifications which shall take place at Washington as soon as possible.

The present treaty shall remain in force for a period of five years and in case neither of the high contracting parties shall have given notice one year before the expiration of that period of his intention to terminate the treaty, it shall continue in force until the expiration of one year from the date on which such notice of termination shall be given by either of the high contracting parties.

On the coming into force of the present treaty it shall supersede all other existing provisions of treaties and conventions relating to extradition between the United States of America and Canada.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the above-named plenipotentiaries have signed the present treaty and have hereunto affixed their seals.

DONE in duplicate at Washington this twenty-ninth day of April, 1942.

CORDELL HULL [SEAL]
LEIGHTON MCCARTHY [SEAL]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The treaty is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the treaty will be reported to the Senate.

The treaty was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive C, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, an extradition treaty between the United States of America and Canada signed at Washington on April 29, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the treaty is ratified.

TAXATION CONVENTION WITH CANADA

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Executive B, a taxation convention with Canada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the convention, Executive B, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, a convention between the United States of America and Canada providing for avoidance of double income taxation, modification of certain conflicting principles of taxation, reductions of certain rates of taxation, and establishment of exchange of information between the United States and Canada in the field of income taxation, signed at Washington on March 4, 1942, which was read the second time, as follows:

The Government of the United States of America and the Government of Canada, being desirous of further promoting the flow of commerce between the two countries, of avoiding double taxation and of preventing fiscal evasion in the case of income taxes, have decided to conclude a Convention and for that purpose have appointed as their Plenipotentiaries:

Mr. Sumner Welles, Acting Secretary of State of the United States of America; and

Mr. Leighton McCarthy, K. C., Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of Canada at Washington;

who, having communicated to one another their full powers found in good and due form, have agreed upon the following Articles:

ARTICLE I

An enterprise of one of the contracting States is not subject to taxation by the other contracting State in respect of its industrial and commercial profits except in respect of such profits allocable in accordance with the Articles of this Convention to its permanent establishment in the latter State.

No account shall be taken in determining the tax on one of the contracting States, of the mere purchase of merchandise effected therein by an enterprise of the other State.

ARTICLE II

For the purposes of this Convention, the term "industrial and commercial profits" shall not include income in the form of rentals and royalties, interest, dividends, management charges, or gains derived from the sale or exchange of capital assets.

Subject to the provisions of this Convention such items of income shall be taxed separately or together with industrial and commercial profits in accordance with the laws of the contracting States.

ARTICLE III

1. If an enterprise of one of the contracting States has a permanent establishment in the other State, there shall be attributed to such permanent establishment the net industrial and commercial profit which it might be expected to derive if it were an independent enterprise engaged in the same or similar activities under the same or similar conditions. Such net profit will, in principle, be determined on the basis of the separate accounts pertaining to such establishment.

2. The competent authority of the taxing State may, when necessary, in execution of paragraph 1 of this Article, rectify the accounts produced, notably to correct errors and omissions or to reestablish the prices or remunerations entered in the books at the value which would prevail between independent persons dealing at arm's length.

3. If (a) an establishment does not produce an accounting showing its own operations, or (b) the accounting produced does not correspond to the normal usages of the trade in the country where the establishment is situated, or (c) the rectifications provided for in paragraph 2 of this Article cannot be effected the competent authority of the taxing State may determine the net industrial and commercial profit by applying such methods or formulae to the operations of the establishment as may be fair and reasonable.

4. To facilitate the determination of industrial and commercial profits allocable to the permanent establishment, the competent authorities of the contracting States may consult together with a view to the adoption of uniform rules of allocation of such profits.

ARTICLE IV

1. (a) When a United States enterprise, by reason of its participation in the manage-

ment or capital of a Canadian enterprise, makes or imposes on the latter, in their commercial or financial relations, conditions different from those which would be made with an independent enterprise, any profits which should normally have appeared in the balance sheet of the Canadian enterprise but which have been, in this manner, diverted to the United States enterprise, may be incorporated in the taxable profits of the Canadian enterprise, subject to applicable measures of appeal.

(b) In order to effect the inclusion of such profits in the taxable profits of the Canadian enterprise, the competent authority of Canada may, when necessary, rectify the accounts of the Canadian enterprise, notably to correct errors and omissions or to reestablish the prices or remuneration entered in the books at the values which would prevail between independent persons dealing at arm's length. To facilitate such rectification the competent authorities of the contracting States may consult together with a view to such determination of profits of the Canadian enterprise as may appear fair and reasonable.

2. The same principle applies, mutatis mutandis, in the event that profits are diverted from a United States enterprise to a Canadian enterprise.

ARTICLE V

Income which an enterprise of one of the contracting States derives from the operation of ships or aircraft registered in that State shall be exempt from taxation in the other contracting State.

The present Convention will not be deemed to affect the exchange of notes between the United States of America and Canada, dated August 2 and September 17, 1928, providing for relief from double income taxation on shipping profits.

ARTICLE VI

Wages, salaries and similar compensation paid by the Government, or any agency or instrumentality thereof, of one of the contracting States or by the political subdivisions or territories or possessions thereof to citizens of such State residing in the other State shall be exempt from taxation in the latter State.

Pensions and life annuities derived from within one of the contracting States and paid to individuals residing in the other contracting State shall be exempt from taxation in the former State.

ARTICLE VII

1. A resident of Canada shall be exempt from United States income tax upon compensation for labor or personal services performed within the United States of America if he conforms to either of the following conditions:

(a) He is temporarily present within the United States of America for a period or periods not exceeding a total of one hundred and eighty-three days during the taxable year and such compensation (A) is received for labor or personal services performed as an employee of, or under contract with, a resident or corporation or other entity of Canada and (B) does not exceed $5,000 in the aggregate during such taxable year; or

(b) he is temporarily present in the United States of America for a period or periods not exceeding a total of ninety days during the taxable year and the compensation received for such services does not exceed $1,500 in the aggregate during such taxable year.

2. The provisions of paragraph 1 (a) of this Article shall have no application to the professional earnings of such individuals as actors, artists, musicians and professional athletes.

3. The provisions of paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article shall apply, mutatis mutandis, to a resident of the United States of America deriving compensation for personal services performed within Canada.

ARTICLE VIII

Gains derived in one of the contracting States from the sale or exchange of capital assets by a resident or a corporation or other entity of the other contracting State shall be exempt from taxation in the former State, provided such resident or corporation or other entity has no permanent establishment in the former State.

ARTICLE IX

Students or business apprentices from one of the contracting States residing in the other contracting State for purposes of study or for acquiring business experience shall not be taxable by the latter State in respect of remittances received by them from within the former State for the purposes of their maintenance or studies.

ARTICLE X

Income derived from sources within one of the contracting States by a religious, scientific, literary, educational, or charitable organization of the other contracting State shall be exempt from taxation in the State from which the income is derived if, within the meaning of the laws of both contracting States, such organization would have been exempt from income tax.

ARTICLE XI

1. The rate of income tax imposed by one of the contracting States in respect of income derived from sources therein, upon individuals residing in, or corporations organized under the laws of, the other contracting State, and not engaged in trade or business in the former State and having no office or place of business therein, shall not exceed fifteen per cent for each taxable year.

2. Notwithstanding the provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article, income tax in excess of five per cent shall not be imposed by one of the contracting States in respect of dividends paid by a subsidiary corporation organized under the laws of such State, or of a political subdivision thereof, to a parent corporation organized under the laws of the other contracting State, or of a political subdivision thereof: Provided, however, That this paragraph shall not apply if the competent authority in the former State is satisfied that the corporate relationship between the two corporations has been arranged or is maintained primarily with the intention of taking advantage of this paragraph.

3. Notwithstanding the provisions of Article XXII of this Convention, paragraph 1 or paragraph 2, or both, of this Article, may be terminated without notice on or after the termination of the three-year period beginning with the effective date of this Convention by either of the contracting States imposing a rate of income tax in excess of the rate of 15 percent prescribed in paragraph 1 or in excess of the rate of 5 percent prescribed in paragraph 2.

4. The provisions of this Article shall not be construed so as to contravene the Tax Convention between the United States of America and Canada, effective January 1, 1936, to April 29, 1941.

ARTICLE XII

Dividends and interest paid on or after the effective date of this Convention by a corporation organized under the laws of Canada to individual residents of Canada, other than citizens of the United States of America, or to corporations organized under the laws of Canada shall be exempt from all income taxes imposed by the United States of America.

ARTICLE XIII

Corporations organized under the laws of Canada, more than 50 percent of the outstanding voting stock of which is owned directly or indirectly throughout the last half of the taxable year by individual residents of Canada, other than citizens of the United States of America, shall be exempt from any taxes imposed by the United States of America with respect to accumulated or undistributed earnings, profits, income, or surplus of such corporations. With respect to corporations organized under the laws of Canada not exempt from such taxes under the provisions of this Article the competent authorities of the two contracting States will consult together.

ARTICLE XIV

1. (a) The United States income tax liability for any taxable year beginning prior to January 1, 1936, of any individual resident of Canada, other than a citizen of the United States of America, or of any corporation organized under the laws of Canada, remaining unpaid as of the date of signature of this Convention may be adjusted on a basis satisfactory to the Commissioner: Provided, That the amount to be paid in settlement of such liability shall not exceed the amount of the liability which would have been determined if—

(A) the Revenue Act of 1936 as modified by the Tax Convention between the United States of America and Canada, effective January 1, 1936, to April 29, 1941 (except in the case of a corporation organized under the laws of Canada more than 50 percent of the outstanding voting stock of which was owned directly or indirectly throughout the last half of the taxable year by citizens or residents of the United States of America) and

(B) Articles XII and XIII of this Convention had been in effect for such year.

If the taxpayer was not, within the meaning of the Revenue Act of 1936, engaged in trade or business within the United States of America and had no office or place of business therein during the taxable year, the amount of interest and penalties shall not exceed 50 percent of the amount of the tax with respect to which such interest and penalties have been computed.

(b) The United States income tax liability remaining unpaid as of the date of signature of this Convention for any taxable year beginning after December 31, 1935 and prior to January 1, 1941, in the case of any individual resident of Canada, other than a citizen of the United States of America, or in the case of any corporation organized under the laws of Canada shall be determined as if the provisions of Articles XII and XIII of this Convention had been in effect for such year.

2. The provisions of paragraph 1 of this Article shall not apply—

(a) Unless the taxpayer files with the Commissioner within two years from the date of signature of this Convention a request that such tax liability be so adjusted together with such information as the Commissioner may require;

(b) In any case in which the Commissioner is satisfied that any deficiency in tax is due to fraud with intent to evade the tax.

ARTICLE XV

In accordance with the provisions of Section 8 of the Income War Tax Act as in effect on the day of the entry into force of this Convention, Canada agrees to allow as a deduction from the Dominion income and excess profits taxes on any income which was derived from sources within the United States of America and was there taxed, the appropriate amount of such taxes paid to the United States of America.

In accordance with the provisions of Section 131 of the United States Internal Revenue Code as in effect on the day of the entry into force of this Convention, the United States of America agrees to allow as a deduction from the income and excess profits taxes

imposed by the United States of America the appropriate amount of such taxes paid to Canada.

ARTICLE XVI

Where a taxpayer shows proof that the action of the revenue authorities of the contracting States has resulted in double taxation in his case in respect of any of the taxes to which the present Convention relates, he shall be entitled to lodge a claim with the State of which he is a citizen or resident or, if the taxpayer is a corporation or other entity, with the State in which it was created or organized. If the claim should be deemed worthy of consideration, the competent authority of such State may consult with the competent authority of the other State to determine whether the double taxation in question may be avoided in accordance with the terms of this Convention.

ARTICLE XVII

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Convention, the United States of America in determining the income and excess profits taxes, including all surtaxes, of its citizens or residents or corporations, may include in the basis upon which such taxes are imposed all items of income taxable under the revenue laws of the United States of America as though this Convention had not come into effect.

ARTICLE XVIII

The competent authorities of the two contracting States may prescribe regulations to carry into effect the present Convention within the respective States and rules with respect to the exchange of information.

The competent authorities of the two contracting States may communicate with each other directly for the purpose of giving effect to the provisions of the present Convention.

ARTICLE XIX

With a view to the prevention of fiscal evasion, each of the contracting States undertakes to furnish to the other contracting State, as provided in the succeeding Articles of this Convention, the information which its competent authorities have at their disposal or are in a position to obtain under its revenue laws in so far as such information may be of use to the authorities of the other contracting State in the assessment of the taxes to which this Convention relates.

The information to be furnished under the first paragraph of this Article, whether in the ordinary course or on request, may be exchanged directly between the competent authorities of the two contracting States.

ARTICLE XX

1. The competent authorities of the United States of America shall forward to the competent authorities of Canada as soon as practicable after the close of each calendar year the following information relating to such calendar year:

The names and addresses of all persons whose addresses are within Canada and who derive from sources within the United States of America dividends, interest, rents, royalties, salaries, wages, pensions, annuities, or other fixed or determinable annual or periodical profits and income, showing the amount of such profits and income in the case of each addressee.

2. The competent authorities of Canada shall forward to the competent authorities of the United States of America as soon as practicable after the close of each calendar year the following information relating to such calendar year:

(a) The names and addresses of all persons whose addresses are within the United States of America and who derive from sources within Canada dividends, interest, rents, royalties, salaries, wages, pensions, or other fixed or determinable annual or periodical profits and income, showing the amount of such profits and income in the case of each addressee.

(b) The names and addresses of all persons whose addresses are outside of Canada and who derive through a nominee, or agent, or custodian in Canada income from sources within the United States of America, and who are not entitled to the reduced rate at 15 percent with respect to such income provided in Article XI of this Convention, showing the amount of such income in the case of each addressee.

(c) The names and addresses, where available, of persons whose addresses are outside of Canada and who derive dividends during the calendar year from corporations organized under the laws of Canada, more than 50 percent of the gross income of which is derived from sources within the United States of America, showing the amount of such dividends in each case.

(d) The names and addresses of all persons whose addresses are within the United States of America and who beneficially or of record own stocks or bonds, debentures or other securities, or evidences of funded indebtedness, of any company taxed in Canada as a Non-Resident-Owned Investment Corporation. The term "Non-Resident-Owned Investment Corporation" shall have the same meaning as when used in the Income War Tax Act of Canada.

ARTICLE XXI

1. If the Minister in the determination of the income tax liability of any person under any of the revenue laws of Canada deems it necessary to secure the cooperation of the Commissioner, the Commissioner may, upon request, furnish the Minister such information bearing upon the matter as the Commissioner is entitled to obtain under the revenue laws of the United States of America.

2. If the Commissioner in the determination of the income tax liability of any person under any of the revenue laws of the United States of America deems it necessary to secure the cooperation of the Minister, the Minister may, upon request, furnish the Commissioner such information bearing upon the matter as the Minister is entitled to obtain under the revenue laws of Canada.

ARTICLE XXII

This Convention and the accompanying Protocol which shall be considered to be an integral part of the Convention shall be ratified and the instruments of ratification shall be exchanged at Washington as soon as possible.

This Convention and Protocol shall become effective on the first day of January 1941. They shall continue effective for a period of three years from that date and indefinitely after that period, but may be terminated by either of the contracting States at the end of the three-year period or at any time thereafter provided that, except as otherwise specified in the case of Article XI, at least six months prior notice of termination has been given, the termination to become effective on the first day of January following the expiration of the six-month period.

Done in duplicate, at Washington, this fourth day of March, 1942.

SUMNER WELLES [SEAL]
LEIGHTON MCCARTHY [SEAL]

PROTOCOL

At the moment of signing the Convention for the avoidance of double taxation, and the establishment of rules of reciprocal administrative assistance in the case of income taxes, this day concluded between the United States of America and Canada, the undersigned plenipotentiaries have agreed upon the following provisions and definitions:

1. The taxes referred to in this Convention are:

(a) for the United States of America:
the Federal income taxes, including surtaxes, and excess-profits taxes.

(b) for Canada:
the Dominion income taxes, including surtaxes, and excess-profits taxes.

2. In the event of appreciable changes in the fiscal laws of either of the contracting States, the Governments of the two contracting States will consult together.

3. As used in this Convention:

(a) the terms "person", "individual", and "corporation", shall have the same meanings, respectively, as they have under the revenue laws of the taxing State or the State furnishing the information, as the case may be;

(b) the term "enterprise" includes every form of undertaking, whether carried on by an individual, partnership, corporation, or any other entity;

(c) the term "enterprise of one of the contracting States" means, as the case may be, "United States enterprise" or "Canadian enterprise";

(d) the term "United States enterprise" means an enterprise carried on in the United States of America by an individual resident in the United States of America, or by a corporation, partnership, or other entity created or organized in or under the laws of the United States of America, or of any of the States or Territories of the United States of America;

(e) the term "Canadian enterprise" is defined in the same manner mutatis mutandis as the term "United States enterprise";

(f) the term "permanent establishment" includes branches, mines, and oil wells, farms, timber lands, plantations, factories, workshops, warehouses, offices, agencies, and other fixed places of business of an enterprise, but does not include a subsidiary corporation.

When an enterprise of one of the contracting States carries on business in the other contracting State through an employee or agent established there, who has general authority to contract for his employer or principal or has a stock of merchandise from which he regularly fills orders which he receives, such enterprise shall be deemed to have a permanent establishment in the latter State.

The fact that an enterprise of one of the contracting States has business dealings in the other contracting State through a commission agent broker or other independent agent or maintains therein an office used solely for the purchase of merchandise shall not be held to mean that such enterprise has a permanent establishment in the latter State.

4. The term "Minister", as used in this Convention, means the Minister of National Revenue of Canada or his duly authorized representative. The term "Commissioner", as used in this Convention, means the Commissioner of Internal Revenue of the United States of America, or his duly authorized representative. The term "competent authority", as used in this Convention, means the Commissioner and the Minister and their duly authorized representatives.

5. The term "United States of America", when used in a geographical sense, includes only the States, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, and the District of Columbia. The term "Canada" when used in a geographical sense means the Provinces, the Territories and Sable Island.

6. The term "subsidiary corporation" referred to in Article XI of this Convention means a corporation all of whose shares (less directors' qualifying shares) having full voting rights are beneficially owned by another corporation, provided that ordinarily not more than one-quarter of the gross income of such subsidiary corporation is derived from interest and dividends other than interest and dividends received from its subsidiary corporations.

7. (a) The term "rentals and royalties" referred to in Article II of this Convention

shall include rentals or royalties arising from leasing real or immoveable, or personal or moveable property or from any interest in such property, including rentals or royalties for the use of, or for the privilege of using, patents, copyrights, secret processes and formulae, goodwill, trade marks, trade brands, franchises and other like property;

(b) The term "interest", as used in this Convention, shall include income arising from interest-bearing securities, public obligations, mortgages, hypothecs, corporate bonds, loans, deposits and current accounts;

(c) the term "dividends", as used in this Convention, shall include all distributions of the earnings or profits of corporations.

8. The term "pensions" referred to in Article VI of this Convention means periodic payments made in consideration for services rendered or by way of compensation for injuries received.

9. The term "life annuities" referred to in Article VI of this Convention means a stated sum payable periodically at stated times, during life, or during a specified number of years, under an obligation to make the payments in consideration of a gross sum or sums paid by the recipient or under a contributory retirement plan.

10. The terms "engaged in trade or business" and "office or place of business" as used in Article XI of this Convention shall not be deemed to include an office used solely for the purchase of merchandise.

11. The provisions of the present Convention shall not be construed to restrict in any manner any exemption, deduction, credit or other allowance accorded by the laws of one of the contracting States in the determination of the tax imposed by such State.

12. The citizens of one of the contracting States residing within the other contracting State shall not be subjected to the payment of more burdensome taxes than the citizens of such other State.

Done in duplicate, at Washington, this fourth day of March, 1942.

[SEAL] SUMNER WELLES
[SEAL] LEIGHTON MCCARTHY

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement regarding the convention. It is a very important agreement, under which the United States obtains quite substantial concessions and rights. It deals primarily with two classes of taxes—that is to say, the income tax, both normal and surtax, applicable to individuals, and excess-profits taxes applicable to corporations.

The convention itself had consideration by the Foreign Relations Committee. A report has been submitted in writing setting forth the terms of the treaty; but I desire to make a statement with reference to one matter which has arisen in connection with the convention.

The motion-picture industry has filed, not an objection to the treaty because of anything contained therein, but exceptions to it because that industry is not, as it conceives, properly protected. The whole controversy arises by virtue of the following facts:

For the purpose of the convention, the term "industrial and commercial profits" shall not include income in the form of rentals, royalties, and interest. The motion-picture industry in this country does not sell its films to exhibitors in Canada but merely rents them. I submitted to the State Department the exceptions taken to the treaty by the motion-picture industry, and I ask unanimous consent to have them printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the exceptions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM RELATIVE TO THE APPLICATION TO THE MOTION-PICTURE INDUSTRY OF THE TAXATION CONVENTION WITH CANADA SIGNED MARCH 4, 1942

One of the principal purposes of the convention is the avoidance of double income taxation. This is evident from the communication of the President of the United States to the Senate transmitting the convention for ratification. The first article of the convention, by its terms, is intended to carry out that purpose. This article reads as follows:

"ARTICLE I

"An enterprise of one of the contracting States is not subject to taxation by the other contracting State in respect of its industrial and commercial profits except in respect of such profits allocable in accordance with the articles of this convention to its permanent establishment in the latter State.

"No account shall be taken in determining the tax in one of the contracting States, of the mere purchase of merchandise effected therein by an enterprise of the other State."

Article II of the convention contains an exception which, unless clarified, will affect seriously the members of the motion-picture industry. This article reads as follows:

"ARTICLE II

"For the purposes of this Convention, the term 'industrial and commercial profits' shall not include income in the form of rentals and royalties, interest, dividends, management charges, or gains derived from the sale or exchange of capital assets.

"Subject to the provisions of this Convention such items of income shall be taxed separately or together with industrial and commercial profits in accordance with the laws of the contracting States."

The term "rentals and royalties" is defined in paragraph numbered 7 (a) of the protocol accompanying the convention. That paragraph reads as follows:

"7. (a) The term 'rentals and royalties' referred to in Article II of this Convention shall include rentals or royalties arising from leasing real or immoveable, or personal or moveable property or from any interest in such property, including rentals or royalties for the use of, or for the privilege of using, patents, copyrights, secret processes and formulae, goodwill, trade marks, trade brands, franchises, and other like property"

It is a peculiarity of the motion picture industry that its industrial and commercial profits, for it hardly may be questioned that the business of producing and distributing motion pictures is an industry and is commerce are derived from "rentals and royalties" as defined in paragraph 7 (a) just quoted. A motion picture is produced at great cost, is copyrighted, and positive prints of the picture are distributed throughout the world under licenses to exhibit. The income from this picture, generally called rentals or license fees, consists in great measure of a return of the cost of the picture together with a profit if the picture is profitable. There are many pictures, of course, which are unprofitable, in which event even the costs may not be recovered through the aggregate rentals or license fees received.

Canada, for a number of years, has been, and it presently is, levying a tax at the source on these rentals. The tax has become progressively more onerous. It has been increased from an effective rate of 2 percent in 1936 to a presently effective rate of 10 percent on these gross rentals, a confiscatory rate resulting, in many instances, in a tax on capital, i. e., the cost of the picture.

The motion-picture industry knows no reason why it is not entitled to the same protection against double taxation which any other American industry will receive under the convention. In principle, there is no difference between the American corporation which derives income from the sale of patented machines in Canada and one which derives income from the sale of a right to exhibit copyrighted motion pictures in Canada. It would hardly be said, in the first instance, that the corporation derived income from royalties for the use of patents within the provisions of paragraph 7 (a) of the protocol. The motion-picture industry's method of doing business, a method which cannot be changed, should not result in the withdrawal from it of the protection from double taxation which the tax convention is designed to accomplish for all American enterprises.

It is important to make the observation that the principal, if not all, American producers and distributors have no offices or places of business in Canada. Canadian subsidiaries of American producers and distributors operating in Canada are subjected to and pay the rates of taxation applicable to all Canadian corporations.

Respectfully submitted.

MOTION PICTURE PRODUCERS & DISTRIBUTORS OF AMERICA, INC.
WILL H. HAYS.
JACK BRYSON.

APRIL 20, 1942.

Mr. GEORGE. I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point—because I think it is the proper place in the RECORD to have it appear—the memorandum submitted by the representatives of the Department of State and the representatives of the Department of the Treasury who participated in the negotiation of the pending tax convention between the United States and Canada. The conclusion reached is that the taxpayers here concerned, that is, the motion-picture industry, are relieved of double taxation so far as reciprocal considerations permit. I ask that the memorandum be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM CONCERNING THE PENDING TAX CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Representatives of the Department of State and representatives of the Treasury Department who participated in the negotiation of the pending tax convention between the United States and Canada have considered the memorandum of April 20, 1940, submitted by the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, Inc., concerning certain points in that convention and submit the following statement in regard to the questions involved:

IN RE PROPOSED TAX CONVENTION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

Reference is made to letter dated April 20, 1942, addressed to Senator GEORGE by the Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America, Inc., and a memorandum attached thereto quoting certain provisions of the proposed tax convention between the United States and Canada in their application to the taxation by Canada of rentals or royalties derived by United States domestic corporations from use or exhibition in Canada of motion-picture films produced by such corporations in the United States but leased or rented to Canadian corporations constituting

subsidiary corporations of the producing corporations. Both the letter and memorandum take exception to the absence from the convention of specific exemption of such rentals or royalties from Canadian income tax.

The treatment of income of this and related character was carefully considered in the course of the negotiations incident to the drafting of the convention now before the Committee on Foreign Relations. It was recognized in the course of such negotiations that the amount of dividends, interest, rents, and rentals or royalties of the character here under consideration, moving from Canada to the United States, was preponderantly in excess of those moving in the opposite direction. This factual situation is well illustrated in the case of motion-picture rentals or royalties here under consideration. The vast majority of motion pictures shown in Canada is produced in the United States. On the other hand, relatively and actually few Canadian pictures are exhibited in the United States. Consequently, to provide outright exemption in the case of this kind of income from Canadian sources would not constitute a reciprocal provision reasonably balanced with respect to revenue considerations as between the two countries. A somewhat similar situation, although less pronounced, is present with respect to dividends and interest For these reasons it was found essential to adhere to taxation at the source in the case of such income, relief from double taxation as to such income being substantially effected through the medium of stabilization in the rate of tax and through application of the credit for foreign taxes.

As already suggested, the result thus reached, when other factors are taken into consideration, avoids double taxation of the income involved. Under Canadian law a tax, deducted at the source, is laid upon only two-thirds of the amount of such royalties or rentals, the remaining one-third being tax exempt. Section 9 B 2 (e) (ii), Canadian Income War Tax Act. It should also be observed that the Canadian corporation paying such royalties or rentals is permitted to deduct in computing its taxable income the entire amount of such royalties or rentals and that under existing United States revenue laws and the proposed convention the tax paid at the source in Canada by the United States producer is allowed as a credit against its United States income and excess profits tax. Section 131, Internal Revenue Code, Article XV of the convention. In addition to the credits and deductions described, if the Canadian subsidiary corporation pays dividends to its American parent the provisions of United States revenue laws and of the proposed convention require a credit to be given against the United States tax of the parent company for a proportionate part of the Canadian tax paid by the Canadian subsidiary company. The cumulative effect of these provisions is that the domestic corporation is relieved from the lesser of the two taxes.

It will also be observed that under article XI of the convention the rate of income tax, if any, imposed by Canada upon dividends paid by a Canadian subsidiary corporation to its United States domestic parent corporation here involved cannot exceed 5 percent while the rate of such tax in the case of nonsubsidiary dividends is 15 percent.

It is also pointed out that the aggregate tax burden in both the United States and Canada of the American motion-picture corporations here under consideration corresponds, other factors being the same, to the tax burden of such other domestic corporations as may derive business income from Canada without being subject to Canadian tax under the convention. In the case of the former corporations, tax is paid to Canada upon the Canadian portion of their income but credit is allowed for such tax in the determination of the tax payable to the United States; in the case of the latter corporations, the entire tax is paid to the United States because there is no credit for Canadian tax since no such tax has been paid. In the case of the corporations on whose behalf the memorandum of April 20, 1942, was filed, the tax is, in effect, shared with Canada for reasons already set forth.

It is, therefore, submitted that the taxpayers here concerned are relieved of double taxation so far as reciprocal considerations permit.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Would the Senator object to delaying the ratification of the convention until the next meeting of the Senate? The convention seems to me to contain important matters which the Senate itself has not considered. Only a few Members of the Senate are now present, and I myself should like to have an opportunity to read the convention and the report. After all, the report has been in the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations for over 2 months; and it seems to me that we should have a chance to examine it. It cannot be done in a hurry.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to make a statement, and then, if the Senator insists upon having ratification of the convention passed over, of course, it can take that course, so far as I am concerned.

The senior Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], a most industrious member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, withheld his approval of the convention at the meeting of the committee which finally ordered the favorable report on ratification of the treaty. The Senator from Maine went into it with a great deal of care, and yesterday he advised that he would have no objections to raise to ratification of the treaty.

Mr. TAFT. I think that my own conclusion would be the same; but I should like to have the privilege of reading it over and studying its effect in connection with the forthcoming tax bill.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to submit for the RECORD one other matter. If the Senator from Ohio desires to consider the convention and to examine it, I think he should have the advantage of the further objection which has been received.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that I hope the Senator from Ohio will conclude his examination by tomorrow, inasmuch as if we finish the Department of Interior appropriation bill we probably shall adjourn until Monday.

Mr. TAFT. I shall be glad to do so by tomorrow.

Mr. GEORGE. I hope the Senator will do so, because I am advised that it is desired to have ratification of the treaty by the 1st of June, for reasons which are known to the Department of State.

Mr. President, a further exception is taken to the convention, again not because of anything contained in it, but because of omissions from the convention. Certain citizens of the United States and certain citizens of Canada are described as commuters. A United States citizen, living in the United States, goes daily into Canada to work. He receives his compensation or salary from a Canadian corporation. Inasmuch as he is employed more than 180 days of the year in Canada, he describes himself as a commuter. Such persons constitute a rather large class. One such citizen points out, in a letter which was addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, that his case is not covered by the convention; and upon careful examination of the convention it must frankly be admitted that reciprocal rights which he has some reason to insist upon do not seem to be fully covered.

I have conferred with certain representatives of the State Department, and have made the suggestion that this particular situation might well be cared for by an interchange of notes between the Canadian Government and our Government. I have reason to believe that that will be done.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the letter to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NIAGARA FALLS, N. Y., *April 13, 1942.*

CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am a native-born United States citizen living in the United States, but have been commuting daily to Niagara Falls, Ontario, for the past 19 years, where I am employed as a chemical engineer by the Canadian branch of the American Cyanamid Co. During this time I have become well acquainted with the cyanamide process of nitrogen fixation—a process not used by any other firm in the Western Hemisphere. Cyanamid is now an important source of nitrogen for munitions, at least one plant being wholly dependent upon it. If I were forced to quit my present employment, my 19 years' experience would be of little benefit to me in any other line.

This year, when making out my Canadian income-tax report, I found that, although I am a married man with two minor-age children, I was classed in Canada as a single man, exemption $750, but was allowed exemption of $400 for each of the children. In other words, I was a single man with two dependents. As my Canadian income tax, based on a $1,500 exemption, plus the defense tax, would have already been double what my United States would be, the added tax on the $750 added $150 to my Canadian tax bill. Salaries and wages in Niagara Falls, Ontario, are about one-third lower than on this side. In order to get along I must either move to Canada or start all over again in the United States, which is not so easy when one is in the middle forties. The management of the company are anxious for me to remain with them, but they cannot raise my salary to compensate for the unequal tax because salaries and wages have been frozen in Canada.

I am, of course, not the only one faced with this problem. There are many other United States residents working in Niagara Falls, Ontario, the same as I. Then there are many more in the Buffalo and Detroit districts.

Prior to this year United States residents working in Canada were given the same treatment as Canadian residents in reference to income-tax payments, and the same held true for Canadian residents working in the United States.

Recently Buffalo and Toronto newspapers gave considerable space to the new United

States-Canadian Taxation Convention, which was to restore the former method of taxation between the two countries and also to modify certain conflicting principles of taxation. I have obtained a copy of the convention from the Treaty Division, Department of State, and was sorry to find that no mention was made as to the restoration of the former method of treatment of so-called commuters; that is, for the purposes of taxation, the same exemption and tax rate for resident workers as is given for nonresident workers, or rather for nonresident workers as for resident workers.

Mr. Barnes, of the Treaty Division, informs me that the United States-Canadian Taxation Convention is still under consideration in your committee. I am therefore taking the liberty of writing you to state our problem and to ask whether you may be able to see fit to help us while the convention is still under consideration in your committee and before it becomes final through your recommendation to the Senate. Although there are probably less than a thousand of us so-called international daily commuters, yet the added tax and/or changing of positions will cause us much inconvenience, as well as the defense plants in which we are working. I am sure the spirit of the convention is for fairness of treatment and that our minority group has been overlooked. I have heard generally favorable comment on the convention, as far as it goes, on both sides of the border, and by restoring the method of taxation for resident and nonresident workers on an equal basis I believe that the spirit of fairness will be complete.

Thanking you, I am,
Sincerely,

CARLOS W. SMITH.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Georgia that he has just covered a point to which I was about to address myself. The view of the committee with reference to the particular matter to which the Senator just referred was that it could be handled by an exchange of diplomatic notes or probably by mutual administrative action.

Mr. GEORGE. The chairman of the committee is quite correct; and I presume that will be done.

In conclusion, all I desire to say with regard to the convention is that none of the objections goes to anything contained in the convention, but all are based on omissions of certain matters which the two particular classes of taxpayers referred to feel might have been covered by the convention.

Mr. President, I think it very proper that the matter go over until the Senator from Ohio has an opportunity to read the convention.

Mr. TAFT. Until tomorrow will be sufficient.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that further action on Executive B, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, be deferred until tomorrow? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

That concludes the Executive Calendar.

MOBILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS FOR WAR PRODUCTION—PRINTING OF HOUSE AMENDMENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask that Senate bill 2250, the so-called small-business bill, a bill to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, be printed, showing the House amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, May 28, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 27 (legislative day of May 26), 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The following-named persons, now Foreign Service officers of class 4 and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, to be also consuls general of the United States of America:

Wainwright Abbott, of Pennsylvania.
Karl deG. MacVitty, of Tennessee.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Lynn R. Brodrick, of Marysville, Kans., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Kansas, in place of William H. Burke, resigned.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Harry P. Hornby, of Uvalde, Tex., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 23, with headquarters at Laredo, Tex. (reappointment).

Joseph McGrath, of Boston, Mass., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass. (reappointment).

ADMINISTRATOR OF CIVIL AERONAUTICS

Charles I. Stanton, of Florida, to be Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, vice Donald H. Connolly, resigned.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Capt. Oscar C. Badger to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 24th day of April 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 27 (legislative day of May 26), 1942:

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Adolphus Andrews to be a vice admiral, for temporary service, to rank from May 1, 1942, and to continue during his assignment as commander, eastern sea frontier.

John W. Greenslade to be a vice admiral, for temporary service, to rank from May 1, 1942, and to continue during his assignment as commander, western sea frontier.

Robert H. English to be a rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from May 8, 1942.

Donald B. Beary to be a rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from December 1, 1941.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY

Walter B. Woodson to be Judge Advocate General of the Navy, with the rank of rear admiral, for a term of 4 years from the 20th day of June 1942.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

TO BE REAR ADMIRALS

Charles A. Lockwood, Jr.
Marc A. Mitscher

REGISTERS OF LAND OFFICES

Lloyd T. Morgan to be register of the land office at Pueblo, Colo.

Arthur J. Ewing to be register of the land office at Coeur d'Alene, Idaho.

Paul A. Roach to be register of the land office at Las Cruces, N. Mex.

Clarence W. Ogle to be register of the land office at Lakeview, Oreg.

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Eileen B. Cardiff, Altadena.
Thomas V. Holmes, Duarte.
Chester W. Seely, Hamilton Field.
J. Edward Huston, Huntington Beach.
Helen P. Haines, Jacumba.
Bertha Hilbert, La Habra.
Rollie A. Petty, Mountain View.
Ryland M. Gorham, Palm Springs.
Arthur E. Flint, Penryn.
Mabel B. Mosgrove, Perris.
Walter A. Hornbeck, Red Bluff.
John H. Fairweather, Reedley.
Leslie J. Thomas, Richmond.
Charles D. Golvin, Riverbank.
John H. Kelley, San Mateo.
John M. Ellason, San Quentin.
Charles D. South, Santa Clara.
Robert H. Frost, Sausalito.
M. Frances Shuler, South Laguna.
Herbert P. Pritschke, Wasco.
Frank A. Lauer, Westwood.

IDAHO

James W. Dyar, Elk City.
Claude L. Ballard, Fairfield.
Frederick J. Rodgers, Midvale.
Edith R. Morgan, Paul.
Matt H. Moshinsky, St. Maries.

ILLINOIS

William R. Fisher, Chapin.
Clarence B. Muchmore, Charleston.
James M. Allen, Decatur.
Rufus A. Carrell, Greenup.
Deans J. McAlister, Greenville.
John F. Foster, Lovington.
John H. Priepot, Mendon.
Winifred G. Whitham, Ontarioville.
John J. Hart, Ottawa.
Hazel E. Strobel, Ransom.
Fred E. Battershell, Roodhouse.
John R. Slater, Savanna.
Fred N. Mayer, Virden.

IOWA

Ralph N. Shott, Birmingham.
Helen B. Rutledge, Blairsburg.
Bernard G. Remmes, Charter Oak.
Grace V. Fellers, Fremont.
Lillian E. Wicks, Minburn.
Alvin J. Tisdale, Union.
Logan B. Urice, Vinton.
Myrtle C. Stockmann, West Burlington
Viola L. Eaton, Woden.

KENTUCKY

Clyde V. Ross, Hardyville.
Robert L. Case, Mount Olivet.
Virginia B. Pittman, Perryville.

LOUISIANA

Milton E. Kidd, Choudrant.
James Bland Fain, Jonesboro.
Roberta M. Duffy, Montgomery.
Henry F. Couvillon, Moreauville.

MAINE

George I. McIntosh, Lisbon Falls.
Helen C. Donahue, Portland.
Eddie J. Roderick, Rumford.
Allie D. Richards, Strong.

MARYLAND

Patrick E. Conroy, Barton.
John Hershberger, Boonsboro.
Charles S. Moxley, Brentwood.
Margaret M. Williams, Lutherville.
Helena R. Guyther, Mechanicsville.

NEW YORK

Burdette G. Dewell, Catskill.
Albert E. Olson, East Moriches.

Laurence D. Brown, Eastview.
Fred J. Burns, Jr., Glenwood Landing.
Beth I. Henry, Newfield.
Francis X. Desmond, Niagara University.
Hugh M. Bulger, Norwich.
Clarence T. Cahill, Palisades.
Charles A. Pickard, Wantagh.
John H. Joyner, White Sulphur Springs.

OHIO

Michael J. Callaghan, Bellevue.
Edward V. Hartmann, Holland.
Carson D. Faber, Jeromesville.
Olin B. Stahl, Jewett.
Harry D. Arnold, Leetonia.
Fred W. Justus, Massillon.
Paul M. Keyser, Shadyside.
Arnold M. Speir, State Soldiers Home.
William E. Passmore, Washington Courthouse.
Frank A. Hawkins, West Farmington.

OKLAHOMA

James T. Norton, Nowata.
Guy E. McClain, Perkins.

PENNSYLVANIA

Maurice F. MacDonald, Ridgway.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John W. Willis, Lynchburg.

VERMONT

Mildred A. Dailey, Hartford.
Murray K. Paris, Lyndon.
Catherine E. Sheehan, Richmond.
Adelbert G. Dudley, Shoreham.
David A. Aubin, Vergennes.

WISCONSIN

Charles N. Cody, Antigo.
Joseph O. Goff, Bristol.
Ted Cole, Cashton.
Frank N. Scherer, Kohler.
Hilary T. Karls, Norwalk.
Clifford T. Peterson, Poplar.
Charles F. Heald, Sheboygan Falls.
Howard F. Vande Hei, West De Pere.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Levin Hicks Campbell, Jr., to be Chief of Ordnance for a period of 4 years from date of acceptance, with the rank of major general.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Albert Eger Brown
Henry Lawrence Cullen Jones
William Henry Harrison Morris, Jr.
Durward Saunders Wilson
William Middleton Grimes
Rapp Brush
Joseph Dorst Patch
John Emmitt Sloan
William Hanson Gill
Harry Lewis Twaddle
Frank Cadle Mahin
Homer Ray Oldfield
Joseph Lawton Collins
Harold Roe Bull
Robert Olds

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Thoburn Kaye Brown
Lucian King Truscott, Jr.
Clift Andrus
Paul Everton Peabody
Gilbert Richard Cook
Hayes Adlai Kroner
Leland Stanford Hobbs
Stonewall Jackson
Lloyd Davidson Brown
Thomas Dewees Finley
Alfred Jefferson Lyon
Robert Lily Spragins
Horace Logan McBride
Barnwell Rhett Legge
Roland Paget Shugg
James Francis Brittingham
Ward Hale Maris
Guy Ichabod Rowe
Roderick Random Allen
John Matthew Devine
George Wesley Griner, Jr.
Arthur McKinley Harper
Warren Thomas Hannum
John Thomas Kennedy
Royden Eugene Beebe
Louis Albert Kunzig
James Arthur Pickering
Milton Baldridge Halsey
James Washington Barnett
Randolph Tucker Pendleton
Idwal Hubert Edwards
Leland Wilbur Miller
Thomas James Hanley, Jr.
Thomas Henry Green
Royal Reynolds
Omar Heinrich Quade
Charles Egbert Branshaw
Thomas Bernard Larkin
Leonard Russell Boyd
Donald Armstrong
Gordon Marshall Wells
John Kay Christmas
Rosswell Eric Hardy
Edward Arthur Evans
Kenneth Buchanan
Albert Edward Colburn

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANT, CAVALRY

William Sayers McCauley.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Capt. Kenneth Earl Thiebaud.

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Oscar Rawles Bowyer.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Severin Richard Beyma.
First Lt. John Rigden Van Dickson.

TO AIR CORPS

Capt. Elwin Herklas Eddy.
First Lt. Benjamin Oliver Davis, Jr.
First Lt. Francis Carlton Truesdale.
Second Lt. Jack Curtright McClure, Jr.
Second Lt. Marshall Warren Carney.
Second Lt. Curtis Francis Betts.
Second Lt. Samuel Wilson Parks.
Second Lt. Paul Allard Kirk.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE COLONELS

Lt. Col. Henry William Harms, Cavalry.
Lt. Col. John Earl Lewis, Field Artillery.
Lt. Col. Walton Harris Walker, Infantry.
Lt. Col. Millard Fillmore Harmon, Air Corps.
Lt. Col. John Duncan Kelly, Cavalry.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, MAY 27, 1942

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

With humble hearts, our Heavenly Father, we make our desires known to Thee, supplicating Thy blessing. Grant that we may wear the vestment of truth and be filled with a deep and saving self-respect and with a tender appreciation of the feelings of others. The exulting spirit and peace into which it flows is as an ever-widening river in an arid land. We praise Thee that there is One whose light is as the sun, whose pity is never too late, and who lingers in sweet gentleness for all men.

We pray that we may enter into complete harmony with everything that lives. Thou dost speak to men in the glory of the heavens and with all the manifold voices of stern Nature, alive and verdant. To the spring song of the woods and fields may there be a response in the gladness of our souls. Take of Thine own spirit and lay it upon us, prevailing through the east window of our souls, revealing Thy purpose in this day of opportunity. Purify our vision that an inner joy and peace may shine forth as glowing sacraments of Thy guiding presence. In the name of our Lord and Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution passed at West Michigan Tourist and Resort Association meeting, held at Muskegon, Mich., Thursday, May 21, 1942, pertaining to gas rationing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HON. MANUEL PRADO

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read by the Clerk:

DETROIT, MICH.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C.:

Please let me offer you and all the Members of the House my sincerest thanks for your warm and gracious reception with which I was honored yesterday.

MANUAL PRADO.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, Mr. PAGÁN, I ask unanimous consent that he may be given permission to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include two newspaper articles on Puerto Rico.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GASOLINE RATIONING IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's Capital should set the example in making gasoline rationing succeed. Indeed, it would be most unfortunate for the country if the gasoline-rationing program should break down in Washington, the seat of the Government. There is no reason why it should break down, but it is breaking down and it will collapse if we do not make a more serious effort to cooperate.

The public transportation system is definitely inadequate and people with B cards and X cards have got to carry others with them as they go to and from work or the program will collapse. They are not doing this on anything like a big scale. They are going to have to do it, and I believe they will want to do it after they have practiced it awhile. The time will come, and it ought to come, when a man will feel like a traitor to his country if he rides alone in his car down the ave-

nue without offering a ride to anyone when people are standing on the sidewalks frantically trying to catch a bus, streetcar, or taxi to get to work.

I am not talking about X cards, B cards, or A cards. They all have their proper place. I am trying to help awaken the spirit of cooperation and unselfishness. Really the only trouble is thoughtlessness. If we are big enough and worthy enough to win the war, we can certainly make gasoline rationing succeed in Washington. But we have got to mend our ways.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include an article written by George Rothwell Brown, appearing in the Los Angeles Examiner.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about our citizens giving false information to Government. Penalties have been provided of $10,000 fine and 10 years' imprisonment.

From recent events, I am just wondering if a law should not be enacted providing a penalty of $10,000 fine and 10 years in the penitentiary for Government officials who give our citizens false information.

Here we have the spectacle of our Government telling 17 States they cannot have gasoline, giving, as a specific reason, the lack of transportation facilities in the way of tankers, pipe lines, and tank cars not now available. They say there is a tremendous shortage of gasoline. Now, then, when resistance and objection is made by the 17 States to this program these officials say it is going to be made national.

In those districts where they have more gasoline than they know what to do with and have no facilities to store it, cannot get priority to build such facilities, and will therefore have to resort to burning it, those people are told that their gasoline consumption will have to be curtailed. The reason given to these people out there is, "It is not a gasoline shortage but a rubber shortage."

What is this whole program? Why are not our people told the plain, honest-to-God truth? Are the officials afraid to face the people on account of the failure of over-all planning, or is it a matter wherein certain interests are to be protected in their refusal or failure to deliver a substitute for rubber?

The confidence of our people cannot be sustained when they are not told the truth, and they know they are not being told the truth. There never was a truer statement than that made by Lincoln when he said:

> You may fool all the people some of the time; you can even fool some of the people all the time; but you can't fool all the people all the time.

The people are catching up with this misinformation that has been given them by these bureaucrats.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some short resolutions from my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PATRIOTISM OF CITIZENS OF INDIANA

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, some self-appointed authorities have been going about the country making statements that "Indiana does not know there is a war going on."

This remark was made by Cecil Brown, a C. B. S. war correspondent, speaking over a national hook-up from Indianapolis the other evening. Mr. Brown evidently does not know that the State of Indiana is among the top States in volunteer enlistments in the Navy, Army, and Marine Corps, and is among the leading States in the sale of defense bonds to date.

Evidently Mr. Brown is ignoring the fact that the workers at the Burns City naval depot are voluntarily contributing $100,000 a month for defense bonds. The workers at this same plant just recently donated 1 full day's work without pay to the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, if these uninformed informers will learn to analyze civic sentiment and war consciousness as capably as the people of Indiana have settled into the harness of war effort, they will not be leaving themselves open in the future to the criticism I am directing their way now.

Mr. Brown, how popular do you think you are with the mothers and fathers of Indiana servicemen and Indiana taxpayers and Hoosier war bond and stamp purchasers? Our people are buying and dying the same as the people of every other State of the 48.

"Indiana doesn't know there's a war on!" Can you imagine that being said about the State which the Indianapolis Star says has war factories in every major city, that has a leading record for volunteers per capita, whose war bond sales lead the country, and which is turning out more than its share of war materials? That remark was made in regard to the mother State of Sgt. John Engleman, who with a comrade dangled head down from a bomber to close a bomb bay under the plane which had jammed after bombing a Japanese target.

In the language of Amos and Andy, "I relents that," and I think I am speaking for every Hoosier in Indiana.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a letter to a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FREE LIFE INSURANCE FOR MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there is under serious consideration a committee amendment to provide for a $5,000 policy, free insurance, for the men in the armed forces of the United States.

I rise at this time to express my satisfaction with such a move. I think it is one of the most constructive steps yet taken for the men in the service.

I also want to say at this time that credit should go to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] for making such a proposal as he did about 2 months ago, introducing a separate bill which broached the subject of free insurance for the first time in the country. I am sure that the action taken by him and the publicity given the matter caused the committee to give it consideration. I am glad to hear of it.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, owing to the fact that many Members did not know we were going to meet at 11 o'clock this morning, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move the call of the House.

The call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 58]

Baldwin	Guyer	Plumley
Beam	Gwynne	Reed, Ill.
Bennett	Harrington	Rees, Kans.
Bolton	Jarman	Sasscer
Buckler, Minn.	Jarrett	Schaefer, Ill.
Burdick	Johnson, Ind.	Schuetz
Byron	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Scrugham
Cluett	Kelley, Pa.	Shannon
Coffee, Wash.	Kerr	Sheppard
Cole, Md.	Kilburn	Sheridan
Cullen	Kocialkowski	Short
Dies	Kramer	Smith, Pa.
Douglas	Kunkel	Smith, Wis.
Duncan	McIntyre	Sumner, Ill.
Ellis	Maas	Sweeney
Fish	Maciejewski	Terry
Fitzpatrick	Magnuson	Thomas, Tex.
Ford, Miss.	Mitchell	Tinkham
Gale	Nichols	Vreeland
Gibson	O'Brien, N. Y.	Walter
Gifford	O'Day	Wasielewski
Gilchrist	Osmers	Welch
Granger	Patrick	Winter
Grant, Ind.	Plauché	Worley
Green		

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 357 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of

his secretaries, who also informed the House that on Tuesday, May 26, 1942, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6927. An act to amend the National Housing Act, and for other purposes.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with today.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL CADETS FOR THE MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6979) to authorize an increase in the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6979) to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

ANDREW J. MAY,
EWING THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the part of the House.

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
JOSH LEE,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6979) to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House bill authorized the appointment to the United States Military Academy of one additional cadet by each Senator, Representative, and Delegate in Congress, and of one additional cadet by the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and the Governor of the Panama Canal, a total of 536 additional cadets. The House bill further provided that in any case in which the principal and alternates designated by an appointing authority should be rejected, the appointing authority might, within 10 days after receiving notice of the rejection, make another appointment and might continue that procedure until the vacancy should be filled or until it would be too late to examine nominees. The Senate amendment authorized the same number of additional cadets but provided that whenever, on the date of admission of a new class, the total number of cadets should be below the number authorized, the Secretary of War might bring the corps of cadets to full strength by appointing to the vacancies qualified alternates and candidates who had been recommended by the academic board. Under the Senate amendment two-thirds of those appointed to vacancies would be selected from among qualified alternates and one-third would be selected from among qualified candidates, and the appointments so made would be in addition to any appointments otherwise authorized by law. The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate amendment.

ANDREW J. MAY,
EWING THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, this conference report presents the Senate form of the bill relating to the appointment of cadets to the United States Military Academy at West Point. I shall take a very brief time on the report so that others may discuss the mechanics of the bill and other issues that may be raised.

The present authorized attendance at the Academy is 1,960; the bill increases that 536, making a total of 2,496 cadets. Of the 536, 531 belong to Senators and Representatives. The other five are apportioned as follows: One to the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone to be filled by the appointment of sons of civilian personel of that Zone; one to each of the three delegates in Congress, and one to the District of Columbia. Of these proportions the congressional percentage under existing law is 81.27; under the new bill it will be 85.6. There are usually a hundred vacancies at the beginning of each class. The next class will begin, or be registered, as of the first of the coming July, a little over a month. The next examination that will be held for the qualifications of these 536 will be on the 22d day of June. Out of this grows the imperative necessity of disposing of this legislation as soon as possible.

Let me say this in passing, that unfortunately the Congress of the United States as the legislative branch of the Government is constantly under attack and criticism from the press and radio. We are at this very moment charged with selfishness about several matters I will not mention in detail. To my mind if it goes out to the country that the Congress of the United States in the election of the personnel to the United States Military Academy is demanding more than 85.6 percent it will create an impression that will not be good for the Congress of the United States.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. Why then did not the committee bring back the provision that 85 percent of the vacancies should be filled from the alternates of congressional appointees instead of only two-thirds? That would have been fair.

Mr. MAY. Two-thirds amounts to 85 percent of the number that will be selected; that is the reason for it. I hope that the Congress will not put all of us in the attitude of trying to be, I will say, hoggish about the matter.

The question is raised here that sons of Army officers are going to get a part of these appointments. They get those fixed by statute, and this does not give them any additional advantage. The charge has been made in the discussion on the bill when it was originally presented that examinations had been delayed and that they failed applicants in order to make places for military chaps. That is not true—and it cannot be true—because every candidate who goes to the academic course goes there not by name but by code number. The academic board that grades those papers does not know whose papers it is grading. They are graded on the standards of qualifications, and that is all.

That is the situation in respect to this bill. I will yield the time as I come to it, but before doing so I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, at this time I desire to yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the class should enter on the 1st of July, I think this legislation should be disposed of today without further ado. It insures using West Point to its capacity. It adds one cadet for each congressional district. If a Member's nominees do not qualify, he does not lose the nomination, under the conference agreement; it is carried over to the next year. In the meantime the facilities at West Point will not go unused. Two-thirds of any vacancies after entrance date will be filled by the selection of qualified alternates named by Members, and the balance by the selection of qualified boys from among those who may have applied. Certainly Members of Congress are not losing any of their prerogatives, and my guess is that the country is much more concerned with having a full quota of trained officers than it is with whether Members get to name every boy who enters the Military Academy. The legislation has been on our doorstep for some time. Action should be completed without fur-

ther delay in order that nominations may be made, examinations given, and boys advised of the outcome in time to enter by July 1.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, this is the third time the present bill has been before us. Your conferees saw fit to agree with the Senate amendment for a number of reasons. I am going to make only a brief statement.

This bill provides one additional appointment for each Member of the House and Senate. Under the proposed bill this number will be increased—that is, the number authorized at the academy—by 536. There will be 384 for Senators and 1,740 for Representatives. No change in the Presidential list, still 89. No change in the Vice President's list, still 3. No change in the Regular Army, still 90. No change in the National Guard, still 90. One increase in the District of Columbia, making 6. One increase for Alaska, making 4. One increase for Hawaii, making 4. One increase for Puerto Rico, making 4. No increase for the honor schools, still 40. No increase for sons of deceased officers, still 20. One increase for the Panama Canal, making 2. A total new authorized strength under regular appointments of 2,496, an increase of 536.

I mention this to show that we in the House and those in the Senate are the only direct beneficiaries of this bill in additional appointments. Many Regular Army boys in the service, National Guard men, boys in honor schools, reside in your district; but this bill gives them no other opportunity to be considered. That would come under the one-third, not our two-thirds. I want to remind you, and anyone who has studied this knows it is the fact, that this is a brand new congressional appointment.

If you name candidates now, the principal candidate, if he qualifies, will enter on July 1. If you name no candidate now, or if your present candidates in the rush examinations fail, the vacancy is held in escrow, you may say, inviolate for you so long as you remain in Congress.

I would like to say a word about the action of the academic board at West Point. I have been familiar with it for some time. We all say that we give the Secretary of War the power, but insinuations are made that they fix the committee at the academic board; that someone goes to General Wilby or goes to the professor up there and tries to fix the deal up. Every boy who takes an examination, once the examination is reported, his papers receive a code number, and when the academic board acts on those papers it has no idea whether the boy is from Texas, New York, or anywhere else. The members of the academic board judge those papers on their merits.

As the conferees support this conference report, all this bill does under its provisions is to give us one more appointment, and it permits any alternate who is qualified to have a chance to go to West Point immediately under the selection of the academic board. They can review the case by code number. If there were a hundred deficiencies, they would say 66 of these have to go to the 66 highest congressional alternates, and they take the papers and the code numbers on those 66. They would take 33 from the Presidential list, which might include National Guard men, boys from the honor schools, the son of a deceased officer, or the son of a deceased enlisted man, or they may be taken off the Presidential list.

If we do not adopt the Senate provisions we are making ourselves deliberate hogs after we have already advanced ourselves one additional vacancy against none to the others. I think it would be rank injustice to any qualified alternate not to adopt the provisions of the conference report.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman explain why the conferees left out of the report the provision for three alternate appointees to be submitted? I notice that is left out.

Mr. ANDREWS. We do not think that is important at the present time, because the statistics show that we have plenty of qualified alternates.

May I say that the qualified alternates for the last 10 years are as follows:

1931	84
1932	163
1933	139
1934	117
1936	118
1937	154
1938	224
1939	160
1940	170
1941	281

My own opinion is that a qualified alternate who never gets to the academy is a good deal like a discontented cow.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the gentleman and I have an understanding that he is to control this 20 minutes. If he wishes to use it all himself, he can do so. If he does not, he can allot it to somebody else.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, this conference report brings back to the House a proposal which has been three times rejected by this body by votes averaging 2 to 1. On July 16 of last year it was rejected by a roll-call vote of 197 to 92. Approximately 10 days ago it was rejected by standing votes in this body approximating 2 to 1. Yet the conferees bring back here the identical proposal as to which the House had expressed its overwhelming disapproval, and blandly request that in the interest of what they say is necessary expedition in the handling of this matter you approve the conference report.

If there had been any need for haste, they have had since July 16, 1941, to bring in this bill, yet they brought it in only some few days ago. There is no need for haste because this is not a war measure. The appointees who enter West Point under the provisions of this bill cannot be graduated in the regular course for a period of 4 years, and, even if graduated 1 year ahead of the usual schedule, not for a period of 3 years. There is no justification for the position on the part of anyone that as a matter of war interest there is reason for hastily considering it.

I think it has been fairly demonstrated by the argument had last year in connection with this same proposal, by the hearings had before this committee, which I hope you may have had the opportunity to examine, and by the action of the conferees in bringing back to you now this identical proposal which you have three times rejected, that the real objective of this measure is not the furnishing to each of you of an additional appointment to West Point but the incorporation into permanent law of a provision which, not only with reference to this pending appointment but with reference to all of your appointments, will authorize the Secretary of War to fill all vacancies, and not even require that in the filling of a vacancy he shall name an alternate or a candidate who has taken the Presidential examinations who is a resident of your State.

May I point out to you that this bill is not the bill of the academic board. It is not the bill of the West Point Military Academy. I have it upon high authority that the authorities of the academy drew for submission to the Committee on Military Affairs an entirely different measure; that their measure provided that when the Secretary of War should exercise this authority to fill vacancies he should for your State where a vacancy existed appoint an alternate from your State. I understand that that bill did not provide for the naming by him of candidates who had taken Presidential examinations to fill these vacancies at all, but provided that all the vacancies should be filled by the appointment of alternates from the States where the vacancies exist.

That bill was not satisfactory to the War Department. I think you know why it was not satisfactory. I think you know and any Member of Congress who has had occasion to deal with the efforts of Army officers to have their sons appointed to West Point over a period of years knows that the purpose of this measure is to provide additional opportunities for these sons of Army officers. That was almost frankly admitted by Colonel Walsh in his testimony before the committee.

I have no objection to the provision of additional means for the sons of Army officers to enter West Point, but if that should be done it should be done by increasing the number of Presidential appointments and not by taking away from the Members of Congress the appointments which are allocated to them under the law.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. May I ask the gentleman from Georgia, if either one of those bills had passed, would it

not have taken away from the various districts the right to fill these appointments, and virtually have turned them over to the Army officers to fill them, or to get them filled, by their own sons?

Mr. TARVER. No. A Member would fill the appointment from his district, but if his appointee and his alternate should be rejected, the authority would then be vested in the Secretary of War to fill the vacancy by the appointment either of an alternate from any State in the Union or the appointment of one of these Presidential candidates for whom a place had not been found.

When this bill was brought in last year there was no provision for giving an additional congressional appointment, but when you rejected this proposed authority to the Secretary of War by a vote of more than 2 to 1, then they brought in, not immediately, but just prior to the time when admission to West Point Academy must be had, new legislation in which they provide for an additional appointment for you to West Point, apparently under the impression that if you receive an additional appointment to West Point under the provisions of the bill it would be satisfactory for you to accord this additional authority to the Secretary of War. In other words, a little sugar coating is offered for an otherwise unpalatable proposal.

I do not conceive that my district is affected by this proposal. In over 15 years here I have never had a vacancy which was not filled by either my principal appointee or one of the alternates. I follow the civil-service method of selection. Every boy in the district has an equal chance, whether he is the son of a political friend or of a political foe. I have not regarded and do not now regard such appointments as political patronage. And as I have said, I have had no vacancies I have been unable to fill.

I have two alternates to West Point who have been found qualified for entrance in July and cannot enter because of the entrance of my principal, so I might possibly feel that I might receive, or my district might receive, a benefit under the bill and that one of these alternates who cannot enter might be selected for entrance by the Secretary of War. That is not the point with me. I do not believe we ought to surrender any greater authority to the executive branch of the Government than it already has.

If the Members of Congress ought not to be charged with the duty of making these appointments or if the Secretary of War, upon the recommendation of the academic board, is the best qualified authority to select these candidates for admission to West Point, then the existing law should be changed, but so long as the existing method of procedure is followed, then, certainly, there ought not to be any objection to the language which was written into this bill when it passed the House, which would insure to each Member of the House the opportunity, when his candidates are rejected, to submit additional names for consideration until the entrance of one is effected, or to the action which was had in the House in striking out section 2 of the bill, which would have vested additional authority in the Secretary of War.

I now want to yield to gentlemen who have indicated a desire to interrogate me. I yield at this time to the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. We understand that the present arrangement is to distribute over the country the selection of the officer personnel of the Army. As I understand the gentleman's position, he objects to disturbing the distribution of this officer personnel in the various districts.

Mr. TARVER. Exactly so.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. And this assignment which the gentleman speaks of is to the people of the respective districts as distinguished from the Member of Congress himself. In other words, he is only an agent.

Mr. TARVER. Certainly; and so far as I am concerned, I would not object if the law were amended to provide for their selection entirely by civil service, with precautions to insure their distribution equitably over the country. But so long as the present method is followed, then the only way to insure that your district or my district or any other district will receive equitable consideration is by maintaining the present system of having these appointments made upon the recommendations of the Members of the House and of the Senate.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I understand the gentleman's position is that we have not a congressional district in the United States that cannot furnish a good man to West Point?

Mr. TARVER. I am quite sure that is true.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. The fundamental purpose of the original law was also to keep down a military class or a professional army, with assignment handed on from father to son. Is not that correct?

Mr. TARVER. I think so, and I think there would be no legislation more calculated to contribute to the building up of a military oligarchy in this country than that which is here proposed.

Mr. BOREN. And if this conference report as drawn is adopted, it would destroy that fundamental principle in the original law as here established?

Mr. TARVER. I think my colleague is absolutely correct.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Each Member of Congress gets one appointment; and if for any reason we do not have boys who pass the examination, then, I understand, the Army takes an alternate from some other district who has made the highest mark on the examination.

Mr. TARVER. Or from some other State.

Mr. RICH. And they take two-thirds of the best boys of the land who have passed the entrance examination. They might be from your State or they might be from Pennsylvania. If the Army is going to do that honestly, I would think that would be the best way to build up the Army.

Mr. TARVER. I assume that the Members of Congress who have the authority under the law as it exists at the present time are capable of doing the same job honestly and that they are also able to select qualified candidates from their respective districts. The bill, as it passed the House, provided for the continuance of this authority in them and also provided that when their appointees should be rejected, they should have the privilege of submitting the names of additional appointees until the vacancy should be filled.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman contend that the Congressmen will not control the appointment of the 536 increase here with the exception of the one who is to be appointed by the Governor of the Panama Canal Zone?

Mr. TARVER. Oh, no; the gentleman, of course, knows that I understand that the extra appointees that the gentleman's committee have offered to Members of Congress as bait for the enactment of this fundamental proposition will be named by the Members of Congress. But if they are rejected, then substitutes for them will be named by the Secretary of War. In that connection, may I say that I have been informed this morning, and I am not advised as to whether or not it is true, these appointees that are proposed under the provisions of this bill are going to be required to report for examination to West Point. The man appointed in California as principal and his alternates, if it is thought they have any chance of admission, and if I have been correctly informed as to the procedure that is contemplated by the authorities who have charge of the matter, would have to travel to West Point to be examined to determine whether or not he should be admitted to the Military Academy. Under such procedures, poor boys, unable to pay heavy traveling expenses with no certainty of entry, would have no chance.

The effect of any such legislation as that would be to provide that those Congressmen from the far reaches of the country would not fill their appointments at all, and a very large number of these new appointments to be made would have to be filled by the Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia has consumed 15 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. There are not 100, but probably 180, according to the evidence before the committee last year, and in addition those that would be added under the machinery of this bill from vacancies in the new appointments it authorizes. All of these places would be filled under this bill by the Secretary of War.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Take this case: Suppose this bill is passed and I make an

appointment of a principal and two alternates, and the three of them fail. That right in me remains inviolate, does it not?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman can make the appointment next year, provided there is room for the appointees, provided Congress does not pass legislation reducing the number of cadets at the academy in the next year, which could easily be done by limitation in a War Department appropriation bill, but the gentleman does not fill it this year. This year's appointment would be filled by the Secretary of War.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Provided I do not fill it this year.

Mr. TARVER. Unless the gentleman fills it this year, but the gentleman will have but one opportunity to fill it so far as the pending additional appointment is concerned. We have to name a candidate who is found qualified, or the district loses the appointment this year, and the gentleman could make the appointment next year, possibly, but that is in the lap of the gods, and nobody knows what the condition will be next year and what number of cadets it will be necessary to appoint to West Point, or who can be cared for at West Point after the Secretary of War exercises his authority this year as a supplement to the appointing authority of other officials.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. BOREN. I was amazed to hear the argument advanced that what the press might say about this should determine our action. Either it is right or it is wrong. If the present system that we have is right, we ought to maintain it, and if it is wrong we ought to revise it.

Mr. TARVER. I am interested in the press from this standpoint: I think it is useful in the molding of public opinion, but I do not want the press to be able to say anything about me truthfully which is condemnatory or critical; but if I feel that nothing in what I have done as a Member of Congress is subject to just criticism, then I certainly would not be influenced in any action of mine by any misconstruction that might be placed on what I do by the press, and I feel that that is the position of every other Member of Congress. In other words, I do not fear unjustified criticism.

Mr. BOREN. But the proposed change here deals with something that is either right or wrong. If our present system is good, we ought to maintain it, and if it is not we ought to junk it. To say that to fill these vacancies it is necessary to delegate the appointing power to the Secretary of War is ridiculous. Anytime they need more cadets any congressional district can provide them. I can give the academy 100 eligibles any 24-hour period.

Mr. TARVER. There is a suggestion in the argument of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] about the impression going out over the country that Congress is trying to hog all the appointments. The adoption of the House amendments did not give Congress a single additional appointment, yet these amendments have been eliminated in the conference report. The committee did not have to bring in legislation which provided for additional congressional appointments. The committee could have brought in legislation providing for additional Presidential appointments, if it desired. They brought in the appointments for the Members of Congress as a palliative to persuade you to swallow the more important provisions of the proposed law, and let me make this suggestion: If you send this back to conference, as I hope you will, for I expect to move a recommittal in a few moments, I do not believe our friends on the Military Affairs Committee will permit the passage of any legislation at this time, unless it contains this provision for appointments to fill vacancies by the Secretary of War. That is what they want; that is what the War Department wants, and everything else in the bill is incidental thereto. If you want to be forced to accept that position in this matter as the condition precedent to getting another appointment to West Point, that, of course, is your affair, but, as far as I am concerned, I am not that anxious to have another appointment. I do not think there is any need for additional appointments at West Point now, so far as the war effort is concerned. I cannot conceive of those boys going there in July being of any particular use during the period of this emergency, and I am not willing to swallow what I believe to be an unwise and arbitrary piece of legislation proposed by the War Department in order that my district may be credited with an additional appointment at West Point.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. BARDEN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that in order for the principals and the alternates to take this examination to qualify they would have to make a trip to West Point, N. Y.?

Mr. TARVER. I said I had received information to that effect this morning, which I have not had an opportunity to verify.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] did not give quite all the history of this legislation. It is true a similar bill was before the House last year. That bill carried with it a provision for the appointment of another cadet to West Point, but this particular section over which the controversy is now raging was not in that bill at all. It is an entirely different plan for filling the vacancies at the academy.

I might say also that this very provision which we are now discussing and this bill as it is now presented to this body passed the Senate Committee on Military Affairs unanimously. It passed the Senate unanimously. It passed the House Military Affairs Committee unanimously. It passed the conference unanimously, and this morning it passed the Senate unanimously. It is now up to us to vote it up or down as your wishes may dictate. It is the only plan now presented for the filling to capacity of that great school.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. No; I do not yield right now. In this brief time allotted to me I want to appeal not only to your intelligence but to your fairness, because I have never known a bill about which there is more misunderstanding. I can also see some prejudice cropping out.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I prefer not to yield for a minute.

Mr. HOPE. On this question of misunderstanding. There is this contention that this bill takes something away from Members of Congress as far as appointing cadets to West Point is concerned.

Mr. THOMASON. This bill does not take away from a Member of Congress a single right or privilege, but it does give every Member of the House and Senate one additional appointment. In order to fill the vacancies now at the academy, and that have been there every year for the past 10 years, it also gives us two-thirds of those vacancies. Now, here is what it does: Every Member of the Senate and the House will get an additional appointment, and there is no power on earth that will take it away from him. If your principal and both of your alternates fail this year, that appointment rides over until next year. The only increases outside of those to Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives is one to the Territory of Alaska, one to the District of Columbia, one to the Canal Zone, and one to Puerto Rico, which makes four. Then if your principal and alternates fail to qualify, that appointment is yours and carries over until next year, or whenever you do have a candidate who can qualify. The only thing this does is this: For more than 10 years there has been an average of more than 100 vacancies at the academy each year, for which we have appropriated the necessary money. The War Department wants this bill. The authorities at the academy want the bill, because they want to fill those vacancies. It is the greatest institution of its kind on earth. We ought to support it wholeheartedly or abolish it. I wonder where we would be in the present emergency without General MacArthur and countless other West Pointers who have made the Army a profession.

I would like to amplify what the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] said. If you think the academic board members are not men of integrity, that is a different proposition, but every boy's application and examination carry a code number and not his name. He is graded and admitted only upon merit. We have had hearings before our committee on that, and every boy enters under a code number. Nobody knows who that boy is when it comes to passing on his qualifications for admission.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. It is said that during the past few years there have been 100 vacancies.

Mr. THOMASON. One hundred and ninety this year.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to know if there are going to be 190 put in to fill those vacancies, and next year they are going to give the appointment back, what is going to happen to the size of your institution. In a few years are they not going to tell you there is no room for your appointees?

Mr. THOMASON. Of course you do not have your appointment taken away. No such condition could possibly come about.

Mr. RABAUT. But how are you going to add 100 people every year?

Mr. THOMASON. This bill fixes the limitation at 2,496.

Mr. SPARKMAN. As a matter of fact, if you fill those 100 vacancies, then each year you will not have any vacancies.

Mr. THOMASON. Of course, there is no chance for you to lose your appointment. That is begging the question.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman made the statement that the academy authorities are for this bill. I have information directly to the contrary, that the bill which was drawn by the academy authorities provided for the appointment of these alternates from States where the vacancies are filled.

Mr. THOMASON. That is all the time I have to yield.

Mr. TARVER. Well, is that true?

Mr. THOMASON. All I know is that the Superintendent of the academy, General Wilby, Colonel Counts, and others came before our committee, and I believe it appears in the hearings, and said that they wanted this bill. The War Department said that they wanted it. It is absolutely a fair and just bill and does not take away from a Member of Congress a single right he now has. In fact, it increases his privileges. It gives him one additional appointment that no power on earth can take from him, and then if there are any vacancies at the academy, two-thirds of those boys have to come from our qualified alternates. The other one-third come possibly a very few from the sons of Army officers, some from sons of World War veterans, some from sons of members of the National Guard, and various others who are listed on page 12 of the hearings.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Other than giving the Congressmen an additional appointment to West Point, does this bill in any wise change the present law?

Mr. THOMASON. No; it does not change the present law at all, except to give the gentleman and every other Member an additional appointment. We are trying to devise some fair means by which these vacancies can be filled.

Mr. ANDREWS. Or some means by which the gentleman's alternate, who otherwise would be precluded from going to the academy, may enter to fill up the annual deficiency.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. IZAC. Will the gentleman explain, if there are 200 alternates who are eligible for appointment, how the two-thirds which are apportioned to Members of Congress will be chosen?

Mr. THOMASON. By the academic board absolutely on their record. Their names are not known. Their files are there. The board goes through those files, goes through the boys' records carefully, and makes an award upon merit. The board does not even know the names of the candidates. That was testified to before our committee, and I feel those who testified were men of principle and honor. I have great faith in the tradition of West Point. Honor is a slogan there.

Mr. ANDREWS. If there are 200 vacancies to be filled, the academy board will take two-thirds of the highest qualified congressional alternates, choosing them by code number and not by name.

Mr. IZAC. The alternates do not have to be apportioned according to States?

Mr. THOMASON. No. I may say to the gentleman from California that there is a possibility that a Member might get both his alternates in if they could win on a merit basis.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. HARE. As I understand, there are 190 nominees this year who failed to qualify. If this be so, how would the Secretary of War fill these vacancies for next year?

Mr. THOMASON. He could fill two-thirds from qualifying alternates appointed by Congressmen. He could fill one-third of them from other qualified candidates.

Mr. HARE. I am assuming that they all failed; that the vacancies go over to next year. The Secretary of War will fill these 190 vacancies. What becomes of the 190 next year?

Mr. THOMASON. They are just not filled, that is all; the Congressmen do not lose any right under this bill. I repeat, the committees of both the Senate and the House studied the matter most carefully, and I assure the gentleman that no Congressman loses a single right he now has.

Mr. HARE. Then do the 190 go out of the academy or stay in?

Mr. THOMASON. Of course, nobody goes out of the academy. They have already gone out because they failed for some reason. This provides a means for filling those vacancies.

Mr. HARE. Then, in the course of 4 years the Secretary might appoint 760 to the academy.

Mr. THOMASON. Oh, the gentleman is mistaken about that. Like many others, he completely misunderstands the bill.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS. Specificially answering the question of these gentlemen who have asked about the 190 vacancies each year, I direct their attention to the fact that this has been the average over a 100 years so there can be no question about the Congressman not losing his appointment for next year.

Mr. THOMASON. I may say in reply to my friend that, of course, if he feels as does the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, that we ought not to increase the cadets at the academy, that we do not need any more extraordinarily qualified military leaders, he should vote against the bill, but if he feels that under existing circumstances we need some more highly trained officer personnel for the hard and uncertain years ahead, that we should fill the academy to its capacity, for which we appropriate each year, then I beg of you vote for the conference report. As it is the bill provides that every Senator and every Congressman gets one additional cadet and then he has the chance that one or more of his alternates may be among the two-thirds appointed by the academic board to fill any existing vacancies for the particular year. This conference report is meritorious and should be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to bring out one point at this time: that is the need for speed in disposing of this bill. The examination is given at West Point on June 22. During the debate on the bill in the House I made inquiry to determine how long a time they would need to process the nominations in order to get them ready for the examination on June 22. They estimated June 1 would be about the deadline if they were to process them for the examination on June 22.

You will find in the hearings the statement that the examination will be given on June 22 at West Point to accredited candidates, but that they could qualify also by taking the college entrance board examination at or near their homes. Such credits would be accepted at West Point for qualification. This demonstrates the need for haste if June 1 is the deadline for making nominations.

Now the question comes up as to whether or not we are going to fill West Point to its capacity and whether we are interested in really qualifying as large a number of officers as possible by West Point training. If we delay and bicker over this bill beyond June 1, we are going to jeopardize the opportunity we have to utilize the facilities at West Point.

The average number of vacancies unfilled during the past several years has been 100 cadets per year. The point in issue, Mr. Speaker, is whether or not we shall entitle the Secretary of War to name 33 of those boys from the list of candidates who are not alternates named by Congressmen. This whole fight is over the filling of 33 appointments, and whether or not the boy who serves in the ranks or the officer's son may have a chance at 33 out of that average of 100 vacancies this year. The chance which this bill would give those 536 boys will be

forfeited simply because we fail to give the academic board and the Secretary of War the opportunity to give these enlisted men and these sons of officers a chance at not more than one-third of the vacancies on the average each year.

I would like to discuss one or two other points. The reason for the two-thirds restriction, as written in the bill, is based primarily upon the fear of certain Congressmen that if these boys were selected on their grades in the competitive examination, and on that basis only, more than one-third of them would go to the candidates rather than to the alternates, and it is in order to protect the Congress to that extent that we have limited this bill to provide that not less than two-thirds shall go to the alternates named by the Members of Congress. For my part I am very happy to see the officials willing to expand the facilities at West Point and to give to Congress 536 additional appointments.

In return for that I am willing to concede this right and privilege to select 33 or less, if they so desire, from the list of candidates who are those boys named from the line, from the Army itself, or who may be sons of officers. In return for our 536 I think we can well afford to be generous enough to give the Secretary of War the privilege of naming 33 or less, as he sees fit, from that list of candidates.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am surprised at the amount of misinformation that seems to be abroad with reference to this bill. In the first place, let me say in connection with the question propounded the gentleman from Georgia by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] with reference to changing the geographical distribution of these appointees, that this bill makes no change whatsoever in the distribution of those appointees. It simply provides that the Congressmen may have their additional appointments and then, in order that the full capacity of the institution may be used, the academic board may select from those persons who have been named by the various Congressmen as well as from those who have attained a qualified rating through competitive examination, to be divided two-thirds to the Congressmen and one-third to those competitive candidates. Those places may be filled in that order.

You speak about 100 places or 190 places. While it is true that that number will be filled the first year, they would not be filled the second year. You would only fill in the second year the number of vacancies or casualties that developed during that year, and, once you got them filled, then you would have a less number each year to put in by that method.

Let me tell you how these vacancies come about. In the March examination this year there were 362 principal appointments made to West Point. Of those 362 principals named, 64 percent qualified. Twenty percent additional of the places were filled by qualified alternates. This gave 84 percent qualified persons named, leaving a vacancy of 16 percent out of those 362. The reason a great many of those did not have qualified persons to fill them was simply that Members of Congress did not name the alternates which they were entitled to name.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. I have been very much interested in the matter of the alternate appointments, as the gentleman knows. I know the gentleman has been likewise interested. In the original bill the House adopted section 2 which provided that we shall have the right to appoint 3 alternate appointees.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS. As I understand it, the gentleman has had some conversation with the War Department. I would like to have that show in the RECORD.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I am familiar with the gentleman's desire in that regard and I join him in his desire. I was disappointed to find it had been left off. The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs tells me it was inadvertently left off. However, the number of alternates that each Member may name is not set by law but by regulation. I have checked with the War Department this morning and I have a note here which states that General McNarney confirms the agreement on the part of the War Department to amend the regulations in order to provide for the appointment of three alternates instead of two as at present.

There is one other point I want to make at this time and this has to do with the examinations and delay. Every year each Member of Congress has the right to have his principal and two alternates submit a college certificate or take the examination in March. If they fail to fill the place, he can still name others to take the examination in June, and if they fail then he can still name some one with a college certificate that will be eligible to enter.

With reference to having to go to West Point to take these examinations, may I say that there are two methods by which the examination may be taken on June 22. The boy who is named, if he prefers to do so, may go to West Point and take the examination, or if he prefers not to do that he may stay at home, take the regular college board entrance examination, which is standard throughout the country, and which will be given to every boy who wants to take it, within 100 miles of his home.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield for a question?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TREADWAY. I think there is great confusion in the minds of the Members as to the right of a Member to retain the place if his original appointee fails. I understood the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] to say that if the principal or the alternate whom a Member of Congress nominates fails the Member does not lose that place but the place stays to his credit until he fills it; that the Secretary of War has no authority over a Member's appointee. Will the gentleman explain that detail?

Mr. MAY. The gentleman has explained it exactly as it is. If the principal qualifies, he goes in immediately.

Mr. TREADWAY. Certainly.

Mr. MAY. If he does not qualify and the alternate does qualify, the alternate goes in immediately. However, if a Member does not qualify some man in his district, the appointment for that year goes over to the next year.

Mr. TREADWAY. But the Member holds the right to make that appointment when the proper time comes.

Mr. MAY. That is exactly right.

Mr. TREADWAY. The only opportunity the Secretary of War has to make an appointment is in case the total number of cadets should be below the number authorized.

Mr. MAY. That is right; and the only appointments he could make would be where the Congressman failed utterly to make an appointment.

Mr. TREADWAY. I think it is very important that it should be brought to the knowledge of the House, as I know Members are confused about it, that the Member does not lose his right to make a new appointment to the academy.

Mr. THOMASON. That is correct. I repeat that it is not only the unanimous opinion of the conferees but of both the Senate and House Committees on Military Affairs—and I bring it to you with their assurance—that under no conditions does a Member of Congress lose his appointment. The only thing in the world this does is to give the Secretary of War, on the recommendation of the academic board, the right to fill these existing vacancies, which average about 100 a year.

Mr. TREADWAY. I want it definitely understood once more, and I want it to come from the committee direct, that every Member on this floor retains this right of appointment. If his principal or alternate fails this year under this new appointment the appointment goes over until he fills it some other year.

Mr. MAY. I repeat that with emphasis as being the condition under this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITE. I think we ought to have more time to discuss this very important matter. Is there any way to get the chairman to yield some of the time still unconsumed?

The SPEAKER. There is not, unless the gentleman who is in control of the time yields.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITE) there were—ayes 137, noes 22.

So the previous question was ordered.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. TARVER. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves to recommit the bill and report to the conference committee for further consideration.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 71, noes 133.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 86, nays 271, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 59]

YEAS—86

Andresen, August H.	Gavagan	O'Toole
Barden	Gehrmann	Pace
Bates, Ky.	Gillette	Patton
Bell	Gossett	Peterson, Fla.
Bland	Graham	Pierce
Bonner	Gregory	Poage
Boren	Hare	Rabaut
Bradley, Pa.	Harris, Ark.	Ramsay
Brown, Ga.	Harris, Va.	Rankin, Miss.
Camp	Hendricks	Richards
Cannon, Fla.	Hull	Rivers
Cooley	Jacobsen	Rodgers, Pa.
Cooper	Kee	Rogers, Okla.
Cox	Kennedy, Martin J.	Russell
Cravens	Kinzer	Sabath
Crawford	Kopplemann	Sacks
Crowther	Lambertson	Sanders
D'Alesandro	Lanham	Sauthoff
Disney	Larrabee	Scanlon
Domengeaux	Leavy	Sikes
Dondero	Ludlow	South
Downs	McGehee	Starnes, Ala.
Duncan	McMillan	Tarver
Elliott, Calif.	Manasco	Vincent, Ky.
Engel	Mills, La.	Voorhis, Calif.
Flaherty	Mitchell	West
Flannagan	Moser	White
Ford, Thomas F.	Norrell	Whitten
Fulmer	O'Brien, Mich.	

NAYS—271

Allen, Ill.	Case, S. Dak.	Fenton
Allen, La.	Celler	Fitzgerald
Andersen, H. Carl	Chapman	Fogarty
Anderson, Calif.	Chenoweth	Folger
Anderson, N. Mex.	Chiperfield	Forand
Andrews	Clark	Ford, Leland M.
Angell	Clason	Gale
Arends	Claypool	Gamble
Arnold	Clevenger	Gathings
Barnes	Cochran	Gearhart
Barry	Coffee, Nebr.	Gerlach
Bates, Mass.	Cole, N. Y.	Gillie
Baumhart	Collins	Gore
Beckworth	Colmer	Grant, Ala.
Beiter	Copeland	Haines
Bender	Costello	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Bishop	Creal	Hall, Leonard W.
Blackney	Crosser	Halleck
Bloom	Culkin	Hancock
Boehne	Cunningham	Harness
Boggs	Curtis	Hart
Boykin	Davis, Ohio	Harter
Bradley, Mich.	Davis, Tenn.	Hartley
Brooks	Day	Healey
Brown, Ohio	Delaney	Hébert
Bryson	Dewey	Heffernan
Buck	Dickstein	Heidinger
Bulwinkle	Dingell	Hess
Burch	Dirksen	Hill, Colo.
Burdick	Ditter	Hill, Wash.
Burgin	Doughton	Hinshaw
Butler	Drewry	Hobbs
Byrne	Durham	Hoffman
Byron	Dworshak	Holbrook
Canfield	Eaton	Holmes
Cannon, Mo.	Eberharter	Hope
Capozzoli	Edmiston	Houston
Carlson	Elliot, Mass.	Howell
Carter	Elston	Hunter
Cartwright	Englebright	Imhoff
Izac	Faddis	Jackson
Jenkins, Ohio	Fellows	Jenks, N. H.
Jennings	Mills, Ark.	Jensen
Johns	Monroney	Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Ill.	Mott	Johnson, Luther A.
Johnson, Okla.	Mundt	Johnson, W. Va.
Jones	Murdock	Jonkman
Kean	Murray	Kearney
Keefe	Myers, Pa.	Kefauver
Kelley, Pa.	Nelson	Kelly, Ill.
Keogh	Norton	Kilday
Kirwan	O'Brien, N. Y.	Kleberg
Klein	O'Connor	Knutson
Kunkel	O'Leary	Landis
Lane	Oliver	Lea
LeCompte	O'Neal	Lesinski
Lewis	Paddock	Lynch
McCormack	Patman	McGranery
McGregor	Pearson	McLaughlin
McLean	Peterson, Ga.	Maas
Maciora	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Mahon
Mansfield	Pheiffer, William T.	Marcantonio
Martin, Iowa	Pittenger	Martin, Mass.
Mason	Ploeser	May
Merritt	Powers	Meyer, Md.
Michener	Priest	Miller
Mills, Ark.	Ramspeck	Monroney
Mott	Randolph	Mundt
Murdock	Rankin, Mont.	Murray
Myers, Pa.	Reed, Ill.	Nelson
Norton	Reed, N. Y.	O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Connor	Rich	O'Leary
Oliver	Rizley	O'Neal
Paddock	Robertson, N. Dak.	Patman
Pearson	Robertson, Va.	Peterson, Ga.
Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Robinson, Utah	Pheiffer, William T.
Pittenger	Robsion, Ky.	Ploeser
Powers	Rockefeller	Priest
Priest	Rockwell	Ramspeck
Ramspeck	Rogers, Mass.	Randolph
Randolph	Rolph	Rankin, Mont.
Rankin, Mont.	Romjue	Reed, Ill.
Reed, Ill.	Satterfield	Reed, N. Y.
Reed, N. Y.	Schulte	Rich
Rich	Scott	Rizley
Rizley	Secrest	Robertson, N. Dak.
Robertson, N. Dak.	Shafer, Mich.	Robertson, Va.
Robertson, Va.	Shanley	Robinson, Utah
Robinson, Utah	Sheridan	Robsion, Ky.
Robsion, Ky.	Simpson	Rockefeller
Rockefeller	Smith, Maine	Rockwell
Rockwell	Smith, Ohio	Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Mass.	Smith, Pa.	Rolph
Rolph	Smith, Va.	Romjue
Romjue	Smith, Wash.	Satterfield
Satterfield	Smith, W. Va.	Schulte
Schulte	Snyder	Scott
Scott	Somers, N. Y.	Secrest
Secrest	Sparkman	Shafer, Mich.
Shafer, Mich.	Spence	Shanley
Shanley	Springer	Sheridan
Sheridan	Steagall	Simpson
Simpson	Stearns, N. H.	Smith, Maine
Smith, Maine	Stefan	Smith, Ohio
Smith, Ohio	Stevenson	Smith, Pa.
Smith, Pa.	Stratton	Smith, Va.
Smith, Va.	Sullivan	Smith, Wash.
Smith, Wash.	Sutphin	Smith, W. Va.
Smith, W. Va.	Sweeney	Snyder
Snyder	Talle	Somers, N. Y.
Somers, N. Y.	Tenerowicz	Sparkman
Sparkman	Thill	Spence
Spence	Thom	Springer
Springer	Thomas, N. J.	Steagall
Steagall	Thomason	Stearns, N. H.
Stearns, N. H.	Tibbott	Stefan
Stefan	Tolan	Stevenson
Stevenson	Traynor	Stratton
Stratton	Treadway	Sullivan
Sullivan	Van Zandt	Sutphin
Sutphin	Vinson, Ga.	Sweeney
Sweeney	Vorys, Ohio	Talle
Talle	Wadsworth	Tenerowicz
Tenerowicz	Ward	Thill
Thill	Wasielewski	Thom
Thom	Weiss	Thomas, N. J.
Thomas, N. J.	Wene	Thomason
Thomason	Wheat	Tibbott
Tibbott	Whittington	Tolan
Tolan	Wickersham	Traynor
Traynor	Wigglesworth	Treadway
Treadway	Williams	Van Zandt
Van Zandt	Wilson	Vinson, Ga.
Vinson, Ga.	Wolcott	Vorys, Ohio
Vorys, Ohio	Wolverton, N. J.	Wadsworth
Wadsworth	Woodruff, Mich.	Ward
Ward	Woodrum, Va.	Wasielewski
Wasielewski	Wright	Weiss
Weiss	Young	Wene
Wene	Youngdahl	Wheat
Wheat	Zimmerman	Whittington
Whittington		Wickersham
Wickersham		Wigglesworth
Wigglesworth		Williams
Williams		Wilson
Wilson		Wolcott
Wolcott		Wolverton, N. J.
Wolverton, N. J.		Woodruff, Mich.
Woodruff, Mich.		Woodrum, Va.
Woodrum, Va.		Wright
Wright		Young
Young		Youngdahl
Youngdahl		Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—73

Baldwin	Gwynne	Reece, Tenn.
Beam	Harrington	Rees, Kans.
Bennett	Hook	Sasscer
Bolton	Jarman	Schaefer, Ill.
Buckler, Minn.	Jarrett	Schuetz
Buckley, N. Y.	Johnson, Ind.	Scrugham
Casey, Mass.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Shannon
Ciuett	Kennedy, Michael J.	Sheppard
Coffee, Wash.	Kerr	Short
Cole, Md.	Kilburn	Smith, Wis.
Courtney	Kocialkowski	Sumner, Ill.
Cullen	Kramer	Sumners, Tex.
Dies	McIntyre	Taber
Douglas	McKeough	Talbot
Ellis	Maciejewski	Terry
Fish	Magnuson	Thomas, Tex.
Fitzpatrick	Nichols	Tinkham
Ford, Miss.	O'Day	Vreeland
Gibson	O'Hara	Walter
Gifford	Osmers	Weaver
Gilchrist	Patrick	Welch
Granger	Plauché	Whelchel
Grant, Ind.	Plumley	Winter
Green	Reece, Tenn.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Guyer	Rees, Kans.	Worley

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Taber for, with Mr. McKeough against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Rees of Kansas against.

Mr. Coffee of Washington for, with Mr. Guyer of Kansas against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Terry with Mr. Short.

Mr. Weaver with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Courtney with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.

Mr. Green with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Bennett.

Mr. Whelchel with Mr. Grant of Indiana.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Granger with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Cullen with Mr. Gwynne.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Cluett.

Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Patrick with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Jarrett.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Gilchrist.

Mr. Sasscer with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. O'Hara.

Mr. Maciejewski with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Tinkham.

Mr. Harrington with Miss Sumner of Illinois.

Mr. Beam with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Magnuson.

Mr. Worley with Mrs. O'Day.

Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Kramer.

Mr. Hook with Mr. Schuetz.

Mr. Shannon with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. McIntyre with Mr. Gibson.

Mr. Plauché with Mr. Sheppard.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—HOUSING FOR WAR WORKERS (H. DOC. NO. 743)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and with the accompanying papers referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

From time to time I have indicated to the Congress the need for adequate housing facilities for the workers moving in vast numbers into areas of expanding war production.

This war involves a total national effort and industrial mobilization. Industry cannot effectively mobilize and plants cannot expand with sufficient rapidity unless there are enough houses to bring the worker to the job, keep him on the job, and maintain his efficiency and morale. More than ever before in our history, we need houses to help win the war.

Thus far, Congress has shown a full appreciation of this need and has made $1,020,000,000 in appropriations available for the construction of war housing. This figure reduces to its true perspective when we realize that it is less than 1 percent of the funds made available for war purposes. The allocation of war funds for the shelter of the men and women leaving their homes to serve our war industries is a wise and established national policy.

That policy should continue. War production is now increasing in geometric ratio. Plant capacities are expanding faster and faster. Consistent reports from all over the country indicate a rising need for housing, running far ahead of the supply and threatening seriously to reduce the effective use of these plants unless remedied at once.

It is clear that the increase in employment in war industries, during the fiscal

year 1943, will amount to several million workers. To reduce the amount of new housing required by this expansion, all reasonable resources are being earnestly pursued. These include conversion of local plants to war purposes, transfers of local workers to war jobs, and drawing upon new sources of local labor supply. While in some cases adequate housing should be provided to keep families together, particularly where there are small children or where the breadwinner cannot afford to maintain two separate living units, there are other cases where workers may find it feasible not to move their families to the locality of their war jobs. It is estimated that the volume of war workers migrating to centers of war activity will be kept down to about 1,600,000 during the fiscal year 1943.

These 1,600,000 war workers need housing. Existing structures are being counted upon to absorb a large portion of them, despite present overcrowding in many industrial areas. Private enterprise is being relied upon to serve a large proportion of the remaining need, and toward this end Federal legislation has recently been enacted. But beyond these methods there remains the irreducible requirement for a volume of new public construction, largely temporary in nature and designed to serve the lower income brackets of war workers.

The main vehicle for such public-housing construction has been the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, known as the Lanham Act. The funds under this act and under other acts to provide war housing are practically all committed. They are being relied upon to meet needs arising before the end of the current fiscal year, and also to meet a part of the need for the fiscal year 1943.

To meet the minimum needs of the 1,600,000 war workers migrating to war centers during the fiscal year 1943, I am suggesting to the Congress the enactment of legislation providing an increase of $600,000,000 in the authorization contained in the Lanham Act, as amended. A large portion of these funds will be returned to the Government in the form of rents during the national emergency and through sales thereafter.

There is of necessity a period of several months between the authorization of funds for housing and the completion of living quarters. In view of the urgency of the need, which is a matter of common knowledge, I suggest that this proposed legislation receive the early consideration of the Congress.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *May 27, 1942.*

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF MEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That, for the purpose of computing the annual pay of the commissioned officers of the Regular Army and Marine Corps below the grade of brigadier general; of the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey below the grade of rear admiral; and of the Public Health Service below the grade of assistant to the Surgeon General, pay periods are prescribed, and the base pay for each is fixed as follows:

"The first period, $1,800; the second period, $2,000; the third period, $2,400; the fourth period, $3,000; the fifth period, $3,500; and the sixth period, $4,000.

"The pay of the sixth period shall be paid to colonels of the Army, captains of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade; to lieutenant colonels of the Army, commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, and lieutenant commanders of the line and Engineer Corps of the Coast Guard who have completed thirty years' service; and to the Chief of Chaplains of the Army when not holding rank above that of colonel.

"The pay of the fifth period shall be paid to lieutenant colonels of the Army, commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the sixth period; and to majors of the Army, lieutenant commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed twenty-three years' service.

"The pay of the fourth period shall be paid to majors of the Army, lieutenant commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the fifth period; to captains of the Army, lieutenants of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed seventeen years' service.

"The pay of the third period shall be paid to captains of the Army, lieutenants of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the fourth period; to first lieutenants of the Army, lieutenants (junior grade) of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed ten years' service.

"The pay of the second period shall be paid to first lieutenants of the Army, lieutenants (junior grade) of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the third period; and to second lieutenants of the Army, ensigns of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed five years' service; and to contract surgeons serving full time.

"The pay of the first period shall be paid to all other officers whose pay is provided for in this section.

"Officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act temporarily appointed to higher grades or ranks shall, for the purposes of this Act, be considered officers of such grades or ranks while holding such temporary appointments.

"Every officer paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 per centum of the base pay of his period for each three years of service up to thirty years.

"For officers appointed on and after July 1, 1922, no service shall be counted for purposes of pay except active commissioned service under a Federal appointment and commissioned service in the National Guard when called out by order of the President and service authorized in section 2 (b) of the Act of January 19, 1942 (Public Law 402, Seventy-seventh Congress). For officers in the service on June 30, 1922, there shall be included in the computation all service which was then counted in computing longevity pay, and service as a contract surgeon serving full time; and also 75 per centum of all other periods of time during which they have held commissions as officers of the Organized Militia between January 21, 1903, and July 1, 1916, or of the National Guard, the Naval Militia, or the National Naval Volunteers since June 3, 1916, shall be included in the computation. Longevity pay for officers in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act shall be based on the total of all service in any or all of said services which is authorized to be counted for longevity pay purposes under the provisions of this Act or as may otherwise be provided by law.

"The provisions of this Act shall apply equally to those persons serving, not as commissioned officers in the Army or in the other services mentioned in the title of this Act, but whose pay under existing law is an amount equivalent to that of a commissioned officer of one of the above grades, those receiving the pay of colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, first lieutenant, and second lieutenant, being classified as in the sixth, fifth, fourth, third, second, and first periods, respectively.

"SEC. 2. The base pay of any enlisted man, warrant officer, or nurse (female) in the military or naval forces of the United States shall be increased by 20 per centum and the base pay of any commissioned officer of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act shall be increased by 10 per centum for any period of service while on sea duty as such duty may be defined by the head of the Department concerned, or duty in any place beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, which increases in pay shall be in addition to pay and allowances otherwise authorized: *Provided*, That the per centum increases herein authorized shall be included in computing increases in pay for aviation and submarine duty: *Provided further*, That this section shall be effective from December 7, 1941, and shall cease to be in effect twelve months after the termination of the present war is proclaimed by the President.

"SEC. 3. When officers of the National Guard or of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including Reserve officers, are authorized by law to receive Federal pay, those serving in grades corresponding to those of colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, first lieutenant, and second lieutenant of the Army shall receive the pay of the sixth, fifth, fourth, third, second, and first periods, respectively, unless entitled to the pay of a higher period under the provisions of section 14 of this Act. Such officers whenever entitled to Federal pay, except armory drill and administrative function pay, shall receive as longevity pay, in addition to base pay, an increase thereof at the per centum and time rates up to thirty years provided in section 1 of this Act. In computing the increase of pay for each period of three years' service, such officers shall be credited with full time for all periods during which they have held commissions as officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, or in the Organized Militia prior to July 1, 1916, or in the National Guard, National Guard of the United States, or in the Officers Reserve Corps, or in the Naval Militia, or in the National Naval Volunteers,

or in the Naval Reserve force, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve force, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, when confirmed in grade and qualified for all general service.

"Members of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act who shall become entitled to Federal pay for a continuous period of less than one month at the rates fixed for the regular services shall receive such pay for each day of such period, and the thirty-first day of a calendar month shall not be excluded from the computation.

"Payments authorized under the provisions of the preceding paragraph may include the entire amount lawfully accruing to such persons as pay, allowances, and mileage on account of such service, and, including pay and mileage for their return home, may be paid to them during said period and prior to their departure from the camp or other place at which such service is performed.

"SEC. 4. The term 'dependent' as used in the succeeding sections of this Act shall include at all times and in all places a lawful wife and unmarried children under twenty-one years of age. It shall also include the father or mother of the person concerned provided he or she is in fact dependent on such person for his or her chief support: *Provided*, That the term 'children' shall be held to include stepchildren and adopted children when such stepchildren or adopted children are in fact dependent upon the person claiming dependency allowance.

"SEC. 5. Each commissioned officer on the active list, or on active duty, below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent, in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, shall be entitled at all times, in addition to his pay, to a money allowance for subsistence. The value of one subsistence allowance is hereby fixed at 70 cents per day. To each officer of any of the said services receiving the base pay of the first, second, third, or sixth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to two subsistence allowances, and to each officer receiving the base pay of the fourth or fifth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to three subsistence allowances: *Provided*, That an officer with no dependents shall receive one subsistence allowance in lieu of the above allowances.

"SEC. 6. Except as otherwise provided in this section, each commissioned officer below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent, in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act, while either on active duty or entitled to active-duty pay shall be entitled at all times to a money allowance for rental of quarters.

"To an officer having a dependent, receiving the base pay of the first period the amount of said allowance shall be $60 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the second period the amount of this allowance shall be $75 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the third period the amount of this allowance shall be $90 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fourth period the amount of this allowance shall be $105 per month, and to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fifth or sixth period the amount of this allowance shall be $120 per month.

"To an officer having no dependents, receiving the base pay of the first period the amount of said allowance shall be $45 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the second period the amount of said allowance shall be $60 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the third period the amount of said allowance shall be $75 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fourth period the amount of said allowance shall be $90 per month, and to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fifth or sixth period the amount of said allowance shall be $105 per month.

"No rental allowance shall accrue to an officer having no dependents while he is on field or sea duty, nor shall any rental allowance accrue to an officer with or without dependents who is assigned quarters at his permanent station unless a competent superior authority of the service concerned certifies that such quarters are not adequate for the occupancy of the officer and his dependents, if any: *Provided*, That an officer although furnished with quarters shall be entitled to rental allowance as authorized in this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependents are prevented from occupying such quarters.

"Regulations in execution of the provisions of this section shall be made by the President and shall, whenever practicable, in his judgment, be uniform for all of the services concerned, including adjunct forces thereof.

"SEC. 7. The annual base pay of a brigadier general of the Army or the Marine Corps, rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard, the Engineer in Chief of the Coast Guard, commodore of the Navy, an Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and an assistant to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, shall be $6,000; and the annual base pay of a major general of the Army or the Marine Corps and of a rear admiral (upper half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey or the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall be $8,000. Every such officer shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters authorized in sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the sixth period.

"Officers of the Navy serving in the grade of vice admiral, officers of the Army serving in the grade of lieutenant general, and officers of the other services mentioned in the title of this Act serving in corresponding grades, shall be entitled, while so serving, to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (upper half) and to a personal money allowance of $500 per year. Officers of the Navy serving in the grade of admiral or as Chief of Naval Operations, officers of the Army serving in the grade of general or as Chief of Staff of the Army, and officers of the other services mentioned in the title of this Act serving in corresponding grades, shall be entitled, while so serving, to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (upper half) and to a personal money allowance of $2,200 per year.

"SEC. 8. Warrant officers (junior grade) of the Army except first mates and assistant engineers of the Army Mine Planter Service, and warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, shall receive the base pay of the first period as established by section 1 of this Act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

"First mates and assistant engineers of the Army Mine Planter Service shall receive base pay at the rate of $1,950 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

"Chief warrant officers of the Army except masters in the Army Mine Planter Service, and commissioned warrant officers with less than ten years of commissioned service, of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, shall receive base pay at the rate of $2,100 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the second period: *Provided*, That a commissioned warrant officer or chief warrant officer promoted from the grade of warrant officer or warrant officer (junior grade) shall suffer no reduction of pay by reason of such promotion: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be held to affect the authority of the Secretary of War to designate permanent or temporary chief warrant officers of the Army to receive the base pay and allowances of the third and fourth pay periods as provided in section 3 of the Act approved August 21, 1941 (Public Law 230, Seventy-seventh Congress).

"Commissioned warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard with creditable records on the active list, after ten years of commissioned service, and masters in the Army Mine Planter Service, shall receive the base pay of the third period as established by section 1 of this Act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the third period.

"Commissioned warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, with creditable records on the active list, after twenty years of commissioned service, shall receive the base pay of the fourth period as established by section 1 of this Act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the fourth period.

"Every person paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 per centum of the base pay of his period for each three years of service, not exceeding thirty years. Such service shall be: active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act or Reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve: *Provided*, That commissioned warrant officers shall be credited only with all commissioned service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act including commissioned service in the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard.

"When the total pay and allowances authorized by this section for any person shall exceed the rate of $458.33 per month, the amount of the allowances to which such person is entitled shall be reduced by the amount above $458.33.

"SEC. 9. The monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be as follows: Enlisted men of the first grade, $138; enlisted men of the second grade, $114; enlisted men of the third grade, $96; enlisted men of the fourth grade, $78; enlisted men of the fifth grade, $66; enlisted men of the sixth grade, $48; and enlisted men of the seventh grade, $42. Chief petty officers under acting appointment shall be included in the first grade at a monthly base pay of $126.

"For purposes of pay enlisted men of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard shall be distributed in the several pay grades by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively.

"Every enlisted man paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 per centum of the base pay of his grade for each three years of service up to thirty years. Such service shall be active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act or Reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve.

"SEC. 10. To each enlisted man not furnished quarters or rations in kind there shall be granted, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, an allowance for quarters and subsistence, the value of which shall depend on the conditions under which the duty of the man is being performed, and shall not exceed $5 per day: *Provided*, That payments of allowances for quarters and subsistence may be made in advance to enlisted men under such regulations as the President may prescribe. These regulations shall be uniform for all the services mentioned in the title of this Act. Subsistence for pilots shall be paid in accordance with existing regulations, and rations for enlisted men may be commuted as now authorized by law.

"Each enlisted man of the first, second, or third grade, in the active military, naval, or Coast Guard service of the United States having a dependent as defined in section 4 of this Act, shall, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, be entitled to receive, for any period during which public quarters are not provided and available for his dependent, the monthly allowance for quarters authorized by law to be granted to each enlisted man not furnished quarters in kind: *Provided*, That such enlisted men shall continue to be entitled to this allowance although receiving the allowance provided in the first paragraph of this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependent is prevented from dwelling with him.

"Enlisted men entitled to receive allowances for quarters or subsistence, shall continue, while their permanent stations remain unchanged, to receive such allowances while sick in hospital or absent from their permanent-duty stations in a pay status: *Provided*, That allowances for subsistence shall not accrue to such an enlisted man while he is in fact being subsisted at Government expense.

"An enlistment allowance equal to $50, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the first three grades who reenlists within a period of three months from the date of his discharge, and an enlistment allowance of $25, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the other grades who reenlists within a period of three months from the date of his discharge: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not affect the provisions of the Act approved August 18, 1941 (Public Law 215, Seventy-seventh Congress): *Provided further*, That during the present war and for six months thereafter the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (Public Law 215, Seventy-seventh Congress) are hereby suspended.

"Hereafter the President may prescribe the quantity and kind of clothing which shall be furnished annually to enlisted men of the Navy, the Coast Guard, the Naval Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve, and he may prescribe the amount of a cash allowance to be paid to such enlisted men in any case in which clothing is not so furnished to them.

"SEC. 11. The pay and allowances of whatever nature and kind to be authorized for the enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts shall be fixed by the Secretary of War and shall not exceed or be of other classes than those now or which may hereafter be authorized by law for enlisted men of the Regular Army.

"The rates of pay of enlisted men of the insular force of the Navy shall be one-half the rates of pay prescribed for enlisted men of the Navy in corresponding grades.

"SEC. 12. Officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including Reserve components thereof and the National Guard, while on active duty in the Federal service, when traveling under competent orders without troops shall receive a mileage allowance at the rate of 8 cents per mile, distance to be computed by the shortest usually traveled route and existing laws providing for the issue of transportation requests to officers of the Army traveling under competent orders, and for deduction to be made from mileage accounts when transportation is furnished by the United States, are hereby made applicable to all the services mentioned in the title of this Act, but in cases when orders are given for travel to be performed repeatedly between two or more places in the same vicinity, as determined by the head of the executive department concerned, he may, in his discretion, direct that actual and necessary expenses only be allowed. Actual expenses only shall be paid for travel under orders in Alaska and outside the limits of the United States in North America.

"Unless otherwise expressly provided by law, no officer of the services mentioned in the title of this Act shall be allowed or paid any sum in excess of expenses actually incurred for subsistence while traveling on duty away from his designated post of duty, nor any sum for such expenses actually incurred in excess of $7 per day. The heads of the executive departments concerned are authorized to prescribe per diem rates of allowance, not exceeding $6, in lieu of subsistence to officers traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty: *Provided*, That for travel by air under competent orders on duty without troops, under regulations to be prescribed respectively by the heads of the departments concerned, members (including officers, warrant officers, contract surgeons, enlisted men, aviation cadets, and members of the Nurse Corps) of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, and of the legally constituted Reserves of said services while on active duty, and of the National Guard while in Federal service, or while participating in exercises, or performing duties under sections 92, 94, 97, or 99 of the National Defense Act, shall, in lieu of mileage or other travel allowances, be allowed and paid their actual and necessary traveling expenses not to exceed $8 per day, or, in lieu thereof, per diem allowances at rates not to exceed $6 per day.

"Travel by personnel of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard while on active duty in the Federal service, on commercial aircraft, domestic or foreign, including travel between airports and centers of population or posts of duty when incidental to travel on commercial aircraft, shall be allowed at public expense when authorized or approved by competent authority, and transportation requests for such travel may be issued upon such authorizations. Such expense shall be allowed without regard to comparative costs of transportation by aircraft with other modes of transportation.

"Individuals belonging to any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including the National Guard and the Reserves of such services, traveling under competent orders which entitle them to transportation or transportation and subsistence as distinguished from mileage, who, under regulations prescribed by the head of the department concerned, travel by privately owned conveyance shall be entitled, in lieu of transportation by the shortest usually traveled route now authorized by law to be furnished in kind, to a money allowance at the rate of 3 cents per mile for the same distance: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to any person entitled to traveling expenses under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926.

"When any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man above the fourth grade, having dependents as defined in section 4 hereof, is ordered to make a permanent change of station, the United States shall furnish transportation in kind from funds appropriated for the transportation of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service to his new station for such dependents: *Provided*, That for persons in the naval service the term 'permanent station' as used in this section shall be interpreted to mean a shore station or the home yard or home port of the vessel to which the person concerned may be ordered; and a duly authorized change in home yard or home port of such vessel shall be deemed a change of station: *Provided further*, That if the cost of such transportation exceeds that for transportation from the old to the new station, the excess cost shall be paid to the United States by the officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man concerned: *Provided further*, That transportation supplied the dependents of such officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man, to or from stations beyond the continental limits of the United States, shall not be other than by Government transport, if such transportation is available as may be determined by the head of the department concerned: *Provided further*, That the personnel of all the services mentioned in the title of this Act shall have the benefit of all existing laws applying to the Army and Marine Corps for the transportation of household effects: *And provided further*, That in lieu of transportation in kind authorized by this section for dependents, the President may authorize the payment in money of amounts equal to such commercial transportation costs for the whole or such part of the travel for which transportation in kind is not furnished when such travel shall have been completed.

"The words 'permanent change of station' as used in this section shall include the change from home to first station and from last station to home when ordered to active duty other than training duty, of any officer, warrant officer, nurse, or enlisted man of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including retired personnel and members of the Reserve components thereof, in a grade for which the transportation of dependents is authorized at Government expense, and the change from last station to home in connection with retirement, relief from active duty, or transfer to a Reserve component.

"Personnel of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act performing travel on Government-owned vessels for which no transportation fare is charged shall be entitled only to reimbursement of actual and necessary expenses incurred.

"The head of the department concerned may determine what shall constitute a travel status and travel without troops within the meaning of the laws governing the payment of mileage or other travel expenses.

"SEC. 13. The annual base pay of female nurses of the Army and Navy shall be as follows: During the first three years of service, $1,080; from the beginning of the fourth year of service until the completion of the sixth year of service, $1,260; from the beginning of the seventh year of service until the completion of the ninth year of service, $1,440; from the beginning of the tenth year of service until the completion of the twelfth year of service, $1,620; from the beginning of the thirteenth year of service, $1,800.

"Superintendents of the Nurse Corps shall receive pay at the rate of $2,500 a year, assistant superintendents, directors, and assistant directors at the rate of $1,500 a year, and chief nurses at the rate of $600 a year, in addition to their base pay as nurses. Nurses shall be entitled to the money allowances

for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

"The annual pay of a retired member of the Army Nurse Corps or the Navy Nurse Corps retired for other than physical disability shall be 3 per centum of the total annual active duty pay which she is receiving at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of complete years of service rendered prior to retirement, but not exceeding 75 per centum of such annual active-duty pay: *Provided*, That in computing the period of service for retired pay a fractional year of six months or more shall be considered a full year: *Provided further*, That for the purpose of computing eligibility for retirement and retired pay, there shall be credited active service in the Army Nurse Corps and in the Navy Nurse Corps, active service as contract nurse prior to February 2, 1901, and service as a Reserve nurse on active duty since February 2, 1901.

"SEC. 14. Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, when on active duty in the service of the United States, shall be entitled to receive the same pay and allowances as are authorized for persons of corresponding grade and length of service in the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or Public Health Service.

"Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard, when in the Federal service or when participating in exercises or performing the duties provided for by sections 94, 97, and 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended, shall receive the same pay and allowances as are authorized for persons of corresponding grade and length of service in the Regular Army.

"Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, officers of the National Guard, other than general officers, and warrant officers and enlisted men of the National Guard, shall receive compensation at the rate of one-thirtieth of the monthly pay authorized for such persons when in the Federal service, for each regular drill, period of appropriate duty, or other equivalent period of training, authorized by the Secretary of War, at which they shall have been engaged for the entire prescribed period of time: *Provided*, That such pay shall be in addition to compensation for attendance at field or coast-defense instruction or maneuvers. General officers of the National Guard shall receive $500 a year in addition to compensation for attendance at field or coast-defense instruction or maneuvers, for satisfactory performance of their appropriate duties. In addition to pay herein provided, officers of the National Guard commanding organizations less than a brigade and having administrative functions connected therewith shall, whether or not such officers belong to such organizations, receive not more than $240 a year for the faithful performance of such administrative functions under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply when such persons are on active duty in the Federal service.

"SEC. 15. On and after the effective date of this act, retired officers, warrant officers, nurses, enlisted men, and members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve shall have their retired pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay, computed as now authorized by law on the basis of pay provided in this act, which pay shall include increases for all active duty performed since retirement or transfer to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve in the computation of their longevity pay and pay periods: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this act shall operate to reduce the present pay of officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men now on the retired list or drawing retainer pay, or personnel in an equivalent status in any of the services mentioned in the title of this act. Retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service and retired warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of those services, shall, when on active duty, receive full pay and allowances of the grade or rank in which they serve on such active duty and, when on active duty status, shall have the same pay and allowance rights while on leave of absence or sick as officers on the active list, and, if death occurs when on active duty status, while on leave of absence or sick, their dependents shall not thereby be deprived of the benefits provided in the act approved December 7, 1919, as amended, and in the act of June 4, 1920.

"In the computation of the retired pay of officers heretofore or hereafter retired with pay at the rate of 2½, 3, or 4 per centum of the active duty pay received by them at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay on the active list, not to exceed a total of 75 per centum of said active duty pay, active duty performed by such retired officers subsequent to the date of their retirement shall be counted for the purpose of computing percentage rates and increases with respect to their retired pay. The increases shall be at the rate of 2½, 3, or 4 per centum for each year of active duty and a fractional year of six months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years: *Provided*, That the increased retired pay of such retired officers shall in no case exceed 75 per centum of the active duty pay as authorized by existing law.

"The retired pay of any officer of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, hereafter retired under any provision of law, shall, unless such officer is entitled to retired pay of a higher grade, be 75 per centum of his active duty pay at the time of his retirement.

"SEC. 16. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard may receive additional compensation not less than $1 nor more than $5 per month, for special qualification in the use of the arm or arms which they may be required to use.

"SEC. 17. Cadets at the United States Military Academy, midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, and cadets at the Coast Guard Academy shall be entitled to pay at the rate of $780 per annum, and to allowances as now or hereafter provided by law for midshipmen in the Navy, and to transportation, including reimbursement of traveling expenses, while traveling under orders as a cadet or midshipman.

"SEC. 18. Officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act and members of the Reserve forces of such services, and the National Guard shall receive an increase of 50 per centum of their pay when by orders of competent authority they are required to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights, and when in consequence of such orders they do participate in regular and frequent flights as defined by such Executive orders as have heretofore been, or may hereafter be, promulgated by the President: *Provided*, That when personnel of the National Guard are entitled to armory-drill pay, the increase of 50 per centum thereof herein provided shall be based on the entire amount of such armory-drill pay to which they shall be entitled for a calendar month or fractional part thereof, and the required aerial flights may be made at ordered drills of an air-service organization, or at other times when so authorized by the President. Regulations in execution of the provisions of this paragraph shall be made by the President and shall, whenever practicable in his judgment, be uniform for all of the services concerned.

"Any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, not in flying-pay status, who is assigned or attached as a member of a parachute unit, including parachute-jumping schools, and for whom parachute jumping is an essential part of his military duty and who, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Treasury, has received a rating as a parachutist or is undergoing training for such a rating shall receive, while engaged upon duty designated by the head of the department concerned as parachute duty, additional pay of the rate of $100 per month in the case of any such officer or warrant officer, and additional pay at the rate of $50 per month in the case of any such enlisted man.

"SEC. 19. No person, active or retired, of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard, shall suffer, by reason of this Act, any reduction in any pay, allowances, or compensation to which he was entitled upon the effective date of this Act: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this Act shall be construed to deprive any enlisted man transferred to the Fleet Reserve on or prior to the date of enactment of this Act, or transferred from the Fleet Reserve to the retired list of the regular Navy for physical disability, of any benefits, including pay, allowances, or compensation, which he would be entitled to receive upon the completion of thirty years under laws in force on the date of enactment of this Act.

"The Act of June 10, 1922 (42 Stat. 625), as amended, subsections 12 (a), (b), and (c), of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), section 18 of the Act of March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, Seventy-seventh Congress), and section 8 of the Service Extension Act of 1941 (Public Law 213, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved August 18, 1941), and those portions of the Act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1217), and of the Act of June 30, 1941 (Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress), which authorize allowances for enlisted men on the retired list, and all other laws and parts of laws which are inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That Acts or parts of Acts incorporating directly, by implication, or by reference, the provisions of the Act of June 10, 1922, as amended, and not in conflict herewith, shall not be considered modified by the provisions of this Act, except that the pay, allowances, or compensation established herein shall be substituted for the pay, allowances, or compensation set out in the Act of June 10, 1922, as amended.

"No back pay or allowances shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this Act.

"The provisions of this Act shall be effective on the first day of the calendar month following the enactment thereof.

"SEC. 20. Beginning June 1, 1942, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall every sixty days thereafter report to the Congress the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned during said period in the Army of the United States and in the Naval Establishment respectively from civilian life, who prior thereto has had no commissioned military service: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy shall not be required to report persons commissioned where such disclosure would in his opinion jeopardize the national interest or safety.

"SEC. 21. This Act may be cited as the 'Pay Readjustment Act of 1942'."

And the House agree to the same.

ANDREW J. MAY,
EWING THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the part of the House.

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The first section of the Senate bill contained a provision imposing a limitation of $479.17 per month on the base pay plus pay for length of service of officers below the grade of colonel or a corresponding grade. The House amendment eliminated such provision. The conference agreement eliminates such provision.

The first section of the House amendment added a provision providing that the time spent at the United States Military Academy, United States Naval Academy, or the United States Coast Guard Academy by any officer who was appointed to either of such academies after August 24, 1912, should not be counted for the purpose of computing his length of service. Since this matter is already covered by existing laws with respect to the extent to which credit may be given for time spent at the academies and since such laws are not repealed by S. 2025, the conference agreement eliminates this provision.

Section 2 of the House amendment contained a provision authorizing the head of the Department concerned to define "sea duty" for the purpose of determining the entitlement of members of the military or naval forces to extra pay for such duty. The conference agreement adopts the House provision.

Section 3 of the Senate bill provided for allowing, in the computation of longevity pay of commissioned officers, full time for active duty under Reserve and National Guard Commissions and one-half time for all other periods during which such commissions have been held. The House amendment provided for allowing full time for all periods during which such commissions have been held and included the National Guard of the United States and the Officers Reserve Corps in the list of organizations, commissioned time in which may be counted for longevity purposes. The conference agreement adopts the House provision.

Section 4 of the Senate bill provided that the term "dependent" as used in the sections of the bill providing for rental and subsistence allowances should be deemed to include a mother dependent upon an officer for her chief support. The House amendment provided for including a father dependent for his chief support as well as a mother. The conference agreement adopts the House provision

Sections 6 and 7 of the Senate bill contained provisions imposing limitations upon the amount of allowances which might be received by officers in the grade of colonel, brigadier general, or major general, or in corresponding grades, in cases where their combined pay and allowance payments would be in excess of specified amounts. The House amendment eliminated such provisions. The conference agreement eliminates such provisions.

Section 9 of the Senate bill provided that the pay of enlisted men of the sixth grade should be $48 per month and the pay of enlisted men of the seventh grade should be $42 per month. The House amendment provided that the pay of enlisted men of the sixth grade should be $54 per month and the pay of enlisted men of the seventh grade should be $50 per month. The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the Senate bill with respect to the pay of enlisted men of the sixth and seventh grades.

Section 9 of the House amendment provided for giving credit, for longevity pay purposes, to enlisted men for service in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army. The Senate bill contained no such provision. The conference agreement adopts the House provision.

Section 10 of the House amendment contained a provision suspending during the present war and the 6 months thereafter the provisions of all laws providing for payment of reenlistment allowances. The Senate bill did not contain such a provision. The conference agreement provides only for a suspension of section 2 (providing for double-enlistment allowances to enlisted men in the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard who reenlist during the war) of the act of August 18, 1941. The conferees deemed it inadvisable to suspend the provisions of all laws providing for reenlistment allowances, since such action would hinder the Navy in its efforts to secure reenlistments by men whose terms of enlistment expire during the war and might result in the Navy's being left at the end of the war without adequate personnel to man the ships of the two-ocean Navy which the Congress has authorized.

The House amendment contained a new section, section 12A, providing for reimbursing service men for actual and necessary medical and hospital expenses incurred by them after their induction into the armed forces and prior to the date of enactment of the bill. The Senate bill contained no similar provision. The conference agreement eliminates the section. The conferees deemed it inadvisable to include the section in the conference agreement because of information furnished to them by the War Department that adoption of the section would tend to promote absenteeism and was inadvisable in view of the fact that the laws with respect to payment for medical care and treatment in private hospitals of military personnel had been liberalized by a provision in the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942. This provision, a similar one to which it is proposed to include in the War Department Military Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1943, enables the War Department to pay for medical and hospital care, not of an elective nature, which is furnished in a private hospital to a member of the Army on leave of absence, even though such leave of absence is for more than 24 hours.

Section 15 of the Senate bill contained a provision providing for giving retired officers credit in the computation of their retired pay for all periods of active duty performed by them subsequent to retirement. The House amendment eliminated this provision but included one providing that nothing in the bill should be construed as authorizing any increase in pay for any retired commissioned officer. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment and eliminates the House provision.

The Senate bill contained a paragraph providing that the retired pay of officers heretofore retired under section 24b, National Defense Act, who served in the military or naval forces prior to November 12, 1918, should hereafter be 75 per centum of active duty pay. The House amendment eliminated such paragraph. The conference agreement eliminates such paragraph. The conferees are of the opinion that the question of whether or not an adjustment should be made in the rate of retired pay of such officers is one which should be given further consideration at a time when general legislation relating to the subject of retired pay of officers is under consideration.

Section 15 of the House amendment contained a provision providing that the retired pay of officers hereafter retired under any provision of law and who served in the military or naval forces prior to November 12, 1918, should be 75 per centum of active duty pay. The Senate bill contained no similar provision. The conference agreement adopts the House provision.

Section 20 of the House amendment prohibited the appointment, except under circumstances where military necessity requires the use of persons already possessing special knowledge, skill, training, or experience, of any person as an officer in the Army of the United States who had not had previous military or naval experience or who had not completed a satisfactory course of instruction at the Military or the Naval Academy, or in military science and tactics in a college having a senior Reserve Officers Training Corps unit, or in an officers' candidate school. The section provided for reports to Congress by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy with respect to persons commissioned after May 1, 1942, who had no previous commissioned military service. The section also provided for the completion, prior to commissioning, of a course of indoctrinal training by persons hereafter commissioned in the Naval Reserve or the Marine Corps Reserve. The Senate bill contained no provisions similar to section 20 of the House amendment. The conference agreement retains so much of section 20 of the House amendment as requires the rendition of reports by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy with respect to commissions granted after June 1, 1942.

The House amendment added a new section to the bill providing that the legislation should cease to be in effect upon the expiration of 12 months after the termination of the present war. The Senate bill contained no provision limiting the effective period of the legislation. The conference agreement eliminates the House limitation on the effective period of the bill.

ANDREW J. MAY,
EWING THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the part of the House.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Kentucky yield to me for a unanimous consent request?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley, former Postmaster General of the United States, to the graduating class of Villanova College.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF MEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, this is what is commonly known as the Army-Navy pay bill. It was debated at length in the House and in the Senate, and it is the first pay bill that is inclusive of all branches of the service that has been passed by the Congress in the last 50 years. The first one was passed during the World War, and this bill is patterned very largely upon the World War pay bill except, of course, that this one takes into consideration all of the conditions that are existent today, which differ in many respects from the conditions that existed when the legislation of 1917 was enacted.

There are only two provisions of this report, as I understand it, that are in any real sense controversial. Of all the amendments contained in the House bill the Senate yielded to the House except in two instances. The amendments which were written into the Senate bill by the House Committee and not contained at all in the Senate bill were likewise agreed to by the Senate.

The two matters about which there was any controversy to amount to anything were with respect to the pay of the sixth and seventh grades, which the House voted to raise from $42 per month to $50 per month. In this connection let me say that under the law as it exists every man in the armed forces, when he is sent abroad, is entitled, on top of his base pay, to a 20-percent raise, and when you place the pay of the sixth and seventh grade at $42, and you add 20 percent of that sum to it, you give him exactly $50.40 if he is sent abroad. If he stays in this country he is a $42-a-month man straight through. The same thing applies to the seamen on our ships. This is the rule as to both services. Let me add here that this is the first time in the history of the two services when all of the services got together and agreed about a matter of this kind. The Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service all sent representatives to the conference and announced following the discussion that had been had by the Interdepartmental Pay Committee that they had all agreed that this legislation, as presented by the conference, would be satisfactory to all of the services. We think, therefore, it is a good bill, and all this clamor you hear here on the floor of this House about a six- or eight-dollar raise for the enlisted men is not going to be received by our fighting men with much enthusiasm. They are not asking for bonuses or bounties at the hands of the Congress because they are fighting for the defense of their country from wholly patriotic motives and must not be put in the position of demanding a price for their loyalty to the country. I am sure that if they were permitted to express their feelings on the question, 95 percent of them would resent this proposal. Since they must fight a deadly enemy, they will need arms and ammunition more than money.

An amendment was placed in the bill in the House without much opposition that provided that the legislation should be temporary, but the Army and the Navy are basing this bill upon a rule or principle of a career system of military and naval service, and think, possibly, that after this war is over there will be necessity for maintaining a much larger armed force than we have maintained heretofore in the past.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does the gentleman think this Nation would be justified in paying 20-percent increase for naval service at sea in peacetime? If this law becomes permanent, it will permit that to be done.

Mr. MAY. I do not like that provision of it, but like every other conferee—and the gentleman from Georgia has been there many times—one sometimes has to yield something he does not want to yield in order to get an agreement, and that is what we were compelled to do in this instance; but here is what we did to compensate for having to yield on that: In the Navy they have a bonus or system of bonuses. This report eliminates one of those, and reduces it 50 percent, so that hereafter when a man reenlists in the Navy during this period of war, he does not get the bonus that he got theretofore. I do not know whether bonus is the proper term or not.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. A reenlistment gratuity.

Mr. MAY. That is a better term. We had one other controversial matter referred to often as the Faddis amendment, and that caused the committee quite a good deal of trouble in the committee and in the conference. The War Department undertook to say, I think without merit, where we required them to report to the Congress every 60 days the number of men they commissioned from civilian life, with certain specific information in detail as to their qualifications and special reasons for them, their residences, and so forth, that that was a reflection on the War Department and an expression by the Congress that we do not have sufficient confidence in them. Of course, that is answered by the fact that every one of these officers who is commissioned must be reported to the Senate for confirmation, and they have to pass muster there.

Furthermore, even if the War Department did object to making a report, it is mighty wholesome for the Congress of the United States to keep itself informed as to what is actually going on in the Military Establishment. For that reason we kept that provision in the bill. In addition to that the Faddis amendment provided for certain other requirements which we eliminated, because we realized in conference, as some others did on the committee, that we had not given special consideration to that on an actual hearing. The matter came up rather suddenly, and there is this further consideration: We are fighting a different kind of war now from what we fought in 1898, in 1812, and in 1776. We did not have mechanization and the technicians, and the technology and the technocracy that we have in these modern times. For instance, radio has grown up as a new institution since the last World War, and air warfare has changed in many respects. In 1776 we had never heard of a radio, and in 1812 we had never heard of a radio, nor in 1846—and I will not mention that other scrap that we had among ourselves—nor did we in 1898, but we do have radio now, and I imagine there are thousands of listening stations around this great, long seacoast of ours and in this great country of ours. We have to have men and women in these stations listening for something that might slip through in the time of a second. They did not have that kind of men in the Army and they ought to be permitted to go out and get them; and let me say here in respect to this Faddis amendment, that in my judgment no man in Congress has greater zeal and a more abiding interest in an efficient Military Establishment than has the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], who proposed that amendment. His motive was a high and lofty one in determining to create an Army of military men instead of civilian experts, and he is entitled to great credit for having done what he did, and I think it has done the country a great deal of good.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlemen yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. To revert to the most important feature of this conference, is it not a fact that this legislation as it passed the House provided $50 minimum for the duration, and a period of 1 year thereafter, and the conference report comes in with permanent legislation providing $42 a month minimum until such time as the Congress acts otherwise?

Mr. MAY. For what?

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not a fact that this pay fixed in this conference report is permanent legislation, whereas in the bill as it was passed by the House, it was for the duration of the war and 1 year thereafter?

Mr. MAY. That is correct. Now, that is all I want to say about this conference report. I think it should be adopted.

Mr. YOUNG. Will the gentleman yield for one further question?

Mr. MAY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. YOUNG. Is it not possible, then, that if we adopt the conference report as it is now, the taxpayers of this country in the end will pay more than had the conferees adhered to the Rankin amendment?

Mr. MAY. They will pay a great deal less. I do not have the figures before me, but in my extension of remarks I will put them in the RECORD.

Mr. YOUNG. But in the years to come the facts may be different.

Mr. MAY. Does the gentleman think that if 6 months after the war we undertake to maintain an army of a half a million men, $42 is too much for those men who decide to make the Army a life's career?

Mr. YOUNG. As I understand it, the Rankin amendment was for the duration and 1 year after. I voted in favor of the Rankin amendment for a minimum of $50. I favor higher pay to the enlisted men in our armed forces throughout the period of this war.

Mr. MAY. Yes. I am sure the gentleman is glad to have that in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I may be incorrect, but have impression that the only serious difference in this report is over the pay provision. I believe in that connection the amendment adopted in the House upon the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], making the provision temporary or only for the duration and a short time thereafter, also has a bearing on this. I am tempted to say that I believe a portion of the support for the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] was due to the pay scale adopted on motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

It would seem to me in my approach to the entire question that we might well review certain matters having to do with pay.

You will recall that in the passage of the extension of the Selective Service Act we established a provision whereby a man, after he had served 1 year, was entitled to a bonus of $10 a month. That seems to me to have a fundamental bearing on the situation as we approach it today. The two bills in the House and Senate, as agreed to in the conference report, dropped that $10-a-month provision. Somewhat replacing that provision is a provision granting a 20-percent bonus on base pay to all those in foreign service outside of the continental United States. In one sense it replaces the $10-a-month bonus to those who have been in the service more than a year, for this reason: You will all agree that in most cases it takes a year to train a man and that, presumably, all men who are going into foreign service will have been in training in this country a year beforehand. So that when you grant an increase of 20 percent on $42 or $50 you will, in effect, give him about $10 more. At the same time there are a great many men who will be inducted through the Selective Service who never will leave continental United States.

Beyond doubt, and entering into this entire subject, is the plan for allotments and the question of war-risk insurance, and whether or not that war-risk insurance will be given free to the man, or any of the amount, or if not given to him free, if it is given on a 50–50 basis, and how much of that will be charged against his monthly pay. I want to be frank. I do not want to be displeasing to my good friend from Kentucky, the chairman of our committee, but I held the view in conference—and I signed the conference report—but I held the view in conference that we should agree on $46 and bring that back to the House and let that go back to the Senate, rather than accede completely to the Senate provision. I was one of those who voted against the Rankin amendment. Nevertheless, a 10-to-1 vote in the House, in my mind, imposes some obligation upon any conferee. I felt, in justice to the situation, that it might well be brought back to the House at $46 for the sixth and seventh grades, particularly having in mind that the allotment bill will shortly come in and therein will probably be any provision for war-risk insurance. Now, it seems to me, that all those things should be taken into consideration.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] made the motion, and it was his amendment which made this bill temporary. I voted for his motion in the House, and I agreed with the provision to make this permanent for the war. Nevertheless Congress will always meet. I think the only real reason for the temporary amendment was in view of the higher pay scale.

It has been the history after every war that when Congress gets back to normal—if ever—and the after effects have worn off they cut the Army and Navy to pieces, they cut everything. The pacifists get hold of the proposition and we cut the Army with the result that then we usually could put the entire Army in the Yankee Stadium. Congress will be here and will be in position to legislate and make such changes as are necessary. Personally I am not terribly concerned about the pay provisions. I believe I said so in conference I believe them important, but I think we made a mistake in not arriving at $50 and $46 rather than coming back with $42 and $46.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let me call the attention of the gentleman from New York to the fact that after every war these laws are always overhauled and readjusted to conditions that then exist.

Reference was made to these men being given 20 percent additional when they go into foreign service. As a matter of fact, even at $50 in the case of a soldier going to Australia he would still get $2 a month less than the Australian with whom he fights.

Mr. ANDREWS. I believe that is correct; we are putting him up against the highest-paid soldier in the world.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes, and we are furnishing the highest-class soldier in the world.

Mr. ANDREWS. I may say in closing that I am more concerned about the provisions covering insurance. In the long run every boy in the Army, and his father and mother are concerned about this which to my mind is more important than the provision of pay increase. The allotment bill will be brought in next week, probably. We shall find that this subject has been well considered, and I hope there will be no question of its passage.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Does not the gentleman believe that these boys who face death so much of the time will enjoy a pay increase fully as much as they will insurance which cannot benefit them if they are killed?

Mr. ANDREWS. I am not arguing against the gentleman on that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Is it not true that the hazards the soldiers face in this war are greater than the hazards of any other war that has been fought? Is there not more danger to him than in any other war that has been fought?

Mr. ANDREWS. That may be true of the men in the air—that there is more danger to life—but for the soldier on the ground there is no more danger than there was in the last war, and probably less.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And should they not receive the highest pay?

Mr. ANDREWS. I believe they should be well paid.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Commensurate with the hazards they assume?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Putting this in plain language, what does the man receive per month under this recommendation in the report—the man who has been in the service 1 year and who is serving within continental United States or its territories?

Mr. ANDREWS. The lowest class would receive $42 per month, plus an insurance allowance of maybe $4, or, to put it another way, $42 per month, plus a $10,000 insurance contract, one-half of which is paid by the Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What would be the rate of pay of the lowest-paid man who served in Australia?

Mr. ANDREWS. Fifty dollars and forty cents per month, plus insurance; 20 percent of $42 is $8.40.

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an observation?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. SACKS. I have received quite a few complaints from boys lately, and I think the Congress ought to understand it. While the railroads give the boys half fare, the Pullman Co. and the diners still charge them a quarter for a cup of coffee and $1.50 for a meal. Very little concession has been made by the Pullman Co. I think the committee ought to protect them.

Mr. ANDREWS. That is correct, although I have not had occasion to witness it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, there are two provisions in this bill to which I hope the House will not agree. The conferees have dropped back to an increase in pay for the private soldier of $2 per month, but at the same time they have written into the bill an increase in allowances for officers for subsistence and quarters amounting to as much as $50 per month. When, therefore, you approve the conference report—which I am unable to do—you vote to increase the allowances for the officers in many cases $50 a month but give the private who carries the gun an increase of $2 a month. Yet the private is the one who must meet the enemy

face to face and risk his life, in many cases give his life, for our defense.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. How does the gentleman figure that the increase is only $2?

Mr. PACE. Because now every soldier who has been in the service for as much as 12 months is drawing $40.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Then the gentleman should qualify his statement.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman must understand that number is increasing by leaps and bounds every month. There are hundreds of thousands of our boys who volunteered or went in under the draft when it was first enacted and they have completed their 12 months' service; then there are thousands and thousands of others who are completing their 12 months' service each month, and by the time they get to the front they will have attained that 12 months' service. You must remember, when you talk about the 20-percent increase for foreign service, that the $10 a month for 12 months' service is more than a 20-percent increase on $42 for foreign service.

The second mistake I think we would make in adopting this report would be to make these pay raises permanent. I cannot give my consent to placing upon the taxpayers of this Nation the permanent increases of this bill after the war is over. I am willing to vote for any reasonable sum for the private and the officer when he is out fighting for his country, but when this war is over and we maintain a standing army of probably a million or two million men sitting around the camps in idleness and riding the seas without any danger, I cannot agree that the increases should then be paid. In addition for the officers' retirement fund you are voting an additional 10 percent that must be placed in the retirement fund for their benefit, as they make no contribution whatsoever to their retirement fund.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS. Let it be said in all fairness that this bill affects no one over the grade of second lieutenant, and there are no advances in the bill above that grade.

Mr. PACE. It increases the quarters and subsistence allowance of every Army officer in the United States Army and every officer in the Navy and Marine Corps. I have no objection to these increases in time of war. There is not enough money really to pay these officers and men for fighting the battles of our country, to care for them if they are injured, or to provide for their dependents if they are killed. Such service is above any price. But when peace has returned and all the fighting is over, and we go back to the ease, safety, and comforts of peacetimes, I think the Army and Navy pay rates should drop back to the present pay schedule, with such adjustments as may appear proper at that time. Please remember the enormous national debt we will have upon us at that time.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will vote to recommit this report to the conference committee, with instructions to limit all pay increases to the duration of the war and to increase the base pay of the private soldier to at least $50 per month, with 20-percent addition for foreign service. That is too little.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was before the House on May 13 I offered the amendment to raise the base pay of the enlisted men to a minimum of $50 a month.

I am sorry that the House conferees did not insist on the Senate voting on that amendment. I believe the Senate would have adopted it almost unanimously.

I am going to offer a motion to recommit with instructions to insist on the House provision in order that this bill may be taken back to the Senate and the Senate allowed to vote on this provision. I will offer this motion to recommit as soon as the previous question is ordered, and I am going to ask the Clerk to read it in my time.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the proposed motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi moves to recommit the conference report to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to further insist on the House amendment to section 9 to raise the base pay of enlisted men to $50 a month by striking out the figures "$48" as base monthly pay for men in the sixth grade and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$54", and striking out the figures "$42" as base monthly pay for men in the seventh grade and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$50."

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, this motion would instruct the House conferees to insist on my amendment that was adopted by the House on May 13, by a vote of 332 to 28. It represents the will of more than nine-tenths of the membership of this House; in my opinion it represents the will of more than nine-tenths of the United States Senate. In my opinion, it also represents the will of nine-tenths of the American people. They want the pay of these men raised.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If the pay is raised in accordance with the gentleman's amendment, does the gentleman know how we are going to raise the money to pay this and at the same time keep the country solvent?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further. We are going to raise the money just as we are raising the money now to pay all the other expenses of this war.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I cannot yield; I have only 5 minutes.

Mr. RICH. For one question?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Make it short.

Mr. RICH. How are you going to raise that money?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Just as we are raising it now.

Mr. RICH. How are you going to raise it? You are not raising it now.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I decline to yield further. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is not for this amendment, and I do not want him to take up my time.

The opposition to this amendment has said that we are going to make allotments, but they did that during the World War. That has nothing to do with the soldier's pay. He has to take a part of his pay and send it home. They talk about insurance. Why, we took out insurance before, and when the boys came home only 600,000 out of the 4,000,000, or about 1 out of 7, were able to carry it for even an appreciable term of years after the war closed. The soldier gets no benefit from his insurance until he dies or becomes totally and permanently disabled.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. For a question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I just want to remind the gentleman that when the original conscription bill was before the House I offered an amendment providing a base pay of $50 a month for those men. I voted for the gentleman's amendment on the 13th of May, and I am going to vote for the gentleman's motion to recommit the conference report.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I thank the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. Speaker, this is not an attack on the conferees or on the conference report. We are not asking the Members to vote down the conference report; and, as I said, I am not attacking the conferees. What we are asking is that this report be sent back with instructions to the conferees to stand by the House amendment adopted on May 13 and let the Senate vote on it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If the conference report is recommitted, it will cause no unnecessary delay, will it?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Certainly not. The Senate can vote on it in 2 hours.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SUTPHIN. The Committee on Naval Affairs is conducting hearings right now in regard to the activities of some of the war profiteers. This morning it was brought out that a man who received a salary of $12,452 last year also

received a bonus of $40,000, also dividends of $75,950 on stock which cost him nothing. Now, if we refuse to give these soldiers $50 a month, I think we should hang our heads in shame when we pass an enlisted man on the street.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I agree with my friend from New Jersey.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I am sure that man would be opposed to this provision.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As the gentleman's motion to recommit is written, does it include restoring the limitation of time?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. No; that was not in my amendment before, but Congress will probably change the law after the war closes, do not worry about that.

You are paying a man working in the shipyards $1.07 an hour, or more than $200 a month, and time and a half for overtime. Some of them are making $300 a month. You are drafting these boys off the farm, out of the factory, out of the stores, and out of the shops; you are taking them away from their farms right in the middle of the crop, leaving nobody to look after their work. To pay them $50 a month even then will not raise them up to a parity with what you are paying in industry throughout the whole country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What is the principal objection that has been made against the gentleman's amendment to raise it to $50 a month?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. To be perfectly frank with you, I have not found any. The few men who voted against it now regret it, I think. If we get a roll call, they will probably all vote for it.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. I should like to know if there is any rhyme or reason why our soldiers should be fighting alongside of Australian soldiers, with our soldiers getting the lower pay and theirs getting the higher pay, and their pay probably coming out of the lease-lend fund.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Certainly not; and let me tell you another thing. The Australian soldier pays no railroad fare at all in Australia or New Zealand.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. If the gentleman's amendment is agreed to and the 20 percent goes on top of that, it will make $60 per month for our soldiers, which is $8 higher than the Australian soldier gets.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Oh, no.

Mr. MAY. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman is wrong again. Besides it does not bring the pay at all up even with what men are getting in industry. These men are not asking for time and a half for overtime and they are not getting it. They are not asking for double time on Sunday and holidays and they are not getting it. This is merely a measure of justice to the soldiers, sailors, and marines in the service, and it ought to be adopted without a dissenting vote.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that the only American who is actually making a sacrifice today is the man in the front line?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Certainly, the man in the service is the man who is making the sacrifice today.

Mr. LELANL M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Is it not true that the man who is working in industry works there in safety, whereas it is the man in the Army who makes the sacrifice?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes. The man in industry has an electric fan and ice water and all those conveniences, while these boys are in the hell of war on land and sea. This is the least thing we can do for them.

Let us make it unanimous.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, where I come from we understand politics. I think I understand politics, to a certain extent. I fully appreciate the political situation I am confronting.

There is no larger percentage of men in the Army from any State than from the State of Texas. I can tell you right now that not one of those men would have undertaken that job for any amount of money. They went in as fighting men and they went in intending to fight. Fifty dollars a month would not have hired them and $5,000 a month would not have hired them. There is no compensation sufficient for the service these men are rendering or the service they are going to render. You could not hire them. They are in there for a far higher motive than that. They are in there because they think they are sustaining the way of life in which you and I believe. That is the purpose for which they are there.

I have here a letter which will express the opinion of these Texans. It is from a Texas Mexican from along the Mexican border. It was written to my colleague the Honorable MILTON H. WEST, of Brownsville, whose district parallels the Rio Grande.

This is from Private (First Class) Juan N. Cavazos. If you do not know the Mexican people, you may not appreciate the language in which this is written; but if you had Juan here, Juan would be talking to you just exactly as he is talking in this letter. It is coming from his heart Let me read it to you:

DEAR SIR: I am writting you this few lines to Explain. you this things that I have been thinking. that I read on the Post Napoleon Said that men fought with their Belly which it was true In those days. But In this new world of today men fight with belly and arms or amunition. I am Reffering at the raise of the Soldier getting $50.00 a month Instead of $40.00 well I think that every Soldier that loves his Country would Rather have thoes extra ten dollars a month Instead of cash get ten dollar worth of amunition Money In my Pocket In the Front line is not going to do me no good and amunition will. I think this is all for Today.

Sincerely Yours

JUAN N. CAVAZOS.

I just want to lay that letter before you.

I was a member of the subcommittee which wrote this bill.

We went about it seriously and conscientiously and worked hard. We brought in here a bill that was uniform in all of its provisions. I thought then that there was no compensation adequate, but I felt that $42 would provide for the things that he needed while he was in the service. I still think it will. I was not one of those who voted in the committee for $42 a month and then came on the floor and got caught in public giving him only $42 when he was entitled to $50 and voted against the committee proposal. I voted on the record here against the $50. Of course, there were only 27 others who voted that way. I know as well as you do that if the committee had recommended $50, there would have been the same sort of an amendment to increase it over that figure and the same rush to support it. I am sorry to say that a vast majority of my own committee did not vote with me. This bill has been brought in here devised to fix some semblance of a military policy.

As we come before this House constantly with bills from the Military Affairs Committee, I just wonder whether the Members of this House are interested in formulating a military policy. You have starved the Army always. You talk about what you are going to do for the Army when this war is over. You are not going to do a darned thing and you know it. You are going to do just as you have done in the past. You are going to go out and talk against militarism. You are going to talk about disarmament, and you are going to chisel the Army down in every way that you can possibly do it from about the same motives that you are going to vote to reject this conference report today.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let me say to the gentleman from Texas that I agree with him that the men are not fighting for money, but that is no reason why they should be underpaid. With reference to what we did for the veterans after the last war, I was one of the men who worked here for years to readjust the pay of the soldiers, and I heard them called Treasury raiders because of what they were asking—for the pay they should have received during the war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas 5 additional minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. The point I make is that if you are going to do anything, you are going to do it now while you are loving the Army, because you are not going to love it after the war is over any more than you have in the past, and you know it. Let us be men. Let us be worthy of the offices we hold. Sometimes I think that much of this criticism of Congress is justified. When we left this floor the last time we voted on this matter I said to myself, "I have been criticizing, I have been condemning the columnists and the commentators who are reflecting on Congress as an institution but actions such as this justify the criticism." To my way of thinking the only thing we are fighting this war for, when we analyze it all the way down, is the preservation of a free legislative branch of government, because totalitarians have everything else. When they attack this Congress as an institution they are attacking the only thing that we are attempting to preserve. But how can we ask for the respect of the American people, how can we contend for the preservation of a free, legislative system, when we act as we acted on the 13th day of May?

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have here a bill that has been properly devised. We have here a bill that has been properly worked out. We are coming in next week with two other bills. One of them is the allotment and allowance bill which will provide for the man who has dependents, who has a family, and if it should be that we have to take them with families depending upon them, I believe we are making adequate provision for them. Then we are coming in here with the soldiers and sailors' civil relief bill, a very technical and highly complicated measure that has been worked out in committee. Are we going to run wild when we get up here on the floor or are we going to take that bill and do as we ought to do?

I say to you, let us approve this conference report. You are then approving a bill that has been written with the idea in mind that we are providing for the military system and we do not give a darn what the consequences are on election day.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I have been shocked at the suggestion voiced by certain Members in this debate that the pending proposal to increase the pay of our soldiers is a political proposal. If the gentleman from Texas, who has just addressed the House, wishes to consider it as a political matter, he may do so. Most certainly I do not consider it a political matter, and I do not believe that any Member of the overwhelming majority who voted a few days ago for the Rankin amendment to increase the pay of the privates and the two lower grades of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps personnel considered this proposal a political matter either.

There is only one issue involved in the motion to recommit this report to the conference committee, and that issue is whether the great bulk of the United States soldiers, sailors, and marines in the lower grades will receive the miserably small increase of $2 a month, which is what this conference report recommends, or whether they will receive a substantial increase, bringing their present pay up to $50 a month, which is what the Rankin amendment, overwhelmingly adopted by the House on May 13, provides. This is all there is to it. The question of insurance is not involved here. That is covered in another bill. The question of extra pay for overseas service is not involved. That matter has already been agreed to by the conferees. The question of subsistence and the question of rentals are not involved. The conferees have agreed to that also, and the point is not in controversy on the motion to recommit. There is nothing involved in the motion here except this one question of whether we shall raise the pay of the first two grades to $50 and $54, respectively, as the House overwhelmingly decided to do when it passed the bill on May 13, or whether we shall recede from the decision we then made and accept the recommendation of the conference committee that the increase be limited to $42 and $48 for those two grades.

In the face of what I consider to be the unwarranted action of the conference committee in ignoring the verdict of the House in this regard, I think it is incumbent upon every Member who voted for the Rankin amendment, as I did, to increase the pay of these grades to $50 and $54, to vote for the motion to recommit and thus to compel the House conferees to insist upon those rates of pay. The House in passing the bill fixed the pay at those figures, and I, for one, do not propose to allow the conferees to override the decision of the House.

I have listened carefully during the course of this debate for a statement of one single reason why the soldiers of the United States Army and the marines and the sailors of the Navy in the lower grades should not receive as much as $50 a month, and I have failed to hear such a statement made. The argument that they do not need it has not been made, because, in the face of the overwhelming evidence to the contrary, no such argument can be made. The argument has not been made that this Government cannot afford it. In the face of the hundreds of billions of dollars which have been and will be appropriated for other phases of the war effort, such an argument would be ridiculous. Of course, the Government can afford it. The additional expense incurred by reason of this increase in pay is infinitesimal in comparison to the whole cost of the war, and the people, including the fathers and mothers and brothers and sisters of these soldiers, will be glad to help pay it.

The Government can afford this very vital and most necessary thing as well as it can afford adequate appropriations for every other necessary phase of the war effort, and until we hear some valid objection from the floor to the Rankin amendment, this House should, and I believe it will, recommit the conference report, so that the conferees may report it again as the bill originally passed the House, providing for $50 and $54 a month in the two lower grades, and in accordance with the will of the House as expressed by the overwhelming vote on May 13.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. The vote the other day was 332 to 28. Is it not evident that completely ignoring the wishes of the House, not even a compromise having been brought back, the committee has come back here without keeping faith with the House?

Mr. MOTT. Oh, I would not want to impugn the good faith of the committee. It was reported that the chairman of the committee stated immediately after the vote was taken on the 13th that the Rankin amendment would be taken care of in conference, and that the conference report would provide $42 a month instead of $50 per month, as the House had voted. Whether the chairman actually said that or not, I do not know, but I believe the House by its vote today on this motion should make it emphatically clear to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee and to every member of the conference committee that the House conferees must consider the will of the House in making their report. They should not have brought this report in under the circumstances without first coming back to the House and asking the House for instructions.

Mr. Speaker, the bill as reported from the conference committee is, of course, of considerable value to the enlisted men who have served less than a year and of very definite value to those who have served less than 4 months. To those of the two lower grades who have served more than a year, however, the bill without this amendment offers very little relief. As a matter of fact, it gives privates and privates first class and apprentice seamen and seamen second class a raise of only $2 per month.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], on the other hand, and which the House adopted by a huge majority vote when the bill was originally considered and passed on May 13, provided a substantial increase and changed entirely the picture presented by the table in the committee's report. If this motion to recommit is adopted and the Rankin amendment thus retained, the table showing

the increase in the base pay of enlisted men will read as follows:

Grade	Present base pay [1]	Proposed base pay
1. Master sergeant; chief petty officer	$126	$138
(1a. Acting chief petty officer, Navy and Coast Guard only)	(99)	(126)
2. First or technical sergeant; petty officer, first class	84	114
3. Staff sergeant; petty officer, second class	72	96
4. Sergeant; petty officer, third class	60	78
5. Corporal; seaman, first class	54	66
6. Private, first class; seaman, second class	36	54
7. Private; apprentice seaman	30	50
Seventh-grade men with less than 4 months' service	21	[2]

[1] Add $10 per month to total pay after 12 months' service.
[2] Eliminate.

The enlisted men, who are the backbone of the armed services, and without whom we could have neither Army nor Navy or Marine Corps, are certainly entitled to this much consideration at the hands of the Congress, and I sincerely hope the motion to recommit will be adopted and the Rankin amendment retained.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the debate on the so-called Rankin amendment, which is the same one that he introduced when the original bill was before the House here, and the House passed the bill with this amendment in it, 332 for to 28 against it. I voted for its passage.

In the motion to recommit, which my colleague from Mississippi proposes to offer on this conference report, there is embodied the same amendment as was proposed in the original bill, and I am for it. The only arguments that I have heard against it today have been two—first, that politics enters into it, and second, that the country cannot afford it.

As far as I am personally concerned, politics does not have anything to do with my position. I will say that I would hate to look any of our soldiers or sailors in the face who are on the firing lines today, fighting our battles everywhere, if I voted against giving them as much as $50 a month for doing it when men in private industry, who are protected from any danger, are getting three times as much, in many instances, as our fighting soldiers and sailors are getting.

The second argument is that the country cannot afford it. This country has appropriated over $162,000,000,000 to take care of the Army and the Navy and prepare for our national defense. We have appropriated and placed in the hands of the President of the United States approximately $48,000,000,000 to give to foreign countries for any purpose that they may see fit to use it for during the war. Now, if we can give away billions of dollars to foreign countries to prepare their national defenses, we ought to be able to pay our soldiers and sailors a reasonable wage to defend our own country.

It has been said that this will continue after the war is over. Under the bill as passed by the Senate, which we would agree to under this conference report, that would be true, and I would like to know if there is anyone on the House floor or anyone else that they know of who would like to volunteer to help police the world, after the present war is over, for $50 a month. Whether we have union now, tomorrow, after the war is over, or at any other time, there is one thing sure, and that is: When we do win this war we are going to have to help police the world to maintain peace. Just how long we will have to do that no one, at the present time, I am sure, knows or could even offer a reasonable guess.

I do not know anything that would make the men who are on the front lines today, on the land and sea and in the air, happier than to know that they are getting at least a fair compensation for their efforts. There will be a number of patriots in this war who will be at home, and a great many of them are going to be well paid for staying there, so let us pay the boys in our fighting lines, the flower of American manhood, for their efforts to protect everybody else. This motion to recommit should have the unanimous vote of the House, and I do not believe there will be more than a few votes against it.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this is not a political issue. This is an issue, as was said in the letter read by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], where the men at the front line want ammunition. They are not interested as much in pay now as that we should pass laws here that will furnish them those things that will not only save their own lives, but give them something with which to fight in order to preserve democracy, and in order to defend themselves against the Japs and the Germans. Our greatest desire at this time would and should be to furnish the men at the front ammunition, airplanes, guns, tanks, ships, clothing, and food. We should see that those who furnish it should not get exorbitant profits or wages. This is a time for all to sacrifice if we are to be successful in winning the war. There is one thing that we have to do these days. We have this Nation to look after in a sense so that we are not going to break it down financially, and if you will look at the Treasury statement and see that we have gone into the red with $16,000,000,000 and up, and have a national debt of more than $73,000,000,000, you must believe that we have to do something here to save this country from bankruptcy.

You cannot furnish an Army with a bankrupt nation. You cannot give them food, guns or airplanes, ships, or ammunition. Let us get sane common sense and give the soldiers support by a sane business administration. It is imperative, necessary, and fundamental.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE].

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, during the 6 years I have been a Member of this House, I have seen the House vote appropriations for W. P. A., for N. Y. A., for the youth organization and the youth movement. It is now rather amazing to me to see the quibbling between the two Houses over giving our soldiers who are really doing something and not relief beneficiaries, $8 a month increase. There is not a man in this body, no matter how fine his mentality, who is capable of feeling for one moment the sacrifices made by the men of Bataan, or the men in the Navy who were engaged in battle. There is no man here who is aware of how the men in our camps feel over their separation from their folks, and yet here we are quibbling about $8 a month. Let us realize that many of these men, perhaps hundreds of thousands of them, will never come back to these shores, and that about the only thing that we can give them is a few dollars additional a month so that they may procure a few creature comforts; a few hours of happiness. Let this body keep its head and realize what these men are facing. Let us give them some money to spend, so that they may have something of their own.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] 2 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, when the Committee on Military Affairs presented legislation recently proposing a substantial raise in the base pay of the young men in our armed forces, I actively supported this legislation then and urged its passage. At that time I also suggested that actual dependents of our soldiers, sailors, and marines should be provided for. This has not yet been done. I also pointed out then how inadequate was the pay of those engaged in our armed forces in World War No. 1 and how aged mothers and fathers of some of our boys in the armed forces of the United States actually suffered because of lack of foresight on the part of a then badly confused and somewhat disorganized Congress. There is no reason why such a condition should longer exist during the present emergency. For this great Government to pay $21 to $31 per month to our men in uniform is a disgrace to this Nation. As has been pointed out on the floor of this House, that is less than half of what the Australian soldiers receive, and it has even been suggested that their pay comes out of the lend-lease bill which, of course, comes from the pockets of the American taxpayers.

Someone has suggested that Congress cannot put a dollar sign on patriotism. No one is trying to do that, and I agree that no salary can begin to adequately pay our men in uniform who are defenders of our liberties. Yet, on the other hand, a reasonable increase in the salaries of these men to permit them to have some of the extras they need and send a few dollars home to their dependents will undoubtedly be a power for good in building and maintaining morale among our armed forces.

When we take into consideration that unskilled labor is now receiving several times the amount of salary being paid our soldiers, sailors, and marines, I do not see how any fair-minded person could object to the salary as proposed in the Rankin amendment.

I have a high regard for the Committee on Military Affairs that has presented this legislation. Several years ago, I had the pleasure of serving with the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the able committee chairman, for whom I have a very high regard. I must confess, however, that I have never taken the position that any committee or committee chairman is infallible, that it or he is immune from making mistakes. Frankly, I am surprised that the committee would bring back a bill giving an additonal allowance, as I understand, for quarters for all officers of the various ranks, an additional allowance for clothes for officers of all grades, and at the same time reduce by $8 per month the amount for the buck private in the rear ranks. It just occurs to me that the proposal is unjustified from any standpoint. It is not giving the enlisted man a square deal; it is, in effect, making the soldiers who must bear the brunt of this war pay for the quarters and the clothing of the officers. And yet the gentleman from Texas cries "politics." On the face of the matter it looks as if the big boys with the brass hats and bars have been playing politics at the expense of the buck privates.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman from Texas spoke about this being a political measure and bringing Congress into disrepute. It is strange that only 1 out of 11 voted against it. In addition, this amendment meets the approval of the people in every section of this country, and it will do more to strengthen the morale of the men in the service than anything else we can do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. I predict his motion to recommit this conference report with instructions to stand firm for the salaries as provided in the Rankin amendment will prevail by an overwhelming vote, and that the efforts of the gentleman from Mississippi will be appreciated and applauded by our valiant men in all of our armed forces.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I am sure the distinguished gentleman is familiar with the fact that we are paying men in the Civilian Conservation Corps $30 a month. They work 8 hours a day and we furnish them with uniforms, medical attention, dental care, and education.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is true, and they have done an excellent job.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SECREST] as he may desire.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, I have long been convinced that the pay of the American soldier, sailor, and marine has been inadequate. In fact, on July 31, 1940, I introduced a bill in Congress to increase the pay of all boys in the armed service of the country.

I am happy to go on record today to instruct the conferees to insist on the Rankin amendment which will provide fairer and just compensation.

The soldier must pay for his insurance, his cleaning, pressing, and laundry. Out of $21 per month, he has practically nothing left. If he gets a furlough, his family, in most cases, is compelled to send him money for his transportation home.

In addition to these and many other expenses, we shall, no doubt, compel those with dependents to send half their pay home.

Aside from the fact that the soldier needs more money, there are two moral reasons why he should receive more.

One is the fact that wages and profits of civilians are high in comparison, and the other is the fact that Australian soldiers, alongside of which our boys fight, get more money than Americans. If we can give money to Australia under the lend-lease program, we can certainly pay our soldiers as much as they pay theirs. We all know our young men are inspired to fight by patriotism and not money, but that is all the more reason why we must care for them and their families. No man can be his best if he worries as to whether or not his wife and children or parents are clothed and fed. This bill will help the morale of our men in every branch of our service, and I am glad of the opportunity to support it.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

INCREASED PAY ALLOWANCE IN THE LOWER BRACKETS FOR PERSONNEL OF OUR ARMED FORCES SHOULD BE ADOPTED

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, when this legislation was before this body on the 12th of this month I urged the adoption of the amendment and supported the increase embodied in the motion by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. The conferees have seen fit to eliminate this small increase in pay to these men serving our country, and we are now called upon to pass judgment again upon the question of whether or not these men are entitled to this small increase in their compensation. It should be remembered that it only applies to those receiving the lowest monthly allowances in the schedule of compensation for the men in our armed forces. The base pay of $21 per month under the original act was increased to $42, and under the Rankin amendment is further increased to the sum of $50 per month. When time for overseas service is taken into consideration, as well as increased allowances for those who have been in the service for 1 year or more, this additional increase in pay to $50 is only a small increase and will not be a heavy burden upon the finances of the Federal Government.

I am sure we all appreciate that the heroic service rendered to their country by these men in bearing arms for the defense of their country cannot be compensated for in dollars and cents, and the small stipend received by these fighting men, even on the increased basis as provided in the Rankin amendment, cannot be considered compensation in the sense we ordinarily use that term. However, when we remember that we are generous indeed with our citizens who remain at home and take employment in defense industries, paying often several times the amount paid to these men on the battlefronts, we should not hesitate to grant this small increase.

It is my purpose, therefore, Mr. Speaker, to vote in favor of recommitting this conference report, instructing our conferees to insist upon the Rankin amendment so that these small increases in compensation may be written into law.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of sending this report back to the Senate, and ask them to stand up and be counted as to whether or not they believe in $50 per month base pay for our armed forces. Why should the American armed forces be asked to receive less pay than the armed forces of other countries that are receiving financial assistance from our own Federal Treasury? Why ask the American armed forces to accept lower base pay than the comrades with whom they are mingled and whose country they are helping to protect? Why, I ask, should we refuse the $50 per month base pay to this group of our society when our nonmilitary groups have no such limitation, and when many of these nonmilitary groups are really making money out of this war?

In fact, we should further reduce the income of all nonmilitary groups on the basis of ability to pay and set up machinery to provide funds for adequate provisions for our combatant forces as long as they live.

Every thinking man knows that this $50 per month base pay is even yet too low in comparison to the income of nonmilitary or civilian groups.

Therefore, let us vote this conference report down and send it back to the Senate. Let us once and for all indicate to the people of this country that the members of the armed forces are going to have as fair consideration as we can obtain for them at this time.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to recommit the conference report of the House and Senate on the Army and Navy pay bill, with instructions to the House conferees to insist upon the provisions of the bill as it passed the House on May 13, 1942.

The bill as it passed the House fixed the entrance pay of privates of the Army the seamen of the Navy at $50 per month, and first-class privates and seamen at $54 per month, and corporals in the Army and seamen of comparable grade in the Navy at $66 per month, and with increased rates for the various grades of sergeants, with a 20-percent increase for overseas service.

The bill as it passed the Senate fixed the entrance pay of enlisted men for the

Army and Navy at $42 per month, and for first-class privates and comparable grades in the Navy at $48 per month.

The bill was then sent to the conference committee made up of Members of the House and Senate, and the House conferees yielded to the conferees of the Senate, although the Rankin amendment fixing the entrance pay of these enlisted men had passed the House by a vote of 351 to 28.

I spoke and voted for the Rankin amendment on May 13. I thought these rates ought to be fixed at those sums at that time, and after mature reflection I am convinced we were right, and I now favor the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] to recommit the bill to the conference committee with instructions to the House conferees to insist upon these rates being retained in the bill.

We pointed out in our speech on May 13, in support of the Rankin amendment, that the entrance or base pay of Australian soldiers and sailors was $62.10 per month, and that we were informed the base pay of Canadian soldiers and sailors for overseas service was $65 per month.

We are providing not only men but a great deal of equipment and other war supplies, under the Lend-Lease Act, to these countries, and it seems to me, as a matter of justice, we should not fix the base pay of our soldiers and sailors at less than $50 per month. It is my sincere hope this motion will prevail and I think it will by an overwhelming majority.

Next week Congress will likely pass an allotment bill, and $20 of the pay of our soldiers and sailors will go for the benefit of their dependent wives, children, or parents. This sum will likely be matched by the Government with an additional sum of $20 for each dependent wife, and $10 for each dependent child, and also an allotment for dependent fathers and mothers. The amount remaining will be little enough to take care of the necessary requirements of the soldiers and sailors themselves.

It is urged by some of those who are opposing the increases provided in the House bill that the soldiers and sailors cannot be paid for their great services to our country. I agree absolutely with that statement. That is no excuse, however, for paying them the modest sums provided in the House bill.

Undoubtedly our American soldiers and sailors are sacrificing more than any other group. One part of our population should not receive the profits while the other part does the sacrificing. Let all of us share in these sacrifices with our heroic defenders.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO].

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed an unfortunate situation that this happens to be an election year, because, undoubtedly, no matter whether you vote for or against this proposed increase, the tinge of politics is bound to color what we do here today. I do not doubt but what there was a certain amount of politics that took place upon this floor when this measure was considered before, but I do want to say to this House and to every Member here that no matter what you do in regard to pay of the soldier, you are not paying him. You might as well get that clear. There is no use talking about industry and its $100-a-week pay. Of course, industry is not going to come to Congress after the war and ask for a bonus and other compensation. They get theirs now and after the war they are through, but remember you are not paying the soldiers. You are trying to pay labor what it is worth for what it produces, but if the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] or any other Member of this body thinks for a moment that with dollars and cents he can pay the man who is sacrificing and suffering on Bataan Peninsula, he has another guess coming.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. You cannot pay him. If you paid him $5,000 a week you are not paying the soldier. You are not even attempting to pay him, because you cannot pay for patriotism. I, for one, today am not going to stand in the Well of this House and vote to smear patriotism with the dollar sign. That is what you are doing when you try to put a price limit on what the soldier is worth. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] made the statement that he wants to pay the men what they are worth. You just cannot do it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield for a question but not for a speech.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Of course, it is a pretty broad indictment for the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] to stand there and intimate that we are trying to smear the soldiers' patriotism which is as far from the fact as could possibly be. As chairman of the World War Veterans' Committee I want to say that the gentleman from California is in his usual stride today in opposition to pay for the veterans of the country.

Mr. COSTELLO. I will state to the gentleman that while he may be quite correct that I have opposed some veterans' legislation, I want to call to the gentleman's attention that I have consistently urged greater benefits for the disabled veterans, the while I have opposed unjustifiable handouts to training camp veterans who suffered in no way by reason of their service. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the argument that the reason for raising this pay $8 a month is to prevent a bonus demand when the war is over. I venture the statement that those who are loudest in supporting this proposal will be the first to drop legislation in the hopper providing bonus payments and various other demands that usually follow in the wake of the war.

Indicative of public sentiment is the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor for May 15. Unfortunately the editorial has made reference to the final vote on the passage of the bill, rather than the actual vote on the Rankin amendment, when 28 Members of the House voted against his proposal. The editorial reads as follows:

SOLDIER PAY—AND INFLATION

The House of Representatives, which has heard impassioned demands for wage ceilings and the control of inflation, voted Thursday, over the lone courageous dissent of Representative WESLEY E. DISNEY, of Oklahoma, to grant a substantial increase in pay to the largest group of persons working for a single employer or even a single industry in America—the armed forces of the United States.

As originally presented to the House, and as previously passed by the Senate, the bill to increase Army and Navy rates of pay, especially in the lower grades, would have been well justified. The schedule had been carefully studied out by a Senate subcommittee in conjunction with the War and Navy Departments. It began with an increase of 100 percent—from $21 to $42 for a private at time of enlistment—and tapered off to present levels in the higher commissioned grades. But this was not enough for the lower House. It had to increase the increase.

It adopted an amendment proposed by Representative JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, to raise the base pay for the beginning ranks in the armed services to $50 a month instead of $42. Mr. RANKIN, a leading advocate of the soldiers' bonus to veterans of the last war, made the rather surprising argument that to do this would prevent a bonus fight after this war. Of course, it may be recalled that the Nation during and after that conflict provided war-risk insurance, allowances to dependents, disability payments, and an adjusted compensation, thinking to meet the service man's needs better than by an immediate lump-sum payment.

Actually, the factor that will do most to win this war and to avert another bonus lobby after it is a change in the strain of political thinking. The adoption of the RANKIN amendment bears all too clearly the earmarks of awareness of the approach of a congressional election.

If America earnestly desires—as doubtless it does—to make as full compensation as is possible to those who actually incur the wounds and bereavements of war, there are more direct and effective ways of accomplishing this purpose than by raising further the pay of every boy who dons a uniform regardless of whether he ever sees a firing line or spends the duration at a typewriter in a training camp headquarters.

Congress will wish, rightly, to provide fair allowances to family dependents as it becomes necessary to call more married men into the ranks. The present pay bill might very wisely require that part of the increase contemplated in the Senate schedule should be put aside to the soldier's credit at the end of the war. More and more attention should be given to making sure that adequate provision is made for men disabled in line of duty or for the families of those who make the final sacrifice.

The increase in cost of from $300,000,000 to $1,000,000,000, depending on the size of the Army, which has been added by the Rankin amendment, will have to come ultimately out of the same pockets it goes into. As a fillip to inflation it may add indirectly several times as much to the aggregate war bill which future producers, including the returned soldiers, will have to earn and pay. The pay schedule should be enacted as it came from the Senate, not as it has been impulsively raised by the House.

The thought that should animate every American today, whether in the armed service, in a munition factory, on a farm, at a store

counter, or behind an office desk, is not how well he is to be paid but how much he can give toward defending freedom. If Americans win the war, it will be by production and sacrifice, not by voting themselves bonuses.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that the veterans who suffer are entitled to all the compensation we can give them, but I do not like to see legislation used for political purposes. I fear, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what is happening on this proposal today. We are going out to the people of the country, to the voters of the country, and telling them we have raised the pay of the soldier, but are we asking the soldier what he thinks of it? Here is a paper which came out of a camp in Texas on May 15 carrying the headline "Pay raise opposed by Barkley privates." But maybe the soldiers are not going to do any voting. Maybe you do not care what the soldiers think. I will tell you what they think. They think this bill has passed at $42 a month. They think it is fixed to start on June 1. Defeat this conference report and it will not go into effect until the next month; and, what is more, they may well not get that $50 even then, and there is not one of them, I believe, who expects to get $50. They are perfectly satisfied with receiving an increase from the base pay of $21 up to $42. You are giving them a sane and reasonable increase in pay in keeping with the added expenses they meet on the outside. Let me remind you that no parent who is the least bit solicitous for the welfare of his son is going to give the son more than he needs for his own well being. So it is now with the soldier; if we are going to give the soldier something more it should be only what he needs for his normal expenses while he is in camp. This extra pay is just to be spent on entertainment; it is not to provide for his welfare in the future; it is not to pay rent on his home, as is the case with the industrial worker; it is not to be spent for food, clothing, or hospital bills; but is just to take care of his personal expenses, to take care of the normal increase in the cost of his personal entertainment. I say to you it would be much better to pass it on that basis than to say we are paying the soldier what he is worth, because we are not. Rather, have the patriotic courage to stand by this bill as it has been presented to you after careful study by the Military Affairs Committees of both the House and the Senate.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I am.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi moves to recommit the conference report to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to further insist on the House amendment to section 9 to raise the base pay of enlisted men to $50 a month by striking out the figures "$48" as base monthly pay for men in the sixth grade and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$54", and striking out the figures "$42" as base monthly pay for men in the seventh grade and inserting in lieu thereof the figures "$50."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and there were—yeas 332, nays 31, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 60]

YEAS—332

Allen, Ill.	Dirksen	Johnson,
Allen, La.	Ditter	Luther A.
Andersen,	Domengeaux	Johnson, Okla.
H. Carl	Dondero	Johnson, W. Va.
Anderson, Calif.	Doughton	Jones
Anderson,	Downs	Jonkman
N. Mex.	Duncan	Kean
Andresen,	Dworshak	Kee
August H.	Eaton	Keefe
Andrews	Eberharter	Kefauver
Angell	Elliot, Mass.	Kelley, Pa.
Arends	Elliott, Calif.	Kelly, Ill.
Arnold	Elston	Kennedy,
Barden	Engel	Martin J.
Barnes	Englebright	Kennedy,
Barry	Faddis	Michael J.
Bates, Ky.	Fellows	Keogh
Bates, Mass.	Fenton	Kinzer
Baumhart	Fitzgerald	Kirwan
Beckworth	Flaherty	Klein
Beiter	Flannagan	Kopplemann
Bell	Fogarty	Kunkel
Bender	Forand	Landis
Bishop	Ford, Leland M.	Lane
Blackney	Ford, Thomas F.	Lanham
Bloom	Fulmer	Larrabee
Boggs	Gale	Lea
Bonner	Gamble	Leavy
Boren	Gathings	LeCompte
Boykin	Gavagan	Lesinski
Bradley, Mich.	Gearhart	Ludlow
Bradley, Pa.	Gehrmann	Lynch
Brooks	Gerlach	McGehee
Brown, Ga.	Gillette	McGranery
Brown, Ohio	Gillie	McGregor
Bryson	Gore	McLaughlin
Burch	Gossett	McLean
Burdick	Graham	McMillan
Burgin	Grant, Ala.	Maas
Butler	Gregory	Maciora
Byrne	Haines	Mahon
Byron	Hall,	Manasco
Camp	Edwin Arthur	Mansfield
Canfield	Hall,	Marcantonio
Cannon, Fla.	Leonard W.	Martin, Iowa
Cannon, Mo.	Halleck	Martin, Mass.
Capozzoli	Hare	Mason
Carlson	Harness	Merritt
Carter	Harris, Ark.	Meyer, Md.
Cartwright	Harris, Va.	Michener
Case, S. Dak.	Hart	Mills, Ark.
Celler	Hartley	Mills, La.
Chapman	Healey	Monroney
Chenoweth	Hébert	Moser
Chiperfield	Heffernan	Mott
Clason	Heidinger	Mundt
Claypool	Hendricks	Murdock
Clevenger	Hess	Murray
Cochran	Hill, Colo.	Myers, Pa.
Collins	Hill, Wash.	Nelson
Colmer	Hinshaw	Norrell
Cooley	Hobbs	Norton
Cooper	Hoffman	O'Brien, Mich.
Copeland	Holbrook	O'Brien, N. Y.
Courtney	Holmes	O'Connor
Cox	Hook	O'Hara
Cravens	Hope	O'Leary
Crawford	Houston	Oliver
Creal	Howell	O'Toole
Crosser	Hull	Pace
Crowther	Hunter	Paddock
Culkin	Imhoff	Patman
Cunningham	Izac	Patton
Curtis	Jackson	Pearson
D'Alesandro	Jacobsen	Peterson, Fla.
Davis, Ohio	Jenkins, Ohio	Peterson, Ga.
Davis, Tenn.	Jenks, N. H.	Pfeifer,
Day	Jennings	Joseph L.
Delaney	Jensen	Pheiffer,
Dewey	Johns	William T.
Dickstein	Johnson, Calif.	Pierce
Dingell	Johnson, Ill.	Pittenger
Ploeser	Schulte	Thom
Poage	Scott	Thomas, N. J.
Powers	Secrest	Tibbott
Priest	Shafer, Mich.	Tolan
Rabaut	Shanley	Traynor
Ramsay	Sikes	Treadway
Ramspeck	Simpson	Van Zandt
Randolph	Smith, Maine	Vincent, Ky.
Rankin, Miss.	Smith, Ohio	Vinson, Ga.
Rankin, Mont.	Smith, Pa.	Voorhis, Calif.
Reece, Tenn.	Smith, Wash.	Vorys, Ohio
Reed, Ill.	Smith, W. Va.	Ward
Reed, N. Y.	Snyder	Wasielewski
Richards	Somers, N. Y.	Weaver
Rivers	South	Weiss
Rizley	Sparkman	Welch
Robertson,	Spence	Wene
N. Dak.	Springer	Wheat
Robinson, Utah.	Starnes, Ala.	Whelchel
Robsion, Ky.	Steagall	Whitten
Rockefeller	Stearns, N. H.	Wickersham
Rockwell	Stefan	Wigglesworth
Rodgers, Pa.	Stevenson	Williams
Rogers, Mass.	Stratton	Wilson
Rogers, Okla.	Sullivan	Wolcott
Rolph	Sumners, Tex.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Romjue	Sutphin	Wolverton, N. J.
Sacks	Sweeney	Woodruff, Mich.
Sanders	Talbot	Wright
Sasscer	Talle	Young
Satterfield	Tarver	Youngdahl
Sauthoff	Tenerowicz	
Scanlon	Thill	

NAYS—31

Baldwin	Durham	O'Neal
Bland	Edmiston	Rich
Boehne	Folger	Robertson, Va.
Buck	Hancock	Russell
Bulwinkle	Kilday	Sabath
Clark	Kleberg	Thomason
Coffee, Nebr.	Knutson	Wadsworth
Cole, N. Y.	Lewis	West
Costello	McCormack	Whittington
Disney	May	
Drewry	Mitchell	

NOT VOTING—67

Beam	Gwynne	Rees, Kans.
Bennett	Harrington	Schaefer, Ill.
Bolton	Harter	Schuetz
Buckler, Minn.	Jarman	Scrugham
Buckley, N. Y.	Jarrett	Shannon
Casey, Mass.	Johnson, Ind.	Sheppard
Cluett	Johnson,	Sheridan
Coffee, Wash.	Lyndon B.	Short
Cole, Md.	Kerr	Smith, Va.
Cullen	Kilburn	Smith, Wis.
Dies	Kocialkowski	Sumner, Ill.
Douglas	Kramer	Taber
Ellis	Lambertson	Terry
Fish	McIntyre	Thomas, Tex.
Fitzpatrick	McKeough	Tinkham
Ford, Miss.	Maciejewski	Vreeland
Gibson	Magnuson	Walter
Gifford	Nichols	White
Gilchrist	O'Day	Winter
Granger	Osmers	Woodrum, Va.
Grant, Ind.	Patrick	Worley
Green	Plauché	Zimmerman
Guyer	Plumley	

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Terry for, with Mr. Taber against.

Mr. Lambertson for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

General pairs:

Mr. Harter with Mr. Short.

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Green with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Granger with Mr. Gwynne.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Cluett.

Mr. Patrick with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Jarrett.

Mr. Thomas of Texas with Mr. Gilchrist.

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Maciejewski with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Tinkham.

Mr. Harrington with Miss Sumner of Illinois.

Mr. Beam with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

Mr. Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. Bennett.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Grant of Indiana.
Mr. McKeogh with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Rees of Kansas.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Guyer.
Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Magnuson.
Mr. Worley with Mrs. O'Day.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Kramer.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson.
Mr. McIntyre with Mr. Gibson.
Mr. Plauché with Mr. Sheppard.
Mr. Coffee of Washington with Mr. Schuetz.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Kocialkowski.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion by Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was recommended was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on three subjects and to include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and to include therein two newspaper articles, and I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in another particular.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BUCK asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I asked unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech by Dr. Young, of Purdue University. Yesterday I submitted this and it was found to be one-third of a page too much. I ask unanimous consent that it may be included in the RECORD notwithstanding its cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an oration by the Very Reverend James T. McDermott, at memorial services held last sunday at Lowell, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the late Michael T. Finnan, former national secretary, National Association of Letter Carriers, and editor of the Postal Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SWEENEY]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. RABAUT asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BELL and Mr. CAPOZZOLI asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted by the Unity Council of Oklahoma at its last meeting.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT]?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT TO SECTION 32 OF THE EMERGENCY FARM MORTGAGE ACT OF 1933, AS AMENDED

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill S. 2508, to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER]?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand the situation, it is necessary for this bill to pass immediately because of the fact that the Farm Mortgage Corporation will have no power to make loans after the 30th of this month, and we must pass the bill at this time?

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is correct.

Briefly, Mr. Speaker, may I state the whole purpose of this bill is to extend the operations of the Federal Land Bank Commissioners for another year, due to the fact the operations of the Federal Land Bank Commissioners will end on the 30th of this month unless this bill is passed. The bill has already passed the Senate. It was reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture. That is the whole purpose of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended (title 12, U. S. C. 1016 (b)), is further amended by striking out the semicolon in said sentence and the following: "nor shall a loan in excess of $7,500 be made to any one farmer." and inserting in lieu thereof a period and the following: "The amount of loans to any one borrower shall in no case exceed a maximum of $50,000, but loans to any one borrower shall not exceed $25,000 unless specially approved by the Land Bank Commissioner, nor shall any one loan be for a less sum than $100, but preference shall be given to applications for loans of $10,000 and under: *Provided*, That no loan shall be made outside the continental United States or in Alaska for a longer term than 20 years."

SEC. 2. The tenth sentence of such section 32, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 1, 1942" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1946."

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FULMER: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following wording: "That the tenth sentence of section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 1, 1942" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1943."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2250) entitled "An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HUGHES, Mr. WAGNER, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. TOBEY, and Mr. TAFT to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4476) entitled "An act providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment."

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

OUR OBLIGATION TO BRING ABOUT WORLD UNDERSTANDING, COMITY, AND COOPERATION

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, in the streets and shops, in the forums and on the farms the common topic of discussion is war and victory, the problems which flow from war, the impact of war upon our domestic well-being, and the ultimate disposition of victory.

It was therefore timely and appropriate that the Republican National Committee in formulating a policy of national conduct should address itself to the very matters with which the country is so deeply concerned today. A discussion of that program is equally appropriate since it deals with problems and

policies with which the Congress must deal from time to time.

On April 20, 1942, the Republican National Committee convened in Chicago and adopted a 12-point program for national guidance. That program is a document of unity which recognizes the part we must play as a nation in the disposition of victory and the responsibility which we must undertake in world affairs.

The third point in that program reads:

> We realize that after this war, the responsibility of this Nation will not be circumscribed within the territorial limits of the United States; that our Nation has an obligation to assist in the bringing about of understanding, comity, and cooperation among the nations of the world in order that our own liberty may be preserved and that the blighting and destructive processes of war may not again be forced upon us and upon the free, peace-loving peoples of the earth.

What shall we do with victory? Whither do we go when "grim-visaged war hath smoothed his wrinkled front"?

Marcus Aurelius once referred to the "yawning void of the future." Shall that be the world's lot after millions of young bodies have been bruised to eternal sleep that order, hope, and faith might be restored to a fitful world?

After the futilities of a generation shall it again be the lot of mankind to speak of "this terrible peace, whereby we halt forever on the crater's brink and feed the wind with phrases."

On the shelf before me is a bound document of 192 pages dated July 10, 1919. It is the treaty of peace with Germany.

It is like an adventure to thumb the pages and observe the titling. There is the Covenant of the League of Nations in ashes. There are the boundaries of Germany, for which only a current map has the answer. There are the political clauses and guaranties reduced to grim irony as one lifts his eyes to contemplate a smoldering Poland, a dismembered Czechoslovakia, a bleeding Greece, a supine Austria, a conquered Norway, a bewildered France, a prostrate Belgium. One reads the military, naval, and air clauses and can hear the tramp of a million booted feet, the drone of planes, the swish of tin fish as they sink Atlantic shipping. Whence all these? One reads the penalty clause for the trial of Wilhelm II for his crimes against the world. How explicit it was. The tribunal of five judges was created in the treaty for a case never presented to the court. It seems like mockery.

All this was but a generation ago, and again the world is bleeding and prostrate.

Shall we continue to speak of Europe's endless wars and fold our hands only to find that inevitably they end in the United States Treasury and on the backs of our own people? There is a time for everything and a season for every purpose, and this is the time to ponder our responsibility in bringing about understanding, comity, and cooperation among the nations of the world in the fervent hope that the blight of war may not again be forced upon the peace-loving people of the earth.

In the factories of California I saw the airplane of the future, which will shrink the oceans, laugh at mountains and surface obstructions, and bring the world together as an integrated community. To give that shrunken world a new and resilient hope and faith is one of our responsibilities and it deserves attention now.

The costly administrative mistakes of the last 10 years in creating emergency machinery to meet domestic problems is eloquent of the necessity for creating effective peace machinery if haste, mistakes, and blunders are to be avoided.

A victorious, successful, and enduring peace and a successful ordering of the world's problems will not be the work of a day, a week, a month.

Shall the imperative of time find us unready to successfully dispose the victory when it comes and cause us to repeat the blunders of yesteryear?

There is a season for every purpose and a time for everything. This is a time for exploration of the problems which will confront us when there is thrust upon us the responsibility for assisting in bringing comity, understanding, and cooperation among the nations of the world.

It is a time for moral preparation and study. That lack of imagination which thwarted the development of the steamboat, that capacity for disbelief which made the development of the incandescent lamp so difficult, the inertia which required years for the transposition from the candle to the electric lamp, that fear of change which caused workers generations ago to break labor-saving machinery with sledges, and that neophobia which fears every innovation must be met with a faith and a determination that a less brutal, a free, a better, and a peaceful world can be achieved.

When the last shot has been fired, when the last bomb has been dropped, when the last life has been snuffed out, and the stillness of armistice brings rejoicing to all corners of the earth, we must be ready to dispose the victory with leadership, with plans, and with machinery.

Organized forces of union, of federation, of world government, of international organization are already at work. They are symbols of the spirit reaching forth from behind the barriers of frustration to a new hope that cooperation, comity, and understanding can be achieved, and that the blight of warfare will be no more.

These forces need study. They need direction. They need exploration. What better approach would we take now than to create a joint committee of the Senate and House of Representatives to give sustained and profound study to the ideas now at work so that when the great day of victory arrives we shall be ready and unhurried in assuming the responsibility of assisting this stricken world?

It is true that under our system of government the Senate is charged with approval power of treaties and arrangements with foreign lands. But let it not be forgotten that the capstone of victory will be more than a treaty of peace. It must be a plan for rehabilitation. It must be a settlement of obligations. It must be an understanding concerning currencies and trade. It may have to be implemented with an expenditure of funds which are derived from the Public Treasury. All this becomes a matter of concern to all the people and to every representative of the people, irrespective of the body in which he serves.

To win the peace we must be ready, and the time for preparation is now. We can best bring understanding to the world if we ourselves thoroughly understand what we seek to do and how to do it. Let us begin now.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BOYKIN] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD on three topics and to include therein certain excerpts and other matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COSTELLO). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

(Mr. KILDAY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

PROPOSED GAS RATIONING IN THE MIDDLE WEST

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, the invention of internal-combustion engines and the creation of the automobile revolutionized the economic life of every civilized nation on earth. The American people, above all other peoples of the world, have been influenced by the effect of the automobile upon transportation and nearly every other phase of life in America. Our entire economic structure has been geared to the economy produced by and through the automobile. It has had its effect upon the culture, education, religion, and home life of our people. It has transformed rural sections and areas of the Nation into residential areas. It has decentralized the residential sections of the laboring man so that he no longer lives near or in the congested area of his place of employment.

In the State of Michigan, a portion of which I have the honor to represent in this body, the automobile capital of the world was domiciled. From the mass-production lines of the great automobile factories located in or near the dynamic city of Detroit moved cars and trucks to every civilized nation on earth.

Those great productive machines are silent now, and they are no longer producing that great convenience of our day and age, the automobile. Those giant industries have been transformed from the production for peace and commerce to the production of war, and Detroit, Mich., has become a great center in the Nation's gigantic war effort. Its tens of thousands of skilled workmen, loyal and devoted American citizens, still travel to their places of employment in automobiles. I come from that section of our country. I know the methods and means by which they carry on their daily employment to and from their homes. I believe that 90 percent of the working-

men in that industrial area, now so busily engaged in producing the implements of war, use their cars in traveling to and from their places of employment. Many of them travel as much as 50 miles per day from their homes in the rural and semirural areas to the hub and center of the manufacturing plants.

Due to the fortunes of war, gasoline has been rationed along the Atlantic seaboard. Not because of a shortage of gas or oil but because of a want of transportation. The Nation already has been prepared, through public announcement in the press, that all of its people are likewise to be rationed soon in the use of gasoline. No Government official or agency can, with any degree of integrity or honesty with the American people, take the position that such a move is necessary because of a shortage of gas, or that there is any want or scarcity of transportation to the interior regions of the United States. Neither of the two elements yet exists.

Within the last few days, a large number of representatives of the oil industry from the State of Texas appeared before the Rivers and Harbors Committee of this House, of which I have the honor to be a member, urging the construction of a pipe line across the State of Florida and other means of communication, in order that the industry in the Lone Star State, which State by the way is reputed to contain more than one-half of all the oil reserves in the United States, may be saved from threatened bankruptcy and stagnation. The substance of their appeal was that the oil industry in the South and Southwest is drowning in gasoline due to a lack of tankers to transport it to the eastern or Atlantic seaboard of the country. It was pointed out that wells having a capacity of 30,000 barrels per day had been cut down to 20 barrels per day. It was shown with great emphasis and unquestionable accuracy that such a condition failed to produce sufficient income to defray the overhead or carrying charges of much of that great industry, and that many engaged in it were facing economic loss and ruin.

With the threat to ration gasoline to all of the people of the Nation, the demand or market for gasoline would be further curtailed and reduced with the result that economic chaos and destruction might become the lot of a considerable portion of the industry. A recent report on the bill considered by the Rivers and Harbors Committee contains the following significant clause, and I quote it:

> There is no shortage of oil or gasoline in this country. All storage facilities of the Southwest are filled to capacity, while the wells and refineries are being closed down. People there are suffering great financial loss because the surplus stocks cannot be moved to market. In the East, gasoline is being rationed because of the inability to secure transportation under existing conditions. As winter approaches the need for fuel oil to relieve actual suffering may become very acute.

With such a condition facing this great industry and the American people, the cause underlying any proposed or threatened rationing must be great and convincing indeed.

There is neither a shortage of gasoline nor transportation in the interior areas of the country, therefore, gas rationing is neither necessary nor justified. To impose gas rationing in the rural areas of the Nation is nothing less than suicide.

If the excuse for the threatened rationing is the saving of tires, let the Government say so, and every patriotic American will yield his personal convenience for the good of his country; but until the Government can demonstrate to the people that it needs the tires on privately owned vehicles, there should not be and there ought not be any threat to ration this most essential commodity. It is required day and night by the great masses of our laboring men and women to reach their places of employment in the production of much needed war materials.

In one of the great daily papers of my State, the Detroit Free Press, was carried an item recently most pertinent to the subject under discussion. I cannot refrain from quoting a portion thereof:

> Tires don't wear out much from distance, but from speed. The tires of a slow, careful driver will last about as long on the road as they will standing on the garage floor.

There is no point in restricting or closing down the rest of the United States just because the Atlantic seaboard cannot get all the gas it needs. Let us not shackle and retard nine-tenths of the United States in its normal and necessary functions of living and production of war materials because the other one-tenth is unable to obtain the fuel necessary to keep pace.

We must do everything necessary to assist the eastern section of the land to regain its normal condition of life and production. Let no grave error be committed under a war hysteria to the detriment of our war effort and national security. Caution and common sense should be exercised before there is any further disruption in the normal way of life of the American citizen. When necessity is shown our people respond, but when necessity is not shown the people revolt.

This morning's press—the Washington Post—carried the story that there were tires for all in the offing. A few days ago it appears that Donald M. Nelson, head of the War Production Board; Leon Henderson, the Price Administrator; James B. Eastman, Transportation Director; and Arthur B. Newhall, Rubber Coordinator, in a joint statement, described our tire situation as grave. Evidently the President is of the opinion that there is nothing to get excited about and has indicated that tire substitutes can be developed before the present tires now in use are worn out. These conflicting statements are confusing to the American people and cause bewilderment and a loss of confidence in government. It is regrettable that such a statement, one in direct opposition to the other, coming from the highest authorities in our Government, relating to one of the most critical problems before us, namely, transportation, should occur at this time. Government officials should have no priorities on confusion. Cooperation to the fullest extent is necessary. Tell the people the truth and they will make whatever sacrifice is demanded.

MOBILIZING THE PRODUCTIVE FACILITIES OF SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL], I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, with House amendments thereto, insist on the House amendments, agree to the conference asked by the Senate, and appoint conferees.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. STEAGALL, WILLIAMS, SPENCE, WOLCOTT, and CRAWFORD.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the other special orders for today I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, the Oklahoma delegation in the House of Representatives today unanimously adopted the following statement and asked me, as chairman of the delegation, to announce this to the Congress:

> The Oklahoma delegation is informed that the War Production Board is considering the rationing of gasoline throughout the Middle West.
>
> 1. Because of the importance of the oil industry to all of Oklahoma and to other oil-producing States, the Oklahoma delegation is opposed to any rationing plan where supplies of the rationed article are plentiful and where its production, transportation, or distribution is not detrimental to the war effort.
>
> 2. The delegation recognizes the need for restricting the use of tires on the passenger cars and trucks of the Nation and favors any restriction on mileage consistent with tire conservation. But we emphatically protest

against any rationing plan that would make one industry the goat because of the shortages existing in another industry.

3. If rationing of rubber is necessary for the war effort, we feel that restrictions should be placed on the use of the tires, and no effort made to close down or eliminate another industry because of its relationship to the operation of the automobile.

4. Byproducts of petroleum will play an ever-increasing role in the victory program. Oil must be refined to obtain essential gases for explosives, 100-octane aviation gasoline, gases for synthetic rubber, and a thousand other high essentials to the war program. It is impossible to obtain these without the production of from 40 percent to 50 percent of the crude oil being made into gasoline. This product cannot be stored. To demoralize entirely the outflow of this gasoline through arbitrary and uninformed action would be detrimental to the war effort.

5. We feel that tires can be conserved far better by a reasonable permitted mileage than by such drastic action as was required on the east coast because of transportation difficulties. If such restrictive measures are extended to areas where gasoline is plentiful and its transportation is available, the oil industry, the States, schools, and other governmental branches depending upon it for tax income, and the economy of the States all will be detrimentally affected.

6. Everyone knows that tires operated a reasonable amount of mileage regularly will be conserved better than to restrict their use to such an extent that the cars will be immobile and stored over weeks at a time.

7. Because of the importance of this matter to so large a number of persons in Oklahoma and other oil-producing States, we respectfully demand that a hearing be granted by the War Production Board and thorough consideration be given this matter before any action is taken. Governors, taxing authorities of the oil States, and representatives of the petroleum industry are entitled to be fully heard.

Will Rogers, Wesley E. Disney, Jack Nichols, Wilburn Cartwright, Lyle H. Boren, Mike Monroney, Jed Johnson, Victor Wickersham, Ross Rizley.

This is signed by the entire membership of the Oklahoma House delegation.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. I want to compliment the gentleman from Oklahoma and the entire Oklahoma delegation for its far-sighted and forthright action in bringing this resolution to the attention of the House. I also want to tell the gentleman from Oklahoma, as the dean of the Democratic delegation from Kansas, that we are in 100 percent accord with the provisions of the resolution which the gentleman has presented.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I thank the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I also wish to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, and I wish to ask him this question: Is it the feeling or opinion or philosophy of the gentleman's delegation that they are willing to make any sacrifice whatsoever that the Government may outline in connection with turning in automobiles or rubber or doing without gasoline so long as the policy is consistent and so long as you really know what the program is?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. The gentleman has asked a question and has answered it. It is important that the people understand the reason and the necessity for any gas-rationing policy if adopted.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the attitude of the people in my district, and they are becoming very much concerned about this matter. They want to know what the program is and they are willing to put whatever they have on the barrelhead and push the program along.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the discussion of this all-important subject by the distinguished gentleman from Oklahoma, under whom I am pleased to serve in the Roads Committee of the House. I should just like to add to the subject matter by saying that in my own congressional district I have 15 counties, 8 of which are rationed and 7 are not rationed. You can very easily see what sort of situation that makes. I am not going into the details of the troubles which we have had except to say that the individuals living in the 8 counties that are rationed are patriotic and they desire to comply with the regulatory orders set from Washington, if and when, as the gentleman has well said, they know the valid reasons for doing so. I have expressed to the Office of Price Administration and to the other groups in Washington having to do with this subject matter the fact that these persons do not want any special favors, neither do they want any discriminations against them as compared with any other group. I thank the gentleman for bringing this subject matter before the House today.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. I thank the gentleman from West Virginia.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

COOPERATION DOES NOT MEAN PURGE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 25, on page 4531. I refer to the statement made by the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], and I quote:

Mr. Chairman I rise to make a few observations and to show, in supporting the appending amendment, the complete manner in which the Congress of the United States has cooperated with the President and the executive branch of the Government in the conduct of the war since the declaration of war on December 8. * * * The Congress of the United States, since December 7, has cooperated with the President. There has been unity existing between the legislative and the executive branches of the Government. I make this statement to answer what I consider improper criticism, criticism that fails to recognize the true picture and does not give due consideration to what the Congress has accomplished.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] was speaking above on what has happened since December 7. Previous to that, our country was not at war. Many of us were opposed to war and wanted to keep this country out of war—a laudable thing to do. I am proud to say—and I say it as a 100-percent American—that I am glad I took that stand, for I believed then and I believe now it was the wise, sane, sound, sensible course to follow. Thank God I followed it. Now, since the the 7th of December I have tried to cooperate with the administration to win the war we are in, at all corners of the earth. Had we used our good offices over the conference table in time, and had the President been so inclined for our best interests as Americans, I still believe the differences could have been ironed out and we would not be at war today. I make this statement as my own, as an individual. I believe it, and I apologize to no one for saying it.

Mr. Speaker, my object is today to show the desire of some of the New Deal group to purge and belittle all Members of Congress who before December 7 opposed the New Deal, opposed doing those things that led us into the war. I am sure those who opposed the administration thought that it was the honest thing to do according to their own convictions and their own best ideas as 100-percent American citizens, citizens who were thinking of America and the welfare of the American people, patriotic citizens elected to support the Constitution and uphold it as patriotic men and women who wanted to maintain our American way of life and retain our liberty and our freedom. That was their right and their duty.

Now we all agree that the criticism of legislative bills proposed by this administration did not defeat the legislation the President wanted. It all passed, and the New Deal has had its way 100 percent. So why should some of the New Deal spokesmen and the administration try to purge, purge, purge Republicans and Democrats alike who disagreed with New Deal steam-roller tactics previous to December 7? It is un-American, it is not in good taste, and the American public should resent it. I have associated with all the Members of Congress some New Dealers and the Democratic national chairman, Mr. Flynn, would purge, and I will say the ones who opposed the New Deal did so from a sense of honesty, a sense of duty, and as true American citizens.

After Majority Leader MCCORMACK made the statement that Congress has supported the war movement since December 7, he also said "Fair criticism is always in order, but unfair criticism should in all decency stop." In that I agree. But why does it not stop? Why does the principal newspaper columnist of the President, Ernest K. Lindley, not stop? In his article in the Post of May 18, 1942, entitled "Measuring Up—the Trouble With Congress," and in many articles which he writes, Mr. Lindley favors the New Deal. He should write for the New Deal. His wife, Mrs. Betty G. Lindley, is or was on Mrs. Roosevelt's O. C. D. staff at a salary of $5,600 a year

as principal civilian participation adviser, and I am quite well informed that Betty Lindley is one of Mrs. Roosevelt's closest advisers and handles the personal finances of Mrs. Roosevelt. Mr. Lindley has a reason for supporting the New Deal.

Mr. Ernest K. Lindley criticized the Congress for the boondoggling which had been uncovered and exposed in the Office of Civilian Defense. Mr. Lindley criticized the Congress for calling attention to the employment of Melvyn Douglas, "Tiny" Mayris Chaney, and the so-called glamor boys and girls that were employed in the O. C. D.

Now, refer again to Mr. Lindley's article, Measuring Up, in the Post of May 18, and see how he criticized some of the Members of Congress. He calls attention to the article written in a certain red or yellow sheet published in New York, which is trying to purge Members of Congress. This red or yellow sheet is published by Bruce Bliven, one of the foreign agents who registered with the State Department, and yet this same Mr. Lindley would have you believe that the Members of Congress who did not agree with the New Deal and wanted to keep this country out of war should be purged. In the name of heaven, is it not about time that Mr. Lindley and other New Deal writers would find out the motive behind such men as Bruce Bliven, a registered foreign agent? I have nothing personal so far as Mr. Lindley is concerned. I have met him and talked to him. But I think if I were Mr. Lindley I would try to do the things that Majority Leader McCORMACK and the President want now, and that is harmony. If you expect to have the Members of Congress sit still and have you put us up to the public in the light of Communists, Nazi sympathizers, or un-American, then I want you to know we are ready to fight. If it is fight you want, fight you will have, because I do not expect to sit here supinely and listen to Members on the floor of the House or those in public who are closely associated with this administration trying to make the people of this country believe that anyone who wanted to keep this country out of war and was against the things the administration wanted before December 7 ought to be purged. I say to the American people they should be reelected.

I want to say to you, Mr. Lindley, and I want to say to the President and all those in authority, that you ought to keep your mouths shut and be mighty glad that we can swallow all the things that have transpired in the past, because we know you have gotten this country in the deepest hole America has ever been in. If there is any credit for that, you can have it. We want none of it. We could quote many things that have happened in the past, that many of the people of this administration have done, which we just do not like because we think they are detrimental to America. I inserted in the RECORD of May 12 a news article showing what the President thought of war preparation since he has taken up the office of President, and I insert that as part of my remarks. It is entitled "Charley the Smear." It is another New Deal agent who wants quieting down on his news articles and statements.

"CHARLEY THE SMEAR"

"Charley the Smear" Michelson, boss press agent for the Democratic Party, has betrayed the political desperation of the administration by the venom of his attack on the Republicans. The only possible explanation of the falsehoods that he uttered Saturday in Washington is that the Democrats recognize the growing resentment throughout the country over the incompetence and waste which are hampering the war effort. The Democratic leaders are forced to any expedient, however low, to save themselves in the November election. They are trying to use the blood and sweat of war for their personal advantage.

HISTORY REPEATS

It becomes necessary to remind Michelson that it was never the Republican Party that sought to destroy the American Union. After the Democratic Party got us into the last war the Republicans furnished the bulk of the fighting men, and this is repeating itself in this war. Slackers and cowards in Washington and on Broadway are protected by the same political pull that enabled Michelson to line his own pockets as a lobbyist. The Republicans are on the fighting line and the production line.

Michelson's animus so clouded his discretion that he made one important confession. This was the admission that in the eyes of the administration Pearl Harbor did not mark our entrance into the war. We were already, says Michelson, tied up in the war of the Atlantic, and he asserts that if the administration had not divided the fleet to engage in undeclared warfare the Japanese would not have dared attack.

RECORD PROVES HIM FALSE

As for Michelson's attempt to lay on Republican shoulders the blame for our Nation's deficiency in arms, the record proves him false at every step. The Democratic Party has had control of the House, in which appropriations originate, for 11 years. It has had control of the Presidency and of both Houses of Congress by overwhelming majorities for more than 9 years. That complete control of the executive and legislative departments goes back exactly 1 day further than the accession of Hitler to power in Germany.

Mr. Roosevelt as a candidate in 1932 endorsed "100 percent" the Democratic platform which criticized the Republican administration bitterly for its expenditures for natonal defense. President Roosevelt's first four Budgets, from 1934 to 1937, inclusive, appropriated less money for the Army and Navy than was appropriated in the preceding four Budgets of the Hoover administration, this despite the fact that in his annual report for 1933 General MacArthur, then Chief of Staff, warned that "the Army strength, personnel, and material, and its readiness for employment are below the danger line." In 1933 when President Roosevelt was starting his experiment of spending the country to prosperity, both General MacArthur and the late Gen. Hugh Johnson, then head of the National Recovery Administration, urged him to use a modest portion of the billions to mechanize the Army. They were ignored. In succeeding years other warnings of our lack of preparedness also went unanswered.

BONNEVILLE SPEECH RECALLED

Only a week before the "Quarantine" speech at Chicago on October 5, 1937, the President, speaking at the dedication of Bonneville Dam, said that "instead of spending, as some nations do, half their national income in the piling up of arms and more arms for purposes of war, we in America are wiser in using our wealth on projects like this."

In his annual message of 1939 the President said: "No responsible officer defends building our air forces up to the total either of planes on hand or of productive capacity equal to the forces of certain other nations."

On May 4, 1940, while the Nazi flood was coursing across Flanders, the President said at a press conference that anyone who believed in a two-ocean Navy was just plain dumb.

HOW GRAND OLD PARTY AIDED DEFENSE

On June 4, 1940, when appropriations for defense were limited to a 5-year program to cost $4,000,000,000, the President urged that Congress adjourn and go home. As a result of Republican opposition to adjournment, Congress remained in session during the rest of the year, appropriated more than $7,000,000,000 additional for defense, including the start of the two-ocean Navy, and authorized conscription and the mobilization of the National Guard.

Regardless of the forces that brought this Nation to war, it is at war now and its citizens are united in the demand that the war be pushed through to victory. Michelson's false and ill-timed attack was a malicious contribution to disunity. The Democratic Party must either disown it or accept the responsibility for his attempt to pervert the war effort to partisan ends.

Now, in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, we need harmony in this country. We need common sense. If the administration is going to censure everything that people do from now on and regulate everything they can use, it is about time that you shut up some of your pet newspaper reporters and radicals who are trying to purge honest, loyal, conscientious American citizens who are running for Congress. You do not need to include me in that category. I have been here for 12 years. I have seen enough of the New Deal. It has been one of the most difficult things in my life to see the way you have handled the affairs of this Government, and unless you do change your attitude and cut out unnecessary functions of government, unnecessary spending, you will wreck this Nation, and nothing under the heavens will stop it. You will not only wreck this Nation, but you will not win this war, which I and many others of my colleagues tried to keep you from getting into. We tried to keep the Neutrality Act in effect; we tried to keep you from sending our ships into the danger zones; and we tried to keep you here in this country and attending to your own business. But we were unable to do it. Now we want to give you assurance again that we will fight for America and the American principles. Once more I say to you that proper criticism is essential for the winning of this war; proper criticism is necessary and vital to the democratic form of government as long as it is honest and for the best interest of our country. But because some of the New Deal sympathizers want to do purging, now that is not honest. That is not the democratic way, and we are not going to stand for it. We are going to call a spade a spade, and we are going to be just as patriotic American citizens in doing that which is essential to America, the welfare of America, and the American way of life. But we warn you now, we want cooperation, Mr. President; you

need it; the Government demands cooperation, not dirty politics. If you are right, Mr. President, you will get it from all those who opposed you before December 7, and when you are wrong we will point out to you your errors, and if you are big enough for the job you now have, you will heed the warning and try to do that that is best for our country, for the freedom of America and for the American people and their liberties.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUGAR, GASOLINE, AND RUBBER

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States are operating under sugar rations established by the Office of Price Administrator, Mr. Leon Henderson. They have also gone out and through public and private subscription financed an organization known as U. S. O.—the United Service Organizations—for the benefit of the men in the military and naval forces. At various places throughout the country there is an effort made by housewives and mothers of this country to give the boys who may drop in at these service organization establishments, sweets in the form of candy and pies and cakes. It seems to me that it would be well for Mr. Henderson to provide in his sugar rationing so that the women who donate cakes and candy and pies for the boys in the service could obtain the sugar for preparing those sweets without having to take it out of the family ration. Today I received a letter from one of the important men in the service in my district who is serving as a buck private, but still who is important, in which he outlines some of the difficulties they are up against from this standpoint and I ask unanimous consent to include that letter in my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

DEAR MR. CRAWFORD: For the last 2 months I have been stationed in Camp Sutton, Monroe, N. C. Today, and for the past week, I have run into a situation that I believe worthy of your consideration as far as the sugar rationing has been concerned; namely, the work the women of the various churches have been doing for the boys in service.

At Camp Sutton there are over 20,000 men. The town of Monroe has a population of 3,000 and every night and Saturday and Sunday the churches of this town are at our service. They serve us cookies (home-made) and coffee, and every time they do this the women are compelled, in most cases, to draw upon their own meager allotment of sugar to provide us with the pleasures that we had at home, at the sacrifice of the sugar for and meant for the use of their families.

My question is this: Should these fine people be forced, by the goodness of their hearts, to sacrifice the sugar allotted to their families? Why can't sugar be provided in adequate amounts through such agencies as the U. S. O. for purposes such as this? You can't imagine what home-made cookies and coffee mean to a boy hundreds of miles from home. You may use this letter in any argument that may come up on this question.

I would appreciate learning your opinion on this question.

PVT. THOMAS D. O'REILLY,
Headquarters Battery, Seventy-third F. A. Brigade, Camp Sutton, Monroe, N. C.

Mr. CRAWFORD. There is one other matter I want to refer to, for just a moment. Prior to the declaration of war I disagreed with the administration on a great many subjects that came up: For instance, in connection with the lend-lease bill and appropriations thereunder and the repeal of the Neutrality Act. I make no apologies for the way I voted on those questions when they were submitted. I reached my own conclusions before voting, but when I voted for a declaration of war, insofar as I am personally concerned, I put my material assets on the barrel head to carry this war to a successful conclusion; and insofar as my personal assets are concerned, the Government may have all of them. It may take all of my income, leaving simply a sufficient amount to keep soul and body together for myself and the members of my family, and I shall be satisfied.

If we lose this war, as has been properly said, we lose every war which has been fought on the right side during the past 2,000 years, and I make no reservation whatsoever insofar as sacrifice in winning the war is concerned. In my opinion we have a long, tough road ahead of us. I think millions of men will be killed and maimed before the war is ended. I have very little respect for those who go about the country dishing out optimism and drivel to the effect that the war will end shortly. I think that is highly destructive to the morale of the country, and is doing much more damage than good, and I apply those remarks to those holding high office as well as those who hold no office at all.

The other point I wish to cover is that referred to by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. CARTWRIGHT]. The people in my district are willing to make whatever sacrifices are necessary in connection with gasoline and rubber, but they would like to have a full, frank statement from the administration as to what the administration wishes them to do in connection with rubber. I think, at the present time, the situation is about as muddled as it could be, and in my opinion it is not clearing up. I have an oil-producing and refining district. They do not know what to do. The people in my district know that oil and gas are plentiful there, but they have not heard any straightforward remarks to the effect that rubber should be turned in which is now on their cars, and they object to putting their cars in the garage and letting the rubber rot, simply to satisfy somebody who has some particular whim about the use of gasoline. If the Government needs rubber, let them call for it, and at the present time I wish to say it can have all of the rubber that I use in my private and farm operations on several motor vehicles, and we will get along in some way, but I do wish they would make a clear-cut statement as to what they want us to do about it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I find in my district that the public wants to do everything possible for the winning of the war.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is universal; all over this country.

Mr. RICH. As the gentleman said a moment ago, that is the most important thing that faces America today.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And about the only thing of importance.

Mr. RICH. All other things are subservient to that.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. RICH. If and when we get rules and regulations laid down that the public is not confused, it will satisfy many people and stop a lot of criticism that is now going on. I want to call your attention to the fact that I have oil in my district. There are three counties in my district that are unrestricted. Then, there are three counties that are restricted. The people in the three counties who want to go over to the other three counties have to load up enough gasoline to go over there and do their work and go back, because they cannot buy any in those restricted counties.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has made a very frank statement of his stand in support of the Government to win this war. I am satisfied he was equally frank and sincere in his stand before the war. We have national unity in the United States and I hope we can maintain it. I am alarmed about what is going on in this country by some men in high places who are trying to smear the gentleman and other Members of Congress for the position which we took prior to our entrance into the war, and also because of the position which the gentleman and I took against some of the policies inaugurated by the administration. I do not know whether the gentleman cares to comment on that, but I think it is of great concern that certain groups in this country are trying to disorganize the people and break the unity which exists and which we need in order to win this war.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I merely want to make this brief reply on that point. It is absolutely immaterial to me what happens in the next election. That is secondary. The only primary question before this country is to win this war and do it as quickly as possible, before millions of men are unnecessarily sacrificed. Those people referred to by the gentleman who are contributing their effort and their fertile brains toward destroy-

ing the standing of Congress as an institution, and this in the minds of the people of this country, are as anti-American and are assisting the Axis as much as any force probably could. I feel very certain that an enormous amount of damage has been done and that many people have lost faith in the Congress of the United States as an institution. Some of them have about as little respect for Congress today—I mean the institution itself—as they have for a yellow dog. I refer you to certain editorials. The people can take care of individual Members at the polls, but once they lose Congress as an institution, they cannot recapture it without a fight, and the people will suffer the consequences.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has again expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks and comments by the two gentlemen who have just spoken. I endorse what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] and the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. ANDRESEN] said 100 percent. Since we declared war this Congress has given everything the President has asked, every power that he has asked, every dollar that he has asked. It has cooperated 100 percent. I do not think there is a Member of this House who has not done so. That should be the test of an American. It was my conviction that the debate was closed when Pearl Harbor happened. A curtain was drawn on everything that had occurred before that. My own opinion is that any person—I do not care what position he occupies and I do not care what party he belongs to—who brings up the record of any Senator or Congressman prior to Pearl Harbor in the hope or wish of rehashing the issues and debates that preceded the declaration of war in connection with how he voted or any statement that he made upon the foreign policy of the administration is doing more to create disunity in this country than anything anyone can do. We all have but one job to do, that is to win this war.

I have a deep personal interest in this. Some of my own blood is down in Australia. Two boys from my own district participated in the raid on Tokyo, out of 80 persons throughout the United States. My friends, I want to say that that raid did more to shock the Japs and set them back on their heels and bring the war to their home than anything that has happened, because it has shown that they can be bombed right in their own homes in their own country. It is alarming that anyone, for political reasons, in any position, would attempt to create disunity in this country by bringing up the record of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], or my record, or the record of the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], as to how he voted. We all know that it would have been far easier to have said "Yes" to everything. Every one of us voted what he thought was right. We voted what we thought would keep this country out of war. We were sincere in it. Whether we were right or wrong only history will answer. Personally, I do not claim infallibility.

Somehow though I feel our great country and our great people, notwithstanding political ambitions of individuals, will not be destroyed on the rock of politics, and will survive in spite of politics.

Maybe I am wrong and have not thought through on this. Maybe the minds that are stirring into activity the poisonous pen or tongue or both of the smearer are actuated or moved by a deeper and more destructive venture of trying to involve our country directly in a union of world politics, eventually absorbing our own form of government. Methinks a scent could be trailed leading to such a goal. Maybe, just Americanism is not liked anymore.

Now I want to speak about another matter. We are talking now about rationing gasoline. I come from a State where there is an abundance of it. We have gasoline in nearly everybody's backyard. If the farmers of my State, if the people of my State are going to be told that they cannot use their gasoline, though they have the necessary equipment to use it and need to use it—in carrying on their farming operations and business—I do not know what they will think about us. What are the farmers going to do who have tractors on which there is no rubber at all? How can they farm if they are not going to be permitted to use gasoline they have in their own States, to use their tractors in farming operations?

Just what kind of damn fools are they going to think we are? Those imposing the rationing claim they are doing it to conserve rubber. Suppose our farmers have plenty of rubber, suppose our farmers have good rubber on their cars and on their trucks, are they going to be denied using them because forsooth we cannot avail ourselves of gasoline that flows from the wells we have in Montana from Cutbank clear down to the south side of the State? Does that make sense?

Suppose gas is rationed in our State and limited as it is here. What will be the result? Our distances in the West are vast and many of our farmers would use more than 3 gallons of gas just driving to town. They are producing sugar beets, grains, cattle, and sheep needed in our national defense. You can see that they could scarcely survive if such a step would be taken. Moreover such a step will cause hundreds of our filling stations to be forced to close, which of itself would be a serious blow. Many of our small businesses have already suffered seriously because of the war program and, my friends, unnecessary gasoline rationing would only make a bad situation worse.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Here is another thing I cannot understand: The big companies down in Texas are importing gas into our State competing with our local producers. Our local producers will have to close down if this continues. Why cannot the transportation facilities that are being used for the importation of gas into our State be used for some purpose necessary to prosecute the war effort instead of taking gas into our State which can only have the effect of closing down our own gas and oil wells?

[Here the gavel fell.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

Mr. GILCHRIST, at the request of Mr. LECOMPTE, for 10 days, on account of important business.

Mr. KRAMER, for an indefinite period, on account of illness.

PERMISSION FOR FILING OF RULE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 28, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

The hearings in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be postponed for approximately 2 weeks.

There will be a meeting of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum Investigation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, May 28, 1942.

COMMITTEE ON LABOR

There will be a meeting of this committee, Thursday, May 28, 1942, at 10:30 o'clock a. m., in the committee room, 429 House Office Building.

It is hoped that each Member will find it convenient to be on hand promptly at the hour stated.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1677. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $100,000 (H. Doc. No. 739); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1678. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services, Office for Emergency Management, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $2,440,000 (H. Doc. No. 740); to

the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1679. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting four supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943, amounting to $697,300, and five drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to appropriations, for the Department of State (H. Doc. No. 741); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1680. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of Scientific Research and Development for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $73,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 742); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7067. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to protect trade and commerce against interference by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation," approved June 18, 1934; with amendment (Rept. No. 2176). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7121. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 2177). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6618. A bill providing for the temporary service of circuit judges with the Supreme Court of Hawaii in case of vacancies in such court; without amendment (Rept. No. 2178). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 490. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 6999, a bill to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipe line and a navigable barge channel across Florida, the construction of an inland route from the western terminus of this channel to the present eastern terminus of the Intracoastal Waterway, and by deepening and and enlarging the Intracoastal Waterway from its present eastern terminus to the vicinity of the Mexican border; without amendment (Rept. No. 2179). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COLE of New York:

H. R. 7140. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty," to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 7141. A bill to amend the act of April 20, 1918, as amended, entitled "An act to punish the willful injury or destruction of war material, or of war premises or utilities used in connection with war material, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 7142. A bill relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of witnesses and jurors and the accounting therefor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7143. A bill to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 7144 (by request). A bill regulating compensation of employees working in excess of 40 hours per week in the executive departments and agencies; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 7145. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Secretary of the Interior to make exchanges with the Defense Homes Corporation of certain lands in northwest Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 7146. A bill to authorize the use of certificates by officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, in connection with pay and allowance accounts of military and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction of the War and Navy Departments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 7147. A bill for the relief of W. Harold Shackleford; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 7148. A bill for the relief of John Daniel Manchester; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 7149. A bill for the relief of David E. Clark; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 7150. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Eliza Ward; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2944. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition submitted by Anna Kenan and 20 other residents of the city of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2945. Also, petition submitted by Rev. A. L. Berger and 150 other residents of the city of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2946. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition submitted by Adalee Fishel and signed by Mayme E. Clodfelter and 65 other residents of West Salem, Ill., urging the early passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2947. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Mrs. D. E. McDonald, of McLouth, Kans., and 44 signers of other Kansas towns, notarized, and addressed to Senators REED and CAPPER and Congressman LAMBERTSON, appealing for legislation which will provide the best protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the influence of vice and alcoholic liquors; also asking for the passage of the Sheppard bill (S. 860); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2948. Also, petition of Mrs. T. B. Boyle, of Topeka, Kans., and 53 members of the Reformed Presbyterian Church, of Topeka, Kans., for legislation which will provide the largest possible protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; also urging the passage of the Sheppard bill at an early date; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2949. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of E. F. Partridge, pastor of the First Baptist Church of Chariton, Iowa, and members of his congregation, urging the greatest possible protection for the men of our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquors, and especially urging the passage of the Sheppard bill, S. 860, at an early date; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2950. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Rev. M. A. Gable, pastor, First Methodist Church, Fairfield, Iowa, and members and friends of this church, urging the passage of Senate bill 860, providing for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2951. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition signed by Amiel Seagert, of Erie, Mich., and 38 other residents of Monroe County, Mich., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2952. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, San Francisco, Calif., relative to postal employees (H. R. 6486); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE

THURSDAY, MAY 28, 1942

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 26, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess, and was called to order by the President pro tempore.

Rev. Peter Marshall, D. D., pastor of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, before whom all hearts are open, and from whom nothing is hid, lend us Thy grace that from this hour we may live in such a way that Thou mayest be able to bless this land that we love so much. Consider in Thy loving kindness Thy servant, the President of the United States, and those who with him share the high responsibilities of leadership. Open their minds and hearts that they may be receptive to Thy guidance. Make them willing to follow Thy plan, and by Thy grace endow them with strength and courage to do Thy will, that it may once again be true of this Nation that "In God we trust."

In this place of great decisions may Thy spirit move. May Thy voice be heard in the whispering galleries of the human heart, and Thy presence be known, unseen but voting. So may these chosen leaders, at the head of affairs in our Nation in these dangerous days, be guided, inspired, encouraged, and used of Thee to lead us on through the darkness into the light ahead.

We ask these things humbly, conscious of our own unworthiness, in the strong name of Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McKELLAR, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, May 27, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2508) to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (S. 2305) to relieve disbursing and certifying officers of the United States of responsibility for overpayments made on transportation accounts under certain circumstances, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	O'Daniel
Andrews	Glass	O'Mahoney
Austin	Green	Pepper
Bailey	Gurney	Radcliffe
Ball	Hatch	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hayden	Rosier
Barbour	Herring	Schwartz
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Holman	Smathers
Bone	Hughes	Smith
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Burton	Kilgore	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Langer	Truman
Caraway	Lucas	Tunnell
Chavez	McCarran	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Van Nuys
Connally	McNary	Wagner
Danaher	Maybank	Walsh
Davis	Mead	Wheeler
Doxey	Millikin	White
Ellender	Murdock	Wiley
George	Norris	Willis
Gerry	Nye	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] and the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained in his State on official business.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is unavoidably absent.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A petition of sundry citizens of Granville and vicinity, New York, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A resolution adopted by the Osage City (Kans.) National Farm Loan Association, favoring the enactment of legislation to continue the 3½-percent-interest rate on land-bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans for a period of 2 years from July 1, 1942; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Allen, Americus, Climax, and Emporia, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present a group of 33 petitions containing the signatures of approximately 1,622 citizens in about 32 communities and 20 counties, all in the State of Ohio, recommending the enactment of Senate bill 860.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petitions presented by the Senator from Ohio will be received and lie on the table.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, I ask consent to present for appropriate reference a petition signed by a large number of citizens of Spokane, Wash., petitioning the Congress to pass Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to members of our land and naval forces and to provide for the suppression of vice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the petition presented by the Senator from Washington will be received and lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SMITH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 5204. A bill authorizing the charging of fees for brand inspection under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1425); and

H. J. Res. 315. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect of meat-packing establishments engaged in intrastate commerce only, in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat food products by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1423).

By Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 6502. A bill to change the name of the Black Warrior National Forest to the William B. Bankhead National Forest; without amendment (Rept. No. 1424).

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 4845. A bill to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $30 to $40 per month, to grant such rate at age 65, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1426); and

H. R. 6646. A bill to provide that the unexplained absence of any individual for 7 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration; without amendment (Rept. No. 1427).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 2556. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of War to convey to the port of Cascade Locks, Oreg., certain lands for municipal purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 2557. A bill for the relief of Bradbury & Marchant; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYNOLDS:

S. 2558. A bill to further expedite the prosecution of the war by authorizing the control of the exportation of certain commodities; to the Committee on Military Affairs

INSPECTION OF NAVY YARDS, NAVAL AIR STATIONS, AND OTHER ACTIVITIES BY COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

Mr. WALSH submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 259), which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Resolved, That the Committee on Naval Affairs, or any subcommittee thereof duly appointed by the chairman of the committee, hereby is authorized to visit, for the purposes of inspection, United States navy yards, air stations, and other naval activities, between July 1 and December 31, 1942, the expenses incurred in pursuance thereof, not to exceed $3,000, to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate.

MABEL L. BUDLONG

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 260), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Mabel L. Budlong, widow of Percy E. Budlong, late an Official Reporter of debates of the Senate, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the base rate he was receiving at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

CELEBRATION OF NATIONAL FOREIGN TRADE WEEK—STATEMENT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement by the Secretary of State, Hon. Cordell Hull, in connection with the celebration of National Foreign Trade Week, May 17 to 23, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAKE UP! WASHINGTON, YES; IT IS LATE—MESSAGE FROM COESSE, IND.

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a newspaper advertisement prepared by certain citizens of Coesse, Ind., addressed to the Congress, entitled "Wake Up! Washington, Yes; It Is Late," which appears in the Appendix.]

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WAR HOUSING AND PUBLIC WORKS IN AND NEAR THE DISTRICT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a conference report regarding war housing in the District of Columbia, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The conference report will be read.

The conference report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, and 5; and agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 1.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARTER GLASS,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
EMMET O'NEAL,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the House agreed to all the amendments of the Senate which were in dispute except one, and that related to the amount of housing to be provided in the District of Columbia, the appropriation for which was raised by the Senate from $12,000,000 to $25,500,000. The House conferees did not agree to that amendment. Under those circumstances, I ask for the adoption of the report as presented, and move that the Senate ask for a further conference on the amendment still in disagreement.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection to that, but when the report was presented I rather assumed it was a complete report.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; there is a difference as to the amount of money to be used in the District of Columbia.

Mr. McNARY. I thought, and rather hoped, that the Senate conferees would yield to the attitude of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. We could not do that, for the reason that the Housing Administration found themselves in this situation: The House appropriated only for houses of one unit, that is to say, consisting of one bedroom, a kitchenette, a small dining room, and a very small bathroom, a house to accommodate only one person, or certainly not more than two.

The Housing Administration asked for appropriations for a certain number of two-room and three-room units. They wanted even more than the Senate allowed. We did not allow all they asked, but we increased the appropriation $13,500,000 for the larger units. That was done because it was shown that there were at times four or five girls living together in the same room. The committee thought that presented a situation which should not be permitted to continue. We have invited people to come to Washington and work for the Government, and it seemed to the committee that we should provide some of these larger units. That is why I am asking that we have a further conference as to this one amendment.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it may not be inappropriate for me to state at this time that, in my opinion, we have asked too many to come to Washington—more than we need and more than are being employed on full time. An effort was made some time ago, at least a suggestion was made, it was not really an effort, to decentralize some governmental activities, and I had hoped that would be done, but that seemed to be abandoned after a few permanent activities were moved away from the city. Furthermore, when I note the construction of these additional houses, it appears to me that we are adding to the congestion on one side of the city, near the river, instead of scattering the employees around where there is more room for housing facilities.

Mr. McKELLAR. This bill provides for housing in the suburbs, in Maryland and Virginia, as well as in Washington City itself. While some of the permanent activities have been removed to other cities, there are still very many people in this city who are without housing, and whatever may be our idea as to whether it is valuable to have this extra number of employees or not, I do not believe we should have them here without providing adequate housing.

Mr. McNARY. Of course not, but, in my opinion, the committees which are recommending these vast appropriations should look into the question of overemployment and excess activities in this city. No one seems to be doing anything about that.

Mr. McKELLAR. We will have to do that if we are ever to reach a conclusion in the matter.

Mr. McNARY. I observe in the press that a very huge sum is to be asked for housing. I wonder whether that bears any relation to the items we are now discussing.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not know about that. I myself have been out of the city for a week.

Mr. McNARY. That is frequently and too often the answer; no one seems to know; hence the progress of waste and overemployment continues from day to day. Of course, I shall not object, because this is a matter of procedure, of which I cannot complain, but the philosophy, the fundamental reasons I have stated, still remain with me.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator for his attitude in regard to the matter, but I think that sending back to conference the particular item I have suggested will result in the facts being ascertained before we can reach an agreement, and I think to that extent it will do good.

Mr. McNARY. I think the Senator had better be prepared to answer some of the inquiries I suggested a moment ago before he expects to get favorable action on the final conference report.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very glad to give the Senator the information when we come in with the final report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the present consideration of and agreeing to the conference report submitted by the Senator from Tennessee.

The report was considered and agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate request a further conference with the House on amendment No. 1, now in disagreement, and that the Chair appoint the same conferees.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

AMENDMENT OF EMERGENCY FARM MORTGAGE ACT OF 1933

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, Tuesday of this week the Senate passed Senate bill 2508, a bill extending the time of Land Bank Commissioner loans to 4 years. The House reduced the time to 1 year, and the action of the House has just been reported to the Senate. I ask the Chair to lay the action of the House before the Senate at this time, because I intend to make a motion to concur in the House amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2508) to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, which was, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the tenth sentence of section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, is amended by striking out "June 1, 1942" wherever it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1943."

Mr. BANKHEAD. The House action extends the time for 1 year instead of 4. The law will expire on Monday unless we act, and in view of that circumstance, with the agreement of the Department of Agriculture, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

INCREASE IN NUMBER OF CADETS AT THE MILITARY ACADEMY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. REYNOLDS submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6979) to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military

Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same.

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
JOSH LEE,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

ANDREW J. MAY,
EWING THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
WALTER G. ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, a year ago the 1st of May our beloved colleague, the late Senator Sheppard, introduced Senate bill 860, a bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments.

There has been quite a demand for action on the proposed legislation, but the Congress has hesitated and delayed action because of the halfway assurance from the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy that the evils which the bill attempts to remove in the neighborhood of the training camps of the Nation would receive attention at the hands of those in authority and in control of the training camps. But every day Members of Congress are being flooded with petitions and complaints from all sections of the country testifying to the fact that absolutely nothing has been done about the matter, and that the camps where our boys are being trained for the war effort are being literally flooded with all sorts of alcoholic drinks, prostitutes, and other abuses, which certainly do not contribute to the proper preparation of the boys to win the war.

In this connection I wish to serve notice on the Senate that it is my purpose on next Monday to make a motion to take up the bill for definite decision. I know Senators want a chance to get the bill out of the way and stop the flood of protests and complaints they are receiving from all sections of the country.

Mr. President, in my State there is located the largest military-training camp in America, and I know personally and from incontrovertible testimony that whisky and strong drinks are being sold even on the grounds of the camp with the consent most certainly of those in authority and control of the camp. The conditions there are indescribable.

In this connection I wish to place in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a letter from Dr. H. V. Tweedie, of Rockland, Maine, published in the Rockland Courier-Gazette of Friday, May 22, 1942. I shall not take time to read the letter now, but I wish to ask Senators to read the letter written by Dr. Tweedie describing the conditions which now obtain throughout the country, and which have obtained for over a year, with nothing having been done about them. The only way the Senate can discharge its duties and responsibilities to the youth of the Nation who are being housed in training camps for the purpose of military training so they may end the war is for the Senate to take affirmative action on the question; otherwise the responsibility for the results of these conditions will rest on our shoulders.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"MAKE DIN OF PROTEST"—DR. TWEEDIE TELLS OF VICES WHICH FACE THE BOYS IN THE SERVICE

ROCKLAND, MAINE, May 21.—The present orgy of beer drinking in the armed forces of the United States with its concomitants, prostitution and venereal disease, is creating an atmosphere of disturbance and alarm among the mothers of United States soldiers.

Young men away from home for a protracted time, in their loneliness are an easy prey to the vultures of liquor saloons and hives of indecency. That this should be condoned by those in authority, who could easily put an end to such an insane proceeding—I say insane for the reason that the reduction of manpower from the above cause is a serious obstacle to the success of our Army and Navy—is something that we cannot understand.

Hear what Surgeon General Thomas Parran and Dr. R. A. Vonderlehr, who is in charge of the Venereal Division of the United States Public Health Service, say as quoted in a recent issue of Progress: "The recruitment of prostitutes has kept pace with the recruitment of the Army. Army venereal diseases this year are costing the Nation more man capacity than all the Nation's labor troubles and strikes combined." Is it not a fair question to ask, in view of the above conditions, are we working for the United States or for the Axis Powers?

Reviewing this bold exposé by the above quoted doctors, the New York Times on November 23 said, according to Clinton N. Howard: "Our courageous authors paint a picture—not hesitating to name the communities—of prostitution raging in a marvelous modern streamlined form, from Salinas, Calif., to Jacksonville, Fla. They tell the story, fascinating as it is sinister, of our country's newly organized panzer prostitutes; of well-dressed women in smart automobiles patrolling the roads around Army camps, giving soldiers a lift to houses of ill fame; brothels on wheels; of a deadly trailer camp near Fort Knox populated by elderly "parents" each with a surprisingly large family of dubious and dangerous "daughters"; of one powerful syndicate organizing a great band of panzer prostitutes operating in mechanized units among the roadhouses and juke joints from Chicago to the Dakotas.

Again, from Liberty magazine: "The camps have attracted a gathering of prostitutes, lush workers, gyp carnivals, shady night clubs, gamblers, and bootleggers which would put a gold rush or an oil boom to mortal shame. On last pay day at camp * * * a fly-by-night joint doped the beer of all its soldier guests, knocked them unconscious, and rolled them for every cent they had.

Again, from Clinton Howard, in reply to the statement of Secretary Knox that drafted men should not be asked to give up privileges under rules that do not apply to other citizens, and to Secretary Stimson, who opposes protection of men, because "it is a difficult problem to combat bootleg operations, Zions Herald goes on to say, "Yes; the Government has authority and power to tear away men from their homes, from their work, from their incomes in order to train them for the trenches in peacetime, but it does not have authority or power to protect those men from a comparatively small gang of vice venders and liquor dealers.

"Against every precedent in national history (never before has liquor flowed in our Army camps in time of war) in defiance of the protest of hundreds of educational, benevolent, and religious organizations, and millions of our best citizens, the authorities of our country continue to drug our soldier boys in training camps. Every one of the educational, benevolent, patriotic, and Christian organizations in our country; every patriotic citizen, every father and mother of boys in training on their way to the front; every one of the 63,000,000 professed Christians in our land, should make ether waves and telegraph wires white hot with indignant demand for this debauchery of our sons and betrayal of our country in this crucial hour stop dead in its tracks.

Let them remind the legislators that if the Sheppard bill barring liquor from our camps and environments is not immediately passed, and the law concerning vice in environs is not enforced, we have weapons with which to fight—the black list at the polls, and impeachment proceedings, and let them make it clear that we shall not hesitate to use these democratic weapons in a merciless fashion.

During World War No. 1 General Joffre, commander in chief of the French forces said, "Alcohol, by diminishing the morale and material strength of the army, is a crime against national defense in the face of the enemy." Lloyd George, British Prime Minister, added: "We are fighting three great enemies, Germany, Austria, and Drink, but the greatest of these is Drink." In the present war, after the Army of France, supposed to be one of the strongest in the world, had gone down in 35 days under the blows of the German Army and signed away the life of its country, Marshal Petain said, "One of the first contributing causes of this defeat was alcohol in the army, and its concomitant vices."

A letter from a soldier boy recently said, "We had a beer party last night. There were 150 of us, just our battery. They had 75 gallons of beer. The boys were all in 'high.' You should have heard the noise. There is enough here to run anybody to drinking."

A Pennsylvania draftee from Camp ——— wrote to a friend, "I hope that you don't get into this—it's hell—drinking is unrestrained."

What are we going to do about it? Let all the taxpayers of this country stand on their hind legs and make such a din of protest that the dull ears of those in charge of affairs at Washington will hear the noise and also the verdict in regard to their own future and that the suspicion of Quislings in places of power in this country may cease to exist. And while we speak of taxpayers we note the increasing murmur of indignation that is spreading all abroad in this country at the lavish waste of the taxpayer's money.

* * * * *

H. V. TWEEDIE.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in connection with the remarks made by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], I wish to ask leave to insert in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a memorandum which I received from the American Social Hygiene Association, and a copy of the minutes, and a resolution which they adopted in connection with House bill 4000 and Senate bill 860. The substance of their resolution is to the effect that, insofar as H. R. 4000 and S. 860 attempt to deal with the problem of prostitution is concerned, that that problem has

already been dealt with in the so-called May Act, which was passed over a year ago.

It is the contention of this organization, which has given greater study to this problem probably than has any other similar group, that the confusion in the public mind created by the fact that these measures attempt to combine a proposal to reinstate the powers of prohibition with regard to alcoholic liquors around these camps, and the problem of prostitution, has resulted in the public being misinformed and misled concerning this subject, and that many thousands of persons are under the impression that the Congress has not acted so far as the control of prostitution around military camps is concerned, and that the Army is without authority in this regard. The contrary is true; and in view of the American Social Hygiene Association, the May Act is a much better measure dealing with the problem of prostitution than would be the proposal contained in S. 860 and H. R. 4000.

Mr. President, I therefore ask that the memorandum and minutes and resolution to which I referred be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN SOCIAL HYGIENE ASSOCIATION OFFICE MEMORANDUM

To: Senator LA FOLLETTE.
From: William F. Snow.
Subject: Senate bill 860 and companion bill House of Representatives 4000.

The American Social Hygiene Association has studied its own correspondence regarding these bills, and has reviewed the references to them in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD since their introduction. The association has also made some inquiries regarding the petitions which have been presented to Congress and ordered to lie on the table in the Senate or to be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs in the House.

At the meeting of the board of directors of the association in Washington, April 22, Mr. Alan Johnstone, a member of the board, reviewed the situation in relation to these two bills and presented a resolution for consideration of the board. A copy of his remarks and of the resolution is attached.

Following general discussion of this matter it was voted—

"That it is the sense of the board (the board of directors of the American Social Hygiene Association) that the bills in question (S. 860 and H. R. 4000) should be amended by striking from the titles and from the bills these repetitive and duplicating provisions, the state of the Federal law with respect to prostitution having already been satisfactorily and more completely determined."

EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS' MEETING OF THE AMERICAN SOCIAL HYGIENE ASSOCIATION, APRIL 22, 1942

Mr. Johnstone then reviewed the general status of Senate bill 860 and the companion bill, H. R. 4000, which are still pending in Congress. The title of these bills reads as follows: "To provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments." Mr. Johnstone pointed out that section 4 of these bills—that is, that portion relating to the suppression of prostitution in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments—has already been acted into law in a more acceptable and complete form in the bill popularly known as the May Act, which was introduced by Chairman ANDREW J. MAY, of the House Military Affairs Committee, was passed and was signed July 11, 1941. Mr. Johnstone stated that the Congressmen were constantly receiving petitions asking the passage of these present bills; that evidently these petitions were signed by persons who did not know that part of the bill was already law, and that as citizens they can now promote and support vigorous enforcement of existing laws (including application of the May Act) in their States and communities. He said the confusion arising from continued efforts to get these bills considered as they now read militated against promptness and efficiency in enforcing the May Act and did nothing to aid those who are also desirous of supporting some practical legislation for dealing with the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States.

In order to bring this matter before the board for discussion, Mr. Johnstone introduced the following resolution:

Resolved with respect to H. R. 4000 and S. 860, now pending in the Congress, That—

Whereas the May Act prohibiting prostitution in the vicinity of training areas of the armed forces for the protection of soldiers and sailors against demoralization and venereal infection attendant on such vicious conditions has been enacted into law and constitutes a statement of the policy of the Federal Government with respect to these matters; and

Whereas in the May Act certain duties have been conferred upon the Secretaries of War and Navy, and the Federal Security Administrator; and

Whereas H. R. 4000 and S. 860, in the titles and in sections 4 thereof, deal with the same subject without placing responsibility upon the Federal Security Administrator; and

Whereas the reenactment of the provisions of these bills in this respect would be repetitive and create administrative confusion: It is

Resolved, That it is the sense of this board that the bills in question should be amended by striking from the titles and from the bills these repetitive and duplicating provisions, the state of the Federal law with respect to prostitution having already been satisfactorily and more completely determined.

Full discussion of this resolution by members of the board and guests followed, including the presentation of written views of Dr. Wilbur and others who could not be present; and on call of the chairman, the board voted to adopt the resolution as presented.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I appreciate the statement made by the Senator from Wisconsin in connection with the May Act. There is plenty of authority on the part of the Navy and the Army to do this job. The point I make is that they are not doing it. Nothing but an affirmative act on the part of the Congress making it obligatory to take action will get results. The reports which are coming to us are recent reports.

While I have the floor I announce that at the request of the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], who wants to help in this cause and who cannot be here Monday, I shall make the motion to which I referred on the first day the Senate convenes after next Monday.

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I have been quite interested in Senate bill 860, because it was introduced by my predecessor, the late beloved Morris Sheppard, and because I believe it is a good bill. I have also made strenuous effort to bring the bill up for consideration on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, I have received and entered in the RECORD thousands upon thousands of petitions from folks in Texas, also from good citizens of other States, asking that the Congress take action on the Sheppard bill, Senate 860. Therefore I most heartily join with the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] in another attempt to bring the bill up for consideration next Monday, or at the next session of the Senate following that of Monday.

I also at this time present the following list of petitions from 24,453 citizens of Texas and 25 other States urging the Congress to give prompt consideration to Senate bill 860:

Arkansas	1,006
California	137
Colorado	1
Florida	173
Georgia	11
Idaho	1
Illinois	226
Indiana	51
Iowa	2
Louisiana	1
Maine	32
Massachusetts	251
Michigan	84
Mississippi	31
Nebraska	55
New Jersey	553
New York	9,332
Ohio	989
Oregon	117
Pennsylvania	2,545
Tennessee	2
Virginia	295
Washington	2,381
District of Columbia	151
Wisconsin	14
Total	18,446
Texas petitions	6,007
Grand total	24,453

I have also received 75 letters and petitions from the following churches in Texas:

Trinity Christian Church, Dallas; First Baptist Church, Oak Cliff, Dallas; Young People's Church of the Nazarene, Pittsburg; First Methodist Church, Panhandle; First Methodist Church, Hereford; Weatherford District Conference Methodist Church, Graford; Plainview District Conference Methodist Church, Tulia; Greenville Avenue Christian Church, Dallas; Methodist Church, Matador; San Jacinto Methodist Church, Amarillo; Central Park Church of the Nazarene, Houston; Methodist Church, Hico; Main Street Methodist Church, Cleburne.

ALCOHOL AND SYNTHETIC RUBBER FROM GRAINS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I call to the attention of the Senate, and ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD, a statement issued by Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange, urging immediate expansion of plant capacity for the production of industrial alcohol, and immediate and great expansion of plants for the production of synthetic rubber from grains.

No argument is needed to show the necessity of adequate transportation in

the United States, nor is any argument needed to show that our transportation is based very largely upon gasoline and rubber. We have plenty of gasoline in our section of the country. We have no sources of rubber supply available for no one knows how many years to come, except from grains and from petroleum. I have no doubt we shall need to use both.

Before the Gillette subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry this morning, Mr. H. F. Willkie, of Louisville, Ky., urged that all the distilleries in the United States be modernized and converted, where conversion is necessary, to the manufacture of industrial alcohol from grains. He said present distillery capacity would use 234,800,000 bushels of grain per annum, producing 657,000,000 gallons of industrial alcohol.

Any new distilling plants constructed, he said, should be located in the Grain Belt. From grains, I am informed, good quality of synthetic rubber can be made by at least two proved processes.

We have surpluses of grains. We need every pound of rubber that can be manufactured in the next few years. It seems to me it is time the W. P. B. gave the go-ahead orders for, first, conversion of all existing distilling plants to the production of grain alcohol; and second, for the construction immediately of plants for the making of synthetic rubber from grain alcohol. These plants should be located in the Grain Belt so as to save unnecessary transportation of raw materials and the finished products.

I understand also that the Gillette committee will introduce proposed legislation toward this end. I hope it will act speedily, and that the matter will be brought to the Senate for action at an early date.

I ask unanimous consent to have the statement from the National Grange printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL GRANGE,
Washington, D. C., May 26, 1942.

To the Members of Congress:

We are persuaded that the welfare and the safety of the Nation calls for considerable expansion in our program for the production of synthetic rubber. It offers no solution to our pressing transportation problems to be told that under present plans no synthetic rubber will be available for civilian use during the next 2 or 3 years.

No argument is necessary to prove that transportation is as necessary to the success of our war effort as is production. The steps that are being taken for the conservation of the existing supply of tires must meet with the full approval of all thinking people. But to conserve what we have will fall far short of filling our actual needs.

So far as agriculture is concerned, it is useless to talk about going back to the horse-and-buggy days. In the first place, the number of horses and mules on our farms has been almost cut in half since the close of World War No. 1. In the next place, even if we had the horses, their legs and feet would not stand the strain of traveling long distances over modern hard-surfaced highways.

Many branch lines of the railroads that had become unprofitable have been abandoned, and there are more than 48,000 communities in the United States, chiefly in the agricultural districts, that are without rail facilities. In the case of these communities motor transportation is indispensable.

There are approximately 5,000,000 passenger cars and more than 1,000,000 trucks on our farms. These motor vehicles are a necessary part of our farm equipment, and the national interest demands that rubber be made available to keep them in running order. Nor can we afford to allow other necessary forms of motor transportation to break down for lack of tires.

In addition to speeding up plans for the manufacture of synthetic rubber from petroleum products, we heartily favor the use of wheat, corn, and any other available farm products for the making of alcohol, which in turn can be converted into rubber. Plants for the distillation of alcohol should be erected in the Grain Belt, not only for use during the present emergency but as a permanent fixture in the economy of the Nation. Today we have huge surpluses of wheat and corn that are taxing our storage capacity to the utmost, and it is highly desirable that these surpluses be put to the most profitable use. Since these grains are not all needed for human consumption or for feed, to what better use could they be put than to turn them into rubber, which now has a value beyond all price? Never again should we be satisfied to import our rubber from the other side of the globe when it is so much safer and more economical to produce it here at home.

Alcohol for industrial consumption offers promise of a long-time market. It looks as though the chemical industries of the future would require increasing quantities of alcohol. By obtaining it from our western grain fields, a sound support can be put under the agricultural economy of several States. In this way the earning power of the people of these States will be sustained and vastly increased. In turn, their purchases will then quicken the industrial activities of other sections of the country. So far as possible vegetable oils should also be used in making rubber.

Taking advantage of the opportunity that is here presented, and by acting promptly, we shall not only add materially to the supply of rubber that is vitally necessary toward winning the war, but we shall have taken a long step toward solving the agricultural-surplus problem.

We respectfully urge all Members of Congress to give their active support to this plan. This is the time to act. The tragic words "too little and too late" should not be allowed to become applicable to our program for the production of synthetic rubber.

Sincerely yours,
FRED BRENCKMAN,
Washington Representative.

ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR MARINE AND WAR-RISK INSURANCE FUND

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, yesterday the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate reported favorably House Joint Resolution 314, appropriating $210,000,000 for the purpose of increasing the marine and war-risk insurance fund for insurance of merchant vessels. Admiral Land, the head of the Maritime Commission, testified before the committee that we have insured a great many vessels and persons, as provided in the act, both of our own merchant marine and of ships which have been taken over by the United States under various acts providing for their acquisition. Heretofore $40,000,000 was established as the fund. Admiral Land said that within the last 2 or 3 months, especially, losses have been heavy, and that it is absolutely necessary that the fund be increased by $210,000,000. The House unanimously passed the joint resolution. It came to the Senate and was unanimously reported by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. House Joint Resolution 314, making an additional appropriation for the marine and war-risk insurance fund.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, is the joint resolution based on authority of statute?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. The joint resolution was not referred to the Commerce Committee, which has jurisdiction of all legislation of this kind?

Mr. McKELLAR. It has jurisdiction, but the authorizing legislation was passed long since. This measure merely carries out what was authorized by previous legislation. The joint resolution merely appropriates money as heretofore authorized by the Congress.

Mr. McNARY. Did the Appropriations Committee vote unanimously to report the joint resolution?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 314) making an additional appropriation for the marine and war-risk insurance fund was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACTIVITIES OF GOVERNMENT PRESS AGENCIES

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I have in my hand a very short editorial from the Washington Daily News, of Washington, D. C., which must fill with a great deal of discouragement one who has any idea of making dollars count in the great struggle in which this Nation is engaged. The editorial is not long, and I should like to read it.

"Words will win the war" is the headline of the editorial in today's News, and the editorial reads:

You may wonder how the Government uses the thousands of press agents on its pay roll.

Well, they're busy turning out words to win the war.

Here's an example from Office for Emergency Management:

We are offered for publication five short articles on How To Spend the Week-End Without a Car.

Article No. 1 points out that you can work in the garden, "dig for fun, for health, for good living, for economy, and for patriotism."

Or, suggests article No. 2, why not organize a neighborhood discussion group?

Then, as explained in article 3, you can explore your own neighborhood by hiking, bicycle riding, or by streetcar.

Or you can play games, Uncle Sam has discovered in article 4.

Article No. 5 will come as a surprise to husbands—who have never suspected that they might pass the time by acting as handy man, or if they're not mechanically minded they

might "take up an absorbing hobby * * * like stamps, coins, and autographs."

As for ourselves, we've thought of a hobby for newspapermen: to start saving the bales of press-agent tripe and trivia which pour in from the Government and, by ultimately turning over to the junk dealer enough paper to make cartons for all the ammunition used when a second front is opened, possibly win the war

That would not be so bad, perhaps, if it came from one of the old established orthodox bureaus or divisions of the Government not connected with the war; but here is an agency, an emergency agency, set up with millions of dollars to aid in the war effort that actually has high-priced newspapermen, publicists, press agents, or whatever one may want to call them, turning out this drivel, using up good paper and ink and machines which often cost two or three thousand dollars apiece, and employing a large number of people. I say it is the most discouraging thing in the world, with the Government going overboard into the "red," and having been in the "red" for the past 10 years, in the midst of a great war, which we are told threatens civilization, to find that sort of drivel being turned out and sent to newspaper offices in the United States of America by the Office for Emergency Management. If that is all they have to do with the millions of dollars which we have appropriated to permit them to function, in my humble judgment, the very first act of Congress ought to be to wind up that emergency office, because it is hurting the war more than it is serving the purpose for which it was constituted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator does not think that this particular agency is any worse than a good many others, does he? I read an article in a newspaper a few days ago about some other pamphlets which have been put out by the Women's Division of the War Department—I have forgotten the exact title of the office—which contained perfect drivel, such drivel that a 2-year-old child ought to have more sense than to be spending Government funds to put it out.

Mr. TYDINGS. The small committee of which I am chairman, and which is going over these duplications and splitting of functions, and so forth, will release for publication in the press on Friday the result of its findings, dealing with hundreds, yes, thousands of these releases. The most trivial, inconsequential stuff is being sent all over this country. To publish one week's output of these foolish releases from the various departments of the Government would require one and a half times, indeed, almost twice the number of pages contained in a 50-page issue of the New York Times.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me ask the Senator a further question, Irrespective of the common idiocy of a great many of these "releases," why should any Government agency be permitted to maintain a press agency at Government expense? What business has any Government agency maintaining a lot of high-priced ex-newspapermen or professional publicity agents simply to send out a lot of communications to build itself up?

Mr. TYDINGS. In a humorous vein, I should think we ought to make one great appropriation with which to import a lot of squirrels so that they could consume some of the nuts that are running around loose. [Laughter.]

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I should like to make a brief statement in respect to the bill itself. As will be noted by the committee report, the bill appropriates $185,752,998, which is $4,144,078 under the Budget estimate and $52,348,282 less than the sum appropriated for the Department of the Interior last year.

In this connection I should like to read a brief statement from the report of the House committee on the bill. The Interior Department is the only one that reduced its request for appropriations after Pearl Harbor. The House committee said:

In this connection the committee wishes to commend the Department for its voluntary cooperation with the Bureau of the Budget in effecting supplemental reductions in the Interior Department budget resulting in additional savings amounting to $10,000,000. This reduction was made after the declaration of war and represents a decrease which was not applied to the estimates of any other Government department. It is significant that this is the first department of the Federal Government that has voluntarily requested such a decrease

I read this to the Senate in order that Senators may understand that this measure came as a clean bill.

Among the principal increases made by the committee is one of $1,200,000 for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, which is practically all a restoration of Budget estimates. There is an increase of $12,400,000 for the Bureau of Reclamation. Of that amount, $4,000,000 is for the Central Valley project in California. The remaining amounts are for various projects, the largest one being the Colorado-Big Thompson project. The Budget estimate was submitted with the idea of expediting the production of badly needed hydroelectric power. In certain other projects the storage works and canals are all completed, and an appropriation is needed to place water on the land in order to meet the increased demand, which the Secretary of Agriculture pointed out, for foods and fibers which we have heretofore imported from abroad.

The next largest item is $6,242,000 for the Bureau of Mines, of which $4,000,000 is for production of helium, needed particularly for the blimps which are used to patrol our coasts.

There is an increase of $1,500,000 for the Fish and Wildlife Service, based upon Budget estimates.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I notice that the committee did not make any provision for taking care of a shortage of cans, which is likely to threaten the whole sea-food industry. As the Senator knows, much of the sea-food industry relies upon tin cans as a means of preservation and transportation. Why was it that the committee, in answer to Mr. BLAND'S request for a study, did not provide some money so that substitutes for tin cans might be found?

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me say to the Senator that the very able Representative from Virginia [Mr. BLAND], chairman of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, appeared before our committee. The junior Senator from Maryland also appeared. At the time their request was made the committee was in doubt as to whether such an appropriation would be authorized by law. It was not supported by a Budget estimate. I have since examined into the matter and am satisfied that an appropriation of that kind is within the scope of the basic act creating the Authority. The Senator's colleague has introduced an amendment to that effect.

Mr. TYDINGS. I know that.

Mr. HAYDEN. I hope the Senate will consider the matter after the committee amendments shall have been disposed of.

Mr. TYDINGS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. HAYDEN. In taking up the amendments, I ask unanimous consent that instead of the first amendment being considered first, the last amendment, which relates to travel pay, be first considered. It appears on page 151 of the bill.

I make this request for the following reasons: It will be remembered that in connection with the appropriation bill for the Department of Agriculture, and the bill for the State, Commerce, and Justice Departments, the Senate, by a yea-and-nay vote of two to one in the case of the Department of Agriculture bill, agreed to the restoration of all Budget estimates for travel, and then adopted a provision that the sum total of travel expenses should be reduced by 10 percent within the Department, within 30 days after the 1st of July. That principle was established by a record vote in connection with the Department of Agriculture bill. The vote was 2 to 1. The same principle was adopted in a subsequent appropriation bill. To follow that procedure today would require separate consideration of numerous amendments throughout the bill restoring the Budget estimates so that they might then be subject to the cut.

I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the amendment on page 151. If that is agreed to, I shall ask unanimous consent that the amend-

ments making the various changes in the bill be agreed to en bloc. In that way we can save the time of the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. As I understand, the House reduced traveling expenses by $526,547. Is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. That is the correct amount.

Mr. BYRD. The reduction proposed to be made by the Senate is $310,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. It is proposed that the Senate increase by $216,547 the amount for traveling expenses in the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. HAYDEN. By adopting exactly the same principle as was adopted in connection with the Agricultural Appropriation bill and the other bill.

Mr. BYRD. Does not the Senator think that such expenses in some of the departments could be reduced more than 10 percent?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not believe that the reductions made by the House, in the way they were made, are justified. As best I can decipher the method which was followed, in those instances in which the House determined that the appropriation affected national defense, travel pay was reduced 5 percent. If the appropriation was not connected with national defense, it was reduced 10, 15, 20, or even 50 percent. The reductions were utterly arbitrary, and without proper understanding. We battled that question out in the Senate; and by a vote of 2 to 1 the Senate decided that the more intelligent and better way to approach the question was not to guess at it, not arbitrarily to chop and cut, but to say to the head of the department, "You will operate under a reduced amount for traveling expenses as compared with last year. We will compel you, within 30 days after the passage of the bill, to make a further reduction, and restore to the Treasury 10 percent of the amount allowed by the Budget." That requires the head of the department to determine where the cuts can best be made. It has been developed in the hearings in a number of cases that a reduction in travel expenses in certain bureaus would be utterly impossible, and would lead to inefficiency. In other places reductions could be made. That is the principle which the Senate adopted.

Mr. BYRD. The 10-percent reduction is an arbitrary cut. Could not travel expenses in some departments be cut more than that?

Mr. HAYDEN. If the Senator wishes to know my private opinion, I think we cut too much out of the agricultural bill when we provided for the 10-percent reduction; and I think we are going too far in this bill when we reduce appropriations for travel expenses 10 percent. However, the committee is the servant of the Senate. The Senate has adopted that policy and we are carrying it out.

Mr. BYRD. Take the Bonneville Power Administration. The House cut its travel expenses $150,000. How much of that did the Senate committee restore?

Mr. HAYDEN. We restored it all, subject to the 10-percent cut. Mr. Raver appeared before our committee and insisted that the proposed reduction would be very detrimental.

Mr. BYRD. Under the 10-percent provision, what reduction would be made in the appropriation for the Bonneville Power Administration? The House cut the appropriation $157,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Secretary of the Interior will have to find $310,000 somewhere in all his Bureaus. How much he will take away from the Bonneville project will be up to him to determine.

Mr. BYRD. What is the total amount for traveling expenses of the Bonneville project?

Mr. HAYDEN. It is $477,000.

Mr. BYRD. Why should the Bonneville power project spend $477,000 for traveling expenses? I do not understand why that is necessary at all.

Mr. HAYDEN. It is distributing power over the entire Northwest. It is entering into a wide distribution of power. In order to travel from one place to another, traveling expenses are necessary. I am not prepared to say, and I do not think any other Senator is prepared to say, exactly what ought to be done in any particular bureau; but if we put this overall charge on the head of the department, it is up to him to make the reductions in the proper places. What the Senator from Virginia should be interested in is saving so many dollars for the Treasury. As to where the particular dollars come from, I should rather trust the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior than that of the Senator from Virginia or my own. I think the Senate did exactly right when it adopted that principle by a vote of 2 to 1.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia is simply attempting to understand how this plan would operate as compared with the reductions made by the House. Take the Bituminous Coal Commission. How much do its traveling expenses amount to?

Mr. HAYDEN. In that case I know that the House cut was out of line, for two reasons: In the first place, a cent a ton is charged on every ton of coal mined, for the purpose of serving the industry. The industry pays it. It does not come from the taxpayers. A considerable sum of money has been accumulated over and above the amounts needed. The traveling expenses under the Budget estimate, which we have restored, amount to $165,826.

Mr. BYRD. The House reduced that amount by $65,826.

Mr. HAYDEN. Without rhyme or reason, in my judgment. The total amount was $165,826. The House reduced it to $100,000, and the Senate committee restored the $65,826.

What does the Bituminous Coal Commission have to do? It has to pass upon an infinite number of cases involving coal of varying character, produced under varying conditions, and selling for various prices. If it were possible to sit in an office in Washington and administer the law for one of the great industries of the country, I should be happy to see it done.

Mr. BYRD. Nobody contends that it is possible to sit in an office in Washington and do all that; but does not the Senator agree that the traveling expenses have been entirely too large, and out of proportion to the results obtained?

Mr. HAYDEN. I think the reductions made by the Budget were substantial. Take the case of the Bituminous Coal Commission. Last year it had $232,000 for traveling expenses. The Budget reduced the amount to $165,826. We propose to take off $16,500 more. In my judgment, that is a very substantial reduction. If we are not careful we may cripple the agency so that it cannot perform the functions for which the producers of coal have paid. They have paid 1 cent a ton in order that they may obtain certain services. To deny those services to them, and hold in the Treasury the money which they have paid for that purpose, would not be fair or just. Either we ought not to collect the tax, or we ought to spend it for the purpose for which it was collected.

Mr. BYRD. There is hardly a department in Washington which could not stand a reduction of 10 percent in administrative expenses and continue efficiently to do the same work it is now doing.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senate has decided that question.

Mr. BYRD. We are now considering only traveling expenses. The House has consistently reduced appropriations for overhead expenses, and the Senate has restored a large proportion of the House reductions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an itemized statement showing the reductions made by the House in appropriations for traveling expenses, and also the reductions made by the Senate. In the case of the present bill, $216,547 is added to the bill by the Senate committee, as compared with the reduced amounts in the House provision for traveling expenses. The net increase for traveling expenses, after the proposed reduction of 10 percent, is $216,547.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Increase in travel expenses over House bill for the Interior Department, Senate appropriation bill, fiscal year 1943

1. Grazing Service	$11,955
2. Petroleum Conservation Division	250
3. Bituminous Coal Division	65,826
4. Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior	2,500
5. Commission of Fine Arts	2,600
6. United States High Commissioner to the Philippines	2,000
GENERAL LAND OFFICE	
7. General expenses	850
8. Surveying the public lands	10,000
9. Salaries and expenses, branch of field examination	6,600
10. Salaries and expenses of land offices	1,540
11. Prevention and suppression of fires on public domain in Alaska	100
12. Revested Oregon & California Railroad and reconveyed Coos Bay Wagon Road lands, Oregon	1,000

13. Range improvements	$50
14. Bonneville Power Administration	157,000
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS	
15. General expenses	2,480
16. Purchase and transportation of supplies for the Indian Service	500
17. Maintaining law and order on Indian reservations	3,000
18. Expenses of organizing Indian chartered corporations	5,000
19. Administration of Indian forests	2,000
20. Expenses incidental to sale of timber	600
21. Supervising mining operations	5,000
22. Developing agriculture and stock raising among Indians	4,800
23. Revolving fund for loans to Indians and Indian corporations	7,000
24. National Indian Institute	2,750
25. Development of Indian arts and crafts	2,600
26. Development of water supply	500
27. Irrigation and drainage	5,000
28. Operation and maintenance, San Carlos project	300
29. Improvement, operation, and maintenance, irrigation system, Colorado River Reservation, Ariz	10
30. Improvements, maintenance, and operation, Fort Hall irrigation systems, Idaho	50
31. Maintenance, operation, repairs, etc., irrigation systems, Fort Belknap Reservation, Mont	100
32. Maintenance and operation, Fort Peck project, Montana	10
33. Improvement, maintenance, and operation, irrigation systems, Blackfeet Indian Reservation, Mont	50
34. Operation and maintenance, irrigation and power systems, Flathead Reservation, Mont	1,500
35. Improvement, maintenance, and operation, irrigation systems, Crow Reservation, Mont	20
36. Improvement, maintenance, and operation, Klamath Reservation projects, Oregon	50
37. Operation and maintenance, Uintah Reservation, Utah	100
38. Operation and maintenance, Wakato irrigation and drainage system, Yakima Reservation, Wash	20
39. Operation and maintenance, irrigation systems, Wind River Reservation, Wyo	50
40. Protection of project works	100
41. Surveys, investigations, and administrative expenses	2,000
42. Education	8,000
SUPPORT AND EDUCATION OF INDIAN PUPILS AT NONRESERVATION BOARDING SCHOOLS	
43. Phoenix, Ariz	340
44. Sherman Institute, Riverside, Calif	430
45. Haskell Institute, Lawrence, Kans	380
46. Carson City, Nev	275
47. Albuquerque, N. Mex	125
48. Chilocco, Okla	175
49. Chemawa, Oreg	225
50. Indian schools, Five Civilized Tribes	700
51. Education of natives in Alaska	500
52. Conservation and health	17,777
53. Medical relief in Alaska	2,500
54. Administration of Indian property	20,000
55. General support and rehabilitation of needy Indians	1,500
56. Reindeer service in Alaska	550
57. Roads and bridges	2,000
58. Construction and repair, administrative expenses	1,642
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION	
59. Salaries and expenses	$150
60. Minidoka project, Idaho	75
61. Buffalo Rapids project, Montana	15
Yuma project, Arizona	45
Boise project, Idaho	35
62. Rio Grande project, New Mexico-Texas	90
63. Owyhee project, Oregon	5
64. Klamath project, Oregon-California	75
65. Yakima project, Washington	150
66. Riverton project, Wyoming	15
67. Shoshone project, Wyoming	30
68. Secondary and economic investigations	150
69. Operation and maintenance administration	1,145
CONSTRUCTION, RECLAMATION FUND	
70. Owyhee project, Oregon	15
71. Kendrick project, Wyoming	150
72. Riverton project, Wyoming	60
73. General investigations	2,700
74. Administrative expenses	1,500
Colorado River front work and levee system	105
75. Colorado River development fund	1,645
76. Colorado River Dam fund	250
GENERAL FUND CONSTRUCTION	
77. Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada	525
78. Parker Dam project, Arizona-California	600
79. Travel expenses	5,250
80. Colorado-Big Thompson project	900
81. Boise project, Idaho, Anderson ranch	30
82. Tucumcari project, New Mexico	75
83. Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma	25
84. Provo River project, Utah	240
85. Grand Coulee Dam project, Washington	2,325
86. Yakima project, Washington, Roza division	60
87. General investigations	4,500
88. Administrative expenses	2,325
89. Fort Peck project, Montana	525
GEOLOGICAL SURVEY	
90. Topographic surveys	10,970
91. Geologic surveys	2,385
92. Strategic and critical mineral (national defense)	2,000
93. Mineral resources of Alaska	600
94. Gaging streams	8,335
95. Classification of lands	1,180
96. Mineral leasing	1,180
BUREAU OF MINES	
97. Operating mine-rescue cars	3,530
Coal-mining inspections and investigations	24,049
98. Testing fuel	450
99. Mineral mining	600
100. Oil and gas investigations	1,020
101. Mining experiment stations	550
102. Economics of mineral industries	995
103. Investigations of domestic sources of mineral supply	1,500
104. Investigation of raw-material resources for western steel production	675
105. Manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research	1,430
106. Production of alumina from low-grade bauxite, aluminum clays and alunite	75
107. Investigation of bauxite and alunite ores and aluminum clay deposits	1,500
Magnesium pilot plants and research (national defense)	175
108. Investigation of deposits of critical and essential minerals in the United States and its possessions	2,500
NATIONAL PARK SERVICE	
109. Travel expenses	$12,160
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE	
110. General administrative expenses	35
111. Propagation of food fishes	4,000
Operation and maintenance of fish screens	150
112. Inquiry respecting food fishes	5,640
113. Fishery industries	2,200
114. Fishery market news service	530
115. Alaska fisheries	2,900
116. Enforcement of Black Bass and Whaling Treaty Acts	830
117. Food habits of birds and animals	2,700
118. Fur-resources investigation	475
119. Biological investigations	1,835
120. Control of predatory animals and injurious rodents	16,450
121. Protection of migratory birds	7,550
122. Enforcement of Alaska game law	2,370
123. Maintenance of mammal and bird reservations	2,415
124. Migratory bird conservation refuges	450
125. Migratory bird conservation fund	2,820
GOVERNMENT IN THE TERRITORIES	
126. Incidental and contingent expenses (Alaska)	100
ALASKA	
127. Legislative expenses	500
128. Care and custody of insane	150
129. Construction and maintenance of roads, bridges, and trails	2,928
130. Wagon roads, bridges, and trails	100
131. Construction of Palmer-Richardson Road	100
HAWAII	
132. Contingent expenses	50
133. Legislative expenses	200
VIRGIN ISLANDS	
134. Salaries and expenses	270
135. Salaries and expenses, agricultural experiment station and vocational school	100
136. Defraying deficits in treasury of municipal government, St. Croix	200
Equatorial and South Sea Islands	25
Total	526,547
Reduction by Senate in blanket amendment	310,000
Net increase by Senate over House bill for traveling expenses	216,547

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment on page 151 be first considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 151 of the bill it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 9. Of the total amount available under this act for traveling expenses, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, on or before August 1, 1942, to cover into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts the sum of $310,200, and in addition, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to reserve from expenditure the total sum of $6,900 under amounts available for traveling expenses in appropriations made in this act from the reclamation fund-special fund, Colorado River Dam fund, and Colorado River Development fund: *Provided*, That the sum covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts and the sum reserved from expenditure shall be in addition to reductions in

amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in the appropriations made by this act below the Budget estimates.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona why he desires to consider that amendment now. Why not let it come in its regular order?

Mr. HAYDEN. We have grouped a large number of amendments proposing changes in travel pay allowances contained in the bill. If the Senator desires to have the clerk state to the Senate each individual proposed change, we shall be voting on them all afternoon.

Mr. BYRD. Does not the clerk have to report each individual amendment?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not if the Senate will agree to the suggestion I shall make in a moment, namely, that the proposed amendments affecting travel pay be agreed to en bloc. If my suggestion be agreed to, all the clerk will have to do will be to read the list of the proposed amendments.

Mr. BYRD. All the clerk will have to do will be to read the changes made by the Senate committee in the bill as it passed the House. Does the Senator from Arizona propose not to have the clerk do that with respect to the pending bill?

Mr. HAYDEN. I propose to furnish the clerk a list of all the proposed changes by which the item for travel pay for any agency of the Government would be restored to the Budget figure, and to ask that those amendments be agreed to en bloc. If that be done, the 10-percent cut would be retained and the items for travel pay would be restored to the amounts contained in the Budget estimates.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I know the utter futility of voting contrary to the recommendations of the committee affecting the bill which the senior Senator from Arizona so ably conducts. I have never yet known him to be defeated with reference to any amendment he has proposed. However, I cannot agree that the amendments be agreed to en bloc. I think they should be read individually, and if any Senator has the temerity to offer an amendment, he should be permitted to do so. I have to object to the suggested procedure of agreeing to the amendments en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made by the Senator from Virginia to the request of the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. BYRD. I further have to object to consideration at this time of the amendment appearing on page 151.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask that the clerk be instructed to read the first amendment in the bill, and thereafter to proceed in the regular order. That will waste a great deal of time, but such a procedure is agreeable to me if it is the desire of the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The first amendment of the committee will be stated.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Office of the Secretary—Salaries", on page 2, line 4, after the figures "$5,000", to strike out "$855,650" and insert "$1,002,170."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Division of Territories and Island Possessions", on page 2, line 15, to increase the appropriation for personal services in the District of Columbia from $120,785 to $126,145.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Grazing Service", on page 3, line 8, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$720,000" and insert "$731,755"; and in line 12, after the words "in all", to strike out "$775,000" and insert "$786,755."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona a question. I notice that the bill contains provision for payment of $5 a day for travel expenses and subsistence of members of advisory committees of local stockmen.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. Can the Senator state how many persons constitute the membership of such committees?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not know the exact number; but in each grazing district in the United States a number of local stockmen confer with the Forest Service about the management of the district. In creating the Grazing Service provision was made for committees of this kind and for the payment of a salary of $5 per day while such persons were actually employed, and for necessary traveling expenses. They meet two or three or four times a year to discuss the problems in the district about the grazing of cattle and sheep.

Mr. BYRD. What will be the total cost for those committees?

Mr. HAYDEN. $55,000, according to the bill.

Mr. BYRD. This item has nothing to do with, and it is in addition to, the 100,000 members of the A. A. A. committees, as I understand; is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Oh, yes; this is entirely separate. In certain areas sheep are grazed. Certain of the wool growers get together and elect their local committeemen to confer with the Grazing Service. In other areas cattle are grazed, and the cattlemen who are permittees elect someone to represent them on the committee.

The committees serve for the purpose of efficient administration and harmonious relationships with the Department.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 3, in lines 8 and 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 19, after the numerals "1934", to strike out "$74,800" and insert "$75,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Petroleum Conservation Division", on page 4, line 14, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$25,030" and insert "$25,280."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Bituminous Coal Division", on page 5, line 12, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$2,442,254" and insert "$2,620,500."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to ask why $1,800 is needed "for purchase and exchange of newspapers, lawbooks, reference books, and periodicals" for the Bituminous Coal Division.

Mr. HAYDEN. The expenditures for such purposes are not to exceed that amount.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall not make any point about it, because I have not studied it; but I know that in a great many of the other departments the comparatively small items for the purchase of periodicals and books have been abused. Such items have simply grown and grown and grown. An item of this sort starts, perhaps, with an appropriation of $100, which later is increased to $300, and then to larger sums. Later on, my committee may have something to say about the matter.

This particular item certainly would seem to authorize the purchase of a great many periodicals—$1,800 worth—for an agency which during the war will have, in my judgment, very little to do, because all the coal which can be mined will be in demand at a very good price.

Mr. HAYDEN. The matter of relationship between prices in one section of the country and in another and in one field and another is very important.

Mr. TYDINGS. It is all to be regulated by Mr. Henderson, and the matter of prices goes out the window.

Mr. BARKLEY. No; let me say that, in connection with the two laws passed by Congress, a very serious question arises as to which agency has jurisdiction over coal—the Bituminous Coal Commission or the Bituminous Coal Division of the Department of the Interior.

I do not know whether $1,800 is needed for the purchase and exchange of newspapers, lawbooks, reference books, and periodicals. I am not certain what periodicals or books they need. However, not only here, but in their regional offices scattered over the country, they do have to keep in touch with trade developments and price developments in the field, and so forth.

Mr. TYDINGS. There is no question in my mind as to who has jurisdiction over the price of coal during this emergency, because the last law passed is the law which will take precedence, particularly when it provides "every article." Certainly that will take care of anything.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me state to the Senator that the question will have to be decided by the Senate, because this appropriation is for 10 months, inasmuch as the Bituminous Coal Act expires in that time; and Congress will have to reenact the law.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall not make any point about it; but I think we have to call these matters of appropriations for the purchase of periodicals and lawbooks to the attention of the country; because while the agencies are entitled to use them in order to function properly, in my judgment the practice of inserting such provisions in appropria-

tion bills is simply a carry-over from 1928 and 1929, when we had plenty of money and were reducing taxes.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Maryland will render a real service to the Senate and to the country if he will make an over-all study of the entire subject and render a report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 5, in line 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Soil and moisture conservation operations", on page 6, line 4, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$120,000", and in line 10, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$1,300,000" and insert "$1,500,000."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona how many new automobiles may be purchased under the terms of the pending bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. However many they may be, not one can be purchased unless its purchase is approved by the Secretary of War. Under a provision placed in the Civil Functions Act, no department of government can purchase so much as one automobile unless certification is made that such automobile is immediately needed in the war effort. How many automobiles will be purchased I cannot say.

Under the estimates, a total of 784 automobiles might be purchased for the Department of the Interior.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator mean that 784 new automobiles are to be purchased?

Mr. HAYDEN. I shall read the limitation which now exists:

(3) If new automobiles are not available for purchase in 1943 or if eligibility for purchase cannot be established under rationing regulations, the activities concerned will need the funds estimated for automobiles to meet increased costs resulting from the use of other transportation facilities. These additional expenses will include the following:

1. Purchase of used equipment if available.

2. Purchase of horses on projects where this method of transportation could be used.

3. Increased costs of repairs to old equipment continued in service or to other used equipment purchased and placed in service.

4. Increased costs of transportation by common carrier.

5. Increased costs of per diem resulting from employees being in a travel status longer when using common carrier or other modes of transportation in areas where automobile transportation is more practical.

6. Increased personnel costs in providing additional employees needed to perform an equal amount of work to that which would be performed by the use of automobile transportation.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator has not yet answered the question. How many new automobiles are proposed to be purchased?

Mr. HAYDEN. The total number which may be purchased is 784, provided that clearance is obtained from the War Department for the purchase of that number—or any number less than that, down to one.

Mr. BYRD. I should not think that would be difficult, if it is certified they are needed.

How many automobiles does the Interior Department have?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not know the total number, but it is quite large, if we include in the figure the automobiles for the National Park Service, the Indian Service, and the Grazing Service—the various field services.

Mr. BYRD. While the clerk is looking up that information, let me ask how many chauffeurs are provided for in the pending bill.

Mr. HAYDEN. I see no evidence that any chauffeurs are provided for in the pending bill.

Mr. BYRD. If they are used by the Interior Department, they must be paid for out of the Interior Department appropriation.

Mr. HAYDEN. In the Department itself, as I understand, there are certain automobiles in what is called a pool, from which, when an official calls for a car, the driver brings it to him, and when he returns to his office the same driver can take another official to another place. Except, perhaps, in the case of the personal car of the Secretary, I know of no chauffeur who is carried on the pay roll.

Mr. BYRD. I inserted the number of cars in the RECORD some time ago. I will send for the list and have it directly.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 7, after line 13, to insert:

Fire protection of forests, forest industries, and strategic facilities (national defense): For all necessary expenses to enable the Department of the Interior independently or in cooperation with other appropriate agencies to initiate and intensify and augment forest-fire prevention and suppression measures on critical forest, brush, and grass areas under the administration of the Department of the Interior, including not to exceed $8,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia; maintenance, operation, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; hire, with or without personal services, of work animals and animal-drawn and motor-propelled vehicles and equipment; and purchase in the District of Columbia or elsewhere of other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior," $96,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior", on page 9, line 14, after the words "provided for", to strike out "$158,500" and insert "$161,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Commission of Fine Arts", on page 11, line 10, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$10,175" and insert "$12,775."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 11, at the end of line 15, to increase the total appropriation for the Commission of Fine Arts from $10,475 to $13,075.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bonneville Power Administration", on page 12, line 1, after the word "expended", to strike out "$21,707,000" and insert "$21,864,000", and in line 4, after the word "and", to strike out "$1,350,000" and insert "$1,700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "United States High Commissioner to the Philippine Islands", on page 12, line 23, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$163,500" and insert "$165,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "General Land Office—General Expenses", on page 14, line 2, after the word "proceedings", to strike out "$17,650" and insert "$18,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 14, line 12, before the word "including", to strike out "$600,000" and insert "$610,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 11, after the word "field", to strike out "$357,535" and insert "$364,135."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, line 21, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$166,700" and insert "$168,240."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 16, line 4, after the word "otherwise", to strike out "$27,650" and insert "$27,750."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 4, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$248,750" and insert "$249,750."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 17, before the word "including", to strike out "$37,550" and insert "$37,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Indian Affairs—salaries", on page 18, line 15, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$604,280" and insert "$610,040."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General expenses", on page 19, line 2, after the word "available", to strike out "$46,820" and insert "$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 7, after the word "supplies", to strike out "$799,000" and insert "$799,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 19, line 16, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$264,660" and insert "$267,660."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 20, line 7, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$45,000" and insert "$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Indian lands", on page 22, line 24, after "(48 Stat. 985)", to strike out "$165,000" and insert "$325,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Industrial assistance and advancement", on page 25, line 18, after the words "Indian lands", to strike out "$381,910" and insert "$383,910."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 1, before the word "reimbursable", to strike out "$125,670" and insert "$126,270."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 3, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$11,000", and in line 4, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$90,000" and insert "$100,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 9, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$693,180" and insert "$708,980."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 20, after the word "crops", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$125,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, line 15, after "(49 Stat. 1967)", to strike out "$112,200" and insert "$150,000"; in line 16, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$27,800"; and in line 18, after the word "and", to strike out "$88,000" and insert "$113,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 22, to insert:

For all necessary expenses of the National Indian Institute for the United States of America in the performance of its functions as prescribed by Executive order of November 1, 1941 (No. 8930), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase of books of reference; and printing and binding, $22,500, of which not to exceed $1,000 shall be available for the payment of actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving while away from their homes without other compensation from the United States in an advisory capacity to the institute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 31, line 23, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$40,350" and insert "$30,000"; in line 24, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$16,000" and insert "$13,500"; and on page 32, line 2, after the word "exceeding", to strike out "$7,500" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Development of water supply", on page 32, line 10, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$101,950" and insert "$102,450."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Irrigation and drainage", on page 32, line 20, after the word "below", to strike out "$193,275" and insert "$218,475."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 34, line 15, after the name "Arizona", to strike out "$22,350" and insert "$22,650", and in line 24, after the words "in all", to strike out "$347,350" and insert "$347,650."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 12, after the word "with", to strike out "$19,990" and insert "$20,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 35, line 22, after the name "Idaho", to strike out "$26,650" and insert "$26,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 5, after the name "Montana", to strike out "$14,000" and insert "$14,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 13, after the word "with", to strike out "$4,965" and insert "$4,975."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, line 20, after the name "Montana", to strike out "$11,850" and insert "$11,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 2, after the name "Montana", to strike out "$128,100" and insert "$129,600"; in line 4, before the word "and", to strike out "$128,100" and insert "$129,600"; and in line 7, after the words "in all", to strike out "$246,300" and insert "$247,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 37, line 14, after the word "with", to strike out "$44,545" and insert "$44,565."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 12, after the name "Oregon", to strike out "$2,480" and insert "$2,530."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 38, line 22, after the word "with", to strike out "$38,300" and insert "$38,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 4, after the word "with", to strike out "$159,000" and insert "$166,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 1, after the word "with", to strike out "$28,850" and insert "$28,900."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 10, after the word "ammunition", to strike out "$31,900" and insert "$90,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 8, after the name "Fort Peck", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 11, to insert:

Oregon: Warm Springs, $15,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, after line 12, to insert:

Wyoming: Wind River, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 18, after the word "binding", to strike out "$122,000" and insert "$136,750."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 19, after the words "In all", to strike out "$433,250" and insert "$553,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Education", on page 42, line 18, after the name "Browning, Montana", to strike out "$5,731,005" and insert "$5,874,755."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 18, after the word "than", to strike out "$334,375" and insert "$335,775."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 14, after the word "paper", to strike out "$165,000" and insert "$165,340", and in line 16, after the words "in all", to strike out "$190,000" and insert "$190,340."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 19, after the word "paper", to strike out "$223,900" and insert "$224,380", and in line 21, after the words "in all", to strike out "$247,600" and insert "$248,080."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 25, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$216,000" and insert "$216,380", and on page 46, line 3, after the words "in all", to strike out "$241,200" and insert "$241,580."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 8, after the word "pupils", to strike out "$170,800" and insert "$171,075", and in line 10, after the words "in all", to strike out "$190,800" and insert "$191,075."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 12, after the word "pupils", to strike out "$172,300" and insert "$172,425", and in line 14, after the words "in all", to strike out "$197,500" and insert "$197,625."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 46, line 24, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$224,800" and insert "$224,975", and on page 47, line 2, after the words "in all", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$250,175."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 2, after the word "paper", to strike out "$154,385" and insert "$154,610", and in line 4, after the words "in all", to strike out "$174,585" and insert "$174,810."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 48, line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,582,240" and insert "$2,584,240."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 1, after the name "Oklahoma", to strike out "$391,150" and insert "$391,850."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 49, line 20, after the word "heads", to strike out "$1,129,990" and insert "$1,130,490."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Conservation of health", on page 50, line 18, after the word "diseases", to strike out "$5,479,835" and insert "$5,569,713", and in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$4,076,769" and insert "$4,090,244."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 3, after the name "Colorado River Hospital", to strike out "$34,052" and insert "$24,052."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 51, line 7, after the figures "$27,597" and the semicolon, to insert "Fort Yuma Hospital, $23,475;".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 1, after the word "heads", to strike out "$550,680" and insert "$553,180."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General support and administration", on page 54, line 6, after the word "provisions", to strike out "$2,605,870" and insert "$2,646,870."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 13, after the name "United States", to strike out "$750,000" and insert "$1,100,000"; in line 16, before the word "shall", to strike out "$30,000" and insert "$59,000", and in line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$35,000" and insert "$44,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 25, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$91,160" and insert "$91,710", and on page 55, line 2, after the numerals "1944", to strike out the colon and *"Provided,* That not less than $40,000 of said amount be used for exterminating wolves and coyotes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 9, after the name "Klamath", to strike out "$111,875" and insert "$118,975, of which not to exceed $4,500 shall be available for fees and expenses of an attorney or firm of attorneys selected by the tribe and employed under a contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 56, line 14, after the name "Ouray", to strike out "$7,000" and insert "$11,000, of which amount not to exceed $4,000 shall be available for the payment of an agent employed under a contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 1, after the name "Keshena", to strike out "$78,525" and insert "$83,725", and in line 7, after the word "friends", to insert a comma and "and $5,200 for the compensation and expenses of an attorney or firm of attorneys employed by the tribe under a contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$365,130" and insert "$381,430."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 57, line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$35,000" and insert "$49,375", and on page 58, line 2, after the word "public", to insert "private,".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 13, after the name "Indian Affairs", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$35,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, after line 23, to insert:

Compensation and expenses of attorneys, Makah Reservation, Wash. (tribal funds): Not to exceed $1,700 of the funds on deposit to the credit of the Makah Indians, Washington, is hereby made available for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 for payment of the compensation and expenses of an attorney employed by the Makah Tribe under a contract executed August 6, 1941, and approved by the Secretary of the Interior in accordance with law.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 6, to insert:

Expenses of attorneys, Northern Cheyenne Tribe, Tongue River Reservation, Mont. (tribal funds): For expenses of an attorney or attorneys employed by the Northern Cheyenne Tribe of Indians of the Tongue River Reservation under a contract approved by the Assistant Secretary of the Interior on March 15, 1941, $600, payable from funds on deposit in the Treasury to the credit of said tribe of Indians.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 13, to insert:

Compensation and expenses of attorneys, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Montana (tribal funds): For compensation and expenses of an attorney or attorneys employed by the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Reservation, Mont., under a contract approved by the Secretary of the Interior on May 9, 1941, $5,600, payable from funds on deposit to the credit of such tribe.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Roads and bridges", on page 62, line 14, before the words "to be", to strike out "$1,148,000" and insert "$1,255,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, line 8, after the figures "$3,500" and the semicolon, to insert "general repairs and improvements, $25,000;".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 64, line 13, after the word "herein", to strike out "$88,110" and insert "$89,752", and in the same line, after the words "in all", to strike out "$366,610" and insert "$393,252."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Reclamation," on page 67, line 17, before the word "including", to strike out "$28,850" and insert "$41,000", and in line 18, after the words "in all", to strike out "$135,850" and insert "$148,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 14, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$66,205" and insert "$66,250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 70, line 25, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$100,965" and insert "$101,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 1, after the word "For", to strike out "operation and" and insert "operation,"; in line 2, after the word "maintenance", to insert "and betterments,"; and in the same line, after the word "works", to strike out "$13,925" and insert "$114,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 10, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$24,985" and insert "$25,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 71, line 22, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$29,910" and insert "$30,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 2, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$174,995" and insert "$175,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, after line 2, to insert:

Vale project, Oregon: For operation and maintenance, $17,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 6, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$112,925" and insert "$113,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 12, after the word "maintenance", to strike out "$247,850" and insert "248,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 72, line 21, after the word "maintestrike out "$112,925" and insert "$56,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 1, after the word "division", to strike out "$14,970" and insert "$15,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 73, line 13, after the word "data", to strike out "$14,850" and insert "$15,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 74, line 16, after the word "projects", to strike out "$34,855" and insert "$54,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, after line 21, to insert:

Sun River project, Montana, $100,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, after line 22, to insert:

Deschutes project, Oregon, $200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 24, after "Owyhee project, Oregon", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$25,015."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 75, line 25, after "Hyrum project, Utah", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$6,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 1, after "Kendrick project, Wyoming", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$20,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 2, after "Riverton project, Wyoming", to strike out "$65,000" and insert "$825,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, during the consideration of the Interior Department appropriation bill this afternoon, on page 76, line 2, an appropriation of $825,000 was approved for the Riverton project in Wyoming. I should like to state for the RECORD at this point the receipts in the reclamation fund by reason of oil and gas development in the State of Wyoming. I have just received a statement from the Interior Department.

To date the Salt Creek field has produced, in royalties from oil, gas, and gasoline, the sum of $56,743,510.94. On the same commodities the Oregon Basin oil field has produced royalties of $853,584.20. The figure for the Elk Basin field is $36,167.53.

The Bureau of Reclamation advises me that the total cost of the Riverton project to date is $6,300,000, and that it is estimated that the project can be completed by the expenditure of $3,700,000. Eighteen million three hundred and fifty thousand dollars has already been expended on the Kendrick project in Wyoming, and $4,170,000 on the Heart Mountain division of the Shoshone project.

The point of these figures, Mr. President, is that the State of Wyoming has contributed in royalties to the reclamation fund an amount far in excess of the sum which has been expended for reclamation within that State. I desire this brief statement to appear in the RECORD at the point where the Senate adopted the amendment recommended by the committee.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The next amendment of the committee on appropriations will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 14, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$250,000" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$90,000"; and in line 19, after the word "field", to strike out "$100,000" and insert "$200,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 21, after the word "fund", to strike out "$451,000" and insert "$1,876,015."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 76, line 23, after the word "fund", to strike out "$1,484,270" and insert "$3,058,665."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 7, after "708)", to strike out "$47,895" and insert "$48,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 14, before the word "from", to strike out "$150,000" and insert "$450,000", and in line 17, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 77, line 24, after the words "civilian guards", to insert "and other necessary expenses", and on page 78, line 5, after the word "protection", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Colorado River Dam fund", on page 78, line 24, after "(43 U. S. C., ch. 12A)", to strike out "$4,999,750" and insert "$5,000,000", and on page 79, line 16, after the words "amounts of", to strike out "$4,999,750" and insert "$5,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 80, line 10, after the word "fund", to strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$1,250,000"; and in line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "General fund, construction", on page 81, at the end of line 6, to increase the appropriation for the Davis Dam project, Arizona-Nevada, from $3,999,475 to $4,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, at the end of line 8, to increase the appropriation for the Gila project, Arizona, from $250,000 to $1,250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, at the end of line 9, to increase the appropriation for the Parker Dam power project, Arizona-California, from $1,939,400 to $1,940,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, at the end of line 13, to increase the appropriation for the Central Valley project, California, from $34,840,750 to $39,019,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment involving the Central Valley project, in line 13, be passed over temporarily, until the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] can be present, as he wishes to address himself to the amendment.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over temporarily, and the clerk will state the next amendment of the committee.

The next amendment was, on page 81, at the end of line 15, to increase the appropriation for the Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, from $4,829,100 to $7,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, at the end of line 17, to increase the appropriation for the Boise project, Idaho, Anderson Ranch, from $2,249,970 to $2,250,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, at the end of line 19, to increase the appropriation for the Tucumcari project, New Mexico, from $299,925 to $800,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, at the end of line 20, to increase the appropriation for the Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma, from $99,975 to $400,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, at the end of line 21, to increase the appropriation for the Provo River project, Utah, from $1,286,760 to $2,200,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 81, line 24, after the word "works", to insert "including the operation and maintenance of camp and construction facilities, heretofore or hereafter turned over by construction contractors, and similar facilities and the furnishing of services related thereto,"; on page 82, line 3, before the words "of which", to strike out "$19,172,675" and insert "$19,175,000"; in line 4, after the words "of which", to insert "(1)"; in line 6, after "(50 Stat. 208);", to insert "(2) not to exceed $2,000,000 may be used for construction of the pumping plant and the equalizing reservoir and dams in Grand Coulee, in accordance with the provisions of said act of May 27, 1937;", and in line 9, after the word "and", to insert "(3)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 82, at the end of line 21, to increase the appropriation for the Yakima project, Washington, Roza division, from $399,940 to $1,000,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 9, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$500,000" and insert "$750,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 13, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$250,000", and in line 15, after the word "field", to strike out "$450,000" and insert "$600,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. It will be necessary to pass over the amendment on line 16, page 83, because it covers the total appropriation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment will be passed over.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to ask the Senator from Arizona in regard to the item of $80,000,000 for the dams. Are all these projects essential to the war effort, or is the appropriation for a continuation of dams already started?

Mr. HAYDEN. As the appropriation was handled in the past, money was appropriated for the irrigation of lands, with incidental development of hydroelectric power. Since war was threatening and since we have become involved in the war the major emphasis in the bill is for the production of hydroelectric power, and the irrigation of land is incidental to the production of power. The basis is completely reversed.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Tennessee is now present, and I suggest that we return to the amendment on page 81, line 13, covering the Central Valley project.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 81, line 13, it is proposed to strike out "$34,840,750" and to insert in lieu thereof "$39,019,000", so as to read:

Central Valley project, California, $39,019,000

Mr. HAYDEN. In explanation of the action taken by the committee, I should like to state that the increases in the total have the following break-down:

For the Friant-Tern and Madera Canals, an increase of $200,000.

For engineering work necessary in preparation for the construction of the steam plant at Antioch, or some other suitable site, $200,000.

For the transmission line, $3,723,000.

With respect to the transmission line, there was a Budget estimate of $7,000,000 submitted to the House. The House did not allow that sum, but went further and took away the $3,723,000 heretofore appropriated by Congress for a transmission line in connection with the Central Valley project. In other words, the House made a reduction under the Budget of $10,723,000.

The Committee on Appropriations of the Senate made a very careful study of the matter, and came to the conclusion that taking away the money appropriated for this purpose last year and the year before could have no other effect than an absolute abandonment of the principle heretofore adopted, and the power generated at the Shasta and Friant Dams in the mountains of California could not be transmitted to the population centers in the vicinity of San Francisco Bay. The effect would be that the power could be purchased at those dams only by one customer, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. Realizing that to be a fact, the committee decided to restore the amount heretofore appropriated for this purpose, putting us right back where we were last year, and to do that requires the amount recommended by the committee.

The committee did not allow the $7,000,000 additional, because there is doubt as to exactly what kind of construction will be undertaken. We are at war, and under war conditions we may have to use substitutes for what in peacetime would be better material, such as wooden poles for steel transmission towers, and things of that kind. Not knowing what would be required, we so provided that $3,723,000 would be available to begin the work, and when we know what is to be done, Congress can appropriate additional sums of money.

The committee believed that it was more important to establish a principle than to appropriate a sum of money, and we feel that if the recommendation we have made shall be adopted by the Senate and concurred in by the House, there will be no question hereafter about the construction of transmission lines and the firming of the power over these two great dams.

I ask to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a statement as to this subject contained in pages 1, 2, and 3 of the report.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT, CALIFORNIA

The bill as passed by the House of Representatives not only eliminates an estimate of $5,000,000 for the installation of a steam power plant at or near Antioch, Calif., and an estimate of $7,000,000 for continuing the construction of transmission lines from the Shasta and Keswick hydropower plants to Antioch but also has the effect of repealing appropriations amounting to $3,723,000 heretofore made for the construction of said transmission lines. This action by the House does not appear to be justified by the testimony presented to the committee and cannot be construed in any other way than as the adoption of a policy which contemplates that all power, both firm and fluctuating, generated at the Shasta and Friant Dams shall be sold when produced to but one customer, which is the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. A majority of your committee believes that this is unsound public policy because—

First. The acts of Congress authorizing the construction of the Central Valley project, the total cost of which is now estimated as $264,990,000, contemplates the return to the Treasury of the greater part of its costs through sales of power.

Second. To obtain maximum revenues from that source, the Bureau of Reclamation should be in position to deliver the power to the best obtainable market and to more than one customer. When transmitted to such point or points, said Bureau should be able to make such power firm by the construction of an auxiliary steam plant.

The committee recognizes that the congressional policy respecting the Central Valley project was adopted during a period of profound peace and that our country is now engaged in a desperate struggle for its existence. Everything must yield to winning the war, but any action taken to insure victory should not be of a character which will prevent a prompt return to the power plan heretofore established for the Central Valley project.

THE ANTIOCH STEAM PLANT

Being officially advised by the Chairman of the War Production Board that the Board is unable, at present, to endorse the appropriation of funds for the Antioch steam plant, although regarding it as essential to the ultimate development of the Central Valley project, we concur in Mr. Nelson's recommendation that funds be provided at once to complete all the engineering work necessary in preparation for its construction at Antioch or some other suitable site. For this purpose only, the sum of $200,000 is included in the bill.

TRANSMISSION LINES

The hearings held by the committee conclusively show that the quickest way to make a part of the power to be produced at the Shasta Dam available to war industries located in northern California with the least expenditure of critical and strategic materials is by transmitting the same over a comparatively short line, east of the Sacramento River, to Oroville, Calif., where the power can be fed into the existing lines of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. But to attain the highest ultimate price for the remaining power from Shasta Dam, it should be transmitted over a power line, west of the Sacramento River, directly to the vicinity of Antioch, where all or any part of it can be made firm by a steam plant or by interconnection with existing steam plants.

In order to accomplish these objectives your committee recommend:

1. That, as has been patriotically accomplished elsewhere in the United States by public and private interests, the Secretary of the Interior and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. immediately enter into a contract, for the duration of the war and a reasonable time thereafter, for the complete pooling of all public and private power facilities which will result in delivering the greatest amount of power to war industries in the least possible time and with the greatest economy in the use of critical and strategic materials. Any such contract should provide for the recapture, without prejudice, of any advantages which temporarily may accrue to either party.

2. In order to make certain that a fixed policy is not to be abandoned by failure to appropriate funds to carry it into effect, it is recommended that the $3,723,000 heretofore appropriated for the Central Valley project transmission system be restored to the bill. Testimony before the committee shows that the design of the transmission system will have to be modified to meet war conditions, but when priorities make available the copper and other materials required to meet the altered needs, construction can proceed. It is to be distinctly understood that when the War Production Board advises that additional critical and strategic materials are available to continue the construction of this transmission line then supplemental appropriations should be made by Congress as needed to continue the work.

To accomplish the above recommendations, the committee has included in the bill under the "Central Valley project, California," the sum of $200,000 for engineering work preparatory to the construction of the power plant and $3,723,000 for construction of the transmission lines.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I dislike very much to differ with my good friend, the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], who has made a very thorough study of the bill we are considering, and has really mastered every proposal in it; but because of actual experience I feel that I should differ with him in this matter. The project in question is not in my State, it is a matter entirely within the State of my friend, the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], whom I admire and esteem and respect, and I may take this occasion to say that he is one of the grandest men I ever knew.

The conditions surrounding this matter are so similar to those we encountered many years ago in connection with the building of the Muscle Shoals Dam that I feel the Senate should know exactly what the result will be if we adopt the course recommended.

Many years ago the Muscle Shoals development was started, and in 1921 it was stopped through a failure of appropriation. It took us years to get it started again, and before it was proceeded with, we found it in the hands of the Alabama Power Co. The Alabama Power Co., a private company, was using as its own all the properties connected with the Muscle Shoals and adjoining dams, and paying an infinitesimal rental for the power. That continued for a long time. The property was absolutely in the hands of the Alabama Power Co., and according to my notion, a similar result will follow in this case if we proceed as is recommended. We are virtually stopping work on the Central Valley project, on which we have already expended $110,000,000, and it will require nearly $150,000,000 more to complete the project.

The head of the Reclamation Service, the Secretary of the Interior, and the President of the United States have all recommended that this work proceed. They have recommended $5,000,000 for a steam plant for the purpose of making firm the enormous amount of power that is to be generated from the Mount Shasta Dam.

They have recommended $5,000,000 for a steam plant and $7,000,000 for transmission lines. Of course there have been so many power projects before the Senate in the last few years that every Senator knows that without transmission lines being owned and controlled by the Government it is very foolish for the Government to spend money building dams. We found that to be so from actual experience with the Muscle Shoals project. Some of us in the Senate fought for years to get transmission lines built there.

The President has recommended that $7,000,000 be added for transmission lines in addition to what is proposed in the bill. Of course, we are at the mercy of the power companies which own the transmission lines unless the Government builds its own lines. Why put

$250,000,000 into the building of a power plant in California unless the Government owns the transmission lines?

I see the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] has just entered the Chamber. He and I fought for years and years to obtain money for transmission lines in the Tennessee Valley. We were stopped time and again, but finally got the lines, and the project became a success when the transmission lines eventually belonged to the Government. That is what should be done in this case. One answer that is made, however, is that we cannot obtain priorities. If the Government cannot obtain priorities surely no one else can obtain priorities to build transmission lines. That goes without saying. If the Government cannot obtain priorities, private companies cannot, and we shall get no power. The Government feels that this power ought to be obtained. The time the power should be obtained is in 1944. Surely the Government has a better chance to get priorities for the building of the transmission lines and for the building of the steam plants than any company can have.

Mr. President, I wish to read a letter of May 19 which the President sent to the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]:

I know that you and your subcommittee are giving the most earnest consideration to the items which were included in the Budget for the Central Valley steam plant and transmission lines in the 1943 Interior Department appropriation.

I have been very much interested in this great project for some years, and I should be sorry to see the attainment of one of its principal objectives thwarted by denial of an appropriation for these features. It does not seem to me to be good policy or sound finance to fail to provide for transmission lines and steam facilities necessary to enable the Government to market Central Valley power without dependence upon a private power company.

I had this thought in mind when I approved a steam plant in the allocation of funds which I made in 1935 to launch this project, and Congress has twice appropriated money for construction of these transmission lines.

I hope that you and your associates will decide to recommend the necessary appropriation for the steam plant and transmission lines.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

I agree a thousand percent with the President. I think the steam plant should be built, and that the transmission lines should be built. The only way this great power plant, one of the greatest in the country, can be made effective for the Government's use and for the people's use in that area is to build the transmission lines and to make the power firm by building the steam plant. That would seem to me to be apparent to anyone, but more apparent to those of us who have been here a long time, because we had exactly that sort of fight in the building of the Muscle Shoals Dam in the Tennessee Valley.

The Associated Gas & Electric Co.—and by the way, the two officers of that company who discussed the matter are two of the most agreeable men I ever met or talked to—is very anxious to get this great project, and I believe has already made an offer to the Government to rent the lines for five and a half million dollars.

Mr. President, I remember how the Alabama Power Co. used to make the same kind of offers, and naturally it wanted to get control of the great dam now known as Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals.

My own judgment is that the President is level-headed with respect to this matter. I believe we should go forward. I think we should appropriate the $5,000,000 which the Bureau of the Budget recommended for the steam plant. I think we should appropriate the additional $7,000,000 for the transmission lines. The $3,000,000 plus which is appropriated for transmission lines by way of unexpended balances will not amount to a row of pins. I think we should appropriate the amount requested. If copper with which to build the lines cannot be obtained, that cannot be helped, and the money will not be used; but certainly we ought to continue this project along in its usual everyday course, because in 1944 we might very seriously need the power it will be able to produce. The fact that we might need power in 1944 led me to change my mind once before, not a great while ago, with respect to a power dam which was built in my own State.

I feel that I almost owe the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] an apology for dealing with matters in his State. When he is satisfied with a bill affecting his State, ordinarily that would be all that would concern me. But this is a matter of vital importance to the entire Nation, and it seems to me to be manifest that the only way we can obtain public power at a low price in peacetime, and obtain it at all in wartime, is to appropriate the necessary money for construction.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] knows, and all other Senators know, that I have attempted to bring about as much economy as possible. I think it is economy to proceed now to build the steam plant and to build the transmission lines. I cannot help so believing, in view of the experience we have had in reference to the building of dams, of transmission lines, and of steam plants.

Therefore, I shall follow the President's letter which I just read, and move to amend the section by adding $5,000,000 for a steam plant and $7,000,000 more for transmission lines.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator is submitting two substantive propositions to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; of course, I am, and if there is any objection to them, I should like to make them as one proposal.

Mr. HAYDEN. For that reason I think the Senator should permit me to read the recommendation I received from the Chairman of the War Production Board in a letter sent to me as chairman of the subcommittee on April 30, 1942. First as to the steam plant Mr. Donald Nelson said:

I should also like to call special attention to the recommendation contained in my letter of March 19—

That is to the House committee—

that funds should be provided at once to complete all the engineering work necessary in preparation for the actual construction of the Antioch steam plant. Even though we are unable to say at this time when priorities could be made available to secure the steam station equipment required to proceed with construction, and are therefore unable to endorse the appropriation of funds for the steam plant itself, we regard the plant as an essential part of the ultimate development of the Central Valley project and believe that the preparatory work for its construction should be undertaken.

The amount of money necessary to do what Mr. Nelson recommends is $200,000, and that amount has been allowed in lieu of a Budget estimate of $5,000,000, which he states would be useless.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, it seems to me that Mr. Nelson has not agreed with the President all along the line. I think the $200,000 is simply for preliminary work. It appears to me to be a very unwise thing, while we are at war and when we may need electricity very greatly, to stop the progress of a great undertaking involving an expenditure of $250,000,000 by appropriating only $200,000 simply to sort of look around or to make some kind of investigation. Mr. Nelson seems to make his recommendation in a half-hearted sort of a way. In other words, he amends the President's recommendation by asking for $200,000 instead of $5,000,000. I am not in favor of Mr. Nelson's recommendation to amend the President's recommendation. I think the substance of the President's recommendation should stand.

Mr. HAYDEN. What did the President recommend?

I hope that you and your associates will decide to recommend the necessary appropriation for the steam plant and the transmission line.

The only sum of money that is necessary, the only sum of money that can be utilized within the next fiscal year, is $200,000.

The testimony before our committee is clear that we cannot obtain generators or boilers. The war commitments of our Government are so great, and the demand for that kind of equipment is so pressing elsewhere, that it simply cannot be supplied. Therefore I say that when we give all that is necessary and all that is recommended by the War Production Board, by the man who is charged with finding the best and highest use of equipment for war purposes, we have complied with the President's wishes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I cannot agree with my friend in that statement for this reason: I find the President of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., which is one of the greatest utility organizations in the country—and he is a delightful gentleman—making an offer of $5,500,000 for a business [illegible] which

the Government has just expended $110,000,000. He agrees to use part of his transmission lines and to build others in order to obtain the contract. Under the circumstances I cannot be convinced that we cannot get the necessary material to build the transmission lines. Mr. Black is one of the most delightful gentlemen I ever met. If he is able to get the material to build transmission lines, it seems to me that the United States Government could get the same materials.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. Is the Senator's very great concern lest the public lose title to this property?

Mr. McKELLAR. No, sir.

Mr. McNARY. How could that be done?

Mr. McKELLAR. We required several years to get a similar plant out of the hands of the Alabama Power Co., which is not so powerful a company as is the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. That is why I make that statement.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have some intimate knowledge of that history, having been on the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and in nearly all the conferences. The cases are not analogous at all. There is no danger of this property getting away from the Government unless the Government, through the Congress, shall decide to dispose of it. The Congress will not do so. I think the concern of the Senator, and his comparison, do not fit the picture.

Mr. McKELLAR. We have testimony from Mr. Black, who is president of the company, that what he wanted to do was to build part of the transmission lines and use all his present facilities for transmitting power. He was willing to pay $5,500,000 for a 5-year contract. My judgment is that whenever we let the tentacles of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. spread all over this plant we shall have a hard time getting it back.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to make a somewhat extended statement. I hope the Senator from Tennessee will kindly bear with me. I attended closely the hearings which were conducted, as did the Senator from Tennessee and other Senators.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator did.

Mr. McCARRAN. I speak from a somewhat more intimate knowledge of the situation than that of many who may do me the honor to listen. I think it might be well for us to review the situation in its entirety.

The Government of the United States is constructing a project the ultimate cost of which, in my judgment, will approximate $300,000,000. The cost is now estimated at $264,000,000.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the estimate is under what the ultimate cost will be. Be that as it may, we are quite certain that it will cost $264,000,000.

The project started under the reclamation law and under the Reclamation Bureau of the Department of the Interior as a reclamation project. Please visualize conditions in the central valleys of California, in which there exists some of the most fertile soil in the world. Today in the San Joaquin Valley water is being pumped from depths of nearly 400 feet in some places. Electrical energy is being used to pump the water. It is desired to impound the waters of the Sacramento and some of the tributaries of the San Joaquin for reclamation purposes; and in connection with reclamation, naturally for power purposes, because power is essential to the form of reclamation and irrigation which is common in California.

It is proposed to repay a large part of the money which will be expended by the Federal Government. Some of the money will be written off because of flood control. Some will be written off because of what is known as salinization. By that is meant that in the waters of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers, coming together just before they enter San Francisco Bay, at the low-water period the flow is not sufficient to keep the tide from coming upstream and bringing salt water to impair the value of very valuable lands in that section. So some of the money will be written off because of salinization; some will be written off because of flood control; some will be written off because of navigation; but, after all, the burden will be largely on the farmers of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, and naturally the question of electric energy is ever uppermost.

The Tehachapi Range separates Northern California from Southern California. The part of California which is north of the Tehachapi Range is known as Northern California, and that which is south of the Tehachapi Range is known as Southern California. Remember that both these river valleys, the Sacramento and the San Joaquin, are north of the Tehachapi Range. In this great territory, 500 miles north and south, and 200 miles east and west, is a section which has been served practically exclusively by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. It was testified that it has been served to the extent of 95 percent by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

The records show that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has acquired power sites on the rivers running westward from the Sierra Nevada Range, and has developed the water power on those rivers. Furthermore, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., in order to firm its own hydroelectric power, has established a number of steam plants. So it comes into the picture, having served the people of that section during all the pioneering and development period up to the present time. It is now serving that entire area, extending 500 miles one way and 200 miles the other.

It is a matter of history that on a number of occasions movements have been initiated to have electric-power facilities in certain sections, if not in all of that area, taken over by municipalities or by the State, thus either limiting or doing away with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. The record discloses that on every occasion when the question was submitted to the people of Northern California the proposal was voted down by a very heavy vote.

Today, in the State of California, there is greater demand for electrical energy than ever before in the history of the State. The record shows that up to the present time the entire demand for service has been met by the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., and that, as far in the future as the War Production Board or anyone else seems to be willing to venture an estimate, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. will be amply able and qualified to render full service.

This is a question of economy. In my judgment, it is not comparable with any other project ever undertaken in this country.

Please understand, in the first instance, that I have no personal interest whatever in the matter. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has not a single line running into my State. It does not serve a single individual in the State of Nevada. I do not know a single individual who is connected with it, except as I have met such persons who may have appeared before the committee. However, as a neighbor, living across the mountain range and knowing the set-up, I have become somewhat familiar with the situation.

There is no comparison between the proposal which is presented to the Senate today and anything in the Tennessee Valley, for the reason that today we are confronted with conditions which did not present themselves during the days when the Tennessee Valley project was in the making. Today the whole proposition turns on the question of saving, not money but war materials. Of course, money must be saved, but in this hour we have forgotten money. The question now is one of effecting a saving and conserving essential war materials.

The record discloses that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is ready to take 100,000 kilowatts almost immediately. In other words, about 1943, when the power will be available, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. will be ready, with its now existing facilities and with the expenditure of scarcely any additional amount, to tie on and convey to the centers of activity in the bay region 100,000 kilowatts.

Furthermore, when another 150,000 kilowatts are ready for delivery, the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., with but small investment, could be ready to transmit that power over its own lines and over additional lines which it might construct. At this time it is not necessary to construct the larger line, the line which would extend from the Shasta Dam to what is known as the Antioch region, where it is proposed to put in the stand-by steam plant, and it might never be necessary to construct it.

The question is not whether the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. shall take over the power and distribute it; but, rather, whether the Government at this time has the materials required for the new line. Mr. Donald Nelson, in his letter to the chairman of the committee, and others—Mr. Page, I think, if I am not mistaken—concede that it is impossible to construct the stand-by steam plant at this time. All that Mr. Nelson wanted, and all the committee did, and the most that it did,

was to afford an opportunity for engineering investigation. The steam plant may never be necessary at all.

We now come to the question raised by the able senior Senator from Tennessee as to why the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. made an offer of $5,500,000.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield at that point, let me ask why the steam plant may never be needed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I was about to discuss that point. It may never be needed for the reason, first of all, that hydroelectric energy must be firmed, because of the fluctuating flow of rivers. The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has found it necessary to firm its hydroelectric energy, although for many years it has had in control a large portion of the sites available for hydroelectric plants. I believe it has constructed 12 or 15 steam plants. I hope the chairman of the subcommittee will correct me if I am mistaken as to the exact number. Does the Senator recall the exact number of steam plants which the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. now has in existence?

Mr. HAYDEN. I do not remember the total number of steam plants it has. It is a substantial number, scattered over the State.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. I think it will be agreed, however, that to firm the entire amount of power which can be generated at the two new dams would require some new steam-plant construction.

Mr. McCARRAN Either that or additional hydroelectric energy would be required.

Mr. HAYDEN. No; the hydroelectric energy being fluctuating and needing firming, the company would have to install additional steam plants. The number which would be required is in dispute.

Mr. McKELLAR. Furthermore, the engineers in charge of this dam have determined and established that in order to firm the entire amount it would be necessary to have the steam plant; and we are obliged to take their technical advice.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me dwell on that point. The ultimate and greatest amount of electrical energy which could be produced by the Central Valley power project—that is, the Government project—would be 450,000 kilowatts. It is estimated that 400,000 kilowatts are probably the maximum which eventually will be produced. There is no question that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. would be ready by its existing facilities, to firm as many as 350,000 kilowatts; and the possibility of producing that amount reaches as far into the future as 1944 or 1945. From the standpoint of economy of essential materials—and that is what we must consider—the cheapest way is that which will consume the smallest amount of copper, cement, steel, and so forth.

The Senator asks how the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. can afford to offer $5,500,000. It is because it has the facilities to take over the electrical energy and because it has the distributing system for the entire region, 500 miles long and 200 miles wide. The energy must be sold to some capable, competent purchaser; and at this time the only possible purchaser of the energy developed at the Shasta Dam, the Government dam, is the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Take the other side of the situation. Suppose the Government should propose to go into the power business in California. It would have to construct transmission lines from Shasta to Antioch, construct a steam plant at Antioch, and then set up a distributing system competitive with the existing private system which has served California for years. It would have to set up a distributing system over a territory extending 500 miles in one direction and 200 miles in the other. Economy does not run that way.

However, let us consider the hour in which we live and the present reasons for economizing. We must economize in copper, steel, cement, and all the materials which would go into the construction of such a plant if we were to construct it now. We have not the materials with which to construct it.

I wish the Members of the Senate could have been with me this morning and heard Mr. Donald Nelson when he gave the Senate committee the picture of conditions which have confronted him, not by reason of lack of money, but by reason of inability to secure war essential metals and materials. That is the situation which confronts us, and that is why Mr. Nelson wrote the letter stating in substance that it is not necessary or feasible to construct the steam plant now, but that he does want something done toward engineering studies, because eventually it probably will be or may be necessary to construct the plant.

If we want the electric energy to reach the volume which may be necessary in 1943 or 1944, then the committee has laid a plan whereby we can go forward just as rapidly as can be. If we want now to set up the foundation for a competitive system which will use God knows how much copper and steel and cement, then we can appropriate and keep on appropriating, but the appropriation will not do any good, because the metals and materials are not available. That is why the committee took the attitude it did in providing the amount of money that Commissioner Page, of the Reclamation Bureau, said was necessary, namely, $200,000 for an engineering study of the steam plant and $3,700,000 for the construction of transmission lines, which sum of money had been in the bill for the current year, but was eliminated by the House. It is not a question of whether we believe in public ownership or private ownership, whether we believe in private utilities or public utilities; but it turns on whether we can construct now with the facilities we have without doing violence to the cause for which we want to conserve war materials and war essentials.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] rose a moment ago. I do not know whether he wanted to ask a question or make a statement. For either purpose I will be glad to yield to him.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I did not desire to interrupt the Senator, but I should like to say a few words at the conclusion of his remarks.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this project is away out in the West. My only reason for bringing the matter to the attention of the Senate was because of the experience we had in my section of the country with a similar project, with a similar great power company which was trying to get control of a project that was being built for the Government. I thought what was done in that instance was very improper; I still think so; and I think it will be improper in this instance. As a matter of fact, the project is a long way from where I live; I am not concerned personally in any way in the world except for what I believe to be a matter of principle and of right. I will leave it to the people who come from the section of the country in question, and to the Senate; and having called it to the attention of the Senate, I yield the floor.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, let me first thank the Senator from Tennessee for his endeavor to aid in the presentation of this matter. I desire to thank him, too, for all the kindly personal references in which he has indulged. There is nothing he could do that could sever my friendship with him which began 25 years ago in this body. So I want him to know that I thoroughly understand his motive in following the course he has taken, and his desire to aid in the presentation of this particular subject.

Mr. President, I shall take but 2 or 3 minutes, and if I should occupy a longer time than that the Chair may call my attention to it.

The reasons for the action of the committee is set forth in the report. I learned something this morning; I learned that the report is a part of the bill, and that the bill should constantly be read in the light of the report.

I had no idea that if they constituted two separate documents one would be read in conjunction with the other, but it seems I was entirely wrong, that that is how matters are handled.

I have always been an advocate of public, governmental ownership. I am an advocate of such a policy today, and I want no mistake made in respect of my attitude at all. I speak as one desiring governmental ownership of the particular project we are now considering.

Mr. President, this project was my baby. Senators may not believe it, it was so long ago, but it was my babe, and one I have nurtured as well as I could during the succeeding years. So that I have an extra interest, a personal interest, in seeing it succeed.

When the committee had this matter under consideration it reached certain conclusions. This is what the committee says in its report:

> The hearings held by the committee conclusively show that the quickest way to make a part of the power to be produced at the Shasta Dam available to war industries located in northern California with the least expenditure of critical and strategic materials is by transmitting the same over

a comparatively short line, east of the Sacramento River, to Oroville, Calif., where the power can be fed into the existing lines of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

I am not qualified to quarrel with that statement, but they proceeded then to state their reasons. Just before that, however, they said:

Being officially advised by the Chairman of the War Production Board—

Being officially advised by the Chairman of the War Production Board—

Being officially advised by the Chairman of the War Production Board that the Board is unable, at present, to endorse the appropriation of funds for the Antioch steam plant, although regarding it as essential to the ultimate development of the Central Valley project, we concur in Mr. Nelson's recommendation that funds be provided at once to complete all the engineering work necessary in preparation for its construction at Antioch or some other suitable site. For this purpose only, the sum of $200,000 is included in the bill.

This has not been read to the Senate heretofore, and I want Senators to hear it:

1. That, as has been patriotically accomplished elsewhere in the United States by public and private interests, the Secretary of the Interior and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. immediately enter into a contract, for the duration of the war and a reasonable time thereafter, for the complete pooling of all public and private power facilities which will result in delivering the greatest amount of power to war industries in the least possible time and with the greatest economy in the use of critical and strategic materials. Any such contract should provide for the recapture, without prejudice, of any advantages which temporarily may accrue to either party.

When Mr. Ickes undertakes to enter into a contract with P. G. & E. I have no fears for the Government of the United States, and I have no fear that the people of the State of California will not be duly protected.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that a very interesting precedent in this respect is the case of the Grand Coulee and Bonneville power, which, as the Senator knows, is under the supervision of the Secretary of the Interior, with Dr. Paul J. Raver in direct charge. In that instance an agreement was entered into between the public body represented by the Secretary of the Interior, and the Washington Water Power Co. and the Pacific Power & Light Co., in the Northwest, to do identically what is proposed to be done in the case we are now discussing. If the Secretary of the Interior could enter into that kind of an arrangement for Columbia River power in the interest of national defense, he can make the same kind of an arrangement in the case we are considering.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I wish to say, too, that I have sufficient confidence in the bargaining power of the Secretary of the Interior to believe that, if he entered into any contract at all, it would be a contract which would be for the benefit of the people of the United States.

The committee report proceeds:

In order to make certain that a fixed policy is not to be abandoned by failure to appropriate funds to carry it into effect, it is recommended that the $3,723,000 heretofore appropriated for the Central Valley project transmission system be restored to the bill.

That is in order to make certain the policy that is adopted by the bill. How language could be plainer I cannot understand.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. This project is entirely in the Senator's State, and I wish to ask the Senator whether he feels that what is in the bill and what is in the report is ample to protect the interests of this public power operation.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator feels that it is?

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do, assuredly. If I did not feel that way, I should not be standing here saying anything in regard to this particular provision.

Mr. McKELLAR. Precisely. I differ entirely with the Senator about what will happen if this shall be done; I think the same result will follow that ensued at Muscle Shoals, and that it may be many years before we will get the Senator's project through, but I shall leave it to the Senator, and I shall not offer the amendment. I shall leave the matter just as it is, and not offer an amendment, because the project is in the Senator's State, and I do not want to interfere with it.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I want the Senator to offer the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have not as yet offered it, and I shall not offer it, under the circumstances.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I do not like such an offer, and I hope the Senator will not make it. Let him offer the amendment, and do as he sees fit, because I know that he does it from the best of motives.

Mr. McKELLAR. Absolutely.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. And I cannot have in my heart the slightest rancor toward the Senator for doing it.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know that.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I hope the Senator will proceed and make his offer, and deal with the matter in any way he sees fit.

We insist the policy suggested shall be the policy of this Nation, and we insist it in language which cannot be misunderstood.

The report concludes:

To accomplish the above recommendations, the committee has included in the bill under the Central Valley project, California, the sum of $200,000 for engineering work preparatory to the construction of the power plant and $3,723,000 for construction of the transmission lines.

Now just a further word. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has painted the picture as I could not hope to paint it. He has told the background of the Central Valley water project and something of its origin geographically.

I would only recall that away up in northern California the project starts, away up in northern California it has its origin. It comes down in one of the ribs of the fish, as we term it, and continues with the Sacramento River to the Straits where the Sacramento flows into San Francisco Bay. There it is met by the San Joaquin River, and the San Joaquin River is relied upon for furnishing water to the southern part of the State. The water question has become so very difficult with us that it is necessary that we have some relief in that regard.

Not only does this project appeal from the reclamation standpoint, from a water standpoint, but it appeals from every other standpoint, like the standpoint of the creation of power hereafter. So far as the settlement is concerned, whatever settlement may be made—I would not have made the settlement, because I am an obstinate fellow who likes to have his way. I admit that and I admit that it is something from which I should recover, being of the age I have reached, but the policy is what we care for, the particular policy. We especially point out, and we protect in every way, the policy that the people should own this particular project.

When we provide for the recapture of anything in relation to this contract which may be made with Secretary Ickes, I think we have done all that could be asked at this time, when we are denied the materials necessary for the construction of the stand-by plant. This problem could be solved easily enough if Mr. Nelson and others were not chary of giving us the right to use the materials necessary for the construction of the plant. But we cannot build it, we will not have anything with which to build it for a long time probably, and therefore we are willing to take a declaration defining the character of the project, and because our favorite mode is carried out we hopefully go forward.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 81, line 13.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall content myself with voting against the committee amendment, and I want that to appear in the RECORD. I shall not offer any amendment, in view of the statement made by the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], and the statement made by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], who lives near the project. I think my friends are wrong but that is a matter for them and not for me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 81, line 13.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, on page 83, line 16, after the word "construction", to strike out "$70,317,970" and insert "$80,384,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, line 1, after "Stat. 403)". to strike out "$499,475" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 84, after line 8, to strike out:

Labor and services of enemy aliens and of all American-born Japanese who are under the control of the War Department or other Federal agency may be utilized by the Secretary of the Interior in the construction of water conservation and utilization projects under such regulations and conditions as the War Department or other Federal agency exercising said control may prescribe and in accordance with the provisions of section 2 of the act of October 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 1119).

And in lieu thereof to insert:

Labor and services of enemy aliens and of all American-born Japanese who are under the control of the War Department or other Federal agency may be utilized by the Secretary of the Interior, under such regulations and conditions as the War Department or other Federal agency exercising said control may prescribe, in the construction of Federal reclamation projects and water conservation and utilization projects and in other work performed under cooperative agreement between said Secretary and said War Department or other Federal agency.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Geological Survey", on page 85, line 21, after the name "Puerto Rico", to strike out "$689,080" and insert "$700,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 11, before the words "of which", to strike out "$498,515" and insert "$1,000,-900", and in the same line, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$480,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 17, after the word "possessions", to strike out "$245,980" and insert "$647,-980", and in line 18, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$45,000" and insert "$125,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 86, line 21, after the name "Alaska", to strike out "$75,635" and insert "$76,235", and in line 23, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$25,000" and insert "$26,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 4, after the word "resources", to strike out "$1,241,795" and insert "$1,-363,130"; in line 5, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$140,000" and insert "$180,000", and in line 14, after the word "That", to strike out "$970,000" and insert "$980,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 87, line 25, after the word "Commission", to strike out "$105,115" and insert "$106,-295."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 6, after the word "maps", to strike out "$200,000" and insert "$246,370", and in the same line, after the words "in all", to strike out "$325,570" and insert "$371,-940."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 88, line 16, after the word "thereto", to strike out "$326,670" and insert "$352,850."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 91, line 4, to increase the appropriation for salaries and expenses, United States Geological Survey, from $3,677,535 to $4,788,555.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Bureau of Mines—Salaries and General Expenses", on page 92, line 21, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$709,940" and insert "$713,470."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 93, line 21, after the word "industry", to strike out "$729,000" and insert "$753,-049."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 94, line 11, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$283,305" and insert "$376,755."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 94, after line 13, to insert:

Experimental plant for synthesis of motor fuel, Pittsburgh, Pa.: For the construction and equipment of a building on Government-owned land adjacent to the Bureau of Mines Central Experiment Station at Pittsburgh, Pa., for chemical engineering study of processes for the synthesis of liquid motor fuels and lubricants from gases, and all necessary expenses incident thereto, including supplies and equipment and the engagement by contract of otherwise, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine of the services of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof necessary to design, construct, and equip the building, $85,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 95, line 17, after the name "District of Columbia," to strike out "$390,745" and insert "$391,345."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 96, line 11, after the word "aprons", to strike out "$368,100" and insert "$369,120."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 96, line 23, before the words "of which", to strike out "$551,795" and insert "$552,-345."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 98, line 3, after the word "foregoing", to strike out "$455,330" and insert "$456,-325."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 98, line 23, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$651,265" and insert "$652,765."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 99, line 21, after the word "work", to strike out "$349,325" and insert "$350,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 100, after line 6, to insert:

Construction and equipment of a Northwest Electrodevelopment Laboratory: To cover the construction and equipment of an electrodevelopment laboratory in the Northwest to study the application of electrical energy to the processing of minerals occurring in that region, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriting, adding and computing machines, accessories and repairs; professional and scientific books and publications; traveling expenses; purchase of land; construction and equipment of a building or buildings to house the electrodevelopment laboratory; engagement by contract or otherwise, and at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, of the services of architects or firms or corporations thereof, that are necessary to design and construct the building or buildings; and for all other necessary expenses not included in the foregoing, $500,000, of which amount not to exceed $8,300 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) shall not be construed to apply to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is hereby authorized to accept lands, buildings, or other contributions from public or private sources offering to cooperate in carrying out the purposes of this laboratory.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I assume that the action in approving the amendment on page 100 is intended to apply to the amendments on pages 101 and 102?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes. They are separate proposals. They should be stated separately, I think. The next one deals with "gaseous and solid fuel reduction of iron ores" on page 101.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, on page 101, after line 8, to insert:

Gaseous and solid-fuel reduction of iron ores (national defense): For all necessary expenses, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, for pilot-scale tests on the gaseous and solid-fuel reduction of iron ores, including laboratory research and maintenance and operation of pilot plants; procurement of necessary materials and ores; purchase or lease of land or buildings; construction and equipment of buildings; engagement by contract or otherwise, at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof necessary to design and construct the buildings and pilot plants; supplies and equipment; travel expenses; not to exceed $9,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $500 for printing and binding; books of reference and periodicals; purchase not to exceed $2,775 (including exchange), operation, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; special wearing apparel and equipment for the protection of employees while employed; purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior," $600,-000, to be immediately available and remain available until June 30, 1943: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior, through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources for the purposes hereof, and to carry out projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private.

Mr. HAYDEN. The amount in that case is $600,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 101, after line 8.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, on page 102, after line 10, to insert:

Construction and equipment of helium plants: For all necessary expenses, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, to enable the Secretary of the Interior to increase and improve the capacity for the production of helium, as authorized by the act approved September 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 885), by the acquirement by purchase, lease, or condemnation, of lands or interests therein or options thereon; the making of contracts and agreements (with optional provisions where necessary) for the acquisition, processing, or conservation of helium-bearing gas; the construction and equipment of buildings or additions to existing buildings; the drilling of wells and construction of pipe lines, and other appurtenant facilities; and to conduct investigations with respect to available resources of helium-bearing gas and the transportation of helium; engagement by contract or otherwise, at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof necessary to design and construct the buildings, structures, and equipment; travel expenses; books of reference and periodicals; supplies and equipment; purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior"; purchase not to exceed $16,600 (including exchange), operation, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; and not to exceed $30,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, $4,000,000 to be immediately available: *Provided,* That the unexpended balances on June 30, 1942, of the appropriations under the head "Helium plants and investigations" contained in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, and the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1942, and of the appropriation "construction and equipment of helium plants" contained in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, shall be added to and constitute one fund with the amount herein appropriated, which fund shall be available until June 30, 1944, for all the objects and purposes of said consolidated appropriations: *Provided further,* That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources for the purposes hereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 105, line 8, after the word "work", to strike out "$1,517,570" and insert "$1,519,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 106, line 1, after the word "of", to strike out "a building" and insert "buildings"; in line 6, after the word "the", to strike out "building" and insert "buildings"; in line 7, after the word "expenses" and the semicolon, to insert "not to exceed $16,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia;"; and in line 13, after the word "work" to strike out "$93,925" and insert "$744,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 107, line 12, after the numerals "1943", to strike out "$498,500" and insert "$500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 110, line 4, after the word "automobiles", to strike out "$549,825" and insert "$550,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 110, line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$33,000" and insert "$40,000"; in line 20, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$1,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 111, line 5, before the words "to be", to strike out "$997,500" and insert "$1,275,000."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send forward an amendment to the committee amendment on page 111, line 5, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment on page 111 in line 5, it is proposed to strike out "$1,275,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$2,275,000."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement in furtherance and explanation of my amendment to the committee amendment. Again I respectfully refer to that which is uppermost in the minds of everyone today, namely, not the question of money or the question of producing war equipment, but the question of finding, discovering, developing, and bringing forward the natural essentials for war equipment. What are the natural essentials for war equipment today? They are what are known as the essential strategic metals and minerals. We are looking to countries far away in order that we may bring across the water, and through hazardous waters, essential war metals and essential war materials to be manufactured into war equipment here, but, more than that, it is necessary that we discover here at home, and develop here at home, and produce here at home, the essential war metals and materials.

For instance, we are hundreds of thousands of tons short of copper, which is essential in order that we may go forward with our war activities. We are short hundreds of thousands, even millions, of tons of zinc, lead, and manganese. We are short of nearly all those very essential metals. We know, however, that they exist within our own borders.

In times past the miners of our country, when discovering natural deposits, have often found it not to be profitable to develop the deposits, or to develop the metals or minerals which would be discovered within the deposits. Hence it is not until war activity sets in that such prospectors are at all encouraged in going forward to discover mineral deposits. It was not until war had set in that we discovered how short we were of these essential materials. Not until we are able to encourage private capital to take the hazard—and it is a hazard—of investing money can we develop these essential war metals and materials, and go forward with their production and their refinement.

The head of the Bureau of Mines, when appearing before the Senate Appropriations Committee, disclosed that the Bureau had asked of the Bureau of the Budget—and I quote rather liberally now—the sum of $1,750,000, in addition to what was allowed for the development of war essentials in this country. For some reason or other the Bureau of the Budget did not see fit to grant the request. During the time the committee sat and held hearings the Bureau of the Budget increased the amount by a supplemental estimate of $275,000; but, in my judgment, and I say in the judgment of the head of the Bureau of Mines, such an amount is not sufficient to warrant a progressive development for discovery of the metals and minerals which we know we have. The head of the Bureau of Mines in testifying before the committee said that he would have no trouble in securing qualified mining engineers to go out into the field and assist in this development, and he stated that he could put them to work at once. He also stated what the result might possibly be in the way of discoveries and by way of development.

Mr. President, those of us who live in the mining States know, as a matter of fact, that discovery comes first, then development, and then production. With the essential impetus of sufficient money to warrant discovery and development and production, this country can stand on its own feet, and not be dependent on bringing in essential war metals and materials from South America and other countries, when such shipments must come through waters which are today infested by destructive agencies which send the shipments to the bottom of the ocean.

Mr. President, it is a thousand times better that we put another million dollars into home development than to have several million dollars' worth of ships sunk while coming from South American countries and other countries carrying these essential commodities. So I am offering an amendment to provide an additional $1,000,000 to the amount contained in the Senate committee amendment, because the additional amount is essential, as has been testified by the head of the Bureau of Mines. The facts show that it is essential, and that it would be for the welfare of the country to expend it in this hour of great danger.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to the committee amendment on page 111, line 5.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator's proposal is to increase the amount in the bill to $2,275,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. An increase of $1,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes; the amount in the bill as reported by the committee is $1,275,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. My amendment would add $1,000,000.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator's statement was that his request was for 2½ million dollars. He is not quite up to the request.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. HAYDEN. Under the circumstances, no point of order can be made, because it is authorized by law. I am willing to take the matter to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada to the committee amendment on page 111, line 5.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 113, at the end of line 4, to increase the total appropriation for the Bureau of Mines, from $8,405,290 to $14,647,339.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that total will have to be corrected. I now ask unanimous consent that the clerks be authorized to correct all totals in the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Park Service," on page 114, line 5, after the name "District of Columbia," to strike out "$61,110" and insert "$61,430."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 114, line 13, after the name "National Park Service", to strike out "$28,465" and insert "$32,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 115, line 2, after the words "park work", to strike out "$51,215" and insert "$51,305."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 115, line 8, after the words "park work", to strike out "$20,385" and insert "$20,425."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 115, line 14, after the words "park work", to strike out "$105,260" and insert "$105,-315."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 115, line 20, after the word "park work", to strike out "$88,870" and insert "$89,045."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 116, line 6, after the words "park work", to strike out "$198,430" and insert "$198,-760."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 116, line 12, after the words "park work", to strike out "$128,535" and insert "$128,-840."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 116, line 22, after the word "Park", to strike out "$31,420" and insert "$31,475."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 117, line 3, after the words "park work", to strike out "$114,130" and insert "$114,-190."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 117, line 9, after the words "park work", to strike out "$64,070" and insert "$64,165."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 117, line 15, after the words "park work", to strike out "$75,150" and insert "$75,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 117, line 17, after the word "improvement", to strike out "$28,520" and insert $28,605."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 117, line 23, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$37,555" and insert "$37,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 118, line 6, after the word "Forest", to strike out "$57,990" and insert "$58,080."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 118, line 11, after the words "park work", to strike out "$80,900"' and insert "$80,930."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 118, line 18, after the words "park work", to strike out "$64,570" and insert "$64,710."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 118, line 24, after the words "park work", to strike out "$27,610" and insert "$27,790."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 119, line 5, after the words "park work", to strike out "$146,275" and insert "$146,-460."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 119, line 11, after the words "park work", to strike out "$62,290" and insert "$62,555."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 119, line 17, after the words "park work", to strike out "$20,225" and insert "$20,250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 119, line 23, after the words "park work", to strike out "$105,665" and insert "$105,-725."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 120, line 7, after the word "Park", to strike out "$133,780" and insert "$133,925."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 120, line 13, after the words "park work", to strike out "$101,405" and insert "$101,-470."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 120, line 19, after the words "park work", to strike out "$23,600" and insert "$23,625."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 121, line 4, after the word "keepers", to strike out "$449,530" and insert "$450,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 121, line 16, after the word "features", to strike out "$317,690" and insert "$317,-960."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 121, line 22, after the words "park work", to strike out "$44,090" and insert "$44,160."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 122, line 4, after the word "work", to strike out "$334,625" and insert "$335,380."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 122, line 9, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$208,000" and insert "$208,235."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 122, line 23, after the word "Monument", to strike out "$431,315" and insert "$431,-940."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 123, line 6, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$91,375" and insert "$91,590."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 123, line 17, before the word "together", to strike out "$39,770" and insert "$40,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 124, line 7, after the word "elsewhere", to strike out "$131,055" and insert "$131,-300."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 126, line 5, after the word "expended", to strike out "$179,850" and insert "$180,-000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 126, line 20, after the word "expended", to strike out "$269,235" and insert "$270,-000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 127, line 15, after the word "parks", to strike out "$52,260" and insert "$52,370."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 127, line 22, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$23,240" and insert "$23,350."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 128, line 6, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$9,400" and insert "$10,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 128, line 17, after the word "periodicals", to strike out "$9,820" and insert "$50,000."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator from Arizona explain that item. It does not seem to me that there ought to be a travel bureau associated with the parks at this time, and that a large increase over the House figure should be provided.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, let me state to the Senator that last year the appropriation for this purpose was $75,-000. The House reduced that amount to practically $10,000, including travel. The committee was of the opinion that the sum should be $50,000. I think the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] made the best explanation of the matter which was made before the committee. I suggest that he explain the item.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I was impressed, and represented to the committee the impression which had become mine, by reason of representations concerning the importance of the travel-bureau item, particularly this year.

The national parks are largely dependent upon public attendance and the ability of the public to get into the parks. Whatever patronage the parks enjoy this year will be by reason of rail travel rather than automobile travel. There is great

need for coordination between the national parks and the railroads in accomplishing anything resembling maintenance of attendance at the parks. I feel that this year there is greater need for that item than in the preceding year; yet the item now carried in the bill is approximately $25,000 less than the Bureau had last year for the same purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 128, line 17.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 128, line 23, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$198,700" and insert "$199,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 130, line 3, after the word "employees", to strike out "$404,535" and insert "$404,565."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Fish and Wildlife Service—Salaries and expenses", on page 130, line 18, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$166,895" and insert "$167,230."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 131, line 3, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$906,715" and insert "$914,715."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 131, line 5, after "(16 U. S. C. 791)", to strike out "$11,350" and insert "$11,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 132, line 12, after the word "stations", to strike out "$400,000" and insert "$472,720."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 132, after line 12, to insert:

> The appropriation of $2,500 contained in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, under the heading "Inquiry respecting food fishes" is hereby reappropriated for the fiscal year 1943 and shall be available for printing the report of the International Board of Inquiry for the Great Lakes Fisheries.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 133, line 2, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$194,740" and insert "$196,940."

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, to strike out "$196,940" and insert in lieu thereof "$368,940, of which $25,000 shall be available immediately."

This amendment is offered for the reason that the packing of sea food is gravely jeopardized by the shortage of tin and steel. The Government has commandeered practically all the output of certain kinds of packed sea food; and there is not sufficient tin to take care of the situation. It is necessary that some substitute be found. Since tin is not available for this purpose, and since our steel is needed otherwise, it is necessary that research for a suitable substitute be made immediately.

The research would be conducted by the Fish and Wildlife Service, which has the nucleus of an organization and is prepared to make the investigation and to start immediately. At present certain examinations and studies are being made by the National Canners Association and by certain private industries; also by certain bureaus in the Government.

Such studies will be continued in close cooperation with the Fish and Wild Life Service. However, these are not adequate for the purpose. In short, it is necessary that sea food be packed in unusually large quantities for private use, the needs of our armed forces and our Allies, and yet the proper containers for it are not available.

As we all know, sea food must be watched very carefully, both before and after packing. It is quite perishable and easily subject to toxic influences. It is therefore extremely important, for various reasons, that the containers selected be suitable. Various substitutes are now being considered, glass among others; but glass is fragile. It also requires the use of rubber bands and metal for tops. Various kinds of fibers are being studied. Wood is also being considered, but wood is lacking in heat conductivity. So it is quite apparent that we are not prepared at this time to know exactly what is a satisfactory substitute for tin; yet some substitute must be found as quickly as possible for the needs of our war program, and I have urged the Appropriations Committee to give favorable consideration to this request for an appropriation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I had intended to offer an amendment identical with that offered by my colleague. I consider this a subject which is not only important in its general sense, but particularly important to the war effort.

This matter was originally brought to the attention of the Senate Appropriations Committee by Representative BLAND, of Virginia, who gathered very convincing statistics from Government reports, showing the necessity in the present circumstances for containers to take the place of the tin containers ordinarily used to pack sea food.

It must be remembered that sea food is highly perishable. Unless it can be packed immediately upon being taken from the water, in most cases it is a complete loss. Not only are we faced with the possible loss of employment to millions of people who produce food, but also the loss of hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of food produced by the fishermen for general use. From 55 to 60 percent of the canned sea food has already been commandeered by the Army and Navy. The question of finding some form of container in which to pack this food is a major problem, because tin may not be available. Furthermore, machinery for packing sea food is no longer available because it is no longer being manufactured.

The refrigerating equipment which is used so largely for the storage of fish and the transportation of fish likewise is not available. So, unless we can immediately begin to explore all these avenues and find some way to save the great catch of fish and sea food generally, it will be lost. That statement applies to the fish and sea-food industries of a great many States along the Atlantic seaboard, along the Gulf, and all along up the west coast, as well as to such industries in Hawaii, Panama, and other parts of the Territories and the continent of the United States.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. In a moment. I desire to add to what my colleague has said that I have already talked to the chairman of the committee about the matter, in the hope that something tangible may be done to relieve the serious condition with which we are confronted.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment submitted by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] to the committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 133, in line 2, it is proposed to strike out "$196,940," and insert "$368,940, of which $25,000 shall be available immediately."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, this matter was presented to the subcommittee by the chairman of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Mr. BLAND of Virginia. No point of order can be made against it. It is within the scope of the organic act creating the Bureau.

I am willing to take the amendment to conference; and I wish to say to the Senators from Maryland, whom I know are very keenly interested, that whether the House will agree to it will depend largely on the action taken by the legislative committee of the House in arranging for its authorization. If the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries reports a bill which will authorize the handling of this matter in the way the Senators have suggested, the House Committee on Appropriations might be persuaded to accept the increase. Otherwise not. With that understanding, I am willing to agree to the amendment.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. As I understand, the Senator advises us that we should look to that phase of the matter so that what we have accomplished in the Senate will not be lost in another place, is that correct?

Mr. HAYDEN. Exactly so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], to the amendment of the committee on page 133, in line 2.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the clerk be instructed to make the necessary changes in the limitations and totals, in line with the amendment just agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will state the next amendment of the Committee on Appropriations.

The next amendment was, on page 133, line 10, after the word "thereof", to strike out "$80,000" and insert "$86,220."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 133, line 18, after the word "therewith", to strike out "$486,180" and insert "$489,080."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 134, line 3, after "(16 U. S. C. 901–915)", to strike out "$14,870" and insert "$15,200."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 134, after line 3, to insert:

Food habits of birds and animals: For investigating the food habits and economic value of North American birds and animals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry, including methods of conserving beneficial and controlling injurious birds and animals, $71,550.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 134, line 13, after the word "structures", to strike out "$105,925" and insert "$106,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 134, line 17, after the word "including", to strike out "$27,500" and insert "$40,000", and in line 22, after the word "structures", to strike out "$131,660" and insert "$231,660."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 135, line 11, after "(16 U. S. C. 667)", to strike out "$700,000" and insert "$1,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 136, line 4, after the word "therewith", to strike out "$342,590" and insert "$350,140."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 136, line 14, after "(48 U. S. C. 192–211)", to strike out "$132,630" and insert "$135,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 137, line 10, after the word "Refuge", to strike out "$544,315" and insert "$546,730."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 137, line 22, after "(16 U. S. C. 715–715r)", to strike out "$79,240" and insert "$79,690."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 137, after line 23, to insert:

Alaska fur-seal investigation: For all necessary expenses for the investigation of the migration routes, food, and other life habits of the Alaska fur-seal herd, $15,840.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 138, at the end of line 3, to increase the appropriation for salaries and expenses, Fish and Wildlife Service, from $4,297,110 to $4,890,615.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Federal aid in wildlife restoration", on page 139, line 4, after "(16 U. S. C., 669–669j),", to strike out "$1,250,000" and insert "$2,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 139, line 7, after the word "Service", to strike out "$5,547,110" and insert "$7,140,615."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in line 10, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$893,605" and insert "$943,105."

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to strike out "$943,105" and to insert "$951,505."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, that was the matter I disposed of a moment ago by asking that the clerk be instructed to correct the limitations and totals, which will be in that amount.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 139, in line 10, after the word "exceed", it is proposed to strike out "$943,105" and to insert in lieu thereof "$951,505."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Government in the Territories—Territory of Alaska", on page 141, line 11, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$7,780" and insert "$12,380", and in line 21, after the words "in all", to strike out "$19,690" and insert "$24,390."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 141, line 24, after the word "members", to strike out "$7,500' and insert "$8,000", and on page 142, line 1, after the words "in all", to strike out "$49,500" and insert "$50,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 142, line 12, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$208,930" and insert "$209,080."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 143, line 7, after "(48 U. S. C. 321a–321c)", to strike out "$700,000" and insert "$702,928."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 143, line 10, after the name "Alaska", to strike out "$152,000" and insert "$152,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 143, line 19, after the word "thereto", to strike out "$299,900" and insert "$300,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Territory of Hawaii", on page 145, line 13, after the word "business", to strike out "$1,950" and insert "$2,000", and in line 14, after the words "in all", to strike out "$5,800" and insert "$5,850."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 145, line 19, after the numerals "1930", to strike out "$46,800" and insert "$47,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Government of the Virgin Islands", on page 146, line 10, after the name "Saint Croix", to strike out "$147,980" and insert "$148,250."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 146, line 20, after the word "vehicles", to strike out "$37,640" and insert "$37,740."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 146, line 24, after the numerals "1943", to strike out "$114,800" and insert "$130,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Equatorial and South Sea Islands", on page 148, line 3, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$26,675" and insert "$26,700."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 150, line 15, after the word "law", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That this section shall not apply to the temporary employment of persons in the field service for periods of less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or destruction of property."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 151, to insert the following new section:

SEC. 9. Of the total amount available under this act for traveling expenses, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, on or before August 1, 1942, to cover into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts the sum of $310,200, and in addition, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to reserve from expenditure the total sum of $6,900 under amounts available for traveling expenses in appropriations made in this act from the reclamation fund-special fund, Colorado River Dam fund, and Colorado River Development fund: *Provided*, That the sum covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts and the sum reserved from expenditure shall be in addition to reductions in amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in appropriations made by this act below the Budget estimates.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 151, line 15, to change the section number from 9 to 10.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer a perfecting amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 33, line 6, before the figures "$4,000", it is proposed to strike out the word "project" and to insert "projects."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I send to the desk four amendments which I am directed by the committee to offer. They are legislative in character and are offered under a motion to suspend the rule. I offer the first amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 62, after line 2, it is proposed to insert the following:

That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay to the enrolled members of the Seminole Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma entitled under existing law to share in the funds of said tribe, or to their lawful heirs, out of any money belonging to said tribe in the United States Treasury or deposited in any bank or held by an official under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, not to exceed $50 per capita: *Provided*, That said payments shall be made under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided further*, That in cases where such enrolled members or their heirs are Indians who belong to the restricted class the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, withhold such payments and use same for the benefit of such restricted Indians: *Provided further*, That the money paid to the enrolled members or their heirs as provided herein shall be exempt from any lien for attorneys' fees or other debt contracted prior to the passage of this act: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to use not to exceed $1,500 out of said Seminole tribal funds for the payment of salaries of necessary employees and other expenses for the distribution of said per capita payments.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer a further amendment, which I have sent to the desk, and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 62, after line 22, it is proposed to insert the following:

The State of Oklahoma is hereby authorized to acquire by condemnation, under judicial process, for use for highway purposes in connection with the highway designated as United States Highway No. 60, any lands or interests in lands within the Seneca Indian School property in Ottawa County, Okla. The United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma shall have jurisdiction of proceedings for such condemnation. The practice, pleadings, forms, and modes of proceedings in proceedings for such condemnation shall conform, as near as may be, to the practice, pleadings, forms, and proceedings in like cases in the courts of record in the State of Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer a similar amendment pertaining to a right-of-way in the State of Minnesota. I ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 62, after line 22, it is proposed to insert the following:

The State of Minnesota is hereby authorized to acquire by condemnation under judicial process, for use for highway purposes in connection with State Trunk Highway No. 61, also designated as United States Highway No. 61, any lands or interests in lands within the Grand Portage Indian Reservation in Cook County, Minn. The United States District Court for the District of Minnesota shall have jurisdiction of proceedings for such condemnation. The practice, pleadings, forms, and modes of proceedings in proceedings for such condemnation shall conform, as near as may be, to the practice, pleadings, forms, and proceedings in like cases in the courts of record in the State of Minnesota.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. On behalf of the committee, I offer a further amendment, for which there is a Budget estimate. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 112, line 3, after "1942" and before the semicolon, it is proposed to insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That section 3709, Revised Statutes, shall not be construed to apply to this appropriation, or to the appropriation for development and operation of helium properties (special fund) in section 3 (c) of the act of September 1, 1937 (50 U. S. C. 164)."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer a further amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 113, after line 3, it is proposed to insert the following:

Effective immediately and for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior, or any official to whom he may delegate such authority, may, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, appoint skilled and unskilled laborers, mechanics, and other persons engaged in a recognized trade or craft, including foremen of such groups, employed at experimental plants and laboratories of the Bureau of Mines.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amendment offered by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] increasing the amount of money for the investigation of critical and essential materials requires the making of changes in the limitations and totals contained in the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the clerk be instructed to rearrange the bill in that manner.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 6845) was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HAYDEN. I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1637. An act to authorize the conveyance to the State of Illinois, for highway purposes only, a portion of the Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.;

S. 2088. An act to authorize aircraft flight rations for officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Navy and Marine Corps while engaged in flight operations;

S. 2097. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the board of trustees, School District No. 20, Charleston County, S. C., a parcel of land situated in the city of Charleston, S. C.;

S. 2229. An act to provide for the retirement, rank, and pay of heads of staff departments of the Marine Corps; and

S. 2382. An act to amend the act approved June 24, 1926, entitled "An act to authorize the construction and procurement of aircraft and aircraft equipment in the Navy and Marine Corps, and to adjust and define the status of the operating personnel in connection therewith," so as to provide for the establishment of the designation of naval aviation pilot (airship), and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2446) to prescribe the pay and certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training and aviation instruction, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4723) for the relief of the legal guardian of John Lesniak.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1563) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6315) to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans, agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. FULMER, Mr. FLANNIGAN, Mr. PIERCE, Mr. HOPE, and Mr. KINZER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4153) for the relief of Cleaver Kelley, asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and and Mr. WINTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to each of the following bills of the House, asked conferences with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conferences:

H. R. 5000. An act for the relief of Ferd W. Meile; and

H. R. 5439. An act for the relief of Joseph Soulek.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4476) providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

DOUGLAS MacARTHUR DAY

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 144, Calendar No. 1343.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me inquire of the Senator from Wisconsin what is the subject matter of the joint resolution?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It is a joint resolution which I introduced on the 23d of April, and which on May 5 was unanimously reported from the Committee on the Judiciary. The joint resolution designates June 11, 1942, as Douglas MacArthur Day, and authorizes its appropriate observance.

Before the joint resolution is taken up, let me say to the Senator that I intend to offer a substitute for the preamble, concerning which I have consulted the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I shall not object to the consideration of the joint resolution, but I should like to make this observation: At the time the Senator from Wisconsin offered the resolution, which, of course, he did in a very proper spirit, with a view to recognizing the services of General MacArthur in the Philippine Islands, the President had not designated the 14th of June, which is Flag Day, as a day upon which we should celebrate not only the flag of the United States, but to encourage and inaugurate a program which would be in the interest of the United Nations and the whole psychological and patriotic situation with respect to the present war.

The day fixed in the Senator's resolution is the 13th of June, which is the day before Flag Day. My information is that there probably will be quite an elaborate program on the 14th of June under the proclamation of the President, in which he urges not only proper recognition of Flag Day but a proper and suitable recognition of the services of all our forces throughout the world, including, of course, those in the Philippine Islands and other places.

The only thing that worries me about it is whether there should be celebrations on 2 days in succession, the 13th and the 14th of June. It so happens that the 13th of June is, I believe, the day upon which General MacArthur entered the Military Academy, or was appointed to the academy. Of course, we all appreciate the outstanding services of General MacArthur and the heroism which he has displayed, but, at the same time, we appreciate the services of General Wainwright, who was in the Philippines, and the services of all the members of the American and Filipino Armies in that heroic struggle.

This resolution will have to go to the House, and it may be possible to integrate these two dates or these two situations, which we wish to recognize and from which, of course, I would not detract one iota, as the Senator knows, yet I doubt the wisdom of having, in the circumstances, too many holidays when people may not be inclined to work. I noticed the other day that Mr. Nelson urged, in a public statement, that we celebrate Decoration Day which will be next Saturday, by working and turning out more products for the winning of the war. I myself think it is a very happy suggestion that we work instead of taking a holiday on the 30th day of May.

Is it the Senator's view to have two celebrations—one on the 13th of June and one on the 14th of June—the 14th having been, in a sense, for a number of years, celebrated as Flag Day? Having the 13th of June celebrated as MacArthur Day, as the Senator's resolution provides, would carry the implication that we are a little easy in our thought in regard to the number of days that we shall lay off or celebrate or do something besides work. What is the Senator's reaction in regard to that thought?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Kentucky that in presenting the resolution originally I selected June 11, which was the date upon which General MacArthur graduated from the United States Military Academy; but, after the resolution was submitted to and taken up by the Judiciary Committee, I was informed that the State of New York, whose legislature was then in session, had adopted a resolution designating the 13th of June as the day upon which this celebration should take place. I have also been informed that similar action has been taken in California. Therefore, the Judiciary Committee, in reporting the resolution, changed the date from June 11 to June 13, the idea being, I think, that, since the day would not be a legal holiday and since the resolution simply provided for an invitation on the part of the President of the United States to the people of the country to celebrate that day, it would be celebrated in those communities where people felt that they wanted to celebrate it, and it would afford an occasion for the expression of the appreciation of the people of the United States for the services which General MacArthur and his associates and the armed forces under his command rendered to the American people by their heroic defense of the Philippine Islands.

In conjunction with conferences which I have had with the Senator from Kentucky, I have, as I stated, drafted an entirely new resolution, which I intend, if my request shall be granted, to offer as a substitute for the one pending. The substitute makes special mention of General Wainwright and of all the armed forces, both American and Filipino, who made the heroic stand in the Philippines under the American flag. I believe, Mr. President, it is fitting that the people of the United States should be afforded an occasion when they may express their appreciation for the heroic defense made by these men and by their general officers. I do not think it will interfere with the Flag Day celebration in any respect whatsoever. I feel, especially after listening to the report of some of the representatives of the War Labor Board, that we need have no fear that there will be any shirking on the production line. I only wish the entire membership of the Senate could have sat in the informal discussion which took place in the committee this morning and have learned of the splendid record which the men in the production lines in this country are making.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr HILL. I wish the Senator would make the point, which was made to us this morning, that the record of our workers is twice as good as the record of the workers of Great Britain.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; our record of lost time as stated to us—and this is not in any sense an invidious comparison but one simply that we can make with pride—is that since Pearl Harbor the stoppages of work on the production lines in this country have been one-half of what they have been in Great Britain since Dunkerque. So I do not share any fear or apprehension that people are simply looking for an occasion to cease work and to celebrate. On the other hand, Mr. President, I felt at the time I offered the resolution, and I feel now, that since we have had to suffer, along with the other United Nations, so many humiliating defeats, we ought to give the American people an opportunity to express their pride in the heroic achievements of their courageous sons. While the ultimate outcome in the Philippine Islands was a technical defeat, I think the people of this country and, I am sure, all my colleagues, look upon the action there as one of the heroic chapters in the glorious record of American arms. Therefore, I believe that a celebration of the character proposed will be appropriate and fitting; and I do not think there will be any conflict; in fact, as I understand, arrangements have been made in at least several States for such a celebration on the day set aside.

So I feel that I can say to the Senate that I do not share any apprehension that the celebration proposed by the resolution will either conflict with the celebration on Flag Day or that it will in anywise be permitted to interfere with the productive efforts of our people.

Mr. BARKLEY. One further observation. I appreciate the fact that the Senate joint resolution was introduced and reported before the President issued his proclamation, which I think was a very thoughtful and proper proclamation, emphasizing the celebration of Flag Day this year.

For some time I have had a feeling that we were not giving enough attention to public celebrations. I have even gone so far as to suggest that I thought we should have some parades, with a little more music, in connection with the war effort. I recall that during World War No. 1 nearly every time a contingent of boys marched to the train to leave for camp they were followed to the station by nearly everyone in the community. They were given Godspeed, and there was a patriotic spirit among

the people. I do not think the fact that that has not been done during this war indicates any lack of interest on the part of the people, or any lack of deep determination on their part, and deep feeling. But we all know that there is nothing so contagious as enthusiasm, and I have felt that there has been too little of public demonstration of the feeling of the American people with respect to the war, what we are up against, and what we have to do, and I think that feeling is shared in many quarters in the country.

What disturbed me a little was whether, these two dates coming immediately one after the other, one celebration might detract from the other so that there might be less of an appreciation than there would be if both celebrations could have been concentrated in one day throughout the country as a celebration not only of our flag but of all the heroes in the Army, the Navy, and Marine Corps from top to bottom.

I hope that, whatever may happen, there will be no detraction from the solemnity and the importance and the enthusiasm of the celebration of either day, if it should finally be determined that there should be special mention of June 13 because of General MacArthur's entry into the Military Academy on that day.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I share the Senator's hope, and I have every reason to believe that it will be fulfilled because, as stated previously, it is my information that arrangements for harmonious conduct of these celebrations have already been made in several States of the Union.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I share the view expressed by the senior Senator from Kentucky with respect to one patriotic observance coming within 24 hours after another. There is no one in the Senate who has a greater admiration for General MacArthur than has the Senator from Illinois, as well as for General Wainwright and all the men who have served in the Philippine Islands in this great crisis, along with the Philippine Scouts. But I am just wondering whether or not it is wise to have two national celebrations one immediately following the other. I am wondering whether it would not be possible for the Senator from Wisconsin to agree to have MacArthur Day on the 14th of June rather than the 13th. Then the communities throughout America would be celebrating Flag Day and MacArthur Day together, thereby combining all their efforts in that one joint celebration.

I have agreed already to make an address on Flag Day in Baltimore, and I understand other Senators have arranged to make addresses on that day. Obviously, I should be glad to speak on the 13th, MacArthur Day, as well, but it does seem to me that if the Senator from Wisconsin would agree to the 14th and make that MacArthur Day, we then could celebrate Flag Day and MacArthur Day as one. I am satisfied that our efforts would be more successful. We would get a better response from the people throughout the country.

I do not think it makes much difference whether we celebrate MacArthur Day on the 13th, the 10th, or the 14th. I do not believe the fact that he entered the academy on the 13th is sufficient basis for celebration. In other words, we will celebrate MacArthur Day, not because he entered the academy on the 13th a number of years ago, but primarily because of what he and his brave men have done in the Philippine Islands.

I merely offer this as a suggestion—it occurred to me that it should be brought to the attention of the able Senator from Wisconsin. He may have other ideas about it, and there may be valid reasons for his not wanting to agree. However, I am certain that if we could combine the two celebrations into one, we could really put on a patriotic demonstration throughout the country which would be in keeping with what the President of the United States has in mind with respect to Flag Day, and with what the Senator from Wisconsin has in mind with respect to MacArthur Day.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I very much appreciate the suggestion of the Senator from Illinois, and I want him to know that I am always glad to give the most careful consideration to any suggestion he makes. However, I have considered the question he raises, and I should much prefer to let the joint resolution fixing the 13th as the day pass, and let it go to the House, where further consideration can be given the matter. I do not wish to interfere with any plans which have been made since the joint resolution for the celebration of the 14th was reported, and I should not desire to take any action on the floor of the Senate which might seem in any way to interfere with the celebration which the President of the United States has in mind. Naturally, because the time is short, I do not like to have the joint resolution sent back to the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, where it would have to be further considered, but I feel certain that consideration of the Senator's suggestion can be given by the Judiciary Committee of the House, if the Senate is willing to act on the joint resolution today.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the time is very short, and, so far as Flag Day is concerned, it is my understanding that communities throughout the Nation are now preparing programs for that day. In order properly to celebrate MacArthur Day, it seems to me Congress should make a decision at the earliest possible moment, because we just cannot provide for a matter like this overnight and do it properly. If we are to celebrate the 13th, it certainly should be done properly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I agree to the Senator's statement.

Mr. LUCAS. One of my reasons for rising was that I fear there is not sufficient time to prepare a separate celebration which would properly demonstrate the feeling of the people toward MacArthur, Wainright, and their soldiers. I know that could be done if the celebration were held on the 14th, because the patriotic machinery is already in motion so far as Flag Day is concerned. It would weave in properly with the MacArthur spirit, as the Senator from Wisconsin indicates is his desire.

Mr. BARKLEY. I should like to make a suggestion. I think it would be more impressive if the celebrations were concentrated in one day, and all over the country, not only now, but every year, there should be a celebration of Flag Day.

The 13th of June has been suggested by the Senator from Wisconsin, as we all know, because that happened to be the date on which General MacArthur was admitted to the Military Academy. That is so close to the 14th that I think the importance of the 13th, merely as the date on which he entered the academy, is outweighed by the fact that the next day will be Flag Day, which will be nationally celebrated. All over the country men, women, and children will be celebrating that day, in the light of the present situation, in honor of our soldiers, sailors, and marines all over the world.

All of us wish to honor General MacArthur. I hope that, whatever is done, the entire patriotic demonstration can be combined into a single day's celebration, which I believe would be more impressive than to have 2 days celebrated, the 13th and the 14th, which might detract from the celebration of each day.

Mr. LUCAS. One of the reasons which prompted me to make the observations I have submitted was the fact that one of the great metropolitan newspapers of the city of Chicago has requested me to confer with the Senator from Wisconsin and other members of the Senate to ascertain whether it would be possible to have a MacArthur Day either on the 13th or the 14th. This newspaper was getting ready to celebrate Flag Day and a MacArthur Day, the two of them combined, in the city of Chicago. I replied to them that it would probably be impossible to have a MacArthur Day on the 13th or the 14th, but that I would see what could be done to merge the two, and have the celebration on the 14th, if possible.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, nothing in this connecttion is compulsory, it is only a suggestion, and regardless of what day is chosen, any community can have its celebration center around one man, or center around the flag, or center around the whole war situation. It will be entirely within the jurisdiction of each community to decide whether it will celebrate a MacArthur Day or Flag Day or a combination of the two. In any event, even if it were decided, in the final disposition of the joint resolution, to combine the two on Flag Day, any community in America which wanted to emphasize the contribution of General MacArthur and General Wainwright, and all our forces in the Philippines and elsewhere, might do so. They could turn it into a celebration of that particular kind if they saw fit to do so.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Perhaps I was overly sensitive, after the President's proclamation was issued, in not wishing in any way to seem to impinge upon or interfere with any program which he might have in mind. If it would satisfy the Senator from Kentucky, I can change the date in the joint resolution to the 14th with very little trouble, but I

thought perhaps if we passed the resolution making MacArthur Day the 13th, and it went to the House and was considered by the House Judiciary Committee, there would be no trouble in our acquiescing in any suggestion they might make. The disadvantage has been that the joint resolution has been on the Calendar since the President's proclamation was issued, and not in the committee, where it could have received further consideration. I can change the date to the 14th with no trouble at all.

Mr. HILL. The Senator may be assured that the House Committee on the Judiciary will give this subject serious consideration, because they give serious consideration to all such matters. Since the joint resolution provides for the celebration of MacArthur Day on the 13th, and that was the date on which the Senate committee acted, and is the date the Senator prefers, I do not see any reason why we should not pass the joint resolution and send it to the House.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I would welcome any change they might make in it, and, so far as I could, I should urge the Senate to accept any amendment they might make.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 144) designating June 11, 1942, as Douglas MacArthur Day, and authorizing its appropriate observance, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments so as to make the joint resolution read:

Whereas June 13, 1942, will be the anniversary of the appointment to the United States Military Academy of Gen. Douglas MacArthur; and

Whereas General MacArthur has inspired the peoples of all of the United Nations by his brilliant and heroic leadership of the defending forces in the Philippine Islands; and

Whereas it is fitting that the anniversary of the appointment to the United States Military Academy of one whose career serves as an inspiration to all the members of the armed forces, to the entire American people, and to other free peoples everywhere should be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That June 13, 1942, is hereby designated as Douglas MacArthur Day.

SEC. 2. The President is authorized and requested to issue a proclamation inviting the people of the United States to observe June 13, 1942, with suitable patriotic and public exercises as Douglas MacArthur Day.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I submit an amendment, to strike out all after the resolving clause, as proposed to be amended by the committee, and to insert:

That June 13, 1942, the forty-third anniversary of the appointment of General MacArthur to the Military Academy at West Point, which marked the beginning of his brilliant career as a soldier, is hereby designated as Douglas MacArthur Day, in honor of himself and of all those in the American and Filipino armed forces who served with him and under him in heroic defense of the Philippine Islands

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the first amendment to the preamble.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I submit an amendment as a substitute for the preamble as proposed to be amended by the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment in the nature of a substitute will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to strike out the preamble as proposed to be amended by the committee and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

Whereas the members of the United States land and naval forces who participated in the defense of the Bataan Peninsula have, by their heroic stand, won the admiration of the peoples of all of the United Nations; and

Whereas such forces were first led by Gen. Douglas MacArthur and then by Gen. Jonathan Wainwright, who each exhibited sterling qualities of leadership in the defense of the Philippine Islands; and

Whereas it is fitting that a day should be set aside and commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises as an honor to Generals MacArthur and Wainwright and to all the officers and men who took part in the defense of the Bataan Peninsula: Therefore be it

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the preamble, as proposed to be amended by the committee.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble as amended was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution designating June 13, 1942, as MacArthur Day, and authorizing its appropriate observance."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to state briefly that although General MacArthur is a national figure, he is of special interest and affection to the people of Wisconsin. His grandfather, Arthur MacArthur, was Lieutenant Governor of the State of Wisconsin before the Civil War.

General MacArthur's father enlisted in the Army from Wisconsin during the Civil War.

General MacArthur himself was appointed to West Point by Representative Otjen, of Wisconsin. He later served a brief assignment as assistant engineer at Milwaukee.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be inserted in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a summary of General MacArthur's career.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEN. DOUGLAS MACARTHUR

General MacArthur was born at Little Rock, Ark., on January 26, 1880, and is the son of the late Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur. He was appointed to the United States Military Academy on June 13, 1899. He was graduated at the head of his class on June 11, 1903, and was commissioned a second lieutenant of engineers

PROMOTIONS

General MacArthur was promoted to the grade of first lieutenant on April 23, 1904; to captain on February 27, 1911; to major on December 11, 1915; to colonel of Infantry; National Army, on August 5, 1917; and to brigadier general, National Army, on June 26, 1918, and to brigadier general, Regular Army on February 28, 1920; to major general on January 17, 1925; and was appointed Chief of Staff, with the rank of general, on November 21, 1930. On October 1, 1935, after serving nearly 5 years as Chief of Staff, he reverted to his permanent rank of major general. He retired with the rank of general on December 31, 1937. He was recalled to active duty as major general on July 26, 1941, and was promoted to lieutenant general (temporary) effective July 27, 1941; and to general (temporary) effective December 18, 1941.

SERVICE

Shortly after General MacArthur graduated from the United States Military Academy, he sailed for the Philippine Islands, where he was engaged in various engineering duties, including construction work at Guinaras Island, wharves, seawalls, and roads, until October 1904. When he returned to the United States, served at San Francisco, Calif., with the California Debris Commission; as Assistant and Acting Chief Engineering Officer, Pacific Division, until October 1905, when he was ordered to Tokyo, Japan, where he served as aide to his father, Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur, until September 15, 1906. During this period he was assigned to duty on a confidential mission, and visited several countries in the Orient.

Upon his return to the United States, General MacArthur joined the Second Battalion of Engineers, at Washington Barracks, D. C., and, in addition to this duty, served as aide to President Theodore Roosevelt until August 1907. He attended the Engineer School of Application, graduating on February 28, 1908, and then served as assistant engineer, Milwaukee, Wis. until April 1908. General MacArthur then joined Company K, Third Battalion of Engineers, at Fort Leavenworth, Kans., and served at that station, at San Antonio, Tex., and on detached service in the Canal Zone until August 14, 1912. He was an instructor of engineering at Army Service Schools, Fort Leavenworth, until November 1912.

General MacArthur was then ordered to Washington, where he was on duty in the Office of the Chief of Engineers to April 30, 1913, as superintendent of State, War, and Navy Building until November 1, 1913, and as a member of the General Staff Corps until September 1917, during part of which time he accompanied the expedition to Vera Cruz as assistant to the engineer officer.

In September 1917 General MacArthur was appointed Chief of Staff of the Forty-second (Rainbow) Division at Camp Mills, N. Y., and accompanied this division to France on October 17 1917. He served with the Forty-second Division in Vancouleur training area, in La Franche training area, in Rolamont training area, in the Luneville sector, in the Baccarat sector, in the Esperance-Souain sector, in the Champagne-Marne defensive, and in the Aisne-Marne defensive until August 1918. He then commanded the Eighty-fourth Infantry Brigade, Forty-second Division, in the St. Mihiel offensive, in the Essey and Pannes sectors, Woevre, in the Meuse-Argonne offensive, and in the Sedan offensive until November 11, 1918, and commanded the Forty-second Division until November 21, 1918. He commanded the Eighty-fourth Infantry Brigade in the Army of Occupation, Germany,

until April 12, 1919, when he returned to the United States, and served in the Office of the Chief of Staff, Washington, D. C., until June 12, 1919. General MacArthur was superintendent of the United States Military Academy to June 30, 1922, when he was ordered to the Philippine Islands. He served at headquarters, Philippine Department, until November 11, 1922, in command of the district of Manila to June 29, 1923, and in command of the Twenty-third Infantry Brigade at Fort William McKinley to January 30, 1925. Returning to the United States, he commanded the Fourth Corps Area, Atlanta, Ga., to July 26, 1925, and the Third Corps Area, Baltimore, Md., to September 3, 1928. In that year he took the American olympic team, as its president, to Amsterdam, Holland.

General MacArthur was ordered to the Philippine Islands in September 1928, where he commanded the Philippine Department to September 19, 1930. After his return to the United States he commanded the Ninth Corps Area, San Francisco, to October 30, 1930, when he became Chief of Staff of the Army. Upon completion of his duty as Chief of Staff on October 1, 1935, he was appointed military adviser to the Philippine Commonwealth government and later was made a field marshal in the Philippine Army.

At his own request, General MacArthur was retired from the Army with the rank of general on December 31, 1937, remaining with the Philippine Army as field marshal. He was recalled to active duty on July 26, 1941, and designated as Commanding General of the Far East Command, to include the Philippine Department, the forces of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, and other forces which may be assigned to it, with headquarters at Manila.

General MacArthur holds numerous honorary degrees from universities, including the following: Doctor of laws awarded by the University of Maryland in 1926, by Western Maryland College in 1929, by the University of Pittsburgh in 1932, and by the University of the Philippines in 1938; doctor of military science, awarded by the Pennsylvania Military College in 1929; master of military science, awarded by Norwich University in 1935.

DECORATIONS

General MacArthur has been awarded the following decorations:

Distinguished Service Cross with Oak Leaf Cluster, for heroism in the Salient du Feys, France, March 9, 1918. "When Company D, One Hundred and Sixty-eighth Infantry, was under severe attack in the Salient du Feys, France, he voluntarily joined it, upon finding that he could do so without interfering with his normal duties, and by his coolness and conspicuous courage aided materially in its success."

An oak-leaf cluster was awarded General MacArthur for the following acts of distinguished service. "As brigade commander General MacArthur personally led his men and by the skillful maneuvering of his brigade made possible the capture of Hills 288, 242, and the Côte de Châtillon, October 14, 15, and 16, 1918. He displayed indomitable resolution and great courage in rallying broken lines and in reforming attacks, thereby making victory possible. On a field where courage was the rule, his courage was the dominant feature."

Distinguished Service Medal with oak-leaf cluster: "He served with credit as Chief of Staff of the Forty-second Division in the operations at Challons and at the Château-Thierry salient. In command of the Eighty-fourth Infantry Brigade he showed himself to be a brilliant commander of skill and judgment. Later he served with distinction as commanding general of the Forty-second Division."

An oak-leaf cluster was awarded General MacArthur for the following meritorious and distinguished services in a position of great responsibility. "As Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States since November 21, 1930, he has performed his many important and exacting duties with signal success. He devised and developed the four-army organization of our land forces; he conceived and established the General Headquarters Air Force, thus immeasurably increasing the effectiveness of our air defenses; he initiated a comprehensive program of modernization in the Army's tactics, equipment, training, and organization. In addition, the professional counsel and assistance he has continuously rendered to the President, to the Secretary of War, and to the Congress have been distinguished by such logic, vision, and accuracy as to contribute markedly to the formulation of sound defense policies and the enactment of progressive laws for promoting the Nation's security."

Silver Star with six Oak Leaf Clusters.

Purple Heart with Oak Leaf Cluster.

French Legion of Honor (Grand Cross).

French Legion of Honor (Commander).

French Croix de Guerre, with Palm and Gilt Star.

French, Honorary Corporal of the Eighth Regiment of the Line, with Legion of Honor Fourragere.

French, Honorary first-class Private, of the Battalion de Chasseurs Alpins, with medal Militaire fourragere.

Belgian Order of the Crown (Commander).

Italian Croce di Guerra.

Italian Order of the Crown (Cavaliere da Gran Croce).

Mexican Order of Military Merit (First Class).

Yugoslavian Grand Cordon of the White Eagle.

Polish Grand Cordon of Polonia Restitutia.

Polish, Honorary Member of Polish General Staff.

Czechoslovakian Grand Cordon of the White Eagle.

Czechoslovakian Order of the Grand Cross of the Czechoslovak Order of the White Lion.

Hungarian Grand Cordon of Pour le Merite.

Rumanian Great Cross in the Order of the Faithful Services.

Ecuadorian Star of Abdon Calderon (First Class)

OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION ORDER NO. 5 RESPECTING PRIVATE TRUCKS

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I wish to speak of a matter which seems to be of small interest to this body. Order No. 5 of the Office of Defense Transportation provides that all private trucks doing business throughout the country, if they carry a load one way, must bring back a load of equal amount. The enforcement of that order will paralyze all business throughout the country. It pertains to every State. I have before me a telegram which I should like to read, and I wish to say to the Senate that if something is not done voluntarily by the august body which is running the transportation business of the country a great injury will result. We are responsible for what is being done, because we have delegated much of the power we have to other people, and are now grumbling about what is being done. I read the telegram:

Office of Defense Transportation General Order No. 5 effective June 1 will work serious hardship on the entire population of rural communities as well as on distributors of food products. It is requested that every effort be made to secure postponement of effective date until such time as effect of this order on consuming public can be determined.

Mr. President, every Member of the Senate can understand what effect the order will have. Our whole civilization is built around automobiles and rubber tires. Horses and buggies have disappeared, and I am afraid we are in a "jackass age." Now we are actually doing away with the sine qua non of ordinary communication, transportation and orderly processes of civilization. We do not do it ourselves, but we are responsible for making it possible for someone else to do it. Chickens are coming home to roost. My mail is flooded with complaints because we have delegated to others certain powers with respect to transportation. I have the order to which I refer before me. It provides that every truck doing a commercial business carrying a load of goods from the town to the little country stores must come back with an equal load, or the truck owner's license will be canceled.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. BONE. If there is no material available at the terminal to be loaded onto the truck, how is the truck to be loaded for the return trip?

Mr. SMITH. It will not have a load for the return trip. The effect of the order will be indirectly to stop the movement of trucks. Our country has been built up largely by the form of transportation affected, and now it will, to a great extent, be cut off by fool orders such as this. No one who has sense enough to be an American citizen would issue such an order. Those who issued it should have considered the service performed by trucks. In my own home town hundreds of trucks every day carry commodities to distributors in rural communities and to small villages.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I live in Memphis, Tenn., which is an important distributing point. Many of our food products are distributed by trucks. There is a bridge from Memphis across the river which is used for this purpose. There are roads extending in every direction from Memphis which are used by trucks distributing food. The effect of the order will be to bring about a tremendous loss not only to our merchants but to the people in the surrounding country. If the trucks cannot continue to deliver groceries and other food products in the surrounding territory great hardship will ensue. The sentiment in that community is overwhelmingly against any such order. I have complained to Mr. Eastman, the head of the Office of Defense Transportation, but have been unable to make an impression on him. This order, if it is continued in effect, will disrupt business, it will prevent profits from being made, and it will lower our tax income. It will result almost in a blackout to the grocery business in my section of the country. I wish to commend the Senator from South Carolina, if he will not deem me presumptuous for doing so, for his efforts in this respect, and I endorse what he is doing.

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. BONE. As I recall, the Senator from Tennessee lives in Memphis?

Mr. McKELLAR. I do.

Mr. BONE. That is a distributing point?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes.

Mr. BONE. What the Senator from Tennessee has said is true. A good many businesses use trucks to distribute groceries. Wholesale grocers and other concerns use trucks in their business. When they load up a large truck and make delivery to various points I do not see how they can get a return load. I suppose that is what the Senator from South Carolina is referring to.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; of course it is.

Mr. McKELLAR. It is physically impossible for those trucks to obtain a return load.

Mr. BONE. I agree that it would be an excellent idea if the trucks could be forced to carry loads to full capacity both ways, but we all know that we are up against what the Senator from Tennessee referred to, the delivery of products to terminal points. We would have to reorganize the whole industrial fabric in order to create a situation whereby the trucks could be operated fully loaded both ways; at least it seems so to me.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not only would we have to reorganize the industrial fabric but also the transportation fabric we now have.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, under our divine tariff law we had to send our ships abroad loaded, and bring them back empty, and we attempted to give a ship subsidy to defray the cost of bringing the empty ships back. Everyone knows that is true. That was the reason for the vanishing of the American merchant marine from the scene.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. From what I have heard of this questionable regulation from the Senator's able presentation of it this afternoon, and from the great volume of correspondence I have had with respect to it, it seems to me to be of the character of a statute which I heard of as having been passed in the pioneer days of the country by a western State, which in substance read:

When two trains shall meet neither shall proceed until the other has passed.

[Laughter.]

Mr. SMITH. Exactly. That is correct.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a word?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. The order to which the Senator refers is the order of the O. D. T. No. 5, which requires that trucks going out with 100-percent load shall bring back a 75-percent load. Of course, the Senator has properly pointed out that this order is one which is impossible of application, and it is impossible to comply with it in all cases where goods, wares, or merchandise are distributed into areas remote from railroads and regularly chartered public carriers.

It also imposes a serious hardship on the farmers who depend upon outgoing trucks to return their products to the market. I have had the matter up for the past several days with the Office of Defense Transportation, and I am pleased to say that my information is that either the effective date of the order will be postponed until the matter can be thoroughly reviewed, or else some modification of it will be made which will prevent the hardships which have appeared, of which I think the Office of Defense Transportation is now aware.

As I understand, one of the things now being studied is a modification of the order so as to permit the total mileage of private trucks to be reduced, which can be done in a great many instances. Such a reduction would effectuate some saving in gasoline and tires.

The Office of Defense Transportation takes the position that the order was promulgated primarily for the purpose of preventing waste in gasoline and tires. It was a most unfortunate order. It is doing the country a great deal of harm. In the case of many restrictions which are being imposed, those who are imposing them seem to be entirely unaware of the fact that they may be destroying the economy of private business in the country, breaking up the means of livelihood on the part of our people, and destroying any possibility of collecting taxes. They give themselves a great deal of worry, because they have vast powers, and feel that they must be cracking down constantly in order to impress the country with the fact that they are on the job.

I believe that the Office of Defense Transportation is making a very earnest and sincere effort to correct this particular order. I think the result will be postponement of the effective date, so that the people of the country may be fully heard and something in the way of an amendment to the order may be worked out which will prevent hardship and at the same time result in the elimination of waste, which was intended in the first instance.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to take the time of the Senate for a moment to say that I am very happy to hear the able Senator from Georgia make the statement which he has just made with respect to postponement of the effective date of the order.

I have in mind a particular problem in my section of the country which has been drawn to my attention in a very forcible way. The president of the Inland Daily Press Association, comprising 317 newspapers in 16 Midwestern States, including Illinois, has communicated with me in regard to orders 4 and 6. These orders affect the trucks which are used in the transportation of newspapers to various vantage points for further distribution. Most of the newspapers have a circulation of 30,000 or less. The orders which have been issued practically destroy the transportation of the newspapers to these various points for further distribution. I have attempted to confer with the proper authorities responsible for these orders and have been given some consideration. I was first informed that there might be a decision Monday or Tuesday upon the question of relief under the general order. Later I was told there would not be any decision before the end of this week. I was not so fortunate as was the distinguished Senator from Georgia in finding out what the Office of Defense Transportation proposes to do.

Mr. SMITH. Neither was I so fortunate as was the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. LUCAS. The truth of the matter is that my office could not get any further information with respect to what is proposed. I was practically advised that they were too busy down there to discuss the question with a United States Senator. That is one of the present troubles. As the Senator from Georgia has said, we have delegated power to various governmental agencies. The mere fact that they have power does not mean that they may use it in any way they see fit. In this emergency we are the only ones to whom our constituents can really complain. We are receiving many complaints, and that is all right. I do not mind it at all. However, when I receive a just complaint from one of my constituents in Illinois, I expect the departments in Washington to render the type of service which the people demand and to which the people of the democracy under which we live are entitled. If we do not receive that type of service, the delegation of power to some of the bureaucrats will have to be withdrawn in order to protect the people.

We have all understood for a long time that this is a Government of the people, by the people, and for the people. I do not like the way in which some of the officials in the departments look upon the representatives of the people. I do not say that the attitude to which I refer is prevalent in all the departments. I have had little or no trouble with most of them, but all of them ought to cooperate with Members of Congress. Some of the individuals in the departments give a Senator the impression that he has no right to call them. I appreciate that the Office of Defense Transportation, the War Department, the Navy Department, the War Production Board, and various other agencies are very busy. I wish I never had to call any of them. I never disturb them unless it is absolutely necessary in connection with what seems to me to be an important problem affecting society out in my State or in the Middle West. I do not want to be disturbing them. They should not be called any more than is absolutely necessary. However, in connection with the matter to which I referred, 317 newspapers in the Central West are involved. I maintain that if an order has been issued by a branch of Government which seriously curtails or affects the distribution of the commodity which they produce—namely, newspapers—I am entitled, upon just complaint, to know exactly what the order is all

about, and if a decision has been reached. I should know about it.

This presents a very serious problem for the owner of these newspapers. I have not yet been able to find out whether or not a committee of three, representing the newspapers, can come to Washington and present their case for an interpretation or clarification of these orders. It may be that relief will be granted, and it may be that what I am saying is unnecessary; but so far I am in the dark. My people remain in an uncomfortable position.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, it is amazing how one unfortunate act, correlated with others, may spread unthought-of destruction. Not only is this order disastrous, but the rationing of gasoline as it is now administered has just about destroyed some of the most efficient functions of my State government. The highways are maintained on the tax which the State lays on gasoline. That revenue has disappeared. Furthermore, the little gasoline filling station is disappearing. This morning I received a most heartbreaking letter from a man who had organized a company to build what are called automobile courts. He said that in the past month he had had two patrons. He is broke. He has a quarter of a million dollars invested in a chain of automobile courts.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have just returned from my home at Memphis, Tenn. The orders issued by officials in Washington have stopped innumerable businesses and have put them out of operation entirely. If such restrictive orders continue, I am wondering where we are going to get the tax money next year to operate the Government. Whenever businesses are stopped and placed in such a situation that they cannot make any money, and their employees are thrown out of employment, it is impossible for the businesses to make profits. Without profits we shall be without taxes. I am wondering what we are going to do. Such orders, some of them very improvident and some of them very unnecessary, are bad economy, bad business, and unwise statesmanship. I understand that it has been stated that gasoline is to be rationed even in Oklahoma, Texas, Louisiana, and surrounding States, where transportation is easy and accessible at all times—and, indeed, in the whole country. If such a plan is followed, the income of the country will be greatly decreased, and the sources of taxes will be dried up. Without taxes we shall be in a very deplorable situation. I think we ought to have some investigation as to where we are going. Some of the orders are very improvident, to say the least.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I think that if nothing else grows out of the orders which are irritating the people, at least they may have some effect on this body. Let us do our duty and stop delegating powers to those for whom no one ever voted or, please God, ever will.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri and Mr. MAYBANK addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In line with what the Senator from Tennessee, the Senator from South Carolina, and other Senators have said, let me inquire whether any Senator ever had any doubt in his mind as to what would happen when the Congress of the United States deliberately abdicated its authority.

Mr. SMITH. "Abdicated" is the correct word.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Did any Member of the Senate ever have any doubt in his mind as to what would happen when the Congress of the United States deliberately abdicated not only the authority but the duty imposed upon it by the Constitution to a number of bureaucrats in Washington? We are all more or less blameworthy for turning loose the bureaucrats. I opposed it and opposed it until I became tired, and finally I voted for a great deal of it. Whenever we delegate our authority to bureaucrats in Washington we may be sure that one of the first things they will do will be to repudiate the views of the people of the United States as expressed through their elected representatives in the Senate and House.

That must be stopped. I realize that in time of war we must delegate a great deal of general authority to the President of the United States and, in turn, to his subordinates; but, in my judgment, the only way to stop the general practice of allowing minor clerks and bureaucrats in the departments to issue orders merely for the purpose of issuing them is for the Congress to undertake to regain some of the authority which it heretofore has granted and given away.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. MAYBANK. I merely wished to say, in connection with what was said by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia that perhaps the order will be delayed. I was so advised by the commissioner in charge.

However, the great worry I have about these orders arises from the fact that Senators from the States concerned are not consulted. If Senators from the rural regions had been consulted before the orders were issued, much trouble would have been averted. If there is delay, the danger and possibility of great loss hangs over the people who raise the peach crops and other crops in the Carolinas, which in a short time will be moved.

The other observation I desired to make is that today in the lower section of South Carolina and in Georgia, the potato crop is moving to market. The Interior Department has been very kind in attempting to make possible the delivery of some additional gasoline to that section; but to the best of my knowledge it has not been able to do so because so many persons are involved. By the time deliveries of gasoline are made to enable the potatoes to be moved from the field to the railroad platform most of the potatoes will rot unless something is done immediately. We have to move our potatoes in a hurry; the whole crop is moved within two or three weeks. That is the situation which we confront today.

I appreciate the cooperation I received from the Department; but the trouble I find is that no one seems to have the final decision about doing something for the people in the country.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. Along the line of the remarks made by the Senator, let me say that the subcommittee of which I was chairman had before it a certain bill. Hearings were held for approximately two weeks. I believe the situation will be alleviated if we can bring the bill before the Senate. We are preparing a report.

In regard to gasoline and oil, let me say that yesterday a man telephoned me from Williston, Fla., and told me that his tanks were full of gasoline, but that for nearly 2 months he had not been able to sell it or make use of it, and that he has had no way to dispose of it.

As the Governor of Florida said the other day, the gasoline tanks in every port on the Gulf coast are filled to capacity, but there is no way to dispose of the gasoline. Something must be done about that situation. Under a resolution of the junior Senator from South Carolina an investigation is being conducted which may help considerably along that line. We also have a report in the House from Judge Mansfield's committee on Rivers and Harbors, recommending that the situation be relieved by development of a certain project about which we have been talking for many years. If that development had been made when we asked to have it made, in my judgment, we should not find ourselves in the present situation, and there would be no necessity of rationing either fuel oil or gasoline on the East coast.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I shall conclude my remarks by calling attention to the confusion worse confounded existing throughout the country. We do not know upon whom to depend or where to go. Let me call the attention of the Senate to the fact that Mr. Nelson is reported to have said, "Forget about rubber; you are not going to get it." Mr. Someone-else—I do not attempt to enumerate all those who have charge of the program; I think everyone has his finger in the pie—is reported to have said, "Rubber will not be available until 1944 or 1945." The investigators said, "It looks very doubtful." The President has said, "We shall have new rubber before the old rubber wears out."

Whom are we to believe? What does the public think about the situation? It is like what they said about the old doctrine of predestination:

I can and I can't.
I will and I won't.
I'll be damned if I do.
And damned if I don't.

So no one knows just what to depend upon.

With reference to the matter to which I have called attention, let me say that I think it is the duty of Congress to stand up for the rights of the American people, and to say, "You shall rescind this order." There is plenty of gasoline; and if the old tires will last until the new ones come, why not let the people use their tires?

We have heard from the experts. I do not have much faith in experts; in fact, I have heard some definitions of those gentlemen that suit me down to the ground, but I will not repeat them. They speak of crepitation, which is a word which I perhaps should explain. They say that the actual use of rubber prolongs its life; and if the rubber is left idle or standing, it will deteriorate faster than when in use.

We have allowed all this authority to those august gentlemen whose feet rest upon the table, and who lean back in their great authority and power. Do not think that I am blaming them. I am blaming us for delegating to them power which we should have reserved to ourselves. However, we have reached a condition which is actually threatening the unity of the American people. That is what is occurring as a result of what we have done.

My mail frightens me. People ask, "What are they doing this for?" They need not only an explanation, but a plausible one. The situation is frightful. We must remember that the American people are accustomed to doing as they please so long as the laws are such that they can understand them. And when they do not understand them, someone will be hurt. The present situation is one which requires that we make sure that the laws are understandable. If they were, the people would willingly cooperate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The remarks which the Senator has been making prompt me to add the comment that the condition revealed in the orders of the Office of Defense Transportation and concurrently revealed in orders issued by other agencies and administrations, to my mind constitute the very best illustration of the wisdom of those who originally ordained the parliamentary system of government. Under that system the representatives of all the people prescribe the policy which is followed in government, and adjust the details to the general objective.

In this emergency we have abandoned that policy; and, instead of having committees of Congress, made up of Members who come from divers States and who know the conditions in those States, consider policies, proposals, and details, they are being considered piecemeal by separate agencies which do not have the opportunity that Members of Congress have to understand all sides of a problem.

Of course, we are deficient in ability, and we never pretend to anything else. We recognize the fact that we are the mere representatives of the people. We do not claim to be pundits or philosophers or persons in whom all the wisdom of the universe is consolidated, as is sometimes the case with those who speak with finality over the radio and in the various press columns; nor do we pretend to have complete knowledge of all the problems which come within our jurisdiction. Legislators, by and large laying claim to no infallibility, do the best they can.

The thing which stands out, however, is that when the Office of Defense Transportation, for example, passes a rule which has the force and effect of law, it is done in camera, it is done in secret, it is done without public hearing, it is done without proper review of the conditions which are to be affected by the order which is issued.

If there were public hearings as in a legislative committee, then every person would have the right to be heard and the whole matter would be handled in the public view, just as the tax problems will be handled in the Finance Committee of this body when the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives has made its recommendations to the House and that body has acted.

In the case of the orders affecting transportation, going to the very fundamentals of our whole economy in every community of the land, the decisions were made without consideration of the results which would flow from the action. The consequence is that when Members of the Senate and Members of the House of Representatives, hearing from their constituents as to the effect such orders, issued privately, are having upon our economy, make complaint, then the bureaus have to back up, reconsider, promise one Senator that the order will not go into effect until later, perhaps, and promise another Senator there will be a modification. What the modification will be no one knows. Of course our system of legislation is defective but it is democratic. The system of departmental legislation is also defective, and it is not democratic. So I was very much interested when the Senator from Illinois this afternoon rose, speaking on behalf of 300 newspapers in his State, which have not as yet been given an opportunity to appear before the bureau heads. They would be heard without question by a Senate committee.

Mr. President, we are governed now by press release and press conference. I read a column in one of the newspapers the other day in which it was stated that there was no sense in paying any attention to what was said in debate in the Senate or in the House of Representatives because 70 or 80 percent of what is said here is pure demagogy, meaning nothing. It was said that most of the contents of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is "tripe." I am using exactly the word that was employed by one of the wisest and best of the newspaper writers.

Mr. SMITH. Let me ask the Senator who is responsible for that condition?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Let me say, first, that the author of that attack upon the Congress did not think of analyzing the contents of the average newspaper, nor even of the papers in which his column appears. I do not know whether or not it would be proper to say that 90 percent or 80 percent or 50 percent of the ordinary newspaper is philosophical matter worthy of being handed down from generation to generation as something to guide the moral welfare of the people, but I venture to say that the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will stand comparison with any newspaper. I speak as one whose whole experience in life, until I studied law, was that of a newspaperman. I understand what the objective of a newspaperman ordinarily is—to get a good story; one that will make a headline.

It takes a little digging, however, to get the material that is in the RECORD, because it is not immediately reduced to type. What is said here today will not appear in print until tomorrow; so tonight's broadcasts and tomorrow morning's papers will deal not with the debate of the House or Senate, but with the ready-made material of today's "hand-outs" and the wisecracks of the news conferences. Committee hearings will receive attention, in all probability, but there will be no report on the regulation that now may be in process of formulation by half a dozen bureaus.

Of course, answering the question of the Senator from South Carolina, the responsibility lies upon us. We have delegated away our power and our authority; we have surrendered to the bureaus the responsibility for legislating for the people; and the consequence, of course, falls upon our heads; but it is not altogether reasonable to criticize the bureaus too much, for we must be frank with ourselves, and admit that we are fighting a totalitarian war, and we must have executive authority.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, Mr. President; the Senate and the House of Representatives should be the legislative arm to pass on these matters. Take, for instance, the office of O. D. T. Why could not a committee have studied and considered transportation matters and have the information brought to them? But we have been so generous as to say, "We will turn it all over to the President, and let him turn it over to those whom he may see fit to designate to legislate." These orders are legislation; they have the effect of legislation. I did my best to try to stem the tide, but one need not talk about assuming the real office of the legislative branch of the Government while such practices continue.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If I may add a further word, the Office of Defense Transportation is concerned with only one problem, and when it issues its regulations it issues them with the thought only of that particular problem. Likewise, in the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator, all the time and attention of the officials there is devoted to petroleum and petroleum alone. In the Office of Price Administration, those in that rapidly expanding Bureau who are to administer prices which affect our whole economy are thinking only of prices, and they lack the advantages which are manifest in a legislative body to the committees of which various problems are presented and

which consider them in all their aspects, having in mind the effect upon our entire economy of everything that happens.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from South Carolina allow me to ask the Senator from Wyoming a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from South Carolina yield to the Senator from Tennessee?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I was told a day or two ago that the Office of Price Administration are going to have 90,000 employees traveling over the country to enforce their orders. I wonder if that is correct? Does the Senator know?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. All I know is that the Administrator of that office has appeared before the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives and has asked for an appropriation. It is currently reported in the press that he is asking for $200,000,000. I understand that an organization to administer prices will be built up in every State of the Union. It probably will be necessary to do so in order to administer the law. I wish to say here, as I have said very many times before, speaking from personal acquaintance with Mr. Henderson extending over several years, that I have every confidence in his desire to maintain our present economy, but I recognize the fact that a stupendous task has been undertaken, and I know that our free economy is threatened.

I should like to make a further remark. We were discussing yesterday the bill which had been reported from the Banking and Currency Committee giving authority to the Price Administration and the R. F. C. in one instance to purchase and sell commodities and articles of all kinds and to subsidize the production of such articles and commodities, and giving the Office of Price Administration and the Commodity Credit Corporation, on the other hand, the authority to do the same thing with respect to agricultural commodities.

Now I understand a member of the War Labor Board appeared before one of the committees of the Senate today and testified—this is purely hearsay, so far as I am concerned—that the Price Control Act is almost certain to fail unless we undertake to stabilize immediately production costs as represented in wages.

There were Members of the Senate and the House who 6 months ago declared their belief that the recommendation which was made to the Government by Bernard M. Baruch, head of the War Industries Board during the World War, out of his experience in that war, that there should be a freezing of all the factors that go into our economy should have been adopted. I know I was one who so believed. It was not adopted. We chose rather to follow the selective price-control system which was recommended by Mr. Henderson. It has turned out to be a failure, and because it was a failure the Office of Price Administration was asking for this power to subsidize industry.

Mr. President, it becomes obvious that the moment we undertake to subsidize industry of all kinds in this country we are destroying that industry itself; we are destroying the system which we are fighting to save.

The Baruch principle was perfectly simple. It was only to freeze all the elements of price as of a particular day prior to the action so that none of these questions of one group getting ahead of another could arise. That plan would have asked of all, as a sacrificial contribution to the war, the agreement that the compensation which all receive, all the costs and charges which enter into our economy, should not be altered during the war.

Mr. SMITH. That would have been all right if we ourselves had adopted that freezing order and then saw that it was administered.

Mr. President, I have no more to say. I hope that the attention I have drawn to this matter will result in our making some little gesture toward maintaining our rights.

CADETS UNDERGOING FLIGHT TRAINING AND AVIATION INSTRUCTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2446) to prescribe the pay and certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training and aviation instruction, and for other purposes, which were, on page 1, line 4, to strike out all after the word "training" down to and including the word "and" in line 8, and insert "involving participation in regular and frequent aerial flights they"; and to amend the title so as to read: "An act to prescribe certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training, and for other purposes."

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I call attention to the action of the House which has just been laid before the Senate on a bill pertaining to the pay of cadets at West Point who are engaged in flying instruction. The Senate asked that their pay be increased from $65 to $75, and that they be permitted to have allowances insofar as travel was concerned, but the House did not wish to increase their pay, and in view of the fact that the West Point cadets are leaving today for training camps, and in view of the further fact that on their return hereafter we will have facilities for the cadets without their having to leave West Point, the War Department has advised me that they are perfectly willing that the amendment of the House be accepted. So I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Rev. E. B. Joyner, pastor of the Del Ray Methodist Church of Alexandria, Va., urging the passage of legislation to protect the armed forces from the liquor and vice traffic around military camps. This is one of many such letters I have received, and a matter in which the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] has been vitally interested. I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEL RAY METHODIST CHURCH,
Alexandria, Va., May 22, 1942.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Senate Military Affairs Committee, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: I am writing you at the request of the congregation assembled at the Del Ray Methodist Church, on Sunday, May 17, 1942. I am writing you, not personally, but officially as chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee.

The congregation voted to urge the Congress of the United States to pass legislation to protect our armed forces from the liquor and vice traffics similar to that passed in 1917.

The congregation also requested that you read this action on the floor of the Senate, and for incorporation in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Respectfully,

E. BENJAMIN JOYNER,
Pastor, Del Ray Methodist Church.

COMMENDATION OF THE MEDICAL SERVICE OF THE ARMY

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, I have received a letter from Mr. Le Roy Volk and his wife, Mrs. Elsie Volk, of Farmingdale, Long Island, commending the medical service of the Army, and I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FARMINGDALE, LONG ISLAND, N. Y.,
May 17, 1942.

Senator REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Military Affairs Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: While reading the New York Journal-American of May 17, 1942, we came upon a news item dated Washington, May 16 (Associated Press), in which was stated you had received a letter from L. H. Patterson, of the Indiana State Alcoholic Commission, quoting his son's account of his experience after suffering a knee injury while a private at Fort Monmouth, in which he praises the hospital treatment he has been receiving at an Army hospital.

May we add to this our account of the splendid treatment which our son, Pvt. Donald Volk, serial No. 12028172, who was injured in an accidental shooting while on duty at Savannah Air Base on July 20, 1941, has been receiving. Our boy sustained four gunshot wounds, one through the abdomen, two through both kneecaps, and one flesh wound in the calf of the leg. But for the excellent surgery and skill of First Lt. Charles A. Baumhauer, chief of surgery at that time at the station hospital of the air base, our son would not be alive at this time.

We were summoned to the air base at the time of the accident and spent 2 weeks there. During this time we were amazed at the efficiency and cleanliness at this station hospital, in view of the fact that the hospital was not entirely completed. Our stay was made as comfortable as possible under the circumstances by the courtesies extended to us by those in command.

Since our son's partial recovery, he has been transferred to Stark General Hospital at Charleston, S. C., for major operations on both legs. We are happy to state that due to the skill of the Army doctors at this hospital, our boy is able to walk and is rapidly covering the road back to normal health. We

have visited him at this hospital on two occasions and found the same cleanliness and efficiency prevalent there as at Savannah.

May we convey to you, as chairman of the Senate Military Affairs Committee, our sincere appreciation for the splendid treatment given to our son by the Army and hospital authorities both at Savannah, Ga., and Charleston, S. C.

We feel that too little appreciation of the great work being done at the various camp and base hospitals by the doctors, nurses, and personnel is shown by the general public, who are always willing to condemn, but seldom to commend and praise; therefore, as parents of just one soldier, we wish to thank all who have worked with him and brought him back to health, usefulness, and to us.

Sincerely,

LE ROY VOLK.
ELSIE VOLK.
(Mrs. Le Roy Volk.)

POWERS OF SENATE SPECIAL SILVER COMMITTEE

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk a resolution which I offer, and which I ask to have reported by the clerk, in order that I may ask for its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read.

The resolution (S. Res. 261) was read as follows:

Resolved, That the special committee created pursuant to S. Res. 187, Seventy-fourth Congress, agreed to August 16, 1935, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed, in addition to the authority conferred by such resolution of August 16, 1935, to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the origin of, and the necessity for, the amendment made on March 2, 1942, to Preference Rating Order P-56 (relating to preference ratings for deliveries of materials for mining enterprises) under which mines are excluded from the benefits of such order if more than 30 percent of their production in dollar value consists of gold or silver, or both. In connection with such investigation, the committee shall ascertain and determine the extent to which consideration was given, in making the amendment to such order on March 2, 1942, to the effect of such amendment on (1) the mining industry in general; (2) the economy of hundreds of communities which are wholly dependent upon mines producing gold or silver, or both; (3) the creation of additional unemployment in mining communities; (4) the extent to which silver may be used in the war effort as a substitute for strategic minerals; (5) the activities of prospectors searching for new discoveries of strategic minerals needed for the war effort; and (6) the losses in tax revenue to the Federal, State, and local governments resulting from the closing of mining enterprises which are unable to secure materials for their continued operation.

The committee is further authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the production, or the lack of production, of silver, strategic and critical metals and minerals, and other metals and minerals which are essential or necessary to the successful prosecution of the present war.

The committee shall report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, the results of its investigations pursuant to the additional authority conferred by this resolution, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HILL. Is the Senator asking for consideration of the resolution at this time?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; and I wish to give a word of explanation.

Mr. HILL. I shall reserve my right to object until the Senator shall have made his explanation.

Mr. McCARRAN. In 1935 there was established what is known as the Senate Special Silver Committee. The chairman of that committee was my beloved former colleague, Senator Pittman. The committee is in existence, and has been an active special committee of the Senate, and is holding meetings from time to time pursuant to the resolution which brought it into existence. The resolution now offered, and for which immediate consideration is requested by the senior Senator from Nevada, is one to expand the powers of the committee regarding investigation, to the end that the committee may hold hearings and bring before it witnesses and experts, those who have knowledge of the subject, bearing on the question of the rule of depletion as applied by the respective tax committees of the Senate and the House, as well as the rule of application of the excess-profits tax, and the effect any of these rules and the application thereof may have upon the mining industry, in order that we may in turn advise the Committee on Finance and other committees having to do with tax subjects.

This is merely to augment the powers of the special committee of the Senate on silver so that it may report to the Senate the result of its investigations, in keeping with the work it has carried on during the years it has been in existence I am asking for immediate consideration.

Mr. HILL. Is the resolution offered at the request of the special committee, if I may ask?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is; the committee met this morning.

Mr. HILL. Has the Senator had opportunity to confer with the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY]?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have not had that opportunity.

Mr. HILL. Has the Senator talked with the chairman of the Committee on Mines and Mining of the Senate, the committee, I take it, to which the resolution would go under ordinary procedure?

Mr. McCARRAN. Under ordinary procedure one would think it might go to that committee, but on a similar occasion one part of a resolution was sent to the Committee on Mines and Mining, but they sent it back to the Senate on the ground that the Committee on Mines and Mining had no jurisdiction, that the jurisdiction belonged to the Special Silver Committee. I trust the Senator understands fully what is in the resolution. There is no request for additional funds, there is no request for anything except additional latitude of jurisdiction.

Mr. McKELLAR. A broadening of the powers of the committee?

Mr. McCARRAN. A broadening of its powers so far as investigation is concerned, to provide for power broader than was encompassed within the original jurisdiction of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Brought about by the war?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. HILL. I do not like to object to the consideration of the resolution, but of course the Senator knows that under the rules all resolutions are referred to the proper committees which have jurisdiction over the subject matters. I do not see why there is any great haste in this matter. I did not know the resolution was to be brought up, I had no opportunity to speak to the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], about it, and the Senator from Nevada did not have that opportunity. The Senate will be in session again on Monday, as the Senator knows, and I wonder if he would not be willing to wait and press the resolution on Monday. If he would agree to that, I think it would be a very happy circumstance.

I hesitate to object to the consideration of the Senator's resolution, but I know that the majority leader, as well as the minority leader, both of whom are necessarily absent from the Chamber at this time, have on different occasions insisted on resolutions of this kind going to the proper committees, and that they not be called up without having been properly referred. Did the Senator have opportunity to confer with the minority leader, the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. McCARRAN. I did not, I am sorry to say.

Mr. HILL. In the absence of both our leaders, I ask the Senator whether he will not permit the resolution to go over until Monday.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no objection to it going over. It could with propriety be acted upon, but I understand the Senator's position, and I am willing to let it go over.

Mr. HILL. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will go over, under the rule.

FLORIDA SHIP CANAL

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I feel that I should be remiss if I did not say a word of approbation of the patriotic and very valuable contribution which has recently been made to the country by a Member of the House of Representatives, and an eminent committee of that body. I refer to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD, chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives, and to the Rivers and Harbors Committee of our sister body.

We all know that the Nation has been deeply stirred by the painful consciousness of a shortage of petroleum products on the Atlantic seaboard. We know that there is no shortage of oil, but only the means of transporting oil from the producing areas around the Gulf of Mexico to the essential consuming areas on the Atlantic coast.

We know that the tankers which have previously been rendering 95 percent of the oil-transport service have been taken off that kind of duty, of necessity, in order that we might further serve the

cause of freedom and our own security in the world.

The removal of those tankers from that service has left the authorities of our Government confronted by a great dilemma, as to how the deficiency could be supplied, at least supplied in time to keep the production curve of our wartime industries centered on the Atlantic seaboard from flattening out, and to keep the prospects of a cold winter from taking in its frigid embrace the citizenry of the whole Atlantic seaboard of the United States, in which is to be found the greatest concentration of population in the whole land.

The agencies of the Federal Government have been considering various proposals. Judge MANSFIELD, leading his Rivers and Harbors Committee in the House of Representatives, has, in my opinion, rendered a great, patriotic service, not by considering but by getting under way a specific method by which this challenging deficiency may be at least partially, and a little while later wholly, supplied. Judge MANSFIELD introduced in the House of Representatives a bill providing that the Intracoastal Waterway which now runs from Port Arthur, Tex., to Port St. Joe, Fla., should be deepened to a constant depth of 12 feet and widened to a width of 125 feet, projected on around the west coast of Florida to a point at or near the Withlacoochee Bay, and then proceed across the peninsula of the State of Florida, a distance of approximately 80 miles, to a junction with the St. Johns River, which leads out to an intersection of the Intracoastal Waterway on the Atlantic seaboard. When completed that great project would make possible barge transportation from Port Arthur, Tex., all the way to Trenton, N. J. Indeed, I should have added that it proposes to extend that Intracoastal Waterway even down to the Mexican border, so that when the whole project is completed a continuous transit of barges would be possible from the Mexican border all the way north of or in the vicinity of Trenton, N. J.

Indeed in the report on that bill, H. R. 6999, it is said that the completion of even a segment of that project might be a means by which the total problem might be solved, for in the report of that committee the following language appears:

> The barge channel across Florida authorized by this bill is the only proposal that can be made capable of supplying all the oil needs of the Atlantic seaboard in the absence of the ocean tanker service.

Again I am reading from the report of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives on the bill H. R. 6999, as follows:

> The barge channel connection across Florida is the only proposal that will be capable of supplying all the oil and gasoline needs of the Atlantic seaboard.

So therefore, Mr. President, Judge MANSFIELD has actually introduced himself and had favorably considered and reported to the House by his committee, a proposal that within a period of 15 months—for so General Reybold, the Chief of Engineers of the United States, testifying before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, assured that committee, the Congress and the country—in 15 months that barge canal across Florida, a distance of about 82 miles from the Withlacooche Bay to the St. Johns River, to a depth of minimum 12 feet, and a width of 125 feet, can become a reality and serve America, and through America the world. In about 3 years' additional time all the other intervening segments of that project can also be completed with reasonable diligence and dispatch.

However, we do not have to wait for the completion of all those segments before the whole Atlantic seaboard may adequately be served with petroleum products, because it is only a distance of 179 miles from the terminus of the existing inland waterway on the Gulf coast, Port St. Joe, Fla., to the western terminus of the proposed barge canal across Florida, and already existing barge operations are three times weekly traversing that open water.

The nature of the coast and the depth of the water and the character of the weather are all such that this is a reasonable, dependable, and safe operation. So all that is needed to make barge transit possible from Port Arthur and other oil areas in the Gulf of Mexico to the consuming areas on the Atlantic seaboard in ample quantities to meet all needs, largely by wooden barges in respect to cruder oils, is to construct in a period of 15 months this barge canal across the northern part of the Florida peninsula.

Mr. President, someone may say, "Well 15 months is a long time away. We have a winter approaching. People are going to be cold on the Atlantic seaboard. Coal shortages will in all probability exist in the same area, due to the depletion of transportation facilities between the coal areas and the consuming portion of the Atlantic coast, and therefore we see the specter not only of fear that may be inflicted upon the people by a threatened enemy attack, but the more frigid embrace of cold which is stretching its arms out this coming winter to take to its bosom the people of the Atlantic seaboard of the United States. How can that be met?"

Judge MANSFIELD has also provided a solution to that question for our satisfaction, Mr. President. He proposes that in a period of about 4 months, for it can be done in about that length of time—it is said a minimum of 3 months might be possible—a pipe line can be constructed across the northern part of the State of Florida from Port St. Joe, the eastern terminus of the existing intracoastal canal which runs westwardly from Corpus Christi to Jacksonville, Fla., a distance of about 280 miles, 24 inches in diameter, which can supply to the Atlantic seaboard from 60,000 to 300,000 barrels of petroleum products a day.

The situation is this. The rail lines are transporting substantially 650,000 barrels a day from the oil areas of the Gulf coast to the consuming areas of the Atlantic seaboard. The pipe lines and inland barge lines already in existence transport about 200,000 barrels. The proposed pipe line from Texas, one which it is proposed to construct from Texas toward Philadelphia, would carry, when completed, about 300,000 barrels daily additional. The proposed line across Florida, the one to which I just referred, the pipe line from Port St. Joe, Fla., to Jacksonville, Fla., a distance of about 282 miles, which would connect up two existing intracoastal waterways, would carry about 60,000 to 300,000 barrels, depending in amount on the size of the pipe that can be secured. So the immediate partial contribution that this particular route can make is the construction of this pipe line, with a diameter of 24 inches, between those termini connecting up those two existing waterways.

Then immediately there should be begun, as Judge MANSFIELD proposes, the construction of this barge canal. Then the barges which come from Port Arthur, instead of emptying their supply at Port St. Joe and putting it into a pipe line, would traverse the open water from Port St. Joe to the Withlacoochee Bay on the west coast of Florida, thence transit the barge canal to which I referred, 12 feet deep and 125 feet wide, until they made a junction with the St. Johns River, already deep water, thence into the inland waterway on the Atlantic seaboard about 20 miles below Jacksonville, Fla., virtually on the coast to points north. Thus there would be a continuous transit possible from Port Arthur, Tex., all the way to Trenton, N. J.

Mr. President, there is another benefit that that would have. It would not only make continuous transit of barges loaded with petroleum products possible, but it would also make possible a water route for the transportation of other essential commodities that come from the main area, salt, sulfur, pulp products, and many other commodities which are equally essential to the industrial activity of the Nation.

So I felt, Mr. President, that it would not be doing justice to our colleagues on the other side of the Capitol if we did not here in this body give some recognition to the pioneering that they have done in respect to meeting this challenging problem. I am glad to say that although I had introduced a bill which had some characteristics which were comparable to and similar to the provisions of the Mansfield bill, I recognize the superior merit of the Mansfield bill. I shall acquiesce completely in it and substitute it appropriately in the place of my bill, and do what I am able to do in expediting its passage and consideration in this body.

I think Senators would like to know that next Monday, so Judge MANSFIELD informed me yesterday afternoon, a rule has been allowed, and the Mansfield bill will come up for consideration in the House of Representatives, either under a rule or under a waiver of the rule. I anticipate its passage that day. It will therefore come to this body next week. When it comes to our Commerce Committee I am sure it will receive expeditious consideration, and that all of us want it to return to the floor of the Senate at the earliest possible time.

If we are to hold off the specter of cold and discomfort, and perhaps another wave of influenza which may strike the country in the coming winter to add to the other sorrows which we may be experiencing in that which may be for us all a sad time, we must with every possible dispatch get this project under way and bring it with all the ability which we possess to a satisfactory and successful conclusion.

DEVELOPMENT OF SYNTHETIC RUBBER FROM FARM PRODUCTS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I have before me an editorial from a newspaper published in New London, Conn., dated May 11, 1942. The editorial charges the President and Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE with being "asleep at the switch" in the matter of production of synthetic rubber from farm products at the time Mr. WALLACE was Secretary of Agriculture.

On May 20, 1942, I made a few remarks on the floor of the Senate, which appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in which I included certain excerpts from the RECORD. One excerpt was from the address which Hon. HENRY A. WALLACE, while Secretary of Agriculture, delivered at Peoria, Ill., on October 18, 1939, on the occasion of the opening of the Department of Agriculture regional laboratory there. That address and other excerpts in the record show very definitely that not only was Mr. WALLACE, as Secretary of Agriculture, not "asleep at the switch" but on the contrary that he demonstrated vision, diligence, and determination in this matter.

On the authority of Mr. Donald B. Nelson, Director of the War Production Board, let me say that it was not until May 1, 1942, the 1st of this month, that there was assurance that butadiene, which is the basic product for the manufacture of synthetic rubber, could be produced from alcohol made from grain. In other words, it was not until the 1st of the present month that the processes for the production of synthetic rubber from grain or any other farm product were established. The knowledge to produce synthetic rubber from grain or from any other product simply was not available. No one had such knowledge until May 1, 1942.

In connection with my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial to which I have referred printed in full in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASLEEP AT THE SWITCH

The statement of Senator BURTON K. WHEELER, of Montana, that the Department of Agriculture has been "asleep at the switch" in the development of synthetic rubber from farm products, in the experimentation that should have been carried on by the Department in other industrial-chemical directions, and that the Department should immediately get priorities for the production of the alcohol needed for artificial rubber, perhaps was in some respects unfair to the present Secretary of Agriculture, Claude R. Wickard. Wickard has been in his post only a short time. The Wheeler comments, in fact, could better have been directed at the former Secretary, who now happens to be the Vice President of the United States, HENRY A. WALLACE.

The complaint is that great quantities of surplus grains—and this Nation has been glutted with surplus grains for years back—ought to have been converted into industrial alcohol, and the alcohol then used to make butadiene, which in turn can be made into artificial rubber. About 80,000,000 bushels of wheat or corn, for instance, would have made 200,000,000 gallons of alcohol, and this alcohol would have made 220,000 tons of butadiene, which in turn would have been sufficient to make 240,000 tons of artificial rubber. It was failure to experiment with this process, and failure to have a synthetic rubber plan ready for immediate adoption, when it became apparent that this Nation was not going to be able to amass a large stock pile of natural rubber soon after the war began, that motivated the Wheeler criticism.

The fact is, however, that not only was the Department of Agriculture "asleep at the switch" but practically everyone else in the Nation was also. There seems to have been little real effort made to expand the production of artificial rubber in this country right up to the time of Pearl Harbor. Government officials gave the idea no special boost; apparently the reason was that Dutch and British interests were eager to safeguard the continued market for natural rubber, and to hold the price up. There is no question that the price of natural rubber has been carefully maintained by regulating supply, through these rubber interests. The danger to this country became apparent when it was first assumed that the Japanese couldn't possibly prove a menace to us, despite the fact that most of the crude-rubber supply was in their back yard, not in ours; and, second, the refusal of this Nation to take ordinary precautions to examine the background of the artificial-rubber processes, with an eye to using this home-produced product rather than being dependent on a source of natural rubber many thousands of miles away in case of war in the Pacific.

When the history of the days just before the war is impartially written, this particular bit of national stupidity will probably hold first rank with underestimating Japan's military strength.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF BILLS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in a few moments I shall move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business, and at the conclusion of the executive session shall move that the Senate adjourn until Monday next. Pending those motions, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate the Presiding Officer be authorized to sign bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Alabama? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance (all in the United States Public Health Service):

Ralph E. Tarbett, senior sanitary engineer, to be a sanitary engineer director, to rank from July 23, 1942;

Several passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons;

Sundry assistant surgeons to be passed assistant surgeons; and

Several passed assistant dental surgeons to be dental surgeons.

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Finance:

Lynn R. Brodrick, of Marysville, Kans., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Kansas, in place of William H. Burke, resigned.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Finance:

Harry P. Hornby, of Uvalde, Tex., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 23, with headquarters at Laredo, Tex. (reappointment).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Finance:

Joseph McGrath, of Boston, Mass., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass. (reappointment).

TAXATION CONVENTION WITH CANADA

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate resume consideration of Executive B, the taxation convention with Canada, which is on the Calendar, and which was under consideration yesterday and was passed over at the request of the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the convention, Executive B, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, a convention between the United States of America and Canada providing for avoidance of double income taxation, modification of certain conflicting principles of taxation, reductions of certain rates of taxation, and establishment of exchange of information between the United States and Canada in the field of income taxation, signed at Washington on March 4, 1942.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Ohio has looked into the convention and has advised me today that he has no objection to offer to it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. Assume that there are banks along the border between the two countries which are parties to the convention, that business is transacted across the border by citizens of Canada having deposits in banks on the American side, and by citizens of the United States having deposits in banks on the Canadian side, and that commercial transactions occur between citizens of one of the contracting parties and a bank of the other contracting party: Is there anything in the convention which would require sworn written reports to be filed with the taxing departments of the two contracting parties?

Mr. GEORGE. The convention provides for the exchange of information between the Governments of Canada and the United States; but the primary purpose of the exchange of information is to advise the two Governments of any double taxation, particularly income taxes, imposed by one country on the citizens of the other. I do not think there is anything in the convention which would require furnishing information beyond what each Government has the right to ask of its own citizens at the present time.

Mr. AUSTIN. That is the real point of the inquiry.

Mr. GEORGE. The convention does not undertake to confer upon either the United States or Canada any extra power with respect to inquiries made of the citizens of either country. It does not undertake to confer power upon Canada to make inquiry of an American citizen residing in the United States, or upon the United States to make inquiry of a Canadian citizen residing in Canada.

With respect to a bank or depository of any kind located within either country, of course, the country where the bank was located would have the right to make inquiry; but the convention does not deal with that question. The primary purpose is to prevent double income taxation, both on individual incomes and corporate income, and to iron out some of the inequalities which have existed in the tax laws of the two countries.

Mr. AUSTIN. If the Senator will permit another question, I understand that the Senator from Georgia has said, in effect, that there is nothing in the convention which would grant to Canada, for example, the power to require of a bank on the American side that it make returns to the tax collector of Canada with respect to the property of Canadian citizens held in that bank. Is that correct?

Mr. GEORGE. We have heretofore had a treaty with Canada, and in our income-tax laws we have provision for withholding dividends or earnings accruing to any nonresident alien. The tax on dividends is withheld at the source, under a provision in our tax law. Canada has a similar tax law. The convention makes an effort to provide for equality of treatment of citizens of Canada and citizens of the United States in Canada, by securing for our citizens equality of treatment such as we give to Canadian citizens here.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think perhaps the Senator from Vermont may be referring to a provision in the convention by which each Government undertakes to furnish the other Government with information regarding its citizens' activities in that country.

In other words, if an American citizen were using a Canadian bank deposit to evade income taxation, I think the convention would permit the United States Government to ask the Canadian Government to obtain information from its own bank and furnish it to this Government in connection with the enforcement of our internal-revenue laws.

Mr. GEORGE. It does provide for exchange of information, as the Senator from Ohio points out.

Mr. TAFT. But no general information of that kind would be requested except perhaps in specific cases in which inquiry was being made relative to income-tax evasion.

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator from Ohio. I had noticed that provision in the convention, but that is not exactly what I was endeavoring to ascertain.

My question goes beyond income, and goes to the subject of principal and property. I was endeavoring to ascertain whether by virtue of this convention the United States would receive information from Canada as to the assets or property, held by a bank or other trustee or depositary, of persons living in the United States who have placed their property in institutions in Canada.

Mr. GEORGE. The convention does make provision for the interchange of information, the purpose being, as I have said, to enable each country to enforce its tax laws, but particularly to enable each country to make sure that there is equality of treatment, so far as circumstances may permit, in the case of income tax paid either by an individual or by a corporation.

Mr. AUSTIN. I have observed a concrete case in which a request was made by another country on a bank for a list of depositors of a certain nationality. I wondered whether there was anything in the convention which would enable either of the contracting parties to require such information of the other party.

Mr. GEORGE. I do not think so, except in some specific cases in which there might be reason to make the inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The convention is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the convention will be reported to the Senate.

The convention was reported to the Senate without amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive B, Seventy-seventh Congress, second session, a convention between the United States of America and Canada providing for avoidance of double income taxation, modification of certain conflicting principles of taxation, reductions of certain rates of taxation, and establishment of exchange of information between the United States and Canada in the field of income taxation, signed at Washington on March 4, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. [Putting the question.] Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the convention is ratified.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles M. Cooke, Jr., to be rear admiral, to rank from November 20, 1941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John W. Reeves, Jr., to be rear admiral, to rank from May 2, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, all the nominations in the Marine Corps are routine in character, none being of higher rank than lieutenant colonel. I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 1, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 28 (legislative day of May 26), 1942:

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Adrian Pool, of El Paso, Tex., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex. (reappointment).

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

Commander William K. Scammell to be a captain in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

Commander Russell L. Lucas to be a captain in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 25th day of May 1942.

Lt. Comdr. Robert C. Sarratt to be a commander in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 25th day of May 1942:

Raymond V. Marron — Joseph H. Rosenthal
Carl H. Hilton — Frank M. Meals

Lt. John P. Crowley to be a lieutenant commander in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 25th day of May 1942:

Arthur G. Morrill
Philip A. Short
George N. Bernier

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY

Rear Admiral John H. Hoover to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 25th day of May 1942, and to continue during his assignment as commander of the Caribbean sea frontier.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

CALIFORNIA

Joseph V. Gaffey, Burlingame, Calif., in place of J. V. Gaffey. Incumbent's commission expired May 27, 1942.

Thomas G. Boothroyd, Central Valley, Calif., in place of R. F. Hiebert, resigned.

Lillian L. Throne, Palos Verdes Estates, Calif., in place of E. T. Schellenberg, resigned.

William H. McCarthy, San Francisco, Calif., in place of W. H. McCarthy. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1942.

Elmer R. Winchell, Susanville, Calif., in place of E. R. Winchell. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1942.

GEORGIA

Don W. Pettitt, Nelson, Ga., in place of D. W. Pettitt. Incumbent's commission expired November 30, 1941.

IDAHO

Norval B. Hawk, Craigmont, Idaho, in place of H. L. Clovis, transferred.

ILLINOIS

Preston C. Beal, Dupo, Ill., in place of A. J. Paul, resigned.

Martin L. Hunt, McLeansboro, Ill., in place of J. W. Epperson, resigned.

James W. Jesk, Oak Forest, Ill., in place of R. E. Tscheulin, removed.

George F. Proff, Oaklawn, Ill., in place of J. J. Matejka, removed.

E. Agnes Zook, Prairie City, Ill. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Dow E. Anderson, Vienna, Ill., in place of E. D. Veach, removed.

IOWA

Flora M. Bradley, Bancroft, Iowa, in place of M. M. Engesser, resigned.

Arthur E. Mason, Carnarvon, Iowa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

MAINE

Edwin J. Bossie, Stockholm, Maine, in place of F. E. Anderson, resigned.

Hilliard R. Spear, Warren, Maine, in place of W. E. Spear, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Helen L. Vincent, Eloise, Mich., in place of S. M. Keenan. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1936.

Elaine C. Clements, Lyons, Mich., in place of J. W. Currigan, transferred.

MINNESOTA

Evelyn M. Kolhei, Cottonwood, Minn., in place of Alexander Kolhei, resigned.

Malter B. Gullickson, Peterson, Minn., in place of Gerhard Byholt. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1941.

MISSISSIPPI

Ben H. Bacon, Schlater, Miss., in place of R. W. Bacon, retired.

MISSOURI

Evelyn Steward, Sheldon, Mo., in place of M. L. Gamble, transferred.

NEW YORK

Claude O. Weidman, Hartwick, N. Y., in place of J. R. Byard, not commissioned.

NORTH CAROLINA

Clarence W. Boshamer, Gastonia, N. C., in place of C. W. Boshamer. Incumbent's commission expired March 3, 1942.

N. Hunt Gwyn, Lenoir, N. C., in place of N. H. Gwyn. Incumbent's commission expired April 16, 1942.

Erma S. Lancaster, Rural Hall, N. C., in place of J. W. Ogburn, transferred.

NORTH DAKOTA

John Paul Ackerman, Fullerton, N. Dak., in place of J. L. Hatfield. removed.

OHIO

Frank J. McCauley, Marietta, Ohio, in place of F. J. McCauley. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

John Maurer, New Philadelphia, Ohio, in place of John Maurer. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

OKLAHOMA

Rosemary H. Floyd, Fittstown, Okla., in place of F. P. Morrison, transferred.

Eddie L. White, Leedey, Okla., in place of D. L. Sapp. Incumbent's commission expired July 30, 1941

OREGON

Clement Y. Arnold, Cave Junction, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1940.

William E. Reed, Mitchell, Oreg. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Jay Terrill, Talent, Oreg., in place of L. W. Tame, resigned.

PENNSYLVANIA

Earl M. Rynier, Gordonville, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Albert A. Schutte, Harborcreek, Pa. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Mark B. Rickabaugh, Wayne, Pa., in place of M. J. Porter, retired.

Nancy L. Hawthorne, West Bridgewater, Pa., in place of M. E. Amon. Incumbent's commission expired February 6, 1941.

TENNESSEE

Hugh C. McKellar, Memphis, Tenn., in place of H. C. McKellar. Incumbent's commission expired April 2, 1942.

TEXAS

Grace B. Jones, Bivins, Tex., in place of R. P. Taylor, resigned.

John T. Davis, Jr., Throckmorton, Tex., in place of W. W. Merriman, transferred.

VIRGINIA

Henry C. Swanson, Danville, Va., in place of H. C. Swanson. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

WASHINGTON

Clinton L. Byers, Longview, Wash., in place of C. L. Byers. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

WISCONSIN

Thomas F. McDonald, Marshfield, Wis., in place of T. F. McDonald. Incumbent's commission expires May 31, 1942.

Howard J. Merryfield, Wild Rose, Wis., in place of T. A. Wiora, transferred.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate May 28 (legislative day of May 26), 1942:

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

PROMOTIONS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be rear admirals

Charles M. Cooke, Jr.
John W. Reeves, Jr.

MARINE CORPS

To be lieutenant colonels

William W. Davies
Vernon E. Megee

To be majors

Clovis C. Coffman
Alva B. Lasswell
William B. McKean

To be captain

William E. Boles

To be second lieutenants

Thomas M. Leineweber	George Boot, Jr.
Charles J. Kimmel	William W. Curtis
Daniel H. Davis	Robert W. Nelson
James B. Davis, Jr.	James H. Naylor
John F. Gheen	Willard A. Pate
John E. King	Hugh J. Irish
Robert T. Gillespie	Raymond H. White

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, MAY 28, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O immortal Son of God, who for our sakes wore the robe of flesh, revealing the love of the Father's heart, give us eyes to see the light and hearts to love the truth. In patient humility we would seek to keep Thy commandments and come into those relations where Thou dost pour the splendor of spiritual illumination and peace. Come, blessed voice of quietness, come in the stillness of the newborn morn; come like a sweet repose and breathe Thy nearness upon us.

Out of the depths Thou hast brought us, and with unutterable gratitude we would take the vow of rededication at the altar of our country in memory of our sacrificial heroes. It is not enough to praise and call the names of our American youth in battle for a better world. In behalf of the Nation in which we dwell, of all struggling nations of the globe, may we purge our minds of all distrust and fear and stand forth with restraint, toil, and sacrifice, cherishing above all things else the glorious destiny of our free land. Deeper than we have known, clearer than we have ever seen, do Thou light the flame of human liberty upon the hearthstones of all homes, in every schoolroom, and at the altar of every human soul under the folds of our flag. Almighty God, be at the side of our President day and night. In our Saviour's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 69. An act to authorize the adjustment of land-ownership lines within the General Grant grove section of the Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., in order to protect equities established by possession arising in conformity with a certain survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 488. An act for the relief of Kathryn O. Sweeney and others;

H. R. 1162. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the final homestead proof submitted by Henry Martin Coffman;

H. R. 1595. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Plumas National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 1736. An act for the relief of Lillian Last.

H. R. 1757. An act for the relief of James D. G. Alexander;

H. R. 2307. An act validating a certain conveyance, heretofore made by the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way in the town of Indio, in the county of Riverside, State of California, acquired under section 23 of the act of March 3, 1871 (16 Stat. 573);

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of George P. Crawford;

H. R. 2685. An act to authorize the disposition of recreational demonstration projects, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Wiley W. Watkins;

H. R. 2934. An act for the relief of L. H. Martin;

H. R. 3201. An act for the relief of Walter B. Williams, Jr.;

H. R. 3937. An act to change the designation of the Fort Marion National Monument, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4205. An act to add to the Cleveland National Forest, Calif., certain contiguous lands of the United States which can be most effectively and economically protected and administered as parts of said national forest;

H. R. 4213. An act for the relief of persons in connection with the extraction of gold-bearing ore from the Ruck-a-Chucky dam site;

H. R. 4347. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the North Pacific Union Conference Association of Seventh-Day Adventists;

H. R. 4526. An act for the relief of Joseph Donatelli and Rose Donatelli;

H. R. 4629. An act for the relief of Alfred Smith;

H. R. 4676. An act to accept the cession by the Commonwealth of Kentucky of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mammoth Cave National Park; to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for the park in accordance with the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 635); to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the development of a proper entrance road to the park; and for other purposes;

H. R. 4733. An act to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest, the Salmon National Forest, and the Targhee National Forest in the State of Idaho;

H. R. 5013. An act for the relief of James P. Crawford;

H. R. 5016. An act to amend section 1 of the act approved August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 700), entitled "An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to notify the State of Virginia that the United States assumes police jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Shenandoah National Park, and for other purposes";

H. R. 5142. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the claims of any landowner or water user on the Owyhee reclamation project, Oregon, arising in 1940 by reason of a break in the North Canal of such project;

H. R. 5210. An act for the relief of E. M. Conroy;

H. R. 5287. An act relating to the transfer to the Secretary of War of certain lands owned by the United States;

H. R. 5329. An act for the relief of J. J. McIntosh;

H. R. 5394. An act to authorize the lease or sale of public lands for use in connection with the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and so forth;

H. R. 5484. An act for the relief of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska;

H. R. 5490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim to the States of Oregon and California, respectively, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands of Goose Lake in Oregon and California;

H. R. 5527. An act for the relief of Gerney M. Claiborne;

H. R. 5636. An act to expedite the settlement of claims and accounts incident to certain agricultural adjustment programs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5680. An act for the relief of James M. Hays;

H. R. 5687. An act for the relief of Edwin L. Wade;

H. R. 5713. An act for the relief of George W. Lyle under the jurisdiction of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission;

H. R. 5723. An act for the relief of Anna Danielson and Betty Tiedeman;

H. R. 5772. An act for the relief of Glenn A. Hoss;

H. R. 5847. An act for the relief of Mrs. Julia campbell;

H. R. 5910. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rudolph Treiber, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 5955. An act for the relief of Harold W. Burch and Lucille M. Burch;

H. R. 6102. An act confirming the claim of Augustin Dominique Tureaud for the Church of Saint Jacques to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, parish of Saint James, said claim being listed as No. 392;

H. R. 6365. An act for the relief of Comdr. Cato D. Glover;

H. R. 6625. An act granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the Constitution of the State of New Mexico, providing a method for executing leases for grazing and agricultural purposes on lands granted or confirmed to the State of New Mexico by the act of Congress approved June 20, 1910;

H. R. 6748. An act for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder;

H. R. 6797. An act for the relief of the estate of Tom Gentry;

H. R. 7008. An act to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of $5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority; and

H. R. 7097. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to extend its present track connection with the United States navy yard so as to provide adequate railroad facilities in connection with the development of Buzzards Point as an industrial area in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1932 (47 Stat. 322), as amended by the act approved June 20, 1939 (53 Stat. 849).

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills and a joint resolution of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 925. An act for the relief of Lemuel T. Root, Jr.;

S. 1034. An act relating to the sale of public lands granted to or vested in the State of Idaho by the act of July 3, 1890;

S. 1220. An act for the relief of G. C. Barco and W. G. Knowles;

S. 1788. An act to provide for the leasing of certain lands of the United States in the State of North Dakota for the development of oil, gas, and other minerals;

S. 1953. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of James B. Shuler in his individual capacity and as husband and legal representative of the estate of Elise Morrison Shuler, deceased, and as father of Ellie S. Shuler, deceased;

S. 2099. An act for the relief of Mrs. Reita M. Lary;

S. 2191. An act for the relief of Clara Wrobliski;

S. 2203. An act for the relief of Bayard M. Atwood;

S. 2248. An act to amend the law relating to the care and custody of insane residents of Alaska, and for other purposes;

S. 2254. An act providing for certain additional appointments to the United States Naval Academy;

S. 2273. An act for the relief of Ruth D. and Henry L. Brittingham;

S. 2310. An act for the relief of Roy Chandler;

S. 2330. An act to enable the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two-hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans;

S. 2362. An act relating to the jurisdiction over certain lands in the Isle Royale National Park;

S. 2369. An act for the acquisition of Indian lands required in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of electric transmission lines and other works, Parker Dam power project, Arizona-California;

S. 2420. An act for the relief of Isabelle Fuller;

S. 2437. An act to amend section 9 of the act of August 18, 1941 (Public Law 213, 77th Cong.), by striking out the proviso thereto which requires a monthly report by the Secretary of War to the Congress of the number of men in active training and service;

S. 2454. An act to prescribe the relative rank of members of the Navy Nurse Corps in relation to commissioned officers of the Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 2470. An act for the relief of Eileen Collins Treacy;

S. 2488. An act to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased;

S. 2490. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941 (Public Law 8, 77th Cong.), as amended by section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1941 (Public Law 166, 77th Cong.);

S. 2495. An act extending the maturity date of loans made or arranged for by the Commodity Credit Corporation on cotton, corn, and wheat of the 1941 crop;

S. 2496. An act to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution granting permission to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General (retired) of the United States Public Health Service, to accept certain decorations bestowed upon him by the Republics of Colombia, Haiti, and Chile.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2646. An act for the relief of L. W. Marek, Jr.;

H. R. 4370. An act for the relief of Charles L. Lair;

H. R. 4533. An act to provide for the disposition of trust or restricted estates of Indians dying intestate without heirs;

H. R. 4554. An act for the relief of the estate of Julian B. Wiggins, deceased, and the estate of R. E. Thompson, deceased;

H. R. 4941. An act for the relief of J. C. Lemon, Louis McCoy, and Patricia McCoy;

H. R. 4953. An act for the relief of Emil Lassila, Martha Lassila, Ellen Huhta, and Sylvia Huhta;

H. R. 4975. An act to add certain lands to the Sequoia National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 5070. An act for the relief of Francis Corwin Circle;

H. R. 5454. An act for the relief of David Caron;

H. R. 5496. An act for the relief of Cecile McLaughlin;

H. R. 5499. An act for the relief of Henry Daley, guardian of James Ray Daley and Norman Franklin Daley;

H. R. 5920. An act for the relief of E. A. Williams;

H. R. 6033. An act for the relief of William Tipton, Mrs. William Tipton, and Mrs. Eula Nelson;

H. R. 6071. An act to grant a preference right to certain oil and gas lessees; and

H. R. 6557. An act for the relief of James Gilmore and Marian E. Gilmore.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6315. An act to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land-bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. HERRING, Mr. CLARK of Idaho, Mr. DANAHER, and Mr. BALL to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of the Interior.
2. Department of the Treasury.
3. Department of War.
4. War Production Board.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4092) entitled "An act for the relief of E. P. Corley."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of the Interior.
2. Department of War.
3. Civil Service Commission.
4. Federal Works Agency.
5. The National Archives.

FILING OF A REPORT

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Foreign Affairs Committee may have until 12 o'clock tonight to file a report on the bill H. R. 7096.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM]?

There was no objection.

FILING OF CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the managers on the part of the House may have until midnight Saturday to file a conference report on the bill S. 2250.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman incorporate in his request that it may be taken up notwithstanding that it is not printed in the RECORD?

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, let the request be until Friday at midnight.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, what is the request?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to have until Saturday night to file a conference report, and the Chair suggested that if he intended to take it up Monday he incorporate it in his request.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request if there is not to be a RECORD printed then.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a statement from William T. Kerr, president of the National Flag Day Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a letter from W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings, and the reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PADDOCK]?

There was no objection.

GAS RATIONING IN INTERIOR AREAS OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a statement in regard to gas rationing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I addressed the House on the subject of gas rationing in the Midwest and the interior areas of the United States, protesting and making an appeal that such threatened rationing be delayed on the ground there was no shortage of gasoline nor transportation in that area. This morning there came to my desk a statement from a committee representing 16 States in the Midwest area of the country; this committee was appointed by the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Coordinator for War. That committee has made its report, and in the report there is this significant statement:

> It is our studied opinion that before gas rationing is extended to the Middle West governmental agencies should devote their energies to the continued encouragement of the proper use of tires instead of denying the use of gasoline in areas where that product is abundant.

[Here the gavel fell.]

SUGAR, RUBBER, AND OIL

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the rubber-gasoline situation has come to a point where it is apparent even to the most rabid administration supporters that the truth is not being told the American people—at least, all of the truth—and that there are some sinister conditions back of this rubber-gasoline mystery.

The people have been told—and it has not been denied by any responsible spokesman—that the British-Dutch rubber interests prevented us, before our entry into the war, from acquiring an adequate stock pile of reserve rubber. Jesse Jones has admitted the truth of that statement before a congressional committee. It has also been commented on frequently that the administration has wanted to discourage the establishment and development of a synthetic rubber, or rubber substitute, industry in this country, because it wants to keep the Latin-American countries assured that they will be able to build up a natural rubber industry after the war to serve American needs.

This whole rubber situation is the sugar situation all over again. It has become evident that the American people are being penalized by administration bureaucrats for the benefit of foreign interests. It is becoming apparent that the livelihood of thousands of American citizens and the business of other thousands of Americans are being deliberately ruined by these bureaucrats, who, it seems, prefer to let that happen rather than put the interests of American citizens ahead of the interests of foreign politics.

The favorite technique of the administration and its supporters has been to cry that disunity is being fostered and that confidence of the people in the Government is being weakened whenever anybody has criticized these mysterious and illogical actions of the administration.

As Senator LEE, of Oklahoma, a Democrat, has pointed out in the last few days, the American people will have to be given some reasonable explanation of why the administration intends to ration gasoline and fuel oil, especially in those territories adjacent to the oil wells and refineries which are now being and have been pinched down.

An authority which cannot be controverted for the statement that the Government is paying more attention to postwar rubber development in Latin America than to the disastrous effects of its rubber policy on American businesses and wage earners, is to be found in none other than the Vice President of the United States, HENRY A. WALLACE. Mr. WALLACE has been authentically reported in the last 2 weeks as seeking authority under a definition of policy by the administration to assure the rubber-producing countries in Latin America that after the war their rubber industries will be of interest to—which means will serve—the

United States. It was the same Mr. WALLACE who, as Secretary of Agriculture, stated to a senatorial committee that the American beet-sugar industry was an inefficient industry, should never have been established, and should be abolished, but that it did not at that time appear to be politically possible to do so. The American people are today operating under the sugar-rationing cards directly and solely because of that policy on the part of Mr. WALLACE and the rest of the administration. The American people are today operating under the tire and gasoline rationing, because the same policy has been obstinately adhered to by the administration in the face of plain critical needs for the establishment of synthetic and substitute rubber industries in this country.

It is a deceptive subterfuge for the administration bureaucrats to cry that criticisms of their mistaken policies create disunity. There is nothing that can more quickly and more effectively create disunity and destroy the confidence of the people in the Government than the administration's course in sugar and rubber production.

You cannot destroy a man's business, or take away his livelihood needlessly, and expect unity between your views and his. Ruining people's businesses needlessly and destroying their jobs needlessly does not increase a feeling of enthusiastic patriotism in their hearts.

Let us have the truth about the rubber situation, and let us have a policy designed to meet the interests and needs of the American people first.

If anything were needed to convince the people that we should become self-sustaining as rapidly as possible, it is our experience with sugar, rubber and oil.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute to ask the majority leader a question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Can the majority leader advise the House as to next week's program?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very glad to. On Monday there will be the call of bills on the Consent Calendar. There will also be one suspension. That is, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] will be recognized to move to suspend the rules and pass the bill covering construction of a pipe line across the northern part of Florida, which is of importance to the east coast.

Mr. MICHENER. That is the one the Rules Committee granted a rule on yesterday?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. On Tuesday there will be the call of the bills on the Private Calendar. There is also the Labor-Federal Security Agency's appropriation bill which will come up for consideration on Tuesday. There is also the allotment bill in connection with the dependents of those in the service reported by the Committee on Military Affairs; and if a rule is granted on that, we intend to take it up next week, probably on Wednesday.

There are several possibilities with reference to conference reports, which, of course, are always in order. I have talked with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] and understand that he is hopeful the conferees on the small business bill will bring in a report next week. The legislative and independent offices appropriation bills are also in conference. I am unable to state definitely at this time what the status will be with reference to conference reports, except that they will be in order next week if reported.

Further than that, I have nothing else to announce to the House at this time. That will constitute a pretty busy week, probably.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. There is one very important bill that it is necessary to bring into the House, that is, the tax bill. Can the gentleman tell us when we will get that bill to keep this country from sinking?

Mr. McCORMACK. I shall attempt to answer the first part of the gentleman's inquiry. I think this country is not going to sink.

Mr. RICH. It may come close to it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Let us not get into a discussion of that at this time.

Of course, a tax bill is a very, very serious matter. I can assure the gentleman from my experience of 10 years on the Committee on Ways and Means, during which time six tax bills were considered, that the problems confronting the committee are tremendous. This is the most difficult tax bill the committee has had to consider probably since the World War, if not including that. The committee has a tremendous task to perform. The best information I have is that the bill probably will not come in here much before the first of July. That is the information I received this morning and yesterday.

Mr. RICH. I will admit it is a very difficult thing to put taxes on the people, because it will be hard for them to pay taxes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein a telegram received by the Speaker of the House from the Governor of Texas, Coke Stevenson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a copy of an article by Mrs. Florence S. Ogden, published in the Delta Democrat-Times of Greenville, Miss., on May 24, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

(Mr. TRAYNOR asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short letter relating to the draft.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

THE TAX BILL

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, there are at least two proposals of the Treasury Department concerning the new tax legislation now being written by the Ways and Means Committee which are causing grievous concern to the people of my district, as well as the entire country. The first of these proposals would limit the proportion of an estate that may be bequeathed to educational and charitable institutions. The second would tax all gifts to such institutions made by persons 65 years of age or older, on the theory that they are made in anticipation of death.

The enactment of these proposals would virtually kill privately controlled colleges, universities, and philanthropic institutions, and would definitely stifle the spirit of charity and service, which has so long characterized our American way of life. Privately controlled institutions would be deprived of their most significant sources of financial support. In brief, public welfare would be seriously damaged.

The result would be that the taxpayers of the State and the Nation would be called upon to defray the expenses of educational and charitable activities which are now borne by private bodies.

This would be a very poor arrangement from a business point of view, since the added financial burden on the taxpayer would far outweigh the relatively small advantage attained by the proposed method of taxation.

I trust that the Ways and Means Committee will see fit to reject these Treasury proposals.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an address delivered by the Honorable Frank C. Walker at the commencement exercises of Georgtown University.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and include therein an article on agriculture's greatest opportunity.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

THE TAX BILL

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to confirm the remarks the majority leader has just made relative to the possibility of securing any action in the near future on the tax bill. As a member of the Committee on Ways and Means, I can definitely say that the committee has had a very difficult and trying job, and is working at it day and night. I feel the House ought to be patient with the committee in order that we can accomplish the best results in the shortest time possible. I confirm what the majority leader has said, that it will undoubtedly be July before we see the bill on the floor.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, it is with pride and satisfaction that I find my name on the purge list of the "reds." I have fought the Nazis, I have fought the Communists, I have fought the Fascists, and all the teachers of the philosophy of Karl Marx, and I am going to continue to do so as long as I am in this House. The issue is clear cut. Now, all those who stand for the subversive activities of the "reds" can get on one side of the fence and I will take the American side. I am quite sure the American people can answer that question.

They could not put me on the purge list because I did not support the administration, because I did support the administration 100 percent on foreign policy and 100 percent on defense. They could not take me for that, but they had to take me on a fight on the "red" outfit, and I am going to continue that fight as long as I live.

[Here the gavel fell.]

FARM PRICES AND WAGES

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, there has been so much pure propaganda and prejudice on the subject of parity, wages, and kindred subjects, that it occurred to me a few facts might be in order. On the 15th of May I asked the Secretary of Agriculture to supply me with the historical facts on wages and farm prices over a period of years, and particularly for the war years. The result I have here and it should be of general interest.

Using the 1909–14 years as a base with an index of 100, these figures show that in 1914 earnings of factory workers stood at 105.5 and farm prices at 101.

In 1919 earnings of factory workers stood at 225.6 and farm prices at 213.

That was the peak for farm prices. In 1920 wages went up to 273.3, and farm prices receded to 211. Next year, the big slump came; wages going back to 239.1, while farm prices crashed to 125.

That was the story of World War No. 1. Now compare the story of World War No. 2.

In 1939, earnings of factory workers were 304.3 of the 1909–14 level, while farm prices were only 93 percent of that level.

In 1941, last year, wages went to 348, up 44 points, while prices received by farmers went to 122, up 29 points, but leaving farm prices at about one-third of an equitable relationship based on the parity period of 1909–14.

Parity, it should be remembered, is an equitable relationship and is not a fixed figure. It is designed to express the ratio between what a farmer has to buy and what he has to sell. These figures, prepared by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics, are an amazing revelation that not only are farm prices far below the level of wages in fixed dollars, but that they are only a fraction of wages in terms of purchasing power and far below World War No. 1 ratios. And his memory is dull who does not recall the World War $2.20 wheat. Today it is $1.20.

Yet the staggering truth is that in the entire field of national endeavor, the farmer was the one individual who was most ready to do his job in this war. We have had a shortage of almost everything except food. The farmer, most undercompensated class in the country, has done his job the best.

Mr. Speaker, because of their general interest, I ask permission to insert the brief letter and table from the Secretary of Agriculture at this point:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, May 26, 1942.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CASE: In response to your letter of May 15, I have had prepared and am sending you a table showing index numbers of hourly earnings of factory workers and of prices received by farmers for the periods 1914–22 and 1939–42.

I am also enclosing three charts which show the changes in prices received by farmers and in industrial wage rates during the first World War and during the present war.

Sincerely yours,

CLAUDE R. WICKARD,
Secretary.

Hourly earnings of factory workers and prices received by farmers, United States, 1914–22 and 1939–42

[Index numbers]

Year or month	Hourly earnings of factory workers (1910–14=100)	Prices received by farmers (August 1909–July 1914=100)
WORLD WAR NO. 1		
1914	105.5	101
1915	108.3	98
1916	123.3	118
1917	147.1	175
1918	192.8	202
1919	225.6	213
1920	273.3	211
1921	239.1	125
1922	219.3	132
WORLD WAR NO. 2		
1939	304.3	93
1940	316.7	98
1941	348.0	122
January 1942	378.4	149
February 1942	379.6	145
March 1942		146
April 1942		150

Source: Division of Statistical and Historical Research, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include the figures I have referred to and also the letter from the Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I had a special order for today. I now ask unanimous consent that that may be put over until next Wednesday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

LINDBERGH FLIGHT ANNIVERSARY

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, 15 years ago yesterday Charles A. Lindbergh landed in Paris after the first solo flight over the Atlantic. This feat thrilled the

world. He immediately became the hero of every small boy in America. I have tried to think many times if there were ever any other single heroic act in the world that equaled it—certainly nothing where no lives were lost nor damage intended.

These past 15 years have had a tremendous development in aviation, but nothing possibly to come will ever dim this heroic accomplishment of 15 years ago. We might say with justification that half the men in the flying armed forces got their inspiration from this lone eagle.

The after acclaim accorded Charles Lindbergh found in him an unparalleled modesty which indelibly recorded his further greatness. America was proud of him, and I think it is only fitting that we should remember this anniversary.

I remember the night after the morning he took off. His infinity so permeated the air that the referee at Madison Square Garden boxing matches asked that huge crowd to stand a minute in silent prayer for his safe arrival. This, to my notion, was one of the greatest demonstrations of humanity's finest hopes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of post-war plans and to include therein two addresses, one by James Max Weiss and one by Norman Thomas. The latter two would cost, according to the statement of the Public Printer, $90.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include a brief magazine article from the Kiwanis magazine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include some newspaper editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief address by Dr. Laws.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

FEDERAL LAND BANK AND LAND BANK COMMISSIONER LOANS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6315) to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. FULMER, FLANNAGAN, PIERCE, HOPE, and KINZER.

PUBLICATION OF INVENTIONS OF NATIONAL INTEREST

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2427), relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2 of the act of Congress approved July 1, 1940 (Public, No. 700, 76th Cong., 3d sess., ch. 501), be amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 2. This act shall take effect on approval and shall remain in force during the time when the United States is at war."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and ask the gentleman from Texas to make an explanation.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, in the Seventy-sixth Congress we passed a law to keep secret inventions primarily useful for national defense, a law in no way controversial. In the Seventy-seventh Congress we passed an amendment to make that law more effective. That law by its terms expires on the 1st of July, and this Senate bill, with the House amendment, merely extends the operation of that law and the amendment thereto for the duration of the war.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman indicate how we are to determine the duration of the war?

Mr. LANHAM. After the duration of the war the law will terminate automatically, by reason of the fact that we have in the patent law certain regulations to which we will revert when the war is over, and this law by its terms provides that this act shall take effect on its approval and shall remain in force during the time the United States is at war. By its terms it is not operative any longer than the end of the war.

Mr. MICHENER. It is very difficult sometimes to know just when a war ends.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say to my friend that, of course, we can determine that definitely later, but I think as a matter of fact this should be made permanent legislation.

Mr. MICHENER. That is what we are getting at. Is it the purpose to make it permanent legislation?

Mr. LANHAM. Not at this time. The legislation is to terminate at the end of the war.

Mr. MICHENER. Usually there is a provision in such a bill providing that after the President's proclamation of peace the law shall be of no further force and effect.

Mr. LANHAM. If the gentleman wishes to submit such an amendment, I have no objection to it, but I am sure that by perusal of the law the gentleman would conclude that it should be permanent legislation, but it would require legislative action at the end of the war to make it so.

Mr. MICHENER. Of course, I rely on what the gentleman has said.

Mr. LANHAM. I am sure that we are all of one mind about the necessity for and the importance of this legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "and", insert "together with the provisions of the act of August 21, 1941 (Public Law 239, 77th Cong., 1st sess., ch. 393.)"

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

PAY AND ALLOWANCE FOR CADETS IN UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY IN AVIATION INSTRUCTION

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, by agreement with the chairman on the majority of the members of the Committee on Military Affairs, which committee is now in executive session, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 2446, to prescribe the pay and certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training and aviation instruction, and for other purposes, with a committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain to the House in understandable language just what this amendment does?

Mr. ANDREWS. There has been a certain change in the curriculum at the Military Academy, which provides for the aviation training of certain cadets at the academy, and this bill provides for additional pay and certain allowances for those cadets who are in flight training. It is necessary in order to straighten out the account to have this authorization.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That during such time as cadets of the United States Military Academy are undergoing flight training and aviation instruction they shall receive the same base pay as is now or may hereafter be provided for Army aviation cadets, which pay shall include extra pay for flying risk, as provided by law, and shall be issued at Government expense the necessary aviation clothing and equipment for such training; during the course of such training when not quartered at the Military Academy they shall receive the same allowances for travel, subsistence, and quarters as are now or may hereafter be provided for Army aviation cadets; and during the course of such training they

shall be entitled to the same insurance benefits are provided by the act of June 3, 1941 (Public Law 99, 77th Cong.), for enlisted men of the Army detailed as aviation students: *Provided*, That, upon completion of the prescribed training as aviation students, and until permanently relieved from duty involving participation in regular and frequent aerial flights, the insurance provided shall continue, but the premiums shall be deducted from the pay of the individual concerned and paid as the Secretary of War may direct to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs; and upon being permanently relieved from duty involving participation in regular and frequent aerial flights, the insurance may be continued at the option and at the expense of the individual concerned.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "training", strike out "and aviation instruction they shall receive the same base pay as is now or may hereafter be provided for Army aviation cadets, which pay shall include extra pay for flying risk, as provided by law, and" and insert "involving participation in regular and frequent aerial flights they."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to prescribe certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO RECEIVE MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the adjournment of the House, the Clerk be authorized to receive a message from the Senate and that the Speaker be authorized to sign the enrolled bill of the Senate, S. 2508.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the subject of gasoline rationing in the Midwest.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of gasoline rationing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

O. P. A. IN OHIO

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a newspaper of general circulation in Ohio, the headline of which reads "Politics creeps into choice of Ohio O. P. A. head."

The story is about Mr. Harry Beckmann, who was appointed on February 27 by Gov. John W. Bricker of Ohio, to be rationing chief for our State. This man's work has been highly commended by Leon Henderson personally, and by members of that department. I trust the charge made in this newspaper is not correct. However, the fact remains that this man worked without salary, and has not been appointed to the job recommended by the Government. This job now pays, I understand, approximately $8,000 a year. This man is not looking for the money. He has done an excelmended by the Government. This job stand in the way of his being continued in the fine work he has been doing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution from the Chamber of Commerce of Gulfport, Miss.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LABELING OF BLOOD BANKS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and to insert certain newspaper clippings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF JOHN LESNIAK

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4723) for the relief of the legal guardian of John Lesniak, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

On page 2, line 3, strike out "Works Progress" and insert "Work Projects."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLEAVER KELLEY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4153) for the relief of Cleaver Kelley, with a Senate amendment, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER.

FERD W. MEILE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5000) for the relief of Ferd W. Meile, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER.

JOSEPH SOULEK

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5439) for the relief of Joseph Soulek, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER.

ALBERT M. HOWARD

Mr. McGEHEE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill S. 1563 an act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered printed:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 1563) entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the House amendment insert "*Provided*, That the judgment shall not exceed the sum of $7,500", and the House agree to the same.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
W. A. PITTENGER,
Managers on the part of the House.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference of the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1563) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying report:

The bill passed the House with an amendment providing that the amount of any judgment in the above-referred-to case shall not exceed the sum of $5,000.

At the conference, certain additional evidence was submitted and it was agreed upon that the judgment of the court in this case shall not exceed the sum of $7,500.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
W. A. PITTENGER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill S. 1563, an act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Albert M. Howard, and that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report was agreed to.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it, but the Chair did ask the gentleman awhile ago to submit it to the Chair in advance.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I submitted one to the Parliamentarian 3 days ago and waited until the legislative program was disposed of before bringing it up. I understood there was no legislative program for today.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman did not submit it to the Speaker.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; I submitted it to the Parliamentarian.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

ATTENDANCE OF MARINE BAND AT FIFTY-SECOND ANNUAL REUNION OF UNITED CONFEDERATE VETERANS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 7036, to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the fifty-second annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Chattanooga, Tenn., June 23 to 26, inclusive, 1942.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to permit the band of the United States Marine Corps to attend and give concerts at the fifty-second annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Chattanooga, Tenn., from June 23 to 26, inclusive, 1942.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of defraying the expenses of such band in attending and giving concerts at such reunion, there is authorized to be appropriated the sum of $5,432.25, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to carry out the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That in addition to transportation and Pullman accommodations the leaders and members of the Marine Band be allowed not to exceed $5 per day each for additional living expenses while on duty, and that the payment of such expenses shall be in addition to the pay and allowances to which they would be entitled while serving at their permanent station.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this is the usual bill that permits the Marine Band to go to the Confederate Veterans' reunion and to the reunion of the Grand Army of the Republic, the only two reunions the Navy Department recommends that the Marine Band be permitted to participate in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLIGHT RATIONS FOR MARINE CORPS FLYING PERSONNEL

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2088) to authorize aircraft flight rations for officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Navy and Marine Corps while engaged in flight operations.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This bill has been prepared by our distinguished colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. FLAHERTY]. I will ask him to explain the bill.

Mr. FLAHERTY. Mr. Speaker, this bill was presented by the Navy Department for the purpose of eliminating a lot of paper work that is now involved when men of the Navy are assigned on flight duty. At the present time there are seven closely written pages of instructions that concern the accounting for these flight rations that are provided for men who go out on flights of 20 or 30 or more hours. In order to eliminate that cumbersome task the Navy Department recommends this legislation, which authorizes them to draw stores at the base from which they proceed, and thereby eliminate the necessity of accounting for these supplies after they return to their base. It is a piece of legislation that is greatly desired by the Navy Department and that is really needed to facilitate operations. I hope there will be no objection to the immediate consideration and passage of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter there may be furnished to officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Navy and Marine Corps, while actually engaged in flight operations, an aircraft flight ration in kind, chargeable to the proper Navy or Marine Corps appropriation, which flight ration shall be supplementary to any ration or subsistence allowance now granted to such personnel: *Provided*, That no part of an aircraft flight ration shall be furnished without cost to any person in a travel status or to any person to whom a per diem allowance is granted in lieu of actual subsistence.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIREMENT, RANK, AND PAY OF HEADS OF STAFF DEPARTMENTS OF THE MARINE CORPS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill, S. 2229, to provide for the retirement, rank, and pay of heads of staff departments of the Marine Corps.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill was reported to the House by our distinguished colleague, the ranking minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS]. I will ask Mr. MAAS to explain the bill to the House.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is to bring the Marine Corps into conformity with the existing law and system in the Navy. Some years ago Congress passed legislation bringing the Navy into conformity with the Army. The Army practice is that the heads of the various corps or branches in the Army who hold temporary rank as major general in the Army are permitted upon retirement to have the rank they held as bureau chiefs. Frequently there are many young officers in this group, and when their term is over they revert to their permanent rank of captain in the Navy or colonel in the Army. It is thus desirable and essential to the morale of the Navy that these officers not revert to a lower status.

This simply extends the same thing to the Marine Corps, where there are three staff heads, the Adjutant Inspector, the head of the Quartermaster Corps, and the Paymaster General, who hold temporary rank, but who are not permitted to retire with that rank. Generally speaking, it involves no cost whatever, because the retired pay of a brigadier general is identical with that of a colonel.

I trust there will be no objection to the bill and its immediate consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any officer of the Marine Corps who may be retired while serving as head of a staff department of the Marine Corps, or who has served or shall have served 2½ years or more as head of a staff department of the Marine Corps, and is retired after completion of such service while serving in a lower rank or grade, may, in the discretion of the President, be retired with the rank, pay, and allowances authorized by law for the highest grade or rank held by him as such head of a staff department of the Marine Corps: *Provided*, That the President in his discretion may extend the privileges herein authorized to such officers as have heretofore been retired and who satisfy the foregoing conditions: *Provided further*, That no increase provided herein in retired pay or allowances shall be held to have accrued prior to the passage of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE TO STATE OF ILLINOIS, FOR HIGHWAY PURPOSES ONLY, A PORTION OF NAVAL TRAINING STATION, GREAT LAKES, ILL.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the imme-

diate consideration of the bill (S. 1637) to authorize the conveyance to the State of Illinois, for highway purposes only, a portion of the Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill is reported by our distinguished colleague, the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON], but I will make a brief explanation of the bill.

It permits the Navy Department to transfer to the State of Illinois for highway purposes only a portion of the Naval Training Station at Great Lakes, consisting of about 2 acres of ground. When it ceases to be used by the State of Illinois for road purposes, then it reverts back to the Navy Department.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to convey to the State of Illinois for highway purposes only, upon such terms and conditions as he may prescribe, all right, title, and interest of the United States of America in and to a parcel of land of the Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill., containing two and six hundred and eighty-nine one-thousandths acres, more or less.

SEC. 2. That if any part of the above-described lands herein granted to the State of Illinois shall be used for any other purpose or purposes or shall cease to be maintained by the State of Illinois for the purpose for which granted, such part shall revert to the United States.

SEC. 3. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHMENT OF DESIGNATION OF NAVAL AVIATION PILOT (AIRSHIP)

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2382) to amend the act approved June 24, 1926, entitled "An act to authorize the construction and procurement of aircraft and aircraft equipment in the Navy and Marine Corps, and to adjust and define the status of the operating personnel in connection therewith," so as to provide for the establishment of the designation of naval pilot (airship), and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill is presented to the House by our distinguished colleague from New York [Mr. COLE]. I will ask the gentleman to explain to the House the purpose of this bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, while it is true the report was submitted under my name, the distinguished chairman of the committee has the information there and is entirely familiar with it. I suggest he explain it.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, may I make an explanation of the bill? The purpose of the bill is to create the grade of enlisted pilot in lighter-than-air. Heretofore, lighter-than-air pilots have been officers only, although in heavier-than-air there have been enlisted pilots for many years. With the vast expansion of lighter-than-air to handle the antisubmarine patrols along our coast, it is considered desirable and essential that we permit these high petty officers who are pilots to be designated as airship pilots as well as airplane pilots. It simply brings about uniformity and is essential to the proper expansion of our lighter-than-air branch in combating submarines.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. These bills are very technical, and they carry a lot more weight than the House realizes when it passes them. I am sure the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Georgia understand those things.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman from Michigan that we endeavor to give the highest, the fullest, and most complete information so that no Member can ever say we did not advise him. I think the explanation of the gentleman from Minnesota has covered every detail that is in the bill. At no time do we want to hide in any explanation anything that is in the bill. We want the Congress and the country to know fully every detail about every bill we present here.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield further for the present until I find out whether these gentlemen are taking my time or not.

The SPEAKER. They are not taking any of the time that will be allotted to the gentleman.

Mr. MICHENER. I am not questioning what the gentleman says. I know he is sincere, and I know he always brings facts to the House, but when we are dealing with matters of this kind which are so technical, which cannot and are not understood by the average layman unless he be an expert on the gentleman's committee, then I think we should be very careful about bringing matters of this import before the House under these conditions to be passed by unanimous consent when there is no knowledge on the part of the average Member as to just what is being done.

Mr. MAAS. May I say to the gentleman that there is nothing mysterious about what we are doing in the lighter-than-air branch, which has been relatively small heretofore. We have a great many enlisted men who have been assisting in flying and who are capable of flying these blimps but who are not at present authorized to be designated as pilots. In the vast expansion that is going to take place it is essential that we permit them to be designated as pilots in this program. There is nothing mysterious about it and nothing technical about it.

Mr. MICHENER. There is nothing technical about a prescription by a physician to be taken by the patient. Two physicians can discuss a prescription intelligently and know all about it, but if they want to explain what that prescription means they have got to use something besides technical language and hieroglyphics.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think the point raised by the gentleman from Michigan is well taken, and for that reason the Naval Affairs Committee is exceedingly cautious in presenting its bills. We recognize the fact that a great many of these things are technical, that it takes some study to understand them and to explain them; therefore, we are, as I stated, exceedingly cautious in presenting them to the House, as we do not want to present anything that will mislead the House.

Mr. MICHENER. I am convinced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraphs 1 and 2 of section 3 of the act of June 24, 1926 (44 Stat. 766, 767; 34 U. S. C. 735), are hereby amended to read as follows:

"PAR. 1. That hereafter when the term 'naval aviator' is used in this act or any other act it shall mean any commissioned officer or warrant line officer in the Navy or Marine Corps who has successfully completed the course prescribed by competent authority for naval aviators and who has been or may hereafter be designated or appointed a naval aviator by competent authority and who has flown alone in a, or as first pilot of a dual-control, heavier-than-air craft not less than 75 hours and who has flown in heavier-than-air craft a total of not less than 200 hours, or who has been in the air, under training, in airships not less than 150 hours and successfully completed the course prescribed by competent authority.

"PAR. 2. That hereafter when the term 'aviation pilot' is used in this act or any other act it shall mean any enlisted man in the Navy or Marine Corps who has successfully completed the course prescribed for aviation pilots and who has been or may hereafter be designated or appointed an aviation pilot by competent authority and who has flown alone in a, or as first pilot of a dual-control, heavier-than-air craft not less than 75 hours and who has flown in heavier-than-air craft a total of not less than 200 hours or who has been in the air, under training, in airships not less than 150 hours and who has flown in lighter-than-air craft a total of not less than 200 hours.

"The term 'pilot' shall be construed to mean a naval aviator or an aviation pilot."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRANT OF LAND IN CHARLESTON, S. C.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2097) to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the board of trustees, school district No. 20, Charleston County, S. C., a parcel of land situated in the city of Charleston, S. C.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized to grant to the board of trustees, School District No. 20, Charleston County, S. C., for

use in connection with the Murray Vocational School in the city of Charleston, S. C., all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the naval radio station site in the city of Charleston, S. C., recently used as a Naval Reserve armory adjacent to the said Murray Vocational School, containing approximately 0.344 acre.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill permits an exchange of property in the Charleston Navy Yard. The purpose of the bill is to authorize the granting to the board of trustees of school district No. 20, Charleston County, S. C., all right, title, and interest in the naval radio station site in the city of Charleston, containing approximately one-third of an acre of land.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. CANNON of Florida asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very excellent article on winning the war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, on the 13th day of April 1942 a daily paper published and circulated in Michigan contained this statement:

> Life magazine, reputed to have the largest circulation in America, published an article "naming names" and listing people and organizations hindering the war effort. Representative HOFFMAN was among those listed.

The same daily quoted August Scholle, of Detroit, president of the Michigan CIO council, as saying:

> Congressman HOFFMAN, by his present actions in Congress, is rendering a service to nazi-ism.

The May 18, 1942, issue of the publication, the New Republic, circulated in Washington and a few other places, contained the following statement:

> For the past few weeks HOFFMAN has been busily occupied before a grand jury trying to explain the 145,000 copies of his inflammatory speech, "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes," which were distributed by William Kullgren, editor of the pro-nazi Beacon Light, under HOFFMAN's frank.

Sunday night, May 24, Walter Winchell broadcast in substance the following statement:

> The Honorable CLARE HOFFMAN, of Michigan, has never stopped claiming that I tried to smear him. The Honorable CLARE HOFFMAN has been very busy lately trying to explain to a Federal grand jury why a Nazi named Kullgren was able to distribute 145,000 copies of HOFFMAN's speech made under his franking privilege.

The quotations above referred to reflect upon the integrity and patriotism of the Member from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan in his official capacity and raise the question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. The Chair holds that the language printed in the Michigan paper, which contains the words "Congressman HOFFMAN, by his present actions in Congress, is rendering a service to nazi-ism," challenges the patriotism of the gentleman from Michigan and raises a question of personal privilege.

THE END OF FREE SPEECH AND A FREE PRESS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the statements just read by me and similar statements from New Republic and other publications referring not only to the Member from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan but to more than 50 Members of Congress, call in question the ability, the integrity, the loyalty, the patriotism, in the representative capacity of those Representatives and Senators who are named in those articles.

Those statements tend directly to create disunity among our people. Whatever may be the purpose, the inevitable result of statements of that nature is to raise in the minds of some people at least a suspicion that those who have been elected to represent them, that those who are members of one of the three branches of our Government, are not honestly, faithfully, and patriotically performing their duties.

Those statements give encouragement to the enemies of our country by leading them to believe that our Nation is not united in the effort to defeat them. Those statements tend to create in the minds of those serving in the armed forces of our Nation the thought that many of those here in Washington, charged with the duty and the responsibility of enacting and enforcing the legislation necessary to the support of the armed forces are not only derelict in their duty, but are, through their lack of ability, their incompetency, or from selfish motives, aiding the enemy which the armed forces day and night are courageously fighting.

Mr. Speaker, the statements which I have quoted and the other statements to which I have made reference are false. There is not one shred of truth in them.

That being true, the conclusion inevitably follows that those who gave utterance to them are either ignorant of the truth or, being advised, for their own ends or for the purpose of destroying our form of government, advancing their own political fortunes, made them deliberately and, in so doing, themselves aid the cause of our enemies.

The statement in the New Republic that for the past few weeks I have "been busily occupied before a grand jury trying to explain away the 145,000 copies of his inflammatory speech, Don't Haul Down the Star and Stripes, which were distributed by William Kullgren, editor of the pro-Nazi Beacon Light, under Hoffman's frank," aside from carrying the information that I appeared before a grand jury, contains not one word of truth.

It is true that, on three occasions—twice at the request of Special Attorney Maloney and once at my own request, to correct a misstatement made by Maloney—I did appear before the special grand jury and that, on six occasions, one of the secretaries in my office, Helen M. Boyer, appeared in answer to similar requests. On no occasion was either of us subpenaed.

But at no time have I have been trying to explain, in the sense of excusing, any of my actions. Neither the special attorney nor any member of the grand jury, nor anyone else, has ever even intimated to me that there was anything that needed explanation in the two speeches which were sent out under the title "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes."

Moreover, I had previously stated from the floor of the House that if the district attorney wanted to call me I would tell him who paid for speeches sent out by me, and I would also tell him that if good honest Americans wanted additional copies of my speeches I would send them out.

From the floor of this House and on April 13—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 3452—before I appeared before the grand jury, referring to the speech Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes, I said:

> The district attorney here, if he wants, or anyone else who wants to know who paid for them, can come over to my office and get that information. The files are open. The letters are open that they wrote me asking for them.

There were just three things which the district attorney could learn by calling for the testimony of my secretary or myself. Those were: First, who ordered the speeches from the Public Printer; second, who paid for them; third, who received them.

The first two—who ordered them; who, in the first instance, paid for them—he could ascertain by looking at the records of the Public Printer. That record shows that the speeches were ordered by a secretary in my office and that they were paid for by my check.

If he desired to ascertain whether anyone reimbursed me and to what extent and who made such reimbursement and who received copies of the speech, all he needed to do was either to phone the office, write a letter, or send a representative to my office for the information he desired.

That procedure would have answered his purpose. It would not, however, have given either him or me any publicity. It would not have conveyed to the public, as did some of the press, the misinformation that I was in some way connected with some individual who held pro-German opinions.

Repeated requests to appear before, and the appearance before, the grand jury of my secretary and of myself gave to certain publications, which are apparently more interested in defeating certain Members of Congress who oppose their political views, the opportunity of discrediting sitting Members of Congress.

If the special attorney knew what information he wanted from my office, a written request, specifying in detail what

he sought, would have enabled my secretary or me to have given him on one appearance all the information he desired.

Whether he was thoughtless or whether he had some definite purpose in mind I can only judge by what he did. I do know that by repeatedly giving publicity to the fact that he was calling my secretary and that I was to be called, the opportunity was given to a few—a very few; three or four—unscrupulous reporters and columnists to discredit by innuendo and insinuation Representatives selected by the people by linking my name with those of known Nazi agents.

That discreditable, underhanded procedure of deception, such as is practiced by one Stokes, of the Washington Post, is nothing new. Stokes but followed the procedure of Esau. Stokes, by vilifying others, seeks to establish himself as a patriot, as an exposer of what he imagines are other people's frailties.

The truth in no way cramps his style. Like Esau of old, who clothed himself in the raiment of Jacob, Stokes, printing what he calls news, which must gratify Hitler if he reads it, puts on an attitude mislabeled patriotism. He assumes the smirk of hypocrisy and, with a holier-than-thou attitude, he seeks the columns of his paper and in them pretends that he is serving his country by printing statements which carry the false impression that some of those who insist upon the preservation of our constitutional form of government, who are doing their utmost to maintain it, are doing something wrong.

An illustration of Dillard Stokes' method, which is somewhat similar to that of Winchell, is shown by what happened yesterday and his article in this morning's Washington Post. Late yesterday afternoon and within perhaps 10 or 15 minutes, both Maloney and Stokes called me. Maloney, as I have stated, asked if Miss Boyer would appear this morning and was told she would. She expected to, but unfortunately she is ill, and probably will not be able to appear until Saturday or the first of next week. Maloney also asked that I appear today and I told him that I would do so. I can probably give him the information that would have been given by Miss Boyer. There was no argument, no controversy about the question of the appearance of either of us nor has the incident, at least as far as I can see, any great news value entitling it to a place on the first page of a metropolitan daily. Yet Stokes headlines his article "HOFFMAN To Go Before Agents Jury Again, Agrees To Testify Today" and carrying it over to the sixth page in a two-column black-faced lead, he boldly tells all the readers of the Post "Representative HOFFMAN Agrees To Testify Again Today in Agents' Probe." It is true that I did agree, but the inference which Stokes would create that it took an argument to persuade me is wholly false. And Stokes, who tries so hard to smirch me and who lies about me in the columns of the Post, had the gall to ask me yesterday to give him an outline of what I expected to say today on the floor. His methods would make a hog with 2-inch bristles and both feet in the trough blush with shame.

Before I go further, I want to tell you a little more about Stokes. There is nothing new about that bird's methods of deception and misrepresentation. You know that long, long ago there was a fellow who wanted to sneak in and get something to which he was not entitled. Stokes wants to appear before the public as a great giant killer—Jack the Giant Killer. He is just beating around seeing if he cannot find something that smells. I do not get the explanation of his actions, I do not understand them. It may be that that fellow has fussed around in filth and dirt so long that everything he touches appears that way to him. You know a dog rolls around in carrion, and after a time gets up and smells himself and is uncertain as to his own identity. It may be that that is what has happened.

The smear campaign is not confined by any means to the New Republic, the Communists—from the verdict of a jury rendered this week it would appear that they tried it in Michigan but they did not make it work. They did not get Frank McKay up in Michigan. I hold no brief for Frank, but he is entitled to a fair, square deal, and as one of the editors in Michigan wrote me today, they have been after Frank for 5 or 6 years, and unless I am mistaken, Maloney was one of those aiding in the persecution. The first jury disagreed, and then what did they do? They tried, by an investigation, to show that the jury was bribed or that some members of it had been tampered with. Then they tried Frank again, and for 12 long weeks they persecuted McKay and then a jury of Michigan law-abiding citizens—although juries up there have convicted many in Detroit in recent years—rendered a verdict of not guilty. But one of the papers carried the information and said:

> They succeeded in one thing anyway. Because of the long and expensive trial, they have redistributed some of the McKay wealth.

Well, that is one way of cleaning up on a fellow, is it not?

The balance of the quoted statement from the New Republic contains not one word of truth. The speech, as anyone who reads it will learn, was not an inflammatory speech, as stated in the New Republic.

William Kullgren, described as editor of the pro-Nazi Beacon Light, never distributed 145,000 copies of the speech, Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes. He never distributed, under my frank, as charged by that publication, one single copy of that speech, unless he stole the frank or surreptitiously obtained a franked envelope. I never gave him permission to use my frank; nor did I ever send him an empty franked envelope or a franked envelope with that speech in it with permission to remail it.

WALTER WINCHELL

On May 24, Sunday last, Walter Winchell, in his broadcast, repeated the substance of the charge printed in the New Republic, and he added that I had never stopped claiming that he, Winchell, tried to smear me.

For once in his long record of misstatement Walter is correct. I have not stopped claiming that he tried to smear me. Fortunately for me, undoubtedly to his great disappointment, his attempt to smear me has not accomplished his purpose.

Whatever the Communists may think of his utterances, decent people, respectable people, solid, substantial people long ago learned how little reliance could be placed upon anything he said.

Not long ago he stated that I was a member of the House Naval Affairs Committee. I never was on that committee and the House membership is aware of that fact. I was quoted as saying that he, Winchell, should be sent to Samoa. No such statement was ever made by me. Unable to learn who on the Naval Affairs Committee had exposed him, he charged it up to me. It was a good job, well done, even though I did not do it.

The foregoing is but one of the many instances which have shown to the people that Walter never permits the facts to interfere with the sensationalism of his broadcasts.

Another statement broadcast and published by Winchell was to the effect that, after being called before the grand jury, I was forced to retract the charge that a smear campaign was on.

If you will look at page 3560 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the proceedings of April 20, you will find that what I said on that occasion about that charge was this:

> I am not retracting, and I am not apologizing.

Winchell just left out the little word "not."

Winchell states that, while broadcasting, he does not wear the uniform of the Navy. He does not, however, tell us when he does wear it. He does not say that he does not wear it while visiting saloons, dives, and disreputable resorts gathering information. He does not deny that, as a lieutenant commander, he is in the Navy on full-time pay of a lieutenant commander. Nor does he explain to the public how he can carry on a money-making business and still be a full-time lieutenant commander. He evidently does not believe in the Scriptural statement that no man can serve two masters.

Yet he is the man who attempts to tell the people of the United States who they should elect as their Representatives in Congress. Winchell is courageous. He must be. He tells us he is. He is a fighting man. He must be, for he wears the uniform of the Navy, and that is a fighting organization.

His statements as to his own virtues leave us in no doubt as to his patriotism. Continuously, he announces his willingness to sacrifice. It is interesting to compare his utterances before December 7 with those he has made since that date.

What some of us cannot understand is why a man as brave as he is, possessing his courage, with all of his professed animosity toward the Germans and the Japs, with his willingness to fight, does not make some practical use of the uniform which he wears, and get into the

Navy, instead of loitering around New York, questioning the patriotism and the motives of the people's chosen Representatives.

WHO AND WHAT IS WALTER WINCHELL?

It has not been my privilege to meet the valorous Walter, either when he was arrayed in his uniform or in his money-making clothes.

Knowing him to be pugnacious and undoubtedly resentful of anything which might be said derogatory to his reputation—and having been advised that he is not averse to anything which would bring in the shekels—it seems probable that, if slanderous or libelous statements were printed or said about him, he would long ago have brought action for his pound of flesh.

Yesterday a Member of the House suggested that, if I cared to learn about Winchell, I read My Last Million Readers, by Emile Gauveau, published in 1941. The curious will find some information about Winchell on pages 118, 122, 134, 139, 152, 155, 163, 166, 173, 180, 181, 183, 196, 199, 214, 218, 225, 248, 249, 258, 268, 269, 319, and 452 of that publication.

WHAT IS THE NEW REPUBLIC?

Inasmuch as the New Republic is so presumptuous as to tell the people of 81 congressional districts and of three States that they are not competent to select their Representatives in Congress and their Senators, it might be well to be advised as to some of the editors of that publication.

On page 657 of the May 18 issue, under the heading "Editors," we find the names of Bruce Bliven, Malcolm Cowley, and Michael Straight.

Cowley is the man whose name was stricken from the Government pay roll by the action of this House.

Michael Straight was toastmaster at a dinner held here in Washington not long ago, where Attorney General Biddle, speaking before a typical New Deal group, was quoted by the Washington Post as advising his audience to "hold the political trench because the opposition is going to fight, whether you do or not." This at a time when the administration was telling Republicans that politics was adjourned for the duration.

The same publication quoted Michael Straight as saying at the meeting that—

> The New Deal is more dynamic than fascism, and more revolutionary than communism.

He it was who published in the December issue of The New Republic the statement that—

> Known Communist sympathizers are again finding it relatively easy to get Government jobs.

Now, apparently, Straight wants the people to select Communists as their Representatives in Congress and apparently a vote against the sitting Members of Congress, which the New Republic proposes to defeat, would be a vote for the Communists.

While administration spokesmen have insisted that partisan politics for the duration is out, few are deceived by that statement, for the evidence is conclusive that the war issue is being used to defeat the enemies of communism.

"Paving Block" Flynn and "Mud Slinger" Michelson started the fight by an assault on the "Before Pearl Harbor Isolationists." However, as the days went by, the real battle lines were disclosed and we now know the front on which the fight will be made.

Long have I been contending that the argument in Congress was between Republicans and Democrats on the one side, and New Dealers and Communists on the other side. Now, that was so; that is true. Why do I say that? You Members on the majority side know. You know now. In one of these lists setting forth those who are characterized as traitors and disloyal and not supporting the war effort there were 10 Republicans and 17 Democrats.

The gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD] said this morning they could not find anything in his record opposing the administration which would justify them in asking for his defeat. They cannot find anything in the record of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GORE] on your side, or the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH] on the majority side. They cannot find anything in the record of those two men in opposition to the President's foreign policy, can they? No, they cannot. They can find in the record of those men and many others, opposition to the red Communists; and there is where they draw the line. Not whether we are Republicans, not whether we are Democrats, not whether before Pearl Harbor we were isolationists or interventionists. No. Did we support the Dies Committee? Did we oppose the Communists in their desires and in their efforts to overthrow this Government? If we did, then we are out.

Now, I say it is a good thing that we are learning where these lines are drawn, and to convey to you the idea, I am asking permission to insert in the RECORD an article by Frank Kent in last night's Washington Star marked exhibit C, showing just how those gentlemen—not Democrats, oh, no; New Dealers and Communists—and they are getting so close together that it is difficult to separate them—expect to keep out of Congress all who disagree with them. They will be grown together like the Siamese twins soon if they do not watch out, because their ideas are running back and forth from one to the other all the time.

Bruce Bliven wants the privilege of selecting the Congressmen and Senators who shall represent these 81 congressional districts, these 3 States.

My knowledge of Bliven is limited. By a reference to the testimony given before the Dies committee—pages 475, 530, 540, 566, 568, 582, 703, 875, 2073, 2409, 2742, 2745, and 3092—you will doubtless learn something of his background. Perhaps some member of that committee will, in the near future, give us information which will be of interest to the public.

For the present the following must suffice:

The act of Congress of June 8, 1938, as amended, requires the registration of the agents of foreign principals who are operating in these United States. On January 2, 1941, the State Department published a list of the persons and organizations who were registered with the Secretary of State as the agents of foreign principals. On page 7 of that list you will find the name of Bruce Bliven, 40 East Forty-ninth Street, New York, N. Y.

Do you wonder that I protest when the people of my district are asked to permit men like Bliven, who was registered as the agent of a foreign principal; like Cowley, who was stricken from the public pay roll by the action of Congress; like Straight, who now tells us that the New Deal is more revolutionary than communism; like Winchell, the purveyor for hire of dirty gossip and vicious rumor, to select their Congressmen?

Such a suggestion is an insult to the intelligence of our people.

The inconsistency, the absurdity, of the New Republic's alleged analysis and recommendation as to the competency of the Congressmen and Senators it names is scathingly demonstrated by Morris H. Rubin in his article, Dividing America's Progressives, printed on the first page of the Progressive of Saturday, May 23, 1942, a copy being attached hereto and marked "Exhibit A."

Another article, prepared by Elton Raymond Shaw, president of Shaw Publishing Co., Washington, D. C., can, with profit, be read by the thoughtful. It is attached hereto and marked "Exhibit A–1."

ONE OF THE FOUR FREEDOMS

While we are fighting a war throughout the world to establish the four freedoms, the action of a Washington grand jury and a special district attorney, appointed to guide their investigation and deliberations, raise the question of whether one of these freedoms—the freedom of speech and a free press—shall be exercised by those elected by the people to represent them in Congress.

Making no complaint that either the speech delivered by me on the floor of the House on January 27, or that delivered on the 30th contain a single pro-Nazi, pro-Italian, pro-Japanese thought or statement, I have nevertheless been called by the grand jury and Special Attorney Maloney to account for the distribution of that speech by others.

One of the secretaries in my office was last week notified by Special Attorney Maloney to make search of my records and files and to be prepared to appear before the jury with the original list giving the information as to the names and addresses of those to whom that speech "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes" were sent in quantities in franked envelopes.

Late yesterday afternoon Special Attorney Maloney, guiding the investigation and deliberation of the grand jury here in Washington, asked Miss Boyer to appear this morning before the grand jury and he said, and I quote:

> The grand jury would like to have a list of the names and addresses of all persons to whom reprints of the speech entitled, "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes" were sent to, enclosed in franked envelopes, in bulk.
>
> Mr. HOFFMAN. What do you mean, in bulk?
>
> Mr. MALONEY. One copy of the speech enclosed in an envelope—and sent out—that is, 100 or more franked envelopes at a time.

He further asked me to appear this afternoon prepared to tell him and the

grand jury, the names and addresses of the persons to whom I had sent copies of that speech.

This grand jury is supposed to be investigating the activities of Nazi agents; of those who are working in the interest of our national enemies.

Inasmuch as no claim is made that anything in this speech, Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes, can possibly give encouragement to any enemy of this country, and in view of the fact that it is a plea for the preservation of our national government, it is somewhat difficult to understand why this grand jury should be interested in what I did with it.

Previously, and on the 6th day of April, I inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page A1325, the statement that I proposed to send out more than 100,000 copies of those speeches

This Government of ours consists of three branches and the legislative branch is in no way inferior to the other two. Section 5 of article I of the Constitution recognizes that fact by providing that—

Each House shall be the judge of the * * * qualifications of its own Members * * *. Each House may determine the rules of its proceedings, punish its Members for disorderly behavior and, with the concurrence of two-thirds, expel a Member.

Section 6 of the same article, among other things, provides that—

for any speech or debate in either House, they—

Meaning the Members—

shall not be questioned in any other place.

Notwithstanding these constitutional provisions, it is apparently proposed that I shall be called in question for two speeches made on the floor of the House and will be required, if the views of Special Attorney Maloney prevail, to produce my private files and records for his inspection and approval.

THE HOUSE IS THE SOLE JUDGE OF PROPRIETY OF SPEECHES MADE ON THE FLOOR

When a Member of the House of Representatives speaks on the floor or extends his remarks in the RECORD, he does so either by unanimous consent or under the rules of the House.

Inasmuch as the Constitution itself provides, as just stated, that "for any speech in the House, a Member shall not be questioned in any other place," what legal right has a grand jury to inquire as to the contents of a speech delivered on the floor or to even criticize, much less prosecute, for the sentiments expressed in that speech?

It would seem as though constitutional provisions prohibiting the questioning of Members for what they may say on the floor excludes all questions as to who wrote the speech, where it originated, and to whom it was given.

The fact that a Member delivers a speech on the floor of the House or extends his remarks in the RECORD fixes the responsibility for that speech on him. No other body, no individual, can shift that responsibility. It must be assumed that the remarks are the remarks of the Member, unless he states that he is quoting from some other source.

The House is the sole judge of the propriety of the remarks made by its Members on the floor. When the House has permitted a Member to speak, if he speaks improperly his remarks can be expunged and he can, by the House, be punished for any improper utterances.

If improper remarks are extended in the Appendix under unanimous consent, they can later, at the discretion of the House, be expunged. The House, and only the House, can determine what shall go into the RECORD.

If the people of a congressional district do not approve of the utterances of their Congressman, they can and they will defeat him at the polls.

If the people of the Fourth Congressional District do not approve of what I say or do here in Congress, beyond question they will see to it that I am not here in January next. But whether I shall or shall not represent that district is no concern of Winchell's, of the Communists who do not reside in the Fourth District, of the grand jury, or of a district attorney. Were it otherwise, the Constitution and the law promulgated by the States would have made some provision whereby the Winchells and the Communists might cast their votes in the Fourth Congressional District.

THE FRANKING PRIVILEGE

There has been considerable discussion in the press and elsewhere about the franking privilege, its use and abuse. The fact, if it be a fact, that departments of the Government, under the franking privilege, send out tons of propaganda is no reason why that privilege should be abused by a Member of Congress.

The fact that certain publications save, because of the franking privilege, millions of dollars per year is no excuse for a misuse of that privilege by a Member of the House. Nor is the indiscriminate use of its franking privilege by officers, agents, and departments of the Government any reason why the proper use of that privilege by a Member of Congress should be criticized.

Inasmuch as the grand jury does not claim that the speech, Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes, is Nazi propaganda; inasmuch as no one, nobody other than Congress, has the right to question the propriety of the remarks made on the floor of the House, is the grand jury, in asking me to produce a list of those to whom speeches were franked out in lots of 100 or more, attempting to challenge my right to frank out my congressional speeches?

If it can question my right to frank out 100 speeches, then it can question my right to frank out 50, 10, 5, or 2. If it is challenging my right, I most respectfully call its attention to the following communications:

On November 19, 1937, a letter was written to the then Solicitor of the Post Office Department, Karl A. Crowley, by the then minority leader of the House, Bert Snell. That letter is as follows:

DEAR MR. CROWLEY: Will you please give me a ruling on the following: Is it legal for a Member of Congress to frank communications, either typewritten or mimeographed, dealing solely with the public business?

In reply, the following was written under date of November 23, 1937:

The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of November 19, requesting to be advised whether it is legal for a Member of Congress to frank communications, either typewritten or mimeographed, dealing solely with the public business.

It is provided by 39 United States Code 327 that: "The Vice President, Members and Members-elect of, Delegates and Delegates-elect to Congress, and the Resident Commissioners from Puerto Rico and the Philippines, shall have the privilege of sending free through the mails, and under their frank, any mail matter to any Government official or to any person, correspondence, not exceeding 4 ounces in weight, upon official or departmental business (until the 1st day of December following the expiration of their respective terms of office)."

Your inquiry is accordingly answered in the affirmative.

I wrote the Office of the Solicitor of the Post Office Department the following letter:

On page 18519 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 14, 1940, I extended my remarks by including an article on the March of Democracy.

If I have copies of these remarks printed by other than the Government Printer and in different type, may I still send them out under my franking privilege?

On the 25th following, my letter was answered in these words:

In answer to your letter of September 21, which the Solicitor has referred to this office, you are advised that the act of Congress of March 3, 1875, embodied in section 609, Postal Laws and Regulations, provides as follows:

"The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, or any part thereof, or speeches or reports therein contained, shall, under the frank of a Member of Congress or Delegate, * * * be carried in the mail free of postage."

The place of printing of extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD or the style of type used does not affect their frankability. In this connection, I may say that when it is desired to send under frank extracts from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, the extracts should, in order that their character may be apparent on the face, bear such identifying indicia as will clearly show that they are from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Inasmuch as under the law cited by the Legal Division of the Post Office Department, I was advised that my speeches contained in the RECORD might, under the law, be carried in the mail free of postage, just what is Special Attorney Maloney attempting to do?

He has never made any claim that I am a Nazi agent. He has never made any claim that Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes contains any Nazi sentiments. If I understand the newspaper reports of his activities correctly, all he claims is that that speech came into the hands of persons who sent it out, paying the postage, with other material which was improper.

He does not claim that I ever knew what went out with it or that I ever gave any authority to anyone to send anything out with it, or to send it out with any other material.

Certainly, in view of the above opinions from the Legal Division of the Post Office Department, he can make no claim that I have abused the franking privilege.

Had I done so, the remedy lies with the House.

The purpose of the franking privilege is to aid those to whom it is granted in the dissemination of information. One of its purposes is to aid Congressmen in circulating their speeches and other matters appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. There is no restriction as to the class of people to whom those speeches may be franked, nor is there any limit as to the number which may be sent out; that is all left to the good judgment of the Member. The propriety of the contents of the speech is within the control of the House itself, which alone is responsible for what goes into the RECORD.

Once a speech is made and placed in the RECORD, it makes no difference, so far as the contents of the speech are concerned, who addresses the envelopes which carry those speeches or who pays for the printing of those speeches. The contents of the speech, its thought and argument, cannot possibly be changed by the fact that one individual or another addresses the envelopes.

Certainly, if copies of a Member's speech are printed and sent out under frank and someone, without the author's knowledge or consent, inserts other material in the envelope with the speech, a Member cannot be held accountable for that act. The one who does it violates the franking regulations and is subject to prosecution.

Obviously, the Members of Congress cannot be expected to police the use of, or to determine the ultimate destination of every copy of their printed speeches.

The fact that a copy of a Congressman's speech might be found on the person of a man who might have just robbed a bank, would neither change the contents, or the purpose of the speech, nor would it involve the integrity of the Member of Congress who made it.

The fact that an individual or an organization paid for the printing of speeches, properly inserted in the RECORD, does not alter the contents of such a speech, nor does it indicate any improper conduct, providing the franking privilege is not misused.

If it be accepted, without protest, that either a grand jury or a court may question a Member of Congress as to speeches made by him on the floor of the House, then because of the intimidation or the coercion which naturally results from such questioning, the right of free speech, of a free press is destroyed.

MY DECISION

Relying upon the constitutional provision quoted; upon the fact that our Government, our form of government and its existence, depends upon the preservation of the three departments of the Government—the executive, the judicial, and the legislative, each separate and apart; each charged with a definite function and responsible therefor—I deny the right of the executive department, through any of its agencies, to question the propriety of the remarks made by me on the floor of the House or to require me to produce before any grand jury my records and files showing to whom speeches made on the floor of the House were sent.

No personal consideration prompts that conclusion. If this House does not wish to protect what I conceive to be its integrity, I certainly shall not, by claiming the benefit of a constitutional privilege, expose myself to the suspicion which can be aroused by insinuations of political opponents whose purpose seems to be the destruction of a representative, republican form of government here in these United States of America.

I have three times voluntarily appeared before the grand jury; I go again today. I answered, without evasion or equivocation, every question put to me, even though I knew that I could not lawfully be subpenaed to appear before that jury while the House was in session; even though I knew that that jury had no legal right to question me as to anything said by me on the floor of the House, I testified.

Both my secretary and myself have not only testified freely but we have volunteered to give Mr. Maloney any information partinent to the inquiry he is directing. If he prefers to inconvenience us; if he rather, instead of sitting down and deciding what he wants, then asking for it and getting it, instead of taking one bite of the cherry, taking several, so making copy for his friend, Dillard Stokes, and for the Communists who are attempting to defeat me, that he may do. It is not my fault nor the fault of anyone in my office that he has not obtained on one appearance all the information he wanted. He may sit down, decide what he wants, write out his requests and he can shorten the procedure, save the time of the grand jury and my time. That, however, would not be the New Deal way. It would not be the Michelson or Winchell way.

I deny the legal right of the grand jury to call for a list of those to whom I have sent copies of the speech, Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes.

I have nothing to conceal. I have no apologies to make for anything contained in that speech. That speech set forth good, sound American doctrine.

So far as I know, not one of the persons to whom it was authorized to be sent in franked envelopes is other than a patriotic American citizen. Nevertheless, because I do not propose to give to those who I believe are engaged in this smear campaign, in an effort to destroy our representative form of government, the opportunity to raise a false issue, to deceive the American people, I am giving herewith and inserting in the RECORD the names and addresses of those to whom that speech was sent in lots of 100 or more and the number which was sent to each, together with the instructions under which those speeches were to be distributed. A statement showing the number of copies sent out in the flat, unfranked, to whom sent, and at whose request, was previously given Mr. Maloney.

All this information any Member of the House might have had. Maloney might have had it by a simple request either by phone or by letter or by a visit to my office. However, that course would not have enabled his reporter friend to picture him as a glorified Jack the Giant Killer; nor would it have furnished political ammunition to his war-worn fighting friend Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell, who specializes in poison gas.

It may be that this method of giving out this information will deprive a certain reporter of a scoop; will be a disappointment to Maloney and to Winchell.

Nevertheless, in the approved Winchell manner, let us tear off the mask of secrecy and expose to the public this hideous secret of where some of these speeches went.

Here it is: 500 in envelopes went to Mrs. A. H. Heppes, of Dowagiac, Mich., who is a Republican residing in the city of Dowagiac interested in sending a Republican to Congress, and at my request she addressed the envelopes to resident voters of Dowagiac. She was instructed not to send or address any envelopes to anyone on a rural route, as I was covering the rural routes of the county. Mrs. Heppes also requested that she be put on the list as a recipient of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and that I did.

Does any Member of this body know of any reason, either legal or ethical, why I should not ask a personal friend, or why a personal friend, interested in the affairs of our Government, should not address for me and send out under my frank, speeches made by me in Congress? I only wish there were more Mrs. Heppes in the Fourth Congressional District and I hope that the residents of the fourth district, sensing the attempt that is being made to deprive them of a knowledge of what is going on in Congress, of information which conveys to them the views of the man they sent here to represent them, will volunteer to address copies of my speeches to residents of the city in which they live.

March 23, 1942: 500 copies or thereabouts, I do not recall the exact number, nor does my secretary who sent them out, went to Mrs. Beatrice M. Knowles, President of the American Mothers, 1104 Book Building, Detroit, Mich., with instructions that they be sent to the persons whose names were on a list which she had previously shown to me when she was here in Washington and which I examined.

Mrs. Knowles also received about 2,000 copies which were not in envelopes but which were to be handed out by members of her organization.

March 25, 1942, copies of the speech went out to all those who receive their mail on rural routes serving the district.

March 26: Copies went to all post office boxholders in the district and to rural routes from post offices outside the district having over 20 patrons residing in the district.

March 30: Copies went to Mrs. N. N. Bethune, the LaSalle Apartments, 1028 Connecticut Avenue, NW., Washington, D. C., upon the understanding had with her and with Mrs. Good, who was in the office with her asking for reprints, that they were to be addressed and mailed to the members of the organization known as the Dames of the Loyal Legion and

others mentioned by Mrs. Good when she first came to my office asking for reprints.

April 14: Eight hundred copies in envelopes went to Mrs. Mamie Bope, Decatur, Cass County, Mich., personally known to me as a Republican who desires to assist in the preservation of a constitutional form of government. She had written me that—

> Every citizen of these United States should have this called to their attention * * * we hope at this fall's election to show Walter Winchell that he does not know the caliber of this district * * * I nearly smashed my radio, I was so mad at him * * * shall do everything we can to help you win.

Mrs. Bope either herself or through the assistance of those who volunteered their services, addressed these envelopes to voting residents of the district and I have no doubt that she enthusiastically followed those instructions.

I have known Mrs. Bope personally for a number of years. She is a loyal, patriotic American. She has no patience with either the wasting or the misuse of public funds. If I know her sentiments, and I think I do, she will work her fingers to the bone to support our war efforts, and if she has any strength left she will use it to reform the New Deal and set the starry-eyed dreamers on the right course. Thank God there are such women in the Fourth Congressional District.

April 22: Three thousand copies went to C. L. Spense, Sturgis, Mich., who at my request arranged to have them addressed to residents of the district.

March 30: Five hundred copies were sent to Vernon C. Decker, 106 East Michigan Avenue, Paw Paw, Van Buren County, Mich. Mr. Decker, a well-known resident of the city of Paw Paw and a supporter of a man who made the primary race against me twice and once ran at the general election in opposition to my candidacy, wrote me on the 8th of April as follows:

> As you know Racette is an old friend of mine, so worked some for him in the past, but have been with you and agree with your views. I am with you now 100 percent, only wish we had more men in Washington like you.
>
> I received your last RECORD by mail, Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes, and am wondering if you have a few copies left, as I would like very much to have a few more copies to mail around to some friends of mine.
>
> If you can send me a few would appreciate it very much. Wishing you the best of luck up there with the odds against you, I am

I was very busy at the time and did not get around to thank him until the 24th when I wrote him:

> Certainly appreciate your letter and if you wish to address envelopes containing "Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes" to the citizens of Paw Paw, I will be glad to send them to you.
>
> Hope to see you when I am home.

To that letter he replied:

> Send them along and I will be glad to address them where they will do the most good.

I then wrote him on the 30th as follows:

> Your notation written on my letter of the 24th just received and I want you to know that I sincerely appreciate the help you are giving.
>
> Under separate cover I am sending 500 of the reprints and shall be glad indeed to have you address them to the residents of Paw Paw. Have mailed the reprint to all the rural-route boxholders.

Reference to these letters indicates that I did not send Mr. Decker as many copies as I should have sent.

On the 30th I also sent out to the Hennepin County Republican Club, Minneapolis, Minn., at their request, 1,500 copies of the speech without any—not one—frankable envelope.

I hope the residents of that State, if there were any such who believed that we should haul down the Stars and Stripes, surrender our independence and now or after the war become a province or principality of some foreign nation or the Santa Claus of a group of nations, might be converted and become, as they say, a 100-percent American.

This morning came the following communication dated May 26:

> DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We wish to thank you for your courtesy in sending us 1,500 copies of your great speech, Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes. We also received the $4 which you so courteously returned.
>
> If there were more patriots like you, the country would not be in the sad condition it is today. It appears to many of us that the New Dealers, when the people are distracted by war, seek to install their system of managed economy and national communism.

May I pause here to thank Mr. Maloney and Mr. Winchell for the publicity which aroused the curiosity of our people, warned them of their danger, and enables me to furnish them with some information of the campaign being carried on by the enemies who are boring from within.

To show that I have not been guilty of discrimination, other thousands of these speeches went out in the flat—not in franked envelopes—to other American citizens. May I say that in answer to requests I sent copies of my speech to individuals at Pasadena, Calif.; to Vicksburg, Miss.; Trenton, N. J.; Benson, Miss.; Berkeley, Calif.; Minneapolis, Minn.; University Park, Iowa; North Mankato, Minn.; St. Paul, Minn.; Denver, Colo.; Colorado Springs, Colo.; the president of American Indian Federation, Sapulpa, Okla.; American Monetary Research Association, Spokane, Wash.; Everett, Mass.; Pittsburgh, Pa.; Chicago, Ill.; Forest Park, Ill.; chaplain of St. Paul's House, Chicago, Ill. I will not go through the list. Let me say that requests were made for from 1 to 1,000 copies of these speeches from the residents of 34 of the 48 States in the Union, and I am quite certain that all of those who requested copies, yes, each and every one is not only wholeheartedly supporting the efforts to defeat our enemies but just as vigorously fighting to preserve the "four freedoms" and our constitutional form of government here at home.

CONDEMNATION OF CONGRESS

Of late, it has become the fashion to abuse the Members of Congress. It is both the indoor and the outdoor sport of some radio commentators, columnists, and editors. These gentlemen in their wisdom profess to believe that the legislative branch of the Government is made up of the off-scourings of the country.

To illustrate what is meant, let me quote from an editorial written by John S. Knight, of the Detroit Free Press, who joins Mr. Winchell in his condemnation of Congress. Mr. Knight wrote:

> A Congressman is a man who played ball with the drys during prohibition, but never missed an opportunity to sample his friends' private stock.
>
> A Congressman is a man who will drink your liquor all night.
>
> A Congressman is a man who collects mileage from the Government for trips he never takes.
>
> A Congressman is a bumptious, slow-witted politician who depends upon smarter men to elect and reelect him; a small chip in the big international poker game now being played at Washington. He is susceptible to flattery, devoid of backbone, lacking in principle, short on ability, and usually labors under the delusion our Government exists chiefly to perpetuate him and his kind on the public pay roll.
>
> In brief, most Congressmen are a total waste of time, money, and effort.

On the front page of the Detroit Free Press of Sunday, May 17, 1942, under the heading "You can do something about this," among other things, Mr. Knight wrote:

> By the action of some 200 of its Members who participated in an undignified scramble for unlimited gasoline ration cards, the Seventy-seventh Congress has again confirmed its reputation as one of the worst in history.
>
> * * * * *
>
> "Bundles for Congress" and the X gasoline rationing farce are but symbols of its restricted collective mentality and utter inability to sense the national temper before hearing from the people back home.
>
> * * * * *
>
> A stupid, spineless post-war Congress which yielded to the insistent demands of each selfish pressure group could very well throw this Nation into an economic tailspin from which there could be no recovery under our present system of government.

He concludes that editorial with this statement:

> The inept, spineless Seventy-seventh Congress now assembled in Washington should be a direct challenge to every good citizen to see to it personally that the Seventy-eighth Congress will be a better one.

Mr. Knight condemns Congress because it is a rubber-stamp Congress. Then, without turning around, he damns individual Members of it, demands their political execution, their defeat at the polls, the moment they show any signs of independence in opposition to the administration's fallacious policies.

He blows hot and he blows cold. He characterizes as enemies of our country those who venture to disagree in the slightest degree with the President's actions or policies. Yet, on Sunday, May 24, in an editorial in the Free Press, he laid the President's hide wide open because the President had commuted Browder's sentence. A copy of that editorial is attached hereto and marked "Exhibit B."

Like the mother of a spoiled brat, Knight resents any criticism of the administration, but claims for himself the right to, figuratively speaking, spank hell out of it.

In the editorial of May 17, Knight wrote:

Capable men have hesitated to run for Congress because it meant the absolute subordination of their own ideals if they expected to be elected. For years upon end, it has been traditional that no candidate for Congress who hoped to be successful could afford to offend the farm bloc if he came from an agricultural area or the labor vote if he hailed from an industrial district. Then he has had to cater to the Townsendites, the wets and the drys, the old-age pension folks, the racial and religious groups, and, at the same time, contrive to extract a few campaign contributions from self-seeking industrialists and businessmen.

If what Mr. Knight wrote be true—and there is no question but that capable men have hesitated to run for Congress—who is to blame for the situation? No one but the people themselves and the editors and the publishers such as Mr. Knight and others who have failed to back up and support honest, sincere Congressmen who have shown some degree of independence; who have exhibited some courage in opposing the demands of the pressure groups.

Has Editor and Publisher Knight, a wealthy man, the owner of several great newspapers, campaigned against the racketeers in the ranks of union labor? Has he had anything to say about the closed shop issue, the adoption of which denies to American citizens their God-given, their constitutional right to earn a livelihood without paying tribute?

Is it any wonder that men of ability hesitate to run for Congress, when, as soon as they are elected, they become the recipients of the abuse of such men as Knight? I ask you, Mr. Knight, and I ask it in the kindliest manner—were our positions reversed, would you stay in Congress and what would you do if you did?

Raymond Clapper, evidently in a moment when he was subject to a mental lapse, in his column published on Saturday, May 16, charges, in substance, that Congress is destroying itself. He wrote:

As a force in our Government, Congress is sliding downhill.

Then he said that it was—

endangered, not by the press nor by the executive branch, but by its own shallow incompetency. * * *

Congress has remained a collection of 2-cent politicians who could serve well enough in simpler days. But the ignorance and provincialism of Congress renders it incapable of meeting the needs of modern government. Consequently the center of gravity has shifted toward the executive branch.

Clapper is one of those columnists who consistently demand that Congress turn over its powers and its functions to the administration. Often he demands that we follow the President without questioning. He writes:

People are looking to editorials, radio commentators, and newspaper columnists for the discussion of public affairs that they ought to get from Congress.

If that be true, then it is because those gentlemen have set themselves up as all-wise and, through their publications, continuously belittle the people's representatives.

Clapper writes:

Since we have no Webster-Hayne debates, people want to know what Dorothy Thompson and Walter Lippmann think.

Did any Representative in any congressional district tell Mr. Clapper that that was what the people wanted? Or have the publishers forced the columnists upon the public?

Scarcely a day passes but that Washington editors, through their editorials, presume not only to advise Congress as to what it should do but to demand that it do it, and that without delay.

It is my misfortune that I have never had the privilege of meeting either Knight, Clapper, or any of the Washington editors or publishers. It does seem to me that even those gentlemen will concede that the people of the districts, at least in the rural communities, know the men they send to Congress either personally or by reputation. Do these writers mean to charge that the people of our districts are so unconcerned or so ignorant or so thoughtless of their own welfare that they select men who, as has been charged, are dumb, inept, venal, ignorant, 2-cent politicians? These charges made against Congress as a whole are an insult to the people of our districts.

There is another thought that comes to me while reading these editorials, these remarks, which are derogatory to Congress. Why is it that some of those who so bitterly condemn us; who so consistently and so loudly proclaim our lack of ability, of honesty, of sincerity—yes; charge us with a lack of common sense, of ordinary intelligence—shirk their duty?

Is it unfair to suggest that Knight, and Clapper, and Winchell, and the publishers, and the editors of the Washington dailies do their part toward the preservation of our Government? They are all courageous men. We know that, because they speak their minds fearlessly from the columns of their publications. It cannot be said, can it, that they lack patriotism; that they are unwilling to serve their country? It cannot be charged that, because the compensation of a Congressman may be less than that which they receive in their present positions, they would refuse to serve?

Certainly, no one would even suggest that they would not be independent if they became Members of Congress or that they would be unable to resist the demands of the unions, of the farmers, of the other pressure groups. Oh, no. They are all men of ability, fearless, independent.

But, for some reason that has always been a mystery to me, which still remains a mystery, none of them appears to be willing to forsake his chosen occupation, make the sacrifice of becoming a candidate for public office, move into a district represented by one of the Congressmen they so frequently condemn, be elected, and then give the Nation a demonstration of what a proper Representative can and will do.

Before I came to Congress, the practice of my profession brought me at least a comfortable living. The fact that I was elected indicates that, in some degree at least, I had the respect and the confidence of my neighbors and fellow citizens. Otherwise, I would not have been elected. Having passed the age of 60, it is not probable that, all at once, I changed my character or followed off after new gods. Yet I discover that, in the opinion of some of these gentlemen, I now am not only ignorant, cowardly, disloyal, but that the good people, sober, industrious, and God-fearing, who sent me here, lacked common sense and intelligence.

If I was the only one who was so condemned, there might be some inclination on my part to accept their judgment. But when Congress as a whole, or with very, very few exceptions, is so characterized, I am inclined to wonder whether there is not a screw loose somewhere in the belfry of these gentlemen.

May I in all humility respectfully suggest to each and all of these radio commentators, these columnists, and these editors who are convinced that the people are misrepresented by a group of numskulls and ignoramuses, that they and each of them make the sacrifice of moving into a congressional district now misrepresented, there stand for election and give the country the benefit of their wisdom and their experience. To me, it seems rather selfish for these gentlemen, who are so well qualified to represent the people, to refuse to accept the burden, the responsibility, and may I say, the honor, of becoming a Congressman.

Here is the thought that comes to me in that connection. Being all these things, having neither intelligence nor ability, utterly lacking in honesty and integrity, being blanks, you may say, or worse than blanks, I think it is a shame that men like Knight, men like the editors of the Washington papers and the publishers of those papers, these columnists who tell us day after day that we do not know anything, I say it is a shame. Do they not show selfishness, greed, lack of willingness to save their country, if we are what they say we are, if we are what they claim we are, and then if they are patriotic, if they are loyal, if they then refuse when our country is in need, when its very existence is threatened, they do not move into districts somewhere in the United States—and there are plenty of them—run for office and be elected and give the people of the United States an honest, decent government as long as they are the only ones capable of doing it? I call on them, and you boys upstairs get word to them that the lists are open. There is a primary election in the Fourth Congressional District on the 15th day of September and there is a general election up there in November. If I am anything like they say why do they not come to the rescue of their country? Do not pick a stooge, run yourself. They are insisting that our boys be drafted, that they enlist; they are insisting that they be sent by the thousands and millions to all the four corners of the earth to maintain this Republic.

They say that here in Washington the Government is being betrayed; that here

is the place where the war will be lost. If they believe what they say I call on them, then, to enter the lists, the political battle lists, and do their part to rectify the evil, to save the country from this danger.

Will they do it? I doubt it. And why? Knight says that no respectable man is willing to enter. Why? Because every man who ever was elected to Congress in the last few years knows that the moment he gets down here and fails to follow the admonitions of one of these self-appointed dictators, publishers, columnists, or radio announcers, from that day on he is subject to their dirty, nasty, political abuse. Not a Member of this House has any criticism of those who call him to account for what he does on the floor, who question his judgment, but when they say the things about us, which I have quoted, my answer is, "Now, you fellows either shut up or get out and run for office and perform your duty to the people of this Government by giving them the kind of Congressmen they should have."

EXHIBIT A

DIVIDING AMERICA'S PROGRESSIVES—NEW REPUBLIC AND UNION FOR DEMOCRATIC ACTION PRODUCE A ROLL CALL WHICH MAKES TORIES LOOK LIKE LIBERALS AND VICE VERSA

(By Morris H. Rubin)

The frantic effort of certain groups in America to award themselves an exclusive monopoly on liberalism, progressivism, and patriotism because they favored involvement in war before Pearl Harbor is producing some astounding results. Perhaps the most fantastic result of all was available for public inspection last week when the well-meaning but confused New Republic and Union for Democratic Action released their congressional roll call.

Its sponsors hope that the roll call will serve as a guide for American liberals when they vote for Senators and Congressmen in the fall, but it is so confusing and contradictory that its value to progressive voters is virtually nil.

Here and there the roll call manages to expose an enemy of democracy and progressivism, but these cases are almost lost in a jungle of distortion. Nowhere in the harsh language hurled at the Seventy-seventh Congress is there any recognition of the fact that it gave President Roosevelt everything he asked for in the field of foreign policy, or the fact that most of the shortages and reverses since Pearl Harbor can be traced to administrative rather than legislative failures, or that Congress has passed every administration war bill with record-breaking speed since December 7.

BASED ON A FALSE PREMISE

Contradictions in the roll call are understandable because the whole idea is based on the fallacious premise that interventionism and liberalism are synonymous. So muddled is the result of the poll that its sponsors found it necessary to denounce in a separate section some of the most vicious Tories in Congress who managed to score high in the roll call itself.

The New Republic and the Union for Democratic Action took 10 measures in the field of foreign policy and 10 in the field of domestic action, recorded the votes of the 435 Congressmen and the 32 Senators up for reelection this year, and called on liberals to elect or defeat lawmakers on the basis of how they voted on these 20 proposals.

This scrambling of foreign and domestic issues turns up amazing results. Some of the southern Bourbons who have knifed the New Deal in the back whenever they could—which was pretty often—and some of the errand boys for the Tammany and Hague machines emerge with better records than do some of the genuine liberals and progressives of the North and Northwest.

The reasons are obvious enough. Many of the votes to support the Administration's foreign policy came from machine Congressmen who collected their reward in patronage. Naturally they rate high in the foreign policy section of the roll call.

Many other votes came from southern and northern Tories—mostly the former—who figured that whooping it up for the "Four Freedoms" for the rest of the world would lessen the pressure for action on the home front. Naturally they rate high in the foreign policy section of the roll call. That there were genuine liberals who voted for interventionist measures because they sincerely believed in them goes without saying, but they constituted a tiny fraction of the total vote for involvement in war.

REELECT MR. HYDE, DEFEAT DR. JEKYLL

The roll call itself makes the point better than we can. Take the State of Georgia, for instance. The 10 Congressmen from that State cast only 3 "bad" votes in a total of 90 votes on foreign policy, according to the New Republic, but they were wrong 38 times on domestic issues.

The case of Virginia is even more glaring. That State has 9 Congressmen. Sponsors of the roll call would have you believe that they are practically perfect liberals in foreign policy because they were right 80 out of a possible 82 times. These same men, however, are reactionaries in the field of domestic policy because they were wrong 46 out of a possible 69 times. How the voters of Virginia can reelect Mr. Hyde and leave Dr. Jekyll at home is not made clear.

But then, maybe we're not being fair. Maybe you're not supposed to look at the foreign and domestic records separately. Maybe the sponsors want you to swallow the product as a whole, sort of strike an average between the votes on foreign and domestic issues. Let's try it in a few cases and see what happens:

Three of the most violent critics of everything progressive—Representatives COX, SMITH, and DIES—turn out to be greater liberals than Wisconsin's three Progressives in Congress, Representatives SAUTHOFF, HULL, and GEHRMANN, according to the roll call. Not only better, mind you, but 100 percent better.

Senator BALL, of Minnesota, who started introducing antilabor legislation as soon as he got his bag unpacked in Washington, emerges with a much better average than Senator GEORGE W. NORRIS, one of the great liberal leaders in American history.

Representative THOMAS ELIOT, who has won the applause of all liberals for his courageous exposure of the Dies committee, gets a pretty good grade, but nowhere near as good as the one the roll call gives Representative MICHAEL KENNEDY, the new leader of Tammany Hall.

HALF TORY AND HALF LIBERAL

Representative JOHN TOLAN, whose superb investigation of migratory labor and related subjects has drawn praise from all genuinely progressive groups, gets a measly .588 batting average as compared with .684 for Cox, .777 for VINSON, and .666 for DIES.

Representative THAD WASIELEWSKI, who is held out to Wisconsin Progressives as an example of what a real liberal should be, gets a .600 average from the New Republic because he was so "right" on foreign policy. The fact is, too, that he was wrong four out of a possible five times on domestic issues because he has a habit of taking his cue from the viciously reactionary Milwaukee Journal.

Representative LELAND FORD of California, one of the most intolerant critics of everything progressive, comes out of the roll call half reactionary and half liberal. The New Republic and Union for Democratic Action think he voted 100 percent right on foreign issues and 100 percent wrong on domestic issues. Elsewhere in its issue the New Republic warns that FORD is one of the worst Members of Congress—which he is—but Mr. FORD gets a clean bill of health on foreign policy from the New Republic and Union for Democratic Action!

And here's the one that deserves the grand prize in the hog-calling contest. Senator CHARLES MCNARY of Oregon is awarded an ignominious .176 average. He was wrong 14 out of a possible 17 times, according to the New Republic and Union for Democratic Action roll call. But the fact remains that Senator MCNARY is running for reelection with the blessing of the White House, Secretary Ickes, Senator NORRIS, the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the Oregon Public Power Districts, and the Oregon Commonwealth Federation. And yet the Messrs. Cox, DIES, and SMITH, not to mention some of Hague's boys and the Tammany gang, emerge as 5 times better liberals!

THOSE MODEST EDITORS

Much of the explanatory material in the New Republic roll-call supplement is devoted to proving how this or that Congressman was wrong in predicting this or that about the course the war would take. The editors of the magazine modestly refrain from telling us that they, too, took a flyer in prognostication when the mood moved them.

A month before Pearl Harbor, for instance, the magazine assured its readers that "If Japan chose war, the tremendous odds against her would limit the hostilities to a relatively brief period," and that it was not unreasonably optimistic to conclude we could dispose of the Nipponese in 6 months.

Six days before Pearl Harbor the same publication assured us that "Japan cannot undertake war against us unless the French Navy engages the British in the Mediterranean and the Russian armies collapse." Apparently some of the brass hats at Pearl Harbor must have been reading the New Republic. These quotations, of course, are not reprinted in the current issue of the magazine; there is room only to show how others were wrong—according to lights of the New Republic and the Union for Democratic Action.

YOU TAKE YOUR CHOICE

Liberals who decide to wade into the 1942 campaign with the New Republic supplement for ammunition will be further confused when they compare a leading editorial in the magazine itself with the introductory material in the roll-call supplement.

First we are assured that "the Seventy-seventh Congress (the Congress which voted for lend-lease, draft extension, scuttling of the Neutrality Act, and record-breaking military appropriations) will go down in history as one of the weakest, blindest, most disunited we have had." We are told that the few good men in this Congress are "lonely soldiers fighting their country's legislative battles against disheartening odds."

Elsewhere, however, there is a different version of the personnel of this Congress. We are told that the "willful deceit" came from "only a small minority within Congress." "We cannot overemphasize the fact that it is only a minority which should plead guilty," say the editors.

The reader, of course, is free to decide whether the good men are "lonely" and "battling against disheartening odds" or whether "it is only a small minority" which has gummed up the works.

DIVIDING AMERICAN PROGRESSIVES

The whole effort of the New Republic and the Union for Democratic Action can only divide and confuse the liberals and progressives of America at a time when they need

so urgently to be united. There are men in Congress against whom all progressives should unite, and there are others who deserve the undivided support of all of us. But this roll call, keyed in part to a foreign policy debate which ended December 7, 1941, muddies the issues of 1942 beyond recognition.

What are liberals in New York supposed to think for instance when PM lists Representative T. H. CULLEN of New York as one of the small clique in Congress that is trying to wreck the New Deal, while the New Republic lists him as "right" 16 out of a possible 19 times on foreign and domestic issues? PM thinks Representative ROBERT M. DOUGHTON of North Carolina is a leading member of the conspiracy to destroy the New Deal, but the New Republic finds he was on the side of the gods 13 out of 18 times.

The New Republic-Union for Democratic Action roll call collapses so completely because it tries to fuse foreign and domestic issues and turns up with ridiculous results. It is based on the false assumption that interventionists are liberals or liberals are interventionists. It becomes a victim of its own twisted reasoning when it awards a higher average to die-hard Tories than to sincere and hard-working progressives. It deceives progressives by awarding a premium for the rubber-stamp voting of machine Congressmen. It penalizes progressive Congressmen who were responsive to the will of their people. It rewards southern Tories who represent districts where whole sections of the populace are disenfranchised.

In short, the roll call is a mess.

EXHIBIT A–1

THE NEW REPUBLIC GOES HAYWIRE

LEFTISTS AND COMMUNISTS EXHIBIT GLANDS INSTEAD OF BRAINS, EMOTIONS INSTEAD OF INTELLIGENCE—REASON TURNED INSIDE OUT—LOGIC TURNED UPSIDE DOWN—AMAZING IGNORANCE OF HISTORY DISPLAYED—ABRAHAM LINCOLN AND THE THIRTIETH CONGRESS CONTRASTED WITH THE NEW REPUBLIC INTERPRETATION OF SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS—PURGERS OVERREACH THEMSELVES—TRUMPED-UP CHARGES—CONTEMPTIBLE AND DASTARDLY CAMPAIGN TO SMEAR AND PURGE ALL PRE-WAR NONINTERVENTIONISTS — INVESTIGATION FEARED AND OPPOSED

On May 13, 1846, Congress declared that war existed with Mexico and President Polk called for 50,000 volunteeers. That same month Abraham Lincoln was nominated for Congress out in Illinois, and he defeated Peter Cartwright, the eccentric but popular Methodist evangelist, being the only Whig elected in Illinois to the Thirtieth Congress. The House was organized December 6, 1847. Sixteen days later, Lincoln, who was opposed to the war with Mexico, both from his own personal convictions and as a representative of the Whig Party, offered a preamble and resolutions setting forth his views of the varied wrongs involved in the course pursued by the administration of President Polk in the current dispute with the weak, chaotic republic of Mexico. Lincoln's advocacy of Mexico's cause lost to him and his party the greater portion of his political strength in Illinois for, while the war had been unpopular at the start, it had become more popular as time went on, as wars always do by reason of war propaganda and military glory and all of the war psychology. Lincoln, however, followed his conscience instead of political opportunism and made a somewhat elaborate speech in behalf of his resolutions on the 12th of January 1848. It was all too late to stem the tide of the war, already in progress more than 20 months. All that any politician could do, in or out of Congress, was to put himself in such a position that he would surely be swept away by the flood of popular passion.

It is interesting to note that Lincoln's position with reference to the Mexican War was analogous to that afterward held by many conscientious Democrats with reference to the war for the Union. In the history Abraham Lincoln: The Man and the War President, William O. Stoddard, the author, who was one of President Lincoln's confidential secretaries during the War of the Rebellion, said: "It goes far to explain the mutual confidence which existed, at the latter period, between him and them; and the country was the gainer."

Lincoln was true to his convictions, even though it cost him a second term in Congress. He read the handwriting on the wall and was not even a candidate for a second term. Was that famous speech against a war long in progress an expression of treason? Was it only congressional immunity that kept him from prosecution? Or was the first amendment to the United States Constitution taken more seriously then than now? Anyway, 11 years later that man Lincoln was nominated for and elected President of the Nation.

Times have changed greatly since 1846. How many men in Congress now have as much intestinal fortitude as did Lincoln? Today, millions of people question the patriotism of all in Congress who opposed the steps toward war, as they conceived and understood them, though all those measures were presented as steps to keep the Nation out of war; and others, just as honest, no doubt, supported them as measures to insure our nonintervention. Today, the administration attempts to purge Congress of all who were for nonintervention and who opposed those pre-war measures. One lone Congresswoman, no matter how much others differed with her, had the courage to vote her convictions as did Lincoln, though Lincoln was not a Member when war was declared. One who made a speech against the war 20 months later would certainly have voted against the war had he been a Member at the time. Such a speech as Lincoln made would never be tolerated now. Ask JEANNETTE RANKIN of Montana, who listened to the hisses and jeers when she voted against war. Could she make a speech now as did Abraham Lincoln? In that famous speech Lincoln said: "There is an important sense in which the Government is distinct from the administration. One is perpetual, the other temporary and changeable. A man may be loyal to his Government and yet oppose the peculiar principles and methods of the administration." And Lincoln was speaking of the right of a Congressman or any other citizen to speak against the war in which the Nation was engaged, for that was the act of the administration which he was attacking.

Today men do not even ask that much. They only ask that the American people respect their sincerity and integrity in their action before Pearl Harbor and the declaration of war. Neither in Congress nor out of Congress are men making speeches against our participation in the war. Neither do they apologize for having tried to keep us out of it. Today we turn our reason inside out and our logic upside down. We insist on thinking with our glands instead of with our brains. Our emotions control instead of our intelligence. A current leftist magazine, the New Republic, comes out with a 32-page extra section attacking Members of the House and Senate who voted against some or all of the 10 administration sponsored foreign-affairs bills and 10 domestic-affairs bills, especially attacking 44 Representatives and 3 Senators who are called "obstructionists," though all of these voted for war and have supported all of the war measures since the war declaration. What would Lincoln say of that?

And the New Republic says in a footnote: "The symbols * * * indicate for and against the Government." Shades of Abraham Lincoln! The administration is now the Government, and was long before the war. And poor, ignorant Lincoln said that the administration was never the Government—that the Government is perpetual, while the administration is temporary and changeable. If the administration is the Government, if Lincoln was wrong, and the New Republic right, why have a Congress? Why have the party system? Why have a minority in Congress, even if we have a Congress? Congress must be just a rubber stamp, just a group of "yes" men. All who oppose the administration on either domestic or foreign policies in peacetime or in wartime are now and ever shall be obstructionists. Then, what was Lincoln on February 12, 1848, after the war had been in progress over 20 months? Now voting records since Pearl Harbor and the declaration of war don't count. Did those men stand with the administration during the 16 months before Pearl Harbor? By that their patriotism and further usefulness is to be judged. Those men of the New Republic and Union for Democratic Action seem to forget that the administration presented all of those bills before the war as measures to keep the United States out of the war. There could have been no honest difference of opinion as to how best to keep out of the war. These self-appointed and anointed fixers of the world's troubles would have us believe that any Congressman who voted against appropriation for the Guam naval base, against neutrality revision, against military-airplane appropriation, against conscription, against lend-lease, against the first lend-lease appropriation, against draft extension, against repeal of the ban arming ships, against lifting belligerent zones, was voting against not the administration but against the Government—an obstructionist to be purged out of Congress.

The present attempt of the administration, the left wing New Republic, the Union for Democratic Action, the Henry R. Luce magazines (Time, Life, and Fortune), the Marshall Field Press, the Friends of Democracy, and such individuals as Walter Winchell, Morris Ernst, Dorothy Schiff Backer, publisher of the New York Post, and others, to purge Congress, by fair means or foul, true or false, of all Members who opposed the administration bills is most contemptible, dishonest, un-American, and strikes at the very foundation of democratic government. And those men pretend to honor Jefferson and Lincoln!

Turn back to the issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Read over those debates. Some able men honestly believed that those bills were steps toward war. Other able men honestly believed that they would help to keep us out of the conflict. Others who advocated our participation in the war advocated those bills as means to get into it. That was democracy. That is our system of government. Destroy that and democracy is dead. Now many men still believe that the passage of those bills helped to get us into the war, but since war was declared, they felt that further opposition was useless, as Lincoln learned in 1848, and they have fallen into line and supported the war program, reserving the right to criticize constructively, when they see inefficiency or dishonesty. Even the New Republic says: "Congress can do a great deal to debate, criticize, and investigate the shaping and administration of those policies. For that reason we do not want a Congress of 'yes' men, whether the yes that they say be to the President, the big newspaper moguls, or the tycoons of the corporations. We want a Congress that is not afraid to say yes to those policies that are clearly wise and clearly represent the wishes of the people, but that is also not afraid to say no when the administration has been lax, timid, inefficient." All right. What

are those folks "kicking" about? That is exactly what those men did in Congress, according to their own thinking. Does the New Republic and do those others who now want to purge Congress of the former "noninterventionists" want a monopoly on the right to say what is wise, what represents the people, what is lax, timid, and inefficient?

What plan could be worked out to destroy quicker the unity of action and unity of purpose of Congress than to purge it now of all who honestly differed on those bills last year? Japan unites Congress but these die-hard administration men who want no opposition at any time are determined to have a purge of all who challenged them, not knowing that the administration men and God alone knew what was best. In this connection, one thing is amazing. Before Pearl Harbor, Congress was divided between interventionists and noninterventionists. Both groups opposed or at least claimed to oppose our participation in the war. To the very last bill last November, the Democratic floor leader called for votes to secure passage of the bill (draft extension) to keep us out of the war. Now, in spite of all of this campaign of purging, in spite of both party platforms and the declarations of both candidates, the purgers speak of the interventionists as those who tried to keep us out of war. Well all of them claimed to be doing that. Do the administration men now admit that they were just fooling us? Were they trying to get us into the war and lying to us to get our support for those bills? Now their action seems to indicate that they were not sincere in their claims for they try to purge Congress of all who honestly tried to keep us out. No wonder that millions of people are confused by this present crusade to purge Congress and shocked by the nasty contemptible conspiracy to smear Senator WALSH, of Massachusetts, with dastardly faked testimony. What next from this gang?

"The Seventy-seventh Congress will go down in history as one of the weakest, blindest, most disunited we have had," say the New Republic and Union for Democratic Action, because some men still had courage to differ with the administration as how to best keep the Nation out of war. Never in my many years of reading in the field of government, politics, current affairs, have I read anything else so amateurish, so illogical, so filled with false statements and contradictions as the 64 pages of the double issue of the New Republic of May 18, 1942.

A complete study of this entire amazing document convinces one that the New Republic and the Union for Democratic Action do not believe their own analysis. They say that the plus and minus signs indicate votes for and against the Government, but they proceed to make many contradictory comments. Among the 23 Representatives whom they single out for attack and name as meriting defeat at the polls, they name HOWARD SMITH of Virginia, EUGENE COX, of Georgia, CHARLES FADDIS, of Pennsylvania, JOSEPH STARNES, of Alabama, and MARTIN DIES, of Texas Of the 50 test votes cast by these men on matters of foreign policy—and the New Republic certainly makes clear that it is the foreign policy most at stake in the coming election—only 1 vote (SMITH'S vote lifting the ban on entrance of American ships into belligerent zones) fails to receive a plus mark. On this New Republic chart on foreign policy 4 men are 100 percent, and the other one 90 percent. If we take this chart as our criterion, these men could claim that their election has been endorsed. But the New Republic and the Union for Democratic Action repudiate their own chart. Why do they ask us to follow their chart on other Members of Congress?

Geographically, the chart is also interesting and very enlightening. The plus States are the solid South, plus those districts controlled largely by the Kelly-Nash machine in Illinois, the Hague machine in New Jersey, the Guffey machine in Pennsylvania, and the Tammany machine in New York. In the South we have the one-party system. In those northern boss-ridden districts we have one-man administration control. In the South we have reactionary social and labor policies, racial discrimination at the very bottom of all social and political life, a fascist political order. That seems to be what the New Republic would prefer to have everywhere in the Nation. They seem to want a one-party system with a rubber-stamp legislature, no honest independent thinking, just executive control. They want a rubber-stamp Congress which will approve anything and everything the Executive proposes. That is dictatorship with a vengeance. In other words, they want fascism, control from the White House, death to democracy.

The minus States are those of the Midwest where the two political parties are about evenly balanced, States superior socially, economically, and politically. All of that these Fascists condemn. Their chart makes the Midwest black and the South white. Yes, strange as it may seem, dear reader, the New York Tammany, the Hague New Jersey, the Guffey Pennsylvania, and the Kelly-Nash Chicago are about the only really white sections of the North.

Politically, that is, from the party standpoint, the deductions are interesting. Of the Senators, plus signs indicate approval of 20 Democrats, 2 Republicans, and Senator NORRIS, of Nebraska. Minus signs express disapproval of 2 Democrats and 6 Republicans, including JOHNSON, of Colorado; CAPPER, of Kansas; BROOKS, of Illinois; LODGE, of Massachusetts; THOMAS, of Idaho; and MCNARY, of Oregon. Of the Representatives, plus signs follow the names of delegations and portions of delegations from Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, the single Democratic Congressman from Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Mississippi, Missouri, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, Oklahoma, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia (foreign policy).

On the contrary, rows of minus signs condemn the one Democratic Congressman from Idaho and from Nebraska, the Democrats from Iowa and Montana. The Democrats from Ohio are divided—all mixed up between plus and minus. Republicans from California, Colorado, the lone Republican from Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, the Republican from Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, the Republican from Montana, Nebraska, North Dakota, Ohio, the Republican from Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, and Wisconsin are minus or obstructionists.

Speaking generally, most Republicans and most of the Midwest Congressmen are unpatriotic obstructionists, because they do not agree with the New Republic and the Union for Democratic Action as to "what is wise and what is lax, timid, and inefficient." In other words, the future welfare of the country depends on rigid partisanship to the party in power and the destruction of independent thought, the complete annihilation of our system of checks and balances—the executive, legislative, and judicial. Instead, we must have a one-party government, Fascist dictatorship, regimentation with a vengeance now and forevermore.

Why do not men think before they write? The trouble is that many who think they are thinking are just trying to find more material to bolster up their own prejudices. First of all, they did not have the facts. They could have gotten them. But they would not have interpreted the facts correctly. The man who has the scientific attitude toward knowledge must interpret the facts correctly. That can be done only with the calm dispassion of the true scientific man, not in the heated passion and emotion of politicians out to get the scalps of all who disagree with them.

After pages of abuse of Congressman who honestly found reason to differ with the administration, the editors of the New Republic say in the editorial entitled "Martinique": "The New Republic believes that the whole policy of the State Department toward Vichy has been wrong from beginning to end; that it was not dictated by shrewd strategical plans to keep the French fleet out of Hitler's hands, but by appeasement, inertia, and timidity."

In the editorial entitled "Make the Seventy-eighth Good!" the editors say: "Congress cannot, in the nature of the problems the Government has to confront, alone shape national policies. But Congress can do a great deal to debate, criticize, and investigate the shaping and administration of those policies. For that reason we do not want a Congress of 'yes' men, whether the yes that they say be to the President, the big newspaper moguls, or the tycoons of the corporations. We want a Congress that is not afraid to say yes to those policies that are clearly wise and clearly represent the wishes of the people, but that is also not afraid to say no when the administration has been lax, timid, inefficient."

Now please note in the above quotation that the New Republic wants a Congress that is not afraid to say yes to those policies that are clearly wise and clearly represent the wishes of the people. Well, last year both candidates and both parties pledged to keep us out of war. The Gallup poll showed that the great majority were opposed to getting into the war. Before Pearl Harbor there was never a time that 100 votes could have been mustered in Congress for a declaration of war. WHEELER and others of the noninterventionists called for such a vote many times. Then Congress and the so-called obstructionists were representing the people. What is the New Republic kicking about? When the people changed, Congress changed. The great majority in Congress differed only on how best to keep out of it prior to Pearl Harbor.

These poor editors do not see that all this is in direct conflict with their criticism of the obstructionists in their voting through those 16 months. Men have difference of opinion as to what things are wise and what are lax, timid, inefficient. Congress did debate, criticize, and investigate, and that seems to be what has enraged the New Republic. They say that they want that but they do not want anything of the kind unless Congress will listen to the New Republic as to what it wise and what lax, timid, and inefficient.

They condemn on one page and commend on another page. Now they want it and now they don't. In one editorial they criticize the administration and on another page they condemn in the strongest language the Congressman who did the same thing on some of those 20 bills which seemed to the New Republic as vital to our future. The more one reads these 64 pages, the more one wonders what the editors had been drinking while they wrote the copy.

EXHIBIT B

THE EDITOR'S NOTEBOOK

At the risk of sounding like a hopeless reactionary and an unreconstructed American, we are going on record in branding Communist Earl Browder's release from a Federal penitentiary as a slap in the face to every good citizen who believes in his country and its form of government.

Furthermore, we think the reason given for commuting his sentence is a sad reflection upon the intelligence of the American people

and an indication of how far down the scale our respect for principles and laws has descended.

On the very day before great numbers of people were assembling to proclaim their fidelity to flag and country, a convicted lawbreaker and Communist Party secretary, Comrade Earl Browder, walked out of jail a free man because someone in Washington convinced President Roosevelt that his release "would have a tendency to promote national unity."

Promote national unity, my eye!

National unity is the one thing that Communist Browder has done more to undermine than any other termite within memory.

Born in Wichita, Kans., some 50 years ago, Browder has made a lifetime work of attempting to destroy the capitalistic system in this country.

He was such a good patriot in 1917 that he refused to register for service and served 2½ years in prison for obstructing the draft law. Here, also, his sentence was commuted after the war ended and "Unity" Browder was free to continue with his conniving and plotting against his own country while in the pay of Soviet Russia.

In recent years, Browder has been trying to sell communism in this country as "Twentieth Century Americanism." But as he talked, he spoke in the name of Joseph Stalin because, as the general secretary of the Communist Party of the United States, he is the faithful slave of the Russian dictator. He and the other functionaries of the Communist Party must depend for their political existence on the approval of the Soviet Party.

Back in 1939, Communist Browder made the astounding statement that "the United States is most ripe, the most prepared for a quick transition to socialism." In expanding upon this thesis, Browder outlined the new order he had in mind for the American people:

1. Opposition political parties would be "put out of business" and meet "the same fate" as the 13 non-Communist parties that survived the revolution in Russia. Note: You can guess what that fate was.

2. The educational system would follow Communist ideologies.

3. Religion would be purged of most of its present leaders and teachings. Religious institutions which could be "shown in public debate as not a social menace" to the new system would survive.

4. Industry, national economy, property, and profits would be taken over by the Government.

5. The press is a "great industry" and, therefore, it is impossible to think of it continuing as it is.

Browder then went on to compare each phase of the government he recommends with the Soviet Russian Government, "in the wisdom and integrity of whose leaders" he expressed the greatest confidence.

Our American-born fuehrer of the Communists refused to make a direct reply to the question as to whether punitive measures such as mass starvation and the constant "liquidation" of officials, clergy, and citizens would be necessary to the establishment of his regime in America, but every man can judge for himself as to the methods that might be employed in building Browder's dream state.

In the same speech, he denounced President Roosevelt as having succumbed to the American monopoly capital's greed for profits.

In December 1939 he placed the blame for present European hostilities at the door of England and France and, from the day that the Hitler-Stalin pact was signed until the day that Hitler marched against Russia, the Browder-inspired Communist effort in this country was directed against the rearmament of America and against participation on the side of British imperialism.

Such was "Unity" Browder's role as the stooge of Stalin, and it has never changed. When Stalin decides that it is to the best interests of Russia to head in still another direction, Comrade Browder will be found standing by his side and to hell with America. In all his efforts to discredit the country in which he was born, his second wife, a Russian lawyer, participated openly. As long ago as 1940 she was ordered deported, but for some reason the order has never been enforced. Why?

If any good reasons can be offered for releasing Browder before he had paid the full penalty for lying to our Government while applying for an American passport to Russia, national unity is not one of them. Most of us have no desire to pick up any Soviet fleas by crawling into the same bed with the Browders.

It is hardly conceivable that our American soldiers in Australia or Ireland will thrill to the news that an ex-draft dodger who refused to bear arms for his country in the last war has been let out of jail in order to promote national unity.

Since Russia is now one of our Allies and a very important one at that, it has been suggested that perhaps the commutation of Browder's sentence was intended as a friendly gesture to Moscow. If this be true, we can picture the smile that curls on the lips of Maxim Litvinov, the Soviet's Ambassador to Washington. He must be thinking what Stalin would say to a request from our Government that the Russians go easy on one of their boys who was marked for the purge.

As the Free Press said back in January 1940, "If Mr. Browder had done as a Russian against the Reds what he did as an American citizen against our Federal laws, he could scarcely have escaped a session with the firing squad."

Browder's release was the result of a high-powered publicity campaign largely fostered by members of his own party. It was more difficult to understand the action of hundreds of trade-union leaders who stated in a signed advertisement published in the Free Press that the freeing of Browder "would inspire millions of workers to even greater sacrifice and greater efforts in the battle for production and in fighting the enemies of national unity."

It is hard for us to believe that Browder can be placed on the same pedestal as kindly pacifistic Eugene Debs or that labor generally looks upon Earl Browder as typifying either political martyrdom or good citizenship.

As the Church League of America said recently, "Why should the matter of national unity be involved any more with Browder than with any other convicted criminal unless we are willing to inaugurate a general policy of emptying our jails in the cause of national unity?"

Apart from the law violation involved Browder is the symbol of a movement that is based fundamentally upon atheism and is notoriously opposed to religious activities and worship.

How can the coddling of such a man possibly be construed as promoting national unity?

If we understand Webster's dictionary, national unity means a nation's singleness of purpose, absence of diversity, concord, harmony, accord, a unity of sentiment.

When it is demonstrated to us that Earl Browder has ever evidenced any such manifestations during the years he has been spitting on our flag, we will be glad to swallow this long editorial without gulping.

And that goes for Harry Bridges too, Bridges is the man who runs the maritime unions on the west coast, a job that keeps him so busy stirring up trouble he has never had time to become a naturalized citizen.

National unity must spring from the hearts of a people determined to work and fight together with all their energies in order to achieve an early victory over the most powerful enemies we have ever faced.

It can be fostered only by a clear understanding of our ideals and traditions, the love of country that comes with free education, opportunity, freedom of speech, and a respect for our laws and statutes.

We salute our flag, because it is the symbol of all these precious liberties which we prize so highly. Our fathers and forefathers fought to protect them for us. We must never toss them away lightly.

That is what America means to us.

Some other country can have the Bridgeses and the Browders. We'll take the MacArthurs and the Wainwrights of Bataan.

JOHN S. KNIGHT.

EXHIBIT C

THE GREAT GAME OF POLITICS—NEW DEALERS SEEN MOVING POLITICAL FRONT FORWARD IN EFFORT TO PURGE HOWARD SMITH AND GORE

(By Frank R. Kent)

This war, as Herbert Hoover pointed out the other day, is dangerous enough to require one single, undeviating purpose upon the part of the Government. That is a statement which admits of no argument. It is, therefore, natural to be disturbed at evidences that other matters, in addition to the successful prosecution of the war, occupy the minds of our rulers in Washington.

It is particularly distressing to find that, besides insistence upon pushing forward the social and economic reforms so dear to the New Deal hearts, but wholly out of place in this critical period, the administration is heavily engaged in the most practical kind of political maneuvering, totally unconnected with the war effort. The recent encouragement given by the President himself to the evil Hague machine in New Jersey is a sufficient proof of this, but there are other examples coming to light as the primaries approach.

Perhaps the most glaring are the campaigns being waged against the renomination of two outstanding Democratic Representatives—HOWARD SMITH of Virginia and ALBERT ARNOLD GORE of Tennessee. Each of these men has incurred equal enmity from the labor lobby and the administration by his effective independence upon vital domestic issues which arose during the last session. Mr. SMITH introduced and put through the House bills modifying the 40-hour-a-week law, which the President's personal influence killed in the Senate, but for which there was a very real sentiment in the country.

HIGH ON BLACKLIST

Mr. GORE, as far back as last summer, introduced a price-control bill fixing ceilings for both wages and farm prices along the Baruch lines as contrasted to the feeble and ineffectual measure sponsored by the administration and in which its own sponsors disbelieved.

It is true that the administration now virtually has admitted the soundness of Mr. GORE's proposals and, at heart the more level headed among the President's aides agree with Mr. SMITH, though under White House pressure they publicly took an opposite stand. However, the additional sympathy which both Representatives have shown toward drastic curtailment of nonwar governmental expenditures has given them a high place on the New Deal blacklist.

At the moment, administration political strategists are intensely interested in seeing that neither of these men is renominated. They are to be purged. In the case of Mr. SMITH, the C. I. O. is leading the fight against him in his district, but they are being

supported by New Deal weight in a thoroughly practical way, and the administration organs have launched a disgraceful smear campaign against him.

OPPONENT FOR GORE SOUGHT

In the case of Mr. GORE, the labor leaders are also in the front of the opposition, but it is New Deal influence which is trying to get a candidate strong enough to beat him in the primaries. Sgt. Alvin York is being mentioned in this connection.

This is a rather shocking state of affairs. Here are two Democrats of character, ability, and courage. They have supported the President's foreign policy to the hilt. They have voted to give him everything for which he has asked to prosecute the war. Yet, because they dared exercise independent judgment on domestic issues and did not cringe before the White House frown, the President's labor and political friends are now engaged in trying to drive them out of public life, while the President maintains his nonpolitical pose, concentrates on the war, and talks about national unity.

Apparently he is much concerned about national unity. At least, one would judge so from the fact that he gave that as the reason for releasing the Communist Browder. There are a considerable number of people who think that that made for disunity rather than unity. But, giving Mr. Roosevelt full credit for his belief about Browder, it is certainly permissible to point out that a much greater step toward unity could be taken if he would put an end to the pernicious political activity of his aides, show his personal disapproval of this new "purge" campaign and make it clear that he cherishes no resentment toward those who, in the exercise of their right of free thinking, differ with him on methods, so long as they support him on the vital issue of the war.

POLITICAL FRONT FORWARD

These partially concealed administration efforts to defeat Mr. SMITH and Mr. GORE are significant of the attitude of the New Deal group which believes that the New Deal political front must be moved forward, war or no war. They are especially offensive because of the consistent prating of administration publicity agencies about nonpartisanship and morale.

If they should succeed, one result would be to enhance the political power of the labor-leader bullies who have vowed vengeance against both of these Democrats. Another result would be to increase the administration "yes" men in Congress by making it clear that independence and character do not pay. A third result would be to lower the level of the legislative body—none too high as it is.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] is recognized for 10 minutes.

MERGE CIVILIAN INFORMATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the President's proposal to merge the Office of Facts and Figures, the Information Division of O. E. M., the United States Information Service, the public-relations activities of Army, Navy, and Board of Economic Warfare, and other units dealing with war information and publicity is timely and commendable. It is to be hoped that the functions of the central information agency will be redefined and limited to its true objectives, and that, within the limits of military advisability, it will keep the Nation accurately informed.

The people are robust of spirit. They will not be demoralized by bad news nor dispirited by good news.

This merger should be followed immediately by a merger of the informational and publicity units scattered throughout the civil agencies of government.

Within reasonable bounds, such activities are proper adjuncts of governmental endeavor. Their extent and cost should be measured in terms of constructive results.

Today that function is being abused and overdone. Publicity, instead of serving as an incident to Government functions, has become an end in itself.

Proof for that contention will be found in the huge 163-page report submitted to the House Appropriations Committee on June 25, 1941, by the Director of the Budget on informational and publicity activities in every branch of the Federal structure.

A summary of this remarkable document indicates that 153 agencies in the executive branch employed 2,895 full-time and 31,618 part-time employees at a cost of $27,700,000 for the fiscal year 1941 to write press releases, compile publications, prepare radio scripts, prepare and deliver speeches, produce movies and lantern slides, develop lecture material, and provide other informational and publicity material.

Here, then, is a vast army of 34,513 persons, equal in size to 11 infantry regiments, laboring ardently to prove that the pen is mightier than the sword, in publicizing civilian activities of government at a time when every energy should be concentrated on victory. Nor do these figures do full justice to the case, for they were prepared and submitted 11 months ago.

A more detailed break-down reveals that 947 persons are devoting full or part time to press service at a cost of $1,170,700,310 are engaged in radio work, 10,093 are devoting themselves to publications, while 3,085 give whole or part time to group contacts which the Budget Bureau explains as consisting of attending meetings and making speeches.

Nor has this army of "pen-fantry" been lacking in diligence. The report indicates that for the fiscal year it issued nearly 300,000,000 publications, of which 283,000,000 were not required by law.

This expansive ocean of official literature embraces in round numbers about 12,000,000 rulings and decisions by Federal agencies, 5,500,000 house organs, 4,000,000 manuals and handbooks, 13,000,000 technical publications, 14,000,000 programs and study outlines, and 95,000,000 popular publications. At the risk of facetiousness, one might observe with chrononhotonthologos that with 5,500,000 house organs, every agency of government should be able "with vocal voices most vociferous, in sweet vociferation outvociferize even sound itself."

As one contemplates this mountain of printed, multilithed, multigraphed, and duplicated material, it is difficult to realize that but a little while ago, the schoolchildren of the land were collecting waste paper to meet an alleged paper shortage.

Nor is this the whole story. Since these figures were compiled, new functions have been created, additional funds have been allocated for this type of activity so that the burden upon the taxpayers for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 will be substantially greater.

No person will begrudge to any agency of government a proper publicizing of its proper and legitimate functions but how can this enormous expenditure for a full-time and part-time army of informational experts be defended when the Nation is at war?

It would appear wise, practical, and in the interest of economy that this army of experts be drastically reduced, that this expenditure be curtailed, and that these diverse and scattered functions be consolidated and merged for better accounting and greater usefulness at reduced cost.

By so doing, we can meet the demand enunciated in the ninth point of the victory program adopted by the Republican National Committee in Chicago on April 20, 1942, in which it said that "such service be reduced to a minimum and combined in one agency, dedicated to telling the people the truth within the limits of military advisability. Bad news should not be withheld for any political reason or from any false notion of its effect on morale."

Just as the President's proposal to merge the war-information agencies meets this demand, let us urge that a similar merger of civilian publicity and information units be promptly effected in the interest of economy and efficiency.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a recent radio talk by Mr. Henry Miller, director, Trade Practice Conference Division, Federal Trade Commission. The statement, which deals with the Wool Products Labeling Act by one who is in charge of its enforcement, is informative and to the point. Also an article written for the Houston Post by Mr. George Stimpson shortly after the act was passed. In the interest of brevity, I have omitted certain parts of Mr. Miller's remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MILLS of Arkansas). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain passages from an address by Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes on a Nation-wide hookup the night before last in which he warned the American people of the danger of unrestrained criticism of their Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, recently there was published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a reply by me to some 65 economists on the silver question. These

gentlemen have now printed an answer, An Open Letter on Silver, addressed to me, which is broadcast over the country. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein that Open Letter On Silver, addressed to me, and my answer thereto, with the necessary tables.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, the day before yesterday I was granted unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an article by Dr. Young, of Purdue University. I am informed that this article exceeds the limit by one-half page and will cost $120. In view of the fact that it is a very important contribution to the agricultural program, I ask unanimous consent to insert this article in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

REAR ADMIRAL RAY SPEAR

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been written in the law, wise or unwise, that officers of our Navy, upon reaching the sixty-fourth milestone on life's way, shall be removed from the active list of the Navy. That is a good ripe age, and, in ordinary times, I have no doubt that many of our naval friends, after long and arduous and dangerous careers, then welcome relief from the great responsibilities which usually attach to the high grades to which they have succeeded toward the eventide of their service. Many men, however, at 64, practically are in the prime of life. Nature, for one reason or another, has taken light toll, and it always has seemed to me that such men, if they should so elect, should be permitted to carry on.

At the end of this month Rear Admiral Ray Spear, paymaster general of the Navy and Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, will be relieved of his duties and on October 1 will go on the retired list because he has reached the age limit fixed in the law. That seems to me to be a pity. Here, a really great paymaster general, strong and vigorous, in the midst of war, in the midst of directing the procurement, accounting, and disbursing work for the Navy on a scale never even nearly approached in all history, must pause and step aside for another to take over.

I really did not intend to stress so much that seeming incongruity, though stressed it should be. I rose to say a word about Rear Admiral Ray Spear.

Admiral Spear was born in the State of Illinois in 1878. He entered the Navy from the State of Washington in 1900, and for more than 42 years has given his all to the Navy and to the Nation. Today he stands not alone at the head of his corps by reason of being paymaster general, but because of progressive and deserved advancement to the head of the lineal list of officers of the Supply Corps.

His record is replete with signal accomplishments. For his outstanding service in World War No. 1 he was awarded the Navy Cross and the Distinguished Service Medal awarded by the War Department.

From July 1, 1940, to date, there has been appropriated for the Naval Establishment alone $35,826,564,427. When we stop to think that for the entire period for which we made appropriations for the Navy for and incident to and in consequence of World War No. 1, that is, from July 1, 1916, to June 30, 1922, the aggregate was less than $6,000,000,000—six billions as opposed practically to thirty-six billions, we can form some idea of the tremendous job Admiral Spear has been called upon to discharge.

He has performed magnificently, without any furore or fanfare, in his own quiet, modest, determined, inimitable way, and the Nation owes him much.

I know every Member of this House deplores, as I do, the termination of the loyal and devoted service of this truly great public servant, and join with me in wishing him long years of contentment in his retirement.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 925. An act for the relief of Lemuel T. Root, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1034. An act relating to the sale of public lands granted to or vested in the State of Idaho by the act of July 3, 1890; to the Committee on Territories.

S. 1220. An act for the relief of G. C. Barco and W. G. Knowles; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1768. An act to provide for the leasing of certain lands of the United States in the State of North Dakota for the development of oil, gas, and other minerals; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 1953. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of South Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of James B. Shuler in his individual capacity and as husband and legal representative of the estate of Elise Morrison Shuler, deceased, and as father of Ellie S. Shuler, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2099. An act for the relief of Mrs. Reita M. Lary; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2191. An act for the relief of Clara Wrobliski; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2203. An act for the relief of Bayard M. Atwood; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2248. An act to amend the law relating to the care and custody of insane residents of Alaska, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Territories.

S. 2254. An act providing for certain additional appointments to the United States Naval Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2273. An act for the relief of Ruth D. and Henry L. Brittingham; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2310. An act for the relief of Roy Chandler; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2330. An act to enable the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two-hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans; to the Committee on the Library.

S. 2362. An act relating to the jurisdiction over certain lands in the Isle Royale National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2369. An act for the acquisition of Indian lands required in connection with the construction, operation, and maintenance of electric transmission lines and other works, Parker Dam power project, Arizona-California; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 2420. An act for the relief of Isabelle Fuller; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2437. An act to amend section 9 of the act of August 18, 1941 (Public Law 213, 77th Cong.), by striking out the proviso thereto which requires a monthly report by the Secretary of War to the Congress of the number of men in active training and services; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2454. An act to prescribe the relative rank of members of the Navy Nurse Corps in relation to commissioned officers of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 2470. An act for the relief of Eileen Collins Treacy; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2488. An act to authorize the exchange of lands in the city of Philadelphia, Pa., between the War Department and the city of Philadelphia, trustee under the will of Stephen Girard, deceased; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2495. An act extending the maturity date of loans made or arranged for by the Commodity Credit Corporation on cotton, corn, and wheat of the 1941 crop; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. J. Res. 140. Joint resolution granting permission to Hugh S. Cumming, Surgeon General (retired) of the United States Public Health Service, to accept certain decorations bestowed upon him by the Republics of Colombia, Haiti, and Chile; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4476. An act providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2305. An act to relieve disbursing and certifying officers of the United States of responsibility for overpayments made on transportation accounts under certain circumstances.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GAVAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 44 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, June 1, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Special Subcommittee on Petroleum Investigation of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Friday May 29, 1942.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, June 2, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearing in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on June 2, at 10 a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1681. A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Twenty-eighth Annual Report of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System covering operations during the calendar year 1941, pursuant to the requirements of section 10 of the Federal Reserve Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

1682. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 11, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Valdez Harbor, Alaska, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on April 24, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1683. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 11, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Sebewaing Harbor and River, Mich., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 15, 1939; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1684. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on lists of papers recommended for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1685. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to permit appointment of White House Police, in accordance with the civil-service laws, from sources outside the Metropolitan and United States Park Police forces; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar as follows:

Mr. MAAS: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 3152. A bill to remove restrictions upon the service of certain officers of the Marine Corps in the Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2181). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SUTPHIN: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1587. An act to provide rental allowances for officers without dependents on sea duty when deprived of quarters on board ship; without amendment (Rept. No. 2182). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 2286. An act to authorize inclusion of service on active duty as service on the active list in computation of service of commissioned warrant officers in the Navy for pay purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2183). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 2285. An act to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank, of certain officers of the Navy; with amendment (Rept. No. 2184). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COLE of New York: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 2455. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty," to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2185). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLOOM: Committee on Foreign Affairs. H. R. 7096. A bill to provide for the settlement of claims of the Government of the United States on behalf of American nationals against the Government of Mexico comprehended within the terms of agreements concluded by the United States and Mexico; without amendment (Rept. No. 2186). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 7151. A bill to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941, by extending the authority to censor communications to include communications between the continental United States and any Territory or possession of the United States, or between any Territory or possession, and any other Territory or possession; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 7152. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DOWNS:

H. R. 7153. A bill authorizing the use of part of the United States Capitol Grounds for war housing purposes; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. MOTT:

H. R. 7154. A bill to authorize the Director of the Census to issue certifications of birth records; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. GREEN:

H. R. 7155. A bill granting an increase of pension to certain persons now upon the pension rolls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. J. Res. 317. Joint resolution providing for allocation of tires, tubes, and retreads to members of selective service boards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2953. By Mr. ARENDS: Petition submitted by Rev. F. C. Read, secretary of the McLean County Citizenship League, and signed by 1,624 other residents of McLean County, Ill., appealing for the speedy enactment of Senate bill 860, which will provide for the protection of the men in our Army and Navy against the influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2954. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of Rev. Rodney F. Cobb, rector of Trinity Episcopal Church of Rochester, Beaver County, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 860 to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2955. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Beaver County, Pa., favoring the passage of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2956. Also, petition of 80 residents of Beaver County, Pa., urging the early passage of the Sheppard bill, S. 860, to provide the largest possible protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2957. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Pattern Makers Association of San Francisco, relative to House bill 6486, a bill to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2958. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Rev. R. Menning, of Sully, Iowa, and sundry citizens of Kellogg, Lynnville, Taintor, Prairie City, Sully, and other towns in Iowa, urging legislation which will provide the largest possible protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquors, and especially asking for the passage of the Sheppard bill, S. 860, at an early date; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2959. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Robert W. Swick and a number of citizens of Fort Madison, Iowa, urging the curbing of certain influences brought to bear on our boys in and near Army and Navy camps and cantonments, and urging the passage of corrective legislation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2960. By Mr. VORYS of Ohio: Petition of Mrs. Fred Shasberger and 33 others, supporting Senate bill 860, for suppressing the liquor traffic around military camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2961. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Rural Electrification Administration Union of St. Paul, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to opening of a western front in Europe and renewing our pledge of loyalty to our President's great leadership; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 1, 1942

The Reverend Albert J. McCartney, minister, Church of the Covenant, Washington, D. C., and chaplain, United States Navy, offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, who hast led us in the past, Thou art our refuge and our strength today. We lift our prayer to Thee in simple, childlike trust to ask Thy guiding spirit in our deliberations here, that the safety, honor, and well-being of our people may be advanced.

As we address ourselves to the tasks of another day, give us strength for our

burdens, wisdom for our responsibilities, and insight for our times.

We commend to Thy protecting care our President and all who share with him the responsibility of leadership. Especially do we pray for our sons and brothers in the armed services of the Nation. Wherever they may be this day, on land, on sea, or in the air, have them—body, mind, and soul—in Thy safe and holy keeping. Prosper, through their sacrificial service, the cause of justice, liberty, and human brotherhood throughout the earth, and hasten the day when the benediction of peace shall rest again upon our land. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, May 28, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 28th ultimo,

During adjournment of the Senate the President pro tempore signed the enrolled bill (S. 2508) to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

REPORT ON OPERATION OF SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to the personnel in the land forces under the provisions of law at a specified time, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution adopted by the Citizens United States of America Committee, 82 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill., relative to the bombing of Tokyo; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the States of New Jersey and California, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. HUGHES:

Petitions signed by 94 citizens of Camden, Dover, Clayton, and Kenton, all in the State of Delaware, praying the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A resolution adopted by members of the Detroit (Mich.) Sales Committee of the Michigan Milk Producers Association, protesting against the alleged attitude of certain Federal officials in regard to the use of substitutes for dairy products and the weakening of certain laws designed to promote the health of citizens as well as to stabilize the dairy industry; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

Resolutions of the Board of Supervisors of St. Joseph County, Mich., favoring action to place St. Joseph County (Mich.) and vicinity on the same time as that prevailing in Indiana, Ohio, and Illinois, and also favoring the abolition of all strikes and the 40-hour workweek for the duration of the war; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

A statement by the board of directors of the Automobile Club of Michigan, relative to the rationing of gasoline, the conservation of rubber, and favoring keeping as many essential motorcars on the highways as possible, and full cooperation with the authorities in Washington, and that unnecessary sacrifices be not demanded of one section of the country because such sacrifices may be necessary in another section; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A resolution adopted by the fifty-third annual convention of the Michigan Federation of Labor, at Port Huron, Mich., favoring the enactment of the bill (S. 594) to clarify the employment status of special-delivery messengers in the Postal Service; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

A resolution adopted by the Michigan Branch of the National Woman's Party, favoring adoption of the so-called equal-rights amendment to the Constitution; ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens and religious organizations, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I present petitions from citizens of the counties of Harrison, Jackson, Clay, Hinds, Lee, George, Forrest, Benton, Newton, and Jones, and from members of the Mississippi Methodist Conference all in the State of Mississippi calling on the Congress to enact the bill known as S. 860, for the protection of the boys in the training camps of America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions presented by the Senator from Mississippi will be received and lie on the table.

PRINTING APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE—LETTER FROM DR. HENRY M. WRISTON

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a communication from Dr. Henry M. Wriston, president of Brown University, urging an increase in the item of printing in the appropriation for the State Department over that in the bill recently passed by the Senate and now pending in conference.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROWN UNIVERSITY,
Providence, R. I., May 27, 1942.

Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR GREEN: It has just come to my attention that the appropriation bill for the Department of State, as passed by the Senate, has reduced the amount available for printing to such an extent that it would prevent the publication of the records of the Paris Peace Conference of 1919.

At a time when we are looking forward to participating in another peace conference, the availability of those records in printed form is of the first importance. I earnestly hope that in the public interest the Senate will recede from the position which it has taken on this matter. If, in the conference committee, it would accept the House version insofar as it will allow the publication of these vital records, it will perform a vastly important service for the future.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY M. WRISTON.

RATIONING OF GASOLINE—RESOLUTIONS OF GULFPORT AND WASHINGTON COUNTY, MISS., CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a resolution adopted by the Gulfport, Miss., Chamber of Commerce, W. H. Hatten, president, B. C. Cox, secretary. I am going to ask permission to read the resolution into the body of the RECORD, because, to my mind, it is one of the best arguments I have seen in opposition to the proposed Nation-wide rationing of gasoline. The resolution reads:

GULFPORT, MISS., *May 26, 1942.*

At a regular meting of the board of directors of the Gulfport Chamber of Commerce, of Gulfport, Miss., held May 25, 1942, after full discussion, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"Be it resolved, That it appears that the War Production Board, with the approval of the President, is seriously considering Nation-wide rationing of gasoline for the purpose of conserving rubber; be it further

"Resolved, That it is the opinion of the directors, and the citizenship generally, that this proposed gasoline rationing is not only unwise at this time but is unnecessary, for the following reasons, to wit:

"1. There is no shortage of gasoline except in such territories where transportation is a problem.

"2. Rubber now in the hands of 27,000,000 or more civilians will not be conserved, for the reason that the life of rubber has a definite limitation regardless of use,

"3. The petroleum industry and its employees are the largest taxpayers in this country, and curtailment of gasoline sales would make these employees not only dependents but the Nation would suffer from the loss of their earnings.

"4. The curtailment of gasoline production would also curtail many other dependent products of the refining process.

"5. The entire economic structure of the various States would be ruined by reason of the loss of gasoline taxes necessary to care for outstanding bonded indebtedness.

"6. The civilian population is dependent upon automobiles for transportation, and the curtailment of this service would work serious and unnecessary hardship without any promotion whatever of the war effort; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the War Production Board in authority, to our Senators, and to each Congressman representing this State."

GULFPORT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
W. H. HATTEN, *President,*
B. C. COX, *Secretary.*

In line with this protest and argument, which, as I have indicated, are, in my judgment, sound, wholesome, and to the point, the Chamber of Commerce of Washington County, Miss., adopted a resolution from which I desire to read

two paragraphs into the RECORD, as follows:

In the thinly settled areas of the East, with adequate passenger transportation facilities, it is easier to become adjusted to the 3-gallon-per-week rationing, which will practically take passenger cars off the road. In this immediate section—

That is in Mississippi—

our entire economy is predicated upon a reasonable, at least, use of automobiles, and restrictions to 3 gallons per week per car would have a very adverse effect not only upon the oil and gas business but every other line as well. In some instances it would amount to paralysis.

* * * * *

As you perhaps know in regard to our immediate neighborhood, a number of miles of railroad have been taken up, and we of this section are almost entirely dependent upon trucks and highways for our transportation and for carrying on our agricultural activities, and it would be much more severely affected by a severe restriction than almost any other region.

That is from the Washington County Chamber of Commerce, of Greenville, Miss., signed by John A. Fox, manager.

Mr. President, in this connection, I desire to repeat that if the Government insists on going through with this unreasonable program of the Nation-wide rationing of gasoline, the sole argument and reason for which is the shortage of rubber, I am fearful of the consequences, because the American people know that we have in this country 10,000,000 tons of scrap rubber which could be very easily reclaimed in a very few months, and thus meet the demands of the civilian population, as well as contribute to the war effort.

When there is no effort on the part of the Government, with all its agencies and employees scattered over the Nation, to give attention to this program and gather together this 10,000,000 tons of scrap rubber and reclaim it and proceed with the recapping of tires and the making of new tires without interference with the war effort, the people are not going to be satisfied to have their economic structure broken down and millions of people thrown out of employment. Furthermore, while we are calling on the same people to buy stamps and bonds to help finance the Government, and we are taxing them, we are going to do away with their ability to meet their desired wish to support the Government. I say very frankly I believe the American people are so thoroughly patriotic that if it is necessary, in order to win this war, to strip every car in America of tire casings and tubes, the people would submit to it without complaint; but when they know so very well that somebody has "thrown a monkey wrench into the machinery," that nothing is being done to help solve immediately the problem of rubber, and that gasoline is taken away from them, using rubber as an excuse, although the country is so flooded with gasoline that there is not sufficient storage room for it—and we have enough of it in America, if we could operate all our wells, to supply the whole world—there will be brought about a sad condition—indeed, a mild revolution among the people—because they are advised that there is no sense in such a program. Personally, I think it is stupidity in the superlative degree.

GASOLINE-RATIONING PROGRAM — LETTER FROM PRESIDENT OF THE BEACON PUBLISHING CO., WICHITA, KANS.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I received from M. M. Levand, president of the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon, one of the largest dailies in the State, protesting against the proposed Nation-wide gasoline-rationing program at this time.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WICHITA BEACON,
WICHITA, KANS., *May 28, 1942.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: As you no doubt know, the Wichita Beacon has felt it to be its duty to support the efforts of the United States Government and its effort to wage war on our mortal enemies. We have tried to carefully consider the gas-rationing plan insofar as it affects the Midwestern and oil States, and we believe gasoline rationing in this part of the country will hinder and not help our war effort.

It is useless, in our opinion, to dislocate not only the entire oil industry in the Middle West but also the lives of all our workers and citizens. Gasoline is plentiful in this region, and no useful purpose can be served by piling it up in reserves out here, or can any useful purpose be served by cutting down production of the same in this region.

We believe the rubber on present allowables will deteriorate if not used just as fast as it would if there were normal use.

We believe rationing should only be resorted to as a final method and only where no other method can work. We, therefore, protest the adoption of gasoline rationing in the Midwest and oil States and respectfully recommend the extension of the time at which gasoline rationing is to be commenced in this region until it is conclusively proved that this drastic method is the only method available. With best wishes,

Yours very truly,

M. M. LEVAND,
President, the Beacon Publishing Co.

RATIONING OF GASOLINE—LETTER FROM GOVERNOR RATNER, OF KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I send to the desk, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, a letter I have just received from Hon. Payne Ratner, Governor of Kansas, setting forth the concern of that State, as a part of the midcontinent oil-producing area over the proposed Nation-wide gasoline-rationing plan. This communication presents, in a clear and earnest manner, phases of this important question which should have the serious consideration of all concerned.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF KANSAS,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Topeka, May 26, 1942.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Kansas is deeply concerned by reports that gasoline rationing may be extended to include the midcontinent area, despite its vast oil production and the fact that gasoline supplies, already at their highest peak, are even now mounting higher and higher.

Kansas is now cooperating 100 percent in every phase of the war effort and, of course, will continue to do so. But our people are entitled to know why these sacrifices are being made. If they are not informed, the effect might be disturbing to morale and to the unity of effort the country must maintain.

Certain information from usually reliable sources in Washington indicate that gasoline rationing is not actually necessary in this Midwest area, but that it is to be imposed in order to placate those rationed in other sections where such rationing is apparently necessary. Under this theory, if one child in a large family became ill, the parents would desire to spread the illness to all children in the family on the theory that misery should have company. If this is the real objective of rationing in Kansas and States in this area, then our people will seriously object.

Our people fear the economic shock which would result from such drastic restrictions upon one of our principal industries. Harmful repercussions would be felt in every line of business and economic life and every citizen would feel the effects. It is feared that such a move would impede instead of help the successful prosecution of our war effort, which is paramount in all our minds.

State government in this area would suffer. A large part of the funds with which to maintain a highway system capable of meeting war requirements would be lost. Other essential State governmental functions would be crippled by resulting loss of revenue.

If rationing is for the purpose of saving rubber, it is felt by our citizens that idle cars and tires would deteriorate and could be of little use in either war or economic effort. This economic waste seems unwise at a time when all our resources should be utilized to the utmost.

If gasoline rationing is a prelude to the commandeering of cars and tires, should not the people be told in advance of such plans and the intermediate step of rationing be eliminated? Also, should not the Government first utilize the hundreds of thousands of cars and tires which are still frozen under the ban in the storerooms of motorcar and tire dealers throughout the country?

Because these questions have such a vital bearing in our economic life and our war effort, I suggest and urge that a conference be held at which Governors or their representatives from the Mid-Continent oil-producing States may have an opportunity to go over the situation with Federal officials before final determination is made.

Sincerely,

PAYNE RATNER,
Governor of Kansas.

GASOLINE RATIONING—RESOLUTION OF PETROLEUM EMERGENCY ADVISORY COMMITTEE, ILLINOIS STATE COUNCIL OF DEFENSE

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by the Petroleum Emergency Advisory Committee, Illinois State Council of Defense, which I request may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred. The resolution sets forth conditions in Illinois and expresses the belief that there is ample gasoline available and "until the time when the use of automobile travel shall be considered injurious to the main objective of the Nation," no system of rationing in Illinois and other Midwestern States should be put into effect.

In the discussion accompanying the adoption of the resolution, it was indicated that Illinois ranks high in oil

industry, production, and refining. There are 21 refineries in Illinois and adjacent territory, 16 marine terminal points, and 11 pipe-line terminals from which gasoline can be drawn in supplying the more than 900 licensed oil distributors of the State, and 10,000 service stations serving motor-vehicle owners.

Illinois has a wonderful system of railroad and waterway transportation. Its oil wells are accessible to this transportation and no difficulty has been raised in connection with distribution. As a matter of fact, the State is self-sustaining in gasoline and oil production and amply able to contribute materially toward the Nation's supply. When supplemented by the great fields in other Midwestern States, such as Oklahoma and Texas, it does not seem that this territory should be penalized and its people rendered uncomfortable, unless it should be demonstrated that there is an absolute need for national rationing.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the government of the State of Illinois is deeply interested in the welfare, morale, and the well-being of its people during these times of national strife; and

Whereas the Honorable Dwight H. Green, Governor of Illinois, has caused to be formed a petroleum emergency advisory committee functioning under the auspices of the Illinois State council of defense to cooperate with Federal authorities on matters of national emergency in relation to the production, refining, and distribution of petroleum products in Illinois; and

Whereas it is reported that rationing of gasoline and fuel oils is being considered as an economic war measure; and

Whereas the State of Illinois in relation to this problem has many advantages by reason of its favored geographical location, its abundant petroleum resources and excellent State-wide facilities of distribution and transportation; and because a careful study by this committee reveals facts which prove that rationing is unnecessary and that it is consistent with the national welfare and security to exclude the State of Illinois from any gasoline and fuel oil rationing program; and

Whereas the petroleum industry committee for the Midwest appointed by Petroleum Coordinator Ickes has gone on record as strongly opposed to proposed midwestern rationing of gasoline or any other petroleum products at this time; and

Whereas Petroleum Coordinator Ickes has on many occasions clearly stated there is no shortage of petroleum or its products in this area; and

Whereas the committee, after studying facts and data covering the petroleum resources of the State, transportation facilities, on many occasions clearly stated there is no urgent need for the rationing of gasoline and fuel oil in Illinois, in the near future, so far as supply and demand and transportation are concerned; and

Whereas if the opinion expressed by certain governmental agencies that the necessity of rationing gasoline Nation-wide is to conserve rubber now on civilian cars and trucks be correct, then it is the unanimous opinion of the committee that motorcar owners of Illinois are reconciled to the fact that there are to be no tires for nonessential users for some time to come, and consequently the citizens of Illinois are inclined to take an optimistic view that with proper care of tires, adequate service of motorcar transportation can be carried on for an indefinite period, thus contributing materially their part in the war effort; and

Whereas the rationing of gasoline is simply forcing upon motorcar owners an unnecessary restriction, especially within the areas overflowing with gasoline; and

Whereas motorcar owners are as patriotic as any classification of citizens, and will do their part to share the hardships of the war effort, but to unnecessarily regulate their mode of transportation is simply taking away from them rights and privileges for which our democracy stands: Therefore be it

Resolved, That until such time as an actual shortage of gasoline shall exist; until such consumption of gasoline in Illinois and the midwestern area, where the supply is now known to be adequate, shall become harmful to the war effort; until the the time when the use of automobile travel shall be considered injurious to the main objective of the Nation; until there be no other acceptable alternative except rationing of gasoline, it is the consensus of the committee that no system of rationing of gasoline in Illinois and other Midwestern States be put into effect; and be it further

Resolved, That such shall be the committee's report to the people of Illinois, their National Senators and Representatives, and all officials in Washington charged with the responsibility of rationing petroleum products.

A. H. KREUDER,
Chairman.
G. A. PRIMM,
Secretary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2553. A bill to create the title of flight officer in the Army Air Forces, to amend the Army Aviation Cadet Act, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1428).

By Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2555. A bill to authorize the use of certificates by officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, in connection with pay and allowance accounts of military and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction of the War and Navy Departments; without amendment (Rept. No. 1429).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

S. 2543. A bill to amend subsection (3) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1430).

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2467. A bill to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1431).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 2503. A bill to provide for the payment of retired pay to certain retired judges of the police and municipal courts of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1432);

S. 2505. A bill to amend sections 23-701 and 23-702 of title 23, chapter 7, of the District of Columbia Code, 1940 edition; without amendment (Rept. No. 1433);

H. R. 6297. A bill to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Dr. Wesley K. Harris; without amendment (Rept. No. 1434);

H. R. 6782. A bill to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to assign officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force to duty in the detective bureau of the Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1435); and

H. R. 6804. A bill to amend paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1436).

SUSPENSION OF OPERATION OF THE ANTITRUST LAWS AND FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION ACT—REPORT OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, from the Committee on the Judiciary I report back, with amendments, the bill (S. 2431) to suspend the operation of the antitrust laws and Federal Trade Commission Act in certain instances requisite to the prosecution of the war, and I submit a report (No. 1437) thereon. I ask that the bill may be printed in the RECORD as reported and proposed to be amended by the committee.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as reported and proposed to be amended by the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever the Chairman of the War Production Board shall, after approval by the Attorney General, find, and so certify to the Attorney General in writing that the doing of any act or thing, or the omission to do any act or thing, by one or more persons (during the period that this act is in effect) in compliance with any request or approval made by him in writing, is requisite to the prosecution of the war, such act, thing, or omission shall be deemed in the public interest and no prosecution or civil action shall be commenced with reference thereto under the antitrust laws of the United States or of the Federal Trade Commission Act. Such finding and certificate may in his discretion be withdrawn at any time by the Chairman whereupon the provisions of this section shall no longer apply to any subsequent act or omission.

SEC. 2. The Attorney General from time to time, but not less frequently than once every 120 days, shall transmit to the Congress a report of operations under this act. Reports provided for under this subsection shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, if the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, is not in session.

The Attorney General shall order published in the Federal Register every such certificate and, when he deems it in the public interest, the details of any plan, program or other arrangement promulgated under, or which is the basis of, any such certificate.

SEC. 3. This act shall remain in force until 6 months after the termination of the present war or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate.

UTILIZATION OF EXISTING STOCKS OF RUBBER TIRES—REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES (PT. 4 OF REPT. NO. 479)

Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. MEAD, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CAPPER, and Mr. TAFT), from the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of American Small Business Enterprises, submitted an additional report (pursuant to S. Res. 298, 76th Cong.), which was ordered to be printed

and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE EFFECTIVE UTILIZATION OF EXISTING STOCKS OF RUBBER TIRES, TO AID IN MAKING RUBBER TIRES AVAILABLE FOR ESSENTIAL USES, AND TO PRESERVE AND MOBILIZE THE INDEPENDENT SMALL BUSINESS IN THE TIRE AND TIRE SERVICING AND RETREADING INDUSTRY

STATEMENT

The Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises, on March 3, 4, 5, and 6, 1942, held extensive hearings on tire dealer and rebuilder problems. The testimony of 45 expert witnesses was heard on the various problems in the industry, a great many of which have arisen out of the war and the Nation's crude rubber stringency resulting from the seizure of far eastern crude-rubber sources of supply by the enemy.

These witnesses represented various agencies of the Government, including the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice, the War Production Board, and the Office of Price Administration; the tire manufacturers, large and small, the large corporate chain retailers, and small independent tire dealers, tire retreaders, and tire servicing stations. Some 200 local organizations of tire dealer and service stations from all parts of the country sent representation to these hearings.

Because of the very great public interest in rubber tires as an essential part of our motor transportation system, the hearings were also attended by a total of 25 Members of the United States Senate and representation from the United States House of Representatives.

An extraordinary amount of valuable information and opinion was developed during the course of these hearings and may be found in the printed hearings of the committee titled "Part 2: Tire Dealer and Rebuilder Problems."

Such has been the increasing state of confusion created by conflicting statements regarding the rubber situation and the availability of rubber tires for our vast motor transportation system and of such vital importance has been the maintainance of this transportation system, both in essential civilian and war production activities, that the committee has devoted the greater part of 3 months' intense study and exploration of not only the testimony presented at the March hearings, but it has also drawn in for consultation experts from all lines of endeavor, who the committee believed could show any real light on the problem.

The committee, in the early stages of its investigation of the tire and tire rebuilding industry, recognized forthwith the necessity of encouraging the continuation of the vast system of some 60 thousand independent tire dealers and servicing stations throughout the country. The committee found that, by and large, the independent tire dealer and servicing unit was the only class in the industry which had consistently maintained a distributing system for the sale of tires and tubes, but also had especially catered to the servicing, repairing, and rebuilding of tires. This latter is now of vital importance to our rubber conservation program with special reference to maintenance and repair of automobile and truck tires and tubes.

In addition to the independent small dealers and servicing stations, the committee found two other principal methods of distribution in the industry—the so-called corporate chain distributors, only a lesser part of whose volume was confined to the sale of tires and tubes, and tire and rubber manufacturer-owned stores. Retail tire stores are owned by a limited number of manufacturers in the industry whose principal business is the manufacturing and wholesaling of tires and tubes and a wide variety of other rubber products. In addition, these manufacturers are known to have secured a large volume of war contracts from our own Government and our Allies.

In view of the fact that the manufacturing of passenger-car tires from crude rubber has been wholly banned by the Government for the duration of the emergency, or until new sources of crude or synthetic rubber may be developed, and also in view of the fact that the sale of such tires and tubes has therefore been limited to the distribution of existing stocks in the hands of manufacturers and distributors, the committee was convinced that some special dispensation was necessary in behalf of the 60,000 independent tire dealers and service stations if our essential civilian and war activities, largely dependent upon the maintenance of our motor transportation, was not sooner or later to break down through the inability of these independent service stations to continue in business as a result of a substantial curtailment of sale of tires and tubes, upon which a large part of their existence depended.

The assistant (John Hamm) to the Price Administrator, testifying before the committee, stated that the Office of Price Administration would require special direction of the Congress as its authority to accomplish this purpose.

The committee unanimously adopted a resolution which was made a part of the committee hearings and which urged all Government agencies having anything to do with the subject to take such steps as necessary to confine the distribution, sale of tires and tubes, and the servicing and repairing of same to the independent small dealer and service station.

The intent and the purpose of this committee resolution is incorporated in the committee's recommendation to the Congress in the form of a bill (S. 5260) which accompanies this report.

The committee has determined, as a result of its hearings, studies, and the assistance of experts in the field, that the maintenance of a minimum of 20,000,000 passenger cars is essential to the efficient functioning of the necessary civilian and war-production activities of the country. It is noteworthy to report that the Brookings Institution has just published the results of a similar independent study and it arrives at the same conclusion.

The committee has therefore incorporated in this bill measures which it believes will provide a substantial degree of assurance that these 20,000,000 passenger cars can be maintained in service throughout the emergency with only the very minimum demands of 3,500 tons per year from our national stock pile of crude rubber, now owned or that may be acquired by the Government. The best information available to the committee indicates that the present stock pile of crude rubber in the hands of Government agencies is about 750,000 tons.

Analysis of the bill by sections

The bill is in the form of an amendment by the addition of section 6 to the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942.

Section 6 (a) directs the Price Administrator to appoint a Deputy Administrator who, under his supervision, shall have charge of administrating and coordinating the functions set forth in the bill.

Section 6 (b) provides that all functions of the Price Administrator and any other officer or agency of the Government relating in any manner to tires or to the component material of tires, shall be exercised according to the provisions of section 6.

Price Stabilization

Section 6 (b) (1) provides that the ceiling price now established by the Price Administrator shall be the going price in the industry on the sale of tires, casings, and tubes. Every purchaser of a tire casing or tube is required to turn in a used tire casing or tube on the purchase of a new one and no allowance is to be made either in cash, trade-in, or discount for the same.

The committee believes that this would substantially increase the flow of scrap rubber into the hands of reclaimers and further, that due to the previously mentioned substantial curtailment of the sale of new tires and tubes, it is necessary to provide a definite form of price stabilization in order to preserve and provide a reasonable chance to live for the independent small tire dealer and tire-servicing stations throughout the Nation.

Odd-Sized Tires

Section 6 (b) (2) provides for the lifting of all restrictions (except those regarding price and inspection, (1) and (5)) on the sale of odd-sized passenger-type tires and tubes and on all obsolete types of tires as defined in the revised tire-rationing regulation issued by the Price Administrator on February 11, 1942, and in exhibit C, Passenger Car Tires and Tubes, as defined in Maximum Price Regulations No. 143, issued by the Price Administrator May 14, 1942.

Testimony and expert advice secured by the committee shows that odd-sized tires specified as 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 inches in diameter, are of no value in the war program, as are also the obsolete types of tires. The release for sale without limitation of these classes of tires at the earliest possible moment is of substantial value in keeping our motor-transportation system rolling. It will bring back substantial tonnage of reclaimed rubber into use. No economic purpose is served in freezing these classes of tires in the hands of dealers and manufacturers, where they are certain to deteriorate and thus result in substantial economic loss.

Restrictions on the sale of any tubes more than 1 year old are also lifted for the reason that the rubber in tire tubes deteriorates far more rapidly than that in outer casings, according to expert testimony before the committee.

Substandard Grades of Tires

Section 6 (b) (3). According to expert testimony before the committee, there is an established recognized system in the tire industry of grading tires according to quality of product. Tires coming as original equipment with the purchase of new automobiles are classed as a 100-level tire. There are various levels recognized below this. Any tire of 88½ level and above is recognized as a first-quality tire. Tires below the 88½ level are cheapened in quality by the substitution of varying percentages of reclaimed rubber and other rubber substitutes for crude rubber, together with varying percentages of crude. As the amount of substitute material is increased, the percent of crude rubber is reduced in the finished tire.

Experts in the tire industry report to the committee that because of the substitution of these varying percentages of reclaimed rubber and rubber substitutes, tires below the 88½-percent level deteriorate on the shelves very rapidly. To continue to freeze these stocks only results in the economic loss in both the deterioration of the tires and the increased cost of warehousing them for an extended period. Therefore, it is provided in the bill that these types of substandard grade tires be permitted (except as in subparagraphs (1) and (5)) to flow into use, as rapidly as the demand permits, to users described in list "A" and "B" in the Revised Tire Rationing Regulations issued by the Price Administrator on February 11, 1942, and for use on any vehicle operated by a traveling salesman or a farmer living on a farm.

Unfreeze Used-Car Market

It is also provided that these tires be released to any dealer in used cars for replacement use on such cars as are now unsalable because of the condition of their tires.

When the manufacturing of new passenger cars was prohibited by the Government on January 1, 1942, large numbers of the 44,000 automobile dealers in the country based substantial hope for their continuation in business on the increased demands for the sale and use of used cars, which they believed would result from the shutting off of new-car sales.

However, in the ensuing months since January, the constantly repeated threats of almost complete stoppage of the use of motor-car transportation and confused and conflicting statements of high Government officials with reference to civilian use of cars, has created a near panic in the minds of passenger-car users. The result has been to freeze for all general purposes the investments of millions of dollars in used cars in the hands of dealers throughout the ccuntry.

Moreover, it is reliably reported to the committee that thousands of dealers are faced with a condition where automobile users still owing monthly payments on their cars, are turning their cars back to dealers for the cancelation of the unpaid balances because they believe they will not be able to obtain any form of rubber-tire replacement.

As a result, thousands of cars are accumulating on the used-car lots throughout the country because tires are worn to the extent that the cars are absolutely unsalable unless provision is made for the replacement of the tires. For instance, a careful survey made in the State of Pennsylvania shows that 20 percent of the used cars now in dealers' hands are unsalable because of the condition of their rubber tires.

Retreading Program Providing for 30,000,000 Retread Tires Per Year

Section 6 (b) (4) directs the Administrator to take such action as is necessary to carry out a program for providing 30,000,000 retread tires per year during the next 3 years.

Tire manufacturers and retreaders have demonstrated to the committee the recent development of a retread or rebuilt tire out of reclaimed rubber. This rebuilt tire requires a maximum of but 2 ounces of crude rubber per tire for use as a binder or adhesive material. Manufacturers and tire retreaders state to the committee that this type of retread or rebuilt tire is serviceable for 8,000 miles per tire at a maximum speed of 40 miles per hour. The committee is reliably informed that the reclaimed rubber from 1½ to 2 scrap tires will produce one new tire of this class. It is also informed that the reclaimed rubber from one old tire is sufficient to retread two tires.

Experts in the tire-manufacturing field advised the committee that a maximum of 3,500 tons of crude rubber is all that is required for the retreading of 30,000,000 tires per year of this type retread.

This 3,500 tons per annum is far less than that which has now monthly been allocated from the crude rubber stock pile by Government officials for the manufacturing of camelback for civilian passenger tire use since Pearl Harbor.

Supply of Scrap Rubber

Experts place the amount of reclaimed rubber necessary for this 30,000,000-per-annum retread tire program as 90,000 tons. There is, beyond question, a tremendous quantity of scrap rubber now in the country which would be available for reclaiming if proper inducements and reclaiming facilities are provided. Some estimate the quantity of this hidden scrap rubber at as high as 10,000,000,000 tons. Mr. John L. Collyer, president of the B. F. Goodrich Co., at Akron, Ohio, estimates that there are 1,200,000 tons in the form of unworn rubber in 173,000,000 tires and tubes now in the possession of American automobile and truck owners.

Rubber experts of the War Production Board estimate that at present only about 50 percent of our present rubber-reclaiming facilities are being used.

Experts in the tire-manufacturing field report that rubber can be reclaimed over and over again. They also report to the committee that there is enough rubber-reclaiming machinery and equipment now idle in the hands of used-machinery dealers to establish from five to six additional reclaiming factories in strategic points throughout the country.

Rubber Reserve Corporation To Acquire Scrap Rubber

This paragraph (4) further directs the Rubber Reserve Corporation to acquire by purchase or requisition, to the fullest practical extent, any scrap rubber now in the stocks of dealers and to pay the present applicable maximum price as established by the Price Administrator. It is then provided that at the end of 60 days after the effective date of this section maximum-price regulations on scrap rubber shall be lifted in order to create a free market and thus encourage the flow of hidden scrap rubber back into the reclaiming factories.

Tire Inspections

Section 6 (b) (5). The Administrator is authorized in this paragraph to establish a compulsory national program of tire inspection and to put into effect such regulations as will insure through this inspection program a maximum conservation of tires and tubes in use by owners of passenger cars and trucks.

Any independent tire dealer and service station is authorized to act as an inspection station, subject to such rules and regulations as the Administrator may determine.

Preservation of Small Tire Dealers and Retreaders

Section 6 (b) (6). This section directs the Administrator to take such action as necessary to provide for the distribution of new and rebuilt tires and tubes and camelback material, through the independent tire dealer. As previously mentioned in this report, independent tire dealers and service stations have been set up to render a complete tire service. Their continuation is essential to the efficient operation of the motor transportation system and the conservation of rubber tires. Through the discontinuation of the manufacturing of passenger car tires, their income from sale of new tires is substantially curtailed. It is a serious question whether these complete tire-service stations, some 60,000 in number, can continue in business without special dispensation in their behalf. There have been many other types of distributors who have been distributing tires and tubes, although the major part of their business is in other lines. These firms will be able to continue profitable operations even though they may be wholly deprived of the sale of tires and tubes during the war-emergency period.

Section (6) (c) provides that all officers and agencies of the Government having anything to do with tires or tire materials shall conform to the policies, programs, and measures prescribed by the Administrator in the execution of the powers invested in him by the bill.

National Inventory of Stocks of Tires

Section (6) (d) provides for a national inventory, within reasonable limitation of cost, consistent with reasonable certainty and accuracy, of the number of tires and tubes in the United States not mounted on motor vehicles. There is not now available in the hands of any Government agency, so far as the committee has been able to determine, a reasonably accurate inventory of the national stock pile of usable but unused tires and tubes.

Definition of an Independent Tire Dealer

The bill defines an independent tire dealer as any person engaged in selling and servicing tires, substantially all of whose business consists of one or more of the following activities: Selling or servicing (but not manufacturing) tires, automobiles, or automotive equipment, selling motor-vehicle fuels and lubricants, or repairing, recapping, or retreading tires.

Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. MEAD, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CAPPER, and Mr. TAFT) also introduced a bill (S. 2560) to provide for the effective utilization of existing stocks of rubber tires, to aid in making rubber tires available for essential uses, and for other purposes, to accompany the foregoing report, which was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is amended by adding after section 5 thereof the followi ng new section:

"RUBBER TIRES

"SEC. 6. (a) The Price Administrator shall appoint a Deputy Administrator who, under the supervision of the Administrator, shall have charge of administering and coordinating the functions of the Administrator and of the Office of Price Administration under this section and such other functions of the Administrator and of the Office of Price Administration relating to rubber tires as the Administrator may determine.

"(b) All functions of the Administrator, and of any other officer or agency of the Government, relating in any manner to tires or to the component materials of tires, shall be exercised subject to the following provisions:

"(1) To the extent deemed necessary by the Administrator for the purpose of aiding in the conservation of rubber and the reclamation of used rubber and in the maintenance and operation of the Nation's motor vehicle transportation system, he shall provide that no person shall in the course of trade or business sell or deliver a tire, casing, or tube to a consumer unless he receives from such consumer a used tire, casing, or tube. No allowance shall be made in cash, trade-in value, or discount from the price of any rubber tire, casing, or tube sold or delivered to a consumer on account of any used tire, casing, or tube so received from such consumer; and no tire, casing, or tube shall be sold or delivered at a price below the applicable maximum price therefor established under this act.

"(2) No restrictions, except restrictions under paragraphs (1) and (5) of this subsection and restrictions relating to price, shall be imposed with respect to the sale or delivery of (A) any passenger type tires, casings, or tubes in existing stocks which were manufactured for use on rims 17, 18, 19, 20, or 21 inches in diameter or which are of any other size described as an obsolete type in the Revised Tire Rationing Regulations issued by the Price Administrator on February 11, 1942, or 'exhibit C passenger-car tires and tubes' as defined in Maximum Price Regulations No. 143, issued by the Price Administrator May 14, 1942, or (B) any tubes which are more than 1 year old.

"(3) The sale and delivery of tires, casings, and tubes of any grade below the grade known in the tire industry as 88½ level shall be permitted, without any restrictions except restrictions under paragraphs (1) and (5) of this subsection and restrictions relating to price, for use on any vehicle described in list

A and B in the Revised Tire Rationing Regulations issued by the Price Administrator on February 11, 1942, or for use on any vehicle operated by a traveling salesman or a farmer living on a farm, or to any dealer in used cars.

"(4) The Administrator shall take such action as is necessary to institute and carry out a program for providing 30,000,000 retread tires per year and the necessary tubes therefor for passenger automobiles during the next 3 years. For the purposes of such program not less than 3,500 tons annually of crude rubber shall be reserved and set aside from stocks owned or hereafter acquired by agencies of the United States; and the program of the Administrator shall be designed to assure the production and distribution of such additional reclaimed rubber as may be necessary for the purposes of such program, but not less than 90,000 tons a year over and above the amount of reclaimed rubber necessary for other essential uses. For the purposes of aiding in such program, the Rubber Reserve Corporation shall, to the fullest practicable extent, acquire by purchase or requisition any scrap rubber which is in the stocks of dealers on the effective date of this section. The price paid for any scrap rubber so acquired shall not be less than the applicable maximum price, if any, in effect under the provisions of this act on such date. After the sixtieth day following the effective date of this section, no maximum price limitation with respect to scrap rubber shall be in effect under the provisions of this act.

"(5) The Administrator is authorized to require that as a condition upon the acquisition of any tire for use on any vehicle, with such reasonable exceptions as the Administrator deems necessary, the tires on such vehicle shall be inspected at such intervals, in such manner, and upon such terms and conditions, and that such records with respect thereto shall be kept, as the Administrator shall prescribe. Such inspections may be made by any independent tire dealer, subject to such regulations as may be prescribed by the Administrator, and the Administrator is authorized to fix maximum limitations upon the charges which may be made for such inspections.

"(6) The Administrator shall take such action as is necessary to provide that all new, rebuilt, retreaded, and recapped tires, casings, tubes, and camelback, sold or delivered in the course of trade or business to consumers (except governmental agencies) shall be sold or delivered only by or through independent tire dealers. The Administrator shall also take such action as is necessary to assure equitable distribution of existing stocks of new, used, and rebuilt tires in the hands of manufacturers to all independent dealers, with due regard for the preserving to each manufacturer of his independent dealer distribution.

"(c) The various officers and agencies of the Government authorized to perform functions relating in any manner to tires or to the component materials of tires shall, in performing such functions, conform to such policies, programs, and measures as the Administrator may prescribe in the execution of the powers vested in him by this section.

"(d) The Administrator is authorized and directed to make, within 60 days after the date of enactment of this act, a survey or inventory which will indicate with reasonable certainty and accuracy the number of tires in the United States not mounted on motor vehicles and such information with respect thereto as may be necessary or appropriate for the purposes of aiding in the maintenance and operation of the Nation's motor-vehicle transportation system and in the conservation and effective utilization of our rubber supplies. The Administrator is authorized to arrange with the Bureau of the Census or any other governmental agency possessed of the necessary personnel and facilities for making all or any part of such survey or inventory, and to transfer to such bureau or agency such funds, from any funds available for expenditure by the Office of Price Administration, as may be necessary for such purpose.

"(e) For the purposes of this section—

"(1) The term 'tire' means any tire consisting in substantial part of rubber or a rubber substitute and designed for use on a motor vehicle; and, unless the context otherwise indicates, the term 'tire' includes both the casing and the tube.

"(2) The term 'independent tire dealer' means a person—

"(A) who is, or has been, engaged in selling and servicing tires, or who may be authorized by the Administrator to engage in selling and servicing tires, if, in the judgment of the Administrator, the public interest in specific localities is not properly serviced by existing facilities;

"(B) Substantially all of whose business consists of one or more of the following activities: Selling or servicing (but not manufacturing) tires, automobiles, or automotive equipment, selling motor-vehicle fuels and lubricants, or repairing, recapping, or retreading tires."

SEC. 2. Section 4 of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is amended by inserting, after "section 205 (f)", the words "or section 6."

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

On May 28, 1942:

S. 2305. An act to relieve disbursing and certifying officers of the United States of responsibility for overpayments made on transportation accounts under certain circumstances.

On May 29, 1942:

S. 2508. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2559. A bill to provide additional insurance protection for members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

(Mr. ELLENDER (for himself, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. MEAD, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CAPPER, and Mr. TAFT) introduced Senate bill 2560, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2561. A bill to redefine the powers and duties of the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, to establish a Department of Public Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 2562. A bill to establish the War Petroleum Corporation and to define its functions; to the Committee on Finance.

ADDITIONAL CLERK, COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 262), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Immigration hereby is authorized to employ an additional clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $1,800 per annum until otherwise provided by law.

DEMOCRACY AND WAR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR BARKLEY AT COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF KENTUCKY

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him Friday evening, May 29, 1942, at the commencement exercises at the University of Kentucky, which appears in the Appendix.]

WIN THE WAR AND BUILD "A BRAVE NEW WORLD"—ADDRESS BY SENATOR LEE

[Mr. LEE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from an address delivered by him to the graduating class of the Baptist University, Shawnee, Okla., which appear in the Appendix.]

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE SUMNER WELLES

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, at the Arlington National Amphitheater on Memorial Day, Saturday, May 30, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE TO CHINA FROM HON. JOSEPHUS DANIELS

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a message from Hon. Josephus Daniels to the people of China, broadcast over short wave radio from San Francisco on May 30, 1942, and with the accompanying introductory statement, which appear in the Appendix.]

ACTIVE UNITY IN THE WAR EFFORT—ADDRESS BY RAY H. BRANNAMAN

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an Army Day address delivered by Hon. Ray H. Brannaman, chairman of the Industrial Commission of Colorado and commander of the Department of Colorado, Disabled American Veterans, which appears in the Appendix.]

"WITHOUT STAIN"—EDITORIAL FROM THE PERIODICAL AMERICA

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Without Stain", paying tribute to Senator WALSH, of Massachusetts, published in the periodical America of date May 30, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

RUBBER CONFUSION—EDITORIAL FROM WASHINGTON POST

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Rubber Confusion", published in the Washington Post of May 29, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

RECLAMATION OF SCRAP RUBBER—ARTICLE FROM NEW YORK JOURNAL-AMERICAN

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from New York Journal-American of May 31, 1942, relating to scrap rubber, which appears in the Appendix.]

POWERS OF SPECIAL SENATE SILVER COMMITTEE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 261) submitted by Mr. McCARRAN on May 28, 1942, to confer additional

authority on the Senate Special Silver Committee created pursuant to Senate Resolution 187, Seventy-fourth Congress.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I think the Senate does not have sufficient information concerning the resolution to enable action to be taken on it. I suggest that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be passed over.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. SMATHERS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Andrews	Green	O'Mahoney
Austin	Guffey	Overton
Ball	Gurney	Pepper
Bankhead	Hatch	Rosier
Barbour	Hayden	Russell
Barkley	Herring	Schwartz
Bilbo	Holman	Shipstead
Brooks	Hughes	Smathers
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Capper	La Follette	Taft
Caraway	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Chavez	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Idaho	Lucas	Tobey
Clark, Mo.	McCarran	Truman
Connally	McFarland	Tunnell
Danaher	McKellar	Tydings
Davis	McNary	Vandenberg
Doxey	Maloney	Van Nuys
Ellender	Millikin	Wagner
George	Murdock	Wheeler
Gerry	Norris	White
Gillette	Nye	Wiley
Glass	O'Daniel	Willis

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are detained from the Senate on important public business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senators from Washington [Mr. BONE and Mr. WALGREN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained in his State on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] and the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] are members of the Committee to Investigate National Defense and are, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is detained on official business.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

ALBERT M. HOWARD—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BROWN submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1563) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the House amendment insert "*Provided*, That the judgment shall not exceed the sum of $7,500"; and the House agree to the same.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
W. A. PITTENGER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

CLEAVER KELLEY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4153) for the relief of Cleaver Kelley, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BROWN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. ROSIER, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

FERD W. MEILE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5000) for the relief of Ferd W. Meile, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BROWN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

JOSEPH SOULEK

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5439) for the relief of Joseph Soulek, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BROWN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider bills on the Calendar to which there is no objection, beginning with Calendar No. 1454.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to call the bills on the Calendar.

APPOINTMENT OF CERTAIN COMMISSIONED WARRANT AND WARRANT OFFICERS TO COMMISSIONED RANK

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6496) to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an amendment in section 8, on page 4, line 3, after the word "Corps", to insert "and Coast Guard."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN CLERKS IN THE POST OFFICE AT DETROIT, MICH.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5619) for the relief of certain clerks in the post office at Detroit, Mich., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment at the end of the bill to add the following new section:

SEC. 2. That for the purposes of the provisions of law governing the compensation payable to clerks in the Postal Service, the appointment of James E. Kane, formerly a clerk in the Burbank, Calif., post office, shall be held and considered to have been effective as of May 15, 1941.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

COLUMBIA BOAT & BARGE SYSTEM, INC.

The bill (H. R. 4999) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by the Columbia Boat & Barge System, Inc., was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANGELA SKEOCH

The bill (S. 2506) for the relief of Angela Skeoch was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized

and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Angela Skeoch, of Frederiksted, St. Croix, V. I., the sum of $2,500, in full settlement of her claim against the United States for personal injuries sustained when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a United States Army truck on the Christiansted-Frederiksted Main Highway near Christiansted, St. Croix, V. I., on March 1, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

CHARLES E. YATES AND THE MOTOR FACTS SALES CO.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5385) for the relief of Charles E. Yates and the Motor Facts Sales Co., which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$2,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CLARENCE J. METEYER, LESTER W. ENGELS, AND DOROTHY B. ENGELS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2424) for the relief of Clarence J. Meteyer, Lester W. Engels, and Dorothy B. Engels, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$4,624" and insert "$3,000", and in line 8, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,517.70" and insert "$2,500."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

DOROTHY SILVA

The bill (H. R. 2730) for the relief of Dorothy Silva was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SAN DIEGO GAS & ELECTRIC CO.

The bill (H. R. 5438) for the relief of the San Diego Gas & Electric Co. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

LUTHER HERBERT TENCH AND MRS. MILDRED FARMER TENCH

The bill (H. R. 5778) for the relief of Luther Herbert Tench and Mrs. Mildred Farmer Tench was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GERHARD R. FISHER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3398) for the relief of Gerhard R. Fisher, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,950" and insert "$50."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

ROCK HILL STONE & GRAVEL CO., OF ST. LOUIS, MO.

The bill (S. 1853) for the relief of the Rock Hill Stone & Gravel Co., of St. Louis, Mo., was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Rock Hill Stone & Gravel Co., the sum of $3,766.13. The payment of such sum shall be in full satisfaction of the claim of the Rock Hill Stone & Gravel Co. against the United States for the value of one Northwestern gasoline caterpillar crane belonging to said company, which was demolished by falling from the quarry incline road to the quarry floor of the Rock Hill quarry while being operated by Federal Works Progress Administration employees in St. Louis County, Mo., on September 10, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

CLAIM OF JAMES H. LANE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2264) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of James H. Lane, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 2, line 2, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut to hear, determine, and render judgment, as though the United States were suable in tort, upon the claim of James H. Lane, of Mason's Island, Mystic, Conn., for damages resulting from property damage and personal injuries sustained by him on April 10, 1941, by reason of being struck by a United States mail truck at Linden and Pine Streets in Providence, R. I.: *Provided*, That the judgment, if any, shall not exceed $5,000.

SEC. 2. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year from the effective date of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, appeals therefrom, and payment of any judgments thereon shall be in the same manner as in the cases over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph 20 of section 24 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2403) to provide for use of net weights in interstate commerce transactions in cotton to provide for the standardization of bale covering for cotton, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMITH. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

WILLIAM B. BANKHEAD NATIONAL FOREST

The bill (H. R. 6502) to change the name of the Black Warrior National Forest to the William B. Bankhead National Forest was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROVISION FOR FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 315) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect of meat-packing establishments engaged in intrastate commerce only, in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat food products by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, at the request of the Department of Agriculture I offer an amendment to House Joint Resolution 315.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, at the end of line 18, it is proposed to amend subsection (b) of section 2, by adding:

The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to employ persons without regard to the Civil Service Act, as amended, and subsection 6 of section 6 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, provided that any persons so employed shall be regarded as holding war-service appointments, under Executive Order 9063.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Iowa.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5204) authorizing the charging of fees for brand inspection under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended, was announced as next in order.

Mr. LANGER. I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

INCREASE OF PENSIONS TO WORLD WAR VETERANS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4845) to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $30 to $40 per month, to grant such rate at age 65, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee

on Finance with an amendment, on page 1, after line 6, to strike out:

SEC. 2. Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, part III, paragraph I, is amended by adding thereto a new subparagraph (1), to read as follows:

"(1) Any veteran 65 years of age or over who meets the service requirements of part III and subject to the income limitation therein, shall be entitled to receive a pension of $40 per month."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $30 to $40 per month, and for other purposes."

EVIDENCE OF DEATH OF VETERANS

The bill (H. R. 6646) to provide that the unexplained absence of any individual for 7 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the calendar.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE REPORTS, SIGNING OF BILLS, ETC.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session the Committee on Appropriations may be authorized to report bills or resolutions, that the Presiding Officer of the Senate may be authorized to sign bills or resolutions ready for his signature, and that the Secretary of the Senate may be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

APPLICATION OF CIVIL-SERVICE LAWS TO ASSISTANT OR DEPUTY COMMISSIONERS OF GENERAL LAND OFFICE AND OFFICE OF INDIAN AFFAIRS.

Mr. BULOW. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider House bill 3488, Calendar No. 1204.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the title of the bill for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 3488) to provide that assistant or deputy heads of certain bureaus in the Department of the Interior shall be appointed under the civil-service laws, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I probably shall not object, but I should like to have a statement made by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW]. The Senator requests that the Senate consider a measure which appears on the calendar before the measure at which we began considering the calendar today.

Mr. BULOW. Mr. President, when the calendar was called on the previous occasion the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] asked for an explanation of the bill. I was not present at the time. The Senator from Missouri has since that time studied the bill. The purpose of the bill is to extend the civil-service provisions to the Assistant or Deputy Commissioners of the General Land Office and the Office of Indian Affairs. The bill was introduced at the request of the Department of the Interior, and it has the approval of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. McNARY. Very well; that is what I wanted to know. The bill came up so unexpectedly and hastily I did not know its purport. If the bill has the approval of the Civil Service Commission and, of course, of the committee which has jurisdiction——

Mr. BULOW. It has the approval of the committee.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill, H. R. 3488, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ARMY PAY ADJUSTMENT BILL—MOTION TO DISCHARGE SENATE CONFEREES

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to enter a motion to discharge the Senate conferees on the bill (S. 2025) to adjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service. It is my understanding the motion has to lie over 1 day under the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be entered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2427) to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7036) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the fifty-second annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Chattanooga, Tenn., June 23 to 26, inclusive, 1942, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LEAVY, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. RICH, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. JONES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1637. An act to authorize the conveyance to the State of Illinois, for highway purposes only, a portion of the Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.;

S. 2088. An act to authorize aircraft flight rations for officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Navy and Marine Corps while engaged in flight operations;

S. 2097. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the board of trustees, school district No. 20, Charleston County, S. C., a parcel of land situated in the city of Charleston, S. C.;

S. 2229. An act to provide for the retirement, rank, and pay of heads of staff departments of the Marine Corps;

S. 2382. An act to amend the act approved June 24, 1926, entitled "An act to authorize the construction and procurement of aircraft and aircraft equipment in the Navy and Marine Corps, and to adjust and define the status of the operating personnel in connection therewith," so as to provide for the establishment of the designation of naval aviation pilot (airship), and for other purposes;

S. 2446. An act to prescribe certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training, and for other purposes;

H. R. 69. An act to authorize the adjustment of land-ownership lines within the General Grant grove section of the Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., in order to protect equities established by possession arising in conformity with a certain survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 488. An act for the relief of Kathryn O. Sweeney and others;

H. R. 1162. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the final homestead proof submitted by Henry Martin Coffman;

H. R. 1595. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Plumas National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 1736. An act for the relief of Lillian Last;

H. R. 1757. An act for the relief of James D. G. Alexander;

H. R. 2307. An act validating a certain conveyance, heretofore made by the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way in the town of Indio, in the county of Riverside, State of California, acquired under section 23 of the act of March 3, 1871 (16 Stat. 573);

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of George P. Crawford;

H. R. 2685. An act to authorize the disposition of recreational demonstration projects, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Wiley W. Watkins;

H. R. 2934. An act for the relief of L. H. Martin;

H. R. 3201. An act for the relief of Walter B. Williams, Jr.;

H. R. 3937. An act to change the designation of the Fort Marion National Monument, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4205. An act to add to the Cleveland National Forest, Calif., certain contiguous lands of the United States which can be most effectively and economically protected and administered as parts of said national forest;

H. R. 4213. An act for the relief of persons in connection with the extraction of gold-bearing ore from the Ruck-a-Chucky Dam site;

H. R. 4347. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the North Pacific Union Conference Association of Seventh-day Adventists;

H. R. 4526. An act for the relief of Joseph Donatelli and Rose Donatelli;

H. R. 4629. An act for the relief of Alfred Smith;

H. R. 4676. An act to accept the cession by the Commonwealth of Kentucky of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mammoth Cave National Park; to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for the park in accordance with act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 635); to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the development of a proper entrance road to the park; and for other purposes;

H. R. 4723. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of John Lesniak;

H. R. 4733. An act to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest, the Salmon National Forest, and the Targhee National Forest in the State of Idaho;

H. R. 5013. An act for the relief of James P. Crawford;

H. R. 5016. An act to amend section 1 of the act approved August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 700), entitled "An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to notify the State of Virginia that the United States assumes police jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Shenandoah National Park, and for other purposes";

H. R. 5142. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the claims of any landowner or water user on the Owyhee reclamation project, Oregon, arising in 1940 by reason of a break in the North Canal of such project;

H. R. 5210. An act for the relief of E. M. Conroy;

H. R. 5287. An act relating to the transfer to the Secretary of War of certain lands owned by the United States;

H. R. 5329. An act for the relief of J. J. McIntosh;

H. R. 5394. An act to authorize the lease or sale of public lands for use in connection with the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, and so forth;

H. R. 5484. An act for the relief of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska;

H. R. 5490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim to the States of Oregon and California, respectively, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands of Goose Lake in Oregon and California;

H. R. 5527. An act for the relief of Gerney M. Claiborne;

H. R. 5636. An act to expedite the settlement of claims and accounts incident to certain agricultural adjustment programs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5680. An act for the relief of James M. Hays;

H. R. 5687. An act for the relief of Edwin L. Wade;

H. R. 5713. An act for the relief of George W. Lyle under the jurisdiction of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission;

H. R. 5723. An act for the relief of Anna Danielson and Betty Tiedeman;

H. R. 5772. An act for the relief of Glenn A. Hoss;

H. R. 5847. An act for the relief of Mrs. Julia Campbell;

H. R. 5910. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rudolph Treiber, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 5955. An act for the relief of Harold W. Burch and Lucille M. Burch;

H. R. 6102. An act confirming the claim of Augustin Dominque Tureaud for the Church of Saint Jacques to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, parish of St. James, said claim being listed as No. 392;

H. R. 6365. An act for the relief of Comdr. Cato D. Glover;

H. R. 6625. An act granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the Constitution of the State of New Mexico, providing a method for executing leases for grazing and agricultural purposes on lands granted or confirmed to the State of New Mexico by the act of Congress approved June 20, 1910;

H. R. 6748. An act for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder;

H. R. 6797. An act for the relief of the estate of Tom Gentry;

H. R. 6979. An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength;

H. R. 7006. An act to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of $5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority;

H. R. 7097. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to extend its present track connection with the United States navy yard so as to provide adequate railroad facilities in connection with the development of Buzzards Point as an industrial area in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1932 (47 Stat. 322), as amended by the act approved June 20, 1939 (53 Stat. 849); and

H. J. Res. 314. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the marine and war-risk insurance fund.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7036) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the fifty-second annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Chattanooga, Tenn., June 23 to 26, inclusive, 1942, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Calendar.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Lynn R. Brodrick, to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Kansas.

Mr. CAPPER. With respect to the nomination of Mr. Brodrick to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Kansas, I wish to say that I have known him for many years and that he is a high-class businessman who has the confidence and respect of the people of the State. I think the selection is an excellent one and will be approved generally by the people of Kansas.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph McGrath, to be collector of customs, for customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry P. Hornby, to be collector of customs, for customs collection district No. 23, with headquarters at Laredo, Tex.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the United States Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

That completes the calendar.

MABEL L. BUDLONG

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 260, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 260) submitted by Mr. McKELLAR on May 28, 1942, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay, from the contingent fund of the Senate, to Mabel L. Budlong, widow of Percy E. Budlong, late an official reporter of debates of the Senate, a sum equal to 1 year's compensation at the base rate he was receiving at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

SALLIE H. PHILLIPS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution No. 258, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 258) submitted by Mr. BARKLEY on May 27, 1942, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Sallie H. Phillips, widow of Zebarney T. Phillips, late the Chaplain of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate

he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, June 4, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 1, 1942:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Lynn R. Brodrick to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Kansas.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS

Joseph McGrath to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 4, with headquarters at Boston, Mass.

Harry P. Hornby to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 23, with headquarters at Laredo, Tex.

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

TO BE SURGEONS

Chapman H. Binford	Sidney P. Cooper
John A. Trautman	Waldemar C. Dreessen
Joseph A. Bell	Noka B. Hon
Edward C. Rinck	Otis L. Anderson
Gordon A. Abbott	

TO BE PASSED ASSISTANT SURGEONS

James J. Griffitts	Robert A. Hingson
John B. Vander	Robert L. Griffith
Albert L. Chapman	Kenneth W. Chapman
George K. Massengill	Edward C. Jenkins
Michael B. Shimkin	James K. Shafer
Lloyd S. Rolufs	Benno K. Milmore
Lloyd R. Hershberger	John D. Porterfield
Daniel D. Chiles	John T. Wright
Dorland J. Davis	Benjamin Wolfman
Harlan E. Wilson	Allen B. Eschenbrenner
Joseph C. Sturgell	Haskell B. Rosenblum

TO BE DENTAL SURGEONS

James F. Lewis
Thomas L. Hagan
Ray P. Breaux

TO BE A SANITARY ENGINEER DIRECTOR

Ralph E. Tarbett

POSTMASTERS

MISSOURI

Leslie B. Kincaid, Braymer.
Nat M. Snider, Cape Girardeau.
Ora Lee Dean, Dearborn.
Max Clodfelter, Dexter.
Thomas F. Herndon, Hume.
William D. Groom, Kearney.
Charles E. Sears, Macon.
Ruth Vandiver, Orrick.
Rosa M. Hall, Parma.
Leonard D. Dyer, Rushville.
Gertrude R. Maupin, Watson.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 1, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O God of manifold mercies, who givest us the breath of life and keepest in us righteous desire, we approach Thee for peace, wisdom, and power. Thou who dost breathe upon cloud and mist, revealing the shore line to struggling mariners, clothe us with faith as immovable as the mountain and as lasting as the stars which guide where angry waves await, to the tablelands of life.

Amid the corruption and lust of power in this turbulent world, amid the hard, hard questions and trembling distrust of many of our own people, and amid those who are in the twilight of vision and fail to see, for them we humbly pray. Dear Lord, deliver all from prejudices, from ignorant misunderstandings, and failure to bear valiantly responsibilities as citizens of this free land. Increase our fervent fidelity and gratitude toward our country, which is seeking to bring release to all peoples in bondage. Crown us with the assurance that no dire calamity, no hopeless grief, or needless breath of ill can ever defeat the soul that rests in Thee. In our Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 28, 1942, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 314. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the marine and war-risk insurance fund.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6845. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a joint resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution designating June 13, 1942, as MacArthur Day, and authorizing its appropriate observance.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) entitled "Joint resolution making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia."

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment No. 1 to said joint resolution disagreed to by the House; requests a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2446. An act to prescribe the pay and certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training and aviation instructions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6979) entitled "An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength."

AMENDMENT OF EMERGENCY FARM MORTGAGE ACT OF 1933

The Speaker laid before the House the following letter from the Clerk of the House:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 29, 1942.*

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: Pursuant to the special order agreed to on yesterday, the Clerk did on this day receive from the Secretary of the Senate a message in writing indicating that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2508) entitled "An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended."

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to announce that pursuant to the authority granted him on May 28, 1942, he did on May 29, 1942, sign the enrolled bill of the Senate, S. 2508.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of the legislative business today, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes on The Small Businessman and Pending Legislation Affecting That Man.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PADDOCK] may be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MICHENER asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO DECLARE RECESS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order tomorrow for the Speaker to declare a recess of the House for the purpose of receiving as a guest of the House a distinguished visitor, President Quezon, of the Philippine Islands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce that the recess will be taken at 12:30 p. m. tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein, if not already included in the RECORD, the speech recently made by

General Marshall to the graduating class of the Military Academy at West Point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachustts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BULWINKLE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6845), making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LEAVY, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. RICH, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. JONES.

FORMER REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM E. HULL

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, a stalwart American, a true patriot, a community builder, a generous husband, an altruistic citizen, and an able Member of the Congress a decade ago has embarked upon the eternal sleep. It is my sad duty to announce that the Honorable William E. Hull, who served in this body from the Sixteenth District of Illinois from March 4, 1923, to March 4, 1933, has responded to the final roll call.

Born at Lewistown, Ill., on January 13, 1866, Mr. Hull removed to Peoria at an early age, where he laid the foundation for an outstanding business and political career, which was to endure for nearly a half a century until his untimely death on Memorial Day.

In 1898 he was appointed postmaster of the city of Peoria and served with distinction for 8 years. Gifted as he was with an amazing and dynamic energy, his ventures in business proved highly successful and the fruits of these ventures he devoted in a most unselfish and generous measure to the upbuilding of his community and State. He was ever alert to the needs of the community in which he lived and overlooked no opportunity to present its virtues and attributes to those who might be induced to establish themselves and their enterprises in the city of Peoria.

For twoscore years and more he was active in the councils of the Republican Party and served its best interests with vigor and ability on local, State, and National matters. In 1916 and again in 1920 he served as a delegate to the Republican National Convention and did notable service in giving direction to party affairs.

In 1922 he was elected to the Sixty-eighth Congress and served with distinction for a period of 10 years, during which time he was a most active and energetic member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. Many of his associates and colleagues will remember well his service in this body and can attest the bold and vigorous way in which he addressed himself to the Nation's problems.

His retirement from Congress in 1933 did not diminish his interest in national and party affairs and he found time, notwithstanding his extensive and far-flung business interests, to give generously of his time, his talents, and his substance for the welfare of his country, his State, his community, and the party with which he was so long identified.

Truly he was a part of that endless stream of our national life which began with the founding of the Republic and which will carry on and on to a better and a nobler existence. Of this stream he was a moving and constructive part.

It was for him to serve in these Halls in that eventful period of rehabilitation which followed the first World War, when many complex problems engaged the attention of the country. He served in an era when the Congress was wrestling with the problems of farm relief, agricultural marketing, immigration, national credit, unemployment, war debts, and a host of others which followed in the backwash of war. To the solution of these problems he brought a rich and varied background of business experience, a courageous outlook, a sincerity of purpose, and earnest enthusiasm, and a rare vigor which has imperishably inscribed his name on the rolls of the Republic.

As he closed his eyes in dreamless sleep on Memorial Day, it might be said of him—

Life's race well run,
Life's work well done,
Life's victory won,
Now cometh rest.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include in the RECORD a report which I have received from the Motor Transport Service of the War Department on rubber conservation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RUBBER

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I suppose one of the most talked of subjects today is the conservation of rubber. I took occasion recently to go down and talk to Mr. Thatcher, the gentleman in charge of rubber conservation in the War Department. He made some startling revelations to me concerning the stock pile there is in this country at the present time. He said that the rubber situation is not only serious, but that it is perilous. Many reductions have been made in the Army and the Navy in the use of rubber. Formerly they used to carry two extra tires, and they now carry only one, and they are doing everything in their power to conserve this rubber, so that the greatest number of people will be the recipients of any rubber that is available.

I am inserting in the RECORD today the statement of Mr. Thatcher, and I sincerely hope that everyone will avail himself of the opportunity to read it, because it is of very great importance. This gentleman is conversant with the whole situation, and he will give you, through the instrumentality of this article, an idea of what is going on. He is a red-blooded, two-fisted, hard-headed, square-shooting fellow and will give you all of the information that you desire. He is well informed, and any one of you who goes down there will be sure to enlighten himself fully on the subject.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

IOWA CONTINUES TO HOLD FIRST PLACE IN LITERACY

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post for May 30 there is an article dealing with rejections of men called in to qualify for military service under the Selective Service Act. In this article the State of Iowa is correctly given credit for holding first place in the Nation in literacy, but the figure cited in it is wrong. In an account on the same subject furnished by the Office of Government Reports for May 29, the figure cited is correct, but the name of the State holding first place is wrong.

In the interest of truth and accuracy, I have checked this matter with Dr. John W. Studebaker, Commisioner of the United States Office of Education, and I am prepared to assert on the best authority that not only does the State of Iowa hold first place in literacy in our Nation, but my State has held that place for

many years. In a subsequent issue of the RECORD, I shall have printed detailed facts with reference to this matter.

This enviable record is an eloquent tribute to the teachers who do the classroom work, to the school boards who represent the public in the various communities, to the State department of public instruction charged with over-all administration of education, and to the people in general who must find the money needed for maintaining the schools. I salute them all for their intelligent attitude. The State of Iowa continues to set an example for other States to follow.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein two letters, one from Hon. Henry L. Stimson, Secretary of War, and the other from Hon. Frank Knox, Secretary of the Navy, both of them addressed to Hon. SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of the legislative business and any other special orders that may have been entered, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

HARRY BRIDGES

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the past few days relative to the recent ruling of the Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Francis Biddle, in which he upheld the decree of one of our courts to deport the alien, the un-American, and the Communist, Harry Bridges.

Harry Bridges should have been deported years ago. The general public has been aware of the dastardly deeds and crimes committed by him against our Government and the American people, which were so flagrant until the House of Representatives has twice passed bills ordering his deportation. But when these bills arrived in the other body, by the magic wand of some unseen influence and power, they were pocketed.

Finally the courts in our land having jurisdiction of the case ordered his deportation. Hence, Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the head of our Justice Department for his action, and I do hope that in his future conduct of this high office he will continue to heed the voice of the people and the representatives of the people in all matters whose tendency will be to save democratic America and its ideals.

I am sure that the membership of this House and the American people will now await with intense interest the decision of the court of final resort in this matter, which will reveal to them whether that tribunal, which is our last recourse for the preservation of the life and property of each individual, will follow the law, the mandates, and the voice of the people in the finality.

In our form of government communism has no place. In the form of government of communistic Russia, Americanism has no place. Both are fighting the common enemy, whose purpose is to destroy Americanism and communism. Certain the Attorney General's action is no affront to the Russian Government.

We shall await with patience and see what the American court of final jurisdiction is going to say.

SESQUICENTENNIAL OF ADMISSION OF KENTUCKY AS A STATE

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, this is the sesquicentennial year of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Today is the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the birth of Kentucky as a State. From the time of the adoption of the Constitution, the citizens of the territory which is now Kentucky wished it to become a sovereign State. Because Kentucky was formed within the jurisdiction of Virginia, under the Constitution it was necessary to obtain the consent of the legislature of that State and also the consent of the Congress of the United States for its admission into the Union. Although it was generally recognized that the Government of Virginia could afford little benefit or protection to the territory which is now comprised by Kentucky because of its remoteness and inaccessibility, satisfactory resolutions of the Legislature of Virginia for that purpose were not passed for several years. Almost 4 years after the ratification of the Constitution of the United States, Kentucky on June 1, 1792, pursuant to a resolution of the Congress of the United States signed by George Washington as President, became the fifteenth State under the Constitution. The citizens of Kentucky will celebrate that event this year and they extend a cordial invitation to the citizens of the other States to participate in that celebration. I shall not dwell upon the splendid history of the Commonwealth of Kentucky. It is a part of the history of the Nation of which not only Kentuckians but all the people of our common country may well feel proud. In war and peace, Kentucky has done her full duty and the achievements of her people are a national heritage.

HON. SAM RAYBURN

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, once again the great State of Pennsylvania has come to the front by one of its great educational institutions, Muhlenberg College, recognizing a great man, from the great State of Texas, the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, by conferring upon him the degree of doctor of laws before any of the colleges or universities of Texas conferred a degree upon him.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD], I ask unanimous consent that he may extend his own remarks in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two telegrams to Mr. Henderson and a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GALE was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects and in one to include an editorial and in the other a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein the baccalaureate address of His Excellency Most Rev. Francis J. Spellman, archbishop of New York, at the military mass celebrated in Holy Trinity Chapel at West Point on Wednesday, May 27, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, the June issue of one of our magazines, the House Beautiful, carries on page 11 an advertisement from a Canadian firm seeking to sell to American housewives English bone china. The last two lines of the advertisement read:

A generous supply of gasoline for tourists in Canada is available.

I want to suggest to this House that the advertisement itself is in extremely bad taste. At a time when we are all straining our backs in a united effort, it comes with very poor grace for our neighbors in Canada to try to tempt American tourists across the line on the plea that they can have plenty of gasoline for touring when it is admitted that our own gasoline rationing is done not only to conserve essential fuel but to preserve the life of automobile tires. Our associates in Canada apparently suggest that it is all right to wear out American tires if they are worn out touring in Canada.

But more important to us at home is the plain lesson that we need to watch every suggestion that is made for Nation-wide rationing of gasoline. From the standpoint of our gasoline supply we surely do not need rationing in such

States as Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Kansas, Colorado, Wyoming, and Montana. We have no transportation problem and we have an abundant supply of gasoline.

Furthermore, the great parks and playgrounds of the Rocky Mountain West have always invited the summer tourist. The plea to "See America First" is unnecessary this year because America is almost the only country which Americans can reach for their vacation. It therefore would be unfair competition if these Midwestern and Southwestern States should be deprived of their normal summer tourist business by a gas-rationing program which would also permit American tourists to run wild throughout the resorts of Canada.

Is there any reason why a tourist should be rationed on the American side of Glacier National Park and be allowed to buy all the gasoline he wants on the Canadian side? Is there any reason why a tourist should not visit the Yellowstone, the Garden of the Gods, Pike's Peak, the Indian country around Santa Fe or Gallup, N. Mex., the Carlsbad Caverns, or the Grand Canyon of the Colorado because of nation-wide gasoline rationing in the United States, but be allowed to visit beautiful Lake Louise or Banff?

This advertisement of a Canadian firm in an American magazine should put the American Congress on guard against any proposal toward a Nation-wide rationing of gasoline.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As I understand, there is no gasoline actually produced or refined in Canada. I am also advised that there is no gas shortage with our friendly neighbors on the north, so far as American tourists are concerned. In fact they advertise that they have an abundance of gas for tourists, yet Oklahoma, New Mexico, and Texas and other States where there is an oversupply of gas, we are warned that the rationing of gasoline is around the corner.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That is true.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BISHOP] may extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next my colleagues the gentlemen from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. JOHNS] and myself after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other special orders may address the House for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE ODD FELLOWS AND THE WAR EFFORT

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, fraternal organizations throughout the country are cooperating in every way in the World War efforts of our Government. They desire a word of commendation for their patriotic activities. Recognizing the transportation difficulties which now confront America, the sovereign grand lodge of the Independent Order of Odd Fellows through proclamation issued by its presiding officer, Lynn J. Irwin, of Des Moines, Iowa, under date of April 28, 1942, proclaimed that the next regular session of the national organization, which was set for September 1942 at Chicago, be postponed on account of the war emergency and that various State bodies be advised to do the same thing.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. I understand this splendid organization has been most patriotic and that the money that was to be used for the expenses of this convention are to be used to buy war bonds.

Mr. PITTENGER. That was what I was about to call attention to. It is significant that the officials of the Odd Fellows took action to invest in war bonds all funds which would be saved as a result of the postponement of this annual session. This is the first organization to take such action. The costs of travel and other items of expense would amount to a substantial amount of money, and this will be invested in War Savings bonds.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend by own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the May 30 issue of the New Orleans Item, and also to include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include sundry newspaper clippings from Puerto Rico regarding a former colleague from Missouri, Thomas C. Hennings.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include the text of a letter I wrote to Leon Henderson.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a short article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a speech on hours and labor of farmers.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the Automobile Club of Michigan.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. D'ALESANDRO asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech delivered by Fred S. Wallace, Chief of the Agriculture Adjustment Agency, recently made in Chicago.

I have obtained a statement of cost from the Public Printer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FLORIDA PIPE LINE AND BARGE CANAL

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, a little later today the bill H. R. 6999 will be up for consideration of the House under an effort to suspend the rules.

This bill includes a so-called pipe line across Florida, together with a barge canal. It is interesting to note that the so-called barge canal is planned over the route of the old Cross State Canal so often defeated in this House. I am wondering if this is an opening wedge for the so-called Cross State Canal.

The pipe line is a war measure, to be sure, and I shall never place myself in a position of voting against a pipe line; but there should be a divorcement between these two measures.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman for that purpose at this time.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. May the Chair have this understanding: The bill with reference to the Florida canal and pipe line will be called up during the day and there will be ample time for debate on it then.

Without objection, the gentleman from Florida may proceed for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I take a minute at this time because I do not know how much time there will be under the suspension. This bill provides an authorization of an appropriation of $144,000,000, and

will come up under suspension of the rules. There will not be enough time to adequately debate the matter.

We have no objection to deepening the waterway from Texas to the Florida coast nor to the pipe line, but we do have objection to building a barge line across the State of Florida at the site designated without adequate provision to protect the water supply of the State of Florida or provision to pay for the bridges. Those things have not been considered by the House.

We also say that at a time like this an appropriation of $144,000,000 should not be considered under suspension of the rules until the House has had a chance to go into the various phases of the matter. There is an existing canal at the present time that can be used.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a table on parity payments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]?

There was no objection.

CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Consent Calendar day. The clerk will call the first bill on the Consent Calendar.

PUYALLUP TRIBE, WASHINGTON, CORRECTIONS IN TRIBAL ROLL

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar (H. R. 4578) to authorize certain corrections in the tribal membership roll of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians in the State of Washington, and for other purposes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR AMENDING THE PETITION OF THE INDIANS OF CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 268, to extend the time for amending the petition of the Indians of California, under section 4 of the act of May 18, 1928.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, at the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA] and other members of the California delegation, I have given weeks of time to a study of this resolution.

This resolution would amend what is known as the California Indian Jurisdictional Act passed in May 1928. Its purpose is to validate an amended petition which was filed after the statute of limitation had run. The original resolution gave the representatives of the Indians 3 years in which to file their petition. Pursuant to the provisions of the act, the original petition was filed in 1929, and it was not until 1932 the amended petition was filed. On the face of it, this resolution appears to be harmless, but after one has read the amended petition then it is disclosed how harmful the passage of this resolution would be.

In the original petition filed in 1929 there was sought a judgment in the total sum of $12,800,000. In the amended petition filed in 1932, however, the amount of the judgment requested was increased from $12,800,000 to $18,000,000, but even this sum was represented as constituting only the principal amount claimed. In addition to this principal amount of $18,000,000 there was also claimed interest on the judgment in the amended petition.

If interest at the usual rate of 5 percent should be allowed on the sum of $18,000,000 from 1852 to date, such interest for this period of 90 years would amount to approximately 450 percent of the principal sum, or approximately $81,000,000.

Gratuity offsets would be deductible from the gross amount of the judgment and interest, not from the principal sum, claimed. It has been asserted by counsel for the Indians that the gratuity offsets which will probably be allowable against the claims of these Indians will amount to approximately $14,771,312.55. This statement obviously is in reference to the amount claimed in the original petition rather than that specified in the amended petition. It also fails to take into consideration any sum which might be allowed by the court as interest. If the Indians should succeed in recovering the $18,000,000 claimed as principal, plus interest thereon to the extent of $81,000,000, the total amount of such a judgment would be $99,000,000, from which there would be deductible such gratuities as the court might allow. If offsets in the amount of $14,000,000 should be allowed, the net amount of the judgment to be rendered in favor of the Indians on the basis of such a recovery would be approximately $85,000,000. Bear in mind now the offsets are not deducted until the interest is added to the principal.

On the basis of the Indians' contention, the 1928 act was in effect a gift; the offer of that gift expired in 1931; any proposal to renew that offer should be considered in the light of conditions existing in 1942. It is argued on behalf of the Indians that the Congress intended to provide by the jurisdictional act of 1928 for the imposition of a substantive liability upon the United States, which would not have existed independently of that act. This will be found in the plaintiff's brief.

The defense made by the Government in the Court of Claims controverts this argument of the Indans as to the effect of the 1928 act. Another defense relied on by the Government is that the original petition filed by the Indians in 1929 was defective in that it did not comply with a jurisdictional requirement of the 1928 act, and that the attempted removal of the defect on March 14, 1932, by the filing of an amended petition, came too late, thus leaving the Indians without the benefit of the provisions of the 1928 act and the court without jurisdiction over the claim asserted. Consequently, even if it should be assumed that the Congress did intend to create a liability by the enactment of the 1928 act, or, in other words, to make a gift to these Indians, there is raised for the determination of the court the question whether there was attached to the offer of that gift the condition that it should be accepted within 3 years by the filing of an adequate petition. Such a petition was not filed until 1932, some time after the expiration of the 3-year period. On the basis of the Indians' contention, therefore, House Joint Resolution 268 would, in effect, revive an offer made almost 15 years ago and give effect to proceedings taken after the expiration of that offer. The result would be a new gift. I insist the proposed joint resolution, viewed in this light, should be considered on the basis of conditions as they exist now rather than in the year 1928.

At a time such as this, in my judgment, the Congress by no means should pass legislation that might result in requiring the Treasury to pay nearly $100,000,000 for land alleged to have been taken by the Government in 1852.

This case has been submitted to the Court of Claims. Briefs have been filed and arguments completed. Why reopen the case now?

Mr. Speaker, for the reasons stated, I must object to consideration of the resolution.

Mr. LEA. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LEA. The gentleman will admit, will he not, that the resolution the House is asked to act on does nothing but continue the time for an amendment, and any amendment permitted under this bill would only be such as was authorized by the original act passed by the Congress?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is true, it was authorized; but the attorney general of California did not take advantage of it and the statute of limitations ran. However, as I said, in the amended petition which this resolution would validate, there is a provision asking for interest, and that interest would be 450 percent from 1852.

Mr. LEA. I have consulted with the attorneys who represent the attorney general of California who represents the plaintiff in this case, and they have no such conception of the bill as the gentleman indicates.

The question with them is whether or not under the act there would be any substantial judgment. In any event, there are claimed offsets in excess of what the attorney general of California himself has asserted was the claim in the original bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. May I say to the gentleman from California that the offset is not applied until the interest is computed and added to the gross judgment, after which the offset is deducted. The gentleman can confirm my statement by

consulting the Department of Justice or the Court of Claims.

Mr. LEA. The interest could not run, so the attorneys tell me, back to the time the gentleman states. It would not go further back than the time the act was passed by the Congress.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is what the attorneys on your side say, but the Department of Justice, and I listen to them in connection with these jurisdictional bills, tells me that the interest would run from 1852, and it would be 450 percent.

Mr. LEA. Of course, opposition of this bill at most simply wants to take advantage of the statute of limitations. It has nothing to do with the original merits of the bill as passed by the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is true, and if the bill did not validate the amended petition, which asks for interest and makes other concessions, I would not object, but it does validate the amended petition, which has a paragraph in it providing for the interest, and the Department of Justice insists this will amount to 450 percent from 1852.

Mr. LEA. The amended petition is within the terms of the original act. The only question, so far as the law is concerned, is as to the right to amend after 3 years from the date of the authorization of the suit. The act gives a right to amend without any limit. This attack on the petition is purely technical. It will do nothing more than cure the possible, but not probable, construction, that the court may place on the right to amend the petition. If the pleading be beyond correction, it is so purely because of an error of the attorney general of our State made in drawing the pleadings. The Indians should not be penalized for such a technical mistake and which is now so easily in the power of Congress to correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. I think the Congress erred when it passed the original bill. There never was a treaty signed between the Government and these Indians, and the attorneys for the State of California and the Indians say it is an outright gift. The officials of the Department of the Interior tell me they use this language, that it is an outright gratuity.

Mr. LEA. The Indians were robbed of their right to the use of their lands where they and their ancestors lived for centuries. If there is anything wrong about this bill, it is in paying to their descent a small part of the value of what was so taken from their ancestors.

Mr. COCHRAN. There is not an Indian living today who was involved at that time. They are the grandchildren and the great grandchildren of the Indians who lived in 1852. This is no time to take a chance of subjecting the Treasury of the United States to an obligation of nearly $100,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It requires three objections. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Messrs. COCHRAN, TABER, WOLCOTT, SCHULTE, ZIMMERMAN, and KEAN objected.

FRED B. WOODARD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3759, to limit the operations of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to certain counsel.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

SNAKE OR PIUTE INDIANS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 622, authorizing the Snake or Piute Indians of the former Malheur Indian Reservation of Oregon to sue in the Court of Claims, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, several times when this bill has been called heretofore on the Consent Calendar we have asked that it be passed over without prejudice because a minority report was filed. The minority members who filed the report wanted opportunity to present certain amendments, which I understand the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] is prepared to submit.

I have received the following letter from the members who signed the minority report:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 25, 1942.*

Hon. JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
House of Congress.

HONORABLE SIR: We the signers of the minority report on H. R. 622 wish to have our amendments on this bill considered upon the next reading of the Consent Calendar.

Most respectfully,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
USHER L. BURDICK,
B. J. GEHRMANN,
R. F. ROCKWELL,
R. T. BUCKLER,
SAMUEL DICKSTEIN.

In view of the action taken by the members who signed the minority report and the assurances that the amendments they desire will be offered, I shall not object to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction be, and the same is hereby, conferred upon the Court of Claims, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States by either party as in other cases, anything in the Judicial Code of the United States and amendments thereto to the contrary notwithstanding, and notwithstanding the lapse of time or the statute of limitation, to hear, examine, and adjudicate the claims of, and decree just compensation for, any and all claims of the Snake or Piute Indians of the former Malheur Reservation of Oregon arising or growing out of the Executive orders of September 12, 1872, May 15, 1875, and July 23, 1880, setting aside certain lands as a reservation for said Indians, which lands were taken from them and restored to the public domain by the Executive orders of January 28, 1876, September 13, 1882, May 21, 1883, and March 2, 1889; and it is hereby declared that the taking and the loss, without just compensation to the said Indians, of their lands, reserved to them by the said Executive orders of 1872, 1875, and 1880, and which were restored to the public domain by the said Executive orders of 1876, 1882, 1883, and 1889, is sufficient ground for the court to render equitable relief, and the court shall determine the acreage of the lands set aside for the said Snake or Piute Indians by the aforesaid three Executive orders, as near as may be, and shall determine the value thereof as fixed and classified under the terms of the public lands and mining laws of the United States, provided the minimum value shall be fixed at $1.25 per acre, and render just compensation for the value and loss of use of the same. For the purpose of this act, the Snake or Piute Indians of the former Malheur Reservation shall be defined to be all Snake or Piute Indians who occupied and used lands set aside under the said three Executive orders creating the Malheur Reservation (1) from September 12, 1872; (2) from the time of establishing their home on such lands if such home was established between September 12, 1872, and January 1, 1878; or (3) from the time of their birth if they were born on such lands after September 12, 1872, and who continued to occupy and use such lands until their removal therefrom by force in 1878, and their descendants. Any payment or advances made to the said Indians by the United States shall not be pleaded as an estoppel but may be pleaded by way of set-off, where such payments or advances have inured to the benefit of said Indians.

SEC. 2. The claim of said Snake or Piute Indians of the former Malheur Reservation of Oregon shall be presented by petition or petitions to be filed within 5 years from the approval of this act and shall make the said Indians party plaintiff and the United States party defendant. Such petition shall be verified and signed by such attorney or attorneys employed by the representative or agent of said Indians under and by virtue of authority given at a council of said Indians duly called by the Indian Department and held on October 1, 1934, and by virtue of a certain contract entered into by said Indians with their representative or agent dated October 6, 1934, in accordance with existing law, which may be made upon information and belief and no other verification shall be necessary. Official letters, papers, documents, maps, and other public records, or certified copies thereof, of any department of the Government shall be available to the Government and the claimants, and may be used in evidence, and be furnished without cost.

SEC. 3. Upon final determination of such suit instituted hereunder, the Court of Claims shall have jurisdiction and fix and determine a reasonable fee for all services rendered before the departments of the Government, committees of Congress, and the courts, not to exceed 10 percent of the amount recovered. In addition thereto all necessary and proper expenses incurred in the preparation and prosecution of such suit hereunder, the said fees and expenses shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury out of any sum or sums found to be due said Indians, when appropriation therefor is made by Congress to pay any judgment rendered, and the balance of any sum or sums shall be placed in the Treasury of the United States as a trust fund to the credit of said Indians decreed by said court to be entitled thereto, and shall draw interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of said judgment, and shall be subject to appropriation by Congress for the benefit of said Indians.

SEC. 4. That for the purpose of the distribution of the proceeds of such judgment, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make a proper roll of said Indians within 2 years from the date of the approval of this act. Each community of the Snake or Piute Indians of the former Malheur

Reservation, of Oregon, shall prepare a roll of its membership, which roll shall be submitted to a council of the majority of their Indian chiefs, who lived on the above said Indian reservation, for its approval or disapproval. The said central council of these chiefs shall prepare a combined roll of all members and descendants of members of the respective communities of said Indians of the former Malheur Reservation, of Oregon, and shall submit the same to the Secretary of the Interior for a final approval which shall operate as final proof of such Indians to share in the benefits of this act.

With the following committee amendment: Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That jurisdiction be, and the same is hereby, conferred upon the Court of Claims, with the right of appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States by either party as in other cases, to hear, determine, adjudicate, and render final judgment on any and all legal or equitable claims of whatsoever nature which the Snake or Paiute Indians, or any band thereof, may have against the United States, including, but without limiting the scope of the foregoing, any claims arising under or growing out of any treaties, agreements, acts of Congress, departmental or Executive orders, or otherwise, insofar as these or any of them were lawfully made or authorized. In any claim for the appropriation, expropriation, taking, acquisition, or deprivation of land, or any rights in land, the jurisdiction conferred by this act upon the Court of Claims to hear and determine any such claim is limited to the determination of the value of the land at the time of the appropriation, expropriation, taking, acquisition, or deprivation, and no judgment shall be rendered by the Court of Claims which includes any increment, interest, or equivalent thereof, from the date of taking to the date of judgment as an element of just compensation or otherwise, except that in the event the court shall find that there was a taking of land or any rights in land by the exercise of the power of eminent domain, the court shall have jurisdiction to render judgment for simple interest on the value of the property so taken at the time of the taking at the rate of 4 percent per annum for a period of not exceeding 6 years following the said taking; and this provision is not severable from the provisions of this act conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims.

SEC. 2. For the purpose of this act the phrase "Snake or Paiute Indians" shall, without limiting the scope thereof, include members and descendants of Winnemucca's Band, Egan's Band, Leggins' Band, Ochocho's Band, Oite's Band, Weiser's (or Wesser's) Band, and all other Indians who, between the dates of September 12, 1872, and March 2, 1889, lived within or occupied any land included at any time within the territorial limits of the former Malheur Reservation and their descendants living on the date of the enactment of this act. Any representative body of Snake or Paiute Indians as herein defined, the population of which exceeds 50, living in the same general community or on the same reservation, and which has heretofore employed, or shall hereafter employ, attorneys in accordance with the provisions of section 2103 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, is hereby recognized, for all purposes under this act, as having the status of a band and may bring suit hereunder, irrespective of whether said body be composed of survivors and/or descendants of one or of several of the original bands of said Snake or Paiute Indians.

SEC. 3. A suit or suits under this act may be instituted by the Snake or Paiute Indians, or any band thereof, either separately or jointly, as party or parties plaintiff against the United States as party defendant, by filing within 5 years from the date of the enactment of this act, a petition or petitions in the Court of Claims, a copy of each petition so filed to be served on the Attorney General of the United States who, either in person or by some attorney from the Department of Justice to be designated by him, shall appear and defend the interests of the United States. Such petition or petitions shall set forth the facts upon which the claim for recovery is based and shall be verified by the attorney or attorneys employed by said Snake or Paiute Indians, or any band thereof, under contract approved in accordance with existing law, which verification may be made upon information and belief and no other verification shall be required. The petition or petitions shall be subject to amendment at any time prior to final submission of the case to the Court of Claims. In the event more than one suit shall be instituted hereunder with respect to the same claim the court may, if justice requires, consolidate such suits on such terms and conditions as it may deem proper. Any tribe or band of Indians which the court may deem necessary to a final determination of any suit instituted hereunder may be joined therein as the court may order, and the court is authorized to bring in and make parties to the suit any and all claimants, either individuals, tribes, or bands of Indians to the end and purpose that a complete, full, and final adjudication may be made which will bind all persons, bands, tribes, and Indians.

SEC. 4. At the trial of said suit or suits the court shall settle and determine the rights therein, both legal and equitable, of said Snake or Paiute Indians against the United States, notwithstanding lapse of time or statutes of limitation. No payment or payments which have been made by the United States upon any claim or claims therein asserted or for the account of said Snake or Paiute Indians, or any band thereof, shall estop the United States from denying the validity of such claim or claims, or apply as an estoppel against any suit brought hereunder, but there shall be set off against any recovery obtained by said Snake or Paiute Indians, or any band thereof, any payment made in its or their behalf by the United States on any claim asserted hereunder by said Snake or Paiute Indians, or any band thereof, as the case may be, and such gratuity expenditures made by the United States for the benefit of any of said bands as are directed to be set off by the act of August 12, 1935 (49 Stat. 571, 596).

SEC. 5. In any suit instituted hereunder, any letter, paper, document, map, or record (or a certified copy thereof) in the possession of any officer or department of the United States may be used in evidence, and the departments of the Government of the United States shall give full and free access to the attorneys for said Snake or Paiute Indians, or any band thereof, to such letters, papers, documents, maps, or records as may be useful to said attorneys in the preparation for trial or trials of such suits and shall afford facilities for the examination of the same and for the making of copies thereof.

SEC. 6. Upon the final determination of any suit or cause of action instituted hereunder the Court of Claims, in the event of a judgment in favor of any tribe or band of Indians suing hereunder, shall, out of any judgment received, award to the attorneys representing said Indians pursuant to their contracts approved in accordance with existing law, and to persons other than the attorneys of record who, prior to the enactment of this act, shall have assisted the Indians in presenting their claims to the committees of Congress and the departments of the Government, as compensation for their services before the committees of Congress, the departments of the Government and the courts, such fees as based upon a quantum meruit the said court shall deem reasonable, which fees in the aggregate shall in no event exceed 10 percent of the amount recovered. The attorneys of record and such other persons as shall claim compensation for services of the character herein defined shall present their claims directly to the Court of Claims and said court is hereby specifically invested with jurisdiction of such claims. In addition to the aforesaid fees the Court of Claims shall also allow, out of any recovery for said Indians, to the attorney or attorneys of record such expenses as are necessary and proper in connection with the preparation and prosecution of such claims. All such fees and expenses shall be paid by the Secretary of the Treasury out of any sum or sums found to be due said Indians when an appropriation therefor is made by Congress.

SEC. 7. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 2 hereof, the court in making its award or awards, if any, shall, unless justice otherwise requires, differentiate between the various bands of Indians enumerated and render judgment in behalf of those bands entitled thereto. The net amount of any judgment recovered shall be placed in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the various bands of Snake or Paiute Indians in such proportions as the Court of Claims shall find them equitably entitled to receive, or in the event the said court shall find it impracticable to differentiate between the various bands of said Indians, to the credit of the Snake or Paiute Indians without specifying the beneficiary bands. The net amount of any judgment recovered shall draw interest at the rate of 4 percent per annum from the date of the judgment and shall be subject to appropriation by Congress for the benefit of said Indians.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITE:

On page 5, line 17, after the words "Snake or Paiute Indians" and wherever these words occur in this bill, strike out the comma or period and insert: "of the former Malheur Indian Reservation of Oregon."

On page 5, line 21, strike out "departmental".

Strike out section 2 and insert therefor: "Any alleged band of Snake or Paiute Indians of the former Malheur Indian Reservation of Oregon may prove themselves as such in the Court of Claims."

On page 10, line 8, after the word "as" insert "engaged by the Snake or Paiute Indians of the former Malheur Indian Reservation of Oregon."

Insert:

"SEC. 8. That for the purpose of the distribution of the proceeds of such judgment, the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make a proper roll of said Indians within 2 years from the date of the approval of this act. Each community of the Snake or Paiute Indians of the former Malheur Indian Reservation of Oregon shall prepare a roll of its membership, which roll be submitted to a council of the majority of their Indian chiefs, who lived on the above said Indian reservation, for its approval or disapproval. The said central council of these chiefs shall prepare a combined roll of all members and descendants of members of the respective communities of said Indians of former Malheur Indian Reservation of Oregon, and shall submit the same to the Secretary of the Interior for a final approval which shall operate as final proof of such Indians to share in the benefits of this act."

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, this is a perfecting amendment to bring into the purview of this bill, and to limit its application to them, the Indians who are

recognized by the Department and the Government under the Executive order establishing the Malheur Indian Reservation. Certain Indian tribes received rights when that reservation was established. These amendments only limit the application of the bill to the Indians who are entitled to go into court and establish their rights under the provisions of the bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does the gentleman's amendment in any way affect Indians other than those in the State of Oregon?

Mr. WHITE. This amendment is to give to the Indians of the Malheur Indian Reservation in eastern Oregon who come under the purview of the Executive order of the President establishing the reservation the right to go into court and establish their rights under the bill now before the House.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What I am trying to find out is whether or not any of the Indians in my State of Montana are affected by the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. WHITE. If they can prove themselves to be members of the Snake or Paiute Indians, then they will have rights the same as the Indians I represent in the State of Idaho.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahama. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Does not the gentleman's amendment limit this bill to those Indians in Oregon, and all other Indians would be cut out?

Mr. WHITE. No; it does not.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. That is the way I understood the amendment as the Clerk read it.

Mr. WHITE. No; it does not. It includes Indians in Oregon, Montana, or anywhere else who were originally in the Malheur Reservation in the State of Oregon. Some of the Indians whom I have the honor to represent in Idaho will be included in the provisions of this bill, but the bill does not include any roving bands of Indians who are not included under the rights granted when the Malheur Indian Reservation was established.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Then it does not exclude Indians in other States?

Mr. WHITE. It does not.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. It is the descendants of the Malheur Indians who are in Oregon.

Mr. WHITE. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. I misunderstood the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It has been difficult over here to hear what the colloquy has been over on that side. Will the gentleman state what are the facts with respect to the amendment to the committee amendment? Is it to expand or limit the measure?

Mr. WHITE. The purpose of the amendment is to limit the Indians that come under the provisions of the Executive order of the President in establishing a reservation in Oregon, the so-called Malheur Reservation, for the use and enjoyment of these Indians.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I understand the background of the bill, but I wish to understand the effect of the amendments which the gentleman has offered. Do they extend or contract the scope of the bill?

Mr. WHITE. The amendment contracts the scope of the bill. I may say to the gentleman that I have in my hand an affidavit signed by Oliver Applegate, who is a former Indian agent on this reservation, and we find in the provisions of this bill there is included a tribe or band of Chief Ocheho, and it develops from this affidavit that Chief Ocheho and his band were a part of the Klamath Indian Reservation and received allotments there, and under no conception could they be entitled to participate in this grant. It is to exclude Indians of that kind that the amendment is introduced.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. The purpose of this bill, as I understand it, is merely to give these Indians and their descendants their day in court to determine what rights, if any, they have in this reservation. The amendments offered by the gentleman are for the purpose of limiting the scope of the bill to those Indians who have been recognized as the ones who had rights in this reservation.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the subcommittee which considered this bill for a long, long time, I want to assure the Membership of this House that I think this amendment is an extremely dangerous one, which this House should not adopt.

The amendment carries a provision that 2 years after the passage of the bill there shall be prepared a roll of all the Snake and Paiute Indians that might come under it. I want to remind the House that this task alone would require a tremendous sum of money when the possibilities are that these Indians will never recover anything from the United States of America.

The Supreme Court of the United States, within the past month, has found that a reservation created by Executive order is not a valid reservation. The only claim that these people have is under an Executive order setting aside some lands in the State of Oregon. If the Supreme Court follows the same rule it followed in the Sioux Indian case a short time ago, these Indians will lose their suits. But in the meantime, some people will have been employed to go all over that country and try to prepare a roll of these Indians.

The established policy of this Government, where there is something to divide, is that it is time enough to find out with whom to divide it after it is established what there is to divide. The sensible thing to do is to wait until they recover something from the United States Government before we attempt to find out who will be entitled to it.

I want to assure the membership of this House that if the gentleman from Iowa, Judge GILCHRIST, was on this floor today he would explain the constitutional and legal points that prompted him to take the position that we must make up no roll until this matter of an Executive order reservation is decided. You will be wasting years of time and a lot of Government money if you do it.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. As I understand, the gentleman's position is that the House should vote down this amendment and pass the bill as the committee reported it to the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The House should vote down this amendment and pass the bill exactly as the committee reported it and these people will have their day in court to see if they have any rights.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Why does the gentleman object to establishing the identity of the Indians who may have rights under this bill?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I object to wasting money until you know there is going to be something to divide.

Mr. WHITE. How can we tell now what there is going to be to divide?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The whole matter is a legal one based upon whether or not an Executive order reservation is any good in court. You must have a treaty or you must have an act of Congress to create an Indian reservation, and you do not have either of them in this case.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Recently I made a statement on the floor when this bill was called, read a letter from the Attorney General and said that I would support this bill as reported by the committee, and as drawn by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] and his colleagues, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST] and the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK]. I stand by that statement. I will support this jurisdictional bill as brought in by the committee, but I will not support the amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield in order that I may ask the gentleman a question?

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from New Mexico has the floor.

Mr. WHITE. But the gentleman from Missouri has made a statement on the floor that I would like to reply to. I will ask the gentleman from New Mexico this: If you include Indians like the Osceola band that had rights and allotments on other reservations in this bill, would not the gentleman amend it in that way?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. No.

Mr. WHITE. Why would you include them in this bill when they have already established their rights?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The subcommittee put them in there in the hope that all parties to the litigation would be in court, and it would not be necessary at a later date to go back and set that judgment aside on the ground that all parties were not formally represented.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am somewhat familiar with the Sioux case to which the gentleman has referred. I do not agree that that case applies here. The addition to the Sioux Reservation was created for the explicit and express purpose of controlling the liquor traffic. While I do not like the Supreme Court's holding in that case, yet in the reservation involved in this bill before us there is no necessary analogy. Both reservations were created by Executive order, but the Malheur was created for the express purpose of providing a home for some scattered Indians, and that is a far different situation from that in the Sioux case, where lands were added to control ports of entry along the river for the control of the liquor traffic.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman knows that I have tremendous respect for the gentleman's friendship for the Indians, and I can only say to him that an equally good friend has assured us that the conditions are parallel. The Sioux Indian case deals with a reservation set up by Executive order. Never mind for what purpose it was established. The President of the United States has no authority to cede away the public domain of the United States. That must be done by act of Congress.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman knows, of course, that many reservations were created by Executive order, probably more created by Executive order than by act of Congress?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I do not doubt that, but that does not happen to be the point. The point is that after they are created by Executive order, whether they are set aside for the purpose of determining the place where the Indians may establish their homes, or not, yet after that has been done, there then comes a treaty or an act of Congress, and that is what conveys the title.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. If we are going to make this an omnibus bill for all Indians, why were not my Indians in north Idaho included? They are entitled to come in, if we are going to make this an omnibus bill. If all are to be put in, let us put in the Indians in north Idaho also.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I simply want to say that it takes the time of the Supreme Court, and in a case of this nature the wise provision is to let everybody, who has a shadow of title, come in, just as you do when you sue to clear title on a piece of real estate. You recognize that in a suit to quiet title perhaps a hundred people named as defendants may have no interest in the title, but you must name them all to clear the title. That is what we are trying to do in this case.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] submitted what was referred to as an amendment to the committee amendment, but, as a matter of fact, did the gentleman not submit several amendments, and may they be voted upon separately?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] offered an amendment to the committee amendment which is now under consideration.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It seemed to me as I heard the amendment that it referred to different parts of the committee amendment. I was wondering if it could be separated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The committee amendment strikes out all after the enacting clause and includes a new draft.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. To get directly at the question involved, is it possible to have a separate vote on that portion of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho which provides for the establishment of a roll?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. It would be in order to have separate votes if separate votes should be demanded on each part of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would like to have a separate vote upon that portion of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho which calls for the establishment of a roll.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Oregon is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Would the gentleman from Oregon yield for me to make a short statement?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The reason for my asking for a separate vote on that portion of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho which deals with the establishment of a separate roll is simply this: It seemed to me that the balance of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] has considerable merit. But I believe there is also considerable merit in the argument offered by the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] that we should not authorize the expense of establishing a roll until it is determined whether there is some equity to distribute. If that could be separated from the balance of the White amendment, then the cost of a separate roll would be deferred until after the court has passed upon the question involved in the case.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation is to give the right to the Indians described in the bill and their descendants to come into court and establish their claims to certain lands which were set aside as a reservation to them in Oregon by Executive order a great many years ago. They have been trying for a great many years to have this opportunity to get into court. This bill gives them that right. There certainly could be no valid objection raised to allowing those Indians to come into court and establish their claims if they have any. The purpose of the amendments which have been offered by the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] is to limit the operation of this legislation to those Indians in Oregon who were interested and concerned in this particular land.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. In other words, the gentleman is opposed to the language in the amendment upon which the gentleman from South Dakota did not ask for a separate vote?

Mr. ANGELL. Well, I am not opposed to that language. I am simply saying this, that the purpose of this amendment was to limit the scope of the legislation so that it would apply only to those Indians who were directly concerned with this land, and not to throw it wide open and let all Indians, wherever they might be, come in. For instance, if it is decided that a certain sum of money is available to be allotted to the Indians who were, under the Executive order, entitled to the land originally, or their descendants, then every Tom, Dick, and Harry all over the United States may not come in with some trumped-up claim. I think it is quite essential that we should have a roll established. It is not going to be any great work to determine who these Indians are. The records of the Department of Indian Affairs show who these Indians were who were originally on the reservation. It limits the scope of the proposed act to those particular Indians who are interested, and not make a grab-bag out of it, after it is once determined that there is a certain amount of money to be distributed, and let every Indian, whether his ancestors had ever been in Oregon or not, come in and delay this legislation and delay the allotment of the funds for years.

I hope that you gentlemen will approve the amendments that have been offered and will pass the bill as amended, so that it will give these Oregon Indians—limited to the Oregon Indians—an opportunity to come into court and prove their claims. If they are unable to sub-

stantiate their claims and prove that they have a valid claim, then the court will decide against them. If they have valid claims they should be allowed to come into court and prove their claims.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Indians Affairs, this bill has been before us for 8 years. I know the history of it. Never until this bill did we include most of the Indians in the Northwest Territory. I am talking plain. I believe it has got to the point where a bunch of attorneys representing different Indians are running over each other, trying to get into this bill. I am sure if the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] understood that this limits it to this one band he would not have any objection to it. I am not going to say so much about that last amendment.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Does the gentleman feel that the fact it was limited to this one group for these 8 years has been the reason for the opposition?

Mr. GEHRMANN. The reason is that every Indian bill that has ever come up has been objected to until we made them conform to the requirement of the Department of Justice, or the Attorney General, which we have done now in this one. These amendments do not change the bill insofar as Department of Justice requirements are concerned; it simply limits it to this one tribe.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I agreed to support the bill as it came from the committee. Now they want to amend it on the floor without our having a chance to find out what the amendments do.

Mr. GEHRMANN. We are limiting its scope to this one group.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. As the bill was reported by the committee, it met the requirements of the Department of Justice.

Mr. GEHRMANN. This does not change it one iota.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. But this amendment has not been submitted to the Department of Justice to see whether it meets their requirements.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Certainly the Department of Justice would not have any objection to it. All this does is to limit it to one tribe. The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] has asked for a separate vote. We can vote on that one amendment—vote it out if we do not like it. The other five amendments are limitations and in no way change what the Attorney General wants.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. But why not pass the bill as reported by the committee? The Department of Justice endorsed it. Is not that right?

Mr. GEHRMANN. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Why amend it, then?

Mr. GEHRMANN. Because this limits it. Why not limit it? For instance, on page 5, line 17, this language appears after the phrase "Snake or Piute Indians", we add: "of the former Malheur Reservation." Why should the Department of Justice have any objection to that? I do not believe it would.

The next one is on page 5, line 21, where we strike out the word "departmental." Striking this word out simply leaves it then to "agreements, acts of Congress, or Executive orders." Are we going to give the Department the right to bind us? If the Executive order is not binding, how could a departmental order be binding upon the Congress? Certainly no one can object to that language.

By striking out section 2 we are simply shortening the bill and defining who may go into the Court of Claims under this legislation and restricting them. If we adopt the amendment, the language will read as follows:

> Any alleged band of Snake or Paiute Indians of the former Malheur Reservation in Oregon may prove themselves as such in the Court of Claims.

They may go into the Court of Claims. We leave it open for them. The only other amendment would be to strike out the limitation of 50. The bill is written so that a group of less than 50 cannot be proved. There may be 49, there may be 40 in one of these bands who ought to be entitled to the benefits of the bill, but without this amendment the language would exclude any but a large band of 50 or more, yet the others should have the right to go into the Court of Claims.

I say again that for 8 years this bill has been kicked around. When it has passed the House, it has not passed the Senate, or vice versa. We have amended it here so as not to include any others except this one group. I think we ought to stick to it.

If the gentleman or anybody else criticizes the bill because of this amendment which would permit them to take the roll within 2 years, I would not have any objection if it were not adopted; but I do not think there should be any objection to the other amendments.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. I yield.

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. In putting in such bands as the Osceola, does not the gentleman think the lawyers are imposing on the Congress and on the Indians? I certainly do.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] for 5 minutes.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, as the author of the bill, may I say just a few words? The matter has been discussed pretty well and is understood by the House. If I understand the recent Supreme Court decision, this bill may not mean much. The Court decision seems to hold that any reservation created by Executive order is in a different position from those created by act of Congress.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. If that is true, would it not be a good idea to throw it out before you get to the Supreme Court?

Mr. PIERCE. I believe there is enough uncertainty to justify the course proposed by this bill and that the Paiute Indians are entitled to their day in court. This bill has passed the Senate, and I would like to see it pass the House.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I may say to the House the gentleman has been extremely kind and helpful, and I commend him for it.

Mr. PIERCE. I repeat, the recent Court decisions may create a new situation, and the Indians should have the right to test it.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. As the author of the bill and in dealing with these Indians, does not the gentleman think we ought to know who the Indians are and have this roll call? Is not the gentleman favorable to that provision?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes. I think it should be limited to the Indians who were on the reservation at that time as determined by an enrollment. That is all that is intended in these first amendments that you have been kind enough to introduce, if I read them right.

Mr. WHITE. As the author of the bill, the gentleman approves all the amendments?

Mr. PIERCE. Yes; I would approve them. It then comes back nearer the original bill. There was a subcommittee of the Indian Affairs Committee that did a good deal of work on it. Our colleague from New Mexico was chairman of that subcommittee and presented what we are now voting on as an amendment. These amendments by the gentleman from Idaho carry it back toward the original bill that Senator MCNARY and myself introduced in the two Houses of Congress. I do not see any harm in the amendments offered by our colleague from Idaho. The matter has been before the Congress ever since I have been a Member of Congress and I would like to see it go to the Supreme Court and have the matter tested and settled.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Speaker, the reason for my interest in this bill attaches to the fact that the Supreme Court decision to which reference has been made is that concerning the Sioux Tribe of Indians against the United States. Because of my interest in that particular case I have been interested in the principle involved here, which is whether or not a reservation created by an Executive order can give to the Indians to whom it is given certain vested rights. I do not want the Congress to seem to give legislative sanction to an application of that decision far beyond the intent of the Court. To those of us who are interested in justice for the Indian, the decision goes plenty far enough in saying that Uncle Sam can change his mind and take back what he once said he was giving to Mr. Indian. It should not be extended without consideration of questions involved.

I have in my hand a copy of that decision of the Supreme Court in the October term of 1941 in which the Sioux Tribe was involved. The issue in that particular case was quite different from the one presented in the case of this Malheur Reservation.

In the case of the Sioux Indians they had a reservation which extended to the Missouri River. The whisky trade was operating at certain points of entry to that reservation. An Executive order was recommended and was issued to put lands on the east side of the river within the reservation boundary so that the Federal liquor laws operative on reservations would apply. This addition put the east bank of the river under the liquor laws and prevented river traders from bringing their wares up the river and selling them freely. Subsequently that addition was canceled by another Executive order, and the Sioux tribe endeavored to obtain compensation. The Court held against them.

Now, then, the statement has been made that that is a parallel case to this Malheur case. While I do not like the holding of the Supreme Court in the Sioux case, yet I would assert that there is a very great difference between that case and this Malheur case. In the Malheur case the reservation was created by Executive order for the express purpose of creating a home for some scattered Indians.

The distinguished gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] has pointed out that the Constitution confers upon Congress the power to dispose of territory belonging to the United States. That is correct, but in the Sioux case, to which reference has been made, the Supreme Court called attention to numerous decisions in which the practice of Executive withdrawals of the public domain had been recognized, and that—

> As long ago as 1830 Congress revealed its awareness of this practice and acquiesced in it. * * * Although the validity of these orders was occasionally questioned, doubts were quieted in *United States* v. *Midwest Oil Co.* * * * In that case it was squarely held that even in the absence of express statutory authorization, it lay within the power of the President to withdraw lands from the public domain. * * * The basis of the decision was that, so far as the power to withdraw public lands from sale is concerned, such a delegation could be spelled out from long continued congressional acquiescence in the Executive practice.

And now I quote a sentence from the Sioux decision which I think is very much at point in the Malheur matter before us:

> The answer to whether a similar delegation occurred with respect to the powers to convey a compensable interest in these lands to the Indians must be found in the available evidence of what consequences were thought by the Executive and Congress to flow from the establishment of Executive order reservations.

The consequence that was expected to flow in the case of the Sioux Tribe was an ability by the Government to cope with the liquor traffic. At least that is the holding of the court and there is language in the recommendations of the Indian agent to support that point of view.

The consequence that was expected to follow in the Malheur case was the creation of a home for certain Indians. There can be and is no question on that point when one reads the recommendations that led to the Executive order creating the reservation. I have read them but do not have them at hand, but they are all clear on this point.

Now, then, in a footnote to the last quoted sentence from the Sioux decision I read this:

> This question is an open one.

Hence, clearly the court has indicated that the Sioux decision was not intended to cover issues involving reservations created by Executive order for other purposes. The footnote to the decision goes on to cite a ruling by the Attorney General based on the case of United States against Midwest Oil Co. I read now the ruling as quoted in the footnote:

> Whether the President might legally abolish, in whole or in part, Indian reservations once created by him, has been seriously questioned, and not without strong reasons; for the Indian rights attach when the lands are set aside; and moreover the lands then at once become subject to allotment under the General Allotment Act. Nevertheless, the President has in fact, and in a number of instances, changed the boundaries of Executive order reservations by excluding land therefrom, and the question of his authority to do so has not apparently come before the courts.

So it seems clear to me that the Malheur Indians, for whom this reservation was set aside for them to live in, and who did acquire vested home rights, are entitled to have the value of those rights determined in court. It is not on all fours with the Sioux case, where the purpose was the exercise of police powers.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman's attention should be called to the fact that the order setting aside this land reads:

> That it shall be withdrawn as public land for the space of 18 months with a view of the selection of a reservation site upon which—

And so forth.

That is quite different from establishing an actual home. That took place under the treaty.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. But the actual creation of the reservation was by Executive order and not by act of Congress. I am glad to have the gentleman cite the first Executive order, but if that is going into the RECORD, we should put in all of the record, the recommendations and the several Executive orders that pertain to the creation of the Malheur Reservation. They are all based on the idea of creating a home for a small band of homeless Indians. I am sure that if the gentleman from New Mexico, who is known for his interest in the Indian people, were to read the Sioux decision in its entirety he would be the first to say that it does not cover the issues in this Malheur matter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] offers an amendment embracing five parts to the committee amendment. The gentleman from South Dakota has demanded a separate vote on the last or fifth part of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

Without objection, the first four parts of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho are agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the first four parts of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico) there were—ayes 23, noes 12.

So the first four parts of the amendment were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will now report part 5 of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Part 5 of the amendment offered by Mr. WHITE:
>
> "Insert section 8: That for the purpose of the distribution of the proceeds of such judgment the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed to make a proper roll of said Indians within 2 years from the date of the approval of this act. Each community of the Snake or Paiute Indians of the former Malheur Indian Reservation of Oregon shall prepare a roll of its membership, which roll shall be submitted to a council of the majority of their Indian chiefs who lived on the above said Indian reservation for its approval or disapproval. The said central council of these chiefs shall prepare a combined roll of all members and descendants of members of the respective communities of said Indians of the former Malheur Indian Reservation of Oregon and shall submit the same to the Secretary of the Interior for a final approval, which shall operate as final proof of such Indians to share in the benefits of this act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on part 5 of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Idaho.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WHITE) there were—ayes 11, noes 43.

So part 5 of the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment, as amended.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render final judgment on any and all claims of whatsoever nature the Snake or Paiute Indians, or any band thereof, may have against the United States, and for other purposes."

DEFINING MISCONDUCT, FOR COMPENSATION AND PENSION PURPOSES, AS LIMITED TO FELONIOUS MISCONDUCT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2226, to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I object to that request. There is no use delaying this matter indefinitely.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill liberalizes the basis on which a veteran may be eligible for disability compensation or pension caused by his own misconduct. It would permit him to receive compensation for a disability incurred by his own misconduct except when such misconduct constituted a felony.

When the bill was called up 2 weeks ago, I asked that it be passed over. The Veterans' Administration estimates that the annual cost for the first year will be at least $1,720,000. It has been the policy of those of us who have been watching these bills that no bill costing more than $1,000,000 shall be passed by unanimous consent. It was for that reason I had to object to the consideration of the bill the last time the calendar was called, and am forced to object to it again today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three objections are required to strike the bill from the calendar.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. KEAN. I object, Mr. Speaker.

MAKING TEMPORARY DISABILITY RATINGS OF WORLD WAR VETERANS PERMANENT AFTER 10 YEARS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6824, to make temporary disability ratings of World War veterans permanent after 10 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three objections are required to strike the bill from the calendar.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order. Only one objection has been made to the consideration of the bill, and three objections are required. If they are determined to block this legislation, let them say so. I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The regular order is demanded. Three objections are required. Is there further objection?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I reserved the right to object—and I intend to object if the gentleman insists upon the bill being considered on the calendar today—because I did want to point out certain things of interest to the House.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, that is not a parliamentary inquiry. I object to the gentleman's making a speech. He has said he is going to object to it. I demand the regular order.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I thought so.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two objections are heard. Is there a further objection?

Mr. COLE of New York. I object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three objections are heard. The bill is stricken from the calendar.

SUSPENDING STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS FOR FRAUDS AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6484, to suspend during the present war the running of statutes of limitations applicable to certain offenses.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the running of any existing statute of limitations applicable to offenses involving the defrauding or attempts to defraud the United States or any agency thereof, whether by conspiracy or not, and in any manner, and now indictable under any existing statutes, shall be suspended for the period of the present war and for 6 months thereafter. This act shall apply to acts, offenses, or transactions where the existing statute of limitations has not yet fully run, but it shall not apply to acts, offenses, or transactions which are already barred by the provisions of existing laws.

SEC. 2. That this act shall be in force and effect from and after the date of its passage.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, a year ago, I introduced H. R. 4916, a bill to suspend during the time of war or national emergency the running of any statute of limitations on prosecutions for Federal offenses.

This bill provided that, in computing for the purpose of any statute of limitations the period within which prosecution must be brought for an offense punishable under the laws of the United States, there should be excluded any period during which the United States is at war.

In other words, it would extend the statute of limitations 3 years beyond the termination of the war. It would include all offenses punishable under the laws of the United States.

The general statute of limitations on Federal offenses—18 U. S. C. 582—provides that prosecutions for any Federal offense must be begun within 3 years after the offense is committed. While during normal times this 3-year period gives to the Attorney General sufficient time to investigate, discover, and gather evidence to prosecute Federal offenses, it is not an adequate period in time of war or national emergency.

The Government is now embarked upon a huge program of national defense involving the expenditure of billions of dollars. It has become the largest purchaser of goods and services in the world today. It is inevitable that in the expenditure of such sums and in the varied dealing, which the Government now has with numerous persons, despite every precaution taken, opportunities will appear for unscrupulous persons to defraud the Government. Because of the very enormity of the program confronting the Government today, these frauds will in numerous instances go undiscovered or be discovered only after the statute of limitations has run.

The law-enforcing agencies of the Government are also confronted with new situations taxing their capacities to the utmost. Sabotage must be prevented, subversive activities must be discovered and rooted out, and numerous new laws made necessary by the emergency must be enforced, all in addition to their normal functions of law enforcement.

Under these circumstances, a 3-year statute of limitations on Federal offenses is inadequate. Complicated investigations may in many cases be necessary to unravel the details of business transactions resulting in a fraud upon the Government. Even if the fraud is discovered within a 3-year period, evidence sufficient to indict may not be unearthed until considerably later. Even offenses common in times when no emergency is in force may go unpunished because the law-enforcement agencies of the Government are too busy to make their routine investigations.

H. R. 4916 remedies this evil by suspending the running of the statute of limitations during any period of war or emergency. The provisions of H. R. 4916 are applicable to offenses heretofore committed as well as to offenses hereafter committed so long as prosecution is not now barred by the statute of limitations.

No doubt exists as to the power of Congress to enact this legislation. Shortly after the last World War, Congress discovered that because of circumstances very similar to those now in existence, a 3-year statute of limitations permitted numerous offenders to escape punishment. In order to preserve the right to prosecute wartime frauds to the fullest extent possible, Congress at that time extended the period of the statute of limitations on frauds against the United States from 3 to 6 years (42 Stat. 220). While a definite period of extension was possible at that time when the emergency had passed, it is impossible now to foresee the period for which the present emergency will endure and a fixed period is not feasible.

Immediate action would seem advisable upon H. R. 4916 in order to stop the running of the statute of limitations on crimes already committed. It will not be long before the statute will have run on crimes committed since the declaration by the President of the limited national emergency in 1939.

The present bill (H. R. 6484) limits the offenses to those involving the defrauding or attempt to defraud the United States or any agency thereof, whether by conspiracy or not, and in any

manner, and now indictable under any existing statutes.

May I suggest that the all-inclusive statement is more desirable at this time.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAYMENTS TO FARMERS FOR CROPS ACQUIRED UNDER NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6921, to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to authorize payments in cases where farmers' crops are acquired, prior to harvest, in connection with the acquisition of their farms for use in the national war effort, and to provide for the division of such payments.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 (e) of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, is hereby further amended by striking out the words "except that" in the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "or, in the event of acquisition of title to, or lease of, any farm for use in connection with the national war effort which caused the producers on such farms to lose, prior to the time of harvest, their interests in the crops planted thereon, or the proceeds thereof, payments with respect to such crops, to the extent that full compensation for the loss of payments with respect thereto in connection with such acquisition or lease was not made to such producers, shall be divided among the landlords, tenants, and sharecroppers on such farm in the proportion which it is determined that such producers would have been entitled to share in the proceeds of such crops but for such acquisition or lease: *Provided*, That."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OBLIGATION OF FUNDS OF THE COAST GUARD AT GOVERNMENT-OWNED ESTABLISHMENTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6949, to authorize the obligation of funds of the Coast Guard for work or material at Government-owned establishments, and for other purposes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire of the gentleman from Virginia if this bill is required because of the war construction program.

Mr. BLAND. Yes; and the bill makes applicable to the Coast Guard an identical provision with reference to the Navy.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is it only because of the war effort that this bill is necessary?

Mr. BLAND. So far as I know, it is. Ships come in late in June, possibly, needing repairs, and without this measure the work would have to stop. It is because of the war effort and the present necessity that the bill is reported, and, as I say, the language of this bill is identical with the language provided in the naval appropriation bill with respect to the Navy, of which the Coast Guard is now a part.

Mr. COLE of New York. I would point out to the gentleman that this bill is not limited to ship construction or ship repair, it affects all contracts of the Coast Guard for work or materials, regardless of their purpose. My thought is that if it is a war measure, should it not be limited to the duration of the war and not adopted as permanent policy?

Mr. BLAND. I know of no particular reason for that and the language is identical, as I have said, with the provisions which have gone into the naval appropriation bill.

Mr. COLE of New York. Let me ask the gentleman whether that provision affecting the Navy is a temporary or emergency provision or is it permanent policy?

Mr. BLAND. It is identical in language, and I should regard it as a temporary provision.

Mr. COLE of New York. But the language is contained in an appropriation act, is it not?

Mr. BLAND. Yes, that is true; but it is legislation and is not limited to the appropriations in the appropriations bill. This is necessary now because of the necessity of carrying on this work and not holding up until June 30 work that is necessarily going on and necessary for the repair of these vessels.

Mr. COLE of New York. Would the gentleman have any objection to this bill going over so that an amendment might be prepared limiting the measure to the duration of the war?

Mr. BLAND. I would much prefer not to do that, but if the gentleman wants it passed by, I think we can show him it is not intended to go further than a war proposition.

Mr. COLE of New York. Of course, I do not want to interfere with the Coast Guard and its efforts.

Mr. BLAND. We feel that may be the case unless we get the bill through. A similar bill has already passed the Senate and I am going to ask to substitute the Senate measure. If it had to go over for further consideration, it might not become law before June 30, and its particular importance is with respect to work that otherwise would be stopped on June 30.

Mr. COLE of New York. And in any event, it is definitely understood by the gentleman that this is a war measure and is intended to run only for the duration of the war.

Mr. BLAND. That is true.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute the similar Senate bill (S. 2453) for the House bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all orders or contracts for work or material, under authorization of law heretofore or hereafter placed with Government-owned establishments by the Coast Guard, shall be considered as obligations in the same manner as provided for similar orders or contracts placed with private contractors, and appropriations for such work or material shall remain available for payment therefor as in the case of orders or contracts placed with private contractors.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The similar House bill was laid on the table.

ADVANCEMENT OF CERTAIN RETIRED OFFICERS OF THE UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The Clerk called the next bill (H. R. 6950) to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Coast Guard.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute an identical Senate bill containing the committee amendment.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill (S. 2452), as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all officers of the Coast Guard and the Coast and Geodetic Survey who have been specially commended for their performance of duty in actual combat by the head of the executive department under whose jurisdiction such duty was performed, shall, upon retirement, be placed upon the retired list with the rank of the next higher grade and with three-fourths of the active-duty pay of the grade in which serving at the time of retirement

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The similar House bill was laid on the table.

COAST GUARD AUXILIARY AND RESERVE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7006), to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941 (Public, No. 8, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), as amended by section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1941 (Public, No. 166, 77th Cong., 1st sess.).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, and I do not intend to object, but I do think it important that the intent of the Congress and of the Coast Guard be made perfectly clear before we pass this legislation. I refer particularly to that part of the bill on page 3, line 16, after the words "Coast Guard," and the balance of the section. I understand that in passing this legislation, it is the intent of the Coast Guard to commission in the Coast Guard Reserve, subject to call only to temporary active duty, certain licensed officers of vessels on the Great Lakes, the purpose being to obviate the present necessity of carrying armed guards, Coast Guard enlisted men, on these vessels, for use only on active duty at certain times

and in certain restricted narrow waters of the Great Lakes. I should like to have the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] explain to the House, in order that there may be no misunderstanding on the part of commissioned officers on the Great Lakes of the intent of the Congress and the Coast Guard, as to whether it is the intention of the Congress in enacting this legislation to permit of their being assigned to any other duties than on the Great Lakes?

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman's inquiry, this bill goes further than officers in the matter of personnel for it permits enlisted men to be used also. Speaking on the bill generally there are certain conditions, as the gentleman knows, and which it is not necessary to enumerate here, which make the enactment of this bill very necessary now. Referring particularly to the inquiry as to the Great Lakes and in order to make clear the intention with reference to the Great Lakes, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a copy of a telegram from the Commandant of the Coast Guard headquarters issued to the district Coast Guard officer at Cleveland, in the Ninth Naval District. That telegram makes clear that, in connection with the enrollment of licensed officers, it is the intention of the headquarters that such officers will be temporary members of the Reserve, and as such they will serve on the Great Lakes only, and their services required only during the navigation season.

In order to clarify further the intent with respect to the Great Lakes, I shall ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD also a letter, which I have just shown the gentleman from Michigan, and which is from the Commandant of the Coast Guard headquarters to the commandant of the district Coast Guard in Chicago. That letter amplifies and emphasizes the intent of the bill to be that in granting these commissions and assigning duties in the Coast Guard, these men are accepted for temporary service in the Reserve, that the service is entirely voluntary, that the conditions and regulations upon which commissions are granted will be specified in writing, and that the terms of the appointments will be shown in the papers issued to the appointees.

The papers referred to are as follows:

APRIL 10, 1942.

DISTRICT COAST GUARD OFFICER,
Cleveland, Ninth Naval District:

In connection with enrollment licensed officers Great Lakes vessels it is headquarters intention that such officers will be appointed as temporary members Reserve and as such they will serve on Great Lakes only and their services required only during navigation season.

COMMANDANT, COAST GUARD HEADQUARTERS.

APRIL 15, 1942.

From: Commandant.
To: District Coast Guard Officer, Chicago, Ninth Naval District.
Subject: Induction of licensed officers of Great Lakes vessels into Coast Guard Reserve.

1. An amendment to the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941 has been proposed which will authorize the Commandant to enroll as temporary members of the Reserve, members of the Auxiliary, and such others as may be deemed qualified by their experience and training. Headquarters anticipates that the proposed amendment will shortly be introduced in the Congress as a bill and that its enactment into law will soon follow thereafter.

2. Under the authority of this amendment headquarters desires that the licensed officers employed on American vessels carrying bulk cargo and operating on the Great Lakes be inducted into the Reserve as temporary members in order that their services in connection with security measures on board ship may be utilized by the Coast Guard. The licensed officers enrolled on the Great Lakes for the above duty will serve on the Great Lakes only and their services will only be required on the vessels during the navigation season. It is not the intention of headquarters to transfer these temporary officers from one vessel to another.

3. The ranks of the personnel so inducted will, in general, depend on the age and experience of the man concerned and the capacity in which he is serving on board the vessel. The limiting rank for original appointment is lieutenant commander. In this connection headquarters feels that only the masters of vessels are eligible for that rank.

4. It is headquarters intention that reservists of this class be placed in an active-duty status, without pay, as may be necessary during a voyage. At other times they will be on inactive duty. Temporary reservists will be reimbursed for uniforms required. Instructions relative to status of temporary reservists and their duties will be set forth in a separate communication.

5. The district Coast Guard officer, Chicago, Ninth Naval District, will take immediate steps to procure the personnel indicated above. In order to expedite the induction of those recommended for appointment, investigations, physical examinations and written applications will not be required. The character and integrity of an applicant must be vouched for by a responsible official of a steamship company.

6. Submit to headquarters by letter the names and ranks of the licensed officers recommended by you for appointment. When the commissions have been signed they will be returned to you with the oath of office forms and instructions for the appointee.

7. When the proposed amendment to the Reserve Act has been approved you will be advised by dispatch and authorized to deliver the commissions and to administer the oaths of office.

R. R. WAESCHE.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I know it is the attitude of the vessel operators and also of the licensed personnel that they are wholly sympathetic with the aims of this measure. They appreciate that it is a voluntary measure, and it must also be appreciated by the gentleman—and I am sure he does appreciate it, as does the Commandant of the Coast Guard—that if we are to put this program into effect and secure the desired results, it must receive the 100-percent voluntary cooperation of these officers.

Mr. BLAND. That is true. Limitations similar to those applicable to the Great Lakes will be made with respect to other volunteers who come in. These limitations will deal with the particular conditions applicable on the Great Lakes, on the sea, or other areas where the appointees may serve. A very large number of persons who are qualified are offering their services, and they can be of great use on both the sea, on the Great Lakes, or wherever else they may be used in protecting against espionage and in reporting conditions that may aid in national defense. In the case of the Great Lakes, there are some officers over 64 years of age already serving on ships; and, under this bill, they may be accepted as members of the Coast Guard Reserve. These men are now actually serving on the boats that pass through the locks and other places which it is quite necessary to protect. The use of these men will relieve the enlisted men and others now in the Coast Guard to the number of from 4 to 10 per boat, or an average of 6, now assigned for duty on each of those Great Lakes freighters, who could be employed in other work. As the gentleman well knows, those men who would be commissioned and vested with the authority of the Coast Guard would do just as well, or probably better, work on these boats than would the enlisted men of the Coast Guard.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, for the purpose of clarification, I think the gentleman realizes that these officers on the Great Lakes, in accepting this service, do so with the understanding, of course, that the over-all war effort is not to be impeded by any possible further change in regulations, which may take them off of their vessels, transfer them to another vessel on the Great Lakes, or perhaps to ocean duty, during the navigation season.

Mr. BLAND. It is not intended that they shall be taken off of their boats or carried to the ocean.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I shall not object.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, in further explanation of the bill, its purposes in general terms are:

First. To liberalize appointments;

Second. To utilize the services of qualified persons in a part-time and intermittent capacity without pay or allowances and without cost to the Government;

Third. To make the Coast Guard Reserve and Auxiliary more flexible for defense purposes and more adaptable to war needs;

Fourth. To harmonize and coordinate the Coast Guard Reserve and Auxiliary with the Naval Reserve;

Fifth. To correct defects and omissions ascertained in actual operation; and

Sixth. To articulate the legislation with the necessities of warfare. There are six amendments to the existing law. The most outstanding is the amendment to section 207 of the Reserve Act, that is the fourth amendment. This is the amendment to which the previous discussion relates.

This amendment would permit the Coast Guard to utilize the services of temporary members of the Reserve on a part-time basis with or without compensation. The amendment removes the restrictions respecting the source of supply of temporary Reserve officers. Under the present provisions of the Reserve Act the Coast Guard is authorized to secure

temporary officers through the medium of the Coast Guard Auxiliary only. Under the proposed amendment the Coast Guard would be enabled to procure temporary Reserve officers from any source. The amendment would also remove the restrictions upon the nature and scope of the duties to be performed by temporary reservists.

The amendment will serve to save money for the Government, because there are many patriotic men who have indicated their willingness in some part-time capacity, without any compensation.

The amendment would also permit the commissioning of such specially qualified temporary Reserve officers as may have passed their sixty-fourth birthday.

The amendment would untie the hands of the Coast Guard respecting the procurement of temporary Reserve officers and the utilization of their services.

As stated in the Senate report, the amendment would permit the Coast Guard to utilize the services of temporary members of the Reserve on a part-time basis, with or without compensation, free from the present necessity of continuous enrollment and discharge coincident with the use of the temporary reservist's vessel. The amendment would permit, in many cases, the enrolling of Reserve officers of known ability who, under the present restrictions, are unable to accept commissions in the Coast Guard Reserve, and whose temporary services in sudden emergencies of a local nature will be invaluable. It also enlarges the field from which Reserve officers can be drawn by relaxing restrictions on membership in the auxiliary, on the use of auxiliary vessels, and on the crews that may man these vessels.

OTHER AMENDMENTS

Section 1: Section 8 of the act dispenses with the necessity to convene a board of three commissioned officers to determine responsibility for damage or loss of equipment incident to the operation of a motorboat or yacht of the auxiliary. Officers now should devote their time to more important duties, and each and every small loss or damage could not be investigated in that way without impairment of efficiency. This will be determined by regulations prescribed by the Commandant, and the same regulations governing regular Coast Guard vessels will be made effective; in other words the procedure now applicable to determine damages to regular Coast Guard vessels will apply also to auxiliary vessels. These regulations provide, briefly, that repairs of a more or less routine nature which are an incident of operation may be effected on the recommendation of an appropriate local Coast Guard officer; that repairs involving more than $500 cannot be undertaken without authorization of the Commandant; and that when serious damage occurs, the senior Coast Guard officer, if the circumstances in his opinion warrant, shall convene a board of investigation to ascertain the extent of the damage and fix responsibility therefor.

Section 2: Section 203 of act will change the highest rank in the Coast Guard Reserve from lieutenant commander to captain. Original appointments would remain below the rank of commander. It is now necessary to create ranks of commander and captain in the Reserve in order that the officers concerned will be vested with ranks commensurate with their duties and responsibilities. The ranks will be filled by promotion. Original appointments of commissioned officers in the Naval Reserve are likewise limited to ranks below commander.

Provision is also made in this amendment for the recognition of cadets of the Coast Guard Reserve.

Section 3—Section 206 of act: This makes the same provision relative to pay and allowances of the Coast Guard Reserve as already exists for midshipmen in the Naval Reserve.

Section 4—Section 207: Already discussed.

Section 5—Section 210: This would allow the Commandant to prescribe a lesser uniform allowance to each commissioned and warrant officer of the Reserve who may not be required to possess the complete uniform outfit of clothing, which is $250 and is based upon securing a complete outfit. The utilization of a number of temporary officers for special part-time duty without pay, and the plan contemplates a uniform outfit less expensive and less complete than that of the Regular officer. This would avoid any question about reimbursement for the full sum.

Section 6—Section 210: Further amendment so as to authorize the issuance to cadets of the Reserve for necessary items of uniform, bedding, and equipment. This is done by Navy to midshipmen and also done to aviation cadets.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to substitute an identical Senate bill, S. 2490, for the bill which was reported by the House committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941, approved February 19, 1941, (Public Law No. 8, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), as amended by section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1941 (Public Law No. 166, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), is hereby further amended as follows:

(1) Section 8. In the second sentence thereof, delete the words "upon investigation by a board of not less than three commissioned officers of the regular Coast Guard"; and insert after the word "determined", in the fifth full line of said second sentence, the words "under regulations prescribed by the Commandant", so that said second sentence as amended shall read as follows: "The term 'actual necessary expenses of operation', as used herein shall include fuel, oil, water, supplies, provisions, and any replacement or repair of equipment or any repair of the motorboat or yacht, where it is determined under regulations prescribed by the Commandant that responsibility for the loss or damage necessitating such replacement or repair of equipment or such repair of the motorboat or yacht rests with the Coast Guard."

(2) Section 203. Delete the entire section and substitute therefor the following:

"SEC. 203. The ranks, grades, and ratings, including cadets, in the Reserve shall be the various ranks, grades, and ratings not above captain, prescribed by law for the Coast Guard: *Provided*, That no officer shall be initially appointed in the Coast Guard Reserve in the grade or rank of captain or commander."

(3) Section 206. Delete the period at the end of the first sentence, insert in lieu thereof a semicolon, and add the words "pay and allowances of cadets of the Reserve shall under the same conditions, for the same purposes, and in the same manner, be assimilated to the pay and allowances of midshipmen of the Naval Reserve."

(4) Section 207. Delete the entire section and substitute therefor the following:

"SEC. 207. The Commandant, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury or of the Secretary of the Navy, while the Coast Guard is operating as a part of the Navy, is hereby authorized to enroll as temporary members of the Reserve, for duty under such conditions as he may prescribe, including but not limited to part-time and intermittent active duty with or without pay, and without regard to age, members of the auxiliary, such officers and members of the crew of any motorboat or yacht placed at the disposal of the Coast Guard, and such men who by reason of their special training and experience are deemed by the Commandant to be qualified for such duty, as are citizens of the United States or of its Territories or possessions, except the Philippine Islands, to define their powers and duties, and to confer upon them, appropriate to their qualifications and experience, the same ranks, grades, and ratings as are provided for the personnel of the regular Coast Guard Reserve. When performing active duty with pay, as herein authorized, temporary members of the Reserve shall be entitled to receive the pay and allowances of their respective ranks, grades, or ratings, as may be authorized for members of the regular Coast Guard Reserve."

(5) Section 210. (a) At the end of the first sentence change the period to a colon and add the following: "*And provided further*, That notwithstanding the foregoing provisions of this section, the Commandant may prescribe a lesser amount as a uniform allowance to such commissioned and warrant officers of the Reserve as are not required to purchase or have in their possession the complete outfit of uniform clothing which is prescribed for other commissioned and warrant officers of the Reserve."

(b) At the beginning of the second sentence insert the words "Cadets and" so that the second sentence, exclusive of provisos, shall read: "Cadets and enlisted men of the Reserve may be allowed the cost of, or issued such items of uniform, bedding, and equipment as may be prescribed by the Commandant:".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 7006) was laid on the table.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I have just made on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CITIZENS OF FOREIGN COUNTRIES, GRADUATES OF AIR CORPS, TO WEAR AVIATION BADGES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2103, to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, so as to authorize citizens of foreign countries who are graduates of Air Corps advanced flying schools and Air Corps service schools to wear aviation badges.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think this bill is all right, but I do think that the letter from the Secretary of War should be included as a part of the RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks by including therein a letter from the Secretary of War under date of December 4, 1941, in respect to this bill, addressed to the chairman of the Senate committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter is as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT,
Washington, December 4, 1941.

Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: There is enclosed herewith a draft of a bill to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, so as to authorize citizens of foreign countries who are graduates of the Air Corps advanced flying schools or Air Corps service schools to wear aviation badges of the Army.

For some time citizens of friendly foreign countries have been admitted as students in advanced flying schools and service schools of the Army Air Corps. China and the Latin-American Republics and various parts of the British Empire are among the countries whose citizens have graduated from these schools. Upon completion of their training they return to their own country to engage in military or civilian aviation.

Aeronautical ratings as pilot or observer are given to personnel of the Army of the United States upon graduation from these schools. Upon receiving these ratings, aviation badges are awarded to such personnel. The badge is a device consisting of a pair of wings of oxidized silver 3⅛ inches from tip to tip. The various types of pilot and observer ratings are identified by devices at the center of the wings. For example, the shield of the United States without stars in the chief, indicates a pilot; a combat observer has the letter "O" in the center of the wings. Aviation badges are worn on the left breast above the line of medals or service ribbons. They are part of the duly prescribed uniform of the United States Army and a visible indication that the wearer has received an aeronautical rating as a pilot or observer.

Section 125 of the National Defense Act provides that it shall be unlawful, for any person not an officer or enlisted man in the United States Army, to wear any distinctive part of the duly prescribed uniform of the United States Army. A fine, not exceeding $300 or 6 months in prison or both, is imposed for violation of the provisions of section 125. Various exceptions are set forth in the act to permit uniforms to be worn by such organizations as the Boy Scouts of America or for the cadet corps of institutes of learning.

It is desired to add to these exceptions, in order to permit graduates of Air Corps advanced flying schools or Air Corps service schools who are citizens of foreign countries, to wear the appropriate aviation badges in such manner and subject to such regulations as the Secretay of War may prescribe.

The reasons for desiring this legislation are as follows:

1. The aviation badge is the symbol of competency awarded to indicate satisfactory completion of a prescribed course of training conducted by the Army Air Corps. As such, it may appropriately be awarded to all who complete the course and are qualified for the rating of pilot or observer.

2. The awarding of the aviation badge to citizens of friendly foreign powers would have a material effect in creating good will toward the United States Army Air Corps among important civil and military aviation groups in the countries concerned. In general, foreign citizens taking the course are doing so because adequate facilities are not available to them at home. Upon returning to their own country their prestige as trained pilots or observers can be utilized to enhance the prestige of the Army Air Corps if they are permitted to wear the aviation badges of the Army. In this respect, the aviation badge is not unlike a decoration awarded to a citizen of a friendly foreign power.

Nothing in the act infringes in any way on the control by foreign countries of their own citizens. Each foreign country is free in its turn to regulate or even to prohibit the wearing of the badge by its citizens, just as the United States is fre to regulate and prohibit the wearing of foreign badges by members of its armed forces.

The purpose of authorizing the Secretary of War to prescribe regulations for the wearing of the badge is to restrict the authorized wearing to appropriate and dignified dress and proper occasion. The sole effect of the proposed legislation is to remove an existing prohibition which prevents the wearing of aviation badges in such manner and upon such occasions as the Secretary of War may prescribe. If the regulations should be violated, prosecution under section 125 of the National Defense Act would follow, just as at present the wearing of an aviation badge by any person not an officer or an enlisted man of the Army is in violation of the act.

Enactment of the bill would have no fiscal effects.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of this legislation for the consideration of the Congress.

The War Department accordingly recommends enactment of the proposed legislation.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, be, and the same is hereby, further amended by striking out the colon at the end of the first proviso and inserting in lieu thereof a semicolon followed by the words: "nor to prevent graduates of Air Corps advanced flying schools or Air Corps service schools who are citizens of foreign countries from wearing the appropriate aviation badges of the Army in such manner and subject to such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe:".

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROMOTIONS OF OFFICERS ON RETIRED LIST

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6081, to amend an act entitled "An act to promote on the retired list officers who were decorated and recommended for promotion for distinguished service during the World War and who have not attained the rank to which recommended," so as to confer on officers above the rank of brigadier general the same retirement privileges now enjoyed by other officers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so merely to say that while it is of minor importance, it seems to me it would be valuable to those who are interested in this subject. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks at this point by including the copy of the letter to the chairman of our committee from the Secretary of War.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The letter referred to is as follows:

Hon. ANDREW J. MAY,
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs, House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MAY: The War Department favors the enactment of H. R. 6081, a bill to amend an act entitled "An act to promote on the retired list officers who were decorated and recommended for promotion for distinguished service during the World War and who have not attained the rank to which recommended," so as to confer on officers above the rank of brigadier general the same retirement privileges now enjoyed by other officers.

The title of H. R. 6081 is in conflict with the body of the bill, since the title describes the bill as conferring "on officers above the rank of brigadier general the same retirement privileges now enjoyed by other officers," under the act of June 13, 1940, whereas the bill itself, by striking out the words "below the grade of brigadier general", in line 3 of the act of June 13, 1940, confers on officers holding the rank of brigadier general, or a higher rank, the same retirement privileges now enjoyed by officers below the grade of brigadier general. The War Department recommends that the title of H. R. 6081 be amended so as to substitute for lines 5 and 6 of the title the following words: "on any commissioned officer of the Army, the retirement privileges provided in the act of June 13, 1940 (Public, 614, 76th Cong.)." The suggested change in language will result in the employment, in the title of H. R. 6081, of the same general language as is used in lines 2 and 3 of the act of June 13, 1940, and will constitute an accurate description of the result which will be achieved by the proposed bill.

The proposed bill is an amendment to the act of June 13, 1940 (Public, 614, 76th Cong.), which provides in substance that any officer below the grade of brigadier general who is subsequently retired, except those who were retired under the section 24–b of the act of June 4, 1920, who for services rendered during the World War was officially recommended in writing for promotion to increased rank by a division commander or coordinate or higher authority or by the chief of staff, corps, or department, and who had not attained the said rank, and who as evidenced by bestowal of Medal of Honor or Distinguished Service Cross or Distinguished Service Medal rendered exceptionally meritorious services or demonstrated gallantry beyond the call of duty

shall, upon application, be advanced one grade on the retired list. The act of June 13, 1940, further provides that any such officer on the active or retired list who dies prior to the approval of the act or on the active list who may die before retirement shall, upon application in his behalf, be advanced one grade as of date of death; but that such promotion shall not carry with it any increase in pay or allowance.

The effect of the proposed bill will be to bestow on officers holding the rank of brigadier general, or a higher rank, the same retirement privileges now enjoyed by officers below the grade of brigadier general. Specifically, it will remove the discrimination against certain officers in the grade of brigadier general and major general, who, except for their rank, satisfy the requirements of the act of June 13, 1940. This result is accomplished by striking out the words "below the rank of brigadier general" in line 3 of that act. In short, all commissioned officers of the Army under the proposed bill, are for the purposes of the act of June 13, 1940, placed on the same footing.

The records of the War Department show that there are seven officers who would be eligible for promotion under the proposed bill. Their names are as follows: Maj. Gen. James G. Harbord, Brig. Gen. Joseph C. Castner, Brig. Gen. Harley B. Ferguson, Brig. Gen. William P. Jackson, Brig. Gen. George H. Jamerson, Brig. Gen. Julian P. Lindsey, and Brig. Gen. Paul A. Wolf. These officers are all retired and are not on active duty. They average 71 years in age. General Harbord, who is 75 years of age, is the oldest; and General Ferguson, who is 66 years of age, is the youngest.

The discrimination which the present law works against these distinguished officers should be removed.

The proposed bill will add no additional cost to the Government.

The War Department recommends that H. R. 6081, Seventy-seventh Congress, be enacted into law.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there would be no objection to the submission of this report.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,
Secretary of War.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, last Saturday we honored America's heroic dead. This afternoon in passing this bill we are given an opportunity to honor America's heroic living. The measure affects seven officers, one major general and six brigadiers, heroes of the A. E. F. in World War No. 1, who were recommended for promotion and decorated because of their distinguished service. It promotes them one grade on the retired list, and it costs not a cent to extend this deserved pat on the back to these grand old-timers who range in age from 66 to 76. There is no increase in pay or allowances.

The Seventy-sixth Congress provided this recognition for all A. E. F. officers recommended for promotion and decorated below the rank of brigadier general. The discrimination in law against this small group attracted the attention of the American Legion, which asked for correction. I was happy to sponsor the bill as a Legionnaire, and even more happy when the General of the Armies, John J. Pershing, wrote me of his hearty support, emphasizing his desire to see the "unjustified discrimination" removed. More than 30 American dailies gave prompt editorial approval, and the War Department's report is most favorable.

Soldiers of the armies, the new and the old, will approve our action today, and all America will join in salute to seven grand American heroes. May they be with us for many years to come, and may they always feel a grateful America never forgets.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to promote on the retired list officers who were decorated and recommended for promotion for distinguished service during the World War and who have not attained the rank to which recommended," approved June 13, 1940, be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking out the words "below the grade of brigadier general."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PHILIPPINE ARMY PAY BILL

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2387, to equalize the rates of pay of all personnel in the United States Army, the Navy, the Philippine Scouts, and the Philippine Commonwealth Army, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, not to oppose the bill but to secure some explanation.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice by the letter from the Secretary of War to the Speaker, dated March 19, 1941, that the cost of the proposed legislation as contained in the bill (S. 2387) will be $60,579,500. I may say that I believe the bill has merit and probably should be passed, but it should be passed after due consideration is given to the advisability of spending that much money for this purpose. A bill of this sort calling for this amount of appropriation, as has been frequently said, should not be passed by unanimous consent.

For that reason I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman withhold that request until I make a brief explanation of the matter and the reasons for it?

Mr. WOLCOTT. May I say I had intended to yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan yields to me. I want to address my remarks to the chairman of the committee. I am in favor of this bill, but I would like the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs to explain to the House how it is that we are doing something that the Philippine Legislature has control of? Does the bill also include the Philippine Constabulary? I would like an explanation of the bill. I am in favor of the Philippine Commonwealth Army getting recognition. I am very much in favor of doing something for the Philippine Commonwealth Army, and also for the Philippine Constabulary, but I want a full explanation. I think the letter of the Secretary of War should be incorporated in the record at this point in order that we may have some full explanation of it.

Mr. MAY. If the gentleman will permit, what is the use of my making an explanation now if the gentleman from Michigan proposes to object to it and have it go over?

Mr. STEFAN. I did not know that he was going to object to it. He did not say he would object.

Mr. MAY. That is what I understood his statement to be.

Mr. STEFAN. He said the bill had merit. He did not object.

Mr. MAY. I was in hopes that if I made an explanation possibly he would withdraw his objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Michigan yield to the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee to make an explanation to answer my request for information about the Philippine Constabulary?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I asked unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice. I had understood that the gentleman from Kentucky reserved the right to object and yielded to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MAY. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Nebraska was asking that I make an explanation of the reasons for the report of the bill, which I am prepared to do and will do, but what is the use of doing that, of encumbering the RECORD with it, if the gentleman from Michigan proposes to object after the explanation?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I did not say that I proposed to object; I have not got to that point yet. I hope the gentleman will not put me in the position of forcing me to object, because I believe the bill has some merit. I merely asked that the bill go over without prejudice. I hope the gentleman will make an explanation, as the gentleman from Nebraska asked, for I feel it will clarify some points of the bill for later consideration.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I will make this explanation of the matter with the hope that it will not be insisted that the bill go over without prejudice.

There was a difference, of course—a rather large difference—between the pay of the United States troops in the Philippines and the troops who are members of the Philippine Commonwealth Army. Some years ago, General MacArthur was sent to the Philippines for the purpose of training both the troops of the Philippine Commonwealth and the United States troops stationed there. He did train them all together, and they have been fighting together.

The very fact that there is a wide difference between the pay of the United States trooper and the Philippine Commonwealth Army trooper is being urged by Japan today all over India and Burma and in all the islands of the far Pacific as a basis and ground for their propaganda that the United States Gov-

ernment does not propose to treat the orientals in the same way we propose to treat others even if we win the war, and it is having a decidedly bad effect. For this reason, therefore, this legislation is imperative at this time in order to kill the propaganda machine of the Japanese Government.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I am sure the gentleman from Kentucky has gone into the matter very carefully. I agree with him, but why not take into consideration also the Philippine Constabulary troops, who participated in the defense of the Philippines equally with the members of the Philippine Commonwealth Army?

Mr. MAY. It includes all of them.

Mr. STEFAN. It does not include the Philippine Constabulary at all, it does not say so in the bill before us.

Mr. MAY. They are all included.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman talks about the Philippine Commonwealth Army, but he does not talk about the Philippine Constabulary at all.

Mr. MAY. It was included in it by an Executive order of the President after MacArthur took over all of them with the permission of the Philippine Government.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman tell the House and assure me that the Philippine Constabulary is included in the benefits of this legislation?

Mr. MAY. They are both included, the Philippine Commonwealth Army and the Philippine Constabulary, and all the American troops.

Mr. STEFAN. I am glad to know this. The heroism of many members of the Philippine Constabulary is well known and I am glad that they are being recognized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan that the bill be passed over without prejudice?

There was no objection.

OVERTIME PAY IN LIEU OF VACATIONS FOR CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES COVERED BY PUBLIC LAW 100, SEVENTY-SEVENTH CONGRESS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7020, amending Public Law No. 100, Seventy-seventh Congress (approved June 3, 1941).

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman from Kentucky inform us whether this bill in any way affects the question of overtime pay? Or is it limited to pay for annual leave which employees forego in an effort to help win the war?

Mr. MAY. It is confined to the annual leave that has been earned by certain necessary employees of the War Department who were privileged to take either 30, 60, or 90 days, whatever they had earned, and stay on the job and work and be paid their regular pay plus time and a half. It does not affect the regular pay schedule at all.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Or the overtime provisions?

Mr. MAY. Any overtime provisions merely extend the provisions of Public Law No. 100 for another 2 years.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 4 of Public Law No. 100, Seventy-seventh Congress (approved June 3, 1941), be amended by striking out therefrom "June 30, 1942" and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1944."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, in the colloquy between the gentleman from Michigan and myself I said that I would ask unanimous consent to insert certain papers. I do not know that that was stated at the time and consent received. I ask that consent now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks on H. R. 6081 passed this afternoon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD]?

There was no objection.

CONTINUANCE OF FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION

The Clerk called the next business, House Joint Resolution 311, continuing the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation as an agency of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice that the committee amendment strikes out the limitation in the bill that authority will "continue until Congress shall otherwise direct", and substitutes the date June 30, 1947, which is 5 years from now. That would extend the life of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for 5 years. It seems to me that we should protect this situation because perhaps 5 years from now the authority of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation might be in conflict with Congressional policy and we might have some difficulty to repeal the law. May I ask the gentleman why the committee intends to substitute the date June 30, 1947, for the language contained in the original bill?

Mr. FULMER. I may say that the committee, when we had this under consideration, felt that within the next 5 years, depending on the war, we would be in a better position to ascertain whether or not it would really be necessary to extend this Corporation for a further time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think we recognize that the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation has extended its activities somewhat beyond its original scope in the last few months, and it is perfectly all right that it should, of course. But this is a Delaware Corporation, a nonprofit, nonstock Corporation, over which the Congress exercises some jurisdiction, but has little or nothing to say in respect to its charter and its scope of activity.

My objection goes to the point that we confirm this Corporation. We do not freeze it at all in respect to its objective, but we do extend the life of the Corporation by legislative fiat to June 30, 1947. In the meantime the Corporation can amend its charter in any way it sees fit and the life of the Corporation is not affected thereby. If we should extend the life of the Corporation to June 30, 1947, I doubt whether the board of directors of the Corporation or the President by Executive order could limit the life of the Corporation to any date between now and June 30, 1947.

It seems to me there should be a date agreed upon, we will say 2 or 3 years from now, so that we can exercise more control over the activities of the Corporation without making it, in effect, permanent.

Mr. FULMER. May I say to the gentleman that for the duration of the emergency and extending after the close of the war the members of the committee thought that this Corporation was doing a splendid job, and definitely tied in with our war effort, and perhaps could be utilized after the close of the war if the war closed within the next 2 or even 3 years, and that it would be well to extend the time until 1947. In the meantime the Congress would have the right to cancel this by special legislation or give an additional extension at that time.

Mr. WOLCOTT. What is the life of the Corporation now?

Mr. FULMER. June 30.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It can be extended under the laws of Delaware?

Mr. FULMER. It expires on June 30.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It can be extended just the same as it was created, so we do not add anything to this Corporation excepting the confirmation of it by the Congress. We confirm this Corporation and make it an agency of the Government until June 30, 1947. They have the authority to set up this Corporation by Executive order. They have the authority to extend the life of the Corporation by Executive order. Now, what else is there in the bill other than confirmation of the order setting up the Corporation? In other words, by this action we confirm the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation. We have not taken congressional action directly in respect to the four corporations set up under 5 (b), the War Plants Corporation, Rubber Reserve Company, Metals Reserve Company, and one other that I have not in mind just now. We have not seen fit to take any direct legislative action in respect to those corporations. Why do we deem it necessary to take direct legislative action in respect to the Surplus Commodities Corporation, which, as the gentleman says, is doing a good job and should not be hampered, perhaps, by any further limitations by the Congress?

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman would be in a position to pass on that just as

well as I would. The bill proposes to extend this an unlimited time, inasmuch as the Corporation has been doing such splendid work not only in connection with the agricultural program but with our war effort. We have amended the bill so as to make it 5 years.

Mr. WOLCOTT. If the House does not act on this bill, are any of the activities of the Surplus Commodities Corporation going to be interfered with at all?

Mr. FULMER. I would not think so, except that they tell me that it will expire on the 30th of June.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The gentleman means that the life of the Corporation would be extended under this bill?

Mr. FULMER. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I think that perhaps we should look into this matter a little further. For that reason, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

CODIFYING TITLE I OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4280, to codify title I of the United States Code.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

NAVAL AIRCRAFT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7007, to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, in order that the House Committee on Naval Affairs may have a chance to pass on certain Senate amendments, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CERTAIN MINING CLAIMS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6295, to suspend the requirement for the performance of annual labor on certain mining claims.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to have somebody explain this bill. Some time ago we passed a bill suspending assessments on unpatented mining claims. The Senate passed the bill, and the President has signed it. It is now law. I do not understand the necessity for this bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this legislation has been covered by the O'Connor bill, I believe, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES TO ACCEPT CERTAIN DECORATIONS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2404, to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or the other American Republics.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs about this bill. I do not think there can possibly be any objection to section 1 of the bill. It was the same thing that was passed in the last war. Everybody wants it to go through now. Section 2, however, seems to provide for four medals to be given to members of the military forces of countries friendly to us and also to be given to persons in the military forces of this country, not for services in the face of danger or in face of the enemy. Does it not seem to be going pretty far to provide for four medals?

Mr. MAY. It is only four degrees of medals.

Mr. KEAN. That means four medals.

Mr. MAY. That is to correspond to four different ranks in the military service, to certain officers.

The gentleman understands that many of the countries of South America have tendered medals that are down here in the War Department awaiting authority to deliver them to General Marshall as Chief of Staff of the Army, and to other officers of lower rank who have served in those countries. The purpose of having four degrees of medals—probably the word should be "ranks"—is to enable them to give an appropriate medal to the Chief of Staff, a 4-star general, or to a brigadier general, or a major general.

Mr. KEAN. In other words, four medals.

Mr. MAY. That is right, four different medals.

Mr. KEAN. It is the same general idea as they have in France, where they have the Legion of Honor, First Class, the Legion of Honor, Second Class, the Legion of Honor, Third Class, and the Legion of Honor, Fourth Class. If one is only a small man he can get the lowest rank of medal, but if he is a great big man he gets the one with a rosette and everything of that kind.

Mr. MAY. That is exactly right, but if the gentleman will look at the report he will find that the committee struck out all of paragraph 2 of section 2, which related to the Medal for Merit, because in the view of the committee that was in the nature of cheapening the medals we were authorizing. There is nothing in this legislation that was not done during the other war.

Mr. KEAN. We have the power now to give the Distinguished Service Medal to anybody "in a duty of great responsibility." Is not that sufficient?

Mr. MAY. That is the Congressional Medal.

Mr. KEAN. No, not the Congressional Medal, the Distinguished Service Medal, which was given in the last war to various colonels, I believe, and others in positions of great responsibility. It is the same medal that was given to this boy in Hawaii who heard the planes coming and reported them, but to whose report nobody paid any attention.

It seems to me we are now able to take care of this matter. You know that in the last war some of these European countries were handing out these things in buckets. They would go to a colonel and say, "We have a dozen or two dozen or three dozen medals for your outfit"——

Mr. MAY. The gentleman would not want to give the same kind of medal to a four-star general that he would give to a brigadier general or a colonel.

Mr. KEAN. I would. Absolutely; yes.

Mr. MAY. For different service or different recognition?

Mr. KEAN. Absolutely. If a man has performed good service, I do not see any reason why he should get anything better simply because he has four stars on his shoulder. A private is just as good a man as a general.

Mr. MAY. Then the gentleman would be cheapening the medal to the extent that if a man performed some service infinitely inferior to what some other man has performed, they would all get identically the same thing?

Mr. KEAN. I would; yes. I would give them all identically the same thing. I would give the enlisted man the same thing I would give an officer, because there is no reason why a general should be considered of a superior class.

Mr. MAY. You would not give a man who captured an ordinary fishing boat the same thing you would give Colin Kelley for diving into a battleship?

Mr. KEAN. Certainly not; this medal has not anything to do with service while in danger. It refers to service to the country in general and not in face of the enemy.

Mr. MAY. I understand that.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

APPOINTMENT OF DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6702, to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern district of California in order to fill a vacancy in the office of an additional district judge heretofore authorized for such district.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill sets up a permanent judgeship. Heretofore we merely filled a vacancy, and I think perhaps we should give a little further consideration to the necessity for setting up a permanent judgeship in this district, and for that reason, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman give consideration to the report of the

judicial conference and to the opinion of Judge Wilbur?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have given consideration to the report of the judicial conference, but I do not always like to accept that without inviting a little discussion of the merits of the bill. I think, probably, if the gentleman will let this go over for a couple of weeks, we may be able to work it out to everyone's satisfaction.

Mr. HOBBS. The only reason in the world I am taking this time is to call attention to the fact that the senior district judge in this district and the senior presiding judge, Judge Wilbur, of the circuit court of appeals, both say that the need is urgent.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The bill was introduced on February 28 and was not reported out until May 25.

Mr. HOBBS. That is right. We were not able to get the facts and statistics assembled and the hearings held. As the gentleman knows, the chairman of this subcommittee, Hon. FRANCIS WALTER, went into the service of the Navy, and we have only recently taken over. However, we find a situation there which appears to be really important and critical so far as dispatch of judicial business is concerned. There is no question but that California has had its population increased about as much as any other State in the Union. The need for filling this vacancy is really acute, so Justice Wilbur and Justice St. Sure say, as does the administrative office of the courts.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not believe there would be any objection at all if it was made temporary. The only objection there might be to it is that this is to be a permanent judgeship.

Mr. HOBBS. That is right and because of the greatly augmented population in California and because of the increased volume of business, there is no question but that this district should now have four judges.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I wish the gentleman would give us an opportunity to look into the matter a little further and, probably, there would be no objection to it.

Mr. HOBBS. I voice the plea not for myself nor for any member of the committee nor for the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA], the author of the bill, but for Mr. Justice Wilbur and Mr. Justice St. Sure. They say that the need is very important and the Council of the Senior Circuit Judges O. K.'s that, and so does Mr. Chandler, the Director of the Administrative Office of the Courts. They say the need is vital and that there is not any question but that this vacancy should be filled as a necessary adjunct to their judiciary. As far as that is concerned, as the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN] has just suggested to me, there will, of course, have to be Senate action when you could advance any arguments contra, which would give you adequate time for consideration. But in view of the pleas which have come to us from these sources, we certainly would appreciate it if the gentleman would let the bill go through today.

Mr. WOLCOTT. The necessity is not so urgent that it cannot go over for 2 weeks so we may have a little time to look into the bill further.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]?

There was no objection.

PICTURE IN THE CAUCUS ROOM

The SPEAKER. A picture is to be exhibited in the caucus room of the House Office Building this afternoon at 3:30 o'clock. It takes about 20 minutes to view it. The picture will be held on view until 6 o'clock.

PIPE LINE AND BARGE CANAL ACROSS FLORIDA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6999), to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipe line and a navigable barge channel across Florida, the construction of an inland route from the western terminus of this channel to the present eastern terminus of the Intracoastal Waterway and by deepening and enlarging the Intracoastal Waterway from its present eastern terminus to the vicinity of the Mexican border, as amended, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in order to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment, there is hereby authorized to be constructed under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers a barge canal 12 feet deep and 125 feet wide from the existing channel of similar dimensions in the St. Johns River of Florida across Florida to the vicinity of the Gulf of Mexico, and from the western terminus of this canal across Florida, a canal of similar dimensions within the coast line of Florida to the present eastern terminus of the Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Apalachee Bay; and that there is also authorized the enlargement of the present Intracoastal Waterway from the vicinity of Apalachee Bay to Corpus Christi, Tex., and its extension to the vicinity of the Mexican border so as to provide throughout the entire length of the canal a channel 12 feet deep and 125 feet wide: *Provided*, That between Mobile, Ala., and New Orleans, La., the project shall be modified in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 27, 1942: *Provided further*, That the Chief of Engineers is authorized within reasonable limits to vary, in his discretion, the above-prescribed dimensions wherever advisable: *And provided further*, That pending the completion of the aforesaid navigable channels there is authorized to be constructed under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers a pipe line, together with all necessary terminal facilities, for the transportation of petroleum from the vicinity of Port St. Joe to the vicinity of Jacksonville, Fla. For the above purposes there is hereby authorized $144,000,000.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] is entitled to 20 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 61]

Baldwin	Haines	Pearson
Bates, Mass.	Hall,	Pfeifer,
Beam	Leonard W.	Joseph L.
Bishop	Harrington	Plauché
Boehne	Harris, Va.	Plumley
Bolton	Hart	Reece, Tenn.
Bonner	Harter	Rich
Bradley, Pa.	Heffernan	Richards
Bryson	Heidinger	Rivers
Buckler, Minn.	Howell	Robertson,
Burdick	Jacobsen	N. Dak.
Burgin	Jarman	Rockefeller
Butler	Jarrett	Rogers, Mass.
Byrne	Jennings	Sasscer
Byron	Johns	Satterfield
Camp	Johnson, Ind.	Scanlon
Capozzoli	Johnson,	Schaefer, Ill.
Chapman	Lyndon B.	Schuetz
Clark	Jones	Scott
Cluett	Kelley, Pa.	Scrugham
Cole, Md.	Kerr	Shannon
Crowther	Kocialkowski	Sheppard
Culkin	Kramer	Smith, Pa.
Cullen	Kunkel	Smith, W. Va.
Dewey	Lane	Smith, Wis.
Dies	Leavy	Starnes, Ala.
Ditter	Lesinski	Stearns, N. H.
Downs	McGregor	Sumner, Ill.
Durham	McIntyre	Sweeney
Eaton	McMillan	Terry
Edmiston	Maciejewski	Thom
Eliot, Mass.	Maciora	Thomas, N. J.
Ellis	Magnuson	Tinkham
Elston	Martin, Mass.	Treadway
Faddis	Mitchell	Vorys, Ohio
Fellows	Mundt	Vreeland
Fitzgerald	Myers, Pa.	Wadsworth
Ford, Leland M.	Nichols	Walter
Ford, Miss.	O'Brien, Mich.	Weaver
Gifford	O'Day	Weiss
Gilchrist	Osmers	Welch
Granger	Paddock	Winter
Gwynne	Patrick	Worley

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and five Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the bill before us at this time is for enlarging the present intracoastal canal from a point near the Mexican border to a point in Florida near Port St. Joe, Fla. It is now 9 feet deep, 100 feet wide, with the exception that from Corpus Christi to the Mexican border the canal has never been constructed, although a favorable report is made upon it by the engineers of the War Department, and it is embraced in the omnibus river and harbor bill, which is upon the calendar, but which is not now under consideration. This bill extends it on down to the Mexican border and enlarges the whole of it

to 125 feet in width, and 12 feet in depth, which will correspond with the intracoastal canal of the Atlantic seashore from Jacksonville to Norfolk, Va. From Norfolk up to Trenton, N. J., we now have a ship channel through Chesapeake Bay and Delaware Bay and the Delaware River, and the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal connecting the Chesapeake Bay with Delaware Bay, all of which is 30 to 35 feet in depth, and provision in the pending river and harbor bill enlarges Delaware River Channel to 40 feet in depth up to Philadelphia.

The proposal here is to put a pipe line across Florida for immediate construction. That pipe line is estimated to cost, by different people, from $3,700,000 up to $10,000,000. The $10,000,000 estimate was made by the Chief of Engineers on the basis that it would be a pipe line, a steel line, 24 inches in diameter. No pipe of that kind is now being made in the United States. No pipe line of that type has ever been put into operation for the movement of oil. The largest oil pipe in the United States is 16 inches, and there are very few miles of that in operation. Twenty-four-inch pipe lines formerly were made for gas. However, it is believed that it would be practical for oil, but it is impossible to get that type of pipe now. It would have to be made out of new steel, and Donald Nelson has already on two different occasions turned down allocations for it. I am strongly in favor of it, if it can be done consistent with the war effort. The line we propose to put across Florida under the provisions of this bill will consist of pipe now in the State in which I live—Texas—second-hand pipe, to be taken up. It is not of importance there at the present time, and several hundred miles of it are available. The chairman of the State railway commission, Colonel Thompson, who is now in the gallery, so informs me. They can enter an order for that pipe to be taken up and transferred over to Florida. What we are endeavoring to do is to get at least three lines of pipe to be laid in the same trench.

If we can get three 10-inch pipes across Florida, it will furnish practically 200,000 barrels of oil or gasoline daily to the East. You all know what the serious difficulties have been on the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Ocean. The papers today state that 227 ships have been sunk by submarines up to date. The vast majority of those ships have been tankers on the Atlantic Ocean, bringing oil and gasoline up to the East. That line of service is out of the picture entirely. Even if there were not a submarine menace, since the oil production of the South Pacific has fallen into the hands of the enemy, our gasoline supplying the Army and the Navy overseas has to be conveyed eight or ten thousand miles across the seas. Even if there were no submarine menace here, it is not possible for tankers to be allocated to this line of work because they all have to be put into the foreign service.

The enlargement of the canal from Florida to the Mexican coast has already been recommended by the engineers. Nearly all of it was embraced in the pending rivers and harbors bill reported last November. One section of it was reported only recently—a few weeks ago—since we have passed the order reporting this bill. That involves a slight change of route in the section between Mobile and New Orleans running south of Lake Pontchartrain, where 7 miles have already been dredged by the Maritime Commission. It leaves about 7 or 8 miles more to be dredged to connect it up with the entire channel.

Now, if this bill is passed and this channel is put across there to connect the Atlantic and the Gulf canals, which I am advised have cost more than $200,000,000, we will then have a continuous channel—all 12 feet or more deep, all 125 or more feet wide, for 2,400 miles. It would be of tremendous importance in our war program at this time. It would bring all the oil and gasoline that could possibly be used to the East; 1,600,000 barrels a day is the normal consumption on the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the Speaker of Congress.

Mr. RAYBURN. Realizing the serious situation with reference to oil, not only for national defense but also for the defense of the homes of the people in the North and East, and especially in New England, can the gentleman imagine any act that Congress could pass that would be more in the interest of national defense at this time than the passage of this bill?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no other proposal that has been made that is half as practical as this, in my judgment, and no other proposal that can put gasoline to the East in 90 or 120 days, but this one, and this one will do it.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Is it not a fact that this canal will require 3 years to construct, and is it not a further fact that the pipe line can be constructed in 3 months, and needs no additional legislation in order to have that pipe line constructed?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentleman is misinformed in regard to the intent and purport of existing law.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. We are operating under suspension of the rules. There are only 20 minutes for debate on a side. Would it be in order for me to ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Texas, who is the one man who understands this bill, be extended for 15 minutes, in order that he may explain to the House the many things the House wants to know about the bill?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The House can do anything it pleases by unanimous consent.

Mr. MICHENER. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the chairman on Rivers and Harbors be extended for 15 minutes in order that the House may be advised as to what he knows about the necessity for the building of this canal across Florida, in addition to the pipe line. I mean the immediate war necessity of the canal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, a rule has been granted by the Rules Committee for the consideration of this bill, and it could have been brought up here under that rule, where we would have had an opportunity for liberal debate. That course was not followed. The bill was brought up under suspension of the rules. If we are going to take it up under suspension of the rules we ought to adhere to that procedure, and if the time is going to be liberalized it should be extended to Members on both sides of the aisle. I have numerous requests for additional time that I cannot grant. Unless I can grant these requests for additional time on this side, I shall be constrained to object to the request.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not think the gentleman from California should be put in the position of objecting. I think the gentleman's position is sound. The request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] was unexpected, and I think the gentleman from Michigan should withdraw his request, because if the time of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] is extended 15 minutes, it is only fair that 15 minutes additional should be given the other side.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I modify my request that 15 additional minutes be granted each side.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will assume the responsibility of objecting. We will go ahead under the 20-minute limitation of the rule.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not want to place the majority leader in that position. If the gentleman will permit, I think there is a lot of misunderstanding here over this bill, and that if it can be explained as the chairman of this committee explained it to the Rules Committee, there would be a different opinion about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Nobody misunderstands the intent of the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. If it is necessary as a war measure, I am going to vote for it, regardless of my opposition to the Florida Canal.

Mr. McCORMACK. One thing is certain; I will assume my responsibility. I am not going to have the gentleman from California assume that responsibility. The gentleman from Texas has 13 minutes remaining. If he wants to use some more of it, I am sure he can explain the bill to the satisfaction of the Members.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If every Member of the House had heard the Army engineers themselves explain it before

the committee, there would be no misunderstanding.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I have the floor under a reservation of objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the regular order is demanded. I withdraw my request if it is going to cause all this trouble.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman from California yield some of his time.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, if oil is taken out of this bill there is nothing left of national defense value in it.

I am opposed to this bill in the interest of national defense, even though the bill in its preamble states that it is to move promptly war materials for national defense. There is no need for this House to pass any legislation granting authority to the administration or the President to build pipe lines; that authority was granted July 30, 1941, and the President now has complete, ample, and adequate authority to build pipe lines anywhere in the United States as long as it is connected with national defense. That statute has been on the books for 10 months.

I quote briefly from the act, being Public Law 197, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session:

SEC. 2. Whenever the President finds that the construction of any pipe line for the transportation and/or distribution of petroleum or petroleum products moving in interstate commerce, or the extension or completion of any such pipe line already wholly or partly constructed, is or may be necessary for national-defense purposes, he shall by proclamation declare such finding.

SEC. 4. (a) In the event that it is impracticable for any private person promptly and satisfactorily to construct, extend, or complete any such pipe line, the President, if of the opinion that such action is desirable in the interests of national defense, may provide for the construction, extension, completion, or operation of such pipe line by such department or agency of the Government as he may designate.

Therefore there is no necessity nor reason for coming to Congress asking for authority to build pipe lines across the State of Florida as proposed in this bill before us today. This being true, and oil being eliminated from this bill, nothing remains except the proposal to build the Florida barge canal which General Reybold, the Chief of Army Engineers, has said to this committee would take from 16 months to 3 years to complete. In the face of that testimony you are asked to commit this Government to a program costing $144,000,000, taking the finances of the country, machinery, materials, and manpower to build a barge canal that will take 3 years to complete, when time is of the essence in the face of a war going on.

There is not a Member in this House who is against building these pipe lines; I am for it. I am satisfied that every Democrat and every Republican is for it; no one is against it. We know the emergency and the need for it; it should therefore be done immediately. I hope the President will act quickly. Every Member of this House is eager to do everything necessary to win this war, but let us be careful that we do not do the wrong thing in our eagerness. Maj. J. R. Parten, Director of the Transportation Division in the Office of Petroleum Coordinator, a practical oil man with many years' experience, testified that in his opinion and the opinion of all the authorities in the oil industry, the quickest way to solve the problem of providing oil to the Atlantic seaboard was by the pipeline method.

This being true there is no need of wasting the time of Congress to pass additional legislation on a subject over which the President already has authority to act.

What is behind this barge canal proposition? Perhaps there might be some merit to the plan in normal times, to connect the Atlantic and Gulf intercoastal waterways by barge canal across the State of Florida. I hold in my hand a copy of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for March 31, 1942, in which a distinguished Senator from the State of Florida, in the Senate, told the country about this barge canal—and I quote him from page 3248 of the RECORD:

That—

Referring to the barge canal—

obviously I think will be found to be the first stage in the construction of the Florida ship canal.

The dictionary defines "obvious" as "immediately evident without further reasoning or investigation."

Taking the Senator at his word, then we are to understand that this proposal to build a barge canal across the State of Florida is but the entering wedge for the building of the heretofore defeated Florida ship canal.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I have only 4 minutes; I must decline to yield.

In the face of that record and the urgent need for immediate solution of transportation of oil to the Atlantic seaboard, should we commit the country at this time, when finances are needed so badly for extreme war purposes, to the building of a barge canal that cannot possibly be ready for 3 years? It would not bring any oil to New England or to the Atlantic seacoast in time to prevent distress and suffering or supply our war needs in that area. We could use the money that would be expended for the building of this barge canal to build pipe lines and provide a solution of this problem.

This bill is here today because of the submarine menace in the Atlantic and the loss of tankers used in the transportation of oil along the eastern seaboard. It has caused a situation in all the New England States that calls for an immediate solution, but the solution is not to be found in the building of a barge canal across the State of Florida, but through the use of pipe lines and other facilities now available. I propose, therefore, to vote against this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself particularly to the very gracious, genial chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD]. I am a little bit confused about this bill. It provides $144,000,000 for the construction of this so-called barge canal and for the pipe line.

It is rather interesting to note that on the 25th of May, which is only a few days ago, the majority leader had printed as House Document No. 737 a letter by General Reybold, Chief of Engineers, addressed to Mr. Joseph B. Eastman, Director of Defense Transportation, and I have a copy of it here. It is available to anybody who wants to go to the Document Room for it. They considered this matter of oil and transportation to the eastern coast for a long time and finally this report came out.

They suggested three alternative plans for meeting this transportation problem to the eastern coast. One is to go up the Mississippi, and they will use that route, using towboats and barges to transport about 150,000 barrels per day. Secondly, there is the use of the intercoastal waterway from a point down in Mexico all the way across here to Florida, then a pipe line across Florida, and using the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway. The third plan is a variation of that plan and involves the use of medium-sized tankers running close to the coast in the Gulf of Mexico to Florida, then the pipe line, then the Intracoastal Waterway.

I notice their estimate was a little over $14,000,000 for barges, $24,000,000 for towboats, and $9,500,000 for a pipe line, total $48,550,000, to supply a minimum of 1,300,000 barrels of oil a day, including, of course, the pipe line and tank cars.

In the light of this report that comes from General Reybold, I am frank to confess that I shall do everything for victory, I shall do everything for the convenience of the public on the Atlantic seaboard, but I cannot see how we would be justified in spending $144,000,000 when the Chief of Engineers states in this document filed by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the majority leader, that it could probably be contrived with an expenditure of $46,000,000. Certainly I cannot justify that kind of an expense, involving $100,000,000 over and above what is proposed in this measure unless there is some genuine justification for it. Until that time I would be disposed, of course, to vote against suspension of the rule.

Finally, we do not lose our right to consider it under the rule reported by the committee. There will be 2 hours of debate; there will be the possibility of amending the bill and having a division on these two propositions. Let the House determine whether one or both should be approved.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The document the gentleman spoke of is for across Florida.

This proposition runs to the Mexican border.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This does, too. This provides for the use of that canal all the way down here.

Mr. MANSFIELD. My bill provides for the enlarging of it so that it can handle this increased traffic. We had 25,000,000 tons last year, and with this channel across Florida that will be doubled. The channel ought to be enlarged.

Mr. DIRKSEN. This proposal is for deepening it and widening it and carrying it on just like the gentleman would do under his bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I sat for a week in the hearings on this matter and I am satisfied in my own mind that there is plenty of gasoline in this country for everybody, and that we can get it to the Atlantic coast if we build a pipe line across Florida. That is all that is necessary at the present time.

I do not know whether the Members of the House know it or not, but there is another canal across Florida at the present time. There is also a division of the people down in Florida as to whether they want any additional canal across there or not. Southern Florida does not want any, northern Florida does. They have one canal across there now by which they are taking gasoline and other products.

If the suspension of the rules is voted down, I expect to offer an amendment here to build this pipe line at once, which the President of the United States has the power to do now if he wants to do it under Public Law No. 197. There is no question about that. The language is still there and it was stated in the committee that the Attorney General of the United States has so stated. I do not think there is any question if you understand the English language but what that is true.

If this proposition is voted down, then I want to offer an amendment here so that we may build this pipe line across Florida and give the President of the United States, if he feels that it is absolutely necessary for the national defense of this country, the power by Executive order to order this canal built across there; but there is not any more reason for having a canal built across there now than to build one from Lake Superior to the Gulf of Mexico, as somebody wrote me.

What the House should do is to vote down the suspension of the rules, give us an opportunity to debate this and present to you the testimony that came before this committee, and then we will know more about the whole matter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it seems unfortunate that in these trying days, with the realistic facts that confront us, an important project of this kind meets the type of opposition that has been advanced in this debate.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] made reference to a letter sent by General Reybold to Mr. Eastman, a letter which I had printed as a House document for the information of the Members. General Reybold's recommendation was to meet an immediate situation, but the long-range recommendation was along the lines recommended by the committee and before the House today.

There is no question but that there is a very acute situation existing in 17 States of the Union along the east coast. Along that coast are located not only the homes of individuals who are going to suffer keenly next winter, but very important businesses in connection with the national defense.

The bill reported out of the committee meets the immediate situation, and it is also a part of a long-range program that will be operative if the war is over quickly, and certainly will be very important if we are engaged in a long war. Any man who predicts a short war, as we view world conditions today, certainly is a courageous individual. I would not want to undertake to predict that the conflict in which we are now engaged will be of short duration, much as I hope and pray that it will be, with a quick collapse of the morale of the people of Nazi Germany.

This bill is of vital importance. It is of paramount importance. The pipe line is to meet the immediate situation, but the barge canal is also a part of the immediate situation. Who can say that the war will not be continuing more than 2 years?

General Reybold stated, as I recall, that it will take about 16 months to build the barge line. I predict that in view of the manner in which our contractors are operating in these days it would take a considerably shorter period to complete the barge canal across Florida. I have in mind the case of a friend of mine who, several months ago, was given a contract by the Navy Department to build a pier in the Boston Navy Yard for the purpose of constructing several destroyers at a time. He was given 18 months in which to complete the work. This work is being completed in a little over 6 months.

This project is of vital importance. We are confronted with a situation that requires us to think along realistic lines. This is a matter of extreme importance to the entire country. The transportation of fuel oil, bunker oil, and gasoline to the Atlantic coast is of paramount importance. It seems to me we should not permit the argument of cost at this particular time, when everybody admits that some day this will be necessary, to interfere with the passage of this bill today.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. There is one thing I wish to call to the attention of the Members of the House. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] made the statement that the junior Senator from the State of Florida has stated that this would be an opening wedge for the ship canal. The gentleman knows just as well as I do and as well as every Member does that not one inch can be added to this canal until it is authorized by the lower House, and there is no use to bring that in to cloud the issue.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. One gentleman said that they could go down and go through that 6-foot canal way down on the peninsula of Florida. It is impossible to carry oil in a barge down to that point. You might as well just not do anything.

Again, this pipe line will not do the work. It would take at least twenty 12-inch pipe lines to carry the amount of oil that will be necessary on the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. McCORMACK. In conclusion, this is a very serious proposition and a matter of extreme concern to the country. This legislation is of vital importance. I hope the motion to suspend the rules will prevail.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, there has been called to the attention of the House the report recently filed by General Reybold, the Chief of Engineers. A careful analysis of that report does not show any recommendation for the barge line across the State of Florida. He recommends three things:

(a) A more extensive use of the route, by barge, over the Gulf-Intracoastal Waterway, Mississippi River, Ohio River, to Pittsburgh, thence by existing facilities to the New York-Philadelphia area.

(b) and (c) are practically the same, by barge over the Gulf-Intracoastal Waterway to Florida, thence by pipe line, to be constructed, across Florida, thence by the Atlantic Intracoastal Waterway by barge.

Then the estimated cost of that is set forth. I believe the gentleman from Illinois brought out those estimates. The total cost of that is only $48,515,000.

There has been called to your attention the canal further south, the Okeechobee-Caloosahatchee Canal. A deepening of that canal by 8 feet has already been recommended. I do not want to put myself in the position of advocating that just because it is in my district, but it is an existing waterway that can be used and is to some extent being used at the present time with practically no expenditure of funds.

The main thing is this: The pipe line gets you immediate results. The testimony shows that in about 90 days this pipe line can be constructed. From 18 months to 3 years would be taken to construct the canal.

I have no objection to the construction of the pipe line. I deplore the fact that they tied the canal in with the pipe line. As a matter of fact, if they had not tied in this canal with the pipe line this particular committee would not have had jurisdiction of the bill, and it would have gone to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce; so they tried to tie

the canal in to get jurisdiction of the pipe line, a pipe line which is needed.

I yield in my patriotism to no man in this House. I supported the preparedness proposals; I advocated the building of fast tankers and merchant ships years ago. I am as anxious as anyone to have oil and gas brought into the East. I have hung around the Maritime Commission advocating the use of barges and inland waters. Existing waterways can be used to great advantage.

There is no use in bringing up in this House today a bill authorizing the expenditure of $144,000,000 and considering it under a suspension of the rules and tying in controversial matters just because a pipe line is needed. The pipe line can and will be built. It does not necessarily require legislation to build a pipe line. Even if the barge canal were feasible, then every effort must be made to safeguard the State from the dangers to the water supply. Time will not permit me to discuss this in detail, but we certainly ought to have the right to amend to protect the water supply and to provide for the necessary bridges.

I hope you will vote down this motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, this measure comes before you without the approval of the War Production Board or of the Bureau of the Budget. Ten months ago we authorized the President to construct additional pipe lines. No additional legislation is necessary for the construction of these pipe lines. This is a sugar-coating for the Florida ship canal, so offensive to so many Members of this House. As a matter of fact, the Miami Herald only last week had this to say:

> The barge route follows the line of the proposed big ditch. It has one purpose. Construct a little ditch now under the guise of war effort and it will be a push-over to expand it to the big canal when the battle is over.

Here is a telegram from the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence group urging the Congress today to vote to suspend the rules for this sister project, the Florida ship canal.

We are not against the widening of the waterway in Texas; we are for that. We are for the construction of the pipe line, and that is all you need. This barge canal is the entering wedge. They are asking us to spend $144,000,000 for a nondefense project. The Miami Herald, in a recent issue, said:

SCREEN FOR BIG DITCH

> The House Rules Committee has ordered to debate a bill authorizing expenditure of $144,000,000 for construction of a pipe line and barge canal across Florida to connect inland waterways for movement of petroleum products from the Southwest to the eastern seaboard.
>
> There are two phases to this bill—the surface and the hidden.
>
> On the surface it would appear a considered effort by the Rivers and Harbors Committee to devise a solution for gasoline shortages in the East. Yet this bill boldly ignores the existing Fort Myers-Okeechobee-Stuart Canal connecting with the East Coast Intracoastal Canal which could be quickly and easily readied into a channel to barge the products in complete safety.
>
> Solely from this viewpoint, the bill is beyond comprehension. It offers no immediate solution of a pressing emergency. It would take upward of 2 years to dig the new canal. The time element alone removes it as a consideration. The bill is a cloak for the discredited $300,000,000 cross-State ship canal boondoggle.
>
> The barge route follows the line of the proposed big ditch. It has one purpose—construct a little ditch now under the guise of war effort and it will be a push-over to expand it to the big canal when the battling is over.
>
> To south Florida the proposed barge canal is more than a wanton waste of public money, an additional burden on a people staggering under the onerous load of war taxes.
>
> It resurrects the ghost of the ship canal which threatens the social, economic, industrial, agricultural, tourist, and business life of the most populous section of Florida by destroying its fresh-water supply sources.
>
> All of that could be countenanced if victory hung in the balance. However, nothing is involved here except a deception, which, advanced as a war need, is hypocrisy of the first order.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Florida ship-canal question is about 30 years old. They have now changed the name of it to the barge canal. There should be a divorcement between the ship canal question and the pipe-line question, yet this bill combines the two. There is not a Member in this House who would not vote for a pipe line across Florida, if necessary. Since we are in agreement, therefore that it is necessary, why then do we curse the question with the oft-argued and oft-debated question of a cross-State canal following the same dimensions, the same proposed course, inch by inch as did the old, oft-kicked and oft-whipped Florida State canal? Surely it cannot be dreamed that I am less patriotic than other Members of Congress, but those who support this bill would lead one to believe that to fight this measure is to be unpatriotic. I am sorry, just as sorry as I can be, that they have now wrapped up this project in the flag of the United States. The cross-State canal has nothing to do with national defense or Florida's efforts in national defense, if it did, why are we not now using the Fort Myers-Stuart Canal. We have that one built—why build another?

A rule has been granted and why, then, I ask these self-styled patriots, do you bring it in under a procedure of this kind when, as a matter of fact, if it is for the betterment of the country, surely the House would pass it if it were brought up under the rule that has been granted for the consideration of this measure. Are you who support this measure afraid that if the matter were fairly debated the Members of this body would divorce these two alien subject matters and put both questions on their merits? To curse a needed pipe line across Florida with a canal that cannot stand on its own merit is a travesty.

I yield now to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN].

Mr. BOREN. I am anxious to see all needed pipe lines built, but I want to ask the gentleman if it is possible to vote for pipe lines under this bill without voting for the Florida canal.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. No, it is not; and may I ask the gentleman, under a bill from the gentleman's committee is it not within the power of the President to build any pipe line that he wishes to build?

Mr. BOREN. Under Public Act No. 197, passed by the Interstate Commerce Committee last summer, the President has authority to build pipe lines either directly by the Government or by private enterprise, and build all he considers essential for national defense.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Is not the gentleman willing to trust the recommendation of the Chief of Army Engineers and the Secretary of War on what they need to prosecute this war? And they recommend this measure.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I am willing to trust their recommendation, and that is the reason I am fighting this bill. They did not recommend it; that is, originally they did not recommend the canal, although they did recommend the pipe line.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge the immediate passage of legislation before us today which provides for the construction of a barge canal across the northern part of Florida and for a pipe line from the vicinity of Port St. Joe, Fla., to Jacksonville, Fla. Extensive and comprehensive hearings have been held upon this bill by the House Rivers and Harbors Committee. It developed at the hearings that such pipe line can be constructed in from 4 to 6 months and that the barge canal across the northern part of the peninsula of Florida can be accomplished from 15 months to 3 years. From testimony given by the Army Engineers at this hearing and at previous hearings held on legislation for a canal across northern Florida by our committee, it is my considered opinion that a 12-foot barge canal across northern Florida can be and will be completed within 12 months after beginning of work. Our Nation has embarked upon a long-range war production program which will extend over a period of probably 5 years. Such war essential items as battleships, synthetic rubber, airplanes, barges, and other items embrace fully a 5-year program.

The completion of this barge canal will solve the traffic problem for the eastern seaboard and a large part of the Nation before the winter of 1943. The fact that the canal can be built from 12 to 15 months emphasizes the need for immediate authorization.

The Office of Defense Transportation has announced that the railroads have reached the peak of their effort. Any substantial increase in their capacity is prohibited by the impossibility of getting new engines, cars, and trackage, and by the continued depreciation of these

items. The burden which the roads will be desired to carry—but which they cannot carry—this winter will be double that of last winter. Ships are out. Trucks are out. The canal is the only remaining possible solution of the problem.

I understand that Chairman Eastman has recently issued an order that ships on the Great Lakes are to haul iron ore and other war essentials only. In other words, they cannot haul grain until at least this order is modified.

It is apparent also that the railroads of our country recently requisitioned 1,275 locomotive engines—these to take the place of engines which are giving out—but the War Production Board was able to allow them only 350 new locomotive engines. I mention this to emphasize the fact that our railroads may not be expected to transport during the next 12 months as much material as has been transported during the past 12 months. And even if they can transport as much, this amount is still not at all sufficient to meet the present transportation demands. The railroads of our country are accomplishing a great and unprecedented performance in the present war effort, but the now required transportation job in our country far surpasses the ability, present and future, of the railroads to meet it. The hope of relief of our present oil, sulfur, salt, lead, food, and other war essential bottlenecks is the passage of this bill and immediate construction of this barge canal across north Florida.

The canal is simply a job of excavation. There is required no critical material, and the great bulk of the labor is unskilled. All labor could be recruited in State of Florida. Existing and idle State road department excavating equipment in many States—drag lines, scrapers, shovels, and so forth—is available in ample quantity. The Chief of Engineers has stated that before the end of the year there will be an ample supply of hydraulic dredges available for this work, they having completed the jobs they are now working on.

I am advised that there are available for this job such equipment as the great dredge *New Jersey*, which has about finished its present assignment and can be with very little dismantling process transferred to the Florida Canal project. It is noteworthy that this canal will not be subject to bombing damage sufficient to stop traffic through it. It must be remembered that with all the onslaught of enemy bombs for the past many months traffic has not been stopped through the Suez or Keil Canals. This security of barge-canal traffic impels us to the wisdom of prompt action on this bill.

While the link from Port Inglis to Carrabelle is desirable for recreational craft and other small boats, commercial navigation does not need it. The contour of the coast line, prevailing off-shore winds, and shallow coastal waters combine to make this stretch safe for navigation of inland barges and tugs both as regards hazards of wind and wave and submarines. The latter cannot approach within effective distance. There is now and has been for more than 15 years a regular commercial traffic in barges along this stretch. Oil is now transported regularly between Carrabelle and Port Inglis, and Cedar Keys. These barges carry regular inland-waterway insurance. This stretch is far less hazardous than the stretch through Mississippi Sound or the stretch through Chesapeake Bay, although both these latter are regularly navigated also by barges in tow.

The pipe line alone is not adequate. At best, pipe lines can carry only a portion of the required oil. After allowing for rationing of both gasoline and fuel oils, there still remains a minimum of 600,000 barrels daily to be transported to the eastern seaboard for the war effort. This is in addition to the 700,000 barrels daily which it is hoped the railroads can continue to carry. The largest pipe line in this country is a 12-inch pipe line. Such a line across Florida will carry 60,000 barrels of crude oil daily. It would take 10 such lines to carry the 600,000 barrels required, even if all of one grade of oil. If several grades are transported, a multiplicity of pipes would be required. The canal will carry not only the 600,000 barrels, but the 700,000 barrrels now expected to be carried by the roads. The authority for this statement is the Chief of Engineers. Pipe line or lines across Florida are needed as quickly as possible to do whatever can be done to ease the situation pending the completion of the canal. But the canal is the only possible and permanent solution of the problem.

While the need for petroleum is spectacular and is understood by the people, it is in no way more vital to the war effort and the civilian needs than numerous solid commodities which must go via the canal if they are to move in sufficient quantities to avert disaster. These include sulfur, salt, grain, beef, ores, pulp, lumber, refractories for the lining of the furnaces, and so forth. The prospect of food rationing in the East is becoming more imminent daily because of the break-down of our transportation. The Office of Defense Transportation has now forbidden the transportation of the wheat crop by the Great Lakes carriers, and the movement of this commodity to the seaboard areas has not yet been solved. It could go largely by canal. Sulfur (from Texas) for sulfuric acid, without which we cannot make a pound of explosive, a sheet of steel, a single tin can, a pound of plastic, a barrel of any one of a number of vital war chemicals, must be moved, and it cannot be moved via pipe line. Salt is almost as vital as sulfur, and the transport of the material from Louisiana to the East must be provided. Chlorine, alkalies, muriatic acid, and numerous war chemicals depend on this commodity. In short, without some increase in our facilities for the transport of these solid commodities, our war effort will be crippled.

Should the enemy submarines further close the Straits of Yucatan and the entrances to the Caribbean, the Panama Canal would be substantially cut off. The Canal would also be closed if even one gate of one lock is damaged seriously. With Panama Canal traffic sharply curtailed or shut off, we cannot defend the Pacific Coast States by the transcontinental railroads alone. General Summerall has stated this. In such event, goods and all matériel from the East would have to be sent to Galveston or Houston via the proposed canal, and thence to California by rail. This fact alone should make every Pacific coast Congressman insist on the immediate construction of the canal.

Eight hundred and six standard inland barges and 269 tugs will deliver 250,000 barrels of petroleum daily from Port Arthur, Tex., to Philadelphia. All tugs and 70 percent of all barges can be of wood. Steel barges are needed only for gasoline and light products. The necessary steel for the steel barges must be allocated. It amounts to less than six one-hundredths of 1 percent of our total steel output per year. The steel required for engines for tugs must also be allocated, but amounts to less than six one-thousandths of 1 percent of our annual output. A survey of idle yards in the southeast and Gulf areas shows that there are enough idle available yards to construct barges and tugs at the rate of 300 barges and 100 tugs per month. The wood material is at hand and the labor available. Long before the canal is completed we can have ample fleets of tugs and barges not only for petroleum but for solid commodity cargoes.

Our ocean domestic shipping is out. Our railroads have reached and possibly passed the peak of capacity and are entering a period of declining transport. Rubber shortages have relegated truck transport to a mere incidental. The inland waterway barge is the only vehicle the use of which we can now expand. We must do this or we must slacken the war effort. There is no other choice.

Unless we can transport adequate fuel and food to the civilian population on the eastern seaboard and New England we face the grave possibility of epidemic influenza and its attendant diseases which follow on food and fuel rationing in populous centers in those latitudes. This is something more than a threat. It is much nearer a probability.

The absolute necessity for quick transfer of destroyers, torpedo speed boats, mine sweepers, patrol boats, and so forth, from the Gulf to the Atlantic and vice versa is now a demonstrated fact, and the need will undoubtedly increase. The proposed 12-foot canal will permit the passage of all destroyers and all other naval craft above mentioned.

From the commercial viewpoint alone the cross-State canal will pay for itself in a matter of days. The cost to transport a barrel of petroleum from Port Arthur to Philadelphia by this route is less than 60 cents. The railway freight is more than a dollar more. At only 600,000 barrels transported daily via the canal, it would pay its entire cost in 90 days—cost is $58,000,000.

This figure, of course, is the highest estimate and would give 12 feet depth and 150 feet width construction. Many engineers believe that construction can be accomplished at far less cost. In fact, at hearings some time ago before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee it was developed in Army engineers' reports that a barge canal may be con-

structed for $21,000,000. We may fully rely upon the wisdom and judgment of the Army engineers in the details of plans and construction of the canal. They are best informed, and in all projects which have been carried out by the Congress their judgment has been relied upon and abided by, and I believe in every instance their conclusions have been wise and superior.

They may be trusted to carry out the project with the minimum cost and with the best results. The Army engineers have, of course, strongly approved the bill before us and the Chief of the Army Engineers, Maj. Gen. Eugene Reybold, in our committee hearings recently strongly emphasized the approval of his department for this bill and his recommendation that the pipe line and barge canal across north Florida be constructed now. His recommendation was affirmative, strong, and definite for immediate construction of both, and emphasized that construction of both are in the interest of, and needed by, the war effort immediately.

It is appropriate, I believe, to remind my colleagues that some 4 years ago at hearings of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee on a bill which I introduced for the construction of a canal across north Florida, the testimony of the now Brig. Gen. Brehon B. Somervell, then of the Army Engineers Corp, and Gen. Charles P. Summerall, formerly Chief of Staff, United States Army, these distinguished and capable military strategists pointed out at our hearings the imminent essentialness for the war defense and security of our country of the construction of this canal. They indicated the hazards to Gulf and Atlantic coastal shipping which could be anticipated in the next war (this war). They indicated the necessity of a ring of bases of defense for the protection of the Florida Straits, the water between Cuba and South America, the Gulf of Mexico and its coast, and the Panama Canal. These defense establishments, as outlined by them, have by the Congress each been provided for except the Canal across north Florida and today that item is now before you in H. R. 6999. They said that for military and defense reasons that this project was worthy of construction. They said this link in our intracoastal canal system was imperative and in all justice for our security should then be constructed. They pointed out that raw materials and food essentials to our Nation's war weapon construction effort was in Texas, the Rocky Mountains, the Pacific coast, and the Mississippi, and that the factories to process these materials were primarily on the eastern seaboard of our country.

They then indicated the impossibility now of our existing common carriers to take care of the strain and increased transportation volume. I would ask my colleagues to bear in mind the peril which would face our country should the Panama Canal be put out of use. Even if this should occur, if we have our coastal canal system from the upper eastern Atlantic States on across Florida to the Rio Grande, we can from the mouth of the Rio Grande to California transfer cargoes by rail more expeditiously than we can transfer all of these cargoes from the Pacific to the Atlantic coast by rail. You would have a comparatively short haul from the mouth of the Rio Grande to California and this barge canal to take to and receive from the mouth of the Rio Grande our cargoes bound from the west to the east coast. Everyone of you should enthusiastically support the bill before us for this, if for no other reason. In my first campaign for election to Congress more than 18 years ago, I promised the people of Florida to work for a canal across north Florida connecting up this intracoastal system; I have introduced survey bills, preliminary and physical, and have introduced all bills looking toward realization of this project except, of course, the bill before us, which should have, and was, introduced by our chairman, as it embraces portions of the coastal system all the way from the Rio Grande to the St. Johns River, Jacksonville, Fla. Today, I am about to realize, I hope, the success of this 18 years of constant effort for an improvement which will be of tremendous peacetime economic value, and which at the moment is an absolute war essential. I fully appreciate the comprehensive and patriotic feeling existing today in the minds of my colleagues which makes so apparent the prompt passage now of this legislation. You will find that in the long run it will bring even more benefits, security, and protection to the American people than we who have visioned and pictured it have claimed.

I am thinking today of the almost daily occurring submarine tragedies on our Atlantic—particularly the lower Atlantic and Gulf areas. The blood of many hundreds of Americans has been spilled in this area by ruthless and savage attacks by enemy submarines. Millions of dollars' worth of cargoes—primarily oil—have been destroyed. Thousands of you who are inclined not to support this bill will bear in mind that these lives of our American people and these war-essential cargoes destroyed are worth far more in the protection of our great Nation than are financial investments. Should America lose, what will these financial investments be worth? This project is vitally essential to the security of Americans and their homes. America will not lose this war because you and I and all Americans are united to any and all concessions and sacrifices for the winning of this war. The strong sentiment so manifested on the floor of this House today for this essential war project indicates best the determination of the American people to win this war. Conflicting individual opinions and views are submerged in the patriotic zeal and impulse to win and sacrifice. I trust that there will be a tremendous majority vote upon the passage of this essential legislation.

I must say that I regret to see the Republican members of the committee yielding speaking time only to those opposed to the bill. I deplore that you would make party politics out of a war measure. This especially when you know this bill is a war measure and essential to the successful prosecution of the war.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that this bill was never submitted to the Bureau of the Budget, that it does not have the approval of the War Production Board, that it is brought in here with undue haste under a motion to suspend the rules, that a rule has been granted for its consideration by the Committee on Rules, and that the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors stated to the Rules Committee that it was rather an intricate proposition and that there should be at least 3 hours of general debate upon the proposal.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Just to make it clear that the Intercoastal Canal proposed to be established under the $46,000,000 appropriation, including the pipe line, would use the canal in its present state, and not at a 12-foot depth.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think it should be cleared up on that point.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED].

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, all of the testimony seems to be against the canal and all in favor of the pipe line, so far as the official testimony goes. I am for the pipe line, but I call attention to the fact that the committee on which I serve, the Committee on Ways and Means, is now laboring to raise $8,700,000,000, and that, superimposed upon $16,000,000,000 annually under the bills now on the books, in addition to the $10,000,000,000 you pay in State and local taxes, is something to think about. We cannot afford to fool with these nonessential expenditures, because the people cannot stand a $35,000,000,000 annual charge, unless for national defense.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been referred to as a boondoggling bill in an editorial in the Miami Herald in the State of Florida. I do not want this Congress to make itself ridiculous by passing a measure that has been said by somebody to be the beginning of the old Florida ship canal. We must conserve our financial resources to carry on the war and cut out all nonessential expenditures.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] is recognized for 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the question of the ship canal across Florida has been raised. I hold in my hand a minority report, which I made against that proposition, signed by myself and nine other members of the committee, including the gentleman from California, the gentleman from Michigan, and the gentleman from Ohio. I dictated it. They all signed it, in opposition to a ship canal across Florida, more than a year ago, long before this question here before us was ever raised.

There is no ground or reason or argument for a ship canal there. We have no coastwise trade at present. We have no hope that it will be restored anywhere in

the near future, and unless there is a tremendous coastwise trade there is nothing that can use a ship canal across Florida. The bill here as proposed does not go to the ocean at either end. It only connects up the two shallow barge canal channels, 12 feet deep. It specifically states it does not go to the ocean on the Gulf side, and on the other side it goes into the St. Johns River. Several gentlemen from Florida, all of them, in fact, are in favor of a ship canal, if you will put it to their door. They have annoyed the life out of me for 6 years to get it to run here or there, but when you propose to put it across where the engineers say is the most practical place to put it, they object. They have objected to it ever since I have been in Congress, almost, ever since this issue has been under consideration.

So far as the matter of time is concerned, it is going to be altogether a question of money. Congress can arrange that. It will be up to the Congress to appropriate the money to dig the channel across there. It can be done in a very short while if we can provide the money, but the engineers have estimated that it would be a long time in securing the appropriation, and they put the longest time that has ever been adopted for the payment of a river and harbor work. That 3 years' time includes extending it all the way to the Mexican border, and about half of the work proposed would be done there. The only reason for that is that the channel is gorged now, it is congested. It carried more than 25,000,000 tons of freight last year, more than has ever been carried on a river, except on the Monongahela, and that was all coal.

Mr. GREEN. Tell them about the sulphur and the salt.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I have not the time, but it will bring sulphur and salt, two and a half million tons, from Texas up to Wilmington, Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, and some of it to Chicago. It is all used for war purposes.

Mr. KLEBERG. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. KLEBERG. How about the heavy equipment that has to serve shipping operations—ways that are being established to build merchant marine?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, it is needed for that. It is the only proposition that will supply the East with all their needs unless you can get back the tankers. There are only 9,000 oil-tank rail cars in the United States belonging to the railroads. The other tank cars belong to the oil companies. They do not have the equipment. They can increase their supply a little more than they are doing now. They have done great work. They have done twice as much as they thought they could do a year ago, but their hopes for increasing it cannot be exceeded very much. An additional proposed pipe line, together with this one, will not supply all the needs. It will lack 300,000 barrels a day of supplying the needs.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. BECKWORTH. It gives a real opportunity to make available to other sections of the country oil from the greatest reservoir in the whole United States.

Mr. MANSFIELD. There is no question about that. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. It was testified before the committee that it would supply 1,600,000 barrels of oil a day on the Atlantic coast. This short canal across Florida, when completed, in connection with the barge canal, would supply the entire amount, and it is the only proposition that has been proposed that will supply it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Now, who has asked for this legislation as presented?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Millions of people all over the United States, both in the East and the West. Down in my State we have so much oil and gasoline that we cannot dispose of it. Up in the East they are rationed and still suffering for the need of it.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I know, but I am asking who appeared before the committee? In other words, is the War Department asking for this as a national defense measure? Is the Navy asking for it? Is the administration asking for it, or is the War Production Board asking for it? My understanding was when the gentleman appeared before the Rules Committee that all those agencies were demanding this as a national defense measure. Now, if it is true that just the people want to have a pipe line developed, and not those charged with the war effort, then I am against it. If it is, as I understood it, that this is a national defense measure, and solely such, then I think we all ought to vote for it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I do not think there is any question about it being a national defense measure.

Mr. MICHENER. Well, will the gentleman answer my question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. What was the gentleman's question? There are so many talking to me and creating so much confusion I did not hear the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman's time has expired. All time has expired. The question is, Will the rules be suspended and the bill passed?

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DINGELL) there were ayes 85 and noes 121.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER (after counting). Eighteen Members have arisen; not a sufficient number.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order that there is no quorum present, and I object to the vote on that ground.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the gentleman's point of order comes too late.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hold that it does not come too late. The Chair will count. [After counting.] More than 218 Members are present, a quorum.

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill was rejected.

PROCESSING TAX ON COCONUT OIL

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 6682) to suspend in part the processing tax on coconut oil.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 2470 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code is hereby suspended: *Provided*, That if the President, after receipt by him of a request from the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands that the suspension of section 2470 (a) (2) be terminated, shall find that adequate supplies of copra, coconut oil, or both, the product of the Philippine Islands, are readily available for processing in the United States, he shall so proclaim; and 30 days after such proclamation, the suspension of section 2470 (a) (2) of the Internal Revenue Code, shall terminate.

SEC. 2. This act shall become effective the day following its enactment.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may care to consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a national defense measure. It has a unanimous report from the Committee on Ways and Means, which committee considered it very carefully. It has the support also of the War Production Board, the Board of Economic Security, the Price Control Administration, and the Treasury Department.

The purpose of it is to suspend for the duration of the war the differential of 2 cents extra tax on copra and coconut oil. There is a tax of 5 cents a pound now on coconut oil from foreign countries. In 1934 a law was enacted by which 2 cents a pound was taken off as far as the Philippine Islands were concerned. In other words, there is a differential of 2 cents a pound on copra from which coconut oil is manufactured, which is imported from the Philippine Islands.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that this is only suspending that tax during the war?

Mr. DOUGHTON. That is right.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Or is it permanent legislation?

Mr. DOUGHTON. No; it is not intended to be permanent legislation, as the bill provides that 30 days after the President proclaims there is an adequate supply of copra and coconut oil from the Philippines available for processing in the United States, this suspension shall terminate. This is not permanent legislation at all.

Mr. BOREN. It is limited to the duration?

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is for the duration of the war.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I may say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I called the War Department, as undoubtedly the gentleman has done, and all the defense agencies; they are very anxious that this bill pass as soon as possible.

Mr. DOUGHTON. They regard it as essential to national defense and our war effort; there is not any question about that. The evidence before our committee was that the bill was not only essential but necessary at this time for national defense. We have been getting our supply from the Philippine Islands, but as everyone knows we cannot do so now. There are some other small islands in the South Seas from which we get a supply of copra from which coconut oil is extracted. Any extent to which we can increase our supply by removing this obstacle is that much of an aid to our national defense program.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. PACE. It appears from the language of the bill that the suspension would be permanent unless and until the Government of the Philippines had given notice that there was an ample supply of coconut oil and copra from that country, and it is possible that such a notice would never be given. This would, therefore, be a permanent suspension.

Mr. DOUGHTON. It might be necessary. We are not expecting to get any supply from the Philippine Islands any time soon.

Mr. PACE. The thing I am interested in is the effect this bill will have upon the price of domestic vegetable oils, a thing from which glycerin can be made. I would not want, and I am sure the gentleman would not want, to take action here which would break the domestic market on vegetable oils which compete directly with copra and coconut oil, by passing legislation of this kind.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The gentleman does not apprehend there is any danger now of anything taking place that would seriously affect the price of the domestic commodities he mentions; does he?

Mr. PACE. The gentleman knows that the domestic producers of vegetable oils are operating on a price that does not return them always the cost of production.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Can glycerin be produced from the vegetable oils the gentleman mentions in sufficient quantities for national defense purposes?

Mr. PACE. I am not able to say.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I understand the price has been increased until it is almost prohibitive.

Moreover, as I understand it, there is a scarcity of coconut-oil cake which is used for dairy purposes. I do not believe there would be the slightest objection to this bill if it were thoroughly understood.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. All this bill does is to take off the 2 cents additional embargo we have placed on copra and coconut oil. Is that right?

Mr. DOUGHTON. It is a processing tax that is payable by the processor when it is processed. It is not a tariff tax but a processing tax.

Mr. JENSEN. We are not making the product any more scarce by taking this step?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Not at all. There is a price ceiling fixed now on these commodities. The combination of the tax and the price ceiling makes it next to impossible to secure this material from which a necessary war product is produced.

Mr. JENSEN. Certainly the gentleman does not want to say that just because it is going to cost us 2 cents a pound more it is going to make the product scarcer and that we shall be denied it in our war effort?

Mr. DOUGHTON. But the 2 cents a pound is interfering with the importation of it and thereby affecting the supply, as I understand.

Mr. JENSEN. Is not one reason for the lessened importation the fact that we have a substitute to take its place?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Nothing of the kind. I beg the gentleman's pardon; he is mistaken about that.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I understand this bill was reported unanimously by the committee.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Absolutely. The bill was considered very carefully.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I believe representatives of the War Production Board, the Board of Economic Warfare, the Office of Price Administration, the Department of Commerce, and the Treasury Department appeared, and they were for this bill.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Very definitely.

Mr. JENSEN. The Department of Agriculture has not O. K.'d it.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the remainder of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I beg to differ with the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means and his statement that this bill merely suspends the 2-cent processing tax on coconut oil during the war. If you will read the language of the bill on the first page, you will find that it states:

Provided, That if the President, after receipt by him of a request from the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands that the suspension of section 2470 (a) be terminated, shall find that adequate supplies of copra, coconut oil, or both, the product of the Philippine Islands, are readily available for processing in the United States, he shall so proclaim.

That is a condition precedent to any action by the President, and the passage of this bill does not mean we are only going to repeal that 2-cent tax for the duration of the war. It means that until the Philippine Assembly shall notify the President and take the necessary steps the President and this Congress are barred from repealing this very bill, which repeals that 2-cent tax. So it is important.

In the first place, may I say that I do not have here the hearings of the Committee on Ways and Means on this measure. I called the committee and was advised that the hearings were not printed. I do not know who appeared before that committee, further than the statement of the gentleman from North Carolina, and I did not fully understand that. But I have here a brief signed by a former member of this body, now attorney for the American Soap & Glycerine Producers, Inc., and general counsel for the National Institute for Oil Soap Products. It is a very voluminous brief. Evidently the gentleman has been quite active in promoting this bill. I do not know how many others may have been interested.

The ostensible purpose of this bill is to provide glycerin for ammunition purposes. The supply of coconut oil from the Philippines, of course, has been shut off. There is a relatively small amount of coconut oil available from other parts of the world. From general information, which I have not been able to verify, a British and American syndicate has purchased the larger part of 100,000 tons or 200,000,000 pounds of copra or coconut oil that is available from other countries than the Philippines.

They want to bring it in here. We all know much about the operations of such syndicates, particularly in wartime and, as a rule, they are not dominated by patriotic sentiment but rather by profits to be obtained. But what are they going to do with the 100,000 tons they propose to bring in here?

In the first place they can get glycerin and plenty of it from cottonseed oil, they can get it from soybean oil, they can get it from many other vegetable oils.

Mr. PACE. And peanut oil.

Mr. HULL. And peanut oil. They can get it from various other sources in this country, including lard. Furthermore, a price has been fixed by the O. P. A. on glycerin at 11½ cents a pound. That is the price the Government is paying to the soap companies now making glycerin.

Out of that 100,000 tons of coconut oil only 14 percent will be made into glycerin. I am not well advised as to the manufacture of soaps and glycerin, but my understanding is that glycerin is a byproduct in the manufacture of soap and in order to get this glycerin it will be necessary for the soap companies to manufacture so much soap and out of it they will get the 14 percent of glycerin.

Now, 14 percent of the 100,000 tons it is proposed to import will be approximately 14,000 tons.

At the rate which the Government is paying for glycerin, the Government will pay $3,220,000 for all the glycerin that is proposed to be made from this imported coconut oil. However, if this bill passes, there is going to be a reduction of revenue from those soap companies to the Government of $4,000,000 a year indefinitely, not only now and during the war, but until the Philippine Government sends its certificate over here that it is ready to supply that oil that we need in this country. So, when you figure this thing out, we find we will get $3,220,000 worth of glycerin out of 100,000 tons of coconut oil, and we are going to turn over to the soap companies the remainder, the residue of that 100,000 tons, which amounts to 86,000 tons. In order to get this glycerin, we are going to, therefore, enrich the principal soap companies which manufacture practically all the glycerin over $3,000,000 annually. There is a question, under the orders of the War Production Board, whether any of the smaller soap companies can qualify and make use of any of this coconut oil.

We are going to present to the five big soap companies, perhaps a few others, 86,000 tons of the residue; we are going to take off of that residue $40 per ton; in other words, we are going to give them the benefit of $3,440,000 in reduction of taxes in order to obtain $3,220,000 worth of glycerin. That is what this bill is and that is what it means.

Mr. JENSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. In other words, this bill is not going to tend toward improving our defense program. It is simply going to increase the dollars in the pockets of the big soap companies?

Mr. HULL. Indefinitely, to the extent of $3,440,000 a year.

Now, that is the whole question before the House.

In this report from the Committee on Ways and Means, you will find there is not a word stated, and I have not been able to find anything the committee has stated, about the soap-company angle to this bill. I am not opposed to the Government getting a sufficient supply of glycerin, I am not opposed to the Government taking advantage of any reduced rates or anything of that kind, but I am opposed to permitting the soap companies to get a reduction of $3,440,000 a year while the total amount of reduction on the portion of 100,000 tons made into glycerin will be $560,000.

Mr. POAGE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. This comes in here under the guise of a defense proposition, does it not?

Mr. HULL. Yes, sir.

Mr. POAGE. On the theory that we have to do this in order to get the copra?

Mr. HULL. Yes.

Mr. POAGE. Are we going to get copra from the Philippine Islands simply by reducing the tariff against it or the processing tax?

Mr. HULL. It does not make a particle of difference whether you take this 2-cent tax off or not; the price of glycerin is fixed. The soap companies are going to get that much for their glycerin, and they are going to get the reduction of 2 cents per pound on the residue of 86,000 tons.

Mr. POAGE. That is unquestionably right. I think the gentleman has fairly explained that. However, on the proposition that this will add to the supplies of glycerin in the United States, how are you going to bring copra from the Philippine Islands today? If you should subsidize it 40 cents a pound, how would you get it here?

Mr. HULL. You could not bring it here.

Mr. POAGE. Of course not. Therefore, is this going to make one single additional pound of glycerin available for the United States defense purposes?

Mr. HULL. No; because I think the contracts already signed for bringing it in here at 2 cents per pound reduction represent that much profit on 100,000 tons.

Mr. POAGE. Certainly, but the profit will go to this American-British syndicate to pay for copra, rather than to the American farmers who are producing American oils and fats that should be used.

Mr. HULL. Absolutely.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. It appears from the committee report that one of the arguments in support of this bill is that it will increase the supply of oil cake. If the gentleman is familiar with the enormous increase in the production this year of soybeans and peanuts, he will agree with me, I am sure, that we are going to have so much oil cake this fall that it will probably have to be given away in order to get rid of it, and that there is not the slightest necessity in this Nation today for any more oil cake, as the farmers of the United States will produce probably twice as much as can be consumed.

Mr. HULL. I would say, furthermore, that I do not believe there is a dairyman in the entire Northwest that ever used a pound of oil cake made from coconut oil.

I hope this motion will be defeated.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HULL. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. DOUGHTON. The 600,000 tons ordinarily coming in from the Philippine Islands is all cut off. There is no hope of any of that being imported. It is estimated that only 100,000 tons will come in if this law is enacted, so we will have a loss of 500,000 tons there. The 600,000 tons is all cut off, and it is estimated that 100,000 tons is the most we can possibly get.

Mr. HULL. I should like to have the eminent gentleman use his own time in making his statement. Some of the other Members want to be heard on this side, and we are allowed only 20 minutes to present our objections to the bill.

The question up to the House is, Are we going to give the big soap companies a present of $3,440,000 a year? That is the issue involved in this bill. I am opposed to spending in that manner moneys which are so badly needed for our war program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to do anything that will retard our war effort. I know we are all united to do what we can to secure the essential and critical materials so that we may win the war.

After the explanation that has been made about this bill by the chairman of the committee and my distinguished colleague from Wisconsin, it seems to me there is some question whether or not this bill should not have further study and discussion on the floor. It is unfortunate that a bill of this kind comes up without ample time for debate and opportunity to offer amendments.

The chairman has said that this bill terminates when the war is over. There is no provision in the bill, as I see it, which would terminate this suspension of the processing tax at the end of this war. If it is the intention of the proponents of the bill or the members of the Committee on Ways and Means that this suspension of the tax should terminate when the war is over, then we should have the opportunity to offer such an amendment and attach it to the bill, and then we would know that this concession would terminate when the war is over.

I believe this bill can be brought in in the regular manner under a rule from the Committee on Rules. That would give us a chance to discuss it on the floor and to offer amendments.

We do not want to do anything that would jeopardize the war effort. We want to get all the essential materials the Government needs in prosecuting the war to a successful conclusion.

I have no objection to bringing these critical materials in during the war, but let us place an amendment on this bill so that we may know that the concessions we are making will terminate when the war is over.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the motion to suspend the rules be voted down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

PROCESSING TAX ON COCONUT OIL

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CROWTHER], a member of the committee.

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, I think a mistaken idea has crept into the minds of some of my colleagues regarding this bill. I have had a good deal of discussion about it with the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL], but he has clung steadfastly to the idea that there is a Senegambian hidden in the wood pile and that we are going to confer a great favor on the soap makers of the country and enrich their tills by about $3,000,000. I think that is a fallacious conclusion.

You know with my record as a protectionist I would not be here asking to take the tax off any import unless I thought this was actually a war defense measure.

Let me say that the other countries from which this copra comes are British and French Oceania islands in the South Pacific, Ceylon and India, none of which is particularly available now, and from West and East Africa.

The purpose of the pending bill is to temporarily suspend the additional tax upon non-Philippine coconut oil until Philippine production is again available.

I think that is very clearly explained in the language of the bill. I do not think there is anything confusing about the language as to when this legislation is to end. If I can read the English language, it shall be terminated when it is found that an adequate supply of copra and coconut oil, or both, are readily available from the Philippine Islands for processing in the United States.

Under existing law, there is imposed upon the first domestic processing of coconut oil, and certain other oils, a tax of 3 cents per pound. (Sec. 2470 (a) (1), Internal Revenue Code.)

On coconut oil, there is also imposed an additional tax of 2 cents per pound, except on coconut oil from the Philippines or produced from Philippine copra. (Sec. 2470 (a) (2), Internal Revenue Code.)

The purpose of Congress in imposing the additional tax on coconut oil, except that from the Philippines, was to give the Philippine Islands a monopoly in the United States market. Before the invasion of the Philippines by Japan, in excess of 99 percent of the domestic supply of coconut oil came from that source.

In the manufacture of explosives, and for other military purposes, large quantities of glycerin are necessary. Heretofore, glycerin has been largely produced as a byproduct of soap making, in which Philippine coconut oil has been a principal ingredient. We formerly imported from 600,000,000 to 750,000,000 pounds of coconut oil annually from the Philippines, and now this source of supply has been cut off. It thus becomes necessary for us to secure glycerin from every source available, and fortunately it can be obtained from a large variety of domestic fats and oils. However, coconut oil furnishes a greater amount than most other fats and oils. Hence it is desirable to encourage all possible imports of this commodity, which must now be obtained from other than Philippine sources. The fact is, however, that not more than 100,000,000 to 200,000,000 pounds annually can reasonably be expected from other countries.

By reason of the existing additional 2 cents-per-pound tax applicable to non-Philippine coconut oil, a virtual embargo is in effect, and the Government is precluded from obtaining even the small amount which would otherwise be available.

Any coconut oil coming in will continue to pay the regular 3-cent-per-pound tax, which was the rate applicable to Philippine coconut oil when it was being imported. The only difference is that the 3-cent tax collected from the Philippine product was returned to the Philippine Treasury, whereas if the tax is collected from non-Philippine coconut oil, which heretofore has been embargoed, the revenue will go to the Federal Treasury.

No disturbance to the domestic fats and oils market will result from the passage of this legislation, since the same competitive situation will prevail under the regular 3-cent tax as prevailed when Philippine coconut oil—which only paid this tax and not the additional 2-cent tax—was coming in. As a matter of fact, the market for domestic fats and oils will be greatly enhanced by reason of having to furnish substitutes for the difference between the 600,000,000 to 750,000,000 pounds of Philippine coconut oil which formerly came in, and the 100,000,000 to 200,000,000 pounds which is all that will be available from other foreign sources. Actually, the increase in domestic production which will be necessary will be even greater than this amount, in view of the pressing needs of the war program.

The bill has the approval of the War Production Board and other interested Government agencies, and was unanimously reported by the committee. It is vitally necessary in connection with the war program and should be speedily enacted.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CROWTHER. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. HULL. May I ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that the head of the oils and fats division, or the soap division, or whatever division it is down in the War Production Board, or, possibly one of the responsible men down there who is responsible for this order of the War Production Board is a member of one of the five largest soap-manufacturing concerns in the United States?

Mr. CROWTHER. All the witnesses we had before us were men of unusual standing. We had Army officers, we had chemists from the various departments of the Government and representatives of the War Production Board, and we thought we were securing the very best information possible.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, if conditions were normal, I would not favor this legislation. As I recall, I had something to do with putting the present law on the statute books, but as we all know, conditions are not now normal. We also know that the source of imported vegetable oils and coconut oils is now in the hands of the enemy, so we must find new sources on which to draw.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. PACE. We have never brought in from the Philippines more than about 2,000,000,000 pounds, and the consumption in the United States is from 8,000,000,000 to 10,000,000,000 pounds.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am talking about past imports from the Philippines alone. There is no question but that this is a defense measure and is of prime importance; therefore I shall support it. I am sorry that the situation is such that it is necessary to bring out legislation of this kind, but I cannot change the fact.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. And whether we pass this bill or not, is it not a fact that it will not make the product any scarcer or any more plentiful?

Mr. KNUTSON. I would not want to assume responsibility for deciding a question of that kind, because those who are charged with that responsibility came before our committee and stated that this legislation is necessary to winning the war.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is true that there is no definite termination to the legislation, except that when the President shall find that our supply is again normal, it shall terminate. We could not provide in the bill that it would terminate on a certain date, after the close of hostilities, because it will take years and years to restore the supply so some discretion must be left to the Executive to decide when that situation occurs.

Mr. COOPER. The fact is that the provisions of existing law which are sought to be suspended by this bill were enacted solely and alone for the benefit of the Philippine Islands?

Mr. KNUTSON. That is true.

Mr. COOPER. And now that source of supply is cut off.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is correct, and we must turn elsewhere for our pressing needs.

Mr. COOPER. And this bill is simply an effort to get from other sources that part or some of that part that formerly came from the Philippines, that is so vitally needed in the manufacture of glycerin and other material essential for war purposes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is absolutely right and I for one will not assume responsibility for laying any impediment in the path to the bill's passage.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that there is obvious confusion on the part of the proponents of this bill. The chairman of the committee said that the bill is merely temporary, while the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON], who last spoke, said that the bill

would terminate when the President wanted it to terminate. The bill says that the President after receipt by him of a request from the Government of the Commonwealth of the Philippines may terminate this suspension. In other words, the bill actually provides that it cannot be suspended until the President orders it, and he cannot do that until the Philippine Islands have asked him to do so. As a matter of fact it is permanent legislation and it cannot bring any more copra into the country during the present war. Our shortage is caused by physical inability to import copra because of a lack of ships and occupation of most of the sources of supply by Japan.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I have only 2 minutes. I cannot yield at this time. We do not have the ability to bring copra in from the Philippines even if the stuff were worth its weight in gold. You cannot bring it in from the Philippines until we whip the Japs and therefore the effective part of the bill is after the war terminates. Then we will have a bill that will permit copra to come in at a lower price, because we will have taken 2 cents a pound off by removing this processing tax, and they will then bring it in at a price that will ruin every producer in the United States of cottonseed oil, soybean oil, and peanut oil.

You are going to ruin the American producer not during the war, because you cannot bring this copra in anyway, except in limited quantities; but when this war is over and when this bill does not terminate as it was suggested that it would, when it is still in effect, before anybody has terminated it, then the American farmer is going to pay for the profit you are handing the soap makers today, and they will keep right on paying for years to come. If you want to bring something in and think that you can get it from the Philippine Islands by subsidizing it with money, then subsidize it, but do not charge it up to the farmers of the United States.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The proper thing is to bring in this bill so that we can offer amendments to have it terminate when the war is over.

Mr. POAGE. That is right. I think we should have learned a lesson from what happened to the last bill. This bill has been here since along in February, and, as far as I know, no rule has ever been sought or granted on it. Why does it not come in in the regular way, subject to amendments?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield.

Mr. COOPER. I am surprised that the distinguished gentleman from Texas is so much confused about this bill.

Mr. POAGE. Well, possibly my confusion and some of the confusion which has been evidenced by the proponents of the bill result from a lack of time to fully discuss the measure.

Mr. COOPER. It is a question of what a simple one-page bill says.

Mr. POAGE. Yes, but there is a complete disagreement among the proponents as to when and how the suspension will ever terminate. I cannot plead guilty to all the confusion, and if there is any doubt, I am going to resolve it in favor of the American farmer.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I certainly have deep respect for the chairman and every member of the Ways and Means Committee. I regret that representatives of the Department of Agriculture were not consulted on this legislation. It is true we have been getting from the Philippines an average of about a billion pounds of vegetable oil a year in direct competition with our own oil. So in January the Secretary of Agriculture went to the soybean producers of the Northwest and the peanut producers of the South and said, "Now, we are going to be a billion pounds short on vegetable oil. You men get busy and make up that shortage."

You will find that in the Northwest they have about doubled their soybean production for the very purpose of meeting this condition. In the South, instead of planting 1,900,000 acres of peanuts this year we are planting about 5,000,000 acres. So we hope that the soybean producers and the peanut producers will more than make up this shortage, and we feel that instead of a subsidy which this bill gives, by taking off this 2-cent tax, to some foreign producers, the American producers of vegetable oils should be given and continued this protection.

It is mentioned that it is important that we have the oil cake from copra. I have talked to every dairyman on the floor and they say they have never heard of a dairy feeding oil cake from copra, but you do use oil cake from soybeans, from peanuts, and from cottonseed. We have increased our production of those commodities this year so greatly that I am afraid we are going to have to practically give away our meal.

Whenever it is shown that the farmers of this Nation are unable to produce enough vegetable oils for the manufacture of all the glycerin needed in the conduct of the war I shall gladly support any measure necessary to bring in more from foreign countries. The farmers have a deep interest in the successful prosecution of the war. They are ready to make any sacrifice necessary, but they do not feel, and I do not feel, that they should be the only ones to make any sacrifice.

It seems that a small group has bought up all the copra and coconut oil that is now available and they want us to relieve them of the payment of this 2-cents-per pound tax so as to increase their profits. Yet our own farmers have increased their production of vegetable oils and the Price Administrator has put a ceiling price into effect that will hardly give the farmers the cost of production.

Oh, Mr. Speaker, the injustices that are being committed in the name of national defense!

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is recognized for 1 minute.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time merely to claim the attention of the distinguished chairman of the Ways and Means Committee in order to ask a question.

As I understand the purpose of this bill, it is a demand upon the part of governmental agencies for the acquisition of what has been stated to be 100,000 tons of available copra that is available from sources other than the Philippines. Is that true?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I did not understand the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. I understand from your statement and other statements that appear in the report that there is available 100,000 tons, other than copra that formerly came from the Philippines, that can be purchased from some source and be used in our productive effort in this country. Is that right?

Mr. DOUGHTON. Not to exceed that amount, and that takes the place of 600,000 tons lost from the Philippines.

Mr. KEEFE. Now, do I understand that the officers of the Army and the Navy, the War Production Board, and so forth, say that the acquisition of that 100,000 tons of copra is vital and essential to the promotion of our war effort? Did they so testify before the committee?

Mr. DOUGHTON. They emphatically and definitely stated that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has expired.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable confusion about this bill; this is unfortunate, for most of it is entirely unfounded.

The purpose of this legislation is to make it possible to obtain supplies of copra and coconut oil from outside the United States. From these materials are obtained things essential in the national war program. This was brought to the attention of the Ways and Means Committee by officials charged with the responsibility of carrying on the war effort. They are the ones who came to the committee and asked for this legislation, those charged with carrying forward the war program. They are the only ones who have appealed to the Ways and Means Committee for the consideration of this bill.

The simple facts are these: Coconut oil contains the highest percentage of glycerin of any oil, and vast quantities of glycerin are vitally needed for the manufacture of explosives and materials essential for the war effort. Ordinarily we receive enormous quantities of coconut oil from the Philippines. This source is cut off. It is hoped we may be able to get some copra and coconut oil from other sources in the world to take the place of part of this enormous shortage we have now by reason of the Philippine supply being cut off.

The only thing involved in this bill is whether or not we are willing to go along with the urgent request of these men charged with the responsibility of providing explosives and essential materials for the war, whether we will help them by giving them this legislation; or whether we will thwart them and obstruct them in their efforts, and thereby seriously adversely affect the war program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. All the time has expired.

The question is: Shall the rules be suspended and the bill passed?

The question was taken; and (on a division demanded by Mr. HULL) there were—ayes 55, noes 19.

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the bill is passed.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is not a quorum present.

Mr. ANDREWS. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. ANDREWS. I make the point of order that the objection of the gentleman from Wisconsin comes too late, the Chair having announced that the bill was passed.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must be rather liberal about these matters, but the Chair requests Members to be a little more prompt in calling for a quorum—to do so before the Chair announces that a bill is passed.

Evidently, there is not a quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 185, nays 74, not voting 171, as follows:

[Roll No. 62]

YEAS—185

Allen, Ill.	Crosser	Hill, Colo.
Allen, La.	Crowther	Hill, Wash.
Anderson, Calif.	D'Alesandro	Hinshaw
Anderson, N. Mex.	Dingell	Hobbs
Andrews	Disney	Hoffman
Angell	Ditter	Holbrock
Arends	Dondero	Holmes
Arnold	Doughton	Hook
Barnes	Douglas	Hope
Bates, Ky.	Drewry	Houston
Beckworth	Duncan	Hunter
Bell	Eberharter	Imhoff
Bender	Elliott, Calif.	Izac
Blackney	Engel	Jenkins, Ohio
Bland	Englebright	Jenks, N. H.
Bloom	Fenton	Johnson, Calif.
Boehne	Fish	Johnson, W. Va.
Boggs	Flaherty	Jonkman
Boren	Flannagan	Kean
Bradley, Mich.	Fogarty	Kee
Buck	Folger	Keefe
Bulwinkle	Forand	Kefauver
Burch	Gale	Kilburn
Byron	Gamble	Kilday
Canfield	Gearhart	Kinzer
Carlson	Gerlach	Kirwan
Carter	Gore	Knutson
Cartwright	Graham	Lanham
Chenoweth	Gregory	Larrabee
Chiperfield	Guyer	Lea
Clason	Hall, Edwin Arthur	LeCompte
Cochran	Halleck	Lewis
Cole, N. Y.	Hancock	McCormack
Cooley	Harness	McGranery
Cooper	Hartley	McKeough
Costello	Healey	McLaughlin
Courtney	Hébert	McLean
Creal	Hess	Manasco
Mason	Reed, Ill.	Martin, Iowa
May	Reed, N. Y.	Thill
Meyer, Md.	Rees, Kans.	Thomas, Tex.
Michener	Robinson, Utah	Thomason
Mills, Ark.	Rodgers, Pa.	Tibbott
Mills, La.	Rogers, Okla.	Traynor
Monroney	Rolph	Van Zandt
Moser	Romjue	Vincent, Ky.
Mott	Sacks	Vinson, Ga.
Nelson	Sanders	Voorhis, Calif.
Norton	Sasscer	Ward
Norrell	Secrest	Wasielewski
O'Brien, N. Y.	Shanley	Wene
Oliver	Smith, Maine	West
Patman	Snyder	Wheat
Pheiffer, William T.	Spence	Wigglesworth
Pittenger	Springer	Williams
Ploeser	Starnes, Ala.	Wilson
Powers	Stratton	Wolcott
Priest	Sullivan	Woodruff, Mich.
Rabaut	Sumners, Tex.	Wright
Ramspeck	Sutphin	Young
Randolph	Taber	Youngdahl
	Tenerowicz	Zimmerman

NAYS—74

Andersen, H. Carl	Gehrmann	Pace
Andresen, August H.	Gibson	Patton
Baumhart	Gillie	Peterson, Fla.
Bennett	Gossett	Peterson, Ga.
Brooks	Green	Pierce
Brown, Ga.	Hare	Poage
Brown, Ohio	Harris, Ark.	Rankin, Miss.
Cannon, Mo.	Hendricks	Rankin, Mont.
Case, S. Dak.	Hull	Rizley
Clevenger	Jackson	Robsion, Ky.
Coffee, Nebr.	Jensen	Rockwell
Coffee, Wash.	Johns	Russell
Collins	Johnson, Ill.	Sauthoff
Colmer	Johnson, Luther A.	Shafer, Mich.
Copeland	Johnson, Okla.	Short
Cox	Lambertson	Sikes
Cravens	Landis	Smith, Ohio
Cunningham	Ludlow	South
Curtis	McGehee	Stefan
Day	Mahon	Stevenson
Domengeaux	Mundt	Talle
Dworshak	Murdock	Tarver
Fulmer	Murray	Whelchel
Gathings	O'Connor	Whittington
	O'Hara	Wickersham

NOT VOTING—171

Baldwin	Ford, Miss.	Maciejewski
Barden	Ford, Thomas F.	Maciora
Barry	Gavagan	Magnuson
Bates, Mass.	Gifford	Mansfield
Beam	Gilchrist	Marcantonio
Beiter	Gillette	Martin, Mass.
Bishop	Granger	Merritt
Bolton	Grant, Ala.	Mitchell
Bonner	Grant, Ind.	Myers, Pa.
Boykin	Gwynne	Nichols
Bradley, Pa.	Haines	O'Brien, Mich.
Bryson	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Day
Buckler, Minn.	Harrington	O'Leary
Buckley, N. Y.	Harris, Va.	O'Neal
Burdick	Hart	Osmers
Burgin	Harter	O'Toole
Butler	Heffernan	Paddock
Byrne	Heidinger	Patrick
Camp	Howell	Pearson
Cannon, Fla.	Jacobsen	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Capozzoli	Jarman	Plauché
Casey, Mass.	Jarrett	Plumley
Celler	Jennings	Ramsay
Chapman	Johnson, Ind.	Reece, Tenn.
Clark	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rich
Claypool	Jones	Richards
Ciuett	Kelley, Pa.	Rivers
Cole, Md.	Kelly, Ill.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Crawford	Kennedy, Martin J.	Robertson, Va.
Culkin	Kennedy, Michael J.	Rockefeller
Cullen	Keogh	Rogers, Mass.
Davis, Ohio	Kerr	Sabath
Davis, Tenn.	Kleberg	Satterfield
Delaney	Klein	Scanlon
Dewey	Kocialkowski	Schaefer, Ill.
Dickstein	Kopplemann	Schuetz
Dies	Kramer	Schulte
Dirksen	Kunkel	Scott
Downs	Lane	Scrugham
Durham	Leavy	Shannon
Eaton	Lesinski	Sheppard
Edmiston	Lynch	Sheridan
Elliot, Mass.	McGregor	Simpson
Ellis	McIntyre	Smith, Pa.
Elston	McMillan	Smith, Va.
Faddis	Maas	Smith, Wash.
Fellows	Merritt	Smith, W. Va.
Fitzgerald	Mitchell	Smith, Wis.
Fitzpatrick	Myers, Pa.	Somers, N. Y.
Ford, Leland M.	Nichols	Sparkman
	O'Brien, Mich.	Steagall
	O'Day	Stearns, N. H.
	O'Leary	Sumner, Ill.
	O'Neal	Sweeney
	Osmers	Talbot
	O'Toole	Terry
	Paddock	Thom
	Patrick	Thomas, N. J.
	Pearson	Tinkham
	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Tolan
	Plauché	Treadway
	Plumley	Vorys, Ohio
	Ramsay	Vreeland
	Reece, Tenn.	Wadsworth
	Rich	Walter
	Richards	Weaver
	Rivers	Weiss
	Robertson, N. Dak.	Welch
	Robertson, Va.	White
	Rockefeller	Whitten
	Rogers, Mass.	Winter
	Sabath	Wolfenden, Pa.
	Satterfield	Wolverton, N. J.
	Scanlon	Woodrum, Va.
	Schaefer, Ill.	Worley
	Schuetz	
	Schulte	
	Scott	
	Scrugham	
	Shannon	
	Sheppard	
	Sheridan	
	Simpson	
	Smith, Pa.	
	Smith, Va.	
	Smith, Wash.	
	Smith, W. Va.	
	Smith, Wis.	

So two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Cullen and Mr. Johnson of Indiana for, with Mr. Burdick against.

Until further notice:

General pairs:

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Treadway.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Grant of Indiana.

Mr. Harris of Virginia with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Beiter with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Burgin with Mr. Cluett.

Mr. Clark with Mr. McGregor.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Downs with Mr. Jones.

Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Terry with Mr. Jennings.

Mr. Weaver with Mr. Simpson.

Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.

Mr. Steagall with Mr. Bishop.

Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Kunkel.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Crawford.

Mr. Robertson of Virginia with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Rivers with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Bonner with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Grant of Alabama with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Rich.

Mr. Camp with Mr. Dewey.

Mr. McMillan with Mr. Elston.

Mr. Barry with Mrs. Rogers of Massachusetts.

Mr. Whitten with Mr. Fellows.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Gilchrist.

Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Patrick with Mr. Heidinger.

Mr. Granger with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Leland M. Ford.

Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Jarman with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.

Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Paddock.

Mr. McIntyre with Mr. Butler.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Rockefeller.

Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Gwynne.

Mr. Durham with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Claypool with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. Fitzpatrick with Miss Sumner of Illinois.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Winter.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Howell.

Mr. Beam with Mr. Jarrett.

Mr. Harter with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. Bryson with Mr. Tinkham.

Mr. Holbrock with Mr. Vorys of Ohio.

Mr. Pearson with Mr. Welch.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Marcantonio.

Mr. O'Brien of Michigan with Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Harrington.

Mr. Plauché with Mr. Buckley of New York.

Mr. Jacobsen with Mr. Ramsay.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Scanlon.

Mr. Smith of Washington with Mr. Capozzoli.
Mr. Davis of Ohio with Mr. Casey of Massachusetts.
Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Dickstein.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Chapman with Mr. Kramer.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. Cole of Maryland.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Lynch.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Edmiston.
Mr. Schulte with Mr. Klein.
Mr. Kocialkowski with Mr. Sheridan.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Smith of West Virginia.
Mr. Lane with Mrs. O'Day.
Mr. Eliot of Massachusetts with Mr. Faddis.
Mr. Maciora with Mr. Thom.
Mr. Leavy with Mr. Fitzgerald.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Dies.
Mr. Kelly of Illinois with Mr. Somers of New York.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Maciejewski with Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania.

Messrs. CASE, O'CONNOR, RANKIN, SIKES, and WHELCHEL changed their votes from yea to nay.

Messrs. SPRINGER, CARTER, and HILL of Washington changed their votes from nay to yea.

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs may sit during the sessions of the House this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Philadelphia Inquirer.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement of the program of the Farm Security Administration in Kansas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement on the Florida ship canal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. DOMENGEAUX]?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a radio address delivered on yesterday by Attorney A. K. Swann on the subject What Contribution Illinois Can Make Toward the War Effort, Provided Oil-Drilling Restrictions Are Lifted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a memorial address delivered in my district by my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain correspondence with the War Production Board on the subject of gasoline rationing for farmers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two topics, in one to include some short newspaper articles referring to Justice William O. Douglas, and in another to include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time today and ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 15 minutes.

DISTRIBUTION OF PURCHASING POWER

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, the President addressed the Congress in joint session in January 1937, and among other things made this statement:

> One-third of the American people are ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clothed.

He never uttered truer words. Up to that point it is conceded that there was something radically wrong with our economic system. In order for this country to become a world power and furnish leadership in democracy we must make the much talked of four freedoms work in America. Freedom from want had not been established in this country when the President spoke the words quoted. We cannot hope to have the downtrodden nations of the world look to us as their savior or look to us for guidance in their social and economic lives unless we place our country in a position where all will have equal opportunities and where none is ill-fed, ill-housed, or ill-clothed.

It is popular these days to quote Winston Churchill, the Prime Minister of Great Britain. He is reported as saying in 1937:

> There is one way above all others in which the United States can aid the European democracies. Let her regain and maintain her normal prosperity. A prosperous United States exerts, directly and indirectly, an immense beneficent force upon world affairs. A United States thrown into financial and economic collapse spreads evil far and wide and weakens France and England just at the time when they most need to be strong.

We appropriated billions of dollars from 1933 up until the time we became involved in this war for peacetime relief. We had not answered the demand for world leadership asked by the European democracies. We had not attained normal prosperity in this country. Our national income now, of course, will be greatly increased by our war effort, but this wartime prosperity does not reach all peoples. When the war is over the materials which we have been making will be of little value to our people in normal pursuits. We cannot use them. In other words, on the conclusion of the war we will be faced with the same condition economically as we were when we went into the war, with the added huge indebtedness and the returning soldiers, many of whom will be sick and injured and in need of medical care.

You cannot blame countries like India and Burma for not enthusiastically embracing the extended arms of protection of Great Britain and ourselves when we have been unable to answer the problems confronting our own people.

I am going to refer specifically to our own economic shortcomings, and that is as our present system affects the elderly people of this country. It is traditional among the Chinese that they revere their elders. They cherish the advice and counsel of their elders, whereas in our country we scarcely give them the consideration that we do a retired horse or mule at the end of its active service.

We have deliberately neglected the aged and needy of this country, many of whom today are living in poverty. What little that is provided by the social-security program is taken away by rising prices and they are left in want when the end of the month rolls around.

Governments fail in their purpose if they do not work for the good of all, and provide a way of getting the material resources of the country into the hands of all the people to the end that the people might be provided the common necessities of life. We must at the same time guard against any governmental policy which would in the end lose for these people their rights and privileges of freedom.

Sooner or later, and we hope it will be sooner, Japan, Germany, and Italy will

lay down their arms. They will be forced to by the might of the United States and her allies. Then we will be confronted with post-war questions affecting a peace that we hope will stand.

What will be the conditions then? Governments as we now know them may have fallen. Who will be here to deal for a lasting peace? No doubt revolutions and counter-revolutions will take place in various countries so the writing of the peace pact and the promulgating, as well as instrumenting of it, may take years. Consequently, we must now begin to lay a plan to save our own country and our own form of government on the conclusion of the actual fighting in this war.

After a long and bloody war, with our national resources at least impaired; with many of our boys killed or injured and, in one word, our manpower depleted; our machinery unfitted for peacetime production, and the lives of our people used to carrying on war, how will we be able to get back into normal times? How can we return to peacetime pursuits and get back in peacetime production soon enough to prevent mass unemployment and maybe worse?

May I ask how long the boys returning from the seven seas and from every land and those engaged in the production of military equipment when out of employment will remain quiet and take it on the chin? Remember, they will be doing some thinking of their own in the long days and nights they lie waiting to deliver fatal blows. Remember, there may be from five to ten million of these men in uniform in addition to the workers engaged in war production.

If our economic problems are not met, these men may proceed to find a way of their own to meet them. We cannot expect hungry men and women to restrain themselves from direct action if their little ones and they themselves are hungry. Even victory, Members of the House, may leave, unless we take care, a legacy of disaster.

We must begin now to work out a policy of government that will not only guarantee our own country a form of democracy that works but which we hope will serve as an inspiration to all other struggling people in other countries, for them to follow to the end that their peoples may enjoy the privileges of a normal life.

We must not be unmindful that when this war is over we will have no foreign markets for our goods. No country will be able to buy them. Consequently, we must create a market of our own. If we cannot do this, we may find ourselves in such a chaotic condition as that which may compare with any faced by foreign enemies. It is not without the realm of possibility that it may be necessary to retain a large army under arms to quell any possible riots of disappointed peoples in want.

We, Members of Congress, must visualize the future security of our country and prepare against the economic shocks which we are going to suffer just like the man in his private and personal affairs prepares himself to meet any adversity that may come up in his business. If that man does not look into the future he goes broke. It is up to us as Representatives of the American people to commence to prepare for what is inevitably coming.

The conversion of our productive machinery from military production will take time, and it will be a big job to do this. We, right now, should be creating and maintaining plans for peacetime production along with war production. This can be done. We must remember those engaged not as soldiers or in war production must eat, wear clothes, and be housed and supplied with a reasonable amount of the necessities of life.

The natural question for you to ask is how can this be done?

My answer is that we should set up a policy of distributing the products of our fields and factories, justly and fairly, among our people. That should become a national policy of America. Never again can we turn the clock back to the old time of dog-eat-dog and grab everything in sight. Out of this war will come a resolve that distress for the lack of the necessities of life will not be tolerated.

I need not call your attention to the diseases and run-down condition of manhood and womanhood that are caused by poverty. Poverty should be abolished in America, and if the rest of the world sees this, it will serve as a light to illuminate their paths to economic freedom.

Our first act must be to make or create and maintain a market for everything that man needs for his conveniences, comfort, and happiness. The only way this can be done is to adopt a national policy of distributing purchasing power. This must be accorded the aged as well as the active producer.

If we give to the one-third of the American people who the President said were ill-housed, ill-fed, and ill-clothed, a purchasing power we thereby increase production and increase employment.

There has been too little attention paid in the past to the subject of money as it affects distribution. If we have not the money we cannot buy; if we cannot buy, we cannot produce. Our farmers' fields will go unworked. Our industries will be smokeless and will stand idle. I might say that unless all the American people are put in a position of being able to become buyers there will be no occasion to produce goods to the maximum and then what happens? Unemployment, poverty, and hunger will stalk our footsteps.

Remember the building of public improvements at public expense will not be the answer to this problem. That has been tried and found wanting.

I know of no better way today of creating a market and of creating and maintaining increased production and distribution than what is provided for in a bill I introduced. This is H. R. 1036, Townsend plan.

This bill has been before Congress for a long time. One hundred seventy-two Members of this House have signed a petition asking for its consideration. I hope we can get some early action. This bill will place a purchasing power with a great many of our aged, needy people who today have no such power. In addition to the necessities for its passage from a humane standpoint, it has within its scope provisions for national prosperity.

In brief, it provides that all transactions would be taxed and a definite percent of the necessary income be distributed among all the citizens who have reached a certain age. These people would be required to spend this money within a certain period. The amount these people would receive would obviously depend upon the volume of business done each month in the Nation. It is calculated by the best authorities we can find that one-tenth of our population would fall within the class I am speaking of. This one-tenth of our population given a reasonable sum and required to spend it within 30 days would stimulate and increase production and distribution tremendously and also attain in the end a normal prosperity. Our money would also be put to work. This is what we need.

It has been suggested that prices would rise. That might be so for a while, but they will assume a reasonable basis as the demand for goods becomes permanent. Mass production will become universal and then prices will tend toward a steady basis. We need not be so fearful of the threat of inflation. You have inflation only when there is a scarcity of things, together with a plentiful supply of money. Let us try a policy of abundance after this war is over and see what happens. Bear in mind we have the capabilities, the natural resources, the machinery and transportation and the factories. The only thing we lack is the cash market.

The new machine age in which we are living may then become a blessing instead of a curse. We can make it a blessing if we distribute the goods. In fact, we have got to adopt a policy of furnishing a cash market for increased production if we are going to survive after this war.

I want to leave this thought with you. Only through making abundance within the reach of all of our people will it be possible for a world to live in peace and neighborliness. Let us establish contentment at home in the United States and the rest of the world will follow suit.

We have what it takes, let us use it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an excellent editorial from the Washington Star of Sunday, and further to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article in the Political Mill column of Saturday's Evening Star by the distinguished columnist Gould Lincoln.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EBERHARTER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

PENSIONS AND MORALE

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, today, in a world rampant with prejudice and intolerance, we as representatives of a free, democratic America occupy enviable positions. Today the fight against fascism is a universal fight; we are fighting fascism on the far-flung foreign battle fronts and on the domestic front as well.

In this greatest fight of all fights, of all times, the fight between democracy and fascism, we have it within our power to preserve and to extend democracy; it is within our power to defeat fascism everywhere and to guarantee the blessings of democracy for ourselves and our posterity.

One major way of doing both, fighting fascism and guaranteeing the blessings of democracy, is to provide decent pensions for our senior citizens.

Throughout the length and breadth of our land many of these senior citizens, the men and women who have made this country the great country that it is, the grandfathers and grandmothers of the boys who are fighting and dying to save that which their grandparents built, are in destitute circumstances—are poorly fed, poorly clothed, and poorly housed.

Despite the war boom millions of these people have been unable to get jobs, are still unemployed, because they are not wanted; rising living costs, in the face of already limited incomes, further lowers the living standard to that of a Nazi slave or Fascist serf; and induction into the armed forces of sources of support completes the sad picture of the men and women who have built America—unwanted and cast aside.

Yet, in spite of this black picture of the plight of our mothers and fathers, considerable progress has been made in the realm of pensions during the Seventy-seventh Congress. The Gallup poll of last summer gave a better indication of the desire for Federal pensions; the special Downey committee, investigating old-age pensions, and the Senate Finance Committee revealed further the plight of the aged; and both the executive and the legislative branches of our Government have indicated a desire for action this session of Congress on old-age pensions.

Let us examine each of these developments separately:

THE GALLUP POLL

The Gallup poll of July 25, 1941, revealed:

(a) That 91 percent of the people favored Government old-age pensions;

(b) That the largest percentage group favored a 60-year limit;

(c) That the largest percentage group favored a pension of from $40 to $60 per month; and

(d) That the great majority would be willing to pay 3 cents of every dollar of income until they reach 60 years of age to get a Government pension of $50 per month after 60.

These cold facts suggest that Americans are pension-conscious and is a direct indication from the populace of the desire for pensions.

THE DOWNEY COMMITTEE

During the hot days of last summer, while some were vacationing and others were dreaming of things to come, the special Downey committee unearthed more facts; and, in Senate Report 666, of August 28, 1941, made the following recommendations:

First. Reduction of the age limit for pensions from 65 years to 60 years;

Second. Elimination of the humiliating and unpopular means test and grant a minimum pension to all workers retired from gainful employment;

Third. Abolition of the present Federal-State matching system, which had such disastrous results for the less prosperous States; and

Fourth. Extension and liberalization of the contributory features of the present Insurance Act by making the coverage of the system almost universal and by raising the minimum payment thereunder to $30 and further liberalization of payments under the act to wives and widows with dependent children.

THE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE

Last December the Senate Finance Committee conducted hearings on S. 1932, introduced by the veteran campaigner for pensions, Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY, of California, which, among other things, aimed to provide for general pensions. These hearings revealed:

(a) That people between the ages of 60 and 65 are in nearly as dire need as those beyond 65 years;

(b) That the United States has a capacity to produce a decent pension for all who have reached 60 years;

(c) A leading tax expert declared that Federal needs—as pensions—could be financed through a gross income tax; and

(d) Eric Biddle, consultant of the American Public Welfare Association stated that England, through expanding the social services, has augmented the morale of her people:

I think—

Said Biddle—

That there has been no period in British history when the social services have been as much extended as they have been during the past 2 years. * * *

The health, unemployment insurance, and old-age and survivor's insurance acts, and the last two acts are similar to our own acts, generally speaking, have been extended both in coverage—that is, as to number of people covered—and in benefits. The extension in benefits has been, frankly, to meet rising living costs, but a great number of people are being covered by those acts.

CONGRESS FAVORS PENSIONS

The consensus of opinion in Congress, which reflects the incessant and growing demand of the people for a more decent old-age pension, is that something must and will be done this session of Congress for the senior citizens.

Indicating this sentiment for old-age pensions, more than 100 bills have been introduced in the Senate and in the House, mainly to amend the Social Security Act, as amended—to improve upon the present social-security system.

A number of the bills introduced provide for an age limit of 65 years and for benefit payments of $30 per month—and these on a Federal-State matching basis. A number of bills also have been introduced which do not relate directly to the senior citizens nor to old-age pensions; these deal with amplifying the existing set-up to be more inclusive; administrative improvements; aid to the blind; aid to the otherwise incapacitated; and others.

THE VICE PRESIDENT FAVORS PENSIONS

One who increasingly more every day reveals his understanding of the problems of his fellow citizens and wants to do something about them also favors pensions to the aged.

Vice President WALLACE, in an address delivered at Los Angeles, on September 28, 1940, declared:

We look forward to the day when every old person can have a decent old-age pension without humiliation as a natural and proper dividend on his citizenship in the richest Nation in the world.

THE PRESIDENT, TOO, FAVORS PENSIONS

The President on a number of occasions has indicated his favorable attitude toward pensions—toward the general extension of the coverage of social security, both as to numbers of people and to benefit payments.

In September 1940 the President, in his message to the convention of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, and Helpers' Union, indicated his approval of increasing the coverage of social-security benefits. Late in November 1941, in a statement to the press, the President reiterated his attitude as desiring to see the social-security system broadened to cover a larger number of workers.

In the Budget message of January 7, 1942, the President said:

I recommend an increase in the coverage of old-age and survivors insurance, addition of permanent and temporary disability payments, and hospitalization payments beyond the present benefit programs, and liberalization and expansion of unemployment compensation in a uniform national system. I suggest that collection of additional contributions be started as soon as possible, to be followed 1 year later by the operation of new benefit plans.

And finally, just last week, Monday, May 25, in a message to Congress, the President stated:

* * * However, it is estimated that at present there are still some 3,000,000 unemployed. Of these many will be hired during the coming year; yet in a labor force exceeding 60,000,000 persons there will remain a substantial number of individuals who will not be hired by private employers because of age, lack of skill, or other handicaps. A certain number may not be able to migrate from regions having surplus labor to regions where workers are needed.

* * * I am now giving attention to proposals for revising and extending the Social Security Act, and expect to make recommendations to the Congress for such legislation as may be necessary to extend the protection of our social-security measures to provide alternative means of meeting the needs presented by the residual group now being aided by the Work Projects Administration.

CONCLUSION

Everyone and everybody is in favor of pensions; the Gallup poll showed that the

overwhelming majority of the American people favor Federal old-age pensions; the special Downey committee, which investigated the old-age pension system, has recommended expansion of the present pension system; Congress generally favors pensions; and the Vice President and the President also favor pensions.

So let us prove to the American people that Congress is not selfish; that Congress is not just interested in pensions and gas for itself. Let us help those boys on the high seas, in Australia, in Ireland, or wherever they may be to keep faith with us by our keeping faith with their mothers and dads.

Let us take action on universal old-age pensions now.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SMITH of West Virginia, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 69. An act to authorize the adjustment of land-ownership lines within the General Grant Grove section of the Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., in order to protect equities established by possession arising in conformity with a certain survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 488. An act for the relief of Kathryn O. Sweeney and others;

H. R. 1162. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the final homestead proof submitted by Henry Martin Coffman;

H. R. 1595. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Plumas National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 1736. An act for the relief of Lillian Last;

H. R. 1757. An act for the relief of James D. G. Alexander;

H. R. 2307. An act validating a certain conveyance, heretofore made by the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way in the town of Indio, in the county of Riverside, State of California, acquired under section 23 of the act of March 3, 1871 (16 Stat. 573);

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of George P. Crawford;

H. R. 2685. An act to authorize the disposition of recreational demonstration projects, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Wiley W. Watkins;

H. R. 2934. An act for the relief of L. H. Martin;

H. R. 3201. An act for the relief of Walter B. Williams, Jr.;

H. R. 3937. An act to change the designation of the Fort Marion National Monument, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4205. An act to add to the Cleveland National Forest, Calif., certain contiguous lands of the United States which can be most effectively and economically protected and administered as parts of said national forest;

H. R. 4213. An act for the relief of persons in connection with the extraction of gold-bearing ore from the Ruck-A-Chucky dam site;

H. R. 4347. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the North Pacific Union Conference Association of Seventh-day Adventists;

H. R. 4526. An act for the relief of Joseph Donatelli and Rose Donatelli;

H. R. 4629. An act for the relief of Alfred Smith;

H. R. 4676. An act to accept the cession by the Commonwealth of Kentucky of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mammoth Cave National Park; to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for the park in accordance with the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 635); to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the development of a proper entrance road to the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4723. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of John Lesniak;

H. R. 4733. An act to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest, the Salmon National Forest, and the Targhee National Forest in the State of Idaho;

H. R. 5013. An act for the relief of James P. Crawford;

H. R. 5016. An act to amend section 1 of the act approved August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 700), entitled "An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to notify the State of Virginia that the United States assumes police jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Shenandoah National Park, and for other purposes";

H. R. 5142. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the claims of any landowner or water user on the Owyhee reclamation project, Oregon, arising in 1940 by reason of a break in the North Canal of such project;

H. R. 5210. An act for the relief of E. M. Conroy;

H. R. 5287. An act relating to the transfer to the Secretary of War of certain lands owned by the United States;

H. R. 5329. An act for the relief of J. J. McIntosh;

H. R. 5394. An act to authorize the lease or sale of public lands for use in connection with the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, etc.;

H. R. 5484. An act for the relief of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska;

H. R. 5490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim to the States of Oregon and California, respectively, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands of Goose Lake in Oregon and California;

H. R. 5527. An act for the relief of Gerney M. Claiborne;

H. R. 5636. An act to expedite the settlement of claims and accounts incident to certain agricultural adjustment programs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5680. An act for the relief of James M. Hays;

H. R. 5687. An act for the relief of Edwin L. Wade;

H. R. 5713. An act for the relief of George W. Lyle, under the jurisdiction of the United States Employees' Commission;

H. R. 5723. An act for the relief of Anna Danielson and Betty Tiedeman;

H. R. 5772. An act for the relief of Glenn A. Hoss;

H. R. 5847. An act for the relief of Mrs. Julia Campbell;

H. R. 5910. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rudolph Treiber, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 5955. An act for the relief of Harold W. Burch and Lucille M. Burch;

H. R. 6102. An act confirming the claim of Augustin Dominique Tureaud for the Church of St. Jacques to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, parish of St. James, said claim being listed as No. 392;

H. R. 6365. An act for the relief of Commander Cato D. Glover;

H. R. 6625. An act granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the Constitution of the State of New Mexico providing a method for executing leases for grazing and agricultural purposes on lands granted or confirmed to the State of New Mexico by the act of Congress approved June 20, 1910;

H. R. 6748. An act for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder;

H. R. 6797. An act for the relief of the estate of Tom Gentry;

H. R. 6979. An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength;

H. R. 7008. An act to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of $5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority;

H. R. 7097. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore and Washington Railroad Co. to extend its present track connection with the United States navy yard so as to provide adequate railroad facilities in connection with the development of Buzzards Point as an industrial area in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1932 (47 Stat. 322), as amended by the act approved June 20, 1939 (53 Stat. 849); and

H. J. Res. 314. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the marine and war-risk insurance fund.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1637. An act to authorize the conveyance to the State of Illinois, for highway purposes only, a portion of the Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.;

S. 2088. An act to authorize aircraft flight rations for officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Navy and Marine Corps while engaged in flight operations;

S. 2097. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the board of trustees, School District No. 20, Charleston County, S. C., a parcel of land situated in the city of Charleston, S. C.;

S. 2229. An act to provide for the retirement, rank, and pay of heads of staff departments of the Marine Corps;

S. 2382. An act to amend the act approved June 24, 1926, entitled "An act to authorize the construction and procurement of aircraft and aircraft equipment in the Navy and Marine Corps, and to adjust and define the status of the operating personnel in connection therewith," so as to provide for the establishment of the designation of naval aviation pilot (airship), and for other purposes; and

S. 2446. An act to prescribe certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On May 29, 1942:

H. R. 4476. An act providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment.

On June 1, 1942:

H. R. 6979. An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the corps of cadets at authorized strength; and

H. J. Res. 314. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the marine and war-risk insurance fund.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 2, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON CIVIL SERVICE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Civil Service on Tuesday, June 2, 1942, at 10:30 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 7071 and H. R. 7144, room 246, Old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Wednesday, June 3, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearing in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on June 3, at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, June 3, 1942, for consideration of H. R. 3776 and H. R. 7152.

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Census on Thursday, June 4, 1942, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 7154.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 11, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 7105, to provide for the suspension, during the war, of operating differential subsidy agreements and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1686. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 16, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the channel from Back Sound to Lookout Bight, N. C., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on August 6, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 746); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

1687. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on lists of papers recommended for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1688. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, Acting Secretary of War, and the Chairman of the War Production Board, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to exempt from the antitrust laws compliance with the directions issued by the Chairman of the War Production Board; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1689. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to redefine the powers and duties of the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, to establish a Department of Public Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

1690. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 2 of the act approved October 30, 1941 (Public Law 287, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), so as to authorize transportation for the dependents of Reserve and retired personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, upon release from active duty, from their last duty stations to their homes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1691. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the sale by the Superintendent of Documents of copies of certain historical and naval documents printed by the Government Printing Office; to the Committee on Printing.

1692. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1940 and prior years in the sum of $2,224.74, and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 in the sum of $10,305,000, amounting in all to $10,307,224.74, for the Department of Justice (H. Doc. No. 747); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1693. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 748); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1694. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the national defense activities of the Federal Communications Commission, amounting to $2,149,876 for the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 749); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1695. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the National Housing Agency, in the amount of $173,000 (H. Doc. No. 750); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1696. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to certain appropriations for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 (H. Doc. No. 751); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1697. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Federal Security Agency for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $13,095,000, in the form of amendments to the Budget for said fiscal year (H. Doc. No. 744); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1698. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision affecting certain naval appropriations for the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 752); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1699. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Navy Department and naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, amounting to $200,000,000 cash (H. Doc. No. 753); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1700. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1941 and prior fiscal years in the amount of $16,526.90, and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1942 in the amount of $5,318.38, in all, $21,845.28 (H. Doc. No. 754); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1701. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the national defense activities of the Civil Service Commission, amounting to $4,147,476 for the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 755); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1702. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Labor as an amendment to the Budget for that Department for the fiscal year 1943, involving an increase of $185,000 (H. Doc. No. 745); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1703. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1941 amounting to $6,200 and supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 amounting to $8,549,760, in all, $8,555,960, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations (H. Doc. No. 756); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1704. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting deficiency estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1941 of $555,000, supplemental estimates of appropriations of $38,098,000 and $8,640 for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943, respectively, in all, $38,661,460, together with a provision affecting an appropriation for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year 1943 (H. Doc. No. 757); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1705. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the War Shipping Administration, Office for Emergency Management, executive office of the President, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $1,100,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 758); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1706. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for the Department of Commerce, Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics, for civilian pilot training, amounting to $36,677,450 (H. Doc. No. 759); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1707. A communication from the President of the United States transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Board of Economic Warfare for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $13,818,000, and a draft of a proposed provision relating to the unexpended balance of a revolving fund (H. Doc. No. 760); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. IZAC: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 2456. An act to amend the act approved February 4, 1919 (40 Stat. 1056), entitled "An act to provide for the award of medals of honor, distinguished-service medals, and Navy crosses, and for other purposes," so as to change the conditions for the award of medals, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2187). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. Senate Joint Resolu-

tion 130. Joint resolution to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2188). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FADDIS: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 1707. An act to prevent the making of photographs and sketches of military or naval reservations, naval vessels, and other naval and military properties, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2189). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7119. A bill to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2190). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee of the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2191. Report on the disposition of records of sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2192. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2193. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2194. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 7156. A bill to provide for the effective utilization of existing stocks of rubber tires, to aid in making rubber tires available for essential uses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 7157. A bill to enable the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two-hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 7158. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R 7159. A bill authorizing the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 7160. A bill to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy during the existing war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 7161. A bill to further expedite the prosecution of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 7162. A bill to suspend for the duration of the war certain requirements of section 11 (a) of the Federal Register Act of 1935; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 7163. A bill to amend the United States Arbitration Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 7164. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the relief and benefits provided therein to certain persons, to include certain addition proceedings and transactions therein, to provide further relief for persons in miliary service, to change certain insurance provisions thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SACKS:

H. R. 7173 (by request). A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyright," approved March 4, 1909, as amended; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. MAY:

H. J. Res. 318. Joint resolution to amend section 1700 (a) (1) of the Internal Revenue Code by exempting from tax the amount paid for admissions to theaters and other activities operated by the War Department or the Navy Department within posts, camps, reservations, and other areas maintained by the Military or Naval Establishment; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY:

H. Res. 491. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript entitled "Poems of Faith and Freedom," compiled in the office of the Consultant in English Poetry from manuscript displayed in the Library of Congress, as a document; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. Res. 492. Resolution for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 130, a resolution to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DINGELL:

H. Res. 493. Resolution that the proceeding held in the House of Representatives on April 30 and May 4, 1942, in commemoration of the one hundred and fifty-first anniversary of the adoption of the Constitution of Poland, be printed as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

H. Res. 494. Resolution authorizing an investigation of shortages in petroleum products in natural and synthetic rubber; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 495. Resolution to provide for expenses of investigation authorized by House Resolution 494; to the Committee on Accounts.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 7165. A bill granting a pension to Ida Wilson McCabe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 7166 (by request). A bill for the relief of John Fleckstein; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 7167. A bill for the relief of Elmore Lee Lane; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HILL of Washington:

H. R. 7168. A bill for the relief of Grover C. Wedgwood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KILDAY:

H. R. 7169. A bill for the relief of Col. E. H. Tarbutton; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PETERSON of Georgia:

H. R. 7170. A bill for the relief of Gus Smith; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. R. 7171. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. C. Tommey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 7172. A bill for the relief of Clare A. Miller; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2962. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition relative to Senate bill 860, and requesting that same be brought before the House for consideration; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2963. Also, petition relative to Senate bill 860, and requesting that the bill be brought before the House for consideration; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2964. By Mr. CRAVENS: Petition of Mrs. Has Owen and others of Miller County, Ark., urging enactment of Senate bill 860, to prevent the sale of intoxicating liquors in military camps and defense areas and for the suppression of vice in such localities; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2965. Also, petition of Mrs. Ross Gamble and others of Mena, Polk County, Ark., for the elimination of intoxicants as a means of furthering the war effort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2966. By Mr. FITZPATRICK: Petition of the New York State Legislature, memoralizing Congress to pass appropriate legislation to eliminate any inequitable discrimination against the New York Merchant Marine Academy, to provide the same emoluments for the cadets of the academy as is now granted to United States Maritime Commission cadets in order that the two training programs may be on a parity, and to take such other proper steps as may be necessary to secure such parity and enhance the value and usefulness of the New York State Merchant Marine Academy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2967. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Women's Missionary Society of the United Presbyterian Church, Beaver Valley Presbyterial (comprising Lawrence and Beaver Counties, Pa.), urging the enactment of the Sheppard bill for the protection of our boys from the evil of drink and vice; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2968. Also, petition of Rev. Donald McGarrah, pastor, Sarver (Pa.) Presbyterian Church, and 111 residents of Butler County, Pa., urging in this hour of crisis the complete removal from our country of the alcoholic beverage industry and its accompanying dangers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2969. Also, petition of Rev. H. E. Dornheim, representing the Riverview Evangelical Church, Beaver Falls, Pa., urging an early passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval bases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2970. Also, petition of 28 citizens of Beaver County, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2971. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Joseph K. Elliott and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2972. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Rev. Troy P. Bess, minister of First Christian Church, Holton, Kans., and 100 fathers, mothers, wives, brothers, and sisters of the men in our armed forces, urging protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquors, and urging the passage of the Sheppard bill, S. 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2973. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Rev. J. E. McClellan, pastor of the Methodist

Church of Reasnor, Iowa, and members of his congregation, urging the passage of Sheppard bill, S. 860, which prohibits sale of intoxicating liquor in our camps and defense project areas; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2974. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of O. L. Byrns and a number of citizens of Morning Sun, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860, providing for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2975. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Newspaper and Periodical Drivers and Helpers, Local 921, San Francisco, Calif., relative to House bill 6486, a bill to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2976. By Mr. SHAFER of Michigan: Resolution of the Michigan Milk Producers Association, opposing attitude of Federal officials in regard to use of substitutes for dairy products and demoralization of dairy laws which were designed to promote the health of the citizens; to the Committee on Agriculture.

2977. Also, resolution of the West Michigan Tourist and Resort Association, requesting that gasoline rationing in the Great Lakes region be either deferred until the close of the vacation season, or that suitable provision be made to provide defense workers and vacationists with sufficient motor fuel to enable them to travel reasonable distances for their annual vacation, unless it be adequately demonstrated such measure will impede the war effort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2978. Also, resolution of the Michigan Federation of Labor, urging favorable consideration of Senate bill 594; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2979. Also, resolution of the Michigan Federation of Labor, urging passage of war displacement bill now under consideration by the Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2980. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of members of the Methodist Church of Browntown, Wis., favoring the immediate passage of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2981. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Cincinnati Automobile Club, Cincinnati, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to helping the Government in its present war efforts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2982. Also, petition of Warren G. Myers, of Lynchburg, Va., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to Federal District Judge John Paul; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2983. Also, petition of the Texas Bankers Association, Dallas, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to rationing of gasoline in Texas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2984. Also, petition of the Florida Water Conservation League, Bradenton, Fla., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 6999; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

2985. Also, petition of the Michigan Federation of Post Office Clerks, Detroit, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 7071; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

2986. Also, petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Kansas City, Kansas City, Mo., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Nation-wide rationing of gasoline; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2987. Also, petition of the Texas Safety Association, Inc., Austin, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the proposal that gasoline rationing for tire conservation purposes be applied to Texas; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

2988. Also, petition of the Philadelphia Post Office Clerks Union, No. 89, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to price control; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 2, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Commander Robert J. White, Chaplain Corps, United States Naval Reserve, dean, Catholic University of America Law School, former national chaplain, American Legion, offered the following prayer:

Lord, God of heaven and earth, the eternal Father of us all, we humbly bow before Thee, and petition by prayer thy benediction upon the proceedings of this day.

To Thee, O Lord, from whom is every best and perfect gift, we render thanks for this occasion to welcome and to honor, within our national family, the gallant leader of a brave and loyal people. They have proved themselves the bravest of the brave, in defense of hearth and home. Their character has been found true in the crucible of suffering and death. Their spirit is truly the reflection of the spirit of their Executive. His wisdom, his love of all his people, his energy, and character have brought glory to him and to his people. Hasten, O Lord, the day of the restoration of our gallant friend and able Executive to the leadership of his people in a new-found freedom.

The vivid memories of our mutual sufferings in a common cause blend our prayers for his men and for our men who have offered their final sacrifices on the altar of human freedom. May their souls rest in peace and may Thy blessed light shine upon them forever. May their loved ones not languish in unavailing grief, but with strong hope look up through their tears to Thee, our God of all consolation.

Let our mutual sacrifices be the tinder of the raging flames of righteous wrath that shall subdue tyranny and injustice, and preserve our heritage of liberty.

Strengthen our wills in the way of discipline for the sacrifices necessary to achieve our destiny in Thy law and under Thy protection.

May Thy holy spirit light up the days of trial before us, and in time of war and time of peace give us the gift of wisdom in the manifold tasks before us.

Bless our reconsecration to the ideals of democratic government, for in truth and in essence they are the religious ideals of faith and mutual sacrifice and justice. Bless our complete consecration in the time of our trial to the restoration of liberty under law. For only thus can Thy kingdom come on earth as it is in heaven, when the ideal of every human being as a son of God shall be restored to supremacy. To that victory—bless the consecration of all we have, are, or hope to be. With Thy help we cannot fail. We shall restore, at whatever cost, that human freedom which has no boundary of east, or west, or south, or north, but shineth everywhere is Thy divine truth—universal and eternal.

We ask these blessings through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Gatling, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2730. An act for the relief of Dorothy Silva;

H. R. 3488. An act to provide that assistant or deputy heads of certain bureaus in the Department of the Interior shall be appointed under the civil-service laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4999. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by the Columbia Boat & Barge System, Inc.;

H. R. 5438. An act for the relief of the San Diego Gas & Electric Co.;

H. R. 5778. An act for the relief of Luther Herbert Tench and Mrs. Mildred Farmer Tench;

H. R. 6502. An act to change the name of the Black Warrior National Forest to the William B. Bankhead National Forest; and

H. R. 6646. An act to provide that the unexplained absence of any individual for 7 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1853. An act for the relief of the Rock Hill Stone & Gravel Co., of St. Louis, Mo.;

S. 2264. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of James H. Lane; and

S. 2506. An act for the relief of Angela Skeoch.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2424. An act for the relief of Clarence J. Meteyer, Lester W. Engels, and Dorothy B. Engels;

H. R. 3398. An act for the relief of Gerhard R. Fisher;

H. R. 4845. An act to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $30 to $40 per month, to grant such rate at age 65, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5385. An act for the relief of Charles E. Yates and the Motor Facts Sales Co.;

H. R. 5619. An act for the relief of certain clerks in the post office at Detroit, Mich.;

H. R. 6496. An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the

line and staff corps of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 315. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect of meat-packing establishments engaged in intrastate commerce only, in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat food products by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 4153) entitled "An act for the relief of Cleaver Kelley," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. ROSIER, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5000) entitled "An act for the relief of Ferd W. Meile," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5439) entitled "An act for the relief of Joseph Soulek," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1563) entitled "An act conferring jurisdiction upon the court of claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 761)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania have declared war against the United States. I realize that the three Governments took this action not upon their own initiative or in response to the wishes of their own peoples but as the instruments of Hitler. These three Governments are now engaged in military activities directed against the United Nations and are planning an extension of these activities.

Therefore I recommend that the Congress recognize a state of war between the United States and Bulgaria, between the United States and Hungary, and between the United States and Rumania.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 2, 1942.*

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. BEITER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

CONFERENCE REPORT ON THE LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. O'NEAL submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6802) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Providence Journal-Evening Bulletin, on the gasoline shortage.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a resolution adopted by the Farmers Association of Puerto Rico requesting the removal of Governor Tugwell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Puerto Rico?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a report which I received from a high-ranking official in the motor transportation service of the War Department on the conservation of rubber. Let me add, Mr. Speaker, that I made this request on yesterday and I have received a letter from the Public Printer stating it will cost $112. I renew my request on account of the value of this article for the general information of the Congress and the people of the country.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT

The SPEAKER. It is the purpose of the Chair to declare a recess at 12:20 and the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines will be on the floor at 12:30. The Chair asks that the telephone operators notify the offices of the Members of this fact.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the rationing of gasoline in the Middle West cannot, in my opinion, be justified upon either practical or economic grounds. Kansas and the Midwest area has more refining facilities and gasoline than it can market. On the eastern seaboard, because of shortage of transportation, it has been deemed necessary to cut down the supply, and on that ground rationing orders have been put into effect. The reason for the rationing of gasoline in our part of the country is for the preservation of tires.

Mr. Speaker, it is not necessary to drastically limit the use of gasoline in Kansas or in the areas of this country where we have a big supply of gasoline in order to preserve rubber. The people of the Midwest are already keen to the situation and are exerting their efforts to save tires. They are patriotic and will let the Government have their tires for the prosecution of the war if they are convinced that it is necessary to do so. They do not need rationing regulations to persuade them to preserve the rubber. They are doing that now; they are patriotic and want to cooperate in the war effort in every respect. I think it can be fairly estimated that automobile traffic in the middle States has been cut as much as 30 or 40 percent. It does not make good sense to say that we are limiting the use of gasoline in one part of the country because it is scarce and then tell folks in other places that it is being done to conserve rubber.

Mr. Speaker, the midwest area now has more refining facilities and gasoline than it can market. Attention should be called to the fact that in the large-scale manufacture of high-octane aviation gasoline there is produced a huge amount of commercial gasoline used in automobiles and trucks. If this product is not used it will otherwise be wasted.

Mr. Speaker, this situation should be clarified. The entire program should be definitely and clearly explained to the people of this country. As I have said, our people are tire conscious, they are patriotic and want to cooperate in every respect in the war effort. If convinced that it is necessary to do so, they will even share their tires with their Government, but they do not need to be rationed in the use of gasoline, of which there is an over-abundant supply right in their own communities, in order to save rubber. They have not abused that privilege and they are not going to do it at this critical time.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by including therein an account of the proceedings at which the Harrisburg Steel Co. was awarded the Navy E, and to include some remarks made by myself on that occasion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

CLASS OF 1942, WEST POINT

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include in my remarks the names of the graduates of West Point of the class of 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SNYDER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute, to ask the majority leader a question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a very important message has just been presented to the Congress by the President of the United States. I ask the majority leader what the purpose is as to the disposition of that particular message?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, it was originally intended to take the matters up today and present the necessary resolutions, but as a result of a conference with my friend from Michigan, and in view of the fact that the Senate has recessed until Thursday, and that a number of Members were advised that the only business to be considered today would be the visit of our distinguished guest, the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, and the call of the Private Calendar, it is the intention to present the resolutions tomorrow, and I so advise the House, that the Members may know that the resolutions declaring a state of war in accordance with the message of the President will be presented at that time.

Mr. MICHENER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order tomorrow to present resolutions declaring that a state of war exists in relation to the three countries mentioned in the message recently received from the President of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I ask the majority leader whether he intends to ask for a roll call on these resolutions?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. FISH. On all of them?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I think it would be the wise policy for the House to follow that practice on an important matter of this kind.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

RATE OF PENSIONS, WORLD WAR VETERANS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4845) to increase the rate of pensions to World War veterans from $30 to $40 per month, to grant such rate at age 65, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, strike out lines 7 to 10, inclusive, and lines 1 to 3, inclusive, on page 2.

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to increase the rate of pensions to World War veterans from $30 to $40 per month, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. RICH. I reserve the right to object. Were these amendments passed on by the Committee on Pensions?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, when this bill passed the House, it included World War veterans who had reached the age of 65 years. The Senate struck that provision out in the bill. In other words, the Senate reduced the scope of the measure.

Mr. RICH. And what has the committee of the House done in reference to the striking out of those provisions, and in reference to the bill generally?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, the bill was reported from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation of which I am the chairman. Subsequently it was taken up in the House and passed the House unanimously, I believe. It went to the Senate and the Senate added the amendment which the Clerk has reported. I polled the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation about taking this up and concurring in the Senate amendments.

Mr. RICH. Did the gentleman poll all of the members of the committee?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Are they unanimous?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. All that are in town; all that I could reach.

Mr. RICH. Has the gentleman polled them all? If he has not, I think it should be taken up by the committee.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM], who is present, is a member of the committee, as is also the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT]. We called every single member on both sides, and not a single one of them that we could reach but was in favor of this procedure.

Mr. RICH. I think that legislation of this kind is so important that the committees in charge of this legislation should take them up and act upon them.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has been standing on this floor clamoring for reducing expenses. The Senate has done that by this amendment. All you can possibly accomplish by objecting would be to force us to go to the Rules Committee and bring this in under a rule. That is all in God's world the gentleman could accomplish by objecting to this unanimous consent request.

Mr. RICH. All I want to do is to see that the legislation that comes before the House of Representatives has consideration by the committee which is in charge of that legislation. We are not going to let any more bills go through without due consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so only for the purpose of reminding the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the committee has already passed upon this, the House has already passed upon this bill, and there is not any possible excuse for objecting at this time.

Mr. RICH. All right. That is what I wanted to know. I wanted to get that information.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I had already told the gentleman that in terms that I did not think he could misunderstand.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I am strongly opposed to the extension of gasoline rationing on a Nation-wide basis to those areas where refineries abound, and transportation of oil is no problem. There is no occasion for such rationing. Our people in the Middle West, realizing that no more tires are in prospect until after the war, have voluntarily rationed the use of their automobiles. My observation has been that the traffic throughout that area is from 25 to 40 percent less than a year ago. If further conservation of rubber is necessary, let us tell them outright what is required, because no more patriotic citizens are to be found anywhere, and they will yield to that which needs to be done. However, the conflicting statements of the administrative branch of the Government are not conducive to the best spirit of cooperation that is possible. My people want to be told outright what is required, and not be rationed by subterfuge. It is my sincere hope that unnecessary measures will not be adopted at this time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief address.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana with reference to gasoline rationing.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. WICKERSHAM was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a radio speech which I delivered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, after the disposition of the legislative business and any other special orders today, I ask unanimous consent to be allowed to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that the magazine called In Fact made this statement, that fellow Congressmen who are afraid of losing support of home-town papers vote DIES money every year although they know he is a faker. I say the magazine with the name In Fact does not publish the truth and I am much inclined to think by the statements it makes it is fooling and faking the American public.

I want to say to that magazine and to this country that MARTIN DIES and the Committee on Investigation of Subversive Activities are not fakers. They are good, honest, loyal, 100-percent American citizens. We voted them that money because we have confidence and believe in them. This magazine that is called In Fact is a faker. I want the people of this country to know it. It is high time that the people of this country realize that Members of Congress who try to do their duty are honest men, and especially the Dies committee. When the time comes in America that the radicals who publish such statements are permitted to do so we will tear down our form of government. The administration should pay attention to such matters now, especially since we are at war. The Communists and radicals are trying to overthrow our form of government—and they are making too much progress to suit me. I am for getting them out of the country and doing it quickly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

ALLOWANCE FOR DEPENDENTS OF ENLISTED MEN

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 496, Rept. No. 2196) for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7119) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

LAWS RELATING TO MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 492, Rept. No. 2197) for printing in the RECORD:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. J. Res. 130) to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article on aircraft cargoes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

VISIT OF THE HONORABLE MANUEL L. QUEZON, PRESIDENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE PHILIPPINE ISLANDS

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as a committee to escort to the Chamber the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Thereupon at 12 o'clock and 24 minutes p. m., the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

VISIT OF THE HONORABLE MANUEL L. QUEZON, PRESIDENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE PHILIPPINES

The President of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands entered the Chamber at 12:37 p. m., and was escorted to the Speaker's rostrum by the committee appointed by the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Members of the House of Representatives, the coming to America of our distinguished guest today, our former colleague in the House of Representatives, is, of course, unfortunate, but as it was necessary we welcome him with open arms and with grateful hearts.

He comes to us as the representative of a valiant and a gallant race of people. When the true history of the times is written, the valor, the courage, and the fortitude of the people of the Philippine Islands will make a bright page.

I deem it a high privilege—it is certainly a great personal pleasure—to present the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands.

PRESIDENT QUEZON. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply touched by your very kind words.

Once again I find myself in this august Hall, where for 7 years I pled the cause of my people, their freedom, and independence. The memory of those happy days, some of the happiest of my life, rush into my mind now, almost making me forget the sad plight in which I find myself.

I came to Washington in the winter of 1909–10. On the very first day that I was introduced to the Speaker and given a seat in this Chamber, a stranger in a foreign land, I received a hearty welcome. And through all the years I served with you I was treated with not only courtesy but cordiality.

On the 14th of May 1910 I addressed the House of Representatives for the first time. On that occasion I described the splendid work that had already been done by the American administration in the Philippines, with particular reference to schools, sanitation, and roads.

I am glad—

I said on that occasion—

to be able to affirm that, under American occupation, there has been established in the Philippines a more liberal government; and the Filipinos have enjoyed more personal and political liberty than they ever did under the Spanish crown. These facts are freely acknowledged throughout the length and breadth of the islands, and my countrymen wish me most earnestly to assure the House, and, through them, the people of the United States, that they are grateful, profoundly grateful, for all the benefits that your Government has conferred upon them.

But, sirs, despite it all, the Filipinos are not as yet a happy people. You would ask me why? Then I will answer in the language of that great apostle of human freedom, Daniel Webster: "No matter how easy may be the yoke of a foreign power, no matter how lightly it sits upon the shoulder, if it is not imposed by the voice of its own opinion and of its own truth, he will not, he cannot, and he means not to be happy under its burden."

These words I uttered in this same Hall 32 years ago. It took 7 years of constant pleading before I secured the enactment of the act known among us as the Jones law, in which the United States for the first time solemnly pledged the faith of this country to the independence of the Philippines when a stable government should have been established there. Under this act the Filipino people for the first time in their history were to have a legislature of two houses elected by themselves.

Thereupon we began building, day after day, the foundations of a government that the United States would, in due time, consider stable, so that independence might be granted.

Later, in the course of a few years, another act was passed by the Congress

which fixed the year 1946 for the granting of complete independence to the Philippines. Under this Independence Act the Commonwealth of the Philippines was organized and established, with a constitution framed and adopted by the Filipino people themselves.

I was elected the first President of the Commonwealth. A fine delegation from the House of Representatives, headed by its Speaker, and an equally fine delegation from the Senate, headed by its President, came to the islands to witness the inauguration of the Commonwealth. They came there to see with their own eyes the inauguration of human liberty which had been granted by the United States.

Mr. Speaker, from that day on the Commonwealth of the Philippines enacted those laws and executed those policies necessary to prepare the Filipino people to assume their responsibilities as an independent nation in 1946. The first act passed by the legislature, to create a citizen army, was recommended by me and known as the National Defense Act. The act was in accordance with the plan submitted by General MacArthur.

I had secured from the President of the United States permission to bring him to the Philippines as my military adviser in order to organize our armed forces. The outcome is the army that has just fought side by side with your own men in the defense of your flag in the Philippines. That is the army which has shed its blood bravely, nay, willingly, so that it might show to the United States the gratitude of our people for the just and wise policy that you have adopted and followed in your dealings with us.

I am not going to tell you, Mr. Speaker, what the armies in the Philippines, Americans and Filipinos alike, have done. You have read of all that in your press. Nor am I going to dwell at length upon the gallantry, the heroism, and the wonderful leadership of Douglas MacArthur.

You well know that in those dark and terrible days there were many other men, too, who deserve your recognition. There was, of course, General Wainwright, whose tragic responsibility it was at last to surrender Corregidor. He, too, has been a hero throughout the war, from the first day to the last. And there were other American officers and, may I say, some Filipinos also.

There was General Lim, a West Pointer, the first Filipino to graduate from that famous military academy, and there was General Capinpin, who had risen from the ranks. I might mention many other gallant Filipinos, but the names of Lim and Capinpin alone would be enough to cover with glory the military history of my country.

Mr. Speaker, you have heard of the gallant achievements of many Americans and Filipinos during the war. To me perhaps the most striking act of heroism was one that has not been publicized enough. It is the story of a Filipino mess sergeant. You would expect a general, an officer, even a soldier of the line, to be a hero. That is his duty; that is what he is there for. But a cook; the duty of a cook is to feed his men. He is not supposed to be on the firing line. He is supposed to be as far removed from the bullets as possible, so that the men for whom he provides food may be duly taken care of.

I shall read to you the citation for the award of the Medal of Honor:

AWARD OF MEDAL OF HONOR

By direction of the President, under the provisions of the act of Congress approved July 9, 1918, a Medal of Honor was awarded by the War Department in the name of Congress to Jose Calugas, sergeant, Battery B, Eighty-eighth Field Artillery, Philippine Scouts, United States Army. For conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty in action with the enemy at Culis, Bataan Province, P. I., January 16, 1942. When the battery gun position was shelled and bombed until one piece was put out of action and casualties caused the removal of the remaining cannoneers to shelter, Sergeant Calugas, mess sergeant of another battery, voluntarily and of his own accord proceeded 1,000 yards across the shell swept area to the gun position and joined the volunteer gun squad, which fired effectively on the enemy, although heavy bombing and shelling of the position continued.

He deserves the Congressional Medal, Mr. Speaker. I am positive that in the whole history of the war there has never been a cook who felt it his duty or even his privilege to run 1,000 yards into an almost hand-to-hand fight. To me he represents the determination of the Filipino people to do more than their duty in standing by their mother country, the United States of America.

I am not going to tell you all about the war. I will not even tell you the story of my escape from Corregidor, a beleaguered fortress surrounded by enemy warships and bombed frequently by enemy war planes and heavy artillery. Instead, I want to read to you documents which will tell you of the recent commitments of the President of the United States to the Philippines, and of my own promises to my people. Perhaps these documents will tell you better than in any other way a very important chapter of the battle of the Philippines.

I left Manila on the 24th of December last. The enemy was bombing the port area of the city at that moment, just where I had to take and did take the ship for Corregidor. We arrived at Corregidor late in the afternoon.

I may tell you, however, that I went to Corregidor only upon the insistent demand of General MacArthur. This I make of record, because I wish my people to know that I did not leave Manila of my own free will. As a matter of fact, I did not want to leave Manila. I did not wish my people to think that I was going to the fortress and leaving them behind. I told General MacArthur, when he first proposed that I go with him to Corregidor, "General, I don't want to do that. I think my duty is to be with my people. If they are going to be overrun by the enemy, I want to be overrun with them. If they are going to be prisoners and enslaved, I want to be a prisoner and enslaved with them. If they are going to be killed, I want to be killed with them."

But General MacArthur said, "No; that is not your duty, Mr. President, as I see it. With your consent, I have declared Manila an open city and therefore the Japanese forces will enter it without a struggle. Your Government must be saved. Under international law, as you know, as long as your Government has not been overtaken by the enemy they have not conquered your country."

Acting upon this theory, I left Manila and went to Corregidor.

On the 28th of December I received from the President of the United States the following message:

To the People of the Philippines:

News of your gallant struggle against the Japanese aggressors has elicited the profound admiration of every American. As President of the United States, I know that I speak for all our people on this solemn occasion. The resources of the United States, of the British Empire, of the Netherlands East Indies, and the Chinese Republic have been dedicated by their people to the utter and complete defeat of the Japanese war lords. In this great struggle of the Pacific the loyal Americans of the Philippine Islands are called upon to play a crucial role. They have played, and they are playing tonight, their part with the greatest gallantry. As President, I wish to express to them my feeling of sincere admiration for the fight they are now making. The people of the United States will never forget what the people of the Philippine Islands are doing these days, and will do in the days to come. I give to the people of the Philippines my solemn pledge that their freedom will be redeemed and their independence established and protected. The entire resources in men and materials of the United States stand behind that pledge. It is not for me or for the people of this country to tell you where your duty lies. We are engaged in a great and common cause. I count on every Philippine man, woman, and child to do his duty. We will do ours.

Gentlemen of the House, I have spent the major part of my public career in legislative bodies. I know how legislators react to Executive pronouncements of this sort. They say—and perhaps, speaking from the point of view of constitutional law, they are right—"The Chief Executive has no power to commit the people and this Government to any policy." But I know you and I know your heart. I think also that I know the American people. I feel that the pledge made by the President of the United States will be considered by every one of you as his own pledge, and will be honored by the American people as a national commitment. I am confident that the country and the Congress will back it up wholeheartedly.

Three days after I received this proclamation from President Roosevelt I published this proclamation to the Filipino soldiers at the front.

To the Filipino Soldiers at the Front:

The people of America and your own countrymen have been thrilled by the gallantry with which you have been defending our country. I am grateful and proud for the resistance you have offered against such tremendous odds. You have performed deeds of heroism and valor which will live in the history of these stirring days. The service that you are rendering to your people and your country is, to say the least, the equal of that rendered by our fathers who fought and died in the battles for our liberty.

The President of the United States, speaking for the Government and people of Amer-

ica, in a recent proclamation addressed to the people of the Philippines, solemnly pledged that the freedom of our country will be redeemed and our independence protected. He asserted that behind that pledge stood all the resources of America in men and materials. You are, therefore, fighting with America because America is fighting for our freedom. Our salvation will depend upon the victory of American and Filipino arms.

America will not abandon us. Her help will not long be delayed. The enemy's temporary superiority in the air, on land, and on sea cannot last much longer. We must resist further advance of the enemy until assistance arrives and I trust it will be soon. The outcome of the battle of the Philippines will depend in very large measure on your firm and unyielding resistance.

I am aware of your sufferings, your privations, your sacrifices, and the dangers to which you are exposed. All these weigh heavily upon my mind, but I am consoled by the fact that I am sharing with you your trials and sacrifices. Indeed, right now bombs are falling near me just as they must fall around you. But we cannot allow them either to daunt our spirit or weaken our determination to continue fighting to the bitter end. We must stand by our plighted word, by the loyalty that we have pledged to America, and by our devotion to freedom, democracy, and our liberty. We are fighting that the Filipino people may be the masters of their own destiny and that every Filipino not only of this generation but of the generations to come may be able to live in peace and tranquility in the full enjoyment of liberty and freedom. Your duty—our duty—is to fight and resist until the invader is driven from our land. You must not give up a foot of ground when the battle joins. You must hold in place—and hold—and hold.

I also sent to the President of the United States this answer to his message:

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT:

My heart, and I know the hearts of all Americans and Filipinos in this country, are filled with gratitude for the reassuring words of the President of the United States. My answer, our answer, to him is that every man, woman, and child in the Philippines will do his duty. No matter what sufferings and sacrifices this war may impose upon us, we shall stand by America with undaunted spirit, for we know that upon the outcome of this war depends the happiness, liberty, and security not only of this generation, but of generations yet unborn.

Mr. Speaker, I shall delay you no longer. These communications which I have just read show the effect which the message of the President had upon us, and upon the spirit with which our soldiers fought side by side with yours in defense of your flag. I shall not tell you, Mr. Speaker, I shall not tell the House of Representatives, I shall not tell the Senate of the United States, I shall not tell the Government and the people of America what they should do for us in the days to come. All I want to say is that death, ruin, and destruction have never daunted our spirit or lessened our faith in the United States.

The President of the Commonwealth of the Philippine Islands stood in the Well of the House and was presented to the Members individually by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM].

AFTER THE RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 37 minutes p. m.

LEAVE TO FILE CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may have until midnight tonight to file a conference report and statement upon the bill S. 2250.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ELECTIONS TO COMMITTEE

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I send the following resolution (H. Res. 497) to the desk and move its adoption.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the following-named Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committees of the House of Representatives on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress:

JOHN E. RANKIN, Mississippi; HERBERT C. BONNER, North Carolina; CARTER MANASCO, Alabama.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FORMER REPRESENTATIVE MOREHEAD

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COPELAND. Mr. Speaker, it is with the deepest and sincerest regret and with the personal feeling of a true friend lost that I report to the Members of the House today the passing on May 30 of a former Representative of the First District of Nebraska—John Henry Morehead, of Falls City.

Governor Morehead served well his district and his State, serving two terms as Governor and six terms as Representative from the First District from 1922 to 1934, from the Sixty-eighth to the Seventy-third Congress, inclusive.

Governor Morehead was a Democrat, one of those true and loyal 100-percent Jeffersonian Democrats so well respected by members of all political faiths.

He made a success of his home life and his public life. He interested himself as much or more in the financial welfare of his district than he did in the financial welfare of his private and personal businesses. He was a patriot and a statesman, a loyal friend, and a courageous foe. There was no hypocrisy in his make-up, as many of the older Members of this House will well agree. His outstanding characteristics were courage, loyalty, and the patriotic discharge of his duties, regardless of their nature. I regret that I am unable to report at this time the full measure of his achievements.

Mr. Speaker, the Nation has lost a great man from its public life and Nebraska has lost one of its outstanding leaders. The sincere sympathy of all who knew him will go out to his friends and his family in their bereavement.

INCLUSION IN THE RECORD OF PROCEEDINGS DURING THE RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings during the recess be incorporated as a part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders, on Thursday next, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution adopted on gasoline rationing.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the regular business and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE SECOND FRONT

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DICKSTEIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article appearing in the Post on May 31 by Dr. McMahon, an associate professor of philosophy at Notre Dame University.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business today and following other special orders I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, would the gentleman from Massachusetts advise the House as to what the program is tomorrow and for the rest of the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I expected that the Labor and Federal Security appropriation bill would come up tomorrow, but I have received information that they will not be able to bring it up at that time. The Committee on Rules reported a rule today on the allotment bill for the dependents of those in the service, and that bill will be called up tomorrow.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an excellent article by James Morgan on the Congress of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

DR. MANFRED SAKEL

The Clerk called the first bill on the Private Calendar (H. R. 6843) for the relief of Dr. Manfred Sakel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HANCOCK and Mr. MOTT objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

HELEN MARY NICHOLS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4248, for the relief of Helen Mary Nichols.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MOTT and Mr. HANCOCK objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

WILLIAM FRANK COMAN NICHOLS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4249, for the relief of William Frank Coman Nichols.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE and Mr. BARDEN objected, and the bill, under the rule, was recommitted to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

VIVIAN CHANG

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5819, directing the Attorney General to record the lawful admittance for permanent residence of Vivian Chang.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admittance for permanent residence of Vivian Chang, 10-year-old Chinese daughter of a widowed American citizen.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 6, after the word "residence" insert "as of April 12, 1941, the day on which she was temporarily admitted to the United States,"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

W. K. RICHARDSON

The Clerk called the next business, Senate Joint Resolution 24, for the relief of W. K. Richardson.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two objections are required. The Clerk will report the resolution.

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 179 of the Judicial Code, as amended, or any statute of limitations or court rule, practice, or prior decision to the contrary, the Court of Claims of the United States is authorized and directed to take jurisdiction of, and to consider and render judgment on, the case known as No. A-200, W. K. Richardson against the United States, concerning the claim of W. K. Richardson for compensation for the use by the United States, between June 1, 1915, and June 1, 1932, of an invention with respect to which patent No. 1,141,415 was granted to the said W. K. Richardson.

SEC. 2. The judgment of such court, with respect to such case, shall be in accordance with law and equity and shall be based upon the evidence previously presented, the testimony heretofore taken, and the findings of fact made by the Commissioner designated for such purpose by such court in its order dated September 27, 1926, which findings of fact are contained in the report filed by him on March 5, 1928. The amount of any such judgment, if in favor of the said W. K. Richardson, shall not exceed an amount equal to 3 percent of the amount for which suit was originally brought in such court with respect to such claim.

SEC. 3. Such court is authorized and directed to forthwith place such case on its docket and trial calendar and to expedite consideration and the rendering of a decision with respect thereto.

SEC. 4. Proceedings with respect to appeals from and payment of any judgment thereon shall be in the same manner as in the case of other claims with respect to which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BEACON OYSTER CO. ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 221, conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Beacon Oyster Co., the Point Wharf Oyster Co., and B. J. Rooks & Son.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, as to liability of the United States, and render judgment upon the claims of the Beacon Oyster Co. and the Point Wharf Oyster Co., both of Wickford, R. I., for compensation for damages sustained by said claimants by reason of the injury to their oyster beds at Quonset Point, R. I., as a result of dredging operations carried out in behalf of the United States in connection with the establishment of the naval air station at Quonset Point in the year 1940, and upon the claim of B. J. Rooks & Son, of Warren, R. I., for compensation for damages done their oyster beds at Sabins Point, R. I., as a result of dredging operations carried on by the United States Army engineers in the year 1939: *Provided*, That suit hereunder shall be instituted within 6 months from the date of the approval of this act, and proceedings therein shall be had in the same manner as in the case of claims over which the Court of Claims has jurisdiction, by virtue of section 145 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

L. H. GOODMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1044, for the relief of L. H. Goodman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $1,500 to L. H. Goodman, of Monteagle, Grundy County, Tenn., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the death of his minor son, Harleth Goodman, who died as the result of injuries sustained by him on November 9, 1939, when he was struck by a truck of the Works Progress Administration on United States Highway No. 41, between Pelham, Tenn., and Monteagle, Tenn.: *Provided*, That payment under this act shall be conditioned upon the filing by L. H. Goodman of a discharge and satisfaction of the judgment against Wallace Welsh: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHAVER FORWARDING CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1648, conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Shaver Forwarding Co., of Portland, Oreg.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the lapse of time, jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Shaver Forwarding Co., of Portland, Oreg., for alleged damages for loss of revenues from its transportation business during the period November 1, 1935, through December 31, 1938, resulting from the closing to navigation of the Columbia River during the construction of the Bonneville Dam: *Provided*, That such suit shall be brought within 1 year of the enactment of this act.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JERRY McKINLEY THOMPSON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1820, for the relief of Jerry McKinley Thompson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to cancel the amount of $3,820.19 entered on the accounts of Jerry McKinley Thompson, carrier in the post office at Hampton Beach, N. H., by reason of disallowance by the General Accounting Office of payments made to the said Jerry McKinley Thompson by the Post Office Department for his services in delivery of mail at the Hampton Beach post office during periods from June 15 to September 15 of each year from 1929 to 1937, inclusive.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAX MILLER ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1732, for the relief of Max Miller and Vera Caroline Miller, and others.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Max Miller and Vera Caroline Miller, parents of Lucille Alice Miller, deceased, the sum of $3,000; to Elizabeth Frances Chapman, mother of John Frederick Chapman, deceased, the sum of $3,000; and to Gladys Estella Reid, mother of Caryol Norrine Reid, deceased, the sum of $3,000, in full settlement of all their claims against the United States for the deaths of Lucille Alice Miller, John Frederick Chapman, and Caryol Norrine Reid, respectively, who died as a result of injuries received in an automobile accident between the automobile in which they were riding and a United States Army truck driven by Pvt. James Duncan at the intersection of Illinois State Route 22 and U. S. Route 45 at Half Day, so-called, on March 1, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANKLIN B. McNEW

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1756, for the relief of Franklin Benjamin McNew.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,000 to Franklin Benjamin McNew, of Oklahoma City, Okla., in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for the permanent loss of sight in one of his eyes as the result of an injury sustained by him on June 1, 1937, while on an institutional assignment as an inmate of the United States penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kans.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LT. W. S. WALKER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2048, for the relief of Lt. William Stewart Walker.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to First Lt. William Stewart Walker the sum of $115.87, out of any funds available for pay and travel of the Army, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for pay, allowances, and mileage, which claim was disallowed by the General Accounting Office on May 26, 1941.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of the bill add ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

QUIMBY-RYAN ENGINEERING CO., INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2069, for the relief of the Quimby-Ryan Engineering Sales Co., Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Quimby-Ryan Engineering Sales Co., Inc., of New York, N. Y., the sum of $962.48, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for the payment of amounts heretofore withheld from said company as liquidated damages for delay in delivery of pumps furnished to the Treasury Department and the Works Progress Administration under several contracts entered into in March 1939; such delay having occurred without fault on the part of said company and because of circumstances beyond its control, and having resulted in no actual damage or inconvenience to the Government: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARRIETT BOSWELL

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2235, for the relief of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harriett Boswell, of Paducah, Ky., guardian of Betty Fisher, the sum of $1,266.50, in full settlement of any claim of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher, against the United States for personal injuries caused Betty Fisher on January 21, 1937, by the negligent operation of a truck owned by the United States Government and driven by one of the employees in the Soil Conservation Service, which was at the time using said truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOB SAMPLEY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2278, for the relief of Bob Sampley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Bob Sampley, of Forrest City, Ark., the sum of $250, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained and for reimbursement of medical expenses incurred as the result of having been struck by a tin bucket thrown from an Army troop train near Madison, Ark., on June 18, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE CORBITT CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4242, for the relief of the Corbitt Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Corbitt Co., of Henderson, N. C., the sum of $6,659.80, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for liquidated damages for delinquency in making deliveries charged against such company in the settlement of a certain contract (No. W-ord-226) entered into by such company with the War Department for furnishing 20 T 9 scout cars and a quantity of spare parts: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. H. LARZELERE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5938, for the relief of A. H. Larzelere.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I object.

There being no further objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to A. H. Larzelere, of Beverly, N. J., the sum of $746.64, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for 38 days of unused annual leave credited to him by the United States New York World's Fair Commission at the expiration of the World's Fair on October 18, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MARION YARNOTT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5957, to provide compensation for Mrs. Marion Yarnott for injuries sustained by her in a collision between a United States mail truck and a car in which she was riding as a passenger on May 23, 1940, in Venice, Calif., and to appropriate money therefor, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Marion Yarnott, of Venice, Calif., the sum of $20,000, the same to be in full satisfaction and settlement of any claim she may have against the United States Government on account of injuries sustained to her back, spine, legs, and other portions of the body, which were sustained without any fault or wrong on her part, but suffered through the negligent and careless operation of a United States mail truck driven by one G. N. Fellows, a post office employee in the service of the United States Government, on the streets of the city of Venice, Calif., on or about May 23, 1940.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$20,000" and insert "$2,000."

At the end of the bill insert the following:

": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDWARD P. REILLY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6077, for the relief of Edward P. Reilly.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edward P. Reilly, of St. Louis, Mo., the sum of $1,877.25. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by the said Edward P. Reilly as the result of personal injuries received on May 11, 1939, when struck by a United States mail truck No. 11789 in the city of St. Louis, Mo.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$1,877.25" and insert "$1,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JEFF ROBERTS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6349, for the relief of the estate of Quitman Roberts.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Quitman Roberts the sum of $10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of the said Quitman Roberts, who was fatally injured on July 12, 1941, when the automobile which he was driving was in collision with a United States Army truck at Camp Shelby, Miss., and died on July 15, 1941.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "the estate of Quitman Roberts" and insert "Jeff Roberts, of Forrest County, Miss."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$10,000" and insert "$5,453.70."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "the said" and insert "his son."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "and died on July 15, 1941", and insert the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Jeff Roberts."

ARCH A. BROWN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6421, for the relief of Arch A. Brown.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $169 to Arch A. Brown, of Manteo, N. C., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the payment of travel expense of transportation of personal and household effects, and use of own conveyance, due to his transfer from manager, Shelby Forest Recreational Demonstration Area, Millington, Tenn., to manager, Cape Hatteras National Seashore project LD-NC-13, Manteo, N. C., while an employee of the Department of the Interior, National Park Service.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, at the end of line 3, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That not part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

L. H. MILLER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6510, for the relief of L. H. Miller.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to L. H. Miller, of Idlewild, N. C., in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by him on October 17, 1941, while assisting agents of the Treasury Department, Alcohol Tax Division, raid an illicit distillery in Pine Swamp Township, Ashe County, N. C.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SPENCER MEEKS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6545, for the relief of Spencer Meeks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Spencer Meeks, of 3901 Jefferson Street, Savannah, Ga., the sum of $24,000 in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for damages for permanent injuries sustained on May 9, 1941, when he was struck by a bullet fired from the pistol range of the Savannah, Ga., air base of the United States Army Air Force while the said Meeks was performing his duties, as an employee of the Atlantic Coast Line Railroad Co., in a building situated beyond the boundaries of the Savannah air base.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$24,000" and insert "$5,000."

Page 2, line 3, change the period to a colon and add the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM M. MILLER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6569, for the relief of William M. Miller.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500, in full satisfaction of all claims against the Government of the United States on account of personal injuries and property damage suffered by him on November 12, 1941, when the automobile in which he was riding was struck by a Work Projects Administration truck operated by Talmadge Townley at the intersection of Bankhead Highway at Townley, Walker County, Ala.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$500" and insert "$250 to William M. Miller, of Townley, Ala."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A. MACK DODD AND HENRY DODD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6597, for the relief of A. Mack Dodd and Henry Dodd.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500 each to A. Mack Dodd and Henry Dodd, of Macon, Ga., in full settlement of their claim against the United States for personal injuries suffered by them on January 28, 1941, when they were injured as the result of a collision with a Civilian Conservation Corps ambulance of the United States Army at Macon, Ga.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$500 each to A. Mack Dodd and Henry Dodd" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$100 to A. Mack Dodd, and $250 to Henry Dodd."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEANNA M. STRIGHT

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6598, for the relief of Leanna M. Stright.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Leanna M. Stright, of Pittsburgh, Pa., the sum of $1,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained when the automobile she was driving was struck by a United States Army automobile on July 17, 1941, on U. S. Highway No. 1, south of South Hill, Va.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL W. LAYMAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6629, for the relief of Mrs. Julia A. Layman and Dorothy J. Layman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Julia A. Layman, Compton, Calif., the sum of $5,358.32, and to the said Mrs. Julia A. Layman, as guardian of her minor daughter, Dorothy J. Layman, the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of Paul W. Layman, husband of the said Mrs. Julia A. Layman and father of the said Dorothy J. Layman, who died as the result of personal injuries sustained on June 9, 1941, when the automobile which he was driving was in collision with a United States Army truck on U. S. Highway No. 101, approximately 10 miles northwest of Santa Monica, Calif.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out after the word "to" in line 5, and lines 6, 7, 8, and 9, and insert the following: "the estate of Paul W. Layman, of Compton, Calif., the sum of $5,358.32".

Page 2, line 1, after "Layman", strike out the remainder of the line and line 2, down to the word "who";

Page 2, after line 7, insert the following: ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Paul W. Layman."

F. A. HOLMES

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6676, for the relief of F. A. Holmes,

former United States disbursing clerk for the State of Illinois.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States is authorized and directed to allow credit in the accounts of F. A. Holmes, covering the period from February 21, 1937, to May 20, 1937, inclusive, for sums aggregating not to exceed $2,784.87, representing items of exception in his accounts taken by the Comptroller General, which items consist of payments to Stacy C. Mosser, receiver for the Great Northern Majestic Building Corporation, Chicago, Ill., in connection with the leasing of the Great Northern Theater to Works Progress Administration, Federal theater project No. 1, Cook County, Ill., during the period from October 20, 1936, to July 3, 1937. Such theater was leased under a license agreement signed by the agent cashier of Works Progress Administration, Federal theater project No. 1, and payment in good faith and in accordance with the agreement made by F. A. Holmes: *Provided*, That Stacy C. Mosser, receiver for the Great Northern Majestic Building Corporation, shall not be required to refund the sum so credited.

SEC. 2. No charge shall be made against the certifying officer, or if heretofore made, shall be removed.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HARVEY C. ARTIS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 780, for the relief of Harvey C. Artis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 and 20 of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, secs. 767, 770), are hereby waived in favor of Harvey C. Artis, who contracted a disability while employed by the Bureau of Plant Industry of the Department of Agriculture and his case is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files a notice of such disability and claim for compensation with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "17 and 20" and insert "15 to 20, inclusive";

Page 1, line 8, after the words "Artis, who", insert "is alleged to have";

Page 1, line 9, after "disability", insert "resulting from the use of bichloride of mercury."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES THOMASON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 888, for the relief of Charles Thomason, administrator of the estate of Iverson Thomason.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $15,000 to Charles Thomason, administrator of the estate of Iverson Thomason, who died as a result of injuries sustained in a collision of a motorcycle on which he was riding with a truck negligently operated by the driver of a Civilian Conservation Corps truck on Highway No. 71 near Gatlinburg, Tenn., on the 18th day of May 1940.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$15,000" and insert "$5,000."

Line 7, after "Thomason", strike out the remainder of line 7 and all of lines 8, 9, and 10, and line 1, on page 2, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "and the sum of $6,500 to L. D. Byrd, Jr., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by L. D. Byrd, Jr., and for personal injuries that resulted in the death of Iverson Thomason, when the motorcycle on which they were riding was struck by a truck operated in connection with the Civilian Conservation Corps on Highway No. 71 near Gatlinburg, Tenn., on May 18, 1940: *Provided*, That payment shall not be made under this act until the above-named claimants have released all of their claims against Calvin Trentham, in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Charles Thomason, administrator of the estate of Iverson Thomason, and the relief of L. D. Byrd, Jr."

LUTHER CHITTY AND SUSIE CHITTY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1740, for the relief of Luther Chitty and Susie Chitty.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Luther Chitty, Muncie, Ind., the sum of $2,060.30; and to Susie Chitty, Muncie, Ind., the sum of $5,000. The payment of such sums to be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries and property damage sustained and expenses incurred by the said Luther Chitty and Susie Chitty when the automobile in which they were passengers was struck, on August 24, 1938, near West Salem, Wis., by a truck owned by the Civilian Conservation Corps and operated by an employee of the corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,060.30" and insert "$1,020.70."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. CHARLES O. DEFORD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3173, to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to Mrs. Charles O. DeFord.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Employees' Compensation Commission be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to extend to Mrs. Charles O. DeFord, widow of Charles O. DeFord, on account of injuries sustained by the said Charles O. DeFord resulting in his death on November 15, 1937, while working in his capacity as an employee of the Navy Yard, Portsmouth, Va., the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That the limitations of time in section 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Mrs. Charles O. DeFord, of Norfolk, Va., and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is authorized, under the remaining provisions of said act, to receive and consider the claim for the death of her husband, Charles O. DeFord, who was alleged to have been injured on July 29, 1937, in the Navy Yard, Norfolk, Va., when he fell while working on the U. S. S. *Blue*, and died on November 15, 1937, from said injuries: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be filed within 6 months from the date of the approval of this act: *Provided further*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CATHERINE R. JOHNSON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3402, for the relief of Catherine R. Johnson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limitations of time in sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Catherine R. Johnson, of 1521-A Fourth Street, Santa Monica, Calif., and the United States Employees' Compensa-

tion Commission is authorized under the remaining provisions of said act to receive and consider the claim for disability from tuberculosis alleged to have been contracted as a result of her employment by the veterans' hospital at Sawtelle, Calif., as an attendant during the months from December 1934 to June 1935, inclusive: *Provided*, That claim hereunder shall be filed within 6 months from the date of the approval of this act: *Provided further*, That no benefits shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MIDWEST OIL CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4741, for the relief of the Midwest Oil Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Midwest Oil Co., the sum of $308.28, in full settlement of all claims against the United States growing out of a certain contract it had with the Government of the United States for the sale and delivery of fuel oil to the Pierre Indian School, at Pierre, S. Dak.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$308.28" and insert "$248.90."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES E. SAVAGE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5526, for the relief of James E. Savage.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 and 20, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for the employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934, ed., title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of James E. Savage, who sustained injuries to his leg in the line of his duties on March 23, 1922, while employed in Veterans Hospital No. 25, At Houston, Tex., and his claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this act.

SEC. 2. The monthly compensation which the said James E. Savage may be entitled to receive by reason of the enactment of the act shall commence on the first day of the month during which this act is enacted.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 3, strike out "17 and 20" and insert "15 to 20, inclusive."

Line 9, after "who" insert "is alleged to have."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARSHALL E. CANNON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5610, for the relief of Marshall E. Cannon.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Marshall E. Cannon, Denver, Colo., a sum equal to the difference between the actual salary received by the said Marshall E. Cannon while employed by the Office of National Parks, Buildings, and Reservations (later the National Park Service) as elevator conductor in the Old Custom House Building, in Denver, Colo., for the period from February 1, 1934, to May 31, 1939, inclusive, and the actual salary which the said Marshall E. Cannon would have received during such period if his gross salary during such period had been at the rate of $1,320 per annum. For several months prior to February 1, 1934, the said Marshall E. Cannon had been employed as elevator conductor in the Old Custom House Building, in Denver, Colo., at a salary fixed by the Bureau of Reclamation and paid from funds allotted by the Public Works Administration. As in the case of all employees paid from such funds, the salary of the said Marshall E. Cannon was fixed at the prevailing standard rate for the type of work involved less the 15 percent reduction then in effect for employees of the United States. Effective February 1, 1934, the said Marshall E. Cannon was placed on the pay roll of the Office of National Parks, Buildings, and Reservations with a gross salary at the same rate as the net salary he had been receiving, and deductions were made, as provided by law, from such salary.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after "appropriated", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert the following: "the amounts herein specified: G. H. Condon, $141.85; M. E. Cannon, $99.85; W. J. Esterle, $99.85; C. C. Gasaway, $99.85; James F. Retallack, $99.85; and L. G. Yinger, $92.71, in full settlement of all claims against the United States, such sums to equalize the difference between the actual salaries received by such individuals and the salaries such individuals should have received, had not two deductions been imposed on their salaries, while such individuals were employed on the custodial force in the old customhouse, in Denver, Colo., for the period from February 1, 1934, to March 31, 1935: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of G. H. Condon, M. E. Cannon, W. J. Esterle, C. C. Gasaway, James F. Retallack, and L. G. Yinger."

HEIRS OF JOHN W. ADAMS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6491, for the relief of the heirs of John W. Adams.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be recommitted to the Committee on Claims for further consideration.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

EILEEN COLLINS TREACY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6992, for the relief of Eileen Collins Treacy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 2470, be considered in lieu of the House bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to Eileen Collins Treacy, widow of Hubert John Treacy, Jr., a special agent of the Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice, who was killed in Abingdon, Va., on March 13, 1942, in the line of his official duty: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAN FRANCISCO MOUNTAIN SCENIC BOULEVARD CO.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 244, for the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co. the sum of $15,500, as compensation to said company for the value to the United States of that part of a certain road constructed by the company within the Coconino National Forest in Arizona which will be used by the

United States for the protection, administration, and development of said national forest: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDGAR B. DUNLAP

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2037, for the relief of Edgar B. Dunlap.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted., etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Edgar B. Dunlap, of Gainesville, Ga., the sum of $4,000, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for compensation for damages to farm property owned by him and leased by him to the Georgia Rural Rehabilitation Corporation, an agency of the Federal Government, for the years 1935 to 1939, inclusive, such damages having been sustained by reason of (1) the failure of such Corporation to maintain and repair houses and buildings on such property as provided in the lease agreement, (2) the failure of such Corporation to terrace lands as provided in the lease agreement, (3) depreciation in the value of land by reason of the failure of such Corporation to comply with the terms of the lease agreement, and (4) the wrongful destruction and use of timber by persons who were tenants of such Corporation: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES BRAUCH

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2251, for the relief of Charles Brauch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles Brauch, the sum of $1,639.75, in full settlement of all his claims against the United States for damages and personal injuries suffered by him as a result of an automobile accident which occurred on the Pacific Highway, being United States Highway No. 99, about 3 miles south of Sutherlin, Oreg., on July 31, 1940, when the truck which he was operating was struck by a truck owned by the United States and operated by the United States Army: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF HUNTSVILLE, TEX.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2309, for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the First National Bank, Huntsville, Tex., the sum of $105.61, in full settlement of the claim of the said bank on account of two checks Nos. 4120725 and 5455048, dated November 1, 1940, in the amounts of $27.66 and $77.95, respectively, drawn on the Treasurer of the United States by the Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, over symbol No. 894-404, in favor of Jesse Cooper Hickman, and cashed by the said bank on the endorsement of Mrs. Jesse Cooper Hickman as temporary guardian, such checks thereafter being erroneously canceled by the Division of Disbursement, Treasury Department, and the amounts thereof included in a new check issued to Mrs. Jesse Cooper Hickman: *Provided*, That nothing herein contained shall be construed to relieve the said Mrs. Jesse Cooper Hickman from any liability to the United States on account of any amounts improperly received by her: *Provided further*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 9, after the word "her", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert:

"SEC. 2. That the Canton Exchange Bank, of Canton, Miss., is hereby relieved of all liability to the United States in connection with 10 checks drawn on the Treasurer of the United States, aggregating $791, which were negotiated during the years 1936 and 1937 through such bank by J. C. Harris, then county agent of Madison County, Miss., who had fraudulently obtained such checks and forged the endorsements of the payees thereon. Any subsequent endorsers of such checks are hereby relieved of any liability arising out of their endorsements and the Treasurer of the United States shall be entitled to credit in his accounts for any sums paid out by him on account of such checks.

"SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to such Canton Exchange Bank, a sum equal to the amount, if any, paid by such bank to the United States, or any officer thereof, on account of its liability in connection with such checks.

"SEC. 4. That the First National Bank, of Canton, Miss., is hereby relieved of all liability to the United States in connection with three checks drawn on the Treasurer of the United States, aggregating $234, which were negotiated during the years 1936 and 1937, through such bank by J. C. Harris, then county agent of Madison County, Miss., who had fraudulently obtained such checks and forged the endorsements, and the Treasurer of the United States shall be entitled to credit in his accounts for any sum paid out by him on account of such checks.

"SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to such First National Bank, a sum equal to the amount, if any, paid by such bank to the United States or any officer thereof, on account of its liability in connection with such checks: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained in sections 2 to 5, inclusive, shall be construed to relieve the said J. C. Harris of any liability to the United States on account of any amounts improperly received by him."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

PRIMO GIORDANENGO AND ANGIE GIORDANENGO

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2318, for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo, of San Pedro, Calif., the sum of $1,784.51, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for damages to, and for loss of rentals from, their apartment building in San Pedro, Calif., which resulted from heavy gunfire on June 17 and 18, 1941, by Coast Artillery units located at Fort MacArthur, Calif.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. GEORGE M. LEGG AND LOETTA TRAINER

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2354, for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George M. Legg and Loetta Trainer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mr. and Mrs. George M. Legg, of Dodge City, Kans., the sum of $5,000, and to Loetta Trainer, of Cimarron, Kans., the sum of $908, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of the death of

Howard Legg, and for personal injuries sustained by Loetta Trainer, when the automobile in which they were sitting was struck by any Army airplane piloted by Col. Laurence F. Stone (O-4829), United States Army Air Corps, on May 25, 1940, at the airport approximately 3 miles east of Dodge City, Kans.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTHONY W. LIVINGSTON

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2451, for the relief of Anthony W. Livingston.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $164.23, to reimburse Anthony W. Livingston, first sergeant, United States Marine Corps, for the value of personal property lost or damaged by a storm on February 16, 1942, which flooded Government quarters occupied by him at the United States naval air station, Quonset Point, R. I.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM EDWARD FLEMING

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2469, for the relief of William Edward Fleming.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $138.45 to reimburse William Edward Fleming, pharmacist's mate, first class, United States Navy, for the value of personal property lost or damaged by a hurricane on January 15, 1931, which badly damaged Government quarters occupied by him at Ofu, Samoa: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this Act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

O. T. TRAVIS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 180, for the relief of O. T. Travis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby authorized to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated to O. T. Travis, of Newport News, Va., owner of the power boat *Dorothy Frances*, the sum of $5,000 for damages sustained by the said O. T. Travis on the 12th day of June 1937 as a result of the said power boat *Dorothy Frances* striking an improperly and insufficiently marked wreck, in navigable water, on the west side of lower Chesapeake Bay, southeast of Back River (Va.) light, through the neglect of the Government, thereby causing the said power boat to sink and the said O. T. Travis, as owner thereof, to sustain the damages aforesaid.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of O. T. Travis, of Newport News, Va., for alleged damages sustained to the power boat *Dorothy Frances*, as the alleged result of striking on June 12, 1927, the improperly and insufficiently marked wreck (U. S. 232) in navigable waters on the west side of lower Chesapeake Bay, southeast of Back River (Va.) light."

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BLAND to the committee amendment: On page 2, in line 10, strike out the figures "1927" and insert "1937."

The amendment to the committee amendment was agreed to.

The committee amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WAR RESOLUTIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it be in order tomorrow for the Speaker to recognize to suspend the rules on resolutions declaring a state of war to exist with the countries mentioned in the message of the President previously received today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

L. W. COLLINS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1675) for the relief of L. W. Collins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General is authorized and directed to credit the account of L. W. Collins, former superintendent of Lassen Volcanic National Park, in the sum of $13,537.03, representing expenditures made by him while performing his duties as such superintendent, such expenditures having been made for the benefit of the United States.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 5, strike out "$13,537.03" and insert "$13,241.64."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill, as amended, was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

ALICE W. MILLER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3352) for the relief of Alice W. Miller.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alice W. Miller, the sum of $2,500, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for the death of her husband, Fred S. Miller, who was drowned when his boat capsized in the wake of a United States Navy plane at Eau Gallie, Fla., on March 2, 1939.

With the following committee amendments:

Provided, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLAUD R. JOHNSTON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4804) for the relief of Claud R. Johnston.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 17 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (U. S. C., 1934 edition, title 5, secs. 767 and 770), are hereby waived in favor of Claud R. Johnston, who allegedly was permanently disabled as the result of an injury received on or about November 16, 1929, while employed as a fireman at the post office at Macon, Ga., and his claim for compensation is authorized to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act as amended, if he files such claim with the United States Employees' Compensation Commission not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act: *Provided*, That no benefits hereunder shall accrue prior to the approval of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 2, strike out the numerals "17" and insert "15", and line 9, after the word "an", insert "ankle."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM H. COGSWELL, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5714) for the relief of William H. Cogswell, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William H. Cogswell, Jr., Charleston, S. C., the sum of $2,500. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained by the said William H. Cogswell, Jr., and his minor son, William H. Cogswell III, and damage to personal property of the said William H. Cogswell, Jr., as the result of a collision on June 21, 1939, on United States Highway No. 52, near Cheraw, S. C., involving an automobile owned by the said William H. Cogswell, Jr., and a National Park Service truck operated by an enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEONARD ALMAS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 5898) for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard Almas.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized and directed to be appropriated, from funds to the credit of the District of Columbia in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of Leonard Almas the sum of $8,435. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States by the said Leonard Almas for damages on account of injuries received when he was struck by an Army truck driven by a member of the National Guard on June 7, 1940, in Detroit, Mich.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$8,435" and insert "$4,000."

At the end of the bill, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. E. P. BALL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6184) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. E. P. Ball.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $5,000 to Mr. and Mrs. E. P. Ball, of El Dorado, Ark., in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of their daughter, Louise Ball, who died as the result of personal injuries sustained on September 6, 1941, when she was struck by a United States Army truck near the intersection of United States Highway 82 and United States Highway 167, El Dorado, Ark.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,590.59."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ALEX GAMBLE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6410), for the relief of Alex Gamble.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Alex Gamble, of Chattanooga, Tenn., the sum of $8,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages and injuries sustained when a Government vehicle, driven by John A. Taylor, an employee of the Work Projects Administration, struck Alex Gamble, on March 19, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

SEC. 2. Payment shall not be made under this act until the above-named claimant has released his claim against the said John A. Taylor, in a manner satisfactory to the Secretary of the Treasury.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$8,500" and insert "$4,000" and in line 7, strike out the words "damages and" and insert the word "personal."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALLACE F. SAFFORD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2755, authorizing the President of the United States to reinstate Wallace F. Safford to the position and rank of captain in the Army of the United States.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, authorized and empowered to reinstate Wallace F. Safford, formerly of the United States Cavalry, to the position and rank of captain.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a part of a sermon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two respects, and in one case to include a portion of a statement made by me before an appropriations committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is recognized for 30 minutes.

SHALL A LITTLE BAND OF FOREIGN-MINDED REACTIONARIES PREVENT THE ELECTION OF HONEST MEN TO THE SEVENTY-EIGHTH CONGRESS?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, May 10, an article appeared in the New York Times that a drive was on to oust all isolationists from Congress by an organization denominating itself as the Union for Democratic Action, and that I was one of the targets of the drive.

On May 11 an advertisement appeared in the Times, on page 9, signed by the Union for Democratic Action, to the effect that I was an obstructionist to the war effort and a tool of interests inimical to the United States.

The Union for Democratic Action, which signed the article, has the following officers: Frank Kingdon, president; Reinhold Niebuhr, chairman; Albert S. Coolidge, treasurer; Thomas R. Amlie, Washington director; and James Loeb, Jr., executive secretary. Amongst the members of that union are Morris Ernst, the counsel for the New York Post; George Backer and Dorothy Schiff

Backer, the owners and operators of the New York Post, who have obtained much notoriety in connection with the assault upon Senator WALSH.

Whom will this lawless group try to smear next?

Simliar articles by other leading radicals have appeared in Time magazine, in PM, and in the New Republic.

The statement in the article and in the advertisement in the New York Times is clearly libelous.

During my nearly 20 years in the House I have always voted my own convictions and have been more outspoken in that respect than any other Member of the House. No one has ever controlled my vote—no one ever will.

I am not an isolationist, and never have been.

I am not regarded as an isolationist in my own district.

I am not so regarded on the floor of this House.

Let us see for just a moment who some of this smear brigade are:

Frank Kingdon is a notorious radical; he has been a member of the executive committee of the American Committee for Democracy and Intellectual Freedom, which organization was opposed to all war efforts until Russia entered; he has been a member or participant in other notorious activities promoting ideas contrary to the liberties of the American people, and has represented a foreign philosophy always.

Reinhold Niebuhr has been a member of various communistic front organizations; he was a member of the advisory board of the American Student Union, chairman of the program of the United States Congress Against War, member of the American League for Peace and Democracy, and of the left-wing group of the American Labor Party, amongst others; he clearly has represented a foreign viewpoint.

Thomas R. Amlie has served in the House of Representatives. The Members of the House all know him. Three years ago he was refused confirmation by the Senate on an appointment by the President because he was a Communist. The hearings on that case show his record.

Albert S. Coolidge has been active in connection with various communistic efforts.

These people are not interested in preserving the opportunity of the American people to maintain their freedom, but are anxious to do away with the private employment of our people and private ownership of farms and to establish a communistic state with a dictatorship fixing wages and employment and all prices of farm products and what can be raised here in this country. They brazenly call themselves liberals. As a matter of fact, they are reactionaries with a foreign slant to the *n*th degree. They are at the present time doing their very best to stir up disunity in the United States. With a small band of followers, estimated by Kingdon to be 200,000 in the United States, they are going to try to secure the adoption of a policy which will waste the substance of the United States upon all sorts of nondefense expenditures at a time when we need to devote ourselves entirely to the war effort.

It is a case of a small group of dangerous radicals who are endeavoring to put over upon the United States an experiment in government which would be disastrous to the welfare of the people of the United States and would impede and impair the war effort.

Some of these people imply that a person who voted for the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] to the War Department appropriation bill pending in the House on June 21 and 22, 1939, was opposed to the interests of national defense. Let me call your attention to the fact that Mr. POWERS' motion to recommit, on page 7724 of the RECORD, while it called for the reduction from 5,500 planes provided for to 4,217, at the same time called for an addition to the bill for experimental purposes and development, of $9,000,000.

The Army Air Corps was so far behind other countries in its experimental work that with the single exception of the 4-motor bomber no plane of American manufacture was comparable to any plane on hand or being manufactured by Germany as to maneuverability, firing power, armament, or self-sealing tanks. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] claimed that if these planes were purchased they would be obsolete at the time of delivery and obsolete 2 months later. It is a matter of record that today none of these original 5,500 planes have ever been delivered because of their obsolete type. The entire design has been changed and deliveries actually made have been of a different type of plane than those originally ordered.

This $9,000,000 for experimental purposes, together with other funds, was provided for later on after Colonel Lindbergh, General Arnold, and Dr. Lewis of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics had been before the Deficiency Committee in the fall of 1939.

The result of all this is that a vote for defense was a vote with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS]. The vote against his proposal was a vote to further delay for 6 months the experimental work that was so vitally needed to put the Army Air Corps on its feet.

Incidentally, the money that was appropriated 6 months later for experimental purposes as a result of this fight is to a very great extent responsible for the research and developments which have made possible the P–38, P–39, and P–40 pursuit planes and their various improvements. That fight which Mr. POWERS started on June 21 and 22, 1939, is largely responsible for the fact that our airplane production is better in quality than almost anything else in the world today.

The vote on some things in connection with Guam has been cited as a war measure. This is one of the most ridiculous suggestions that has ever been made. It never was put up to the Congress as a war measure. This was simply a harbor improvement and was not intended for fortifications. This has been discussed fully upon the floor of the House.

The people of the United States are not going to be fooled by such talk.

For my own part, I wish to say there has been no doubt in my mind that we were in very great danger in September 1939. My action all the way through has indicated that. My statements all the way through have indicated that. With a proclamation of neutrality outstanding, I, frankly, did not feel that we should propose measures to violate that neutrality without withdrawing that proclamation, nor did I feel that we should say to the people that the amendment to the Neutrality Act was going to keep us out of war. I have never said so.

My attitude is shown in the RECORD pretty thoroughly at the time of the consideration in the House of the lease-lend appropriation bill. At that time I stated:

> The die has been cast. The United States has embarked upon a program of rendering material aid to Great Britain and to other countries that are involved in the struggles that are going on throughout the world. We have not only embarked upon it from the standpoint of determining to do so by legislative act, but already millions of dollars' worth of things have been turned over to those countries. We are so far involved that it is impossible for us to turn back. Today we are asked to supply, insofar as our country is able to produce, those things that are needed for the defense of Great Britain and those other countries. For my own part, no one is going to be able to say that I have not been ready to vote the funds to give them what they need to win. For us to embark upon a program to provide a quarter or a half of the funds that they need to put down the Hitler insurrection against mankind would be ridiculous.

And later on, on the same page of the RECORD, in answer to a question by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], I said the following:

> If the gentleman will look over the history of the last 5 or 6 weeks, he will find that there were very many Members who were loath to give certain powers and authority to the President, some of which, such as the lending and leasing of things, were fantastic, some of which were against the interests of America's economic position, such as that scheme by which an agreement might be required for the payment in kind later on, which might embarrass our own economic and industrial situation tremendously; and because of the lack of proper limitations upon it. But the gentleman will find, if he will examine the legislative history of the last 6 or 7 weeks, that there were hardly 15 or 20 Members of this House, and very few in the Senate, who did not vote in some way for substantial aid to Great Britain. I was one of those who did vote for substantial aid to Great Britain. I feel that when we are giving that substantial aid we are doing the thing that is absolutely necessary. When we have gone as far as we have to protect the United States of America, I frankly feel that my vote on that bill and my vote in connection with it and my vote that is to come tomorrow, I expect, upon this bill are not in any way contradictory.

When I had concluded my statement, of which the foregoing remarks were a part, the present great chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], made the following statement, which appears on page 2323 of the RECORD for March 18, 1941:

> It is a privilege to follow the gentleman from New York in perhaps the most significant pronouncement of his long and useful

legislative career. His attitude and the attitude of the other members of the committee in voting unanimously to report out the pending bill is one of the most reassuring trends of these troubled times. The cooperation of majority and minority members in the consideration and drafting of this bill and the attitude of both parties, as indicated by the debate here on the floor up to this time, are in marked contrast with the course of every democracy drawn unwillingly into the European conflict.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri and other Members of the majority side of the House have repeatedly made similar statements.

I call attention to the fact that upon the passage of the appropriation for lease-lend aid that 89 of the Republican Members voted for the passage as against only 46 opposed. Also to the fact that only about 15 out of all the Members in the House failed to vote for the passage of the lease-lend appropriation or some kind of war aid to Great Britain.

I have repeatedly and steadfastly during my service in Congress supported every appropriation that was in any way justified for the support of the Army and Navy and any other military activity that this country was required to engage in. I expect to do so just as long as I am here. My attitude in this respect has been generally recognized in the House of Representatives and I have no apologies to make for my record in any respect.

The Republican Members of the House have always steadfastly voted for every dollar that was in any way needed for our own defense. Since Pearl Harbor every single Member of the House, regardless of his politics, has voted freely every dollar that was asked for the support of the war effort, whether it was for our allies or ourselves.

There has been no disunity until this little band of foreign-minded reactionaries started out with this attempt to purge those who have had the courage and the character to vote their convictions and who really support the war effort. This group of foreign-minded reactionaries are especially hostile to those of us who have opposed the W. P. A., the N. Y. A., and the C. C. C., all of which have had a damaging effect on the morale of our people.

To my mind it is natural that we should see this antidefense program sponsored by this small group of noisy radicals who would destroy unity in America. For my own part, I do not believe that the attitude of this radical gang will prevail. I do not believe that the efforts they are making to create disunity in America have the backing of the Democratic leadership in the House or Senate, or of the Democratic National or Congressional Committees. If I did so believe they were engaged in such a brazen dishonest effort to destroy the unity that is needed for the success of the war efforts, I would say so, and say it frankly; but my own idea is that this attempt to destroy unity in America is the product of the fertile minds of people who do not want to see this country come out of the war effort with its freedom intact.

It is a foreign effort to change the American way of life.

I do not believe the American people are prepared at this time to submit to the domination of this radical group.

I have criticized and I shall continue to criticize appropriations for activities which are to my mind a part of an antidefense program.

I am again asking for complete support of the war effort by the President.

We have done pretty well in America under the American system of government and economy. Our system has brought to the American people more of the comforts and happiness of life than has ever been enjoyed by the people of any other land, and we do not intend to substitute Browderism for Americanism.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE OF CITIZENSHIP

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization had before it the bill H. R. 6600, a bill which provided for issuance of documentary evidence of United States citizenship. Many Members of Congress and the public generally have been requesting action on this legislation and requesting immediate passage of the legislation.

The committee of which I have the honor to be chairman immediately took under consideration H. R. 6600, which provided for some documentary evidence or certificate to persons who were born in the United States but who cannot by any means establish their citizenship. The committee unanimously reported this bill out, and after due debate on the floor on March 19, 1942, the bill was passed. The bill has been in the Senate since that time. Inquiries are coming in by the thousands. It is impossible for me to answer all the inquiries made as to why this bill has not been enacted into law. There are thousands or millions of American-born in this country who cannot prove their American citizenship. Under the defense program and under the laws now in existence they cannot get a defense job, and every day some of them are being discharged from their work because of that fact.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes; for a brief question.

Mr. MURDOCK. I wish to confirm what the gentleman has just said. I have had numerous letters from my own constituents in the State of Arizona, and a letter recently from a public official, complaining of the fact that because they cannot prove birth many American citizens are refused employment on public works. I hope the gentleman can get some such legislation enacted.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Now, along these lines, the committee saw fit, in the passage of H. R. 6600, to vest the power of issuing these certificates in the Justice Department; that is, the Immigration Service, which has investigated the situation, which has a set-up now ready and willing and able to go to work, and give some identification to honest Americans, born in this country, for the purpose of procuring defense jobs, and establishing the fact that they are American citizens. You understand that an alien or person who is naturalized can very easily establish the fact that he is an American citizen by presenting his certificate of naturalization, whereas a native-born citizen has a difficult time, because he may have been born in a community where there were no vital statistics kept; where there were no physicians, but only midwives, and there was no record kept of their birth. It seems to me that the American-born are having a hard time in this defense program.

I talked to a distinguished Senator, member of the Senate Immigration Committee, and he thinks that the matter ought to be placed in the hands of the Census Bureau. We have heard the Census Bureau at length, and the committee did not feel that Congress should appropriate additional money, running into the millions, to create a new bureau in the Census Bureau, to issue these certificates of identity, when the Justice Department through its field offices all over the country is now definitely equipped to handle the problem. The Immigration and Naturalization Service has sufficient investigators to make a careful investigation in each case, so that when a certificate of this character is issued the person is known to be a person of American birth.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Does not the gentleman think that the Census Bureau is the agency which has the most information in regard to the birth of people born in this country, the agency which already has the machinery set up to get that information?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not quite agree that they are essentially the bureau or that they have the agency. All that the Census Bureau can say is that in 1920 or 1930 or 1940, when they took the census, someone in the house told the investigator that there were so many children and that they were born in that place. That is all the information the Census Bureau has; it has no investigators.

Mr. MOTT. Is not that a larger and a more efficient facility for getting this information than any that will be possessed by the Justice Department?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not quite agree with the gentleman. The Immigration and Naturalization Service has field offices in all sections of the country, which is very important, since people in all sections of the country will be affected. The Census Bureau does not have such field offices and would have to set them up to handle cases in various sections of the country.

Mr. MOTT. The reason for my inquiry is that I introduced a bill similar to the one the gentleman spoke of which was introduced in the Senate, a bill which vested administrative authority in

the Census Bureau. If that is not the appropriate bureau, I am very much interested in the gentleman's point as to why some other agency would be better.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is exactly my point. My point is that the committee has given careful study to the testimony of representatives from the Census Bureau. They agree with the committee that they will need another bureau within that Bureau, the creation of a sort of investigating agency to determine certain facts of findings that may be necessary in passing upon these various applications.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Certainly.

Mr. MOTT. Is the testimony of the officials of the Bureau of the Census of record in the hearings on the gentleman's bill before the Immigration Committee?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. So we can read it?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Yes. Furthermore, they would need additional money to create a new bureau, which would mean another appropriation. It would also take considerable time before the bureau could be established; whereas the Immigration Service of the Department of Justice is already established. Under the Smith Act we have a number of investigating bodies. The F. B. I. is under the same Bureau. We gave the Department of Justice the naturalization inspector and the court records relating to the Immigration Service.

The mere fact that a man stated he was born in Iowa or some other State should not be sufficient evidence on which to issue a certificate certifying to the country as a prima facie matter that the man is a citizen.

Mr. MOTT. No; I do not think that either; but let us for illustration take a case of this kind: Say that an American citizen under legislation submitted to the Census Bureau the information required as to his birth in the form of affidavits stating the name and addresses of people who did know of his birth, whose statements could be checked with the statistics of the Census Bureau as to whether this person was alive immediately before or after the affiant said he was born; would not that be sufficient in itself for the issuance of a birth record?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am in full sympathy with the gentleman's point of view and appreciate the thought and study he has made along this line.

Let us draw the line here. Are we ready to make another appropriation of several millions of dollars to set up this bureau within the Census Bureau, when the Department of Justice already has the power to subpena witnesses? The Census Bureau cannot compel witnesses to testify. Remember, also, that the Census Bureau has no investigators. We should have to establish a group of investigators in the Census Bureau, if you wanted to have it along those lines, before that Bureau would be capable of performing the functions we are talking about.

Mr. MOTT. I did not suppose that the gentleman would require a person applying for a record of birth to appear before the Justice Department and prove it under subpena.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. No; except that the Immigration Service in the Department of Justice has agencies all over the country, whereas the Census Bureau is a centralized bureau located in the city of Washington. The gentleman sees the point, does he not?

Mr. MOTT. I firmly believe that legislation along this line is very necessary. It is just a question of what method is the best.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman is correct. The committee thought immediate action should be taken, for because of the emergency today we have over 4,000,000 people who could take part in the defense program but who are either being discharged or cannot get employment because they cannot prove their citizenship. We provided that employees in defense industries must be American citizens, yet here are men who have lived in this country all their lives, and their forefathers lived in this country many years, and they are unable to help in the defense program of their country. The difficulty comes in proving their citizenship.

Mr. MOTT. Are the hearings on this bill printed?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I believe so.

Mr. MOTT. What is the number of the bill?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It is H. R. 6600. I shall be pleased to give it to the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman's remarks are timely. The question, of course, is whether the work should be done by the Justice Department or some other department such as the Census Bureau. Within less than 24 hours I as a member of the Census Committee have talked with other members of the committee with regard to the Mott bill, and the question in our mind is which agency is best able to do the work properly.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have nothing against the Census Bureau, but because of the urgency of the situation neither I nor the committee was ready to add more burdens to the Census Bureau or ask for more money to create another bureau within a bureau which has only the right to take the census of the people of the country every 10 years.

The Immigration and Naturalization Service and the Department of Justice are working together and they in turn are also working with the Census Bureau. If they want additional proof they may check in the Census Bureau. But in the final analysis the Immigration Department and the Department of Justice have the machinery now. They not only may take the word of the Census, but they can have some other documentary evidence laid down to establish the fact a man was born here, so that when a certificate is issued which makes it prima facie proof of his birth in this country, the employer will have to take it at face value. That is a different situation.

Because of the urgency and because of the emergency we felt that the Department of Justice should handle it. They testified they are ready to do it right now without setting up any more agencies. One of the distinguished members of the Senate committee is probably holding it up because there is a little jealousy between the Census and the Justice Department. The Census wants to get it in its hands and the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization and the Department of Justice people feel they can do a better job. It is just a matter of which is the better way to do it.

Mr. MOTT. So far as I am concerned there is no jealousy on my part. I think this legislation is very necessary at the present time, and I would very willingly support any Member's bill that had a chance of getting through.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. We passed this bill, H. R. 6600, unanimously after careful debate. We discussed that very question.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I congratulate the gentleman or any other Member of Congress who will try to get a simplified bill through the House that will permit people who are now above the age when they are required to register, to identify themselves as American citizens, because it is a most difficult proposition. I have run up against that with my constituents. I am not so much concerned with red tape or what department does it, but I do hope we will get some legislation which will qualify people who do not have any record of their own birth to work. In Pennsylvania when I was born they did not keep any record, and that is not so many years ago. The only way I would know, if I tried to prove my own birth, would be to get the family Bible and find it recorded there, because my mother kept those records. But there are lots of people today who do not have those records because they have been burned up and they are unable to produce them. Some people would have a very difficult and hard time in order to establish their birth record.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I think the gentleman has stated the case very clearly.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair may say to the gentleman that there are other special orders.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Then I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN]?

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the request, and grant to the gentleman 5 minutes of my time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wanted to observe, since we are trying to marshall all the manpower of the country, that it is quite ridiculous to have artificial barriers erected against the use of many competent people, such as is taking place now.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is right.

Mr. HOBBS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. HOBBS. I want to yield to the gentleman an additional minute of my time.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I thank the gentleman for his nice courtesy.

Mr. Speaker, let me give you some figures: 40 percent of the population of my own State of New York and 41 percent of the population of the United States lack a proof of birth. In the State of New York alone there are some 960,000 women and 910,000 men without a record of their birth or without a certificate of birth. The figures show that 80,000 persons under 21 years of age lack these certificates and the number increases with each age group.

I am confining my figures to New York State alone. In the age group from 20 to 40 there are 650,000; in the age group from 45 to 64 there are 610,000.

In other States the situation is even worse. Illinois, Pennsylvania, and Texas are States with the highest number of persons without birth certificates. Illinois has 3,880,000 American-born that cannot establish that they are Americans. Pennsylvania has 3,850,000 people who cannot establish they were born in Pennsylvania. In Texas there are 3,460,000 people who cannot establish their birth by birth certificates.

I do not want to take up the time of the House by enumerating the figures with regard to other States of the Union, but the fact of the matter is that there are millions of people in this country who, if asked where they were born, and should answer in Texas or Pennsylvania, would have no proof of that at all.

This bill proposes to cut the red tape to give those who are American citizens by birth an opportunity to work, and an opportunity to establish their birthright, whereas under the present system they do not have that opportunity.

I submit that the legislation this House passed was a step in the right direction. It followed the ideas of the committee. The Senate because of some jealousy between certain factions is simply tying the hands of millions of Americans who are trying to get jobs; and as I said at the outset every day some of these Americans are being discharged for lack of proof that they are American citizens.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] is recognized for 20 minutes.

SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my discussion today is to outline briefly, if that is possible, some of the injury that has come to small business in America and the specific measures of relief which the House of Representatives is attempting in the hope of affording some benefit to the future of small business. I asked for 20 minutes today not because I had any intention of using 20 minutes, but because I thought there might be others who would be interested in entering this discussion.

This House formed by resolution a select small-business committee composed of seven members. A similar committee was formed in the Senate some months back for the purpose of studying the impact on small business by the war effort.

Numerous pieces of legislation have in one way or another directly or indirectly dealt with some relief to small business. Various revisions of the Federal Housing Act and other types of legislation that have come through the Congress in recent months have been instigated partly out of a desire to get some relief to various forms of small business.

Your Small Business Committee of the House, after specific studies of much involved problems, has had before you up until now, and has had successfully passed by the House, two measures, and yesterday introduced a third measure. This third measure deals directly with a specific form of benefit for a specific industry.

I am going to attempt today to outline briefly what these relief measures have been and to dwell particularly on the measure introduced yesterday by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Small Business, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

The first measure came through this House and was generally proclaimed as a relief measure for automobile dealers. As a matter of fact, it was not a specific relief measure for automobile dealers but was a measure granting loan relief and eventual financial assistance by way of Government purchases of commodities which have been directly affected by freezing or rationing orders emanating from the Office of Price Administration, a division of the War Production Board.

Let us say, for example, if an automobile dealer has on hand a stock of 200 automobiles which were frozen by virtue of these orders, he now can come for aid to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and borrow up to the full retail value plus the incurred expenses for the maintenance of these cars, in an attempt to maintain himself in business for the duration of the war.

True enough, this is not a complete measure of relief, but the bill goes even further than that in that it does provide for an ultimate purchase of these cars on the part of the Government, so that he may liquidate his business and presumably come out whole. This applies to any commodity which has been either frozen or rationed. The second measure designed as relief was passed by this House on May 25. I am aware of the fact that a great many of the proponents of that measure are over-optimistic in their hope as to the results that may be obtained. I said on the floor of the House on that occasion that to me it seemed more a preliminary funeral oration for small business than it did an act of actual relief. I voted for the bill because as I also stated and firmly believe that if that bill offered relief to 1 percent of the small manufacturers of the Nation, it was worthy of our votes. In other words, I did not claim that your Small Business Committee of the House or that I or anyone I know of knows the solution for the plight of small business. There are many remedies which can be given, and if each of these remedies or all of them collectively do afford some small aid to at least a few, then they are worthy of the votes of the Members of the Congress.

I pleaded with the membership to be careful not to overstate the value of any such measure. Congress and the administration have no right to send words of false hope.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I will be glad to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to ask the gentleman what evidence his committee may have found of cases where, in the judgment of the committee, there may have been in connection with war production use made of machinery and facilities which were in the hands of small businesses but where such use was not made and, instead, new facilities were constructed for a prime contract.

Mr. PLOESER. It would be difficult for me to give the gentleman specific instances, now, in my limited time.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. All I am asking is a general answer—did you find such cases?

Mr. PLOESER. We did; yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And would not the gentleman agree that a vigorous use of the powers granted in the bill, Senate 2250, might lead to a betterment of that situation?

Mr. PLOESER. Yes; and that is the hope of the bill. However, we face this situation in the war effort. The first phase of the war effort, as I pointed out to this House the other day, was the development of production facilities for the production of munitions and implements of war. The War Production Board feels it has just about reached the culmination of that first phase of the effort and they have entered into what they term a reversion of policy. From here on out those facilities which have been developed or are being developed and can be completed before midyear 1943 are to be devoted in toto—and by that I mean time and energy—to the production of munitions and implements of war.

We all know there is ample evidence before various committees, and ample evidence in the press every day, that there are many small plants which can be converted to manufacturing war materials, but because of certain types of orders issued by the command, in either the Army or the Navy, use of such facilities has never been made.

The legislation which we passed a week ago was designed primarily as a directive to the War Production Board to make use of those facilities, and yet all of us will admit that when we make such a directive it must be one carrying with it the advice to use discretion, because, after all, the first motive of all of us is

to win this war and win it as soon as possible. Even small business fully recognizes that the impact of the war effort cannot be anything but injurious to the great bulk of small industry. They are not complaining about that. They can take it, a great many of them have. All must be aware that to a great degree they must take it. There has been a tremendous demonstration of willingness on the part of small business to give all; but there is no reason why we as the legislative branch of the Government or the administrative branch of the Government, because of that patriotic willingness to make every sacrifice, should necessarily be so negligent in our planning and in our efforts as to cause unnecessary injury.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I gladly yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman is making quite a statement, and one which is very interesting and constructive, but it seems to me our main trouble lies in the fact that when these contracts are given out as a whole to a number of industries and they cannot perform the entire contract, they are too selfish and hoggish to divide them with other subcontractors, but go out peddling them amongst certain groups of their own kind. In a short time the work under the contracts is lagging. The small man has shops, and has machinery and men who are rearing to go, but they cannot get an entire contract from the Navy or the Army, while some other man gets a $20,000,000 or a $50,000,000 contract and wants to hog everything. There ought to be some law to compel a man, if he is putting up a building, to give the electrical work to some little fellow, or the carpentering work to some little fellow, or in other words, to provide in the contract some method by which some of the work can be distributed.

Mr. PLOESER. To pass a law that would compel that might also compel inefficiency. We did, through the bill we passed a week ago, provide for a Smaller War Plants Corporation, which would act as the prime contractor, who is the offensive individual about whom you speak. By that I do not mean that all prime contractors are offensive, but I mean in the instance which you cite the Government itself could be the prime contractor and would therefore sublet various parts of the particular job to be done. The Government, in the beginning, naturally went out to seek capable management, and it was so frequently found in larger concerns that they naturally took the course of least resistance and followed through in that order. Little regard was given for economic injury.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. That is true, but will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. PLOESER. I will.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Is it not true there are a number of industries that have received as many as five or six contracts, which they cannot complete, although they are hogging them and clogging the machinery and refuse to distribute the work among the smaller men?

Mr. PLOESER. Yes; there have been cases of that kind, and I do not mean, by any means, to condone that. I abhor it. I think that is a terrible mismanagement on the part of Procurement.

I shall briefly explain to you the bill which was introduced yesterday by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], known to the House as H. R. 7156, which has been referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

I am enthusiastic about this piece of legislation because of the fact that it goes after a specific ill with a specific remedy. When the War Production Board froze all automobile tires and then froze all camelback and retreading materials, they practically put out of business every independent tire dealer and came near putting out of business every independent filling-station operator in the United States. As camelback was released for retreading, it was pretty well controlled and kept in the hands of the company-owned stocks, because there was no provision made for equitable distribution of the raw material for the retreading of tires.

The very industry which for years fought against the system of retreading tires, that is, the tire manufacturing industry, became the dispensers of retreads, though on the average they did not have the equipment possessed by the independent tire retreaders who throughout the United States had been advocating the retreading of tires for years.

A very inequitable situation arose. That has been a direct problem of your small business committee. It has given us a lot of concern. The people of this country, driving 30,000,000 automobiles, are today greatly concerned about their transportation problems. One day they are told that they will get tires within a year and a half, made of synthetic rubber, and on another day they are told that it will be 2 years, and the next day they are told that never again would they get tires before the war is over. The next day they are told that it is necessary to ration gasoline in order to conserve their tires, which they are almost to a man conserving themselves. Then again, we hear that the tire problem will be relieved by the time we get to the end of our present tires, and that there will be new ones made of synthetic rubber. The fact remains that the War Production Board and the Office of Price Administration have not completed a comprehensive survey of the stock of pleasure car automobile tires existing in America today, and without such a survey how in the world are they ever going to know how many tires need to be rationed or what measures of rationing are necessary to bring about the conservation of rubber.

We know that rubber must be conserved; we know that we are not getting any new rubber from the Far East. The British, Dutch, and American interests prevented the building of a stock pile of rubber prior to Pearl Harbor—it was not until almost the middle of 1941 that they started to increase the imports in substantial amounts to America. This fact is water over the dam. It is something that has happened and cannot now be corrected. We are not going to get the expected amount of rubber from South American countries because of the fact that they are increasing their consuming demands down there, and our chances of new rubber from that section are diminishing daily. Then some effort, some constructive and direct effort must be made in this Nation to accomplish, first and primarily, the conservation of rubber; and, second, to soften the blow on the man who has been putting the automobile tires on your cars for all of these years and servicing them, and who has been forced out of business by no fault or action, either directly or indirectly, of his own. This bill is designed to specifically take care of that problem. It is specific legislation for that purpose, and the provisions of this bill are briefly outlined as follows:

First, that an administrator in the office of the Price Administrator specifically charged with the duty of handling the rubber-tire situation be appointed.

Second, that when a new tire is purchased on a rationing order, you will have to turn in an old tire before you can get it.

No mention is made of the condition of that old tire, but the point is to bring in old rubber for what reclamation processes may be needed.

Third, that there be no restriction on so-called obsolete tires. There is today in America a large stock pile of new, but obsolete, sizes of automobile tires. The farmer, for example, is one who uses many of this type of tire, because many a farmer is driving a very old model automobile. The new modern automobiles used by most folks do not use this obsolete size of tire. The Army does not need that size tire. The Navy does not need that size tire, and the modern automobile user cannot use that size tire. There is no point in freezing entirely the sale of that obsolete tire, which can be useful, particularly to the agriculturists of America.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is it not also true that the farmer uses these obsolete tires to equip horse-drawn vehicles which he uses in his work?

Mr. PLOESER. That is true.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. There is another special order. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] has permission to address the House.

Mr. ANGELL. I will be glad to yield, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from Missouri is recognized for an additional 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. PLOESER. Fourth, there are substandard grades of tires, and they may likewise be used for farm vehicles. They may likewise be used for certain commercial pursuits. Traveling salesmen, men who have to travel in order to maintain their business, might well be allowed these substandard tires that are on the

market today, and of which we have no adequate survey.

Fifth, to institute a program for the retreading of 30,000,000 automobile tires per year for the next 3 years. This will require 3,500 tons of crude rubber out of a stock pile estimated somewhere in the neighborhood of 750,000 tons, most of which it is necessary to conserve for the benefit of the Army and the Navy, and which will also require 90,000 tons of reclaimed rubber.

I will admit and so will everyone else, that this will not make very high-grade camelback for retreading, but it possibly will give a service of somewhere between 2,500 and 5,000 miles. I have to go strictly upon figures given me by tire people, because frankly I admit I know nothing about the quality of rubber, without conference or reference to those who do.

Sixth, it provides for inspection of rubber tires by independent tire dealers. It requires also that the Administrator put a maximum on the fees to be charged for such inspection service. I think we are all going through the same program now independently.

Seventh, it requires distribution of new tires and old tires and the retreading of tires to be made and delivered through the independent tire dealers of the Nation.

Now, that part of this legislation is a particular phase which I do not believe I would normally support in peacetime; but, we are in war. We are engaged in a war, the impact of which threatens to crush much of our private enterprise and daily we are adopting drastic measures necessary to try to preserve for the duration of that war those private enterprises. The great tire manufacturers of this Nation are being converted to war production and will live through the war, but the little independent tire dealers of this Nation can be converted into nothing, and will die long before the war is over unless given adequate relief. I confess that this specific provision is designed to give them protection and relief, not only from the manufacturers of tires who are spreading their operation in the servicing industry, but also from the necessary requirements and rules and regulations of government.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PLOESER. I yield.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Why is it necessary to have a bill like this? Why cannot this all be done under the present arrangement? Why is not someone taking an interest in this and accomplishing the purpose, for the small amount of rubber involved?

Mr. PLOESER. This could have been done by administrative order.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Why has it not been done?

Mr. PLOESER. I cannot answer that.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Last March the tire dealers were here and appeared before the Senate Small Business Committee and presented their program, and I have not heard of anything being done since.

Mr. PLOESER. The Senate has under consideration an identical bill, and it is hoped that it will be up for action in the House soon. This could have been done by administrative action. The power exists to have done all of this.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I wonder if we are not going a little out of our field in passing such a bill?

Mr. PLOESER. In the absence of a willingness on the part of the administrators of the ration program to do something to try to salvage what we can of small business, I think it becomes the duty of this Congress to enact such legislation as will require it.

The eighth provision of the bill makes it mandatory that within 60 days the administrator of this program make an adequate and comprehensive survey of the stock pile of new and used automobile tires in America.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL] is recognized for 10 minutes.

OREGON SHIPBUILDER ESTABLISHES RECORD

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, in a local paper of this date, the Washington Post, there appears the following headline:

U-boat toll of Americas rises to 234—3 more vessels sunk.

This is only one of the many like news items appearing from day to day showing the heavy toll enemy submarines are exacting from United Nations ships. However, in spite of the gloomy picture presented by these sinkings, we are heartened by the fine record being made by our many shipbuilding plants throughout the United States. In my own State of Oregon only yesterday there was carried a United Press dispatch showing that the Oregon Shipbuilding Co. was delivering yesterday a 10,000-ton Liberty freighter 48 days after its keel was laid. The day before it delivered one of these freighters 56 days after the laying of the keel. This company was commended less than a month ago for completing a ship in 78 days, notwithstanding 105 days was the scheduled time for the completion of such ships. This company has three plants in the Portland area, and it, together with other shipbuilding concerns, is making great strides in our program to beat the submarines.

During the period from September 1941 to May 1942 we have built in Portland shipyards 39 of the Liberty ships, 1 mine layer, 4 net tenders, and 12 submarine chasers and mine sweepers, making a total of 56 ships of a gross tonnage of 425,000. With all the shipyards of the United States working on like schedules, the day will soon be here when we will be able to more than replace the ships lost by the launching of new ships to take their places. However, in the meantime every effort will be made to clean the seas of this menace, the submarine, so that our sea lanes servicing our forces throughout the world may be kept open.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the record established not only by the management of these great shipbuilding yards in my district, but also by the men who are actually doing the manual labor to make these ships possible. If it were not for the loyalty and faithfulness of this great body of civilian workers in exerting every effort to produce these ships many days ahead of schedule, we would not be able to meet and overcome this bottleneck in our war efforts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] seek recognition?

Mr. HOBBS. I do, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS] is recognized for 4 minutes.

THE DECISION OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, HON. FRANCIS BIDDLE, ORDERING HARRY BRIDGES TO BE DEPORTED

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Star were two columns by distinguished columnists who took the Attorney General of the United States to task for ordering the deportation of Harry Bridges.

Miss Dorothy Thompson, in her On the Record column, calls the order silly. This is but another illustration of the lengths to which some of our friends of the fourth estate go in such matters. It may be stated positively without fear of successful controversion that this order of the Attorney General was based solely upon the law and the evidence and written because of a high sense of duty to interpret and enforce the law as we wrote it.

Let me read you the decision and order of the Attorney General:

Case No. 55973/217.

In re Harry Bridges.

Before the Attorney General in deportation proceedings.

This case comes to me for decision from the Board of Immigration Appeals.

HISTORY OF THE CASE

On March 2, 1938, the Assistant to the Secretary of Labor issued a warrant for the arrest and deportation of Harry Renton Bridges [1] on the ground that he was subject to deportation pursuant to the provisions of section 2 of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by the act of June 5, 1920. Section 2 of that act provides as follows:

"* * * any alien who, at any time after entering the United States, is found to have been at the time of entry, or to have become thereafter, a member of any one of the classes of aliens enumerated in section 1 of this act, shall, upon the warrant of the Secretary of Labor, be taken into custody and deported * * *." [2]

Section 1 of the act (as amended by the act of June 5, 1920) insofar as relevant to this report, is as follows:

"Aliens who * * * are members of or affiliated with any organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advises, advocates, or teaches: (1) The overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States * * * (3) The unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property, or (4) Sabotage—

"Aliens who are members of or affiliated with any organization, association, society, or group that writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes, or displays, or causes to be written, circulated, distributed, printed, published, or displayed, or that has in its possession for the purpose of circulation, distribution, publication, issue, or display, any written or printed matter of the character described in paragraph (d).

[1] The warrant was served on Bridges on March 5, 1938.

[2] 40 Stat. 1012.

"The giving, loaning, or promising of money or anything of value to any organization, association, society, or group of the character above described shall constitute affiliation therewith; but nothing in this paragraph shall be taken as an exclusive definition of advising, advocacy, teaching, or affiliation." [3]

James M. Landis, dean of the Harvard Law School, was appointed trial examiner for the purpose of the hearing which lasted from July 10 to September 14, 1939.

On April 17, 1939, the Supreme Court of the United States, in *Kessler* v. *Strecker*,[4] construed the above-quoted act so as to confine the Secretary of Labor to a determination of the relation of the alien to an organization, seeking and advocating the overthrow of the Government by force and violence, to the time at which the arrest of the alien took place. The trial examiner, on December 28, 1939, found [5] that the evidence did not establish that Bridges was a member of or affiliated with the Communist Party of the United States of America, the organization under scrutiny, at that time.[6] The Secretary of Labor sustained the finding, canceled the warrant, and dismissed the proceedings on January 8, 1940.[7]

On June 28, 1940, Congress amended the statute referred to so as to provide for deportation of an alien who was "at the time of entering the United States, or has been at any time thereafter" a member of any one of certain classes of aliens.[8] On June 14, 1940,[9] the Immigration and Naturalization Service had been transferred from the Department of Labor to the Department of Justice, pursuant to the provisions of the Reorganization Act of 1939.[10] The Attorney General, in view of the amendment referred to, directed the Federal Bureau of Investigation to make a further investigation to determine whether, under the law as changed, grounds existed for reopening the deportation proceedings against Bridges. As the result of this further investigation a warrant was issued by the Attorney General and Bridges was arrested on February 14, 1941, and released under bond of $3,000. The Honorable Charles B. Sears, a retired judge of the New York Court of Appeals, was appointed an inspector in the Immigration and Naturalization Service to preside over the hearings, take testimony, and make the appropriate recommendations, in accordance with the provisions of section 150.6 of the regulations of the Immigration and Naturalization Service.[11]

The presiding inspector held hearings in San Francisco from March 31 to June 12, 1941.[12] Bridges was represented by Carol King, of New York, and Richard Gladstein and Aubrey Grossman of San Francisco. The public and the press were admitted to the hearings.[13] The evidence covers 44 volumes of 7,546 typewritten pages. In addition the Government introduced 297 exhibits, and the alien 62. On September 26, 1941, the presiding inspector transmitted to the Attorney General his memorandum of decision, covering 187 printed pages. His proposed findings of fact [14] and conclusions of law,[15] made in accordance with the regulations of the Service, held, in part, that the Communist Party of the U. S. A. was, "from the time of its inception in 1919 to the present time, an organization that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States"; [16] that it was an organization that "writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes, and displays printed matter advising, advocating, or teaching" such overthrow; [17] that "the Marine Workers' Industrial Union was a part of the Communist Party dominated and controlled by it" [18] and advocated similar overthrow; [19] and that after entering the United States the alien had been a member of the Communist Party [19a] and had been affiliated with both the Communist Party [20] and the Marine Workers' Industrial Union.[21] Judge Sears accordingly concluded that Bridges was subject to deportation under the statutes referred to, and submitted a proposed order for his deportation.[22]

The alien excepted to the proposed findings, and, in accordance with the usual practice briefs were filed by both sides and oral argument was had before the Board of Immigration Appeals on November 24, 1941. On January 3, 1942, the Board handed down a long opinion—99 mimeographed pages—which contained findings and conclusions that the record did not establish that Bridges was at any time a member of or affiliated with any organization prescribed by the statute, and accordingly entered an order that the warrant of arrest and bond be cancelled, execution of the order to be stayed pending further order of the Attorney General.[23] The case is therefore now before me for decision.

THE ISSUES INVOLVED

The statute under which this proceeding is brought is the act of October 16, 1918,[24] as amended by the acts of June 5, 1920 [25] and June 28, 1940.[26]

The issues presented are chiefly issues of fact, and they are vigorously contested. The Government claims that Bridges, after entering the United States, was a member of and affiliated with the Communist Party of the U. S. A., and the Marine Workers' Industrial Union, and that both these organizations advocated and advocate the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States. Judge Sears found in favor of the Government on both these issues.[27] The Board of Immigration Appeals determined that Bridges' membership in or affiliation with these organizations had not been established, and therefore deemed it unnecessary to decide whether the Communist Party or the Marine Workers' Industrial Union comes under the statute. The alien offered no evidence to controvert this.[28] There was ample evidence to sustain it, which I shall now discuss briefly as, although not admitted, it is not disputed.

HISTORY OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY—ITS AIMS AND PURPOSES

The Communist Party of the United States, a section of the so-called Third International, was founded in 1919; [29] and, after its name was changed several times, finally became "The Communist Party of the U. S. A." in 1929.[30] The Third International advocated the class struggle, which was described as entering the phase of civil war in America. Illegal methods were also advocated, where necessary, to carry on its work; systematic agitation in the Army; the renouncing of patriotism; and the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism.[31]

The American "section" adopted a program declaring:

"The Communist Party will systematically and persistently propagate the idea of the inevitability of and necessity for violent revolution and will prepare the workers for armed insurrection as the only means of overthrowing the capitalist state." [32]

The Communist Party teaches the violent overthrow of existing governments, including the United States. This concept reaches

---

[3] 41 Stat. 1008, 1009.

[4] 307 U. S. 22 (1939).

[5] Landis, J. M., In the Matter of Harry Bridges (1939), p. 134.

[6] The trial examiner pointed out that one type of evidence examined as to Bridges' membership or affiliation with the Communist Party was that which consisted of alleged conduct consistent only with such membership or affiliation (p. 9). In this connection testimony and evidence were developed which showed Bridges' "well-defined opposition toward 'red baiting'; his acceptance of aid and assistance in his industrial struggles from the Communist Party—indeed, his solicitation of that aid; his expressed disinclination to disavow that help; his association with persons admittedly Communists, an association that derives primarily from his requests for and acceptance of such aid. There are, specifically, his support of the Western Worker during the 1934 maritime strike; his requests for aid in connection with such issues as the *King-Ramsay-Connor* and *Modesto cases* and the United Labor Party ticket; his not infrequent conferences with the Communist officials on the Pacific coast in regard to these and other matters; his admiration of the sincerity of persons in the trade-union movement, some of whom were avowedly Communists, and his willingness to work with them in the realization of his trade-union ideas." (P. 133.)

[7] Sears, Charles B., memorandum of decision in the matter of Harry Renton Bridges. (P. 2.)

[8] 54 Stat. 673. (The classes of aliens are those enumerated in section 1 of the act of October 16, 1918, as amended June 5, 1920.)

[9] 54 Stat. 230, 1238.

[10] Approved April 3, 1939, 54 Stat. 563.

[11] Sears, p. 2–3.

[12] Sears, p. 5.

[13] Sears, p. 6.

[14] Sears, p. 178.

[15] Sears, p. 179.

[16] Proposed finding of fact No. 3.

[17] Proposed finding of fact No. 4.

[18] Proposed finding of fact No. 7.

[19] Proposed finding of fact No. 8.

[19a] Proposed finding of fact No. 9.

[20] Proposed finding of fact No. 10.

[21] Proposed finding of fact No. 11.

[22] Sears, p. 180.

[23] Memorandum of Board of Immigration Appeals, In re: Harry Renton Bridges, p. 99.

[24] 40 Stat. 1012.

[25] 41 Stat. 1008. The relevant portions of that statute are as follows:

"Aliens who * * * are members of or affiliated with any organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advises, advocates, or teaches: (1) The overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States * * *. (3) The unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property, or (4) sabotage.

Aliens who are members of or affiliated with any organization, association, or group that writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes, or displays, or causes to be written, circulated, distributed, printed, published, or displayed, or that has in its possession for the purpose of circulation, distribution, publication, issue, or display, any written or printed matter of the character described in paragraph (d).

"The giving, loaning, or promising of money or anything of value to any organization, association, society, or group of the character above described shall constitute affiliation therewith, but nothing in this paragraph shall be taken as an exclusive definition of advising, advocacy, teaching, or affiliation."

[26] 54 Stat. 673.

[27] Sears, p. 179.

[28] Board memorandum, p. 3.

[29] Transcript, p. 54.

[30] Government exhibit 135, pp. 296, 299, 300; Government exhibit 129, pp. 2, 17; Government exhibit 130, pp. 18, 19.

[31] Government exhibit 94, pp. 27–32.

[32] Government exhibit 98, pp. 6–7.

back to the famous Manifesto of Marx and Engels of 1848,[33] which declares:

"The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions."[34]

In The Thesis and Statutes of the Third International (1920) this doctrine is expanded. "The mass struggle means a whole system of developing demonstrations growing ever more acute in form, and logically leading to an uprising against the capitalistic order of government."[35] Lenin speaks of the necessity of violent revolution.[36]

This and much other documentary evidence introduced by the Government, and the oral evidence of a number of witnesses to the same effect, who testified that the Communist Party of the United States had indoctrinated its members with these purposes,[37] establishes, as Judge Sears concludes, that it is an organization that advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow, by force and violence, of the Government of the United States.[38]

The evidence also sustained the Government's contention that the party writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes, and displays printed matter advising such overthrow, so that the party comes within the purview of the statute.[39] This also Judge Sears found.[40]

PENETRATIVE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Penetration into trade-unions was strongly emphasized in Communist literature, and conversion of their members by constant agitation and propaganda. Reforms in the labor movement should be accepted as screens behind which revolutionary activities could be carried on. To carry out this program the Trade Union Educational League was formed about 1921, for the purpose of infiltration into the American Federation of Labor unions, of "boring from within."[41] "Fractions" were organized within particular unions to advance the aims of communism behind the "front" of education.[42] The union was the American affiliate of the Red International of Labor Unions, which was the Trade Union Bureau of the Comintern.[43] The league was to compel its party members to join labor unions; the party was to engage in strikes and wage movements, to war against class collaboration plans, and to organize the unorganized.[44]

In 1929 the Trade Union Educational League became the Trade Union Unity League, which began a new program of organizing directly its revolutionary industrial unions controlled directly by the Communist Party.[45] Its official publication was Labor Unity, of which the Government witness Nat Honig was for a time editor.[46] The T. U. U. L., as it was called, openly supported[47] and was dominated[48] by the Communist Party.

The Trade Union Unity League chartered the Marine Workers' Industrial Union in 1930.[49] The Government contended that Bridges was a member of or affiliated with this union during the years 1932, 1933, and 1934. This union included both seamen and longshoremen in its membership, contrary to the craft type of organization of the American Federation of Labor. It was liquidated in 1935.[50]

Judge Sears found, and I concur in the finding, that affiliation with or membership in the Marine Workers' Industrial Union was grounds for deportation.[51]

FRONT ORGANIZATIONS

Testimony on front organizations showed that they were represented to the public for some legitimate reform objective but actually used by the Communist Party to carry on its activities pending the time when the Communists believe they can seize power through revolution.[52] The party took control of the Workers Alliance as a medium through which to organize the unemployed, "to develop widespread militant mass struggles," and "to build the revolution" through association in "a militant class conscious unemployed organization."[53]

Other Communist front organizations were the International Labor Defense, whose immediate purpose was to defend Communists, but among whose members were many non-Communists unaware of its Communist control;[54] the All-American Anti-imperialist League,[55] the American Negro Labor Congress,[56] and the American League Against War and Fascism.[57]

THE BACKGROUND AND HISTORY OF BRIDGES

Bridges is a citizen of Australia.[58] He entered the United States in 1920 and has not returned to Australia. In 1933, having been a longshoreman, he became active in trade-union work on the San Francisco water front. It is apparent that he has done much to improve the conditions that existed among the longshoremen. He was successful in reorganizing and leading the International Longshoremen's Association, an American Federation of Labor union. He led the 1934 maritime workers' strike on the Pacific coast; was president of the local I. L. A. from 1934 to 1936, and Pacific coast president in 1936. In 1937 his union was expelled from the American Federation of Labor, changed its name to International Longshoremen and Warehousemen's Union, and affiliated with the Congress of Industrial Organizations, of which Bridges was promptly elected Pacific coast district president. He holds several important offices in the Congress of Industrial Organizations.[59]

BRIDGES' CONNECTION WITH THE WATER-FRONT WORKER

There is sharp disagreement between the presiding inspector and the board of appeals as to whether or not Bridges' connection with the water-front worker shows affiliation with an organization proscribed by the statute. Judge Sears holds that it does;[60] the Board, convinced that "the alien's testimony on the matter is consistent and truthful,"[61] finds that at the time Bridges was connected with the paper it was not an organ of the Marine Workers' Industrial Union or of the Communist Party.[62]

The Worker was a mimeographed sheet published in San Francisco from December 1932 until 1936. It was first issued by the Marine Workers' Industrial Union,[63] identified as an affiliate of the Communist Party. Bridges, with a group of longshoremen, was active in the publication of the paper.[64] At the 1939 hearing little was made of this fact, and no copies of the paper were introduced in evidence. At that hearing Bridges testified that he became connected with the paper in September or October 1932, "maybe a month or two" after it had been running.[65] Thirteen copies of the paper were introduced at the second hearing, the first, dated February 1933, being numbered volume 1, No. 2. The same number refers to the first issue, and to the December issue. Judge Sears concludes that the first issue under Bridges' sponsorship was that for December 1932 giving reasons which seem to me persuasive.[66] He notes that of the issues of the paper in evidence, four of the five published prior to September 15, 1933, acknowledge the assistance of the Marine Workers Industrial Union; and that the alien, in the 1941 hearing, stated that his group had not taken it over till September 1933,[67] contradicting what he had previously said, apparently to disassociate himself from any connection with the Marine Workers Industrial Union. Judge Sears concludes that there was no change in the sponsorship of the paper in September 1933, and that Bridges and his group were responsible for its publication from 1932 to 1936. Judge Sears finds during that time no substantial change in the paper's policy.[68]

Bridges admitted that the address, 830 Market Street, was the first used by his group; yet it was used only before July 1933. Judge Sears further concludes that the paper during Bridges' sponsorship was under the control of M. W. I. U. and the Communist Party, because (1) of the acknowledged cooperation with M. W. I. U. at first, and later the favorable treatment of M. W. I. U. and T. U. U. L. and other Communist-sponsored organizations; (2) consistent attacks upon reactionary leaders of the American Federation of Labor; (3) support of Communist candidates for political office; (4) advice to read Communist literature; and (5) the use of addresses of Communists or Communists organizations.[69]

The Board treats Bridges' changed testimony at the two hearings as a normal incon-

---

[33] Government exhibit 91, p. 3.
[34] Government exhibit 91, p. 44.
[35] Government exhibit 94, p. 47.
[36] Government exhibit 182, pp. 19–20.
[37] Transcript, pp. 51–55, 76, 93, 115–117, 285, 363–364, 376–378, 381, 1393–1394, 1398, 1433–1434, 1863–1864.
[38] Sears, p. 178.
[39] Government Exhibit 93, pp. 6, 12–13; Government Exhibit 105, p. 16; Government Exhibit 182, pp. 9–34; Government Exhibit 184, pp. 14–18; Government Exhibit 95, pp. 36–37; Government Exhibit 98, p. 7; Government Exhibit 102, p. 62; Government Exhibit 237, p. 20; Government Exhibit 120, pp. 32, 54, 59, 62; Government Exhibit 225, p. 453; Government Exhibit 239, p. 57; Government Exhibit 138, pp. 127, 14.
[40] Sears, p. 178.
[41] Transcript, pp. 72–77; Government Exhibit 135, pp. 164–165.
[42] Transcript, p. 444; transcript, pp. 72–77, 150, 161; transcript, pp. 368–372; Government Exhibit 120, p. 6.
[43] Transcript, p. 78; transcript, p. 137.
[44] Transcript, pp. 208–213.
[45] Transcript, pp. 234–236; Government exhibit 164, p. 809; Government exhibit 220, p. 26; Government exhibit 129, p. 32; transcript, pp. 486–487; see also Government exhibit 66.
[46] Government exhibit 135, p. 218.
[47] Government exhibit 135, p. 220; Government exhibit 221, p. 13.
[48] Transcript, pp. 443–448; Government exhibit 220, p. 31; Government exhibit 164, pp. 799, 810.
[49] Government exhibit 221, p. 8; transcript, p. 1920.
[50] Government exhibit 164, p. 812; transcript 1920, 5886.
[51] Sears, p. 62. The alien himself evidently recognized the character of this organization since he testified in the 1939 hearing that he was aware that the goal stated by the M. W. I. U. was the establishment of a "Revolutionary Workers Government."
[52] Transcript, pp. 78–79.
[53] Transcript, pp. 450–454.
[54] Transcript, pp. 179–180.
[55] Government exhibit 35; Transcript, pp. 154–155; see also Government exhibit 13, pp. 1–2; Government exhibit 36, pp. 7, 12; Government exhibit 60.
[56] Government exhibit 36; Transcript, pp. 160–163; see also Government exhibit 28, pp. 4–5.
[57] Transcript, pp. 365–368; 454–459; 1262, 1264–1265.
[58] Transcript, p. 10.
[59] This information is not disputed and it is more fully developed in Judge Sears' memorandum. See pp. 82–88.
[60] Sears, p. 97.
[61] Board memorandum, p. 43.
[62] Board memorandum, p. 43.
[63] Transcript, p. 2553.
[64] Transcript, pp. 2551–2565.
[65] Transcript, pp. 2562–2563.
[66] Sears, p. 91.
[67] Sears, p. 92.
[68] Sears, p. 92.
[69] Sears, p. 94.

sistency, the first testimony being merely a slip of the tongue as to the year;[70] and concludes that the hiatus in publication referred to by him at the first hearing had actually occurred in 1933, when in the August issue the paper was dated by the day of publication (August 15, 1933) instead of by mere reference to the month, as previously.[71] The paper had changed from a monthly to a semimonthly basis in July, yet a full month elapsed between August 15 and September 13.[72] This and certain evidence of changed editorial policy in the paper pointed out by the Board is not highly persuasive. The main consideration is the alien's veracity. Judge Sears heard him testify at the second hearing, and was not impressed. The Board did not have that advantage, and merely passed on the written record. I accept Judge Sears' finding on this point.

The Board having found that Bridges did not become connected with the Waterfront Worker until after September 15, 1933, considers the nature of the paper only after that date. But having agreed with Judge Sears' finding that Bridges had been connected with the paper since December 1932, I concur also with his finding that the paper was Communist dominated since that date. No single reason given by Judge Sears conclusively establishes this: That the paper attacked American Federation of Labor leaders; that it supported Communists for political office (Bridges said he would not decline to support people with respect to matters on which he was in agreement with them solely because they were Communists); because it advised reading Communist literature (Bridges claimed such literature alone printed the truth on labor matters); finally, because of the use of Communist addresses by the paper, though to my mind this latter reason is the most convincing of all. The first address, 830 Market Street, San Francisco, room 421, was the headquarters of the Needle Trade Workers Industrial Union, a T. U. U. L. affiliate. The second, 3470 Nineteenth Street, San Francisco, was a building occupied by Walter Lambert, an admitted Communist.[73] The third, post office box 1158, San Francisco, was rented by Harry Glickshon, an admitted Communist, who had been responsible for the publication of the Worker under the M. W. I. U.[74] Standing alone no reason, except perhaps this last, is conclusive; but they are cumulative, and taken together, make out a strong case.

The presiding inspector accordingly concluded that Bridges' connection with the Waterfront Worker showed his affiliation with the Communist Party.[75]

This link, Judge Sears held, was supported by further evidence. Bridges was chairman of the strike committee of the International Longshoremen's Association in the 1934 strike.[76] He worked with Harry Jackson, an admitted Communist, in getting the Marine Workers' Industrial Union (a Communist union) to join the strike, and induced seamen to join the latter union.[77] Bridges opposed the adoption of a resolution by the central labor council and by his own union, repudiating Communist organizations;[78] and, before the resolution was adopted, notified Sam Darcy, district organizer of the Communist Party, that the resolution was being contemplated.[79] He approved acceptance of the services of the "Western Worker," the Communist Party newspaper, to help the strike by publishing a daily strike bulletin free of charge.[80] This cooperation was referred to by William Z. Foster in his book, "From Bryan to Stalin." "Harry Bridges," Mr. Foster wrote, "was elected chairman of the I. L. A. strike committee, and the 'Western Worker,' local Communist organ, was endorsed as the official strike journal."[81] William F. Dunne, in a pamphlet describing the strike said: "The leadership passed into the hands of a left-wing group, working in fraternal cooperation with the M. W. I. U., headed by Harry Bridges."[82] Judge Sears concludes that these associations and transactions were further evidence of the alien's affiliation with the Communist Party.[83] I think this conclusion is not unwarranted.

TESTIMONY BEARING ON BRIDGES' MEMBERSHIP IN OR AFFILIATION WITH THE COMMUNIST PARTY

Judge Sears examines in detail the evidence of 15 witnesses as bearing on Bridges' membership in or affiliation with the Communist Party. Much of this evidence is rejected as being untrustworthy, contradictory, or unreliable. However, the evidence of two witnesses is accepted as showing that Bridges was a member of the party. If this evidence is believed—and Judge Sears believed it—the doubt is decided. The question is substantially one of credibility. The Review Board did not think the evidence credible. But it should be remembered that Judge Sears saw the witnesses on the stand, watched their demeanor and expression, and was in a far better position to judge their truthfulness than the Review Board, dealing with the cold print of the record.

The two most important witnesses as to membership are Harry Lundeberg and James D. O'Neil.

Harry Lundeberg

Lundeberg, a prominent American Federation of Labor west coast labor leader, testified that in the summer of 1935, at a dinner in Bridges' home, a man, whom Bridges later told Lundeberg was Sam Darcy, a prominent Communist, asked Lundeberg to join the Communist Party, saying that Bridges was a member. Bridges said, "You don't have to be afraid because nobody has to know you are a member of the Communist Party," and added, "You don't have to be afraid, because I am one, too."[84] Bridges denied the conversation;[85] denied that Darcy had ever been at his house;[86] but admitted that Lundeberg had dined with him in 1935.[87] The witness testified that Bridges' wife, his daughter, and his secretary were at the dinner.[88] Bridges thought that his wife and secretary had been there.[89] They were not called to testify, and the presiding inspector felt, rightly, I think, that their absence weakened Bridges' statement,[90] although the Board was of the opinion that no such inference could be drawn.[91]

Lundeberg was, by his own admission, a biased witness; but so, for that matter, was Bridges. Lundeberg had previously told Federal agents that he had no information that Bridges was a Communist.[92] But Judge Sears thought that this was a "natural reluctance * * * to testify"; and believed the evidence.[93] As I have said, it is solely a matter of credibility. Judge Sears was the trial judge, and it seems to me not inappropriate to accept his reaction to the witness. The review board analyzes Lundeberg's testimony at great length and rejects it for several reasons. Lundeberg had, on three previous occasions, told Government agents that he had no information that Bridges was a Communist. When subpenaed in this case he told the story to counsel for the Immigration Service the night before he was called. But anyone who is familiar with witnesses, and their reluctance to testify, as referred to by Judge Sears, knows that such a contradiction frequently occurs. Judge Sears was impressed with the "natural, rugged, hard-bitten fashion" with which Lundeberg testified.[94] The review board thought that since Bridges' testimony on other matters showed no indication that self-interest operated he should be believed in this question.[95] But because a man tells the truth in one instance hardly indicates that he is not lying in another. And Judge Sears saw and heard Bridges, while the review board did not.

James D. O'Neil

O'Neil, a Government witness, failed to appear, and had to be cited. As publicity director of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, he shared offices with Bridges after 1936. The two men were intimate. In October 1941 he made a statement to two Federal Bureau of Investigation agents, which was taken down by a stenographer who was present, that he joined the Communist Party in December 1936;[96] that he walked into Bridges' office one day in 1937 and saw Bridges pasting assessment stamps in a Communist Party book; and that Bridges reminded the witness that he had not been attending party meetings.[97] O'Neil admitted making the statement, testified that what he had stated was the truth, but that it was garbled, and untrue in the particulars mentioned.[98] The stenographer, however, verified the correctness of the statement;[99] and Major Schofield testified that later O'Neil had repeated the statement to him and to other witnesses. Judge Sears admitted the statement, saying:

"Whatever may be the common-law rule in relation to the reception of such evidence as that of Mrs Segerstrom and Major Schofield, in this hearing the parties are not confined to common-law proof. Hearsay is admissible but the character of such evidence is an element to be used in its evaluation. The principal reason for the exclusion of hearsay at common law is that the opportunity for cross-examination is absent. In the present case, the sanction of cross-examination was present. Although the statement given to Mrs. Segerstrom and the statement made in the presence of Major Schofield were not under oath, there is something equivalent, for O'Neil testified on the stand that he told the truth in his interview with the agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation and in the interview at which Major Schofield was present. There is, in my opinion, therefore, every reason why this testimony should be heard and considered as substantive proof."[1]

Judge Sears was convinced of the truth of the statement. Certain inconsistences between the statement and what the witness said in his later conversation with Major

[70] Board memorandum, p. 18.
[71] Board memorandum, pp. 18–20.
[72] Board memorandum, see table, p. 19.
[73] Government's Exhibit 219.
[74] Government's Exhibit 211.
[75] Sears, pp. 97-98.
[76] Transcript, pp. 5401, 5411, 5423, 5848.
[77] Transcript, pp. 5755–5757, 5854–5855.
[78] Transcript, p. 7388.
[79] Transcript, p. 5956.
[80] Transcript, p. 5789.
[81] Foster, Wm. Z., From Bryan to Stalin (1937), p. 260.
[82] Dunne, Wm. F., The Great San Francisco General Strike (1934), p. 47.
[83] Sears, p. 103.
[84] Transcript, pp. 7006–7010, 7087.
[85] Transcript, pp. 7509–7510.
[86] Transcript, p. 7361.
[87] Ibid.
[88] Transcript, p. 7083.
[89] Transcript, pp. 7362, 7503.
[90] Sears, p. 106.
[91] Board memorandum, p. 83, footnote 105.
[92] Transcript, p. 7087.
[93] Sears, p. 106.
[94] Ibid.
[95] Board memorandum, p. 93.
[96] Transcript, p. 2403.
[97] Transcript, p. 2408.
[98] Transcript, pp. 2387–2388, 2282, 2288, 2293–2294.
[99] Transcript, pp. 2401–2413.
[1] Sears, p. 115.

Schofield were emphasized by the Board. But these go to details, and do not affect the substance of what he said. It is important to note that the Board found "that O'Neil did make to Segerstrom (the stenographer) and Major Schofield the statements attributed to him by these witnesses." [3]

The Board held that the statements were admissible for purposes of impeachment, but not as affirmative, probative evidence.[3] The Board, admitting that the technical rules of evidence do not apply to administrative procedures, was of the opinion, nevertheless, that the fundamental requirement of a fair hearing required that the statements be excluded.[4] With this I cannot agree. They were not submitted in the absence of the witness but only after he had taken the stand, admitted that he had made them, said he had spoken the truth when he made them, and denied merely that he had been correctly reported.

The Board cited regulations (sec. 150.1 (c) (d) of the Service providing that statements of persons during an investigation must be taken down in writing, the signature requested, and the interrogation made under oath.[5] The Board concluded that this was not done and that the statements were therefore inadmissible. But as the Board says, the regulations were not called to the attention of the presiding inspector,[6] and no objection was made to the admission of the statements on the ground that they had not been taken in conformity with the regulations. The regulations provide (d) that where the alien refuses to make a recorded statement under oath or to sign, the investigating officer shall make a report in writing which "may be used in support of an application for a warrant of arrest, when the investigating officer certifies that no other evidence to establish the facts stated in the report can be readily obtained. * * *" [7] It does not appear whether O'Neil was asked to sign the statement and swear to it. On the whole question I am of the opinion that Judge Sears' decision to admit the statements was appropriate and legally sound. The courts have constantly emphasized the fact that the technical legal rules of evidence do not apply to administrative proceedings such as deportation hearings. Hearsay evidence is properly admitted in such proceedings.[8]

The Board stressed the impropriety of Judge Sears' admission of the O'Neil statement in violation of the "published departmental regulations." [9] Had the alien raised the question at the time of the hearing, compliance with the departmental regulations would have been obligatory and a deliberate rejection of a request to exclude the testimony would have rendered appropriate the objections now raised by the Board.[10] No objection having been raised by the alien throughout the hearing, however, he waived the right to object on the technical ground that the statement was not taken in accordance with the rules.[11]

The Board found that O'Neil's statements are not credible.[12] Judge Sears found the opposite.[13] Not having heard him testify it is difficult for me, acting necessarily in a reviewing capacity, to judge. Again I believe that more weight should be given Sears' findings, on matters involving credibility, than the Board's.

OTHER EVIDENCE OF BRIDGES' ASSOCIATION WITH COMMUNIST PARTY

There was other evidence tending to associate Bridges with the Communist Party. Lee F. Barlow testified that in 1935 Bridges, in answer to a question, said that the only way that a young fellow could get ahead in the labor movement was to join the party.[14] Though denied by Bridges,[15] the presiding inspector reached the conclusion that the conversation took place.[16] This has some significance in the general picture. There was testimony that on August 16, 1935, Bridges discussed with several active members of the Communist Party, at least two of whom were not members of a trade union, the contents of a telegram which he proposed to send to an officer of his local union.[17] Judge Sears believed the evidence, and thought it showed a close association with Communists in line with other evidence of affiliation.[18] Howard Rushmore's testimony was to the effect that Bridges had praised the Youth Congress and mentioned cooperation which he had received from the National Students League, both identified as front organizations of the Communist Party.[19] Judge Sears did not consider that this testimony established Bridges' membership in or affiliation with the Communist Party, but did show Bridges' attitude toward the party and its program.[20] Bridges' "sympathetic attitude toward Communists," was shown, said Judge Sears, by the testimony of Ezra F. Chase and John S. Horn, which, however, fell short of establishing membership.[21] Bridges' attack on so-called "red baiting" tended to sustain this attitude.

Judge Sears excluded other evidence that Bridges had attended Communist meetings on the ground that it was inconclusive, unreliable, or contradictory—the evidence of Diner that Bridges had attended a convention of the Communist Party on September 23, 1934; [22] of Honig, who claimed to have seen Bridges at a number of "top fraction" meetings a short time before the 1936–37 strike; [23] of Thomas Lawrence, who claimed to have seen Bridges at a Communist meeting at some time between May 9 and July 31, 1934; [24] of Maurice J. Cannalonga, who testified that Bridges had participated in Communist "fraction" meetings; [25] of Richard A. St. Clair, who gave testimony that he had seen Bridges three times at Communist headquarters; [26] of Robert P. Wilmot, that he had seen Bridges at a Communist "fraction" meeting and had heard him confess to being a Communist; [27] and of John Oliver Thompson, who testified that Bridges had gone with two Communists to the party's headquarters in New York.[28] All of these witnesses were, at one time or another, members of the Communist Party. Although Judge Sears concluded that their evidence, for one reason or another, did not establish membership in or affiliation with the Communist Party, taken as a whole it cannot, because of its volume, be completely disregarded.

Judge Sears found that the alien was not opposed to the publication in a trade-union newspaper of Communist releases provided that they were favorable to the policies being pursued by trade unionists themselves. This finding is largely based on Bridges' own testimony—that: "I believed that if the Communist Party happened to send in a statement saying they would do everything they could to support the particular dispute at that time in behalf of the union position, my position would be that I wouldn't have any great objection to seeing that carried in the union paper." [29]

THE NORTH AMERICAN AVIATION STRIKE

On June 5, 1941, the workers at the North American aviation plant in Los Angeles, engaged in production essential to the national defense, went on strike in violation of an agreement not to strike pending mediation before the National Mediation Board.[30] Richard L. Frankenstein, National Director of Aviation of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, gave his opinion that the strike, though the demands were justified, was Communist maneuvered and unwarranted,[31] Bridges, who kept in close touch with the situation, regarded the strike as justified; and, though the Congress of Industrial Organizations director of the State of California did nothing to avert it or call it off—a view apparently in conflict with other Congress of Industrial Organizations high officials,[32] Judge Sears held, justifiably I think, that though this did not, as the Government contended, show membership or affiliation, it did show Bridges' sympathetic attitude toward a strike denounced as a Communist maneuver.[33]

CONDUCT ESTABLISHING A PATTERN OF AFFILIATION

Judge Sears summarizes Bridges' attitude toward the Communist Party and its policies by saying that the "isolated instances," while not evidence to establish membership in or affiliation with the Communist Party, nevertheless show a sympathetic or cooperative attitude on his part to the party, and form "a pattern which is more consistent with the conclusion that the alien followed this course of conduct as an affiliate of the Communist Party, rather than as a matter of chance coincidence." [34] This conclusion, said Judge Sears, was strengthened by his consistently favoring nondiscrimination against union men because of Communist membership; and by his excoriating "red baiters," as he called those who took an opposite view, which "amounted to cooperation with the Communist Party in carrying out its program of penetration and boring from within." [35]

THE I. W. W. ORGANIZATION

I need not discuss the evidence of Bridges' membership in the Industrial Workers of the World as a ground for deportation, since Judge Sears was unable to conclude that "the I. W. W. during the period of Bridges' membership advocated or circulated documents advocating the illegal destruction or injury of property." [36] A contrary conclusion would not seem to be warranted.

BRIDGES AS A "GOOD" LABOR LEADER

Judge Sears permitted Bridges to show that he was a "good" labor leader.[37] Undoubtedly he helped to establish better working conditions as a result of the 1934 strike, and particularly to secure for maritime workers higher wages. Judge Sears held that the evidence,

[3] Board memorandum, pp. 61–62.
[3] Board memorandum, pp. 64, 66.
[4] Board memorandum, p. 71.
[5] Board memorandum, p. 65.
[6] Board memorandum, pp. 66–67.
[7] Federal Register, Jan. 4, 1941, p. 68 ff.; Federal Register, Jan. 11, 1941, p. 1 ff.
[8] *Nicoli* v. *Briggs*, 83 F. (2d) 375 (1936); *Kjar* v. *Doak*, 61 F. (2d) 566 (1932); *Healy* v. *Backus*, 221 F. 358 (1915); *U. S. ex rel. Bilokumsky* v. *Tod*, 263 U. S. 149 (1923).
[9] Board memorandum, p. 64.
[10] Ex part Radivoeff, 278 F. 227 (1922).
[11] *U. S. ex rel. Vajtauer* v. *Commissioner*, 273 U. S. 103 (1927); *U. S. ex rel. Coria* v. *Commissioner*, 25 F. Supp. 569, 570 (1938); *Nicoli* v. *Briggs*, 83 F. (2d) 375, 378 (1936); *Kjar* v. *Doak*, 61 F. (2d) 566, 567 (1932); *Evanoff* v. *Bonham*, 50 F. (2d) 756, 758 (1931).
[12] Board memorandum, p. 74.
[13] Sears, p. 115.
[14] Transcript, p. 7130.
[15] Transcript, p. 7361.
[16] Sears, p. 118.
[17] Transcript, pp. 1240–1241, 1245–1246, 1276, 1249, 1282, 1285, 1290–1292.
[18] Sears, p. 123.
[19] Transcript, p. 728 ff.
[20] Sears, p. 133.
[21] Sears, p. 137.
[22] Sears, p. 141.
[23] Sears, p. 144.
[24] Sears, p. 147.
[25] Sears, p. 152.
[26] Sears, p. 155.
[27] Sears, pp. 158–159; Transcript, pp. 1659–1662.
[28] Sears, p. 160.
[29] Sears, pp. 157–158.
[30] Government Exhibit 294.
[31] Transcript, p. 7452.
[32] Transcript, p. 7476 ff.
[33] Sears, p. 163.
[34] Sears, p. 169.
[35] Sears, pp. 169–170.
[36] Sears, p. 175.
[37] Sears, pp. 166–168.

however, was without probative value. Because Bridges was a "good" labor leader, and thought that a Communist could be a good labor man, hardly shows that Bridges was not a Communist. The argument is a non sequitur.

WIRE TAPPING

Judge Sears' ruling on the alien's motion in relation to alleged wire tapping seems to me to present nothing of which the alien can complain. The alien made no showing whatever that wire tapping was used to obtain any of the evidence introduced against him at the hearing. The hearing was concluded on June 12, 1941. The alien now alleges that his wires were tapped from August 5 to August 22, 1941. Even assuming this allegation to be true, it certainly constitutes no ground for vitiating the hearing. Nothing in the decisions of the Supreme Court in *Nardone* v. *United States*[38] or *Goldstein* v. *United States*[39] indicates that wire tapping employed after the completion of court or administrative proceedings, and never made the foundation of evidence introduced in such proceedings, is to be regarded as in any manner relevant.

DOUBLE JEOPARDY

The alien claims that the 1939 hearing established that he was neither a member of nor affiliated with the Communist Party of the United States of America, and that hence he was put in double jeopardy by the proceedings before Judge Sears. This contention must be rejected. As Judge Sears says: "No jeopardy at all is involved for that word has application only to prosecutions of a criminal nature."[40] A deportation hearing is not a criminal prosecution—a fact which the courts have pointed out in numerous well-considered cases (*Mahler* v. *Eby*, 264 U. S. 32 (1924); *Bugajewitz* v. *Adams*, 228 U. S. 585 (1913); *Zakonaite* v. *Wolf*, 226 U. S. 272 (1912)). Reference may also be made to *Helvering* v. *Mitchell* (303 U. S. 391 (1938)) in which Mr. Justice Brandeis expressly states that "in the civil enforcement of a remedial sanction there can be no double jeopardy."[41]

RES JUDICATA

The doctrine of res judicata likewise has no application to this proceeding. Deportation is not a punishment, nor are deportation proceedings similar to criminal prosecutions. Decisions in such proceedings are decisions of the executive department, rather than of the judicial. Executive decisions, as Mr. Justice Holmes pointed out in *Pearson* v. *Williams*,[42] a leading immigration case, "cannot constitute res judicata in a technical sense."

FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

Accordingly, I accept and affirm findings of fact (1) to (3), inclusive, and (8) to (10), inclusive, of the Board of Immigration Appeals; I reverse the Board's findings (4) to (7), inclusive; I reverse the Board's conclusions of law; and I make the following findings of fact and conclusions of law, proposed by Judge Sears, to wit:

Findings of fact

1. That Harry Renton Bridges is an alien, to wit, a native and citizen of Australia;

2. That said alien entered the United States at the port of San Francisco, Calif., April 12, 1920, as a member of the crew of the barkentine *Ysabel;*

3. That the Communist Party of the U. S. A., from the time of its inception in 1919 to the present time, is an organization that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

4. That the Communist Party of the U. S. A., from the time of its inception to the present time, is an organization that writes, circulates, distributes, prints, publishes, and displays printed matter advising, advocating, or teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

5. That the Communist Party of the U. S. A., from the time of its inception to the present time, is an organization that causes to be written, circulated, distributed, printed, published, and displayed, printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

6. That the Communist Party of the U. S. A., from the time of its inception to the present time, is an organization that has in its possession for the purpose of circulation, distribution, publication, issue, and display, printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

7. That the Marine Workers' Industrial Union was a part of the Communist Party, dominated and controlled by it;

8. That the Marine Workers' Industrial Union was an organization that believed in, advised, advocated, and taught the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

9. That after entering the United States the alien has been a member of the Communist Party;

10. That after entering the United States the alien has been affiliated with the Communist Party;

11. That after entering the United States the alien has been affiliated with the Marine Workers' Industrial Union.

Conclusions of law

That under the act of October 16, 1918, as amended by the acts of June 5, 1920, and June 28, 1940, the alien, Harry Renton Bridges, is subject to deportation in that:

1. After entering the United States he has been a member of an organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

2. That after entering the United States the alien has been affiliated with an organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

3. That after entering the United States the alien has been a member of an organization, association, society, or group that writes, circulates, distributes, publishes, and displays printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

4. That after entering the United States the alien has been affiliated with an organization, association, society, or group that writes, circulates, distributes, publishes, and displays printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

5. That after entering the United States the alien has been a member of an organization, association, society, or group that caused to be written, circulated, distributed, published, printed, and displayed printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

MAY 28, 1942.

ORDER

I therefore order that the alien Harry Renton Bridges be deported to Australia at the expense of the Government on the charges that:

1. After entering the United States he has been a member of an organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

2. After entering the United States he has been affiliated with an organization, association, society, or group that believes in, advises, advocates, and teaches the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

3. After entering the United States he has been a member of an organization, association, society, or group that writes, circulates, distributes, publishes, and displays printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

4. After entering the United States he has been affiliated with an organization, association, society, or group that writes, circulates, distributes, publishes, and displays printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States;

5. After entering the United States he has been a member of an organization, association, society, or group that caused to be written, circulated, distributed, published, printed, and displayed printed matter advising, advocating, and teaching the overthrow by force and violence of the Government of the United States.

FRANCIS BIDDLE,
Attorney General.

MAY 28, 1942.

Mr. Speaker, the document I have just quoted proves the assertions I have made regarding it. The duty of making this decision was placed by law upon the Attorney General. He did not seek it. His oath of office bound him to do his duty without fear or favor, as the Attorney General of the United States should. He did just that. If enforcement of the law by officers sworn to perform that duty be silly, then I am sure that all of us should say, "God speed the day when all of our law-enforcement officers may be just that silly." Our forefathers took their lives in their hands, and many of them died upon the field of battle, in order that we might bring forth upon this continent a government of law and not of man. It seems to me that it is high time that Americans should compliment and support our officials when they do their duty and enforce the law rather than call them silly.

And then Mr. Frank R. Kent, in his column, The Great Game of Politics, suggests that possibly the reason for the order of the Attorney General was to counteract the effect of the President's parole of Earl Browder. This seems to me to be not only gratuitous, unwarranted, and unjustifiable, but also an ignoble suggestion. It casts aspersion of conspiracy and ulterior motive upon both the President and the Attorney General. Why do some insist upon looking for ulterior motive when duty is plain and nobly done? The Attorney General is a man of brilliant intellect, excellent legal ability and experience, of high courage and character. He studied the record of the Bridges case—as his opinion shows—including the opinions of Dean Landis, Judge Sears, the Board of

[38] 308 U. S. 338 (1939).

[39] 62 Sup. Ct. 1000. See also *Goldman* v. *United States* (62 Sup. Ct. 993).

[40] Sears, p. 16.

[41] P. 404.

[42] *Pearson* v. *Williams*, 202 U. S. 281 (1906); see also *Wilbur* v. *United States*, 281 U. S. 206, 217 (1929); *United States ex rel. Tremaine* v. *Commissioner of Immigration*, 209 Fed. 137 (1913); *White* v. *Chan Wy Sheung*, 270 Fed. 764 (1921).

Immigration Appeals, and the 2,800 pages of evidence gathered by the Federal Bureau of Investigation in a splendid piece of work. His trained legal mind and his intellectual honesty led him to follow the gleam of truth wherever it led.

May I say again, it seems to me that it is high time that all America rose to the support of this high-minded, honest official and glory in what he has done in this instance to enforce the law we wrote. If the law be wrong, then we who wrote it are to blame, not the Attorney General. If the law be right, as we insist that it is, then Americans as one man should rise and applaud a courageous, brilliant, and honest decision.

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE LATE HONORABLE JOHN HENRY MOREHEAD

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that the House has learned of the passing of one of its distinguished former Members, the Honorable John Henry Morehead, of Nebraska.

Born in Lucas County, Iowa, in 1861, he attended public school, later removing to Nebraska where as a young man he taught school and engaged in the mercantile business in a small country town. He rose by his own efforts to positions of trust and confidence in his community, his county, his State, and his Nation. He was elected county treasurer of Richardson County, his home county in Nebraska; mayor of Falls City, his home city; member of the State Senate, serving in that body as president pro tempore. He was chosen Lieutenant Governor, and in 1912 he was elected, and reelected, Governor of Nebraska, occupying that high office from 1913 to 1917, and making a constructive record which left a lasting impression on the State's history. He served with distinction as a Member of this body, representing the First Congressional District of Nebraska from 1923 to 1935 from the Sixty-eighth to the Seventy-third Congresses. In 1918 he was the nominee of the Democratic Party of Nebraska for United States Senator.

Throughout his life Governor Morehead took a deep interest in the welfare of the State of Nebraska and its people. He was a farmer, an orchardist, a stock raiser, and was active in the development of Nebraska's resources.

In this brief statement it is my purpose to express the sorrow which I feel and which all Nebraskans feel at the deep loss which we have sustained in the passing of a distinguished citizen and a faithful public servant of Nebraska. His bereaved family and his many friends will be consoled by the recollection of a life well spent in the service of the people. At a later date appropriate services will be held in this Chamber on which occasion more time will be devoted to a discussion of the inspiring career and achievements of Governor Morehead.

PRESIDENT QUEZON

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I could not let the day go by without paying my tribute to what I thought was a very great message delivered to this body by the distinguished president of a great and gallant people. I refer, of course, to the address by Manuel Quezon, President of the Philippine Commonwealth.

I hope the relations existing between the United States and the Philippines today may be taken as a token of the kind of future world for which America fights. I believe if they could be so taken that the spirit thereby given to the peoples of the world would be very great.

I rise to pay my sincere tribute as a Member of the National Legislature of the United States to a great nation and a great people. Mexico is today, by the forthright and courageous action of her President and Congress and the popular demand of her people, at war against the Axis Powers. The people and the Congress of the United States regret deeply the loss of Mexican lives at sea as a result of Axis submarine attacks. We extend to the people of Mexico the assurance that as we fight to victory in this war together we shall be highly resolved that from this day forward into the future the three great nations of North America, Mexico, Canada, and the United States will never lay down the good-neighbor policy or the good-neighbor creed. On a basis of absolute and unquestioned equality we stand today shoulder to shoulder as allies.

In war or in peace let it always be so.

And out of this struggle and experience will come, I know, to all Americans the same appreciation that many of us long have felt of the culture, the music, the art, the love of childhood, the profound spiritual and religious nature, and the dynamic and courageous patriotism which characterize and inspire our neighbors south of the Rio Grande.

Hail, Mexico. We welcome you as comrades in arms in the cause of human liberty.

[Here the gavel fell.]

VENEREAL DISEASES AND WAR

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, in view of the great public interest and increasing demand for all-out efforts to protect the health and morale of our armed forces and war-industry workers against the venereal diseases and conditions favoring their spread, I desire to call attention to my speeches on this subject May 13, 1937, March 5, 1940, and remarks on other occasions, and to supplement them at this time with current figures on the notable progress which has been made.

THE WORK HAS BEEN WELL ORGANIZED AND STAFFED

Our Federal, State, and local health departments have demonstrated their ability to conduct this work. They have the special scientific knowledge, and they have built up their programs carefully with the close cooperation of the medical and allied professions and the general public. The members of these groups look to us for recognition of their contributions of services and for practical assistance through adequate Federal assistance to the States for venereal disease control work. This is a fight in which we must use every weapon known to modern science and social protection if we are to conquer these diseases, which are such a serious handicap to maximum efficiency. It is our duty in the House of Representatives to see that sufficient funds are provided to do the job.

Adequately financed, this job can be done—can be completed. Inadequately financed, it will be another case of "too late with too little." Of the estimated 3,200,000 syphilis cases in this country, many are still in need of treatment, an unknown number being in a highly infectious stage of the disease. There are at least 700,000 today under treatment who have to ask that their drugs be furnished by State health departments. Half of these can secure private physicians to give them the treatment, but half must also ask that the treatment be administered in publicly financed clinics. The maximum use of doctors, nurses, supplies, and clinics still available for civilian service can increase the total of services; but the present rate of Federal expenditure must be maintained through the coming year. This means about $15,000,000 of Federal money for 1942–43; and will assure us that not only will the established program be maintained, but that additional efforts can be made to cure promptly the men rejected at selectee examinations and thus make them available for military or war-industry service. Also this sum will permit continuation and strengthening of that urgently important work of tracing and helping by treatment and advice those people who are apparently infected and spreading their diseases.

$15,000,000 NEEDED FOR FEDERAL ASSISTANCE IN 1942–43

With this $15,000,000 of Federal funds, which I believe should be made available at this time, plus the funds which the States can be counted on to provide, it will be possible to treat and cure virtually all the men rejected by Selective Service, instead of the 50 percent now under treatment. It will be possible to find and treat a far greater proportion of infected war workers than the estimated 20 percent now being treated. It will be possible to treat until cured a much larger percentage of the known cases among the civilian population generally. Of perhaps even greater importance, it will be possible with these funds to employ and train public-health assistants for field service, to go out and find more of the people who are infected but do not know it, or who do not know what to do. Once found, these "contacts," as our public-health men term them, will be advised and aided to get under treat-

ment also, thus not only preserving their health but preventing them from infecting others. Breaking the chain of infection is the surest way and, in the end, the cheapest way of stamping out venereal diseases. This work must be done if we hope to reduce materially the number of new cases of venereal disease during the next year. The fewer new cases in our armed services the less time lost from training and fighting; the fewer civilian war workers who remain untreated the fewer days lost from the assembly lines of our war industries. And, of course, the fewer men, women, and children infected in the Nation generally during the war period, the better off we will be when peace comes again.

MORE EFFECTIVE CONTROL OF PROSTITUTION AND ALCOHOL REQUIRED

In these remarks I have not said much about other lines of attack on these diseases because I have wanted to direct your attention at this time to the urgent need for our Federal support of the medical and public-health program. But I would remind you that the successful repression of prostitution is a vitally important measure also in preventing the spread of these diseases. Congress endeavored to aid this phase of the work by passing the May Act, which the President signed July 11, 1941. I would remind you also that intoxicating beverages play an important part in promoting the spread of syphilis and gonorrhea. To bring this question before you for careful consideration, I introduced a bill (H. R. 4000) last year, which I revised in view of the May Act, and reintroduced as H. R. 7101. All of these lines of attack, together with the promotion of constructive programs for recreation, proper housing, and economic conditions conducive to good standards of living will support and accelerate the broad campaign against syphilis and gonorrhea.

I have asked permission to speak today, Mr. Speaker, because I want to review what I have said on previous occasions and emphasize our need with current facts. The two principal venereal diseases are syphilis and gonorrhea. Syphilis is a killer. If allowed to go undiscovered and untreated, it may cripple or kill or drive its victims into insanity. Our medical men tell us there is no disease more dangerous than syphilis. How common then is this deadly and contagious saboteur of our national health and strength?

EXTENT OF THE VENEREAL DISEASE MENACE

It is impossible for our public health men to measure exactly the amount of syphilis in the Nation today, but a summary of all the infectious diseases reported to State departments of health in 1940 shows that there were at least 347 cases of syphilis reported for every 100,000 people in the United States. While we know these reported cases for 1 year fall far short of representing all the infected people in the States, the total of reported syphilis for that year was more than the combined reported total in the same year for tuberculosis, typhoid fever, smallpox, pneumonia, meningitis, diphtheria, infantile paralysis, and typhus. Conservative estimates of all our people infected with syphilis would be well over 3,000,000.

When the first million of our young men were examined for our present Selective Service, 45 in each thousand were found infected with syphilis and therefore unacceptable for service in our armed forces at the time they presented themselves for examination. In the last war, venereal diseases among our soldiers were responsible for more time lost from service than any other cause. In our present emergency, the Surgeons General of both the Army and Navy have reported that syphilis and gonorrhea are again causing more lost time among soldiers and sailors than any other serious diseases. Let me emphasize again that phrase "time lost from service"—time lost when time is urgent, when time for training our men, and for building our ships, and for transporting our soldiers and their weapons to the far corners of the world is the scarcest of all our resources. Time lost when the expression "too little and too late" covers a tragic story of lost outposts, lost lives, lost battles, lost opportunities for early victory.

Now, at last, we are aroused to the dangers of "too little and too late," and our Nation is straining every nerve and muscle, first, to stem the advancing enemies of America, and then to throw them back in confused defeat. Strength, health, toughness in our mental and physical fiber are needed for this stupendous task. Health is needed now as never before in the history of a people determined to preserve their freedom.

DANGER OF BEING "TOO LATE WITH TOO LITTLE"

Many ask, "Have we been 'too late with too little' in our fight against the venereal diseases, those most dangerous of all diseases which sap the strength and health of our soldiers and our war workers?" We may answer, "Not yet," but we shall have to work hard and fast to prevent this result. Back in 1938 we passed legislation and began appropriations which during the past 3 years have extended the program into every State and about one-third of all the counties of our Nation. It was in 1937 that I made my first speech on this floor about the necessity for Federal assistance to the States in organizing and conducting a national coordinated, scientific program for control of venereal diseases. Later that year and in the early months of 1938 the Governors of the States sent their public-health officials to meet with the officials of the United States Public Health Service and with other leaders in the field of health and medical science. From these meetings and from deliberations in this Congress, there evolved the Venereal Disease Control Act of 1938. Under the stimulus of this act, the long, uphill fight against syphilis and gonorrhea—those vicious killers and cripplers of American men, women, children, and unborn babies—has steadily gained momentum.

In 1938 we appropriated $3,000,000 for this fight. Each year thereafter, as the program expanded, as more doctors and nurses were trained, more health clinics were established, more physicians in private practice cooperated, and as more treatment drugs were made available, we gradually increased the annual appropriation. Last year we started out the fiscal year of 1942 by allotting the sum of $6,250,000; but during the year, to meet the emergency, we voted a supplemental appropriation of $2,500,000 on recommendation of the President, in addition to several million dollars available from other sources. During each of these years the States and communities have appropriated approximately equal amounts of money, and evidently would have been willing to contribute even more if they had been asked and assured that the sound growth of the program required more money in any one of these years.

WHAT HAS BEEN ACCOMPLISHED WITH THE AID OF FEDERAL APPROPRIATIONS?

From 1,122 venereal disease clinics in 1938, when we started, the number of clinics has increased to 3,363—an increase of 300 percent.

In 1938, 3,598,198 blood tests for syphilis were given. In 1942 this number had increased by 483 percent to a total of 17,400,000.

In 1939, the State health departments reported a monthly average of 210,270 patients were receiving syphilis treatments in public clinics.

In 1942 that figure had increased to 404,885, or by 92.6 percent.

The number of syphilis treatments given by public health doctors in 1938 was 4,215,256; in 1942 that figure had increased 259 percent to a total of 10,578,226. At the same time the number of treatment doses distributed by State health departments to private physicians for treatment of their cases increased from 2,799,110 to 8,497,454, or 303 percent.

Remember, all these figures are for syphilis only. Gonorrhea strikes from 3 to 7 times more often. In 1938 the miraculous new sulfonamide drugs when properly used were just beginning to hold out the hope of more effective and shorter treatment to the millions who each year were contracting gonorrhea. In 1938, an estimated 3,500,000 doses of sulfa drugs were distributed through clinics and private doctors by the State health departments. That early figure has, in 1942, increased by 339 percent to a total of 11,884,000 doses.

These are just a few of the statistics relating to the diagnosis and treatment part of the program for stamping out these diseases, but they are enough to prove that tremendous progress already has been made. And I should remind you that these developments have occurred in peacetime—and now we are at war. Can we speed up and expand this work to meet the war conditions? Can we appropriate enough money; will we in Congress be able to say in future that we did all we might have done in order to insure this country's having the hard and healthy strength needed to fight the gravest battles in our national history? In other words, gentlemen, will we avoid it being said that this is just another example of "too late with too little"?

Remember those 45,000 boys rejected by Selective Service physicians because of syphilis. Remember there are probably

at least 3,200,000 syphilis-infected persons in the Nation. Remember, too, that studies of all the venereal diseases indicate that a considerable loss of time may be incurred by each person in the course of his disease. If we act now, if we add to and reinforce the existing program, we can win out on this small but important sector of our battle for national victory.

Syphilis and gonorrhea are endemic civilian diseases which tend to increase and become more widespread under the impact of war, the separation of men and women from their normal family environment, the feverish activity, and the flow of new money. The Army and Navy can prevent infections occurring within their military establishments, but beyond that they can only strive to cure promptly the diseases after their men have caught them out in the civilian community, and must look to the civilian health authorities to take the lead in efforts to stamp out the sources of the infections. And both the cure and the prevention of these diseases among civilian war workers is a civilian responsibility. Therefore, the job is mainly one of aiding and reinforcing the work of our Federal, State, and local health, law, and welfare authorities, with such cooperation as the Army and Navy and voluntary civilian agencies can give.

THROUGH WAR TO VICTORY AND THE CONQUEST OF THE VENEREAL DISEASES

Fortunately, we already have machinery and procedures for doing this job which have been built up and tested with the aid of Congress, and which have already been adjusted to the demands of wartime, through working agreements between the War and Navy Departments, the United States Public Health Service, the Social Protection Section of the Defense Health and Welfare Services, and the various State health and other departments, and voluntary agencies such as the American Social Hygiene Association. It is only necessary now to use this machinery and apply these procedures in the all-out effort I have mentioned to secure the results which are of such vital importance to winning the war and to completing the conquest of these diseases after the war is over.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I remark that every Member of the House is in accord with what the gentleman is saying and with his purposes. I personally stand ready to support the gentleman in these efforts, and I want to express my appreciation for what the gentleman is doing.

Mr. HOUSTON. I thank the gentleman very much for his contribution.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. EBERHARTER. May I say that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON] is entitled to the thanks of the membership of the House and the entire country for the time and effort he has spent in working on this subject, in studying it and in developing methods through the work of research experts in helping to eradicate this very great evil in this country.

Mr. HOUSTON. I thank the gentleman very kindly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXEMPTION FROM STATE AND LOCAL TAXES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, for many months I have been endeavoring to get before the House legislation that would exempt from State and local taxes the sale, purchase, storage, use, or consumption of tangible personal property to be used in connection with national-defense contracts.

It was in November 1941 that I introduced a bill in order to have this matter considered by the Committee on Ways and Means. Hearings were held and the Under Secretaries of War and Navy, as well as the leading generals of the Army and the admirals of the Navy, appeared before the committee and appealed for the immediate passage of legislation that would bring about the objective I sought.

After the hearings were held the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, introduced a bill, the objective being the same but the language being changed to meet recommendations made by some of the States as well as the Army and Navy. The bill was reported and then a request was made of the Committee on Rules for a rule that would provide for immediate consideration. The Rules Committee departed from its usual procedure and called many of the same witnesses that had appeared before the Ways and Means Committee, despite the fact that the hearings had been printed and were available to all. The Under Secretary of War, Mr. Patterson, several generals, as well as admirals, appeared before the Rules Committee.

Following the hearing before the Rules Committee another bill was introduced by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON], which embodied changes that were practically recommended by the Rules Committee. That bill, H. R. 6955, was reported to the House on April 22, and it is for this bill that the rule is desired. When I say that only 7 out of 25 members of the Ways and Means Committee filed a minority report—it does seem when that great committee puts its stamp of approval on legislation of this kind that the House should at least have an opportunity to consider it.

Testimony before the Ways and Means Committee brought out that it was estimated by the Army and Navy that on the basis of expenditures already authorized up to that time the cost to the Government, if legislation of this character is not passed, would be between $1,500,000,000 and $2,000,000,000. Since that time many more billions of dollars have been appropriated and we will soon consider a bill, the annual Army supply bill, which will carry the tremendous sum of at least $45,000,000,000.

As I have previously said on the floor the necessity for this legislation is due to the decision of the Supreme Court where the Court held that constitutional immunity insofar as paying taxes by the Government to the States did not extend beyond the prime contractor. In other words, all subcontracts and all supplies purchased by prime contractors for national defense purposes will be subject to the sales taxes of the various States that have such laws on their statute books. With such a tremendous amount of additional money to be appropriated, it is easy to see now, and I have unofficial estimates, that the cost to the Government for such taxes will run closer to $4,000,000,000 than it will to $2,000,000,000.

We will soon be asked to pass a tax bill to raise an unprecedented amount of money and it is beyond me to understand, when money is needed so badly at this time, that the Congress will not take advantage of a situation and pass a law that will save the taxpayers of this country around $4,000,000,000.

My purpose in rising today is to appeal to the Rules Committee to report the rule which has been asked for by the Ways and Means Committee so that the matter can be disposed of by the House one way or the other.

SENATE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1853. An act for the relief of the Rock Hill Stone & Gravel Co., of St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2264. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Connecticut to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of James H. Lane; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2506. An act for the relief of Angela Skeoch; to the Committee on Claims.

S. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution designating June 13, 1942, as MacArthur Day, and authorizing its appropriate observance; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 69. An act to authorize the adjustment of land-ownership lines within the General Grant Grove section of the Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., in order to protect equities established by possession arising in conformity with a certain survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 488. An act for the relief of Kathryn O. Sweeney and others;

H. R. 1162. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the final homestead proof submitted by Henry Martin Coffman;

H. R. 1595. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Plumas National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 1736. An act for the relief of Lillian Last;

H. R. 1757. An act for the relief of James D. G. Alexander;

H. R. 2307. An act validating a certain conveyance, heretofore made by the Southern

Pacific Railroad Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way in the town of Indio, in the county of Riverside, State of California, acquired under section 23 of the act of March 3, 1871 (16 Stat. 573);

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of George P. Crawford;

H. R. 2685. An act to authorize the disposition of recreational demonstration projects, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Wiley W. Watkins;

H. R. 2934. An act for the relief of L. H. Martin;

H. R. 3201. An act for the relief of Walter B. Williams, Jr.;

H. R. 3937. An act to change the designation of the Fort Marion National Monument, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4205. An act to add to the Cleveland National Forest, Calif., certain contiguous lands of the United States which can be most effectively and economically protected and administered as parts of said national forest;

H. R. 4213. An act for the relief of persons in connection with the extraction of gold-bearing ore from the Ruck-A-Chucky Dam site;

H. R. 4347. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the North Pacific Union Conference Association of Seventh-day Adventists;

H. R. 4526. An act for the relief of Joseph Donatelli and Rose Donatelli;

H. R. 4629. An act for the relief of Alfred Smith;

H. R. 4676. An act to accept the cession by the Commonwealth of Kentucky of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mammoth Cave National Park; to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for the park in accordance with the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 635); to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the development of a proper entrance road to the park; and for other purposes;

H. R. 4723. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of John Lesniak;

H. R. 4733. An act to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest, the Salmon National Forest, and the Targhee National Forest in the State of Idaho;

H. R. 5013. An act for the relief of James P. Crawford;

H. R. 5016. An act to amend section 1 of the act approved August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 700), entitled "An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to notify the State of Virginia that the United States assumes police jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Shenandoah National Park, and for other purposes";

H. R. 5142. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the claims of any landowner or water user on the Owyhee reclamation project, Oregon, arising in 1940 by reason of a break in the north canal of such project;

H. R. 5210. An act for the relief of E. M. Conroy;

H. R. 5287. An act relating to the transfer to the Secretary of War of certain lands owned by the United States;

H. R. 5329. An act for the relief of J. J. McIntosh;

H. R. 5394. An act to authorize the lease or sale of public lands for use in connection with the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, etc.;

H. R. 5484. An act for the relief of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska;

H. R. 5490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim to the States of Oregon and California, respectively, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands of Goose Lake in Oregon and California;

H. R. 5527. An act for the relief of Gerney M. Claiborne;

H. R. 5636. An act to expedite the settlement of claims and accounts incident to certain agricultural adjustment programs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5680. An act for the relief of James M. Hays;

H. R. 5687. An act for the relief of Edwin L. Wade;

H. R. 5713. An act for the relief of George W. Lyle under the jurisdiction of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission;

H. R. 5723. An act for the relief of Anna Danielson and Betty Tiedeman;

H. R. 5772. An act for the relief of Glenn A. Hoss;

H. R. 5847. An act for the relief of Mrs. Julia Campbell;

H. R. 5910. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rudolph Treiber, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 5955. An act for the relief of Harold W. Burch and Lucille M. Burch;

H. R. 6102. An act confirming the claim of Augustin Dominique Tureaud for the Church of St. Jacques to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, parish of St. James, said claim being listed as No. 392;

H. R. 6365. An act for the relief of Commander Cato D. Glover;

H. R. 6625. An act granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the Constitution of the State of New Mexico, providing a method for executing leases for grazing and agricultural purposes on lands granted or confirmed to the State of New Mexico by the act of Congress approved June 20, 1910;

H. R. 6748. An act for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder;

H. R. 6797. An act for the relief of the estate of Tom Gentry;

H. R. 7008. An act to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of $5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority; and

H. R. 7097. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore, & Washington Railroad Co. to extend its present track connection with the United States navy yard so as to provide adequate railroad facilities in connection with the development of Buzzards Point as an industrial area in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1932 (47 Stat. 322), as amended by the act approved June 20, 1939 (53 Stat. 849).

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 3, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Wednesday, June 3, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearing in connection with the Federal Communications Commission will be resumed on June 3, at 10 a. m.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, June 3, 1942, for consideration of H. R. 3776 and H. R. 7152.

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Census on Thursday, June 4, 1942, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 7154.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 11, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 7105, to provide for the suspension, during the war, of operating differential subsidy agreements and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1708. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated February 23, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Calumet-Sag Channel, Ill., with a view to determining the advisability of constructing a cut-off channel in Little Calumet River; requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on March 2, 1937; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1709. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill authorizing the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 496. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 7119, to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2196). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 492. Resolution for the consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 130, a joint resolution to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2197). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SPARKMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7164. A bill to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the relief and benefits provided therein to certain persons, to include certain additional proceedings and transactions therein, to provide further relief for persons in military service, to change certain insurance provisions thereof, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2198). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 7174. A bill to validate a certain conveyance heretofore made by Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, to San Jose Water Works,

a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way in the county of Santa Clara, State of California, acquired by South Pacific Coast Railway Co. (predecessor in interest to Southern Pacific Co.) under act of Congress approved March 3, 1875 (18 Stat. L. 482); to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 7175. A bill to amend the Social Security Act, as amended, to extend titles I, IV, and X to Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 7176. A bill to redefine the powers and duties of the Board of Public Welfare of the District of Columbia, to establish a Department of Public Welfare, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill entitled "Revenue Revision of 1942"; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BULWINKLE:

H. R. 7177. A bill for the relief of Earl Carbauh; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of New York:

H. R. 7178. A bill for the relief of Irwin A. Borncamp; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. LESINSKI:

H. R. 7179. A bill for the relief of Clay Guthrie; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SIKES:

H. R. 7180. A bill for the relief of J. E. Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2989. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of L. H. Kimmel, of McLouth, Kans., and 37 others, requesting the passage of the Sheppard bill, S. 860, for legislation which will provide the best protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2990. Also, petition of Mrs. Dave K. Dick, of McLouth, Kans., and 24 others, asking for legislation which will provide the best protection for our men in the Army and Navy against the influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2991. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Mrs. W. S. Gray and other mothers of Oskaloosa, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2992. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition signed by Mrs. E. Burt Osborn and 128 other residents of Jackson, Mich., urging enactment of the legislation providing for free transportation to and from their homes of service men on leave from active duty; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2993. By Mr. RICH: Petition of sundry citizens of Montgomery, Pa., supporting Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

2994. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the International Union of Operating Engineers, Local 64, San Francisco, Calif., relative to House bill 6486, a bill to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

2995. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Albert Richiger and others of North Platte, Nebr., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to condemnation of lands; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

2996. Also, petition of Dillard Stokes, of Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their memorial with reference to that matter published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in volume 88, on pages 4724–4735, inclusive, being the report of the proceedings and debates of May 28, 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2997. Also, petition of Mrs. Guy W. Weller, of Saginaw, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to wartime prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2998. Also, petition of the Citizens U. S. A. Committee of Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the amazing attack on Tokyo by Brig. Gen. James Doolittle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, let the Sun of righteousness arise and bring from the heavenly places the beautiful summer of divine love, filling our land with understanding and rectitude through the spirit of our Saviour. Keep us free from a feeble sense of our duty, delivering us from hate and revenge, all selfishness and vainglory, and make us a strength to those who are weak and poor.

O God of mercy and power, send us forth to labor with the panoply of Thy guidance, in the name of Him whose robe of divinity was without seam and who saw the good in every man and hoped the best. Remember all who by reason of great burdens are overtasked and forgotten while the tidal waves of sorrow sweep by. Remember most tenderly and graciously the mothers whose sons have fallen beneath the folds of our flag whose colors are fadeless. Their days were brief and strong; their hearts were brave and undaunted; they fell in unfaltering tracks, seen by One who knows alone where victory lies. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1943

Mr. HARE, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2200), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. ENGEL reserved all points of order on the bill.

SEVENTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 7182) making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2201), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

DECLARATION OF WAR AGAINST BULGARIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 319) declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Bulgaria and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Government of Bulgaria has formally declared war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Government of Bulgaria, which has thus been thrust upon the United States, is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Government of Bulgaria; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on that motion I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution?

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 357, nays 0, not voting 73, as follows:

[Roll No. 63]

YEAS—357

Allen, Ill.	Bloom	Carter
Allen, La.	Boehne	Cartwright
Andersen, H. Carl	Boggs	Case, S. Dak.
	Bolton	Casey, Mass.
Anderson, Calif.	Bonner	Celler
Anderson, N. Mex.	Boren	Chapman
	Boykin	Chenoweth
Andresen, August H.	Bradley, Mich.	Chiperfield
	Bradley, Pa.	Clason
Andrews	Brooks	Claypool
Angell	Brown, Ga.	Clevenger
Arends	Brown, Ohio	Cochran
Arnold	Bryson	Coffee, Nebr.
Baldwin	Buck	Coffee, Wash.
Barden	Buckley, N. Y.	Cole, N. Y.
Barnes	Bulwinkle	Collins
Barry	Burch	Colmer
Bates, Ky.	Burgin	Cooley
Bates, Mass.	Butler	Cooper
Baumhart	Byrne	Copeland
Beckworth	Byron	Costello
Beiter	Canfield	Courtney
Bender	Cannon, Fla.	Cox
Bennett	Cannon, Mo.	Cravens
Blackney	Capozzoli	Crawford
Bland	Carlson	Creal

Crosser
Crowther
Cunningham
Curtis
D'Alesandro
Davis, Ohio
Davis, Tenn.
Day
Delaney
Dewey
Dickstein
Dingell
Dirksen
Disney
Ditter
Dondero
Doughton
Douglas
Downs
Drewry
Duncan
Durham
Dworshak
Eaton
Eberharter
Elliot, Mass.
Elliott, Calif.
Elston
Engel
Englebright
Fenton
Fish
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Flannagan
Fogarty
Folger
Forand
Ford, Thomas F.
Fulmer
Gale
Gamble
Gathings
Gearhart
Gehrmann
Gerlach
Gibson
Gillette
Gillie
Gore
Gossett
Graham
Grant, Ala.
Grant, Ind.
Gregory
Guyer
Haines
Hall,
Edwin Arthur
Hall,
Leonard W.
Halleck
Hare
Harness
Harris, Ark.
Harris, Va.
Hart
Harter
Hartley
Healey
Hébert
Heffernan
Heidinger
Hendricks
Hess
Hill Colo.
Hill Wash.
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hoffman
Holbrock
Holmes
Hook
Hope
Houston
Hull
Hunter
Imhoff
Izac
Jackson
Jacobsen
Jenkins, Ohio
Jenks, N. H.
Jennings
Jensen
Johns
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson,
Luther A.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, W. Va.
Jones
Jonkman
Kean
Kee
Keefe
Kefauver
Kelley, Pa.
Kelly, Ill.
Kennedy,
Martin J.
Kennedy,
Michael J.
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilday
Kinzer
Kirwan
Kleberg
Klein
Knutson
Kopplemann
Kunkel
Landis
Lane
Lanham
Larrabee
Lea
Leavy
LeCompte
Lewis
Ludlow
Lynch
McCormack
McGehee
McGranery
McGregor
McKeough
McLaughlin
McLean
McMillan
Maas
Maciora
Mahon
Manasco
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
May
Merritt
Meyer, Md.
Michener
Mills, Ark.
Mills, La.
Monroney
Moser
Mott
Mundt
Murdock
Murray
Myers, Pa.
Nelson
Nichols
Norrell
Norton
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Connor
O'Hara
O'Leary
Oliver
O'Neal
O'Toole
Pace
Patton
Peterson, Fla.
Peterson, Ga.
Pfeifer,
Joseph L.
Pheiffer,
William T.
Pierce
Pittenger
Ploeser
Poage
Powers
Priest
Rabaut
Ramsay
Ramspeck
Randolph
Rankin, Miss.
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Rich
Rizley
Robertson, Va.
Robinson, Utah
Robsion, Ky.
Rockwell
Rodgers, Pa.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Okla.
Rolph
Romjue
Russell
Sabath
Sacks
Sanders
Sasscer
Satterfield
Sauthoff
Scanlon
Schuetz
Schulte
Scott
Scrugham
Secrest
Shafer, Mich.
Shanley
Sheridan
Sikes
Simpson
Smith, Maine
Smith Ohio
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wash.
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
South
Sparkman
Spence
Springer
Starnes, Ala.
Stearns, N. H.
Stefan
Stevenson
Stratton
Sullivan
Sumner, Ill.
Sumners, Tex.
Sutphin
Sweeney
Taber
Talbot
Talle
Tarver
Tenerowicz
Thill
Thom
Thomas, N. J
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Tibbott
Tolan
Treadway
Van Zandt
Vincent, Ky.
Vinson, Ga.
Voorhis, Calif.
Vorys, Ohio
Ward
Wasielewski
Weiss
Welch
Wene
West
Wheat
Whelchel
Whitten
Whittington
Wickersham
Wigglesworth
Williams
Wilson
Wolcott
Wolfenden, Pa.
Wolverton, N. J.
Woodruff, Mich.
Woodrum, Va.
Wright
Young
Youngdahl
Zimmerman

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—73

Beam
Bell
Bishop
Buckler, Minn.
Burdick
Camp
Clark
Cluett
Cole, Md.
Culkin
Cullen
Dies
Domengeaux
Edmiston
Ellis
Faddis
Fellows
Flaherty
Ford, Leland M.
Ford, Miss.
Gavagan
Gifford
Gilchrist
Granger
Green
Gwynne
Hancock
Harrington
Howell
Jarman
Jarrett
Johnson, Ind.
Johnson,
Lyndon B.
Kerr
Kocialkowski
Kramer
Lambertson
Lesinski
McIntyre
Maciejewski
Magnuson
Mitchell
O'Day
Osmers
Paddock
Patman
Patrick
Pearson
Plauché
Plumley
Rankin, Mont.
Richards
Rivers
Robertson,
N. Dak.
Rockefeller
Schaefer, Ill.
Shannon
Sheppard
Short
Smith, Pa.
Smith, W. Va.
Somers, N. Y.
Steagall
Terry
Tinkham
Traynor
Vreeland
Wadsworth
Walter
Weaver
White
Winter
Worley

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the joint resolution was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DECLARATION OF WAR AGAINST HUNGARY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 320) declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Hungary and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Government of Hungary has formally declared war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Government of Hungary which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Government of Hungary; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on that motion I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution?

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 360, nays 0, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 64]

YEAS—360

Allen, Ill.
Allen, La.
Andersen,
H. Carl
Anderson, Calif.
Anderson,
N. Mex.
Andresen,
August H.
Andrews
Angell
Arends
Arnold
Baldwin
Barden
Barnes
Barry
Bates, Ky.
Bates, Mass.
Baumhart
Beckworth
Beiter
Bender
Bennett
Blackney
Bland
Bloom
Boehne
Boggs
Bolton
Bonner
Boren
Boykin
Bradley, Mich.
Bradley, Pa.
Brooks
Brown, Ga.
Brown, Ohio
Bryson
Buck
Buckler, Minn.
Buckley, N. Y.
Bulwinkle
Burch
Burgin
Butler
Byrne
Byron
Canfield
Cannon, Fla.
Cannon, Mo.
Capozzoli
Carlson
Carter
Cartwright
Case, S. Dak.
Casey, Mass.
Celler
Chapman
Chenoweth
Chiperfield
Clason
Claypool
Clevenger
Cochran
Coffee, Nebr.
Coffee, Wash.
Cole, N. Y.
Collins
Colmer
Cooley
Cooper
Copeland
Costello
Courtney
Cox
Cravens
Crawford
Creal
Crosser
Crowther
Cunningham
Curtis
D'Alesandro
Davis, Ohio
Davis, Tenn.
Day
Delaney
Dewey
Dickstein
Dingell
Dirksen
Disney
Ditter
Domengeaux
Dondero
Doughton
Douglas
Downs
Drewry
Duncan
Durham
Dworshak
Eberharter
Elliot, Mass.
Elliott, Calif.
Elston
Engel
Englebright
Fenton
Fish
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Flannagan
Fogarty
Folger
Forand
Ford, Thomas F.
Fulmer
Gale
Gamble
Gathings
Gearhart
Gehrmann
Gerlach
Gibson
Gillette
Gillie
Gore
Gossett
Graham
Grant, Ala.
Grant, Ind.
Gregory
Guyer
Haines
Hall,
Edwin Arthur
Hall,
Leonard W.
Halleck
Hare
Harness
Harris, Ark.
Harris, Va.
Hart
Harter
Hartley
Healey
Hébert
Heffernan
Heidinger
Hendricks
Hess
Hill, Colo.
Hill, Wash.
Hinshaw
Hobbs
Hoffman
Holbrock
Holmes
Hook
Hope
Houston
Hull
Hunter
Imhoff
Izac
Jackson
Jacobsen
Jenkins, Ohio
Jenks, N. H.
Jennings
Jensen
Johns
Johnson, Calif.
Johnson, Ill.
Johnson,
Luther A.
Johnson, Okla.
Johnson, W. Va.
Jones
Jonkman
Kean
Kee
Keefe
Kefauver
Kelley, Pa.
Kelley, Ill.
Kennedy,
Martin J.
Kennedy,
Michael J.
Keogh
Kilburn
Kilday
Kinzer
Kirwan
Kleberg
Klein
Knutson
Kopplemann
Kunkel
Landis
Lane
Lanham
Larrabee
Lea
Leavy
LeCompte
Lewis
Ludlow
Lynch
McCormack
McGehee
McGranery
McGregor
McKeough
McLaughlin
McLean
McMillan
Maas
Maciora
Mahon
Manasco
Mansfield
Marcantonio
Martin, Iowa
Martin, Mass.
Mason
May
Merritt
Meyer, Md.
Michener
Mills, Ark.
Mills, La.
Monroney
Moser
Mott
Mundt
Murdock
Murray
Myers, Pa.
Nelson
Nichols
Norrell
Norton
O'Brien, Mich.
O'Brien, N. Y.
O'Connor
O'Hara
O'Leary
Oliver
O'Neal
O'Toole
Pace
Patman
Patton
Peterson, Fla.
Peterson, Ga.
Pfeifer,
Joseph L.
Pheiffer,
William T.
Pierce
Pittenger
Ploeser
Poage
Powers
Priest
Rabaut
Ramsay
Ramspeck
Randolph
Rankin, Miss.
Reece, Tenn.
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Rees, Kans.
Rich
Rizley
Robertson, Va.
Robinson, Utah
Robsion, Ky.
Rockwell
Rodgers, Pa.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Okla.
Rolph
Romjue
Russell
Sabath
Sacks
Sanders
Sasscer
Satterfield
Sauthoff
Scanlon
Schuetz
Schulte
Scott
Scrugham
Secrest
Shafer, Mich.
Shanley
Sheridan
Sikes
Simpson
Smith, Maine
Smith, Ohio
Smith, Va.
Smith, Wash.
Smith, Wis.
Snyder
South
Sparkman
Spence
Springer
Starnes, Ala.
Stearns, N. H.
Stefan
Stevenson
Stratton
Sullivan
Sumner, Ill.
Sumners, Tex.
Sutphin
Sweeney
Taber
Talbot
Talle
Tarver
Tenerowicz
Terry
Thill
Thom
Thomas, N. J.
Thomas, Tex.
Thomason
Tibbott
Tolan
Treadway
Van Zandt
Vincent, Ky.
Vinson, Ga.
Voorhis, Calif.
Vorys, Ohio
Ward
Wasielewski
Weiss
Welch
Wene
West
Wheat
Whelchel
Whitten
Whittington
Wickersham
Wigglesworth
Williams
Wilson
Wolcott
Wolfenden, Pa.
Wolverton, N. J.
Woodruff, Mich.
Woodrum, Va.
Wright
Young
Youngdahl
Zimmerman

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—70

Beam	Gwynne	Plumley
Bell	Hancock	Rankin, Mont.
Bishop	Harrington	Richards
Burdick	Howell	Rivers
Camp	Jarman	Robertson,
Clark	Jarrett	N. Dak.
Cluett	Johnson, Ind.	Rockefeller
Cole, Md.	Johnson,	Schaefer, Ill.
Culkin	Lyndon B.	Shannon
Cullen	Kerr	Sheppard
Dies	Kocialkowski	Short
Eaton	Kramer	Smith, Pa.
Edmiston	Lambertson	Smith, W. Va.
Ellis	Lesinski	Somers, N. Y.
Faddis	McIntyre	Steagall
Fellows	Maciejewski	Tinkham
Flaherty	Magnuson	Traynor
Ford, Leland M.	Mitchell	Vreeland
Ford, Miss.	O'Day	Wadsworth
Gavagan	Osmers	Walter
Gifford	Paddock	Weaver
Gilchrist	Patrick	White
Granger	Pearson	Winter
Green	Plauché	Worley

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DECLARATION OF WAR AGAINST RUMANIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 321) declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Rumania and the Government and the people of the United States, and making provisions to prosecute the same.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas the Government of Rumania has formally declared war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the state of war between the United States and the Government of Rumania which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Government of Rumania; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on that motion I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Will the House suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution?

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 361, nays 0, not voting 69, as follows:

[Roll No. 65]

YEAS—361

Allen, Ill.	Baumhart	Bryson
Allen, La.	Beckworth	Buck
Andersen, H. Carl	Beiter	Buckley, N. Y.
	Bender	Bulwinkle
Anderson, Calif.	Bennett	Burch
Anderson, N. Mex.	Blackney	Burgin
	Bland	Butler
Andresen, August H.	Bloom	Byrne
	Boehne	Byron
Andrews	Boggs	Canfield
Angell	Bolton	Cannon, Fla.
Arends	Bonner	Cannon, Mo.
Arnold	Boren	Capozzoli
Baldwin	Boykin	Carlson
Barden	Bradley, Mich.	Carter
Barnes	Bradley, Pa.	Cartwright
Barry	Brooks	Case, S. Dak.
Bates, Ky.	Brown, Ga.	Casey, Mass.
Bates, Mass.	Brown, Ohio	Celler
Chapman	Houston	Powers
Chenoweth	Hull	Priest
Chiperfield	Hunter	Rabaut
Clason	Imhoff	Ramsay
Claypool	Jackson	Ramspeck
Clevenger	Jacobsen	Randolph
Cochran	Jenkins, Ohio	Rankin, Miss.
Coffee, Nebr.	Jenks, N. H.	Reece, Tenn.
Coffee, Wash.	Jennings	Reed, Ill.
Cole, N. Y.	Jensen	Reed, N. Y.
Collins	Johns	Rees, Kans.
Colmer	Johnson, Calif.	Rich
Cooley	Johnson, Ill.	Ripley
Cooper	Johnson,	Robertson, Va.
Copeland	Luther A.	Robinson, Utah
Costello	Johnson, Okla.	Robsion, Ky.
Courtney	Johnson, W. Va.	Rockwell
Cox	Jones	Rodgers, Pa.
Cravens	Jonkman	Rogers, Mass.
Crawford	Kean	Rogers, Okla.
Creal	Kee	Rolph
Crosser	Keefe	Romjue
Crowther	Kefauver	Russell
Cunningham	Kelley, Pa.	Sabath
Curtis	Kelly, Ill.	Sacks
D'Alesandro	Kennedy,	Sanders
Davis, Ohio	Martin J.	Sasscer
Davis, Tenn.	Kennedy,	Satterfield
Day	Michael J.	Sauthoff
Delaney	Keogh	Scanlon
Dewey	Kilburn	Schuetz
Dickstein	Kilday	Schulte
Dingell	Kinzer	Scott
Dirksen	Kirwan	Scrugham
Disney	Kleberg	Secrest
Ditter	Klein	Shafer, Mich.
Domengeaux	Knutson	Shanley
Dondero	Kopplemann	Sheridan
Doughton	Kunkel	Short
Douglas	Landis	Sikes
Downs	Lane	Smith, Maine
Drewry	Lanham	Smith, Ohio
Duncan	Larrabee	Smith, Pa.
Durham	Lea	Smith, Va.
Dworshak	Leavy	Smith, Wash.
Eberharter	LeCompte	Smith, Wis.
Eliot, Mass.	Lesinski	Snyder
Elliott, Calif.	Lewis	South
Elston	Ludlow	Sparkman
Engel	Lynch	Spence
Englebright	McCormack	Springer
Fenton	McGehee	Starnes, Ala.
Fish	McGranery	Stearns, N. H.
Fitzgerald	McGregor	Stefan
Fitzpatrick	McKeough	Stevenson
Flannagan	McLaughlin	Stratton
Fogarty	McLean	Sullivan
Folger	McMillan	Sumner, Ill.
Forand	Maas	Sumners, Tex.
Ford, Thomas F.	Maciora	Sutphin
Fulmer	Mahon	Sweeney
Gale	Manasco	Taber
Gamble	Mansfield	Talbot
Gathings	Marcantonio	Talle
Gearhart	Martin, Iowa	Tarver
Gehrmann	Martin, Mass.	Tenerowicz
Gerlach	Mason	Terry
Gibson	May	Thill
Gillette	Merritt	Thom
Gillie	Meyer, Md.	Thomas, N. J.
Gore	Michener	Thomas, Tex.
Gossett	Mills, Ark.	Thomason
Graham	Mills, La.	Tibbott
Grant, Ala.	Monroney	Tolan
Grant, Ind.	Moser	Traynor
Gregory	Mott	Treadway
Guyer	Mundt	Van Zandt
Haines	Murdock	Vincent, Ky.
Hall,	Murray	Vinson, Ga.
Edwin Arthur	Myers, Pa.	Voorhis, Calif.
Hall,	Nelson	Vorys, Ohio
Leonard W.	Nichols	Ward
Halleck	Norrell	Wasielewski
Hare	Norton	Weiss
Harness	O'Brien, Mich.	Welch
Harris, Ark.	O'Brien, N. Y	Wene
Harris, Va.	O'Connor	West
Hart	O'Hara	Wheat
Harter	O'Leary	Whelchel
Hartley	Oliver	Whitten
Healey	O'Neal	Whittington
Hébert	O'Toole	Wickersham
Heffernan	Pace	Wigglesworth
Heidinger	Patman	Williams
Hendricks	Patton	Wilson
Hess	Peterson, Fla.	Wolcott
Hill, Colo.	Peterson, Ga.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Hill, Wash.	Pfeifer,	Wolverton, N. J.
Hinshaw	Joseph L.	Woodruff, Mich.
Hobbs	Pheiffer,	Woodrum, Va.
Hoffman	William T.	Wright
Holbrock	Pierce	Young
Holmes	Pittenger	Youngdahl
Hook	Ploeser	Zimmerman
Hope	Poage	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—69

Beam	Green	Plauché
Bell	Gwynne	Plumley
Bishop	Hancock	Rankin, Mont.
Buckler, Minn.	Harrington	Richards
Burdick	Howell	Rivers
Camp	Isac	Robertson,
Clark	Jarman	N. Dak.
Cluett	Jarrett	Rockefeller
Cole, Md.	Johnson, Ind.	Schaefer, Ill.
Culkin	Johnson,	Shannon
Cullen	Lyndon B.	Sheppard
Dies	Kerr	Simpson
Eaton	Kocialkowski	Smith, W. Va.
Edmiston	Kramer	Somers, N. Y.
Ellis	Lambertson	Steagall
Faddis	McIntyre	Tinkham
Fellows	Maciejewski	Vreeland
Flaherty	Magnuson	Wadsworth
Ford, Leland M.	Mitchell	Walter
Ford, Miss.	O'Day	Weaver
Gavagan	Osmers	White
Gifford	Paddock	Winter
Gilchrist	Patrick	Worley
Granger	Pearson	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended, and the joint resolution was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE—LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Civil Service be permitted to sit during the sessions of the House for the remainder of this week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SEVENTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7182, Rept. No. 2201) making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes. Pending that, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this bill continue for not to exceed one-half hour, one-half of that time to be controlled by myself, and the other half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7182.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7182, with Mr. BLAND in the chair.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the first reading of the bill will be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the bill carries appropriations exclusively for the Navy. It provides for a

total of $654,999,740 in direct appropriations, and $1,037,500,000 in contractual authority.

Of the cash, $650,000 is to meet an actual deficiency for the fiscal year 1941, $444,909,740 is for additional needs of the current fiscal year, and $209,440,000 is to supplement appropriations already made for the fiscal year 1943.

Our war status precludes my going too much into detail.

Of the amount of cash proposed, approximately $313,000,000 is for and on account of personnel expansion beyond numbers heretofore appropriated for for the current fiscal year, and beyond numbers heretofore appropriated for for the fiscal year 1943. The latter, however, applies entirely to matériel, which must be ordered in advance. Pay, subsistence, and so forth, will be cared for in later presentations.

Another large item of cash is one of $200,000,000 for augmenting the capital of the Naval Supply Account Fund, which is a revolving fund employed to finance the procurement of stores with view to their being available promptly to meet requisitions.

The balance of the cash is spread over eight projects of a general or specific nature, all tabulated on page 3 of the report on the bill. Their nature is there disclosed and their need, I should say, is more or less obvious. The committee's examination found them all to be justified by the war program.

With respect to contractual authority, the bill raises from $475,309,300 to $625,309,300, or by $150,000,000, the amount that may be obligated for the provision of facilities for the production of naval aircraft and accessories, urged as being essential to maintain the prescribed delivery schedule, and it includes authority to initiate the construction, out of funds presently available, of approximately 200,000 tons of undersea craft. This tonnage has been authorized. The number of units in contemplation, it is estimated, will cost $887,500,000.

The committee received a recommendation for the grant of authority to initiate, out of funds heretofore appropriated for new ship construction, the construction of 500,000 additional tons of auxiliary vessels. We have passed the proposal over, without prejudice, since authorization only recently has been requested and there had not been opportunity for action by the Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, who has contributed so much in legislation and in investigation of expenditures to the successful conduct of the war.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. To ask the distinguished chairman of the committee whether his committee will accept an amendment making available the Budget estimate as recommended for 500,000 tons of auxiliary naval vessels. The Committee on Naval Affairs had a hearing on such a bill yesterday, and that bill has been unanimously reported, and the report has been filed this morning. It will delay construction if we are tied up in obtaining the authorization. We can put the appropriation in this bill, and probably tomorrow or next day, to keep the RECORD straight, get the authorization. Is there any objection to that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, our hearings indicate that there is great need for haste in making provision for the construction of these vessels, and our only reason for deferring this item was that the gentleman's committee had not been afforded an opportunity to provide the necessary authorization. We are glad to know that the committee has taken such prompt action. In view of his report on the progress of the bill he has placed on the calendar, we shall be glad to accept the amendment.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, the total amount of the bill, as recommended for appropriation, may be said to be for the purpose of providing promptly adequate equipment for our forces, in order to expedite operations in the theater of war and insure early and complete victory.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this bill calls for total appropriations of approximately $665,000,000 in cash and contract authorizations of approximately $1,037,000,000. The item for 500,000 additional tons of auxiliary vessels which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] advised he was going to offer as an amendment, and which the committee left out solely because it was not authorized, will swell the total of contract authorizations to $2,152,000,000, making the total of contract authorizations and direct appropriations approximately $2,800,000,000, to be added to what has heretofore been provided for the war effort.

There seems to be no question but what we are obliged to supply these items. They relate almost entirely to aviation, to submarine tonnage, pay of the Navy and other personnel expenses, and increase of the capital account of the naval supply fund, which amounts to $200,000,000. This item of $200,000,000 is really not an item that goes out of the Treasury ultimately, but it is an item that has to be built up during a period of rapid expansion of the Navy. When it stabilizes, that fund can go down very rapidly.

I think there is no question but what the bill must be passed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Can the gentleman tell us now what the total appropriations and authorizations have been since July 1, 1940, down to date, including this bill, connected with the war effort?

Mr. TABER. Approximately, including this bill, almost $170,000,000,000. I do not have the exact figure, as I had when the last bill was under consideration, but that would be approximately correct.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Up to this time it is about $160,000,000,000 in actual appropriations and contract authorizations—not including the pending bill.

Mr. TABER. That includes contract authorizations also.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; including both appropriations and contractual authority, the total aggregates, in round numbers, approximately $160,000,000,000.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is exclusive of the twelve or fifteen billion commitments of the R. F. C.?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Oh, yes, certainly; exclusive of R. F. C. commitments and this bill.

Mr. TABER. The expenditures have been from thirty to thirty-five billion. I cannot tell exactly.

That is all I care to say, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me in order that I may ask the chairman a few questions?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. In the committee this morning we asked the chairman some questions about this $150,000,000 for aviation plant facilities. I think we should get that in the record. I think this subcommittee which made the investigation and conducted the hearings on this bill should explain to the House that that $150,000,000 is not for plants to be built in the future; and also the fact that we are not having any duplication in the Army, the Navy, or any other branch of the Government in the construction of this air force, and that we do not want any duplication.

Now, it seems to me that a statement should be made by the chairman to the effect that he made in the committee on the question that we asked relative to when these plants would be completed, because that has a great bearing. Mr. Nelson or the President made the statement some time ago that plants that would not be constructed before 1943 would not be constructed at the present time. Now, we understand that those plants are to be constructed this year. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from Pennsylvania raises a question which should have attention. In view of the wide discussion in the newspapers and the frequent suggestion that a change in program is imminent, the committee took this matter up in detail, and Vice Admiral Robinson, who is in charge of naval production, and whose position is comparable to that of General Knudsen in the War Department, after an opportunity to investigate the matter thoroughly, has indicated that the whole proposition has been carefully canvassed and that the apprehension is unwarranted. Construction, therefore, should be completed within the year at most and probably within 6 months.

Mr. RICH. Now I want to bring out this point, because I want to have my own skirts clear, relative to the fact that

we are not going to have any duplication in the Army, the Navy, the Air Corps, or any other branch of the Government, but that they will utilize these facilities for all the armed forces.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The two branches of the service, I am glad to say, are collaborating effectually. They are working in unison and are cooperating in every way practicable. That is especially true in the production of engines and airplane accessories, on which they are closely collaborating. I think there is no need to fear that there will be any overlapping, any duplication or lost motion on that score.

Mr. RICH. I thank the gentleman very much.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to draw the attention of the committee to the same subject my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania has just referred to, the authorization provided in this bill for facilities in either public or private plants. I believe the majority should realize its responsibility as a result of the confidences we are reposing in the executive branch of the Government. I am glad to see my distinguished friend the gentleman from Georgia, the able chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee here. I want to compliment him on the splendid work his committee is doing in ferreting out the irregularities in connection with some of these plants. As we give the Navy this larger sum, this authorization for facilities, it seems to me that he and his committee, the Department and the administration should realize that with the commitments of confidence that we are giving go increased responsibilities for honest and competent administration. I hope that the Naval Affairs Committee will not discontinue the work it is doing as we are adding additional millions for the implacement of facilities. I hope the good work it has already done will be continued and enlarged; that the mistakes which have been so glaring in the past that they shocked the sensibilities of the American people will be corrected. I hope that work will be continued; that the errors will be admitted; and that the facilities instead of being placed where parasites can readily lodge, and out of which choice sinecures can come, and from which the suspicion of patronage privilege at times might arise—that they will be facilities for the honest, competent, faithful prosecution of the war effort. I know the distinguished gentleman from Georgia shares this opinion with me, and I believe he will do his part in seeing that the abuses, the abuses that have been permitted—that those abuses which he has denounced will be discontinued and that we will hew to the line to make it apparent we are not in a political battle but in a battle to win the war; that we will abandon political trenches as we put these facilities at the disposal of private plants.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr DITTER. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let me say to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania that I thoroughly agree with what he has just said. As far as the Naval Affairs Committee is concerned, following the responsibility the House placed upon us we are trying to do our level best to see that there is no log rolling, pork barrelling, or politics in any of this war effort or this naval program. We are also trying to convince the American public and the manufacturers that they do not need to come to Washington City or to employ any special agents to get contracts with their own Government. We are also trying to assure the American public that we are not going to sit quietly by and permit unconscionable profits to be made and large bonuses paid without exposing them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

I knew, of course, that would be the attitude of my distinguished friend from Georgia; it always has been; and if he would permit me to amplify for a moment on the splendid statement he has made I believe it includes the thought that under no circumstances would he condone the sins of omission or commission of the past, that there shall be no condonation by acquiescence, but that there will be a condemnation out of which there will come a correction of conditions which he has criticized.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the distinguished gentleman that the other day in the Naval Affairs Committee I made a statement to the effect that while they are going to make errors we can overlook errors, but there were certain things that could not be excused under the cloak of a war situation, and we do not propose to excuse conduct of that character.

Mr. DITTER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. Yes; hurriedly.

Mr. RICH. In this appropriation bill is carried contractual authority to the amount of $2,152,500,000. We feel that we want the Navy in letting out contracts to see to it that these contracts are let with the minimum amount of profit necessary; that we do not want any more 200-percent and 250-percent profits to be made by any contractor, whether it be for the Army, the Navy, or for some other branch of the Government.

Mr. DITTER. Answering the gentleman from Pennsylvania, I may say that, in my opinion, the officers of the Navy will measure up to the responsibility with which they are charged and will perform a service in keeping with our best Navy traditions.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If the gentleman will yield——

Mr. DITTER. Certainly.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] that I thoroughly endorse that statement. We have implicit confidence in the Navy Department and the officers charged with its responsibility. They are doing a magnificent job, a worth-while job. Referring to the question of profits, it may interest the gentleman to know that the largest profit has been made on contracts let by the competitive-bid system, not on the negotiated contracts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, one of the encouraging features developed in the hearings on this bill was the report by the Chief of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery of the United States Navy, Rear Admiral McIntire, who reported in a general survey of medical conditions from the beginning of mobilization, that notwithstanding the hurried provision of facilities and the large number of men involved, there has been no epidemics, no contagion, especially no influenza, and a comparatively negligible rate of hospitalization. According to his evidence, our Navy is the best fed, the best clothed, the best housed, and best hospitalized force to be found anywhere in the world today.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I take this time for the purpose of making a brief statement. When I spoke about the Navy making these contracts I did not believe that the Navy would be doing something irregular, or the Army or anybody else was doing anything irregular, but I do want to say that the Congress has placed a faith in the Army, the Marine Corps, the Navy, and aviation facilities, and we are looking forward to them. The responsibility is theirs to see that these contracts are let in a way that is commensurate with good business so far as the taxpayers of the country are concerned.

The chairman of the Committee on Appropriations stated that we have appropriated over $160,000,000,000. Let me call your attention to the statement of the Treasury dated May 30. It shows that we are now $74,000,000,000 in the red, that we have gone in the red over seventeen and one-half billion dollars since the 1st of last July, that we will be in the red over $30,000,000,000 by the time the next year rolls around.

If we want to make this Nation count for anything in the world, we have to have a solvent nation, we have to have a nation that is going to be able to pay the bills that it contracts, we have to have a nation that is going to be able to pay the Army that will fight for us, we have to be able to pay the bills for the Navy that we are contracting for, we have to pay the bills for the airplanes that we are building; in other words, we have a lot to do.

The people of this country will have to bow their backs to pay the taxes that Congress has imposed upon them, and they want to know that every dollar we spend will be spent and used wisely and judiciously, else something dreadful might happen to the Nation. That is just as important as anything to consider, and when we have the time here to consider these bills we should know that the responsibility we place on the Army, on the Navy, and on the Chief Executive is not going to be betrayed. The Congress expects them to diligently carry out

their job as it is intended, and to do it in a wise, sensible, sane, businesslike manner.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in this connection it is gratifying to know that data submitted in the hearings by the Marine Corps Quartermaster Department indicates that supplies are being purchased at a figure comparable with the lowest market quotations. In a number of instances, as reported in the hearings, they are buying material at lower cost than previously paid. For example, in the purchase of green kersey, the unit cost on June 31, 1941, was $3.73. On April 13, 1942, the cost of the same material was $3.50. That is all the more notable because of the fact that in June 1941, the quantity bought was considerably more than in April 1942. We were buying in smaller quantity, almost a year later, and in the face of constantly rising prices of all materials, especially wool, of which these garments were fabricated, as will be noted we are able to buy this material today at a saving of 23 cents per unit in comparison with the price paid over a year ago. It reflects favorably on the care and vigilance with which supplies are being procured and is in consonance with the gentleman's position that every care should be exercised in the disbursement of the funds which we appropriate.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL EXPENSES, MARINE CORPS

Clothing, 1943, $32,000,000;

Military supplies and equipment, 1943, $101,000,000;

In all, to be accounted for as one fund, $133,000,000.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for this time only to find out, if I can, on what basis the Navy Department determines what percentage of profit a contractor shall have in furnishing the various supplies to the Navy. Do you have any particular procedure or any particular policy on that subject?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Navy has no specific formula. It follows general business practices in that respect. That is a matter over which neither the Army nor the Navy can exercise arbitrary control. It is governed by current business practices, and general business standards are followed in making contracts.

Mr. CLASON. In the Navy contract you have a provision for the renegotiation of a contract after it is 50 to 60 percent completed.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; at such times as profits can be reasonably gaged, and in many instances, as the gentleman is aware, the departments are renegotiating contracts and have already recovered millions of dollars for the Federal Treasury.

Mr. CLASON. I understood that was so.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course, in many instances, where no precedent exists—that is, when the contract applies to products of a character entirely different from that ordinarily produced by commercial industry—it is impossible to tell at the time the contract is made and before operations are begun what the cost of manufacture will be and what would constitute a legitimate profit, so, under the law, we retain the right to renegotiate and readjust in consonance with business standards the amount of profit to which the contractor is justly entitled.

Mr. CLASON. When you come to renegotiate a contract and find that the contractor is perhaps making a larger amount of profit than the Navy Department feels he should make, what policy have you in mind for determining to what extent you will cut down the profit and on what basis you will renegotiate the contract?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The routine is prescribed by the statute itself. A rather definite form of procedure is laid out under which the Departments proceed immediately to recover from the contractor, or, if the money has not yet been paid, to withhold from the contractor, an amount that would limit his profit to a fair rate of income.

Mr. CLASON. How can the contractor tell in advance, when he enters into a contract, how much profit he will be allowed if there is a renegotiation perhaps 3 months later?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. He cannot tell. Neither can the Government agent tell. That is why it is necessary to provide for renegotiation. Up to this time many renegotiations have been made at the instance of the able chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], and in those cases of renegotiation there has been complete cooperation on the part of the contractors. As soon as aware of the excess profits involved in their contract, they have immediately and readily agreed to renegotiation and have revised the contracts to provide a reasonable profit. And without exception they have paid back to the Federal Treasury or have released contract claims upon the Federal Treasury, for the excess amount due or paid under the original contract.

Mr. CLASON. Assuming the contract calls for $100 for an item, agreed upon after the contractor has come in to the procurement offices of the Navy and shown his cost analysis. The Navy procurement officers have to rely, perhaps, on that cost analysis inasmuch as they have no other way of determining what the probable cost is. The man may say his cost will be $94 and they may finally agree on $100 as the price, indicating a 6-percent profit, or approximately that, on that particular item; yet when he comes back 3 or 4 months later for renegotiation, with the contract 50 to 60 percent completed, that contractor has perhaps assumed all along that his profit by agreement will be about 6 percent of the cost. Is it the policy of the Navy Department to permit that man to retain 6-percent profit, assuming that his costs have changed, perhaps, turning back to the Navy Department whatever he has saved in cost but making him take out of his own pocket whatever he has lost in cost?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. These contracts are tentative under both the intent and the language of the statute. They are contingent upon the accuracy of the estimates made by the contractor and by the Government. If it develops, as manufacture proceeds, that the estimates are accurate, there is no change, but on the other hand, if it develops that due to unfamiliarity with the subject matter and lack of experience in manufacture, too large an amount has been provided, then, as has occurred in many instances, they have been called in and have reconsidered the terms of the contracts and have made provision for the return of any excess profits.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say that when a contract is entered into it is understood by the contractor and by the Navy Department that the Navy Department at any time during the performance of the contract can ask for a renegotiation. Of course, there is no law on the statute books that compels a man, when a negotiation is made, to pay back what the Navy Department thinks he should pay back, but in general dealings with the Navy a contractor is wise to go ahead and reach an agreement, because the Navy can quit doing business with him if it is disclosed that he makes a large and unconscionable profit.

Mr. CLASON. The point I am making is, would you consider that the contractor, having dealt at arms length with the Navy Department, and they having agreed on what appeared to be about a 6-percent profit on the business, would be allowed to retain that profit?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. If it develops after the article is being made in quantity production that, based on the unit cost, his profit is fair and right, there is no renegotiation. If it develops that his contract is way out of line and the unit cost entirely too high when the contract was first made, the contractor agreed to renegotiate and therefore he knows at any time during the performance of his contract he may be called upon for a renegotiation of the contract.

Mr. CLASON. That is true.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, may I say there appears to be only one weak spot in the procedure. If, as in some instances has actually occurred, the contractor instead of estimating too much, has estimated too little, and has lost money there is no provision in the law under which we can reimburse him. A man who has miscalculated his costs and has entered into a contract under which he fails to secure enough to pay the cost of manufacture is without recourse. However, I may say, that in such instances, arrangement has been made by common consent whereby future, or supplementary, contracts carrying terms under which sufficient profits

have been provided to reimburse him for his loss.

The Clerk read as follows:

INCREASE AND REPLACEMENT OF NAVAL VESSELS

In addition to the objects specified under the heads "Construction and machinery" and "Armor, armament, and ammunition" in the Naval Appropriation Act, 1943, said appropriations shall be immediately available for the construction of 200,000 tons of combatant ships, as authorized by Public, 551, approved May 13, 1942.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia: On page 5, after line 7, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"In addition to the objects specified under the heads 'Construction and machinery' and 'Armor, armament, and ammunition' in the Naval Appropriation Act, 1943, such appropriations shall be immediately available for the acquisition, conversion, or construction of 500,000 additional tons of auxiliary vessels: *Provided*, That Public Law 72, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 24, 1941, as amended by Public Law 353, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 17, 1941, is further amended by deleting the words 'one million three hundred and fifty thousand tons' and inserting the words 'one million eight hundred and fifty thousand tons' in lieu thereof."

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment carries out the Budget recommendation to take care of 500,000 auxiliary tonnage which has been favorably reported to the House by the bill H. R. 7159, which was reported out of the Naval Affairs Committee on yesterday.

On May 24, 1941, we passed an authorization bill for 550,000 tons of auxiliaries. On December 17, 1941, we passed a bill authorizing an additional 800,000 tons. This makes 1,350,000 tons of auxiliaries, and the bill which has been reported out of the Naval Affairs Committee authorizes the money for an additional 500,000 tons of auxiliaries. Of the total amount of auxiliaries heretofore appropriated for, they have used up 1,411,306 tons, and they have commitments already for an additional 372,285 tons, leaving uncontracted for, and as to which no commitment has been made, 66,409 tons.

The Navy Department feels that in the prosecution of the war it is absolutely essential to have this additional auxiliary tonnage. These ships are of a character that cannot be disclosed to the House. I can say to the House that the Naval Affairs Committee went into the matter most carefully and this tonnage has a direct bearing upon a speedy prosecution of the war. Therefore I am asking that this amendment go into the bill even though, technically, it would be subject to a point of order, because the authorization measure has not yet passed the House.

This Budget recommendation only reached the Appropriations Committee last Friday. Monday morning I introduced a bill to carry out the Budget recommendation, which had to be authorized, and on Tuesday morning we reported it out of the committee, and today we have filed a report on it in the House. Later on in the week I will try to get it up either by a rule or by unanimous consent in order to keep the record straight, to carry out the authorization as well as the appropriation.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. TABER. The effect of the gentleman's amendment is simply to add availability for contract by the Navy of 500,000 tons of auxiliary ships.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. TABER. And it is an item that will not require funds until they get a little further along with the construction.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is right.

Mr. TABER. So there is not anything involved here except a contract authorization.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; and I may state to the Committee that the cost of this item, when appropriated for, will be in the neighborhood of $1,100,000,000.

Mr. TABER. That is my understanding and I think the gentleman is on sound ground.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment provides authorization for the construction of 500,000 additional tons of auxiliary vessels greatly needed to supplement the auxiliary tonnage heretofore authorized and appropriated for. It was recommended to the committee by the Budget. In the hearings it was shown that this tonnage is greatly needed, but due to the fact that we lacked authorization, we deferred action until such time as legislation could be enacted.

We appreciate the action of the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee in offering this amendment. We strongly urge its adoption, and I take advantage of this opportunity to express appreciation of the promptness and celerity with which the chairman and his committee have taken steps to provide this much-needed authorization. I trust the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to prescribe per diem rates of allowance for officers of the Coast Guard as authorized for officers of the Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I have asked for this time in order to ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations one or two questions and make a brief observation. May I ask the chairman another question along the line that I was speaking on awhile ago? I believe he stated that something like $160,000,000,000 had been implemented through appropriations and authorizations for the war effort since July 1, 1940. Do I understand that there is something like forty to fifty billion dollars of authorizations and appropriations in bills now coming through, to be acted upon within the near future?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the newspapers have from time to time over the last 3 or 4 weeks, carried estimates of the amount to be provided in this bill. But I may say frankly that no Member of the committee or of the House has any official information on the subject, and I doubt whether anyone in the War Department is yet in a position to say definitely what the amount will be. Conditions change from day to day, and it is necessary to make corresponding readjustments. For that reason we have as yet no information as to what the Budget recommendation will be. You may be certain, however, that it will be ample and will provide as far as humanly possible, all needed requirements for speeding up the program and for adequate equipment of our forces at home and in the field.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that is a satisfactory explanation, especially taking into consideration the changing conditions that now prevail. Certainly that explanation is satisfactory to me.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other feature that concerns me very much in the making of these appropriations and authorizations and all of those acts that we are in favor of. It has to do with raising the funds. The Committee on Ways and Means can come in and recommend to us tax burdens, and those no doubt we will support to a great extent, but these appropriations have now reached a point where the taxes we contribute to the Federal Treasury are only minor portions of the war cost. There is one thing that concerns me greatly and that is this: Insofar as I understand the workings of the Congress, there is no committee in this House which can closely confer or work with the Treasury in the financing of the required funds after the taxes are assessed against the people by the Congress and actually collected.

Let us take this illustration: Suppose we have a Federal outgo for war purposes alone of, let us say, $84,000,000,000 a year, or $7,000,000,000 a month. As I understand the program, we will top perhaps eight and a half or nine billion dollars a month expenditures for defense alone in the coming fiscal year. Suppose out of that estimated $84,000,000,000 we contribute only $24,000,000,000 in taxes. That would mean $60,000,000,000 to be raised otherwise. It seems to me, and I use this opportunity to say so again, that we proceed along rather disastrous lines when we go to commercial banks for the larger portion of that additional $60,000,000,000, which is required after our contributions in form of taxes. Such a procedure propagates inflation. As I view the situation there are 4 places where we can go for these funds. One is from the people out of income. The second is from the people, to be paid out of their hoardings outside of commercial banks. The third is from the commercial banks; and the fourth is from the central reserve banks themselves—the 12 Federal Reserve banks. It seems to me that if we gather these funds from the last source, the 12 Federal Reserve banks, that we court disaster in its worst form, and that if we fall back upon the commercial banks for the $60,000,000,000, that we flirt with disaster, and that every effort on earth should be made by the Treasury, and personally I do not concede that it has

been made, to get those funds from places other than commercial banks and the Federal Reserve banks.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

I wish to direct the attention of the House and the officials of the Navy and War Departments to a situation that exists in my city and State, a situation that involves the welfare of thousands of my fellow New Yorkers. The Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, and the mayor have been holding conferences, to find a solution to our problem of unused resources. The newspaper reports indicate that our local officers expect to shortly have many unemployed skilled workers in the city of New York.

The officials headed by the Governor propose to make a special plea to President Roosevelt to have allocations made to the New York area of war contracts.

This bill provides an appropriation of millions of dollars for clothing and other articles available in my city. I sincerely hope that the purchasing agencies of the Army and Navy Departments will cooperate with Governor Lehman and immediately utilize the services of our workers and facilities.

I know that I speak for my entire delegation when I make this plea for fair play.

New York is making its full contribution to the war effort in men, money, and materials, and maintains the highest labor standards.

New York is doing its duty toward the Nation; let the Nation do its duty toward New York.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BLAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7182, directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and amendment to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all who have spoken on the bill may have 5 days within which to extend their own remarks on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

AUXILIARY VESSELS FOR THE UNITED STATES NAVY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7159) authorizing the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

Mr. HESS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the bill that the gentleman referred to a few minutes ago when the appropriation bill was under consideration?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct. This is a bill that was reported out of the Naval Affairs Committee on yesterday, for which contractual authorization has already been placed in the appropriation bill. I am now asking that the authorization be enacted by the House so that it will go along with the contractual authorization.

Mr. HESS. The report from the committee was unanimous?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It was unanimous.

Mr. DONDERO. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman make a statement explaining the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to provide authorization for additional auxiliary vessels urgently needed to meet the immediate requirements of the Navy for vessels of this class.

Previous authorizations of this session of Congress for auxiliary vessels were contained in the act of May 24, 1941—Public Law No. 72—as amended by the act of December 17, 1941—Public Law No. 353. These acts provided for the acquisition, conversion, or construction of 1,350,000 tons of auxiliary vessels of such type, size, and design as the President may consider best suited for the purposes of national defense. The bill H. R. 7159, if enacted into law, would increase this authorization by 500,000 tons.

Thus, if the bill becomes law the total authorizations by the present Congress for auxiliary vessels of the Navy would be 1,850,000 tons. The necessity for this additional authorization is shown by the following figures, which are based upon the assumption that this bill will be enacted:

Tonnage for which contracts have been let	1,411,306
Tonnage for which contracts have not been let but for which definite plans have been made	372,285
Tonnage to provide for future contingencies	66,409
Total	1,850,000

The additional tonnage contemplated by this bill will cover the Navy's immediate need for vessels of this category, with a safety factor of 66,409 tons to take care of unforeseen contingencies. New requirements, however, are arising daily and it is difficult to predict accurately the need for such ships during time of war. As an example, during the month of April there arose an urgent need for 54,474 tons of auxiliary vessels of a certain type, the requirement for which had not been previously considered in arriving at a determination of the amount of this class of ships for which provision had to be made. Consequently if the war continues, it will probably be necessary, later, for the Navy Department to seek further authorization for the procurement of additional auxiliary ships.

It is vital to provide this authorization in order that the productive capacity of all shipbuilding facilities may be continuously utilized to the fullest extent during the present war. I am convinced that the tonnage contemplated by this bill is urgently needed for the successful prosecution of our war effort.

This bill, as introduced, would have restricted the authorization contained therein to the construction, as opposed to the acquisition and conversion, of the vessels intended to be provided. It is the sense of the committee of which I have the honor to be chairman that this restrictive feature is not desirable. As reported by the committee, therefore, the bill contains the usual flexibility in this connection which has been incorporated in similar laws of this character recently enacted.

During the committee's hearings on this bill the Navy Department furnished it with a complete break-down, by categories of ships, of the allocations heretofore made and those in prospect with respect to the existing and contemplated authorizations which I have discussed. This information, for obvious reasons, is not incorporated into the report submitted by the committee.

The bill H. R. 7159 has the unanimous recommendation of the Naval Affairs Committee. I hope that it will receive your immediate approval in order that the Navy Department may proceed with this important phase of its construction program.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. JOHNS. The gentleman said that most of this would be built on the Great Lakes and in New England. Is that correct?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct. I specifically asked the admiral where these ships would be built, and he said a great many of them would be built on the Great Lakes around Chicago; in the Mississippi Valley; on the New England coast, and out on the west coast. We know exactly what type of ship these are to be, and they are very important ships, and necessary to aid in the successful prosecution of the war. The ships must be built as soon as humanly possible.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to undertake the construction of 500,000 tons of auxiliary vessels of such size, type, and design as he may consider best suited for the purposes of national defense, such vessels to be in addition to those heretofore authorized.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "to", insert "acquire and convert or to."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION DURING WAR EMERGENCY

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 315 to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect of meat-packing establishments engaged in intrastate commerce only, in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat food products by Federal agencies, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 20, insert:

"(c) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to employ persons without regard to the Civil Service Act, as amended, and subsection 6 of section 6 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, provided that any persons so employed shall be regarded as holding war-service appointments, under Executive Order 9063."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the amendment? I did not know the gentleman was going to call the resolution up at this time. I would like to have some explanation.

The SPEAKER. The Chair suggests that the gentleman from South Carolina withdraw his request at this time.

The Chair has stated many times that before the chairman of a committee calls up a matter under unanimous consent from the committee he should consult with the minority members.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

MOBILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill S. 2250 to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On the first page of the House engrossed amendment, in the last line on such page, strike out the words "the production of" and in lieu thereof insert the words "production by."

On page 5 of the House engrossed amendment, line 14, strike out "$200,000,000" and in lieu thereof insert "$150,000,000"; and on the same page, in line 18, strike out "$200,000,000" and in lieu thereof insert "$150,000,000."

On page 12 of the House engrossed amendment, line 24, before the period at the end of section 8 insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That such guaranties, agreements, or commitments are unconditional and must be performed by payment of cash or its equivalent within 60 days after demand. The Comptroller of the Currency is hereby authorized to define the terms herein used if and when he may deem it necessary."

On pages 15 and 16 of the House engrossed amendment, strike out all of section 12 of such amendment and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"SEC. 12. Whenever the Chairman of the War Production Board shall, after consultation with the Attorney General, find, and so certify to the Attorney General in writing, that the doing of any act or thing, or the omission to do any act or thing, by one or more persons during the period that this section is in effect, in compliance with any request or approval made by the Chairman in writing, is requisite to the prosecution of the war, such act, thing, or omission shall be deemed in the public interest and no prosecution or civil action shall be commenced with reference thereto under the antitrust laws of the United States or the Federal Trade Commission Act. Such finding and certificate may in his discretion be withdrawn at any time by the Chairman by giving notice of such withdrawal to the Attorney General, whereupon the provisions of this section shall not apply to any subsequent act or omission by reason of such finding or certificate.

"The Attorney General from time to time, but not less frequently than once every one hundred and twenty days, shall transmit to the Congress a report of operations under this section. Reports provided for under this section shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, if the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, is not in session.

"The Attorney General shall order published in the Federal Register every such certificate and, when he deems it in the public interest, the details of any plan, program, or other arrangement promulgated under, or which is the basis of, any such certificate.

"This section shall remain in force until 6 months after the termination of the present war or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate, but no prosecution or civil action shall be commenced thereafter with reference to any act or omission occurring prior thereto if such prosecution or civil action would be barred by this section if it remained in force."

And the House agree to the same.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
CLYDE WILLIAMS,
BRENT SPENCE,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
Managers on the part of the House.

JAMES H. HUGHES,
ROBERT F. WAGNER,
FRANCIS MALONEY,
CHAS. W. TOBEY,
ROBERT A. TAFT.
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House amendment to the bill, S. 2250, struck out all of the text of the Senate bill and inserted new language in the nature of a substitute for the whole bill. However, there were only a few differences of major importance between the Senate bill and the House amendment.

The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the House amendment, with the following exceptions:

1. A minor clarifying change is made in the language of the first section.

2. The capital stock for the Smaller War Plants Corporation, which was fixed at $100,000,000 by the Senate bill and at $200,000,000 by the House amendment, is fixed by the conference agreement at $150,000,000.

3. The provisions of section 8 of the House amendment, which made a further exception to the 10 percent limitation of section 5200 of the Revised Statutes on the total amount of the obligations of any person to any national bank, is modified so the exception will apply only to obligations secured or covered by guaranties, agreements, or commitments made by a Federal Reserve bank or by the United States or any department, bureau, board, commission, or establishment of the United States, including any corporation wholly owned by the United States, which are unconditional and must be performed by the payment of cash or its equivalent within 60 days after demand. The Comptroller of the Currency is authorized to define the terms used.

4. Section 12 of the House amendment provided that when the Chairman of the War Production Board found and certified that the doing of any act or thing, or the omission to do any act or thing, in compliance with any request or approval made by him in writing, was requisite to the prosecution of the war, such act, thing, or omission should not be deemed to be a violation of the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission Act. The Chairman was authorized to withdraw any such finding and certification at any time, and thereby to terminate its effectiveness. The section was to remain in effect until 6 months after the termination of the war or until such earlier time as the Congress or the President might designate. The Senate bill contained no provisions comparable to section 12 of the House amendment. The conference agreement re-

tains the provisions of section 12 of the House amendment with modifications which require the Chairman of the War Production Board to consult the Attorney General before making a finding under the section and require that the certification be made to the Attorney General. The conference agreement also provides that the acts or omissions which are certified by the Chairman to be requisite to the prosecution of the war shall be deemed to be in the public interest and that no prosecutions or civil actions with reference thereto shall be commenced under the antitrust laws or the Federal Trade Commission Act, rather than providing as did the House amendment that such acts or omissions should not be deemed to be violations of such laws. The conference agreement also requires that certificates issued under the section be published in the Federal Register and that the Attorney General make reports to Congress concerning operations under the section. Other changes of a clerical and clarifying nature are made in the language of section 12.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
CLYDE WILLIAMS,
BRENT SPENCE,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, as the statement shows, there is very little change in the bill as it was passed by the House. The Senate accepted practically all the amendments to the original bill as passed by the House.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I yield.

Mr. KEAN. I wish to ask the gentleman concerning the amendment to section 12 reading as follows:

Provided, That such guaranties, agreements, or commitments are unconditional and must be performed by payment of cash or its equivalent within 60 days after demand.

Does not this cut out the opportunity for these banks making loans under Executive Order 9112?

Mr. WILLIAMS. We thought not. The idea of the conferees was that the limitation was removed on loans to be made by the national banking institutions and where they were permitted as an exception to section 5200, that the guaranties and commitments upon which those loans were made should be unconditional.

Mr. KEAN. Does the gentleman feel, then, that when a guaranty is made by the War Department, the Navy Department, or the Maritime Commission, the banks will be able to make these loans?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think so. It was an unconditional guaranty. I do not believe it is sound policy to remove the limitation of section 5200, which provides that a bank may not lend to one borrower more than 10 percent of its capital and surplus. If we remove that limitation and permit an unlimited loan based upon a guaranty or a commitment that was conditional and which might fall down, it might leave the bank broke overnight.

Mr. KEAN. I agree with the gentleman in what he says about the unconditional guaranty; but the point I am inquiring about is the phrase "must be performed by payment of cash or its equivalent within 60 days after demand." That is the point I am inquiring about.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is one of the conditions attached to a great many obligations that are of short duration.

Mr. KEAN. The gentleman feels that this is satisfactory under that clause?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I think it is absolutely correct. In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement of the Comptroller concerning that matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

STATEMENT RE PROVISO TO SECTION 8 OF S. 2250

Section 8 of this bill exempts certain loans made by national banks on the security of governmental guaranties from the provision of the National Bank Act (sec. 5200 of the Revised Statutes) which limits loans to any one person to 10 percent of the lending bank's capital and surplus. This section will only embody in specific statutory form the position which has already been adopted by the Comptroller of the Currency, who is charged with supervision and regulation of the national banking system, in his interpretation of existing statutes.

The proviso to section 8 specifies two requirements which must be complied with in order to bring an obligation within the purview of the new exception. The first of these requirements is that the governmental guaranty or commitment be unconditional, and the second is that the guaranty or commitment must be performed by payment of cash within 60 days after demand.

In order to meet the varying circumstances surrounding the making of guaranties or commitments by numerous agencies of the Federal Government, it is essential that a certain measure of flexibility exist in connection with the two requirements stated. For this purpose, the Comptroller of the Currency is authorized to define the terms used in the new exception if and when he may deem it necessary. This power will enable the Comptroller to carry out the purpose of the new exception by authoritatively defining terms so as to relieve national banks of uncertainty whether a particular guaranty, commitment, or agreement is within the exception and therefore not subject to any limitation upon amount.

For example, the term "unconditional," as used in the proviso, is intended to require the guaranty or commitment to be substantially unconditional, so that the lending institution can be assured that the obligation can be liquidated by Government take-over at any time. No guaranty or commitment is unconditional in an absolute sense. There are certain inherent conditions of good faith which must not be violated, and there are certain procedural conditions, such as making demand within a specified period, giving notice to the guarantor, protecting collateral, turning over of the obligation and collateral to the guarantor upon performance of the guaranty, and the like, which are almost invariably present. The presence of conditions of this type, of course, would not prevent guaranties or commitments from being unconditional for the purpose of the new exception, and the Comptroller of the Currency, if it were necessary, could define this term so as to make this entirely clear. In this way it is believed that the purpose of the section can be carried out with flexibility and efficiency, so that unlimited loans of the nature contemplated thereby may be made by national banks, provided they do not contain features or conditions which might jeopardize the liquidity of any national bank or the safety of the national banking system.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6802) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman take a little time to explain the effects of the Senate amendments?

Mr. O'NEAL. Certainly.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6802) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 26, 30, and 36.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, and 46; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$2,280 and $120 additional"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": Provided further, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 241), no part of the foregoing sum of $3,985,000 shall be used for printing and binding part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture (known as the Yearbook of Agriculture)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 34.

EMMET O'NEAL,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
BUTLER B. HARE,
KARL STEFAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

M. E. TYDINGS,
HARRY S. TRUMAN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the

two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6802) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Nos. 1 to 25, inclusive, relating to the Senate: Appropriates for employes of the Senate in the numbers and at the salary rates proposed by the Senate.

No. 26: Strikes out the paragraph, inserted by the Senate, providing that mileage and stationery allowances of Senators and Members of the House shall not be deemed to be part of their salary or compensation.

Nos. 27 and 28: Increases, as proposed by the Senate, from $80,550 to $82,550 the amount for the office of Legislative Counsel and makes the additional $2,000 available for the Senate section of the office.

No. 29: Appropriates $289,900 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $288,341 as proposed by the House, for the Capitol Building and repairs.

No. 30: Strikes out the additional appropriation of $331,880, inserted by the Senate, for reconstruction and alteration of the ceilings and roofs of the Senate and House Chambers.

No. 31: Reappropriates not to exceed $6,000 of an existing appropriation, as proposed by the Senate, for repairs to the space under the terrace of the Capitol Building used as a school for pages.

Nos. 32 and 33: Reappropriates unexpended balances of an existing appropriation for safe storage in the Capitol Building of valued documents of the Senate and House and makes them available to provide additional space for such documents in the Senate Office Building and in the Library of Congress Annex Building, as proposed by the Senate amendments.

Nos. 35, 36, and 37, relating to the Library of Congress: Appropriates $173,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $55,000 as proposed by the House, for general increase of the Library; appropriates $90,000, as proposed by the House, instead of $72,000 as proposed by the Senate, for increase of the law library; and appropriates $260,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $360,000 as proposed by the House, for printing and binding.

No. 38: The Senate struck out the House provision prohibiting the use of funds in the bill for printing the Yearbook of Agriculture for 1943 and also prohibiting the use of such funds for payment of the salary of any person in connection with the printing of such yearbook for 1942. The conference agreement restores the House prohibition against the use of funds for printing the 1943 Yearbook and omits the House limitation upon 1943 funds in connection with printing the 1942 Yearbook.

Nos. 39 to 46, inclusive: Gives a section number to a paragraph in the bill and renumbers the other sections accordingly.

Amendment in disagreement

The House managers report in disagreement Senate amendment No. 34, relating to the Senate Office Building. Legislation in the amendment relates to the respective jurisdictions, in connection with the operation and management of the building, of the Committee on Rules of the Senate and the Architect of the Capitol. The House managers will recommend that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment and accept it.

EMMET O'NEAL,
CHARLES H. LEAVY,
BUTLER B. HARE,
KARL STEFAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] for a question.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. This is the Legislative Appropriation Act. May I ask the gentleman from Kentucky if there is anything in this Legislative Appropriation Act which has to do with gas rationing or with the issuance of special X cards to Congressmen?

Mr. O'NEAL. Not a thing.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The reason for my asking that is because I hold in my hand copy of a South Dakota newspaper which carries a column that is carried in many South Dakota newspapers, and it contains a brief paragraph which I would like to read because it pertains to the reputation of the House of Representatives. The column reads as follows:

The Gas Ration Act passed by Congress is likely to call out about as much public criticism before the situation is cleared as did the congressional pension plan. The bill passed rations to ordinary citizens, but specifically grants immunity of its provisions to Members of Congress. It has already stirred objections. An attempt to have that regulation set aside, on the part of certain Members of Congress, who do not believe in that kind of legislation was voted down by about 30 to 1 in the House. What the final reaction will be is for the future to decide.

The gentleman has assured me that this bill does not carry any special immunity for Members of Congress in the matter of gas rationing. Does he know of any act of Congress that does?

Mr. O'NEAL. I do not. The article is consistent in its inaccuracy all the way through.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Has the matter ever been voted on in the House?

Mr. O'NEAL. It has not been to my knowledge.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does not the gentleman think this refers to a vote of 30 to 1 on a resolution that was considered in another body?

Mr. O'NEAL. I do not even think it has that much of a basis. It is certainly inaccurate in its entirety.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad to have the gentleman's assurance on that point, because I knew of no such legislation, and I wanted to be sure nothing was being done in this bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I get many letters from people condemning Congress, and that includes me, by the way, on this X-card proposition, and in the same letter they say to me, "But you be sure to keep the Price Administrator from rationing gasoline against us." Of course, no such proposition of issuing X cards to Congressmen has been voted on here. The Congress passed a price-control bill, and that price-control bill, through Mr. Henderson's appointment, turned over to him gasoline and sugar rationing. Mr. Henderson issued some very specific forms which say how gasoline shall be rationed. In those forms he stated that nurses, doctors, and other types of human form shall have cards of such and such description. It was under the regulation of Mr. Henderson that the X cards were issued and not under a specific X-card act passed by the Congress of the United States. I voted against the act which made it possible to issue the cards under the Price Administrator's rules and regulations.

What puzzles me is why brainy newspapermen—and they are brainy; I give them credit for that—will get a situation so bungled as in the article to which our attention has just been called by the gentleman from South Dakota. I am glad he made that statement because we are all in this—the press, the public, Congress, and everyone—and we might just as well face it. I carry an X card. I make it public to my people and any time they want to see it they may examine its details. We will have many disagreeable things under the Henderson rule. I have never drawn any gasoline under it, but I carry the X card for amusement purposes and so people may see the monstrous thing which some press writers would have wreck the present personnel of Congress.

Mr. O'NEAL. There is nothing in this bill that even approximates anything dealing with that subject.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEAL. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

Mr. MOTT. I would like to ask the gentleman from South Dakota a question. The editorial just read by the gentleman from South Dakota does not indicate any particular brain ability on the part of that editor at least, as suggested by the gentleman from Michigan. I want to ask the gentleman from South Dakota if there are any literacy requirements or legal qualifications or otherwise for newspaper editors in South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. As I think the gentleman knows, when I am not in Congress, I am the editor of a newspaper in South Dakota, so I might suggest that the question of the gentleman borders on personal privilege. Speaking seriously, however, let me assure the gentleman that the editors of South Dakota are strictly high class and they write for readers in a State that has had the highest rate of literacy of any State in the Union. The gentleman understands, of course, that the writer of this particular paragraph has been misled by something he has read or possibly heard on the radio. Knowing the writer as I do, I am sure that he was not actuated by any malice toward the House of Representatives and I can vouch that he is a man of good understanding. He has been the unwitting victim of reports that were circulated by others who are closer to the Washington scene than he. I have called attention to the item, however, in order to correct it and to illustrate how these false stories circulate; and, having brought up the matter, lest anyone think I am personally sensitive on the subject of gasoline rationing or X cards, let me say for the record that I have never received an X card. I filled out a blank and answered all the questions and I was issued a B card. It gives me sufficient gasoline to get to work and to make departmental calls, which is all that I desire. So, personally, I have no feeling against the rationing folks and am not

personally disturbed by these inaccurate stories, but I think it is unfortunate for Congress as an institution. I think it is unfortunate for representative government that inaccuracies like the one I read get into circulation.

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion may I place in the RECORD the following statement in reference to this bill:

Amount of bill as passed the Senate	$27,884,588
Amount of bill as passed the House	27,463,866
Amount added by Senate	420,722
House has agreed to Senate amendments of increases:	
Senate items of employments (net)	55,860
Legislative counsel (Senate)	2,000
Capitol Building and repairs	1,559
General increase of Library of Congress	118,000
Senate Office Building	29,423
	206,842
House has agreed to Senate amendment of decrease: Printing and binding, Library of Congress	100,000
Net amount added to House bill	106,842
Senate has receded from:	
Roofs of Senate and House Chambers	331,860
Cut of House amount for Law Library	18,000
Net decrease under Senate bill	313,880
	420,722
Amount of bill as agreed upon	27,570,708
Bill as agreed upon is under Budget estimates	1,280,110
Bill as agreed upon is under 1942 appropriations	1,818,416

If there are no further questions on matters not germane to the conference report, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 34, line 24, strike out lines 24 and 25, and on page 35, strike out lines 1 to 7, and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

"Senate Office Building: For maintenance, miscellaneous items and supplies, including furniture, furnishings, and equipment, and for labor and material incident thereto, and repairs thereof; and for personal and other services for the care and operation of the Senate Office Building; to be expended under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol, including 4 female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms at $1,500 each; in all, $306,260, of which $6,000 shall be immediately available: *Provided*, That hereafter the Senate Office Building, and the employment of all services (other than for officers and privates of the Capitol Police) necessary for its protection, care, and occupancy, together with all other items that may be appropriated for by the Congress for such purposes, shall be under the control and supervision of the Architect of the Capitol, subject to the approval of the Senate Committee on Rules as to matters of general policy; and the Architect of the Capitol shall submit annually to the Congress estimates in detail for all services (other than for officers and privates of the Capitol Police) and for all other expenses in connection with said office building and necessary for its protection, care, and occupancy: *Provided further*, That hereafter the assignment of rooms and other space in the Senate Office Building shall be under the direction and control of the Senate Committee on Rules and shall not be a part of the duties of the Architect of the Capitol: *Provided further*, That hereafter it shall not be a duty of the Architect of the Capitol to certify any pay roll or other voucher covering any expenditure from any appropriation for the Senate Office Building, or for any other building or activity, unless the obligation involved was incurred by him or under his direction."

Mr. O'NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which the motions were agreed to was laid on the table.

FEDERAL INSPECTION OF MEAT DURING WAR EMERGENCY

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 315) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect of meat-packing establishments engaged in intrastate commerce only, in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat food products by Federal agencies, and for other purposes, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 20, insert:

"(c) The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to employ persons without regard to the Civil Service Act, as amended, and subsection 6 of section 6 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, provided that any persons so employed shall be regarded as holding war-service appointments, under Executive Order 9063."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. HOPE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say that this amendment provides that the civil-service law shall not be followed in making appointments under this act. Ordinarily it would seem to me to be a very great mistake to relax the law in that respect, but I am informed by the Bureau of Animal Industry that it will be impossible for them to get enough inspectors to carry out the provisions of this act under the civil-service law, and that it is very important that the legislation be modified in this respect. For that reason, I feel that it is necessary that the amendment be accepted.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain to the House what this bill does?

Mr. FULMER. This bill passed the House just a few days ago, to extend Federal meat inspection to intrastate packers. It is to operate only during the emergency, and in order to get quick action in putting this law into operation, those who will be in charge of the administration of the law ask that they may be able to appoint employees without regard to the civil-service law.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How many employees do they expect to have?

Mr. FULMER. It is impossible to tell at this time. It will depend on how many packers qualified for Federal inspection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There will not be another large army?

Mr. FULMER. No; I am sure there will be just a few appointments—only those that will be necessary to carry out the program.

Mr. HOPE. I think I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I am assured by the Department of Agriculture that they are going to maintain a high standard and maintain the efficiency of the inspection service, but that it will not be possible for them to get veterinarians, as has formerly been the case. There just simply are not enough veterinarians who can be secured, but they expect to employ men who are experienced in this type of work.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are these appointees going to be just veterinarians?

Mr. HOPE. The inspectors ordinarily are veterinarians. They have some lay inspectors, and I presume there will have to be some lay inspectors employed here, but the veterinary schools are simply not turning out enough graduates to meet the requirements of this legislation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There was no estimate as to how many employees will be needed?

Mr. HOPE. I do not believe I have heard any figures on that. I know that question was asked at the time the bill was before the committee, and it was impossible for them to make an estimate at that time. There will not be any considerable number.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Of course, we have control anyway, through the appropriations later.

Mr. HARNESS. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Kansas if this will mean that there will be an army of inspectors who will go into the States and break down the rights of the States over their own commerce?

Mr. HOPE. No; nothing of that kind will happen. This legislation was passed originally here in the House, I believe by unanimous consent, in order to permit packing plants which operate only within a State and do not do an interstate business to sell their products to the Federal Government, particularly the Army and the Navy. Under existing legislation, the Bureau of Animal Industry has no right to inspect meat except such as goes into interstate commerce. This bill provides that inspections may be made of meat which is sold within the State, in intrastate commerce.

Mr. HARNESS. Under regulations issued by the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Where the States have a meat-inspection system of their own, as I understand, the Bureau of Animal Industry will work in entire harmony with the State. In talking with Dr. Miller just now, I was told that in California, where they have

a very efficient system of State inspection, the Bureau will just accept the certificates of the State inspectors, or rather, have them give a Federal certificate. There will be no interference with the State inspection.

Mr. HARNESS. That is exactly what I thought. What this means is that the Federal Government will step into the State and simply wipe out all the State inspectors and take over the whole proposition from the State.

Mr. HOPE. No; the gentleman is entirely mistaken about that. That will not be done. If I am an operator of a packing plant, and want to sell meat to the United States Army, I must have a certificate that that meat has been federally inspected. Until this law was passed I could not do it unless I was a large packer operating in more than one State. This law will give the small packer in the gentleman's own State an opportunity to have his meat inspected and a Federal certificate placed on that meat, and it will give him an opportunity to sell it to the Federal Government.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, unless this bill does become law, the intrastate packing business must necessarily die under the conditions that now exist. This bill will preserve this industry in the States instead of enabling the Federal Government to come in and choke it to death. That is my conception of this bill. I think the bill is very necessary.

Mr. HOPE. That is absolutely correct. The small packers about whom the gentleman from Indiana is speaking are the ones who will benefit under this bill. It will not adversely affect them or adversely affect the States in any way.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The States are inviting the Federal Government to come in and do this.

Mr. HOPE. Yes.

Mr. HARNESS. I am certainly in favor of doing anything that will help the small packers, but in trying to help them I do not want to break down the rights of the States over intrastate commerce.

Mr. HOPE. I do not believe the gentleman need have any fear on that account, because the committee went into that question very carefully when it considered this legislation.

Mr. FULMER. This bill will operate in the interest of small packers, farmers, and the taxpayers of the country. If small packers are permitted to bid and accept orders for the various Federal agencies in the States, it will put an end to shipping hogs out of the States to large packers and reshipping the meat products back into the States. This will mean a tremendous saving of money and shipping space.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman from Kansas or the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture assure us that if a packer in a State wants to sell to a State purchaser, it will not be necessary to have a Federal inspection?

Mr. FULMER. Absolutely not necessary.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is sure of that?

Mr. HOPE. Not unless the State requires it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But must he have a Federal inspection as well, if this legislation goes through?

Mr. HOPE. The only purpose of the legislation is to enable those not able to get Federal inspection to sell to Federal agencies such as the Army and the Navy. It does not in any way touch any other sales made to the State or otherwise.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Within the State.

Mr. HOPE. Within the State; yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to support what the gentleman from Kansas has said. I have had letters from a small packer in my district, who is very much interested in having this legislation passed in order that he may be permitted to sell to the Army on contracts.

Mr. HOPE. Unless we do pass this legislation, a great many of the small packers are going to be forced out of business.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I will be glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. GILLIE. Can the gentleman tell us in connection with this inspection work whether lay inspectors will have full choice or will there be one full-time inspector along with the lay inspectors who have charge of the work.

Mr. FULMER. It is impossible for me to tell the gentleman how they will proceed except under rules and regulations written by the Secretary of Agriculture. Any packer who will ask for this service and can comply, will get it. Otherwise you leave your packer right where we found him. If a packer at this time has a veterinarian or someone who is satisfactory to those in charge of administering the act, he would receive the appointment and function both for the local packer and for the Federal Government.

Mr. GILLIE. The packing company still has to abide by rules and regulations as set out by the Bureau of Animal Industry.

Mr. FULMER. If he asks for it; yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimouse consent that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts from the hearings on the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes. Pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that general debate be continued throughout the day, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and myself.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, that does not mean that we are going to conclude general debate today?

Mr. HARE. Not necessarily.

Mr. ENGEL. I have no objection to the request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7181, the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill, with Mr. SMITH of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands it, debate is to proceed throughout the day, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina and the other half by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first time I have had the privilege, responsibility, and honor of serving as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations, and I desire at the outset to express my deep appreciation for the interest, cooperation, and valuable assistance rendered by members of the subcommittee consisting of the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. Without exception they have all made most valuable contributions in our efforts to properly analyze and interpret the actual necessity for each item carried in the bill.

We were most fortunate in having the former chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, remain with us and give us the advantage of his experience and familiarity in conducting these hearings. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], the gentleman fron. Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], the other members of the committee, have been most cooperative and diligent in rendering capable and efficient services. It is a great pleasure for me to give public expression of my very

high appreciation for the cooperative interest they have displayed. It would be an unpardonable oversight if I failed to say they have not only demonstrated a pronounced desire to assume their responsibility but all have proven that party politics is forgotten when opportunity is afforded to demonstrate patriotic virtues.

Due to his enlistment in the Navy, your committee has been deprived of the very valuable services rendered by the former clerk, Mr. Jack McFall. He was recognized by all as being extremely efficient and, many of us thought, indispensable to the work of the committee. We have missed him greatly. However, Mr. George Harvey has proven to be a most worthy successor by showing his familiarity with the work of the committee and the many details connected with each item of this bill. I am personally very grateful for the valuable and most efficient services rendered by Mr. Harvey.

I am sure you understand that an appropriation bill is not written by the chairman; it generally represents the combined and cooperative judgment of all members of the subcommittee. Although the items contained herein represent the best judgment of a majority of the members, there are a number of items which do not have the full endorsement of the full committee, but under a long-established practice the chairman of the committee reporting a bill is supposed to defend and justify the appropriation for each and every item even though he may personally find himself in disagreement with some of the items included. I know there are some items to which I do not fully subscribe but in view of the prevailing custom I shall attempt to explain the various items and present the justifications submitted to the committee in their behalf. This committee has spent 12 weeks in conducting hearings and receiving testimony in behalf of the appropriations carried in the bill—upward of 2,000 pages.

Drastic reductions of amounts recommended in a number of items have been made. It may be that some of the reductions are out of line with the work and efficiency expected and required of various agencies, and it may be that some further economies could be effected by increased reductions of other items, but your committee is convinced that no irreparable loss to the public good will follow reductions made, and that there will be little or no waste of funds by the failure of the committee to make greater reductions. There will probably be criticisms to the effect that the reductions made will materially interfere with the orderly and efficient service in the interest of the public, and there will probably be other criticisms to the effect that there will be extravagance or waste of public funds in some places, but we want to assure the full committee and Members of the House that your subcommittee has gone diligently into every detail and has registered its best judgment in every case. We may have made some mistakes, and I will not attempt to justify any of them further than to say that if there are any they are due to a lack of information.

Your committee has been fully conscious of the necessity in this emergency to reduce appropriations of what is referred to as nondefense activities, and it is not unmindful of the many demands occasioned by the emergency in our defense program, but whatever these latter demands may be, they do not relieve your committee, nor does it relieve the Congress, of the necessity of making thorough inquiry into all justifications of appropriations for defense purposes, because a dollar wasted or misspent in a defense activity is just as burdensome to the taxpayer as a dollar wasted or misspent on a nondefense activity.

The amount involved in this bill is not as large as that carried in a number of the other appropriation bills, but the number of agencies or separate governmental activities is probably more numerous here than those provided for in any other appropriation. The subject matters covered are so numerous and widely separated in character it is practically impossible for one man to discuss and present the justifications in the time usually allotted. Furthermore, we think that if each member of the committee should participate in discussing various matters referred to in the bill, Members of the House will be in better position to pass judgment upon the actions of your committee. Therefore, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has been requested to discuss the items providing appropriations for the Social Security Board and related subject matters, including vocational education and the Public Health Service; the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] will explain the provisions of the bill relating to the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, the Railroad Retirement Board, and other related agencies, including the Wage and Hour Division of the Labor Department; the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], ranking minority member of the committee, will discuss in more detail such matters as he may desire; and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] will discuss the defense training program in the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency, including the Employment Service, and other matters.

We regret to lose the very valuable services of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON], but his absence is due to his enlistment in our armed forces.

GENERAL ANALYSIS

The bill carries a total direct appropriation of $1,058,451,660. This sum is $202,687,838 less than the appropriations for 1942, and $99,642,081 less than the Budget estimates for 1943.

National defense items

A number of the items carried in the bill are for the support of national defense activities, the total carried for national defense being $213,641,463, and is $11,862,000 less than the Budget estimates for 1943, but an increase of $23,070,788 over such appropriations for 1942.

Mandatory items

Many of the items in the bill are for grants to States for cooperation in programs which have been established under law and for other purposes, such as vocational education, old-age pensions, dependent children, crippled children, public-health service, and so forth, the costs of which are determined by operation of the various statutes involved and over which it is possible to exercise little or no control by way of reduced appropriations. However, the committee has studied these items very carefully and made deductions wherever possible. Severe cuts, however, cannot be made unless the Congress should determine to amend the basic statutes. The amount for such items carried in the bill, $760,351,000, is a reduction of $9,550,000 below the Budget estimate for 1943, and an increase of $117,610,400 over the appropriations for 1942.

Eliminating the funds for national defense, $213,641,463, and the funds for mandatory items, $760,351,000, or a total of $973,992,463, from the grand total of the bill, $1,058,451,660, leaves a total of $84,459,197, which represents the amount of funds appropriated for administrative expenses and for the cost of direct Federal activities which is subject to some control through reduction of appropriations. This represents a total reduction of $2,459,197, which is for the cost of administration of the mandatory items referred to above. Changes in the basic legislation reducing such items would make possible reductions in the cost of administration, but so long as these statutes remain and the programs are in operation, it is necessary to make provision for adequate administration. Practically one-fourth of the amount is accounted for in salaries and expenses of the Social Security Board, which is engaged in enforcement and administration of the laws establishing the largest insurance business in the history of the world. The committee has not found it possible to make reductions in the administrative costs of this program as the increased industrial activities incident to the war effort have so greatly increased the burden of work of the Board and its bureaus that it is necessary in order to meet the obligations of the Government to the participants, both employers and employees, in this program to increase the appropriation above current year levels.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

In discussing briefly some of the various items I shall attempt to follow as nearly as possible the order in which they appear in the committee report.

Office of the Secretary

It will be observed that the Budget estimate, $401,005 for 1943, is reduced to $382,325, which represents a decrease of $18,630 under the Budget estimate and an increase of $825 over the appropriation for 1942. The increased Budget estimate included funds for 10 new positions in the Secretary's office totaling $13,680, all of which were disallowed by the committee, although the proposal to transfer two positions from the Wage and Hour Division was approved and the expenditure of sufficient funds to cover within-grade promotions under the Ramspeck Act was disallowed.

Office of the Solicitor

The amount carried in the bill for the office of the Solicitor for 1942 was $850,000, the estimate for 1943 being $869,612, the amount recommended in this bill being $841,532, a reduction of $28,080 below the Budget estimates for this year and $8,468 below the appropriation for the current year. We think it appropriate to say that following a recommendation of the committee last year the legal functions of the Department were consolidated by transferring the Wage and Hour Administration to the office of the Solicitor. The consolidation was heartily approved by the general council and has apparently been the means of effecting considerable economies and at the same time increasing the efficiency of operation. The committee feels that, coupled with the consolidation for increased efficiency, additional savings can be made, and, as a consequence, has eliminated the salaries of 6 attorneys, 1 in grade 5 at $4,600, 1 in grade 4 at $3,800, 2 in grade 3 at $3,200, and 2 in grade 2 at $2,600 each, together with the salaries of 2 stenographers at $1,440 each, or a total reduction of $22,880. This reduction is in addition to 2 new positions requested for 1943 which the committee failed to approve.

Safety and health program

The Bureau of the Budget estimate of $200,000 for the Bureau of Labor Standards under the safety and health program is the same as that carried in the current appropriation, but from the showing made before the committee by representatives of the Bureau the effectiveness of the work in the way of reducing accidents and its failure to establish uniform standards of safety the appropriation has been reduced to $150,000, making a decrease of $50,000, as compared with the appropriation for 1942. The committee went into the matter at length, for it is a subject in which it is vitally interested, but it was unable to obtain evidence showing that any real gains have been made, although the committee feels there is an opportunity for the establishment of a constructive program that may prove to be of great service and value in preventing accidents and protecting the health of employees in industry.

Conciliation Service

Despite the fact that many of us have been greatly concerned and somewhat agitated over the number and frequency of strikes during the earlier part of this year we are glad to note there is still general confidence on the part of the public in the efforts and efficiency of the Conciliation Service in adjusting and settling a very large percentage of differences and disputes daily arising between employers and employees in industry. The Budget estimate for the regular annual appropriation of $452,697 is approved in full with the exception of a proposed increase of $3,080 for communications, it being the judgment of the committee that the department officials can, by using the mails, effect a saving of this amount in long-distance and telegraph tolls.

The original Budget of $302,535 as a national defense appropriation was subsequently increased by a supplemental estimate, House Document 650, to $1,020,535, which contemplated the employment of 100 additional inspectors under the national defense item. Following the defense program in industry, there was a marked increase in the number of cases coming to the Conciliation Service which would naturally require an additional number of inspectors in order to expedite their consideration. However, it was developed in the hearings that for the past few months the rate of increase is being substantially reduced and in the judgment of the committee the requested additional appropriation for the increased number of inspectors could be reduced without materially interfering with the efficiency of the services being rendered. Consequently, the estimate was reduced to $930,735, providing for 90 additional inspectors, rather than 100 as proposed in the Budget. A further reduction of $18,000 was made in the amount intended to be used for communications from this item with the idea that items for communication services should be reduced in proportion as the number of inspectors provided.

Division of Public Contracts

In the Division of Public Contracts in the Department of Labor two appropriations are provided for, one the regular annual appropriation and the other an appropriation for national defense. The estimate for the regular appropriation, $268,500, representing an increase of $5,305 over the appropriation for the current year, is approved, the increase being necessary to provide automatic within-grade promotions under the Ramspeck Act. The Third Supplemental National Defense Act provided for an appropriation of $75,000 on a 6-month basis, the estimate for the full fiscal year 1943 being $155,000, the amount necessary to continue on an annual basis the program provided for 1942.

The work of the Wage and Hour Division and the Division of Public Contracts is quite similar in character and it is the judgment of the committee that if there could be a consolidation of the two divisions the necessary inspections and investigations could be carried on by the same field staff and the two divisions by being operated concurrently under the direction of a single administrator should result in considerable saving by eliminating duplication of overhead costs, and it is the suggestion of the committee that by further cooperation and coordination of the work more efficient, effective, and satisfactory services can be rendered.

Bureau of Labor Statistics

The amount provided for the Bureau of Statistics is also divided into the regular annual appropriation and a national defense appropriation. The amount carried in the bill for the regular appropriation, $1,099,803, is $13,000 less than the Budget estimate for 1943 but $19,213 above the appropriation for the current year. The decrease in the Budget estimate is due to the failure of the committee to allow new positions in the amount of $13,000, and the increase over 1942 appropriations is due to the within-grade promotions under the Ramspeck Act.

The amount included in the bill for national defense, $837,218, is $185,000 less than the Budget estimate for 1943 but an increase of $549,228 over the appropriation for 1942. There were two national defense appropriations made for the current year, one authorizing a study of "post-defense problems" and the other providing for an "occupational outlook survey." The increase for 1943 over 1942 is accounted for by grants obtained from emergency funds for the fiscal year 1942 totaling $1,072,477, and the projects carried on and paid for from these emergency funds are projected through 1943 and paid for from the national defense appropriation in this bill. A supplemental estimate submitted in House Document 745 for $185,000 to conduct a study and collaboration with the Bureau of Home Economics in the Department of Agriculture in family spending and saving in this emergency was disallowed by the committee for the reason that the justifications were not sufficient to convince the committee of the urgency of the item.

The Children's Bureau

The amount recommended in the bill for salaries and expenses in the Children's Bureau, $317,310, is a decrease of $56,000 under the Budget estimate for 1943 and a decrease of $51,015 below the appropriation for the current year. It will be noted that an increase of $4,983 proposed in the Budget has been allowed to meet within-grade promotions under the Ramspeck Act. The reason to be assigned for this reduction is that while the committee is fully aware of the value of the work done by this Bureau it has a distinct feeling that probably a great deal of its research work might well be discontinued during this emergency. I feel and have the impression that other members of the committee feel that a great deal of the work in this Bureau might profitably be consolidated with the Public Health Service in the Federal Security Agency.

Maternal and child welfare

The Budget estimate for maternal and child welfare was $413,815 for 1943, or $38,020 more than the amount recommended in the bill, $375,490, although this amount is $5,463 more than the appropriation for the current year, the increase being necessary to meet the within-grade promotions of the Ramspeck Act. The grants-in-aid to States for maternal and child-health service, $5,820,000; services for crippled children, $3,870,000; and the Child Welfare Service, $1,510,000, proposed for 1943, the same as the amount appropriated for 1942; and while no changes are made in these appropriations, the committee did not feel justified in allowing any increase for administrative expenses.

Fair Labor Standards Act

The Fair Labor Standards Act has now been in force for a period of about 3 years, and no doubt officials of the Department engaged in the enforcement of the law have become quite familiar with the problems involved and the people affected have also become more fully advised as to their rights and procedure for exercising them under the law, and for this reason the committee felt that the proposed

increases for administrative expenses in 1943 could not only be eliminated but there could be some reductions below the appropriation for 1942. Therefore, the amount recommended in the bill, $251,660, is $62,914 below the Budget estimate for 1943 and $27,963 below the appropriation, $279,623, for 1942. In making this reduction the committee felt that for the reasons already submitted the within-grade promotions under the Ramspeck Act could be met as required by law by reducing the number of personnel in this Bureau.

Wage and Hour Division

The facts and conclusions here are quite similar to those recited in discussing the item carried under the head of Fair Labor Standards Act, but, in addition, a good portion of the work heretofore involving the enforcement of the law of the Wage and Hour Division should now be carried on by those in charge of the enforcement of the Walsh-Healey Act for the reason that a great part of the industry of the country is now engaged on work for the Government which would certainly effect a further reduction in the salaries and administrative expenses required under the Wages and Hours Act and at the same time make it possible for the Division to absorb such reduction without impairing the efficiency of the work. The committee is further convinced, as it stated in its report last year, that the inspection service of this Division can be efficiently and effectively rendered by following the practice of what is known as spot-checking industrial enterprises and avoid the necessity and expense of going into every establishment at more or less regular intervals. This policy has proven to be very satisfactory in the enforcement of the Walsh-Healey Act, and the committee feels that if such a policy were adopted by the Wage and Hour Division, substantial reductions can be made in the salaries for the enforcement of this law. Therefore, the Budget estimate of $4,791,657 for 1943 has been reduced by $344,657 to the amount included in this bill, $4,447,000, which is a reduction of $250,700 carried in the appropriation for 1942. In the proposed Budget increase, $81,937 was included to make the within-grade promotions under the Ramspeck Act. Reductions made by the committee will require that the cause of such promotions be absorbed by reduction of personnel.

FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY AND RELATED AGENCIES

The total carried in the bill for the various activities of the Federal Security Agency is $803,298,140. This represents reductions under the Budget estimates of roundly $96,000,000 and reductions under appropriations for similar purposes for 1942 of slightly in excess of $276,000,000. The reductions under the current year's appropriations are more than accounted for in the reduction made in the Civilian Conservation Corps and National Youth Administration. The total reduction in these two organizations amounts to about $339,000,000 and this figure is offset by a number of increases, the largest of which is the appropriation grants to States for old-age assistance where it was necessary to provide an increase of $29,000,000 above the current year's appropriation.

Training of war workers

Probably the most important problem now confronting the Federal Security Agency is that of training of the additional workers necessary in the war effort. The Executive order creating the War Manpower Commission transferred training activities of the Department of Labor and the War Production Board to the Federal Security Agency and thereby placed under the control of one administrator the several programs operating in this field which should make for greater coordination of effort and prevent any possibility of overlapping and duplication. The committee is informed that it will be necessary to infuse several million new workers into industrial plants during the next year if the industrial goals which have been announced are to be met. Many of these workers have had no previous industrial experience and will require basic training before they will be able to take their places in the production line. The Office of Education will, during the fiscal year 1943, train approximately one and one-half million of such new workers and prepare them to enter war industry. The National Youth Administration will train from three to four hundred thousand additional.

Another group of prospective industrial workers are those who have had some experience or training and are now employed in industrial plants but who require supplementary training to qualify them for more skilled positions and enable them to contribute to a larger degree to the manufacture of war materials. The Office of Education will afford training of this type to about 1,300,000 different individuals.

Another office in the Federal Security Agency is conducting a program of training for employees within industry. This activity was transferred from the War Production Board under the Executive order establishing the War Manpower Commission. The purpose of this type of training is similar to the supplementary courses offered by the Office of Education, but operates entirely within industrial plants rather than through the vocational schools as is the plan followed by the Office of Education. These various training programs might at first glance give the appearance of being thrown together in a hit-or-miss fashion without regard to proper delineation of the functions of each, but a careful analysis discloses that they fit together in a nice pattern providing a complete and far-reaching system for developing the various sources of the necessary wartime labor. Each is reaching a different class of persons for a different type of training, and when considered together, they provide training for persons of all ages in all walks of life for all phases of industry.

Other training activities necessary to the war program include the training of technical and professional personnel required in industry now carried on through a program administered by the Office of Education and the training of nurses, a program which is handled by the Public Health Service.

National Youth Administration

The program for the National Youth Administration contemplated by the Budget included only training of workers of defense industries and the committee has approved the amount in full. In addition thereto, the bill as reported carries $5,000,000 for the college student aid program. It was proposed by the Budget to eliminate the entire student aid program which has heretofore been administered by the National Youth Administration. However, the need for assistance to college students was recognized by the Budget in submitting an estimate for $10,000,000 for a so-called student loan program to be administered by the Office of Education. The loan feature of that program is a pure fiction as an analysis of it indicates that practically none of the loans would ever be paid. Any borrower could secure cancelation of his note by merely joining the armed forces of the United States or accept employment in defense industry. The committee could see no justification for this type of program and determined that continuation of the student aid program hertofore administered by the National Youth Administration would provide a better form of student assistance. The provision in the bill is restricted to assistance to college students and preference is to be given to those students who are in the advanced stages of their college career.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I was called out of the Chamber for a moment and I do not know whether the gentleman has covered the Children's Bureau. If so, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes. We have made some observations with reference to that. I shall be glad to yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I notice on page 434 of the hearings of part 1, in a question by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] directed to Miss Lenroot, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] asked the question:

Is that the amount authorized by law?

And the answer is "Yes." Does that mean that there cannot be any larger appropriations under that item?

Mr. HARE. That is my understanding. This appropriation is the maximum amount of the authorization provided in the law.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. If the gentleman will yield further, my attention has been called to the fact that they have not sufficient administrative services, at least in my part of the country. They have insufficient personnel to enable them to investigate many emergency cases. They have divided the cases into three classifications, and sometimes the mothers of children have not been investigated when the matter is urgent. There is no other source of supply to

provide that aid for little children. I am interested to see whether we can get more in the bill, or what steps should be taken.

Mr. HARE. No further appropriations can be made for this purpose until the original legislation provided for is amended, so that increases may be made. The question is whether or not those in charge of administering the law have sufficient funds to employ people to investigate, and that is a matter over which we would have no control. My thought is that if they have surplus funds they are not able to dispose of, and yet find there are a great many people who are entitled to them under the law, they would have sufficient authority to appoint additional inspectors or investigators for the purpose of making necessary investigations.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I thank the gentleman very much.

Public Health Service

Mr. HARE. The Public Health Service in wartime becomes almost entirely a war activity. The hospitals which it maintains provide the necessary care for the members of the Coast Guard and merchant marine. These organizations are greatly expanded by wartime necessity and the responsibilities of the Public Health Service are commensurately greater. In addition the Service administers a program known as emergency health and sanitation activities through which it assists local communities to meet the health and sanitation problems resulting from large overnight increases in population on account of wartime industrial plants or Army encampments. As a part of this same program, the Service is cooperating with the Army and Navy and other agencies in the control and eradication of mosquitoes and other insect pests which might well spread disease among the armed forces and the population generally.

The venereal-disease program has been affected by the war as the Service has found it necessary to undertake work in areas adjacent to Army camps in order to prevent the spread of venereal disease among the troops. The record of the Service in this regard, while not entirely satisfactory, has resulted in considerable gains, but the committee believes the War and Navy Departments have not cooperated to as full a degree as they might have in that the May Act which authorizes the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War to establish zones in which prostitution would become a Federal offense and in which the Department of Justice would be charged with the enforcement activity, has been invoked in only one instance. This law was passed nearly a year ago but has not been utilized until in the last 2 weeks. The purpose of the law was to eliminate prostitution as nearly as possible in the areas adjacent to the large troop concentrations and undoubtedly would contribute to that end if the responsible officials of the two Departments involved would exercise the powers conferred.

Prostitution, on account of the spread of venereal disease, and the ready availability of alcoholic beverages in the areas adjacent to troop concentrations are probably two of the greatest threats to our war effort. Certainly, they constitute a great menace to the health and welfare of the forces. Many of these young men are great distances from their homes for the first time and it is the responsibility of the Government to provide every safeguard for their well-being. There is a responsibility to the Nation to put a healthy physically equipped army in the field and there is a responsibility to each boy to provide adequate measures of protection for his health.

Social Security Board

The business of the Social Security Board is increased each year as larger numbers of persons become eligible for participation in the various phases of the social-security system. For that reason, the appropriations for the Board both for administrative expenses and for the grants-in-aid must increase commensurately. Total appropriations for the Board this year, five hundred and twenty-four million, are nearly thirty-nine million above similar appropriations for 1942 and account for about 45 percent of the total of the funds carried in the bill. The committee devoted considerable attention to the estimates for unemployment compensation administration and the United States Employment Service. Prior to January of this year, both of these activities were administered by State agencies. In January the Employment Service was upon request of the President, completely federalized for the duration of the war and provision is made for carrying on the activity under Federal control for 1943. The federalization of the Employment Service has presented several knotty problems which are enmeshed in the appropriation. All of them, however, center in the feeling widespread among the State directors of unemployment compensation that the Social Security Board is endeavoring to gain control of all of the State functions and to carry on the entire program at the Federal level. The State directors have pointed out a number of what they considered to be overt acts in this direction; first among these was the attempt of the Board to take over and place on the Federal pay roll those persons stationed in Employment Service offices but engaged in taking claims for unemployment compensation. State officials seemed to feel that this was merely a first step and was indicative of the trend of thought in the Social Security Board. There has also been a demand for a readjustment of the salaries of the employees of the Employment Service who, prior to federalization were employees of the States, to the Federal salary scale in all instances. They are currently paid the scale applicable under the State laws in their respective States. The committee has inserted limitations on the appropriation tending to prevent the encroachment of the Federal authority on State jurisdiction and requiring the payment of the State salary scales during the temporary period of Federal control. If the Social Security Board, in its judgment, believes the entire program should be administered as a Federal program, the Board should seek legislation to accomplish the purpose in orderly fashion and should not endeavor to undermine the State agencies.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. It is my understanding that after the subcommittee, of which the gentleman is the chairman, recommended to the full committee $75,818,000, which is $5,000,000 below the Budget estimate, for the operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps, the full committee this morning struck that item from the bill. Is that correct?

Mr. HARE. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. COCHRAN. The $75,818,000 that the subcommittee recommended was $171,142,000 less than the appropriation for the present fiscal year, and, as I read the testimony in the hearings, this money has to be used solely for national defense purposes. Two hundred of the camps that would be left were to be used on Army reservations for work that if the Civilian Conservation Corps does not perform civilian employees must perform, and the other 150 camps were to protect the forest areas, where we would likewise have to have men patrolling the forest areas, civilians, if we do not have those 150 camps in the areas along the Pacific and the Atlantic coasts. This is a war measure, this time for the Civilian Conservation Corps, and in my opinion the full committee was not justified in overriding the recommendations in the subcommittee. I hope that that amount will be restored when we get into consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes more.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me for a moment in connection with the inquiry submitted by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. I am one member of the subcommittee who is in hearty accord with the statement just made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and expect to address the Committee of the Whole this afternoon on that subject matter, and when the bill is read for amendment it is my purpose to offer an amendment restoring the provision for the Civilian Conservation Corps which had been made by the subcommittee and which was stricken out by the full committee by a very close margin, some 13 members of the committee not being present. I hope the gentleman will be present at the time that amendment is considered.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will not only be present, but if the gentleman from Georgia or some other member of the committee does not offer the amendment I will offer it myself.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. The fact of the matter was that the subcommittee stood 3 and 3 on the question of whether or not the

C. C. C. should go into the bill. That is true, is it not?

Mr. HARE. I think that is the way the committee stood in agreeing to submit it to the full committee for consideration.

Mr. ENGEL. And under the ruling of the chairman of the subcommittee the item was included in the bill by a vote of 3 to 3.

Mr. HARE. That is correct.

Mr. ENGEL. So that the item did not have a majority of the subcommittee endorsing it. That is true, is it not?

Mr. HARE. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Was the item in the bill and was it a motion to strike it out which was decided 3 to 3, or what was the motion? Was the motion to strike the C. C. C. from the bill?

Mr. HARE. The motion, as I understand, was to strike it from the bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Now, if that was the situation, then it would not be stricken out under a tie vote.

Mr. ENGEL. The difference of opinion on the ruling was this, was it not: The gentleman from Michigan who is now addressing you took the position that where a bill is referred to a committee, the motion would be to strike out of the bill a certain item, and in that case it would require a majority vote to strike it out? But my position was that where a bill was being drafted in a subcommittee, as the appropriation bill is drafted, it required a majority vote to place an item in the bill, and I was overruled on that by the chairman. That is true, is it not?

Mr. HARE. Well, I do not think I should be called upon to argue what took place in the committee further than to say there was a tie vote to report it to the full committee.

Mr. ENGEL. Those are the facts, are they not?

Mr. HARE. My position was that the committee had been submitted a tentative bill. The committee could have gone ahead and reported it without the crossing of a "t" or the dotting of an "i" or changing it in any shape or form. In order to change the bill as it was submitted, it was necessary to move to strike out or move to amend to some other form.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. Since the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has informed the House as to what occurred in the subcommittee, a matter of course that is of an executive nature, I think it would not be inappropriate that the House also be informed of what occurred in the full committee. The vote in the full committee was 15 to 12 in favor of striking the C. C. C. appropriation from the bill, with 13 members not present and not voting.

Railroad Retirement Board

Mr. HARE. The appropriations for the Railroad Retirement Board, $217,842,000, have been approved as submitted in the Budget and represent an increase of $73,842,000 above the 1942 appropriations. This is entirely accounted for in the increase in the retirement account. As a matter of fact, the administrative expense items show reductions in excess of $100,000. This program, like that of the Social Security Board, will increase from year to year. However, revenues from the act are sufficient to cover the total amount proposed to be expended.

Federal grants to States

Let me say before concluding that approximately $500,000,000, or nearly half of the funds provided for in this bill, go to meet grants to States for various purposes, such as grants to agricultural colleges, vocational education, child welfare, crippled children, maternal health, and so forth. This is not only a considerable sum, but it entails a heavy tax on the States.

The increasing number as well as the increasing amount of grants by the Federal Government to the States upon the ground that a State will match the funds appropriated dollar for dollar has, in my judgment, reached a point where the taxable resources of some of the States is practically exhausted and is rapidly becoming a great burden for the poorer States to participate in the benefits derived through Federal grants necessitating a reduction of appropriations in these States to provide for their normal functions. In other words, the Federal Government is by indirection imposing upon the States a burden of taxation beyond which they are unable to go. It is a matter, in my opinion, which commands the most serious consideration. It is a matter to which I have given considerable thought during the past few years, and I am fully convinced that the policy of providing grants for aid to States on a 50–50 basis should be modified, and instead the grants should be based on the ratio which the per capita wealth or income of a State bears to the average per capita wealth or income of the United States. We will take, for example, the grant to a State for old-age assistance, dependent children, or crippled children. In each case the State must match the Federal grant dollar for dollar, and the amount received by any beneficiary is contingent upon the amount the State is able to pay. One State may be able to provide for a crippled child only three or four dollars per month. The amount to be contributed by the Federal Government would also be three or four dollars a month. Another State, because of its wealth-producing activities and taxable resources, may be able to provide ten or fifteen dollars per month for a child similarly afflicted, and the Federal Government would also contribute a similar amount. The point I am making is that the child in the first instance is entitled to the same consideration by the Federal Government as the child in the second instance, but the policy heretofore followed in the matter of providing equality is placed upon the States, and where their natural resources or industrial developments, or other wealth-producing advantages are greater, the burden of taxation is light on the resources of the State, but a State that does not have these advantages is bled white in an effort to meet and match Federal funds, for they are urged to try and keep pace with other States, particularly where the Federal Government has agents going into these States with an everlasting prodding program urging them to increase their appropriations to meet these most worthy objectives.

Mr. Chairman, I have already consumed more than my allotted time, but let me say that there are a number of other matters in this bill I would like to discuss, but I am sure they will be discussed more or less in detail by other members of the committee. I have only endeavored to present the high points in the appropriation itself and some of the justifications submitted for them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has again expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, it is seldom that a Member of the House has an opportunity to address such a large and enthusiastic and attentive audience.

I read in the newspapers that Joe Louis had been promoted to a corporal. No one can have any objection to that slight recognition of America's champion prizefighter. But why stop there? Why not give this great fighter a commission and authorize him to train our armed forces to box and learn to give and take blows?

The Army and Navy have already, and properly so, recognized the experience and knowledge of numerous American athletes by giving them commissions to train our selectees. Gene Tunney and Jack Dempsey, both former world's heavyweight champions, and hosts of football and baseball stars have been commissioned to teach physical training. Why should not the Brown Bomber, one of the squarest and fairest fighters that ever lived, also be commissioned?

Joe Louis is an idol of millions of Negroes and is respected and admired for his sportsmanship by millions of Americans regardless of race or color. He has already given $100,000 as his share of two prize fights to Army relief organizations. Why not make the world's heavyweight champion a commissioned officer to teach boxing and physical training to the new colored division stationed in Arizona?

As a former officer with colored troops, I know of nothing more important for the morale of the troops than physical training, and particularly boxing, which develops endurance, courage, and physical fitness.

Mr. Chairman, I expect to be unavoidably absent in my own district for the balance of the week. I am heartily in favor of the family allowance bill for the dependents of enlisted men in our armed forces. This is much needed and eminently fair legislation and nothing more than a simple act of justice to the wives and dependents of our soldiers, sailors, and marines. It will also help to fortify the morale at home.

I hope the conference committee will expedite the vote on the increased pay to

$50 for our enlisted men. There has already been too much delay. It is beginning to look as if an effort was being made to thwart the will of the House. There is rising resentment against the so-called deadlock. Members of Congress have made up their minds and are ready to act. Why any further delay in passing a bill to provide fair and reasonable pay for our Army and Navy in the midst of the greatest war in the history of our country? Let us stop shadow boxing and pass the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN].

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, one of the sections of this bill has to do with an appropriation to continue the work of securing and teaching trained nurses, to insure adequate care of our sick and of our armed forces. A year ago this coming July appropriation was made by the Congress of $1,200,000. This money has been exceedingly well used, and I think the committee is very wise in giving another grant to this work, for we are going to need so many more nurses than could possibly have been anticipated a year ago. With the increase of the armed forces, the number of nurses needed is almost frightening. We anticipate that there will be a need for some 50,000 trained nurses in the coming year. This means that in addition to bringing back into the active nursing of the country as many as possible of the married and inactive group by refresher courses, of whom there can be only about 20,000, we must filter into our schools of nursing a great many girls so that we may increase the total number of the nurses in the country as this war progresses and as the problem of the peace looms up before us. This country is going to be very much in need of nursing of all sorts and kinds when the peace comes, preceded, as it may well be, by a long armistice, about which many of us are thinking and for which many of us are planning. The world is going to need nurses.

The private nursing schools of the country are doing all they possibly can, and are very definitely increasing the number of their students. But it is absolutely necessary to continue to give Federal subsidy to a certain number of schools if the nursing need is to be met.

Of the 620 schools having an average attendance of 100 students, 125 have participated in this program. They are spread over the country, all States but 6 having benefited under the grants, and 1 of these has no school of nursing.

You will be happy to know that even in Hawaii and Puerto Rico excellent work is done through this appropriation.

We are now going forward with a very much improved program. We are beginning to feel the results of what has been done. More and more students are coming into the schools; more and more schools are having it made possible today to increase their student body through this Federal program. Sometimes the need is for additional housing, sometimes for additional teaching staffs, sometimes for additional students made possible by a scholarship method.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield.

Mr. CHENOWETH. I wonder if the distinguished gentlewoman can tell us why they do not take married women as nurses?

Mrs. BOLTON. Does the gentleman mean into the schools?

Mr. CHENOWETH. Into the Army as Army nurses. The gentlewoman called attention to the great need for nurses in the Army. I have had inquiry from professional nurses who are anxious to get in, but they happen to be married, and some of them have husbands already in the service. They are not taken for some reason.

Mrs. BOLTON. There are a number of things that caused the adoption of that policy. It is a matter that is under constant discussion. The Army, however, has some very real reasons for its policy.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield in that connection?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. HARE. They also have regulations that they will not enlist married women in the Army at this time for the same reasons they have not seen fit to take married women in as nurses. We may reach the point where the Army will wish to enlist married women.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the chairman.

I want to express my very great appreciation—perhaps I should say the appreciation of the nursing profession, of which I am only an honorary member—for the stimulation and cooperation we have had from the Surgeon General of the Navy, and for the very helpful discussions we have had with the Surgeon General of the Army. The work itself is as you know under the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service. These three men have and will, I feel sure, continue to lend themselves to forwarding the tremendous task of assuring the armed forces of the country's all-out war a continuing flow of adequately trained nurses. I wish it were possible for me to express my appreciation of the work that has been done by the subcommittee relative to this bill. Most careful study has been given to every subject, and each member has taken infinite pains to be both sympathetic and understanding of all the human problems involved. In considering this particular item the committee took a splendidly realistic attitude and made it possible for all those interested to be heard.

May I take this opportunity of expressing my personal appreciation to the members for their courtesy in permitting me to come before them.

To build an ever increasingly large Army without providing an adequate nursing force would be unthinkable. The women of America will send their men into battle with a little less anguish knowing that the Congress is doing its utmost to care for those who are wounded.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Permit me to say that the committee increased the appropriation from $1,200,000 last year to $3,500,000 for next year.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman for bringing that out at this point.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I would like to express my appreciation for the constant surveillance of this problem by the gentlewoman from Ohio. When I was home I found that they were having difficulty in being sure even that they would have sufficient nurses in cases of childbirth. It is gratifying to the people to know that there are Members in Congress who are trying to see that this thing goes forward very diligently.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentlewoman for her statement.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. BOLTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. The gentlewoman is very modest. She says she is an honorary member of the nursing profession, but the gentlewoman has been a great influence and has rendered a service for a great many years in this direction, long before she came to Congress. In fact, there is a school of nursing at Western Reserve University, named after the gentlewoman. It is the Frances Payne Bolton School of Nursing. The gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON] has been a great benefit to the nursing profession.

Mrs. BOLTON. I thank the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, during the year 1941 the Secretary of Agriculture asked the people of this country to eat less cheese so we could ship more to Great Britain. He also asked the farmers of this country to produce more dairy products. Every Member of Congress from my own State of Wisconsin took the Secretary seriously and urged our farmers to produce more.

To show the Congress how well they responded to their country's call, I am going to give you the increase in the production of dairy products in Wisconsin.

As you perhaps know, Wisconsin produces over 50 percent of the American cheese produced in this country. In the year 1939, we produced 284,035,000 pounds of American cheese; in 1940, 314,867,000 pounds; and in 1941, 371,804,000 pounds, an increase of 18.1 percent in 1941 over 1940.

In 1939 Wisconsin produced 28,881,000 pounds of Swiss—drum and block—cheese; in 1940, 32,304,000 pounds; and

in 1941, 37,570,000 pounds, an increase of 16.3 percent in 1941 over 1940.

We also make a large amount of brick cheese. In 1939 we made 24,791,000 pounds; in 1940, 23,073,000; and in 1941, 22,836,000, a loss of 1.1 percent in 1941 over 1940.

Munster and brick cheese was also a large item with us in 1939 when we made 31,366,000; and in 1940, 30,825,000 pounds; and in 1941, 29,404,000 pounds, a loss of 3.1 percent in 1941 over 1940.

We also produced considerable other cheese in 1941: Munster cheese alone, 7,068,000 pounds; Limburger, 5,292,000 pounds; Italian, 17,822,000, which was an increase of 43.1 percent over 1940; cream cheese, 9,710,000 pounds; also cottage, pot, and bakers cheese, 8,572,000 pounds.

We also produce a large amount of condensed and powdered products.

For instance, in 1939 we produced no sweetened condensed whole milk, while in 1941 we produced 18,579,000 pounds, which was an increase of 233.6 percent over 1940.

In 1939 we produced evaporated whole sweet milk, unsweetened, in cases, 714,412,000 pounds; in 1940, 780,496,000 pounds; and in 1941, 1,094,102,000 pounds, an increase of 40.2 percent in 1941 over 1940.

In 1939 we produced no concentrated whey. In 1940 we produced 1,411,000 pounds, and in 1941, 7,653,000 pounds, or an increase of 442.4 percent in 1941 over 1940.

In 1939 we produced dried powdered skim milk for human use in the amount of 69,430,000 pounds; in 1940, 80,715,000 pounds; and in 1941, 100,881,000 pounds, or an increase of 25 percent in 1941 over 1940.

We also produced dried powdered whole milk in 1939 in the amount of 8,920,000 pounds; in 1940, 12,075,000 pounds; and in 1941, 16,465,000 pounds, or an increase of 36.4 percent in 1941 over 1940.

We also shipped milk out of the State in 1939, 15,725,000 pounds; in 1940, 15,152,000 pounds; and in 1941, 16,371,000 pounds.

We also produced many other byproducts of whole milk, which we consumed and shipped out of the State during the same period.

To give you some idea of what a drop of 3 cents a pound in the price of cheese will do to a farmer, I call your attention to the price of milk cows. On April 15, 1942, they sold in Wisconsin on an average of $3 per cow less than on March 15, the previous month. The rise in the price over a year ago also reflected itself in the rise in price of cows. On April 15, 1942, cows sold on an average of $27 a head more than they did a year ago.

The milk production throughout the United States in 1942 for the month of April was about ten and three-tenths billion pounds, which is an increase of about 14 percent over the 1936–40 average for the same month.

These figures will convince you, if you are not already convinced, that the dairy farmers of this country are doing their share to produce the food to help win this war.

The average price for milk for all uses in Wisconsin in 1941 was $1.85 per hundredweight; for the United States as a whole, $2.19. For Wisconsin in January 1942 it was $2.30 per hundredweight; for the United States, $2.64. In February 1942 it was $2.19 per hundredweight for Wisconsin; $2.58 for the United States. In March, for Wisconsin, it was $2.06 per hundredweight, and for the United States, $2.48; in April, for Wisconsin, $1.99 per hundredweight, and for the United States, $2.38.

The farmers have been receiving a fairly good price for their milk since last August up to June 1 this year. The drop of about 2½ cents a pound on cheese has affected the farmer in Wisconsin materially. He is not complaining greatly but is trying to do his part under conditions not too pleasing to him otherwise. When he reads in the papers that there will be no tires for his milk truck when the ones he has wear out, he is worried. He hears this over the radio. He is also told that there will be a rationing of gas. Perhaps he will not have tires to get his products to the market. Then if he conserves tires and has them, if he cannot get gas he is just as bad off. The milk wagon is gone; old Dobbin cannot longer be hitched to it. His tractor also needs gas. He has sold his surplus horses and purchased a tractor. That also uses gas or fuel oil. Will he be able to get rubber tires for it? Will he be able to get gas to run it? He worries more than some Congressmen are worrying now about gas. They were given X-cards, without asking for them, entitling them to gas enough to look after their official duties. This Congressman was told yesterday morning that he could not have over 3 gallons, no matter what kind of a card he had. That is all right with me, but I am wondering just what some farmers will say if the gas rationers pull a fast one on them about harvest time. I suggest that some gasoline be stored away for the farmers, because, if it is not, there may be some people who will not only be short of gasoline and fuel oil next winter, but also something to eat.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, as the House of Representatives begins the consideration of the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related agencies, I feel it would be appropriate to call the attention of our colleagues to the admirable manner in which the chairman of the subcommittee having jurisdiction, the gentleman from South Carolina, the Honorable BUTLER B. HARE, has discharged the very heavy and exacting duties which have devolved upon him.

As my colleagues know, I have for 2 years prior to the present year served as chairman of this particular subcommittee, and still retain membership thereon. I am, therefore, familiar with the very great responsibility resting upon the chairman of the subcommittee and the nature and type of work he is required to perform in connection with the hearings, the writing of the bill, and the presentation of the bill upon the floor. For approximately 3 months the committee has been engaged in hearing not only officials of the various organizations for whose support provision is made in the bill, but all outside individuals and organizations who desired to be heard, including Members of Congress not members of the committee.

Never in my experience of several years on the Appropriations Committee has a chairman been more careful and painstaking in his attention to the work of the committee or shown more sympathetic interest in making adequate provision for the worth-while activities maintained by the appropriations carried in this bill, coupled with earnest and persistent efforts to effect every reasonable economy.

The gentleman from South Carolina, BUTLER HARE, in the 3 months work which has preceded the bringing of this bill to the floor has performed service of as high type as that of any officer of the Government, administrative or legislative, with whom I have ever been associated. While his work on the Appropriations Committee has always been of an exceedingly able character, and his assistance to other subcommittees, particularly to the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations, on which I serve as chairman, has always been of very great value, I feel that in the handling of this bill in connection with which the chairman, as a matter of course, assumes the very highest degree of responsibility, our colleague has amply demonstrated his right to be regarded as not only one of the outstanding members on the Committee on Appropriations but one of the ablest Members of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Chairman, this committee has had a pretty tough job. For about 3 months we have been working on this bill, and while I think each member of the committee has been entirely conscientious in expressing in committee his views with regard to it, we have not been able to agree on some very important subject matters which are or have been contained in the bill. The committee has been as free from partisanship as any committee with which I have been associated during my congressional service. The members on the Republican side, Messrs. ENGEL and KEEFE, have, I know, as they have heretofore when I undertook to serve as chairman of this subcommittee, cooperated in endeavoring to bring in for your consideration a bill which is wisely drawn and which appropriates the money of the Government only in such amounts as are absolutely necessary for the purposes for which it is provided. The gentlemen on the Democratic side, Messrs. THOMAS and HARRINGTON, have, of course, been equally diligent in trying to protect the public interest.

It will not be possible for me to undertake to discuss all of the subject matters which are included in this bill and in regard to which there exist differences of opinion on the part of members of the subcommittee. I hope to be able to say something which may clarify the issues with regard to two organizations which

are dealt with in the bill. One of them is the Civilian Conservation Corps. The other is the National Youth Administration.

The appropriation for the Civilian Conservation Corps, as you have already been advised, has been stricken from the bill as reported from the subcommittee to the full committee by a very close vote of the full committee. The committee with 13 absentees was almost evenly divided on the subject.

I realize that there is ground for very great difference of opinion, honest difference of opinion, conscientious difference of opinion, with regard to the desirability of continuing under present conditions the Civilian Conservation Corps. I am not here for the purpose of insisting that in any position I take in regard to the matter I may be unquestionably right. I may be wrong. I know there are some very important facts which can be and undoubtedly will be cited in the argument which we will have on this bill to support the contention that under present conditions the Civilian Conservation Corps should be abandoned. I think there are also some very important facts, and to my mind they preponderate in weight, which should cause us to restore the proposed appropriation to the pending bill.

On the reading of the bill for amendment, it is my purpose to offer an amendment which will restore the language providing for the appropriation which was contained in the bill as it left the subcommittee, and it is my hope that the members of the Committee of the Whole may see fit to approve this amendment. If they do not do so, of course, it will not be a matter in which I have any personal interest or any interest greater than that which is had by every American citizen in the maintenance of an institution which may or may not, according to individual opinion, be necessary under present emergency conditions.

I may say that every Civilian Conservation Corps camp in my congressional district has already been abandoned, with the exception of one camp located on a military reservation at Fort Oglethorpe, Ga., a camp in which the citizens of my district have no more interest than other citizens of the United States. This abandonment has occurred at a time when there are between five and six hundred camps still being maintained.

The appropriation which is proposed would provide for the continuance of only 350 camps, so there is no possibility whatever that, if the appropriation is granted, any of these camps would be continued in my congressional district, unless it be the one on the military reservation which I have mentioned.

I mention these facts merely in order to demonstrate that I have and my district has no direct interest in this matter, except as they are concerned in any matter of national policy.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. May I inquire of the gentleman from Georgia about the camps that are engaged in the work of forest conservation. Some of us represent States where forestry is a very important matter.

Mr. TARVER. I expect to get to that subject matter in just a few moments, if the gentleman will permit me to continue my discussion. If I do not cover the subject he has in mind, I shall be glad to have him interrogate me further.

For the present fiscal year Congress appropriated for the Civilian Conservation Corps approximately $247,000,000. I am not undertaking to quote the exact figures. This appropriation was intended to take care of the maintenance of 1,236 camps. As a matter of fact, due to difficulties in securing enrollment and due to the freezing or placing in reserve of a considerable portion of the funds which have been appropriated by the Congress, the number of camps has steadily decreased, until now there are being maintained only some five or six hundred camps.

The Budget estimate as amended by a supplemental estimate which was received by our committee shortly before our bill was reported provided for the appropriation of approximately $80,000,000 for the next fiscal year, as compared with $247,000,000 for the present fiscal year, and was intended to provide for the continuance of 350 camps.

The subcommittee in its report of the bill to the main committee effected a reduction of $5,000,000 below the Budget estimate, and the amount which appeared in the bill when it was reported to the full committee was only approximately $75,000,000, it being the intention of the subcommittee, as indicated in its report, that the deletion of this $5,000,000 from the Budget estimate should be absorbed by the reduction of administrative expenses which, in the judgment of the subcommittee, had been entirely too high.

The proposal envisioned the use of 207 of these 350 camps on military reservations and on purely defense activities, leaving only 143 which were to be utilized principally in national-forest areas in doing what is called, I believe, pre-fire protection work; that is, work in trying to prevent the occurrence of forest fires before the fires actually occur, a work which, in the judgment of most of the members of the subcommittee, I believe, is of a highly important defense character.

I call attention in connection with our national forests and their protection from fire to the fact that you appropriated only a short while ago $5,000,000 additional to undertake to deal with this danger, and that in addition $5,000,000 has been added by the Senate to the agricultural appropriation bill, about which we are to have conferences with representatives of the Senate within the next few days. So I think that you intend to provide, and I believe the American people want you to provide, for adequate fire protection in our national forests.

When you abandon all of the C. C. C. camps which have been stationed in the national forests and have been rendering service of that type, you do not avoid expense; you probably bring about the incurrence of greater expense through direct appropriations from the Federal Treasury for the employment of other means to afford forest protection; but, as I have said, 207 of these 350 camps are proposed for allocation to military reservations. If you will examine the hearings, you will see that representatives of the Army appeared before the subcommittee and testified that they could use, and earnestly desired to use, this number of camps, and that the work done by these camps on military reservations would be accomplished for less money than would be required if direct appropriations to the War Department were made by Congress for the purpose of having contractors perform that necessary work. So that when you decide that you will not put these 207 C. C. C. camps on military reservations in the name of economy, you are not economizing, you are making it necessary to appropriate other money, larger in amount, for the War Department for the purpose of doing the identical work which would have been done by the 207 C. C. C. camps if they had been provided.

It is said that these boys who are enrolling in the C. C. C. are dodging the draft. I mention to you some of the arguments I have heard used in committee and elsewhere. That is not true. The enrollment in the C. C. C. is from boys within the ages of 17 and 23, inclusive. According to the hearings, which I hope you will have time to examine, practically all of the enrollment, with the exception of a very small percentage, is composed of boys of the ages of 17, 18, and 19, who are under the military draft age, according to the Selective Training and Service Law as it is now written. If this were not true, the enlistment of a boy in the Civilian Conservation Corps would in no way affect his liability to service in the armed forces of this country, and many thousands of them, during the period of their service in the corps, have been selected and have been inducted into the military services of the United States.

It is said, also, that the service of these young men in the Civilian Conservation Corps comes in large part from agricultural areas of the United States, that there is very great demand in those areas for farm labor, and that we ought to do away with the corps so that these young men could enter the service of farmers in the areas from which they come, who are in need of their services.

My observation has been that many of the boys who have enlisted in the Civilian Conservation Corps have been boys who have never learned to work; never been trained for work, through no fault of their own. They came in some cases from farm areas, but not from farms or farm work, but they came in most cases during the period of the life of the corps from our cities, boys who in many instances had not fitted into the industrial life of their locality, in some instances boys who loafed around pool rooms, and were entirely idle, and had never learned to do the things that they had to know how to do in order to secure

remunerative employment even in normal times.

This corps has been a training-for-work corps. The objective of its director, Mr. McEntee, as he has frequently expressed it, has been to teach these young men how to work and how to earn livelihoods for themselves. I do not believe that in many cases boys have gone into this corps from agricultural regions whose services, if they had not gone into the corps, would have been utilized by farmers in those regions on the farms. I base that, in part, upon this statement of fact, and that is that I represent what is largely an agricultural district, and I have yet to receive one single complaint from one single farmer in my district to the effect that labor which he could have employed on his farm was being utilized by the Civilian Conservation Corps. There may be cases in my district of farmers who feel that they are being deprived of labor through the operations of the corps, but it seems rather remarkable to me if that condition really exists I have not been advised by any of them of that complaint.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman tell us the nature of the services that are performed by the C. C. C. camps on the Army reservations?

Mr. TARVER. The services are of such a diversified character that the best I can do in the limited time I have at my disposal is to refer the gentleman to the hearings, which give detailed information furnished by officers of the War Department with regard thereto.

I want to discuss at this time, if I may—and I must hurry along because I do wish to discuss briefly the work of the National Youth Administration—what has been done by the Civilian Conservation Corps during the period of its existence from April 1933 to December 31, 1941. I want to call your attention to the statistics on page 960 and the following pages of part 2 of the hearings had in connection with this bill. I, of course, would not undertake to quote all of these voluminous figures, but I do think I am justified in calling your attention to a few of them.

During this period the Corps has built some 45,000 bridges; it has built 7,393 diversion dams; it has built 27,956,000 rods of fences; it has built 20,171,000-plus cubic yards of levees, dikes, jetties, and so forth. It has treated for gullies, eroded land acreage to the amount of 4,300,000 acres. In the forest work which it has done, it has planted or seeded for trees 2,286,000 acres. In forest standing improvement it has dealt with 4,000,000 acres-plus, and so on down through the whole list. I put these statistics in the RECORD in connection with my remarks at this point in accordance with the consent which has already been obtained earlier in the day.

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

STATEMENT A.—*Total work completed during the period April 1933–Dec. 31, 1941*

Class No.	Type of job or project classification	Unit	New work	Maintenance
	STRUCTURAL IMPROVEMENTS (100 SERIES)			
	Bridges:			
101	Foot and horse	Number	7,343.1	812.0
104	Vehicle	Number	38,377.3	9,434.0
	Buildings, other than Civilian Conservation Corps camp:			
105	Barns	Number	1,142.0	625.0
106	Bathhouses	Number	388.0	114.0
107	Cabins, overnight	Number	2,356.0	117.7
108	Combination buildings	Number	497.0	250.0
110	Dwellings	Number	4,152.0	6,419.2
111	Equipment and supplies storage houses	Number	3,311.0	1,781.0
112	Garages	Number	2,445.0	832.0
113	Latrines and toilets	Number	11,806.3	4,365.0
114	Lodges and museums	Number	179.0	116.0
115	Lookout houses	Number	1,171.4	879.5
116	Lookout towers	Number	3,070.5	1,846.0
119	Shelters	Number	2,263.0	508.0
120	Other buildings	Number	29,711.0	15,951.5
121	Cribbing, including filling	Cubic yards	533,593.0	23,972.0
122	Impounding and large diversion dams	Number	7,393.2	3,281.0
131	Fences	Rods	27,956,820.9	6,819,505.9
132	Guard rails	Rods	254,421.8	10,871.0
133	Levees, dykes, jetties, and groins	Cubic yards	20,171,637.2	3,066,763.0
133A	Dykes, water-spreading	Linear feet	26,684.0	
134	Power lines	Miles	852.8	1,057.3
137	Incinerators	Number	604.0	89.0
139	Sewage and waste-disposal systems	Number	5,770.0	1,265.0
140	Telephone lines	Miles	87,279.5	265,927.2
	Water supply systems:			
141	Fountains, drinking	Number	1,821.0	71.0
142	Open ditches	Linear feet	12,947,250.4	464,255.0
143	Pipe or tile lines	Linear feet	9,463,657.7	907,783.0
145	Storage facilities (in thousands)	Gallons	367,614.4	8,777.0
146	Wells, including pumps and pumphouses	Number	7,899.9	5,229.0
147	Miscellaneous	Number	42,925.(	8,792.0
	Other structural improvements:			
148	Camp stoves or fireplaces	Number	80,992.0	5,033.0
149	Cattle guards	Number	5,170.0	402.0
150	Corrals	Number	1,421.5	255.0
152	Seats	Number	21,887.0	405.0
153	Signs, markers, and monuments	Number	383,356.0	24,104.0
154	Stone walls	Rods	38,562.6	6,694.0
155	Table and bench combinations	Number	59,796.0	13,313.0
156	Tool boxes	Number	15,639.0	125,690.0
157	Miscellaneous	Number	70,556.0	17,627.0
158	Radio stations	Number	115.0	281.0
159	Springs	Number	12,163.0	2,298.0
160	Waterholes	Number	3,301.4	3,316.0
161	Small reservoirs	Number	9,831.0	1,702.0
162	Landing docks and piers	Number	524.0	17.0
	TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS (200 SERIES)			
201	Airplane landing fields	Number	77.0	81.0
202	Truck trails or minor roads	Miles	125,001.6	567,059.6
	Trails:			
206	Foot	Miles	13,105.1	40,837.8
207	Horse or stock	Miles	14,817.4	71,720.4
	EROSION CONTROL (300 SERIES)			
301	Stream- and lake-bank protection	Square yards	154,421,147.0	12,469,665.0
302	Treatment of gullies, area treated	Acres	4,300,773.5	157,620.6
	Treatment of gullies:			
303	Bank sloping	Square yards	373,768,246.0	6,231,759.0
304	Check dams, permanent	Number	317,155.8	20,911.0
305	Check dams, temporary	Number	5,753,136.3	148,679.0
306	Seeding and sodding	Square yards	475,833,507.0	21,774,359.0
307	Tree planting, gully	Square yards	455,414,978.0	125,856,115.0
308	Ditches, diversion	Linear feet	65,966,966.7	7,183,660.0

STATEMENT A.—*Total work completed during the period April 1933–Dec. 31, 1941*—Continued

Class No.	Type of job or project classification	Unit	New work	Maintenance
	EROSION CONTROL—cont.nued			
309	Terracing	Miles	44, 225. 1	4, 659. 5
	Terrace outletting:			
310	Channel construction	Linear feet	44, 783, 893. 0	2, 296, 221. 0
311	Outlet structures	Number	427, 931. 0	26, 848. 0
313	Planting, seeding, or sodding	Square yards	136, 265, 772. 0	30, 240, 949. 0
314	Sheet-erosion planting	Acres	627, 151. 5	37, 601. 2
	Limestone—For liming soil:			
315	Quarrying	Tons	2, 583, 019. 2	726. 0
316	Crushing	Tons	1, 451, 629. 3	214. 0
317	Hauling	Tons	805, 252. 3	806. 0
318	Miscellaneous erosion-control work	Man-days	1, 019, 117. 0	12, 096. 0
319	Contour furrows and ridges	Miles	151, 171. 8	27, 340. 6
320	Preparation for strip cropping	Acres	214, 514. 6	2, 165. 1
321	Road erosion demonstration	Miles	1, 027. 6	181. 4
322	Wind erosion area treated	Acres	25, 801. 3	615. 8
323	Water spreaders (rock, brush, wire)	Linear feet	7, 448, 955. 0	273, 685. 0
324	Water spreaders (terrace type)	Linear feet	7, 211, 787. 0	321, 624. 0
	FLOOD CONTROL, IRRIGATION, AND DRAINAGE (400 SERIES)			
	Clearing and cleaning:			
401	Channels and levees	Square yards	73, 790, 805. 0	447, 276, 015. 0
402	Reservoir, pond, and lake sites	Acres	205, 262. 6	5, 523. 9
402A	Clearing and cleaning channels	Lineal yards	494, 027. 8	200. 0
403	Lining of waterways	Square yards	2, 122, 257. 0	1, 121, 118. 0
	Excavations, channels, canals, and ditches:			
404	Earth	Cubic yards	28, 238, 542. 0	73, 258, 517. 0
405	Rock	Cubic yards	1, 157, 590. 0	85, 810. 0
406	Pipe lines, tile lines, and conduits	Linear feet	2, 925, 614. 0	2, 021, 988. 0
	Riprap or paving:			
407	Rock or concrete	Square yards	4, 045, 066. 0	105, 836. 0
408	Brush or willows	Square yards	1, 150, 358. 0	177, 393. 0
411	Water control structures other than dams	Number	47, 818. 0	6, 309. 0
412	Concrete core walls other than dams	Cubic yards	9, 925. 0	12. 0
414	Leveling of spoil banks	Cubic yards	1, 917, 756. 0	13, 007, 586. 0
	FOREST CULTURE (500 SERIES)			
501	Field planting or seeding (trees)	Acres	2, 286, 195. 7	278, 794. 5
502	Forest stand improvement	Acres	4, 063, 538. 4	16, 755. 0
503	Nurseries: Man	Man-days	5, 949, 887. 2	499, 858. 0
	Tree seed collection:			
504	Conifers (cones)	Bushels	876, 921. 7	----------
505	Hardwoods	Pounds	13, 614, 783. 0	----------
506	Collection of tree seedlings	Number	14, 326, 304. 0	----------
	FOREST PROTECTION (600 SERIES)			
601	Fighting forest fires	Man-days	6, 406, 867. 1	----------
602	Fire breaks	Miles	67, 942. 9	56, 531. 5
	Fire hazard reduction:			
603	Road and trailside	Miles	80, 729. 5	4, 089. 5
605	Other	Acres	2, 128, 008. 5	6, 684. 7
606	Fire presuppression	Man-days	5, 662, 525. 0	25, 208. 0
607	Fire prevention	Man-days	719, 233. 5	1, 412. 0
608	Tree and plant disease control	Acres	7, 953, 046. 8	718, 059. 7
609	Tree insect pest control	Acres	13, 070, 149. 1	178, 973. 3
	LANDSCAPE AND RECREATION (700 SERIES)			
701	Beach improvement	Acres	3, 412. 3	312. 9
703	General clean-up	Acres	498, 811. 4	45, 424. 0
705	Landscaping, undifferentiated	Acres	226, 923. 4	3, 380. 7
706	Moving and planting trees and shrubs	Number	43, 210, 386. 0	4, 834, 702. 0
710	Parking areas and parking overlooks	Square yards	8, 015, 889. 0	394, 992. 0
711	Public camp ground development	Acres	52, 047. 0	48, 738. 2
711A	Other public camp ground facilities	Number	46, 683. 3	5, 194. 5
712	Public picnic ground development	Acres	10, 194. 1	5, 425. 0
713	Razing undesired structures and obliterations	Man-days	2, 000, 832. 0	2, 065. 0
714	Seed collection, other than tree	Pounds	3, 676, 122. 0	----------
715	Seeding or sodding	Acres	186, 873. 8	37, 963. 1
716	Soil preparation (t. soiling, fertil., ftg., etc.)	Acres	199, 691. 2	3, 152. 3
717	Vista or other selective cutting	Acres	30, 962. 7	91. 1
718	Walks, concrete, gravel, cinder, etc	Linear feet	1, 322, 111. 6	187, 315. 0
	RANGE (800 SERIES)			
801	Elimination of predatory animals	Number	358, 855. 0	----------
802	Range revegetation	Acres	786, 027. 8	21, 086. 3
803	Stock driveways	Miles	3, 296. 1	606. 5
804	Pasture sodding	Acres	272, 911. 1	19, 527. 1
805	Pasture and range terracing	Acres	3, 528. 6	806. 7
	WILDLIFE (900 SERIES)			
901	Fish rearing ponds	Number	4, 600. 4	1, 258. 5
902	Food and cover planting and seeding	Acres	111, 603. 9	7, 417. 8
903	Lake and pond development	Man-days	927, 935. 0	10, 599. 0
904	Stocking fish	Number	967, 249, 789. 0	9, 541. 0
905	Stream development (wildlife)	Miles	6, 966. 2	491. 5
906	Other wildlife activities	Man-days	1, 289, 879. 0	12, 405. 0
907	Wildlife feeding	Man-days	115, 337. 0	37. 0
908	Widllife shelters	Number	31, 945. 0	687. 0
	OTHER ACTIVITIES (1,000 SERIES)			
1001	Educ., guide, cont. station work	Man-days	755, 737. 0	272. 0
1003	Emergency work	Man-days	1, 996, 109. 0	----------
1004	Eradication of poisonous weed or exotic plants	Acres	1, 016, 106. 4	----------
1005	Experimental plots	Number	56, 894. 6	7, 947. 1
1006	Fighting coal fires	Man-days	197, 055. 0	----------
1007	Insect pest control	Acres	5, 803, 613. 4	47, 400. 6
1009	Maps and models	Man-days	607, 922. 0	1, 844. 0
1009A	Model and relief maps	Square feet	32, 510. 0	----------
1010	Marking boundaries	Miles	34, 960. 7	3, 525. 6
1011	Mosquito control	Acres	238, 614. 7	97, 842. 5
1011A	Mosquito control, ditching	Linear yards	2, 096, 799. 0	1, 206, 141. 0
1011B	Mosquito control, staking	Linear yards	1, 461, 670. 0	----------
1012	Preparation and transportation of materials	Man-days	8, 746, 053. 0	1, 033. 0

STATEMENT A.—*Total work completed during the period April 1933–Dec. 31, 1941*—Continued

Class No.	Type of job or project classification	Unit	New work	Maintenance
	OTHER ACTIVITIES—continued			
1013	Railroads, narrow-gage	Man-days	2,838.0	7,170.0
1014	Reconnaissance and investigation:			
1015	Archeological	Man-days	225,465.0	
	Other	Man-days	1,061,142.0	4,307.0
1016	Restoration of historic structures	Number	3,965.0	9.0
1017	Rodent and predatory animal control	Acres	39,552,504.3	754,190.6
1023	Surveys	Man-days	4,766,539.8	283,176.0
1024	Timber estimating	Acres	35,446,421.7	65,170.9
1025	Tree preservation	Man-days	386,043.0	64,845.0
1026	Equipment, repair of construction	Man-days	1,568,650.0	
1027	Hydraulic research	Man-days	177,456.0	13,456.0
1028	Warehousing	Man-days	425,955.0	6,495.0
1029	Technical service cp building	Number	3,016.0	2,789.0
1030	Central repair shop labor	Man-days	227,202.0	9,501.0
1031	Repair of tools and equipment	Man-days	1,150.0	
1035	Unclassifiable	Man-days	88,628.0	11,060.0

I think few will question the fact that this organization has been the greatest contribution of this Administration, not only to the conservation of natural resources, conservation of the soil and the forests, but to the conservation of our human resources.

Now there are those who admit this to be true and yet say that under present conditions we ought to do away with it; that it is a matter of extravagance and we can get along without it; that these boys ought to be in the Army, they ought to be at work on the farms, or they ought to be engaged in industrial employment. There will only be about 76,000 of them involved if this appropriation recommended by the subcommittee is approved. Some 15,000 of them will be World War veterans who have found it necessary to accept this type of employment in order to have a livelihood for themselves. The most of the remainder will be boys 17, 18, or 19 years of age who, notwithstanding present conditions of employment, have been unable to fit themselves into useful industrial or agricultural employment in this country today. They say, or will say in the course of the argument, because some of them have said it heretofore, that you cannot get the necessary number of enrollees of this type because you only have about 61,000 now and the appropriation contemplates the use of some 76,000 in the United States and the Territories, including the Indians. This argument is not well founded because boys who desire to remain in the corps have been sent home, numerous camps have been abandoned and the enrollees, in part at least, have been forced to return to their homes because of their not being accorded an opportunity to stay in the Civilian Conservation Corps under the conditions which have existed for the last several months during which it has been brought down from 1,236 camps to a total now of some 500 or 600 camps. We ought to continue these camps aside from such reasons as I may have made reference to heretofore. This war is going to be over one of these days. I am one of those who is optimistic enough to feel that there is very good chance that it may be over within the next year. But when it is over I think you will agree with me that we will probably be faced with one of the most terrible conditions of unemployment which ever existed in the United States, a condition far surpassing in severity that which obtained in the dark days of 1929 and the following years. Millions and millions of the men and women who have been employed in industries related to the war effort will be out of employment.

Millions of boys who have been inducted into the military services of their country will be coming back without jobs, and in hundreds of thousands of cases without being able to obtain employment of the type for which they have been fitted. What are you going to do with them and how are you going to take care of them? You are not going to allow those boys who have given their services to the armed forces in time of war to be thrown onto the streets without work, but you are going to provide for them with some type of public work, and one of the types, in view of our experience with the Civilian Conservation Corps, is going to be work of a Civilian Conservation Corps type. In other words, if you abandon the Civilian Conservation Corps now, you will eventually have to set it up again as soon as this emergency is over, whether that may be next year or the year following or some future year. We will have to take the responsibility of setting it up again when the necessity arises. You have now about 1,500 camps, constructed at a cost of many millions of dollars. The action which is sought here by the full committee eliminating the Civilian Conservation Corps entirely would mean the abandonment of those camps, and the probable junking of a very large proportion of the camps, even though they are situated on projects not yet completed. The Civilian Conservation Corps has now some 32,000 pieces of heavy machinery, not to speak of many other types of equipment, most of which would not be useful in the war effort. If the action of the full committee is approved that will be dissipated.

The personnel of the Civilian Conservation Corps, who know how to carry on this work, will be scattered, and we will have to start from taw to set up this organization next year, or some other year, to take care of these cases that I have been discussing, and you are going to have to expend again the scores of millions of dollars already spent originally in providing these camps and equipment, and getting together this trained personnel. So you are not going to economize, in my judgment, when you undertake the destruction of the Corps at this particular time. I do not think that it should be carried on in the same way as it has been before, and I am in accord with the thought that only a skeleton organization should be maintained. Three hundred and fifty camps amount to only about what would be required to maintain that skeleton organization during the period of this emergency and could be utilized on defense work, work which would cost the Government more if it did not have the Civilian Conservation Corps than it would cost to do it with that Corps, and that is a matter of economy, not extravagance, and those who favor the abandonment of the Civilian Conservation Corps under these conditions are really the ones who are advocating extravagance in Government expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I have perhaps used all the time that I should, or rather that I have consumed all of your time that I should in undertaking to discuss the matter of the Civilian Conservation Corps, although I hope to be heard again in regard to some further details that ought to be brought to the attention of the House in connection with this matter when the proposed amendment is offered to which I have referred. I insert at this point some material from the hearings in accordance with permission heretofore granted in the House:

VALUE OF WORK DONE BY CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS ON MILITARY RESERVATIONS

(See p. 1245 of hearings)

Mr. HARE. If there are no further questions, we would like to hear from Major Lingle and Colonel White with reference to the establishment of these camps on military reservations.

Major Lingle, would you give us your idea as to the value and importance and the need and the necessity of these camps on military reservations?

Major LINGLE. In January of 1941 I was detailed from The Adjutant General's Office as inspector for the Director, Civilian Conservation Corps, of Civilian Conservation Corps camps which were then being placed on the various Army reservations. At that time we had a few at Fort Benning and 3 or 4 at Fort Jackson. I think the total was about 8. I have seen them grow from that time on. There are now about 151, as Mr. McEntee has stated. I have been constantly in touch with their work up until May 5 of this year, when

I was transferred to the Quartermaster Corps; and as far as the value of the work which the corps has accomplished in dollars and cents, I would not want to try to make an estimate of it. But I do know that the amount of work which they have performed under the direction or under the plans which were previously formulated for the corps to prosecute on these reservations——

Mr. KEEFE. Plans made by whom?

Major LINGLE. That were made up previously by the Corps of Engineers and commanding generals of the corps areas.

Mr. KEEFE. Of the Army?

Major LINGLE. Of the Army—has been of tremendous value to the armed services in expediting the training of the selectees who have been brought in and the troops. There were a number of instances where the corps was told, "We need a drill field out on this particular area; we want it 2 weeks from now." In 2 weeks' time I have seen that drill field being used by those troops, with the whole regiment on there drilling.

The work, as Mr. McEntee has said, has been done through the technical agencies, the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior, with their own technicians. It has been said to me more than once—in fact, very often—by the post commanders and others, that they would not know what to do if it had not been for the Civilian Conservation Corps in a lot of respects, because it was a work organization; they were trained to work, knew how to work, and they gave them a job, and it was accomplished in 1-2-3 time.

Not only that, but in respect to the work projects themselves on these various reservations, the Corps has contributed very liberally, I would say, in that in a great percentage of the cases, the officers in command of the troops on the Regular Army post had been formerly Civilian Conservation Corps company commanders, and they knew that if they wanted a good mess sergeant or a good supply sergeant they could go down to the Civilian Conservation Corps company and do a little proselyting and win them away from there, and the first thing we knew we would have them in the Army.

The work that the Corps has accomplished on the Army reservations, as Mr. McEntee stated before, has been varied, including the clearing of artillery impact areas for the artillery to train on, the construction of bombproof shelters, the installation of rifle and pistol ranges, moving target ranges, telephone lines, power lines, bridges and roads; and they used the Civilian Conservation Corps in the maneuvers last year in the Carolinas as spotters at the filter stations for the Air Corps, in which they did a very wonderful job.

Mr. ENGEL. What do you mean by "spotters"?

Major LINGLE. They took notes of all aircraft which flew over that particular station; tried to approximate its height and the direction of its travel; they would telephone in to a central station, and from there the information was disseminated to other places.

On the last inspection trip that I made, which was about a month ago, the Corps was engaged in several airfields, and their work on the airfields included camouflage work, both natural and artificial. "Natural," of course, we know, is by utilization of natural features; "artificial" is by some method other than what it is.

STATEMENT E

STATEMENT BY MR. MORRELL SHOWING DIFFERENCE BETWEEN FOREST CONDITIONS LAST YEAR AND THIS AS TO THE PROTECTION OF NATIONAL FORESTS FROM FIRE

The following paragraphs are quoted from the testimony of Mr. Earl W. Loveridge appearing in the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, sixth supplemental national defense appropriation bill for 1942, part 1, page 142, statement by Mr. Earl Loveridge, Assistant Chief, Forest Service:

"Now that the United States is actively engaged in war, the urgency of the forest-fire protection problem is such that it is necessary to strengthen forest-fire control on those forested lands which surround strategic facilities or are otherwise of critical importance to the Nation's war effort. These estimates contemplate strengthening forest-fire control on such lands within the national forests and in State and private ownership. Because of the widespread damage and confusion which would occur there is no doubt but that our enemies will burn our forests if they can. The fact that our forests are exceedingly more inflammable adds to the tremendous risk involved.

"Among the Allied Nations, the United States is the principal producer of war materials. All-out production of these materials is the primary objective of the Nation today. Large forest fires can seriously disrupt this production program."

Page 151, statement by Mr. Earl Loveridge, Assistant Chief Forest Service:

"Question. Will there be a greater danger because of the removal of the Civilian Conservation Corps camps from many of these areas?

"Mr. LOVERIDGE. Yes, indeed.

"Question. Have you had great cooperation from them in the past?

"Mr. LOVERIDGE. They have been extraordinarily valuable to us in fire protection. I am glad you mentioned that. We have had normally available three and a half million man-days of Civilian Conservation Corps workers for fire-fighting purposes each year. If we were to evaluate that at $4 a day—and the Civilian Conservation Corps boys were worth that much in fire fighting; they are darn good fighters—that would total $14,131,200.

"Question. Are those the actual days that they worked?

"Mr. LOVERIDGE. No. That was the number of days they were available, just as these crews that we are calling for would be available. These men will not fight fires all the time, but they will be available just as the men in the fire department in a town are available. They would be employed for maintenance and other useful work on the forest while awaiting fire calls. They wouldn't be loafing while paid. This does not count the total number of men in the Civilian Conservation Corps crews, but the number who were available for fire fighting.

"Question. What percentage of your protection, as far as manpower is concerned, did you rely on for the Civilian Conservation Corps to take care of?

"Mr. LOVERIDGE. In the eastern country we relied on the Civilian Conservation Corps I should say 75 to 85 percent. That is where we have a very heavy concentration of Civilian Conservation Corps camps. In the West we never did have very many camps, because there were not very many boys enrolled from out there. It would have been as high as 50 percent, I presume."

Additional statements by Mr. Loveridge appear in the report.

Following are copies of statements received regarding effect that loss of Civilian Conservation Corps camps has had on control of forest fires in the East this spring:

Statement from R. W. Shields, acting regional forester, Philadelphia, dated May 7:

"National forests

"The increase in average size of fires and in number of extra period fires, along with the decrease in number of camps during the past 2½ years is shown by the following table:

Calendar year—	Number of camps	Average size fire	Number of extra period fires
1940	32	13.32	1
1941	26	22.23	1
1942 (spring)	9	48.50	4

"A part of this increase in size of fires should be attributed to the increasing rainfall deficiency, but without doubt the removal of certain Civilian Conservation Corps camps played its part.

"Specifically, one of the two extra-period fires in 1941 (around 500 acres) became a large fire almost entirely due to lack of sufficient manpower in its earlier stages. This fire was on the George Washington Forest within 30 to 45 minutes travel from Camp F-2 which had been abandoned earlier in the year. Similarly, the George Washington's two largest fires this spring, 1,700 acres and 2,000 acres, were within about one hour and one-half hour, respectively, of the site of F-25 which had been abandoned a few months earlier.

"Again, the region's largest fire (9,000 acres) this spring was on the Jefferson Forest within an hour to an hour and one-half of previously abandoned F-13.

"In all of these cases the rate of spread was due in part to scarcity of manpower during the fire's earlier stages and in part, of course, to severe burning conditions due to rain deficiency."

Statement by W. P. Wilber, State forester of New Jersey:

"To date there have been more than 1,350 forest fires in New Jersey. Have lost more than 50 percent of regularly trained fire fighters through draft and war industries service and anticipate further loss up to 75 percent account of new draft. Manpower in rural and woodland areas has been greatly depleted and discontinuance of so many Civilian Conservation Corps camps in New Jersey has seriously handicapped the fire service in its efforts to adequately control a serious situation. Areas at Fort Dix and the naval station at Lakehurst have been seriously threatened this spring by forest fires. Impossible to secure enough fire fighters when alarms are first given. We do not have enough mobile apparatus to make up for this loss. Situation would be vastly improved if more Civilian Conservation Corps assistance was available."

Statement by State Forester Bowen of West Virginia:

"Reduction of camps resulted in 20-percent increase in areas burned in areas having camps last spring."

Statement by State Forester McConnell of Kentucky:

"Burned 20,000 acres, could have held to 10,000 in 1941 if Civilian Conservation Corps camps available. Civilian Conservation Corps furnished us 8,800 man-days fire fighting spring 1941—less than 900, 1942. Labor recruitment difficult; seldom enough men on any fire. Sometimes fires burned hours before fighters could be obtained. Lost coal production caused by fires far exceeds timber damage."

Statement by State Forester Cook of Massachusetts:

"Efficiency reduced 65 percent by loss of Civilian Conservation Corps camps. No labor to recruit; can only organize high school boys; not satisfactory. Some of Civilian Conservation camps should be reestablished at once as thousands of acres of hurricane slash throughout central and eastern Massachusetts endangered by lack of manpower."

Statement by State Forester Hawes of Connecticut:

"If we had four junior companies in eastern Connecticut could have saved one-half acreage and expense."

Statement from H. O. Stabler, acting regional forester, Atlanta, Ga.:

"On April 19, weather conditions were such that fire control was extremely difficult. On this date, 2 fires were burning outside the Chattahoochee National Forest, 5 fires originated on the Nantahala, all of which burned between 2,000 and 7,000 acres, and the large fire on the Pisgah started. These weather conditions peaked on the 19th and 20th, following a period of no rain for 9 days, low humidity, and above average winds.

"All of the eight fires mentioned above were handled exclusively by hired laborers. On the Nantahala and Chattahoochee, difficulty was experienced in obtaining an adequate supply of fire fighters due to strong competition in the labor market by defense projects and industries, such as Tennessee Valley Authority dam construction. No difficulty was experienced in securing an adequate supply of labor for the Pisgah fire, largely due to the cooperation of several of the manufacturing plants adjacent to the Pisgah ranger district.

"There is no question that had Civilian Conservation Corps companies been available full strength reductions would have been made in acreage losses on all of the fires. The extent to which these losses would have been reduced is problematical, but it is believed that a safe estimate would be approximately one-third, or approximately 10,000 acres, with a corresponding decrease in suppression cost."

The National Youth Administration has for the present fiscal year an appropriation of approximately $142,000,000. With that appropriation it has carried on its in-school student programs in the high schools and colleges, and it has carried on its work programs, that is, in connection with the schools, and in addition it has carried on the work which is being done at its work centers. Some $28,000,000 of its appropriations have been covered into a reserve fund, that will not be expended, by the Budget, and notwithstanding that it has been taking care of in its in-school program approximately 248,000 students, in high schools and in the colleges of the country and in its work program, or out-of-school program, it has, as I recall, taken care of for the entire fiscal year some 146,000 needy youths. I think that the student-aid program insofar as it has been carried on in the high schools has been exceedingly worthy, and is under normal conditions deserving of continuance. So far as I am concerned I have never been able to feel that the burden of educating the youths who are not financially able to obtain educations for themselves should be the responsibility of the particular locality in which they may happen to reside. I believe that so long as we provide public education at all, the responsibility for the education of the children of America rests upon the people of America as a whole.

I wish to insert at this point some material from the hearings which should be of interest in connection with the N. Y. A. appropriation, permission to insert having been obtained in the House:

CONTINUING NEED FOR NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION STUDENT-WORK PROGRAM

Mr. TARVER. How many students did you state that you have in this student aid, or in-school program at the present time, as near as you can give it?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Two hundred and forty-eight thousand ninety-four as of March 1942. Those are divided as follows: 167,646 in the high schools and 80,448 in the colleges.

Mr. TARVER. What, in your opinion, would be the result in the educational opportunities of many of those who are students if all aid of this type from your organization is suddenly withdrawn as of July 1, 1942; and what would be the effect on the student population of the schools and colleges throughout the country which are now in part affording educational opportunities to students who are receiving this aid in your program? Would that population be materially reduced, in your judgment?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Well, I can give the committee considerable factual information on what you could anticipate, based upon what happened when reserves were established against student work funds last autumn.

We had reports from over 1,290 of the 1,725 colleges participating in the National Youth Administration program indicating that 16,082 college students were forced out of school during the months of January, February, and March because of the lack of funds to continue their education when student work money was withdrawn at the college level. Of this number, 62.03 percent were reported from southern and rural States.

Studies made in several places at the high-school level indicated that of the close to 80,000 students who were dropped from National Youth Administration rolls, 21,476 were forced out of schools because they simply did not have that small difference which the student work fund had provided them with to stay in school.

Mr. TARVER. The withdrawal of this aid, as contemplated by the Budget estimate, will necessarily mean a drastic reduction in the number of students in colleges and high schools——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. Throughout the country who are deprived of schooling because of inability to receive aid?

Mr. WILLIAMS. The testimony along that line, Judge Tarver, is just about as complete as it could be. We have received in the last 3 months 3,870 letters, all indicating that a large number of students would have to leave school and not be able to reenter in the fall or in an accelerated program that colleges may try to get under way in July.

And, further than that, they point out this very important fact: The colleges are trying to put their programs on a year-round basis, which will take away from students the opportunity they have previously had to earn any money during the summer to enable them to continue in school; and, further, this is particularly important at this time because the schools have given over their programs, as nearly as they can, to things that relate to training people for the war. There has been great work done by educators along that line in the last 15 months toward organizing a good part of their work with respect to war needs; putting more and more people into chemistry, engineering, medical services, and so on. I would like to insert in the record a statement from the National College and Graduate Work Council testifying to the need for continuing the National Youth Administration student work program during the war emergency.

"NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION NATIONAL COLLEGE AND GRADUATE WORK COUNCIL, MAY 8, 1942

"The National College and Graduate Work Council, representing the 1,734 colleges and universities participating in the National Youth Administration college-work program, involving 88,000 students out of a total college enrollment in the country approximating 1,000,000, believes that the continuation of the college-work program which the National Youth Administration has provided is most urgently needed at the present time. Data which we have assembled reveal that it will take a minimum of $20,000,000 to do this job.

"The expansion of our modern Army has intensified the need for officers and technical experts. At the same time that the Army needs these trained men the armament-production program and the general acceleration of effort within the country which attends the war crisis requires sharply increased numbers of professionally trained men and women.

"Already there are serious shortages of physicians, of engineers, of chemists and physicists, of teachers, and of dentists. Less acute shortages exist in almost every other profession. The only place from which such trained personnel can be replaced is from the colleges and universities of the country. It is, therefore, highly important that every effort be made to keep as many youth as possible in vital college training.

"In order to train men and women students more promptly for the war effort, the armed services, war industry, agriculture, and commerce, the colleges and universities have accelerated their program on a 12-month basis, which has resulted in need for further assistance, since students are now deprived of the opportunity to earn part of their expenses during the summer vacation.

"Governmental, military, and naval leaders are urging students to remain in college and are using such programs as V–1, V–7, and the Army aviation cadet training to that end. Many students, thus recruited, will not be able to stay in college without National Youth Administration assistance.

"This statement follows conference with lay leaders and educators in practically all of the colleges and universities of the Nation and follows a survey of the needs of youth and the needs of the Nation for the services of trained and educated youth.

"R. C. BEATY,
"Chairman, National College Work Council; Dean of Students, University of Florida, Gainesville, Fla.
"ROBEN J. MAASKE,
"President, Eastern Oregon College of Education, La Grande, Oreg.
"C. E. RAGSDALE,
"School of Education, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wis.
"CYRIL W. GRACE,
"President, State Teachers College, Mayville, N. Dak.
"GEORGE S. MILLER,
"Vice President, Tufts College, Medford, Mass.
"JAMES H. RICHMOND,
"President, Murray State Teachers College, Murray, Ky."

NUMBER OF YOUTH TRAINED FOR WAR WORK AND NUMBER ENTERING PRIVATE INDUSTRY AND PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT

Mr. TARVER. I wonder if you have any information that you could furnish for the record showing how many students who have received high-school and college training through your program have subsequently been utilized in war effort, and in what capacities; how many went into the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps; and how many went into technical services of the Government, where their education and training were of advantage to them and to the Government.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Judge, I would have to try to gather that information. I can say, as far as the out-of-school program is concerned, that 210,000 went from our work into industries directly or indirectly related to the war effort.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, that was going to be my next question. I want to know just what information you can furnish as to the out-of-school programs having furnished trained men for the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, or other services of the Government in the war effort.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I can try to gather that information as quickly as I possibly can. I would like to submit this for the record, though—it is very revealing—the number of youth on National Youth Administration projects who are now engaged in work in colleges that leads directly toward the war effort, such as engineering, military science, medical science, etc.

Mr. TARVER. I think the inquiries I submitted were broad enough to include also the number of youth employed in your work centers and in your work-training program who have entered the employment of industries engaged in war production.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will be very glad to put that in the record.

The matter requested is as follows:

"PRESENT EMPLOYMENT OF FORMER NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION COLLEGE STUDENTS

"Although there has been no national record made of National Youth Administration student graduates from the Nation's colleges and universities, the findings of individual institutions which have surveyed the present employment fields of all National Youth Administration students graduating from their institutions last June is submitted herewith.

"The attached results of these surveys in 17 sample colleges and universities participating in the National Youth Administration college work program show that the large majority of former National Youth Administration students are now employed in fields vital to the war effort.

"The only employment contracts of National Youth Administration college students yet reported this spring are from the State of California, which indicate that of the 1942 graduating classes in the 4-year colleges of that State, as high as 90 percent of all the National Youth Administration men graduating this spring are going into the armed forces or into war industries. This survey from California also indicates that a preponderant number of technically trained women graduates are going directly into war industries, and into governmental and civilian war activities.

"These colleges report that next year's (1942–43) enrollments of men students will find practically all with a reserve status under the Army and Navy V–1 to V–7 programs, or in technical training for war industries."

STATEMENT G.—*Employment of 1941 National Youth Administration graduates based on sampling of 1,070 National Youth Administration graduates in 17 colleges and universities*

	Percent
Total	100
Armed forces (including Army, Army Air Corps, Navy, Navy Air Corps, and Marines)	38
War industries	29
General technical and War Production Board	20
Scientific research	9
Further professional study	11
Medical professional (practicing)	1
Medical school	2
Teaching	6
Other	13

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

STATEMENT C.—*Number of participating institutions and number of youth employed—Regional and State summary—Student work program, March 1942*

Region and State	Total		School work program		College work program		Graduate work program	
	Number of institutions participating	Number of students employed	Number of institutions participating	Number of students employed	Number of institutions participating	Number of students employed	Number of institutions participating	Number of students employed
Grand total	[1] 26,998	248,094	25,306	167,646	1,689	78,704	160	1,744
Region I, total	2,159	36,588	1,926	24,083	231	11,916	41	589
Connecticut	139	1,983	114	1,271	24	600	4	112
Maine	216	1,540	200	1,106	16	434		
Massachusetts	432	7,716	372	4,945	60	2,525	10	246
New Hampshire	109	1,003	101	600	8	397	2	6
New York City and Long Island	260	13,210	209	8,789	50	4,273	12	148
New York (excluding New York City and Long Island)	838	9,155	783	6,191	55	2,892	10	72
Rhode Island	62	1,171	56	721	6	448	2	2
Vermont	103	810	91	460	12	347	1	3
Region II, total	7,184	82,551	6,668	56,124	516	25,859	40	568
Delaware	46	344	44	259	2	85		
District of Columbia	46	897	34	334	12	506	4	57
Illinois	998	11,327	922	7,282	76	3,895	5	150
Indiana	718	6,935	678	4,816	40	2,091	3	28
Kentucky	742	5,089	710	4,011	32	1,078		
Maryland	181	2,489	157	1,692	24	780	1	17
Michigan	800	9,178	758	5,989	42	3,099	3	90
New Jersey	293	5,719	264	4,499	29	1,215	3	5
Ohio	1,204	11,252	1,141	7,635	63	3,566	5	51
Pennsylvania	1,152	18,798	1,061	12,605	91	6,082	11	111
West Virginia	354	2,795	334	1,957	20	827	1	11
Wisconsin	650	7,728	565	5,045	85	2,635	4	48
Region III, total	9,775	63,714	9,341	45,184	434	18,276	39	254
Alabama	1,067	7,196	1,042	5,888	25	1,307	1	1
Arkansas	655	3,733	631	2,966	24	767		
Florida	523	3,042	507	2,330	16	711	1	1
Georgia	843	6,086	796	4,295	47	1,721	6	70
Louisiana	692	4,556	667	3,011	25	1,528	2	17
Mississippi	740	4,012	697	2,841	43	1,165	1	6
North Carolina	1,159	7,808	1,105	5,162	54	2,594	3	52
South Carolina	704	4,990	671	3,604	33	1,364	1	22
Tennessee	643	5,760	600	4,410	43	1,315	12	35
Texas	2,054	10,977	1,968	6,973	86	3,981	6	23
Virginia	695	5,554	657	3,704	38	1,823	6	27
Region IV, total	6,161	41,831	5,818	28,679	343	13,041	16	111
Colorado	332	2,893	313	1,913	19	975	3	5
Iowa	937	4,910	872	2,970	65	1,902	3	38
Kansas	701	4,781	656	3,257	45	1,521	2	3
Minnesota	571	5,341	533	3,500	38	1,822	1	19
Missouri	849	7,294	793	5,041	56	2,213	5	40
Montana	215	1,830	203	1,300	12	530		
Nebraska	549	3,196	526	2,194	23	999	1	3
New Mexico	229	1,122	220	822	9	300		
North Dakota	444	2,126	432	1,540	12	586		
Oklahoma	878	5,775	831	4,194	47	1,578	1	3
South Dakota	368	2,017	352	1,329	16	488		
Wyoming	88	546	87	419	1	127		
Region V, total	1,627	21,955	1,465	12,669	161	9,076	23	210
Arizona	80	920	75	563	5	354	1	3
California	600	11,172	513	5,990	86	5,013	13	169
Idaho	188	1,436	179	1,000	9	433	1	3
Nevada	36	230	35	167	1	63		
Oregon	273	2,330	249	1,369	24	954	3	7
Utah	109	2,190	98	1,251	11	935	2	4
Washington	341	3,677	316	2,329	25	1,324	3	24
Territories, total	92	1,455	88	907	4	536	1	12
Alaska	8	41	7	25	1	16		
Hawaii	29	510	28	387	1	111	1	12
Puerto Rico	50	883	48	474	2	409		
Virgin Islands	5	21	5	21				

[1] This is the unduplicated number of cooperating institutions.

Source: Reports of State Youth Administrators on National Youth Administration Form 507.

STATEMENT D.—*Number of youth employed by race—Regional and State summary—Out-of-school work programs, week ending Mar. 21, 1942*

Region and State	Total								
	Combined programs			Regular programs			Defense program		
	Total	White	Other	Total	White	Other	Total	White	Other
Grand total	176,035	147,475	28,560	104,268	83,798	20,470	71,767	63,677	8,090
Continental United States, total	173,247	145,944	27,303	101,831	82,521	19,310	71,416	63,423	7,993
Region I, total	21,719	19,233	2,486	11,572	10,023	1,549	10,147	9,210	937
Connecticut	925	817	108	505	423	82	420	394	26
Maine	1,684	1,628	56	640	632	8	1,044	996	48
Massachusetts	4,141	3,849	292	2,323	2,183	140	1,818	1,666	152
New Hampshire	530	528	2	318	318		212	210	2
New York City and Long Island	6,450	4,897	1,553	3,315	2,263	1,052	3,135	2,634	501
New York (excluding New York City and Long Island)	6,963	6,573	390	3,812	3,618	194	3,151	2,955	196
Rhode Island	553	470	83	325	254	71	228	216	12
Vermont	473	471	2	334	332	2	139	139	
Region II, total	54,050	45,542	8,508	21,941	17,735	4,206	32,109	27,807	4,302
Delaware	452	201	251	356	159	197	96	42	54
District of Columbia	796	67	729	564	60	504	232	7	225
Illinois	8,945	6,949	1,996	2,815	2,229	586	6,130	4,720	1,410
Indiana	3,664	2,966	698	1,405	1,103	302	2,259	1,863	396
Kentucky	4,756	4,301	455	2,641	2,401	240	2,115	1,900	215
Maryland	1,440	981	459	715	410	305	725	571	154
Michigan	5,483	4,909	574	2,251	1,996	255	3,232	2,913	319
New Jersey	2,540	1,811	729	1,435	1,063	372	1,105	748	357
Ohio	4,750	3,512	1,238	1,963	1,286	677	2,787	2,226	561
Pennsylvania	11,542	10,531	1,011	3,880	3,326	554	7,662	7,205	457
West Virginia	4,897	4,620	277	2,670	2,486	184	2,227	2,134	93
Wisconsin	4,785	4,694	91	1,246	1,216	30	3,539	3,478	61
Region III, total	59,741	46,711	13,030	44,463	33,101	11,362	15,278	13,610	1,668
Alabama	5,797	4,075	1,722	4,670	3,071	1,599	1,127	1,004	123
Arkansas	4,905	4,358	547	3,130	2,843	287	1,775	1,515	260
Florida	2,470	1,617	853	1,662	978	684	808	639	169
Georgia	6,084	4,708	1,376	4,214	3,012	1,202	1,870	1,696	174
Louisiana	4,014	2,763	1,251	2,729	1,696	1,033	1,285	1,067	218
Mississippi	3,752	2,801	951	2,392	1,547	845	1,360	1,254	106
North Carolina	7,612	6,048	1,564	6,118	4,852	1,266	1,494	1,196	298
South Carolina	3,028	2,108	920	2,517	1,628	889	511	480	31
Tennessee	5,544	4,872	672	4,567	3,900	667	977	972	5
Texas	12,175	10,078	2,097	9,024	7,135	1,889	3,151	2,943	208
Virginia	4,360	3,283	1,077	3,440	2,439	1,001	920	844	76
Region IV, total	28,378	25,901	2,477	18,005	16,272	1,733	10,373	9,629	744
Colorado	2,321	2,259	62	1,965	1,910	55	356	349	7
Iowa	3,299	3,096	203	1,803	1,752	51	1,496	1,344	152
Kansas	2,915	2,625	290	1,925	1,748	177	990	877	113
Minnesota	4,065	3,977	88	2,511	2,440	71	1,554	1,537	17
Missouri	4,289	3,275	1,014	2,790	1,998	792	1,499	1,277	222
Montana	908	860	48	801	754	47	107	106	1
Nebraska	1,629	1,537	92	1,054	1,015	39	575	522	53
New Mexico	1,108	1,106	2	871	871		237	235	2
North Dakota	1,097	1,057	40	769	731	38	328	326	2
Oklahoma	5,126	4,611	515	2,265	1,922	343	2,861	2,689	172
South Dakota	1,094	983	111	812	704	108	282	279	3
Wyoming	527	515	12	439	427	12	88	88	
Region V, total	9,359	8,557	802	5,850	5,390	460	3,509	3,167	342
Arizona	664	594	70	543	477	66	121	117	4
California	3,571	3,009	562	1,918	1,640	278	1,653	1,369	284
Idaho	914	910	4	410	407	3	504	503	1
Nevada	127	107	20	127	107	20			
Oregon	961	932	29	579	562	17	382	370	12
Utah	782	775	7	606	599	7	176	176	
Washington	2,340	2,230	110	1,667	1,598	69	673	632	41
Territories, total	2,788	1,531	1,257	2,437	1,277	1,160	351	254	97
Puerto Rico	1,959	1,456	503	1,608	1,202	406	351	254	97
Hawaii	588	63	525	588	63	525			
Virgin Islands	241	12	229	241	12	229			

Source: Statistics Section, Division of Finance and Statistics, May 9, 1942.

STATEMENT E.—*Number of youth awaiting assignment, by race and sex—Regional and State summary—Out-of-school work program, March 1942*

Region and State	All youth			White			Other		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Grand total	196,387	86,624	109,763	144,704	65,146	79,558	51,683	21,478	30,205
Region I, total	4,730	1,485	3,245	4,387	1,417	2,970	343	68	275
Connecticut									
Maine	775	291	484	775	291	484			
Massachusetts	1,597	224	1,373	1,459	218	1,241	138	6	132
New Hampshire	42	15	27	42	15	27			
New York City and Long Island	1,054	666	388	914	618	296	140	48	92
New York (excluding New York City and Long Island)	1,129	228	901	1,071	215	856	58	13	45
Rhode Island	19	5	14	12	4	8	7	1	6
Vermont	114	56	58	114	56	58			

STATEMENT E.—*Number of youth awaiting assignment, by race and sex—Regional and State summary—Out-of-school work program, March 1942*—Continued

Region and State	All youth			White			Other		
	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female	Total	Male	Female
Region II, total	36,866	15,601	21,265	29,245	13,576	15,669	7,621	2,025	5,596
Delaware	43	9	34	6	2	4	37	7	30
District of Columbia	94	3	91	24	1	23	70	2	68
Illinois	3,762	1,624	2,138	2,348	1,329	1,019	1,414	295	1,119
Indiana	2,246	758	1,488	1,584	648	936	662	110	552
Kentucky	9,526	4,790	4,736	8,262	4,288	3,974	1,264	502	762
Maryland	927	116	811	352	59	293	575	57	518
Michigan	3,214	1,574	1,630	2,039	1,065	974	1,175	519	656
New Jersey	645	138	507	329	99	230	316	39	277
Ohio	4,107	1,240	2,867	2,782	1,121	1,661	1,325	119	1,206
Pennsylvania	6,701	1,749	4,952	6,325	1,626	4,699	376	123	253
West Virginia	4,560	3,203	1,357	4,176	2,962	1,214	384	241	143
Wisconsin	1,041	387	654	1,018	376	642	23	11	12
Region III, total	89,112	38,269	50,843	57,564	24,515	33,049	31,548	13,754	17,794
Alabama	4,510	1,201	3,309	1,809	527	1,282	2,701	674	2,027
Arkansas	5,721	3,472	2,249	4,512	2,664	1,848	1,209	808	401
Florida	6,552	2,442	4,110	3,991	1,299	2,692	2,561	1,143	1,418
Georgia	11,722	4,736	6,986	7,178	2,869	4,309	4,544	1,867	2,677
Louisiana	3,930	675	3,255	1,791	360	1,431	2,139	315	1,824
Mississippi	12,774	7,410	5,364	8,386	4,277	4,109	4,388	3,133	1,255
North Carolina	6,810	2,153	4,657	4,311	1,383	2,928	2,499	770	1,729
South Carolina	5,413	2,179	3,234	2,861	1,087	1,774	2,552	1,092	1,460
Tennessee	4,127	1,359	2,768	3,254	1,139	2,115	873	220	653
Texas	25,681	12,017	13,664	18,085	8,407	9,678	7,596	3,610	3,986
Virginia	1,872	625	1,247	1,386	503	883	486	122	364
Region IV, total	18,697	7,777	10,920	15,603	6,837	8,766	3,094	940	2,154
Colorado	713	304	409	700	299	401	13	5	8
Iowa	1,709	559	1,150	1,655	551	1,104	54	8	46
Kansas	139	56	83	113	52	61	26	4	22
Minnesota	1,661	674	987	1,588	656	932	73	18	55
Missouri	3,293	1,187	2,106	2,058	895	1,163	1,235	292	943
Montana	147	51	96	145	49	96	2	2	
Nebraska	595	146	449	548	139	409	47	7	40
New Mexico	1,307	550	757	1,295	543	752	12	7	5
North Dakota	1,699	881	818	1,520	801	719	179	80	99
Oklahoma	5,829	2,567	3,262	4,499	2,089	2,410	1,330	478	852
South Dakota	1,400	740	660	1,291	701	590	109	39	70
Wyoming	205	62	143	191	62	129	14		14
Region V, total	3,045	806	2,239	2,746	727	2,019	299	79	220
Arizona	149	36	113	129	26	103	20	10	10
California	1,309	361	948	1,060	297	763	249	64	185
Idaho	299	131	168	299	131	168			
Nevada	2		2	2		2			
Oregon	180	25	155	180	25	155			
Utah	339	122	217	339	122	217			
Washington	767	131	636	737	126	611	30	5	25
Territories, Puerto Rico and Virgin Islands, total	43,937	22,686	21,251	35,159	18,074	17,085	8,778	4,612	4,166

Source: Statistics Section, Division of Finance and Statistics, May 9, 1942.

High-school student aid is not involved in the appropriation proposed in the pending bill, because the Budget estimate entirely eliminated any provision for the student-aid program. While we have undertaken to take $5,000,000 from the Civilian Conservation Corps estimate and set it up for partial continuance of the college student-training program, we do not make any provision in this bill for a continuance of the high-school program, important as it may be and well justified as it may be in normal times. The greater portion of the estimate carried in this bill for the National Youth Administration, $53,000,000, approximately, aside from the $5,000,000 for the college student-aid program, is to be used for work training for some 80,000 youths who are to receive work training which would qualify them for work in war industries. It is, therefore, strictly a war appropriation. While they are engaged in receiving this work training they will also be engaged, in many instances, in manufacturing articles which are needed by the War and Navy Departments.

I take it for granted there will not be any objection on the part of many Members of the House to the granting of this very much reduced appropriation, $53,000,000, for a program which is approved by the defense authorities of the administration as being a vital necessity in our war effort. There is, however, some question in my mind as to whether a considerable issue may not be made with regard to the $5,000,000 which the committee has undertaken to set up above Budget estimates, for the carrying on of the college student-aid program in a very greatly modified degree.

According to the evidence which you may find upon examination of the hearings, there have been some 88,000 young men and women receiving the advantages of this program in the colleges and universities of the United States. You will also observe from the hearings that in a great many instances, if this assistance is withdrawn, those young men and women will not be able to proceed with their college education.

In connection with this item there should also be called to your attention a Budget estimate which was submitted for our consideration, and which was disapproved, an estimate of $10,000,000, supported by the War Manpower Commission and by the Office of Education for the purpose of setting up a loan program, under which loans of $500 each should be made to students who had had as much as 2 years of college training, for the purpose of continuing their training as doctors, dentists, physicists, pharmacists, engineers, and in certain other technical lines. It appeared from the evidence that in cases of doctors at least and some others who would have received this training, had the estimate been approved, their training could not have been completed in less than a period of 4 years, even though they might have already received 2 years of college pre-med training.

It did not seem to the committee that the program outlined in this Budget estimate was a sound program. It provided that these loans should be canceled if those receiving the benefit of the loan should, in good faith, comply with their obligation and tender their services to the Government in its war effort, if their services might be needed at some time before the conclusion of the present emergency. If they in good faith complied with that obligation, the loan should be canceled. If their services were never required, it should be canceled. So it amounted to very little except a proposed

donation to each of those individuals who would have been allowed the benefit of this collegiate training.

Before I go into the sentiments of the committee on the matter, let me say this, that it was further stated in the hearings before us that an understanding existed with the Selective Service Administration, under which those young men should be deferred from military service, in the event they were selected to receive loans in order to carry on education of the types to which I have referred. That exemption from the military service does not obtain in the college student-aid program of the National Youth Administration, and in the judgment of our subcommittee it simply amounted to this, that a certain number of thousands of young men, many of whom would have been able to pay for their education anyway, whether the Government assisted them or not, would have been selected to receive collegiate education in the various branches to which I have made reference, covering in most instances, a period of time that would probably last until after the conclusion of the present emergency and during that period of time, being in a bombproof condition as far as selective service is concerned.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TARVER. In other words, they would be absolved from any duty of responding to the needs of their country in this time of peril by rendering service in a military way. We thought that this college-aid program under the N. Y. A. is much better. Under that program students work for the aid they get, and we felt that working some 2 or 3 hours a day in connection with their college training would not be hurtful to those young men and women and that they would appreciate in most instances an opportunity to work for what they are receiving from the Government instead of receiving a large amount as proposed in the Budget estimate as an outright gift, which is what the thing in the Budget estimate as proposed amounts to. We disallowed that $10,000,000. We do provide, on the other hand $5,000,000 above the Budget estimate for the N. Y. A. college student program. My colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is very much interested in this subject matter and proposes to offer an amendment when we get to a consideration of the bill to add $5,000,000 to that amount and to provide $10,000,000 for the continuance of this N. Y. A. college-student aid program largely for the completion of the education of those who have already received some aid and who without this additional assistance would not be able to complete their college educations, and who can be utilized in the national war effort in most instances just as effectively as those whom the Bureau of the Budget proposed to educate entirely at Government expense in the program which it undertook to set up under the jurisdiction of the Office of Education. I hope you may find it possible in your best judgment to support the amendment which is to be offered by our colleague from Wisconsin, because I feel that such an extension of the college-student aid program of the N. Y. A., especially when it involves no over-all increase of Budget estimates, is justified. The $10,000,000 estimated for a comparative purpose has already been eliminated from the bill by the action of the subcommittee, and this provision of $10,000,000 will not be an unreasonable amount under present conditions for the purpose for which it is intended and will very greatly contribute to our national war effort.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia yields back 1 minute.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is needless for me to say that I have always been interested in economy, but I am extremely careful before eliminating entirely a Government agency.

I am really exercised today over the action of the full Committee on Appropriations this morning in completely eliminating the appropriation for the Civilian Conservation Corps. To destroy this outstanding organization entirely by refusing to make any appropriations for its continuance is an action which I think can never be justified. It is little I can add to the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

For the present fiscal year we appropriated $246,960,000 for the Civilian Conservation Corps. The Budget recommendation for the fiscal year that starts July 1 was $80,818,000, while the recommendation of the subcommittee that handled the bill now before us was $75,818,000, a reduction over last year's appropriation of $171,142,000 and a reduction in the Budget estimates of $5,000,000. Certainly such a tremendous reduction in the activities of an organization of this character should be sufficient, but when the full Committee on Appropriations met this morning a motion was offered and adopted to eliminate all the recommended appropriation for the C. C. C.

As we all know, many C. C. C. camps have been eliminated in the last few months. You will find in the hearings 154 pages of testimony justifying the Budget recommendation. The Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps, Mr. J. J. McEntee, was the first witness. He testified at length. The hearings show heretofore the camps were used for various purposes, but it is the intention of Mr. McEntee to use every dollar of the appropriation this year, if it is not eliminated in the end for national defense activities. Two hundred of the camps will be on military reservations and 150 in critical fire-protection areas. Analyze this very carefully. Consider what must be done on the military reservations and for fire protection and you cannot but come to the conclusion that if the C. C. C. is destroyed, then some kind of a substitute must be provided to carry on the necessary work both on the reservations and for fire protection.

In times of war, and considering the methods being used in this war, especially incendiary bombs, you know and I know that we must have forest-fire protection, especially in the western and eastern parts of this country. Can you realize the harm that would be done if incendiary bombs were dropped on our forests by the enemy? Maintaining these 150 camps for fire-protection means protection to our forests, and considering the great loss in timber if our forests would be destroyed, the amount used for the maintenance of the 150 camps would be but a drop in the bucket. But the point that I want to bring out now in reference to the protection of our forests is, if they are not protected by civilians whom it will be necessary to employ for this purpose and the salaries that those civilians will receive will be far in excess of what are paid the young men in the Civilian Conservation Corps. In other words, you are not going to save any money for the Government by refusing to make an appropriation for this purpose.

Now as to the military reservations, the same condition exists. Roads must be constructed; rifle ranges must be established; camouflage work is essential; fields must be cleared, and any number of additional activities that civilians can accomplish are necessary on military reservations. Deny the appropriation for the 200 camps on military reservations and you must employ civilians to do this work or use the enlisted men in the Army for that purpose. On the face of it this economy move is penny-wise and pound-foolish.

It was stated at the hearings that there were 5,000,000 youths in this country ranging in ages from 17 through 20. In the large cities of the country today there are thousands of boys standing around idle. It is true that a tremendous number of young men are now engaged in national defense work and many of those young men were employed in the C. C. C. Thousands and thousands of young men who were called by the Army and Navy were rejected because of physical defects. Many of the rejections were due to the teeth and eyes, while of course, there were a tremendous number classed as illiterate, and then again others were underweight. It has been found that boys taken into the Civilian Conservation Corps in the past have come out in perfect physical condition. The illiterate have an opportunity to learn while dental and eye conditions can be benefited, and the underweight are built up, in the end to be found perfect physically.

Weighing the situation from every angle I maintain that it is false economy to eliminate this appropriation from the bill entirely and it is my purpose in the event the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] does not do so to offer an amendment to at least restore the amount recommended by the subcommittee, that sat for days hearing testimony on this bill, and whose favorable recommendation I feel should have been approved by the full committee as well as the House.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I shall direct my few remarks to the C. C. C. and the N. Y. A.

Having in mind what the gentleman from Georgia has just said as well as reports we have had pertaining to these two operations, I for one will not support the appropriations for either the C. C. C. or the N. Y. A. as recommended in this bill and amendments to be offered, provided I have the opportunity to vote against the appropriations that may be covered in the bill as submitted or by amendments which are offered.

It seems to me that if there ever was a time we could afford to discontinue the activities of these two agencies of Government, it is the present. I have paid some attention to the discussions which have been carried on with reference to having the C. C. C. boys do certain types of work inside the military camps. If I remember correctly, during the current week there was some report out to the effect that 250,000 men had been rejected by the Army on account of illiteracy, because they had an insufficient amount of education. Having been raised on farms and in country communities where grade schools, and colleges, and universities are very difficult for the boys to get into I have some conception of the sterling character, and the initiative, and the energy of many young men who have not had the school training that others have been privileged to enjoy. It seems to me it is high time that the Army make such corrections in its regulations as may be necessary so that these men who are physically fit but who have been rejected on account of illiteracy may get into the Army.

I believe if they were given the opportunity to do some of the work in the military camps which it is now being argued should be done by the C. C. C. boys, that it would give these young men perhaps the greatest chance they will ever have in their entire lives for not only mental but physical development and for military training. So if we could just once make up our minds that perhaps the United States could get along for a few months without such pampering and coddling as has been carried on more or less—I do not mean entirely—under the C. C. C. and N. Y. A. operations, perhaps we could make just about as much progress for the next few months, or the next 2 or 3 years as we will by appropriating tens of millions of dollars with which to carry on these two agencies. I am satisfied that the people in my district are ready for both the agencies to be discontinued, and when I say "the people" I mean from 85 to 90 percent of them. We can always find ir any district a few people who are willing to carry on every kind of sociological experiment that can be conceived by the sociologists if that is the group that does the conceiving.

We can also find at all times people who are willing to have the Government finance everything under the sun that they themselves personally are unwilling to make contributions to in the form of taxes or otherwise. Since coming here I have tried to represent my people on this one single proposition, namely, that I am not interested in supporting any appropriations with my vote that I am not interested in supporting with my pocketbook, and involved in that principle is why I voted against so many different types of appropriations that have been submitted to this House in the last 7½ years. If my people let me stay here a few months longer, I expect to continue that same policy, whether it is wartime or peacetime.

As I have said on this floor before, I am willing that all my personal property be taken by the Government for the prosecution of this war, I am willing to have taxes assessed against me up to 90 percent of my income, because I figure that about 10 percent will help me keep my body and soul together, and that of my family. They can take the balance for prosecuting the war. Therefore, I vote for war appropriations with no reservation.

Mr. Chairman, I do not consider the C. C. C. or the N. Y. A. necessary wartime activities, and under no circumstances will I support them. If my people want to remove me from the Congress for voting to cut such operations during wartime, that is satisfactory with me. I will get along some way, because a fellow is just a plain, dumb fool who marries himself to this job in such a way that he gets to where he thinks he cannot get along without it. I have never been in that trap yet, and I do not propose to get into it in the future.

So I hope this House will exercise its power in voting down all appropriations for the C. C. C. and N. Y. A. as submitted in this bill and amendments thereto.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. There is no appropriation carried in this bill for the C. C. C.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I understood the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], who I believe is a member of the committee, to say that he is going to offer an amendment to put it back in the bill.

Mr. HARE. But it is not in here.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In my previous remarks I mentioned the bill and the amendments which may be offered to the bill. So I congratulate the Appropriations Committee for having eliminated the appropriation for the C. C. C., which I understand was recommended by the subcommittee; and if I am correct in my understanding, it is to the effect that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] offered the amendment to strike out the C. C. C. appropriation to be carried in the subcommittee's bill. If he did, I congratulate him for doing that, because I think his record in this Congress since war has been declared, as well as before war was declared, and the recognition he has received from the people of this country, is such that we can well afford to go along with certain of his recommendations.

Mr. HARE. There will be no quarrel between the gentleman from Michigan and myself on that matter.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, in reference to the N. Y. A. proposition, I would like to make a personal reference to some experiences I have had in connection with young men and women going through college. I am going to leave it out of the RECORD, but it is based on experience in life which causes me to reach my conclusion with reference to the N. Y. A. at the present time. When we go out and spend as many millions of dollars for a program such as the N. Y. A. as we have spent, of course, we accomplish some good, but I regret there is not a yardstick by which we can measure the harm that we also accomplish.

I might express it this way: I hope that none of my children, and that none of my nephews and nieces and that none of my family will have to go to the Federal Government to obtain loans or cash donations in order to obtain their education. That is about as plain as I can say it. I hope that in preference to doing that they will be content to live on fried skunks and jackrabbits, because if we have reached the point in this country where the opportunities are so scarce for young men and women that they have to resort to the Public Treasury under a scheme such as the N. Y. A. to get their education, then it is about time we change some of the prospects for opportunities that should be available for the young people of this country. If a young man or woman is blessed with reasonable health and reasonable intelligence, there is a way for them to get an education in this country without resorting to public funds voted by the Congress of the United States with all the political involvements we well know are wrapped up in the package. This assistance cannot and is not given to all deserving young people, and herein we find discrimination and unfairness on a big scale. I say that based on the experience of myself and many of those who have been very closely associated with me. There is a better and sounder and safer way for young men and women to be educated, and the quicker we resort to that better way, the better it will be for everyone involved. There is a bottom to the sound finance barrel, and we shall find it some day the way we are now traveling.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. STRATTON] may have leave to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short newspaper article, and also that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] may be allowed to extend his own

remarks in the RECORD and to include an address made by himself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by inserting a radio address delivered by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FITZGERALD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a Memorial Day address delivered on May 30 by the Honorable Denis W. Delaney, Administrator of the W. P. A., of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WEISS] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered on May 24 in Honolulu by the Reverend William D. Maguire, chaplain, United States Navy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on the bill considered this afternoon and include therein a short statement by H. I. Phillips.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, AND RELATED INDEPENDENT AGENCIES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution, House Resolution 499, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

That notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI, it shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, in connection with the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the appropriations and language providing for the National Youth Administration, the appropriations and language for all items specifically earmarked for national defense for such year, and the language relating to the Civilian Conservation Corps.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

FOOD PRODUCTION

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to offer some constructive suggestions as to how best to help win this war on the agricultural front. Secretary Wickard not only has the responsibility to the farm people but he is charged with the responsibility of furnishing food to the 132,000,000 of our own country, but millions in foreign lands. When one realizes that the increased industrial activities incident to the war, and the increasing of the armed forces are gradually reducing the supply of farm labor, one can readily see that his problems are being constantly increased. I note in a Government report a few days ago that there was a 28-percent reduction in available farm labor in the United States during the year, and that some States like New York had a 50-percent reduction.

To obtain the correct picture of our food production we must realize that Chicago is the agricultural capital of the world. In a comparatively few States in the Midwest we have the great bulk of the Nation's agricultural production. Here we have the great production of livestock and livestock products that are so necessary to carry on the war. Here we have 20 percent of the commercial hogs coming from one State, Iowa. Here in a comparatively small area we have over 50 percent of the dairy production of the Nation. The following article, by Marshall Andrews, in the May 30 Washington Post, shows the activities in regard to furnishing food for the Army at Chicago:

OUR NEW ARMY

(By Marshall Andrews)

CHICAGO, ILL., May 29.—The story of eggs is a fine example of what they do here at the Chicago Quartermaster Depot to give badly needed ships more carrying capacity. Eggs are difficult to handle in transit; they are bulky and heavy and fragile and must be refrigerated to prevent spoilage and a great part of them is waste when they finally reach the company cook's tent behind the front.

A case of eggs weighs 55 pounds, of which an appreciable proportion is shells, fillers, case, and moisture. The same case of eggs dried weighs only 10 pounds and is packed in a tin container weighing only a few ounces.

The case of whole eggs takes up 3,744 cubic inches of shipping space. Dried, the case of eggs requires only 640 cubic inches of space, so you can pack 6 cases of dried eggs into the space needed for 1 case of whole eggs and not bother about packing them so none will be broken. What's more, the dried eggs can be shipped in the vessel's cargo hold, whereas the whole eggs would require refrigeration with the additional weight and bulk of insulation and ice.

In the cook's hands dried eggs can be treated exactly as whole eggs, except that they can't be served sunny side up, boiled, or poached. And he has no question of garbage disposal to worry about; his soldiers can eat everything but the can.

There are two factors that should be considered at this time in connection with this food program:

First. We have the Appropriations Committee considering the wisdom of appropriating millions of dollars to increase the O. P. A. to 90,000 employees.

Second. We have the Civil Service Committee considering the bill (H. R. 7071) to increase by $300 per annum the salary of all civilian employees for the duration and 6 months thereafter. This would call for an annual appropriation of over $580,000,000 for all employees. This increase of salary was merited by postal employees and other low-salaried groups before the recent advance in the cost of living. I think there is sufficient educational, scientific, and practical knowledge available in our land to hold down the cost of living if we let them operate.

How can this be done? Though the dehydration of foods has been followed since ancient times, the widespread practice of dehydration has made great progress during the past few years. The splendid efforts of the Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry of the United States Department of Agriculture is bearing fruit. Shipping space is also entering into the picture in the demand for dehydrated food.

Let us consider the question of dehydrated milk. This product has been dehydrated for 40 years, but it has been only the past few years that its import has been appreciated. There are about 11.78 pounds of powdered whole milk obtained from 100 pounds of normal milk. Up to the present time this has been used largely as baby food, for Red Cross, but now it is being produced for our armed forces and also for lease-lend. Twelve million pounds were exported last year. This product for export is packed under pressure in 1- or 5-pound cans, and it is said to keep for at least a year. For domestic use it could be packed in waxpaper containers if handled on a dated basis the same as coffee, eggs, or other dated food products. What would be the result?

In Washington it costs 8 cents to buy a glass of milk, even in the new House restaurant. What does the producer in the natural dairy sections of our country obtain for this amount of milk? Just about 1 cent for the glassful. Here we have the producer receiving 12½ percent of the consumer's dollar. I realize that milk in the immediate vicinity of Washington is bringing more than 1 cent per glass, and I do not want to enter into a discussion of the local milk problems. Could the milk be sold at 5 cents per glass? Could the price of milk be reduced to the consumer by 25 percent? Would this benefit the low-income groups? Would this be a means of reducing the cost of living? While this product has never been obtainable on the shelves of the grocery stores of our country, why should not it be made available at this time?

Let us take separated or skim milk. Around 8 pounds are obtained from 100 pounds of separated milk. Federal agencies are now paying about 13 cents per pound for this product, and a pound will make about 6 quarts of normal separated milk. This is not only used in cooking extensively but is used as the base for many chocolate milk drinks. It is a very desirable food product and merits a wider use than it has ever enjoyed. Why has not this product appeared on the grocer's shelves? Why is this not available to the public in pound paper bags? Many dietitians contend that 25 percent of the consumer dollar should be used in the purchase of dairy

products. Have we not the responsibility of urging the necessary agencies to provide this most necessary food at reasonable prices? The 17 to 31 percent increase of production of 1941 over 1940 Wisconsin dairy products indicates the possibilities of the vast reservoir of milk that is available when and if the producer can obtain anywhere near production costs.

If you consider the possibilities of a constructive food program, you will first question whether it is necessary to increase the autocratic bureaucrats at this time. You will conclude that instead of getting tough we better adopt a philosophy of getting some common sense, and make use of scientific and practical facts already available for the best interest of our country. The American people do not want to be shoved around when it is not necessary, and we should go slow on the gauleiter and Gestapo approach to controlling the food program when it is not necessary and does not obtain the results desired.

Second, I am sure you will conclude that we can reduce the demand and necessity of blanket salary increases for Federal employees that come under the $3,000 to $75,000 brackets, if we use the scientific knowledge and practical experience that is available at this time. If we wish to sustain the President in his food program and provide a parity ceiling as he suggests, we must consider an approach to the food program in that light.

ANOTHER WRONG APPROACH

Mr. Speaker, it has been well said that the two most important issues today are, first, to win the war, and, second, to get the facts.

I think that due to the unfavorable publicity which was heaped upon Members of Congress as a result of the administration-sponsored "pension grab" legislation and in view of the bungling methods of the price-control bureaucrats in the issuing of the gasoline ration cards, it would be well to call your attention to the newest proposed raid on the United States Treasury. H. R. 7071 would require an additional appropriation of over $580,000,000 per year for the 1,935,000 Federal employees. This legislation is known as H. R. 7071 and is said "to provide temporary additional compensation for civilian employees of the Governments of the United States and of the District of Columbia." Please note it says civilian, not military employees. It is granted that every Member is familiar with the injustices that exist as far as compensation is concerned to certain groups of Federal employees. This group includes the Postal Service, guards and others who have not had the pressure to obtain fair and just consideration. This proposed bill, however, is going to provide not only $300 per annum increase for the groups that are deserving of it, but apparently it will make this same provision of increased salary applicable to Members of Congress, Judges of the Supreme Court, the Cabinet, and the President. Are you looking for another pensions-for-Congress episode?

While changes may be made in this proposed legislation, I am sure that it would be a very unwise procedure at this time, to have the people of our country even think that we would consider a bill like H. R. 7071. We have continually refused to provide an adequate old-age pension plan. These elderly people are equally affected by increased living costs as well as Government employees.

We have seen thousands upon thousands of small businessmen like garage and filling-station operators either ruined or their business being operated at a loss. We have millions of laboring men and white-collar workers that have fixed salaries with no increased compensation. They have accepted the increased cost of living, and they surely will not look with favor on increases of Federal salaries in the $3,000 to $75,000 brackets.

We spent hours of debate in deciding whether the military forces of our country should have an increase of $8 in their base pay and that has not as yet become law. Here we are with a bill to provide a $25 per month increase, a blanket increase if you please, to groups who are getting from $3,000 to $75,000 a year.

The introduction of such a bill is contrary to the spirit of the people at this time. They would like to see a reduction in the salaries of Federal employees who come under the higher income brackets. Let us have legislation presented that is fair to the low-income groups that are entitled to consideration but let us have this legislation passed on the basis of just ordinary good common sense and not the kind that is found in H. R. 7071. A good way to have the confidence of our people is to have the administration-sponsored bills, at least, comply to the wishes of the people and based on common justice. We must always keep in mind that every employee of the Government, whoever he is, is able to divorce himself from the Government pay roll if he so desires. It is not a difficult end to attain.

I think we should all appreciate the fact that the people themselves are getting rather sick of all these schemes continually presented by administration spokesmen that take care of the few at the expense of the many. This would be a good chance for us to "lock the door before the horse is stolen."

Let us for once and for all assure the American people that our interest is for legislation to win the war, and that we want the facts upon which to base our action toward this end. So there can be no mistake as to the extent of the bill H. R. 7071, I will read its contents in full:

H. R. 7071

A bill to provide temporary additional compensation for civilian employees of the Governments of the United States and of the District of Columbia

Be it enacted, etc., That immediately upon approval of this act all civilian employees of the Governments of the United States and of the District of Columbia shall receive additional compensation at the rate of $300 per annum.

SEC. 2. Employees engaged on piecework, or by the hour, or at per diem rates, shall receive the additional compensation provided in this act prorated on the basis of regular working hours. Substitutes in the service of the United States or of the District of Columbia shall receive the additional compensation provided in this act on the proportional basis of time worked.

SEC. 3. In order to pay the additional compensation provided in this act, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such amounts as are necessary.

SEC. 4. This act shall remain in full effect for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURRAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman state whether or not it is a fact, insofar as he knows, that some of the very finest candies placed on the market in this country contain a cream center made of powdered milk products?

Mr. MURRAY. Some of the more famous candies, as I understand, use powdered cream. The powdered cream is used for the centers of high-quality candies.

Mr. CRAWFORD. They produce a powdered cream and then transfer that to the candy manufacturers, who put it in high-priced candies.

Mr. MURRAY. As I understand it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered before the Foreign Affairs Committee this morning by His Excellency, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Luxembourg, Joseph Bech. I also ask unanimous consent to include a short biographical sketch of Mr. Bech.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Dr. Nicholas Murray Butler at the one hundred and eighty-eighth commencement of Columbia University, June 2, 1942, on The American Plan To Prevent War.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an item on the better use of physically handicapped persons.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

NEW DEAL POLICIES TO BLAME FOR SUGAR SHORTAGE

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, the same lack of foresight has been displayed by the administration in its handling of the sugar situation as was the case with alu-

minum and rubber. The current sugar shortage is the result of failure on the part of officials in the Federal Government to provide for increased production of sugar in the United States, as they were urged to do.

Last year Government officials told the American consumers that sugar supplies were ample and that rumors concerning a pending shortage were without basis of fact. Defense officials declared that they were prepared to avert a buying panic should the situation get out of hand.

It is a record which should be examined by every American citizen, for only through the force of an aroused public opinion will similar mistakes with other commodities be averted in the future. Here is the record and the results:

On December 13, 1940, the Agriculture Department announced that domestic beet sugar acreage in 1941 would be reduced 16.2 percent, or from 979,000 acres to 820,000 acres. Previous to this, the mainland cane area had been cut drastically.

In the 1940 annual report the Secretary of Agriculture observed that sugar is one of our agricultural imports that can be produced in the United States. He boasted how the operation of the ever-normal granary as applied to sugar had protected consumers and farmers during the past year.

On February 20, 1941, Miss Harriet Elliott, Consumer Commissioner of the National Defense Advisory Commission, issued the following statement:

Rumors of sugar shortage, sugar rationing, and price increases have no basis of fact and are entirely unwarranted. Existing stocks of sugar readily available to consumers in the United States are now considerably larger than usual. If necessary, sugar production can be expanded materially in domestic areas as well as in nearby foreign areas. Cuba has large surplus stocks of sugar currently because of the drastic curtailment of European markets.

On April 19, 1941, the Agricultural Sugar Division announced that it had looked into the international situation and had decided that there was no need for increasing domestic production. Press release by Agriculture Department stated:

In view of the developments in the international situation and in the sugar market during recent months officials had been considering the advisability of increasing 1941 production allotments, but that because of the availability of large reserve stocks in some of the domestic areas, as well as in nearby foreign areas, it had been decided to maintain the allotments at their present level.

Vice President HENRY A. WALLACE, on May 27, 1941, made the following statement:

In this war, thanks to the ever-normal granary and the efficiency of modern farm production, we can approach the problem more constructively than during the last war. There seems little likelihood that we shall have meatless days, or days without sugar. Apparently, we shall not have to cut down on our own food needs in order to make sure that there is a surplus to send to our friends across the sea.

Two days after the attack upon Pearl Harbor we were again assured that there were ample supplies of all foods.

On December 12, 1941, the Washington Post reports Government officials as saying that—

Supplies of sugar, the bulk of which is obtained from offshore producing areas, continue ample for months ahead—officials conceded—that the war in the Pacific may cut off supplies from the Philippines. They expressed a firm belief, nevertheless, that sufficient supplies could be secured from Cuba, Puerto Rico, and South America, as well as from domestic production of cane and beets.

On December 27, 1941, R. M. Evans, the man who was in charge of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for the past several years, assured us that there were ample food supplies, that there would be no rationing, because we had planned it that way.

On January 18, 1942, the Secretary of Agriculture was forced to announce the existence of a sugar shortage. On January 25, 1942, Leon Henderson announced that rationing plans for sugar were being drawn up and would be put into operation within the next few weeks.

In December of 1940 we gave our promise to the world that we would become the arsenal of democracy, but it was not until late in 1941 that our officials started to get excited about where they were going to get ethyl alcohol. They found we were short between 50,000,000 and 100,000,000 gallons of alcohol with the industry running at about capacity. This is just about the amount that will be needed for smokeless-powder production.

The administration suddenly found out what many have known for a long time—that surplus farm products could be used in the production of industrial alcohol. On August 13, 1941, the Secretary of Agriculture announced that the Commodity Credit Corporation offered to make 20,000,000 bushels of Government-owned corn available to the War Department for the production of alcohol to be used in the manufacture of munitions. However, it was not until January 15, 1942, that actual plans for the sale of corn by the Commodity Credit Corporation to processors for the production of alcohol were announced by the Department of Agriculture.

As a result of this bungling and confusion, sugar is badly needed and every household in America is being rationed.

MORE GUN BARRELS AND LESS PORK BARRELS

In wartime we will have to change our system of scarcity to one of plenty. These huge checks to large sugar corporations and large landowners to restrict food production will have to cease. Some sugar corporations have received more than $500,000 in annual benefits out of the United States Treasury. Large landowners, especially those located in the South, have received more than $50,000 in annual farm benefits.

The policy of the administration has been to pay out these huge checks to sugar corporations to raise less sugar. According to figures of the Department of Agriculture in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 20, 1942, the following corporations received the largest sugar benefits:

Luce & Co., Puerto Rico	$614,643.01
Fajardo Growers, Puerto Rico	528,839.15
Oahu Sugar Co., Hawaii	510,062.64
U. S. Sugar Corporation, Florida	470,007.41
Eastern Associates, Puerto Rico	447,959.73
Waialua Agriculture Co., Hawaii	444,225.97
Ewa Plantation Co., Hawaii	443,021.49

Give the American farmers the home markets, parity prices, and remove the restrictions, and they will produce the food that will win the war.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

COMMODITY PURCHASES FOR LEND-LEASE RELIEF AND OTHER REQUIREMENTS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, following the remarks of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], I have been informed by the Department of Agriculture that since March 15 and continuing through to April 30, 1942, there have been purchased for lend-lease relief and other requirements the following:

Evaporated milk, 33,503,985 cases;
Condensed milk, 11,000 cases;
Cheese, 306,142,317 pounds;
Dry skim milk, 127,870,690 pounds;
Dry whole milk, 4,187,500 pounds;
Dry eggs, 15C,807,805 pounds;
Frozen eggs, 66,189,370 pounds; and
Shell eggs, 1,984,026 cases.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is sufficient proof to demonstrate to our people the enormous volume of dry skim milk and dry whole milk, which is now being produced in this country and being shipped to other countries under lend-lease operations, and consumed by our people. This is a product which I have used more or less for some time and I find it as satisfactory in every respect as liquid milk as delivered by the dairies to the back door of the homes of this country, whether it be skimmed milk or whole milk depending, of course, upon the richness you desire and whether it is for cooking or drinking purposes.

The waste or unnecessary cost involved in delivering fluid milk is a matter which will have to be given serious attention in the post-war period, because of the economies that can be effected through the production and distribution of dry skim milk and dry whole milk. I am sure this dry product will prove entirely satisfactory to millions of our people.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include two brief addresses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted to—

Mr. SMITH of West Virginia, indefinitely, on account of illness.

Mr. GAVAGAN, on account of illness.

Mr. RIVERS, indefinitely, on account of illness.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly

enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2730. An act for the relief of Dorothy Silva;

H. R. 3488. An act to provide that assistant or deputy heads of certain bureaus in the Department of the Interior shall be appointed under the civil-service laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4999. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by the Columbia Boat and Barge System, Inc.;

H. R. 5438. An act for the relief of the San Diego Gas & Electric Co.;

H. R. 5778. An act for the relief of Luther Herbert Tench and Mrs. Mildred Farmer Tench;

H. R. 6502. An act to change the name of the Black Warrior National Forest to the William B. Bankhead National Forest; and

H. R. 6646. An act to provide that the unexplained absence of any individual for 7 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly, at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m., the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 4, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Thursday, June 4, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearing in connection with the Federal Communications Commission.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 o'clock a. m. Tuesday, June 16, 1942.

Business to be considered: H. R. 7002—"To increase agricultural purchasing power and to meet the need of combating malnutrition among the people of low income by defining and making certain a reasonable definition and standard for nonfat dry milk solids."

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Census on Thursday, June 4, 1942, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of H. R. 7154.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 11, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 7105, to provide for the suspension, during the war of operating differential subsidy agreements and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1710. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to establish additional commissioned warrant and warrant grades in the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

1711. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1712. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated March 19, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration on a review of reports on the Miami River, Fla., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on March 26, 1940; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HARE: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 7181. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 303, 1943, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2200). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 7182. A bill making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2201). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico: Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation. H. R. 6904. A bill for the relief of the Bridgeport Irrigation District; with amendment (Rept. No. 2202). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BLAND: Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries. H. R. 7100. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore on the Great Lakes during 1942," approved January 27, 1942 (Public Law, 416, 77th Cong.), to continue it in force during the existing war; without amendment (Rept. No. 2203). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 7159. A bill authorizing the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2204). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURCH: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. S. 2459. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes," to permit payment of total compensation to certain employees of the Postal Service employed in a dual capacity; without amendment (Rept. No. 2205). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 499. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 7181, a bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2206). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 7183. A bill to amend section 2 of the act approved October 30, 1941 (Public Law, 287, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), so as to authorize transportation for the dependents of Reserve and retired personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps upon release from active duty from their last duty stations to their homes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 7184. A bill to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HILL of Washington:

H. J. Res. 322. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim October 9, 1942, as Leif Erikson Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 498. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 7159, authorizing the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BECKWORTH:

H. R. 7185. A bill for the relief of Mrs. James Q. Mattox; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BISHOP:

H. R. 7186. A bill for the relief of Paul A. Frick; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOOK:

H. R. 7187. A bill for the relief of George A. Curry; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

2999. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition of Ella K. Theobald, secretary, and 55 others, members of the Francis Willard Bible Class of the First Methodist Church of Flora, Ill., urging an early passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3000. By Mr. JARRETT: Petition of Mrs. Emma Collins, of Oil City, Pa., and other members of the Bethel Methodist Church of Oil City, Pa., protesting against priority rights to beer delivery trucks and depriving milk deliveries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3001. Also, petition of Mrs. Walter D. Johns and other members of Bethel Methodist Church of Oil City, protesting against priority rights to beer delivery trucks and depriving milk delivery; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3002. Also, petition of Mrs. Joseph Ritz, of Oil City, Pa., and other members of the Bethel Methodist Church of Oil City, Pa., protesting against priority rights to beer delivery trucks and depriving milk deliveries; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3003. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Rev. J. R. Daughtery, pastor of McLouth Baptist Church, and 26 others, asking for legislation which will provide the best protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the influence of vice and alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3004. Also, petition of Alma Sanders, of McLouth Methodist Church, and 51 others, asking for legislation which will provide the best protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the influence of vice and alcoholic liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3005. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of Edna M. Souers, of New Philadelphia, and several hundred residents of Central Ohio, urging the enactment of legislation prohibiting the diversion of grains, useful for foods so necessary to the maintenance of health standards of our Nation and of our Allies, for the manufacture of liquors which are deleterious to physical and mental well-being; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3006. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Mrs. A. W. Hinderman and other citizens of Louisa and Washington Counties, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860, providing for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3007. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition signed by Kathryn E. Otjera, of West Toledo, Ohio, and 14 other residents of Monroe County, Mich., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3008. Also, petition forwarded by Mrs. J. M. Schultz, of LaSalle, Mich., and signed by 51 other residents of Monroe County, Mich., urging enactment of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3009. By Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER: Petition of Thomas W. Lengel and 49 other residents of the Sixteenth Congressional District and numerous other residents of the city of New York, favoring legislation providing for a national lottery and to provide funds for use by the relief associations of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3010. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the hatters union, Local No. 31, United Hatters, Cap and Millinery Workers' International Union, San Francisco, Calif., relative to House bill 6486, a bill to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3011 By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Pine Street Methodist Church of Williamsport, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 1942

The Reverend Howard S. Wilkinson, D. D., rector, St. Thomas' Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Eternal God, through whose mighty power our fathers won their liberties of old, while we offer our petitions for the President and the people of this land, that they may always be mindful of Thy favor and glad to do Thy will, we beseech Thee especially to hear us in behalf of these Thy servants, Members of the United States Senate. Direct them in all their deliberations and in every action, to the advancement of Thy glory and the welfare of this country. Give them vision to see and courage to do whatever may be right in this time of national and world crisis.

Overrule the forces of tyranny and uphold, we pray Thee, those who are struggling for the maintenance of justice and human liberty. Let Thy Divine compassion be with the suffering, the sorrowing, and the dying in all lands and with the homeless refugees driven forth by cruelty and oppression.

Strengthen and protect all those who, at home or abroad, are serving this country or our Allies, that they may be preserved evermore in all perils.

Hasten the advent of a righteous and lasting peace and the establishment of Thy kingdom. Then, to Thy name shall be the glory and the honor, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 1, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills and joint resolution of the Senate:

S. 221. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Beacon Oyster Co., the Point Wharf Oyster Co., and B. J. Rooks & Son;

S. 244. An act for the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.;

S. 1044. An act for the relief of L. H. Goodman;

S. 1648. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Shaver Forwarding Co., of Portland, Oreg.;

S. 1732. An act for the relief of Max Miller and Vera Caroline Miller, and others;

S. 1756. An act for the relief of Franklin Benjamin McNew;

S. 1820. An act for the relief of Jerry McKinley Thompson;

S. 2037. An act for the relief of Edgar B. Dunlap;

S. 2069. An act for the relief of the Quimby-Ryan Engineering Sales Co., Inc.;

S. 2103. An act to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, so as to authorize citizens of foreign countries who are graduates of Air Corps advanced flying schools and Air Corps service schools to wear aviation badges;

S. 2235. An act for the relief of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher;

S. 2251. An act for the relief of Charles Brauch;

S. 2278. An act for the relief of Bob Sampley;

S. 2318. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo;

S. 2354. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George M. Legg and Loetta Trainer;

S. 2451. An act for the relief of Anthony W. Livingston;

S. 2452. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Coast Guard and the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

S. 2453. An act to authorize the obligation of funds of the Coast Guard for work or material at Government-owned establishments, and for other purposes;

S. 2469. An act for the relief of William Edward Fleming;

S. 2470. An act for the relief of Eileen Collins Treacy;

S. 2490. An act to amend th Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941 (Public Law, 8, 77th Cong.), as amended by section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1941 (Public Law, 166, 77th Cong.); and

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution for the relief of W. K. Richardson.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 2048. An act for the relief of Lt. William Stewart Walker; and

S. 2427. An act to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2309) for the relief of the First National Bank, of Huntsville, Tex., with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4845) to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $30 to $40 per month, to grant such rate at age 65, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 315) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect of meat-packing establishments engaged in intrastate commerce only, in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat food products by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6802) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 34 to the bill, and concurred therein.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolutions, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 180. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia to hear,

determine, and render judgment upon the claim of O. T. Travis;

H. R. 622. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render final judgment on any and all claims of whatsoever nature the Snake or Paiute Indians of the former Malheur Indian Reservation of Oregon, or any band thereof, may have against the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 780. An act for the relief of Harvey C. Artis;

H. R. 888. An act for the relief of Charles Thomason, administrator of the estate of Iverson Thomason and the relief of L. D. Byrd, Jr.;

H. R. 1675. An act for the relief of L. W. Collins;

H. R. 1740. An act for the relief of Luther Chitty and Susie Chitty;

H. R. 2755. An act authorizing the President of the United States to reinstate Wallace F. Safford to the position and rank of captain in the Army of the United States;

H. R. 3173. An act to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to Mrs. Charles O. DeFord;

H. R. 3352. An act for the relief of Alice W. Miller;

H. R. 3402. An act for the relief of Catherine R. Johnson;

H. R. 4242. An act for the relief of the Corbitt Co.;

H. R. 4741. An act for the relief of the Midwest Oil Co.;

H. R. 4804. An act for the relief of Claud R. Johnston;

H. R. 5526. An act for the relief of James E. Savage;

H. R. 5610. An act for the relief of G. H. Condon, M. E. Cannon, W. J. Esterle, C. C. Gasaway, James F. Retallack, and L. G. Yinger;

H. R. 5714. An act for the relief of William H. Cogswell, Jr.;

H. R. 5819. An act directing the Attorney General to record the lawful admittance for permanent residence of Vivian Chang;

H. R. 5898. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard Almas;

H. R. 5938. An act for the relief of A. H. Larzelere;

H. R. 5957. An act to provide compensation for Mrs. Marion Yarnott for injuries sustained by her in a collision between a United States mail truck and a car in which she was riding as a passenger on May 23, 1940, in Venice, Calif., and to appropriate money therefor, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6077. An act for the relief of Edward P. Reilly;

H. R. 6081. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to promote on the retired list officers who were decorated and recommended for promotion for distinguished service during the World War and who have not attained the rank to which recommended," so as to confer on officers above the rank of brigadier general the same retirement privileges now enjoyed by other officers;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. E. P. Ball;

H. R. 6349. An act for the relief of Jeff Roberts;

H. R. 6410. An act for the relief of Alex Gamble;

H. R. 6421. An act for the relief of Arch A. Brown;

H. R. 6484. An act to suspend during the present war the running of statutes of limitations applicable to certain offenses;

H. R. 6510. An act for the relief of L. H. Miller;

H. R. 6545. An act for the relief of Spencer Meeks;

H. R. 6569. An act for the relief of William M. Miller;

H. R. 6597. An act for the relief of A. Mack Dodd and Henry Dodd;

H. R. 6598. An act for the relief of Leanna M. Stright;

H. R. 6629. An act for the relief of the estate of Paul W. Layman;

H. R. 6676. An act for the relief of F. A. Holmes, former United States disbursing clerk for the State of Illinois;

H. R. 6682. An act to suspend in part the processing tax on coconut oil;

H. R. 6921. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to authorize payments in cases where farmers' crops are acquired, prior to harvest, in connection with the acquisition of their farms for use in the national war effort, and to provide for the division of such payments;

H. R. 7020. An act amending Public Law No. 100, Seventy-seventh Congress (approved June 3, 1941);

H. R. 7159. An act authorizing the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7182. An act making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 319. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Bulgaria and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same;

H. J. Res. 320. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Hungary and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same; and

H. J. Res. 321. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Rumania and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2730. An act for the relief of Dorothy Silva;

H. R. 3488. An act to provide that assistant or deputy heads of certain bureaus in the Department of the Interior shall be appointed under the civil-service laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4999. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by the Columbia Boat and Barge System, Inc.;

H. B. 5438. An act for the relief of the San Diego Gas & Electric Co.;

H. R. 5778. An act for the relief of Luther Herbert Tench and Mrs. Mildred Farmer Tench;

H. R. 6502. An act to change the name of the Black Warrior National Forest to the William B. Bankhead National Forest; and

H. R. 6646. An act to provide that the unexplained absence of any individual for 7 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolutions were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 180. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of O. T. Travis;

H. R. 780. An act for the relief of Harvey C. Artis;

H. R. 888. An act for the relief of Charles Thomason, administrator of the estate of Iverson Thomason and the relief of L. D. Byrd, Jr.;

H. R. 1675. An act for the relief of L. W. Collins;

H. R. 1740. An act for the relief of Luther Chitty and Susie Chitty;

H. R. 3173. An act to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to Mrs. Charles O. DeFord;

H. R. 3352. An act for the relief of Alice W. Miller;

H. R. 3402. An act for the relief of Catherine R. Johnson;

H. R. 4242. An act for the relief of the Corbitt Co.;

H. R. 4741. An act for the relief of the Midwest Oil Co.;

H. R. 4804. An act for the relief of Claud R. Johnston;

H. R. 5526. An act for the relief of James E. Savage;

H. R. 5610. An act for the relief of G. H. Condon, M. E. Cannon, W. J. Esterle, C. C. Gasaway, James F. Retallack, and L. G. Yinger;

H. R. 5714. An act for the relief of William H. Cogswell, Jr.;

H. R. 5898. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Leonard Almas;

H. R. 5938. An act for the relief of A. H. Larzelere;

H. R. 5957. An act to provide compensation for Mrs. Marion Yarnott for injuries sustained by her in a collision between a United States mail truck and a car in which she was riding as a passenger on May 23, 1940, in Venice, Calif., and to appropriate money therefor, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6077. An act for the relief of Edward P. Reilly;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. E. P. Ball;

H. R. 6349. An act for the relief of Jeff Roberts;

H. R. 6410. An act for the relief of Alex Gamble;

H. R. 6421. An act for the relief of Arch A. Brown;

H. R. 6510. An act for the relief of L. H. Miller;

H. R. 6545. An act for the relief of Spencer Meeks;

H. R. 6569. An act for the relief of William M. Miller;

H. R. 6597. An act for the relief of A. Mack Dodd and Henry Dodd;

H. R. 6598. An act for the relief of Leanna M. Stright;

H. R. 6629. An act for the relief of the estate of Paul W. Layman; and

H. R. 6676. An act for the relief of F. A. Holmes, former United States disbursing clerk for the State of Illinois; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 622. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, adjudicate, and render final judgment on any and all claims of whatsoever nature the Snake or Paiute Indians of the former Malheur Indian Reservation of Oregon, or any band thereof, may have against the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 2755. An act authorizing the President of the United States to reinstate Wallace F. Safford to the position and rank of captain in the Army of the United States;

H. R. 6081. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to promote on the retired list officers who were decorated and recommended for promotion for distinguished service during the World War and who have not attained the rank to which recommended," so as to confer on officers above the rank of brigadier general the same retirement privileges now enjoyed by other officers; and

H. R. 7020. An act amending Public Law No. 100, Seventy-seventh Congress (approved June 3, 1941); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 5819. An act directing the Attorney General to record the lawful admittance for permanent residence of Vivian Chang; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 6484. An act to suspend during the present war the running of statutes of limitations applicable to certain offenses; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6682. An act to suspend in part the processing tax on coconut oil; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 6821. An act to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to authorize payments in cases where farmers' crops are acquired, prior to harvest, in connection with the acquisition of their farms for use in the national war effort, and to provide for the division of such payments; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 7182. An act making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 7159. An act authorizing the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. J. Res. 319. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Bulgaria and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same;

H. J. Res. 320. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Hungary and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same; and

H. J. Res. 321. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Rumania and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

RECOGNITION OF STATE OF WAR BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND BULGARIA, HUNGARY, AND RUMANIA

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read by the legislative clerk and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

The Governments of Bulgaria, Hungary, and Rumania have declared war against the United States. I realize that the three Governments took this action not upon their own initiative or in response to the wishes of their own peoples but as the instruments of Hitler. These three Governments are now engaged in military activities directed against the United Nations and are planning an extension of these activities.

Therefore, I recommend that the Congress recognize a state of war between the United States and Bulgaria, between the United States and Hungary, and between the United States and Rumania.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 2, 1942.*

DECLARATION OF STATE OF WAR WITH BULGARIA

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, House Joint Resolution 319 having been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, I am authorized by that committee to report the joint resolution back to the Senate with the recommendation that it do pass. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution, and, while making this request, I ask that unanimous consent be granted to cover the immediate consideration of all three joint resolutions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas for unanimous consent with regard to the three joint resolutions? The Chair hears none.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 319) declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Bulgaria and the Government and the people of the United States, and making provisions to prosecute the same, which was read, as follows:

Whereas the Government of Bulgaria has formally declared war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the state of war between the United States and the Government of Bulgaria which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Government of Bulgaria; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution having been read three times, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOXEY (when Mr. BILBO's name was called). The senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. BREWSTER's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] has been called from the city on official business of the Senate. I am authorized to say that if present he would vote "yea" on each of the three joint resolutions.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I understand that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. Therefore I am free to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BANKHEAD (when Mr. HILL's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] is necessarily absent on public business. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. HOLMAN (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], who is absent on public business. I am advised that if he were present he would vote as I am about to vote. I am, therefore, at liberty to vote, and vote "yea."

Mr. ELLENDER (when Mr. OVERTON's name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. McKELLAR (when Mr. STEWART's name was called). Mr. President, as stated by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], my colleague [Mr. STEWART] is paired with him. My colleague is unavoidably absent on public business. If present he would vote "yea" on the pending joint resolution. As a matter of fact, he is on a train which should have arrived in Washington before this time, but the train is late. He is returning to Washington especially for this vote.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri (when Mr. TRUMAN's name was called). My colleague, the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], is unavoidably detained from the Senate by reason of his duties on the Senate committee of which he is chairman. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I am advised that, if present and voting, he would vote as I propose to vote. Therefore, I am at liberty to vote, and vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN] is necessarily absent from the city on official business. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. AUSTIN. The junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] has been detained by reason of a death in his father's family. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

All these Senators would vote "yea" if present.

Mr. GLASS. I have a general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. Being informed that if present he would vote as I intend to vote, I am free to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that my colleague [Mr. CHANDLER] is unavoidably absent from the city. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. TYDINGS. My colleague [Mr. RADCLIFFE] is necessarily absent from the Chamber. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. LUCAS. I am authorized to announce that the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is unavoidably absent on business of the Senate. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. KILGORE. I announce that the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER] is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is necessarily absent from the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained in his State on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is detained on important public business.

I am advised that if present and voting, all the Senators whose absences I have announced would vote "yea."

Mr. HERRING. My colleague the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is detained temporarily at the Naval Hospital. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. McFARLAND. I am informed that the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER] is absent on public business. I am advised that if present he would vote "yea" on the pending joint resolution.

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—73

Aiken	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Hayden	Pepper
Austin	Herring	Russell
Bankhead	Holman	Schwartz
Barbour	Hughes	Shipstead
Barkley	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Brooks	Kilgore	Spencer
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McCarran	Tobey
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	McNary	Vandenberg
Davis	Maloney	Van Nuys
Doxey	Maybank	Wagner
Ellender	Mead	Walsh
George	Millikin	Wheeler
Gerry	Murdock	White
Glass	Murray	Wiley
Green	Norris	Willis
Guffey	Nye	
Gurney	O'Daniel	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—23

Bailey	Butler	Radcliffe
Ball	Chandler	Reed
Bilbo	Danaher	Reynolds
Brewster	Downey	Rosier
Bridges	Gillette	Stewart
Brown	Hill	Truman
Bulow	Lodge	Wallgren
Bunker	Overton	

So the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 319) was passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

DECLARATION OF STATE OF WAR WITH HUNGARY

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, with reference to House Joint Resolution 320, declaring the fact that a state of war exists between the Government of Hungary and that of the United States, I am authorized by the Committee on Foreign Relations to report the resolution to the Senate with a recommendation that it pass. Consent has already been given for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Consent has been given for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 320) declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Hungary and the Government and people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same, which was read, as follows:

Whereas the Government of Hungary has formally declared war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the state of war between the United States and the Government of Hungary which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Government of Hungary; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution having been read three times, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOXEY (when Mr. BILBO's name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is unavoidably detained. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. VANDENBERG (when Mr. BROWN's name was called). I again announce the unavoidable absence from the city on official business of my colleague, the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN]. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BARKLEY (when Mr. CHANDLER'S name was called). Making the same announcement regarding the unavoidable absence of my colleague as on the previous roll call, I wish to announce that if present he would vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called.) I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. The senior Senator from Kentucky has just announced that if present his colleague would vote as I intend to vote. I am therefore at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement of my pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] as on the previous roll call, I vote "yea."

Mr. BANKHEAD (when Mr. HILL's name was called). Making the same announcement as to the absence of my colleague, Mr. HILL, as on the previous vote, I announce that if present he would vote "yea."

Mr. HOLMAN (when his name was called). I again announce my pair, as on the previous roll call, with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. If present the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," as I intend to vote. Therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. ELLENDER (when Mr. OVERTON's name was called). I make the same announcement as on the previous roll call as to the absence of my colleague, Mr. OVERTON.

Mr. KILGORE (when Mr. ROSIER's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER] is unavoidably absent. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. TYDINGS (when Mr. RADCLIFFE's name was called). Making the same announcement as on the previous vote regarding my colleague the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], I wish to say that if present he would vote "yea."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri (when Mr. TRUMAN's name was called). Making the same announcement as to the absence of my colleague the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], I wish to announce that if present he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as stated by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], my colleague the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] is paired with him. My colleague is unavoidably absent on public business. If present he would vote "yea" on the pending joint resolution. As a matter of fact, he is on a train which should have been in Washington before this time, but the train has not yet arrived. He started back to Washington especially for this vote.

Mr. McFARLAND. I am informed that the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER] is absent on public business, and that if present he would vote "yea" on the pending joint resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is necessarily absent from the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained in his State on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is detained on important public business.

I am advised that if present and voting, all the Senators whose absences I have announced, would vote "yea."

Mr. WHITE. I again announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. WAGNER. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED]. I understand that if present he would vote as I propose to vote. I am therefore free to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. BONE. My colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], is unavoidably detained on important public business. If present he would vote "yea."

Mr. HERRING. My colleague the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is detained temporarily at the naval hospital. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Nebraska, [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

All these Senators would vote "yea" if present.

The junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] has been detained by reason of a death in his father's family. If present and voting he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—73

Aiken	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Hayden	Pepper
Austin	Herring	Russell
Bankhead	Holman	Schwartz
Barbour	Hughes	Shipstead
Barkley	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Brooks	Kilgore	Spencer
Burton	La Follette	Taft
Byrd	Langer	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lee	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McCarran	Tobey
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tydings
Connally	McNary	Vandenberg
Davis	Maloney	Van Nuys
Doxey	Maybank	Wagner
Ellender	Mead	Walsh
George	Millikin	Wheeler
Gerry	Murdock	White
Glass	Murray	Wiley
Green	Norris	Willis
Guffey	Nye	
Gurney	O'Daniel	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—23

Bailey	Butler	Radcliffe
Ball	Chandler	Reed
Bilbo	Danaher	Reynolds
Brewster	Downey	Rosier
Bridges	Gillette	Stewart
Brown	Hill	Truman
Bulow	Lodge	Wallgren
Bunker	Overton	

So the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 320) was passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

DECLARATION OF A STATE OF WAR WITH RUMANIA

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, House Joint Resolution 321, acknowledging the existence of a state of war which had heretofore been declared on the United States by the Government of Rumania, having been referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, I am authorized by that committee to report the joint resolution back to the Senate with the recommendation that it do pass.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Unanimous consent was granted earlier for the consideration of the joint resolution.

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 321) declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Rumania and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same, which was read, as follows:

Whereas the Government of Rumania has formally declared war against the Government and the people of the United States of America: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the state of war between the United States and the Government of Rumania which has thus been thrust upon the United States is hereby formally declared; and the President is hereby authorized and directed to employ the entire naval and military forces of the United States and the resources of the Government to carry on war against the Government of Rumania; and, to bring the conflict to a successful termination, all of the resources of the country are hereby pledged by the Congress of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no amendment to be offered, the question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, and was read the third time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution having been read three times, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WHITE (when Mr. BREWSTER'S name was called). I again announce the necessary absence of my colleague [Mr. BREWSTER]. If present, he would vote "yea" on the joint resolution.

Mr. DOXEY (when Mr. BILBO'S name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is unavoidably detained. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. VANDENBERG (when Mr. BROWN'S name was called). I again announce the unavoidable absence from the city on official business of my colleague the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN]. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. McFARLAND (when Mr. BUNKER'S name was called). I am informed that the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER] is absent on public business. I am informed that if present he would vote "yea" on the pending joint resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY (when Mr. CHANDLER'S name was called). Making the same announcement regarding the unavoidable absence of my colleague, Mr. CHANDLER, as on the previous roll call, I wish to announce that if present he would vote "yea."

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. I am informed that if present he would vote as I intend to vote. I am therefore free to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). Repeating the announcement of my pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] as on the previous vote, I vote "yea."

Mr. BANKHEAD (when Mr. HILL'S name was called). Making the same announcement as to the absence of my colleague, Mr. HILL, as on the previous vote, I announce that if present he would vote "yea."

Mr. HOLMAN (when his name was called). I again announce my pair, as on a previous roll call, with the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART]. If present, the Senator from Tennessee would vote "yea," as I intend to vote. Therefore I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. ELLENDER (when Mr. OVERTON'S name was called). I make the same announcement as on the previous roll call as to the absence of my colleague, Mr. OVERTON.

Mr. KILGORE (when Mr. ROSIER'S name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ROSIER] is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. McKELLAR (when Mr. STEWART'S name was called). Mr. President, as stated by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], my colleague, Mr. STEWART, is paired with him. My colleague is unavoidably absent on public business. If present, he would vote "yea" on the pending joint resolution. The train on which he should have arrived in Washington by now is still late. He is returning to Washington especially for this vote.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri (when Mr. TRUMAN'S name was called). Making the same announcement as to the absence of my colleague the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], I wish to announce that if present he would vote "yea."

Mr. TYDINGS (when Mr. RADCLIFFE'S name was called). Making the same announcement regarding my colleague the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], I wish to say that if present he would vote "yea."

Mr. BONE (when Mr. WALLGREN'S name was called). I make the same announcement as I made previously respecting the necessary absence of my colleague, Mr. WALLGREN. If present, he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is necessarily absent from the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained in his State on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is detained on important public business.

I am advised that, if present and voting, all the Senators whose absences I have announced would vote "yea."

Mr. HERRING. My colleague the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] is detained temporarily at the Naval Hospital. I am advised that, if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] is absent as a result of an injury and illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] are necessarily absent.

All of these Senators would vote "yea" if present.

Mr. AUSTIN. The junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER] has been detained by reason of a death in his father's family. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 73, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—73

Aiken	Brooks	Clark, Mo.
Andrews	Burton	Connally
Austin	Byrd	Davis
Bankhead	Capper	Doxey
Barbour	Caraway	Ellender
Barkley	Chavez	George
Bone	Clark, Idaho	Gerry

Glass	McKellar	Spencer
Green	McNary	Taft
Guffey	Maloney	Thomas, Idaho
Gurney	Maybank	Thomas, Okla.
Hatch	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Hayden	Millikin	Tobey
Herring	Murdock	Tunnell
Holman	Murray	Tydings
Hughes	Norris	Vandenberg
Johnson, Calif.	Nye	Van Nuys
Johnson, Colo.	O'Daniel	Wagner
Kilgore	O'Mahoney	Walsh
La Follette	Pepper	Wheeler
Langer	Russell	White
Lee	Schwartz	Wiley
Lucas	Shipstead	Willis
McCarran	Smathers	
McFarland	Smith	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—23

Bailey	Butler	Radcliffe
Ball	Chandler	Reed
Bilbo	Danaher	Reynolds
Brewster	Downey	Rosier
Bridges	Gillette	Stewart
Brown	Hill	Truman
Bulow	Lodge	Wallgren
Bunker	Overton	

So the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 321) was passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF THE HONORABLE MANUEL L. QUEZON, PRESIDENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE PHILIPPINES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the Honorable Manuel Quezon, President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, has been invited to be the guest of and to address the Senate at this hour. I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President appoint a committee of four Senators to escort President Quezon into the Senate Chamber, and that the Senate may stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The Chair appoints the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE], the committee to escort the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines into the Senate Chamber.

Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate being in recess, at 12 o'clock and 34 minutes p. m.

His Excellency, Manuel L. Quezon, President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, consisting of Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. MCNARY, Mr. TYDINGS, and Mr. NYE, entered the Senate Chamber, accompanied by the Honorable Sergio Osmeña, Vice President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, Joaquin M. Elizalde, Resident Commissioner, and Col. Manuel Nieto, aide to President Quezon.

The President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines, having been escorted to a place on the rostrum in front of the Vice President, and the distinguished visitors accompanying him having been escorted to places assigned to them,

The VICE PRESIDENT said: Members of the Senate, ladies, and gentlemen, it gives me the greatest pleasure at this time to introduce the most gallant leader of a most gallant people. He makes a marvelous speech in English, but I am told that he makes an even finer speech in Spanish.

Senators, ladies, and gentlemen, the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines.

ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF THE PHILIPPINES

President QUEZON. Mr. President and gentlemen of the Senate, it is a very high honor and a rare privilege that you have conferred upon me in inviting me to address the Senate of the United States, the greatest legislative body in the world. I appreciate it more than I can say, and I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

On August 19, 1941, 4 months before Japan attacked the Philippines, it was my privilege to address Vice President Wallace over the radio from Malacañan Palace in Manila, and, through him, the people of the United States.

On that occasion, I said:

> In this grave national emergency, the stand of the Filipino people is clear and unmistakable. We owe loyalty to America and we are bound to her by bonds of everlasting gratitude. Should the United States enter the war, the Philippines would follow her and fight by her side, placing at her disposal all our manpower and all our material resources, however limited these might be. We stand with the United States in life and in death.

[Applause.]

Those words may have sounded then to some people in this country as more rhetorical than real. To the Filipinos, however, the sentiments that I expressed and the pledge that I made were known to be not only sincere but perfectly natural. What else could be expected of a people whom America has treated justly and fairly and to whom liberty and independence have already been assured through the Tydings-McDuffie Act?

Moreovér, the tie which binds our two countries transcends all political and legal relationships. It depends not merely upon a written alliance, a declaration, or a treaty. It consists of spiritual kinship and relationship. Our aims, our hopes, our aspirations, are the same as your own. In the great moral causes the principles of righteousness, of liberty, of peace, the United States and the Philippines are in complete accord with one another; they are in absolute and hearty agreement.

There has been no question, therefore, as to the loyalty of the Filipinos to the United States, or the extent to which they would go in fighting for the American flag. I say "in fighting for the American flag" advisedly, for we fought in the Philippines by your side against overwhelming odds, not only to defend our country against the invader but also to defend your flag against the attack of Japan. [Applause.]

When you entered the first World War, although the Philippines was in no way involved therein, we offered to the Government of the United States one submarine and one destroyer, and also asked to be permitted to send one division to fight under your banner on the battlefields of Europe. That we did not have the privilege of actually taking part in that war by your side has always been a source of regret to us. However, even then, individual Filipinos fought and died in your ranks. I remember at this time Tomas Claudio, whom we have immortalized by giving his name to the training camp of our national guard.

Gentlemen of the Senate, since I arrived in this country I have learned that there is a war slogan, "Remember Pearl Harbor." I approve and fully understand the slogan. The attack upon Pearl Harbor aroused every redblooded and patriotic American to a point where he can never be satisfied with anything less than the definite and complete defeat of Japan. [Applause.]

How about the Philippines? Of course, so far as their political relations with the United States are concerned, there is a legal difference between the position of Hawaii and that of the Philippines. Hawaii is as much an integral part of the United States as is Washington, D. C., or California, while the Philippines has already been formally declared by the Congress to be a distinct and separate nation, to become fully independent of the United States on July 4, 1946.

But, when we were attacked by Japan, the American flag was still flying over the Philippines, and we were still under the protection of, and owed allegiance to, the United States. Although in domestic affairs we had almost complete autonomy, in foreign affairs all governmental powers and responsibilities rested exclusively in the hands of the United States. In other words, you were then, as you still are, the trustees for the Filipino people in their foreign affairs. No one will deny that the moral and legal responsibilities of a trustee in the care and protection of its trust are greater even than those of an owner in respect to his own property.

Gentlemen of the Senate, I am not in this country to persuade you to send forces at once to the Philippines to drive the invader out of my beloved fatherland. Nor will I try to convince you that the Pacific is more important than the European or the Atlantic theaters of war. Those decisions are to be made by you. You will always have in mind, I am sure, that only in the Philippines has your flag been hauled down and replaced by the flag of the Rising Sun.

In view of this tragic event, I do hope that the American people in this hour of their great responsibility to the world will always keep before them the memory of the devotion and sacrifices of the people of the Philippines. Let me ask then, in turn, that your people adopt still another war slogan—"Remember the Philippines."

[Prolonged applause; Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.]

Following his address, the President of the Commonwealth of the Philippines and the distinguished visitors accompanying him were escorted from the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled; when it was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. LUCAS in the chair).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The presentation of petitions and memorials is in order.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

APPOINTMENTS TO THE WHITE HOUSE POLICE

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to permit appointment of White House police, in accordance with the Civil Service laws, from sources outside the Metropolitan and United States Park Police forces (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

REPORT OF BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

A letter from the Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Board of Governors covering operations for the year 1941 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF FIRST WAR POWERS ACT—CENSORSHIP OF CERTAIN COMMUNICATIONS

A letter from the Director of Censorship, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the First War Powers Act, 1941, by extending the authority to censor communications to include communications between the continental United States and any Territory or possession of the United States, or between any Territory or possession, and any other Territory or possession (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Bothell, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the importation and sale of alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions of sundry citizens of the States of New York and Washington, and the Territory of Alaska, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Belleville, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. HATCH:

A petition of sundry citizens of San Juan County, N. Mex., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr MEAD:

A petition of sundry citizens of Williamsville, N. Y., praying the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens and religious organizations in the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I present a group of 24 petitions signed by approximately 2,500 citizens, from 40 communities in 17 counties, all in the State of Ohio, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions presented by the Senator from Ohio will lie on the table.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 6634. An act to facilitate the employment by defense contractors of certain former members of the land and naval forces, including the Coast Guard, of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1438); and

H. R. 7066. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1439).

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 4923. An act for the relief of the estate of Orion Knox, deceased; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1440);

H. R. 5317. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jessie A. Beechwood; with amendments (Rept. No. 1441); and

H. R. 5854. An act for the relief of Madeleine Hammett, Olive Hammett, Walter Young, the estate of Laura O'Malley Young, deceased, and the legal guardian of Laura Elizabeth Young; with amendments (Rept. No. 1442).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred, for examination and recommendation, 4 lists of records transmitted to the Senate by the Archivist of the United States, which appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. LUCAS:

S. 2563. A bill authorizing the filing of claims with the Employees' Compensation Commission on account of the deaths of Earl D. Milton and Bernard Shonk; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 2564. A bill for the relief of the Edwin F. Guth Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. WAGNER introduced Senate bill 2565, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 2566. A bill to provide for reimbursing counties for losses in revenue sustained on account of the acquisition by the United States of certain lands for use by the military or naval forces; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 2567. A bill to provide for the acquisition of the property known as Temple Heights to be used for the duration of the war as a recreation center for Government employees, or for offices, and thereafter as a site for a memorial building in commemoration of the sacrifices of the defenders of the Union during the Civil War; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2568. A bill to establish additional commissioned warrant and warrant grades in the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 2569. A bill authorizing the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

S. 2570. A bill to provide for the sale by the Superintendent of Documents of copies of certain historical and naval documents printed by the Government Printing Office; and

S. 2571. A bill to amend section 2 of the act approved October 30, 1941 (Public Law 287, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), so as to authorize transportation for the dependents of reserve and retired personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps, upon release from active duty, from their last duty stations to their homes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2572. A bill to permit defendants to waive prosecution by indictment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2573. A bill to provide for the adoption of a Housing Code regulating the use, occupancy, safety, and sanitary conditions of dwellings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 2574. A bill for the relief of Thomas Patrick Heaney; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 2576. A bill for the relief of Harold E. Dalton (with accompanying papers); and

S. 2577. A bill for the relief of Marcus O. Rowland and Faye D. Rowland, the parents of George L. Rowland, deceased (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2578. A bill for the relief of G. H. Condon, M. E. Cannon, W. J. Esterle, C. C. Gasaway, James F. Retallack, and L. G. Yinger; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado also introduced Senate bill 2575, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

AMENDMENT OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE ACT

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to amend sections 12A and 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, which I ask may be appropriately referred and printed in the RECORD. In connection with the bill, I request that an explanation of the proposed amendments to the Federal Reserve Act may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement referred to will be printed in the RECORD and the bill introduced by the Senator from New York will be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and also printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 2565) to amend sections 12A and 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 12A of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 263), is amended by striking out the second and third sentences thereof and substituting the following:

"Such representatives shall be presidents or first vice presidents of Federal Reserve banks and, beginning with the election for the term commencing March 1, 1943, shall be elected annually as follows: One by the board of directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, one by the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve Banks of Boston, Philadelphia, and Richmond, one by the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve Banks of Cleveland and Chicago, one by the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve Banks of Atlanta, Dallas, and St. Louis, and one by the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve Banks of Minneapolis, Kansas City, and San Francisco. In such elections each board of directors shall have one vote; and the details of such elections may be governed by regulations prescribed by the Committee, which may be amended from time to time. An alternate to serve in the absence of each such representative shall likewise be a president or first vice president of a Federal Reserve bank and shall be elected annually in the same manner."

SEC. 2. The sixth paragraph of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 462b), is amended to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding the other provisions of this section, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, upon the affirmative vote of not less than four of its members, in order to prevent injurious credit expansion or contraction, may by regulation change the requirements as to reserves to be maintained against demand or time deposits or both (1) by member banks in central reserve cities, or (2) by member banks in reserve cities, or (3) by member banks not in reserve or central reserve cities, or (4) by all member banks; but the amount of the reserves required to be maintained by any such member bank as a result of any such change shall not be less than the amount of the reserves required by law to be maintained by such bank on the date of enactment of the Banking Act of 1935 nor more than twice such amount."

SEC. 3. The ninth paragraph of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 464), is amended by striking out the proviso thereof, so that the paragraph will read as follows:

"The required balance carried by a member bank with a Federal Reserve bank may, under the regulations and subject to such penalties as may be prescribed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, be checked against and withdrawn by such member bank for the purpose of meeting existing liabilities."

The statement presented by Mr. WAGNER in connection with the bill is as follows:

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS

SECTION 1. FEDERAL OPEN MARKET COMMITTEE

The Federal Open Market Committee consists of the 7 members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and 5 representatives of the 12 Federal Reserve banks, and the proposed amendment would regroup the Federal Reserve banks for the purpose of electing their 5 representatives on the committee. The principal change which would be effected by the proposed regrouping is to provide that a representative of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York be a member of the committee at all times. The regrouping would also provide for 1 representative to be selected by the Boston; Philadelphia, and Richmond Reserve Banks; 1 by the Cleveland and Chicago Reserve Banks; 1 by the Atlanta, Dallas, and St. Louis Reserve Banks; and 1 by the Minneapolis, Kansas City, and San Francisco Reserve Banks.

Under the present statute a representative is elected by the Boston and New York Reserve Banks. As this has worked out in practice, the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston has not had its president or other representative serve as a member of the committee but only as an alternate to the president of the New York bank, who has served continuously. This situation has been unsatisfactory, and the directors of the Boston and New York Reserve Banks have agreed that remedial legislation is necessary. As indicated below, it is desirable in the public interest that a representative of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York be on the committee at all times. At the same time, the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston should have the opportunity for its president to serve from time to time as a member of the committee, as do the presidents of the other Reserve banks.

The Federal Reserve Bank of New York occupies a unique position with respect to the Federal Reserve System, the Treasury, and the banking system of the country. Its resources total approximately 40 percent of the aggregate of the 12 Federal Reserve banks. It is located at the money market and at the principal market for Government securities; its operations as fiscal agent of the United States and its transactions with foreign governments, foreign central banks and bankers, as well as its operations in foreign exchange, are in far greater volume than those of any other Federal Reserve bank. It is clearly in the public interest that the Federal Open Market Committee be given at all times the benefit of counsel of the Reserve bank possessed of this sort of experience and in current touch with such affairs.

It may be suggested that the advice of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York would be available even if it were not represented on the Federal Open Market Committee. Admittedly, regardless of the composition of the committee, the Treasury in discharging its responsibility respecting the Government securities market would still wish to confer with the Federal Reserve Bank of New York. Thus as a practical matter the New York bank would be inevitably drawn into discussions regarding Government financing as well as open-market operations. But advice obtained unofficially is a different matter from full-fledged participation in the committee's work. Sound policy dictates that participation by the New York bank be through its representatives on the Federal Open Market Committee rather than on a voluntary or unofficial basis.

Although it is clear from the hearings and debates that Congress intended the Reserve banks to be represented on the Federal Open Market Committee by their presidents, this was not specified in the act, and efforts have been made to elect officers of commercial banks. Hence it is proposed to specify in the law that the Reserve banks must be represented by their presidents or first vice presidents, and that the details of their election may be governed by regulations prescribed by the committee.

SECTION 2. RESERVE REQUIREMENTS

Section 2 of the bill would amend section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act so as to authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to change the reserve requirements of member banks in central reserve cities, within the limitations of the present law, without necessarily making a change in the reserve requirements of member banks in reserve cities.

Under the present law the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, upon the affirmative vote of not less than four of its members, in order to prevent injurious credit expansion or contraction, may change the requirements as to the maintenance of reserves against deposits by member banks in reserve and central reserve cities, or by member banks located elsewhere. It does not have authority to change the reserve requirements of member banks in central reserve cities without at the same time changing those of member banks in reserve cities. No change in reserve requirements may be made if the result is to decrease the requirements of a member bank below the amount specified in the statute or to increase them to more than twice that amount. At present reserve requirements of all member banks are at the maximum to which they can be raised under the law.

Because of the recent increases in the amounts of Federal taxes, it is probable that there will be a heavy withdrawal of deposits from banks throughout the country in order to meet tax liabilities at or around the quarterly dates on which Federal tax payments are due. In order to meet these withdrawals many banks will find it necessary to draw upon their balances with their correspondent banks, and these in turn upon their balances with banks in central reserve cities, particularly New York City. The excess reserves of member banks located in New York City have been ranging from $630,000,000 to $1,212,000,000 since January 1, 1942, and this amount may not be sufficient to meet the withdrawal of deposits from these banks which may be expected at tax-payment periods. If this situation should arise, the banks in New York City may find it necessary to sell United States obligations in considerable amounts. Such action might have a depressing effect upon the Government security market at a time when this would be contrary to the public interest.

In order to avoid such a contingency it may be desirable to reduce reserve requirements of member banks in central reserve cities. It may not be advisable at the same time, however, to reduce the requirements of member banks in reserve cities and, accordingly, in order to provide the necessary flexibility to meet the situation, it is felt that the Board of Governors should be empowered to change the reserve requirements of member banks in central reserve cities without at the same time changing the reserve requirements of other member banks.

SECTION 3. MAKING LOANS AND PAYING DIVIDENDS WHILE RESERVES ARE DEFICIENT

Section 3 of the bill would amend section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act by repealing the provision which prohibits member banks of the Federal Reserve System from making new loans or paying dividends while their reserves are deficient, remaining in the law, however, the power of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to prescribe penalties for deficiencies in reserves.

One of the difficulties leading to the enactment of the Federal Reserve Act was the fact that bank reserves were unavailable in times of stress, and one of the reforms incorporated in the Federal Reserve Act was a provision permitting reserves to be checked against and withdrawn for the purpose of meeting existing liabilities, subject to regulations and penalties to be prescribed by the Reserve Board.

The addition of a proviso prohibiting the making of new loans and the payment of dividends while reserves are deficient is not consistent with this purpose of this provision. On the basis of this proviso, a recent decision of the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York held a bank director personally liable for losses sustained on loans made by the bank while its reserves were deficient. Although this is in conflict with an earlier decision of a circuit court of

appeals in another circuit, it creates a fear of personal liability, which may prevent banks from availing themselves of the privilege of utilizing their reserves in times of need.

If the proviso were repealed, the Reserve Board would still retain the power to prescribe penalties for deficiencies in reserves, and this would be a sufficient deterrent for willful neglect of reserve requirements. The Board's present regulations prescribe a penalty in the form of an interest charge amounting to 2 percent more than the Federal Reserve bank discount rate, so that it is cheaper for a member bank to borrow from the Reserve bank in order to maintain its reserves than it is to become deficient in its reserves and pay the penalty.

Owing to the fact that large tax collections and the flotation of large amounts of Government securities during the present emergency may cause wide fluctuations in available reserves, especially in the money centers, it is particularly important during the emergency period to avoid any stringency in the money market resulting from the rigid and unnecessary prohibition upon making loans while reserves are deficient.

PREVENTION OF PERNICIOUS POLITICAL ACTIVITIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. HOLMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2471) to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, with respect to its application to officers and employees of educational, religious, eleemosynary, philanthropic, and cultural institutions, establishments, and agencies, commonly known as the Hatch Act, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

At the proper place in the bill to insert a new section reading as follows:

"SEC. 12. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3678 of the Revised Statutes, in any case in which the Senate or the House of Representatives by resolution has authorized, or hereafter authorizes, any of its committees to make an investigation relating to the activities of any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government, or relating to matters within the jurisdiction of any such department or agency, and the resolution providing for such investigation, or a supplemental resolution, either authorizes such committee to request the use of personnel of any such department or agency, or contains a provision under which the head of any such department or agency is requested to detail or assign to the committee such personnel (including legal assistants, experts, and investigators) as the committee may deem necessary, the compensation of any person detailed or assigned to the committee pursuant to any such request shall be paid out of the appropriations available to the department or agency by which such person was employed at the time of such assignment or detail."

Mr. McCARRAN also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

USE OF DEPARTMENTAL SERVICES AND PERSONNEL BY THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND SURVEYS

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 263), which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Resolved, That, in addition to the authority heretofore conferred upon the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys by S. Res. 241, agreed to May 24, 1940, the committee is authorized to request the use of the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies in the executive branch of the Government.

FLAG DAY, 1942—PROCLAMATION OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a proclamation issued by the President relative to the celebration of Flag Day, 1942. The proclamation was issued on May 12.

There being no objection, the proclamation was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROCLAMATION 2556—FLAG DAY, 1942

BY THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, A PROCLAMATION

For many years it has been our American custom to set aside June 14 in honor of the flag, the emblem of our freedom, our strength, and our unity as an independent nation under God. Now we are fighting in the greatest cause the world has known. We are fighting to free the people of this earth from the most powerful, the most ruthless, the most savage enemy the world has ever seen. We are dedicating all that we have and all that we are to the combat. We will not stop this side of victory.

We as a nation are not fighting alone. In this planetary war we are a part of a great whole; we are fighting shoulder to shoulder with the valiant peoples of the United Nations, the massed, angered forces of common humanity. Unless all triumph, all will fail.

For these reasons it is fitting that on our traditional Flag Day we honor not only our own colors but also the flags of those who have, with us, signed the declaration by United Nations, paying homage to those nations awaiting liberation from the tyranny we all oppose, to those whose lands have escaped the scars of battle, to those who have long been heroically fighting in the blaze and havoc of war.

It is also fitting in this time of stress that we express our devotion to our courageous mothers, many of whom are sending out their sons to do battle with the enemy and all of whom are so loyally contributing to the waging of the war on the home front.

Now, therefore, I, Franklin D. Roosevelt, President of the United States of America, do hereby ask that on Flag Day, June 14, 1942, the people of our Nation honor the peoples of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, China, Australia, Belgium, Canada, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, the Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Greece, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras, India, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, Poland, the Union of South Africa, Yugoslavia—knowing that only in the strength and valor of our unswerving unity shall we find the force to bring freedom and peace to mankind.

I direct the officials of the Federal Government, and I request the officials of the State and local governments, to have our colors displayed on all Government buildings on Flag Day, and I urge the people of the United States to fly the American flag from their homes in honor of the Nation's mothers and their valiant sons in the service, and to arrange, where feasible, for joint displays of the emblems of the freedom-loving nations on that day.

In witness whereof I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the United States of America to be affixed.

Done at the city of Washington this 9th day of May, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and forty-two, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred and sixty-sixth.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

RATIONING OF GASOLINE

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD a statement presented yesterday, signed by the entire Kansas delegation in Congress, to Chairman Donald Nelson, of the War Production Board, and to Administrator Leon Henderson, of the Office of Price Administration.

As I have said many times in the past, the proposed rationing of gasoline in the interior of the country is a very great mistake from our standpoint. I do not want to be misunderstood; I do not want the attitude of the people of Kansas and the midcontinent to be misunderstood. Whatever sacrifice may be necessary, that sacrifice we will make, and will make wholeheartedly and cheerfully, and should make; but we cannot see the sense in rationing gasoline in sections where there is excess refining capacity, and huge surpluses of gasoline itself. So far, no adequate explanation of the necessity for such rationing has been made. As fast as one agency presents reasons for gasoline rationing in the midst of the oil fields, some high Government official assures us there will be plenty of rubber when the time comes.

We want to know the facts. Until we do, we protest most vigorously against gasoline rationing in sections of the country where gasoline is not only plentiful, but is present in surplus quantities.

In this connection, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a copy of a telegram on the same subject from the Honorable Payne H. Ratner, Governor of Kansas.

There being no objection, the statement and telegram were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 3, 1942.*

Hon. DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman, War Production Board,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. LEON HENDERSON,
Administrator, Office Price Administration, Washington, D. C.:

We desire to file a formal and most vigorous protest against rationing gasoline in Kansas and other points in the Nation where:

1. There is no shortage or anticipated shortage of refining capacity or of gasoline; where in fact there exists surplus refining facilities and surplus gasoline supplies.

2. Where there is no apparent shortage of transportation facilities that will cause any shortage of gasoline in the near or even more distant future.

Unless it is shown beyond reasonable doubt that:

1. Such rationing is necessary and unavoidable to conserve needed rubber supplies, and

2. Such rationing will not cripple agriculture, industry, transportation, and commerce to such an extent that it will not also seriously impede the war program, and in addition tend to destroy the tax-raising ability of these sections of the Nation.

If such rationing is shown to be necessary to conserve rubber and if it will not cripple the war program, the domestic economy of these sections and the tax-raising ability of these sections of the Nation then, of course, our people will cheerfully sacrifice the use of gasoline, the use of motor equipment, and whatever else is necessary.

But it is our positive belief and contention that the need for this has not been shown, and is not at present demonstrable.

Distances are great in the midcontinent and Southwest. Our entire economy production for our Army, production for the Nation, production for our Allies, production for domestic consumption, and for war needs has been developed on motor transportation to a far greater extent than we believe it is possible for the governmental agencies dealing with the war program in Washington to realize.

It is reported (and there has been so far as we know no accurate surveys to indicate otherwise) that there is more than 500,000 tons, perhaps close to 1,000,000 tons of scrap rubber that could be collected and reclaimed and used for recapping tires, with the additions of some 2 ounces of raw rubber per tire.

Without going into detail as to the reasons why, it seems apparent that various conflicting interests have prevented, to date, any real effort to develop synthetic rubber, either from petroleum or from grains, by using industrial alcohol.

We have been given to understand that it is possible, by using comparatively little of critical materials, to enlarge existing industrial alcohol facilities to the point where there can be produced many hundred thousand tons of rubber from grains. By establishing additional plants in the Grain Belt, many more hundred thousand tons we believe could be manufactured in 1943.

In addition, two or three hundred thousand tons of reclaimed rubber should be available. In addition, also, synthetic rubber from petroleum is not only possible but is actually under way.

The Brookings Institution advises that some 20,000,000 or more of our 30,000,000 automobiles must be kept operating—admittedly under reduced mileages and speeds—to keep war industries and essential peace industries in operation. Unless these industries operate at full steam ahead the war effort will bog down.

Therefore we respectfully, but very firmly, urge that efforts of all governmental agencies concerned be turned to (1) making more complete use of rubber supplies available, (2) providing for greatly expanded production of synthetic rubber, and (3) increasing use of transportation facilities for transporting gasoline and other petroleum products to points where these are needed, before this drastic and, it seems to us, entirely unnecessary and senseless gasoline rationing is imposed on sections where there are surplus refinery facilities and huge surplus supplies of gasoline available.

This is not a question of sacrificing joy riding and pleasure driving. It is a question of seriously crippling, and in many sections and lines of business destroying the essential production and distribution systems that are absolutely necessary to successful prosecution of the war, as well as to maintain enough of our essential civilian economy going to provide the foodstuffs, goods, and financing of the war effort.

We protest most earnestly and sincerely against this Nation-wide gasoline rationing until every effort to utilize existing rubber supplies and to increase synthetic rubber production has been effected and has plainly failed.

Very respectfully,

ARTHUR CAPPER, C. M. REED, W. P. LAMBERTSON, U. S. GUYER, EDWARD H. REES, FRANK CARLSON, CLIFFORD R. HOPE, JOHN M. HOUSTON, TOM D. WINTER.

TOPEKA, KANS., *June 3, 1942.*

KANSAS CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION,
Care of Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Washington, D. C.

Dispatches from Washington in morning newspapers here indicate final decision will be made by the President on Friday as to gasoline rationing on a Nation-wide basis. You will recall that on May 25 I wired Donald Nelson, Secretary Ickes, Leon Henderson, and Joseph Eastman, sending members of the Kansas congressional delegation copies, setting forth the feeling of our people here in Kansas and the Midwest. In those telegrams I asked questions relative to the matter and suggested the severe and far-reaching disastrous effect which would result in this section where our citizens must frequently travel long distances. It was also pointed out that we have a superabundance of oil and gasoline here and that rationing appears to be an unnecessary sacrifice which would impede rather than help our war effort. I did this in cooperation with other Governors of the Mid-Continent oil States.

I urged in my telegrams of May 25 that the Governors of the affected States in the midcontinental oil territory or other representatives of the people be given the opportunity for a conference with Federal officials before any drastic rationing step is taken. I have not yet heard from any of those in the executive branch of Government to whom the telegrams were addressed. I realize, of course, that you and the other members of the delegation have already taken the same position that I have taken. In view of the apparent imminence of the final decision, I am wondering if you think it would be wise and helpful to confer with the congressional delegations from other States in this territory and go to the President as a group to present the case directly to him. I am also wondering if you believe it would help the situation if our midcontinent congressional delegations would inform the President that all of the governors of the affected States in this region have wired their objections to rationing. As you know, all the governors in these Midcontinent States are willing to cooperate in any way necessary and are eager for an opportunity to have a conference with the proper officials before rationing is put into effect.

We are, of course, anxious to have the President know our attitudes and what we have done so that if the President deems it proper he can see to it that our request is granted. We all believe that the successful prosecution of the war is paramount. If the final decision is to ration, the people of Kansas will, of course, cooperate wholeheartedly, just as we have cooperated in every other phase of the war effort. In all patriotism, however, and because we feel that needless rationing would impede rather than advance the war effort, we must object to sacrifices that would impose severe hardships upon all our people and upon our entire economy. Should those in authority decide the advantages to the war effort would outweigh the obvious disadvantages which would be such a severe shock to our people and to our economy, it seems to me that it would be wise to give our people a clear and reasonable explanation of the necessity.

PAYNE RATNER,
Governor.

PRODUCTION OF AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, I am in receipt of a copy of a radio address delivered on May 16 last, by Mr. Albert S. Goss, master, the National Grange. The address is so in harmony with my own views on the urgency of stimulating at this time the production of all agricultural commodities as a fundamental or basic war effort, that I request that it be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BATTLE OF PRODUCTION

Friends of the National Grange farm and home hour, today I want to talk to you about one of the biggest battles of the war, the battle of production. Battles are won by adequate preparation. Waging war is not as simple as it was in Civil War days when a popular general gave the formula for victory as "getting there fustest with the mostest men." Today he would say, "getting there fustest with the bestest and mostest equipment."

It is said that for every man at the front seven or eight men are required at home, in the mines, in factories, in transportation, in offices of engineers and accountants, and in every phase of our modern, complex industrial structure. But the foundation beneath this whole complicated organization is the production of food and clothing, and much of the basic raw material on our farms. If this breaks down, everything else will collapse.

Man's struggle from the dawn of history has been a battle against hunger and cold. The widespread suffering and tragedy of the war today does not lie alone among the millions of men on the field of battle, but also among the hundreds of millions at home facing starvation, while the lack of clothing has contributed horribly to sickness and suffering. The farm production of a large part of the world has been neglected or destroyed in a frantic effort to win on the field of battle.

This destruction cannot be repaired hastily. No army of men and no edict of dictators or courts can restore the livestock of Europe, and no magic of industry can hasten the seasons or bring forth harvests at will. Agriculture alone can produce the essentials of life. If agriculture is destroyed, life itself is destroyed. If agriculture is crippled, hunger, disease, and want are the sure and inexorable consequences. Without ample food, our war efforts are weakened and may fail. Lack of food is the greatest problem today for the great masses of European people.

Do not be mistaken; this can happen here. In fact, it probably will happen here, to a greater or less degree, unless we turn sharply from the short-sighted policies we have been following and adopt a sound policy toward agriculture. For years we have pursued and fostered an unsound economy of scarcity as a means of forcing up farm prices and creating farm wealth, instead of working out a system

of fair prices for ample production based on a two-price system to meet the problems of our protected economy.

Our sugar shortage is the result of this mistaken policy. We can raise most of the sugar we need, but farmers have not been permitted to do so. Now, when shortage occurs, we suddenly wake up to find that there is little we can do except to go without.

Through thoroughly unsound methods of price control, we are blundering into a far worse situation, and farmers and Congressmen who are bold enough to point out where the trouble lies, are called obstructionists, profiteers, and inflationists. In spite of the misrepresentation and abuse, we intend to continue to point out the blundering course we are following, for we have a war to win, and the most vital battle of the war is the battle of production.

The President has rightly said that food will win the war, but we can't raise hogs by waving the flag and by abusing farmers, or by raising false charges of profiteering. We must stick to sound economic law if we are to get the results we seek.

But first let me answer the false charges of profiteering that have been so carelessly made. Farmers are not profiteers. As soon as they were advised of the need for greater production, and the penalties for surplus production were removed, farmers went to work with a will, and last year raised the biggest crop in history, with yet more on the way if labor is available. This was done in spite of the fact that practically every farmer in America knows that surplus production ruined his market following the last war, and will do so again if some way is not devised to prevent it. These record crops were raised without any price guaranty, overtime-payment guaranties, or any guaranties whatever. Farmers willingly increased their hours of labor to an average of approximately 80 hours per week, while many are working over 100 hours per week without complaint. That is not the work of profiteers.

Or, if figures are needed, the per capita net income of farmers is today approximately one-fourth that of nonfarmers, even after including rent and the produce from his own farm in the farmer's income. Let me emphasize that. Today the per capita net income of farmers is approximately one-fourth that of nonfarmers. If there is any profiteering in foodstuffs, it is after the crops have left the farm. Those who try to raise prejudice against the farmers by charging them with being profiteers, either do not know the facts or are deliberately misrepresenting the situation.

But I must return to the battle of production, for I want to point out how thoroughly unsound our price-control policies are, and how they affect this battle. First, I want to point out again, as I have done on previous programs, that no system of price control can be more than temporarily effective unless all groups engaged in production and distribution are brought under control. Labor is one of the largest elements entering into costs of everything we buy, and with labor left out, it is ridiculous to assume that prices can be controlled.

Second, I want to point out that we have begun at the wrong end. European nations, which have successfully struggled with the problem of price control at different times, have found that they must start with the raw materials and control the various steps through to the point of marketing, including a rigid control of profits.

To illustrate how impossible is our present program, let us take the case of canned foodstuffs. As you know, Price Administrator Henderson froze the ceiling prices of canned foodstuffs, along with other items, at the levels which prevailed last March. Let us take as an example a canner of tomatoes or corn. The tomatoes and corn which were sold in March were bought from the farmer in 1941. It is very obvious that the canner cannot pay the farmer in 1942 any more than he did in 1941, if he cannot sell his product for more. In fact, he cannot pay as much, because his freight has gone up 6 percent, his labor has gone up even more, his cans and cases have gone up, as has practically every item going into the cost of canning. If he is going to stay in business, in the face of all these increased costs, he must buy his raw materials at something less than in 1941. When he approaches the farmers to get a contract to raise tomatoes or corn at less than the 1941 price, he finds that the farmer's costs have gone up too, and that the tomatoes or corn can't be produced at the only figure the canner can pay. The net result is that the crops will not be raised, and in our battle of production we will receive a serious setback. This does not apply to tomatoes and corn alone. The same situation prevails throughout agriculture as well as in other lines of industry. It is inherent in any program of freezing prices at the top, with no protection against increased costs at the bottom. Somebody must take the loss, so it is passed on down to the producer who is forced out of production.

I am not talking a mere theory. I am discussing hard and disturbing facts. The canning industry has been in Washington seeking relief. But no relief is in sight, and at present it looks as though no relief will be granted until it becomes apparent that many of the canning crops will not be planted, and it is too late to plant for the 1942 season. This sounds so simple, yet so ridiculous that one wonders if it can be true, but the sad part is that it is all too true, and precious production is being jeopardized because of it. Mr. Roy Hendrickson, director of the Agricultural Marketing Administration, said just last Wednesday, "We are faced with a squeeze on our food supply. While from the standpoint of our total food supply no one should go hungry, we are almost certain to be up against some serious shortages of individual food items. And the sooner that is realized the better."

It all gets back to the principle that control must be all-inclusive and that it must be built from the ground up and not from the top down. Failure to include labor will doom any plan that can be devised.

I might add asparagus to my illustrations of tomatoes and corn to point out what is happening. News dispatches the first of this week told of large areas where the farmers' first crop of the season—asparagus—was going uncut because labor was not available at figures which would pay the cost of harvesting. Thus these asparagus growers get nothing for their full year's work.

The reasons for our farm labor shortage are not far to seek, nor is it difficult to prescribe the remedy. Under existing conditions, industrial workers have a 40-hour week, and they are paid on the basis of time and one-half for overtime. As a rule, the wages paid in our war industries are two or three times as high as a farmer can afford to pay on the basis of the prices he receives for his products. Since this is the case, who can blame the average farm worker when he deserts his job in the fields to join the growing hosts of industrial workers? The farm labor problem is very acute. Attempts are being made to alleviate the shortage by recruiting farmerettes, and unskilled labor from our cities. This may bring some relief, but our costs will increase enormously, and when ceilings are placed which do not recognize these increased costs, volume will surely suffer and the battle of production will receive a setback from which it will take at least one crop season to recover, and probably longer.

From the outset the Grange has pointed out that it will be impossible to control prices unless all groups are controlled alike; that if partial control is adopted our whole economy will be thrown out of kilter, resulting in serious loss of production; and that we must build a program from the ground up instead of from the top down. At its seventy-fifth session last November the National Grange formulated a sound program for price control, but the basic principles laid down in this program have been ignored, and we are rapidly heading for plenty of trouble. Later, when the price-control bill was under consideration by the Congress, we pointed out as vigorously as we could the need for some sort of protection against just such situations as are now arising. We asked that a just level of farm prices be established which would enable farmers to meet their rising costs and continue to produce.

We asked that this level be measured by a practical rule for determining parity and pointed out that our present formula, based on conditions that existed 30 years ago, was obsolete and unworkable. We were unable to get any modification in the formula and had to resort to arbitrary levels of price control which are satisfactory to nobody but constitute the only protection we have against prices which will destroy production. Even as we speak today efforts are being made to abolish these safeguards and reduce farm prices to this unjust and unworkable parity formula 30 years out of date. Unless the formula can be revised on a just basis, any such program would bankrupt the producers of the very crops which are most needed by our armed forces, and by our Allies, and the battle of production will bog down.

The most serious phase of the whole problem lies in the fact that when these blunders are made they cannot be corrected for many months, and sometimes for years. It is high time that we put an end to such dangerous social experimentation and establish our whole price-control structure on a sound basis.

Such a basis would provide a fair and just price for farmers under which they could continue to produce. Such prices should be fair to farmers and consumers alike. Any unnecessary labor and undue profits between the farmer and the consumer should be eliminated. This would assure fair prices to the consumer. Such a course would remove the necessity of parity payments or any other form of subsidy. It is high time somebody began to think about our National Treasury. Farmers don't want subsidies. All they ask is an honest price, fair to farmers, fair to labor, and fair to industry.

TAXATION—LETTER FROM CHARLES T. TREADWAY

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I have received a most interesting letter, dealing with our tax problem and the pending revenue bill, from Mr. Charles T. Treadway, Chairman of the Board, Bristol Bank & Trust Co., Bristol, Conn. It is so interesting, from my viewpoint, that I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BRISTOL BANK & TRUST CO.,
Bristol, Conn., May 20, 1942.

Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Now that the revenue bill seems to be taking form I feel that I should write you once more and explain in as little detail as possible my principal objections to some of the proposals which are apparently coming from Washington.

I always feel that I should preface any objections that I make by a statement of a more or less fundamental viewpoint. None of the men with whom I come in contact during my daily tour of duty are unaware of the terrific responsibility which the framing of an adequate fiscal policy, particularly as regards taxes, imposes upon Representatives in the Congress. I think, in a few words, it is a sound and firm opinion that we all, who are engaged in industrial banking or even in public finance, are wondering at just what point the impact of taxes may become dangerous to our whole economy. Most of us are thinking along the line of how little we should be allowed to retain for addition to working capital and for dividends, and how little we can get along with, and are quite willing that the balance of profits beyond that amount should go to the war effort.

We wish to keep our own fiscal financial economy sound, so that when the war is over we may return to a sufficiently active and prosperous operation to enable us to absorb all the manpower relieved from the Army and from the war effort which will be available and which must be employed. We are, I believe, also firmly of the opinion, as you must be, that the only kind of an economy where the greatest social gains are made is under the capitalistic system. Certainly I doubt that any Member of the Congress or the administrative officers of our Federal Government have any desire to turn our economy over to any totalitarian form. However, to avoid this would be a Herculean task if we were unable to employ somewhere near 100 percent of the manpower of the country in peacetime pursuits. Consequently, all of us in industry, as well as in banking, must keep our house in order, strengthen our reserves and our resources, and otherwise prepare for the time when this war shall cease. This, I think, somewhat inadequately expresses the opinion of the thoughtful businessman of this country.

Now I want to bore you for a few moments in particularizing regarding the proposals that have come out of Washington. First, it seems to me that no adequate plan has yet been advanced for tapping the tremendous surplus of earnings above living costs which has been piling up during the past year or more. This surplus is estimated to be, I understand, somewhere near $20,000,000,000. In my opinion, if all corporate earnings and all the income of all the people receiving more than $5,000 a year were to be siphoned into the Federal Treasury, we would not have accomplished anything but a disastrous result.

As stated above, I believe that in this emergency excess profits should be assessed to the war effort, but let it be an honest statement of excess profits with due regard for the normal tax on profits, and not as now provided for in all proposals that have so far come from Washington. I refer, of course, to the change in the method of computing excess-profits taxes between the 1940 and the 1941 revenue measures. The 1941 revenue measure does not present an honest apprizement of excess profits and, therefore, is dangerous to an extent which I do not like to contemplate.

I believe that none of the measures taken by the Federal Government so far will prove to have halted the inflation which all of us fear so terribly. At the present time there are plenty of consumer goods for this excess of income over living expense to buy. In 6 months' time it is likely that these goods will have disappeared in large part from the market, and then is the time when the black markets will doubtless appear and other rackets tending to upsetting our economy.

Again, it seems to me, and to others to whom I have talked, that it is entirely improbable that the war effort can be properly carried on and financed without at least two new measures being introduced. In the first place, the Treasury has been entirely too soft and perhaps too idealistic in this matter of the purchase of war bonds by the general public. The present campaign, I think, is entirely unsatisfactory and will not be successful. A group of experts, qualified to set up selling campaigns, should be employed to put over this sale. It is no job for amateurs and it can't be done, in my opinion, by the present methods. In the second place, we must be realistic, and realism will tell us that, based on figures that I have before me and which I believe to be correct, if we took all the income over $100,000 of individuals and corporations we could only carry on the war for something less than a week; and, carrying this a step further, if we took all the income over $5,000 we could not carry on the war effort much more than 2 months. This indicates to me that it is necessary that we tap the source income up to $5,000 and siphon it somehow or other into the Federal Treasury. I am far from being a tax expert or an economist, but it seems as plain as the nose on my face that unless we are willing to be realistic and get every income unit into this picture in a large way we shall have inflation, which in the end will cost each and every one of us many times over what the apparent sacrifice of the moment may be. It seems to me that this getting down to the grass roots of the whole problem will provide a compulsory insurance against inflation, which otherwise is bound to come and probably very disastrously.

I realize that this is an election year. I realize very fully that members of the Congress are under pressure from groups in their constituency, and I also believe them to be honorable American citizens who want to do the best for their country. If, however, political expediency proves disastrous to us in the mere matter of inflation alone, the expedient will seem to have failed as a long-range benefit to the proponents. There is so much history in the matter of inflation abroad which we may use as a basis for our considerations, that it seems to me that the Congress can hardly fail to realize that present proposals do not go to the heart of the question. Every measure which has come out of Washington of late by way of the Federal Reserve Board and otherwise has cut heavily into the profitable organizations of our banks, and yet if we are to have a sound economy our banks must be kept on a profitable basis, and they alone cannot possibly, or at least safely, finance the war effort.

There is the further question, of course, of returns to our philanthropic institutions by way of dividends, interest, donations, and devices by will or otherwise. If we are to destroy the sources of this income we are certainly leading up to the point where our hospitals, schools, colleges, and all our charitable institutions must either be closed or financed by the Federal Government. This, to me, is unthinkable, but when one realizes that nearly half of the income from dividends flows to the group of individuals having an income of $5,000 or less, the matter, it seems to me, is important and very, very serious.

I don't suppose that in this letter I have said anything that you do not already know. I have, however, a feeling that in these times any citizen like myself, who is thoroughly imbued with the benefits of the American way of life and with the idea that through a properly controlled capitalistic sytem, and through that only, we shall have gains in our social life, is under moral obligation to speak up, so, once in a while I have to pour out to someone in whom I have confidence, and who I believe will have influence in legislation, the view which I hold. While we may disagree in the trivial things in the details of the program, I feel that our goal is the same and inasmuch as I have had much experience in public affairs and in corporation financing, as well as in banking, in a small city of your home State, I feel qualified to speak with some authority on these subjects.

In your considerations also please don't forget those corporations which are still obligated to banks and which have, as a result of the depression, been carrying on with considerable banking obligations. If no provision is made for these corporations to lay aside something from their profits during this period, they will not even be able to pay the taxes when they accrue but, moreover, will not be able to pay their bank debts and will gradually disintegrate and fade out of the picture. This in itself is a large subject for discussion and for analysis, which I will not attempt to go into here, but it deserves your very careful consideration, and I hope that in your conversations on this subject with your fellow Senators you will not fail to impress them with the importance of this point.

Our whole tax system is on a deferred basis, which is exceedingly dangerous to individual as well as corporation taxpayers alike. No one knows at this moment how much of the income already received during the 5 months of 1942 belongs to the receiver, and yet it is flowing into the receivers in a constant stream, and I doubt that many are realizing that a large portion which they are receiving does not belong to them. This will seem to you, and it is, more or less of a plea for consideration of a tax system which will come from the source and not be deferred into the 12 months following the date of receipt of the income.

I have already written too long and will bring this letter to an abrupt close in hopes that you will have time to read it, and also with the thought that you do not need to acknowledge at all unless it occurs to you that you would like to do so. I know you are too busy to be eternally answering letters such as this.

With very kindest regards, I am,

Very sincerely yours,

CHARLES T. TREADWAY.

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD AT CONVENTION OF NEW YORK POST OFFICE SUPERVISORS AND POSTMASTERS

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the convention of the New York Post Office Supervisors and Postmasters at Rochester, N. Y., on May 23, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CRADLE OF FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at Red Bank, N. J., on May 31, 1942, on the subject The Cradle of Freedom, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY AT GETTYSBURG, PA.

[Mr. DAVIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator WILEY on May 30, 1942, at Gettysburg, Pa., which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENCEMENT DAY ADDRESS BY LEO T. CROWLEY AT THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Leo T. Crowley at the Catholic University of America on the occasion of the commencement day exercises, which appears in the Appendix.]

NORRIS OF NEBRASKA—ADDRESS AT COLGATE UNIVERSITY CLASS-DAY EXERCISES

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by William G. Searle, delivered at the Colgate University class-day exercises held on May 9, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

COMMENCEMENT ORATION BY NORMAN PHILIP ROSS AT BROWN UNIVERSITY

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the commencement oration entitled "Another Lost Generation?" delivered by Norman Philip Ross, of the class of 1942, at the commencement exercises of Brown University, on May 18, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

MEMORIAL DAY ADDRESS BY JOHN TOWLE AT TOPEKA, KANS.

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered at Topeka, Kans., on Memorial Day by John Towle, which appears in the Appendix.]

SUMMARY OF STATEMENT BY E. W. SHEETS ON TRADE AGREEMENT WITH MEXICO

[Mr. McCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a summary of the statement made on May 20, 1942, by E. W. Sheets, secretary of the United States Livestock Association, with reference to the trade agreement negotiations with Mexico, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE ROAD AWAY FROM REVOLUTION—ARTICLE BY WOODROW WILSON

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Atlantic Monthly of August 1923, by Woodrow Wilson, entitled "The Road Away from Revolution," which appears in the Appendix.]

CRITICISM OF GOVERNMENT—COMMENDATION OF BERNARD M. BARUCH

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Daily Mirror of June 1, 1942, entitled "Criticism Can Cut—or Construct," which appears in the Appendix.]

MIRRORS OF MOTORDOM—ARTICLE FROM STEEL

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the May 25 issue of Steel, entitled "Mirrors of Motordom," which appears in the Appendix.]

ARMY PAY AND ADJUSTMENT BILL—MOTION TO DISCHARGE SENATE CONFEREES

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, when the Senate last met I made a motion to discharge the Senate conferees on the bill (S. 2025) to adjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the armed forces of the United States. I have been advised that there are absent today several Senators who did not understand that I intended to bring up the motion today. I do not desire under any circumstances to take any advantage of any misunderstanding. In order that there shall be no misunderstanding in the future, I wish to state now that it is my intention to let the motion come up for consideration under the rule on Monday next.

Mr. President, it is my firm belief that an overwhelming majority of the Members of the Senate are in favor of the House provision for $50 base pay for the enlisted personnel of the armed services. Under the Senate rules, the only way to present the issue to the Senate now, if the conferees themselves do not bring it back to the Senate, is to make the motion which I have made.

Ordinarily, Mr. President, I think that conferees would bring back to the Senate an issue of this importance, and ask for the sentiment of the Senate on it, especially after the House had reaffirmed its position by an overwhelming yea-and-nay vote. Of course, I assume that I do not need to say that in taking up the motion on Monday next I shall not be in anywise critical or intending to cast any personal reflection upon the conferees representing the Senate in the conference; but I believe that the Senate should have a chance to vote on the question, and, as I view the matter, this is the only way under the circumstances that the Senate can vote upon it. I wish to say now that if my motion should prevail it then would be in order to appoint new conferees; and at that juncture it would be my purpose to instruct them to recede, and to accept the House amendment for $50 a month base pay.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I wish to make an observation in regard to the matter. Of course, the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin, coming at the time when it did, was rather unusual, in that the conferees had met only once since the House rejected the conference report and recommitted the report to the conferees. Of course, it was the duty of the Senate conferees at that meeting—at least they considered it to be their duty—to stand by the Senate provision. It is not always possible for conferees in the case of such a controversy, or in the case of many controversies, to agree the first day they meet on an item which is in disagreement. The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs and one of the conferees, was absent because he felt it his duty to go to North Carolina in order to take part in an election. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] likewise considered it his duty to return to his State in order to take part in an election there. The junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] was called from the city because of an illness in his family. So the conferees have had an opportunity to meet only once.

I am satisfied that the conferees will make every possible effort to reach an agreement and to return the issue to the Senate. Whether they can do so on Monday I do not know. The proposed law could not possibly take effect until July 1, no matter how soon we might act on it. Today is the 4th of June. I think it would be beyond the realm of possibility that the conferees would delay action on this matter until July 1. So, whatever is done regarding this matter, the law will take effect on July 1.

For that reason, I regret that the Senator from Wisconsin serves notice that he will make his motion on Monday. I think no time can be lost ultimately as to the final result of the legislation by giving the conferees time to go over it. The Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] has not yet returned. I think he will be back by Monday. I am informed that the Senator from North Carolina will also return by that date, and the Senator from South Dakota has already returned. I think they should be given reasonable opportunity to adjust this matter, without our seeking to hasten them unduly by a motion of this sort.

I want to appeal to the Senator from Wisconsin not to be too hasty because we have practically a month before the legislation could take effect anyway, and I am satisfied that the Senate will be permitted to pass upon it long before July 1.

The Senator from Colorado, who, I believe, is chairman of the conferees on the part of the Senate, and chairman of the subcommittee, is here and can speak for himself and for the conferees.

I think no time will be lost here if the Senator will forego his privilege to offer his motion on Monday; because we shall be in session at least every 3 days during the remainder of this month, so far as I can determine and foresee. I hope the Senator will consider my suggestions in determining his action on Monday.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, of course, I am always glad to give consideration to any suggestion made by the able and genial minority leader, but this matter has been hanging fire for months; the enlisted men have already lost several months' increase in pay because of the delay.

The question involved is not complicated; it merely has to do with whether we want to increase the pay of the enlisted personnel to $50 a month, which is the amount provided by the House, or whether we want to adhere to the lesser amount provided by the Senate bill. It is not a complicated question which makes it necessary to call in experts. It took the House, according to the RECORD, only a short space of time to vote in the ratio of about 10 to 1 in favor of the higher amount, and it is my opinion that is what the Senate will do if it gets an opportunity to act.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I shall yield in a moment. I am willing to consider what the Senator from Kentucky has said, but I am not making any commitments at this time, and I should like my colleagues to proceed upon the assumption, so far as their own attendance is concerned, that I intend to bring this up on Monday, because I think that the men who are serving in the armed forces, risking their lives for this country, are entitled to this increase in pay. As a matter of fact, I think that the Senator from Colorado at least—and he will correct me if I am wrong—does not take any umbrage at this motion; indeed, I believe he would welcome an expression of the Senate on this point, but, of course, he can speak for himself in that regard.

Mr. BARKLEY. If the Senator will yield——

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Kentucky.

Mr. BARKLEY. I merely wanted to observe that the delay to which the Senator has referred was not caused by the Senate or by a Senate committee or by the conferees. The Senate passed this bill nearly 2 months ago, and it went to the House. That body passed it 2 or 3 weeks ago. It then went to conference; the conference committee promptly agreed upon their report, and the report was submitted to the House, but was rejected. That action was taken only a few days ago. The conferees have had one meeting, but, due to the circumstances I related a moment ago, it was not possible for them to hold another meeting.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. With all due respect to what the Senator from Kentucky has said, I desire only to say that it does not make very much difference to the men in the armed services of the United States who are on the seven seas and on all the continents, who has caused the delay; so far as they are concerned, this bill is hung up; months go by, and they still continue to be paid according to what I believe to be an obsolete pay schedule. I do not care to discuss the merits of the measure at this time, but I believe all my colleagues realize that Australia, where, I think I am at liberty to say, we have a considerable body of men, pays her soldiers more than our own soldiers are being paid.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that at the present time the average enlisted man in the Army is not getting as much pay for overseas service as he did in the World War 25 years ago. It seems to me that that situation certainly should be corrected.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there is no one here who opposes an increase in soldiers' pay.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that.

Mr. BARKLEY. The only question is whether, in view of the circumstances, the Senate should take this matter away from the conferees when they have, it seems to me, pursued no course that indicates any deliberate intention on their part to delay.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator from Wisconsin will permit me further, let me say that I am not accusing anyone of delaying the matter; but I agree entirely with what the Senator from Wisconsin has said, that the sooner this question is determined and the sooner the increased pay scale is put into operation, the fairer it will be to the men who are already in the service. It seems to me that there ought to be some sort of a limitation on the debate of the conferees, and that the Senator from Wisconsin is perfectly within his rights. I do not know about Monday, but if the matter is not reported to the Senate and an opportunity given to take a test of the sentiment of this body as to whether it agrees with the overwhelming sentiment of the other House, it is perfectly justifiable for the Senator from Wisconsin or some other Senator to make a motion to concur in the House provision.

I heard over the radio this morning if the Senator from Wisconsin will permit me a moment further, that the Senator from Kentucky himself was proposing a compromise in the way of some deferred payment of the increase, with which I might be disposed to agree, but at the present time, so far as I am concerned, I will say frankly that I am in favor of the House provision. I can readily see, however, that some deferred payment might be of some advantage to the soldiers themselves, and I am sure the Senate will be glad to hear such a plan discussed, but it is a subject which the Senate itself ultimately is entitled to pass on, and, in my judgment, unless there can be a complete agreement on the part of the House and Senate conferees, agreeable to both contentions, the Senate really ought to have an opportunity to vote on the question whether they are willing to agree to the provision which was adopted by such an overwhelming vote in the House of Representatives.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin permit me to reply to the suggestion of the Senator from Missouri in regard to a radio statement?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Missouri mentioned me in regard to a radio report which I did not hear and have not heard of until now. I do not know what was said about it, but I am sure the Senator from Colorado will bear out my statement—I have made no suggestion or proposal of any sort. I was asked, in view of the fact that the House bill provided a maximum of $50 and the Senate bill a maximum of $42, whether the conferees legally and from a parliamentary standpoint could agree on, say, $42 in cash and $8 in bonds. I simply expressed the opinion they could do that if they saw fit to do it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree with the Senator on that point.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is all I said about it, and it was not my suggestion at all.

I wish to say, while I am on my feet, that if I had any proof or if there was any indication that the conferees were unduly delaying a report on this matter I should certainly be one to join in in undertaking to take it away from them, but I do not believe that such a situation has arisen.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, the one point I wish to make is that the only object there can possibly be for holding this bill in conference is to chisel a few dollars out of the enlisted pay of the men in the service of the United States. I am against that. I am not reflecting on the conferees in any way when I say that we are the body which they are representing, and if there is an overwhelming sentiment here to give the enlisted men of the armed forces $50 a month the Senate ought to have a chance to pass on that question.

Let me say a word in connection with the suggestion that as to forcing the enlisted personnel to put their money into savings bonds and savings stamps, require that of the civilians of this country first; require it of the officer personnel first, but do not require it of the enlisted men who are already having allotments and allowances taken out of their pay. There will soon be before the Senate a bill which will take part of their monthly pay check for allotments for dependents.

So, Mr. President, I repeat, this is not a complicated question; it is a question on which men who want to agree can agree at any time. This is one of the rare occasions in my legislative experience when one body had not voted on a proposition and the other body had voted on it, and then went back and reiterated its position by a record yea-and-nay vote, that the conferees representing the body where the matter had not been under consideration did not either yield or at least go back and get instructions from the body they were representing.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad to yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Wisconsin has repeated over and over again that he does not reflect on anyone, and yet he accuses the Senate conferees of being chiselers. I wonder if he thinks that calling a man a chiseler is really a compliment?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. So far as the Senator from Colorado and the other conferees are concerned, I reiterate that there is nothing personal in the motion I have made, but I do say that the only reason for keeping this matter in conference and not yielding to the House is to try to devise some kind of a scheme whereby the men in the armed services, the enlisted personnel, will get less money on their check at the end of each month. Perhaps I was unfortunate in using the word "chisel," and I withdraw it, but the effect is just the same. [Manifestations of applause in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The occupants of the galleries are here as the guests of the Senate. Under the rules of the Senate, no expressions of approval or disapproval are permissible.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in all sincerity, I apologize if I used any improper language or made any improper statement, for I have the utmost respect for every member of the conference committee personally; I have the utmost respect for the Senator from Colorado in particular, and I withdraw any remarks I made about chiseling.

Let me say again, however, that this is the only way under the Senate rules of which I know whereby, if the conferees themselves will not come back for instructions, the Senate can vote on this matter. And I do not think it is such a complicated question that we cannot settle it here in a very short space of time.

I yield to the Senator from Colorado, if he desires to have me do so.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to have the Senator yield to me for a very brief statement.

This is the first time in my recollection that a conference committee of the Senate has been taken to task for upholding the position of the Senate. We conceived it to be our duty to fight for the bill passed by the Senate.

Therefore I do not think the Senator has been quite fair to the Senate conferees. We have been working on a military pay bill for more than 8 months. A resolution was offered by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] calling upon the various branches of the military service to get together and decide what they would recommend in the way of pay increases for the armed forces, and after a long time they finally did reach an agreement. That was the first time in the history of this Nation when all the branches of the military service sat down around one board and worked out what they recommended as a pay schedule.

Military pay is a very complicated matter, as will be discovered by anyone who undertakes to study it. At least we found it quite complicated. It is a subject which has to be approached with a great deal of study, or maladjustments will result which will do great harm to the service.

As I have stated, for many months we have been working on a pay bill. A subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs worked on it for months, and finally we brought a bill before the full committee, and it was passed on favorably by the Senate Committee on Military Affairs. The bill came to the floor of the Senate, and was passed by a unanimous vote—not a viva voce vote, but a recorded vote. Every Member of the Senate on the floor at the time supported the bill.

Mr. President, the bill passed by the Senate made substantial increases in the pay of the armed forces, and in it were worked out adjustments between the different branches of the service. The Senate approved our work, as I have said, by a unanimous affirmative vote.

The bill then went to the House of Representatives, and was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs of that body in the form in which it left the Senate, and was brought to the floor of the House in almost the same form. At the last moment someone had a happy thought, and, moved by the generous impulse we all feel toward the men in military service, jumped to his feet and offered an amendment providing for more generous payment in the last two pay bases under the bill. A vote was had in the House, and the amendment was agreed to by a very large majority.

The conferees on the part of the two Houses then met, and worked out all the differences between the two Houses, accepted the Senate version of the pay schedules, and accepted the House versions of many other parts of the bill, as conference committees do. The bill went back to the House, and the House accepted all the amendments except that covering the pay schedule, and by another vote the bill was sent back to conference.

We again met in conference and went over the bill very carefully once more, but the conferees were unable to agree, and recessed—we did not adjourn—largely because the House conferees could not make any compromises whatever. They could not split the differences between the House and the Senate regarding the figures which had been agreed to. In short, we could not work out a compromise.

As I have said, the Senate bill carried sizable increases for the armed forces, in fact, it doubled the pay of a private. Yet the Senator from Wisconsin accuses the Senate of trying to "chisel" some pay from the soldiers. We voted to give them an increase in pay. Of course, the House wanted to be a little more generous.

We took a great many things into consideration in working out the pay bill which I know received no consideration on the floor of the House when the pay amendment crept in, and I know that they have not been considered by the Senator from Wisconsin to the present hour. I suppose the Senator from Wisconsin does not know that there is war-risk insurance available to every member of our armed forces.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I must interrupt the Senator at that point, because I do know that. I am a member of the Committee on Finance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I wish, then, to tell the other Senators about it, for I am sure they do not know it; and I wish to tell the Senator something about it which perhaps he has not yet discovered.

The $10,000 war-risk insurance is available to every member of the armed forces, at an average cost to the soldier of 67 cents a thousand a month. It is generally thought that that takes care of the premium costs of the war-risk insurance, but it does not. We are told by the Veterans' Administration that, in addition to the 67 cents a thousand a month, amounting to $6.70 for the $10,000, the United States Government has to pay an additional premium, based on the experience in the last World War, of from $3.50 to $4, five times the amount the soldier pays. So, the soldier is getting a war-insurance policy with a token payment by himself, and the Treasury is carrying more than 80 percent of the load. That is one thing.

In the Senate bill there was provided for a new system of longevity pay, an advantage the soldiers have never had before. When anyone in the military forces serves 3 years, he gets an increase in his pay of 5 percent for every 3-year enlistment. In 30 years the increase would amount to 50 percent, and that is the limit; that is as much as they can get. When soldiers retire, if they do retire they get 75 percent of their base pay.

I am not arguing that the soldiers are overpaid, because I know they are not; our military forces are not overpaid, and they will not be overpaid, indeed, they will not be adequately paid, in my opinion, even if the House amendment shall be agreed to. I do not think they can be paid enough to compensate them for combat service. But they have a retirement privilege which the ordinary employee does not have, at 75 percent of their base pay. They have compensation which is far more liberal than any workmen's compensation existent in the United States at the present time.

If a soldier has a disability amounting to as much as 10 percent, he receives a monthly pension of $10, and it increases with the severity of the disability until one can draw as much as $235 a month for the rest of his life as military compensation.

Of course, we cannot compare military compensation with workmen's compensation, yet I say again that the compensation we have provided is far more liberal than that provided by any State in the way of workmen's compensation for employees in the State.

Parachute troops, as we all know, receive $50 a month above the regular pay. Certain riflemen receive from $1 to $5 a month extra.

The pay schedule worked out in the bill, as I have stated, has the approval of all the branches of the military service. Each rank is balanced against the other, so that a private receives so much, a private first class receives somewhat more, then comes the corporal, next come four grades of sergeant. Each rank bears a relationship to the others, which is thrown completely out of kilter by the amendment that was adopted on the floor of the House at the last minute, without consideration by any committee of either the House or the Senate.

Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. O'DANIEL addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield first to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. I did not wish to interrupt the Senator, except that I have a conference report to present.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I cannot yield for that purpose.

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall wait until the Senator concludes.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I do not wish to cast any reflection on the Senate members of the conference committee which has the servicemen's pay increase bill under consideration. I do wish to compliment the committee which have handled the proposed legislation, because I think the bill they have presented is a good measure, except that I thought and still believe the increases in pay should have been larger.

In my opinion it is extremely unfortunate that the situation which now confronts us does exist, because, regardless of parliamentary procedure, or the technicalities involved, it is the general opinion of many citizens, especially the citizens of my State, that the Senate is responsible for holding up the increase in

salaries which is due the soldiers, as it has been provided in the amendment adopted by the House of Representatives. I think every move possible should be made to permit the Senate to pass on the proposal of further increases as proposed by the House. I am in favor of these additional increases and I believe the majority of the Members of this Senate will vote for the increase, if permitted to vote.

I think I am entitled to make this observation, because these suggestions come to me from the citizens of Texas, and while I know that every State in the Union is making a great contribution to the war effort, I wish at this time, in connection with the pay-increase bill now under consideration, to give briefly a history of what the State of Texas is doing which justifies their right to ask for this consideration.

Mr. President, the proud history of Texas has for more than a century been written by deeds of brave men on the field of battle.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Is it the intention of the Senator to make a speech?

Mr. O'DANIEL. I wish to put into the RECORD the names of some of the heroes of this present World War who have come from Texas.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Would not the Senator be willing to defer doing so, because I wish to refer to something the Senator from Colorado said? I should be glad to have the Senator proceed with his statement at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I should like to have the statement in the RECORD at this time, because it pertains to the subject now being discussed.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have no objection if the Senator wishes to have the statement printed, but I should like to have some little of my time.

Mr. O'DANIEL. I ask unanimous consent that the names of these Texas heroes and my remarks concerning them be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. President, the proud history of Texas has for more than a century been written by deeds of brave men on the field of battle. A brief statement of those deeds of our heroes of the past and present outshines any flowery eulogy that might be written by the pens of our greatest poets or writers.

May I have the honor, sir, to record here, on behalf of our six and one-half million Texas citizens the names of some of our brave Texas men who have by their heroic deeds and sacrifices written their names indelibly in the history of the world to live on forever, and who have been honorably decorated by our Commander in Chief and the War and Navy Departments.

The following 13 Texas heroes flew with General Doolittle over Tokyo to return in kind our first installment of the debt we owe them for their sneak attack on our peaceful shores of Pearl Harbor December 7, 1941:

Capt. David M. Jones, Winters.
Lt. Thadd H. Blanton, Gainesville.
Lt. William N. Fitzhugh, Galveston.
Lt. Robert M. Gray, Killeen.
Lt. Dean E. Hallmark, Dallas.
Lt. Nolan A. Herndon, Sulphur Springs.
Lt. Robert L. Hite, Earth.
Lt. E. E. McElroy, Longview.
Lt. James M. Parker, Jr., Livingston.
Lt. Kenneth E. Reddy, Bowie.
Lt. Rodney R. Wilder, Taylor.
Lt. Lucian N. Youngblood, Waco.
Staff Sgt. Douglas V. Radney, Mineola.

The following 14 Texas marines were decorated by our Navy Department for heroism at Corrigedor in the Battle of the Philippines:

Silver Star with oak-leaf cluster, Corp. William N. McCormack, Aransas Pass.

Silver Star:
Capt. Paul A. Brown, Galveston.
Sgt. Houston L. Davis, Big Spring.
Sgt. Joe B. Chastain, Waco.
Sgt. Carl E. Downing, Hillsboro.
Sgt. Uri L. Huckabay, Jr., Lubbock.
Corp. Melvin D. Bailey, Mineola.
Pvt. Lloyd T. Durbin, Tyler.

Letters of Commendation:
Corp. Isaac Clarence Williams, Jr., Belton.
Pvt. Loren Henry Brantley, Daingerfield.
Pvt. Roy W. Miller, Beaumont.

Purple Heart:
Corp. Billy W. Allen, Van Alstyne.
Pvt. Thornton E. Hamby, Seymour.
Pvt. Richard James Watson, San Angelo.

The following 19 daring Texas heroes have been awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for "extraordinary achievement" in various daring airplane flights:

First Lt. Henry Dittman, Goose Creek.
Maj. Alva L. Harvey, Cleburne.
Second Lt. Eddie W. Hayman, Huntsville.
Second Lt. Robert F. Wasson, Odessa.
Staff Sgt. James L. Cannon, Schertz (posthumous).
Technical Sgt. George A. Heard, Longview.
Technical Sgt. Thomas E. Keahey, Sabinal, Uvalde.
Master Sgt. Joseph C. Laza, Ennis.
Technical Sgt. Roger W. Stephens, Waco.
Technical Sgt. Perry W. Whitley, Santo.
Maj. Cecil E. Combs, Dallas.
Capt. James J. Connally, Waco.
Capt. Alvin J. Mueller, Seguin.
Capt. Hewitt T. Wheless, Menard.
First Lt. Richard T. Knight, Lubbock.
Capt. James W. Chapman, Jr., Austin.
First Lt. Elbert D. Reynolds, Beaumont.
First Lt. William F. Vickers, Jr., Beaumont.
Sgt. Edward Schrempf, Kingsville, Kleberg.

The following nine Texas heroes have been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross for heroism in this World War:

Col. Adlai C. Young, Houston.
Lt. Col. Irvin Alexander, San Antonio.
Lt. Col. Ross B. Smith, Waco.
Capt. William E. Dyess, Albany.
First Lt. Samuel H. Marett, New Braunfels, (posthumous).
Lt. John D. Bulkley (U. S. N.) San Antonio.
Staff Sgt. William H. Stewart, Van Alstyne.
Sgt. Charles H. Hollingsworth, Claude.
Pvt. Raymond U. Jones, Sunset.

The Soldier's Medal for Heroism has been conferred on the following enlisted Texas men:

Pvt. L. C. Netherly, Choice (posthumous).
Pvt. Emmett L. Coppock, Alvarado.

The Brazilian Government has conferred the Order of the Southern Cross on Capt. J. W. Chapman of Austin, Tex., pilot in the Army's air ferrying command, for services rendered the Brazilian Government.

Lt. Comdr. Stanley P. Moseley of Ft. Worth received the Navy Cross for sinking Japanese ships with his submarine in Japanese waters and the following Texas heroes have been decorated, promoted, or commended for valorous action, by the Navy Department:

Jack Frank Cavender, chief electrician's mate, Sanderson.

Dee Arthur Donner, chief machinist's mate, Denison (posthumous).

Albert Emil Jurca, aviation machinist's mate, Needville.

Raymond Gano Easterling, storekeeper, Groesbeck.

Glenn William Phinney, Jr., aviation machinist's mate, Freer.

Hubert Sherwood Whittington, painter, Franklin.

President Roosevelt also bestowed the Navy Cross on Doris Miller, 23-year-old Negro Navy mess attendant from Route 1, Waco, Tex., for heroism at Pearl Harbor during the Japanese attack.

Other Texas heroes will be given honorable mention in this CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as their names are revealed.

Mr. President, ever since that little band of immortal Texas heroes at the Alamo in 1836 defended liberty, freedom, and democracy to the death of the last man, the cry "Remember the Alamo" has been ringing in the ears of all Texans, spurring them on to deeds of heroic action. Here today is recorded the names of those brave Texas heroes whose battle cry is "Remember the Alamo"—"Remember Pearl Harbor."

The brave Texas heroes who followed our Gen. Sam Houston into the jaws of death at San Jacinto went in shouting "Remember the Alamo," and came out with one of the world's most decisive victories. That proud name, Houston, was engraven on that powerful battle cruiser which recently went down off Java shores in a blaze of fighting glory. On the lips of those brave men who went down with her you will find engraven these indelible words, "Remember the Alamo—Remember Pearl Harbor." Born of that watery grave a new "Sam Houston" battleship will arise to ride the waves to victory. From the broad plains of Texas there arose last Saturday more than 1,000 brave stalwart Texas boys who marched to the city of Houston, with the battle cry ringing in their ears, "Remember the Alamo—Remember Pearl Harbor"—"remember the brave crew of the battle cruiser *Houston*." There on the streets of Houston, almost within the shadow of that impressive San Jacinto Monument, those 1,000 brave Texas heroes, known as the Houston volunteers, took their oath and were inducted into the naval service in one body. They then left in 5 special trains for naval bases to train for their avowed task of avenging the cruiser *Houston*. The world will hear from those brave Texas boys—those 1,000 Houston volunteers. As long as 1 Texan lives and breathes, freedom, liberty, and democracy will live. Remember the Alamo!

Mr. President, such patriotism and devotion to our country and our cause should be recognized. Therefore, on behalf of these Texas heroes and the thousands of other brave Texas men in the service, I insist that this Senate find a way to agree to the pay increases which have been adopted by the House. This is no time to quibble about the matter or to be chinche with the amount of salaries to be paid to the men who are doing the actual fighting to save our Nation.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I have in mind the objection made against the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin, by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], and I was wondering whether on Monday, or today, we could not present a resolution calling for an expression of the sentiment of the Senate which would not do violence to the present conference committee set-up, and which would give the Senate at the same time an opportunity to make a decision on this very important matter. A resolution submitted today would go over until Monday. It would then be in order, as I understand, to render a decision, so far as the collective Senate is concerned, on this very vital matter.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I gave consideration to that suggestion, but

the difficulty is that a resolution submitted and lying over under the rule, if it comes up after an adjournment and if there is any unfinished business, is displaced at 2 o'clock. This motion is in order. It can be taken up, and it is a parliamentary motion. I do not think that any member of the conference committee should take umbrage at it.

Mr. President, I now want to say a few words in reply to what the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has stated.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to make an additional statement, which I overlooked a moment ago, in regard to the schedule of pay the soldiers receive?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I overlooked mentioning the Clark amendment, which is being incorporated in this bill, providing for a 20 percent increase for all service away from continental United States, including Alaska, Hawaii, the Canal Zone, on the high seas, and in all the rest of the world. For service away from the continental United States the soldier receives a 20 percent increase in pay, which would raise his pay from $42 to $50, and, of course, if the Rankin amendment is adopted, the soldier's pay will be raised to $60 a month under the provision of the Clark amendment.

I should like to ask one other question, if the Senator from Wisconsin will be so kind as to permit me to do so at this point. Was the Senator from Wisconsin present when the bill providing for an increase in pay to $42 a month passed the Senate?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I was.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Did the Senator from Wisconsin offer any amendment to increase the pay to $50 a month?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I did not. Of course I did not, or there would have been a record vote on it. But, Mr. President, that does not embarrass me in the slightest.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It embarrasses me.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. It may embarrass the Senator, but if the Senator from Colorado thinks he embarrasses me by asking me that question I will say that by doing so he simply gives me a springboard from which to take off.

Mr. President, I did not intend to debate the merits of the proposition today, but since the question has come up, I will not let the record stand in this one-sided fashion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me before he finishes his remarks, with respect to what seems to me to be some misapprehension of the general parliamentary situation?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Let me say that, in my opinion, there is nothing in the proposed motion of the Senator from Wisconsin which in any degree whatever reflects on either the House conferees or the Senate conferees with respect to the bill. What happened was that, as the Senator from Colorado has truly said, a bill was passed on a yea-and-nay vote in this body, with a practically unanimous vote; indeed, as I recall, it was unanimous.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It was unanimous.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It was unanimous. Whereupon the bill went over to the House, and the House, acting in full accordance with its constitutional function, proceeded to raise the pay increase of enlisted men in certain ranks to $50. The House did that by a very large vote. Then the bill went to conference. The Senate conferees were entirely within their rights in disagreeing to the House provision and in adopting a so-called compromise. The compromise in effect was the Senate provision. Then the bill went back to the House, and the House again, in full accordance with its function as a full coordinate body of the Congress, proceeded to defeat that compromise by a vote of some 10 to 1, or by even a larger vote than that, I believe.

Mr. President, it seems to me that at that point the normal parliamentary practice, at least in my observation, which has been a good many years here, would have been for the Senate conferees to come back to the Senate and ask for instructions, ask the Senate whether it wanted to proceed further in conference, or whether in view of the overwhelming vote expressed in the House, the Senate wanted to recede from its original provision, and accept the House provision, or some modification between them, and ask for a new conference, at which time it would have been in order, after the further conference had been asked for, and before the conferees were appointed, for the Senate to instruct its conferees on anything it pleased.

That procedure, however, has not been followed. In other words, the conferees have taken it on themselves to act, and as I said, I speak in no terms of reflection on them whatever, because the Senate conferees have been expressing the unanimous vote of the Senate, but a unanimous vote of the Senate before this question of controversy arose. It seems to me the proper thing would be either for the conferees themselves to come back and ask for instructions, or for the Senate itself, if this matter is unduly delayed, to terminate the conference, ask for a new conference, at which time there will be an opportunity—after the conference has been asked for and before the conferees have been appointed—for the Senate to instruct its conferees. That is the only way by which the sentiment of the Senate itself, rather than the sentiment of the Senate conferees, can be taken.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I agree a thousand percent with the analysis of the parliamentary situation made by the Senator from Missouri, who is one of the ablest parliamentarians in this or any other legislative body. As I said a moment ago, I had not intended to debate the merits of this issue, but the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has put some statements into the RECORD which he inferred no one else in the Senate knew anything about. He talks about insurance. If a man wants $10,000 of insurance, that takes $6.70 out of his pay check every month. The Senator from Colorado talks about longevity pay. For those in the regular service in peacetime longevity pay would be of interest. But if a man survives in Australia for 3 years, the Senator from Colorado and his colleagues are ready to raise his pay 5 percent, and if he could stay out there 30 years they would raise it 50 percent. Five percent, Mr. President, after 3 years of overseas combat service would entitle a man to $2 increase per month.

The Senator from Colorado talks about retirement pay. Unfortunately, Mr. President, many of these men who are now fighting the battles of our country will not live to take advantage of the retirement pay of 75 percent of $40.

Mr. President, I have never contended that we could adequately pay men who offer their lives for their country. I admit that. But I say that the Nation, which is the richest nation on earth, can afford to be as generous with its men in combat service as can any other nation, and I have already pointed out that men fighting side by side with the Anzacs in Australia are drawing less money from the United States Government than the soldiers of Australia are drawing from their commonwealth.

The Senator from Colorado talks about disability pay. We are all in favor of that. There is no argument about that. The Senate went on record 100 percent for disability pay.

The Senator from Colorado talks about the rifleman getting extra compensation if he qualifies. Everyone is in favor of that. But, Mr. President, I contend that if the Senate were given a chance to vote on this issue it would be overwhelmingly in favor of accepting the House proposition for a base pay of $50 a month. Then, if we have to make some adjustments in the other grades to equalize it, let us go ahead and do so.

Mr. President, I wish to call attention, however, to the startling contrast in the way in which we deal with legislation involving the pay of the men who are in the field ready to make the supreme sacrifice—and many of them already have given their lives for this country in this war—and the way we treat appropriations for matériel. We will quickly pass a large appropriation bill in the Senate—I think the last one of $35,000,000,000 was passed in an hour and 35 minutes, if my memory serves me correctly. But it has taken 6 months to get even to this stage of doing away with an outmoded, an indefensible and niggardly base pay, for service in time of war. Twenty-percent increase for overseas service! Surely we are all for that; but is there anyone in the Senate who is not willing to give 20-percent increase over a $50 base as distinguished from a $40 base? If there is, I want to see his name on a yea-and-nay vote. Let him come out in the open and let us see where he stands.

Mr. President, I know it has been whispered around here that the men in the armed forces cannot be trusted with all this money. That kind of an

argument makes my blood boil. We are willing to trust them with the future and the fate of this Nation under arms, baring their breasts to the bullets of the enemy and to the bombs from enemy planes, but it has been stated and whispered around that these men are not to be trusted with an extra $10 a month to spend.

Mr. President, I understand, also, there is some opposition from some of the services, some of the higher-ups in the armed services of the United States. If so, this is one time when I think the civilian arm of the Government ought to overrule the "brass hat." We can decide whether we are willing these men should have $50 a month as base pay just as well as those who are on the general staff or who are speaking for the War or the Navy Departments. That is a field in which I think we should exercise our prerogative and privilege of determining policy.

To reiterate, Mr. President, I have offered this motion only so that the Senate may have an opportunity to vote on this issue. I do not think Senators should require any great length of time to come to a conclusion one way or the other as to whether they are willing to grant a base pay of $50 a month to our men in the armed forces.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado rose.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Does the Senator wish me to yield to him?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am sure the Senator knows that no one would be happier than I should be to have an expression by the Senate on this very issue.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator could have obtained such an expression last Tuesday if the conferees had reported a disagreement and asked for instructions. That could have been done without my making this motion. The Senator can accomplish that end on Monday. I shall not press the motion if the conferees will bring in a report of disagreement and let the Senate vote on the issue without having to accept a compromise proposal. If that is done I shall not press the motion. All I am asking is that the democratic process function in this body.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Naturally I should be glad to have an expression from the Senate on that very point. I have no objection to the Senate voting on the question.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator and his colleagues can bring in the conference report on Monday and accomplish that purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. We are not in agreement. The Senator from Wisconsin wishes to discharge a conference committee which has been very faithful to its duty.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator does not wish to have the motion voted on, all he has to do is to have the conferees report a disagreement. The Senate will find a parliamentary means of expressing itself without my motion being pressed.

It is perfectly evident that the conferees on the part of the Senate do not want that; some others do not want it; they do not want the Senate to vote on this naked issue. They want some kind of a compromise or scheme whereby additional pay will be granted in the form of savings stamps or bonds, which the soldiers cannot spend until the war is over. I think that before we force that kind of a proposal on the men in the armed forces of the United States we should impose it upon ourselves, upon Members of Congress, upon other civilian employees of the Government at all levels, and upon the civilian population. Let us not jam it down the throats of the men who are ready to die for every citizen of this country.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. AUSTIN. The conferees on the part of the Senate are the servants of the Senate. There is a rule with respect to the duty of the conferees which the conferees followed in this case. There was nothing about this conference to cause any such uproar as this. The charges just now made about the attitude of the conferees on the part of the Senate are not true.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I will not yield for the Senator to make any such statement in my time. The Senator can bide his time. I have the floor. I decline to yield further to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. If the Senator cares to be fair, he will permit me to continue for just a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I resent the Senator's statement that what I have just said is untrue.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the conferees had not reached the point of disagreement when they took their recess. They were not hopeless; and nobody has any right to assume that they were. The conferees merely took a recess. That is the position of the conference at this time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if I am correctly informed, the facts are that certain of the Senate conferees were ready to yield on this issue, but were prevented from doing so by a majority of the Senate conferees.

The Senator from Kentucky has already stated that one difficulty was that because of the overwhelming vote the House was not in a position to compromise. I wish to be entirely frank about this matter. I am opposed to a compromise on this issue. I believe that if the Senate is given an opportunity to vote on this question, an overwhelming majority of the Senate will be found opposed to a compromise. It is apparent from what has been stated by others—not by the Senator from Wisconsin—that what the Senate conferees are seeking to do is to find some way to avoid accepting the House amendment giving the men $50 a month. I want to give them $50 a month, and I believe a majority of the Senate would be found in favor of doing so if the Senate had an opportunity to vote on the question.

Therefore, Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, if the conferees will report a disagreement, I shall not press my motion. If they will not, I shall press my motion.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he takes his seat?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In the present parliamentary situation, if the conferees should come in with a so-called compromise or agreement which is less than the House provision, on which the House has twice expressed itself, the proposal might be very much less favorable to the enlisted men of the Army than the position which has already been twice taken by the House, and much less favorable than the position which would be taken by an overwhelming majority of this body if the Senate had an opportunity to vote; and yet no such proposal would be presented by the conference report. In such an event, while an overwhelming majority of the Senate might be glad to have an opportunity to concur in the House provision, even though the conference proposal might be much less favorable than the House provision, or much less favorable than the Senate itself would be willing to grant, if the Senate should vote against the conference report it would be in the position of sending the matter back to conference and further prolonging the interminable delay in the matter. It seems to me that there should be an opportunity somewhere along the line for the Senate to express its opinion in the changed parliamentary situation since the House took the position which it has taken.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. All I want is an opportunity for the Senate to vote on the question. If I am wrong in assuming that a majority of my colleagues are willing to give the enlisted personnel of our armed forces a base pay of $50 a month in time of war, I shall be happy to acquiesce in the decision of the Senate, as I have always done.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have never taken umbrage at what a majority of this body has done, and I never shall. However, I say that inherently we have the right to vote on this question. I am not embarrassed by the remarks of the Senator from Colorado to the effect that I did not offer a proposal providing for $50 a month. I admit that I was derelict. I admit that I was asleep at the switch. At last I have awakened; and with the help of the House we are in such a position that if the majority of my colleagues will join with me on Monday, we can give the enlisted personnel of the armed forces of this rich Nation $50 a month. I think that is what the Senate would do.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. I wish to commend the Senator from Wisconsin for the attitude he has taken. I hope he will press his motion. I hope the conferees may find it possible to make a report without the necessity of the motion being pressed.

The question of increased pay for the armed forces of the United States has been under consideration for 8 months. There have been great increases in the wages of those engaged in the production of munitions. It is next to impossible to hire a man to work on a farm for $50 a month. Wages have gone up all over the country. The soldier is the only man with respect to whom the Government reaches out with the arm of the law and says, "You are in the Army." Then he is told where he must go. He has no choice. He does not object. He cannot strike. It is no great credit to this country that we do not overcharge him for insurance when we send him into swamps and other disease-infested areas all over the world. When we were considering the limitation of profits on war contracts, price control, and the fixing of wages, we were asked by the heads of the departments which have control over our armed forces to keep our hands off. We were told that the departments would solve the problem. Our soldiers and sailors are the only ones who are required by the Government to face death, and yet we have required 8 months to determine what their base pay shall be.

We have had a concrete expression by the House of Representatives, representing the will of the people, not once but twice. Even though the Senate thought that $42 a month was adequate pay, I think it is time for us to join in the expression of the representatives of the people, and I am anxious for an opportunity to do so.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I appreciate the Senator's statement. I shall not further prolong the debate, but shall defer any further remarks until Monday.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad that the matter has been brought before the Senate at this time for the reason that I shall not be able to be present in the Senate on Monday. I am glad that we have had this discussion.

In reply to the statements which have been made by the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Wisconsin in regard to $42 a month being adequate, I do not think any Senator believes that $42 a month is adequate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator will search my remarks in vain—unless I misspoke myself—to find any statement by me that $42 or $50 is adequate. At the outset I stated that I have no idea, and never have had, that we can compensate with money for the services rendered by men who join the armed forces of the Nation in time of war. That is not intended. It cannot be accomplished. There are two ways of dealing with the question. We can either try to treat them generously, or try to treat them in a niggardly fashion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The routine morning business is closed.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH—CONFERENCE REPORT

During the delivery of Mr. LA FOLLETTE'S speech,

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I do not wish to take the Senator off the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I cannot yield for the purpose of permitting the Senator to have a conference report considered.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I shall not make any move which will take the Senator off the floor. I should like to submit a conference report on House bill 6802, the legislative appropriation measure, with the understanding that it will be laid before the Senate immediately upon the conclusion of what the Senator from Wisconsin has to say. I am not going to ask for the regular order. I am trying to be courteous to the Senator with respect to the matter.

Mr. McNARY. Action on the conference report will require agreement. We have not yet completed the routine morning business. What is now being discussed is under unanimous consent. I do not wish to object to what is now being done, but I shall object to any agreement with respect to a conference report.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on House bill 6802.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair). Does the Senator yield for that purpose?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received.

Mr. McNARY. Action cannot be taken upon until we shall have completed the morning business.

The report submitted by Mr. TYDINGS is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6802) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 26, 30, and 36.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 18 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29, 31, 32, 33, 35, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, and 46; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert "$2,280 and $120 additional"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": Provided further, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 73 of the act of January 12, 1895 (44 U. S. C. 241), no part of the foregoing sum of $3,985,000 shall be used for printing and binding part 2 of the annual report of the Secretary of Agriculture (known) as the Yearbook of Agriculture)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 34.

M. E. TYDINGS,
HARRY S. TRUMAN,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
C. WAYLAND BROOKS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

EMMET O'NEAL,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
BUTLER B. HARE,
KARL STEFAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

After the conclusion of Mr. LA FOLLETTE'S speech,

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report on the legislative appropriation bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I do not intend to make any special objections to the conference report, because I do not desire to hold up the legislative appropriation bill to which the Senator from Rhode Island offered an amendment providing for the construction of a roof over the Senate wing of the Capitol Building. I understand that in the conference the House conferees objected to the Senate's providing for the building of a roof over the Senate wing, and provision for that purpose is now striken out in the report just filed by the chairman of the Joint Conference Committee.

I was appointed chairman of a committee, under Senate Resolution 150, to make investigation, to take testimony, and to report back to the Senate our recommendations. Two years ago an appropriation was made for the reconstruction of the roof over all the Senate wing. It has not been used. Our committee decided that while we are reconstructing the roof over the Senate wing, we should also undertake to repair the interior of the Senate Chamber so that it will not be dangerous and so that such repairs will not have to be repeated for years to come.

A few days ago—Tuesday, as I recall—we had a test air-raid alarm, and we were instructed to assemble, and did assemble, in the air-raid shelters in the basement of the Senate Office Building. I do not know of anything more dangerous than what is now hanging over our heads. If Senators have not been up between the glass ceiling of this Chamber and the skylights, they should go. The ceiling weighs 90 tons. It is made of cast iron and is hung to stringers weighing 80 tons, made of wrought iron. During the past 83 years of heat and cold they have pulled apart. That is the reason why it was necessary last year to put up the steel braces weighing 76 tons, which now keep the

180 tons of iron and glass from falling in, as they are likely to do, even without any air raid.

In 1858, when the original roof and ceiling of the Senate Chamber were constructed, steel was not used in the construction of buildings of this kind, or perhaps in the construction of any buildings. I have been told by persons who should know that there will very likely be a token bombing of Washington. If there should be a token bombing, one building which our enemies would want to hit is this Capitol. I have also been told that a thousand-pound bomb dropped within three blocks of this building would not leave a single piece of glass either in the ceiling or in the roof of the Senate. All of it would come down. Our enemies may choose their time to make such a bombing experiment.

It seems to me that the Senate and the House have overslept their rights in not undertaking to protect the Chambers which they occupy, and which will continue to be highly dangerous if left as they are now.

In the amendment which we offered to the legislative appropriation bill which went to conference we recommended that $103,000 be added to the appropriation already made for the Senate in order to provide a modern auditorium in which to transact the Senate's business. In doing that we recommended that an acoustic ceiling be installed, either partially or in whole, so that we might be enabled to hear one another when we debate important questions. All Members of the Senate know that on the Republican side of the aisle there are certain points from which we cannot hear anything that is said from some points on the other side of the aisle. Every time any Member of the Senate is speaking on an important question we observe the Senators whose seats are on the other side of the aisle coming over here and sitting in seats on this side in order to hear at all. The corresponding thing occurs when the Senator speaking is standing on the other side of the aisle. Certainly it is not common sense for us to have to sit here day after day and often not know what is going on. On many occasions when I have heard the distinguished senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], and other Senators speak from their desks on the other side of the aisle, and when I should have liked to know what they were saying, by the time I could reach a point near them, from which I could hear what they were saying, they had completed their remarks. That is only one of the reasons why something should be done relative to the reconstruction of the roof and interior of the Senate Chamber.

Again, let me say that 90 tons of cast iron are hanging in the ceiling over us, which I understand could easily drop if the 80 tons of wrought-iron stringers above it should give way. That makes 180 tons of iron and glass which right now hang over this Chamber, in addition to 76 tons of temporary steel braces now in place.

Also, I am wondering if we are not hoarding when we continue to keep all this metal from use. How many ships could be built with it? How many guns would it provide? Yet we sit here and allow such a situation to continue.

Not only that, but the work could be done during the coming summer. If we postpone having the work done until after a bombing occurs, it may be too late. In any event, we shall have to vacate this Chamber, regardless of whether we are here at the time when the bombing occurs. We can easily meet in the old Senate Chamber, as we did last year. There is no gallery there, but it is not necessary to have a gallery. We can transact business faster if we do not have a gallery, and Senators know the reason.

There are other important features which must be considered in connection with this matter. We recommend that the present ceiling and beams be entirely removed, and that a modern, plaster-over ceiling—for which we have drawings—be placed above the Chamber, with coves for indirect lighting. Such a lighting system would relieve us from the situation in which we so often find ourselves. For example, whenever, the sun comes out from behind a cloud we are in a glare; but 10 minutes afterward a cloud passes between us and the sun, and then it is difficult to see. Then someone runs to turn on the lighting switch; but by the time that is done the sun is out again from behind the cloud. The present lighting system is so bad that the galleries are more or less like dungeons.

Why cannot we go ahead and have this Chamber, including the galleries, repaired and put in modern condition with adequate provisions for safety? We have provided fine, modern auditoriums in most of the department buildings.

Some will say that we should not proceed with the work on the Senate Chamber during the war emergency, but should devote all our time and effort to matters relative to the successful prosecution of the war. Let me point out that we plan to meet only every third day for perhaps the next 3 months after July 1. It would take only 6 months to make these improvements if the crews worked 8 hours a day. That is the estimate, and not merely my guess. Probably the work could be completed in 3 months if the crews were to work on 16- or 24-hour shifts. There is no reason why it could not be done.

In the amendment we also included a provision that the necessary materials would receive a priority rating. That should be done not only for the materials required for the indirect lighting system but also for the materials required for the acoustic ceiling.

Perhaps some Senators do not know that the cool air for air conditioning is generated in the basement of this building, and is carried up between the skylight and the glass ceiling, where the ordinary summertime temperature is approximately 120 degrees. The cooled air enters the Chamber between the beams up there, then settles, and passes through the step risers at our feet at the rate of so many cubic feet of air a minute. That system will have to be changed but little, because the proposed new ceiling would also have vents to carry the conditioned air, which would settle and be carried away just as it is now.

A permanent roof of concrete and steel, with insulation treatment, would not store up heat. It would save a great amount of the energy now required to develop the cooled air which enters this chamber at 72 degrees.

I could mention a number of other reasons why the work of modernizing the roof, ceiling, and interior of this Chamber should be undertaken now. Since, as we all know, it must eventually be done, let us not keep over us 76 tons of steel, 90 tons of wrought iron, and 80 tons of cast iron, all of which should be devoted to more important uses in these days of scarcity of those valuable metals. In other words, if we keep it here we will be hoarding just that much steel and iron which otherwise could be used for the construction of implements needed by our armed forces. If it is not common sense to do so, I do not know what is.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

RATIONING OF GASOLINE

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, it may be well to pour some oil on the troubled waters this morning, so I shall discuss the question of gasoline rationing. I, possibly, have had as much experience in the oil business as any other Member of this body or as any Member of the body on the other side of the Capitol.

During the last war I was not only on Mr. Baruch's War Industry Board but was also a member of the Petroleum War Service Committee, and I know how well that committee functioned during that period. When the war was over a number of decorations were bestowed on Mr. A. C. Bedford, chairman of the Petroleum War Service Committee, by the foreign governments for the able manner in which he had handled the petroleum question. The ranking admiral of the British Navy, on presenting a decoration to Mr. Bedford, stated that the Allies floated to victory on the sea of oil furnished by the United States.

At that time the Petroleum War Service Committee had complete charge of the oil problem. Jurisdiction was not divided as it is today, for now the Coordinator has charge of the production, the transportation, the manufacturing, and the marketing of petroleum and its products, while the Office of the Price Administrator has charge of fixing the prices of and rationing the respective products of petroleum.

Mr. Ickes, the Coordinator, has the best and most experienced brains in the oil business associated with him on his committee. I am sorry I cannot say as much for Mr. Henderson and his staff in the Office of Price Administration. In my judgment, we will continue to have trouble until all matters affecting oil are placed under one management.

In the Washington Star of Tuesday evening, this week, an account was given of a radio broadcast between the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], and Mr.

Leon Henderson. Mr. Henderson stated as follows in answer to a question from Senator BROWN:

Practical men—from every field where good brains and horse sense have made their marks. Dollar-a-year men, professors on leave, experts on commodities, millionaires, heads of businesses, research men, and several drafted from other Government departments, and no political tests, either. But everyone of them understands what we are doing and trying to do.

There are no fuzzy-headed theorists or crack-brained experimenters playing ducks and drakes with the daily lives and family budget of 35,000,000 families. The men who work under me are hard-headed and intelligent. I'd like to lay that one right on the line.

The reference to hard-headed men reminds me of an incident which occurred in the Executive Office at the White House during the Wilson administration.

I was there one day when two Senators came from an interview with President Wilson. They had been insisting on the appointment of a man from their State, and admitted, in the course of the conversation, that possibly the man was a little slow and it was sometimes hard to get an idea into his head. President Wilson said, "Well, Senators, I know one thing harder than that." He was asked: "What is it?", and the President said, "To get an idea out of his head." That, I think, applies to some of the hard-headed businessmen in the office of the Price Administrator.

For 7 months I had up with the office of the Price Administrator the subject of aviation lubricants, and I think I know whereof I speak. The day after the hearing, one of the few competent men I met on the Price Administrator's staff, a Mr. Shaughnessy, who is now in India, I understand, remarked that it was the best price hearing they had had in all their many hearings and that an early decision could be expected.

I may say that the Pennsylvania grade of crude oil yields a greater percentage of aviation lubricants than does any other oil produced in the world. Twenty-four percent of the Pennsylvania oil can be used for aviation lubricants, which is the highest percentage of lubricating oil found in any other grade, the average for lubricating oil in this country being slightly below 3 percent.

After the hearing to which I have referred, the whole question of the price of Pennsylvania oil was referred to a "coat and pants" contractor from New York and the president and proprietor of a large department store in my native State of Pennsylvania, who is a very competent and well qualified merchant, but, unfortunately, knows little about the oil business. From them it was referred to a lawyer who had been formerly a United States district attorney, but who had never had any experience, either for himself or his clients, in the oil industry. Finally, after 7 months, from August 23, 1941, to March 25, 1942, they reached the conclusion that the 25-cent cut, which had been made on August 23, 1941, should be canceled and the former price restored.

Had this been done promptly the producers would have received three and a half million dollars in income, which they had already agreed to expend in drilling additional wells and in increasing their production. As the refiners had agreed not to raise the price, the result of this hair-trigger decision of Mr. Henderson, without knowing any of the facts, gave this three and a half million dollars to the refiners at the expense of the producers. In other words, Mr. Henderson uses a hair trigger in making his decisions without study, and slow-burning black powder in reaching his conclusions.

I repeat what I said earlier, that we will never have a satisfactory oil administration until it is all in one centralized authority, and I am sure the brains of the oil industry know more about rationing the quantity of gasoline available and its transportation than does the Office of the Price Administrator.

I am confident that the people themselves would have more faith if this problem was handled by the men who know the oil business and not by rattle-brained economists, fuzzy-headed theorists, and crack-brained experimenters.

Several years ago I had appointed to a position in Washington one of the fuzzy-headed theorists and crack-pot economists. Recently a trade paper printed an article on this expert after he had spent two and a half days testifying on the stand at a hearing. From the article I quote the following:

The lawyers questioning Mr. Economist may have thought they were putting him on the spot, but he certainly reversed the play—he put them on the spot with his answers because nobody knew what his answer was the answer to, if any. When the hearing was over, Mr. Economist was saved by the graciousness and intelligence of his own counsel, who moved that the remarks and all testimony of Mr. Economist be expunged from the record.

I merely recite this incident to show how rattle-brained some of our so-called economists are.

When Mr. Leon Henderson was with the Carnegie Institute of Technology in Pittsburgh, he taught political economy. Whether he was a fuzzy-headed theorist or crack-brained experimenter, I do not know, but he was very highly regarded by his fellow professors in the school. Of course, that was before he had the tremendous power he now possesses.

I finally found it necessary to write a letter to Mr. Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, in which I stated that the aviation program, so far as lubrication is concerned, is in a "Hell of a mess." Had it not been for that letter, I doubt that we would have gotten a decision at all.

LT. WILLIAM STEWART WALKER

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HATCH in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2048) for the relief of Lt. William Stewart Walker, which was, in line 9, after the numerals "1941", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

Mr. ELLENDER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL CLERK, COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably Senate Resolution 251, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 251) submitted by Mr. WALSH (for Mr. THOMAS of Utah) on May 18, 1942, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Education and Labor is hereby authorized to employ, during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1942, an additional clerk at the rate of $1,800 per annum from the contingent fund of the Senate.

UTILIZATION OF EXISTING STOCKS OF RUBBER TIRES

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, on June 1, on behalf of myself and the other members of the Senate Small Business Committee, the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], its chairman; the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], I reported to the Senate a bill (S. 2560) designed to provide tires for 20,000,000 civilian automobiles and thereby alleviate the fears of the great mass of users of motor transportation in the United States that they would be obliged to virtually store their cars for the duration.

This bill and our committee report are printed in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and a copy of the report will be in the hands of every member of the Senate within the next day or so.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], chairman of the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency, has announced that hearings on the bill will start before his committee next Tuesday, June 9, at 10:30 a. m. I invite Members of the Senate to be present and offer such suggestions as they might have so as to perfect legislation that will accomplish our purpose.

I rise, Mr. President, to contribute what I can in a few brief moments to clear the air regarding the rubber tire situation as it pertains to our motor transportation system. The atmosphere has been clouded by a great number of conflicting statements made by important officials of the Government, executives of tire manufacturing companies, and others, regarding whether or not we are going to be able to maintain a

substantial percentage of our motor transportation system in operation through the war emergency because of the recognized crude rubber shortage.

I believe it is incumbent upon every owner of a passenger car in America today to use that car as a public trust and to conserve the vehicle and the tires so that their life and usefulness can be extended for the duration of the emergency period. But public cooperation in a conservation program can only be had if the motorists understand what is expected of them and if their Government gives them a clear picture of the shortages that exist in critical materials.

Unfortunately, I believe that untold damage has been done to the cause of conservation by a welter of conflicting statements emanating from Government officials as to actual shortage conditions pertaining to rubber and gasoline. The country is today in an utter state of confusion as to shortages, rationing objectives, and rationing inequities. It is imperative that the Government give the people a consistent story as to the facts.

As concerns the rationing of gasoline, certainly no shortage prevails in this commodity as far as the country as a whole is concerned. Our efforts as a Nation over the past several years to regulate and prevent the overproduction of gasoline and petroleum products is well known. We know and the country knows there is no shortage of gasoline for our motor transportation system or for all other needs of our war program. There may be some justification for the rationing of gasoline at the present moment along the eastern seaboard. There may be some substantial basis for the allegations being made that rationing of gasoline in that area is necessary due to transportation shortages. Frankly, however, I am not sure that there is real basis for this claim notwithstanding the fact that we know that many of our tankers have been loaned to the British Government and many others have been sunk along our Atlantic seaboard due to the failure of our Government to furnish effective protection against the enemy submarine campaign.

No claim has been voiced that gasoline should be rationed in any other section of the country either by reason of shortage of gasoline itself or lack of transportation facilities.

Nevertheless, the country is now being told that gasoline must be rationed nationally in order to conserve rubber for our motor transportation system. We should deliberate well and long before such a course is inaugurated.

Our whole war and essential civilian economy has been developed and is today in a large measure absolutely dependent upon our motor transportation system represented by trucks and busses and some 30,000,000 passenger cars.

As a result of its studies our Committee on Small Business arrived at the conclusion that if our necessary civilian and war program was not to be seriously injured we must find a way to keep at least 20,000,000 passenger cars in operation. It is noteworthy that the Brookings Institution has conducted a similar study wholly independent of our committee activities and wholly without our knowledge and this institution finds likewise that the maintenance of 20,000,000 passenger cars is essential to the functioning of our country throughout this emergency.

We all recognize that the solution to our motor-transportation problem rests upon a systematic and well-thought-through program of conservation of tires and the most effective use of our crude- and scrap-rubber stock pile.

During the course of our committee hearings and studies many statements were issued by high Government officials that there would be no crude rubber available for civilian use during this war emergency. The names and statements of those high Government officials are well known to Members of the Senate and to the public. I will not name them, for I have no desire here to dwell on personalities.

Yet, while these statements were being made and while the effect of them was to strike consternation and to create utter confusion in the minds of the American people, our Government officials and offices represented by these Government spokesmen were actually releasing a fairly constant and fairly substantial flow of crude rubber into civilian use each month since Pearl Harbor.

As evidence of this, I give you these statistics submitted to our committee by the War Production Board. In April of this year the War Production Board authorized the allocation of 97,250 pounds of crude rubber to be used in the manufacture of passenger-car camelback for retreading purposes. In May 127,700 pounds of crude rubber was allocated for this purpose.

In April 921.9 long tons of crude rubber was allocated for the manufacture of truck and bus camelback. The tonnage for this purpose for the month of May was 798.6 long tons.

For the months of January, February, and March there was respectively allocated 2,400.8 long tons, 1,441.8 long tons, and 493.8 long tons. The report to our committee said only that this was allocated for the manufacture of camelback for passenger-car, truck, and bus tires. The report does not say how much was allocated for each purpose.

Our committee bill, S. 2560, provides for the allocation on an annual basis of only 3,500 long tons of crude rubber as necessary for a recap and retread program for 30,000,000 passenger-car tires annually.

Mr. President, as I have stated, I only desire to speak these few minutes at this time. I do not wish now to go into the whole tire program outlined in the bill. It is only my purpose to bring out first the need to clear the air of the tremendous state of confusion that has been created in the minds of the American people with regard to the true facts concerning our rubber-tire situation in its relationship to the maintenance of our motor-transportation system.

In addition, I wish to point out that the program provided in this bill for the maintenance of 20,000,000 passenger cars will not injure the war program and will require only a fraction of 1 percent of our crude rubber stock pile. On the other hand, if I may quote a statement of a War Department official thoroughly conversant with the rubber needs for our war program, I quote:

> This 3,500 tons is certainly not going to mean the difference between the winning or the losing of the war. It is only a drop in the bucket compared to the vital necessity of keeping our motor transportation system in operation in order to keep our war-production program going at its maximum capacity.

Of course, the owners of passenger cars are going to have to be very careful of the use of their cars. The type of retread and recap which our bill, S. 2560, calls for is made out of nearly 100 percent reclaimed rubber. It will contain an average of 6½ pounds of reclaimed rubber and an average of 2 ounces of crude rubber per tire. Manufacturers and retreaders inform us that this type of tire maintenance is capable of providing from five to eight thousand miles of service at speeds not to exceed 40 miles per hour. However, every Member of this body can recall not so long ago when the very best rubber tire available did not give more than eight to ten thousand miles of wear at a time when we considered 40 miles per hour driving the exception rather than the rule.

In addition, I should like to mention another available rubber-tire supply for a large number of essential users of motor cars. The bill calls for the releasing, under broader rationing conditions than now prevail, of odd-sized tires and substandard grades.

We do not know the total amount of these type tires that will be made available. Experts in the tire manufacturing and distribution field estimate the possibility of releasing 3,000,000 or more tires in this class out of a possible total of 11,000,000 passenger and truck tires in the hands of manufacturers, dealers, and automobile owners which comprises our national stock pile of unused but usable rubber tires.

Mr. President, reverting to the Nation-wide gasoline-rationing proposal, I think I express the views of millions of American citizens when I say that such a step is uncalled for, unwise, and will lead to much unrest and disunity. Why deprive patriotic citizens of a commodity that is within their reach and in abundance? Why unduly decrease the revenues of many communities whose institutions depend for their maintenance largely upon the revenues collected from gasoline sales? Such unnecessary regulations are bound to lead to chaos and despair and, I may say, to a possible retardation of our war effort. The American people are extremely patriotic and will take any necessary steps to win this war, but let us not impose on them useless and unnecessary restrictions.

I predict that in order to enforce Nation-wide rationing of gasoline it will require a large army of enforcement officers, and bootlegging will thrive. The cost of enforcement will be enormous and the loss of revenues from gasoline taxation will be immense due to bootlegging that is bound to flourish, as I have just indicated.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me at that point?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I agree wholeheartedly with nearly everything the Senator from Louisiana has said about the gasoline-rationing situation. I simply wish to point out that in the particular section of the country in which I live the Petroleum Industry Committee has publicly announced that in order to refine the fuel oil which they are now refining and shipping eastward to the seaboard to supply factories for the war effort, they must also produce gasoline. If they cannot sell the gasoline through the usual outlets, the gasoline will be wasted. I simply wanted to emphasize and support the Senator's statement that we cannot expect people to accept in good grace a rationing order when they know that the article which is being rationed is being dumped into the sewers, or burned, or otherwise destroyed.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for his contribution to this debate and I may say that a similar situation prevails in my own State. The Standard Oil Co. of Louisiana is now engaged in establishing plants in order to produce synthetic rubber, and crude oil will be used for that purpose. One of the ingredients that must be extracted from oil used in producing synthetic rubber is gasoline, and unless we are permitted to utilize that gasoline something else will have to be done with it. If we cannot use it for motor transportation, it will either have to be dumped or burned, or some other method will have to be employed so as to dispose of it. The storage facilities for gasoline are now used almost to capacity, and I doubt if any more can be constructed. My guess is that within 30 days after a national rationing regulation becomes effective one of two things will occur at the Standard Oil Co. of Louisiana and many other oil refineries of the Nation; that they will either have to drastically curtail production, maybe close down entirely, or if they continue production, destroy large amounts of gasoline.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. I wish to say that I am in full accord with the views expressed by the distinguished Senator from Louisiana. I have just returned from Montana, where we have developed a very considerable oil industry. Already as a result of the rationing of automobiles and tires as well as the voluntary action of our people in the conservation of rubber the use of automobiles has been greatly reduced. If gas rationing is now put in operation in our State it will mean the closing down of a number of oil refineries. As the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] has just stated, they have to manufacture gasoline in connection with the general operation of the oil industry, and if they are shut off from the sale of gasoline it means that the industry deprived of its market will close down, and it will create serious unemployment. It will also create a feeling of resentment on the part of the people of those States where they have an abundance of oil and are to be deprived of its use in a State where it is so essential. I think it is utterly absurd for the Government to put into operation an unnecessary rationing system in a situation of that kind.

Montana is a State with vast distances and widely scattered cities and towns, totally lacking in adequate transportation facilities in the absence of automobiles. We not only do not need rationing but it seriously disrupts our economy.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator from Montana for his recommendations.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. I believe the discussion to which we have been privileged to listen and which has been led by my distinguished colleague the Senator from Louisiana, points out the value of the contribution made in this particular field by the Small Business Committee, headed by our distinguished colleague the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY]. We have a number of agencies of government concerned with the vital problem which the Senator from Louisiana is now discussing—the rationing of gasoline. The committee referred to provides the medium whereby these conflicting or separate and distinct agencies of government will have an opportunity to come together. The questioning on the part of the members of this committee provides direction to the solution of the problem. For instance, the Petroleum Coordinator, the Office of Emergency Transportation, the Office of Price Administration, and the various divisions having to do with this problem are brought together as a result of the efforts of the Small Business Committee. An exchange of views and of viewpoints results in the development of solutions such as that contained in the report we are now receiving. I believe that before Nation-wide rationing restrictions are made effective an inventory should be made of all the facilities involved, transportation facilities, facilities for the refinement of petroleum products, availability of petroleum, and the effect of the Nation-wide rationing upon the country's morale, upon unemployment, upon the destruction of small independent business, and the effect upon taxes which are so very necessary in order that we may carry the war load.

Mr. President, I believe we ought to ration to a reasonable degree, to a degree sufficient properly and effectively to carry on the war effort, but to go beyond that, to become unreasonable and restrictive, will result in an indictment of the agencies who formulate and issue the orders and instructions, and in a measure will be, in my judgment, an indictment of the administration of the Government at this time.

We ought to see to it that the distribution of gasoline and petroleum shall be adequately, and as fully as possible, carried on, and that there shall be no casualties if they can be avoided. I believe that if we exploit the various channels which are open to us, if we bring these agencies together for a discussion of this problem before rationing takes place, we will lighten the blow, and I think effect a more satisfactory solution of the problem.

The problem is to get the agencies of Government together, to bring those who are in the industry together, and to effect gasoline rationing which will be justifiable and which we will be able to defend and vindicate.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I wish to thank the Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] for his splendid presentation of his views in respect to the question at issue. I wish to say that the Senator is a valuable Member of the Senate Small Business Committee and I appreciate his untiring efforts in its work.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. KILGORE. Has the Senator from Louisiana ever heard of any reason for Nation-wide rationing other than the conservation of rubber?

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not.

Mr. KILGORE. In other words, that is the general theory?

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. KILGORE. Did the Senator read a release to the press yesterday which described the proposed rationing system?

Mr. ELLENDER. I read it hastily.

Mr. KILGORE. Under the theory of conservation of rubber, the purpose behind the rationing is to eliminate unnecessary and nonessential uses of motor vehicles. Yet yesterday's proposed plan would give to every vehicle 4 gallons of gasoline a week for nonessential uses, which means that every automobile will use 4 gallons of gasoline a week, and the tires be worn down to that extent. If this is a move to save rubber, why issue gasoline for nonessential uses at all? That is the point I wish to make.

Mr. ELLENDER. I appreciate the Senator's demonstration of the folly of it all.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. Gladly.

Mr. MURRAY. I merely wish to express my accord with the statement made by the distinguished Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD]. It seems to me it is absolutely important that there be some medium by which the various departments of the Government which have to do with rationing problems can confer with the elected representatives of the people and give an explanation of what they are trying to do. As the result of the conferences we have already held under the auspices of the Special Senate Small Business Committee, when we brought the representatives of the Price Administration and other Government officials before us, many misconceptions were cleared up and the situation was made plain to them. Following those conferences they immediately modified many of the very stringent regulations which they were attempting to put into operation.

Mr. ELLENDER. I may say to the Senator from Montana that I have suggested the holding of a conference in this brief statement of mine. The Senators from the oil-producing States met

last week and urged that a hearing be held to discuss the matter fully in all its ramifications before any rationing order is issued.

Mr. MURRAY. It seems absurd to me that we should be capable of providing an enormous supply of oil and gasoline in the State of Montana, and at the same time be prohibited from using it within or sending it outside our State by unwise regulations from departments of the Government not fully familiar with all the circumstances and conditions.

We could ship tremendous quantities of oil and gasoline to the coast if we were given the opportunity to do so; but, instead of that, we find that this absurd rationing system is to be put into operation, which will close down the oil industry of Montana. I think it is the most unreasonable effort at regulation I ever heard of. I cannot understand why a Government agency should undertake to take such a step without having a full understanding of what it is doing.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield for a question.

Mr. BARKLEY. I think we are all interested in the problem of gasoline rationing, whether we come from oil-producing States or not. At first it was suggested that gasoline rationing be inaugurated throughout the country in order that everybody might be put on the same basis so far as gasoline is concerned, and in order that one section might not enjoy a privilege which was not enjoyed by other sections.

Frankly I did not see very much basis for such a proposal, because we all know that there is plenty of gasoline in the country. The only reason why there is any rationing in the East is because of the sinking of tankers and the lack of sufficient transportation to bring oil and petroleum products to the East.

That reasoning has been abandoned, if it was ever seriously considered. I think there is no merit in capriciously putting in a rationing system because we want to put everybody in the United States on the same basis, regardless of the need.

The question seems to have come down to this: The only basis upon which it is proposed that gasoline shall be rationed throughout the country is for the purpose of conserving rubber. I think the American people are willing to undergo any sacrifice or hardship in this war provided they are reasonably convinced that it is necessary. I have recently been in my State, and I found there a wonderful state of public opinion.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have no doubt of it.

Mr. BARKLEY. The people are ahead of us. They have been ahead of us on the whole war program. They are willing to do whatever is necessary. I think that is the general sentiment of the country. Naturally they want to know whether a given proposal is necessary.

We cannot always rely upon what we hear or see; but over the radio and in the newspapers I have heard and read that in the United States there are vast stock piles of scrap rubber which are not in use, and that there has been no real effort to make use of such scrap rubber for the purpose of increasing the supply. Has the Senator any information on that subject?

Mr. ELLENDER. Yes. Let me say to the Senator that at present there seems to be no incentive to pick up the scrap rubber. We have evidence showing that there is as much as 10,000,000 tons of rubber available throughout the country. Factories which are now engaged in reclaiming rubber cannot run to full capacity because of their inability to obtain scrap rubber. In order to meet that situation, in the bill which I introduced last Monday it is provided that before any automobile owner who desires tires may obtain them he must bring to his dealer an old tire for each new tire purchased. The facts show that from an old tire enough rubber can be reclaimed to recap two tires; and that from three old tires two brand-new tires can be made from reclaimed rubber.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is a provision in the Senator's bill, which is not the law.

Mr. ELLENDER. Let me say to the Senator that we had the facts to justify us in putting that provision in the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have not talked with Mr. Nelson about the rubber situation as it relates to the rationing of gasoline. I have great confidence in the disinterested sincerity and singlemindedness of Mr. Nelson's purpose in connection with the war effort. I am inclined to give him credit prima facie for being right; and I am sure that he and his associates have given consideration to all the avenues, approaches, and angles of gasoline rationing.

However, it occurs to me superficially that if there is a vast quantity of unused rubber in the country which can be used—even dismissing for the moment the expense of its recapture and reconditioning—before we ration the entire country on gasoline and thereby close down the refineries of the country, and in turn automatically close down the oil fields, which may run into salt water before they are reopened, thereby involving a tremendous economic loss to the country, every consideration should be given to the possibility of recapturing this rubber, whatever the amount may be, and in some way closing down on the use of rubber and automobiles for other than necessary purposes. This should be done before a Nation-wide rationing scheme is put into effect regardless of the need or the supply of oil or gasoline in any part of the country.

That is my superficial reaction. I have given some thought to the matter, and have discussed it on a number of occasions with men high in authority who are dealing with the subject.

Mr. ELLENDER. That is really what the committee had in mind in proposing that at least 20,000,000 passenger cars be kept in operation.

From the evidence which was produced before us there is no question that with the production of 30,000,000 retreaded and recapped tires we could maintain 20,000,000 cars. To repeat, that can be done by utilizing only 3,500 tons of crude rubber and about 90,000 tons of reclaimed rubber, or 9,000 tons of reclaimed rubber a month. That is only a drop in the bucket. Every effort ought to be made to put this proposal into operation.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one further observation?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I stated a moment ago, the American people are willing to do whatever it is necessary for them to do, and they will do it without complaining. It may be a great inconvenience, but they are willing to do it.

One of the troubles about rubber is that there does not seem to be any unanimity of opinion about the rubber situation. The head of one agency makes the statement that there is such a shortage of rubber that there will be no rubber for private use before 1944 or 1945. Somebody else makes the statement that rubber is not so scarce, and that very shortly there will be a great amount of synthetic rubber. The public does not know what are the facts. It seems to me that the various agencies dealing with the rubber situation ought to coordinate among themselves, get together on the facts, and let the people know the facts. Whatever the facts are, and however unfavorable they may be, I think the American people can be relied upon to do whatever is necessary in order that the war effort may be speeded up and facilitated to the greatest possible extent.

Mr. ELLENDER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. BARKLEY. There ought to be a clarification of the rubber situation from sources which cannot be disputed, and which are in touch with it day by day.

Mr. ELLENDER. I entirely agree with the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. It is obvious to an onlooker who listens to the statements of grave and reverend Senators that not only is unanimity necessary, but it is obtained in the Senate. The Senate knows how to handle the rubber situation; and the coordinators, or whatever they may be called, who are in charge of the rubber situation, are all wrong.

It is quite evident from the discussion which has been going on for the past hour and a half, and the statements of Senators who know more about the rubber business than do any of the coordinators, that there ought to be no regulation of gasoline which would affect the use of rubber or interfere with it in any way.

We can handle the situation. That has been demonstrated in the past hour and a half. It was further demonstrated by the great speech made this afternoon by the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS], who called attention to the steel and iron in sight in the Senate Chamber. He called attention to 80 tons of iron, 85 or 90 tons of steel, and the great quantity of other metals. He called attention to something which made chills run up and down my spine, when he said that if the facts should become generally

known we might all be arrested for hoarding steel right here in the Senate.

That demonstrates that we know how to regulate rubber and gasoline and that we ought to do it. It has been demonstrated that 96 Senators can do a much better job than can 1 person who wants to be a tyrant, dictator, or something else, and set the pace for the whole country. It seems to me that we have had a demonstration of how to settle the whole thing; and I do not see why we should not proceed to settle it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Like the Senator from Kentucky, I have just returned from my own State. I found a very unusual situation there. I try to keep up with my State, and I believe I do so fairly well.

Tennessee has pipe lines running all the way from the Mississippi River to Chattanooga and Nashville. Tennessee has an ample supply of gasoline and an ample supply of transportation. Petroleum products can be shipped from Louisiana and other States into Tennessee by the Mississippi, the Tennessee, and the Cumberland Rivers. I cannot understand why we should be penalized because there is a dearth of transportation on the east coast.

It is said that we should not have anything to say about it in the Senate. The senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] says we should not bother about it, that we should let the managers look after it. I do not agree with him. I think we have been employed to do that work. We have been elected by the people of our respective States to do such work, and I think we should not only have something to do about it but we should look into it and see what we should do, and then do it. We should do our duty.

Why should all the rest of the country be penalized by a gasoline restriction because of a lack of transportation to the east coast? I simply cannot understand that. I say to the Members of the Senate that what the situation means in my State—I do not know what it means in other States—is that the gasoline business will drop off to nothing; those who are engaged in the gasoline business, those who are engaged in the automobile business, those who are engaged in the tire business will lose their businesses, and consequently the Government will lose an immense amount of taxes. Where are we going in this matter? I do not see the necessity of enacting a general rationing law simply because on the east coast there is a dearth of transportation for gasoline. I think the President was entirely correct the other day when he suggested that there should be provided pipe-line transportation from the oil fields to the east coast; and I should be delighted to vote for a bill providing for such a pipe line, so as to give the people of the east coast ample supplies of gasoline. We all know that there is practically an unlimited supply in the West and in Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma, and other States. There is no reason in the world why gasoline should be rationed in this country, except alone the lack of transportation to the east coast, and, in my judgment, the rationing should be confined to the east coast.

I wish to say here and now that if I have an opportunity to vote along that line, I shall do so. Even though we have already delegated to some gentleman the right to vote for us, we still have a right to vote here; and if such an opportunity arises, I shall vote as I have indicated.

I desire to say to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] that I think his treatment of the subject is very proper and very timely. We should look into it now, before something is done, rather than be sending up committees to see if we cannot get it undone.

I think that some of the very unusual orders which have been issued are injuring business in this country to an immense extent. I do not think this is the time to injure business. I think we should help business wherever we can, so as to have more money with which to win the war. That is the main purpose. It should be the main purpose of every man, woman, and child in America—to win this war. Why do we want to destroy business by foolish general orders which mean nothing except a good deal of newspaper publicity for the man who is issuing the order?

For these reasons I say that if the matter comes to a vote, and if I can be of any service in voting to prevent the issuance of a general order of the kind referred to, I certainly shall do so.

We are told that we should conserve rubber; and we know that, so far as rubber is concerned, the situation is bad. However, we should remember that rubber deteriorates almost as rapidly when it is not used as when it is used. Everyone knows that; I do not think there is any difference of opinion about it. I have no doubt that if a measure somewhat like the Senator's bill were passed—I do not mean his bill, for I have not examined it with sufficient care; I simply know in a general way what it provides—and if an organization were effected for the purpose of conserving and remanufacturing what rubber we have, there would need be very little cessation or interruption of business at all. That would be very much better for the entire country, because this is no time to stop production. When we stop production anywhere along the line, we stop taxes. We might as well make up our minds that when we abolish automobiles, when we abolish gasoline, when we abolish the eating of sugar, and when we abolish the various other things we are about to abolish, there will not be the business, and there will not be the resultant taxes which come from business.

For reasons I have stated I wish to say that the Senator has my very great sympathy.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I desire to thank the distinguished Senator from Tennessee. We have in our records ample evidence to show, as he has just stated, that a tire which is used daily at a speed of between 30 and 40 miles an hour will deteriorate less than one which is not used, but which is stored in a garage.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOXEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Louisiana yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Let me say that I feel, just as the Senator from Tennessee does, that every effort should be made to make certain that nothing is done which will cause any loss of time in war production or cause any dissatisfaction among any groups of people. I have just returned from South Carolina, and I know that the Senator's statement is correct. In South Carolina we are rationed. In Tennessee there is no rationing. That situation is extremely hard on the people in the northwestern section of South Carolina, who are a very short distance from Tennessee; they find it very difficult to understand why they cannot use gasoline which is hauled through South Carolina and into Tennessee, where it is used. They are perfectly willing to give up all their gasoline and to do without any gasoline if they understand the situation.

The same thing is true with reference to the pipe line. The pipe line runs through the upper part of South Carolina, and goes into North Carolina, and from there gasoline is transshipped. Recently I rode on the highways of South Carolina, going to a college commencement. There was no traffic; there was no movement or life. The asphalt had come up between the concrete blocks because the automobiles had not been moving over it so as to keep it down. The tax collections have fallen off terrifically. I may say that the people of South Carolina, for whose benefit no gasoline-tax collections will be made if the present situation continues, feel that if the matter had been carefully thought out and carefully and equitably worked out the necessary sacrifice would be borne by all.

My only thought about the matter is in keeping with the Senator's resolution that the Senate let the people know what is necessary to be done. They cannot understand the situation in connection with a pipe line which passes through their State, whereby gasoline is taken to areas to the north, after passing through the central part of our State; and they cannot understand why they are rationed, and receive A cards, whereas persons living north of them have all the gasoline they need.

So I hope that before anything further is done the Senate at least will make it possible for the people of the rationed States to understand the situation. They will give everything they have. It makes no difference what happens to the bonds and the finances of South Carolina, when war is concerned and when it is our desire to do everything possible to be done in order to win the war; but it does make a difference when the indexes come out and the highway reimbursements and the school districts and all other agencies

of the State and local governments are affected by the lack of revenue from gasoline taxes, when the pipe line runs through the State, and when the people do not understand the necessity for restricting them.

So I want to commend any resolution which will result in bringing out the facts so the people will know them and so that some sensible solution may be found to help win the war. If it takes all we have, that is all right; but let us find out what is necessary, and let the people know. Then they will gladly and joyfully sacrifice everything they have.

I thank the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Louisiana yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret that I was called from the floor and was deprived of the opportunity of hearing all the discussion on the subject of rationing, a matter which has been more or less disturbing to the people of every section of the Nation.

I am confident that the people whom I have the honor to represent in part in this body are as willing to sacrifice for the ultimate victory as are the people of any other section. They have proven that through every step of the program which has brought us down to this hour. They have proven it in the enlistments in the Army in that section, and by their support of proposed legislation.

Practically every poll that has been taken has shown that they have almost unanimously approved every one of the legislative proposals designed to prepare this country for war, and they are willing today, as they have ever been in the past, to make any sacrifice which may be necessary to assure victory at the earliest possible date.

However, they are at a loss to understand some of the things which are happening today. For example, gasoline is being rationed in Georgia at the present time. Word went out from Washington not so many months ago that it would be necessary to have means for the transportation of gasoline, and since that time two pipe lines have been built entirely across the State of Georgia. One of them enters the State on the Florida line, and ends within a mile or two of the Tennessee line, on the north. Another enters the State on the Alabama line, and traverses the State entirely from east to west, running into South Carolina. There are two pipe lines with an enormous capacity of gasoline and oil which now traverse the State, both north and south and east and west. I have been informed by those who should know that those pipe lines are not being operated to full capacity at the present time. I have further been told that there are large supplies of gasoline available within the State of Georgia today, and that with very few exceptions all the storage facilities of the State are full to overflowing with gasoline.

If it were necessary to ration gasoline in this country, and if rationing were imposed on a national basis, I do not believe there would be any complaint from the people of my State; but it is difficult for them to understand how, with all the transportation facilities which are available, gasoline should be carried entirely across the State of Georgia, almost 300 miles, by pipe line to the Tennessee line, and there placed in trucks and carried into Tennessee and sold absolutely without restriction. It is difficult for them to understand why gasoline should be taken out of pipe lines in Georgia and carried into the State of Alabama, and there sold without any restriction or limitation whatever.

Cutting off the use of gasoline is not merely a question of personal convenience; it is not a question of pleasure or joyriding; it affects the business of a State, and it certainly has a tremendous impact upon the revenues of a State.

In my own State about $4,800,000 of gas taxes annually is allocated to the support of the common schools in the rural areas. That fund is the State school equalization fund, and without it the common schools in the rural areas cannot operate, because that is the fund to which all the people of the State contribute to enable them to bolster up and support the schools in the poorer counties. In practically every State, I assume, the highway system is kept in condition through the use of revenues derived from the sale of gasoline and motor fuel.

In my State, in addition to the highways and the schools, from time to time the gasoline taxes have been diverted to general State purposes, and have supplied deficiencies in other funds and enabled the State to operate. It may be that is a bad practice, but it has been a practice which has obtained in the past. To have the State now put on a ration basis as far as gasoline is concerned, when it is said there is an adequate supply of gasoline available, certainly places an unusual burden on the State treasury, which is not in any too good shape to start with.

Mr. President, it is my own view that any form of regional rationing is undemocratic, that the transportation facilities of this Nation should be pooled, and that any sacrifice entailed by virtue of rationing transportation facilities should be borne equally by every State and by the people of every section. It would be just as reasonable to say that we are to ration cotton shirts in every State of the Union except in those which have textile mills as it would be to put gasoline rationing on a purely regional basis.

I cannot conceive of any reason why Georgia has been placed in the ration area unless it is because we happen to touch upon the Atlantic seaboard. The States upon the Atlantic seaboard should not be compelled to stand alone in bearing this burden, and if the present system shall continue, in my judgment, those States will be amply justified in coming to the National Congress and asking that the revenues which have been lost to the State treasuries by virtue of the States having been included in any narrow region for the purpose of rationing should be made good out of the National Treasury. Certainly the States which have not suffered any impairment or loss of revenue whatever should be willing, when they have had the advantage of having all the gasoline they desired, to contribute to the States which have suffered a loss in revenue.

I do not know whether or not this gasoline rationing is necessary. I assume it is. Those in charge of it say it is. But certainly it should have been operated upon a better basis, and it has been very unfortunate—and I am sure the Senator from Louisiana has touched upon this matter—that we should have had the people alarmed when there was no shortage of gasoline, and should have so many conflicting statements coming from every bureau or agency having anything to do with this question, one agency saying there is no shortage, another saying that the shortage is so great that we are likely to have to close down industries which operate with fuel oil; and probably each of them changing its views from day to day.

Someone in authority should take charge of this situation and deal with it fairly and justly and impartially as between the people of all sections of the Nation. If that is done, no one will have just cause for complaint.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not wish to delay the Senate unduly. I know how anxious the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is to have a bill taken up for consideration. However, in view of the facetious remarks made by the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] a while ago about Congress knowing more concerning this matter than any one else, I do not wish my remarks to be so interpreted. I do not think Congress can determine where and when rationing must take place. That authority must be centered in some one. The object of my observations a while ago was to bring to the attention of those charged with this responsibility some considerations which I think ought to be taken into account, and which perhaps have been taken into account, in regard to the gasoline situation. There has been no order issued rationing gasoline throughout the country. There may not be any such order issued. I do not know whether there will be. But in reaching a conclusion about it, certainly all the facts with respect to gasoline and its production, and rubber and its production and use, ought to be taken into consideration, and I have no right to assume that they have not been or will not be. I should not want anyone to understand me as thinking that every time we reach the point where we ought to ration something Congress should pass on the question. I do not think we should do that.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. If the Senator from Kentucky will read the speech I made on the floor of the Senate earlier today on the subject of gasoline rationing, I think he will find that I have placed my finger on the weak spot in the whole program, which is divided authority at the present time. I hope the Senator from Kentucky

will read my speech, and I believe he will then agree with me.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have always read the Senator's speeches with great interest, and I shall wait impatiently until I get the printed RECORD tomorrow.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ELLENDER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to make an observation in connection with what the distinguished Senator from Kentucky has just said. Of course, Congress will not attempt to ration gasoline or anything else. It is our duty, however, to fix the rules under which rationing may be done, and if we do not do so we will not be living up to what the people of the country expect from us. We ought to fix the rules under which these things are done, so that orders may be issued in fairness and justice to every section of the country, and equity be established. That is the position I take with respect to the matter. We do not wish to do any State or any community an injustice; but we should discuss the whole situation of rubber and of gasoline together, and then fix the rules under which the administrators can carry out the directions of the Congress.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I may state to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that I understand the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] proposes to introduce a bill affecting gasoline rationing this afternoon.

When I was interrupted about an hour and a half ago I was discussing with the Senate the effect of a national rationing program. I will repeat what I stated a while ago, that I predict that in order to enforce Nation-wide rationing of gasoline it will require a large army of enforcement officers, and that bootlegging will thrive. The cost of enforcement will be enormous and the loss of revenue from gasoline taxation will be immense, due to bootlegging which is bound to flourish, as I have just indicated.

Such a regulation is bound to affect the morale of our people in no uncertain degree. Liberty-loving people are not prone to abide by useless restrictions of their rights without much unrest and dissatisfaction. True, it may be necessary to conserve gasoline and rubber to win the war, but, Mr. President, let us not overlook the vital necessity of conserving public morale, without which victory cannot be achieved.

Mr. President, as most Members of this body are aware, a meeting of many Senators from oil-producing States was called a few days ago so as to arrange for a conference with officials of the War Production Board in order to provide for a full discussion of this problem before any further restrictions are imposed, and, as far as I know, little progress has been made.

Yesterday I sent the following telegram to the President:

WASHINGTON, *June 3, 1942.*

Hon. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.:

The press states that you contemplate the rationing of gasoline throughout the Nation. I hope that is not true. I am confident that the American people will cheerfully submit to rational rationing and in fact will make any sacrifices necessary to win the war. Their morale should not be lowered by needless governmental restrictions. In most States ample supplies of gasoline can be made available without in any manner affecting our war effort, and why the people in such States should be placed in the same category as the people in less fortunate States where gasoline is unavailable is beyond me. One of the reasons advanced for such a step is for the preservation of rubber. Experience has shown that rubber tires will deteriorate from nonusage at a rate equal to or even greater than the wear on tires that are driven at a moderate rate of speed, are inspected periodically, and properly maintained. It strikes me that rather than ration gasoline we should provide rules and regulations for the proper maintenance and operation of automobiles and tires. Aside from all of this, Mr. President, gasoline rationing will cripple the finances of many States, some of which depend entirely on revenues from gasoline in order to retire their bonds and other obligations. Many depend on such revenues for the maintenance and upkeep of their schools and other institutions. I urge you to suggest to Mr. Nelson that a conference be held so that this problem can be thoroughly discussed and ventilated before any steps toward Nation-wide gasoline rationing are taken. Kindest regards.

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senator.

Today I received a timely resolution that was unanimously adopted by the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana which is now in session, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

House Resolution 9

Whereas the United States of America is now at war, and the people of this great Nation are, once again, fighting for the cause of freedom;

Whereas, in order to win this war, among other things, it has become necessary for our people to buy War Bonds, pay more taxes, and ration many articles.

Whereas, in order to be able to buy a sufficient amount of War Bonds, and pay a sufficient amount of taxes, it is necessary for our people to have a sufficient income, and in order for them to have a sufficient income, it is necessary to keep the wheels of commerce and industry turning;

Whereas, in order to keep the wheels of commerce and industry turning, it is necessary to keep the wheels of our automobiles and trucks turning;

Whereas, in order to keep the wheels of our automobiles and trucks turning as long as possible, and thereby keep the wheels of commerce and industry turning, it was found necessary to conserve tires by rationing same, and by reducing the speed limit to 40 miles per hour;

Whereas, considering the rationing of tires, the reduction in speed, the large amount of new tires on hand, and the large amount of used tires on the thousands of used cars now standing idle on the used-car lots throughout this Nation, it appears certain that the wheels of our automobiles and trucks can be kept turning in many sections of our country for many months and possibly until we have fought our way to victory;

Whereas gasoline is now about to be rationed throughout the Nation, for the avowed purpose of further conserving tires, by making it impossible to use automobiles and trucks in other than a very restricted manner in all sections of our country, regardless of the amount of gasoline on hand or available;

Whereas this will stop the wheels of our automobiles and trucks now, just as surely and effectively as if most of our tires were to be rendered useless overnight, thereby causing a stagnation of business now, with the resultant lowering of incomes, that could and should be postponed until our tires are actually worn out, 2 or 3 years from now; Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the State of Louisiana, That a protest be and is hereby entered against the rationing of gasoline at this time, in all sections of our country where there is an abundance of gasoline on hand or available, providing there is no danger of a shortage of gasoline for our war needs; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be mailed to the President, Price Administrator, War Rationing Board, and Congress of the United States of America.

MOBILIZATION OF SMALL BUSINESS FOR WAR PRODUCTION—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I present the conference report on Senate bill 2250, the bill to mobilize the facilities of small business in the interest of the successful prosecution of the war. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2250) to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

On the first page of the House engrossed amendment, in the last line on such page, strike out the words "the production of" and in lieu thereof insert the words "production by."

On page 5 of the House engrossed amendment, line 14, strike out "$200,000,000" and in lieu thereof insert "$150,000,000"; and on the same page, in line 18, strike out "$200,000,000" and in lieu thereof insert "$150,000,000."

On page 12 of the House engrossed amendment, line 24, before the period at the end of section 8 insert a colon and the following: "*Provided,* That such guaranties, agreements, or commitments are unconditional and must be performed by payment of cash or its equivalent within 60 days after demand. The Comptroller of the Currency is hereby authorized to define the terms herein used if and when he may deem it necessary."

On pages 15 and 16 of the House engrossed amendment, strike out all of section 12 of such amendment and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"SEC. 12. Whenever the Chairman of the War Production Board shall, after consultation with the Attorney General, find, and so certify to the Attorney General in writing, that the doing of any act or thing, or the omission to do any act or thing, by one or more persons during the period that this section is in effect, in compliance with any request or approval made by the Chairman in writing, is requisite to the prosecution of the war, such act, thing, or omission shall be deemed in the public interest and no prosecution or civil action shall be commenced

with reference thereto under the antitrust laws of the United States or the Federal Trade Commission Act. Such finding and certificate may in his discretion be withdrawn at any time by the Chairman by giving notice of such withdrawal to the Attorney General, whereupon the provisions of this section shall not apply to any subsequent act or omission by reason of such finding or certificate.

"The Attorney General from time to time, but not less frequently than once every 120 days, shall transmit to the Congress a report of operations under this section. Reports provided for under this section shall be transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate or the Clerk of the House of Representatives, as the case may be, if the Senate or the House of Representatives, as the case may be, is not in session.

"The Attorney General shall order published in the Federal Register every such certificate and, when he deems it in the public interest, the details of any plan, program, or other arrangement promulgated under, or which is the basis of, any such certificate.

"This section shall remain in force until 6 months after the termination of the present war or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate, but no prosecution or civil action shall be commenced thereafter with reference to any act or omission occurring prior thereto if such prosecution or civil action would be barred by this section if it remained in force."

And the House agree to the same.

JAMES H. HUGHES,
ROBERT F. WAGNER,
FRANCIS MALONEY,
CHAS. W. TOBEY,
ROBERT A. TAFT,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

HENRY B. STEAGALL,
CLYDE WILLIAMS,
BRENT SPENCE,
JESSE P. WOLCOTT,
FRED L. CRAWFORD,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I should like to inquire of the Senator from Delaware the effect of the so-called antitrust amendment which was added to the small-business bill by the other House, and which has been modified to some extent by the conference committee.

As I understand, the House adopted to the bill an amendment which gave the Chairman of the War Production Board almost, if not completely, exclusive authority in undertaking to suspend the antitrust laws with respect to agreements and procedures necessary to the war effort, and that in conference that was modified so as to require the Chairman of the War Production Board to consult the Attorney General. That is substantially the only difference between the two provisions.

Mr. HUGHES. That is practically the only difference.

Mr. BARKLEY. So, if I understand the Senator's interpretation—and I desire to get his interpretation—while this proposed new law under the conference report requires the Chairman of the War Production Board to consult the Attorney General, he does not have to abide by the Attorney General's opinion. He consults with him and then, after consultation, he still has complete authority to deal with the problem and to issue orders in effect suspending the antitrust laws with respect to agreements or procedures deemed by the Government to be necessary in the winning of the war. I understand that this authority will extend during the existence of the emergency, and that the Chairman of the War Production Board will thereafter, at his own discretion and in his own judgment, withdraw the orders so as to reestablish the effectiveness of the antitrust laws, in which case he is to notify the Attorney General. Is that substantially correct?

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator from Kentucky is quite correct. I will say, in addition, that the conference committee considered the matter very carefully, consulting with the different authorities, the Attorney General, Mr. Arnold, and others, and the bill in its present form is entirely satisfactory to them.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. HUGHES. I yield to the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. AUSTIN. In the last consideration of this bill by the Judiciary Committee, my recollection is that there were added to the amendment words requiring the assent of the Attorney General. Were those words stricken out in conference?

Mr. HUGHES. Of course, the bill to which the Senator refers is not the bill now before the Senate. The Senator has in mind, I think, a bill known as the Van Nuys bill which deals entirely with the one subject of the antitrust laws. That bill was considered by the subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee of which the Senator from Wyoming is chairman. This is the small business bill, to which, in the House, there was added an amendment known as section 12. The conference was largely about that section. The bill now before the Senate does not have anything to do with the bill which is before the Judiciary Committee except in the way it deals with the same subject.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. HUGHES. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to answer the Senator from Vermont, if I may. The conference committee took the Van Nuys bill and substituted it for the House provision of the small business bill, with one exception. Where the Van Nuys bill, approved by the Judiciary Committee, provided that the Chairman of the War Production Board shall act after approval by the Attorney General, the conference report provides "after consultation with the Attorney General." In other respects we adopted all the provisions of the Van Nuys bill. That was the only question on which we finally could not get the House to agree to the provisions of the Van Nuys bill. The House provision had nothing about the Attorney General at all. We finally compromised with the House by agreeing on a provision for consultation with the Attorney General, which was satisfactory to Mr. Nelson and the Attorney General both, and so the conferees substituted "consultation" for "approval."

Mr. AUSTIN. I thank the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator from Ohio is entirely correct.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HUGHES. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I wanted to ask a question of the Senator from Ohio. As I understand, the Van Nuys bill, which is pending in the Judiciary Committee, was not before the conference committee, although members of the conference committee may have also been members of the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. HUGHES. I will say to the Senator that while, of course, the Van Nuys bill was not before the conference committee, we did consider the fact that in the Senate there was such a bill which was before the Judiciary Committee, and we did consider the provision in the Van Nuys bill in connection with section 12 of the bill which is now before the Senate. We tried to reconcile the difference that existed as to whether we should use the word in the original House bill or the word in the Van Nuys bill.

Mr. NORRIS. While the Van Nuys bill is a different bill, entirely independent of the one which was in conference, it became important before the conference committee, as I understand, because the House——

Mr. HUGHES. The Van Nuys bill was not before the conference committee at all.

Mr. NORRIS. Because the House had adopted a provision similar to that in the Van Nuys bill as an amendment to the Senate bill relating to small business. Therefore, it became important for that reason only that the conference committee should consider the Van Nuys bill. They changed it, I think, materially, as compared to the House amendment to the small business bill. As it was finally agreed to in conference, I have grave doubt whether they have improved it, because the chairman of the War Production Board will not be required by law to pay any attention to what the Attorney General may think. The only thing that is required of the Chairman of the War Production Board is that he shall consult with the Attorney General. The Attorney General has no voice to decide what shall be done. If the Attorney General were prosecuting, for instance, under the antitrust laws, the War Production Board Chairman could stop the prosecution, could he not? He would have to talk to the Attorney General about it, but he could stop the prosecution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. HUGHES. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Attorney General himself testified that he did not want that power, that he felt he should be consulted so that he could point out what might be the result of setting aside the antitrust laws in a particular case, but that if, having pointed that out, the Chairman of the War Production Board

still felt that what was proposed was essential to the national effort, he, as Attorney General, said, "I have nothing to do with that; I think Mr. Nelson should have that responsibility, and I do not see how I can share in it, for I do not have the facts as to what is necessary for war production."

The Attorney General said, "I am entirely satisfied if I am given the opportunity to point out to Mr. Nelson what the result of a setting aside may be, and, if after he has considered my views, he wishes to go ahead, I think the responsibility ought to be entirely with him."

So I think that the compromise—and it is a compromise, for under the House bill he did not even have to consult the Attorney General and while in the Van Nuys bill he had to get his approval—I think the compromise reached is a fair one; and it is satisfactory to all officials of the Government concerned. I myself think it is a sound solution of the difficulty. We did not like to depart from the recommendation of the Judiciary Committee; we attempted to get the House to agree to that provision; but they absolutely said that they would not, under any circumstances, agree to it. Consequently, I think that the proposal here, both on its merits and because it has made it possible to reach an agreement, is very reasonable and just.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I may say that the House conferees declined to accept the provision which was considered by the Judiciary Committee and that had to do with the approval of the Attorney General of the United States. We tried to find some other solution, but the compromise arrived at providing that there should be consultation with the Attorney General was entirely satisfactory to the Attorney General, and the Senate conferees accepted it.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I have no disposition to oppose and I am not opposing the conference report. I have no fault to find, either, with the Senate conferees. They probably had to make this concession, or we would not have had any conference report. Nevertheless, it does not seem to be fundamentally right that the Department of Justice, one of the great departments of Government, when there is involved a certain law which the Department is trying to enforce, must cease and desist at the demand of the Chairman of the War Production Board. They may never have a dispute which will not be settled in a way satisfactory to both of them; but as a matter of law, and as a matter of right, the Attorney General is entitled to consult with the others. There will be nothing in the law which will really give the Attorney General, the head of the Department of Justice, the right to veto any provision which in effect may nullify a law enacted by Congress which he is attempting to enforce.

I hope there may never be a disagreement which will be serious, that the parties may always agree, but when they do not agree the Department of Justice will have to give in, and a temporary official, appointed in the present emergency, will have a right to nullify the law. I have no reference to Mr. Nelson or to the present Attorney General. I am thinking of the law, without reference to the men, either the head of the War Production Board, or the head of the Department of Justice. I fear that a serious dispute will arise regarding enforcement of some law enacted by Congress.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator will recall that when we discussed the matter before the Committee on the Judiciary I was entirely in accord with the view he expressed; but we could not get the conferees to agree.

Mr. NORRIS. I understand that, and I am not finding fault.

Mr. WAGNER. Was there not also a provision which has not been discussed, which I think is important, namely, that the Attorney General is required to make a report to Congress every 120 days as to the policy? I think that is very important.

Mr. HUGHES. Yes; and that was one of the changes which was made in the Van Nuys bill in the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. HUGHES. And that part of it the conferees accepted very readily. It does provide for a report.

Mr. President, I ask that a statement which I have here in relation to section 8 of the conference report be made a part of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT RE PROVISO TO SECTION 8 OF SENATE BILL 2250

Section 8 of this bill exempts certain loans made by national banks on the security of governmental guarantees from the provision of the National Bank Act (sec. 5200 of the Revised Statutes) which limits loans to any one person to 10 percent of the lending bank's capital and surplus. This section will only embody in specific statutory form the position which has already been adopted by the Comptroller of the Currency, who is charged with supervision and regulation of the national banking system, in his interpretation of existing statutes.

The proviso to section 8 specifies two requirements which must be complied with in order to bring an obligation within the purview of the new exception. The first of these requirements is that the governmental guarantee or commitment be unconditional, and the second is that the guarantee or commitment must be performed by payment of cash within 60 days after demand.

In order to meet the varying circumstances surrounding the making of guarantees or commitments by numerous agencies of the Federal Government, it is essential that a certain measure of flexibility exist in connection with the two requirements stated. For this purpose the Comptroller of the Currency is authorized to define the terms used in the new exception if and when he may deem it necessary. This power will enable the Comptroller to carry out the purpose of the new exception by authoritatively defining terms so as to relieve national banks of uncertainty whether a particular guarantee, commitment, or agreement is within the exception and therefore not subject to any limitation upon amount.

For example, the term "unconditional," as used in the proviso, is intended to require the guarantee or commitment to be substantially unconditional, so that the lending institution can be assured that the obligation can be liquidated by Government take-over at any time. No guarantee or commitment is unconditional in an absolute sense. There are certain inherent conditions of good faith which must not be violated, and there are certain procedural conditions, such as making demand within a specified period, giving notice to the guarantor, protecting collateral, turning over of the obligation and collateral to the guarantor upon performance of the guarantee, and the like, which are almost invariably present. The presence of conditions of this type, of course, would not prevent guarantees or commitments from being unconditional for the purpose of the new exception, and the Comptroller of the Currency, if it were necessary, could define this term so as to make this entirely clear. In this way, it is believed that the purpose of the section can be carried out with flexibility and efficiency, so that unlimited loans of the nature contemplated thereby may be made by national banks, provided they do not contain features or conditions which might jeopardize the liquidity of any national bank or the safety of the national banking system. It is not intended to interfere in any way with this program in operation under the President's Executive order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report presented by the Senator from Delaware.

The report was agreed to.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

RATIONING OF GASOLINE

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I rose for the purpose of moving that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2467, but I have on my desk a bill which I have prepared, dealing with the question of gasoline rationing, and out of order I desire to introduce that bill at this time, and ask that it be printed in full as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2575) to provide for public hearings in connection with the rationing of gasoline was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 is amended by adding at the end of title I thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 6. (a) The Administrator is authorized and directed to make promptly a study and investigation with respect to (1) the extent to which scrap rubber is being reclaimed and made available for use, (2) the

amount of scrap rubber in the United States and the facilities for reclaiming it, (3) the extent to which the reclamation of scrap rubber and the utilization of reclaimed rubber can be increased, and (4) the amount of reclaimed rubber which can be made available for civilian use by an effective program for the collection and reclamation of scrap rubber. In the course of such investigation the Administrator shall hold public hearings, of which general public notice shall be given and at which interested persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard with respect to the subject matter of the investigation. The Administrator shall from time to time, but not less frequently than once each 30 days, make a report to the Congress with respect to the progress of such investigation until a final report is made.

"(b) Whenever in the opinion of the Administrator it is necessary or is likely to be necessary to make the rationing of gasoline effective in any State in which such rationing was not in effect on June 1, 1942, the Administrator is authorized to hold public hearings in such State, of which general public notice shall be given and at which interested persons shall be given an opportunity to be heard with respect to (1) the availability of supplies of gasoline in such State, (2) the facilities for the transportation of gasoline to points within such State, (3) the necessity for conserving motor-vehicle tires within such State, (4) the extent to which scrap rubber within such State is being collected and reclaimed, and (5) the necessity for and the effect of the proposed gasoline rationing.

"(c) After the date of enactment of this section, no regulation, order, or requirement under this or any other act of Congress shall require the rationing of gasoline in any State in which such rationing was not in effect on June 1, 1942, unless (1) a hearing has been held as required by subsection (a) of this section, (2) a hearing has been held in such State as provided in subsection (b) of this section, and (3) the Administrator after such hearings has made a finding that the rationing of gasoline in such State is essential for the conservation of rubber which cannot be replaced by the reclamation and use of scrap rubber or that such rationing is necessary by reason of a shortage in the supplies of gasoline for such State."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the bill which I have just introduced amends the Price Control Act of 1942 by requiring the Administrator to undertake a study and investigation with respect to: First, the extent to which scrap rubber is being reclaimed and made available for use; second, the amount of scrap rubber in the United States and the facilities for reclaiming it; third, the extent to which the reclamation of scrap rubber and the utilization of reclaimed rubber can be increased; and, fourth, the amount of reclaimed rubber which can be made available for civilian use by an effective program for the collection and reclamation of scrap rubber. The Administrator of Price Control is directed to hold public hearings in the United States as a whole following general public notice. Interested persons are to be given an opportunity to be heard with respect to the above four points.

It may come as a complete surprise, but it is a fact nevertheless, that no one in the United States, official or otherwise, can venture even a good estimate of the private and public supplies of scrap rubber in the United States. Some well-informed sources guess the amount to be 10,000,000 tons, some official sources guess 500,000 tons, but I repeat, no one, official or otherwise, knows. The amount of scrap rubber that can be salvaged is likely to be as much as 4,000,000 tons, an amount sufficient to keep every one of our 33,000,000 passenger cars, every one of our 5,000,000 trucks, and all of our half million busses operating at maximum use on rubber for at least 10 years. It is vital that we know the extent of the supply of scrap rubber. Scrap rubber is the key to the whole situation.

However, it is presumed that our military needs will require much of this scrap rubber. Certainly whatever they need in addition to our stored supplies of new rubber, and our current synthetic production, must be given them. Military needs come first, but Mr. John L. Collyer, president of B. F. Goodrich Co., of Akron, Ohio, says there are now in the possession of American automobile and truck owners 173,000,000 unworn rubber tires and tubes, or 1,200,000 tons of unworn rubber already manufactured and distributed. That is a 2-years' supply of tires for all the cars and trucks and busses now in use.

The supply of scrap rubber moving into reclaiming plants is drying up for one reason and one reason only. A ceiling has been placed on scrap rubber of $18 a ton (less than a cent a pound), and that price is too low to bring out the leaky hot water bottles, old rubber boots, and ruined tires and tubes. One manufacturer points out that if the price of scrap rubber were raised to $100 per ton, a price that would move every ounce of scrap rubber from its hiding place, the additional cost of an automobile tire would be 40 cents. In the extreme shortage of rubber it is nothing short of criminal to place so low a ceiling on scrap rubber; so low in fact that hundreds of thousands of pounds of it are being destroyed under the misapprehension that it is practically worthless. Someone needs to build a hot fire under the bureaucrats who are mishandling scrap rubber, and a good public hearing will do just that.

There is not a man or woman in America worthy the name of an American who would not give the shirt off his or her back to help the United Nations win the war. But faithful, loyal Americans who feel that way about the war are entitled to know the facts of war. No one in Washington and no one in the country knows how much scrap rubber there is. Further study, further investigation, and public hearings are absolutely vital.

The indirect approach to rubber conservation through gasoline rationing will not do the job in the most equitable and advantageous manner. If rubber must be conserved, and it must, the Administrator of Price Control should move directly into its conservation. I repeat, gasoline rationing will not do it equitably and advantageously. There are millions of cars on sale lots equipped with tires deteriorating with idleness. There are millions of people in the United States who would voluntarily turn in their tires to the Government. There are thousands of dealers carrying the crushing burden of frozen tires who are begging for relief. Our 33,000,000 passenger cars easily could be cut down to 20,000,000 without demoralizing the transportation business of the United States, as has been suggested by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER]. Let the bureaucrats conserve rubber by dealing with it directly, and stop issuing orders merely to let the people know there is a powerful government in Washington as well as in Berlin and Kuibeshev.

It does not seem to be understood how vital motor transportation is to the United States. We are doing the greatest job of war production ever attempted by any nation since the dawn of history. That production is directly dependent upon motor transportation. Make no mistake! Motor transportation cannot be destroyed in America without great disaster to the war effort.

My bill would require the Administrator of Price Control whenever, in his opinion, it is necessary or likely to be necessary, to ration gasoline in any State in which rationing was not in effect on June 1, 1942, to hold public hearings in such State with respect to—

(1) Availability of supplies of gasoline.

(2) Facilities for transportation of gasoline.

(3) Necessity for conserving tires.

(4) The extent to which scrap rubber is being collected and reclaimed; and

(5) The necessity for, and the effect of, the proposed gasoline rationing.

Under my bill no regulation or order requiring the rationing of gasoline in any State in which such rationing was not in effect on June 1, 1942, shall be made until hearings in that State have been held. The conditions and requirements of my bill ought not to be objectionable to anyone who believes in democracy. Anyone who has any faith at all in the American people ought not to object to the enactment of such a moderate bill.

Much has been said about the "loss of face" by Congress lately. My bill affords the opportunity for Congress to demonstrate whether it has abdicated completely its responsibilities to the people, or whether it wants the people to know what goes on. The question is, shall the bureaucrats arbitrarily rule, or shall they, too, be made accountable to the people. Town Hall needs to be resurrected.

America has undertaken a mighty task. Not only is she fighting the most desperate war of her history, but she is also the arsenal of democracy. A heavy yoke has been placed on the back of every American with his full and complete consent. We must have bureaucrats to direct this stupendous war effort; but there is one thing Congress must tell them. "You can lead the American people anywhere, but you cannot drive them one damned inch."

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator's bill provides for a hearing only in those States in which rationing was not in effect on June 1. In order to make it entirely

democratic, would not the Senator be willing to amend his bill at the proper time so as to provide for a hearing even with respect to those States in which rationing was in effect prior to June 1?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes. I think that is probably a weakness in my bill at present, which needs to be corrected. We must treat all States alike.

Mr. GEORGE. I think so. In the cases of Georgia and Florida I think it can be demonstrated to any impartial mind that there is no reason on earth for rationing gasoline in those two States; in fact, it is admitted by the authorities to whom I have made appeals that such is the case; but they have met me with the suggestion that if we did not allow them to take our gasoline they would not have adequate supplies to transport to more distant parts of the East—as though they could not transport it from the oil-producing States as well as from States which happen to have gasoline within their borders.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator for his observation. My thought in putting that provision in the bill was that I did not want to interfere with an order which had already been issued on the ground, perhaps, that there was a shortage of gasoline. No one claims that there is a shortage of gasoline in the other sections of the country. That is why I placed the provision in the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. As I understand, the able and generous Senator from Colorado has acquiesced in the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia and will consent to the amendment of his bill so as to permit hearings on this subject with respect to all States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Of course, my bill has been referred to a committee. I think the point is very well taken, and I have no objection to the suggested amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE subsequently said: Mr. President, in connection with the remarks made by the Senator from Colorado in relation to gasoline rationing, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a copy of a telegram which I addressed, on May 27, to Mr. Leon Henderson, the Price Administrator.

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 27, 1942.*

Hon. LEON HENDERSON: Deeply concerned over proposal to ration gasoline in Midwest. Economic life much more dependent there on motor transportation than in compactly populated regions along seaboard where rail facilities are greatly concentrated. Farmers especially depend on their cars and small trucks to get produce to market. Vast tourist and recreation business in Wisconsin and other States would be ruined by rationing because many large recreational areas are without rail connections.

Am sure all patriotic Americans including the people of the Midwest are willing to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to promote the military effort and win the war, but rationing of gasoline in that area is entirely unnecessary and people resent it as a subterfuge. If tires must be further conserved, let that problem be faced on its own merits. The Government is not going to conserve tires by forcing individuals to abandon use of their cars and thereby discourage them from giving their tires the care they normally would if they could expect to use them. Am convinced people sense seriousness of rubber shortage sufficiently to eliminate voluntarily unnecessary use of automobiles. Reports indicate substantial reduction of highway traffic in Midwest now just as in other sections.

I feel very strongly that gasoline rationing in Midwest would be serious mistake. We want the highest morale throughout Nation. To achieve it the Government must use its powers with discretion and not ask for needless sacrifice. Furthermore, if farmers' transportation is crippled, it will mean an unavoidable slow-down in food-production program already handicapped by shortage of farm labor, new farm machinery, and stoppage of rural-electrification projects.

ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, Jr.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I desire to occupy only a few moments of the time of the Senate.

In support of the statements made by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I wish to state to the Senate that a week ago, when the proposed rationing order was suggested for the entire country, a number of Members from the oil-producing States met and informally discussed the matter. As a result of that conference it was decided that Mr. Nelson should be appealed to to issue an order for a hearing. Mr. Nelson was selected because he is chairman of the War Production Board. As I understand, before any action can be taken Mr. Nelson and his Board must be consulted. Before appropriations can be made available, they are referred to that Board to see whether they are in the interest of carrying out the war effort. If they are not in the interest of carrying out the war effort, the funds are impounded. So, for the reason that Mr. Nelson occupies such an important position, the informal conference decided to appeal to him for a hearing. The senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and myself were selected by the conference to take the matter up with Mr. Nelson.

Pursuant to that understanding, a letter was prepared and sent to Mr. Nelson by special messenger. The letter was dated May 28, more than a week ago. The letter sets forth briefly the importance of the proposed order, and asked that before the order be promulgated and announced a public hearing be ordered, which the governors of the oil-producing States, at least, shall be invited to attend or send representatives, that representatives of the oil-producing concerns most vitally affected be notified and offered an opportunity to appear and be heard, and that Members of Congress from oil-producing States be given an opportunity to be heard.

As I have said, the letter was sent to Mr. Nelson more than a week ago. To date no reply has been received, unless one has come to my office since I left there at 12 o'clock. In order that the country may know that this matter is under consideration in the proper way, I shall insert in the RECORD the letter sent to Mr. Nelson. Congress has heretofore enacted legislation conferring powers upon certain persons to fix prices, ration certain commodities, and very largely control our domestic economy. Inasmuch as those laws are now being administered, it was thought proper to follow the regular democratic process in asking those in high authority to provide a hearing before acting on a matter of this importance.

In order that the record may be complete, I ask permission to have incorporated in the RECORD in connection with my remarks a copy of the letter sent to Mr. Nelson, signed by the senior Senator from Texas and myself on behalf of the unofficial committee.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 28, 1942.

Hon. DONALD M. NELSON,
Chairman, War Production Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. NELSON: With respect to the proposed or suggested order of Nation-wide rationing of gasoline, we beg to advise that a number of Senators from the oil-producing States met informally this morning to consider such proposal.

As you know, we have some 12 States that produce petroleum in quantities, and as a rule we have refineries in the oil-producing States, so that at least some 12 States are supplied locally with an ample supply of gasoline and oil.

As you are aware, the States producing oil secure a substantial amount of revenue from, first, a gross production tax on oil, oil products, and likewise a substantial tax from the income of the companies and individuals engaged in the oil industry. In addition to the foregoing, the States receive a substantial amount of revenue from the gasoline tax and in many States bond issues have been voted for road construction and other purposes with the revenue derived from the tax on oil and its products pledged to meet the interest charges and the bonds themselves when they become due.

In addition to the State's interest in this matter, the Federal Government likewise has a substantial interest in the oil industry, inasmuch as a very large amount of Federal taxes are derived from the corporations and individuals engaged in the business as well as a large sum of taxes derived from the sale of gasoline.

Because of the importance of this matter, the conference this morning authorized the undersigned to suggest that before any order is prepared and issued that a hearing be provided for those directly interested in the problem. It was suggested that an invitation be extended to the Governors, the representatives of the oil industry, and the Members of Congress representing the oil-producing States to the end that the States most affected should have a chance to be heard prior to the issuance of any general order providing a rationing program for the country at large.

The citizens of the States most directly affected have their cars and trucks and are able to secure ample gas and oil to enable them to continue their normal activities. If a rationing program is provided, making it necessary to store the cars and trucks in such areas, it is represented that the nonuse of the cars, trucks and tires will cause deterioration and damage almost to the same extent that would occur if the cars are permitted to be used in the normal activities.

If a general order is issued now the citizens will have, in their opinion, a just and valid complaint because of such order, while on the

other hand if they are permitted to use their cars so long as they are serviceable, then when they are no longer able to operate their cars for either the want of necessary repairs or for tires, then they could do no more than to consider themselves unfortunate because of their inability to secure a new car or new tires and would be deprived of any just complaint against the Government for having issued a rationing order with respect to gasoline.

To this letter we are attaching a telegram from the Honorable Leon C. Phillips, Governor of the State of Oklahoma, making representations and petitioning you to order such a hearing to the end that those in interest shall have a chance to be heard.

Believing that the best interests of our country will be served by ordering such a hearing, we trust that you will find it agreeable to comply with this request.

Respectfully submitted.

TOM CONNALLY,
ELMER THOMAS,
Representing unofficial conference of Senators from oil-producing States.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma has honored me by mentioning the fact that he and I were associated in trying to obtain a hearing. I merely suggest to the Senator from Oklahoma and other Senators that in this war emergency it is necessary to regulate many things; but I see no reason for regulating things when it is not necessary. We shall have plenty of headaches from real causes. In certain States of the Union where the production of gasoline and oil is abundant and the supply is overflowing, there is no sense in saying to the people of those States, "You cannot have any gasoline." In my own State a man may live across the street from a refinery, and go there with a bucket in his hand; but he is told, "No; you cannot have any gasoline." Many of the smaller refineries will have to fold up and go out of business. We are perfectly willing to send gasoline and oil to all the other States in the Union now. It is not our fault that they are not getting it. It is because transportation facilities are not available.

However, if transportation is the cause of the difficulty, when we do not need any transportation in order to obtain gasoline, why intervene? But it is said, "We want to regulate rubber." Well, let them regulate rubber; but there is no sense in attempting to regulate rubber indirectly by regulating something else.

I want to emphasize what the Senator from Oklahoma has called to the attention of the Senate. We have appealed for the poor privilege of a hearing, but we do not get it. Perhaps we should have appealed to Mr. Henderson; I do not know. However, we appealed to Mr. Nelson. I realize that Mr. Nelson has a multitude of matters to handle. I think very highly of Mr. Nelson. He is doing a big job in a big way. The matter may never have come to his attention; some of his subordinates may not have permitted it to reach his attention. However, it seems to me that we have gone mad in the desire to regulate.

If we simply see something that is not regulated, we say that we are going to regulate it. It may be said that there is no use in regulating it; but the reply is made, "If we are going to regulate anything, we want to regulate everything else. There is not going to be any discrimination." That applies to the present case. We say, "If we are going to regulate the man in New England so that he cannot get gasoline, we will regulate the man in New Mexico." The only reason for regulating the amount of gasoline which may be used by a man in New England is that we cannot get the gasoline to him, because of the shortage of tankers and the shortage of railroad transportation. Is that any reason why the consumption of gasoline should be regulated in sections of the country in which there is no shortage, and where ample quantities of gasoline can be received?

Suppose a man does use his automobile. Is it sounder to let him use his automobile carefully and sparingly, or to require him to keep it stored in a garage? Here is a man who has an automobile with tires which are in fairly good condition. We are going to make him conserve them by not using them at all. To require that he put his car in a garage and let the tires rot is a remarkable way to conserve them.

If a man has any sense at all—and the presumption is that all the people of the country have a little sense left, irrespective of the regulators—would it not inspire him with the idea of thrift if he should reflect, "I know when I wear out these tires I will not get any more"—which is all right—"I know when I wear out this car I will not get another car. Therefore, I will use them, and use them sparingly. I will really conserve rubber. I will save it by not using it except when I have to, because when these tires wear out I am through."

However, the regulators say, "No; the way to conserve rubber is to do away with it by letting it be immobilized." That is a very good word; our people are told to immobilize their automobiles—either to demobilize or immobilize them—by putting them in the garage, where nobody can use them.

We are told that thereby we will save rubber. Well, what are we going to do with it after we have saved it? It will not do one any good if he demobilizes it by putting it in a shed.

Mr. President, I think this is a matter which should have a hearing. In fact, this is one case in which the public should receive some attention and should be afforded a hearing for the present proposal—the rationing of gasoline in places where it does not need to be rationed—is a fairly good sample of the foolishness and injustice which often are inflicted by clerks clothed with executive authority. In 12 or 15 States of the Union there is plenty of gasoline, and people in those States are begging for the opportunity to sell it, but are told, "No; you cannot do it." They ask, "Why?" The answer is, "Because there is a fellow away up yonder in Maine, off the railroad, up in the brush who cannot get any gas, and, therefore, you cannot have any." That is a great philosophy.

Mr. President, I want to second and strengthen and support the views of the Senator from Oklahoma. I have not become quite so familiar as I should be with the bill of the Senator from Colorado; but I am sure it is submitted for a good purpose and a good cause.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It calls for public hearings.

Mr. CONNALLY. I think that a hearing is the least we can call for. I give a hearing to everyone who comes to my office—white or black, rich or poor; I give everyone who comes into my office a hearing. I do not promise to do anything about it after I hear him, but at least I hear him. [Laughter.]

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, let me say that I am very much in sympathy with what the Senator from Texas has been saying. There is one point which he did not emphasize to my satisfaction. I am very much concerned over the fact that one or two Senators addressed an official of one of the bureaus, but, after a reasonable time, have received no reply to their communications. I think they should insist upon a reply, and that the Senate should demand a reply. I do not like to see Senators put aside by officials of Government agencies.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator; but I really doubt that Mr. Nelson himself ever received the appeal. We know how it is: The smaller the job, the more important it is in the mind of the man who fills it. A number of the underlings in the departments do not let communications get to their superiors.

Mr. HOLMAN. But I do not think the Senate should submit to such treatment by underlings, putting aside communications addressed to their superiors.

Mr. CONNALLY. We are trying to call attention to the matter by discussing it on the floor of the Senate. I think when Mr. Nelson hears about it he will do the proper thing. However, it is not always possible for a man to do the proper thing when his subordinates do not let him know about it. Possibly the Senator from Oregon has not learned that fact since he has not been a Member of the Senate as long as some of the others of us have.

Mr. HOLMAN. I have not been here long enough to permit subordinates to run me.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say that when the Senator from Oregon has been here a little longer he will find that a civil-service clerk in one of the departments can stymie a United States Senator. I caution the Senator to watch his step.

FLORIDA BARGE CANAL AND PIPE LINE

Mr. LEE obtained the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LEE. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. I have listened with a great deal of satisfaction to what has been said in the last few minutes by the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia [Mr RUSSELL] relative to the situation in Georgia and Florida with respect to gasoline rationing.

Florida has a pipe line terminating at Port St. Joe, whence it continues to other

States, north and northeast. Florida, of course, is situated right on the Gulf of Mexico for a distance of approximately 700 or 750 miles, accessible by barge, accessible by tanker, accessible by railroad, accessible by truck, accessible by almost every known method of transportation. The tanks and the reservoirs that contain petroleum products in the State are literally brimming over. The people can easily transport petroleum products by motor vehicle or by railroad or by conveyance over water in almost every known way, to almost every part of the State. There is a distance of only 82 miles, for example, across land from the Gulf of Mexico to the St. Johns River, which runs almost from Melbourne, Fla., to the intersection of the intracoastal canal at Jacksonville, Fla., so that so far as we are concerned it is a gross injustice and a very great burden to be subjected to the rationing of a commodity which lies in plentitude right within grasp of almost every citizen and every enterprise in the State; and our people naturally cannot understand why the rule is not more nearly applicable to the facts. They think that a rule of reason should be applied to all these regulations. Just because one favors the winning of the war and the principle of victory through equality of sacrifice does not mean that he favors an effort to win the war through inequality of sacrifice or obligation. If stringent rules are to be applied they should be applied intelligently, with accurate relationship to the facts; and their application should indicate to the public such common sense as to give them confidence in the competency of the administrative agencies of the Government. We therefore very definitely are burdened by this rationing process, due to the fact that the fiscal structure of our State is a somewhat peculiar one. We have no State income tax. We have no State ad valorem tax whatsoever. We have no State inheritance tax—which is distinct from the amount which we are allowed to derive from the Federal share of an inheritance tax. Our principal source of revenue for our schools and for the administration and upkeep of our State government is derived from sources related to the automobile—the consumption of gasoline, upon which we have a 7 cents a gallon tax, and a license tax upon automobiles. Those two principal sources maintain our roads; they build new roads; they provide for the common schools; they contribute to the general revenue taxes of the State; and they provide for the school system and its operation, which includes the furnishing of free school books for every child in the State of Florida.

Take away 50 percent or more of the State's total income from those sources, and it can readily be seen what chaos and confusion must develop in the State's fiscal affairs. It simply means property will have heaped upon it a burden of taxes which will be unbearable; it means that a great many people will be deprived of their homes and physical property; or it means that some other class of our people will be subjected to an unfair burden of taxation which heretofore has been distributed generally to all classes.

Let me refer to another point. Of course, Senators know that we have had a considerable revenue derived from the operation of race tracks, horse and dog tracks. Under war conditions and under licensing provisions, of course, we will experience, as other States will experience, a diminution of the revenue from that source which revenue has been divided equally among the counties of the State and which to many small counties has meant the difference between solvency and insolvency. So, if we are to be subjected to this total derangement of our State fiscal system, we are going to be subjected to a very serious and a very onerous burden against which our people are very naturally keenly remonstrating.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President——

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WHEELER. The reason given for the rationing of gasoline is the desire to save rubber. I have been paying considerable attention to the question of rubber, and hearings have been held on the subject before the so-called Gillette committee. I am at a loss to understand why the departments have not made a drive for old rubber which might be reclaimed. We have made a drive to save paper; we have made a drive to save aluminum; and we have made drives to save this and save that, but, so far as I can learn, nothing has been done by the departments to make a drive to obtain old rubber which may be reclaimed.

I was informed today by a man of vast experience that there is, in this country, enough rubber which can be reclaimed to offset any shortage of rubber for tires. He is a man of very great experience. Why the departments have not sought to make any move in this direction, I do not know, but an examination of the roster of the men who are in charge and have to do with rubber in both the W. P. B. and in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will disclose the fact that practically every one of those men is connected with and tied up with the big four rubber companies of this country, generally been known as the rubber trust in the United States. They are the ones who have been controlling the rubber situation; but no attempt has been made to make a drive to reclaim rubber so that the people could have rubber for their tires, and thus obviate the necessity for rationing gasoline.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I was very much impressed by a statement made, I think, by the able Senator from Colorado, and also by the able Senator from Texas, that if there is to be any taking over or commandeering of the rubber resources of the country, it should be done on a factual basis, pursuant to an intelligent and carefully worked out plan. There is no lack of power on the part of the War Production Board to take over this rubber, and if it be necessary, that should be done upon its own bottom. That is the only way, as I see it, to get any salutary result in the conservation of rubber. If I have two Ford automobile tires upon my car and I am allowed only a limited amount of gasoline to operate the car until those tires wear out, they do not do the Government any good; they cannot serve the Army or any other military agency any good purpose. All they are doing is merely gradually dying on my car. I am the only one who gets any good out of them. So, if the Government needs the tires on my car, the thing for it to do is simply to call for them, pay a fair value for them, and use them for whatever purposes may be most consistent with the national defense.

It does not do anybody any good, so far as I can see, to leave them on my car if the purpose is merely to make me use it more slowly, as the able Senator from Texas suggested here this afternoon. If I am not old enough to be able to save my own tires, when I know I am not going to get any more, I need a guardian and not the Government to come to my rescue.

In the first place, I do not think the people like the way of getting at some principle indirectly. Do not let us cause the people to think we have to do by circumlocution things which need to be done in the national interest. That confuses them, leads them sometimes to believe that we are deceiving them, and that is unsalutary so far as the maintenance of morale is concerned. So I hope, from the viewpoint of public confidence in the competency and fairness of their Government, that if we need rubber we will not undertake by a roundabout way to get it.

Now, Mr. President, just a word about a related subject. In March of this year I introduced in the Senate and had referred to the Committee on Commerce a bill which was designed to relieve and to alleviate the shortage of petroleum products on the Atlantic seaboard. It was a two-part proposal: First, it allowed the President discretionary authority to construct a pipe line across the shortest part of the Florida peninsula of which I knew, across which such a pipe line could be constructed, a distance of about 82 miles from Withlacoochee Bay to the St. Johns River. That was contemplated as a temporary approach to this problem that would give the most immediate prospect of some relief, for the engineers told us that that pipe line or any other pipe line that might traverse the State at the most feasible place could be built in the course of about 3 months' or 4 months' time, if the project was approached with diligence by competent agents. I was not wedded to that particular route for a pipe line. I merely offered it as a proposal, for whatever it might be worth. Other routes have been suggested. I am in favor of the one that competent technical authorities say is the preferable and most desirable route for the pipe line. I think that the construction of it should not be any longer delayed. I believe it offers the quickest hope there is to get some petroleum products to the Atlantic seaboard.

I connected with that proposal for the construction of the pipe line a proposal to build a barge canal along the same route, which is also a distance of about 82 miles. In my bill I provided that that barge canal should have a minimum depth of

12 feet and a minimum width of 150 feet. I have heard it said, from one source or another, that that was a bill to construct the so-called Florida ship canal. Mr. President, I want here and now categorically to say that that is not the fact. It never was so intended and the bill itself makes that point very clear. I will read what my bill provides with respect to the construction of a waterway. I read from page 2 of Senate bill 2426, introduced by me on March 31 of this year:

(b) A waterway having a channel with minimum depth of 12 feet and minimum bottom width of 150 feet from the waters of Withlacoochee Bay, Fla., to the St. Johns River, Fla., along the route designated as 13–B and described in House Document No. 194, Seventy-fifth Congress, together with such lees, breakwaters, jetties, and aids to navigation between St. Josephs Bay, Fla., and Withlacoochee Bay, Fla., as he may find requisite for the use and protection of navigation.

I now read section 2:

SEC. 2. The total cost of the projects authorized in section 1 hereof shall not exceed $68,000,000.

That amount covers both pipe line and canal, and everyone knows that the lowest estimate for the construction of the Atlantic-Gulf or so-called Florida ship canal is in the neighborhood of $200,000,000. So it was never contemplated by anybody that my bill should be considered as an effort to construct the Florida ship canal by indirection or subterfuge.

In my remarks to the Senate introducing that bill I did say, in commenting upon this proposal of mine, on page 3248 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 31:

That, obviously, I think, will be found to be the first stage in the construction of the Florida ship canal.

At that time I expressed the opinion that the administrative and legislative branches of the Government would find such satisfaction in that project, once completed, that they would want to make it available to ships that would require a greater depth and a greater width, but if it did so that was a matter to be subsequently determined by Congress and by the President and by competent authorities of the Government. Yet last Monday the House of Representatives had under consideration the Mansfield bill, a bill introduced not by the Senator from Florida but the able Representative from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD, chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives, providing for the construction of a pipe line across another part of the State of Florida from Port St. Joe to Jacksonville. That bill had attached to it another proposal, to give permanent relief, and that report of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House said the only hope of permanent relief was by the construction of a waterway across the peninsula of Florida which would make possible the continuous transit of barges and other craft from the Gulf area, where oil was produced and refined, to the Atlantic seaboard, where it was principally consumed.

I stated on this floor that the Mansfield bill was a good measure. What did it propose to do? It proposed to reach down from Corpus Christi, Tex., where the Gulf Barge Canal now terminates, to the Mexican border, with an extension of the canal, to pick it up at Port St. Joe, where it now terminates, and extend it to the mouth of the Withlacoochee River, then to cut a barge canal—which I also had proposed in my bill—across the peninsula of Florida from the Withlacoochee River to the St. Johns River.

What would the country have had if the Mansfield bill had passed? It would have had a barge canal, a protected inland waterway, from the Mexican border to Trenton, N. J., with a minimum depth of 12 feet, and a minimum width of something like 125 feet. And the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, reporting to the House of Representatives, said that that offered the only permanent solution of the problem of getting petroleum products across the peninsula of the State of Florida, which sticks out like a thumb into the submarine-infested waters of the Caribbean Sea.

That bill was favorably and unanimously reported by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives. It seemed to have almost unanimous support. The leader of the majority party, Mr. MCCORMACK, not of Florida, but of Massachusetts, rose in the House and pleaded with his colleagues for the passage of that double proposal, the proposal for a pipe line for immediate relief, and the record shows it could have been built within an outside period of 4 months, and would have carried from 200,000 to 300,000 barrels of petroleum products a day to the Atlantic seaboard; then the barge canal could have been built in 15 months, as the Chief of Engineers testified and recommended to the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, that in 4 months would have almost filled the need for petroleum products on the Atlantic seaboard, and in a period of a year and a half would have given the Atlantic seaboard all the petroleum products it would have needed to maintain normal business.

The leader of the majority in the House of Representatives appealed to his colleagues in the public interest to approve the proposal. The Speaker of the House of Representatives, not from Florida, but from Texas, the distinguished Member of our sister body, and a distinguished official of the American Government, rose to his feet and pleaded with his colleagues that the measure should be approved by that body.

The matter did come up in a sort of a peculiar parliamentary form which might in itself have been objectionable. It came up under a motion for a suspension of the rules which, as Senators know, did not permit of any amendment of the proposal. I can well conceive why the membership of the House would not have been pleased to see the bill pass without any possibility of amendment whatever.

What I wish to address myself to, however, is the rumor and the sinister and insidious attack which was leveled against the bill by those who have always tried to destroy the hope of the Florida ship canal, on the theory that this was simply an indirect and collusive effort to achieve that which has previously been denied, namely, the construction of the Florida ship canal.

Let me say, Mr. President, responsibility for the shortage of oil products which exists today on the Atlantic seaboard will not rest upon the shoulders of those who tried to secure the enactment of the Florida ship canal bill. The responsibility for the discontinuance of wartime operations on the Atlantic seaboard because the States on the Atlantic seaboard cannot get oil will not be upon the heads of those who tried to give America, beginning in 1935, the Florida ship canal, a sea-level project 400 feet wide in its narrowest place and 33 feet in depth. Had that canal been allowed to go through these two bodies of the Congress when it was first proposed by the President of the United States, the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy; when it was advocated by one of the greatest men who ever put his foot upon this floor, the Honorable Joseph T. Robinson, of Arkansas; when it was sponsored by one of the best men who ever sat in this body, my illustrious predecessor, Senator Duncan U. Fletcher, whom I believe every Member of this body respected and loved—if it had become law; if the President had been allowed to complete the canal when he had already spent $5,000,000 of Federal money toward its construction, today it would have been a reality, and the tankers from the Gulf area would be transiting that waterway directly to the Atlantic seaboard, and many a seaman who today sleeps in a watery grave would be alive, and many a tanker which today rests at the bottom of the Caribbean or the Gulf of Mexico, or that part of the Atlantic Ocean between the Caribbean and Jacksonville, would today be carrying its burden of service to the war upon the bosom of the waters instead of reclining in its watery grave.

I am perfectly willing to have posterity judge those who favored the Florida ship canal from conscientious motives and those who defeated it.

Even as late as 3 years ago the President of the United States sent a letter to the chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] urging and advocating the passage of the Florida ship canal bill. The President said that he recommended it as being justified for commercial and also for military purposes.

The Chief of Engineers recommended it to this body. The House Committee on Rivers and Harbors three different times recommended it to their body. Yet somehow or other, every time anyone spoke about the Florida ship canal there was a sort of a sinister impression that he should get behind the barrier, or hide behind the post, because he was trying to steal something out of the Public Treasury.

I have been mighty well pleased when as good a man as God ever made, as was ever respected in this body, Senator Morris Sheppard, was the introducer of the

bill which the Senate turned down. It was not either of the Senators from Florida; it was the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate who stood on this floor time after time and recommended the bill to his colleagues.

I think the time has about come, Mr. President, when that project is entitled to consideration upon its merits. If one dislikes it, let him point out the error and the fallacy and the foolishness of it, but get it out of the mire of some sort of insidious connection with a so-called boondoggling scheme proposed by someone in Florida in order to get some money. As a matter of fact, there are many in Florida who do not want it; yet the people along the route of the proposed canal have bonded themselves to the extent of a million dollars, and they have already paid quite a tax to provide a right-of-way for the United States Government.

Some people were frightened lest the canal affect the water supply. The Army engineers spent half a million dollars in making an investigation into that contention. I was willing to trust their judgment, and I believe time would have vindicated their judgment that there would have been no possible harm to any part of the State from the construction of even that waterway of a depth of 33 feet and a width of 400 feet at the narrowest place. But I am perfectly willing to let that go by the board. I have not advocated a revival of the Florida ship canal. I have not introduced a bill on the subject, nor has my colleague, who sits before me at this time. No bill to that effect was offered in the House of Representatives. We presented a proposal which, as plain as the nose on one's face, is a barge canal, to have the same depth as the barge canal which runs from Jacksonville to Trenton, N. J., as the barge canal which runs now from New Orleans to Corpus Christi, as the barge canal which Judge MANSFIELD wanted to extend from 9 feet to 12 feet in depth from New Orleans to Port St. Joe, Fla., as the inland waterway which Judge MANSFIELD wanted to construct between Port St. Joe, Fla., and the Withlacoochee Bay. It asks no more and no less than that asked for other parts of the Atlantic seaboard.

It is not Florida which will suffer the detriment. I suppose we will be able to get along as well as the people of any other State. It is the Atlantic seaboard which will get cold this winter. It is the Atlantic seaboard which influenza will frequent this winter, taking its usual toll. It is the Atlantic seaboard's schools which will have to close down this winter.

I dare say Florida can fare through a winter about as well as any other State. And when the winter comes and the cold takes in its frigid embrace the children and the homes along the Atlantic seaboard then they can remember whether it was the Florida citizenry or whether it was those colleagues of ours who have endeavored to arrest this project who are to blame, or whether it was others who may have the proximate responsibility for their misfortune.

I think, as I intimated a moment ago, that if this matter had come up in a little different way, from a parliamentary standpoint, and if the membership of the House of Representatives had had opportunity to amend the bill in the way the Members of the two Houses always like to proceed when they have a proposal before them, if it had not contemplated quite as large an expenditure, $134,000,000, instead of fifty-odd million, for which a barge canal could have been constructed—I think if it had come up in that way the House of Representatives would not have reacted toward it as they did. There was not a roll call vote.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I wonder if my good friend and colleague will not let me proceed.

Mr. PEPPER. In 1 more minute I shall be through. I say, therefore, because I do believe what I have stated, I am going to allow my bill, which is today pending before the Senate Committee on Commerce, to remain in that committee, and I shall ask for an immediate hearing upon it before the chairman and the members of the committee, so that the matter, in the form in which the bill presents it, with the understanding that the pipe line shall be shifted to such point as the technical people think is the best point—and I believe, in view of the good understanding of the problem which has come to the committee already from the examination of it by the able Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] and the peculiar jurisdiction of that committee now over matters of this character, that that committee will regard the matter with sympathetic interest, and we will not regard ourselves as precluded by the committee from considering how we may most effectively give some immediate and real permanent solution to this problem.

Mr. MEAD. I was just about to ask the distinguished Senator the status of the Senate bill, and I am glad he has given us the information.

Mr. PEPPER. It is before the Senate Committee on Commerce.

PREVENTION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I have been hoping all afternoon to get an opportunity to speak on another subject, but the debate on rubber simply kept stretching and stretching until it covered most of the afternoon. If Senators' minds are now elastic enough to snap back to another subject, I wish to serve notice that in the near future I shall move to take up S. 860 for action by the Senate. This is the bill which was originally introduced by Senator Sheppard, of Texas. At that time he was chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, of which I am a member. We were not actually in war then, but I was convinced that there was good reason why we should pass the bill at that time; but now that we are actually in war, there is much more reason why we should enact this proposed legislation.

Oklahomans have a special reason for wanting the bill passed. Our State is legally dry, but a situation has arisen in connection with the Army camp at Lawton which is making it difficult, if not impossible, to enforce our State laws.

I wish to read two paragraphs from a letter written by Governor Phillips, of Oklahoma, on May 29, 1942. The letter is addressed to me. I quote from it as follows:

> I have visited Fort Sill and Lawton and have had State officers there many times trying to stimulate local officers to enforce the laws against liquor and vice. We discover that one of the principal troubles is the fact that liquor is brought into the camp by Army officers and men who then furnish some of it to citizens of Lawton and vicinity.
>
> The contention is made by those who transport this liquor that the State has no right to interfere with its delivery. I can see no good ground for this contention. It might as well be argued that it could be sent to the post office, W. P. A. headquarters, or any other Federal agency located in a dry State.

Governor Phillips then asks that this situation be taken up with Federal authorities with the hope that we may obtain cooperation in the enforcement of our own State laws.

Mr. President, immediately upon the receipt of this letter from the chief executive of Oklahoma, I wrote a letter to the Attorney General, the Secretary of the Treasury, and the Secretary of War, furnishing them copies of Governor Phillips' letter and requesting their cooperation in correcting this situation.

There has not been time for me to receive replies to these letters, but there is one sure way of correcting the situation and that is by the enactment of S. 860, for the enactment into law of the so-called Sheppard bill would prohibit liquor and vice from the Army camps and from vicinities around the Army camps.

Mr. President, the Democratic Party in its platform of 1932 pledged to protect dry States. I quote from that platform:

> We demand that the Federal Government effectively exercise its power to enable the States to protect themselves against importation of intoxicating liquors in violation of their laws.

Then again, President Roosevelt in his acceptance speech at the Chicago Convention in 1932 pledged to protect the dry States. I quote from his speech:

> I say to you now that from this day on the eighteenth amendment is doomed. When that happens we, as Democrats, must and will rightfully and morally enable the States to protect themselves from the importation of intoxicating liquors where such importations may violate their State laws.

Furthermore, the twenty-first amendment guaranteed protection to the dry States, as follows:

> The transportation or importation into any State, Territory, or possession of the United States, for delivery or use therein, of intoxicating liquors, in violation of the laws thereof, is hereby prohibited.

Furthermore, President Roosevelt on December 5, 1933, in proclaiming the date of repeal of the eighteenth amendment, further emphasized the guaranty of protection to dry States when he said:

> I call specific attention to the authority given by the twenty-first amendment to the Government to prohibit transportation or importation of intoxicating liquors into any State in violation of the law of such State.

Therefore, Mr. President, in the light of these commitments from the party, from the President, and from the twenty-first amendment itself, I shall call upon Congress to enact legislation which will fulfill these pledges of protection to dry States.

Here is a letter from the chief executive of Oklahoma in which he points out a situation whereby our State and local officers are rendered helpless in their efforts to enforce our own State laws.

This argument, of course, is local in its application but it is national in its obligation.

Mr. President, the argument in favor of the passage of S. 860, however, is broader in its scope and more far-reaching in its effect even than the pledge of protection to dry States. A greater reason why this law should be enacted is to protect our boys in the training camps from liquor and vice.

It has been said that alcohol and gasoline make a dangerous mixture. May I submit that it is even more dangerous when that mixture is in an airplane than when it is in an automobile.

The last time I spoke on the floor of the Senate in support of this measure, former Congressman Maury Maverick was in the gallery. He told me afterward that he had seen men in uniform after drinking beer, crawl into the cockpit of a plane and take it up for maneuvers. Mr. Maverick expressed himself very definitely as favoring this measure purely on the basis of a military proposition, since liquor had no place whatever in a military camp.

The Secretary of War, Mr. Stimson, has opposed passage of this measure on the grounds that it would place men in uniform under a different regulation than civilians. But there are many situations in which people of different classifications are prohibited from using liquor. For that matter, when a man dons the uniform of his country he thereby is in a different classification. He is under a different law from civilians.

Consequently, there is little weight to the argument of the Secretary of War. On the other hand there is great weight to the argument that the existence of liquor and vice within and around our Army camps is demoralizing to military training as well as damaging to the health and morals of our boys.

The War Department at one time asked Congress to lower the age limit of draftees to 18½ years, but I should like to suggest that if the Secretary of War expects to have such a proposal supported by the good people of this country it will be necessary for him to reverse himself on the proposition of keeping liquor and vice out of the military camps. I, for one, am unwilling to expose boys of the tender ages of 18 and 19 to the evils of liquor and vice. It is bad enough for older boys, but for boys of these tender years it is so wrong that I cannot believe the Secretary of War fully realizes the situation, or he would withdraw his opposition to the measure.

Mr. President, the people of my State are becoming more and more aroused on this question. They are expressing themselves through the medium of petitions, which is their constitutional right. I, as their representative, consider it my duty as well as my privilege to present their petitions to this Congress. I have here petitions totaling thousands of names, representing the citizens of Oklahoma. I ask that these petitions be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs in order that the members might know to what extent the people of my State are interested in the early passage of this measure.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS OF ENLISTED MEN

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 2467.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2467) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2467) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That this act may be cited as the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942.

TITLE I

SEC. 101. The dependent or dependents of any enlisted man of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grades in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, including any and all retired and reserve components of such services, shall be entitled to receive a monthly family allowance for any period during which such enlisted man is in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after the first day of the first calendar month following the date of enactment of this act during the existence of any war declared by Congress and the 6 months immediately following the termination of any such war.

SEC. 102. The monthly family allowance payable under this title to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall consist of the Government's contribution to such allowance and the reduction in or charge to the pay of such enlisted man.

SEC. 103. The dependents of any such enlisted man to whom a family allowance is payable under the provisions of this title shall be divided into two classes to be known as class A and as class B dependents. The class A dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the wife, the child, or the former wife divorced of any such enlisted man. The class B dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the parent, grandchild, brother, or sister of such enlisted man and who is found by the Secretary of the department concerned to be dependent upon such enlisted man for a substantial portion of his support.

SEC. 104. A monthly family allowance shall be granted and paid by the United States to the class A dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man upon written application to the department concerned made by such enlisted man or made by or on behalf of such dependent or dependents. A monthly family allowances shall be granted and paid by the United States to the class B dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man upon written application to the department concerned made by such enlisted man, or upon written application to the department concerned made by or on behalf of such dependent or dependents in any case in which the Secretary of the department concerned finds that it is impracticable for such enlisted man to request the payment of such allowance. The payment of a monthly family allowance to any class B dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall be terminated upon the receipt by the department concerned of a written request by such enlisted man that such allowance be terminated.

SEC. 105. (a) The amount of the Government's contribution to the family allowance payable to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall be the aggregate of the amount of the Government's contribution to the class A dependent or dependents of such enlisted man and the amount of the Government's contribution to the class B dependent or dependents of such enlisted man.

(b) The amount of the Government's contribution to the class A dependent or dependents of such enlisted man shall be at a monthly rate of—

(1) $28, if such enlisted man has a wife but no child;

(2) $40, if such enlisted man has a wife and one child, and an additional $10 for each additional child;

(3) $20, if such enlisted man has no wife but has one child;

(4) $30, if such enlisted man has no wife but has two children, and an additional $10 for each additional child; and

(5) $20, in addition to the amounts, if any, payable under clauses (1), (2), (3), or (4) of this subsection, if such enlisted man has a former wife divorced.

(c) The amount of the Government's contribution to the class B dependents or dependents of any such enlisted man shall be at a monthly rate of—

(1) $15, if such enlisted man has only one parent who is a class B dependent, and an additional $5 for each grandchild, brother, or sister which such enlisted man has who is a class B dependent, but not more than $50 in the aggregate;

(2) $25, if such enlisted man has two parents who are class B dependents, and an additional $5 for each parent in excess of two, grandchild, brother, or sister which such enlisted man has who is a class B dependent, but not more than $50 in the aggregate; and

(3) $5, if such enlisted man has no parent who is a class B dependent, for each grandchild, brother, or sister which such enlisted man has who is a class B dependent, but not more than $50 in the aggregate.

In any case in which the amount of the Government's contribution to the class B dependents of any enlisted man would be greater than $50, if there were no limitation upon the aggregate amount of the Government's contribution to such dependents, the amount contributed by the Government to each such dependent shall be reduced in the same proportion as the aggregate amount of the Government's contribution to all such dependents is reduced.

SEC. 106. (a) For any month for which a monthly family allowance is paid under this title to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man the monthly pay of such enlisted man shall be reduced by, or charged with, the amount of $22, and shall be reduced by, or charged with, an additional amount of $5 if the dependents to whom such

allowance is payable include both class A and class B dependents. The amount by which the pay of any such enlisted man is so reduced or with which it is so charged shall constitute part of the monthly family allowance payable to his dependent or dependents.

(b) In any case in which the family allowance is payable to more than one dependent of any such enlisted man, the amount by which the pay of such enlisted man is reduced or with which it is charged shall be apportioned among and paid for the benefit of such dependents in the following proportions:

(1) If such dependents are all class A dependents or are all class B dependents, such amount shall be apportioned among such dependents in the same ratio in which they share the total Government contribution payable to them under section 105.

(2) If one or more of such dependents are class A dependents and one or more of such dependents are class B dependents, $22 of such amount shall be apportioned among such class A dependents in the same ratio in which they share the total Government contribution payable to such class A dependents under section 105 and $5 of such amount shall be apportioned among such class B dependents in the same ratio in which they share the total Government contribution payable to such class B dependents under section 105.

(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, in any case in which a family allowance is granted under this title to a wife or a child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or a written agreement, or to a former wife divorced, the amount of the family allowance payable to such wife, child, or former wife divorced shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree or in the written agreement as the amount to be paid to such wife, child, or former wife divorced. In any case in which the application of the provisions of the preceding sentence results in a reduction in a family allowance which would otherwise be payable under this title, the amount by which the pay of the enlisted man is reduced or with which it is charged and the amount of the Government contribution to such family allowance may each be reduced in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the department concerned.

SEC. 107. Any monthly family allowance provided for by this title shall be paid for the period beginning with the day on which application therefor is filed or the day on which the dependent or dependents first become entitled thereto under section 101, whichever is later, and ending with the day on which the disbursing officer paying the allowance receives notice of a change in status of the enlisted man concerned which terminated the right of his dependent or dependents to receive such allowance or notice of the discharge from or death in the service of such enlisted man: *Provided*, That in the case of any dependent of an enlisted man in active service on the date of enactment of this act, if application is filed for a monthly family allowance within 6 months after such date of enactment or within such longer period as may be prescribed in special cases by the Secretary of the department concerned, the period for which such family allowance shall be paid shall begin with the date on which such dependent first becomes entitled thereto under section 101: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may, by regulations prescribed by them jointly, fix the dates of commencement and termination of any such family allowance on any dates not more than 1 month before or 1 month after the dates above prescribed. Such regulations shall in no event provide for the payment of such allowances for any period prior to the first day of the first calendar month following the date of enactment of this act or for any period when the United States is not engaged in a war declared by Congress and which is more than 6 months later than the date of termination of any such war. Any allowances which accrue under this title for the period preceding the first day of the fourth calendar month following the date of its enactment shall not be actually paid until after the first day of such fourth calendar month.

SEC. 108. In any case in which any allotment from the pay of an enlisted man is already in effect at the time a monthly family allowance becomes payable under this title to a dependent or dependents of such enlisted man, such allotment may be continued, modified, or discontinued in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the head of the department concerned.

SEC. 109. Any family allowance to which any dependent or dependents of any enlisted man is entitled under the provisions of this title shall be paid on behalf of such dependent or dependents to any person who may be designated by such enlisted man unless the Secretary of the department concerned determines that the person so designated is not an appropriate payee. In any case in which the Secretary of the department concerned determines that the person so designated is not an appropriate payee or in any case in which the enlisted man has not designated a payee, such allowance shall be paid on behalf of such dependent or dependents to such person as may be designated in regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the department concerned.

SEC. 110. (a) Any family allowance granted under the provisions of this title to the dependent or dependents of any enlisted man shall continue to be paid irrespective of the pay accruing to such enlisted man.

(b) In case of the desertion or imprisonment of any enlisted man to the dependent or dependents of whom a family allowance has been granted under the provisions of this title, the family allowance thereafter payable to such dependent or dependents and the reduction of or charge to pay of such enlisted man shall be determined in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the department concerned.

(c) In any case in which an enlisted man is entitled to receive or to have credited to his account pay and allowances for any period under the act of March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, 77th Cong.), such enlisted man shall be deemed to be an enlisted man during such period for the purposes of this title.

(d) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed to modify the act approved March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, 77th Cong.).

SEC. 111. This title shall be administered by the Secretary of War in its application to enlisted men of the Army of the United States and the dependents of such enlisted men and shall be administered by the Secretary of the Navy in its application to enlisted men of the United States Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard, and the dependents of such enlisted men. Said Secretaries are authorized to prescribe jointly or severally such regulations as they may deem necessary to enable them to carry out the provisions of this title and to delegate to such officers or employees of their respective departments as they may designate any of their functions under this title.

SEC. 112. The determination of all facts, including the fact of dependency, which it shall be necessary to determine in the administration of this title shall be made by the Secretary of the department concerned and such determination shall be final and conclusive for all purposes and shall not be subject to review in any court or by any accounting officer of the Government. The Secretary of the department concerned may at any time on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause reconsider or modify any such determination, and may waive the recovery of any money erroneously paid under this title whenever he finds that such recovery would be against equity and good conscience. The General Accounting Office shall not refuse to allow credit in the accounts of any disbursing officer for any erroneous payment or overpayment made by him in carrying out the provisions of this title unless such erroneous payment or overpayment was made by him as the result of his gross negligence or with the intent to defraud the United States. No recovery shall be made from any officer authorizing any erroneous payment or overpayment under this title unless such payment was authorized by him as the result of his gross negligence or with the intent to defraud the United States.

SEC. 113. Any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made to the department concerned for the pay of enlisted men shall be available for the payment of the family allowances payable under the provisions of this title.

SEC. 114. The Director of the Selective Service System is authorized and directed to cooperate with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy by providing them with such information in the possession of, or available to, the Selective Service System as may be necessary to enable them to efficiently administer the provisions of this title.

SEC. 115. The monthly family allowances payable under the provisions of this title shall not be assignable; shall not be subject to the claims of creditors of any person to whom or on behalf of whom they are paid; and shall not be liable to attachment, levy, or seizure by or under any legal or equitable process whatever.

SEC. 116. Whoever shall obtain or receive any money, check, or family allowance under this title, without being entitled thereto and with intent to defraud, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 117. Whoever in any claim for family allowance or in any document required by this title or by regulation made under this title makes any statement of a material fact knowing it to be false, shall be guilty of perjury and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

SEC. 118. Any person who has been entitled to payment of a family allowance under this title and whose entitlement to payment of such allowance has ceased shall, if he thereafter accepts payment of such allowance with the intent to defraud, be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 119. No part of any amount paid pursuant to the provisions of this title shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with any family allowance payable under this title, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not less than $100 nor more than $1,000.

SEC. 120. As used in this title—

(a) The term "wife" means a lawful wife.

(b) The term "former wife divorced" means a former wife divorced who has not remarried and to whom alimony has been decreed and is still payable.

(c) The term "child" includes—

(1) A legitimate child;

(2) A child legally adopted;

(3) A stepchild, if a member of the man's household, including a stepchild who continues as a member of the man's household after death of the mother or termination of the marriage; and

(4) An illegitimate child, but only if the man has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to such child's support; has

been judicially decreed to be the putative father of such child; or, has acknowledged under oath in writing, that he is the father of such child.

(d) The term "grandchild" means a child as above defined of a child as above defined.

(e) The term "parent" includes father and mother, grandfather and grandmother, stepfather and stepmother, father and mother through adoption, either of the person in the service or of the spouse, and persons who, for a period of not less than 1 year prior to the man's enlistment or induction, stood in loco parentis to the man concerned.

(f) The terms "brother" and "sister" include brothers and sisters of the half blood as well as those of the whole blood, stepbrothers and stepsisters, and brothers and sisters through adoption.

(g) The terms "child," "grandchild," "brother," and "sister" are limited to unmarried persons either (1) under 18 years of age, or (2) of any age, if incapable of support by reason of mental or physical defect.

(h) The terms "pay" and "base pay" mean base pay and longevity pay only.

(i) The terms "man" and "enlisted man" mean any enlisted individual of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grade in any of the services mentioned in section 101 of this act, but does not include any member of the Limited Service Marine Corps Reserve, the Philippine Army, the Philippine Scouts, the insular force of the Navy, the Samoan native guard or band of the Navy, or the Samoan reserve force of the Marine Corps.

(j) The term "department concerned" means the War Department or the Navy Department, whichever may be the appropriate one in the particular case.

TITLE II

SEC. 201. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of any or all categories of those men whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose activity in other endeavors, is found in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States (1) of any or all categories of those men in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those men found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of men is advisable because of their status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support, any allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the land or naval forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration but the fact that such allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of any or all categories of those men who have wives or children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual, and no such deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups or of groups of individuals in any plant or institution. Rules and regulations issued pursuant to this subsection shall include provisions requiring that there be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those men who have been classified by such local board."

(b) Section 15 of such act, as amended, is amended by striking out subsection (c) thereof.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, the bill provides for family allowances of men who are in the service. We divided all dependents into two classes, class A and class B. Class A consists of wives and children, generally speaking, and class B of parents, brothers, sisters, and other dependents. Class A dependents are involuntary, that is they are taken care of on petition by the enlisted man, by his family, or by some other person, but no dependency deductions are made from a soldier's pay for class B dependents.

The amounts paid to class A dependents are as follows: The wife, if she has no children, receives $28 from the Treasury, and $22 is deducted from the pay of the enlisted man, making a total of $50 for a wife without children. For a wife with one child, $22 is deducted from the soldier's pay, and $40 is paid from the Treasury, amounting in all to $62 for the wife and one child. Then $10 is allowed for each additional child.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. There is no limitation in the bill to the effect that a wife or a dependent person may not work in order to get those benefits, is there? The allowances are independent of whether or not the dependent person is employed?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; they are independent. They do not go into the basis of need. The soldier, his wife, or dependents, or some outside person, may apply. That is not true, however, of class B dependency. In that case the soldier himself must make the application.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Once he made application and the application was allowed, the wife, dependent mother, or other dependent might try to get a job and supplement his or her income up to a basis which would sustain a decent standard of living, and still not be cut off from the allowance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct. There is nothing of that kind in the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. One further question: Does the bill contain any provision with reference to the Government paying half, or a part, of the soldier's insurance premiums, and requiring all enlisted men to take a $10,000 insurance policy?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. We had such a provision in the bill at one time, but it was eliminated when we discovered that it would place a burden of $25,000,000,000 on the Federal Treasury.

Mr. PEPPER. Twenty-five billion dollars?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Twenty-five billion dollars would be the cost to the Treasury, as estimated by the Veterans' Administration. When we discovered that, we eliminated the provision from the bill. We tried to work out a compromise with the soldiers' pay bill by providing for a paid-up war-risk insurance policy of $10,000; but when we discovered that the premiums usually collected from the soldiers were only token payments, and that the Treasury had to put up 80 percent in addition, we had to drop it.

Mr. PEPPER. In World War No. 1 the soldier paid $6.50 a month, I believe.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. There is a separate provision of that kind. A soldier can now obtain $10,000 of insurance.

Mr. PEPPER. For about the same price?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. For an average of 67 cents a thousand a month, or $6.70 for $10,000.

Mr. MALONEY and Mr. LEE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Colorado yield, and if so, to whom?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I think the Senator from Connecticut was on his feet first. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. MALONEY. If I correctly understand the questions of the Senator from Florida and the answers, I understand that no basis of need is to apply in the case of the B classification.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In the case of the B classification there is a limitation of $50; and there is a limitation that only the enlisted man himself may decide to make the payment.

Mr. MALONEY. I wish the Senator would elaborate on that point just a little, because on the basis of that explanation it appears that the mere application of a veteran in the B classification would enable his dependents to receive up to $50 a month.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. However, he would have to pay his part.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. First I wish to satisfy the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. TAFT. I believe I could satisfy him by reading the provision.

Mr. MALONEY. All I ask is clarification. I am not as yet offering any opposition.

Mr. TAFT. The class B provision is that the dependent must be found by the Secretary to be dependent on such enlisted man for a substantial portion of his support. There is no such requirement in the case of the class A dependent; but there is an express requirement of actual dependency in the case of class B dependents.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator. That is what I wanted to know.

Let me ask if the bill would apply only to enlisted men?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The bill would apply only to the four lowest grades of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Ma-

rine Corps, and Coast Guard, men who, under the terms of the pay bill which we had before us earlier in the day, would receive $78 a month or less. It would apply only to them.

Mr. MALONEY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me ask the Senator if the terms of the bill would apply to a foster mother or foster father?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; if they were dependent. The bill would also apply to a grandfather or grandmother.

Mr. GEORGE. As I understand, the bill would apply to anyone standing in loco parentis.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Even a brother or sister?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Even a brother or sister.

It has been discovered that 65 percent of the registrants are deferred on account of dependency, and that 59 percent of the registrants are married.

At the time we were considering this bill, after it was referred to the committee, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] introduced a bill which had for its purpose the classification of dependents. It set up 7 categories of dependents. We had that bill under consideration. Under the terms of the bill of the Senator from Ohio, a man with only a wife would be taken for service before a man with a wife and child. Other categories were established. The committee, in considering the Taft bill, or the Taft amendment, decided that 7 categories would not cover all the situations. Perhaps 700 would not. So the straitjacket features of the Taft amendment were eliminated, and there was substituted an amendment whereby the Selective Service Administrator would set up categories by regulation. The Senator from Ohio agreed that, while that was not quite satisfactory to him, he would accept it.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that the family allowance bill does not eliminate dependency as a cause for deferment. The selective service boards must still make the decision. Their powers with respect to dependency would not be changed in any way.

The bill has been given a great deal of consideration by the legislative counsel of the Senate, and by the legal experts in the War and Navy Departments. They have sat in with us, and we have very carefully worked out the details. We do not think there are any technical legal difficulties left in the bill. We think we have ironed them all out.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. As I understand, the Government would put up $28, and the soldier $22, if he had a wife?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That is for class A dependency.

Mr. ELLENDER. To what extent would the soldier contribute for each child?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In class A he would not contribute any more. He would contribute $22, and if there were a wife the Government would put up $28 for the wife, $12 for the first child, and $10 for each additional child. That is in class A.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. In addition to dependents in class A, if a soldier should apply for an allowance in class B for a mother or father, or both, how much would he put up in addition out of his pay?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. If he were in class A he would put up $5. If he had no class A dependency, he would put up $22.

Mr. BARKLEY. Would he put up $5 for each dependent?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No. He would contribute for class B dependents.

Mr. BARKLEY. If he had both class A and class B dependents the most that would be taken out of his pay would be $27?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a few moments in support of the bill. On the 5th of March I introduced a bill to provide a somewhat larger compulsory allowance, based on the World War Act. Perhaps I should call attention to the fact that the introduction of that bill in the Senate preceded this bill by some 6 weeks. I am pleased that the committee has seen fit very largely to adopt the figures which were contained in my bill, which were approximately $10 a month more than those provided in the pending bill when it was first introduced.

It seems to me that some such legislation is absolutely essential. In Ohio many men with dependents have already been drafted. A man may have a wife and children, or possibly a wife who is working at the time he is drafted. Perhaps a child is born later, so that his wife can no longer work.

I have had called to my attention in letters nearly every week additional cases in which the wife and children of enlisted men serving in the Army today are absolutely without support of any kind and are seeking relief from the local authorities. I do not think there is any question about the necessity for the bill. It will become more and more necessary, because more and more we shall be taking men with wives and children to make up the Army of the United States. The last estimate made by General Marshall was that by the end of this year he hopes to have four and a half million men in the Army. In order to do so he will have to take everybody in class 1–A, and possibly others.

I think the Senate would be very much interested in reading the latter part of the report of the committee in this case, because the committee discusses at some length the requirements, and how long it will be before we shall have to take men with dependents. The committee concludes—and I think its conclusion is largely based upon information supplied by the Selective Service organization—that it will be possibly 7 or 8 months before we shall have to go to the dependent classes to obtain more men for the Army. Before that time, or at that time, we shall be faced with the question whether we want to take men with dependents, or whether we want to draft boys 19 years of age, or even 18 years of age.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I have been rather surprised—almost shocked—at the number of persons who have told me of men with wives and children who have already been taken by the draft boards. The other afternoon in Washington I was riding in a taxicab with a man who said, "I am going into the Army next week or the week after." He commented about it. He had a wife and three children. I find that the draft boards in various parts of the country have different rules on the subject. I am rather surprised at the number of cases in which men with wives and children have already been called. I do not know whether that is the intention.

Mr. TAFT. I think that is very generally true.

That brings me to the second part of the bill, title II, which is an amendment of the Selective Service law itself.

Some time ago I introduced a bill to provide definite classes of draftees, and a uniform rule. After all, what people protest most about is the unequal administration of the law by the various draft boards. Two things in particular have come to my attention. A draft board on one side of the street will draft any man with a wife who is working. Another draft board will not draft any man with a wife, because the board says that to some extent she is dependent, even though she may be working. Other boards say that she is not dependent if she can work. Still other boards say that she is not dependent if she has worked in the past and is not working now, because that proves that she could go back to work, whereas a woman who does not know how to do anything remains dependent, and her husband cannot be drafted. There is complete inequality; and it seems to me that the whole question of trying to decide whether a woman is dependent because she can work is one which should be entirely eliminated.

Furthermore, I do not believe that married men over 30 years of age should be drafted until everyone else has been drafted. Married men over 30 years of age with wives and children will presumably have risen to some important place in their various industrial classifications and in their communities. They are better suited to their present jobs than they would be to work in the Army. We have sufficient young men to take care of the needs of the armed forces; and yet I suppose every Senator has a procession of men in the older classification coming here and trying to get commissions because they think they are to be drafted. They should be told to go back home and do their jobs, which they know how to do; or, if their present jobs are not jobs in connection with the war effort, they should be told to get such jobs, and to give up the idea of trying to get into the Army when they have wives and children to support at home.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. When I was at home last week I was asked why there is no certainty as to what registrants shall be called from the various classes, when they are to be called, and whether those who have no wives and children shall be called first, and then the registrants who have wives but whose wives are self-supporting, and so on down the line until the class of men the Senator from Ohio has just mentioned is reached—men 30 years of age or over with wives and children. Complaint has been made to me that there has seemed to be too much uncertainty under the present law about when the registrants would be called. They are perfectly willing to go when they are needed, but they would like to have the authorities clear up the uncertainty regarding when they have to go.

Has the Senator from Ohio received any similar complaints?

Mr. TAFT. That is exactly the kind of complaint I receive. That is why I introduced a bill to provide that one class be taken, then another class, until we have exhausted the various classes. Resort should not be had to the older men with families until all other classes have been exhausted. I introduced the bill as an amendment to the Johnson bill.

The committee has followed my plan, and that is why I am strong for the bill. The bill would not establish the classifications, but would give authority to the Director of the Selective Service System, with the President's approval, to make the classifications. I am most hopeful that when the bill is passed those classifications will be made.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Selective Service Administrator has assured us that he will make those classifications so as to clarify the situation of men with dependents who are waiting to be called.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think that is highly desirable, and I am glad to know it.

Mr. TAFT. Yesterday I received a letter from a man 33 years of age, with a wife and three children. He said:

> I have been classified 1–A, and I expect to be drafted next week. I have been fairly successful and have accumulated enough money so that I have an independent income of $100 a month.

Although he is married and has three children, and is 33 years of age, he is going to be drafted, when many single men have not yet been drafted into the Army.

I believe that the classifications as to age and family status are more important than the question of dependency, and much easier to determine. The attempt to determine dependency has resulted in much inequality, dissatisfaction, and unfairness. Roughly speaking, I think we should take first all the men who are unmarried or who were married since the draft, because we do not want to agree that marriage after the draft should exempt a man who knew he was subject to the draft. Second, when we go into the question of dependents, I think we might well draft the men with B dependents—father or mother—who could be properly taken care of by allowances, before we draft the men with families. That, I understand, is also General Hershey's view. Then possibly we might draft the men who are married but without children, and whose wives, at least presumably, can live on the allowance or go to work and make further provision for their support; next married men under 30 years of age; and in the last group married men over 30 years of age with dependent children.

All the figures show that we would not have to use the men coming in the last group, and that the men over 30 years of age with families should be told to get into war work at home and meet the vast demands for industrial workers.

This bill does not materially affect the question of industrial deferment. It is essential that the whole question of manpower be considered, and that the Director of the Selective Service System and the new Manpower Board provide a plan.

The law was intended to be a selective-service law. We should take for the Army the men who are best fitted for the Army and least needed at home, and who will cost us less by reason of dependency allowances. I believe that the bill would permit General Hershey to make the classification in a sound manner. I did not know that the bill was coming up today. Next week I shall present a more detailed table of the figures which I have, relative to men in the various classifications, showing how far down we shall have to go if we want an Army of four and a half million, an Army of 8,000,000, or an Army of 10,000,000, whatever it may be. I hope I can furnish to the Senate the figures which will show somewhat more clearly what our present manpower situation is.

In the meantime, Mr. President, I think the committee should be commended for what it has done. I very much hope that the bill will pass.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the report of the committee printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 1431) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> The Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2467) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with an amendment and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.
>
> The purpose of this legislation is to provide for the payment to the dependents of the lower four grades of enlisted men in the armed forces of sums which will enable them to at least partially defray their living expenses. The bill has been completely rewritten by the committee and varies in many respects from the bill as introduced. As introduced, title I of the bill provided for the payment to dependents of definite sums by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, and title II authorized the Federal Security Administrator to supplement those sums by the payment to dependents of additional sums sufficient to provide them with reasonable subsistences. No limitation was placed upon the amounts of the supplementary payments which might be made by the Administrator. After careful consideration of this proposal, the committee has determined that it would be inadvisable to provide for the making of supplementary payments and has eliminated the original title II provisions from the bill. Elimination of the title II provisions has, in the opinion of the committee and of the representatives of the War and Navy Departments, made it advisable to increase the amounts of the payments to be made by such Departments. Consequently, the reported bill provides for the payment by the War and Navy Departments of sums which are, in several instances, larger than those provided for by the bill as introduced.
>
> Title I of the reported bill provides for the payment of family allowances by the Government to the dependent or dependents of enlisted men of the lowest four grades in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard. Enlisted men of the first three grades who have dependents are entitled under existing law to receive Government quarters or a rental allowance in lieu thereof. The enlisted men to whose dependents allowances would be payable are those men who, under the provisions of the pending pay bill (S. 2025), would receive base pay at the rate of $78 per month, or less. The family allowances would be payable for the period beginning with the first day of the first calendar month after the date of enactment of the bill and ending 6 months after the termination of the war.
>
> The family allowance payable under the bill to the dependent or dependents of an enlisted man will consist of a sum to be deducted from his pay and a sum to be contributed by the Government. The amount of the family allowance payable to the dependent or dependents of an elisted man will depend upon the number of such dependents and their relationship to the enlisted man.
>
> For the purposes of the bill, dependents are divided into two classes, class A and class B. Class A dependents include wives, children, and former wives divorced who have not remarried and to whom alimony has been decreed and is still payable. Class B dependents include parents, grandparents, grandchildren, brothers, and sisters. The family allowances payable to class A dependents are payable upon the application of the enlisted man, the dependents, or any other person on behalf of such dependents. The family allowances payable to class B dependents are payable only upon the application of the enlisted man, except that in any case where it is impracticable for the enlisted man to make application, the Secretary of the Department concerned is authorized to permit application to be made by or on behalf of such dependents. Family allowances payable to class B dependents can be terminated at any time by the enlisted man.
>
> The amount of the Government contribution to the family allowance payable in the case of an enlisted man who has a wife but no child is $28. The amount of the Government contribution to a wife and one child is $40. An additional $10 would be contributed by the Government for each additional child. The amount of the Government contribution in the case of an enlisted man who has no wife but one child is $20. The amount of the Government contribution in the case of an enlisted man who has two children but no wife is $30. An additional $10 would be added to the $30 for each child in excess of two. The Government contribution to a former wife divorced is $20.
>
> The Government contribution in the case of an enlisted man who has one parent is $15, and in the case of an enlisted man who has

two parents is $25. An additional $5 would be contributed by the Government for each grandchild, brother, or sister which such enlisted man has who is a class B dependent, except that the amount of the Government contribution to class B dependents is limited to $50.

The deduction from the pay of an enlisted man to whose dependent or dependents a family allowance is paid will be $22 if all of such dependents are of either class A or class B and $27 if such dependents include dependents of both classes. The amount of the family allowance which comes from the pay of the enlisted man will, in the case of an enlisted man who has dependents who are all of one class, be distributed to such dependents in the same proportion in which the Government contribution to the family allowance is distributed. In the case of an enlisted man who has both class A and class B dependents, who are receiving a family allowance, the amount of such allowance which comes from his pay will be so distributed that $22 of it will go to his class A dependents and the remaining $5 will go to his class B dependents.

The following table indicates the amounts payable in some of the most typical cases:

	Government contribution	From soldier's pay	Total
To class A:			
Wife, if no child	$28	$22	$50
Wife with 1 child	40	22	62
Wife with 2 children	50	22	72
To class B if there is no class A dependent:			
1 parent	15	22	37
2 parents	25	22	47
1 parent and 1 sister	20	22	42
1 parent and 2 sisters	25	22	47
To class B if there is also a class A dependent:			
1 parent	15	5	20
2 parents	25	5	30
1 parent and 1 sister	20	5	25
1 parent and 2 sisters	25	5	30

Family allowances are payable for the period beginning on the day on which application therefor is filed or the date on which the dependent or dependents first become entitled thereto, whichever is later, and ending on the day on which the disbursing officer receives notice of a change in status of the enlisted man which terminates the right to receive such allowances. However, in order to fully protect the dependents of enlisted men who will be in the service on the date of enactment of the bill, it is provided that the Secretary of the department concerned may pay the allowances for the entire period for which allowances are payable, if such men file applications for payment of family allowances within 6 months after the date of enactment of the bill or even within a longer period in cases which are determined by the Secretary to merit special consideration. It was deemed necessary by the committee to make special provision for such men because of the fact that many of them will be serving in distant places upon the date the bill is enacted into law and will not be able to promptly file applications for the granting of family allowances. The bill expressly provides that, even though family allowances are payable for the period beginning with the first day of the first calendar month following the date of enactment, such allowances shall not actually be paid until after the first day of the fourth calendar month following the date of enactment. While the committee was aware of the fact that there are quite a few cases in which it would be most desirable to have the allowances paid sooner, it has been guided by the advice of representatives of the War and Navy Departments to the effect that it would be impossible to provide the necessary administrative machinery for making the payments until the later date.

The family allowances payable on behalf of the dependents of any enlisted man will be payable to such persons as may be designated by such man unless the Secretary of the Department concerned finds that the persons so designated are not appropriate payees. In the latter case, and in cases where no designations of payees are made, the allowances will be payable on behalf of the dependents to such persons as may be designated in regulations prescribed by the Departments concerned.

The allowances will be paid by the War Department and the Navy Department. The bill provides that all determinations of facts made by the Secretaries of those Departments in carrying out the allowance provisions shall be final and conclusive, and shall not be subject to review by accounting officers of the Government or the courts. It is recognized by the committee that since entitlement to family allowances and the amounts of such allowances are based upon facts which may change rapidly, and since changes in those facts cannot in all cases be rapidly communicated to disbursing and authorizing officers, it is inevitable that some erroneous payments and overpayments of family allowances will be made. Therefore, the bill relieves disbursing and authorizing officers from responsibility for erroneous payments and overpayments in all cases except those in which the erroneous payments and overpayments are due to the gross negligence of such officers or an intent on their part to defraud the United States.

Since the purpose of the bill is to provide for the payment to families of enlisted men of sums which are necessary to enable them to meet living expenses, the bill provides that family allowances shall not be assignable, subject to the claims of creditors, or liable to seizure under any legal or equitable process.

Title II of the bill amends the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940. In view of the allowances provided by this bill for the dependents of enlisted men in the service, it is necessary to reconsider the policy with respect to the deferment of men from service on the grounds of dependency. Under existing law, registrants can be deferred for dependency only if they have dependents who are dependent for support in a reasonable manner upon income earned by the registrant. The allowances provided for by the present bill would to some extent, at least, discharge the financial responsibilities to such dependents of any registrants who might be inducted. It therefore becomes necessary to consider the extent to which allowances payable under this bill shall be deemed to prevent deferment on grounds of dependency and to determine the basis on which men with dependents shall be deferred.

It is estimated that about 65 percent of the registrants classified by the Selective Service System so far have been deferred on account of dependency and placed in class III. Most of this number—about 59 percent of the total registrants classified—are married. Thus it appears that most of the men who have been deferred for dependency are married. It is also true that most of the married men who have been classified have been deferred because they have dependents.

It is the view of the committee that the enactment of this legislation providing for family allowances should not automatically remove the grounds for the deferment of the men in class III. There are a number of reasons for this. In many instances the family allowances provided by the bill will not be sufficient to furnish adequate support for the dependents. The induction of men with dependents to whom allowances must be paid will also substantially increase the costs to the Government for maintaining the military forces. Moreover, it is the view of the committee that married men should generally be deferred until after single men who have no grounds for deferment have been inducted. Married men are normally the heads of families and normally have dependents. The committee believes it is obvious that their induction into military service will more seriously disrupt the family life of the Nation and is more likely to result in hardships than the induction of single men.

Senator TAFT recently introduced a bill (S. 2510) which was considered by the committee in connection with the pending bill. Senator Taft's bill provided for the classification and deferment of men on the basis of their age, marital status, and status with respect to children. While the principle of Senator TAFT's bill appealed strongly to the committee, it appeared to the committee that it was impracticable to attempt to set up rigid classifications by legislation. The infinite variety of situations which are met in classifying registrants and the uncertainty as to the requirements which will have to be met in the future by the Selective Service System make it necessary to retain administrative flexibility in the system of classification.

Consequently, the bill as reported by the committee amends the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 so as to confer upon the President, acting through the Selective Service System, authority to defer any or all categories of those men who have wives or children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. This deferment may be made without regard to financial dependency and may be made notwithstanding the fact that family allowances are provided by the Government. This provision of the bill, together with the provisions of existing law which authorize deferment by age groups, would permit the classification and deferment of men on a basis similar to that set forth in Senator TAFT's bill; however, flexibility is retained which will permit the making of such administrative changes as experience shows to be necessary in any such classification.

The bill leaves in existing law the authority to defer men because they have dependents and eliminates the present definition of the term "dependent" from the law. Thus, those men who do not have wives or children but who do have other dependents may continue to be deferred because of such other dependents. The bill provides that in determining whether they shall continue to be deferred because of such dependents, the allowances payable by the United States to such dependents shall be taken into consideration but shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is of a financial nature and shall not be deemed to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is not based on financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance. Thus the men who do not have wives or children but who have been contributing financial assistance to other dependents would not continue to be entitled to deferment because of their financial assistance to such dependents if such financial assistance amounted to less than the allowances which would be payable to such dependents under this bill. If such financial assistance amounted to more than such allowances, the question of whether the allowances would be sufficient to remove the grounds for deferment would be determined by the local boards.

The situation which will exist with respect to men in class III if these amendments are enacted into law may be summarized as follows:

1. Registrant having wife or child, or wife and child, may be deferred whether or not the wife or child, or wife and child, are financially dependent on him, provided registrant is maintaining a bona fide family

relationship in his home with such wife or child, or wife and child. Regulations would undoubtedly continue to prohibit deferment on such grounds if marriage took place on or after December 8, 1941, or at a time when induction was imminent.

2. Registrant who has been contributing from his pay to the support of a parent, brother, sister, divorced wife, separated wife, etc., and who would be entitled to deferment on the ground of financial dependency if the allotment and allowance legislation were not enacted, will be deferred only if the payments under the allotment and allowance legislation plus income from such person's employment and private property, including registrant's property, will not afford reasonable subsistence to such person.

Therefore, after the dependents' allowances legislation takes effect, only two general types of persons will be entitled to remain in class III, namely: (1) Registrants with wives or children or wives and children, provided there is a bona fide family relationship in the home and provided marriage took place before the declaration of war and at a time when induction was not imminent; and (2) registrants with purely financial dependents after amounts payable under the allotment and allowance are taken into consideration and it is determined that the dependents will not be afforded reasonable subsistence from such payments plus income from other sources. Under this legislation there may also be deferred the relatively few cases where a person is dependent in fact upon the registrant for support other than financial support and other than purely on the basis of husband and wife or father and child relationship.

It is the opinion of the committee that these groups should not be touched until substantially all the 1–A men, including those classified in 1–A from those reaching age from time to time and those to be reclassified out of class III when this act takes effect, have been inducted, and until the Director of Selective Service shall issue further instructions to local boards. When it becomes necessary to take additional men, and hence to take some of the married men retained in class III, the Director of Selective Service may provide for reclassifying some categories before others. For example, it may be deemed advisable at that time to take substantially all men with wives but no children, before taking any of the men with wives and children, or children only. It may also be deemed advisable to take family men who are not engaged in war-effort work before taking family men who are engaged in war-effort work. Further differentiation also may be deemed advisable.

The committee believe, in view of the best available estimates as to the number of 1–A men who will be available and as to the requirements of the armed forces, that it will not be necessary for at least 8 or 9 months from the present time to actually induct men from the groups which will be retained in class III after this legislation takes effect. It should be pointed out that there is no certainty that these estimates are accurate. Also, these estimates contemplate final and complete classification of all registrants between the ages liable for service who will have registered up until that time. Consequently, in addition to allowing some leeway for error, full leeway should be allowed for the number of registrants whose cases will be still pending final classification because of appeal, physical examination, or other reasons.

In this connection it should be taken into consideration that a continuous supply of men to the armed forces must be maintained without interruption, and that the Selective Service System must have the authority and must arrange to have available sufficient pools of additional men some months prior to the time the existing supplies will be exhausted according to such estimates. It appears that the only sources from which the additional men may be obtained are the deferred classes or the age groups not yet liable for service. This means that after the expiration of some 8 or 9 months, on the basis of present estimates, it will be necessary to begin the induction of family men who have been deferred, unless prior to that time men below the ages now liable for military service have been made liable for such service. It will also be necessary for the Selective Service System to make arrangements to have the necessary men available some considerable time in advance of the time that their actual induction is expected to be necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2467) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AUTHORIZATION FOR APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE TO REPORT, ETC.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess or adjournment of the Senate, following today's session, the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to file reports on bills or resolutions before it, and to file a motion to suspend the rule in order that it may offer a legislative amendment if such be found necessary.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF BILLS, ETC.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that during the recess or adjournment of the Senate following today's session, the Presiding Officer of the Senate be authorized to sign bills and resolutions ready for his signature, and that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPENCER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Finance:

Adrian Pool, of El Paso, Tex., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex. (reappointment).

By Mr. WAGNER, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Ganson Purcell, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1947 (reappointment).

Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Ernest K. Kai, of Hawaii, to be judge of the fifth circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii, vice Carrick H. Buck, who has been appointed to the first circuit court, Territory of Hawaii.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

John B. Colpoys, of the District of Columbia, to be United States marshal for the District of Columbia. (Mr. Colpoys is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 28, 1942.)

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Rear Admiral John H. Hoover to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 25th day of May 1942 and to continue during his assignment as commander of the Caribbean Sea frontier; and

Capt. Oscar C. Badger, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from April 24, 1942.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION—NOMINATION OF GANSON PURCELL

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, earlier today I reported favorably from the Committee on Banking and Currency the nomination of Ganson Purcell, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission. He has been a member for 2 years. His nomination was previously formally confirmed by the Senate. Unless the nomination is confirmed today he will be out of office tomorrow, and it is my understanding that the Senate may not meet again until next Monday. So I ask unanimous consent that the nomination be now confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ganson Purcell, of New York, to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission for the term expiring June 5, 1947. (Reappointment.)

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. WAGNER. I ask that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc; and without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

This completes the Executive Calendar.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 8, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 4, 1942:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

James O. Day, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Mississippi, vice George T. Mitchell, term expired.

REGISTER OF THE LAND OFFICE

Loraine Rollins, of Wyoming, to be register of the land office at Evanston, Wyo. Reappointment.

APPOINTMENT IN THE NAVY

Capt. Frederick C. Sherman to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 3d day of April 1942.

APPOINTMENT IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be first lieutenant, Medical Corps, with rank from date of appointment

Capt. Jess Franklin Gamble, Medical Corps Reserve.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Lt. Col. Douglas Horace Rubinstein, Infantry (temporary colonel), with rank from November 20, 1941.

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Maj. James Clarke Carter, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1940.

TO CAVALRY

Col. Edwin Noel Hardy, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from July 1, 1940.

TO COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

Maj. Clarence Henry Schabacker, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1940.

TO AIR CORPS

Second Lt. Robert Huff Edger, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from June 11, 1941.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from June 4, 1942

Maj. Arthur Lee Shreve, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. George Raymond Connor, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Newman Raiford Laughinghouse, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Maj. Patrick Henry Timothy, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Hugh John Casey, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. Patrick Henry Tansey, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Hans Kramer, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Albert Gordon Matthews, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Leland Hazelton Hewitt, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Thomas Francis Kern, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Ralph Edward Cruse, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from June 11, 1942

Maj. Lewis Tenney Ross, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from June 30, 1942

Maj. Charles Francis Baish, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

To be majors with rank from June 12, 1942

Capt. Charles Henry Barth, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Raymond Burkholder Oxrieder, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Gerald Edward Galloway, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Harrod George Miller, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Charles Hare Mason, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Carl Rueben Dutton, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. George Kenyon Withers, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Thomas Leonard Harrold, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Kenneth William Treasy, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Capt. Vincent Joseph Esposito, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Robert Lee Howze, Jr., Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Leland Berrel Kuhre, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Colby Maxwell Myers, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Ralph Tibbs Garver, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. William Ludlow Ritchie, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Amos Tappan Akerman, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Rogers Alan Gardner, Cavalry.

Capt. Albert Harvey Burton, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Bruce Cooper Clarke, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Capt. Carl William Meyer, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. John Henry Dulligan, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. David Henry Tulley, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Walter Grant Bryte, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Warren Nourse Underwood, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Miles Merrill Dawson, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Charles Parsons Nicholas, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Russell Edward Randall, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Carl Warren Holcomb, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Armand Hopkins, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Timothy Lawrence Mulligan, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Finis Ewing Dunaway, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

Capt. Benjamin Cobb Fowlkes, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. John Wilson Huyesson, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Frank Gilbert Fraser, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Frank Andrew Pettit, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

Capt. Walter William Hodge, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

Capt. William Henry Nutter, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Oscar Carl Maier, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Ralph Augustus Lincoln, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Gilbert Edward Linkewiler, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).

Capt. Aubrey Strode Newman, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Ernest Victor Holmes, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. William Frank Steer, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Wiley Thomas Moore, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Ronald Montgomery Shaw, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Conrad Stanton Babcock, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Alvin Truett Bowers, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. William Henry Bigelow, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Lewis Ackley Riggins, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Willard Lamborn Wright, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).

Capt. John Frederick Gamber, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Ernest Andrew Barlow, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. John Loomis Chamberlain, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Frank John Hierholzer, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Carl Frederick Tischbein, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. John Salisbury Fisher, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Charles Pearré Cabell, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. James Joseph Deery, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Archer Frank Freund, Field Artillery (temporary major).

Capt. Roland Ainslee Browne, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Milo Howard Matteson, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. William John Carne, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. John Stephan Henn, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Henry Randolph Westphalinger, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Raymond Cecil Conder, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Ralph Frederick Bartz, Infantry (temporary major).

Capt. Arthur Bliss, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. William Holmes Wood, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. John William Black, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Lucien Eugene Bolduc, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Alfred Boyce Devereaux, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Paul Maurice Seleen, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Henry Ewell Strickland, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Wilmer George Bennett, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Arthur Charles Boll, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Clifford Palmer Bradley, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

Capt. Hubert Merrill Cole, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Gustavus Wilcox West, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. George Peter Berilla, Jr., Cavalry (temporary major).

Capt. Branner Pace Purdue, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. George Joseph Deutermann, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary major).

Capt. George Arthur Grayeb, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Haydon Young Grubbs, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. William Albert Fuller, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Ralph Edmund Tibbetts, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Edwin Lynds Johnson, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Capt. Clyde Eugene Steele, Infantry (temporary major).
Capt. Ernest Holmes Wilson, Infantry (temporary major).
Capt. Norman Holmes Smith, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Capt. John Wingo Dansby, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Robert Milchrist Cannon, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Charles Cavelli, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Thomas Byrd Whitted, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. James Wilbur Mosteller, Jr., Chemical Warfare Service (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Meredith Cornwell Noble, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. George Henry McManus, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Leo Francis Kengla, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Robert Emmett Burns, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. John Amos Hall, Judge Advocate General's Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Donald Janser Bailey, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Nicholas Joseph Robinson, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. John Murphy Willems, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Joseph Cyril Augustin Denniston, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. John Franklin Bird, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Henry Beane Margeson, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Claude Franklin Burbach, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Raymond Miller Barton, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. William Lloyd Burbank, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Wallace Hallock Honnold, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Emmor Graham Martin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Welborn Barton Griffith, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. John Halliday McCormick, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. William Nelson Gillmore, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Hubert Whitney Ketchum, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Marcel Gustave Crombez, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Milton Taylor Hankins, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. John William Gaddis, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. William Everton Pheris, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Alexander Andrew Dobak, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. John Howard Bennett, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Harry Clifton Larter, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Wayne Carleton Smith, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Godwin Ordway, Jr., Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Harry Jean Harper, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Robert Pepper Clay, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Edward Clement Mack, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Ira Kenneth Evans, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Earl Walter Barnes, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Samuel Adrian Dickson, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Dwight Harvey, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. William Eldred Long, Infantry (temporary major).
Capt. John Llewellyn Lewis, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. John William Davis, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. William O'Connor Heacock, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Edwin Bascum Kearns, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Rinaldo Van Brunt, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. George Patrick Lynch, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. John Francis Holland, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel)
Capt. John Porter Kidwell, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Clarence Harwood Smith, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Thaddeus Elmer Smyth, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Waldemar Noya Damas, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. James Durward Barnett, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
Capt. Claude Aubrey Black, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Russell Thomas Finn, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Harry Wells Crandall, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Joseph Pringle Cleland, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Enoch Joseph Scalan, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. John Laing De Pew, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. John Robert McGinness, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. William Griffith Stephenson, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. George Bateman Peploe, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Samuel Selden Lamb, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Curtis D. Renfro, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Charles Henry Caldwell, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Joseph Blair Daugherty, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Haskell Hadley Cleaves, Signal Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Albert Aaron Horner, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Mitchell Alonzo Giddens, Cavalry (temporary major).
Capt. Leif Neprud, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
Capt. Theodore Lamar Dunn, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Elliott Bickley Gose, Infantry (temporary major).
Capt. Floyd Ellsworth Dunn, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Michael John Geraghty, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Donald Dunford, Field Artillery (temporary major).
Capt. Arthur Superior Peterson, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Ralph Randolph Sears, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Edgar Turner Noyes, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. James Keller De Armond, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Ernest Avner Suttles, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. August William Farwick, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).

To be majors with rank from June 13, 1942

Capt. Samuel Mason Lansing, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Pierre Bacot Denson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).

To be majors with rank from June 15, 1942

Capt. Carl William Westlund, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Walter Llewellyn Wheeler, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Norme D. Frost, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Linus Dodge Frederick, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. James Gordon Pratt, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Milton Miles Murphy, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Lee Quintus Wasser, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. Howard Knowles Vail, Cavalry (temporary major).
Capt. Benjamin Thomas Starkey, Air Corps (temporary colonel).

To be majors with rank from June 30, 1942

Capt. Percy Walter Thompson, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Clarence McCurdy Virtue, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Ralph Finch, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Charles Howard Valentine, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Julian Henry Baumann, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Joseph Kerr Gibson, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Judson MacIvor Smith, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. George Vernon Holloman, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. George Henry Dietz, Quartermaster Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Donald Hubbell Smith, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Luther Gordon Causey, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. John Meade, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Glenn Oscar Barcus, Air Corps (temporary colonel).
Capt. William Andrew Weddell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. John Randolph Jeter, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Theodore Anderson Seely, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. George Avery Chester, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. James Thomas Dawson, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Burgo Doyle Gill, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. William Wheeler O'Connor, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Walter Hoyt Kennett, Field Artillery (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Edward Campbell Franklin, Ordnance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. William Frederick Niethamer, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
Capt. Harold Victor Roberts, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

To be captains with rank from June 10, 1942

First Lt. Rush Blodget Lincoln, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
First Lt. Stanley Tanner Wray, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Ellsworth Ingalls Davis, Corps of Engineers (temporary major), subject to examination required by law.
First Lt. Andrew Hero, 3d, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. George Kumpe, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
First Lt. William Ruthven Smith, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
First Lt. Frank Schaffer Besson, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
First Lt. Richard Roberts Arnold, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
First Lt. Herrol James Skidmore, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
First Lt. Francis Ray Hoehl, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
First Lt. Julian David Abell, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).

First Lt. Frederick Raleigh Young, Ordnance Department (temporary major).
First Lt. John Chandler Steele, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
First Lt. Allen Fraser Clark, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
First Lt. Thore Fritjof Bengtson, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
First Lt. Christian Frederick Dreyer, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. William Francis Powers, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
First Lt. James McCormack, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
First Lt. Russell Manly Nelson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Stanley Ronald Stewart, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Arnold Sommer, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
First Lt. Charles Kissam Allen, Ordnance Department (temporary captain).
First Lt. Sam Carroll Russell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. James Hutchings Cunningham, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. John Henry Weber, Ordnance Department (temporary major).
First Lt. Roger Derby Black, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Archibald William Lyon, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
First Lt. Edward Ellis Farnsworth, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Daniel Stickley Spengler, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
First Lt. Milton Leonard Ogden, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
First Lt. Alexander Graham, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Ralph Hemmings Davey, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. William Mencher, Ordnance Department (temporary major).
First Lt. George Wilson Power, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. James Aloysius Cain, Jr., Ordnance Department (temporary major).
First Lt. Kenneth Frederick Zitzman, Signal Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. John Earl Metzler, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. George Robinson Mather, Cavalry (temporary major).
First Lt. Harrison Alan Gerhardt, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Stanley Sawicki, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Lee Peter Dahl, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Edgar Northrop Chace, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
First Lt. Frank Hamilton Britton, Cavalry (temporary captain).
First Lt. Byron Leslie Paige, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Torgils Grimkel Wold, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. John Bevier Ackerman, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Charles Ray Longanecker, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Irving Donald Roth, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. James Karrick Woolnough, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Lauri Jacob Hillberg, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
First Lt. Samuel Watson Horner 2d, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Philip Vibert Doyle, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
First Lt. Robert Augur Hewitt, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Benjamin Jepson Webster, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Earle Gilmore Wheeler, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Edwin Simpson Hartshorn, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. James Forsyth Thompson, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Charles Michael Baer, Signal Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. William Alden Call, Ordnance Department (temporary major).
First Lt. Roland Capel Bower, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Dwight Benjamin Johnson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Joseph Edward Gill, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
First Lt. Everett Wayne Barlow, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Frederick William Ellery, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Loren Boyd Hillsinger, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Horace King Whalen, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. John Paul McConnell, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Preston Steele, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Robert Douglass Glassburn, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Joe William Kelly, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Walter Allen Rude, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Walter Parks Goodwin, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Erven Charles Somerville, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. John Abner Meeks, Ordnance Department (temporary major).
First Lt. Gilbert Nevius Adams, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Aaron Meyer Lazar, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. John Clifford McCawley, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. John Morgan Price, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Edward Gibbons Shinkle, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
First Lt. Robert Lockwood Williams, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
First Lt. John Joseph Hutchison, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Robert Earl Schukraft, Signal Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Carl Morton Seiple, Corps of Engineers (temporary major).
First Lt. Harry Cecil Porter, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Dwight Edward Beach, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. William Little, Signal Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. William Masselo, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Arthur Walter Blair, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
First Lt. Daniel Stone Campbell, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Richard Johnson Hunt, Infantry (temporary major)
First Lt. Stephen Michael Mellnik, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Louis Watson Truman, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Dale Eugene Means, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Hugh Willard Riley, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. William Sammie Colt, Coast Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Curtis Alan Schrader, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. William Fletcher Spurgin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Kenneth Burton Hobson, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. John Reynolds Sutherland, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Donald Linwood Hardy, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Richard Tide Coiner, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Floyd Allan Hansen, Ordnance Department (temporary major).
First Lt. James Edward Godwin, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
First Lt. Harold Walmsley, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary major).
First Lt. Gerald George Epley, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Bernard William McQuade, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Ashton Herbert Manhart, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Harold Simpson Sundt, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Horace Freeman Bigelow, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Charles Albert Clark, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Francis Arkadjusz Liwski, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. James Bates Rankin, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
First Lt. David Emory Jones, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Harvey Porter Huglin, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Robert Folkes Moore, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Bernard Thielen, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. George Dowery Campbell, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Karl Laurance Scherer, Cavalry (temporary major).
First Lt. Charles Hardin Anderson, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Dwight Drenth Edison, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Jefferson Davis Childs, Ordnance Department (temporary captain).
First Lt. John Aloysius Gavin, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Todd Humbert Slade, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. John Ramsey Pugh, Cavalry (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Joseph Edward Stearns, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Charles Ratcliffe Murray, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Wallace Hawn Brucker, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Francis Garrison Hall, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Charles Louis Williams, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
First Lt. William Barnes Moore, Infantry (temporary captain).
First Lt. William Russell Huber, Ordnance Department (temporary captain).
First Lt. Bogardus Snowden Cairns, Cavalry (temporary major).
First Lt. Delbert Abraham Pryor, Infantry (temporary captain).
First Lt. William Burns Fraser, Cavalry (temporary major).
First Lt. Meyer Abraham Braude, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Chester Hammond, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. John George Ondrick, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Isaac Sewell Morris, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Gerard Charles Cowan, Cavalry (temporary captain).
First Lt. Hunter Harris, Jr., Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Gordon Whitney Seaward, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Henry Graham McFeely, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Walter Marquis Tisdale, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Charles Albert Piddock, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Nelson Landon Head, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Walker Raitt Goodrich, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
First Lt. William Harvie Freeland, Infantry (temporary captain).
First Lt. Thomas Henry Harvey, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. William Halford Maguire, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

First Lt. David Hamilton Kennedy, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Merle Robbins Williams, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. William Whitfield Culp, Cavalry (temporary major).
First Lt. Kenneth Edward Tiffany, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
First Lt. Nicholas Earnest Powel, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Norman Herbert Lankenau, Infantry (temporary major)
First Lt. William Bing Kunzig, Infantry (temporary captain).
First Lt. Andrew Meulenberg, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Charles Marvin Iseley, Cavalry (temporary major).
First Lt. Edwin Guldlin Simenson, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Harvey Herman Fischer, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Robert Haynes Terrill, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Avery Madison Cochran, Infantry (temporary captain).
First Lt. Samuel Arthur Daniel, Ordnance Department (temporary major).
First Lt. Franklin Vines Johnston, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
First Lt. Albert Edward Reif Howarth, Finance Department (temporary major).
First Lt. James Lee Massey, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Albert Edward Stoltz, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
First Lt. Thomas Connell Darcy, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Edmond Michael Rowan, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Edward Green Winston, Infantry (temporary captain).
First Lt. Milton Skerrett Glatterer, Infantry (temporary captain).
First Lt. William Henry Mikkelsen, Infantry (temporary captain).
First Lt. Hugh Thomas Cary, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Sewell Marion Brumby, Infantry (temporary captain).
First Lt. Clifford Harcourt Rees, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Arnold Leon Schroeder, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Richard Henry Smith, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Roscoe Constantine Huggins, Signal Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Francis Deisher, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Eugene Porter Mussett, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Lon Harley Smith, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Edward Willis Suarez, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Edward Joseph Burke, Infantry (temporary captain).
First Lt. Walden Bernald Coffey, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. George Reynolds Grunert, Cavalry (temporary major).
First Lt. James Ellison Glattly, Cavalry (temporary captain).
First Lt. David Peter Schorr, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. William George Davidson, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
First Lt. John Clinton Welborn, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Edwin Charles Momm, Infantry (temporary captain).
First Lt. Herbert Bishop Thatcher, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. Charles Salvatore D'Orsa, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Frederick Milton Hinshaw, Infantry (temporary captain).
First Lt. Robert Broussard Landry, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. William Hyatt Bache, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. William Anderson McNulty, Infantry (temporary captain).
First Lt. Joe Edwin Golden, Infantry (temporary captain).
First Lt. Eldon Frederick Ziegler, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Frank Greenleaf Jamison, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. James Winfield Coutts, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Dan Gilmer, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Wilfred Joseph Lavigne, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. George Thigpen Duncan, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Harry Celistine Quartier, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Roy Edwin Moore, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Harley Niles Trice, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. James Ernest Beery, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
First Lt. Arville Ward Gillette, Infantry (temporary captain).
First Lt. Charles Gates Herman, Quartermaster Corps (temporary major).
First Lt. Charles Alexander Carrell, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Lawrence Bartlett Babcock, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. William Roy Thomas, Field Artillery (temporary major).
First Lt. Loris Ray Cochran, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Henry Chesnutt Britt, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Thomas Randall McDonald, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Orville Wright Mullikin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
First Lt. Romulus Wright Puryear, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. John William Keating, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. John Garnett Coughlin, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Thomas Robertson Hannah, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. William Madison Garland, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. William Elwood Means, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. George Louie Descheneaux, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. John William Bowen, Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Frank Ward Ebey, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
First Lt. James Walter Gurr, Air Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel).
First Lt. James Madison Churchill, Jr., Infantry (temporary major).
First Lt. Robert Lee Scott, Jr., Air Corps (temporary colonel).
First Lt. Harold Randall Everman, Infantry (temporary major)

To be first lieutenants with rank from June 12, 1942

Second Lt. Stanley Walter Dziuban, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Andrew Jackson Goodpaster, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Delmar Joseph Rogers, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Louis Albert Kunzig, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Spoor Samuel, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Richard Duncan Wolfe, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Wilmot Ruet McCutchen, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Edmund Kirby-Smith, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Elting Coates, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Harvey Reed Fraser, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Albert Edgar McCollam, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Walter Woodrow Farmer, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Jay Phelps Dawley, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Montgomery Lee Webster, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Roscoe Campbell Crawford, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Marsden Duke, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Harry Nathan Brandon, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Woodrow William Wilson, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John William Medusky, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. David Mason Matheson, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Lewis Cantrell, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Norman Farrell, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Riis Ploger, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Donald Richardson, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Lloyd McBride, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. George Yount Jumper, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Walter Lloyd Winegar, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Nicholas Paraska, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Walter Johnson Wells, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Riel Stanton Crandall, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Thomas Bradley, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Mahlon Wilkins Caffee, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Henry Crandall Newcomer, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Joseph George Perry, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Sidney Taylor Martin, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Harriman Curtin, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Henry Davis, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edward John Gallagher, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Walter Evans Brinker, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Norman James McGowan, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Edward White, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Joseph Pavick, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Lawrence LeRoy Beckedorff, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Thomas Jonathon Jackson Christian, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Robert Francis Cassidy, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Alexander Chechila, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Josephus Alan Bowman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert William Studer, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Robert Benjamin Miller, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Lawton Collins, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Ladislaus Casimir Maslowski, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Wilson Carpenter 3d, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Julian Johnson Ewell, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Harmon Lampley, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Wayne Laverne O'Hern, Signal Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Wilbur Eugene Showalter, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Joseph Harold Frost, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edward Boyd Leever, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Hugh Albert Griffith, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Hyde Camp, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Daniel Joseph Minahan, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Mabry Williams, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Irvin Muir, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Ralph LeMoine Lowther, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Joseph Wald, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Milton Abraham Laitman, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. George Edmund Howard, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Edward Harry Kurth, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Burrell Washington Helton, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Penn Haffa, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Raymond Walter Allen, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Belmont Stuart Evans, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Walter MacRae Vann, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Walter Charles Dolle, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Philip Martin Royce, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Adam Kirk Breckenridge, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Roland Wallace Boughton, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Arthur McDavid, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Robert Schrader, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. George Peterson Winton, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Joseph Richardson Reeves, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Ray, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edward McCleave Dannemiller, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Albert Fenton Rollins, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Crenshaw Pulliam, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Godfrey Urban, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Rufus Hardy Holloway, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Allen Forrest Herzberg, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Thomas James Bartley Shanley, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Jasper Jackson Wilson, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Henry Riggs Sullivan, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Thomas James Webster, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Donald Roy Boss, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Joseph Lawrence Dickman, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Paul Joseph Long, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Harry McNeil Myers, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Carroll William Dietz, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Dalton Byrne, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Henry Hillhouse, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Henry Clay Walker 3d, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Harold Mortimer Crawford, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Philip Henry Lehr, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Roger Edwards Phelan, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Robert Merwyn Wray, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Albert Hinternhoff, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Andrew John Kinney, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Russell Bowers, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Clarence Edward Seipel, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Kenneth Charles Griffiths, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles McNeal Mount, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Vernon Gustavus Gilbert, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John William Dobson, Cavalry (temporary captain)
Second Lt. Charles James Long 3d, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Livingston Nelson Taylor, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Arthur Whitney Bollard, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Haskett Lynch Conner, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Eugene Allen Romig, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Leonard Kaplan, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Frederick Henry Foerster, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Paul Richard Okerbloom, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Orin Henry Rigley, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Richard deForest Cleverly, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Putnam Scroggs, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Kenneth Leon Yarnall, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Jack Kummer Norris, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. David Young Nanney, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Joel Furman Thomason, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James McMenamin Shepherd, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Raymond Anthony Janowski, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Howard Keller, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Elbert Owen Meals, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Sterling Russell Johnson, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Ulrich Georg Gibbons, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edwin John Latoszewski, Air Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Barton George Lane, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Hugh Wright Caldwell, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Arthur Wayne Reed, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Christopher Charles Coyne, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Michael John Krisman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Martin George Megica, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Charles David Thomas Lennhoff, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Theodore Norman Hunsbedt, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William RoBards Buster, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Keith Maughan Hull, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles David Kepple, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Edward Millar Geary, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Richard Daniel Curtin, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Frank Wallace Iseman, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Barclay Knapp, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Frederic William Boye, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Albert Leroy Robinette, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Donald Chessman Beere, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Cecil Cerel McFarland, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Ralph John Hanchin, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Paul Vernon Tuttle, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Campbell Bane, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Francis Koster Newcomer, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Raymond Bradner Marlin, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Watt, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Benoid Earl Glawe, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Herbert Price, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Joseph Irving Coffey, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Albert Ray Brownfield, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Carver Sears, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Carl Herbert Wohlfeil, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Frank Thomas Holt, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Stanley Clippinger Scott, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Evans Greer, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Ralph Edward Jordan, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Shepler Ward FitzGerald, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Clark George, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. David Badger Goodwin, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John George Pickard, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Philip Randall Seaver, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Roy Little, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Burnham Lucius Batson, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Hulen Dee Wendorf, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Frederick Roberts, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Richard Turner Bowie, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Whitehead West 3d, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Carl Davis McFerren, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Roger Merrill Lilly, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Albert Leslie Evans, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Seymour Brearley, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Jay Henry, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Gordon Johnson, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Edwin Lowrey Hoopes, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Claude Lee Shepard, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Sykes Billups, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert John Hill, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Benton Raymond Duckworth 2d, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. John Edgar Beier, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Philip Melchers Breitenbucher, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Secor Clark, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. George Edward Pickett, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Warren Chester Chapman, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Galen Pickering Eaton, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Darwin Kingsley Oliver, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Boiler Maxwell 2d, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edgar Jarvis Jordan, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Max Cochran, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Cochrane Twyman, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Seth Foster Hudgins, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. George Thaddeus Breitling, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Frank Joseph Kobes, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Clark Wilson Mayne, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Richard Steele Morrison, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Samuel Alton Madison, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Joseph Boyle, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Charles James Hackett, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Graham Dean, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Heinz Weisemann, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Warner Winston Croxton, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Thomas Bernard Whitehouse, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Daniel Farrington Tatum, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Elwood Paul Donohue, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Lincoln A. Simon, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Philip William Long, Field Artillery (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Walter Thomas Kerwin, Jr., Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Richard Gifford, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Joseph Alexander McChristian, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Eugene Albert Trahan, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Richard Gordon Lycan, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Phillip Buford Davidson, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. George Wallace Roger Zethren, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Donald Richard Snoke, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Ernest Beverly Maxwell, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Strother Banks Hardwick, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Vester Melvin Shultz, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Charlwood Richardson 3d, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Brereton Bestic, Signal Corps (temporary major).
Second Lt. Marshall Wallach, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Urban Brombach, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Casper Clough, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Welborn Griffin Dolvin, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. John William Watt, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Ames Garnett, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Thomas Mull Crawford, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Hall Cain, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Wiley Burge Wisdom, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Donald Max Simpson, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Walter Martin Higgins, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Daniel Andrew Nolan, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Elliott Vandevanter, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Harry William Osborn Kinnard, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Wilbur Winston Bailey, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Frank Thomas Mildren, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Carl Lentz 2d, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Henry Bowman, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Louis LaPrade, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edward Traywick McConnell, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. William Milligan Herron, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Oliver Ellsworth Wood, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Arthur Dean Poinier, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Donald Burnell Newman, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Harry Thomas Smith, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Henry Schellman, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. George Mercer Higginson, Signal Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Jack Gordon Merrell, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Christopher Joseph Heffernan, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Salvatore Joseph Mancuso, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Joel Terry Walker, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Moorhouse Coleman, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Raymond Joseph Belardi, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Watson Crandall, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Willis Walker, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Stein Boyd, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Victor Leroy Johnson, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Thomas Smith, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Patrick David Mulcahy, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Mulford Van Harlingen, Jr., Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Howard Bertolet St. Clair, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Donald Busby Miller, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Thomas Bennett Bartel, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Alfred Virgil Walton, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Harry de Metropolis, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Stephen Charles Farris, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Langley Patrick Medinnis, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Percy DeWitt McCarley, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Keith Boles, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Tilden Perkins Wright, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Matt Combes Cavendish Bristol, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert George Cole, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Lee McDowell, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Ray Joseph Will, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Rudyard Kipling Grimes, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert John Rogers, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Lyle Everett Peterson, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Arthur Wright Allen, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Howard Vincent Cooperider, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. John Porter Tombave, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. William Charles Jones, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Matthew Comerford Smith, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Shotwell Wintermute, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Lionel Burke DeVille, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Sewall Chester, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edwin Joseph Ostberg, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Perry Milo Hoisington 2d, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Karl Frederick Ockershauser, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Oliver Burtis Taylor, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Walter Charles Wickboldt, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Lee Manning Kirby, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Geoffrey Lavell, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Leon Robert Vance, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Michael Shannon Davison, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William James McConnell, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Salvatore Edward Manzo, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William LeRoy Turner, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Leonard Neil Palmer, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Fidelis David Newcomb, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Elmore George Brown, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Melvin Verner Engstrom, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Thomas Walker Davis 3d, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Clarence Riley Bess, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Kemp Martin, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert David Hunter, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edward Paul Smith, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Royce Gideon, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Joseph McCaffrey, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Carl Walter Hollstein, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Donald Franklin Hull, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Olav Herstad, Coast Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James David Garcia, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Neary Davis, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Osburn Dickerson, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Samuel Goodhue Kail, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Ernest Patricio Lasché, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Benjamin Mart Bailey, Jr., Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. William Carter Stone, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. James LeRoy Rogers, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Malcolm Frank Gilchrist, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John William Jaycox, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Robert Beirne Spragins, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Bernard George Teeters, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Robert Clarence Whipple, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. DeWitt Nalley Hall, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Prentiss Davis Wynne, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Henry Stubbs, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Herbert Raymond Odom, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Raymond Thompson Petersen, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Donald Kuldell Nickerson, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Ellsworth Reily Jacoby, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edward MacDonald Serrem, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Robert Chapman Williams, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles George Fredericks, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Walter Herbert Grant, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Stanley Robert Larsen, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Barclay Carvey, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Joseph Kelly, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Calvin Banning, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. William Montgomery Preston, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Lester Leland Lampert, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Frank Goodwin Forrest, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Matthew Whalen, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Shields Warren, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Holloman Barnett, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Bodine McConville, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. James Thomas Lowe Schwenk, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Ned Woods Glenn, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Richard Mousheglan, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Henderson Patterson, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Vincent Reardon, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Joseph Theodore Kingsley, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Bradford Smith, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Matthew Leon Legler, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Jacob Kopf Rippert, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edward Elliot Rager, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. John Christian Habecker, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Herbert Henry Eichlin, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Wesley Florence, Jr., Quartermaster Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert William Page, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Kenneth Lansing Scott, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Frank Campbell Sellars, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Wiley Lee Dixon, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Eric Olson, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John McMillan Banks, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Clyde Terry Sutton, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Charles Wilmarth Kouns, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Homer Griswold Barber, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Carlos Edwards, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Allen Matter, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Earle Livingstone Lerette, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Harold MacVane Brown, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Paul Tucker Clifford, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Tyler Davis, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Emmet McMahon, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Anderson Roosa, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Robert Pennell, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Harry Lawrason Murray, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. John Louis McCoy, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Willard Barber Atwell, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Loren Chester Grieves, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. William Jackson Fling, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Charles Manly Walton, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edward Randall Ford, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Ernest Frederick Brockman, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Allen Woodrow Ginder, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Clifford Lore Miller 2d, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. George Thomas Coleman, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Joseph Everett Reynolds, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. George Richard Harrison, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Newton Elder James, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. John Patrick Aidan Kelly, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Carl August Buechner, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Edwin Peter Schmid, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Peter Mial, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. James Law McCrorey, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Lewis Wilson Stocking, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Matthew James McKeever, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Vincent Laurence Boylan, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Robison Reilly, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Jack Reeson Looney, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Edward Smith Hamilton, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Edgar William Schroeder, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Oren McCray, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Kenneth Wilson Collins, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Benjamin Charles Chapla, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Josiah Scott Kurtz, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Levin Lane Lee, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Harry Watson McClellan, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Walter Wilson, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. David Samuel Dillard, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Joseph Adams Hill 2d, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Vladimir Paul Yaletchko, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Milton Bernard Adams, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Henry Meyer, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Constant August Troiano, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Lindsay Coates Herkness, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. James Deimel Green, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Charles John Parsons, Jr., Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William Herbert Hale, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. John Joseph Kelly, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Arthur Tilman Williams 3d, Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant).

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

MEDICAL CORPS

To be colonel

Lt. Col. Frank Wiley Wilson, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 7, 1942.

To be major

Capt. Frederic Ballard Westervelt, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 3, 1942.

To be captains

First Lt. Joseph Robert Vivas, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 5, 1942.
First Lt. Wilbur Warren Hiehle, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 10, 1942.
First Lt. Everett Charles Freer, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 17, 1942.
First Lt. Wolcott Loweree Etienne, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 17, 1942.
First Lt. Kenneth Eugene Hudson, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 17, 1942.
First Lt. Richard Hamilton Brierley Deer, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 17, 1942.
First Lt. Harry Gladding Moseley, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 21, 1942.
First Lt. James Wellington Brown, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 27, 1942.

DENTAL CORPS

To be captains

First Lt. Eugene Hamilton Wood, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 1, 1942.
First Lt. Reginald James Fallis, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 3, 1942.
First Lt. John Peter Christensen, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 17, 1942.
First Lt. Charles Hightower Traynham, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 17, 1942.
First Lt. Donald Louis Cook, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 17, 1942.

First Lt. Scott Darrow Linn, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from June 17, 1942.

First Lt. Merle Wayne Ogle, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from June 17, 1942.

CHAPLAINS

To be captain

Chaplain (First Lt.) John Joseph Jedlowski, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from June 4, 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 4, 1942:

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Ganson Purcell to be a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

POSTMASTERS

COLORADO

Joseph B. Sella, Estes Park.
Arthur J. Elmgreen, Evergreen.
Benjamin H. Snyder, Gunnison.
Robert E. McCunniff, La Jara.
Willard A. Teller, Littleton.
Frank Brady, Manassa.
Grace E. O'Neill, Platteville.
Matthew W. Huber, Victor.

TENNESSEE

Hugh C. McKellar, Memphis.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 4, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our blessed Father in heaven, between the night of doubt and the day of triumph, enable us to rejoice that the brightest crowns will be given those who have striven and sacrificed for somebody's sake. Work for others rescues from the captivity of selfishness and makes the worth of life supremely grand.

Allow not ambition, dear Lord, to cloud our gaze but inspire us to do without the things we want that others may have the things they need. With the memories of Thy blessed mercies, crowned and glorified in the unveiled cross, may we still cry, "How beautiful it is to be alive, doing some good, giving our share, stooping in some small, simple ways to help set the world rejoicing!" Have pity upon any who shut out the holy light of our Master and dream that their own light is day. Teach us over and over again the unalterable truth that we pass, but deeds of loving kindness endure. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a statement by Mr. Dinsmore, secretary of the Horse and Mule Association of America, relative to the shortage of horseshoe nails.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short address by representatives from the United States Marine Corps League of America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

REPORTS REQUIRED OF BUSINESS ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I assume that I am receiving similar letters to those received by other Members of Congress from people engaged in the production of defense materials, complaining of the tremendous burdens imposed on them in the form of questionnaires by the departments, and in the making up of reports of no consequence, all of which causes much delay in the work of defense production. I have received these protests and I shall insert in the RECORD some of them, together with a brief editorial. I hope it will result in the Government taking some action looking to fewer requests of various defense industries throughout the country, resulting in delay of war production.

Mr. RICH. The reports that the O. P. M. are asking of people are the same as those filed with the income-tax collector in January.

Mr. TREADWAY. They ought not to be required.

Mr. RICH. They are very voluminous.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend this matter with an editorial in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Shipping Board News Chronicle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLANNAGAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of a memorial address, which I delivered May 30 last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT—INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report and statement on the bill H. R. 6430, the independent offices appropriation bill, 1943, and for other purposes, which I send to the desk.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an article regarding the Federal Register by Alfred Proul, Jr., which appeared in Law Notes for May 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BROOKLYN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I wish I could perform a "Father Malachy's miracle" and transport the world to the Boroughs of Brooklyn and Queens today. The one hundred and thirteenth anniversary-day parade of the Brooklyn Sunday School Union and the fifty-second annual anniversary-day parade of the Queens Sunday School Union will be held. Upward of 150,000 men and women and children of all Protestant denominations will participate in the parade, proudly marching under the banner of God. This event is most unique and does not have a counterpart anywhere in the world. It will be reviewed this year, as in past years, by men and women prominent in local and national affairs.

The day is marked by the closing of the public schools in Brooklyn and Queens. I should like to be able to describe in detail the vision of this parade. Beautiful floats and banners with messages of good will, thousands of children, spic and span, on a holiday of holiness, and serious-minded men and women will be in the line of march. It is an inspiring sight to those privileged to review it and a most powerful force for good. America and democracy will be preserved so long as events such as this take place.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by the inclusion of certain newspaper editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative business and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PUERTO RICAN RUM

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, recently I reported to the House that the Legislature of Puerto Rico planned to levy a tax on sugar for export purposes. Instead of levying a tax of 10 cents on sugar produced in that territory, the legislature provided a tax of 11 cents per gallon on all molasses shipped out of Puerto Rico. I wish to take this opportunity to compliment Governor Tugwell,

who, I understand, has vetoed this legislation.

My purpose in discussing Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands at that time was to apprise the House of the huge quantities of rum which have been and which are now being shipped to the United States instead of the sugar which is so badly needed by the American housewives. I am informed that a ship has just arrived from Puerto Rico carrying mostly rum. I am informed that practically the entire cargo of that ship is composed of rum. Why is it that this ship could not bring to us some of the sugar that is so badly needed in this country at this time? Since September 1941 all statistics have become confidential and must not be used publicly. I have these statistics for my personal information, and I do not think I am violating any confidence when I tell you that these figures indicate a gigantic increase in shipments of rum from Puerto Rico to the United States. I feel it is my duty to suggest that something be done immediately to stop the shipment of rum to the United States. We do not need this rum, but we do need sugar. I feel this action of flooding this country with rum at a time when we need sugar is sufficient notice to the American beet farmer and American cane farmer to expand his fields in order that we can be self-sufficient so far as sugar is concerned in times of need.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and to include a poem written by Mr. Horace C. Carlisle entitled "Echoes From His Last Prayer," dedicated to the late the Very Reverend Zeb Barney T. Phillips, D. D., former Chaplain of the United States Senate.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix and to include an editorial appearing in the Shelbyville Republican on gas rationing in the Midwest.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BEITER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by a distinguished citizen of the Philippines before a group of civic organizations in my congressional district.

The SPEAKFR. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein three letters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include some newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing an editorial from the Chicago Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD an article by Mr. Manly, entitled "Writers' War Board Aids Smear Campaign."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. PLOESER] may be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COMMUNIST PUBLICATIONS OUTRAGED

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a Memorial Day address by myself.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial entitled "Quit Stalling—Pay Service Men $50 a Month."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address to the Arkansas Republican State Convention by Mr. Robert A. Grant.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REECE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by myself at the commencement exercises of Watauga Academy, at Butler, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I made last night on the pay raise for enlisted men in the armed forces.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL—POINTS OF ORDER

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 499 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2, rule XXI, it shall be in order to consider, without the intervention of any point of order, in connection with the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the appropriations and language providing for the National Youth Administration, the appropriations and language for all items specifically earmarked for national defense for such year, and the language relating to the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the committee in charge of the pending appropriation bill requested a rule that would make in order and waive points of order against a few of those provisions against which a point of order might be raised and which the committee thought might be out of order. Consequently yesterday afternoon the Rules Committee, after listening to the chairman of the subcommittee for the need of this legislation, unanimously agreed to report this special rule waiving these points of order. So this resolution will waive all points of order against the bill H. R. 7181 now before the House.

The appropriation provides for the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps and includes items for national defense.

As chairman of the Committee on Rules, I feel we have gone far afield granting rules, especially to this subcommittee, and we hope that other committees will not feel they can do likewise, give the Rules Committee the rush act and obtain a special rule on legislation in appropriation bills. This applies to committees handling any other bills. The Committee on Rules feels that henceforth it will not approve or grant rules unless they have had ample opportunity to familiarize themselves with the need and unless they are satisfied the committee has given the matter due consideration and consulted with the legislative committee having jurisdiction.

These are the provisions in the bill which might be subject to points of order, but which this resolution makes in order.

The powers granted to the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps provide

that he may authorize the exchange of motor-propelled and horse-drawn vehicles, tractors, road equipment, and boats, and parts, accessories, tires, or equipment thereof, in whole or in part payment for other vehicles, tractors, road equipment, or boats, or parts, accessories, tires, or equipment of such vehicles, tractors, road equipment, or boats.

The Director is authorized, during the fiscal year 1943, to dispose of any camp buildings no longer needed for Civilian Conservation Corps purposes and housekeeping and camp maintenance equipment necessary in connection therewith, by transfer, with or without reimbursement, to other Federal agencies, or, upon such terms as may be approved by the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, to any State, county, municipality, or nonprofit organization for the promotion of conservation, education, recreation, or health: *Provided*, That in the case of buildings located on land owned by the United States, any such disposition shall be subject to the approval of the agency of the United States having jurisdiction of such lands: *And provided further*, That such buildings and equipment shall first be tendered to the War Department and Navy Department for use in prosecution of the war, which Department shall have 60 days from the date of notification of availability of such buildings and equipment to accept such tender.

Under these provisions such facilities and camps must first be offered to the War and Navy Departments and then to States or municipalities.

The provisions pertaining to education and training of defense workers in national defense efforts provide in substance for the payment to States or other public agencies, schools, and colleges for training defense workers under the supervision of the Federal Security Administrator; for the cost of vocational courses of less than college grades, essential to the national defense; for the cost of short college courses to meet the shortage of engineers, chemists, and production supervisors in fields essential to national defense, and for the cost of vocational courses for rural persons in the production of farm commodities and the repair of farm machinery and equipment.

I am informed there is a demand for 3 additional hours of general debate, and as it is hoped that this bill may be passed before we adjourn today, I shall not take any more time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend and revise my remarks and insert the provisions that are made in order under this rule.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] 30 minutes, or so much thereof as he may desire.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, so far as the granting of this rule is concerned, I think I am in harmony with the views stated by the chairman of the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]. Similar rules have been asked for over a number of years. There is no law authorizing N. Y. A., for instance. This agency was set up by Executive order, and year after year the Appropriations Committee reported bills providing funds for this agency, well knowing there was no authority of law for the appropriation. I believe the Rules Committee generally has taken the position that while these rules are sometimes necessary on the spur of the moment, there is no justifiable excuse for a committee coming in here year after year asking that points of order against legislation be waived when it knowingly and intentionally has placed those provisions in the bill.

There are items in this bill, as was pointed out to the committee by the Parliamentarian, which are necessary to the national defense at the moment, new items which were not contemplated until recently and which cannot be included in the bill as against a point of order made by any Member on the floor of the House. This brings the matter to a point where I, as one Member who wants to go along with every piece of legislation that is necessary for the immediate prosecution of the war, find myself pausing to think a little. By denying this rule, or by making points of order against those features in the bill to which I have referred, the whole matter would have to go back to the Rules Committee. Time is of the essence if we are to win this war. We cannot quibble about technicalities; we cannot quibble about the philosophy of the rules of the House; we must meet the conditions as they are here and now. I feel that the vast majority of the membership accepts this situation.

So far as N. Y. A. is concerned, there are those who would abolish it entirely. So far as the C. C. C. is concerned, there are those who would abolish it entirely. I happen to be one of those who feel that the C. C. C. has lost its usefulness for the moment. If all the appropriations provided for the C. C. C. in this bill are denied, that will leave the C. C. C. authorized by law, but without money to carry on during the war, but in a position to be taken up if and when the occasion arises that we again need a C. C. C. Today we want soldiers; today we want national defense; today we are in a war, and we must approach the whole situation in this frame of mind. I, for one, therefore, am going to support this rule.

I said to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], chairman of the subcommittee, who appeared before the Rules Committee asking for this rule, that I felt I should vote for the rule, and I concluded by saying:

> Judge, you have been here every year since we have had the N. Y. A.; for goodness sake do not come in a year from now with a like excuse demanding a rule of this kind.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman to whom I referred, to make a brief statement.

Mr. TARVER. I do not intend to enter into a renewal of the discussion I had with the gentleman before the Rules Committee on yesterday, but I want to call his attention to the fact that I am not chairman of the subcommittee. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] is handling the bill. I appeared before the Rules Committee for him.

Mr. MICHENER. I am always glad to keep the record straight, but the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] has become so accustomed and so adept at coming before the Rules Committee to get this type of rule, which he knows he ordinarily should not have, that I am not surprised the new chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE], refused to come and had the former chairman come and make the annual speech in behalf of this rule.

Mr. HARE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. The chairman of the subcommittee did not refuse to appear before the Rules Committee, because he would have felt it a distinct honor and privilege. At the time the Rules Committee met and was able to get a quorum it happened that I was presenting the justifications for the appropriations in the bill and was not available to go before the Rules Committee. For that reason the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] was very courteous, very cooperative, and very gentlemanly in going before the Rules Committee to secure the rule.

Mr. MICHENER. I am sure that the membership of the House will accept the gentleman's apology and I can assure him that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] made his usual annual request in his usual convincing way. We all hope that before this matter comes around next year some definite policy will have been established by the Congress so far as the N. Y. A. is concerned, and that we will not be going along year after year under an Executive order of this kind.

Mr. HARE. I can say that if I should happen to be here, and if I happen to be chairman of the subcommittee next year, I share with the gentleman that point of view, and I hope it will not be necessary.

Mr. MICHENER. That bears out my statement of a while ago as to the attitude of the distinguished chairman with reference to this type of rule.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Personally I do not feel that there is any more dangerous anti-defense activity than the N. Y. A. I am going to bring that up when the debate comes up on the bill, and I am going to vote "no" on the rule because I think it is very bad and very dangerous. I am satisfied that if the membership of the House could go into it thoroughly—and I hope they will when the bill is reached for amendment—they will agree with the position I take in connection with the matter. I am not going to ask for a roll call upon the rule.

Mr. MICHENER. I may say, Mr. Speaker, that the Rules Committee did not have the benefit of the views of the gentleman from New York. However, this rule will give ample time to permit

all Members of the House to express their views on the advisability of the legislation contained in this bill, and I am sure we will, as usual, await with interest the views of the distinguished ranking minority member on the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the able and fearless gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that we go far afield of good legislation when we permit special rules to be granted by the Rules Committee making things in order that are contrary to the regular rules of the House of Representatives. I can recall many instances of rules being brought to the House in cases where a few conscientious Members of Congress could object to such things becoming law and which should have been eliminated from law, and when there were many Members of the Congress driven to vote for legislation, which they did not want to uphold, by the President or special interests. If we had a secret ballot in the House of Representatives, in my opinion there would be a lot of legislation defeated that now goes through. If the time comes when the Members of Congress are afraid to assert themselves in reference to legislation because they are afraid of the man in the White House, then the country will be in pretty bad shape because you will not have the freedom that the Members of Congress would like to enjoy. They not only interfere with the legislation that ought to be enacted into law, but if the Members do anything the White House does not like, then they go out and try to purge those Members, they try to go back to the Member's district and keep him from being elected.

We are in a pretty bad state of affairs in this country today, and I do not like it. Let us take this N. Y. A., for instance. If it had been created by a bill passed by the House of Representatives and Senate and signed by the President, that would be one thing, but it is an organization set up by Executive order and the Congress had nothing to do with it. I wonder whether or not anyone who objects to the N. Y. A. on this side of the House will get a run for his money when it comes to getting votes this fall. I wonder if the Chief Executive is going to send his henchmen out to try to defeat those Members of Congress, as he is trying to defeat the Members of Congress who did not want this country to get in war and who did not agree with the things that the administration wanted before Pearl Harbor.

We have to think the things through ourselves and then come to a realization that they are either good or bad, that it is good legislation or it is bad legislation. I think we are getting a lot of bad legislation just because we have to go to the Rules Committee to get a rule to bring it in here in order to have things passed that the administration wants. That is the way they are holding the club over the Members of Congress. That is the way they are trying to force through legislation that the White House wants and that the Members of Congress do not believe ought to be passed.

If this administration had a sense of decency, I will say, in trying to economize in connection with the operation of our Government—and, goodness knows, we ought to have it—we could go along with it; but if you will consider the administration ever since it has been in power, you will find that it has not a balanced Budget 1 year in its whole history of 9 years. It has been in the red every year since it has been in power. The average deficit for the first 7 years was $3,500,000,000 per year. When it came to the eighth year it went to $5,500,000,000 in the red. Now we are in the ninth year and we are going to be $18,000,000,000 in the red. When we come to next year there will be $40,000,000,000 more added to that. With a national debt now of $75,000,000,000, you are going to sink this Nation unless you get a different attitude on the part of the Congress or unless Congressmen are willing to buck the Chief Executive down here in the White House, because he is wrecking this Nation. You must cut out nonessential expenditures and bureaus and organizations that are not necessary.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, so far as the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania are concerned, may I call his attention to the fact that this rule makes in order the discussion of the very things to which he objects so far as the N. Y. A. is concerned. Full and free debate will be permitted. Then amendments, to add to or strike out items in the bill, will be in order. An opportunity will be afforded for the House to express its will concerning N. Y. A., C. C. C., W. P. A., and all other items for which appropriations are made. These are not surprise items. These agencies have been with us for a number of years. We all know about them, we are all familiar with them. I think we all can act intelligently with the information we have when the bill comes up for consideration.

I doubt sometimes that this is the best hour to talk about the national debt, and whether or not we are going to quit appropriating money in order that we may have a black balance instead of a red balance. No government can continue without practicing economy. The people just cannot stand the taxes. Waste and extravagance must be eliminated and guarded against. Nevertheless, the big job of the hour is to win the war in which we find ourselves. Continuous talking about the omissions and commissions of the past will not help, even though such talk be true.

The American people appreciate today that the Japs have recently been in the Aleutian Islands; that they have come to North America. We should not quibble too much right now as to where the pennies are coming from; rather, we should think only of the necessity of the proposed expenditure. If the thing to be purchased is essential to the war effort and to prevent our defeat, then we should make the appropriation and follow that up later with whatever legislation is necessary to provide the money. The one question before the Congress should be: Is this appropriation necessary in the war effort? If it is, then our course is clear. If it is not, our course is just as well-defined. In these days we must distinguish between luxuries, desirable things, and essential things. Not a penny should be included in the Federal Budget except to cover essentials.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has always been a watchdog of the Treasury. During his service in Congress he has saved millions for the Government. Yet I wonder if he has not become so accustomed to these habits of a lifetime that it is very difficult for him to accept the emergency philosophy which must now control us.

I have not agreed with President Roosevelt on many of his economic and domestic policies. I have not agreed with him ofttimes with reference to his foreign policy. I have said in substance on this floor times without number: Mr. President, come out and tell us the whole truth. Let the American people know. Take the American people into your confidence. When the American people are taken into your confidence and know the facts, I am sure they can, and will, take it. They will support your every demand to bring about national unity and they will help you in every way possible to win the war.

There was difference of opinion about the advisability of getting into the war. That is all behind us now. Any discussion and argument about wasteful expenditures then or difference of views on foreign policy detract from rather than make for national unity now.

As far as Mr. Roosevelt is concerned, he is the President. He is the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy. He is going to be our President and the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy until January 1945, anyway. In my judgment, we are going to lose this war or we are going to win this war under that leadership. This is no time to quarrel with the errors of the past. The "I told you so" attitude is not helpful. Yes; this war is costing, and is going to cost, a lot of money. I do not know just where we are going to get the money, and I do not think anyone else has this whole problem solved. Nevertheless, with the Axis to the right of us and the left of us and all about us, we are in the proverbial corner. There is but one thing to do, and that is to fight our way out. This is a case where united we stand or divided we fall. We must and shall be united.

Sometimes I think of this little incident: When I was a boy I played football. It used to be the custom for the retiring team to elect the captain for next year's team. At times my candidate lost. However, when the team was on the field, when the game was under way, I never questioned the signals, because I thought there was some different or better play that should be inaugurated at the moment.

Our foreign policy has been determined upon. There can be no changing now. Our course has been charted. The engineers have set the stakes. It seems to me that the duty of the Congress lies in careful scrutiny of proposed expenditures. We must not abandon inquiry and criticism. Yet, by the same

token, that criticism must always be constructive and wholesome. Now we are starting from here. I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania I had no part in the selection of the present Commander in Chief, but he is my football captain; he is our football captain. The American people believe in unity. There is only one way we are going to win this war, and that is for everybody to put his shoulder to the wheel and go through under such leadership as we have. It is the tomorrows of which we must think and devote our energy rather than the mistakes of the yesterdays. We must think in prospect rather than in retrospect.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield to the able gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I would like to say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], after what was presumably a chastisement of me, that I have been for economy ever since I have been in Congress. I have been working for economy. The gentleman knows that we have lots of things in this administration that are going on now that are just squandering and wasting the funds of this country. If you want to win this war, as you say you want to win it, and as these fellows over here and I want to win it, and to do what we can to help win this war you have to economize and cut out these nonessentials, or neither you nor anyone else will carry the ball and neither you nor anyone else will call the signals. The first thing you know you will have a Jap over here, because you are not able to carry on in this country, you will be broke and cannot finance it. I think you ought to learn a little something about operating the country just the same as some of these other fellows who are squandering money. You know and I know we need economy so why not practice it.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has correctly stated his position. Yes; we are all for economy. As far as I personally am concerned, I want only the essentials to be appropriated for at this time. I am sorry if my good friend from Pennsylvania misunderstood the meaning of my remarks. Certainly I never intended to chastise him. We all appreciate his worth as well as his ability, his industry, and his sincerity. No man in the Congress has made a more determined fight for economy down through the years than has the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. I am sure the country appreciates this and far be it from me to say one single word that would in any way detract from the credit to which he is entitled. I quite agree with the gentleman that the Congress must be on its toes all the time to see that no money is wasted and that this country is not ruined financially. I quite agree with him that the Congress should be very jealous about granting power to the Executive. I get some consolation out of the fact that these extensive powers granted to the President all revert back to the people where they belong at the end of the war. The people of the country must not forget that in every one of these war power laws will be found a clause providing that if the President does not by proclamation surrender up these dictatorial powers within 6 months after peace comes to us, then the Congress may reclaim these powers by a concurrent resolution of the House and Senate which does not require the signature of the President.

I regret exceedingly if anything I have said is displeasing to my good friend from Pennsylvania. I am sure when he reads these remarks after they are printed he will at least understand my motives.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 66]

Anderson, N. Mex.	Gifford	O'Day
Beam	Gilchrist	Osmers
Bell	Granger	Paddock
Bishop	Green	Patrick
Buckler, Minn.	Gwynne	Pearson
Burdick	Hall, Leonard W.	Richards
Byrne	Halleck	Robertson, N. Dak.
Byron	Harrington	Rockefeller
Clark	Healey	Schaefer, Ill.
Cluett	Hinshaw	Scott
Cole, Md.	Howell	Shannon
Crowther	Jarman	Sheppard
Culkin	Jarrett	Sheridan
Cullen	Johnson, Ind.	Simpson
Dies	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Smith, W. Va.
Ditter	Kee	Steagall
Edmiston	Kefauver	Stearns, N. H.
Ellis	Kelley, Pa.	Stratton
Englebright	Kerr	Thomas, N. J.
Faddis	Kilday	Tinkham
Fellows	Kocialkowski	Vreeland
Fish	Kramer	Wadsworth
Flaherty	Lesinski	Walter
Ford, Leland M.	McIntyre	Weaver
Ford, Miss.	Maciejewski	Weiss
Gale	Magnuson	Winter
Gearhart	Mason	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gerlach		Worley

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 348 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] to make an announcement.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of some of the Members, largely on this side of the House, I wish to announce that it is my understanding, after a conversation with the Speaker and the minority leader and the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee and also with the majority leader, that the allotment bill will be brought before the House on Monday, and I believe I am correct in stating that there is a further agreement that any roll call on that bill, if that point in its consideration is reached on Monday, will be taken on Tuesday. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], the majority leader, correct me if I am wrong?

Mr. MCCORMACK. The allotment bill is scheduled for consideration on Monday. Of course, I am not prepared to make a statement at this time about the latter part of the gentleman's observation. However, if there is a roll call on the passage of the bill, I shall do everything I can to persuade the House to have the roll call the first thing on Tuesday. I have not as yet conferred with my distinguished friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], which I always do before making any such announcement to the House; but in view of the question propounded by the gentleman from New York, I want it understood that before making any positive announcement to the House I always confer with the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that fact. I may say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] made the inquiry at my request.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I assumed that that was so, and I may state that if it is agreeable to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], if there is to be any roll call on the passage of the bill referred to, I would suggest that the roll call be held on Tuesday. Is that agreeable to the gentleman?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is certainly agreeable to me. I do not know that there is any necessity for a roll call vote, because I do not know of any opposition to the bill.

Mr. MCCORMACK. My statement was that if there is to be a roll call.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. While we are discussing that matter, may I ask the gentleman if it is the intention to try to finish consideration of the bill we have up at the present time tomorrow?

Mr. MCCORMACK. It is the intention to dispose of the pending bill tomorrow if that can be done. Monday, of course, will be District of Columbia day. I am not at present advised of any bills that will be brought up. I will know about that later in the afternoon. However, the allotment bill will be up Monday after the disposition of any District matters. Tuesday there will be a conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill. If that is disposed of in time, there will be some general debate on the W. P. A. appropriation bill and the consideration of that bill will be continued on Wednesday. The probabilities are that Calendar Wednesday will be dispensed with. Having announced the program for next week up to that time, I shall confer later with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and advise the House further as to any further program for next week.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Assuming the consideration of this bill is not concluded tomorrow, will we meet on Saturday?

Mr. MCCORMACK. No, I hope not.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, after the rather spirited and, I should say wholesome, interchange of opinion between

the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Michigan, I come as somewhat of an anticlimax. However, in connection with the pending bill which contains appropriations for the National Youth Administration, I propose at the proper time to offer an amendment to abolish completely the defense-training functions of N. Y. A. and to extinguish all appropriations for that function.

Having made some examination of the bill, it occurs to me that they are doing identic, parallel work with the Office of Education in the same age brackets, in the same type of training, all in the interest of national defense. One is an emergency agency, the other is permanent. One deals directly with the problem while the other deals through established State agencies, through vocational education, through the schools in 48 States, in fifteen hundred communities and some twenty-six hundred schools. That kind of a thing is wholly indefensible. From the standpoint of inefficiency and duplication, they are indefensible in peacetime, but they are intolerable in wartime. I propose to hew to the line of that philosophy. When the time comes at the appropriate part of the bill, I shall offer a motion to strike out the $49,000,000—and some odd dollars that are now available for defense training for the N. Y. A. This same bill contains $94,000,000 for the Office of Education for the identic kind of training and, certainly, that type of duplication is indefensible at the present time. A consolidation of the defense-training program under the supervision of the Office of Education is a step toward a more efficient operation in the interest of victory.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. BARDEN. I am interested to know, if the gentleman prevails in his amendment, whether the gentleman has in mind increasing the appropriation for the Office of Education or does he expect them to assume these additional duties and responsibilities with the appropriation they now have in the bill?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I would expect them to come back for a deficiency appropriation just as they came back 2 weeks ago for a deficiency of $9,500,000 to carry on this work for the fiscal year 1942.

Mr. BARDEN. The gentleman does feel that that would require additional funds?

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is right and there was no objection to voting the funds I have referred to.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Has the gentleman given any consideration to what disposition might be made of the training centers which have already been erected by N. Y. A.?

Mr. DIRKSEN. They can be taken over for a variety of purposes, and the equipment can either be released to those industries that need critical equipment today or added to the equipment inventory of the Office of Education in the various States. Since N. Y. A. was created by an Executive order, equipment and facilities can by a like order be transferred where they will be best utilized in the interest of defense training and victory.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I feel quite sure that if my colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] had made a thorough investigation of the splendid work of the National Youth Administration and what it has done for the thousands of young men that it has trained, whose services have been sought by many industries in the United States, that he, like many of those who opposed the matter originally, would have come to the conclusion that the money we have expended and the money that may be in order under this resolution will be helpful and beneficial.

I do not desire to take much time, but in view of what was stated a moment ago I am obliged to call attention to one or two things. In the first place, I congratulate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] upon his constructive and patriotic attitude and the advice that he has given. I feel that it would be in the interest of our Nation if his views and patriotic motives should be followed by others. As a rule, I do not pay very many compliments to gentlemen of the Republican Party, but whenever I see a man do a righteous and patriotic thing, and a man who is courageous enough to express his views, feeling that he is doing it for the best interest of the Nation, I feel that it is my duty to compliment him and encourage thereby others to follow his footsteps.

As for the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], I think he really did not mean what he said, because I know that he does not wish to insinuate in respect to the honesty, the courage, or the ability of our President or the administration. Only a few days ago we read, and I especially with a great deal of satisfaction, that 82 percent of the American people are behind and approve the President's activities and his policies and his determination to bring about an early victory to safeguard the interests of the Nation. I recognize, as does the gentleman from Pennsylvania, that enormous sums of money are being expended, but under this rule the gentleman would have a right to vote against any and all of the provisions that are made in order by the rule. Furthermore, I resent the gentleman's remarks when he makes the statement that if a secret vote could be had the proposition would be defeated. I believe the membership of this House is courageous enough at all times to vote their convictions and vote what they believe is for the best interests of the country.

In view of the unjustifiable attacks which have been made on the Congress by an unfriendly press, for a gentleman who has served as many years as he has to leave the impression that the Members of the House do not carry out their own convictions is a most unfortunate thing. I hope that he will eliminate from his statement the remarks that he has made in that respect.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an editorial from the Indianapolis Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes. Pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate upon the bill be limited to 3 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman means to include the debate of yesterday, all of the time that was used yesterday, that general debate be equally divided.

Mr. HARE. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7181, with Mr. SMITH of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, I am sure the Members were gratified to read in the papers that a veteran faithful employee of the House has been acknowledged last evening by George Washington University, in having conferred upon him the degree of doctor of laws. I would like to read the citation:

> William Tyler Page, for 60 years and more an officer of the Congress of the United States, giving valued advice on governmental procedure. To him life and friendliness are one, reminding us that—
>
> "Old wine is best to drink,
> Old authors to read, and
> Old friends to trust."
>
> CLOYD H. MARVIN,
> *President of George Washington University.*

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation for the courtesies extended to me by the majority members of our subcommittee. This is the sixth year that I have served on this, the Department of Labor and Federal Security Agency subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. Five of those years I have served under the able and distinguished chairman from Georgia, Judge TARVER. This last year I have worked with the distinguished chairman, the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE]. I do not recall an instance during those six bills, which are controversial in nature and cover practically every appropriation for the various departments and bureaus pertaining to labor, where there was a personal remark or any personal feeling on either side. I can only say that the courtesy extended to me by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] and the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] is typical and worthy of every tradition of the Old South from which they come.

First, I want to briefly comment upon the total figures in this bill. In 1942 the appropriation covered $1,261,039,498. The committee bill covers $1,058,451,660, or $202,687,838 below 1942 appropriation. However, when we take out of the bill the two items, the Civilian Conservation Corps and the cut for the National Youth Administration, we find that the bill is $246,036,000 above the 1942 appropriation.

I want to discuss today one of the two controversial subjects in this bill, the Civilian Conservation Corps. I am discussing the C. C. C. despite the fact that that item is not in the bill, for the reason that Judge TARVER expects to offer an amendment which will reinstate the item in the bill. The item was eliminated in full committee on my motion. So it is in controversy and is a subject of debate.

In 1940 I made a study in my own humble way of the Civilian Conservation Corps. I expressed my views on the floor of the House on March 21, 1940. There is a 3,000,000-acre national forest area in my district. I have in my district the largest national forest nursery in the world, the Chittenden Nursery. I had several C. C. C. camps in my district, so perhaps looking at it from a sectional point of view, I should have supported the Civilian Conservation Corps. I did support the C. C. C. until this year, as such. I have criticized the set-up of the C. C. C. many times in the past.

In March of 1940, the C. C. C. was very popular. Every time any effort was made to cut its budget we would find telegrams coming from every chamber of commerce in whose locality there was a C. C. C. camp. I recall during the consideration of the 1940 bill I had telegrams from supervisors, coming from the middle of that forest area, miles from a railroad and telegraph station, telling me that a particular camp in that particular township was going to be eliminated if the bill was cut, before I, a member of the subcommittee that handled the appropriation, had any information on the subject.

At that time in a speech on March 21, 1940, I made the following statement:

> The Civilian Conservation Corps has been a sacred cow. While the people have worshipped the cow the politicians have milked her. Thirty-two thousand, four hundred and six civilian employees, most of whom are political appointees, will receive this year in 1940 $58,234,000 in salaries, while 270,000 Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees and their families will receive $101,000,000 in pay. I am not opposing the Civilian Conservation Corps. I am just trying to stop the politicians from milking the sacred cow.

Repeating, 32,406 civilian employees in the fiscal year 1940 drew $58,000,000, while the 270,000 enrollees received $101,000,000.

In 1941 the number of enrollees was cut from 270,000 to 177,000, or a reduction of nearly 100,000; and we find the 34,406 employees they had in 1940 were cut to 32,330, or a cut of 76. In other words, with a 100,000 cut in enrollees we find a cut of but 76 employees from this tremendous pay roll.

The first 1943 Budget proposal provided an estimate of $49,101,000; $27,748,000 of this was direct enrollee cost with $21,800,000 administrative. The C. C. C. was to operate 300 camps in July, 250 in August, 200 in September, and 150 for the remaining 9 months, or an average of 175 camps with 190 men per camp during the coming year. They were to have an average of 33,250 enrolled men not including 10,000 territorials, an average of which—now get this—15,000 were to be junior colored enrollees, 15,000 veterans, and only 3,250 junior white enrollees. Out of 33,250 in the original set-up only 3,250 were to be junior white enrollees. Representatives of both the Interior Department and the Agriculture Department said they could not use the veterans for forest-fire protection, because when a fire began to roll they had to have young men who could get out of the way and they did not want to take any chance of veterans being killed in forest-fire areas; so the 15,000 veterans could not be used for forest fires. Then they said they could not use 15,000 colored enrollees because of the fact that these colored boys wanted to be in areas where they had colored friends. We had a colored camp in my district in a small colored area. As long as we kept these boys in the colored area where they could go see their colored girls their camp was a success, but when they moved their camp 50 miles away to a white area, the camp went down until they had practically no colored enrollees. So the 15,000 colored enrollees they admit could not be used for forest-fire protection or in these white areas. This left them 3,250 white enrollees. That was the original set-up put before the committee.

Do you believe they would have come before our committee with that sort of set-up if they could have obtained more white enrollees?

In this same set-up they had $21,000,000 for administrative expenses. Mr. McIntee and the officials of the Agricultural and Interior Departments frankly admitted the bill should not be passed as submitted. I admire them for their frankness. The overhead for 150 camps would have been prohibitive. They finally came back with a set-up on a 350 camp basis. This provided for 15,000 colored enrollees, 15,000 veterans, and 36,000 white enrollees, making a total of 66,000, with an additional 10,000 Indians and territorials. In July 1940 they had 32,406 employees for 270,000 enrollees. In July 1941 they had 32,330 employees for 177,450 enrollees. In other words they had something like 93,000 fewer enrollees, but only 76 fewer employees. Coming down to March they finally dropped down to 18,197 employees for 99,000 enrollees, or approximately 1 employee for every 5 enrollees. In May the enrollment dropped down to 73,563 enrollees. This present set-up provides for 10,795 employees who will receive $19,758,000, while the 76,000 enrollees will receive about twenty-eight and one-half million dollars in pay.

The sacred cow is still being milked and they are going to keep on milking it. They have had ample opportunity to cut expenses and have failed to do so. The original per enrollee cost under the supplemental budget, not taking into consideration the $5,000,000 reduction, is going to be $1,054 per enrollee. Because of the amount of clothing on hand, only $13.40 per year was allowed for clothing per enrollee as against $125; so we are using up $110 worth of clothing per enrollee per year. This bill contains only some $200,000 for equipment. When you take into consideration the clothing allowance and everything that is chargeable against each enrollee you will find it will cost about $1,200 or $1,300 per enrollee during the coming year.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The cost per enrollee could not be as much as the gentleman states, as I am sure he will realize that we are considering a total of $75,000,000 for 76,000 enrollees. The amount would be less than $1,000 per enrollee. In the evidence before our committee, with the larger estimate of $80,000,000 which we cut, the testimony was that the over-all cost per enrollee, including equipment, material, and everything utilized in the corps, would be $1,051. Since we cut off $5,000,000 from the estimate the amount per enrollee would be bound to be less than $1,000.

Mr. ENGEL. I said not taking into consideration the $5,000,000 that we cut off. In the last year's bill I tried to put a limitation on the enrollee cost but the Senate took it off. As the number of enrollees goes down, the per capita cost goes up. Experience shows that when they run short of money they reduce the number of enrollees and not the number of employees.

They had only 76 less employees on the pay roll on July 1, 1941, than they had in 1940, with 93,000 less enrollees. I tried time and again in the committee to put a limitation on the per capita cost of the enrollees. I got an amendment

through the House once, but the Senate took it out.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman has made a study not only of the cost of the Civilian Conservation Corps, but he has made a study in connection with the construction cost of various Army camps. I am wondering if the gentleman has made any comparison of the cost of construction on military reservations where air field or runways or grounds of various sorts have been prepared by the Civilian Conservation Corps as contrasted with the cost in the construction that he has investigated so far as the Army camps are concerned.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, when you take an army camp like Edwards, and I do not want to get off on a tangent, which was supposed to cost some $7,000,000, and cost finally $29,000,000, and when you consider Camp Meade with its tremendous cost and waste no such comparison would be fair or could be made. When I made my study in 1940, only 66 percent of the enrollees were in the front line doing field work and the other 33 percent were on leave, doing camp work or some other kind of work. Only about two-thirds of the men were working on field work.

When the C. C. C. was first presented to the House it was justified on the basis of taking the boys from off the city streets. I think all of us voted for it with that in mind. They wanted to take the boys out of the poolrooms, off the streets, and so forth, and give them a chance in God's wide-open spaces.

What has happened since? In 1940 we find that 19.6 percent, or 68,716, came from farms. During the first half of 1942, 46,000 or 43.1 percent came from the farms.

In 1940, 122,778 of these boys, or 34.8 percent, came from nonfarm urban areas or from cities under 2,500 population. In 1942, 21,367, or 20 percent, came from cities under 2,500. In other words, in 1940 54.4 percent of these boys came from either the farms or from cities under 2,500. In 1942, 63.6 percent of these boys are coming from the farms and from cities under 2,500.

We have stripped our farms of practically all labor. In my section of the country, and I think in every rural section of the country, they have allowed no exemptions to selectees because of work on the farm. Young men who are otherwise available for farm work go to the large cities. The N. Y. A. and the other groups training men are going into the rural sections, training them and sending them to the cities. And now we are taking 64 percent of C. C. C. boys from rural sections where they ought to stay and where they are needed. You are going to aggravate the farm labor situation just that much more if you keep on doing that.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Are the boys from the farms in the gentleman's district enrolling in the C. C. C.?

Mr. ENGEL. They have been. I shall touch on that later.

In 1941 142,563 of the enrollees, or 44 percent, were 17 years old. In the first half of 1942 58,000, or 54.5 percent, were 17 years old. In 1941 77,884, or 24.12 percent, were 18 years old. In the first half of 1942 23,438, or 21.92 percent, were 18 years old. In other words, out of 322,000 enrollees, in 1940 220,000, in round figures, or 68 percent, were 17 and 18 years old, and in 1941 76.5 percent were 17 and 18 years old.

Why is this? I happened to be down in Kentucky last Christmas. A complaint was made to me that the C. C. C. employees in one camp were going into the schools and pulling these boys out, some as young as 15 years old. It was rather difficult for me to believe it, but this information coming from people I know to be reliable, people I happen to know personally, compelled be to believe that there were at least some instances of this kind.

I went over to the camp. I found there a camp operating with a full personnel, with all the foremen, all the foresters, all the camp commanders, and all the other men that go with a camp. The enrollment there was dropping down to 70 or 80. When I asked them about this, and saw these young boys who were undoubtedly below 17 years of age, below the legal age, their defense was, "Well, boys mature younger in the South." That was the answer they gave me.

Employees of these camps saw the enrollment going down and they knew that unless the camp enrollment increased to the required number that camp was going out of existence and they would lose their jobs. The result was that they would go through the country, trying to send these enrollees to the enrolling agencies in order to get the enrollment of their camp up so that they could keep their jobs. I think that is the reason why the number of boys 17 and 18 years of age has increased.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. The gentleman has presented some very interesting and startling figures. I wonder if the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps admits the correctness of these figures. From what source do these figures come?

Mr. ENGEL. The gentleman can find these figures in the testimony and in the hearings. They are all in the testimony. The gentleman is referring to the figures now?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes. I do not question them; I just wanted to know their sources. I also commend the gentleman for calling the attention of the Members of the House to the seriousness of the farm labor situation. I say without hesitation that unless the farmers in my section of the country do something to provide themselves with farm labor they might just as well go out of business.

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Has the gentleman made any investigation to determine whether or not the ages of the enrollees in these C. C. C. camps are the same as they are in the camps that are located on military reservations?

Mr. ENGEL. The age of enrollees is the same in the military reservations as elsewhere. My candid opinion is that you can get these boys, 17 and 18 years old, to go into the camps when they are close to home, but it is rather difficult to get a parent to permit a 17-year-old boy to leave home to go into a C. C. C. camp located in a military cantonment.

Mr. DWORSHAK. What is the main objection to that?

Mr. ENGEL. If the gentleman has been in the various military camps in wartime I think he will know what I mean. I know the Army is doing everything it can to eliminate immoral conditions, and I believe it is doing a fine job of it, but nobody has been able to make a perfect camp.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. Is it not possible to eliminate the abuses to which the gentleman has referred without destroying the structure of the C. C. C.?

Mr. ENGEL. I may say to the gentleman from California that I have tried to eliminate them, I have tried to cut expenses down, with the results as I have just given.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman spoke of some camp in Kentucky. Where was that camp located?

Mr. ENGEL. In Harlan County.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Did the gentleman get any information from those in charge as to whether or not they were unable to get older boys?

Mr. ENGEL. As I recall, I did not ask them about that; but they told me that the average age was lower in that camp.

I now wish to discuss the question of forest-fire protection. There is only one agency in the United States, so far as I know, that can go out and spend money with blanket authorization from the Committee on Appropriations and then come back in with a deficiency. That agency is the Forestry Division of the Department of Agriculture. They have authority to go out and spend whatever money they may have to spend to protect the forests of this country from fire. The evidence shows that they come before the Appropriations Committee and the committee allows them in a deficiency bill any amount of money they

ask for, and so far they have not been refused in a single instance. So there will be adequate money for that purpose.

I have talked with a great many men connected with the Forest Service, both State and National, and I have been told that if we gave them from one-third to one-half the money they would give us as much work and equally as much forest-fire protection. I asked the representative of the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture if that was true, and he made a statement verifying it. They also stated they were getting about 50-percent value under the C. C. C. in the way of planting and also in forest-fire protection. On page 1027 of the hearings you will find the following colloquy:

Mr. ENGEL. I have talked during the past number of years with several State foresters. I have talked with State regional foresters and with some national regional foresters, and they have, almost without exception, made the statement that if we would give them one-third or one-half the money that we are using for the Civilian Conservation Corps in the forest area they would give the same amount of work. Do you have any opinion on that?

Mr. MORRELL. I think that is true.

Mr. Worth, of the Interior Department, testified they were getting about 60 or 70 percent value for the amount of money expended.

In 1940 only two-thirds of the boys were working on front line or field work and when you figure that only two-thirds of them are giving from 50 to 60 or 70 percent value for the dollar received, and also take into consideration the fact that they are 17- or 18-year-old boys, no one can argue that you are getting the same efficiency and the same dollar value that you would get if you had older men to do this work.

Under the bill as proposed you are going to take two or three of these companies, or perhaps more, and put them on military reservations. They are going to have their own quartermaster, they are going to have their own clothing allowance and handle it separately. They will have their own rations, their own chaplain, their own medical men, their own service, and under the set-up as it now stands, they will have an entirely independent organization. If we had work battalions such as we had in the World War, they would draw the same rations from the same source, the same clothes from the same source, the same medical service from the same source as the men of the Regular Army. In other words, you would have just one organization and you could handle all of these things without a separate organization. This, in itself, is going to add a great deal to the cost of the C. C. C.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

I have discussed this matter at some length because I feel the time has come when we ought to turn this equipment over to the Budget and through the Budget to the Army. If the amendment to restore the C. C. C. fails, then an amendment will be offered for sufficient funds to wind up the C. C. C. I think the C. C. C. has done a great deal of good although there has been a great deal of waste and extravagance.

I believe the time has come for us to eliminate the C. C. C. When the war is over, if we have unemployment, we will have millions of dollars of Army equipment which we cannot otherwise use. We will have Army cantonments and camps and a great many other things and plenty of it and therefore we should use the equipment we have now in the Army, and when the war is over put the equipment which the Army has back into the C. C. C.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. We have received great benefit in the past from the C. C. C. in our district, but, of course, times have changed now and I have not made up my mind. I would like to ask the gentleman this question. Do they still have Army officers at the head of the camps?

Mr. ENGEL. No; they do not. They had a great many Reserve officers, but several years ago they placed it on an entirely different basis. The men draw practically the same pay, but do not hold down the commissions, but hold a position in the C. C. C.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. The gentleman has referred to nonessential expenditures. Within the past 4 days in my district, on a road being put through the country, three men were working, one on a steam shovel, another on a post puller, and a third a timekeeper—just three men on the job. Would the gentleman consider a timekeeper essential with only three men?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, this Congress has spent almost a year and a half in conferring extraordinary powers upon the Executive. It has appropriated sums of money so vast as to be utterly beyond human comprehension, in most cases with practically no restraints upon the manner in which the Executive may use the funds granted. In fact, this Congress has been so busy appropriating money and creating new Executive powers that it has not once stopped to contemplate objectively the Federal bureaucratic monster it has created.

The American people fully understand that this delegation of vast extraordinary power has been necessary. As Commander in Chief of our armed forces, it is imperative that the President have every bit of authority needed for the successful prosecution of this war. No true American, in Congress or out, would deny him that authority; or would complain at any reasonable demand he might make upon our resources and energies in furtherance of our war effort.

It is still the paramount duty of this Congress, however, to see to it that these extraordinary powers now lodged in the Executive are used to the best possible advantage. It is our inescapable responsibility to the people to keep constant check upon the administration, and to see to it these extraordinary powers do not exceed the necessities of the emergency.

Is it not time that we stop and take check of this situation? Is it not time to demand an accounting, and to turn our attention to trimming this power to fit the necessities? Is it not high time to put the brakes on this ballooning bureaucracy that is actually destroying important portions of the American economy and literally forcing changes in the American way of life which will become permanent if allowed to continue much further?

Today we are faced with the probability of an official order which will ration gasoline throughout the Nation as it is already rationed on the eastern seaboard. Here in the East we readily see the necessity to cut down petroleum consumption. With Axis submarines taking terrific toll of shipping in our hemisphere and actually destroying vessels right in sight of shore, it would be unthinkable to risk a single American seaman's life, or a single ship to haul gasoline to this area for any use that does not contribute in a real and constructive way to our war effort.

But here in the East, the problem is largely one of transportation. There is not any such problem elsewhere. There are actually tremendous surpluses of well and refinery capacity; and there are ample transportation facilities to distribute oil and gas to the regular retail outlets. The rationing officials are quick, in fact, to make it clear that the restrictions will be imposed not to save petroleum, but to enforce conservation of rubber.

No one is going to disagree with Leon Henderson that the shortage of rubber is the very gravest and most critical sort of problem. But it is very doubtful if arbitrary gasoline rationing on a Nation-wide scale is the best way to conserve that part of our rubber supply represented in the tires now on American automobiles.

It certainly ought to appear obvious that there are other ways of conserving the existing tires that would prove much less injurious to American business and much less burdensome upon the American people.

Do not forget that the temporary passing of the automobile industry has already taken a terrible toll of American small business. So far, no true American has complained, no matter how seriously he has been injured. We all realize the grim necessity which drove this giant industry into war production. We know that we need planes and tanks and guns in the mass quantities which this industry is capable of delivering. We know, too, that the Japanese invaders knocked out motorcar production abruptly when they cut our supply of raw rubber with the taking of the Malay Peninsula and

the East Indies. The unpleasant fact remains, however, that shops, salesrooms, and service organizations in every community in America have been wiped out or seriously injured as a result.

An arbitrary plan of gasoline rationing now will undoubtedly destroy many thousands more of these small business operators who now are on the ragged edge of failure. It is also going to be mighty hard to explain to people, incidentally, why they should be denied reasonable amounts of gasoline at a time when the producers may actually be forced to destroy those lower-octane gases which are a by-product of the high-octane fuels we must produce for our air forces.

Actually, I think Leon Henderson and other administration officials in and out of the War Production Board have some difficult explanations to make to the American people. In the first place, there was the deplorable failure of these officials to accumulate any appreciable stock pile of rubber in America during the last 3 years, even though it should have been apparent to them, as it was to Army and Navy officials, that our sources of supply—the Malay Peninsula and the East Indies—were highly vulnerable. There was a lot of talk about establishing reserves of critical materials, such as rubber, before last December 7, but there was deplorably little action.

There ought also to be some frank and clear-cut explanation of the continuing delay in at least getting a start toward the production of synthetic rubber. There are apparently at least a half dozen administration agencies muddling along and doubtless working at cross purposes on this vital problem; but to date these several agencies have not even done the perfectly logical thing of getting together and of unifying their thinking and their efforts in the matter.

In the meantime, the best method we are offered to date by the administration is Nation-wide rationing, which I am certain is no sound and satisfactory solution. I am no authority on this problem, but some simple facts are perfectly obvious. I know that the life of an automobile tire depends upon many things other than the mere number of miles operated. I know that tires deteriorate with age. I know also that tires wear as much as six or seven times faster at extreme speed than they do at a low speed, say of 20 miles per hour.

I know, too, that proper care of tires and proper operation of the car mean much in the life of the tires.

How, therefore, is arbitrary gasoline rationing going to insure that we will get the very most out of the tires now on the cars of America?

Before administration officials are permitted to impose any Nation-wide rationing of gasoline, I believe this Congress ought to insist upon positive proof that there is no better method of conserving rubber and furthering the war effort.

Instead of rationing, I think it would be infinitely better to declare a conservative national speed limit. We already have police systems, State and local, which I know will be glad to cooperate in the enforcement of such a limit and to deal effectively with the very few unpatriotic and unthinking drivers who are not already taking the best possible care of their tires.

In this connection I would like to suggest a way to the several responsible executive agencies that they can save many a ton of rubber in the months ahead. I have no idea how many thousands of people are commuting amazing distances to wartime jobs, but I am sure that there are enough of them that the total must run into several million car-miles daily. Within my own district I know of scores of cases where men and women are driving as much as 50 miles each way daily to war jobs, while plants right in their home communities are idle or working on limited schedules.

The daily mass movement of workers is due, with few exceptions, to the fact that the Army and Navy procurement agencies have glutted the larger companies in the larger communities with contracts and have signally failed to enlist the facilities of thousands of smaller industries in hundreds of small cities and towns throughout the country.

These workers, driven out of their home communities to find work, frequently are unable to find any kind of place to house their families near the wartime job. There is nothing else for them to do but to drive back and forth between their home and jobs, and no sensible rationing of gasoline can change that condition, for the war-production program demands that those jobs must be done.

The solution to that problem, which is also the solution to many larger problems, both now and in the future, is to distribute war production so widely in every American community that can possibly contribute anything that the movement of people between communities will be absolutely minimized.

In an effort to make more effective the distribution of war contracts to smaller industry, we have just recently enacted a measure which I hope will enable every community and every available industry, no matter how small, to share constructively in our war-production program. We ought to remember, however, that this recent enactment only belatedly recognizes a problem which has actually existed for 2 years, and which still is nowhere near solution. The tribulations of small business and industry have, in fact, been something like Mark Twain's estimate of the problem of weather. Everybody from the President right on down to the manager of the smallest industrial plant has recognized the problem and talked about it incessantly but to date nobody has done anything very effective about it.

The sad truth is that, despite all the worrying, planning, and promising that have marked our period of defense and war production, only a shamefully small percentage of our already existing small industrial plant capacity has been enlisted in the production program. Right in my own district there are a dozen smaller industrial cities where industry after industry, forced out of normal peacetime production, have found it difficult, if not impossible, to convert to war production. I have worked closely with these industries and with organized labor in these communities on the problems which have confronted them. I have seen scores of these plants close or reduce their production schedules to a bare minimum. I have seen thousands of honest, industrious working men and women thrown out of work and whole communities suffer severe loss and hardship as a result.

Let me tell you, too, that it has not been the fault of management, labor, or the communities that this has happened. Everyone has worked hard at the problem of fitting these smaller industries into the production program; everyone has really been anxious to do his share in producing the arms and materials for our fighting forces.

But to date, our procurement agencies have thought too much in terms of producing in big units, and too little about the consequences of this tremendous program upon the smaller business and the smaller communities of the Nation. All this time, the executive agencies have had all the emergency authority necessary to distribute production contracts widely and equitably. Or if there has been some minor additional authorization needed, this Congress has been ready to give it promptly. But the fact remains that the job has not been done, and this Congress has failed to follow through to find out why, and to insist that it be done before American small business is completely ruined.

The condition I speak of is by no means peculiar to my State of Indiana. In fact, a study of the contract distribution figures will show that we in Indiana are actually in better condition than the industrial areas of the country as a whole. The fact, also, that the small business bill was approved unanimously in the House is evidence that the smaller industrial companies in every part of the country have suffered. It is not enough, therefore, that we should enact this bill and hope that it will lead to a solution of the problem.

Small business and small industry are America. Nine out of ten enterprises are small by any definition. And small enterprise is so completely and intimately woven into our economic and social pattern that it is foolish to hope that we can successfully conduct a war and achieve an effective peace without it. If this Congress does not stay everlastingly on the job of gearing small enterprise into this production program, our war effort will suffer, and we may come out of this war with our productive capacity concentrated in a comparatively few gigantic industrial combinations. With small business gone, we will inevitably see more and more Federal control and regulation, until we have reached state socialism and the end of the American system of free enterprise. I hope, therefore, that we will not be content with this single gesture to small business; but that each of us will insist that the responsible executive agencies speed the enlistment of small business in this war program.

We have all heard Mr. Henderson's estimate that it will require another army of 100,000 Federal employees to maintain the system of price controls which

he is putting into effect. Here is another matter which this Congress should take the time to look into very carefully. Just why we need 100,000 Federal snoopers and gestapo agents riding herd on American shopkeepers and merchants is a little hard for me to understand. Does Mr. Henderson follow the habitual administration attitude that every American enterpriser, per se, is a fellow to be watched, suspected, and hounded at every turn? Does he believe that every American businessman is a cheater and chiseler at heart, who must have a Federal checker at his elbow every time he makes a sale?

Instead of this system of Federal price policemen, why does not Mr. Henderson recognize the shrewd shopping instincts of the housewives of America? Why does not he organize select committees of these shoppers in each community and give to them the job of policing prices. Capable purchasing agents that they are, I am confident that they would have no trouble in spotting the occasional chiseler and reporting him to Mr. Henderson if he failed to make immediate adjustments of any prices on which he was out of line.

I think it about time this administration adopt a different attitude toward American business and the free-enterprise system. For 9 long, hard years, business in general has suffered abuse and excessive regulation and restriction at the hands of the administration for the sins of a trivial minority within its ranks. Why not put away the lash and give business a free opportunity to cooperate in the solution of our important domestic problems. Certainly American industry has been cooperating wholeheartedly and unstintingly to produce the arms and materials of war. In fact, when the whole story of America's rearmament program is known and understood, I believe it will stand as a monument to the American business and industrial genius, functioning with the Government on a purely voluntary and patriotic basis.

American merchants are, I am sure, just as honest and just as anxious to cooperate voluntarily now in the application of any reasonable system of price and inflation control. If the Office of Price Administration will just give up the half-hearted tinkering with partial controls, and will announce a program of inflation stops which apply equitably to every factor of price from the source of raw materials to the retailers' counters, Mr. Henderson will not need a gestapo to make it work. American businessmen and merchants will do the job for him; and where outside restraints upon the rare chiseler are necessary, select committees of shoppers will be able to do all the checking that will be necessary.

This Congress, together with its predecessors in the last 9 years, have stripped the American people of such sweeping extraordinary powers which are now lodged in the Executive that it is hard to imagine any important additional authority which the administration might need for the effective prosecution of this war and the preservation of the Republic in a period of lasting peace. Certainly, we ought to accept now as our first responsibility to the people we represent to maintain a constant, jealous supervision of the special powers we have granted the Executive. First, we should carefully review these special powers to see where we may have given recklessly or unnecessarily. Where we have granted any more than the minimum authority needed, we ought at the first possible moment to withdraw that portion of the authority which is unnecessary.

Second, we ought to maintain a constant, vigorous check on every executive agency to see that the authority we have granted is not abused, exercised arbitrarily, or applied ineffectively.

The American people are willing and anxious to make any sacrifices and undergo any hardships which they know to be necessary in the present emergency. They are not willing, and must not be expected, to accept blunders of administration, carelessness, extravagance, or "social planning" as usual, which hamper our war effort or threaten the American form of government.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 20 minutes. This bill carries direct appropriations of $1,134,269,000 and odd. The only evidence of any dispute up to date in connection with the consideration of the bill arises out of the consideration of the proposed amendment which has been suggested will be offered by the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, to restore the appropriation item for the Civilian Conservation Corps, and the suggestion that has been made that an amendment will be offered to eliminate from the bill entirely the provision for the National Youth Administration. May I call attention to the fact that the committee, I believe, under those circumstances ought to feel somewhat complimented, when the membership of this body, apparently is so well satisfied with the action of the committee involving appropriations of considerably over a billion dollars, that no one has seen fit up to date to discuss any of the items in the bill seriously, other than those that are involved in the appropriations for the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps.

I, however, should say to you that this bill is the result of some 16 or 17 weeks of hard work on the part of a very small subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, and contains the opinions of the members of this committee, as approved by the full Appropriations Committee, on hundreds of items that the Members of this House and the people of America ought to be interested in, involving appropriations, as I say, of over a billion dollars. Therefore, I feel that I would be remiss in my duty as a member of this subcommittee were I not to pay some little tribute to the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina, Judge HARE, and also to the fine and splendid spirit of cooperation and leadership that was manifested in these hearings by the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER. I also direct attention to the fact that the distinguished gentleman from Texas, ALBERT THOMAS, was in constant attendance upon the hearing of this subcommittee and rendered a great service to the country and to the Congress in his very characteristic cross-examination of the witnesses that developed the many facts of interest when the appropriation measure was under consideration.

Of course, the minority members of the committee enjoyed this very arduous work because on this committee the subject of politics is not involved, and in the consideration of the items which are involved in this bill, including the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration, and all the other items relating to the subject of national defense, I, for one, as a member of this committee, have attempted to be guided in my judgment by the evidence that has been produced to show the necessity for carrying out or curtailing or expanding activities as the need in connection with our national defense effort has been disclosed. I want the people of this country to know without question that the Congress of the United States cannot direct, nor win, nor conduct this war. We must rely upon the Commander in Chief, the President, and the subordinate administrative agencies in the civil branches of the Government, as well as the Army, the Navy, and the other military branches of this Government to outline the proposal and to direct the conduct of this war. When we have furnished them the funds with which to carry on this war, in accordance with the objectives which they have outlined to these committees, it seems to me the Congress has fulfilled its primary mission and that it is unfair to criticize the Congress because of some mistakes of administration of the funds that Congress has given to the President and to these administrative agencies to carry on this war.

May I direct your attention to the fact that this bill encompasses appropriations for two great agencies of government, the Federal Security Agency and the Labor Department. Within the scope of each of those great agencies are a multitude of subagencies, many of which deal directly with the life and the welfare and the happiness of the people of this country. You must bear in mind that although this is a large appropriation bill, the major parts of this bill this committee could not change if they were so motivated. This Congress has laid down a pattern embodied in the social security law, of Federal grants to the States to take care of the various titles of the social security law. For instance, take the subject of payment of old-age pensions, the contributory system to be found in Title I of the Social Security Act; of necessity, the Federal Government's contribution is going to continue to rise and rise in direct proportion as the States of this Nation provide a like contribution for the payment of old-age pensions. So when the States have made provision for the care of the aged in accordance with

their State laws, the Federal Government is bound to match this fund under the matching provisions of that section of the Social Security Act.

Likewise, the old age annuity provisions of the social security law, for which appropriations are made here, are paid out of funds contributed first by the employer and the employee into the Treasury of the United States, and then reappropriated back to the trustees of this trust fund, in order to administer the payment of funds necessary to take care of the obligation that the Federal Government has assumed in the payment of old-age annuities. That fund is bound to rise. It is a fixed fund over which this committee can have no control in the matter of reduction of appropriation.

You can go through item after item in this bill and thus find that a large portion of the bill is bound to be controlled by legislative enactments embodying Federal grants and aids to the States in order to carry out the objectives of social security and education to the various States of this Union. The great grants that have been made to the States and that are being made to carry on the great system of vocational education throughout this land is something that this Congress cannot in good conscience reduce to any material extent without wrecking the program that has already had the approval not only of the Congress but of the people of the whole land. The contribution that must be made out of the Treasury of the United States in order to take care of the expenses of administering unemployment compensation is something that we cannot reduce. It depends entirely upon the needs of the administration as that act is administered in the various States of the Nation, and likewise results from a tax upon the pay rolls in the first instance, to provide the fund out of which we make appropriations for that purpose.

And so all through this bill, aids for maternal and child welfare, aids for crippled children, aids for the blind, all of these great aids that so vitally touch the health and welfare of the people of America make up and constitute by and large the major portion of this particular appropriation bill.

Now, I want to go to the Labor Department and consider the appropriations for the various agencies of that department. There you will find that this committee has wielded the ax in every spot where it was possible to effect any economies. I would feel I was derelict in my duty as a member of this committee were I not to call the attention of Congress and the people of America to what I think is a most splendid job that is being done by the new Administrator of the Wage-Hour Division, Mr. Walling. Two years ago I stood in the Well of this House in connection with this very appropriation bill and again last year, and urged upon the Secretary of Labor and upon the then Director of the Wage-Hour Division and the Public Contracts Division, that steps should be taken to effectuate a consolidation of the inspection services of the Labor Department.

At that time we had an inspection service in the Children's Bureau, an inspection service in the Wage and Hour Division, an inspection service in the Public Contracts Division, and an inspection service in the Labor Standards Division, all under the auspices of the Department of Labor. The thing became so obnoxious to people throughout the country who called it to my attention that the lack of necessity for that great diversified inspection service impressed itself upon me, and I made this suggestion 2 years ago and again last year, that there should be every effort made to consolidate the inspection services and to have one service do the inspection work for the Wage and Hour Division; the Public Contracts Division, administering the Walsh-Healey Act; the Labor Standards Division, handling standards for safety and sanitation in factories; and the Children's Bureau, in enforcing the child-labor provisions of the law. I am happy to say that that is now being carried out; and under the direction of Mr. Walling and with the complete approbation, as I am told, of the Secretary of Labor, a program has been worked out by which this inspection service will be coordinated, and that one set of inspectors will be able to make the necessary inspections for all of these various departments of government.

May I call attention to the fact that the proper legislative committees of this House ought to make some study of this situation in order that they might endeavor if possible to effect ultimate economies in the administration of the Labor Department by the consolidation of some of these agencies so that we shall not have the necessity of having the directing personnel at high salaries of some of these agencies which in my judgment could well be consolidated with others. I refer specifically to the Bureau of Labor Standards, an organization headed by a distinguished gentleman who has been there for a considerable period of time and whose duty it was to build up a spirit of safety and sanitation in the factories of this country and fundamentally to see to it that those plants that were awarded contracts under the Walsh-Healey Act complied with the safety and sanitation provisions of the law with respect to the physical condition of their plants. Last year I called the attention of the Congress and the people of this country to the situation that despite that fact this agency had been in existence for years they had not up until just a few days ago finally written a set of standards, a set of minimum standards, that an employer could point to or that the inspectors of that agency could point to and say: "There is your obligation under the law." I am happy to state that as a result of the efforts I have made those standards have now been adopted and we may expect sometime that those standards will be produced so that manufacturers of this country operating under the provisions of the Walsh-Healey law may have an opportunity to know what the standards are that the Walsh-Healey Act actually prescribed.

So you can go on down through this bill, and I want to say that the committee and every member of the committee has worked hard to bring to the attention of the Labor Department the necessity for the consolidation of effort so that we shall not have all of these various agencies working at cross purposes, overlapping and duplicating their efforts.

Let me also call your attention to the fact—it has not been discussed upon this floor but it is a matter of tremendous importance to the people of this country and to the Congress—that this committee and every member on it has taken a very definite stand against the efforts of the Social Security Board to federalize unemployment compensation. You will find written into this bill the attitude of the members of the Appropriations Committee that very definitely has stated to the Social Security Board that we are in opposition to this announced policy by which the Federal Government seeks through the intervention of legislation proposed by the Social Security Board to entirely federalize the unemployment compensation laws of this country. I want the Congress and the people to know that this is a subject of vital importance to the States of this Nation. This subcommittee under the leadership of Butler Hare permitted to come before our committee the representatives of the unemployment compensation boards of this Nation. They presented their case. As a result of what I consider to be a conclusive showing before the committee we wrote into this bill the provisos you will find which we believe will stop the efforts of the Social Security Board, under existing law, at least, to federalize unemployment compensation or to utilize any of the funds appropriated here for that purpose.

So I could spend some time in showing what the committee did in the matter of cutting some of these appropriations, for instance, the travel item of the Social Security Board. I have repeatedly stated upon the floor of this House what I conceive to be the utter inability of members of the subcommittee or of the Appropriations Committee itself scientifically to deal with a matter involving a travel item of $1,700,000 and to be able to say scientifically that that sum, or a lesser sum, or a greater sum, is the sum that should be devoted to that purpose, because of the lack of any auditing experience which we have as a committee and because of our inability to go in and audit and examine the travel vouchers and items necessary to be inspected to enable us to ascertain the needs. We resolved that there was only one thing left to do: that was an unscientific method of curtailment of expenditures, to apply the ax and cut off a direct percentage of the amount proposed to be appropriated; and that is what we did. We cut off 20 percent; so when the item comes up you will know this committee has already given the ax very severely to that situation. You may find someone in dispute on the

action of the committee in refusing to appropriate the sums necessary for the extension of the apprentice-training program. We believe that the extension of the apprentice-training program is not vital at this time as a long-range program. It is splendid, it should be retained, and we did retain it at its full volume under the existing situation; but the demands for the immediate training of youth to do a certain specific job in the war industry cannot wait the 3, 4, or 5 years' apprenticeship training in order to become journeymen. We want the apprentice-training program continued, and this bill does continue it at its present level.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wish to ask the gentleman from Wisconsin a question about this travel item because I do not know about this matter, and would like to have some information on it. I notice under the Labor Department's portion of the bill the item is cut considerably more than 20 percent; in fact, it is cut from the Budget estimate of $1,472,000 to $932,000. This is a cut of $540,000, or about 40 percent.

Mr. KEEFE. I think I may say to the gentleman that is the cut, and I think the justification may lie in the fact that the committee was of the opinion that such a cut is justified.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I would like to have the gentleman go into that a little bit.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Part of that cut is occasioned by disallowance of the proposed increase in the funds for the apprenticeship training program, $396,000. Of course, all of the travel allowance involved in that item is out.

[Here the gavel fell].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am glad to see in the report that the apprenticeship training program is continued, but I do not agree wholly with the report about its necessity of 4 years' training.

Mr. KEEFE. I am sorry. I have a lot of ground to cover. If the gentleman has a question I will be happy to answer it if I can.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will get time.

Mr. KEEFE. I would be glad to hear the gentleman's exposition. I know his great interest in the apprenticeship training program and, may I say, I also share his interest because we have, in my own State of Wisconsin, one of the finest systems of apprenticeship training that exists in this Nation and I am fully aware of the great contribution that it has made to industry. I am conscious of what is being done under the law that the gentleman from Connecticut himself sponsored when he was previously in Congress.

May I say that the committee was impressed with the fact that the various training programs—and if you are not familiar with them I suggest that every Member of Congress ought to get from the Office of Education this pamphlet which is Job Training for Victory and study it—are like a Chinese puzzle to one who is not thoroughly familiar with it when you see this great list of training programs under various offices of government that are now being carried on to train the youth of this country. I believe that is because of the fact there are so many of these programs that many people have become somewhat confused and disturbed in their thinking on the subject of N. Y. A.

I want to discuss that particular phase of this appropriation bill for just a few moments, because Members of Congress have asked me as to my attitude with respect to it and why I have taken a position such as I have with respect to the activities of the National Youth Administration.

Permit me to say that I am not an expert on all things and I take it that no other Member of the Congress thinks he is. After all, the composite judgment of the people in authority in this Government and throughout the Nation ought to be some directive to Members of Congress as to the course that we ought to pursue and the attitude that we ought to maintain with respect to some of these subject matters. So I approach the discussion of the subject of N. Y. A. not from the standpoint of poison or prejudice or hate, but I try to approach it from the stanrpoint as to whether or not this organization is making a contribution to the war effort and to the welfare of the people of this country. If it is not making a real contribution to the war effort, if it is not making a contribution to the welfare of the people of the country, then I should be the first to disown it and to cut it out of this bill, if possible. You cannot judge N. Y. A. only by pointing to the mistakes that it has made. That is a very narrow and shallow philosophy. If you are to obtain a proper perspective of N. Y. A., you must balance the good that it has done or is doing as against the mistakes which I concede and admit it has made.

May I say at the outset that I think most of the fields in which N. Y. A. has made most of its mistakes have been completely eliminated in this Budget estimate and under the appropriation which is now before us. As I understand the N. Y. A. appropriations as made in the past, they provided for a system of student aids to students in the high school level and a system of aids to students in the college level. Those were aids given to needy students for work performed on projects provided by the local schools and colleges to aid students to stay in school and to receive an education which might otherwise be denied them. So far as I am concerned, I am in complete accord with the Government's activity that will afford an education to the under-privileged of this country who might otherwise be denied the right to an education, and I start right there.

In this Budget all student aids were eliminated, as it was submitted by the President. I think that the President's budget eliminated the finest and the best part of the N. Y. A., which was the student-aid program.

I do not want to classify as a group of parasites the colleges of this country, as some people do, because they have come before our committee and demonstrated to us the hardship that would fall not only upon the students but upon the colleges themselves if this student-aid program were done away with. What is the situation?

Here is your War Manpower Commission headed by Mr. McNutt. Here is the War Production Board headed by Mr. Donald Nelson. They are the people who are planning and carrying on this part of our war effort. Am I going to cast aside their word, their advice, their requests and take the advice of someone who perhaps knows nothing whatever about this work or who may be prejudiced in his or her opinion? They came before this committee and stated, "We need trained men and trained women as never before in the history of this country. We need doctors, we need veterinarians, we need chemists, we need scientists, we need men trained in the sciences badly in industry throughout this country, and there is a great bottleneck and shortage in the educational facilities of this country."

They went to the colleges of this country and said to the colleges that had the facilities to administer and give those courses, "We want you to cooperate in this war effort by expanding your usual college course and accelerating it from a 9 months' course to a full 12 months' course." And the colleges, in agreement with the request of the War Production Board and the War Manpower Commission, acceded to that request and rearranged their schedules and their courses to provide for three semesters' work a year, providing year-round, 12 months' work, keeping those school plants busy trying to turn out the technicians which the War Production Board and industry state are vitally necessary.

In connection with that the War Manpower Commission and the Selective Service Group propose to defer students in colleges who are taking courses and who maintain decent college grades in these various activities. I ask you as fair-minded Members of Congress, supposing the War Manpower Commission and the Selective Service Group do in fact defer students in colleges who are taking the courses specified, and the students are compelled to spend 12 months a year in school, what will happen to the son of the poor fellow who has been able during his summer vacation to go out and earn his tuition, his matriculation fees, and the money to pay for his school books? Sure, he may be able to work for his board and room, as I did, to get through college. He may be able to work waiting on tables and tend-

ing furnaces, as I did; but where is he going to get the money to pay his tuition, pay his matriculation fees, and pay for his books if he is compelled to stay in school for 12 months?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Do not you men and women get the point? If this deferment program goes through on this accelerated college program of 12 months, the son of the rich man, the boy whose father can keep him in school, will stay there to pursue his course, but the son of the poor man will be compelled to leave and go into the combatant service. That is exactly the situation that is staring us in the face today.

The War Production Board came before us and asked for an appropriation of $10,000,000 as a student loan fund.

They propose to loan to needy students their matriculation fees and their tuition, to give them $25 a month, not to exceed $500 to any one student, taking a note for it, and then cancel the note as soon as he goes into the service or takes a job as directed by the War Manpower Commission.

The committee considered that proposal and considered all of the evidence. As far as I am concerned, I recognized at once the necessity for some program to supplement and give some aid to these needy students. So I proposed to the committee that they give $5,000,000 to the National Youth Administration, to be administered under their college-aid program as a work program, not to give money to these students, but to offer them an opportunity during this accelerated 12-months' course to do some work as outlined by the college authorities under a work program set up by the college authorities. That is exactly the program of the N. Y. A. at the present time, and it has been operating successfully in every college in the United States.

I am going to offer an amendment to put that $5,000,000 into this bill. I tell you, Members of this Congress, you will live to see that you have made a mistake, in my judgment, unless you do put that money into this bill. You will live to see the time that the son of some constituent of yours who is seeking to become a doctor or a dentist or a chemist or an engineer may be compelled to leave school for lack of funds, lack of ability to find a job, because he has to spend 12 months a year in this accelerated program.

The $5,000,000 which is in the bill is simply to carry on the general student-aid program. This program I have in mind covers the students who are in college for the last 2 years of their college course. The $5,000,000 the committee put in the bill recognizes the necessity for aiding students generally in their freshman and sophomore years to stay in college, because you cannot be a doctor or a dentist or an engineer and start in your junior year.

The N. Y. A. generally is streamlined under this proposal. The amount of the appropriation, as you see, is comparatively small compared with that of last year. They are doing away with all their shops. One-thousand-nine-hundred-odd are to be closed and in their place 1,600 workshops and centers that are already in operation in this country are to be upgraded and maintained according to the standards of the War Production Board. These shops are in operation, they are in production, they are giving work opportunity and work experience while they are producing under orders from the Army and the Navy, and they are doing a swell job of it, too.

Do you think the N. Y. A. is not making any contribution? I have here in my file letter after letter from all the big industries of this country, who have been the beneficiaries of the work program and work-training program of the N. Y. A. Am I going to take the word, then, of someone who knows nothing about this program and have my judgment guided by that individual and set it up as against these men whose names I could give you, representing firms whose names I could tell you, many of them on the Pacific coast, all through this country, who testify without equivocation that the N. Y. A. trainees are accepted in industry in tremendous numbers and are doing a swell job?

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] says he is going to move to strike it out because the vocational system is doing the same thing. Is it? Has he investigated it? Does he know? Is he sure? Why, there are thousands of communities in this country, rural communities, where there is no vocational-training school. He ought to know that. The vast majority of the students in training in these N. Y. A. centers come from the small communities, the outlying places, where they would never have an opportunity for training were it not given to them by the N. Y. A.

Oh, yes; I am a reactionary because I want to save the Government some money; but I tell you men and women here now I have never regretted the fact that I have been a consistent supporter of projects such as this that make such a great contribution to human welfare and bring to the people of this country who would otherwise be denied it an opportunity and a right to secure vocational training. I ask you who come from northern Wisconsin, for instance, where would the boys in your communities get vocational training if the N. Y. A. had not gone in there and established their training centers?

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GEHRMANN. There are only 2 of the 14 counties that have vocational training now.

Mr. KEEFE. Take your places in the South and all over the country. Where are these people going to get this training when they have to leave their homes and go 100 or 200 miles to live in a vocational-training center? Who is going to support them, and who is going to give them the funds to stay in school while they are there? The N. Y. A. accomplishes that by bringing the training centers where these people are and paying a mere pittance. It will average about $15 a month for 160 hours of work a month to these boys who are actually producing the things we need in our war effort while they are securing their training.

I think I have tried to demonstrate to you that if I ever was sincere about anything I am sincere about this. It does not arise out of prejudice. It arises out of several years of study of this proposition. In my State, let me say to you, the last convention of the American Legion passed a resolution wholeheartedly and overwhelmingly endorsing and supporting the work of the N. Y. A. in my State, which is doing a swell job. Yes; mistakes have been made, money has been spent, salaries have been paid, perhaps, that should not have been paid, but in a Nation-wide organization as young as this point to one where such mistakes have not been made.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I have not time to yield right now.

I want to say just one word about C. C. C. in closing. I wish you would turn to the books and read the authority under which C. C. C. was established. I wish you would turn to the books and see what, if any, Executive orders have been issued with respect to C. C. C. When you do that you will find, as appears in this record, that the Civilian Conservation Corps was established for a specific purpose, to provide relief to needy young men in this country and to engage them in conservation activities in protecting and conserving our natural resources.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

I am unable to adjust myself to the attitude that they are operating according to law when they move these C. C. C. camps on to military reservations, there to do work that is entirely foreign to, and entirely dissociated from, the work of conservation and protection of our natural resources that C. C. C. was set up and designed to do. They have done a fine job throughout this country in the past. I have admired much of the work of the Civilian Conservation Corps, but I cannot bring myself to believe that this Congress or the Army or the Navy has any right to set upon an Army reservation a separate and distinct organization paying voluntary enrollees, if you please, $30 a month for 8 hours' work a day, free to come or go as they please, and right at the other end of the reservation are the selectees, brought in under the draft, enjoying nothing greater by way of perquisites, clothes, food, medical care or dental care or instruction, and you pay them $21 a month. Today an officer in a C. C. C. camp on a military reservation is paid on a parity with or in excess of the perquisites and pay of a captain in the Army. To me it does not make

sense, and I have opposed this C. C. C. in this appropriation bill before the subcommittee and before the full committee and I am opposing it on the floor because it has gotten away entirely from the fundamental purpose for which the Civilian Conservation Corps was organized and set up under substantive law. If they need workmen in these camps to do these menial jobs let the Army recruit them and let the Army have charge of them and let the Army support them.

(Here the gavel fell.)

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] for the compliment that he paid our friend, BUTLER HARE. If he had known BUTLER as long as I have known him, he would know and trust him as I do. BUTLER is pure gold and I would be glad to trust into his keeping all that is precious to me. What has been said of Mr. HARE may, with equal emphasis, be said of Mr. TARVER and of ALBERT THOMAS. They are all outstanding men and faithful servants of the public.

I wish, too, to compliment the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] upon the magnificent address which he has just delivered in this body. It is one of the soundest, strongest, and most convincing I have heard in my 18 years of service. He expresses perfectly and completely the views that I entertain upon the questions dealt with in the pending bill.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to supplement what the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has just said by adding an additional word with respect to the National Youth Administration.

The National Youth Administration has developed into an important war agency that is sending a daily average of about 1,000 trained workers in war industries and occupations essential to the war program. While converting its efforts to war training, the N. Y. A. has retained its basic principle of productive work. Consequently, today when production of war goods and training of workers are both important, this agency occupies the unique position of helping on two scores, with its machines doing double duty as training and as producing equipment.

There are currently in operation some 3,800 N. Y. A. workshops located throughout the country which are taking totally inexperienced young men and young women and preparing them for war work. A good portion of these work training centers are located in areas where there are no other training facilities of any kind. The result is that the N. Y. A. is training a great many young people for war industries who otherwise would be unable to prepare themselves to participate in the battle of production.

The average youth comes to the N. Y. A. with practically no knowledge of modern industrial machinery. At the end of 10 or 12 weeks of on-the-job training by this organization he has had enough experience to step out and go to work in an aircraft plant, a shipyard, an arsenal, or some kind of war plant. Thousands of these young people are being trained in the operation of lathes, shapers, millers, and other types of machine tools. Other thousands are being trained as welders, as sheet-metal workers, as aircraft mechanics, as radio technicians, as ship carpenters, as foundry workers, and a host of other fields in which there are growing shortages of qualified workers.

Young people from Georgia, trained by the N. Y. A., and young people from every State in the Union for that matter, are today at work in our factories and mills helping to forge the weapons needed for victory. A good many Georgia youth are at work in the war plants which are coming into operation in their home State. Some are making their contribution as far away as the Pearl Harbor Navy Yard. Others are at work in the shipyards and the aircraft plants in various States.

It is no mistake to say that these young people were able to get jobs in these war plants because of the N. Y. A. training program. It is no mistake to say that they are better workers as a result of their N. Y. A. training. War industries of all kinds, not only from Georgia, but from all over the country, have gone on record in support of this organization because of the important job it is doing in the preparation of young people for war work. Representatives of both branches of the armed forces and of the Maritime Commission have likewise testified to the contribution the N. Y. A. is making to the war effort.

The investment that we make in the N. Y. A. training program is going to pay dividends, even though some of these young people are later called into the armed forces. With a mechanized and motorized army and with a gigantic air force we are going to need thousands of technicians in all branches of the service. The N. Y. A. training program ties in directly with mechanized warfare as well as with production in war industry. On that very score I point out that the National Youth Administration is cooperating with the Navy and the Marine Corps in training men for them.

It is important that this organization, set up on a Nation-wide basis, be kept in operation during the coming year.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS].

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, your committee has carefully considered every item in this bill, and we submit it, as the product of our best judgment and effort, for your final consideration. We have conducted hearings covering the better part of 8 weeks and have carefully considered each one of the 30 or 40 different bureaus and agencies involved and given each a prolonged hearing and a careful consideration of their requests. As a result of that work I think I am safe in saying that there is only 1 item in this entire bill with which there was any controversy in our committee, and that was on the C. C. C. The vote on that item stood 3 to 3. Now is the time to suspend the Corps for the duration of the war. I hope I am also accurate in saying that perhaps the only remaining item in the bill that may prove to be controversial is the item in respect to the N. Y. A. I hope the House will back up the committee in its recommendations on that item. Heretofore the N. Y. A. has had approximately 3,800 stations or workshops. They have been cut down to about 1,800 or 1,900 this year. The student-aid program for high-school children is out entirely. Last year the Congress gave the N. Y. A. approximately $152,000,000, and this year we are submitting for your consideration the sum of only $53,000,000. I think the reason the committee has gotten along so well and has seen these items almost eye to eye is because of our very fine chairman, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. BUTLER HARE], and also because of the very fine gentleman on the other side, the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. I echo what my friend from Georgia [Mr. COX] has just said about him.

I think he has delivered perhaps the most constructive and analytical statement on any appropriation bill that it has been my pleasure to listen to since I have been a Member. He is a most valuable Member to the committee.

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], has also been one of the outstanding lights in the committee. He has worked hard and tirelessly and attended all sessions of the committee. Some day we Democrats may make a very good Democrat of him. I think he has all of the earmarks of making a pretty good one.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. HARE. I am very glad the gentleman has called attention to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] and I think that I might say for the benefit of the House also, that no member of the committee was more prompt and regular in attendance than was the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS] himself.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I thank the chairman. There is also the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, and I say this affectionately, the bellwether, Judge TARVER. He is a little tough at times, but he has a mind that is as keen as a razor and when he comes to a conclusion you can bet your bottom dollar that the Judge is not far wrong. Also there was the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HARRINGTON], who is not now with us. He worked very diligently and gave this bill his undivided attention.

Mr. Chairman, in weighing the facts and evidence that we have listened to and in writing up this bill, the predominant thought in the mind of each Member of the committee has been only one, namely, that this country is at war, and that we were going to write this bill with that one thought in mind. The items that have to do with national defense we gave a most sympathetic study, and most of them met with our approval. As for the items that did not touch national defense, we gave them all the consideration we were capable of. In most instances

those items were severely cut. Take, for instance, the Department of Labor.

That Department is given approximately $23,700,000. That sum is $429,000 under the appropriation for 1942. It is $1,580,000 under the Budget estimate for 1943. You see that is a cut of $1,500,000 under the Budget estimate. Perhaps it does not sound very large to you, but let me break it down a little bit and you will come to the conclusion, I believe, that the bill is cut to the bone.

Of that $23,700,000, $2,000,000 is for national defense; $11,000,000 is for mandatory items over which the Appropriations Committee does not feel at liberty to do any legislating. Those items deal with the Child Welfare Service of the Department of Labor. So there are $13,000,000 out of a budget of $23,000,000, which we felt were mandatory. We cut the remaining sum of $10,000,000 something like $1,500,000. I think that is a severe cut.

Now, take the Social Security Agency. Its total budget is approximately $803,000,000. Of that $803,000,000, $206,000,000 is for national defense items. They are broken down approximately as follows: Public Health Service, $12,000,000, purely for the national-defense program. The National Youth Administration has been streamlined, so to speak, and cut down to a national-defense proposition of $53,000,000. Vocational education, national defense altogether, $206,000,000. Of the remaining $803,000,000 there are $525,000,000 mandatory items. In other words, they are matching items for the States. Again the committee did not feel at liberty to do any legislating with reference to those items.

So, Mr. Chairman, a severe cut has been made in the Social Security Agency, when you realize that the budget this year, as submitted to you by your committee, is $96,000,000 under the amount passed by the Congress in 1942, and it is $276,000,000 under this year's budget.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, it would be a serious mistake for us to scrap the Civilian Conservation Corps. If ever there was a time when it should be maintained, that time is now, and I cannot conceive that the majority of the Members of the House would take the responsibility of destroying it.

I have personally witnessed hundreds and hundreds of boys riding wild on railroad cars, sleeping in haystacks, living lives of wild carelessness, simply because they could not find the opportunity for useful living. It was out of this condition, prevalent a few years ago, that the C. C. C. was conceived. It is one of the most humanitarian accomplishments of the present administration and it is a credit to every Member of Congress who has supported this great work.

Through the experience gained by the present organization of the C. C. C. in the years of its existence, the Nation has at its disposal a trained personnel able to cope with the problem of these young men. How much more serious the problem may be when hundreds of thousands of young men are discharged from the military services at the close of the present hostilities, no man can say. But certain it is, it will be so serious that it will tax the ingenuity of our Government. To destroy this organization at the present time is the part of folly. While it should be kept intact and without a large unnecessary executive force, we must with foresight anticipate this problem to the extent of our ability by keeping its structure at a minimum of cost.

I thoroughly believe that we should eliminate every possible expenditure of Government during these trying times. Every unnecessary or not immediately needed agency of Government should be subordinated to the purpose of winning this war. But we must not lose sight of the fact that out of this war will grow many evils that must be counteracted before they become a fact, and perhaps one of the most important of these is what to do about the youth of the Nation that will be discharged from the Army and Navy, air force and Marine Corps, who will be out of jobs, unable to find employment and who will require the guiding hand of a C. C. C. camp to aid them in rehabilitation.

Under no circumstances should the Congress take action that will destroy the structure of the C. C. C. and scatter the fine equipment they now have to restore youth to normal life.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Chairman, in my remarks I made the statement that Mr. Morrell, of the Forestry Division, had made a statement regarding the value of work, and I did not find it in the record. I have now found the statement. It is on page 1027 of the hearings, where you will find the following:

Mr. ENGEL. I am discussing this from the point of view of using these enrollees for fire-protection work. I have talked during the past number of years with several State foresters. I have talked with State regional foresters and with some national regional foresters, and they have, almost without exception, made the statement that if we would give them one-third or one-half the money that we are using for the Civilian Conservation Corps in the forest areas they would give the same amount of work. Do you have any opinion on that?

Mr. MORRELL. I think that is true.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, first I want to compliment the members of this Committee, because I sat all yesterday afternoon and all of today in this Chamber, and I do not believe that while I have been a Member of the House I have heard a clearer explanation of a bill than was made in connection with this bill.

I have been very much interested in apprentice training since 1937, because then I saw just what was going to happen if we were ever drawn into a war. I was an apprentice myself 40 years ago in a foundry. I saw the machine age coming in in the industrial life of our country. I saw young men who were brought in to be taught a trade, only to be exploited by industries and to be taught just branches of a certain trade. You members know that many a young man who was supposed to be taught his trade finished with just being a specialist. I know many young men who started out to learn carpentry who finished up by being good concrete form makers. I knew that during 10 years of depression a million and a quarter mechanics and tradesmen from Europe came to this country and found employment. I was interested in securing the passage of a bill that would provide standards and would guarantee to any boy or any girl, who was willing to give his or her time, that they would be taught all of the branches of the trade.

I am glad that this Committee saw fit to see the wisdom of this law and to keep it in this bill, and to provide appropriations to continue it, because it is important. I tell you members that, if this bill had received the appropriation in 1937 that I asked for, we would not now be in need of so many trained mechanics today.

I know that we are in a war and that the country is crying today for trained men in industry. It was impossible to train them in the short time at our disposal and it was necessary to set up other agencies such as the National Youth Administration and the Department of Education. Let me also call the attention of this Committee to the need for including in this bill the item for the National Youth Administration training program. Throughout the debate on this bill a great many things have been said here to the effect that the National Youth Administration was of no value. Let me tell you, however, Mr. Chairman, what the facts are by citing an illustration. On February 1 of this year 2,000 boys from other States in this country went to Connecticut to finish their preliminary training which they received from the National Youth Administration in the different States of this Union, and to take their place in the defense industries of the State of Connecticut. Let me again read into the RECORD for reference and guidance the different States from which these boys came. I shall not attempt to enumerate all but shall read enough to give you a general idea: New York 233, Pennsylvania 238, West Virginia 310, Mississippi 495, Arkansas 139, Kentucky 294, Oklahoma 210, Tennessee 42, Kansas 76, Missouri 25. Practically every State in the Union is represented in this list.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. FITZGERALD. These boys received their preliminary training in their own States, but there being no opportunity to go into industry where they were trained, their training was finished in Connecticut and they found opportunity there for employment.

I hope that when this bill is read for amendment and acted upon that the National Youth Administration item will be retained, for this organization is doing a good job. We need the trained men in great numbers.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the time remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina has 38 minutes remaining; the gentleman from Michigan has 19 minutes remaining.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, in this bill that we have before us, we have a number of items that represent some of the most earnest efforts made by the American Congress and the American Government in the past years to protect and extend the democracy of this country. We have the Public Health Service here with all the importance that attaches to this great Service in its work of building a healthier race of people in America. We have the Federal Security Administration, or a great part of it. We have the Social Security program with all that we hope is going to come from it in the future of this Nation. We have here the matter of education. As the gentleman from Wisconsin so elcquently pointed out, equality of educational opportunity is one of the foundation stones of our Nation, and probably the greatest social institution ever developed by all human society is the American public school. We have the Wage and Hour Division and many things of that character resulting from laws enacted by Congress in an attempt to make more fair the lot in life of the different groups of people in this country.

As I have been thinking about this bill and the matters contained in it there has been one major thought going through my mind. Some day this war will come to an end; nobody can predict when; nobody knows the time. It may last 4 years, 5 years; I do not know. It might end within a year or 18 months. What I do know is that Congress, in my judgment, has a responsibility in connection with the future of this Nation that I do not think we are discharging yet. I have sat in this House many and many a day and listened as Members took the floor and said they were compelled to vote for emergency legislation they did not like but they had to vote for it because of the situation that was upon us and there was nothing else to do.

If I could say one thing, and only one, and hope that my colleagues would act upon it, it would be this: That if the future of democratic government and of American institutions can be said to depend upon any one thing that is within the power of the Congress to give more than upon anything else, it depends upon the Congress being ready when this war ends. A well-tested and democratically conceived reconstruction program whereby jobs can be assured our people, our freedom of economic life preserved, and our Nation's political institutions kept secure. I do not want us in that time when the future of our country, perhaps for centuries to come, will depend on what is done to once more find ourselves compelled to adopt some emergency measure handed down to us. I can refer to many Members on both sides of the aisle who have spoken of the problems we shall be confronted with at the war's end. Today we are converting American industry to total war and are doing it under the impulse of national danger and under the impulse of our Nation's resolve to destroy the tyranny of the Axis Governments which has sought to enslave the entire world. But every single one of us knows that when the war is over a very different spirit will prevail. We know the people will want to be relieved as much as they can of every type of governmental compulsion, and we know, too, that if the job of reconverting industry to peacetime supplying of the needs of this Nation and of much of the world is not prepared for ahead of time that all kinds of dangers may confront us at that time. What I am appealing for basically is legislation such as that contained in this joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 291, reported unanimously by the Labor Committee and introduced by myself. What it will do is to set up a national commission on post-war reconstruction by act of Congress. There are a lot of people who are studying and planning for the post-war period—corporations, labor organizations, a dozen executive agencies, and many others. This work on their part I welcome. But it must be brought together somewhere or its net value will be small, indeed. And, anyway, I do not believe this responsibility ought to rest ultimately with a single body except this Congress, and if this Congress neglects that job long enough, it will, in my judgment, have neglected the most important obligation we have.

We cannot run the war; we can support those who do run it. We are doing it today in this bill, as one member of the committee put it, by some of the items that are included in it. Congress can offer constructive criticism and guidance; it can try to prevent waste; it can do its best to distribute the burdens equitably. But it cannot and should not try to run the war. On the other hand, the job of solving the problems of our domestic economy and our people after this war is over is a job that either this Congress must primarily do and be responsible for or if we do not, then, indeed, the future of this National Legislature and of democratic and constitutional government in this country will be imperiled. I do not think this is a job for Congress to do alone. I do think it is a job where Congress should take the initiative and the leadership, drawing upon the cooperative help of others. I think it should be done by an outstanding national commission, with Members of this Congress at its center but including members of the executive department and people from outside the Government completely coming in to do that job because of their experience in industry, labor, or agriculture; yes, in education or in the churches of the Nation or in cooperatives of the people—farmers, consumers, and others.

Mr. Chairman, when the soldiers come back from this war they will expect jobs to be ready for them. They have a right to expect that at the very least. And they ought to be jobs they can depend on, not jobs in an emergency program. And as time goes on, as we read the casualty lists, as the people of the country are asked to submit to rationings that they have not been asked to submit to yet, as we attempt to fight this total war to victory which we do not really know about yet, there is going to be one thing that will be prerequisite and that is going to be hope in the peoples' hearts about a brighter future for America. That hope has got to be based on the reasonable assurance that there will be jobs within the framework of economic liberty and freedom for all, that we can and will continue full production for peace even as we are now achieving it for war.

The Congress is the only body properly situated to initiate this type of work. I plead with the House not to wait too long, not to wait until the time for careful thought on this matter has passed. I certainly would not propose one thing that could in the slightest degree interfere with the war, but I tell you as time goes on the thing that will strengthen the war effort of this Nation and every other nation more than anything else I know of, except the bravery of the men in the armed forces itself, will be for us to demonstrate to the people of this Nation and other nations that a democratic body like this is capable of taking the leadership in working out in democratic fashion the difficult and complex problems of the future; not that we will institute now the things we believe should be done then but we will go through the process of submitting them and sifting them before the bar of public opinion and get the grass roots opinion of the American Nation in order that we may be intelligently able to proceed with a constructive legislative program, and a program for fundamental lasting health for the American economy when the war has been won.

I submit to the House that there is tremendous popular interest in this matter. One man who wrote a book in which he summarized the various work that is being done looking to the post-war period, told me only a couple of days ago, that that little booklet had gone into three printings already, that thousands upon thousands of copies of it had already been sold.

Mrs. NORTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey, chairman of the Labor Committee.

Mrs. NORTON. May I say to the gentleman that I have had a great many requests for copies of the hearings, held by the Labor Committee on his bill, which evidences a great deal of interest throughout the country for that type of legislation.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentlewoman form New Jersey, both for her contribution and for her very great help on this matter.

May I conclude by saying that I do not care whether my particular bill

passes or not. I am not an ambitious fellow, nor one who cares especially whether a measure in which he is deeply interested carries his name. The only thing I do have a conviction about is the general type of approach I have tried to use, which provides that Congress take leadership for this work and that the group to which the work is entrusted draw upon the cooperation of people completely outside of our Government because of the contribution that they have to make. I do want something done. I submit to my colleagues that this is a matter to which thought should be given, and careful thought.

I appreciate very deeply the unanimously favorable report that was given to the bill by the Labor Committee and especially the work of the subcommittee which held the hearings upon it and which was headed by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK]. The bill is House Joint Resolution 291, and that is a modification of my original bill which is the result of the deliberations of that subcommittee and its changes and amendments. We are living in days that shake the world. We have the greatest opportunity in all history to prove the effectiveness of democratic government and of this American National Legislature. We must see how big and important our job is and how directly we must assume responsibility for the reconstruction and orderly return to peacetime conditions that must follow the war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 2 additional minutes in order to ask him a question.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HARE. I have no opposition to offer at this time to the suggestion made by the gentleman in reference to establishing a post-war program, but I am sometimes fearful. The Congress makes provision for someone else to study problems, analyze them, make suggestions and solutions, then they bring those back to the Congress and Congress is inclined to make them into law. The question in my mind from a study of this question is whether or not this investigation should not be made by the appropriate committee of the House, consisting of the direct representatives of the people, men who come directly from the people, who are to be interested and who come from every section of the country and who have the viewpoint of the public. I have sometimes wondered, as I said, whether it would be better, instead of appointing commissions, boards, or committees outside of the Congress and independent of the Congress to study these problems for the Congress and the people, to assign a committee within the Congress itself to do this work?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman is saying in different words exactly the main thing I am pleading for. I, too, want to avoid having Congress leave the task to someone else. My bill provides that five Members of the House and five Members of the Senate shall be the core of this commission. I may say to the gentleman that so far as I am personally concerned, I should be most enthusiastic to support a measure where the whole official membership of such a committee consisted of Members of Congress, but I would want to add to that men and women representative of the different important groups of people throughout the country, should have a continuing and definitely recognized relationship to such a committee, and for the reason that it is most important for these groups and interests to commence to understand that they cannot ever solve these problems simply by making their demands, but that they must also take a share of responsibility in working out these problems in relation to the Nation as a whole.

I conclude by saying that basically I agree completely with the gentleman and the reason for my speech and my effort has been to get the Congress to take the initiative in this all-important work for the future of our country, the keeping faith with those who now fight her battles.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. CLEVENGER].

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Chairman, I think sometimes we make a lot of fuss over what a distinguished colleague from South Carolina, a Member of the other body, termed the lace trimming on the lingerie of legislation.

Up in my country the C. C. C. has been removed, the W. P. A. has been discontinued, and the heavens have not fallen. But now the casualties of war due to rationing are beginning to take place. I just spent a few days in my district. As you pass around the public squares of these typical midwestern towns you see the doors where formerly the tire man used to sell tires, where the electric shop used to sell electrical apparatus and washing machines, where the automobile salesmen formerly did business. As you meet neighbor after neighbor who has turned over the keys to his gasoline station, and gone out to seek some other way of life, you begin to realize that sooner or later we must look realistically at these economies and begin to trim somewhere along the line if this Nation is going to be strong enough to win the war.

We cannot all be labeled just obstructionists or isolationists, and all these other epithets applied to every American who still thinks there is something worth saving in this way of life of ours. I am willing to take all of that.

Let me read you a letter from the chamber of commerce of my city. It is in response to the following telegram of 105 words, sent out with great urgency under date of May 23, 1942. These went all over the Nation:

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Bryan, Ohio:

All retailers are being asked to cooperate in Nation-wide tribute to America's war effort on July 1 at 12 noon by suspending all sales of merchandise for 15 minutes and devoting this brief period to sale of War Savings stamps and bonds exclusively. We are counting upon your personal cooperation so that we may report 100-percent unity in this vital program to launch Nation-wide July campaign of retailers for victory. Will you advise how many of your local retailers will participate? Please wire as soon as possible, so that I may advise Secretary Morgenthau and President Roosevelt on Monday morning.

BENJAMIN H. NAMM,
Chairman, Retailer Advisory Committee, United States Treasury Department, Room 81, Treasury Building, Washington, D. C.

This is the letter sent by the secretary of the Bryan Business Men's Association to Mr. Namm:

DEAR MR. NAMM: Your telegram requesting all retail merchants to cooperate in Nation-wide tribute to America's war effort on July 1 at 12 noon by suspending all sales of merchandise for 15 minutes and devoting this brief period to sale of War Savings stamps and bonds exclusively, has been received. This community is selling every month more than its quota of War Savings stamps and bonds.

There are 40 days between the date of your telegram and the time you are asking these merchants to sell bonds. You spent between $4 and $5 to send me the telegram. A letter with the same information that was in the telegram would have reached me the same day or the next day after I received the telegram, which would have been carried by the mails without postage. If you and your associates did not waste the money which we are getting for the Government by the sale of stamps by sending such telegrams, we would appreciate it very much. The people who are now buying stamps and reducing their standard of living to furnish money for the Government would appreciate a little cooperation on the part of those at Washington who are recklessly, uselessly, and lavishly spending the money by sending this telegram at a cost of between $4 and $5 when it could have been carried by a frank through the mails. May I suggest to you that on July 1, at the hours mentioned, you ask every Government employee to pause for 15 minutes and ask his God to forgive him for the way he has been squandering the money which a patriotic nation has been sending.

The country is aroused to the war situation. Some of the officials who are spending the money are not aroused sufficiently to use this money for the purposes for which it is raised.

This community has oversubscribed every war drive and is regularly oversubscribing its quota for bonds. We ask your cooperation in spending this money for war purposes.

I may say that the sender of this letter has given his two sons to the service, one to the Navy and one to the Coast Guard.

As I go home and see these loyal citizens losing their businesses without complaint, not even raising their voices in protest as their means of livelihood pass, I think some of these crocodile tears that are shed for some of these "do-gooding" agencies are certainly without warrant and reason. I hope that the good sense of the American Congress will assert itself in trimming the lace off the lingerie of legislative action here today.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, one of the outstanding achievements of this administration is the Civilian Conservation Corps. We who have been in touch with it and know of the thousands, yes, the hundreds of thousands of boys who have received some inspiration, some help, and some training from it, can testify to the value of this institution. We have had in our State hundreds of these

camps which have done useful work in the forests, on the reclamation projects, and in the grazing districts.

In Oregon we have great stands of timber. We are cutting more timber than any other State in the Union and we have more standing timber than any other State. We can continue to cut more timber than any other State in the Union only if the forests are preserved and are protected from fires. Many of the Oregon camps were assigned to the timber regions. Some of them went out into the grasslands.

The triple C camps have done more useful work and made more valuable and permanent improvements in Oregon than any governmental agency has accomplished since I have been a citizen of that State, almost 60 years. We had miles upon miles of grazing land where grass grew knee high but on which we could not graze animals except in winter, when the sheep would eat the snow. There was no water. The boys have gone into these dry regions and made reservoirs, they have dug wells, and they have conserved water, until we have materially increased the carrying capacity of the land used for grazing in our State. The increased values have been almost solely attributable to the C. C. C. boys. In the mountains they have cut roads and paths and protected the forests from fire.

I do not want to be a prophet of disaster, but I do want my colleagues to realize the danger that lies in the possible destruction of the forests of the Pacific Northwest this very summer. If the Japanese planes come over, flying high, loaded with incendiary bombs, they can set a string of fires which it would take an army to extinguish.

I say to those who are opposing the appropriation for the C. C. C. camps that the Government could well afford to make the entire triple C appropriation to preserve Federal interest in Oregon's forests. It would be a wrong unpardonable to deny this protection to the Nation's timber, which is now so essential to the war effort.

The C. C. C. boys are trained fire fighters. They know how to protect the forests and how to live in the mountains. They are necessary to our defense program.

These forests will be worth untold millions in years to come if they are now protected. I cannot conceive how men who realize the necessity of guarding the forests this year can vote against an amendment to put back the C. C. C. appropriation. We have the fire-fighting plans and apparatus. What will they mean without trained men? Let us put back into the bill the C. C. C. camp money.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE].

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, now that I have heard the distinguished Representative from the State of Oregon discuss the worth of the C. C. C. camps, it might appear to me to be superfluous or supererogatory to utter any compliments concerning that enterprise on the part of the Government. It would be like painting the lily, because the gentleman from Oregon, Governor PIERCE, paid a merited tribute to a very worthy Federal activity, the C. C. C. camps.

Out in the far Pacific Northwest, where we have the finest stand of timber in the Western Hemisphere, we are immediately threatened by the menace of Japanese bombing. At this very moment the citizens of that area are on the alert, anticipating from hour to hour the arrival of Japanese planes. This vast acreage in which we find Douglas fir and cedar and hemlock and other lesser species contains the finest stand of timber we have and is one of our greatest national resources.

The War Production Board has recently imposed a freezing order upon lumber for anything except the most essential wartime activities because of the limitation in lumber-production potentials in the United States. These great trees are a treat to see when they are in the great, silent places of nature. They required centuries to grow to their full maturity. They reach a height of from 200 to 300 feet in the air. So thick are they that underneath their enveloping foliage, sunlight has difficulty in penetrating and it is semidark on the brightest summer day. Yet these trees in the fire-dry season face a terrible menace. The Japanese can fly over them with their bombers carrying magnesite-thermite and scatter-leaf bombs, such as are being used by Great Britain, in their planes, and that whole area could go up in flames in a period of 1 hour. I very much fear the possibility of these trees being consumed in the event of such a bombing.

The C. C. C. camps and the boys who are trained in those camps are in position to forestall that menace. They have built their trails and fire-protection works and they are familiar with the conditions and peculiarities of the forests. They understand how to prevent or anticipate the spread of fire. Anyone who has ever been in a fire in the great Pacific Northwest forests knows what a fascinating and yet an awe-inspiring and horrifying experience it is. Such a fire spreads with the speed of an express train. It creates its own wind and a wind which often reaches a velocity of 60 miles an hour due to the hot air caused by the blazing inferno of inflammable leaves and branches. The flames leap like kangaroos from tree to tree. These C. C. C. boys have sold themselves to the people of the area which I represent. Governor PIERCE represents a portion of the State of Oregon and I represent a part of the State of Washington. My home city of Tacoma proudly boasts of being the lumber capital of America. We have one mill which cuts 150,000,000 feet of lumber a year. The whole economy of my State is tied up with the lumber industry. Sixty-eight percent of all the income received by the people in the State of Washington comes directly from the lumber industry. The lumber industry is interwoven inseparably with the continuation of those great stands of trees. Aside from the commercial aspect there is the consideration of the supply of timber cogently needed for reconstruction after the war.

I join with Governor PIERCE and the Representatives of the Pacific Northwest in deploring the action of the House Committee on Appropriations in eliminating the C. C. C., actuated, as I know they were, by the highest considerations and the most patriotic motives. They indubitably felt that this was a proper place in which to impose economies. But there are economies and economies. Sometimes economies are more expensive than to expend the money as was provided originally in this bill for the C. C. C. camps. These boys are denied thus the benefit of the C. C. C. training, but I am not concerned about that now. My constituents are insistently urging that the framework of this great, experienced C. C. C. organization be retained and that this great, impending danger of Jap-caused forest fires be prevented, if possible.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, we have no further speakers on this side.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses, Division of Labor Standards: For salaries and expenses, including purchase and distribution of reports, and of material for informational exhibits, in connection with the promotion of health, safety, employment stabilization, and amicable industrial relations for labor and industry, $146,585.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. HARE: Page 3, line 19, after the words "salaries and", insert the word "other."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Traveling expenses, Federal Security Agency: For traveling expenses (not appropriated for elsewhere) for the Federal Security Agency and all bureaus, boards, and constituent organizations thereof, including actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving, while away from their homes, without other compensation, in an advisory capacity to the Federal Security Agency; expenses, when specifically authorized by the Federal Security Administrator, of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Federal Security Agency; and reimbursement, at not to exceed 3 cents per mile, for travel performed by employees of the Federal Security Agency in privately owned automobiles and within the limits of their official stations, when engaged in the investigation of claims for the furnishing or securing of information concerning claims or wage records under title II of the Social Security Act, as amended (42 U. S. C. 401–409), $1,730,884.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following committee amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. HARE: Page 16, line 20, strike out the word "for" and insert the word "or."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: Page 18, after the title "Civilian Conservation Corps", insert the following——

Mr. TARVER (interrupting the reading). Mr. Chairman, the language of this amendment is exactly the same as the language which was reported in the bill as reported by the subcommittee to the full Committee on Appropriations, and copies of that are available to all persons. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be printed in the RECORD at this point, and that the further reading of the amendment at this time be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. Is it the intention that this amendment should be debated tonight?

Mr. TARVER. It is my understanding that the chairman of the committee intends to ask that the committee rise after the submission of this amendment and that debate upon the amendment be taken up tomorrow. Further, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the provision in the bill relating to the Civilian Conservation Corps, to which my amendment has just been offered, be passed over for today, and that the Clerk continue with the reading of the bill.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object to that.

Mr. TARVER. And that it be in order to consider my amendment tomorrow.

The CHAIRMAN. There is one request pending now.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I hope that unanimous consent will be granted that the provisions of the bill relating to the Civilian Conservation Corps with the pending amendment be passed over and that the bill be read down to page 24, line 13, at which time I understand a motion to rise will be made.

Mr. TABER. And I presume it is intended by that that it may be in order to offer other amendments following the one that has been offered if it is so desired, with reference to the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

Mr. TARVER. Following the disposition of the amendment now offered.

Mr. McCORMACK. Certainly. In other words, every Member's right will be protected to offer any amendment which would be germane.

Mr. TABER. And that we read the other 6 pages in between.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia that the reading of the Tarver amendment be dispensed with and that it be printed in the RECORD at this point?

There was no objection.

The Tarver amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: On page 18, after the title "Civilian Conservation Corps", insert the following:

"For all necessary expenses to carry into effect the provisions of the act of June 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C., ch. 3A), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the purchase and exchange of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals; the purchase (including exchange), operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; hire, with or without personal services, of work animals, animal-drawn and motor-propelled vehicles, and watercraft; printing and binding; travel expenses, including not to exceed $2,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the corps when specifically authorized by the Federal Security Administrator; transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940, and regulations promulgated thereunder; construction, improvement, repair, and maintenance of buildings, but the cost of any building erected hereunder shall not exceed $25,000, as follows:

"For pay, subsistence, medical services, etc.: For pay, subsistence, travel, clothing (and repair thereof), medical services, including hospitalization, fees and travel of physicians, dentists, veterinarians, and nurses, burial of enrollees, payment (not exceeding $50 for any one transfusion) to any enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps or other individual furnishing blood for transfusion to the veins of an enrollee or discharged enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps undergoing treatment in a hospital, authorized to treat such patient, $49,499,288;

"For all other necessary expenses, both field and departmental, in connection with the administration of camps and work projects, $26,318,712;

"The Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps may authorize the exchange of motor-propelled and horse-drawn vehicles, tractors, road equipment, and boats, and parts, accessories, tires, or equipment thereof, in whole or in part payment for other vehicles, tractors, road equipment, or boats, or parts, accessories, tires, or equipment of such vehicles, tractors, road equipment, or boats.

"No part of any appropration in this act for the Civilian Conservation Corps or the National Youth Administration shall be available for obligation after the effective date of any Executive order consolidating such agencies or transferring any of the functions of either of such agencies to the other."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all of the provisions relating to the C. C. C., together with the pending amendment and any other amendments which have been or may be offered, be passed over for consideration when the Committee of the Whole begins its work on tomorrow, and that the Committee of the Whole then proceed with the further consideration of the bill down through line 13 on page 24.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, in that connection I ask unanimous consent that debate on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] be limited to not to exceed 2 hours.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, if we have 2 hours' debate on that and then have a lot of other debate on the other amendments that may be offered to the C. C. C. item, it would be rather liberal. It would seem to me that you should at least limit the debate to 10 minutes on any future amendment that may be offered to the C. C. C. provision. Two hours should be plenty of time to debate the C. C. C., in my opinion, and we ought to get rid of the debate on the C. C. C., both this amendment and any further amendments, in that time.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say I intend to ask unanimous consent that the House meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

Mr. TABER. Yes; that should be done.

Mr. ENGEL. Reserving the right to object, I understand that the 2 hours is to be divided equally between the proponents and opponents of the amendment; is that correct?

Mr. HARE. I have no objection. I will include that in my request, that the time on this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 2 hours, the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan and myself, and divided equally.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I do not think it is fair at this time to undertake to limit debate on all amendments that may be offered to this portion of the bill, when the committee is not advised as to what those amendments are, nor as to what time it may be desired to devote to their discussion. I have in mind another amendment which I may offer to this provision of the bill, and if it should be found that all of the 2 hours is consumed in discussion of the amendment I have just offered and I have no time whatever to discuss the other amendment, I do not think the situation would be exactly what it should be, in justice to the committee as well as to myself. I hope that the request of the gentleman may be limited to the fixing of time on the pending amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, would it not be enough if we had an hour and a half on this particular amendment and then we could decide with reference to the others as we came to them? It seems as if that would be sufficient.

Mr. TARVER. The amendment is of very great interest to a number of Members of the House who have indicated their desire to discuss it. I do not think that within an hour and a half it would be possible for all of the gentlemen who desire to be heard to have an opportunity to address the committee. When the matter of the abolition of an organization of the Government which has been maintained for so many years is under discussion, certainly it seems to me that the House of Representatives should take 2 hours to develop fully the facts with regard to the issue.

Mr. TABER. Very well, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. HARE. They should have been here today. If they were so terribly interested, they should have been here today.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman kindly restate his request?

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I renew my original request, that on the pending amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] the time for debate be limited to not to exceed 2 hours.

Mr. ENGEL. Reserving the right to object, with the understanding that the time is to be divided and controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina and myself.

Mr. HARE. Yes; the time on the amendment offered by Judge TARVER and all amendments thereto, the time to be controlled by myself and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

Mr. TARVER. Reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman should submit the request that the time should be equally divided between the proponents and opponents of the amendment. I believe that is the method of division which would be fairest. I earnestly hope that the gentleman will modify his request so as to have it contain that provision.

Mr. HARE. I can assure the gentleman that as far as I am concerned I shall yield my time to the gentleman proposing the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Expenses, Howard University: For equipment, supplies, apparatus, furniture, cases and shelving, stationery, ice, repairs to buildings and grounds, and for other necessary expenses of the university, $183,000.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that that section of the bill between line 14 on page 24 to and including line 2 on page 35 be passed over until tomorrow and that the Clerk continue to read the bill after line 2 on page 35.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

If during the fiscal years 1942 or 1943 functions are transferred by the Federal Security Administrator from or between any of the said offices or bureaus, the Administrator may transfer from or between the appropriations herein made for salarier for the Social Security Board the amounts necessary for personal services in connection with the functions so transferred.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. HARE: Page 66, line 11, strike out the word "on" and insert the word "of."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 704. This act may be cited as the "Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1943."

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein an article entitled, "Defenseless Alaska, the Ramparts We Do Not Watch," which is a reprint from Liberty magazine of July 20, 1940.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of gasoline control.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and other special orders, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that following the other special orders today I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ARMY WAR SHOW, BALTIMORE, SUNDAY, JUNE 14, 1942

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I should like to take this opportunity to invite the membership of the House to attend the Army War Show to be held in the Baltimore Stadium from June 12 to 15. Maj. Charles Spencer Hart, representing the War Department, will be the officer in charge.

For the first time, civilians will have an opportunity to see 1,500 soldiers from our Regular Army in realistic battle fashion demonstrate the speed and power of practically every type of modern weapon, showing the finest military equipped force in the world.

The purposes of the Army War Show are—

First. To give our citizens the opportunity of seeing at first hand their modern Army and Army equipment and its uses.

Second. How the Army lives, works, and fights.

Third. To strengthen civilian morale and thereby inspire even greater war production effort.

Fourth. To raise funds for the Army Emergency Relief. The entire proceeds of the war show are for the Army Emergency Relief.

The show will include a grand review, crack Infantry demonstration, Field Artillery in action, engineers and camouflage troops in gigantic demonstration, airplane squadron in action, antiaircraft demonstration, Signal Corps exhibition, all forces and equipment in tremendous battle action, a patriotic fireworks display featuring the bombing of Tokyo, together with many other features.

I believe that if all the members of the House and Senate would attend this war show on Sunday evening, June 14, it would be a fine compliment to our fighting forces, and I most cordially invite all of you to be present.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a brief article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a statement made by me before the Judiciary Committee.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WRIGHT] is recognized for 20 minutes.

JOHN L. LEWIS

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak today about a man who was once revered and trusted by many thousand Americans, who was a great leader of labor and the spearhead in the movement to unite into one vast labor organization all the workers in those industries which commonly employ mass production methods. The labor movement of which I speak has come to be known as the C. I. O., or the Congress of Industrial Organizations, and the man to whom I refer is John L. Lewis. Today he has fallen from his high esteem among many who once revered him. Prompted by pique and thwarted ambition he has sought to undo much of the valuable service he has rendered to trade-unionism of America.

I do not wish to detract in any way from the worth of that service. In the history to be written in the future his leadership in the organization of the steel workers, the electrical and the automo-

bile workers, among others, and in the bringing together with them under one fold other great groups of workmen such as the ship workers and the garment and hosiery workers, will be an important chapter in the chronicle of our times. His courage and indomitable will during these times of bitter feelings, of resistance on the part of industry frequently culminating in physical struggle and bloodshed were responsible, at least in part, for the success of this movement.

I believe that in forming this union, or this congress of unions, he performed an important service to his country as well as to the cause of trade-unionism. The workers he helped to organize sorely needed the benefits of union organization. The employer-employee relations in the mass-production industries were menaced from the workers' point of view by the twin evils of industrial monopoly of the labor market and absentee ownership. By dominating the labor market, the large employers made it impossible for the workman to seek better pay elsewhere and so compelled him to work upon its own terms or else remain idle.

Due to absentee ownership—caused by the gradual separation of the functions of production and those of control and ownership in large industry—the workers' only contact with their employer, who was possibly a banker or financier, was through a local superintendent, without authority to meet their grievances, forced by the conditions of his employment to adopt the company's point of view rather than their own. This explanation is perhaps trite, but much of the discussion upon this subject has neglected this simple and fundamental fact, that the workers in large industries who were unorganized, or who were organized in separate competing unions, were completely at the mercy of their employer as to wages and working conditions.

These facts necessitated the formation of a union with membership recruited from an entire industry and whose heads could speak for all the workers of that industry and protect their rights. In leading this vast democratic movement then, John L. Lewis aided appreciably in ameliorating the conditions of a large segment of our population and for this service deserves the gratitude of the public at large.

What then diverted the career of this leader from the service of his people? For now he has fallen into disrepute with his former admirers and has brought upon himself the condemnation of most of the representatives of labor. My own disillusionment dates from the last Presidential campaign. I have not raised my voice publicly until this time because I did not wish my criticism of him to be construed as hostility to the labor movement. Organized labor had many attackers at that time who were both vocal and denunciatory, and I wished to be counted as a friend of the worker and not as his enemy. It is only now that he has attacked a man that I consider a patriotic God-fearing leader of the people, Philip Murray, the president of the C. I. O., that I feel impelled to take sides in this controversy, and let it be known where I stand.

I was not disillusioned with Mr. Lewis because he voted for Wendell Willkie. Many people that I respect did likewise. All of us, regardless of politics, consider Mr. Willkie a fine American and a worthy candidate of a great party. It was not his support of the Republican Party that caused me to lose faith in him. If, as the leader of a great labor movement, he felt that a Republican victory would help his union members it was his duty to change his party allegiance. But I knew, and we all knew, that this was not the reason he opposed President Roosevelt. I knew that his opposition was personal, it was against Roosevelt the man rather than against the policies he espoused, and that private differences with the President had turned his championship into dislike, a dislike which in a man of his nature is akin to a bitter hatred. I realized then that this man would tolerate no opposition in any field, would ride roughshod over anyone who might differ with him, and would seek to destroy those with whom he could not have his way, even in matters of a minor nature. I knew then that the courage I admired in him partook of a blind obstinacy, and that the strong will that had won for him in the early days of the C. I. O. was coupled with an uncompromising and destructive egoism that would tear down anything which it could not dominate. He turned against his friend, the President, in those days of 1940, and now in 1942 he has turned against his friend, Philip Murray, who all his life has worked hard and ungrudgingly beside him, because after he had supported Philip Murray for the presidency of the C. I. O. he found he could not own him body and soul.

I thought at that time that this vindictive and despotic nature that I had glimpsed in Mr. Lewis boded no good for our country. I wanted a strong and free labor movement, but I feared to see it under the leadership of a tyrant. I wished to see leading this movement a wise and patriotic American, brave in protecting his people from injustice, but humble in the knowledge of the responsibility of his office, and its influence for good or evil upon his country. That is why I, and how many more like me I cannot tell, breathed with relief when Mr. Murray, a man whom we knew and trusted, was elected to the presidency of the C. I. O.

Much of the criticism that has in the past year been heaped upon organized labor is, I am convinced, prompted not so much by a desire to oppress the worker as by a lack of understanding of labor's problems and of acquaintance with its recent history. I remembered the bitter struggle with "little steel" and with the automobile manufacturers. I knew the hostility and suspicion between management and labor that was born of these struggles and that still existed through 1941. I was impatient with the strikes that delayed to some extent our production of armament during that period, because I had at that time a growing conviction that we could not escape war. We were all in Washington imbued with this fatalism, and we were desperately anxious for maximum production. I knew, however, that repressive antistrike legislation was laden with dynamite, I knew the temper of the workers, I knew they were not yet thinking in terms of war, and I had the hope which has since been justified that these delays would soon be stopped by amicable agreement. I had confidence that the leadership of the C. I. O. wanted production just as badly as I did, that it was uncompromisingly opposed to Nazi tyranny and wholeheartedly behind our war effort, and that in addition, due to a more intimate knowledge of working conditions, had a far better sense of timing as to strike prevention than I did myself. I think later events have borne me out, and since Pearl Harbor at least there is no question of work stoppages due to labor disputes.

I would not have had this trust in the solution of labor problems had John L. Lewis still been leader of the C. I. O. With an obliviousness to the recent history of European labor which I cannot understand—unless caused by his bitterness to the President—he opposed our defense program, and I do not doubt influenced many engaged in vital production with his ideas. He had also, I remember, at that time the vociferous support of those few whose opposition to the Axis dated only from the German invasion of Russia. Then the captive coal strike of 1941 was called and the Nation gasped at Lewis' effrontery. All other major labor disputes were settled or in the process of settlement at that time. We were all bending our backs to increase our industrial production. We were closer and closer to war, and with a callous disregard for the feelings of the entire country Lewis called out the miners in a controversy over a closed shop. I have never felt that the miners were not entitled to a closed shop, but I was shocked that he should so abuse his power at the time of his country's danger. He surely would not have prejudiced their rights had he waited for a more opportune time for there was no controversy as to the wages they were paid. He could have done nothing to more profoundly injure the cause of organization in the minds of the people. Good labor men were worried about the consequences, and people generally made to feel that organized labor was a selfish group that was taking advantage of the plight of the country. From that time the thought became generally prevalent that power had made John L. Lewis reckless and a dangerous influence in American life.

As to what has occurred as a background for the present controversy, much of it has, of course, been behind the scenes. Eaten by his jealousy, bitter that he no longer determined the policies for the C. I. O., with his characteristic effrontery, Lewis sought to shortcut the president of that organization and to belittle his prestige. Without consulting with Mr. Murray, he announced that he, who had previously wrecked such peace movements, would bring together the two labor organizations—the C. I. O. and the A. F. of L. With becoming dignity Mr. Murray disavowed these proposals, stating that any such movement should properly emanate from the leadership of

these organizations. William Green, of the A. F. of L., likewise paid no attention to the Lewis overtures. The leaders were not hostile, however, to the thought of reconciliation. I have no doubt that conversations had already been had to that end when Lewis made his announcement. Culminating whatever negotiations they might have had, at Pittsburgh in a meeting which I attended, both Mr. Murray and Mr. Green pledged peace between their organizations, with no union raiding and no jurisdictional disputes. They both relinquished for their organizations the right to strike for the duration of the war. It was a great day for organized labor, and indicated the feeling of responsibility of the membership for the welfare of their country.

Defeated in this move, Mr. Lewis then sought to embarrass the C. I. O. by attempting to collect from it a large sum which he maintained was lent by the United Mine Workers to the former group in its early organization days. His mine workers refused to pay dues to the C. I. O. until the money was repaid. That this claim was insincere is patent from the facts. Never during Mr. Lewis' presidency, nor even during the first year of Mr. Murray's incumbency, was there any claim made for the return of this amount. The timing of this demand shortly after Mr. Murray's rebuke in the A. F. of L. incident shows plainly that it was merely a pretext, that Mr. Lewis' intention was to embarrass the C. I. O. and its president, Mr. Murray. He had again shown his vindictiveness. Since he could no longer dominate the C. I. O., his own creation, he tried to injure and destroy it.

Simultaneously a campaign of attack against Mr. Murray was started among the mine workers by the salaried henchmen of Lewis with the view of unseating Murray as vice president of the mine workers. It must be remembered that Murray received no compensation as president of the C. I. O. and that at this time the steel workers group was only an organizing group and not a full-fledged union with salaried officers. The only compensation Mr. Murray received was as vice president of the United Mine Workers, and Lewis determined to drive him from that position.

This maneuver must have been apparent to the steel workers, who are devoted to Mr. Murray to a man, and who, indeed, revere him almost as a saint. The delegates met together, formed the United Steel Workers, and unanimously elected Mr. Murray as the president, with an adequate salary. There was no question where they stood. The other large unions comprising the C. I. O. also rallied to Mr. Murray's support and strongly condemned John Lewis for his destructive tactics. Even high officials of the United Mine Workers, particularly those in western Pennsylvania and West Virginia, whose jobs were at the mercy of Lewis' policy board, proclaimed their loyalty to Murray. In the final scene of the farce Lewis, amid charges against Murray of disloyalty to unionism, declared the office of vice president of the Mine Workers vacant.

This might appear to some as merely a quarrel within a labor organization and a matter of indifference to the general public. It is much more than that. There is no body of men in America today whose unity and all-out effort is more necessary to the winning of the war than organized labor. There is likewise no body of men who are more zealous or determined in their course of action when they become aroused. Labor and its leadership are burningly convinced that their future depends upon victory in war. The two unions have buried the hatchet. This war is a crusade to them and they will not tolerate Lewis stirring up trouble in labor ranks and jamming the wheels of production. They feel that the survival of this country is far less important to him than the survival of his own autocratic power. He is out to make trouble, and it is up to us to see that he is not successful.

We feel in Pennsylvania in the heart of the heavy industrial district—and our sentiments are echoed in Detroit, on the Atlantic coast, and in every section where the wheels of industry grind out material for war—that John L. Lewis has outlived his usefulness as a leader, that he has fallen from his high estate as a spokesman for working people, and that he is on his way to becoming one of the most sinister figures in contemporary American life.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

BOARD OF LEGAL EXAMINERS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, the Board of Legal Examiners was established by the President in the Civil Service Commission by Executive Order 8743 of April 23, 1941. It began work last summer and has been functioning during the present fiscal year on an allocation of funds made by the Civil Service Commission. The independent offices bill for 1943 included about $100,000 in the total for the Civil Service Commission to finance this work. The House committee disapproved this item and recommended a prohibition on the use of funds for the Board. There was no contest on the floor of the House. The Senate committee recommended elimination of the prohibition, and, as the bill passed the Senate, the Civil Service Commission is authorized to sustain the Board from its general funds.

The establishment of the Board derives from the report of the distinguished Committee on Civil Service Improvement, headed by Mr. Justice Reed. The primary functions of the Board are to hold competitive examinations for the establishment of registers of attorneys available for the Government service, and, pending the establishment of registers, to pass noncompetitively on the qualifications of persons selected for appointment by the various departments and agencies. Only in the lower grades will written examinations be employed, and even there they will be designed to test capacity rather than memory. In all instances the examining process will lean heavily upon oral interviews before examining committees drawn from the profession itself. Most important of all, the examination and the interviews will be conducted throughout the country with the result that recruitment for the Government legal service will proceed on a Nation-wide scale. This is a matter of considerable importance under ordinary circumstances. It is uniquely important at the present time when experienced lawyers everywhere are eager to serve the Government, if only for the duration of the war.

Since the establishment of the Board more than 200 oral examinations have been held and more than 1,200 appointments have been cleared, involving individuals from every State in the Union, from almost every law school in the country, and with every conceivable type of experience and background.

In some instances examinations are given outside of Washington, as where the appointment is in the field or where the nominee is at a distance from the Capital and should not be permitted to come here until his appointment has been approved. In such cases the examination is given by a regional committee composed of distinguished practitioners or judges in the area in which the applicant lives. Ultimately the Board will establish standing regional committees to function on a permanent though voluntary basis throughout the country. This system of regional administration will bring to bear upon the selection of attorneys for the Government service the insight and professional ability of the various local bars. The regional committees will also play a crucial part in the administration of the competitive program for the establishment of registers.

While the Board has no power to effect appointments, it can and does serve as a clearing house for the hundreds of applicants who come to Washington in search of legal employment without established contacts or knowledge of the employment situation. Such persons are interviewed and given whatever information may be of use to them in presenting their applications to agencies having positions to fill. Moreover, the Board also receives numerous applications by mail, which are carefully cataloged and made available to the various agencies which may desire to examine them. In this way many of the worst features of the present employment practice are ameliorated pending the development of a recruitment program on a national scale.

The Board consists of the Solicitor General and the Chief Legal Examiner of the Civil Service Commission, as members ex officio and, as members appointed by the President, five of the chief law officers of the Government, two law teachers, and two practicing attorneys. Its members at the present time are Solicitor General Fahy, acting chairman; John Q. Cannon, Civil Service Commission; Clifford J. Durr, member of the Federal Communications Commission; Edward H. Foley, general counsel of the Treasury Department; Abe Fortas, general counsel of the National Power Policy Committee and acting director of the Division of Power of the Department of Interior; Gerard D. Reilly, member of the National Labor Relations Board; Paul R. Hays, of the faculty of law at

Columbia University and a member of the New York State Board of Mediation; M. T. Van Hecke, professor at the Law School of the University of North Carolina; Marion Smith, a distinguished member of the Atlanta bar; and Philip J. Wickser, a member of the New York State Board of Law Examiners and an attorney in Buffalo, N. Y.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOUSTON. I yield.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Who is the Executive Director, or the secretary of the Board? Is it not Mr. Wickser?

Mr. HOUSTON. Wickser; yes.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Is not Mr. Wickser the Government attorney who wrote the Government's brief which in the Supreme Court led to the conviction of Earl Browder?

Mr. HOUSTON. I think that is absolutely correct. I may say to my friend from Massachusetts that in the event there is any controversy over the Americanism of Mr. Wickser he has volunteered to step clear out of this picture, which I think is very fine on his part.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Wickser was former secretary to Mr. Chief Justice Stone. His loyalty and his record speak for themselves.

Mr. HOUSTON. I think that is right.

The Board of Legal Examiners has been at work for less than a year, but the record of the appropriation hearings leaves no doubt that it has made substantial progress. It has the confidence of the Attorney General and of the various Government counsel upon whose appointees it must pass. It has the support of the American Bar Association and the approval of the law schools. The Civil Service Commission, originally partial to a different program, has expressed complete satisfaction with the administration of the present plan. These are solid achievements which will be wasted unless the Senate's view prevails, and I urge that the House agree with the Senate.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a telegram of my colleague, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN.]

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HAINES for today and Friday on account of important personal business.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 5, 1942, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Friday, June 5, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearing in connection with the Federal Communications Commission.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, June 16, 1942.

Business to be considered: H. R. 7002, to increase agricultural purchasing power and to meet the need of combating malnutrition among the people of low income by defining and making certain a reasonable definition and standard for nonfat dry milk solids.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m., on Tuesday, June 9, for consideration of war housing, room 1304, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 11, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 7105, to provide for the suspension, during the war of operating differential subsidy agreements and attendant benefits, under title V of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1713. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated May 22, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and two illustrations, on a preliminary examination and survey of the Hocking River, Ohio, and in the vicinity of Athens, Ohio, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on June 28, 1938 (H. Doc. No. 762); to the Committee on Flood Control and ordered to be printed, with two illustrations.

1714. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $4,825,000, together with drafts of proposed provisions pertaining to existing appropriations and proposed authorization for the expenditure of Indian tribal funds (H. Doc. No. 766); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1715. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of Agriculture totaling $10,430,000, two for the fiscal year 1943 in the total sum of $680,000 and one in the amount of $9,750,000 for the fiscal year 1942, to remain available until June 30, 1943; a draft of a proposed provision affecting an appropriation for the fiscal year 1943; and an estimate of appropriation for administrative expenses payable from the funds of the Federal Mortgage Corporation for the fiscal year 1942 (H. Doc. No. 764); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1716. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the National War Labor Board of the Office for Emergency Management, for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $1,167,000 (H. Doc. No. 765); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1717. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of Price Administration for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $161,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 763); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Committee on the Judiciary. Senate Joint Resolution 144. Joint resolution designating June 13, 1942, as MacArthur Day, and authorizing its appropriate observance; without amendment (Rept. No. 2211). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOWNS: Committee on War Claims. H. R. 1322. A bill for the relief of Frank Burgess Bruce; without amendment (Rept. No. 2208). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana: Committee on War Claims. S. 1075. An act for the relief of George S. Geer; without amendment (Rept. No. 2209). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MILLS of Louisiana: Committee on War Claims. S. 1667. An act for the relief of Mike Chetkovich; without amendment (Rept. No. 2210). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 7188. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 7189. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Code; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JENKINS of Ohio:

H. R. 7190. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works in the basin of the Hocking River, Ohio, for flood control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. JACKSON:

H. R. 7191. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands not in Federal ownership within the Olympic National Park, Washington, for national forest lands in the State of Washington; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 7192. A bill to provide for the adoption of a Housing Code regulating the use, occupancy, safety, and sanitary conditions of dwellings in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania:

H. Con. Res. 68: Concurrent resolution expressing the appreciation and gratitude of Congress for the heroic work of the officers and crews of oil tankers; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. Res. 500. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before Subcommittee No. 3 of said committee on the bill (H. R. 7067) relative to injunctions against illegitimate labor practices and outlawing racketeering; to the Committee on Printing.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3012. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the Epworth Methodist Church, New Castle, Pa., urging immediate legislation which will remove alcoholic liquor and vice from around and in the training camps of the armed forces of our country; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3013. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition transmitted by Mrs. Eldon Katz, corresponding secretary, Woman's Society of Christian Service of Munith, Mich., and signed by 61 other residents of Jackson County, Mich., urging enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3014. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Coopers International Union of North America, Local Union 65, at San Francisco, Calif., relative to House bill 6486, a bill to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3015. By Mr. WHEAT: Petition of members of the First Baptist Church of Decatur, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3016. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Arthur, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3017. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Decatur, Ill., urging early passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3018. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Oreana, Welden, and rural routes 1, 2, and 5, of Decatur and Argenta, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3019. Also, petition of the women of the Women's Society of Christian Service of the Mahomet Methodist Church, Mahomet, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3020. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. J. W. Stoker and Mr. and Mrs. Earl A. Wheeler, of Decatur, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3021. By Mr. WHITE: Petition of the Worth While Club of Moscow, Idaho, concerning conservation of food materials now being manufactured into liquor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3022. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of L. C. Larson and other citizens of West Branch, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860, providing for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 5, 1942

The House met at 11 o'clock.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Lord, touch our spirits, that we may see Thy paths and feel a sincere heartthrobbing in all our ways. We pray for an inspiration that we may, with fidelity, patience, and dignity, meet the obligations which our country has laid upon us. Grant that we may hallow Thy name in all that we may do, that no regrets may follow in the wake of our thoughts to disturb our peace.

Keep in our minds the truth that morality will be impoverished without the cultivation of the religious sentiments and the divine attributes. As wounded vanities and disappointed hopes are the fruits of unrest, oh teach us that Thou art the source of a great calm and an invulnerable faith. Bless the comradeship of our common bonds and the strength of a high resolution to cherish the love for home, the church, and our native Land. For the sake of Him who looked forth as the morning and as clear as the sun. In Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. J. Res. 319. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Bulgaria and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same;

H. J. Res. 320. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Hungary and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same; and

H. J. Res. 321. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Rumania and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2467. An act to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6845) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2048. An act for the relief of Lt. William Stewart Walker.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6802) entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2250) entitled "An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes."

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors may have permission to sit while the House is in session during all of next week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with that old story of the dog in the manger. The dog could not eat the hay but he would not allow the ox to enjoy it. This morning it develops that one of the factors behind the proposed rationing of gasoline throughout the United States, including the oil-producing areas, is the dog-in-the-manger attitude of those who because of geographical factors cannot use the abundant gasoline of the Southwest but who do not want the people of that region to use it. One of the leading daily papers of this city today publishes a statement to the effect that the oil-producing States should not be allowed to use more gasoline than those States where it is difficult to get the oil.

Gasoline rationing, of course, is justified wherever there is an actual shortage of gasoline, but where the gasoline is abundant and where no one else needs it, those who cannot use it should not object to those who have it using it.

We simply ask justice that the great sections of the United States that produce gasoline in abundance shall not be destroyed and their economy ruined simply because other sections are not fortunate enough to have the gasoline available. Motor transportation is much more important to our thinly populated land of magnificent distances than it is to the metropolitan areas of the East. Nevertheless, our people are willing to sacrifice anything and everything to win this war so long as those sacrifices aid in the winning of the war, but do not call on the people to make a sacrifice that has no relation whatever to the winning of the war simply because some sections must make sacrifices and because the major oil companies see an opportunity to break thousands of independent oil producers and dealers.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD in two instances and to include addresses I made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a telegram relating to the national rationing of gasoline.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Minneapolis Star Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, along the line of the speech of the distinguished gentleman from Texas, I want to call the attention of the Members of the House to the fact that in Montana we have all kinds of gas and oil. If gas should be rationed in Montana it is going to seriously affect our farmers in the production of the necessary things to carry on this war, namely, grain, sheep, cattle, sugar beets, and all of those products. It is a country of vast distances. Three gallons of gasoline, or even 6 gallons of gasoline, will not take a farmer to town and get him back home in many instances.

In addition to that we have a tremendous amount of farm machinery that is propelled by means of gasoline power on which there is not one single pound of rubber. These machines have metal wheels and are made entirely of metal. A policy of rationing gas will not conserve rubber except in a trivial way. It is just limiting the farmers in their ability to carry on the operations of their farms and their livestock production.

It is silly and, in fact, is the acme of asininity to ration gasoline in such a State as Montana in which State we can produce enough gas for nearly all of the Western States if we need to. Moreover, if those owning cars are required to park them in garages and in lots outdoors, the tires will depreciate there as badly as if they were used.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include two articles from the Boston Traveler edited by Dennis W. DeLaney.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LANE]?

There was no objection.

THE LATE EDMUND M. TOLAND

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it is with profound regret that I take the floor to announce the sudden passing away last evening of Edmund M. Toland, general counsel for the Naval Affairs Investigating Committee. His death came suddenly in the middle of a vigorous campaign which he was waging, with characteristic zeal, as counsel for the committee in its investigation of the national defense program.

He devoted the major portion of his career to the public service, and a good many of these years were spent here on the hill. The service which gained him the greatest fame and from which he derived the greatest satisfaction was his service as counsel to congressional investigating committees. His zeal and devotion to duty in this service in a large measure hastened his untimely end.

He served his Government faithfully and well. His contribution to the present war effort through results achieved in the reduction of war costs deserves recognition and the highest commendation. The extent of that contribution cannot be measured, however, in terms of the energy, zeal, and devotion to duty which marked that service.

The loss of Mr. Toland will be seriously felt by the Naval Affairs Committee and by the country he served so well.

SUGAR RATIONING

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that in the Office of Price Administration there are many young gentlemen from universities in the East who are very capable in their work, but to my mind a lot of them are not yet dry behind the ears. I will tell you why.

Regulations are being put into effect telling the farmers of my county that they must go to the county seat, 25 or more miles away in some instances, to get a permit to buy a little extra sugar to can a few strawberries. If these people here in Washington were practical, they would provide that every village in the United States should have points where sugar-rationing permits could be issued, and not require the use of sufficient gas and rubber to travel 50 miles, said gasoline and rubber, according to these same gentlemen, being essential to national defense.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein excerpts from a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

LABOR RACKETEERING

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that something should be done about this situation confronting the truck drivers of the country. People operating trucks, such as people from central Pennsylvania, who want to get into the city of New York, cannot drive their trucks in there and unload them unless their men join the truckers union and pay tribute to that organization for driving a truck. Where has American freedom gone to? Such acts are un-American. Just this last week a truck loaded with props from the Eastern Shore of Maryland tried to get into the navy yard at Camden to deliver a load of prop timber that had been ordered over the telephone for at-once delivery, but the driver was not allowed to deliver this much-needed timber, which the navy yard needed, because the truck drivers did not pay tribute to racketeers.

It seems to me the radical labor leaders of this country have the country by the neck. We have a Labor Committee in the House of Representatives, and they sit down and do nothing. Why do they not legislate to stop it? Are we going to permit the radicals of this country to domineer or are we going to have law and justice? It seems to me we ought either to get a new labor committee or we ought to have some justice administered by the Chief Executive on this point. You have given him power to stop it. His inactivity and the inactivity of the Department of Labor shows that the administration approves of such un-American and radical activities.

In the name of American liberty, in the name of American freedom, let the Congress stop it and do it at once.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Providence Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein the text of a short bill and a report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

MACARTHUR DAY

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 144) designating June 13, 1942, as MacArthur Day, and authorizing its appropriate observance.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas the members of the United States land and naval forces who participated in

the defense of the Bataan Peninsula have, by their heroic stand, won the admiration of the peoples of all of the United Nations; and

Whereas such forces were first led by Gen. Douglas MacArthur and then by Gen. Jonathan Wainwright, who each exhibited sterling qualities of leadership in the defense of the Philippine Islands; and

Whereas it is fitting that a day should be set aside and commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises as an honor to Generals MacArthur and Wainwright and to all the officers and men who took part in the defense of the Bataan Peninsula: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That June 13, 1942, the forty-third anniversary of the appointment of General MacArthur to the Military Academy at West Point, which marked the beginning of his brilliant career as a soldier, is hereby designated as Douglas MacArthur Day, in honor of himself and of all those in the American and Filipino armed forces who served with him and under him in heroic defense of the Philippine Islands.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, in the State of Michigan we produce a large amount of crude oil, fuel oil, and gasoline. We are close to the point of consumption. The Saginaw Valley Oil Men's Association recommends that the following five specific steps be taken for gas and tire conservation:

1. Immediate State- or Nation-wide legislation to reduce legal speed limits to 40 miles per hour as suggested by the President. This will reduce tire wear nearly 50 percent and make gasoline rationing and tire rationing unnecessary.

2. Let the Government organize at once a campaign through gasoline stations and tire dealers throughout the United States to salvage used tires and rubber products to be made into tires for civilian use.

3. Let the Government, when necessary, purchase new and used cars, now idle, on dealers' hands, and place in a pool for future needs.

4. As originators of the Michigan plan we pledge ourselves to share our cars and ride with the other fellow.

5. Let all educational and civic institutions conduct a Nation-wide campaign promoting the instruction in the proper use of automobiles to increase their mileage.

Of course, this association and the people of Michigan want a thorough investigation of the oil situation before Nation-wide rationing of gasoline goes into effect.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein four sonnets by Glen Levin Swiggett.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Montana?

There was no objection.

THE AMERICAN RED CROSS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain newspaper and magazine clippings.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 7181, with Mr. SMITH of Virginia in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, in order to clarify the situation before the Committee and in order to inform the Members who were not present last evening, as I understand it, debate on the C. C. C. provision is limited to 2 hours, one-half to be allocated to the proponents and the other one-half to the opponents, and under the agreement entered into the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] is to allot his hour to those who are supporting the Tarver amendment to reinstate the C. C. C. provision, and the gentleman from Michigan, who has control of the other hour is to allot time to the opponents of the amendment.

Mr. HARE. That is my understanding, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. As the Chair understands the parliamentary situation, when the Committee rose yesterday the reading of the bill had been completed under two unanimous-consent agreements. The first unanimous-consent agreement was that the Tarver amendment on the C. C. C. provision would be taken up as the first order of business this morning and we would return to that clause in the bill for the purpose of considering the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] yesterday which was printed for the information of the House in yesterday's RECORD at page 4919. The time is limited to 2 hours of debate on that amendment, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] and one-half controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]. At the conclusion of the consideration of the Tarver amendment and all amendments thereto, the Committee will then revert to the N. Y. A. clause in the bill, which will likewise be open to consideration and amendment.

Mr. HARE. That is the understanding, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] for 1 hour and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] for 1 hour.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, it is not my purpose to consume any more of the time which has been allotted than may be absolutely necessary in order to place fairly before the membership of the Committee of the Whole the facts as I understand them to be with reference to the pending amendment. Two days ago I fully discussed the matter, and I shall not repeat to a greater degree than is necessary arguments then advanced.

I think a reading of the hearings may be somewhat confusing to members of the committee in that the hearings with relation to this particular subject matter are found in two separated parts of volume 2. The first hearings were had with reference to the initial Budget estimate which was for $49,101,000, and contemplated a reduction in the number of the camps, proceeding gradually until after September of the present year, when only 150 camps should remain. In my opinion, as well as in the opinion, I think, of practically all the members of the subcommittee, although I am not authorized to speak for them, the plan, as originally proposed, would not have been practicable, involving the carrying on of too great an administrative overhead expense in the administration of only 150 camps. The need of the Army for additional camps to those which have been proposed for allotment to the Army under the original plan has greatly increased during the pendency of our hearings until they reached the point where the Army had submitted requests to the Civilian Conservation Corps for the allocation to it, for purely defense needs, of 207 camps, with the prospect that additional camps to those which had been requested would be needed in the course of the war program.

The President sent to the Congress and there was referred to our subcommittee an additional Budget estimate in view of the developments which had come about in the war program for enough additional money to bring the amount of the estimate to $80,118,000 and to provide for the maintenance during the entire fiscal year 1943 of 350 camps.

The hearings with reference to this additional estimate appear in the concluding portion of part 2 of the committee hearings. The subcommittee, by a divided vote, placed the amended Budget estimate in the bill with a reduction, however, below the figures of the Budget estimate of $5,000,000, leaving the amount to be appropriated $75,118,000, and with the direction, as you will observe in the committee report, that the deletion should be absorbed by a reduction in the administrative expenses of the corps.

This is an economy amendment which I have proposed. I make that statement in the utmost good faith, because I believe in economy. I have since the beginning of this administration, voted against over $14,000,000,000 of appropriations which have been made by the Congress. I have sought in my service on the Appropriations Committee to contribute to the effectuation of economies in every activity of the Government where it was possible to do so.

I say it is an economy amendment. The work which it is proposed that these 350 camps shall do if the Civilian Conservation Corps is not eradicated, is defense work, war work, and insofar as they will be engaged on military reservations in the construction of rifle ranges, in the doing of camouflaging work and the building of roads and in other work of similar types, they will be doing work which must be done, and which will be done, whether it is done by the Civilian Conservation Corps or through the making of appropriations by the Congress for expenditure through the awarding of contracts to those who will do the work. The work which it is contemplated shall be done by the small number of the 350 camps which are here being considered in the national forests, in fire protection work, is work of a type which is made urgently necessary by reason of the present military emergency conditions. The possibility, and even the probability, of sabotage in our national forests, especially those of the West where destructive fires might be and probably have been already set by enemies of our country with a view to bringing about tremendous destruction of our national resources makes it necessary that fire protection work be done, and that work will be done.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Would the gentleman state how many camps it is contemplated will be continued in the critical fire-protection area, which I consider to be very essential? In the West we have a heavily forested area which is exposed to an extraordinary fire hazard from incendiary bombs and sabotage.

Mr. TARVER. Not less than 90 of the 350 camps which are here involved.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. JOHNS. I notice in the amendment which is offered, the following proviso:

> No part of any appropriation in this act for the Civilian Conservation Corps or the National Youth Administration shall be available for obligation after the effective date of any Executive order consolidating such agencies or transferring any of the functions of either of such agencies to the other.

My question is, What provision is there for taking care of these agencies, if there can be no obligation created after they are consolidated?

Mr. TARVER. The purpose of the subcommittee in inserting the provision to which the gentleman has referred is this: It is the understanding of the subcommittee that it is contemplated that an Executive order will be issued consolidating the activities of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration under one head, with the purpose or at least with one purpose of effecting a savings in the operations of the two organizations. The committee thought that if such a consolidation should be ordered——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask an additional minute?

Mr. HARE. I can yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. TARVER. I regret that on account of my very deliberate manner of expression I have not yet reached the argument I desire to make, and I hope the gentleman will bear with me and do the best he can within the limit of time which is at his disposal.

Mr. HARE. I am sure the gentleman would not want to deprive any other gentleman of time, and I yield the gentleman an additional 10 minutes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I cannot yield at this time, as I have not yet answered the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin. The purpose of the subcommittee in inserting the proviso was to insure that after such consolidation should be ordered, the matter of the needs of the consolidated organization for funds should be reviewed by the Congress, and it was contemplated that if an Executive order be issued, it be made effective, let us say, 60 days after the date of the order so that funds would be available until the effective date of the order, and that during those 60 days the Congress could review the needs of the consolidated organization and make such provision therefor as might be proper.

This forest-protection work which these camps, if allowed, would do is work which must be done, and must be done at public expense, and the work on military reservations is likewise work which must be done and must be done at public expense. It will be observed from the hearings that representatives of the War Department testified that this work on military reservations might be more economically done through the instrumentality of the Civilian Conservation Corps than it could be done through the letting of contracts to private contractors.

So, as I see it, this is a defense measure. It is submitted to the Congress by the President, our Commander in Chief, as a defense measure, and I can conceive of no reason why it should be dealt with on any different basis from the bases that other requests from the Executive for funds to aid in the war effort have been dealt with. I know we all have been subject to a tremendous barrage by people who are evidently acting in coordination, seeking to have us support the conclusions of what is known as the Byrd committee. The Byrd committee—and I speak of that committee with all due respect—is composed very largely of gentlemen who never were in favor of these various activities which in their report they propose to have eliminated. They would be opposed to the continuance of those activities in normal times and under normal conditions. They have sought through their reports to have the Congress destroy the Farm Security Administration, the Work Projects Administration, the National Youth Administration, and the C. C. C. All of those are activities which were instituted by the Congress in an effort to help the underprivileged people of this country, people in the cities as well as people living in the rural areas. There are some who have, in some quarters, been designated as economic royalists, who feel that the Government should be operated entirely for those who comprise the very prosperous classes. There are others of us who have felt that adequate consideration, within the means of the Government to provide, should be accorded to the many millions of underprivileged people, both in the cities and in the rural districts of this country.

Two million eight hundred thousand young men in the C. C. C. program have been accorded work training. It has been said that those young men who in many instances are now being enrolled in the Corps could have been used for work on the farm if not enrolled in the C. C. C. I have questioned that. I have questioned it because of the fact that no single farmer in my district has complained to me that any labor which he could have secured has been enrolled in the C. C. C. My judgment is that a great many of those young fellows who have been trained and are being trained in the C. C. C. to work, had never had any opportunity to learn how to do useful work prior to their enrollment in the Corps, and that if they had not enrolled in the Corps they would not have contributed anything toward relieving the shortage of agricultural labor. I have observed a great many of them after they have returned from the training they have received in the Corps, and have observed that they have learned to fit themselves into agriculture in a useful way, and into industry in a useful way.

Now it is proposed that we destroy an institution which has been authorized legislatively by Congress, by simply refusing to make an appropriation for it. I insist that if the institution should be destroyed, the proper method of destruction would be by repealing the act under which it is undertaking to function. We are destroying it with the knowledge, if we believe the recommendations that have been submitted to us by the Commander in Chief, that it can be used in a very useful, important, and economical way in the war effort which is now going on.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mrs. NORTON. Is it not a fact that the President is very anxious to continue at least 300 of these camps for the war effort?

Mr. TARVER. Undoubtedly. He so stated in his communication to the Congress. Three hundred and fifty of the camps are necessary, in accordance with his judgment, in the war effort.

Mrs. NORTON. Exactly.

Mr. TARVER. Now may I point out again, as I tried to point out the other day when a great many of those who are present now were not present then, that we do not know when there may be need for a very largely expanded C. C. C. If this war should end this year or next year we will have, in all probability, millions of people in this country out of employment, including millions of boys who are returned from the armed services of the country. We ought to have then an organization set up with trained personnel prepared to function, into which those who cannot obtain remunerative jobs in industry or in agriculture, may be fitted.

Mr. HOUSTON. Is it not a fact that the only camps proposed by the gentleman's amendment are for the Army camps and protection of the timber lands against fire?

Mr. TARVER. No. There is a small number of camps which are considered to be necessary in important soil conservation work, which also has a defense value. But may I continue?

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a brief question?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. The gentleman said in answer to my question that 90 of these camps would be maintained in the critical fire protection areas?

Mr. TARVER. That is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I was gratified to learn that, but I understood the testimony of J. J. McEntee, director of the C. C. C., to be that it was contemplated that 150 camps were to be maintained in the critical fire-protection areas. This is a matter of vital concern to the people of my district, and I have just received the following telegram:

MONTESANO, WASH., *June 4, 1942.*

Hon. MARTIN F. SMITH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

News that Civilian Conservation Corps camps are planning to move is of great importance to us. There is immediate need here for the Elma, Quinault, and Montesano Civilian Conservation Corps camps, which are now doing vital defense work. The Civilian Conservation Corps is also being heavily depended upon to fight fires, which are very likely here in the immediate future. Dutch Harbor incident now places this area in defense position and potential danger of enemy action which may take form of sabotage in forests, where every fire-fighting facility needed within hours. Please do everything to keep Civilian Conservation Corps camps here and Elma, where they are needed now. W. H. Abel and others writing you by mail. Montesano and Elma Chambers of Commerce join us in urging your help to save Civilian Conservation Corps camps.

GRAYS HARBOR COUNTY DEFENSE COUNCIL,
K. C. KERSTETTER, *Coordinator.*

Mr. TARVER. I am sure the gentleman is mistaken in regard to that.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. I doubt that number of 90 camps would be ample; we should have at least 150 to take care of the need for protection of the entire country. There is a real need for many of these camps in my own district in southwest Washington to protect the large stands of Douglas fir, Sitka spruce, hemlock, and cedar.

Mr. TARVER. I think there ought to be more, but that is all we have in contemplation.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. HALLECK. I was much interested in the gentleman's suggestion about keeping the personnel of the C. C. C. in operation until such time as we might again need them after the war. Is it the gentleman's position that the administrative personnel of all the depression-born agencies should be kept alive and on the pay roll in order that they might be available to go into immediate action at such time as they might be needed?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield me 3 additional minutes?

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. No such position has been taken. On the other hand, the subcommittee has undertaken to reduce the administrative expense of this organization, and this year the estimate was cut $5,000,000, to be absorbed by reductions in administrative expenses. There is an organization of 1,500 camps and camp sites. The organization has at least 32,000 pieces of heavy equipment. These facilities were acquired with Government funds at a cost running up into the hundreds of millions of dollars. You propose by abolishing the Civilian Conservation Corps to dissipate those assets—to dissipate the entire organization—yet if next year you have occasion to set up a civilian conservation corps to take care of the emergency that might arise, you are going to appropriate again other hundreds of millions that you could now save by retaining the facilities that you have at least until such period as you may determine that there may be no further probable need for them.

I will tell you what you can do. In some of these appropriations that have been made by a certain committee of this House of which some of our most economically minded Members are members, you can save enough from some of those war contracts where money has been expended so extravagantly that hundreds of thousands of dollars in particular instances could be paid out as bonuses to officials of the corporations that have the contracts—you can save enough in some three or four of those cases to pay for this Civilian Conservation Corps for a couple of years. You talk about saving money; I agree with you, but let me remind you that $6,000,000,000 is the total approximate budget for nondefense expenditures for the next fiscal year. This is but a drop in the bucket compared with the $180,000,000,000 we have appropriated since this emergency began for defense expenditures. You are saving at the spigot and wasting at the bung, and will be destroying here if you do not adopt this amendment, an activity which in my judgment has been of greater value to the people of this country in the development and conservation of human as well as of natural resources, than any other organization that has been set up under this administration.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. WELCH. Will the gentleman state how many camps will be retained in the timber-producing sections of the Pacific coast?

Mr. TARVER. Practically all the camps proposed for the forest service will be located in the western forest area. May I say to my friend that I do not believe a sufficient number of camps for that purpose is being provided; in fact, I know they are not, but I do say that those which will be provided if this amendment is adopted, will be of very material benefit in checking and preventing forest fires and that the expenditure therefor will not be any greater than would be the expenditure through other channels for doing the same work.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I was rather interested in the argument presented by my good friend the gentleman from Georgia, to the effect that because we were expending large sums and wasting great sums of money in our war effort we should permit this bill to pass. Impliedly he referred to Members who were economically minded on the committees which deal with the expenditures of that money. Whether he referred to me or not, I am a member of the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. I believe the Members of this body know I have in my own humble way tried to do everything within my feeble powers to eliminate waste from national defense efforts, and I have tried to do so with the help of a great many Members of this House on both sides of the aisle in a nonpolitical way.

This bill should stand or fall as it is presented to this House. Year after year, Mr. Chairman, I have tried to impress those connected with the Civilian Conservation Corps with the necessity of trying to economize and cut out what I considered, and what many of us considered, useless expenditures. Every year they have come back with the same pay roll, with the same number of people on it, and the same wasteful program.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to repeat part of what I said yesterday for the benefit of those who were not here. Back on March 21, 1940, I made a speech on the floor of this House protesting against that waste. In that protest I made the following statement:

The Civilian Conservation Corps has been a sacred cow. While the people have worshipped the cow the politicians have milked her. Thirty-two thousand four hundred and six civilian employees, most of whom are political appointees, will receive this year

in 1940, $58,234,000 in salaries, while 270,000 Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees and their families will receive $101,000,000 in pay. I am not opposing the Civilian Conservation Corps. I am just trying to stop the politicians from milking the sacred cow.

That was the situation that existed in 1940 and the record that we have before us today shows that on July 1, 1941, they did not have 270,000 enrollees, but only 177,459 enrollees, but still had 32,330 employees on the pay roll. This despite the fact that the number of enrollees had dropped nearly 100,000, they only cut the 32,406 employees by 76. The RECORD shows that if the bill is passed as presented to our committee they will have 10,750 employees who will draw nearly $20,000,000, while the 76,000 enrollees will draw only $28,000,000

The committee tried to remedy this situation by transferring $5,000,000 of the C. C. C. civilian pay roll to the N. Y. A. for student aid. If the Senate passes the bill with the C. C. C. in it you will find they will probably restore the $5,000,000 and the C. C. C. will still have $20,000,000 for civilian pay roll. It is difficult to justify that sort of expenditure on the ground of economy.

This bill as originally presented to the House provides a cost of $1,054 per enrollee. Because of the amount of clothing on hand, it provides for $13.50 clothing allowance per enrollee. Last year the allowance was $125 per enrollee. This means that they will use $110 worth of clothing on hand per enrollee which must be charged against the per capita cost for each enrollee. This brings the total cost up to nearly $1,200 per enrollee.

Now, let us consider this economy argument which has been presented.

On page 1027 of the hearings you will find the testimony of Mr. Morrell, the man from the forestry department, who has had charge of the C. C. C. for years within the forestry department. Mr. Morrell testified as follows:

Mr. ENGEL. I have talked during the past number of years with several State foresters. I have talked with State regional foresters and with some national regional foresters, and they have, almost without exception, made the statement that if we would give them one-third or one-half the money that we are using for the Civilian Conservation Corps in the forest areas they would give the same amount of work. Do you have any opinion on that?

Mr. MORRELL. I think that is true.

If it costs us $1,054 per enrollee and we are getting only 50 percent value, then it takes two C. C. C. enrollees in camp to give us the equivalent of one man's work in the field. So under the C. C. C. the cost really is $2,108 a year for one man's work at the work front. Where is there any economy in that?

We started the C. C. C. originally with the idea of taking the city boy from the city streets and putting him out in God's green country. What has happened since then? The testimony shows that in 1940 19.6 percent of the enrollees came from the farm. In 1942 43.1 percent came from the farms. In 1940 34.8 percent came from cities under 2,500, and in 1942, 20 percent came from cities under 2,500. In other words, we are drawing 63.6 percent of the enrollees from the farm. or from cities under 2,500.

You have stripped your farms of labor by taking thousands of selectees from the rural areas.

You have given farm boys no exemption for skilled farm work. They have gone to the Army by the thousands. Other thousands and thousands more have been attracted to the cities because of the high wages. Now you are taking these farm boys from the farm where they are needed and where they ought to stay.

Let us see how old these boys are. In 1941 44 percent of these boys were 17 years old and 24 percent 18.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I am quoting the record.

Mr. COCHRAN. I want to ask the gentleman what he is referring to.

Mr. ENGEL. I do not yield. The gentleman can take his own time.

Mr. COCHRAN. I just wanted to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. ENGEL. The gentleman can take his own time. The record is right here.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the testimony shows that in 1941, 142,563 boys, or 44.15 percent were 17 years of age, while during the first half of 1942, 58,225, or 54.5 percent, were 17 years of age.

In 1941, 77,884, or 24.12 percent, were 18 years old.

In the first half of 1942, 23,438, or 21.92 percent, were 18 years old. In other words, 76.5 percent of these boys are 18 years of age or under.

Much has been said about forestry. The record shows that the Forestry Service now has authority to spend all the money they need without any appropriation for forest-fire protection. They can spend the money they need for fire protection. They, then, may come before the deficiency committee of the Committee on Appropriations and get that money back. Mr. Morrell so stated in his testimony. This is the only organization I know of that the Committee on Appropriations permits to incur liabilities and to spend money without an appropriation, and then come back and get the money after it is spent.

You cannot protect 170,000,000 acres of forest lands against fire with a few enrollees. With the protection you have given through the money appropriated in the agricultural appropriation bill and the money the Appropriations Committee gives the Forestry Service in the way of a blank check to spend all the money it needs, I do not know what else you can do for forest-fire protection.

I am not one of those who believe that when this war is over we are going to have a terrible depression. We are going to have thousands upon thousands of worn-out automobiles and thousands upon thousands of worn-out washing machines and refrigerators, and so forth. The manufacture of nearly all such goods has been stopped. It will be a number of years before we catch up with that production. When and if that time does come, when men are out of work, the Army will have millions of dollars' worth of equipment which they are now using for war purposes but which can in peacetime be used for the C. C. C., W. P. A., or any other organization.

We expect an amendment to be introduced providing money with which to wind up the C. C. C. in case the pending amendment to reinstate the C. C. C. fails.

I sincerely hope the Committee of the Whole and the House will stand by the bipartisan vote of the whole Appropriations Committee when that committee eliminated the C. C. C. Some of the ablest men and the best thinkers on both sides of the House voted carefully on this matter.

As I said before, I have a 3,000,000-acre national forest in my district, and I know something about the C. C. C. They have done a lot of good work in the past, but I believe the time has come to wind up this agency. It is difficult to do that. You will be confronted with the same situation and the same argument every time you try to cut a nonessential item from the Budget. I believe we ought to cut every dollar of nonessential expenditure from every bill we have before us; not only that, but I believe we ought to cut every dollar of waste from the War and Navy Department expenditures.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I noticed in the paper the other day that the gentleman was quoted as giving several reasons why the C. C. C. should be abolished. One of the reasons was that the 17- and 18-year-old boys in the C. C. C. should go into the Army. Was the gentleman quoted correctly on that point?

Mr. ENGEL. That they should go into the Army? Was I quoted as saying that the 17- and 18-year-old boys should go into the Army? I certainly made no such statement. On the contrary, I am opposed to putting 17- and 18-year-old boys into an Army cantonment under the C. C. C. to mingle with Army troops.

Mr. McCORMACK. I asked the gentleman the question in order to be sure whether or not he was quoted correctly.

Mr. ENGEL. I must have been misunderstood. I certainly made no such statement. I am sure the record will show I did not.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the gentleman who just addressed the House to this fact: Assuming that the Forest Service has the power to hire men to control and put out fires once started, where can they go to get the help to do that? We do not have enough men for that work in that area. Most of our workers are engaged in

industry, have enlisted, and have been drafted. If you strip the great States of Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Oregon of these C. C. C. camps you deplete our help to the point where it is absolutely impossible to put out these fires.

My information is that all told, the amendment would provide for 350 camps, divided as follows:

Two hundred military reservation camps.

One hundred and fifty forest protection camps.

Of the 150 forest protection camps it is contemplated that 7 of these would probably be located in Montana in the following places: Cabinet National Forest, Neihart district, Lincoln County, Flathead County, Missoula County, Glacier National Park, and one other place not yet determined. If there was ever a time that it is necessary to protect this timbered area against fire it is now. Sabotage will occur and more destruction can be wrought by our wily, tricky, unscrupulous and dangerous enemy, Japan, by starting fires in that part of the country than any other place. Our Forest Service is indeed very competent but inadequate in numbers.

Remember that we are now at war, our boys are being slaughtered on all seas, and it is up to the executive branch of the Government to run the war machine during wartime. The President of the United States has asked that this amendment be adopted as a war measure. As far as I am concerned, that settles the question, because the responsibility is his. The Congress of the United States is simply the linking agent between the people of the United States and the executive branch. It is up to the Executive to tell us what he wants and it is up to us to give it to him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Suppose this amendment is not adopted. Our forests are certainly a great natural resource, and they must be protected from fire and from any attack that may be made.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Why, of course.

Mr. McCORMACK. And it is going to cost money.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course.

Mr. McCORMACK. So we have got to appropriate the money and we are not saving anything by refusing to make such an appropriation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Certainly not; and I want to call the attention of the Members to the fact that there are 100,000,000 acres of the finest timber that ever grew under God's sun in Montana, Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, exclusive of other timber States. You strip us of our C. C. C. camps and we have no protection whatever at these places against fire. I have seen these fires leap into the heavens, causing the finest trees you ever saw, trees that had taken half a century or a century to grow, go down before such fires. I have also seen the gray trucks containing these C. C. C. boys go into such hell-burning regions and in 2 or 3 days the fire was under control and then was put out. They had the machinery and they knew how to use it. The farmers have not such machinery and they have not the time, because they have to tend to their crops and they have to tend to their livestock. They have got to produce to win this war.

This is no economy. It would be penny-wise and pound-foolish and you would be jeopardizing the greatest industry resource this country has, namely, its timber area in these four great States.

I am in favor of the gentleman's amendment. I am going to vote for it, and I ask every person here who wants to win this war, who wants to conserve our natural resources in this country, to get back of the President of the United States and help win this war. He is the one in charge of it and he is the one responsible for its successful prosecution.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. WELCH. Should not my friend have included California in the western timber-producing States?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; California is another great State and has the most matchless timber outside of my own great State of Montana.

Mr. WELCH. Redwood is not produced in Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; but all other timbers are. We have got to have these camps, and here is another thing involved. Under the war powers of the President of the United States he cannot only use them in the forests or in industry, but he can put them any place he wishes. They can be used to protect our dams. Dynamite Fort Peck, if you please, and the loss of life and the destruction of property will be beyond power of description.

Mr. Chairman, again the President has told the American people, and he has told this Congress, that the C. C. C. program is a definite and important part of his war program. On numerous occasions the President has warned that this war cannot be won without the full support and last ounce of energy of every American citizen. I am voting for this amendment because this Nation cannot afford to take chances. It must support this war 100 percent.

This amendment provides funds for young men and veterans of the World War; 7,000 Indians; and 3,000 residents of Hawaii, Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. Director McEntee has told us that 200 of these camps with an enrollment of 40,000 men, will work on military type projects on military areas, on marine bases, and on lands controlled by the Navy. Most of these men are now at work building air fields, roads, bridges, developing maneuver grounds, carrying on malaria control, and doing other types of work essential to the training of a huge Army.

There is an unlimited amount of work for these youngsters and war veterans to do. All of it is vital work. Through their efforts, Army training is expedited, and thousands of soldiers are freed for full-time combat training. This type of work must go on. To halt it now would inevitably slow up the Army training program. It is a definite part of the war effort.

A second group of enrollees working out of 150 C. C. C. camps has been assigned to strategic locations in our national forests and parks and on other lands for the purpose of natural resource protection. The big bulk of these camps are assigned to the forest fire front line where they are aiding in the protection of 200,000,000 acres of national forests, 174,000,000 acres of national parks, and other lands of the Department of the Interior and hundreds of thousands of acres of other public and private forest lands. In these camps this summer will be 30,000 trained fire fighters. Aiding them on Indian reservations will be 7,000 Indian C. C. C. workers who have been trained especially to protect the 15,000,000 acres of Indian forests and to assist other agencies in protecting forest lands adjacent to Indian reservations. And in addition, all men working in the camps located on military areas are trained in forest-fire fighting and in emergency, they will be called into action. These men already have been called out to fight hundreds of fires in forests located on military areas.

The camps assigned to forest protection are a part of our war effort. There is no doubt but that our forests will be attacked by our enemies if they can break through the coast protective zones. I do not have to tell this House of the disaster that would befall if a single plane was permitted to unload its incendiary bombs on a part of our forests which was unprotected. A huge fire in our western forests would disrupt war production, interfere with Army training, and screen the activities of our enemies. All of you know that the governing principle in fighting forest fires is to get trained men promptly to fires so that little fires can be extinguished before they get out of control. One small crew of a dozen men reaching a fire promptly is worth more than a division of soldiers who get there after the fire gets out of control.

The purpose of this amendment is to aid the armed forces by supplying trained manpower to develop military areas and speed soldier training. The purpose of this amendment is to throw a trained cordon of expert fire fighters around large forest areas to prevent disastrous fires. The purpose of this amendment is to provide the highest type of disciplinary health and work training to young men so that these youngsters can pull their full weight in this war.

Through this program millions of men have been prepared for national service in the armed forces or in industry or on farms. This program today, by putting untrained men at work under expert direction on important essential work, can continue to bulwark the President's effort to develop to the fullest every ounce of effective manpower in this country.

I say to the Members of this House that a vote against this bill is a vote against the President's war program. A

vote for it is a vote to win the war. Through this program the energies of thousands of men which would otherwise be wasted will be utilized 100 percent in the war effort. Through this program thousands of men will be better soldiers when they reach the age of selective service. Through this program thousands of men will be enabled to learn skills which they can apply effectively on farms, in factories, and on every phase of the industrial front. Let us keep this corps going.

Vote for this amendment.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. If there was half as much heat generated out where the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR], who just addressed you, came from, as he showed here on the floor, there would be no purpose in trying to get the forest fires extinguished by the C. C. C., because those fires would be starting day after day.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot yield.

Listening to the gentleman, one would believe that a forest fire had never been extinguished before these C. C. C. camps came into existence. In Michigan we have pine stump cut-over land with oak scrubs grown and for years we had forest fires, as we did in northern Michigan, but the home folks always put them out.

Now the C. C. C. has done some good work, and I am not now criticizing it, but it has got down to a question——

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. This bill provides for seven camps in the State of Montana. How will that take care of the hundreds of millions of acres of land that the gentleman from Montana has talked about?

Mr. HOFFMAN. We have reached the situation where we all know that we have not enough money to do everything, even all the good things cannot be done. We are getting around to the point where we are going to be thankful for meat and potatoes and bread and we are going to cut out the pie and cake and ice cream and dessert. We may not like it, but we are going to do just that and the people back home realize it. You know the papers have not told us of one single instance where German submarines have crossed the English Channel and gone into the rivers or the harbors of England. For that we are glad. We wish that we had equal protection for our home ports for the coast line of the western continent.

England has protection against submarines because she has an adequate number of scouting vessels, of submarines, destroyers, of fighting planes, of bombers—most of the latter two furnished by us. She has, too, an adequate number of trained technical observers, fighting men on land, sea, and in the air.

Do you realize that British shipping, that the shipping of our Allies, is not being destroyed in the English Channel? Why? Because England and the Channel have full protection and that largely through our efforts.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No, I cannot. The gentleman might set me on fire. He is so enthusiastic in his opposition to this bill. After all, when our bombers and fighters and other equipment are going across—and I am not criticizing that at the moment—to such an extent that England is safe, England is protected, and when at the same time we read, as we did the day before yesterday and again yesterday that the Japs are able to go over Alaska and bomb our ports, and when we know, as we do, that submarines of the enemy sail to the mouth of the Mississippi and destroy our cargo vessels there, range up along the east coast, hundreds of miles sinking shipping clear to the mouth of the St. Lawrence River—sail up that river and torpedo ships—when we know those things, should we waste or should we spend even meritoriously, one single dollar for the C. C. C. camps or any other activity that is not absolutely essential, absolutely necessary for war defense? I am asking you the same question that our people are going to ask us next fall. We did not have the power to send aid, not even food and medicinal supplies to the men in Bataan, in the Philippine Islands; we did not have the fighters, nor the bombers nor the ships to get military aid to our fighting men there and because we did not, thousands are dead, others are prisoners of the Japs, and yet we have money to carry on the C. C. C. and the N. Y. A., and other activities so-called social gains here in America. Our people are going to ask us why? They are going to ask us why it is that along our seacoast on the East, and in far Northwest the enemy can reach us and destroy our freighters, bomb Dutch Harbor in Alaska, threaten San Francisco and Panama. Our people are asked to and they willingly go without this or that or the other thing that has always been considered essential, and yet the Congress has money for C. C. C. and N. Y. A., and additional Federal employees.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I cannot. Admit that those things are good; that the C. C. C. has done wonderful work in the past, yet we are confronted by facts as they are today, and we need every dollar, we need every ounce of manpower for our national defense effort, and our people will never forgive us if we waste money on those things which are nonessential, which are nondefense items, and because of that waste we lack the means to defeat our enemies.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. ENGEL. On page 1027 of the hearings, Mr. Morrell testified that the national forests contain around 160,000,000 to 170,000,000 acres, and this does not take into consideration the Interior Department lands. Mr. McEntee testified that there are 500,000,000 acres of forest land in this country. That would allow one camp for every million acres.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, now that the gentleman has been yielded more time, will he yield to me?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not. The only point I want to make is to call attention to the situation confronting us, and to ask that we consider whether or not we should have the things that are necessary or whether we should have some things that are perhaps quite meritorious but which we can get along without.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I know the gentleman wants to be fair.

The gentleman wants some protection afforded that vast area of timbered country in the event the Japanese outfit bring over a bomb or several bombs and drop them during the dry months of July, August, and September, and start those tremendous fires in that great area. I know the gentleman wants to be fair.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is right.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does not the gentleman feel that we ought to have those boys there ready to put out those fires and control them?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I do not think that is necessary.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Who is going to do it?

Mr. HOFFMAN. We should spend our money for scout planes, for fighters, for bombers to patrol and protect our coasts and get the Japs before they ever get to us. Build bombers, build ships, build submarine chasers, and get the Japs before they get here.

Give us the equipment and the trained personnel on each coast line, yes, and inland, at strategic points, so that we may repel those who would set your forests on fire. The fire which rages with unparalleled fierceness in those mountain forests of yours are, as pictured by you, terrifying disasters, doing almost irreparable damage. But the fires which the boys across the seas will be compelled to face will be, in comparison, "hell fire" itself, and they will need every dollar's worth of material—war materials, food and clothing, arms and munitions—which it is possible for us to send them. You see, if we have not now, we will shortly come to the day when we must make a choice between the essential, the absolute essentials, and those things which, however meritorious, are not necessary to enable our fighting men to perform their full duty. Let us vote this amendment down.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I never was more serious in my life than when I say that if this amendment is defeated it will be most welcome news to the Japs. Under our form of government whatever we do in this legislative body becomes public overnight. The information that we have defeated an amendment which will take fire protection away

from our forests on the eastern and western coasts will be just exactly what the Japs want to hear. Do you know that they have paper chemically treated now—they do not need a bomb—that can be dropped from the clouds, and within a certain given time after that reaches the surface, it becomes fire.

Now you talk about economy. You have talked about protection of the forests, where the hearings show that 150 of these camps are going to be located. How about the 200 camps that are going to be placed in the Army reservations, and Navy shore stations and at other training centers, where the C. C. C. boys are going to make the streets, fix the fields, do the camouflage work, lay the sewers and water mains that are necessary? If they do not do the job you will either make the soldiers do it or you will have civilians do it. You know when you employ civilians, especially by contract, how much it will cost over and above the amount necessary to continue this Civilian Conservation Corps.

There is something else back of this fight. There is politics back of this,-and do not let anybody tell you there is not. The President has made it known, or at least it has leaked out, that it is his purpose, by Executive order, to place the C. C. C. and the N. Y. A. together. The effort to destroy the C. C. C. right now is an effort to prevent the President from consolidating the two organizations. Members have spoken about overhead, but let the President put them together and when he does consolidate them, then the overhead is reduced automatically. There is no doubt about that.

I am not talking about what some of you have done prior to December 7. I forgot that; but I have heard many men on this floor who fought the administration prior to December 7, get up here time after time and say, "Now, we are at war. We will follow our Commander in Chief." Are you following him today? No. You are not following him today. You are not only not giving him the amount he asked for in his Budget estimate, which was reduced $5,000,000, but you want to destroy the organization altogether.

I say to you ladies and gentlemen you are making a big mistake if you take that action. I wish to say to the gentleman from Michigan that this organization was not set up solely to take the boys off the streets of the cities—not by any means. I come from a city where I never did see a C. C. C. camp, but they did take some of our boys off the streets.

The boys were sent to the country while the W. P. A. took care of city improvements. Out in the country they were assigned to parks and forest reservations, fighting soil erosion, in fact, doing all kinds of work beneficial to the rural communities. Are the Members from the rural districts distinterested today because this type of work has been discontinued or will be July 1?

The amendment the gentleman from South Dakota will offer requiring a certification before a camp can be assigned to a shore station in the Navy or an Army reservation assures us that the 200 camps for that purpose will be in the interest of national defense only.

Do not forget if you destroy this organization you bring grief to thousands of dependent mothers and fathers who receive the greater part of the earnings of the enrollees. This has always been the policy. Aside from the veterans' camps the enrollee must show that he has dependents. Either the States or the Government will have to take care of these dependents.

Do not revive your fight against the President. Do not, I plead with you, forget we are at war. This is no time to cast your vote for political reasons. If the Japs can bomb Alaska, they can set our forests on fire, so think of how you will feel if they do and you vote against this motion, and we are not prepared to fight those fires.

We are pleading with the people for a solid front. How can we expect to get it if you refuse to listen to the President's appeal for this appropriation?

Your vote today might return to plague you as did many of your votes prior to December 7. Remember that when you go down the aisle. This is a 100-percent war measure and by no stretch of the imagination can anyone show that it is not.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, there is something beside the Civilian Conservation Corps that enters the whole picture of victory. There is a V in victory. There is a V in vigilance also, as we think of the domestic situation. Let us not forget that there is a V in economic salvation. I am of the opinion that the Government, including the Congress of the United States, must very definitely match the patriotism of the people of the country if it expects that type of unity which is so essential to victory in the present conflict.

There is a Ways and Means Committee sitting over in one of the rooms of the New House Office Building that is laboring and sweating to find new sources of revenue. They are trying to resist a sales tax, which will have its incidence, of course, upon the average family of the country. They are exploring every possible avenue of revenue, and all of it must be sweated out of the people. Make no mistake, we shall be derelict in our duty here in Congress unless we make every effort and exercise every precaution to save money where we can, for that, too, is in the interest of victory.

How easy it is to resign to a sense of defeatism and say, "Well, there is only $50,000,000 involved. After all, what is it when we are expending billions upon billions?" Do not forget that the $50,000,000 that is involved here would purchase comfortable homes for 10,000 American families. Do not forget that the $50,000,000 involved would pay the interest on a $2,000,000,000 debt for a year. Do not forget that the $50,000,000 that is involved here is going to have to be sweated out of 500,000 American families at the rate of $100 each for the next fiscal year under the new revenue act.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sorry. Let me continue for a moment, will you please? Let us not forget that $50,000,000 is more than pocket money at any time anywhere.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield? The C. C. C. calls for $80,000,000.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman says $80,000,000. I was just trying to temper the figure somewhat so as to make it a little more explicit. Do not forget that we are charged with the responsibility of saving where we can. This money has got to come out of the people, come out of their frugality of other years and other days. The bank deposits have got to be hauled out in response to the summons of the Bureau of Internal Revenue on the 15th of March, 1943, and on the installment days in the year 1942. If there is one thing we can do, we can share and become partners in sacrifice with the people if we expect to get results.

This has not been the most efficient type of operation from the standpoint of the proportion of administrative expense to the amount that has been paid for the enrollee. The gentleman from Michigan made the figures very emphatic: 1 employee for every 5 enrollees. That was the figure last March. One employee for every 7 enrollees is the set-up for the fiscal year 1943. Suppose we ran every agency of the Government in this fashion; you would have just about one-third of all the families in America on the pay roll. Can you justify this sort of thing: 76,000 enrollees and 11,000 employees? Who would lift his voice and say that is efficient, say it offers a maximum for the efficiency of this operation? Let us see how indispensable it is.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HARE. The Army, the Navy, and the Air Corps, of course, are compelled to have target ranges, bombing ranges, underground storage plants for munitions, bomber planes, airplanes, and tanks, and so forth. The question is how they can do these jobs the cheapest. If they can be done cheaper by the Army, then I think the gentleman has something in his argument.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman from South Carolina, in my judgment, makes the finest argument in support of my position that could be made. If this type of operation is essential to the Army, then let the Army have the corps to do that work. If it is essential to the Navy, then let the Navy have the corps of civilian employees to do that kind of work under its immediate jurisdiction. If it is necessary to agriculture and to the prevention of soil erosion and to soil conservation, let Mr. Wickard employ the necessary people and ask Congress for the funds to do that kind of job. If it is necessary in the far-flung reaches of the West under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, then let them have an organization, or a division for that kind of protective work.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. HARE. The further question is whether or not one agency could do all of this collectively better than to have half a dozen agencies doing it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The fact of the matter is that everyone of them is so jealous about the type of work they do that it would be in the interest of efficiency and economy to let them get their money themselves.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I hope the gentleman will let me continue for just a moment.

The figures have been submitted in the RECORD that 63 percent plus of these boys are from the farms and from the rural areas with populations of less than 2,500. Those are the boys who, you would think, would be engaged in this great program of foods for freedom. Sixty-three percent are in the Civilian Conservation Corps under the enrollment at the present time.

What does organized farmdom say about it? Mr. O'Neal, of the American Farm Bureau Federation, sent a letter to the subcommittee of the House touching this subject. Are the farmers of the country in favor of continuing the C. C. C.? That is not what that letter said. There you have, in that memorandum which was submitted to both the House and the Senate committees, the considered judgment of the largest farm organization in America which represents 500,000 farm families. They, speaking through this organization, the largest farm organization in the country—and no one will controvert that statement—say that no more money ought to be appropriated for the C. C. C.

What does the National Education Association say? They represent 200,000 teachers in America. They are interested in vocational training and that sort of thing. They said there is no excuse for the C. C. C. to continue as a separate organization. They have stated in a long memorandum by Mr. Willard Given, who is the executive director, that if these efforts must continue, put them where they ought to be put, put them in Agriculture, put them in Interior, put them in the Army, put them in the Navy, but there is no excuse for the Civilian Conservation Corps now under conditions of warfare, no reason for the C. C. C. to exist as a separate entity.

I say to those who come here and talk about the President's program that we who are willing to save a little money and be a little vigilant on the domestic front are rendering a greater service to the Commander in Chief than those who go on spending as usual, for they weaken the very substance with which the Commander in Chief must work in coordinating the physical and spiritual resources of the land. We are with the Commander in Chief. Are you?

The job of readjustment after this war will be a difficult one, make no mistake about that; it is going to be a tortuous path when we walk back, and there will be no road map. I do not want to put any additional stones in that tortuous road. If we can dispense with this facility today, then the Congress owes it to the patriotism of the country, the people who are sweating to buy bonds, who are laying down 10 percent of their income month after month to keep the wheels of industry going that there might be an efficacious war effort.

Let us not run out on the country. Let us match patriotism with them and give them a break, because we have right on our side, because the organized farm industry, speaking through the American Farm Bureau Federation, says no more money should be used for this purpose, we need these boys on the farm; because the organized teachers say there is no excuse for this to continue as a separate agency, and because the people want economy in nonessential expenditures. Let us not repudiate and reject the advice and admonitions of those who have given close and painstaking study to this sort of thing for a long, long time.

I am going to rest my case with them. I am going to vote against the amendment to restore the C. C. C. to this appropriation bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, I am going to support the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] to restore to the bill this appropriation for the Civilian Conservation Corps for the reason that in my district and all along the Pacific coast, as you know, we have extensive forests which need the protection provided by this service. The C. C. C. has been doing a very remarkable work in helping preserve and protect from fire those forests during the dry season when they are subject to fire hazards.

A good many of the gentlemen on my side of the House have said that this is a movement to curtail expenses, to cut down, and I am for that 100 percent; but if you will follow their arguments through you will ascertain that this identical work will have to be done even though we abolish the C. C. C. You will have to protect the forests anyway, and you will have to do the work that is now being done by the C. C. C. They will do it in the Army cantonments also, and they will have to do that work through other agencies.

The forest fire season is with us now in these areas. In fact, fires have already started in some of them. The C. C. C. is organized, they have the camps, the equipment, the tools, the trained personnel, and everything necessary to carry on this work; yet these gentlemen, in the interest of curtailing expenses, admitting the work has to be done, would do away with this whole organization, throw it into the discard, in the ash can, and start some new agency, buy new tools, get new equipment, new trucks, new fire equipment, when we do not have the time to do that and when we do not have the funds to do it with.

The C. C. C. has not only the equipment, but it has the improved camps with extensive buildings. These camps are located in strategic places in these areas where they are needed. They have not only all of the equipment, but they know the procedure necessary for effective work in combatting fires. They have everything fully in hand to go forward with this work on a moment's notice. Millions of dollars worth of timber is in danger. Half of it belongs to the United States Government.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to my friend, the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Why does the gentleman say we are trying to destroy everything when they have the tools, the equipment, and everything? Other men would do the work and you are not going to destroy anything.

Mr. ANGELL. Under the set-up by which we are proceeding now, if you abandon the C. C. C. and disorganize the work and throw this whole organization into the discard, these gentlemen who will have the new organization in charge will have to start all over again. I favor cutting overhead expenses to the bone.

Mr. RICH. How about the overhead?

Mr. ANGELL. I refuse to yield further. They will start in all over again. The new organization will probably double the expense. They will get new trucks, new fire equipment, they will get new people to run the organization, they will permit every Tom, Dick, or Harry who never saw a forest or a forest fire to go out and try to protect our forests. These C. C. C. boys and men are already there, they are trained, and they know the business of forest protection, and they should be retained on the job. With all due respects to my friends on this side, we are going to lose money instead of saving it if we do away with the organization that we have.

Mr. LEAVY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANGELL. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. After all, it is not a question of what it is going to cost us in the matter of forest fire fighting as it is preserving a great national asset. The C. C. C. camps in addition to fire fighting do preventive work. The other way we pay the bill and lose the national asset.

Mr. ANGELL. The gentleman is absolutely correct, and I hope this item will be restored to the bill. The President has recommended the appropriation as necessary in carrying forward its war program. His judgment as Commander in Chief in charge of our war efforts should be followed. I will vote to restore the appropriation to continue the work of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, last January I called to the attention of the House the fact that the farm-labor situation in Minnesota was becoming very difficult, and suggested at that time that the boys in the C. C. C. camps, now that we were in a war of survival, could better be used for farm labor rather than in these camps. Today that farm-labor situation, due to thousands of farm boys going into the armed forces to defend their country, is still more precarious.

The C. C. C. has done a worth-while job. There is today, however, a still more important job, and that is the producing of food not only for our own Nation but also for our Allies and later the starving occupied countries in Europe, now under the Nazi heel.

We must cut to the bone the nonessential expenditures of our Nation. C. C. C. can well be disbanded now and enter either the armed forces or the farm labor field. With all due credit to the good that C. C. C. has done in the past, their services are now, to win this war, needed more in other lines closer dedicated to victory.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Missouri made the statement that it looks as if politics had been injected into this discussion. He cannot come to the conclusion that there are politics in this matter when my colleague the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL], who just spoke, is for the bill and I am against the bill.

I am against this bill for the following reason: In 1940 there were 32,406 civilian employees looking after these enrollees, and the enrollees at that time numbered 270,000. In 1941 there were 32,300 civilian employees, a reduction of 76. The pay roll for these civilian employees amounted to $58,000,000. They reduced the number of enrollees in 1941 from 270,000 to 177,000. Now, let us look at the number of men involved in the overhead and the number of employees reduced. You will find there was not a corresponding reduction in those who were looking after the organization. It is not sound business. It is not operated in a sound business procedure. It looks much like a real harbor for political leeches or a place for jobs for the household of the faithful.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] made the statement a few minutes ago that politics had been injected into this matter and that the Chief Executive wanted to put the N. Y. A. and the C. C. C. together. Why did he not do it long ago, or why did he not cut down the overhead? That is something that ought to be explained to the people of this country, and I think it deserves explanation. Certainly the overhead cost has been enormous for the work that has been done by these enrollees. The cost is exhorbitant.

If you want to do a job now and do it effectively you must economize in every phase of Government if you win the war. As was said by the gentleman from Illinois a few minutes ago, how are you going to get the people of this county to buy bonds and do the other things that are necessary for the prosecution of the war when they know we are not trying to economize here in the Government? We must have a sensible Congress if we want the cooperation of our people to win the war by buying bonds. We must cut out all unnecessary expenses.

When we think of sending 17- and 18-year-old youths out to do the things the Army wants done now, things that are vitally important, it seems ridiculous to me to think that they are the kind of men we have to get to do the job; boys, we need men, when we are trying to do everything we can to win this war. Certainly we need the best manpower we have and we need every ounce of energy we can put into the operation of our Government, and into the economic work we have to do.

The farmers of the country are now pleading in every way they can to get aid and assistance on the farm, yet we have to send C. C. C. recruiters out to try to find boys to fill the camps. I know in Pennsylvania those who were trying to recruit for the C. C. C. went out and interviewed individuals, asking them if they would not enlist in the C. C. C. so that they could maintain the camps by getting enlistments. I think it is a desperate situation when they have to coax the boys off the farms and out of the cities and the smaller communities to enlist, when all these boys can get good jobs on the farms and in industry.

We can do away with this organization now. We can restore confidence to the people of this country who are looking to the Congress to do something that is really constructive. What we ought to do that is constructive is to give the people confidence that the Chief Executive and the Congress are trying to economize in every way they can for the constructive forces of warfare. We need it, we must have it. Will you do your part and get a little economy in Government before it is too late?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise especially to refute the statement of our colleague from Michigan that these boys have not done much work—that it takes two or more of them to do a man's work. No one claims that they are trained experienced workers. The object of the camps is to train them. They have completed many programs. I am just wondering if he knows what they have done. I have visited many triple C camps. I never pass a camp in my district without calling on the boys and seeing them at work. I have many letters and telegrams begging for their work on incompleted projects. Our great Wickiup irrigation project, costing $8,000,000 and only half finished, has been made possible by the work of C. C. C. camps. I can assert positively that I have never seen more efficient young laborers than these boys.

Some months ago in Oregon we had a disastrous break on the feed canal of an irrigation ditch, threatening a serious loss—a million dollars or more worth of crops were jeopardized. A C. C. C. camp of 200 boys was moved in. They put in the draglines; they manned the tractors and the bulldozers; they ran that camp night and day for 20 days. The $1,000,000 loss that might have come to the farmers on that irrigation district was greatly decreased.

It is absolutely necessary that trained men use the fire-fighting equipment we now have in the forest regions of the Pacific coast. It cannot be handled by casual volunteers or pick-up labor, as has been alleged here. Men have to know how to handle the chemicals and the various things they use to fight a forest fire. The C. C. C. boys have already protected much of the country against fires by putting in trails and roads. They know just where to go and what to do. There are buildings ready where the boys can sleep. The bedding and the tools are there. Shall we waste that equipment and scatter our trained supervisors? Some new group or agency must do the work. The C. C. C. organization should be given the task of handling outdoor labor of youth in this emergency. They have the "know-how," the equipment, the force, and the camps. While we wastefully cast aside this valuable organization, Australia announces the establishment of a civil construction corps modeled on our C. C. C., but used for older men. We shall need to reestablish the C. C. C. if we make the best use of old and young men not in the armed forces—a war-works army.

Mr. Chairman, most earnestly am I in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

I include as part of my remarks an article from the Christian Science Monitor of June 3 describing the work of their corps and indicating the uses which might be made of our C. C. C.:

AUSTRALIA CALLS 30,000 MEN FOR CIVIL CONSTRUCTION CORPS

CANBERRA, AUSTRALIA, June 2.—The biggest labor call in the history of Australia has been announced. The director general of allied works, E. G. Theodore, states that nearly 30,000 men will be mobilized in the civil construction corps—Australia's war works army.

Suitable volunteers are being accepted, but most will come from a compulsory call on the 45-55-year group.

Many thousands are already serving in the corps throughout Australia, and the corps is rapidly becoming one of Australia's major war services.

Its chief tasks include the building of airdromes, railways, docks, roads, dams, hutments, stores, and munitions factories.

PRIORITY ON JOB

Many of the jobs will be bigger than any single works construction ever attempted in Australia, and the complete scheme dwarfs all previous combined public works programs of the commonwealth and the states.

The plan under which the scheme operates provides for a works council deciding the order of priority of vital jobs for the works authorities and private contractors whose plants of organizations have been co-opted.

To these authorities the council supplies the required labor from the civil construction corps as well as additional plant materials.

The council already has carried out a census of constructional plants which it is calling up as the need arises.

RIGHT OF APPEAL

For laboring work the council accepts men from varied occupations—hotel bookkeepers, insurance salesmen, jewelers, accountants, and grocers are among those already called.

Two of the best pick-and-shovel men on one big South Australian job are a waiter and a butcher. When the men are called they are given a week in which to adjust their private affairs and also the right of appeal on health grounds.

Married members of the corps must allot at least £3 for their wives, which, on the New South Wales basic wage of £1 3s, leaves the worker £1 13s for himself, plus whatever overtime he earns. The corps is not subject to military discipline, but the members must not leave the service for the duration of the war. A welfare section provides canteens, recreation rooms, and mess facilities, and arranges visits to mobile talkie shows to remote camps. Information of a women's auxiliary to provide comforts for members of the corps in remote areas is also under consideration.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL].

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, I do not know just what the strong point of the opposition is. One element says economy and discusses that feature alone. Another says that the same labor is necessary in farm work. Another says that it is a sort of useless extravagance, with no benefits whatever. On the question of economy, in my area the C. C. C. boys are doing labor that the Government would otherwise have to do at much higher wages, therefore, there is no governmental economy in that. They are assisting in the construction of Army camps and work of that nature.

There seems to be some surprise because villages of 2,500 population and less furnish the bulk of these boys to the C. C. C. camps. Those are just the places they should come from. Do you suppose that with the present prices of farm products a man who has land and an 18-year-old son will send that son to a C. C. C. camp? Do you suppose that when a man has land to cultivate at the present prices he will want his boy to be away from home at C. C. C. camp wages? No such condition exists.

I am for abolishing all useless departments that have no bearing on winning the war, but this work now being done at Army camps by the C. C. C. would be done at higher cost to the Government if it was abolished.

Now, if you are expecting to replenish the farm crops this year from city labor, then you are putting yourselves in for a hard winter for something to eat, because 99 percent of city labor that would go to help farmers is of little value due to lack of experience, and, besides, whoever heard of city labor seeking farm employment even in our depression? We have reduced the former C. C. C. army to a mere handful and these are now asked for by the War Department to be assigned to wartime work making Army camps. It thus becomes a war measure, and the small amount left of this organization is asked to be so transferred.

Usually these boys come from the towns that have no war-production plants. The metropolitan cities have swallowed up that labor and the boys from the smaller towns are the ones that are unemployed and this is the very place they should come from in the C. C. C. work. They are not coming from off the farms now unless it be some place where the old man himself, even though superannuated, has a little patch he can handle by himself and can spare the boy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will not prevail. If we are going into the C. C. C. proposition on the scale that has been presented to us it means about $80,000,000. Without counting the overhead, I do not believe that more than 70,000 boys can be taken care of. This means over $1,000 per man, at a time when there is no substantial unemployment, when there is no requirement for relief, and at a time when we are taking nearly 50 percent of these boys off the farms where they ought to remain and be working. If their own parents have not farm work for them to do, their neighbors have, and we should not be butting in and breaking up the farm help situation at this time.

In the cities there is plenty of work for everyone, and there is no reason why we need to have this kind of relief activity.

In the Army camps for any temporary work we ought not to have two organizations in such camps. Everything ought to be directly and positively under the Army and the temporary work they would do can better be done by hired help.

When it comes to the temporary, seasonal activities in the camps, whatever work has to be done can better be done by temporary, hired help.

At this time the situation is that these people are unable to get enrollees except by soliciting and advertising. Is it not time we got through soliciting the public to go on the relief rolls or on relief employment? Is it not time we got rid of these demoralizing agencies, and there can be nothing but demoralizing agencies in relief employment. Is it not time we got to the point where we begin to build up America instead of tearing it down?

I have had this experience with boys that have been to these camps. They were good workers when they went there and when they came out they were not. I think we ought to give consideration to the experience of the farmers who have had to deal with the graduates of these institutions. This has been the general experience in my territory.

We have had the most wasteful and the most destructive management by this organization of almost any organization in the Government. At the present time, I understand, they have abandoned camps and they still have guards there taking care of high-priced new trucks that ought to be turned over to the Army so that they might put them to use. This is a rather general and prevalent condition and is just a waste of public funds.

They came up to the Appropriations Committee with an overhead that was practically as big as the Budget estimate that they brought with them. We are spending just a few dollars for these boys and a great big lot for a number of these fellows who hold jobs in the organization. Is it not time we began to draw in our horns? Is it not time we began to go all out for the defense effort and have everybody do work in connection with that program wherever it is possible, upon the farms, and in the factories that are producing things to take care of our boys, and give us a chance to win a victory over our enemies in the war? This is the first thing we ought to consider. We ought not to be wasting our substance on things that we do not need, but should give it all to the war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN].

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Chairman, 2 minutes, I think, is hardly enough to even start to make an argument about this important matter, but I realize that many others want to talk. I want to refute some of the statements made here by several speakers as to the waste because of the high-priced machinery and the trucks that are lying idle, that should be turned over to the Army. I know that they have been turned over to the Army, and I have been trying my best ever since I came back here at Easter time to get some of the fire-fighting equipment to be used by the Forest Department. I know that by act of Congress these things were turned over to the Budget Bureau and that the Budget in turn has turned them over to the Army, but the Army has them locked up, and they are not sure that they can permit the Forest Department to use them.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GEHRMANN. Yes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. The gentleman knows full well that the authority has been given the Forest Service to use any part of that material which they want.

Mr. GEHRMANN. But they have not been using it.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I have been told so by the Forest Service.

Mr. GEHRMANN. And I have contacted them, and I know the men that I have contacted do not say so. They say they have been given the authority, but you know how it is with red tape in the Army. The machinery and stuff is still locked up. We were fortunate to have had a lot of rain and snow, and have not had any forest fires. I saw our own forester and I asked him what would happen in case of fire, and he said, "We have not got a permit, but I suppose we will use a crowbar and break the lock and take the stuff regardless of the fact that we have not had permission." I know that to be a fact.

Mr. HOOK. And I might say that I have contacted practically every agency

of the Government, and they say that there is no authority to turn machinery over to the Forestry Department.

I think it would be the worst kind of economy to disband the C. C. C. completely. Certainly we should at least partially protect the billions of dollars the Government has invested in our forest areas during the past 10 years. Before the C. C. C. was established, northern Wisconsin was mostly a blackened, burned-over waste, which was not very inviting to tourists. Since then the entire country is green and the young forests are thriving. Observation fire towers have been erected, roads and trails have been built, fire-fighting equipment has been provided for all the camps in forest areas, and no fire during the last several years ever got very far. Now all this is to be left to the elements, the C. C. C. will be abandoned, the equipment taken away, and chances are that at some proper time, when conditions are just right, a large percentage of everything accomplished will be wiped out, and we will be right back where we were 10 years ago. Let us keep at least a few camps scattered in these forest areas so that we can partially protect this great natural resource.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, it would take many more than 2 minutes to say all that I would like to say on this particular subject. I am heartily in favor of this amendment, and I hope that it will be adopted by a very large majority. I cannot believe that this Congress will go on record to destroy through the back door one of the finest pieces of legislation that has ever been enacted by Congress by withholding the necessary appropriation for its continuance, and claiming that it is being done in the name of national defense. The fact is the President, our Commander in Chief, should know more about what is good or bad for national defense than anyone else, and certainly is better informed than any Member of Congress. He is in favor of continuing these camps to assist the defense effort. The record shows that thousands of these young men are employed on military reservations, and the Army engineers have testified to the value of this work, and here we are, with all this work that has to be done, talking of eliminating an organization that has won the support and the admiration and respect of the American people by virtue of its accomplishments, and the benefit it has been to our Nation's greatest asset, our youth.

May I add that the records before the Senate and congressional committees show Army officers testifying that the basic training received by these young men in the C. C. C. has been invaluable to them in the Army. It has saved the Army many months of work in preliminary training.

Some Members of Congress in this debate on the Civilian Conservation Corps seem to lose sight of the fact that here is an organization, born in the depression days of 1933 as an experiment, that has developed into one of the greatest result-producing organizations this country has ever seen. There never has been a major catastrophe—whether it be fire, flood, or hurricane—in which the Corps has not established an enviable record in what it has accomplished in the saving of life and property and in the protection of our natural resources.

I have not the time to go into detail, but most of the Members of Congress are familiar with the timber that has been planted, the lakes that have been built, the fire-protection work accomplished, and the thousand and one other jobs this Corps has performed during the 9 years of its existence.

Something was said here about the work being done cheaper in some other way. I think that is a debatable question. It is not a debatable question, however, outside of its work accomplishments, as to what this Corps has done for the 3,000,000 young men of this Nation along the lines of training and health-building activities.

Do not lose sight of the fact that when you abolish thi. Corps you throw 20,000 war veterans out of employment. Here are men, most of whom just did not fit into the industrial picture, that have been placed on work they can do and work which is necessary.

If this Corps has been valuable in the past in the building of roads and in the building of parks—and the record shows it has built some hundreds of thousands of miles of telephone lines, has done soil-erosion and grazing-control work—then why should this organization, with its manpower, equipment, and technical personnel not be used in the war effort?

It seems strange, indeed, all this talk of economy, and the attempt to prove that economy brought about in this way is necessary economy. I would say that there is much more behind this effort to eliminate this appropriation than economy.

I earnestly hope the C. C. C. camps will not be sacrificed on the altar of political expediency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentlewoman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to the Tarver amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota to the amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: At the end of the Tarver amendment, strike out the period, insert a colon, and the following: "*Provided*, That funds appropriated in this act for the Civilian Conservation Corps shall be available only for the prosecution of projects which have been requested by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, or certified by either of them as important to the war effort."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to carry out the proposal which I made last year, and that is to have the work of the Civilian Conservation Corps devoted to projects certified as important to the war effort.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes.

Mr. TARVER. I think that the purpose of the amendment is in exact accord with the message of the President transmitting this estimate. I do not understand that it would exclude work in the national forests, regarded as national defense work, because that is one of the purposes of the amendment. As far as I am concerned, I would be willing to accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the gentleman.

Now, this amendment seeks to do exactly what all the people who have been talking against the Tarver amendment have asked for. That is, it makes the work of the C. C. C. devoted exclusively to the war effort. It says that no part of the funds appropriated to the C. C. C. shall be available for the prosecution of any project except those that have been asked for by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, or certified to by one of those secretaries as important to the war effort. That puts it upon the same basis of limitation that applies to public roads money this year.

Last year I proposed this idea to the Chief of the Corps of Engineers. I found him much interested. I found the C. C. C. director interested. I urged the idea on the floor of the House. At one time I understood that the War Department had made a recommendation on the subject, but for some reason, possibly because of the consolidation study then under way, no action was taken. I think everybody now agrees that the money and work of the Corps ought to be applied to the war effort. I have seen some of the work of the Corps on military reservations. I have talked with officers who have handled this work, and in instance after instance the testimony is that targets and rifle pits and landing fields and bomb shelters are being constructed at less cost to the Government by the Corps than when done by contract. The Army and Navy now have about 150 of these camps and have asked for more of them for this type of work. My amendment will restrict the use of funds to the prosecution of Army and Navy projects or to those certified as important to the war effort. Whatever your position on the Corps as a whole, I believe this amendment will appeal to you.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, 15 minutes, to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I believe it should be helpful in connection with the discussion of this matter if we would attempt to use some degree of judgment in our discussion of the problem and see if it is not possible to bring our thinking back to some of the facts in connection with the matter.

I heard the distinguished gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] make a

very inflammatory speech. He said that the amendment should be adopted because of the necessity for protecting the great forest areas out in the West. The gentleman who just left the Well of the House seems to predicate his argument upon the fact that it is necessary for the C. C. C. to do the work of the Army cantonments. Others have predicated their arguments upon the admitted splendid work that the C. C. C. has done for the purpose for which it was created, namely, conservation of the natural resources of the United States, and to afford relief for the unemployed youth of America.

May I take you back for just a moment and call your attention to the substantive law under which the organization works? It seems to me that we are forgetting that this is an appropriation designed to implement a program that is expressed in authorizing legislation, and in the Executive orders issued by the President of the United States. If you will read the authorization law and read the Executive orders issued by the President you will find that in each of those instruments the language is "for the conservation and development of the natural resources of the United States."

I will have no quarrel with any person who argues that the C. C. C. has done a splendid job in the past. It has made a great contribution to the protection and the development of the natural resources of the United States. That is the purpose for which it was designed, and I defy any person to stand in the Well of the House and point to any authority to operate the C. C. C. as a work battalion to do work upon Army cantonments in the United States, regardless of the value that that work may be to the war effort.

It seems to me that if we are going to legislate intelligently, there ought to be some basis in the law to enable us to do the thing we are about to do. Now, what do they propose to do? Several of the Members who have discussed this problem in the Well of the House, including the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], have called for a vote in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], on the ground that the President is the Commander in Chief and that he has requested it, and therefore we should follow his direction. Are you all familiar with the facts? Do you know that the President of the United States submitted a Budget message to this Congress which came before our subcommittee, in which he requested funds to carry on and maintain 150 camps? One hundred and fifty camps—100 of which were to be located upon Army reservations, and only 50 to be devoted to Agriculture and Interior, in carrying on conservation activities? Do you know that the Director of the C. C. C. and representatives of Interior and Agriculture came before our committee and said:

> Gentlemen, if you intend to approve that type of Budget estimate, you might just as well abandon the whole thing. We would recommend that you strike it out entirely and abandon the Civilian Conservation Corps. It would be ridiculous to try to operate it under the Budget estimate submitted by the President in the first instance.

There was the Budget estimate. There was the plan submitted by the President, that would have completely wrecked and ruined the conservation of natural resources, for which the C. C. C. was set up.

So, when the attitude of the committee was manifested, immediately a supplemental estimate was sent up, a supplemental estimate that provided for 350 camps, 207 of those camps to be located upon Army reservations, 90 of those camps to be devoted to forest protective work and the balance to be turned over to the work of Interior in some alleged necessary reclamation work throughout the country.

Now, I ask these Members who are talking about fire-protection hazards in the great forests of this country, of what benefit is it going to be to have seven camps in the great State of Montana, four camps located in the great forest areas in my State, six camps in the great State of Michigan, and not a single camp in the State of Georgia? Read your record and find the attitude of the distinguished gentleman from Georgia, the author of this amendment. He was most severe in his cross-examination of the witness and condemned the program that would deprive his State of a single camp designed to fight forest fires and to carry on protection work. Let us be sensible in our attitude on the proposition. If you believe in conservation of our natural resources, if you believe in carrying on worth while and effective forest protection, then let the President send down here a Budget estimate that will permit that to be done.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] says there is some sinister purpose behind the attitude of the Appropriations Committee in striking the C. C. C. appropriation out of this bill. Let me remind you that the President has on his desk an order ready for signature to consolidate the activities of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration. I feel that a mistake is being made in not having that order signed and in not presenting the program to the Congress in order that we may now legislate and appropriate for the consolidated agency, which I understand is about to be made as soon as this appropriation bill passes.

I say to these gentlemen from Montana, from Oregon, from Washington, and down in the great forest areas of the South, and in my State that I am not opposed to conservation as carried on by the Civilian Conservation Corps. I applaud what they have done, but I will not support an appropriation here that intends to destroy the very purpose of the Civilian Conservation Corps, which is conservation. The testimony is that the effective range of fire-fighting forces out through the West is 20 miles. Seven camps in the State of Montana, 6 in the State of Michigan, 4 in my State; why, Mr. Chairman, it is perfectly absurd to come here and ask for an appropriation to provide forest protection on any such basis.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. TARVER. In view of the statement the gentleman has made with reference to the authority to provide for the use of these camps in the way in which they are to be used under this proposed appropriation, I desire to direct the gentleman's attention to Public Law 507 of this Congress, title VIII, which provides as follows:

> The President is empowered to direct the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency to assign the manpower of the Civilian Conservation Corps to the extent necessary to protect the munitions, aircraft, and other war industries, municipal water supplies, power and other utilities, and to protect resources subject to the hazard of forest fires.

What did Congress mean by passing that legislation just a short while ago unless it intended that the C. C. C. should be used for these purposes?

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman is not presenting anything new, for if he will turn to page 1220 of the record he will find that I placed that in the record myself.

Mr. TARVER. It is new to the gentleman's argument.

Mr. KEEFE. If the gentleman will read it further he will see that it does not provide for the maintenance of these camps on military reservations. In reading the Executive order and interpreting it in the light of that language the gentleman will see what the President had in mind, and that he was not contemplating any such thing when that order was made.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman have any doubt that under the War Powers Act the President lacks authority to assign the C. C. C. to any other agency of the Government?

Mr. KEEFE. The very asking of that question would indicate its answer. I am thoroughly familiar with the fact that the President has unlimited power. The point I am making, however, is that I would like to have him to exercise that power. I want him to bring before the Congress his consolidating order. I want him to throw C. C. C. and N. Y. A. together. I want him to bring that order before the Congress, and I want him to provide a program that will set up an effective conservation movement in this country instead of destroying it and removing these camps from the areas where they are most vitally needed. Where you have had about 1,700 camps scattered throughout the country you are going to have 150 if you adopt the plan embraced in this budget estimate; and still you talk about protecting the forest—1,700 camps as against 150.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I agree with the gentleman, and I, too, wish that we could have legislated subsequent to an

order consolidating these two agencies, but I do not quite understand how there can be a consolidation of the two agencies if the House destroys one of them completely today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] who preceded me, is one of the most convincing orators in this body. I always enjoy hearing him speak. Usually I agree with him and although I now agree with much he has said, I cannot follow his conclusions.

If I understood the crux of his argument, it was first and foremost to the effect that with the reduction proposed herein the C. C. C. camps will no longer be permitted to do conservation work for which this program was inaugurated; and second, that he feels the President of the United States has made a very serious mistake in not submitting to Congress an order consolidating the two youth agencies, the N. Y. A. and the C. C. C.

Answering the first argument, I would say that I agree with the gentleman that the conservation program of the C. C. C. has been so outstanding and beneficial that it needs no defense at this time. Under that great, far-reaching program literally millions of acres of depleted lands in widely scattered areas have been conserved and reclaimed. Swamps have been drained to conserve health, roads and trails have been constructed, thousands of acres of land have been reforested and billions of trees have been planted. The peacetime program of the C. C. C. has been a marvelous one, and I certainly have no apology for having given the program my enthusiastic support.

I must confess I do not see the force of the gentleman's argument in criticizing the President for not consolidating these two youth organizations prior to their consideration by this body. Frankly, that does not sound like a reason to me any more than the first argument, but merely an excuse.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], as well as the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], constantly referred to the C. C. C. as a nondefense activity. As important as soil conservation and other phases of the C. C. C. program have been in the past, I agree that nondefense and nonessential activities should be eliminated because of the war effort. I am willing to match my record for economy with either of the gentlemen named. May I again remind these gentlemen that I offered one amendment of the agriculture bill to limit soil-conservation payments to $1,000. That amendment alone, so I was advised by officials of the Agriculture Department, would make it possible to save around $50,000,000 a year. I brought the Interior Department appropriations bill to this body reduced approximately $18,000,000 below Budget estimates after the Secretary of the Interior had voluntarily cut his own estimates $10,000,000.

Certainly we must cut and cut until it hurts all nondefense activities, but if you will read the RECORD you will discover the Commander in Chief said the camps were essential for the war effort. The hearings on this bill will disclose that every witness that appeared for the Department of War who testified on the subject made it plain that the continuation of these camps was not only advisable but essential to the war effort, and that they could be operated more economically than doing the same work by civilians or by the War Department.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] a few moments ago offered an amendment that will require all camps to be placed on projects designated as being essential to the war effort by the Secretary of War. The gentleman from Georgia states he is willing to accept that amendment. With the Case amendment in the bill, all this long and vociferous talk about nonessentials and nondefense activities goes out of the window.

Much loose talk has been made here about the C. C. C. robbing the farms of labor, but the fact is, an order was issued last January prohibiting any boy from being admitted to the C. C. C. camp who was employed on the farm.

Someone has suggested, "Let these 17 and 18-year-old boys join the Army." That seems to me the most cruel, heartless and cold-blooded statement that has been made. I do not care to further comment on such a statement.

The opposition has also scoffed the idea of the C. C. C. being a protection against forest fires. The statements made by responsible officials before the Committee on Appropriations was to the effect that the C. C. C. boys are not only well trained fire fighters but they have done a marvelous job in several areas along the western coast. As we debate today the report comes that the Japs are again shelling Pearl Harbor. I hope that report is not true but we do know of the attack on Dutch Harbor this week and many are expecting further enemy attacks in these areas within the next few weeks or months. One thing is certain—someone must protect our great forests and if the C. C. C. boys are not permitted to do this work, then Congress should immediately make funds available to see that the job is done. I am not a member of the subcommittee that heard the Army officials who appeared before the committee, but I am told that representatives of the War Department gave the committee some off-the-record, rather startling information as to the dire necessity for certain phases of this work, particularly on many of the military reservations. So again I say, if these camps cannot and are not now doing essential work for the war effort, then let's abolish them, but if the President of the United States and responsible representatives of the War Department are correct, then so far as I am concerned, there is nothing to do but to follow the Commander in Chief in this matter.

I have no desire to embarrass the gentleman from Michigan but since he is asking this body to follow him now rather than the specific recommendations of the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, let me say that I wonder what a pitiful plight the Nation would be in if the Congress had followed him in the past on matters connected with the defense of the Nation on land, water, and in the air? When the President of the United States was begging Congress to strengthen the Navy back in 1935, '36, '37, and '40 I wonder how the gentleman stood then on these matters so essential to the defense of the country?

Back in 1938 when the President of the United States asked Congress for 5,000 modern bombers and fighting planes, what was the answer of the gentleman from Michigan to that solemn warning and request of the President of the United States? I hold in my hand the voting record of the gentleman from Michigan on the major bills that have passed Congress for the strengthening of our armed forces during the past few years. Back in 1939 the President of the United States told Congress and the country that it was imperative that we immediately amend the Neutrality Act and lift the Arms Embargo. The gentleman from Michigan evidently took the position that the President didn't know what he was talking about and opposed and voted against the measure.

Again the President told Congress that it should greatly expand the Coast Guard for national defense and the RECORD shows that the distinguished gentleman from Michigan said "Nay" when the roll was called on that important measure. Our Commander in Chief asked Congress for the Naval Establishment Bill of 1940 to greatly augment appropriations for all types of ships in the annual appropriations bill of 1940. But although we were almost in the throes of war then, the gentleman from Michigan put his judgment against that of the President and the naval experts and voted "no."

Again, the President asked Congress for the reciprocal trade treaty bill so important to the defense program. The President said "Yes" but the great leader from Michigan said "Nay" when his name was called. Then we were presented with another naval-expansion bill to increase the naval composition by 160,000 tons. This request was made by the Commander in Chief, but the gentleman from Michigan, whose hindsight is evidently greater than his foresight on national defense, voted "nay", according to the RECORD.

The RECORD also discloses that the gentleman also opposed the Selective Draft Act, known as H. R. 10132. The same is true of the Lend-Lease Authorization Act and also on the appropriation to put that important act into operation.

The gentleman from Michigan voted to recommit the Service Extension Act of 1941 and voted "nay" on final passage; and, believe it or not, the RECORD also discloses that the same gentleman who now so freely gives advice on military matters and asks us to follow him rather than the President or the military and naval authorities, actually voted against House Joint Resolution 237, to arm merchant vessels.

Considering the fact that the gentleman has been dead wrong on these major measures of such vital importance to the

security and defense of the country, I frankly do not feel under any special obligations to follow him at this time.

Now it would seem that the die is cast, that most of our Republican brethren are going to follow this gentleman today despite his record of being wrong on so many previous occasions, and it seems that in the name of economy a goodly number of Democrats are also going to follow his leadership; but inasmuch as the record shows that every responsible representative of the Army says these few camps left are essential to the war effort, and inasmuch as the President of the United States has asked Congress to retain them, let me say that on that basis and that basis alone, I expect to support the Tarver amendment which, if adopted, will reduce the amount for the C. C. C. $5,000,000 below the Budget estimate.

Mr. CREAL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CREAL. If I understood the gentleman from Michigan correctly, he is going to vote to abolish the C. C. C., then he wants the President to consolidate something with something that does not exist. Is that the way the gentleman understands it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, yes; and that is about as logical as all his talk about "sacred cows" that we have heard so much about today.

In closing let me say that you cannot laugh this matter off or scoff at the request of the President and the Army. In this vote Members are either going to follow the Commander in Chief or else this great self-appointed leader. The gentleman has been wrong so many times in the past that I submit, in all seriousness, he might be wrong now.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] has made an observation in relation to the consolidation order that he states is upon the President's desk, and he says the President should sign it. He indicates that if the President did sign it he might be for some kind of a C. C. C. program.

The best evidence of the sound judgment of the President in not signing that order to date is the very fact that we have the present situation existing in the House. We have a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, the subcommittee who heard the bill and was in charge of the bill, reporting the estimate for the C. C. C. We have the full committee by a bi-partisan vote striking it out. We have a situation confronting us now where to get it back an amendment has to be adopted in the Committee of the Whole. Would it not be a useless procedure for any President to follow to sign a consolidation order unless he knew there was going to be an appropriation made by the Congress?

I submit that the President of the United States has used sound judgment in not signing the consolidation order up to the present time and in waiting until he knows just what appropriations will go through, because if there is no appropriation for the C. C. C., it then follows that no consolidation is necessary; at least, the President is taking the proper course until he knows what action is taken by the House. I think that argument answers the observation made by my distinguished friend from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Let me answer a few of the other arguments. It is a question here of following some leadership. Either this body today is going to follow the leadership of Franklin D. Roosevelt, who recommends this as a necessary part of the conduct of the war, or a bipartisan make-up, composed of at least 90 to 95 percent of the Republicans, because that will be necessary for a bipartisan coalition to prevail with some Democrats. So far as I am concerned, not as a Democrat, but as an American citizen in this crisis—and if I were sitting on the Republican side I would feel the same way—I would follow the leadership of the President of the United States, no matter whom that man might be, and in these days it is Franklin D. Roosevelt.

The gentleman from Michigan says, "I am not opposed to the C. C. C.," in one part of his speech. "I am opposed to the politicians milking the sacred cow." What hypocrisy and subterfuge, and by the way, he is a politician himself, but apparently he has not much respect for men in public life when he makes a slurring statement of that kind. Then he later says: "The time has arrived to wipe out the C. C. C."

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot yield now. The gentleman would not yield to me.

Mr. ENGEL. I was quoting a speech of a year ago in which I said that.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman certainly changes rapidly. He says he is not opposed to the C. C. C. but he is opposed to the politicians milking the sacred cow. Then in the next breath he says that the time has arrived to wipe out the C. C. C.

Yes, since December 7 those who honestly opposed the President's policies prior to December 7 have said, "We are going to follow the President." I accepted the utterances of the gentlemen who have made that statement. This is really a test today as to whether or not there will be politics in connection with the war measures and war activities pending before the House.

They say that this is a nonessential expenditure. If we do not appropriate money for this purpose we must appropriate it to hire somebody to do the very thing the boys in these camps would be doing. We must employ men to protect our forests and we must employ men in connection with the activities in the camps. It is estimated that unless these 207 camps are assigned to the War Department it will be necessary to have the equal of 3 or 4 divisions to do the work these young men will be doing if this appropriation is carried and the 207 camps are assigned to the War Department.

If those who oppose the C. C. C. want it defeated honestly and honorably, why do they not do it by openly admitting they are against it, and not advance the hypocritical argument that they are opposed to it now because the consolidation order has not been signed, or give some other fictitious reason so that when they go back to their constituents next fall they will have some kind of an alibi to present to the poor people back home in the hope that that alibi will deceive the people and they will again obtain their votes.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], for whom I have a profound respect personally, and who I consider to be the ablest twister of words I have ever seen, challenges the recommendation of the War Department that the camps are necessary to the War Department. The gentleman took the same position before December 7 on other legislation. He challenged the recommendations of General Marshall and the recommendations of President Roosevelt. Every thinking American now knows that if the majority of the Democrats, with some Republicans, had not constituted a majority of the House before December 7, our country would have been practically defenseless after the catastrophe of Pearl Harbor.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] says, "I am with the President." The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] also says: "I am with the President if the President agrees with me."

In other words "I am the leader, I am with the President when I agree with him. I believe in following the President, but I am not going to follow the President unless the President agrees with me."

If we follow their argument to the logical conclusion, their position is that the President should follow their leadership.

Let me make a few observations. Suppose we have a great fire in one of our forest reserves. Who will answer for it, if no money is appropriated for fire protection? The Congress of the United States. Suppose you wipe out the C. C. C.; we must appropriate money to employ men to protect our forest reserves, and we must assign men from the Army whose assignment normally should be elsewhere to do the work the boys of the C. C. C. would be called upon to do. We must make an appropriation whether or not we wipe out the C. C. C., and it will probably be in a larger amount.

The C. C. C. has done a wonderful job. I hope that in this vote today those who have said they are going to follow the leadership of the President, on this war activity which he has recommended, whether Republican or Democrat, will stick by their word and vote to put this amendment back into the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that both the Tarver

and the Case amendments may be again read.

Mr. TARVER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, the amendment I offered is the language of the original bill. I do not believe the House would be interested in having that amendment again read, but I do think the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] should be read.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I am hopeful that the gentleman from Georgia will permit his amendment to be read, because the House ought to know how much is involved, and so forth. Not every Member has the bill in front of him as it was presented originally.

Mr. TARVER. If the House wants to hear the amendment read again, I have no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will report both amendments.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: On page 18, after the title "Civilian Conservation Corps", insert the following:

"For all necessary expenses to carry into effect the provisions of the act of June 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C., ch. 3A), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the purchase and exchange of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals; the purchase (including exchange), operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; hire, with or without personal services, of work animals, animal-drawn and motor-propelled vehicles, and watercraft; printing and binding; travel expenses, including not to exceed $2,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the corps when specifically authorized by the Federal Security Administrator; transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940, and regulations promulgated thereunder; construction, improvement, repair, and maintenance of buildings, but the cost of any building erected hereunder shall not exceed $25,000, as follows:

"For pay, subsistence, medical services, etc.: For pay, subsistence, travel, clothing (and repair thereof), medical services, including hospitalization, fees and travel of physicians, dentists, veterinarians, and nurses, burial of enrollees, payment (not exceeding $50 for any one transfusion) to any enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps or other individual furnishing blood for transfusion to the veins of an enrollee or discharged enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps undergoing treatment in a hospital, authorized to treat such patient, $49,499,288;

"For all other necessary expenses, both field and departmental, in connection with the administration of camps and work projects, $26,318,712;

"The Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps may authorize the exchange of motor-propelled and horse-drawn vehicles, tractors, road equipment, and boats, and parts, accessories, tires, or equipment thereof, in whole or in part payment for other vehicles, tractors, road equipment, or boats, or parts, accessories, tires, or equipment of such vehicles, tractors, road equipment, or boats.

"No part of any appropriation in this act for the Civilian Conservation Corps or the National Youth Administration shall be available for obligation after the effective date of any Executive order consolidating such agencies or transferring any of the functions of either of such agencies to the other."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will now report the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia, which has just been reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota to the Tarver amendment: At the end of the Tarver amendment, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That funds appropriated in this act for the Civilian Conservation Corps shall be available only for the prosecution of projects which have been requested by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, or certified by either of them as important to the war effort."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. ENGEL) there were—ayes 123, noes 10.

So the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia, as amended.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 110, noes 142.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. TARVER and Mr. ENGEL.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 121, noes 158.

So the amendment as amended was rejected.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TARVER: On page 18, line 1, after the title "Civilian Conservation Corps", insert: "For all necessary expenses to provide for the liquidation of the Civilian Conservation Corps as authorized under the provisions of the act of June 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C. ch. 3A), including personal service in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the conservation and disposition of all of the property of whatever type in use by said Civilian Conservation Corps, including camp buildings, accessories, equipment, and machinery of all types, and for such travel and other necessary expenses as may be incurred in connection with the conservation and liquidation of said Civilian Conservation Corps, $500,000."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no authority in law for the liquidation of the Civilian Conservation Corps.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, the Committee has decided, after full debate, that under present conditions——

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I will accept the amendment.

Mr. TARVER. I was sure the gentleman would accept it, but I want to make this brief statement:

The Committee of the Whole has decided, after full debate, to deny any appropriation for the next fiscal year to the Civilian Conservation Corps. I still believe that the judgment which has been rendered in this matter is probably not a wise one, but I accept, so far as I am concerned, the judgment of a majority of my colleagues. However, the effect of this elimination of any appropriation for the next fiscal year from the bill is to leave the Civilian Conservation Corps, with its 1,500 camps and camp buildings thereon, its 32,000 pieces of heavy equipment, and innumerable other items of equipment hanging in midair, so to speak, with no provision whatever made for even taking care of the camp buildings and other property until some disposition can be made of it. So it has seemed to me that reasonable provision should be made in the bill for conserving the property of the Corps pending its disposition to other Federal, State, or municipal agencies as is provided in the bill, and to facilitate the disposition of its property in accordance wth the terms of existing law I have conferred with the Members on my side on the Committee and with the minority members, and they are in accord with the amendment which I have offered. In other words, there is no opposition thereto from the Committee.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. As I understand it, the gentleman's amendment provides for disposition of the property according to law. Does not the gentleman think it would be well to make the camp buildings immediately available to the War Department for defense housing in defense areas?

Mr. TARVER. If the gentleman will examine the language of the bill he will observe there the proviso which was written by the subcommittee and was not stricken out in the full committee, which gives to the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps, with the approval of the Federal Security Administrator, full authority to make disposition of the property of the corps with attention first to war needs and with the requirement that all of the property, before it is disposed of otherwise, shall be first offered to the War and Navy Departments, and with authority then, if it is not needed by the War or Navy Department, to permit its use by States, municipalities, or nonprofit organizations for recreational, health, and educational purposes, such purposes as making use of camp buildings by 4-H Clubs, or societies for taking care of tubercular children, by boys' clubs, and for other purposes of that type. But the language of the bill requires, first, that any requirements of the War and Navy Departments shall be given prior consideration, and it is only after that these other uses may be authorized. I think the law is complete as to authority to utilize the property in the war effort.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman refer to the present measure containing

those provisions or is that in existing law?

Mr. TARVER. That is in the present bill.

If there are no further questions, I have nothing else to say in the matter.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the Clerk will return to page 44 of the bill and read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION

PARAGRAPH 1. Youth work: To enable the National Youth Administration, which is hereby extended to and including June 30, 1943, under the supervision and direction of the Federal Security Agency, to provide employment and work training for unemployed young persons of the ages of 17 to 24, inclusive, on resident and nonresident workshop and other projects approved by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission as needed in the prosecution of the war in furnishing work experience and work training preparatory to employment in occupations in which there is a present or potential shortage of labor, $49,729,000. This appropriation shall be available for the payment of project supervisory employees; the procurement of project facilities by contract or otherwise and the maintenance of such facilities, including the purchase of materials, supplies and equipment; the purchase, operation, maintenance, and repair of trucks and passenger-carrying automobiles; the payment of rentals; and travel and other expenses essential to the prosecution of the program authorized under this appropriation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: Page 24, line 15, strike out line 15 and the balance of the paragraph, down to and including line 8, on page 25.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object. Do I understand the time is to be controlled one-half by each side?

Mr. HARE. One-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], and the other half by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I understand that under unanimous-consent agreement the time has been limited to 1 hour on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct, and all amendments thereto.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, first let me make clear what this amendment does. It does not touch the student-aid program. It deals only with paragraph 1 of N. Y. A., which contains an appropriation of $49,739,000 for a defense training program. I emphasize the fact that it does not deal with the student-aid program. The reason for this amendment is that, in my considered judgment, there is duplication and inefficiency in this training program for the very good reason that there are two such programs in this very bill.

I want to emphasize my interest in the defense training program. I want to see it administered in an economical and efficient manner. I want to see it under unified direction. Any other position would be a disservice to the very cause of victory.

Several years ago the President requested authority to abolish, reorganize, and consolidate agencies and bureaus in the executive branch in the interest of more efficient and economical administration. I served on the Reorganization Committee of the House. Today we can aid the President by consolidating the defense training program for the benefit of the country and to the service of the taxpayers and in the interest of a more effective war effort.

This bill contains $49,000,000 for the National Youth Administration for defense training. This bill also contains $94,000,000 for defense training, to be administered by the Office of Education.

The very language of the bill provides that N. Y. A. is limited to young persons between ages 17 and 24. In the annual report of the Office of Education and in the report on deficiency or supplementary appropriation bill considered a few weeks ago, Mr. Studebaker, of the Office of Education, testified that out of more than 2,000,000 people who have been trained in the defense-training courses of the Office of Education nearly 1,000,000 are between the ages of 17 and 24—the same age to which N. Y. A. addresses itself.

The language of the bill for N. Y. A. provides that it is for unemployed young persons. In the annual report of the Office of Education, on page 7, you will find this language:

Preemployment courses offered for induction training to unemployed persons.

From the standpoint of age the two agencies are on all fours; from the standpoint of unemployment they are on all fours; and from the standpoint of this bill they are on all fours, in view of the fact that there is a form of duplication of activity in these two agencies.

The N. Y. A. deals with defense training, and the language of the bill is this:

Employment and work training as needed in prosecution of the war in furnishing work experience and work training preparatory to employment.

The language of the bill relating to the Office of Education is "courses supplementary to employment in occupations essential to national defense, preemployment, and refresher courses for workers preparing for such occupations." The very language of the committee's own report on page 16 acknowledges that fact. Here is what they say:

The National Youth Administration should restrict its activity to the type of industrial training necessary to the war effort.

That is the very thing they are providing with the $94,000,000 for the Office of Education. Evidently Mr. Aubrey Williams, who is the Director of N. Y. A., must have sensed that fact and become suspicious of it, because on page 845 of the hearings he speaks about integrating the schedule with the Office of Education. Here is his language:

Related instruction provided by State vocational schools under grants from Office of Education will be integrated in work schedules.

Doing identic work and relating their program; and if that is the case, in the name of efficiency and in the name of economy there certainly is no good reason to have both agencies in this bill doing identic kind of training work, one to spend $49,000,000, the other to spend $94,000,000.

And what are the course they give? The types of course under the N. Y. A. are: Automobile, aviation, construction, drafting, blueprinting, electrical, forging, foundry, machine shop, patterns, radio, riveting, sheet metal welding, woodworking.

What are the courses for the Office of Education? Automobile, aviation, construction, drafting, blueprinting, electrical, forging, foundry, machine shop, patterns, radio, riveting, sheet metal welding, and woodworking.

The Office of Education has approval of courses covering 550 occupations that are followed in the interest of national defense. The N. Y. A. training course also has approval of W. P. B., just as the courses of the Office of Education do.

What kind of equipment have they? The estimate for equipment for the N. Y. A. will run from ten to twelve million. In this bill they are asking for $3,563,000 additional equipment. What kind of equipment does the Office of Education have? Mr. Burnell, who represented the Office of Education before the committee, testified on page 299:

We have enough equipment to train 2,300,000 persons.

How do they operate? N. Y. A. operates through 1,918 shops in their regular program, 1,670 shops in their defense program.

How does the Office of Education operate? They testified before the deficiency subcommittee they were operating in 2,594 schools in 1,541 cities in 48 States.

Now, if there is any proof of duplication needed, Mr. Studebaker came before the deficiency committee and testified in behalf of that $9,500,000 bill to carry out the program for 1942, and here is his language on page 24 of the hearings in response to a question by Mr. SNYDER:

If the purpose, relative to defense training, is only to give training, then I think the policy will have to be determined as to whether it is necessary in any community to have two training agencies.

They sensed the duplication of this operation and the time has come for us to reorganize and to consolidate this training effort and save some money, and put it under unified direction. The N. Y. A. asked the Budget Bureau for $123,116,000. How much did they get? They got less than half. They got $53,000,000.

The Office of Education, for its program, asked the Budget Bureau for $94,000,000. How much did they get? They got all the money that they requested, for evidently the Budget Bureau must have recognized that they are on far better ground in carrying on this program.

So there is duplication all the way through in this program from the standpoint of aids, equipment, competition in the various centers of the country, unemployment, training for employment, and everything else. I submit to the House this afternoon that for a program of that kind it is absolutely unnecessary to have two agencies in the same bill, one fortified with $49,000,000, the other with $94,000,000. In the interest of efficiency, in the interest of a better job for victory, these ought to be consolidated in the Office of Education, and the first step would be to adopt the amendment that is now pending on the desk to strike out paragraph 1 of the bill.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. May I ask the gentleman this question: If appropriation is made in full for the Office of Education for the purpose specified under the Office of Education, could that Office of Education with such appropriation then use the existing facilities and also give the training to those who are now receiving training by the use of those facilities in the N. Y. A.?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The National Youth Administration was created by Executive order. If the President has authority to create the agency and provide the facilities, certainly he has the authority by like Executive order to transfer the facilities wheresoever he pleases and in the interest of victory and national defense.

No matter what argument may be adduced on this floor this afternoon, the record is abundantly clear that here is a duplication of effort which can be made more efficient and more fruitful and more economical through consolidation.

My second amendment is that the operation is inefficient in the sense that the overhead is too great, and that inefficiency springs out of duplication. For instance, the National Youth Administration asked for $49,000,000 for the program and then asked for $3,275,000 for administrative expenses. There is a total of $140,000,000-plus for the Office of Education in the bill. The administrative expenses are $1,240,000—almost one-third of the administrative expenses for the N. Y. A., and yet with a program that is three times as large.

N. Y. A. proposes to spend $918,000 on travel. The Office of Education would spend about 15 percent of that amount, $139,000.

Of the $49,000,000 for N. Y. A., only 25 percent of the money goes to the boys. Only 25 percent is paid in the form of so-called employee youth wages. Here is the break-down: $18,000,000-plus, for travel and supplies; eighteen and one-half million for supervisory personnel. Think of that. That is more than one-third for supervision. In fact, it is nearly 40 percent for supervisory personnel. Six and one-half million for subsistence; $12,300,000 for youth wages.

Let me emphasize that of the whole amount only 25 percent is in wages. The rest of it is subsistence, supervisory training, travel, supplies, and so forth. The Office of Education operates through the States, through the educational set-up for vocational education. They use teachers, they use State and local administration; and so it seems to me that is a far better program than to entrust this defense training to the National Youth Administration.

What is the pay and subsistence for these boys under N. Y. A.? If they are in one of the resident centers they get $10 in cash and $25 in subsistence. If they are nonresident they get $25 in cash. The fact of the matter is that they have about 30,000 resident students altogether in the regular and in the defense program. This means what? It means that boarding and lodging facilities must be provided. You do not do that under the program of the Office of Education because it works out through the State and local centers and through the vocational-education channels everywhere in the State.

How many trainees do they propose under N. Y. A. appropriation? Eighty thousand at one time. This means 320,000 or maybe 350,000 for the fiscal year 1943. Get the number—probably 350,000 for the whole year. According to the testimony of the Office of Education they have 384,000 on the rolls right now—more for the month of May than all the N. Y. A. program for the entire year will provide for.

What about the cost? Here is the testimony in round figures: The pre-employment course of the Office of Education costs $50; the supplementary course costs $25; the engineering course is $52. The whole cost of a course is how much? Under N. Y. A. $150. That is what it will average.

I do not know of any automobiles in the Office of Education set-up. How many automobiles under N. Y. A.? Here are the figures: 1,181 passenger cars and 1,577 trucks. That is the answer.

There is duplication in the 2 agencies pursuing the same features. What about waste in the program? The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] brought that out very well in his argument. He was supported in this by the testimony of Mr. Aubrey Williams himself. The hearings indicate that there are 82 metal shops with 549 people—7 persons per shop; 29 machine shops with 212 persons—8 persons per shop. He testified that they had foundries where they had only 2 persons in each foundry. Do you regard that as an efficient operation, Mr. Chairman? I do not, and particularly when it is a duplication of the work which is being done by the Office of Education.

Look at the supervisory personnel: 7,300 supervisors, 124,000 boys in the regular program—1 supervisor for every 17 boys. In their defense program they have 10,000-plus supervisors with 66,000 boys—1 supervisor for every 6-plus boys. Do you regard that as an efficient program?

They say that N. Y. A. is just taking care of boys who are needy. The Baltimore Sun disclosed the fact that a reporter of the Pittsburgh Press went down and got on the N. Y. A. in Pittsburgh, and they turned him loose among a lot of expensive machinery without asking him any question as to whether he was in need or not.

This work can be done under the Office of Education with less duplication and more efficiency. There is not an iota of excuse for maintaining this N. Y. A. set-up in the defense program today, in view of the fact that an identic kind of training has been in progress under the supervision of the Office of Education more than 2 years.

Since the N. Y. A. program is essentially an operation in the field of vocational education and training, it is extremely interesting to observe the attitude of the National Education Association and its policy committee which speaks for 200,000 or more teachers in the country. In an elaborate memorandum prepared by Willard E. Givens, executive secretary, which was presented to the Committee on Education and Labor of the United States Senate, Mr. Givens said among other things:

> We of the National Education Association are therefore unable to see any fundamental difference between the National Youth Administration and the public schools in this matter of the kind of training which they provide. Work experience, it seems to us, is not a matter of working for National Youth Administration wages or of producing some useful goods. It is a matter of learning to apply oneself continuously and industriously to a job, learning to work under supervision, learning to meet high standards of performance. These learnings, we believe, can and do take place in vocational school shops quite as well as in National Youth Administration shops. A boy in a public school class, who receives no pay but wants to qualify for a job, will work just as industriously and just as skillfully as a boy in a National Youth Administration shop, who is paid for his work and who also wants to qualify for a job. And if neither boy wants to qualify for a job, neither is likely to learn much about work habits, wages or no wages. If the public-school boy needs money to pay his expenses while he is completing his training, that can be furnished through a student aid program.
>
> It is therefore our conviction that the entire National Youth Administration training program, with its attendant production and service projects, should be transferred to the State and local educational agencies at the earliest possible date. Funds necessary for the operation of the program should be allotted to the United States Office of Education, for distribution to the States. The activities transferred from the National Youth Administration should be made an integral part of the national defense training program, which is already being operated in public schools throughout the Nation. Resident

centers which are remote from the larger school systems or which serve youth drawn from many communities, can be efficiently operated by State departments of education or State boards for vocational education.

The shops and equipment purchased by the National Youth Administration can be turned over to State or local educational authorities and utilized in the national defense training program during the war and in the schools' permanent program of vocational education in the post-war period.

Here then is expert testimony from one long identified with the business of education who indicates with definiteness and certainty that this defense training program should be made a part of the regular vocational system of the country under the direction of the Office of Education.

One is constrained to believe that the N. Y. A. is having genuine difficulty in securing students without undertaking to invade the very field which is now served by the schools of the country.

It was reported that on March 19, 1942, the N. Y. A. had circularized the graduates of Pittsburgh high schools urging them to join N. Y. A. defense training classes which are in fact in competition with the courses in local vocational schools and colleges.

This circular was addressed to all graduating students and was signed by Mr. Adolph Schwartz, the area youth personnel officer. The circular stated that the name of the student had been recommended by the principal of his school as a member of the class who might be interested in N. Y. A. defense training. An investigation was made of the various principals by Mr. Ben G. Graham, superintendent of the Pittsburgh schools, and it was vigorously denied that the names of students had been recommended.

To me it is both interesting and persuasive that Mr. Glenn S. Brown, N. Y. A. administrator for the State of Maryland, stated that—

There is nothing that the National Youth Administration is doing or can do that public schools cannot do with the aid of the employment service in placement in employment.

If that be true, and it has never been denied insofar as I know, what better evidence does this Congress require to strike a blow for efficiency in defense training and the elimination of duplication than this admission from a State administrator of the very agency which is presently under discussion.

Much has been made of the fact that the N. Y. A. training program is so closely integrated with industry. This, however, does not square with the statement made by Dexter Kimball, dean of the Cornell University Engineering School and chief of the machine-tool section of the Priorities Division of the War Production Board. When asked whether he considered N. Y. A. shops as integrated with industry, his answer was, "No."

It should also be asserted that the executive committee of the American Farm Bureau Federation made a considerable examination of the N. Y. A. organization and its justification and then stated in a letter signed by Mr. O'Neal and addressed to the subcommittee for this appropriation on April 1 that—

On behalf of the American Farm Bureau Federation I would too respectfully recommend that no further appropriations be made to the National Youth Administration and the Civilian Conservation Corps. We favor the termination of these agencies and the transfer of such of their educational functions to the Office of Education.

Thus one might summarize this testimony by saying that a State administrator of the N. Y. A., the National Education Association, and the American Farm Bureau Federation all embrace the position that this defense training can be continued in a more efficient form by consolidating it with the school system under the direction of the Office of Education.

Finally I should bring to the attention of the Congress the column in today's issue of the Washington Daily News by Raymond Clapper in which he discusses the very matter now under consideration in this body under the title "Youth Agencies":

Congress is in a hot fight over whether to abolish the Civilian Conservation Corps and the National Youth Administration.

Both of these are close to the New Deal heart. In his first inaugural address, in 1933, President Roosevelt announced the Civilian Conservation Corps project. The National Youth Administration came much later and was the special concern of Mrs. Roosevelt.

Both agencies, particularly National Youth Administration, have figured in intense controversy which has made them symbols of the New Deal for both sides. They have symbolized the humanitarian impulses of the New Deal. National Youth Administration particularly has symbolized some of its wasteful tendencies. Both have been targets of anti-new dealers. Now they are targets of the economy bloc in Congress. The new dealers feel that to allow them to go would be to betray the New Deal and to surrender to a reactionary viewpoint. Both agencies also represent a large number of Government jobs. As usual, those with a vested interest in an established Government agency are not ready to give it up without a fight.

All of that is unfortunate. It lugs in many issues which have no proper place in deciding the question of whether these two agencies are to be preserved, abolished, or retained in part.

The justification for creating them in the first place was that there was need for them. They are products of the depression. They provided a way for thousands of young men who could not find jobs to learn or do some useful work. Three million young men went through the Civilian Conservation Corps camps, had self-respecting work, learned a variety of crafts, gave useful and necessary protection to the national forests. The National Youth Administration made it possible for thousands of young men and women to obtain educations and learn useful trades. The good that they did probably outweighs the waste and abuses that occurred in loose administration. Civilian Conservation Corps probably hit a fairly high average in efficiency, far higher than National Youth Administration.

But if the reason for establishing them was that a need for them existed during the depression, when there were not enough jobs to go around, why should they be continued if the need has disappeared? We now have a shortage of young manpower. Every able-bodied young man is needed either in the armed services in war plants or in those essential civilian occupations that must be carried on, such as harvesting crops. Evidence in the House Appropriations Committee was that the Civilian Conservation Corps was recruiting young men for the camps, taking them away from farms where they were needed.

It is not a rejection of the New Deal's program to abandon those of its agencies which have outlived their need. To hang on to them when there is no longer any need is wasteful bureaucracy. The waste in this instance is not as large in dollars as it is in the loss of needed manpower. Civilian Conservation Corps employs nearly 11,000 persons aside from the enrollees.

In defense of continuing these agencies it is argued they are doing needed work. National Youth Administration claims to be training war-plant workers. Civilian Conservation Corps claims to be doing useful work in the national forests.

But the chances are that agencies set up primarily for work relief are not doing that job as efficiently and with as little manpower as would be possible through agencies operating solely for efficient work and not for relief. Probably much overhead staff could be got rid of by transferring the essential work activity to other agencies already doing the same thing.

At any rate, this situation involves a principle which can be applied as a test throughout the huge Government structure. We set up many agencies because of depression conditions. Now that a surplus of labor has turned into a shortage of labor, the Government needs to readapt to the changed situation. If after the war there occurs unemployment, measures such as these will have to be undertaken again. But that seems like a weak reason for continuing a heavy overhead now.

It is hard to see why one's attitude toward the New Deal itself should be involved in this question.

Let me reemphasize the one statement which he makes in paragraph 7 of this article in which he says:

To hang on to them—

These agencies—

when there is no longer any need is wasteful bureaucracy.

Let me reemphasize the point which I said at the beginning of this discourse. I am heartily in favor of the defense training program. I am in favor of making it efficient. I am in favor of eliminating duplication. I am persuaded that the most rational and sensible thing which the Congress can do to improve the defense training program and make it genuinely effective for victory is to consolidate the whole program under the Office of Education with a single overhead, a single administrative staff operated through the vocational schools and the vocational facilities in every State in the Union.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, in opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois I want to make just a few pointed observations. The gentleman bases his case on duplication. Anyone who knows the Office of Education and its activities in this respect knows of course that there is no duplication. N. Y. A. has done a remarkable job. It serves in rural sections to a great extent where the Office of

Education does not enter. Furthermore, if this appropriation is eliminated we will have to increase the appropriation of the Office of Education. I do not know the position of the gentleman from Illinois with regard to a Department of Education, but the more appropriations are increased for this Bureau the stronger will the proponents of a Department of Education urge the passage of such a bill. Personally, I am opposed to any bill to establish a Department of Education in the Federal Government. Many millions of Americans are vigorously opposed to any such legislation.

Several Members of the House have heard the report coming over the radio, so they have stated, that Pearl Harbor is again being attacked. I hope it is nothing but a rumor.

Midway was attacked on yesterday. Now, we have an amendment to eliminate the C. C. C., which the President of the United States said was necessary for war purposes, adopted by the House, while it is rumored the attacks are being made upon Pearl Harbor and Midway Island. In any event, Midway Island was attacked yesterday and Dutch Harbor only a few days ago.

Here we have another amendment which is an attack at an activity which is connected with national defense. The amendment should not be adopted.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMAS], a member of the committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, our distinguished friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has drawn some wrong conclusions in his comparisons. It is true there is duplication between the N. Y. A. and vocational education, there is no doubt about that; but under this program there is no money in here excepting for one thing as far as N. Y. A. is concerned, and that is strictly for national defense. The high-school program has been stricken. Eighteen thousand stations or workships have been done away with and only the best ones are now retained.

If the House wants to do away with the N. Y. A., the quickest way to do it is to adopt the amendment now before the House, because that takes away its funds.

In further reference to the argument of duplication, may I ask, Is it a sound argument to say that because the Ford Motor Co. has an order for so many airplanes it is duplication to give his competitor, the Chrysler Co., the same order? Why, on its face that is absurd. You are simply using both of those companies to make national defense articles. We cannot have too much duplication in producing airplanes and neither can we produce too many trained workers. We need more trained workers than N. Y. A. and the vocational people can train.

Under the program involved here, this money will train 320,000 students a year. The best evidence of the work of this program is scattered throughout the hearings. Read the hearings. Literally thousands upon thousands of these boys are finding their way into the defense plants of the country and the managements of those plants are writing letters stating that their services are fine; "keep sending them to us."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Referring to the statement the gentleman just made, I would like to read a short letter from a large manufacturer in the State of Connecticut.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I wonder if my friend will read that letter later on? Go ahead, read it.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It will take only a second.

THE BAIRD MACHINE COMPANY,
Bridgeport, Conn.

NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION,
Bridgeport, Conn.

GENTLEMEN: We live and learn!

I had such a poor opinion of the National Youth Administration—probably on account of newspaper reports—which have all been changed, that now, after employing some 28 of your trainees, I want to compliment you for your choice—and training given these boys.

If it is a help, you may feel free to use this letter as it best suits your purpose.

My very best regards,

B. C. WARNER,
Vice President.

Mr. THOMAS of Texas. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

In reference to the argument on waste, let me say there is not any waste in the National Youth Administration under this streamlined program, do not make any mistake about that. The Office of Vocational Education is not handling its program any more cheaply than the N. Y. A.

Mr. Chairman, between one-third and one-half of the cost of vocational training is borne by the various States and county taxing units throughout the country and not altogether by the Federal Government, whereas the cost of N. Y. A. is all borne by the Federal Government.

Let me give you one little observation, and I think it is golden. During the course of the hearings before our subcommittee, we had two of the outstanding industrial engineers of the country, Mr. Dooley and Mr. Dietz. They represent two of the largest corporations in America. They appeared before the committee, not on this program, but in connection with another one, and while there I thought it would be a fine time to ask these two outstanding industrial engineers about N. Y. A. to see what they thought about it.

To make a long story short, they said, "Send us thousands upon thousands more of them. We need them."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I was very much interested in hearing the very learned statement of my friend from Illinois with whom I have worked on another committee. I know his accuracy. I know his studious inclination, but I was amazed at the confusion evidenced by his remarks when he continually called attention to the fact that the Bureau of Education could do this job and was doing it, that there was a lot of duplication, and so forth.

I am going to answer that part of his argument by reading a letter to this committee. This gives the opinion of a gentleman whose name I will read and whose official capacity I will give. I had asked for his opinion of N. Y. A.

The letter is as follows:

Regarding my opinion as to the necessity of the National Youth Administration I wish to point out the following reasons:

a. The National Youth Administration is the only organization which has been able to supply me with a high-grade class of youths not in the combat ages.

b. They have had shops and equipment transferred here where they are needed without delay in contrast to the inability of the Office of Education to furnish us with a proper defense school.

c. The National Youth Administration dormitories furnish a proper living space for the National Youth Administration youths to go through a transition period during their 3 months away from small quarters into a large city.

d. The National Youth Administration can select youths properly suited for this work and can give them their preemployment training.

e. The National Youth Administration has given us completely satisfactory service which is much more than can be said of the Civil Service Commission and other Government agencies still operating under antiquated and involved rules and regulations administered by clerks, the majority of whom have themselves less than a year's experience.

f. The National Youth Administration is not "boondoggling" but has been streamlined in Texas for national defense.

I am definitely interested in its continuance here in Texas and its continuance wherever they have a labor problem similar to the one that confronts me in Corpus Christi, Tex.

If an opportunity could be made for me to appear before the House or Senate committee to testify in reference to the National Youth Administration, I would greatly appreciate it.

With best personal wishes,

Sincerely,

HERMAN E. HALLAND,
United States Naval Air Station,
Corpus Christi, Tex.

Mr. Chairman, this is N. Y. A. put to the test. I have personally seen the efforts put forth by the national administration and particularly the efforts put forth by the boys in the N. Y. A. I have seen the results of their efforts. When you get right down to brass tacks and take facts as they come, an analysis of the picture will show you when you get right into the real facts involved that an estimate recently completed by the Bureau of Labor Statistics shows that there will be needed 10,000,000 additional workers in war industry, 7,500,000 of whom will have to be skilled or semiskilled. Three out of every four of the laborers employed today in war industry are either skilled or semiskilled. Thirty-eight percent must be skilled and 37 percent must be semiskilled.

It seems to me to be an unreasonable view that it should become necessary for this great body at this particular and

critical moment, with this Nation at war, and I mean at war, to bring about a battle over the removal from this appropriation of funds for the operation of definitely irreplaceable training facilities. When you are faced with a training job, with 7,500,000 men who will need to be trained or semitrained within the next year, how in the face of the tragic condition that confronts us can we claim it to be in the name of economy or even in the name of good ordinary horse sense to talk about cutting out this appropriation at this time?

Of course, my genial, accomplished, and polished friend from Illinois, insofar as statistical information in connection with appropriation bills is concerned, is one of the best informed men in this body. He is eternally studious and indefatigable in his efforts to obtain information, but the places where he goes for information and the sources of his information are so many and the figures given to him are so multitudinous and complicated that I fear my good friend is lost in an impenetrable forest so heavily bedecked with leaves that he fails to see the light.

My interest in this part of the appropriation bill for the maintenance and continuance of the N. Y. A. program is likewise based on some study, part of which was made outside of committee rooms and actually on the field at the spot where N. Y. A. boys and girls are making their contribution to our country's war effort, a war effort upon whose success more depends and more people are vitally affected than any heretofore recorded in all of history in years gone by. The letter which I read to you was signed by Commander Halland, who is in charge of assembly and repair at the United States naval air station at Corpus Christi, Tex. This naval air station is the greatest air training school for naval officers in the world. It is likewise one of the outstanding examples of that part of our war effort already accomplished. If the members of this committee could go through the naval air station at Corpus Christi and have a look at what is going on there and the part that N. Y. A. youths—boys and girls—are playing there, they would have a different view of the value of this great institution than that which they gain from a study made up of comparing figures and statements.

Assembly and repair is too mammoth an establishment to be described in these remarks. You look upon literally acres and acres of plane-crowded aprons, towering structures still in the process of completion, hangars and workshops in and around which American boys and girls are truly as busy as bees. All over the ground floor of the repair station proper you will find N. Y. A. boys and girls working in smooth, coordinated crews, all under the attention and supervision of a man in the khaki of our uniform who lends an eye and a hand here and there to boys and girls too earnestly engaged for the average person to imagine, overhauling complicated aircraft motors, engaged in studying engineering blueprints and designs; girls working in electric shops handling complicated machines, rewinding armatures, working on standard and gyro instruments; this group in a more highly technical field is composed of N. Y. A. alumni. If one envisions ever the need for trained workmen, truly skilled workmen, patriotic, competent workmen, it is here. In this shop and other shops like it, is where they really and factually "keep 'em flying." Here overhauling jobs are done on fuel oil and pressure gages, rheostats, turret lathes and shapers, drilling presses, tin-plate forms, sand blasting, electroplating, repair of carbureters, the intricate electrical wiring and precision instruments. In this last class, the precision and delicate instrument, you find American girls doing the best jobs that are done anywhere, each striving to do his or her level best to the end that we win this war and decisively.

From studies which I have made and information requested by me and given from the National Youth Administration, I propose to give you a boiled-down statement of the actualities with reference to this important phase of our war effort actively performed by the National Youth Administration.

THE CURRENT PROGRAM OF THE N. Y. A.

The National Youth Administration had anticipated the enlarged job opportunities created by the defense program and realized that the time was coming when every able-bodied youth could count upon a job. It required a great deal of planning to convert an entire program with country-wide installations and facilities from a peacetime work-relief basis to a wartime industrial training program. Yet this is precisely what the National Youth Administration has been doing over the past 3 years—converting its project facilities, which had previously furnished useful work of a general character to needy youth, into actual training sites which stress mechanical operations and shop production techniques, patterned upon methods of production that are used in the war industries. Although these are called production projects and produce many articles for the benefit of the military services, as well as other Federal agencies, their chief product is an unbroken stream of trained workers passing into our shipyards, aircraft plants, and munitions factories, possessed of those specific skills which war industry needs.

People who are not aware of this complete conversion of the N. Y. A. program to a wartime basis still assail it upon the ground that it provides relief to young people when they could go out and find their own jobs. They ignore the fact that while this country has a vast potential labor supply great effort and careful planning are required to train workers in the skills that are currently needed and to shift our manpower to those areas of the country where key industries are located. Estimates brought out by the Tolan committee show that in 550 defense occupations 38 percent of the workers must be skilled and 37 percent must be semiskilled; in other words, 3 out of every 4 workers going into defense industry must have training in order to be hired. Before the same body Mr. Eric Nicol, of the War Production Board, testified that 33 percent of all the workers displaced from civilian industry had to be trained for defense work and 50 percent of those already engaged in such work require supplementary training. By the end of 1942, it has been estimated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, there will have to be 10,000,000 additional workers in war industry. By the standards noted above, seven and one-half million will have to be skilled or semiskilled.

We cannot afford to waste irreplaceable training facilities when faced with this vast training job. The N. Y. A. has 275 machine shops, 278 sheet-metal shops, 25 foundries, 173 radio and electrical shops, 139 aviation and automotive shops, 73 forge and blacksmith shops, 596 for woodwork and joinery, and 187 shops for power machine sewing—all built and equipped during the last 3 years, to give inexperienced youth specific industrial training. The majority of the youth who come to N. Y. A. have had no previous job and, for all their willingness and strength, are of little use to the war effort until they are helped to acquire the experience and dexterity in handling machinery and tools which are required in making the tank, the airplane, the battleship, and the other instruments of modern warfare. The best measure of the success of this undertaking is the impressive number of young people trained by the N. Y. A. who are passing monthly into our war industries. During the period from July 1, 1941, to March 1942 the National Youth Administration has compiled individual records on a total of 35,353 youth who are known to have been hired in plants working on essential war orders.

Total placements in war industries during this period are estimated at 2 to 3 times the number upon which the National Youth Administration was able to obtain individual placement information. Of the known placements, more than 5,000 N. Y. A. youth went into aircraft plants, over 6,300 went into machine tool manufacturing, about 3,600 into shipbuilding, and a similar number into ordnance plants, while about 2,500 are directly serving the United States Army Air Service and other military branches. For the calendar year January through December 1941, about 420,000 young persons, trained on N. Y. A. work projects, went into private employment. With the enlarged demand for trained workers in war industry this year, this record could be surpassed, provided there is no further curtailment of N. Y. A. training facilities.

In March 1942 there were 206,903 youth employed throughout the country on 3,500 production shop units, which had over 52,000 individual work stations. Many of these facilities are being used by more than 1 shift. Besides the physical equipment on its projects, the National Youth Administration has developed an experienced supervisory force of shop foremen, shop superintendents, and

State supervisors of projects. These men and women, numbering 16,360 in March, are equipped for the intensive and expert training that is required to turn green young hands into competent aircraft, shipyard, and ordnance workers. The N. Y. A. supervisory personnel average between 20 and 21 years' experience at their own trade, either teaching or on the job, and they are sticking to their wartime job of instructing thousands of youth for war work.

Although a total of 420,000 N. Y. A. youth found private jobs in 1941 and 206,903 were on N. Y. A. projects in March 1942, the supply of youth eager to learn and do their part in arming America is 206,903 were on N. Y. A. projects in March there was a total of over 196,000 youth registered and awaiting their turn for a chance at N. Y. A. training. In the Southeastern and Southwestern States, for every 100 youth employed on projects, 132 others were awaiting their chance for assignment to the N. Y. A. In the New England States, however, where the war industries were first concentrated, there were only 17 youth awaiting assignment for every 100 youth employed on N. Y. A.

The concentration of war industries in relatively few localities and the curtailment of peacetime civilian industries have created great disparities between labor supply and labor demand in various sections of the country. An order curtailing the production of consumer's goods may create severe unemployment in one area, while war orders produce serious shortages of trained workers in another area. Mass migration of workers may be necessary to meet the war needs resulting from the current adjustment which is being made in our industrial organization. To assist in meeting this problem, the National Youth Administration has established training projects in the sections of the country where youth are most numerous and employment opportunities are meager. Also, it has established reception depots adjacent to busy industrial areas, whose hiring needs, by number and occupation required, are then transmitted to the various training projects where local job opportunities are less numerous.

Young workers in the proper number who have completed the appropriate types of training are then furnished transportation and are accommodated at nearby N. Y. A. reception depots until arrangements for their employment are concluded. By this means, a sound, effective plan is substituted for the haphazard, wasteful migration formerly prevailing, whereby young job seekers never could know with certainty where jobs were to be found or whether they could qualify even if they found the vacancies. This system is placing youth in seven industrial States, with the largest placement in the Connecticut machine-tool area, where 3,258 trained workers have been placed. Since the inception of this plan, through March 1942, more than 5,580 youth have been taken from rural or other areas inaccessible to job opportunities and transferred to areas where their skilled hands are eagerly sought for the war effort. The benefit to the youth—in terms of vocational training and a chance for a livelihood—is genuine and great, but even greater is the benefit to the Nation, which cannot afford to let the production program lag for want of trained hands.

The National Youth Administration conducts two programs for out-of-school youth: A regular program, which has been operated since the establishment of the agency in 1935, and a youth work defense program, which was inaugurated about a year ago to meet the special labor needs of the war industries. This defense program differs from the regular program in a number of concrete ways, as well as in the underlying philosophy.

Of the 90,213 youth on the defense program in April 1942, 89,000 were employed on production projects. The majority, two-thirds of these young people, were at work in machine and metal-working shops, where they were learning to be machinists, sheet-metal workers, welders, and so forth. The remaining third were divided fairly equally among five types of shop projects: Radio and electrical, automotive and mechanical, woodworking, industrial (power), sewing, and shop maintenance and service.

These projects train youth as speedily as possible to fill jobs in defense industries, including those in which there are now labor shortages, and those in which the War Manpower Commission expects shortages to develop over the next few months. The average length of time spent by each youth on a defense project is considerably under 3 months, and, as pointed out elsewhere, the record for placement of defense-program youth in private industry is excellent.

About a third of the youth on the regular program are employed in 1,918 shop units. They are engaged in many of the same activities as the youth on the defense program except that a greater proportion are on woodworking and sewing; there are some additional production projects, such as drafting and map making, food production, industrial laundry, and so forth. Aside from the production program there are 50,000 youth on professional and clerical projects. Of this number, 28,494 youth are being trained in clerical work, which is of vital importance to the war effort. Over 9,000 girls are being trained in public health and hospital work, most of them as hospital attendants, while another 9,000 are helping to build up the health of our country through school-lunch food service projects.

The youth employed in the regular program are not only performing a vital service to the Nation but are learning trades which will enable them to take a direct and constructive part in the total war effort.

During the 7 years since the establishment of the agency four and one-half million young men and women have been employed by the National Youth Administration. Two million of them have been benefited by the student-work program, which helped them realize their vocational ambitions and careers, and also enriched the Nation by elevating the educational level of its citizenry. Over 90 percent of all public educational institutions—high schools, colleges, and universities—have participated in this program. These genuine social benefits have been achieved at a very modest cost to the country; the average monthly cost of maintaining a youth on the high-school program has been $3.91; on the college program, $12.62; and on the graduate-student program, $18.98.

The proposal to abolish the student-work program has aroused a storm of protest over the entire country. Letters have poured into Washington from college presidents, high-school principals, superintendents of State departments of education, and from students—all bearing the same message—that N. Y. A. continue to give youth a chance to get ahead by helping the less advantaged to get an education.

The United States is now at war. Sacrifices have to be made by everyone. Every effort must be made to economize on nonessentials. For these reasons all N. Y. A. projects which were not contributing directly to the war effort have been eliminated from the program. Full consideration is being given to the needs of the Nation at war. The N. Y. A. defense program is helping war industry obtain a continued supply of qualified workers. In addition, the regular program, which prepares workers for indispensable civilian activities, is also doing its share in the total war effort. The student-work program, which helps to assure the Nation of a continued supply of trained technicians and professional personnel, is likewise an essential part of the war program. To curtail any of these activities beyond the point where they have already been curtailed would be false economy. The National Youth Administration, in all three of its programs, enables thousands of youth to make their maximum contribution to victory.

In conclusion it is my sincere hope that this committee, composed of distinguished and patriotic colleagues and friends of mine, each representing a great section of my fellow citizens, will not be persuaded to abate but rather may they be inclined to increase the efforts and value of the services of this at present irreplaceable training facility.

For the additional information of the House, I include the following statement by Aubrey Williams, Administrator, National Youth Administration, before Senate Committee on Education and Labor regarding Senate Resolution 2295:

THE NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION OPERATES AN ESSENTIAL WAR PRODUCTION TRAINING PROGRAM

The objective of Senate Resolution 2295, proposing the abolishment of several Federal agencies, is to reduce nonessential Government expenditures. With that objective I am in complete accord. But in view of the war needs and the effect of the war upon the purposes for which Federal funds are appropriated and expended, the National Youth Administration has adjusted its activities to those essential to a war production training program and has eliminated activities which are not essential to the war effort.

A large part of the current funds appropriated to the National Youth Administra-

tion will be expended to provide training in occupations which are essential to the war effort. If war production is not to be handicapped by lack of skilled manpower, every existing training facility in the country must be utilized to its full and most effective capacity. Even if all training agencies were to make their maximum contribution to the training program, it is doubtful whether all labor requirements of the war-production program can be met without serious bottlenecks developing because of labor shortages.

SHORTAGE OF TRAINED WORKERS IN MANY ESSENTIAL OCCUPATIONS

In several hundred occupations demanded by the war industries, an absolute shortage of labor is already a fact in many localities. The reports of the Bureau of Employment Security emphasize that the expansion of aircraft production, shipbuilding, and other vital war industries is dependent upon an increasing supply of qualified labor which is not now available. During this calendar year, new or expanded plants coming into production will require thousands of new assemblers, riveters, welders, machinists, electricians, and other machine operators. Without considering the armed forces, which themselves will require large numbers of skilled personnel, the need for trained workers in the war industries makes it impractical to curtail any effective training activity for the foreseeable future.

The bulk of the new workers will have to be skilled or semiskilled; the types of industries and processes used in war production require only a small proportion of unskilled workers. The Bureau of Labor Statistics has estimated that, of the new workers who will be needed in selected defense industries by April 1942, almost 46 percent must be skilled or professional, and more than 38 percent must be semiskilled; the proportion of unskilled workers who can be used in these industries will be only 16 percent.

In anticipating the demand for qualified workers for war industries, it would be folly to overlook the potential requirements of the military services. British experience in this connection is conclusive in demonstrating that as the armed forces expand, the total demand for trained labor is intensified. Modern armies, like armies in the past, must be youthful in composition; but unlike all previous armies, the new mechanized forces require a high proportion of specialists and technicians. Like modern defense industry, the modern army leans heavily upon draftsmen, electricians, mechanics, welders, and other specialized workers. The difficulty is that youth and skill are not ordinarily found together. In Britain, as a result, the expansion of the armed services rapidly became a drain upon the young skilled manpower of industry. An Associated Press dispatch from London dated October 3, 1941, states: "Increased mechanization has caused the Army to absorb many men with technical training, which in turn has brought protests from the press and some labor leaders that the output in guns and tanks has been handicapped."

EXPANSION IN LABOR REQUIREMENTS OF THE WAR INDUSTRIES

Employment according to Bureau of Labor Statistics in the war industries must expand from a level of about 5,000,000 workers to at least 15,000,000 workers by the end of the present calendar year. Although the rate of increase may taper off, a continued increase will be necessary through 1943. In turn, the problem of expanding the war labor force will be enormously complicated by the concurrent expansion of the armed services.

Of the 10,000,000 additional war workers required this year, not more than six to eight million will come from converted or curtailed nonwar industries. Many of these displaced workers will require extensive training before they are suitable for employment in war industries. In some localities, according to the testimony of Mr. Eric Nicol before the Tolan committee, as many as 33 percent of the workers displaced from civilian industries require training to fit them to serve in war production industries.

Therefore, the cost of training is a necessary expense in the successful prosecution of the war. And to economize at the expense of training would be to economize at the expense of the production of war equipment and materials.

It will be necessary to recruit from 2,000,000 to 4,000,000 additional workers by December 31, 1942. While no reliable estimates are available for the manpower requirements of the war industries and the armed forces during 1943 and thereafter, no student of labor supply doubts that the need for trained workers, and the consequent need for the training of new workers, will require large-scale training programs. On the speedy and efficient induction of new workers into the war industries will depend to a large extent the success or failure of the war program.

In many areas where war production has been concentrated, the problem of getting trained workers is acute. For example, the Bureau of Employment Security, in its analysis of the labor demand and supply in the Hartford, Conn., area, shows that about 6 times as many workers will be needed than are currently available in that area. Aircraft and other war industries in this one area will require approximately 12,000 additional workers by the end of this year. Shortage of skilled and semiskilled workers will grow more acute each passing month, and training must be supplied to new and displaced workers to meet the war production schedule established by the President. Unless a sufficient number of qualified workers are trained, labor shortages will begin where shortages of plant and materials leave off.

NEW WORKERS AVAILABLE FOR WAR-PRODUCTION TRAINING

In spite of migration to defense areas, unemployment, particularly among young people, has not been eliminated. With defense spending stimulating the entire national economy, unemployment in all ages has been rapidly diminishing in volume, but in January 1942 the monthly Work Projects Administration survey of unemployment reported 1,200,000 youth unemployed throughout the country. When combined with the unpaid-family-worker group, the total youth available for paid employment at the present time reaches a total of about 2,000,000. The existence of this large group of youth available for war work constitutes a waste to the war effort. The contribution which this group can make to the successful prosecution of the war is tremendous and requires only the directed efforts of training agencies to equip them for employment in defense industries.

It is a commonly known fact that in areas having no war contracts there continues to be a large volume of unemployed workers. Priorities have even increased this.

A large part of youth unemployment is concentrated below the age of 20. In November, the Work Projects Administration unemployment survey reported that 700,080, or 58 percent of unemployment among youth, was concentrated below the age of 20.

As more workers are drafted into the armed forces, youth in lower age groups and more female workers must be trained for work in defense industries.

To insure an adequate supply of qualified workers for war industries and the armed forces, emphasis must be placed on training the Nation's youth, who comprise the most vigorous, the most mobile, and the most adaptable section of the population. There are immediately available some 2,000,000 unemployed or unpaid youth who could be trained without delay. In addition, a new youth labor force comes into existence every year as 1,600,000 youth who attain working age, leave school and enter the labor market. With the exception of the small proportion who are graduated from trade or professional schools, nearly all these new workers are inexperienced, untrained, and unqualified for the specialized tasks of industry. But they constitute the best possible material for training, and provide the nucleus of any training program for new workers.

THE NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION WAR-PRODUCTION PROGRAM

During its 7 years of operation, the National Youth Administration has dealt with the problem of preemployment training for unemployed youth. It has developed techniques and methods for providing preemployment work experience to new workers. The diversity of mechanical skills demanded of new workers by the war industries makes this type of training more essential than ever before. The National Youth Administration, which gives youth basic skills through actual work, has concentrated upon training workers for the strategic war industries. Because work is an essential part of training, inexperienced workers are best trained under actual production conditions. In the United States such conditions are most closely simulated in the work projects of the National Youth Administration. In several thousand National Youth Administration shops, which are already equipped and in operation, production methods correspond to those prevailing in private industry. By turning out large quantities of machine-made products for the use of the military services and other public agencies, youth learn an industrial job by doing it. Through counseling and job rotation, the projects allow the youth to try their hand at several different jobs so that each worker can discover the type of work which best fits his abilities. As a result, when they enter industry, labor turn-over is sharply reduced, and the breaking-in period is cut to a minimum.

THE YOUTH WORK DEFENSE PROGRAM

On July 1, 1941, the Youth Work Defense Program was established by Congress as a part of National Youth Administration. It now consists of 939 war production training projects, divided as follows: Seven hundred and fifty-nine local production projects and 180 resident center projects. There are in the projects 1,670 different shop units. These facilities have been set aside from the regular out-of-school work program because they are best fitted to train youth for occupations designated by the War Production Board labor supply officials as immediately vital to the war effort.

These shops have working space and equipment for 39,000 workers at one time, and operate on two or three shifts. Altogether, 77,377 youth received work experience and training in production occupations in these shops during February 1942. The types of production units on the Youth Work Defense Program are as follows:

Type of production unit and number in defense program

Machine and metal working:	
Machine shop	365
Sheet metal	323
Welding	307
Foundry	33
Forge and blacksmith	101
Total	1,134
Radio	97
Electrical	44

Automotive maintenance and repair	163
Aviation services	27
Pattern-making	43
Other woodworking	97
Industrial sewing	65
Total	1,670

SHOPS UNDER THE REGULAR PROGRAM

In addition to the 939 projects operated under the youth work defense program, the National Youth Administration operates 1,566 other production projects, consisting of 1,918 shop units giving mechanical and manual training, under the regular out-of-school work program, as shown in the following table:

Number and type of production shop units—regular out-of-school program, February 1942

Machine and metal working:	
Machine shop	29
Sheet metal	22
Welding	17
Foundry	4
Forge and blacksmith	10
Total	82
Radio	27
Electrical	40
Automotive maintenance	96
Farm implements	8
Woodworking:	
Pattern-making	13
Joinery	4
Other woodworking	546
Total	563
Sewing:	
Industrial	121
Domestic	458
Total	579
Drafting and map making	39
Production of construction materials	31
Food production	215
Crafts	32
Graphic activities	41
Miscellaneous production:	
Industrial laundry	53
Industrial ceramics	8
Industrial weaving	5
Other production activities	99
Total	165
Grand total	1,918

EMPLOYMENT IN NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION SHOPS

The number of youth employed in each type of shop for both the defense and regular programs is shown in the following table:

Number of different youth employed in production activities on the out-of-school work programs, February 1942

Type of production activity	Combined programs	Regular program	Defense program
Total	121,384	44,007	77,377
Machine and metal working, total	50,647	687	49,960
Machine shop	23,796	276	23,520
Sheet metal	12,805	146	12,659
Welding	10,753	170	10,583
Foundry	1,182	9	1,173
Forge and blacksmith	1,111	86	1,025
Radio and electrical, total	4,941	580	4,361
Radio	3,782	475	3,307
Electrical	1,159	105	1,054

Number of different youth employed in production activities on the out-of-school work programs, February 1942—Continued

Type of production activity	Combined programs	Regular program	Defense program
Automotive and mechanical, total	7,520	978	6,542
Automotive maintenance and repair	5,445	867	4,578
Farm implements and equipment	62	62	
Aviation services	2,013	49	1,964
Woodworking, total	18,052	13,855	4,197
Pattern making	952	99	853
Joinery	1,069	156	913
Other woodworking	16,031	13,600	2,431
Sewing, total	23,464	16,225	7,239
Industrial	11,277	4,038	7,239
Domestic	12,187	12,187	
Drafting and map making	404	404	
Production of construction materials	813	813	
Food production	2,979	2,979	
Craft activities	710	710	
Graphic activities	838	838	
Miscellaneous production, total	4,106	4,106	
Industrial laundry	1,347	1,347	
Industrial ceramics and enamelware	180	180	
Industrial weaving	282	282	
Other production activities	2,297	2,297	
Shop maintenance and service activities	6,910	1,832	5,078

Thus it is seen that, since the inception of the national defense program in mid 1940, the National Youth Administration has followed a policy of converting its facilities to the training of war workers and of eliminating all nonessential activities. By April 1, 1942, this transition will be complete.

All the shops listed above are production units, in which youth learn their jobs by producing hundreds of thousands of essential products that meet the specifications of the military establishments or other public agencies which commissioned them. These include large quantities of machine and gun parts, submarine parts, hand tools, sheet metal products, and innumerable small articles such as bolts, studs, bushings, washers, screws and pins. National Youth Administration youth also assist the armed forces by repairing motor vehicles, aircraft, and naval vessels. For example, during the past fiscal year National Youth Administration youth repaired 60 naval vessels in the class over 5 tons. National Youth Administration production units in the area around the United States Navy Yard at Portsmouth, N. H., have supplied the navy yard with 311,826 manufactured articles. These items include almost 95,000 nuts and bolts, almost 63,000 studs, 18,500 section rings, 31,800 bosses, 18,500 bushings, 12,600 boxes, 19,800 covers, and 20,000 miscellaneous items such as brackets and electrodes. National Youth Administration assistance has helped to break production bottlenecks, thus enabling the Navy to meet or even advance its production schedules. For example, in a letter to Col. Frank J. McSherry, dated October 27, 1941, Mr. Raymond G. Pettigrew, production manager at the Portsmouth Navy Yard, made the following statement:

"We are highly pleased at the quality and quantity of work produced in National Youth Administration shops. It was not an easy task for these National Youth Administration people to take on the precise work of this yard in large quantities. One instance to illustrate the above paragraph, may be cited with regard to brass electrodes, which were divided between the Brooklyn, N. Y., center and the Quoddy Village, Maine, center. The yard furnished over 100 castings weighing approximately 600 pounds each for these centers to machine a certain point. The response of the National Youth Administration was such that when the Navy Department advanced the dates 3 months on the vessels requiring this article, the yard was able to accept the advance, and meet its dates, which it could not have done had it not been for the National Youth Administration."

Thus the output of National Youth Administration projects, though small in comparison with total requirements, adds to the available supply of essential military equipment. Much of this material would be difficult to obtain elsewhere, because it is frequently ordered in small quantities of odd sizes. To industry, such products are nuisance orders, but they are needed for military purposes and their production provided excellent training for beginning workers.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED FOR THE WAR-PRODUCTION TRAINING PROGRAM

Prior to 1940 the National Youth Administration had developed mechanical shops as a part of its regular program. In 1940, with the establishment of the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense, the National Youth Administration received funds to develop a defense-training program. This program was pointed toward filling the manpower needs of the shipbuilding, aircraft, ordnance, machine tool, and the related industries that form the heart of the war effort. This development also includes radio and electrical work, automotive mechanics, patternmaking and joinery, industrial sewing, drafting, and blue printing—all occupations which are now needed for the war-production program.

In the latter part of 1940 we had succeeded in developing facilities for about 50,000 youth in production shops. By May 1941 the number had doubled. By November 1941 the National Youth Administration operated a total of 4,475 production units, employing approximately 147,000 youth per month under both programs.

HOURS OF WORK AND RELATED VOCATIONAL INSTRUCTION

The hours of work and training in National Youth Administration shops have been increased from an average of 60 hours per month, which prevailed last year, to a total of 160 hours per month, including a minimum of 60 hours of instruction under supervision of the vocational-school authorities.

LOCATION OF NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION SHOPS

The National Youth Administration is able to reach and train youth in all parts of the country, in the rural as well as the urban sections.

The National Youth Administration projects exist in every part of the country. There were in September 1941 only 188 counties of the 3,073 counties in the country which had no youth on the out-of-school program. By means of this widespread location of projects, youth in rural as well as urban centers are getting an opportunity to obtain training in war-production skills.

To aid in giving opportunities to all young people, resident centers have been strategically located to bring together youth in rural areas. There are 462 of these resident projects throughout the country. About half are located in States predominantly rural, particularly in the South, where opportunities for youth to acquire mechanical skills are relatively restricted and where workshop facilities have not been readily available.

DESCRIPTION OF A TYPICAL NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION RESIDENT SHOP PROJECT

To present a general picture of the operation of a National Youth Administration shop, there is quoted below excerpts from a report of a regional shop supervisor on the

operation of the shop located at a National Youth Administration resident center at Chapman Springs, Ga., some 16 miles from Atlanta:

"The largest portion of the operations are in one large frame building. The units included a machine shop, with 28 youth; a foundry, employing 8 youth; an electric welding shop, employing 8 youth; an auto-mechanics shops employing 20 youth; and a sheet-metal shop employing 28 youth. There are 273 youth in residence, and the shop is operating two shifts of 8 hours each day, and the department of vocational education is using the welding equipment for a third shift. The major portion of their work was in the manufacturing of 50 sets of 6-foot sheet-metal brakes for other National Youth Administration centers and of work for the Fort Benning warehouse. Included in this were some heavy-duty truck casters, both plain and swivel type. These had been designed on the project; the patterns had been made there, the castings made, and the machine work was being done. It was a very high type job, and it provided opportunity for good work experience, in addition to making a useful product. Youth are registered with the employment service and with the civil service immediately upon reporting. A good counseling program permits of readjustment where youth are occupationally unsatisfactory. The sheet-metal shop was making 6,000 pieces of stove pipe for Fort Benning and 500 stove hoods, as well as reworking some 500 that had been procured commercially. They were doing a considerable amount of auto repair and repainting for Fort Benning. The small foundry is being replaced by a larger one. In addition to the 8 hours per day of each youth, 5 hours per week of extra time is required for assigned work in citizenship, health, and student government. Youths are housed on a contract basis in the county-owned cottages and take their meals in the county-owned dining hall. A full-time nurse is in residence and supervises health. The civil service allows the youth 6 months for his time at Chapman Springs considering 3 months as training and 3 months as actual work experience. Youth are leaving at the end of almost exactly 3 months of training and are going largely into civil-service jobs."

EQUIPMENT FOR NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION SHOP PROGRAM

More than 2 years ago the National Youth Administration began the development of facilities and equipment to furnish work experience to youth in the metal and mechanical fields. In the early stages of this program we enlisted the support of other Federal agencies in procuring old equipment which could serve this purpose. To expedite this the President issued an Executive order on October 31, 1938, giving the National Youth Administration priority in receiving Federal surplus property which could be repaired and made useful for training purposes in metal and mechanical fields. Missing parts, as well as necessary repairs, were made to put these machines in working order. Included in the approximately 2,000 items of heavy mechanical equipment secured from the Army, the Navy, and other Federal agencies during 1939, 1940, and 1941 were the following equipment:

Lathes	547
Milling machines	253
Shapers	110
Planers	19
Drill presses	346
Grinders	209
Total	1,484

Purchases of new or used tools and machinery on the open market by the National Youth Administration were limited to such tools and machinery as were not available through surplus or salvage from other Federal agencies. The bulk of all this new and used machinery was obtained prior to the present crisis.

With regard to the National Youth Administration having in its possession critical material needed by the War Production Board, these are the facts: Representatives of the War Production Board have been provided with property records of the National Youth Administration in order to ascertain whether National Youth Administration equipment includes any of the items in the War Production Board's list of critical machinery. We obtained a copy of the list of critical materials on February 20, 1942, from Col. S. E. Reimel, Ordnance Department, machine tool committee. On February 28 we wrote to Colonel Reimel that preliminary investigation of our January 1942 inventory of equipment had disclosed no tools of the sizes and types specified, but that additional information would be transmitted to him as soon as the remainder of our inventory records could be examined.

On March 5, 1942, Captain McGuirke, aide to Colonel Reimel, visited the National Youth Administration office and was advised that regional shop supervisors, at a meeting to be held in Washington, March 7 and 8, would be instructed to locate all possible equipment on the critical list and report it immediately. On March 7 we requested specific information from 17 States, and advised Colonel Reimel of our action.

On March 10 Colonel Reimel was informed that the meeting of regional shop supervisors had taken place and that the supervisors had been instructed as indicated. Follow-up letters, urging the speedy transmittal of information originally requested on March 7, were sent to the States on March 17.

On March 19 the National Youth Administration was able to advise Colonel Reimel as to the locations, specifications, and operating conditions of 13 machine tools which might fall in the categories specified in the critical list.

On March 21 a letter to Colonel Reimel covered information received on a 28-inch lathe located at Memphis, Tenn. On March 23 we furnished Colonel Reimel with a copy of the inventory. Colonel Reimel expressed his gratification with the manner in which the National Youth Administration was cooperating with his office in this work, and requested additional information on milling machines. This information is being obtained as quickly as possible. Our investigations have indicated that very few National Youth Administration machines are among the categories required by the War Production Board. There is attached as exhibit A a listing of major items of National Youth Administration equipment by types of shop in which such equipment is being used for war-production training. More detailed information showing such equipment by individual shop location can be furnished from National Youth Administration records. Exhibit B attached hereto shows equipment by shop location for three typical States. Exhibit C shows, for the same typical States, the amount of equipment which the National Youth Administration received as Federal surplus from other Federal agencies. Exhibit D is a list of types of articles being produced at National Youth Administration shops.

ADDITIONAL WAR TRAINING ACTIVITIES

The National Youth Administration has reduced its other types of training to those which are of immediate service to the war effort. Effective April 1, 1942, by administrative order, National Youth Administration project activities have been limited to the following categories: Training for war-production industries, Army and Navy construction and service work, the production and conservation of food, the training of stenographic and clerical workers, and the training of hospital aides.

PRIVATE EMPLOYMENT OF NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION WORKERS

During the calendar year 1941, 421,000 youth went from National Youth Administration projects into jobs in private industry, of which 210,000 were in industries directly or indirectly concerned with the prosecution of the war. For the past 6 months there has been a steady stream of about 32,000 National Youth Administration workers entering private employment every month. In addition to the 210,000 placed in industries related to the war effort, 21,351 National Youth Administration youth workers left the program during the calendar year to go into the military service.

Placement of National Youth Administration workers in private industries and in public employment during the calendar year 1941 is shown in the following table:

Number of youth leaving National Youth Administration for jobs in private industry and in public employment, out-of-school work programs, cumulative from Jan. 1 through Dec. 31, 1941

Item	Total	Jan. through June 1941	July through Dec. 1941
Private employment, total [1]	421,334	228,606	192,728
Manufacturing industries, total	103,480	58,464	45,016
Food and kindred products, and tobacco	11,029	5,692	5,337
Textile and textile products	17,265	10,732	6,533
Lumber, furniture, and finished lumber products	6,736	4,068	2,668
Paper and allied products	2,695	1,643	1,052
Printing, publishing and allied industries	3,179	1,628	1,551
Rayon and allied products	910	585	325
Chemical products (excluding rayon and allied products)	2,502	1,564	938
Petroleum and coal products	1,046	506	540
Rubber products	1,531	1,029	502
Leather and leather products	4,339	2,705	1,634
Stone, clay, and glass products	2,633	1,565	1,068
Iron and steel and their products (excluding machinery)	9,738	6,150	3,588
Nonferrous metals and their products (excluding machinery)	2,843	1,529	1,314
Electrical machinery and equipment	5,757	3,667	2,090
Agricultural machinery and equipment	940	604	336
Metalworking machinery and equipment	3,080	1,389	1,691
Other machinery and equipment	4,004	2,221	1,783
Aircraft and parts	8,047	3,013	5,034
Automobiles and automobile equipment	3,391	2,200	1,191
Ship and boat building and repairing	2,235	836	1,399
Railroad and other transportation equipment	1,168	751	417
Other manufacturing industries	8,412	4,387	4,025
Nonmanufacturing industries, total	150,659	83,546	67,113
Agriculture, forestry (excluding logging), and fishing	25,875	14,991	10,884
Mining, quarrying and petroleum production	2,303	1,187	1,116
Construction	11,829	7,056	4,773
Air transportation and service	548	273	275
Railroads (interstate)	3,964	2,452	1,512
Other transportation and services	4,325	2,730	1,595
Telephone, telegraph, and related services	3,897	2,140	1,757
Electric, gas, and other local public utilities	2,067	1,048	1,019
Wholesale and retail trade	41,089	21,289	19,800
Finance, insurance, and real estate	5,459	2,835	2,624

[1] Includes one-half of the youth whose reasons for leaving were not reported.

Number of youth leaving National Youth Administration for jobs in private industry and in public employment, out-of-school work programs, cumulative from Jan. 1 through Dec. 31, 1941—Continued

Item	Total	Jan. through June 1941	July through Dec. 1941
Nonmanufacturing industries—Continued.			
Service industries (excluding domestic service)	31,462	18,478	12,984
Domestic service	10,490	5,732	4,758
Other nonmanufacturing industries	7,351	3,335	4,016
Unknown industry	167,195	86,596	80,599
Public employment, total	53,912	33,388	20,524
Military service, total	21,351	14,189	7,162
Selective Service	8,410	5,638	2,772
Other	12,941	8,551	4,390
Other public employment, total	32,561	19,199	13,362
Work Projects Administration	5,418	4,101	1,317
Civilian Conservation Corps	11,127	7,482	3,645
Other	16,016	7,616	8,400

YOUTH AWAITING ASSIGNMENT TO NATIONAL YOUTH ADMINISTRATION PROJECTS

In spite of a high turn-over rate, the National Youth Administration out-of-school work program cannot give employment and work experience to more than a portion of the youth who want and need this opportunity. In February 1942 there were 306,174 youth awaiting assignment to National Youth Administration projects; this meant 144 youth waiting to be assigned for every 100 already receiving training. Unfortunately, because of lack of sufficient funds, the National Youth Administration has at no time been able to meet the needs of all youth who are unemployed and want work experience and training for war industries. With war industries clamoring for trained workers, an expansion of the facilities to give defense training to more youth would pay high dividends. The number of youth awaiting assignment to National Youth Administration projects in each State is shown in the following table:

Number of youth awaiting assignment—Regional and State summary, out-of-school work program, February 1942

State and region	Number awaiting assignment		
	Total	Male	Female
Grand total	306,174	142,489	163,685
Region I, total	6,896	3,067	3,829
Connecticut			
Maine	1,068	420	648
Massachusetts	1,928	366	1,562
New Hampshire	116	34	82
New York City	2,760	1,940	820
New York State	846	233	613
Rhode Island	16	3	13
Vermont	162	71	91
Region II, total	67,119	30,645	36,474
Delaware	120	41	79
District of Columbia	204	15	189
Illinois	3,750	962	2,788
Indiana	3,796	1,178	2,618
Kentucky	17,847	10,036	7,811
Maryland	1,488	214	1,274
Michigan	6,223	3,023	3,200
New Jersey	1,032	112	920
Ohio	5,385	1,581	3,804
Pennsylvania	12,484	3,365	9,119
West Virginia	13,422	9,573	3,849
Wisconsin	1,368	545	823

Number of youth awaiting assignment—Regional and State summary, out-of-school work program, February 1942—Continued

State and region	Number awaiting assignment		
	Total	Male	Female
Region III, total	150,211	69,516	80,695
Alabama	8,719	2,553	6,166
Arkansas	22,497	15,334	7,163
Florida	13,915	6,022	7,893
Georgia	17,638	7,890	9,748
Louisiana	6,156	1,075	5,081
Mississippi	14,028	8,222	5,806
North Carolina	9,737	2,898	6,839
South Carolina	9,873	4,202	5,671
Tennessee	9,900	3,670	6,230
Texas	32,050	15,553	16,497
Virginia	5,698	2,097	3,601
Region IV, total	34,427	15,554	18,873
Colorado	1,365	593	772
Iowa	4,034	1,503	2,531
Kansas	1,234	814	420
Minnesota	2,768	1,385	1,383
Missouri	11,455	4,714	6,741
Montana	106	45	61
Nebraska	899	299	600
New Mexico	1,411	738	673
North Dakota	5,413	3,026	2,387
Oklahoma	4,048	1,624	2,424
South Dakota	1,549	777	772
Wyoming	145	36	109
Region V, total	4,186	1,305	2,881
Arizona	319	102	217
California	1,983	552	1,431
Idaho	484	256	228
Nevada	4		4
Oregon	230	68	162
Utah	638	220	418
Washington	528	107	421
Territories, total	43,335	22,402	20,933
Puerto Rico	43,142	22,365	20,777
Virgin Islands	193	37	156

MIGRATION OF YOUTH

The concentration of war production facilities in relatively few areas and the erection of new plants in places where practically no manufacturing was carried on before, have resulted in problems of labor supply, of housing, and many others. The lure of steady well-paid jobs has attracted migrants who stream into regions where war industries are located. Many do not have the necessary skill for the work and are not hired. About 85,000 workers, it is estimated by the Bureau of Employment Security, have migrated to the Los Angeles area since August 1940. Of these about 50,000 have found jobs; the remainder are unemployed or have migrated elsewhere, but in any event represent a waste of human resources at a time when the country can ill afford such waste.

Youth, the most mobile part of the population, make up a large part of this migrant group. The need for direction in migration and proper training of the workers is very great. Proper training of local workers wherever possible would do much to reduce the need for migration of workers and the directed migration of needed skilled workers would help prevent the large-scale movement from constituting a problem in war production areas.

A systematic labor migration mechanism to supplant the haphazard migration of youth was begun last May by the National Youth Administration. Resident centers were established in areas where labor shortages existed, and youth trained in National Youth Administration workshops in the surplus labor areas were transported to these centers, from which they were able to secure employment in industry. This program, which combines training and transfer of youth to the areas where they are needed, will become of increasing importance as the remaining supply of local labor in the war centers is depleted.

In cooperation with the Bureau of Employment Security, the National Youth Administration is using its resident centers as a means of facilitating the regional movement of workers trained in its shops. A typical example of this type of work is at Nepaug, Conn., where there is a great need for war production workers. With the aid of detailed specifications of the types of workers needed in the Connecticut Valley provided by the Connecticut United States Employment Service, the National Youth Administration is now transferring youth with the proper qualifications from other States to the National Youth Administration resident center at Nepaug Village, 15 miles west of Hartford. There they have a place to stay while receiving some brush-up training, and there they are interviewed by officials of the Employment Service and referred to employers needing workers. Since June 1941, more than 2,500 youth workers from this resident center at Nepaug have gone to work in war production industries in Connecticut.

Projects similar to Nepaug Village are being operated in Baltimore, San Diego, Seattle, Norfolk, Houston, Corpus Christi, and other areas where shortages of qualified workers are acute.

THE STUDENT WORK PROGRAM

The student work activities of the National Youth Administration fall into an altogether different category from the war production training program of the out-of-school projects. Here it is a question of keeping high-school children in school and of maintaining young people in college. The usual economic burdens, which are always difficult for youth in school, have in many cases been added to by the rising cost of living. Hence many youth from families just above the borderline of need, who would remain in school during normal times, now feel encouraged to abandon their technical and professional training to seek jobs resulting from the war effort.

It is not to the best interests of our war effort, however, to have a sudden exodus of youth from the schools, particularly of those youth who are studying for occupations which will be of great use in the future operation of our war program. Some of the threatened loss to the Nation due to the failure to complete the training of necessary engineers, medical men, management specialists, factory inspectors, production managers, and other professionals, can be avoided by permitting needy students to perform useful part-time work for a small wage while remaining in school.

By providing the Nation's youth with work so that they may finance themselves through school, the National Youth Administration's student work program is contributing materially to a future supply of professional and technical workers. In November 1941, the latest month for which data are available, a total of 27,650 separate educational institutions participated in the program. These student work projects employed a total of 342,509 youth in tasks which assured them a marked contribution to their support as well as invaluable experience in fields associated with their education. The projects on which they were employed ranged from those requiring clerical skills to those which contributed greatly to scientific research in the various institutions.

On the secondary school level the problem is not one of impending shortage of technically trained persons but is rather a problem of youth leaving school to try to find a place in the national economy without completing even their high-school education. At the present time these youth are barred by their age and inadequate education from war industries, the majority of which will not take on workers younger than 18 years of age or without at least a high-school education. And even with present labor market conditions, youth at these lower age levels find it

very difficult to obtain employment unless they have had some type of work experience. Hence many of the youth who are leaving high school prematurely at the present time are adding to the ranks of unskilled and untrained labor, and cutting down their potential usefulness to the war program. The National Youth Administration school-work program was, in November 1941, assisting some 245,499 needy secondary students to remain in school until their education was completed. A total of 25,972 institutions participated in this program, helping to keep youth in school until both their age and their training would enable them to contribute positively to the war effort.

At the present time the need for professional and technical personnel is very great, and many colleges have been drained of those students who have completed sufficient training to be of use in the war effort now. It would be very shortsighted to encourage and force the withdrawal of those youth who have not progressed far enough in their training to be used in their chosen fields. Engineers, doctors, chemists, biologists, competent research men, and other professional persons require long training. The National Youth Administration is assisting materially in insuring that this training be completed by enabling youth, who otherwise would leave school for economic reasons, to earn a small amount of money through part-time work in conjunction with their regular school work.

In November 1941, a total of 97,010 college students were employed on both the undergraduate and the graduate college programs of the National Youth Administration. Through their work these students were not only enabled to stay in school and complete their professional training, but many of them were already assisting the national war effort by working on scientific research projects undertaken by the universities at the behest of the Government or on Army projects established on local campuses.

The recent reserves set up by the Bureau of the Budget, cutting the original appropriation of $23,000,000 for fiscal year 1941–42 down to $17,000,000, has meant a reduction of about 25 percent in the number of youth who can be assisted to remain in college and 50 percent in the number of youth assisted in high school during the coming 6 months. Reports from 1,290 out of the 1,734 colleges participating in the National Youth Administration college-work program indicate that more than 16,000 students will be forced to drop out of college completely as a result of this recent reduction in funds. The total withdrawals will probably be much greater than this when, with their small National Youth Administration wage withdrawn, they meet the increased pressure to take jobs at any level of skill. The threat to the future supply of technical and professional workers, without immediate advantage to the war effort through this type of school withdrawal, is emphasized by the fact that more than 62 percent of the students who expected to withdraw because of reduction of funds were attending colleges in Southern and rural States—States which have considerably less than the national average of war contracts and associated employment opportunity.

CONCLUSION

Now, gentlemen, the position I am taking is (1) that the National Youth Administration has put together a program of training that is now serving the war-production industries; (2) that its services are located for the most part in sections of the country not served by any other agency; (3) that it is serving a group of young people who are unable to avail themselves of another opportunity, and that it is doing this at a very modest cost to the taxpayer.

I firmly believe that all training facilities are needed to win the war; that the war-production industries will require at least 10,000,000 additional workers by the end of the present calendar year; and that at least half of the workers to be added to war industries must be given training to fit them for war-production jobs; also, that present training facilities are entirely inadequate to meet these training requirements and that manpower shortages will occur unless the number provided training is sharply increased. While effort is being made to place war industries upon a three-shift basis, a like effort must be made to train the workers who will be required to operate plants on this basis.

Without relinquishing our loathing of Nazi methods, we must appraise the German war effort dispassionately. In regard to labor training, we could well take a leaf out of their book. In March 1941 there were 3,000,000 workers being trained in Germany, and, after 2 years of war, labor training continues on a scale never equaled in the United States.

In this country, the number of youth entering the labor market each year is three times the number in Germany (1,600,000 compared with 500,000), yet our actual youth training program is smaller than that in Germany.

Germany and Japan are enemies powerful enough to threaten our national security because they have mobilized their full resources. The main resource of a nation is its trained manpower. To insure adequate trained manpower, Germany and Japan train not merely unemployed youth, but all youth. Neither our methods nor our aims can have anything in common with those of Nazi Germany or Japan; but if we are to drive the aggressors from the shores of their victims, we must mobilize every human as well as every material resource that we possess. Instead of attempting to destroy the training program carried forward by the National Youth Administration, we should use it fully and expand it wherever possible and necessary.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I think that if anybody will take the time seriously and carefully to analyze the logic and the arguments presented by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and compare those with the records of the Office of Education and the N. Y. A. vocational shop and training program, he will have to arrive at the conclusion that the N. Y. A. program is doing a splendid piece of work and merits continuation. It is because of these facts that I rise in opposition to the gentleman from Illinois' [Mr. DIRKSEN] amendment to abolish the basic program of N. Y. A.

Let me call your attention to some of the arguments presented by the gentleman from Illinois. He said in the first place that the Office of Education and the N. Y. A. were both operating with American citizens of about the same age, from 17 to 24, and gave that as a reason for abolishing the N. Y. A. work-training program.

I am perfectly willing to assume, for sake of argument, that both these agencies may be working with men and women from 17 to 24, but I submit to you that the factors involved which are different are considerably more important than those which are similar.

Let us assume that the students are of the same age, although the Office of Education frequently works with citizens much older than 27; at least, they are in different areas, because the Office of Education is working primarily with young people from 17 to 24 years of age in the urban States and in the cities while the N. Y. A. is working with young people of the same age to a considerable degree in the rural areas, who have no other way of getting the training and experience by which they can serve in the work of national defense.

This is one difference, I submit to you, which outweighs any similarity between the two services.

There is also a considerable distinction between the activities of the two in addition to the areas in which they function. They may take people of the same age and, putting them in different areas and engaging them in different activities, train them in shops and with the tools and machinery provided by the N. Y. A. offices and shops to equip them so they can go into the industrial centers and carry out the necessary work contributing to the war production which we all recognize to be basic to victory in this war.

Consequently, I submit to you there is not the duplication of efforts about which the gentleman from Illinois speaks. Instead, it is a division of effort, because the N. Y. A. does certain functions for people of a definite age and the Office of Education does different functions in different areas for people of the same age and of older ages.

You will notice that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] did not at any time say that the training was not necessary or that it was not needed. He simply suggested that you permit the Office of Education to do it instead of the N. Y. A.

Let me point out what the gentleman from Illinois said yesterday on the subject. He does not even make the plea of economy in this connection. On the floor of the House yesterday in response to an interrogation by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN], who asked the gentleman from Illinois whether or not if the Office of Education had to carry this work on alone it would need an additional appropriation, the gentleman from Illinois had this to say:

> I would expect them to come back for a deficiency appropriation just as they came back 2 weeks ago for a deficiency of $9,500,000 to carry on this work for the fiscal year 1942.

Mr. BARDEN then said:

> The gentleman does feel that that would require additional funds?

Mr. DIRKSEN said:

> That is right, and there was no objection to voting the funds I have referred to.

So there is little or no economy involved in Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment. You are simply being asked by the author of this amendment to eliminate the functions of the N. Y. A. without any considerable degree of economy, but so that the Office of Education can carry out its functions in the urban areas for those children who can afford to go to schools with equipment enabling them to get the experience in industrial pursuits while it is denied to the rural students unless

N. Y. A. provides the facilities as it has in the past.

We find that out in the rural States such as the one I represent, South Dakota, there are innumerable young people eager and desirous of going into war production who have no opportunity to serve apprenticeships in shops in industrial areas, but they can go into an N. Y. A. shop to learn the things they would learn as apprentices if they had an opportunity to do so in a commercial institution, and can then go to the industrial centers and serve this Government in a productive capacity. We have been told again and again that production will win this war. The training for war production provided by N. Y. A. vocational shops helps mightily in this program.

I strongly urge that you vote down Mr. DIRKSEN's amendment and that in the interest of victory in this war that the N. Y. A. activities recommended in this legislation be continued.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, I regret very much that the proposition before the House is to eliminate the N. Y. A. activity in this Government. I wish the appropriation proposed for it was twice as much as it is because it is filling a position in our educational system that nothing else has ever filled.

I wish to call your attention for a few minutes to a historical fact which is interesting and very pertinent in the discussion of this matter. When Thomas Jefferson was on his deathbed some of his friends came to his bedside and said to him, "Mr. Jefferson, what do you want us to say about you when you are gone? What are the outstanding things that you have done in this life?" He said, "Do not say that I was minister to several of the countries in Europe or that I was President of the United States of America, or that I was Vice President of this country; let that alone. Say that I wrote the Declaration of Independence of this country, that I was one of the authors of the Bill of Rights of the State of Virginia, and that I founded the University of Virginia." When Mr. Jefferson was interested in writing the Constitution of this country, he was approached by several of his friends who told him, "Mr. Jefferson, you are attempting to do an impossible thing. Do you not know that the people cannot rule themselves?" Jefferson said, "No; that is not true." They then said, "Do you not know that all republics or democracies such as you are proposing have gone out in mob rule?" and that distinguished statesman, whom we like to quote even in these days, said: "You make the people of this Nation universally intelligent so that one class of men cannot exploit another class, and a democracy or a republic will be an ideal form of government."

So I think the people of this country, in remembering the value of education disclosed by our great statesman, Jefferson, have always been appreciative of the value of universal education. They have followed this great statesman who lived years ago and we are spending in this country today more to educate the men and women of this Nation than is all the balance of the world together. Unfortunately, I think the trouble about our present method of education is that we are pouring into the boys and girls that go to the public schools and other preparatory institutions what I think is a quantitative system of education which has for its purpose solely to prepare them for colleges, when only 6 percent of them ever get to a college, and a large number of those who go through our preparatory schools are really unfitted for the very things they should do in life.

The service which the National Youth Administration does for a large number of boys and girls is it puts them in their schools and shops and teaches them to develop those natural traits and characteristics which will enable them to become useful and valuable citizens and guarantees to them a decent living in this world. It does, in my opinion, what our educational system has never provided for in the United States. I wish I had time to discuss with you for a few minutes what training of this kind did for the slaves long before our Civil War. The masters and overseers of those colored boys who had a talent for certain kinds of work encouraged and taught them to develop this talent and many of these slaves developed into the finest artisans that this country ever produced. You can go into the South today and visit some of the colonial homes there and see the chimneys and the stonework built by these old slaves as taught by their masters and you can cast a plumb line from a chimney 50 feet high and it will fall as fair today as it did a hundred years ago. These colored artisans, some of whom helped build the Capitol in which we now legislate, became valuable and useful men and I insist that we need in our educational life today just that training which is best suited to each individual citizen and that is what the National Youth Administration is largely doing in our educational life. It encourages the poor to learn those traits and useful habits that they cannot get in the average school and enables them to develop talents and characteristics which make them good and worthy citizens and which assures them of a happy life in this world. The proposed amendment should be voted down by this House overwhelmingly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in opposition to the amendment and desire to include the following letter:

The Honorable PAUL CUNNINGHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: In answer to your query regarding the Iowa National Youth Administration program, I have had prepared this report which is highlighted by the following pertinent data:

OUT-OF-SCHOOL PROGRAM

1. A total of 3,389 youths in this State are at present fitting themselves for jobs in war industries or other essential occupations by acquiring experience and training through the out-of-school work program of the Iowa National Youth Administration. Of this number, 1,588 are young men, and 1,801 young women.

2. The bulk of these young men and women are at work in National Youth Administration metal, machine, automotive, and woodworking shops, in sewing rooms, in key governmental offices directly concerned with various phases of our country's war effort, and in hospitals which are anticipating or already experiencing a shortage of workers because of the war drain on their labor supply.

3. One group of these National Youth Administration youth workers is reconditioning small arms and ordnance equipment for Rock Island Arsenal (in large quantities), another is engaged in manufacturing war goods and other types of material for both Rock Island Arsenal and Fort Des Moines, and still another group is making garments and other sewed articles for hospitals and Red Cross chapters in the State.

4. On the basis of terminations of National Youth Administration youth for private employment averaged for the past several months at least 400 of those in the present work group can be expected to gain private jobs this month, with one-third going into manufacturing industries, and the remainder taking up nonmanufacturing pursuits as farm, office, utilities, service, and transportation workers.

5. Their places will be taken by a portion of the 3,619 Iowa youth who have made application for and are now awaiting National Youth Administration assignment to fit themselves for jobs.

STUDENT-WORK PROGRAM

1. As of January of this year, a total of 5,267 Iowa high school and college students were depending upon funds earned at National Youth Administration student work to continue their education. Of this number, 2,118 were high school and 3,149 college youth.

2. The student-work program during that month was in operation in 893 public and parochial high schools and in all 65 colleges in the State.

3. During the month of January, however, there were an additional 2,764 high school and college youth who, although in need of National Youth Administration help to continue their education properly and approved for student-work participation, could not be assigned because of fund limitations.

4. Today this group of approved but not assigned youth has grown in number, because of widespread terminations from the student-work program necessitated by Budget Bureau impounding of allocated National Youth Administration in-school funds.

OUT-OF-SCHOOL PROGRAM

Even though all of the activities of the Iowa National Youth Administration out-of-school work program are now being concentrated on America's war needs, this type of industry is not new to the State administration, just as it is not new to the national headquarters.

For more than a year now, Iowa National Youth Administration youth workers, boys as well as girls, have been reconditioning and recording small arms and equipment at Rock Island Arsenal. Approximately 200 young men and women are employed at this type of work at the present time.

Millions of articles processed

Today the amount of old-issue war goods reconditioned or adapted to new-issue equipment runs into the millions of articles. Included among the items restored to combat condition are bayonets and rifle slings, rifle racks and cleaning rods, machine gun water chests, ammunition kits, and timing devices in the nose fuzes of howitzer shells used for testing artillery pieces.

National Youth Administration participation in this type of production has brought twofold benefits: 1 It has provided our armed forces with huge quantities of materials in advance of their needs; 2. The experience gained by National Youth Administration youth doing this work has enabled many to attain full-status civil-service jobs at Rock Island Arsenal.

By way of illustrating this last point, National Youth Administration termination reports for the 1-week period, March 2 to 9 of this year, list three youth, two young men and one young woman, who left the arsenal project for full-time jobs at that ordnance station. One of the youth earns $18.72 per week, another $24.50, and the third $27.36. These examples are typical of many.

Metal shops for war production and training

Key units in the Iowa National Youth Administration's system for expanded Rock Island Arsenal production and training of youth for war jobs are the 14 metal shops set up to process a variety of metal goods.

Bulk of the items being produced for Rock Island Arsenal are now made in the new, prefabricated steel Des Moines National Youth Administration metal shop, but plans are under way for spreading this production to the other 13 work sites. Some goods have already been processed for the arsenal at these other production points.

Thus far the arsenal has received from the Des Moines shop more than 550 gun and other type metal chests and 3,000 special belt buckles. In the process of production are 9,106 additional chests, 2,500 tool kits, 25,000 steel spools, and an indeterminate number of ball-peen hammers, which were first ordered in a lot of 10,000.

Production is scheduled to be under way soon in all 14 metal shops on an arsenal order for 1,600 various type chisels, 240 special wrenches, 650 funnels, 500 gun-carriage latches, and 500 fluorescent lighting fixtures for installation in warehouse buildings. It is expected that an arsenal order for 13,800 cleaning staffs and 70,000 screw-machine parts may soon be placed with the Iowa National Youth Administration.

Location of metal shops

In addition to the metal shop in Des Moines, others are located in Waterloo, Dubuque, Burlington, Muscatine, Chariton, Ottumwa, Centerville, Council Bluffs, Harlan, Sioux City, Fort Dodge, and at Iowa National Youth Administration resident centers in Milford and Clinton.

All 14 of the shops have welding sections; 13 have sheet-metal divisions; 9 have forging departments; 8 have machine units; 7 have automotive repair stations. All are now operating or being set up to operate on a 3-shift, 24-hour-a-day basis.

Newest of the metal units are those at Clinton, Dubuque, and Sioux City, housed in prefabricated steel buildings of the Des Moines type and equipped with the latest type machinery.

National Youth Administration metal shop and other training leads to private jobs

That training and experience gained by both young men and women in Iowa National Youth Administration metal shops and at other work places does lead to private employment is illustrated in the following data on such placements:

1. An average of 20 young men leave Milford resident center each month for jobs in private employment, some going to aircraft-manufacturing plants on the west and east coasts, others locating in steel-processing manufactories making materials of war, and still others joining firms manufacturing equipment for use in turning out Army goods.

2. In one 2-week period in October 1941, 29 youths left Milford resident center to take jobs in private industry. Of this group, 12 went to work for a steel company in Omaha, Nebr., at 50 cents per hour. Two located with manufacturing firms in 2 Iowa cities at $20 per week. Two others found jobs at $35 per week with a farm-implement manufacturing concern in Moline, Ill., engaged in Army production. One gained employment at 55 cents per hour in the cable department of a large plant making electrical appliances and equipment in Chicago, Ill.

3. Ten percent of the young men and women at the Des Moines National Youth Administration metal shop leave there each month for jobs in private industry, many of them affiliating with local firms processing materials under Government contract.

4. During February seven youths left the newly opened Clinton resident center of the Iowa National Youth Administration for jobs in private employment at salaries ranging from $15 to $45 per week. Most of these young men were taken on by an engineering company and steel-tubing firm, both of which hold War Department contracts. (The Clinton center, in addition to offering machine and metal training, is also used as an intake point for Des Moines youth who have completed their National Youth Administration welding course. No difficulty is anticipated in placing this group of youth in plants producing war goods in the Clinton area.)

5. Average length of time spent by Iowa young men and women at National Youth Administration training before locating in private employment is now 3 months. In the case of those gaining experience and training in metal shops, this time is 2.5 months, however.

6. A few cases picked at random from weekly termination reports for the State as a whole during the 1-week period, March 2–9, show that—

A Clinton National Youth Administration youth went to work in a machine shop at $12 per week.

Another Clinton National Youth Administration youth went into a box-making plant at $14 per week.

A Maquoketa boy located at the Savanna Arsenal Proving Grounds at $23.20 per week.

Three Sioux City National Youth Administration girls gained employment at $14.40 per week with a wind-device manufactory processing war goods.

Seven Des Moines National Youth Administration youth—four boys and three girls—found employment at the Ankeny ordnance plant at salaries ranging from $21 to $33.60 per week.

A Davenport National Youth Administration youth worker was hired at $32.50 per week in the machine shop of an engineering company making materials of war.

Two Des Moines boys started to work for a lithographing and an electric-appliance manufacturing firm at salaries of $14 and $18 per week.

A Clare, Iowa, youth, taking radio training at Milford resident center, was employed by a radio shop at $15 per week.

A Bedford National Youth Administration girl entered the War Department in Washington in civil-service status as a junior typist at $30 per week

Testimonial on the caliber of National Youth Administration workers

Last month, 19 Iowa National Youth Administration youth workers—12 from Milford resident center, and 5 from the Des Moines and 2 from the Fort Dodge metal shops, were sent to the National Youth Administration Seattle, Wash., resident center from which placements are made in aircraft, shipbuilding, and related types of industry.

These boys, along with other National Youth Administration youth workers from Minnesota and Nebraska, were referred to the Puget Sound Navy Yard at Bremerton, Wash., where they are now employed at an hourly wage of 87½ cents for a 40-hour workweek, with time-and-a-half overtime.

Here is what Lieutenant Mason, Navy employment officer at the yard had to say about the group:

"Those National Youth Administration boys from Minnesota, Iowa, and Nebraska, that you sent over to us are the finest-looking applicants we've ever had. * * * These boys will be put to work as sheet metal, shipfitter, and machinist's helpers.

"We want these boys because they are well trained and have learned how to work. In addition to this, they come to our Labor Board Office completely equipped with all of the required credentials. The National Youth Administration officials in charge of sending them to us are doing a splendid job.

"I have 5,000 jobs to fill in classifications into which National Youth Administration youth can fit. * * * I want as many National Youth Administration boys as it is humanly possible for you to send me whether they come from out-of-State or in-State.

"I can testify right now that they are the best trained of all that are being referred to the yard."

Iowa National Youth Administration industrial sewing rooms

Two industrial sewing rooms, equipped with the kind of machines found in commercial garment factories, are operated by the Iowa National Youth Administration, in addition to a number of regular sewing rooms which are turning out stitched articles for hospitals and Red Cross chapters. The one industrial sewing room is located in Des Moines, the other in Waterloo.

In each of these towns there is a heavy demand for garment workers in factories manufacturing war goods under Army contract. Illustrative of this point, are the 52 girls who left the Waterloo and the 50 who went from the Des Moines sewing room into garment factories in the 2-month period, November 1, 1941, to January 1, 1942.

Twenty-four girls gain jobs in 1 month

A more recent illustration of the effectiveness of the training gained in Iowa National Youth Administration sewing rooms is had in the case of 24 girls who, during the month of February of this year, left the Waterloo project to take full-time employment in 2 garment factories in that city.

The industrial sewing rooms are not the only projects of this type to realize placements in private industry, for the Davenport sewing room, as one example, has an average of 10 girls leaving there each month for jobs in garment works.

Thousands of items made in sewing rooms

During November and December of 1941, 8,477 garments were manufactured for the Red Cross in Iowa National Youth Administration sewing rooms, this work supplementing that turned out by Red Cross volunteer workers. In the same period, more than 10,000 sewed articles were also made up for Iowa hospitals.

Added to this production were gun covers, bags, cloth cases, and other stitched material manufactured in the Davenport and Des Moines sewing rooms for both Rock Island Arsenal and Fort Des Moines.

Iowa National Youth Administration hospital attendant projects

Two hundred and twenty Iowa National Youth Administration girls are currently employed in 16 hospitals in 13 cities in the State as hospital attendants, augmenting the work of the regular nonprofessional hospital staffs and enabling such institutions to maintain efficiency in the face of a pending or anticipated labor shortage because of the war.

Such projects are functioning in hospitals in Sioux City (2), Dubuque, Ottumwa (2), Centerville, Oskaloosa, Clarinda, Fort Dodge, Mason City, Perry, Eldora, Boone, Des Moines (2), and Marshalltown, and pending in Grinnell and Council Bluffs.

Iowa National Youth Administration youth take farm employment

Not all Iowa National Youth Administration youth are interested in gaining industrial or urban jobs, for there are a number of young men and women who take National Youth Administration employment during slack periods in farming, then return to farm work as soon as the planting and harvesting seasons open.

During the 4-month period, July through October of 1941, a total of 394 National Youth Administration youths in rural areas took jobs on farms. Six of this group were young women, the balance—388 youths, young men. Monthly placements of National Youth Administration youths at farm work during this period follow: July—80 young men; September—97 young men, 1 young woman; October—179 young men and 1 young woman.

At Calmar, where the National Youth Administration operated a construction project last year, 9 youths of a total 20 employed left this project in a 10-day period for farm work in the fall season. During last summer, 15 boys left this project at varied intervals for farm employment.

At Perry, it was not unusual last year for half of the youth personnel with a National Youth Administration project there to leave at certain periods to take jobs on farms.

Iowa National Youth Administration youth volunteer for Army service

A check on the number of youth who left Iowa National Youth Administration projects for Army service during the period December 1, 1940, to November 1, 1941, reveals that of 1,029 young men who entered the military, 947 enlisted, and that only 82 were called up by Selective Service.

On a percentage basis, 92 percent of the youth who left the Iowa National Youth Administration during this period for military service went in as volunteers. According to State selective service figures, 60 percent of the total Iowa youth who entered the Army were taken in as volunteers.

The January termination record for military service this year shows that of 67 National Youth Administration youth who entered the Army from Iowa, 61 enlisted, and that only 6 were chosen by selective service.

STUDENT-WORK PROGRAM

A survey completed in February by officials in 24 of the 29 senior colleges and 27 of the 36 junior colleges in the State, to determine the effect that Budget Bureau impounding of allocated student-aid money would have on National Youth Administration college students, revealed that:

1. Of a total of 1,813 senior college students furthering their education through money earned at National Youth Administration work, 415 would be forced to leave school this semester because of the fund curtailment.

2. Of a total of 268 youths for whom National Youth Administration pay checks meant the difference between continuing in or dropping out of junior colleges, 83 would have to quit school during the semester for the same reason.

3. Thcse National Youth Administration students remaining in senior and junior colleges would feel the effect of the fund curtailment, since many schools were reducing the National Youth Administration amounts normally paid individual students in order to spread benefits further.

A similar survey conducted in 747 of the 892 high schools participating under the National Youth Administration student-work program, reveals that 162 students have already been forced to quit school because of the withholding of National Youth Administration in-school funds, and that 765 youths have been affected economically to the extent that they cannot properly remain in school.

School officials favor continuance of program

Members of the college work council, made up of representative college officials acting in an advisory capacity to the Iowa National Youth Administration, went on record at its February meeting as favoring continuance of the program and opposing the impounding of student-work funds, because of the hardships this last was working on needy youth desirous of gaining college educations.

They also urged the restoration of the impounded money to junior and senior colleges. The Iowa Association of Educational Business Officers has taken the same action.

Members of the school work council, a representative group of high school officials functioning as advisors to the Iowa National Youth Administration on the high school phase of the program, also adopted a resolution at its February meeting which favored continuance of National Youth Administration student work.

Sincerely yours,

THEODORE P. ESLICK,
State Youth Administrator.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I think at the outset of the consideration of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] we should have clearly in mind just exactly what his amendment proposes to do. If his amendment is adopted it will strike out of the bill all of the N. Y. A. training program and leave nothing in the bill except $5,000,000 for a minimum student-aid program, with no provision for funds for the administration of that fund.

The gentleman from Illinois bases his whole argument upon the theory that there is a duplication of effort between the N. Y. A. and the vocational-training system carried on throughout the country through the medium of grants from the Office of Education to the various States of the Union. Everyone in this Congress should recall that the program of vocational education, as administered by the Office of Education, is pursuant to legislation first passed in 1917, the Smith-Hughes Act, and, later, the George-Deen Act, authorizing the appropriation of funds for vocational training and providing that these funds shall be allocated to the States on a matching of funds basis.

The latter one of these authorizing bills provides a 50–50 matching of funds, Federal and State, and under these two great authorizing acts, which the Congress long ago passed to promote a great system of vocational education in this country, the States and local municipalities have taken advantage of their provisions and set up, largely in the larger cities of the country, vocational-training schools which are administered by the local boards of vocational education. All that the Office of Education has to do with the programs is to simply allocate those funds back to the States, and to give some direction and encouragement in the carrying on of the vocational-training program. It is true that under that program 2,000,000 or more people are today receiving courses of instruction. A large part I think are people who are working during the daytime and go into the vocational schools at night. These vocational schools are, most of them, working on a 24-hour basis, and they attract to those schools for training principally those who live within the large cities that have been able to provide vocational-training centers. I have nothing but applause for the splendid work that is being done by the vocational system in this country, but let me call your attention to this fact: There are 1,900 counties in the United States in which there is not a single vocational educational institution, and it is to reach those who need and are seeking vocational training and guidance in those communities that the N. Y. A. plays such a very important part. How in the name of conscience is a boy living in one of these counties, where there is no vocation system, going to be able to get vocational training? Who is going to give that boy support and work opportunity if he is compelled to go to a city 100 miles away, and there endeavor to support and maintain himself and pay the tuition to the local school in order to get vocational training? It just has not been done and is not being done, and I am vigorously in support of the N. Y. A. training program, because it reaches out into the country, into these 1,900 counties, where there is no vocational training facility provided.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. Yes.

Mr. KLEBERG. To offer to the gentleman the contribution that the set-up in vocational schools, miles and miles away from defense plant industries, cannot be moved into the defense plants, whereas the N. Y. A. can do that job.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin mean to say that the N. Y. A. is out in these 1,900 counties that the vocational education does not touch?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not mean to say that they are in every one of these 1,900 counties; of course not

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I should say not.

Mr. KEEFE. But I say that fundamentally the places where the N. Y. A. centers have been established, are those places where vocational training is not available. Of course, their funds are not sufficient to permit training centers throughout each one of the 1,900 counties in the United States. I think the Members of this Congress should look into the situation and find what the program contemplated by this appropriation really is. Most of the 1,900 workshops they have heretofore maintained throughout the country are to be abandoned under this reduced appropriation. Some 1,600 of these work centers are being continued under this program, centers where they are engaged in production, giving students an opportunity for employment training while they are actually producing and turning out material ordered by the War and Navy Departments. They are making a magnificent contribution to the war effort in these shops and don't make any mistake about that. I am not going to vote to deny to the youth of this country in rural areas and in small communities where no vocational training is to be had—I am not going to deny to them the right to receive this vocational training. With the demands of industry for 10,000,000 trained workers this year, we

need every boy, every trained American that we can get, to put them into industry in order to carry on this great war effort.

Mr. MUNDT. And I think also emphasis should be laid on the fact that these shops are set up in employment centers and boys more or less brought in from close counties and given enough money to live there.

Mr. KEEFE. Of course. That is exactly the situation.

Mr. HARE. I think emphasis should be laid upon the fact that the N. Y. A. shop is doing work in actual war production, in connection with the work training. I think that is a very interesting statement and I am sure the gentleman can elaborate on that.

Mr. KEEFE. Time will not permit. The evidence is in the record and shows the great contribution that the N. Y. A. is making in the shape of actual production of war materials while it is giving training to these boys.

May I call attention to this fact: It is true that in the operations of the N. Y. A. under past programs they have worked in close harmony with the vocational systems, and in those communities where there have been N. Y. A. trainees they have taken advantage of the opportunities for extra training that were afforded by the vocational system. There has been no conflict between the two organizations in that respect.

Bear in mind the N. Y. A. is your program—a Federal program. The vocational system is a State program, administered largely by the States and local communities, but helped only by Federal funds.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOUSTON] such time as he may desire.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. I believe there is a place in this country for the N. Y. A., and I believe it has demonstrated that it is one of the most beneficial agencies that has been set up during the emergency years. It has provided the opportunity for hundreds of thousands of young men and women to gain the training that otherwise would have been denied them.

More than 210,000 N. Y. A. youth, during 1941, were placed in industries concerned with the war effort. During the past 9 months, N. Y. A.-trained youth have been placed with 211 machine-tool, radio, electrical, and other metal manufacturing concerns; 48 aircraft companies; 71 ordnance and munition plants; 58 shipbuilding companies, besides numerous war construction jobs and textile, food, transportation, and public utilities concerns holding war contracts. They have gone to work at 44 Army camps and bases, including Pearl Harbor.

In its Washington office the N. Y. A. has the names and records of more than 55,000 of these young men: 5,195 are working for aircraft companies, including 1,326 at Boeing and 939 at Glenn Martin; 11,413 in machine tool, radio, and other metal industries, including 941 with the Aluminum Co. of America, 281 with the General Electric, 210 with Westinghouse, 232 with Bethlehem Steel, 156 with the Hendy Lathe Co.; 3,659 are in the shipyards, including 331 with the Charleston Navy Yard, 359 with the Norfolk Navy Yard, 265 with the Puget Sound Navy Yard, 141 at Manitowoc Shipyards in northern Wisconsin, 176 at the Houston Shipbuilding Co. in Texas, 111 at the Alabama Shipbuilding Co. in Mobile, and 103 with the Bath Iron Works in Maine; 3,460 are in ordnance and munition plants, 367 of whom are with the Remington Arms and 192 with the du Pont Co.

Every State in the Union has contributed its quota of boys trained by the N. Y. A. who have taken their places in the battle to save America. For Kansas alone, I have before me the names of 582 youth who went from N. Y. A. shops to make munitions of war, and these youth are only a fraction of the Kansas total. These 582 Kansas boys have obtained essential jobs with the following concerns:

Boeing Airplane, Wichita; Beech Aircraft, Wichita; Cessna Aircraft, Wichita; Stone Propeller Co., Wichita; Kansas Ordnance Plant, Parsons; American Aluminum Co., Fairfield, Conn.; General Electric; Marlin-Rockwell; Hendy Lathe; Hartley Wire & Die Co.; Consolidated Aircraft; Douglas Aircraft; and Lockheed Aircraft.

Thirty N. Y. A.-trained girls have passed civil-service examinations and are working as stenographers in Washington.

It should be stressed also that these young people not only have obtained these jobs, but they are making good on them.

I have here two letters from vital war production firms which employed N. Y. A. boys:

Boeing Airplane Co., Wichita, Kans.

New Britain-Gridley Machine Co., New Britain, Conn.

With relation to the letter from the New Britain-Gridley Machine Co., which has employed 289 N. Y. A. youth, I am proud to give you the record of a Kansas boy.

His name is Elbert Schmidler. He is 23 years old. He worked in the N. Y. A. machine shop in Topeka for 6 months. On September 22, 1941, he was transferred to the N. Y. A. in Connecticut for placement in one of the machine-tool industries there. On October 6 he was placed with the New Britain-Gridley Machine Co. in the tool room at 50 cents an hour. Seven months later—on May 29—Miss Laughlin, in Kansas, received the following wire from Richard A. Barrett, N. Y. A. administrator in Connecticut:

We are happy to advise you that the abovementioned youth has been made foreman at the New Britain Machine Co. on a salary basis of $70 per week.

THE NEW BRITAIN MACHINE CO.,
New Britain, Conn., September 26, 1941.

Mr. RICHARD A. BARRETT,
State Administrator,
National Youth Administration,
New Haven, Conn.

DEAR MR. BARRETT: I would like to take this opportunity to write you on how the boys, wihch we have hired from the National Youth Administration in Nepaug and Rocky Hill, have turned out. At the present time we have approximately 30 boys in our employ, who are working on machines or machine assembly. According to all reports that I have received from the foremen, these boys are turning out excellent work and are working conscientiously. They are industrious and ambitious without being too aggressive.

I have read where the National Youth Administration has been under some criticism for importing these boys from out of State. We feel that it is necessary to do so, as the supply of trained or semitrained men is practically negligible in Connecticut and it has been necessary for us to hire men from wherever and whatever source we are able. These National Youth Administration boys have had more training than the graduates of the local defense schools and thus are more valuable to us. However, the supply of local trade school boys has been depleted and now we must draw from the outside. The unemployed now remaining in the State are not of the caliber nor do they have the experience or training that we are looking for.

In general, I can say that we are well pleased with the type of boy that we have obtained from your centers and hope that we may obtain more in the future.

Yours truly,
NEW BRITAIN MACHINE CO.,
JAMES L. BISHOP,
Personnel Manager.

STEARMAN AIRCRAFT,
DIVISION OF BOEING AIRPLANE CO.,
Wichita, Kans., October 7, 1941.

Miss ANNE LAUGHLIN,
State Youth Administrator,
Topeka, Kans.

DEAR MISS LAUGHLIN: We have just been checking the progress on the job of a group of boys trained in your National Youth Administration center at Hutchinson. All the boys on the list we checked have been placed in sheet-metal departments, where they are doing riveting on control surfaces and outer wing panels for Boeing flying fortresses. We are glad to report that in every case checked they are making satisfactory progress and a number are doing exceptionally well for beginners. The average length of service to date for the group is slightly over 4 months, but already each of them has received at least two increases in rate of pay.

The recent report that your residence center to be erected in this community is nearing completion is one we are exceedingly glad to hear. We have the feeling that by providing living quarters and expenses for youth in training in the local defense school that National Youth Administration is not only assisting economically with our training problem but is also helping materially from the social standpoint. If the same quality of leadership and direction is available in this residence center as in others I have seen, there is no doubt but that the experience gained there will be of great value in helping to prepare the youth concerned for a normal entry into industrial life. The assistance in both respects is greatly appreciated by us and I believe by other aircraft firms in this community. We are especially cognizant of such needs because of the size of our expansion program, which will take us from approximately 6,000 employees to somewhere in the neighborhood of 20,000 within the next 18 months, according to present plans.

We are thankful for your cooperation, past, present, and future, which we expect will aid greatly in helping us to do the job ahead.

Sincerely yours,
BOEING AIRPLANE CO., WICHITA DIVISION,
GEORGE TROMPOLD,
Personnel Director.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, the National Youth Administration in North Carolina, under the splendid leadership of State Administrator John A. Lang, has

synchronized its activities with the war machine and has trained many young men and women of North Carolina to take their places as skilled workers in industries which are participating in the all-out war effort. As evidence of the manner in which the National Youth Administration has turned its attention to the problems of this emergency, I desire to read three short paragraphs from a letter which I received from the State administrator on May 25:

At the present time, the National Youth Administration of North Carolina is training 5,848 young people for war industries. War industries for which these youths are being trained include machine shops, welding, sheet-metal shops, radio, power sewing production, ships, carpentry, aircraft woodworking, and clerical service. Since last July 1 more than 2,000 youths have been placed from this program into national defense industries of North Carolina and neighboring States.

More than 1,000 young men have been sent from our work projects to the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard. Youth workers now being trained on the National Youth Administration program are largely white girls, Negro boys, and Negro girls. White boys, who are serving on our program, are either under the draft age, are physically incapable of serving in the Army, or have not yet been called by their local draft boards. Our training is developed so as to be of maximum service to the youth for either industrial or military service.

We estimate that, if the National Youth Administration appropriation for 1942–43 is reduced as much as the Bureau of the Budget has recommended to the House Appropriations Committee, nearly two-thirds of our war-industrial-training program in this State will have to be cut out. This will mean that, instead of training 5,800 workers for the war industries, we shall be training only 2,000 workers at any given time. About two-thirds of our projects, including workshops and resident centers, will have to be eliminated. It would seem that every effort should be made at this time to strengthen and expand upon war training projects instead of eliminating them.

The letter from which I have just read excerpts was written to me by Mr. Lang at my request, to the end that I might be advised as to the activities of this agency in North Carolina.

If the National Youth Administration is doing as well in other States as it is in North Carolina, then certainly it should not now be forced into immediate liquidation. There is a crying need for skilled workers and the National Youth Administration has undertaken to meet this need by providing training centers in which both young men and women are being trained for work which is vital to our victory in the present war, and I agree with Mr. Lang's statement to the effect that these training projects should not be eliminated.

Mr. Lang, from whose letter I have just quoted, is no longer with the National Youth Administration of North Carolina. He recently resigned for the purpose of entering the armed forces. I want to take this opportunity to publicly congratulate and commend him upon the magnificent manner in which he has discharged his duties as State administrator of the National Youth Administration for North Carolina and to wish him every success as he enters upon even more important and exacting duties in the armed forces now fighting for the success of the cause to which we are all devoted.

Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

(By unanimous consent, Mr. COOLEY was granted permission to revise and extend his own remarks and include a letter from the State Administrator of N. Y. A. in North Carolina.)

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Dirksen amendment and address myself to the appropriations for the National Youth Administration contained in this bill. It appears to me that they are a perfect demonstration of a penny-wise, pound-foolish policy.

Let us examine this so-called economy measure whereby the N. Y. A. request for funds has been slashed by almost two-thirds. What has the committee economized on?

National Youth Administration requested $100,739,836 for their war-production-training program. The bill cuts this appropriation in half. Let us see what this means to our victory program.

Beside 1,670 shops which will remain under this bill, N. Y. A. has been operating 1,918 shops, employing 41,251 young people. These are mainly machine shops but they also include shops for welding, forging, radio work, and foundry work. In these shops young men and women are learning the skill that is so necessary to our war industries. This is attested to by the fact that during the past year, half of the N. Y. A. workers who secured jobs in private industry went directly into war work. During the past year the N. Y. A. program has been almost completely converted to a wartime basis. Even the clerical workers under N. Y. A. who formerly received their training and did their work for various nonprofit social agencies, are now working in Selective Service offices or at Army posts.

Under the reduced appropriation in this bill almost all of these 1,918 shops will have to be closed down. At least $10,000,000 worth of facilities will be discontinued. I fail to see how the wasting of facilities that can train war workers can be considered economy. I fail to see how depriving the Nation of trained machinists, welders, radio mechanics, and foundry workers can be considered economy. It looks to me like a scandalous squandering of facilities and human resources.

Yet there seem to be some Members, not satisfied with this severe curtailment of N. Y. A. at a time when this agency should be permitted to go ahead full blast in the interests of our victory program, who are trying to abolish the N. Y. A. completely. Such a move would be sheer sabotage of our war effort.

N. Y. A. has a record that it can be proud of. Not only has it trained hundreds of thousands of young people in useful skills, but in doing so it has also chalked up an astounding record of actual production for the Nation.

For example, in the field of new construction or complete additions, N. Y. A. has to its credit such work as 111 seaplane landing locations, 22 aircraft hangars, 2,323 airport and airway markers placed, 13,097 gun parts and equipment, 37,197 machine-tool parts, 91,742 other machinery parts, and 15,143,250 hospital supplies.

Approximately four-fifths of all the products made in N. Y. A. shops are made for the Army and Navy. These products have been made upon the direct specifications of the Army and Navy, who have considered them important enough to see that N. Y. A. shops receive priorities for the needed materials. The products are handed over to the Army and Navy without any cost to them other than the cost of materials. And despite the fact that the young people on these projects are all without previous training and are learning as they go, the Army finds that the rate of spoilage on these products runs to only about 6 percent. A training program with such a splendid record of production is too valuable in times such as these to be curtailed, or, worse still, abolished.

The present bill completely eliminates the program of high-school aid to needy students. It has been found that when N. Y. A. is forced to drop high-school students from its rolls, more than one-quarter of the number dropped are forced to leave school. The pitifully small amount of $6 a month is enough to make the difference between school and no school for hundreds of thousands. By eliminating the high-school-aid program you are forcing young people out of school. The committee has already junked the C. C. C. program, so the young people cannot go there. The action of the House sustaining this disastrous and false economy is injurious to the war effort. What happens to the young men who are thus deprived of the benefits of C. C. C.? The Army and Navy will not take them under 18. Industry will not take them because they have no training. And all this you do under the banner of economy.

Under this bill the appropriation for college aid suffers, too. Here, again, it would appear to be sheer folly to force students out of the colleges at the very time when our Nation is faced with a serious shortage of doctors, chemists, engineers, physicists, and other trained men.

The N. Y. A. has a most exemplary record of administering its funds with no discrimination on account of race, color, or creed. I am happy to see that the committee has once more included in this bill a section forbidding discrimination "on account of race, religion, political affiliation, or membership in a labor organization."

I note, however, that the general fad of lumping all aliens, whether loyal to this country or not, in one category finds a place in this bill, too. Particularly because this bill is concerned with young people, this failure to make any distinctions as between loyal and disloyal aliens is regrettable.

In closing I say that on the record of its achievements, on the record of young

people trained, needy young people aided, and actual production for the Nation, on the record of its contribution to our victory program, and precisely as a war necessity, the N. Y. A. deserves not only the appropriation contained in this bill but should receive the full amount requested by the National Youth Administration.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]. The N. Y. A. of West Virginia is making a distinct contribution to the war effort. I have observed the boys as they work. It is true elsewhere. I would not favor at this time the elimination of this agency from our national economy. I have believed that each dollar conserved at home in the operation of Government means that much saved for use in our war program. It would be false, in my opinion, to scuttle the N. Y. A. when it is vitally a part of the effort to speedily prosecute the war to a successful end.

Mr. Chairman, it would be bad judgment for this body to stop the needed funds to carry forward a work which is training thousands of boys and girls for important jobs in defense industries. In workshops throughout the Nation these youth are being trained to make valuable contribution to the line of production which in this mechanized conflict equals the front fighting lines in importance. Our armed forces are being backed splendidly by N. Y. A. activities. Let us close ranks these critical days. This agency can and does play its key part in bringing victory nearer day by day.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, last night in Philadelphia the National Selective Service Director, Brig. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey said:

> The United States Army will total six to seven million men by 1943. July and August will be serious months for industry because of the large drafts of men needed for the expanding Army. The time will come when we will have to skirt the edge of dependency in drafting men.

General Hershey said that over 20,000,000 men and women must be put to work in war industries in the United States. This means that we will have to add some ten to twelve million war workers to those already employed. In addition, a large number of workers now employed in industry will be added to our rapidly growing Army and Navy, and their places must be filled by inexperienced persons yet to be trained. It is incumbent upon us, therefore, to utilize to the fullest the existing training agencies, to teach the millions of additional men and women needed in our war industries and to close up the gaps in the ranks of those now employed but who will be taken from industry and placed in the Army and Navy.

I make the deliberate statement to you that all of the training that vocational schools can do, that all of the training that industry can do, and that all of the training that the National Youth Administration can do will not furnish industry with the trained men and women needed to manufacture the implements and articles necessary for our war effort.

That statement was made last night by Dr. Edward Elliott, president of Purdue University.

What are the types of training that these agencies do? The vocational schools are training four types of workers. They are giving courses to experienced persons already employed in industry to qualify them for higher skilled jobs.

Second, vocational schools train men in conversion work. Men who are employed in the automobile industry, for instance, are trained in the manufacture of tanks; men employed in the manufacture of refrigerators are trained to manufacture guns.

Third, the vocational schools, located principally in the larger industrial centers, teach the youth various trades, particularly in the larger industrial centers. Generally, these are 4-year courses.

Fourth, the vocational schools give preemployment and refresher courses to persons who are either inexperienced or who need their skills refreshed.

Now, bear these facts in mind when we consider vocational education, and I am speaking particularly to you men and women on this floor who come from the poorer sections of the country; 42 percent of all preemployment defense training by vocational education is done in five States. Furthermore, about 60 percent of the total enrollment in trade and industrial courses in the schools is in eight industrial States—Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, and California.

Now, as to industry, for industry likewise trains persons for war work. While many of our larger industrial plants are doing a splendid job of training, still they are limited largely to the manpower available in the locality in which they are located. Unfortunately, most of our war industries are located in areas which are experiencing extreme labor shortages. A survey was made about a year ago around Norfolk, Va., a highly industrialized center, and it was found there was practically no available manpower for industry in that particular area.

As to the N. Y. A., Mr. Chairman, I want the Members to listen to this statement: The N. Y. A. program is training youth in all but about 200 of the 3,072 counties in the country. It is training men for industry who, were it not for that training, would not be available to industry. As to cost, you cannot compare costs of N. Y. A. training with vocational educational training, because vocational schools do not give their trainees the small but necessary stipend that N. Y. A. does so that the enrollees can accept the training. Without this small payment these trainees would not be able to take advantage of the training facilities that are available to them. It will not serve our purpose to ignore the fact that large numbers of the youth of our Nation are members of families who cannot stand the expense of sending their boy or girl to a school to receive training. To take advantage of the training facilities many of them must have a small wage to pay for their food, transportation, clothing, and so forth. The youth living within the very shadow of a school may be unable to attend its classes for the simple reason that he does not have the money for the very necessities of life.

I want to repeat what I feel to be one of the most important facts about these training programs. Our war industries need such large numbers of qualified people that we need all of our training facilities and then we may fall short of our needs. The N. Y. A. with its thousands or workshops and its experience in giving training to inexperienced persons is one of our most valuable training agencies in this period of war.

Unless we win the battle of production we cannot win any of our other battles. Our rapidly growing armed forces cannot function efficiently unless we equip them with the finest tools of war that we can furnish them.

Modern war makes the man on the bench, the man on the assembly line, the man in the factory and on the farm as important as a soldier or sailor. We cannot afford in this time of emergency to overlook any factor and source of strength that would help speed the day of victory. Least of all can we afford curtailing the agencies training our men and women for war production. Without these trained workers all else may be for naught.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, the prime function of the National Youth Administration has always been to train youth in the skills that would fit them for private industry. Over 3,500 different youth have been employed so far in fiscal year 1942 on the regular and defense programs of the National Youth Administration in Montana. The major portion of these youth were employed in the 14 Montana shop projects which provide training in machine shop, welding, sheet metal, and other industrial operations.

The 1,670 shop units operating under the N. Y. A. defense program throughout the Nation have been carefully shaped to prepare youth for immediate absorption by war industries and have concentrated entirely on the machine and metal-working operations. The 1,913 shop units of the N. Y. A. regular program serve a broader field, but have been trimmed of all nonessential activities. In order to evaluate the results of this type of work experience, the N. Y. A. has collected all available data possible under the circumstances concerning the employment secured by youth after they leave the program.

Of the 2,900 youth leaving N. Y. A. projects in Montana through April of

fiscal year 1942, almost one-half went directly into private jobs. A large proportion of these were industries directly or indirectly concerned with the prosecution of the war. During this same period 289,000 youth throughout the Nation went from N. Y. A. jobs into private industry.

The unique position held by N. Y. A. in the defense-training program has resulted from its direct approach to the training problem by—

First. Providing training opportunities for youth in isolated areas through its resident centers and well dispersed shop operations.

Second. Enabling youth to take advantage of training by payment of a wage sufficient to maintain themselves during the training period.

Third. The "learning by doing" principle upon its shop operations, in which youth actually engaged in production processes under conditions similar to industry.

In most areas the only problem is to train youth fast enough to meet the needs of the war effort.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask two questions. Do I understand that all the funds for N. Y. A. in this bill are to be devoted solely to the training of boys and girls for war work?

Mr. HARE. That understanding is correct.

Mr. PACE. Are there any funds in this bill to be used in carrying on cooperative farming experiments or for other groups for farm work experience?

Mr. HARE. If there is a dollar in it for that purpose, I never heard of it.

Mr. PACE. It is not the intention of the committee to appropriate money for that purpose?

Mr. HARE. That is correct.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to receive this assurance, for the only way I can get my consent to vote for this appropriation under present conditions is from the fact that we need millions of additional trained workers in the plants which are manufacturing war supplies.

In my own State of Georgia and throughout the country the National Youth Administration is making a practical contribution to the war effort by training thousands of young men and young women for essential jobs in strategic industries.

At the present time the National Youth Administration is operating more than 3,800 workshop units which are providing young people with practical experience and training for such industries as aircraft production, shipbuilding, machine-tool manufacture, and ordnance and munitions production. There are 153 of these workshop units located in 61 communities in Georgia preparing young people from all over the State for essential war work. Experienced workers are in demand in all the key industries, and the National Youth Administration is operating its shops on a 24-hour a day basis to help meet that demand.

In N. Y. A. shops young people are learning the principal operations and use of the basic machines and tools in such fields as machine shop, sheet metal, welding, forge, and foundry, aircraft mechanics, electrical equipment and radio, and pattern-making and joinery. Other projects are preparing young people for work in industrial sewing and as hospital attendants, both of which are extremely important in the victory drive. Several thousand young people have been assigned to clerical and maintenance shop work in military establishments, releasing large numbers of enlisted personnel for military duties.

Proof of the value of this practical training program is the fact that some 421,000 N. Y A.-trained youth went into jobs in private industry—mainly war production—during 1941. This year young workers are pouring from N. Y. A. shops into war-production industries in an ever-increasing flow. Employers faced with the necessity of filling war contracts have been quick to give their approval to the N. Y. A. program. Representatives of nearly 250 war industries have written to N. Y. A. officials testifying to the value of N. Y. A.

The National Youth Administration made another important step toward solving the problem of supplying labor for war production in the institution of its interstate transfer program. Under this plan, which was inaugurated almost a year ago on an experimental basis, youth in areas where the labor surplus is large and there is little opportunity for either industrial or farm work are given N. Y. A. training in their home areas and then transferred to N. Y. A. centers in key industrial areas. After a brief period in such centers they are channeled directly into war industries.

A significant fact about the N. Y. A. is that it has made its facilities available to young people in the smaller cities and villages. Most of these communities lack training facilities of any kind other than the N. Y. A., and without this program the youth of these areas would be denied the chance to prepare for jobs in the war industries which are so desperately in need of trained workers.

Industrialists from all sections of Georgia and from all over the country, for that matter, are on record as urging the continued operation of the National Youth Administration as essential to victory. These are the men who have the job of seeing that our production schedules are met. They have the responsibility of seeing that we get enough of planes, of ships, of guns, and of tanks. When it comes to the N. Y. A. training program, let us not make the mistake, that frequent mistake of too little and too late.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Dirksen amendment and wish to go on record against it.

The gentleman from Illinois speaks of duplication between the work of the Office of Education and the N. Y. A. in their training programs. There may seem to be some duplication, but, in my judgment, it is more seeming than actual. These two programs are complementary rather than competitive. As a friend of both educational agencies, and as a schoolman of long and varied experience, I want to see both continue in the very necessary and splendid work they have been doing.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Chairman, in these critical days, one hesitates to take exception to any proposed action which is presented as an aid in winning the war.

I believe, however, this is just the time when we should study every proposal to be really sure that it will actually aid in winning the war. We all know the old adage, "Never whip a willing horse."

The people of this Nation are not only willing but anxious to make every possible effort and sacrifice that will hasten the ultimate victory.

They will be called upon to make heavy sacrifices, in lives of dear ones, in personal possessions, in comforts, and in security. They will make these sacrifices patriotically and without complaint.

It behooves us, therefore, to be especially careful that no hasty demands be made upon them for unnecessary sacrifices. We must be especially careful that they are not called upon to give up something in the name of the war effort, the surrender of which will not actually aid the war effort.

Right now there is a plan to extend gasoline rationing to the entire United States.

There is no question but that rationing is necessary in the East. It is necessary because a normal supply cannot be maintained here without endangering sailors and ships in running the submarine blockade.

In the Central and Western States there is no such shortage. There is no attempt to prove a shortage, and the reason given for rationing is that the best way to conserve rubber on automobile tires is by rationing gasoline.

No one will dispute the fact that free use of automobiles is a vital necessity if we are to maintain anything like normal life in our average American communities.

We must use automobiles to transport workers if factories producing war materials are to operate.

To get along without a fairly free use of automobiles will entail endless delays, losses, and hardships to people in every line of work.

We should, therefore, look into the matter very carefully before imposing one more hardship such as the rationing of gasoline. We should be absolutely sure that it is necessary and that it will accomplish the purpose for which it is proposed.

I offer no argument against rationing in the East. There is a shortage here. To end that shortage would cost many lives and the expenditure of much material needed for other war purposes.

In the Central States there is no gasoline shortage, and the reason advanced for rationing is that it will save automobile tires.

Apparently no one is able to say yet just what our rubber situation is. No

one has yet suggested what we will do with the tires now on privately owned automobiles which we will save by rationing gasoline; or, if I may extend the thought, it is very doubtful if we really will save rubber by rationing gasoline.

Let us look at the situation in my own city of Toledo, Ohio. We have four major gasoline refineries. Crude arrives by pipe line. No tank cars, no trucks, no rubber would be saved by cutting down on the supply of crude flowing in through those pipe lines.

These refineries not only produce enough gasoline for the Toledo area, but they produce vast quantities that are now being shipped to the East by Great Lakes tankers and tank cars, thus relieving the critical shortage in the East. The supply sent East is limited only by shipping facilities, and there is plenty left for all possible needs in the Toledo area.

We have, however, no great storage facilities, and any serious reduction in use in the Toledo area would result only in a suspension of refining operations.

Now, as to saving rubber.

Statistics which are available to the entire industry show that voluntary reduction in driving, in other words, the elimination of unnecessary driving by motorists in the entire central section of the United States resulted in a decrease in the use of gasoline of 20 percent in April 1942 under that used in April 1941. For May it is estimated that the reduction will amount to 25 percent. This is a voluntary, patriotic reduction made by the people.

I can assure you that there is very little unnecessary driving on Ohio roads since the patriotic people of my State have been asked to conserve.

If we must save tires we will not save them by forcing people to store their automobiles in garages because we refuse them gasoline. Any tireman will tell you that a tire on a car sitting unused in the garage deteriorates just about as fast as a tire on an automobile that is driven at moderate speeds and with due care for its condition.

If we must save tires, these tires should be taken from automobiles and stored away under conditions which will prevent their deterioration.

If the war administration is convinced that such a course is necessary and will so inform the country, then I believe I can say for the people of my district:

"We will give up our automobiles and you can take the tires and put them away or use the rubber on them in any way that is necessary."

"This is another sacrifice we are willing to make. But first be sure it is necessary and inform us fully. Then we will cooperate gladly."

But, before this is done, there are thousands upon thousands of automobile tires not in use on automobiles today that also are deteriorating and which should be commandeered first.

I refer to the thousands of tires upon automobiles standing in used-car lots for which there are no buyers. I am talking about thousands of new automobiles standing in automobile showrooms which cannot be sold because of Government restrictions.

I am talking about thousands of tires, new tires, stacked up in dealers' storerooms which are not permitted to be sold.

Take these first. If it is necessary, take these now—the dealers will be thankful to be relieved of a product they are not permitted to sell.

Then it will be time to consider if it also is necessary to take the tires off of private automobiles that are now carrying their owners to jobs in defense industries and about other necessary tasks.

If it is necessary to conserve automobile tires, let us tackle the problem head on and not in a roundabout manner. Let us conserve tires by conserving tires and not by attempting to ration gasoline in areas where there is a surplus of gasoline.

The CHAIRMAN. All time on the amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, for the information of the House, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be again read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Dirksen amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 62, noes 182.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAR. 2. To provide continuance of part-time employment for needy young persons in colleges and universities to enable such persons to continue their education, $5,000,000.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: Page 25, after paragraph (2), insert a new paragraph, as follows: "To assist students (in such numbers as the chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall determine) participating in accelerated programs in degree-granting colleges and universities in engineering, physics, chemistry, medicine (including veterinary), dentistry, and pharmacy and such other technical and professional fields as said chairman may determine to be necessary in connection with the national war effort, by providing part-time employment, $5,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is not authorized by law.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. SMITH of Virginia). The gentleman from New York makes a point of order against the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois on the ground that it is not authorized by law.

Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. TABER. Merely to say, Mr. Chairman, that it is an activity for which there is no authority whatever. It adds $5,000,000 to this bill. That is about the size of it.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. KEEFE. I do not think it is necessary for me to be heard. There is not any part of this appropriation that is authorized by law, and points of order against them were waived, under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman point out any authority in law for this appropriation?

Mr. KEEFE. The authority in law is to be found in the Executive order of the President of the United States creating the National Youth Administration, which sets up a student-aid program and which has been carried out under a student-aid program by the N. Y. A. since its inception. This simply adds $5,000,000 to the same student-aid program, $5,000,000 for which is already carried in this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule.

In the bill under consideration, which provides an appropriation for the N. Y. A., there is no authority in law setting up the N. Y. A.; and, therefore, in order that this appropriation for that agency might not be thrown out on a point of order it was necessary to have a special rule waiving points of order against that particular appropriation. That rule waived points of order on that clause in the bill.

The gentleman's amendment undertakes to make another appropriation which is to be administered under the Chairman of the Manpower Commission. It is the opinion of the Chair that there is no authority in law for the appropriation proposed in the amendment and the Chair is therefore constrained to sustain the point of order.

Mr. KEEFE. In view of the holding of the Chair, I ask unanimous consent to submit an amendment increasing the amount for student aid contained in paragraph 2 on page 25 of the bill from $5,000,000 to $10,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, why does the gentleman have to have unanimous consent to offer an amendment to paragraph 2? Why may he not offer without the consent of anyone an amendment increasing the amount in paragraph 2 from $5,000,000 to $10,000,000?

Mr. TABER. We have already passed paragraph 2 for amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Paragraph 2 has just been read and amendments are in order. Nothing in the bill has been read after paragraph 2.

The CHAIRMAN. Amendments may be offered at this time to paragraph 2.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment in the language referred to, simply changing the amount in paragraph 2, on page 25, from $5,000,000 to $10,000,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KEEFE: Page 25, line 12, strike out "$5,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$10,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order the amendment comes too late. Amendments have already been offered adding additional paragraphs to the bill and under the practice, as I understand it, that precludes amendments to the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair had concluded the reading of paragraph 2 and it was, therefore, subject to amendment. An amendment was offered and ruled out on a point of order.

The ruling of the Chair is that the section is subject to such further amendments as may be properly offered by Members of the House, and overrules the point of order.

The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, you will observe that $5,000,000 was transferred from the Civilian Conservation Corps appropriation to the N. Y. A. to provide a continuation of the regular student-aid program for the N. Y. A. on a reduced basis. This is a general program designed to carry on what I conceive has been one of the finest functions of the N. Y. A. in all of its activities of the past.

The addition of this $5,000,000 is in conformity with the request of the Bureau of the Budget and the President of the United States. The President and the Bureau of the Budget submitted a proposal to this committee for a supplementary estimate to assist students in college grades of $10,000,000. The committee refused to accept that suggestion because it embodied a loan fund to be administered by the Office of Education, permitting the lending of funds to students who were engaged in the studies of engineering, physics, chemistry, dentistry, pharmacy, and such other technical and professional fields as the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission might determine. It virtually meant a gift of a maximum of $500 per year per student. The committee rejected this proposal.

May I direct your attention to the fact that if we leave out this $5,000,000 and do not make provision for assistance to students in degree-granting colleges, whose services are vitally necessary in the war effort, in scientific and highly technical professions, we will find ourselves in this position: The War Manpower Commission has stated that it is absolutely imperative that these students in all colleges and universities who are studying for degrees in this type of study must be given assistance from the Government in order to keep them in school.

The reason, as I called to your attention yesterday, is that the colleges of the country have accelerated their program from a 9-month program to a 12-month program and are insisting upon these students remaining in college to complete their courses.

How are you going to keep these boys and girls, perchance, in college when you compel them to stay there and work continuously for 12 months, and give them no opportunity to go out and work during the summertime to earn their tuition and their matriculation fees?

All this amendment does is to put back into the N. Y. A. a function it has always had. It will provide funds that will enable the colleges themselves to set up a work program under which these students can do a little work and earn a small amount of money that will be the difference between their staying in school and being compelled to drop out. If you want to implement the request of the President and the War Manpower Commission, I know of no way that it can be done better than by the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I should like to ask the gentleman two questions. In the first place, it would be logically true, would it not, that students who are carrying on these vital types of study for preparation for war service might be deferred from the draft?

Mr. KEEFE. That is right.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. And unless there are funds such as the gentleman seeks to provide here to enable poor students to continue with such studies, there might well be a discrimination between those who could afford to go to college and those who could not?

Mr. KEEFE. That is exactly what I called to the attention of the House yesterday.

If the Selective Service System and the War Manpower Commission put into effect their program of granting deferment to students engaged in these activities, the poor students will be in the combat units and the sons of the rich will remain in college. I do not believe in gifts. I do believe, however, in a student-aid program that will afford work opportunity to these students to enable them to remain in college, and thus acquire the skills so vitally needed in our war effort.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, increasing this item by $5,000,000, comes to the House of Representatives without any recommendation from the President and without any estimate from the Budget. It is above and beyond the Budget. This amendment proposes to hand out gratuities to young men in special types of college work. It proposes to hand out gratuities for made work in these institutions, work to take a couple of hours a day, at a time when they can serve a useful purpose in the defense program by getting work which is available to them anywhere, either around the town in which they are living or on the farms or in those places where they can piece out their funds to get along.

Why should we hand them a gratuity to monkey around at a time when they can go out and earn their money in the regular way? To my mind, it is the most destructive thing for the morale of these boys that we could possibly do. It is time that we should go out for defense and quit wasting money we have to drill out of the taxpayers for such things.

Let me call your attention to the fact that our coasts are blockaded on the Atlantic and we are in trouble enough on the Pacific. Why should we at this time put additional burdens on the Treasury? Why should we not cut out those things that can be cut out if we will use our intelligence and not be carried away by sentiment for things that are not half so important as saving America?

I want to see the United States win this war, but we are not going to win it unless we quit such monkeying around as this. There will not be one more boy trained as a result of this program if this amendment goes through. Inventories have been made of boys who have been receiving benefits out of this program, and it has been found that the parents of a very large percentage of them have incomes as high as $3,500 to $4,000 a year. Why can we not use our thinking apparatus, why can we not get to the point where we meet our responsibilities as legislators here in this Congress, cut out the things that we can do without, and go all-out for defense, get back of the defense program, and help to win the war?

Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment will be beaten.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. I object, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York in connection with this amendment proposes to pay greater attention to the Budget than he did in connection with the amendment for the Civilian Conservation Corps when he refused to follow the Budget. This amendment does not propose an appropriation above the Budget, and the gentleman is in error in so stating. A Budget estimate for $10,000,000 for substantially this purpose was proposed, and evidence in regard to it was had in our committee. That estimate was not allowed. The proposal of the gentleman from Wisconsin is merely to transfer $5,000,000 of that Budget estimate of $10,000,000, which the subcommittee declined, to the college student-aid work under the National Youth Administration. The proposal of the Budget was for college student-aid work done through the medium of loans of $500 in each case, each year, to students in our universities and colleges, which loans under the terms of the Budget language never would have had to be repaid. In other words, the young men who would have received the benefits of the loans provided in the Budget estimates would have been receiving free education in most cases for a period of 4 years at the expense of the Government absolutely as a matter of donation.

The subcommittee, or most of the members of the subcommittee thought that we were to include in this bill not $5,000,000, as is stated in the bill, but $10,000,000 for the purpose of carrying

on this college student-aid program under the National Youth Administration. The chairman of the committee did not so understand and for that reason the bill was reported containing an appropriation of only $5,000,000. I think a majority of the subcommittee now favor the inclusion of the money which is proposed here for appropriation by the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin of $5,000,000 in this item, and to include it will not be contrary to the program outlined by the Budget, but will simply mean that these boys instead of getting donations from the Government in the amount of $500 each a year in continuing their college education will have to work a little for it, two or three hours a day, for a maximum aid from the Government of $20 a month. The same result substantially will be accomplished as would have been accomplished under the provisions and terms of the Budget estimates.

Furthermore, under the Budget estimate, the beneficiaries of that proposed program would have been deferred from the draft, whereas under the provisions of the college-aid program in the National Youth Administration there is no provision in effect or contemplated for such deferment.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to say to the gentleman that it will be just as well or better for the students that they have to work for educational aid. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] implied that they will fool around a few hours each day for this pay. I have seen hundreds of college students earn their N. Y. A. aid. I want to assure the gentleman——

Mr. TARVER. I do not think work on the part of these students for 2 or 3 hours a day is going to hurt them any, and I do not think we ought to establish a precedent as proposed by the Budget of donating $500 a year to a lot of college students throughout the United States without doing any work. Let them work for this pay. There are 80,000 now in the colleges under the student-aid program, under the N. Y. A. who, in large part, will have to be turned out unless you make provision for them.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman has mentioned a limit of $20 per month. Is that in some prior statute or not?

Mr. TARVER. That is in the regulations of the National Youth Administration under which in their college-aid program they do not make payments in excess of $20 a month to students participating in that program.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Does the gentleman know whether they would expect to go ahead with that limitation if the $5,000,000 were added?

Mr. TARVER. I have been so advised.

I sincerely hope that the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE], which, as I have said, is in accordance with the wishes of the subcommittee and is one which the subcommittee proposed or intended to put in the bill, but which was inadvertently omitted therefrom, will be adopted by the Committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 15 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] to increase this $5,000,000 fund to $10,000,000 for the student-aid program of N. Y. A.

I start by saying we are still saving $5,000,000 over the Budget authorization and suggestion for that type of service, because the $10,000,000 which was authorized by the Budget at the request of the War Production Board to be handled through the Bureau of Education was not approved. So, contrary to the impression of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] we will still be depriving the youth of America of $5,000,000 over and above what were the recommendations of the Budget Bureau.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I cannot yield now, I am sorry. My time is too limited. I want to answer the question as to why it is necessary and important to increase this $10,000,000 and make it available to provide higher education for the youth of America. I speak as a Representative of a rural State which has a great many small towns. You know and I know that the small towns and the rural States of America have felt the impact of this war from an economic standpoint much more than the large cities and the industrial centers. Unless you are going to deprive and deny the youth of our small towns and rural States the opportunity to participate in a college education in order that they may become technicians in the Army and Navy, I submit it is going to be necessary for the Federal Government to increase the financial assistance available to these young people and to the colleges and universities which are training them.

The facts are that the man who used to own the garages in my home town, the fellow who used to operate a gasoline station and a tire station, and the merchant whose supply of merchandise has been frozen can no longer send his boy or his girl to college unless the Federal Government steps in and absorbs part of that loss of revenue and makes it possible for his son or daughter to earn at least part of the expenses of attending college, and that these positions in the war effort will be filled by the sons and daughters of the rich or the well-to-do. This $5,000,000 will contribute toward the correction of that situation. It will not go the full route, but it will help to enable the boys and girls of the average families of America to enjoy the same type of college training as is being enjoyed by the sons and daughters of industrialists and others who have the money to provide such facilities and whose incomes have been sustained or increased by our war activities.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. HARE. If the amendment is approved it may accomplish the purpose the gentleman has in mind, but the amendment is not designed primarily to aid needy people but to assist in training people for defense work and for service in connection with the defense program and the war effort.

Mr. MUNDT. I think it is designed for a twofold purpose.

Mr. HARE. It will serve a twofold purpose, but it is not designed to accomplish that end.

Mr. MUNDT. Let us be happy then in the fact that it will achieve both purposes regardless of its original design.

Mr. HARE. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MUNDT. And may I suggest further that in the winning of this war which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] spoke about, it is highly important that we have an adequate supply of skilled technicians in America. We need men to man the production lines but we also need men and women to design the plans and draw the specifications for the equipment being made on these production lines. We need, too, chemists, and engineers. We need doctors and dentists to care for men's bodies, and we need preachers and priests to minister to men's souls. We need mathematicians and astronomists to calculate weather conditions. We need accountants and we need teachers. It is a short-sighted economy which would shut off at its source the vast army of educated men and women upon whom America must largely depend in the future to bind our wounds, to readjust our economic dislocations, to plan for a future which will be better than either our perilous present or our pragmatic past.

Mr. Chairman, our colleges and universities are streamlining their courses of study and operating on a 12-month basis. The young man or woman who formerly utilized the 3 summer months to earn money with which to attend college during the fall and winter is now facing a new challenge. Unless some means is devised to help these young people to finance their higher education we shall be destroying a precious American tradition wherein the sons and daughters of the poor as well as the sons and daughters of the rich have been able to secure all the education their abilities warrant and their ambitions desire. Let us vote to add this $5,000,000 to the student-aid program of N. Y. A. as very cheap insurance against a shortage of the technical talent needed to win this war and against a drought of trained leadership to help formulate the world after the war.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, we spend a great deal of time in speaking about the Budget. I do not think so much about what the Budget Bureau thinks as

I do about what the Treasury statement tells us, and I feel that since the 1st of July last we have gone into the red $17,689,990,000, and when I look at that statement further I find that we have gone into the red altogether some $74,312,000,000, and I ask the Chairman and the various Members of Congress just that one simple question, Where are you going to get the money? None of you can or will answer it. Why?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the Budget did not submit this kind of estimate at all. The Budget submitted a loan fund, which might be wiped out under certain circumstances amounting to $500 a head, to help these boys get through school. They did not submit any such thing as this.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] how the students are selected for this operation. Who makes the selection of the young men and women who are to receive these benefits?

Mr. HARE. I understand that they will be selected by the local colleges and institutions.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us suppose that the son of family A makes application, but is rejected. He has a fine character, meets all of the qualifications, and comes from a fine family. To what court can he appeal if his application is rejected?

Mr. HARE. According to rule, they generally appeal to their Congressman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is facetious and he knows that the question I submitted goes to the heart of this program because a student can go to a public school without appealing to anyone. The taxpayers provide the money for the school, for the books, and for the teachers. He does not have to get a permit from anyone. Who gives the permit to the young men or women who get their education under this scheme? I yield to anybody who can answer that question in a straightforward way. If he cannot answer it, I wish he would say so.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I am very happy to state to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan that no one issues a permit under this program for any student to get an education. Under this program the needy student who is engaged in one of the activities as prescribed by the War Manpower Commission will make application to the president of the university or college which he is attending, if he is in need and needs this aid to continue his education and stay in school, and aid will be granted to that student.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think the gentleman answered my question. My question is this, and it does not go to the type of school assistance that the gentleman refers to. It goes to the type of school provided under the original set-up in the general operations of the N. Y. A., outside the Manpower Commission, and which has been in operation heretofore, and not provided for in this amendment. Apparently no one can answer the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I listened with great interest to the speeches of our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] on yesterday and today. He evidently has made a very careful study of the matters embraced in H. R. 7181, and especially those matters relating to part-time employment for needy young persons in colleges and universities as relating to our war effort and relating to the National Youth Administration as it relates to the manual training for young persons between the ages of 17 and 24, to equip them for work in our defense industries. I was likewise impressed with the speeches of our distinguished colleagues the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR], and others.

I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin to paragraph 2, page 25. This paragraph carries $5,000,000. The amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] increases this sum to ten million. This is the sum recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and approved, as I understand, by the War Production Board and other agencies of our Government charged with expediting production and in the winning of the war. The great problem before the American people at this time is to win the war at the earliest moment possible.

The facts are that there is now a great scarcity of physicians and surgeons, pharmacists, engineers, and others possessing scientific and technical training and knowledge. The colleges and the universities of the country have worked out a program of a 3-year course of 12 months to the year.

There are thousands of needy young men and women who have finished half, or perhaps more, of their college or university courses, but who are unable to finish their courses because of a lack of funds. Under the present set-up of no vacations, they cannot go out between terms and earn money with which to pursue their courses in the colleges and universities. This measure enables them to work and pay their way in the colleges and universities with some small additional help from the Government, and in this way the needy young men and women will be able to finish their courses and become physicians, surgeons, pharmacists, engineers, and technicians along other lines.

The Nation in its production and war effort must have more trained young men and young women. Furthermore, we will wake up one of these days and find the country has been stripped of its physicians and surgeons, chemists, pharmacists, and other persons of technical knowledge who are essential to our people in civil life.

This measure is for the benefit alone of needy young persons to complete their courses in colleges and universities. Unless this plan is followed, the sons and daughters of the wealthy, alone, will be able to take these courses and the sons of the poor man will have to go into the armed forces without this training. This measure places the sons and daughters of the poor on an equal footing with the sons and daughters of the rich.

This is clearly fair and equitable and the program is strongly urged by those in charge of our national defense program and our war efforts.

Part one provides for work training for unemployed young persons of the ages of 17 to 24, inclusive, in resident and nonresident workshop and other projects approved by those in charge of our war program. This money is being spent under the N. Y. A. at the request of the War Production Board and other war production agencies of the Government.

Thousands and thousands of young men and young women have been trained for work in our war production plants. As announced the other day on the floor of the House only about 10 percent of our factories, shops, and plants are now being used for the production of those things necessary to equip and supply our armed forces. The use of other plants will be brought into play and we must have trained young men and young women to man these plants.

I know it will mean the expenditure of a few millions of dollars but we are in a great war. Congress has already voted $165,000,000,000 for war purposes alone, and it will be called upon to vote other billions and do whatever is necessary to win the war.

There will be great destruction of human life and property. These trained young men and young women will be an asset to themselves and to our country after the war is over, and in our efforts to win the war we must not neglect to train the boys and girls and the young men and young women of this country because it will not be long until they must assume leadership as well as the burden of carrying on our complicated system of government, industry, and the other activities of this great Nation.

I am glad to have an opportunity to rise and support the amendment of the gentleman from Wisconsin.

It is up to the schools and colleges to select the needy young men and young women who are to benefit under this law. Perhaps more than 100,000 will be benefited under section 2 of the bill, and perhaps another 100,000 will be benefited under section 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, whatever may be said of the situation at the present time, no one can charge that it is partisan. Some on this side are opposing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin, and if it is defeated it will not be by a partisan vote. We finally got the answer out of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] as to who determines who gets

the money. It is the professor regent at the university who designates the student who is the beneficiary of this appropriation.

The argument on this bill has been free from partisanship. The votes which have been taken, which will be taken, have not been, will not be, on party lines.

So much for that. So consider the amendment on its merits. There is only so much money and there is only so much manpower in this country.

There is a shortage of gas. There is a shortage of tires and automobiles and tanks and planes and ships and guns and munitions of war. There is a shortage of everything. There is a shortage of farm labor, yet you propose to add $5,000,000 to the program to keep these boys and girls in college. What do you expect the farmers to do? There is one thing of which there is no shortage and that is over in Wisconsin. The warehouses in Wisconsin are bulging with cheese to such an extent that the farmers cannot dispose of their milk. There is one thing that we have too much of. It is cheese in Wisconsin.

Going back to the merits of the proposition, which would you rather have? Guns and ships and planes and bombers and fighters and supplies for the soldiers, or would you rather have $5,000,000 worth of education parceled out by university superintendents?

Win the war first—look after social gains later. Vote the amendment later.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time on this amendment has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were ayes 54 and noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the remainder of this paragraph and the succeeding paragraph appearing on page 35, line 3, be considered as read and subject to amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any amendments to be offered to this section? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill, as amended, do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SMITH of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7181, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill, as amended, do pass.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit which is at the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Wednesday next, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes in an attempt to answer the smear brigade in its attack upon Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include two letters in the remarks I made this afternoon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an excerpt from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two topics: In one to include an item from the Tacoma Times, and in the other to include two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein addresses delivered by Lt. Gen. Hugh A. Drum and by Dr. Dixon Ryan Fox, president of Union College, at the commencement day luncheon of the Alumni Federation of Columbia University on Tuesday, June 2, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a poem on bond buying.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. WICKERSHAM, Mr. SMITH of Ohio, and Mr. BUTLER asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on the subject of gasoline rationing.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a concurrent resolution on the question of Nation-wide rationing of gasoline. This is in keeping with a resolution unanimously adopted at a meeting attended by more than a hundred Members of Congress today in protest against the proposal of a Nation-wide rationing of gas. I shall urge early consideration of same. The resolution reads:

Whereas the Nation-wide rationing of gasoline is being considered; and

Whereas there is a large surplus of gasoline in Oklahoma, Texas, Kansas, and other oil-producing States, resulting in widespread unemployment; and

Whereas Nation-wide rationing of gasoline would actually cripple the war effort rather than aid it: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense

of the Congress that rationing of gasoline should not be imposed on a Nation-wide basis, unless prior to such rationing the officials authorized by law to prescribe rationing regulations furnish the House of Representatives the full facts, figures, and such other information as may be necessary in order to show that such rationing is necessary to conserve the supply of gasoline.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include excerpts from editorials.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and include certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the remarks I made today some records in connection with N. Y. A.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two unanimous consent requests: First, to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and, second, to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today in my colloquy with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include, under permission granted in the Committee of the Whole to extend my remarks, a letter from Theodore P. Eslick, State Youth Administrator of Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials from the Fort Wayne News-Sentinel.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE LATE EVERIS ANSON HAYES

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it is with regret that I rise to announce the death of a former Member of the House of Representatives. Everis Anson Hayes, of San Jose, Calif., passed away on June 3 at the ripe age of 87 years. Born in Wisconsin on March 10, 1855, Mr. Hayes moved to California in 1887, where he engaged in fruit raising and mining. With his brother, J. O. Hayes, he became publisher and proprietor of the San Jose Daily Mercury-Herald, one of the pioneer daily newspapers in California, in 1901. Elected to the Fifty-ninth Congress on March 4, 1905, he served seven terms in the House of Representatives with honor and distinction. In cooperation with CARTER GLASS he took an active part in the framing of the Federal Reserve Act. He is also credited with having delivered the first speech in Congress against Japanese immigration and his efforts in behalf of the alien exclusion law are well known. An active civic leader, an able legislator, and a great citizen, his passing will be keenly felt by all who knew him. All honor to his memory.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. SANDERS]?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I understand there has been a change in the program for next week; therefore, I would like to have the majority leader tell us just what we may expect.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday is District Day. I have no knowledge whether the District Committee will have any bills for consideration or not, but if they have any, I assume they will not be controversial.

Then the allotment bill for the dependents of those in the service will come up for consideration. That bill will be taken up on Monday.

On Tuesday there will be the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill, and there will be debate on that conference report. I had intended to follow that with general debate on the appropriation bill for the W. P. A., but I think it best to take that up on Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. We will probably be able to finish that bill on that day?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not sure. I am unable to advise the gentleman on that. However, if it is not finished on Wednesday, it will be taken up on Thursday.

If the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill is completed on Tuesday at a reasonable hour, there will be another bill taken up. That is a bill reported from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Senate Joint resolution 130, to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine. I am informed by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] that this has to pass before June 30. So if we get through with the conference report on Tuesday and if we have time, that bill will be called up. It will be in order to consider that bill. If not, it will succeed the W. P. A. appropriation bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Is the Bland bill the one on which a rule has been granted?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. That bill is hardly controversial. It simply extends the laws now existing for the duration. At the time of the enactment of these particular laws it was not known how long the duration would be and the expiration date was fixed too soon. There have been a lot of questions on this side of the aisle about the bill, but I feel sure that when the situation is fully understood there will be no opposition to it.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am glad to hear that. My understanding was that it probably was not controversial. I will try to bring it up on Tuesday if it can be done. If not, its consideration will be taken up at the conclusion of the W. P. A. appropriation bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

RELIEF OF PRESENT AND FORMER POSTMASTERS AND ACTING POSTMASTERS

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2459) to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes", to permit payment of total compensation to certain employees of the Postal Service employed in a dual capacity.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman just explain the bill to the House?

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that the Post Office Department has requested be passed. It has been passed by the Senate and has been acted on by the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee. As I understand, there is no objection to the bill. It is to remedy a condition on account of the Comptroller's decision that where postal employees were

used in dual capacity, they could not be paid in excess of $3,100.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. They have been paid that previously?

Mr. BURCH. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Until the order of the Comptroller was issued?

Mr. BURCH. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is just to correct that condition. It is a unanimous report from the gentleman's committee.

Mr. BURCH. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 1 of the act of March 1, 1929, entitled "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes" (45 Stat. 1441), be, and the same is hereby, amended by striking from the last two lines thereof the words "if the total compensation actually paid for all services does not exceed $2,000 for any one fiscal year" and substituting therefor the words "at the rate provided by law for such services."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THE UNITED STATES CAN AFFORD AN ADEQUATE OLD-AGE PENSION NOW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon, Mr. ANGELL, is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, many thousands of our citizens who are over the age of 60 years are without an income sufficient to provide a minimum of decency and health. They are unable to find employment in war production and are without a sufficient income to provide for their own needs. At the outset it must be admitted that our one major objective now is to win the war. We must not permit anything to prevent us from achieving a full and unconditional victory at the earliest possible time. While doing so, however, we must provide the minimum requirements for our civilian population, either through gainful employment for those who are able to participate in productive enterprise or by adequate allowances for those who by reason of age or disability are unable to find a place in either civilian or war production. While we are fighting to help provide the four freedoms for all the peoples of the world we cannot ignore the one essential freedom for existence for our own people; namely, freedom from want.

The National Resources Planning Board released in January 1942 a study by Alvin H. Hansen entitled "After the War—Full Employment." The author says:

An important gain will, we may hope, be won from the defense program in the struggle to achieve and to maintain full employment. We have every reason to expect the national income to rise to around $100,000,000,000, in terms of 1940 dollars. It will be much easier to muster support for a program to resist a decline from a high income level than it has been in recent years to win approval for an adequate program to raise income to full employment from a low level. But we must be vigilant lest this gain slip from our grasp. If we let the income slide from 100 to 90, 80, 70 billion dollars, we will have to make the old uphill fight all over again. We must deliberately set out to hold the new income level and to push it higher as rapidly as increasing productivity will permit.

Our national income in 1940 was seventy-seven billions; 1941, ninety-four billions; and for the present year, 1942, it is estimated that it will exceed one hundred billions and possibly reach one hundred and ten billions on current prices. With this greatly increased national income, our Nation is in a much more favorable position now to inaugurate an adequate old-age pension program than it has ever been in its history. Furthermore, we have a heavy excess of income over consumer goods available for purchase with this swollen income. The Government is at its wit's end to devise ways and means by which this increased purchasing power in the hands of our citizens may be curbed and utilized so as to prevent inflation. A considerable portion of this income of necessity will be used to meet war taxes, but there still will remain ample funds not required for actual needs with which to meet the obligations resting upon us as a society to take care of our elder citizens who by reason of infirmities and age are unable to participate in productive enterprises. The President on several occasions has stated that it is advisable to amend the social-security program with reference to old-age payments so as to broaden the field of coverage and increase the monthly payments.

The National Resources Planning Board, in the article to which I have just referred, suggests as one aid in securing full employment after the war:

Expansion of public-welfare expenditures—Federal aid to education, public health, old-age pensions, and family allowances. This involves partly an expanded program and partly a means of reducing State and local property and consumption taxes, thereby stimulating private consumption expenditures.

Viewed from any approach, we cannot escape the conclusion that with the increased national income, the scarcity of luxury goods, and the restricted supply of goods available for purchasers, the present is an opportune time in which to inaugurate a Nation-wide Federal program for adequate annuities for our citizens retired by reason of age from remunerative employment. We will win a hollow victory if in the winning of the war we deprive four-fifths of our 14,000,000 senior citizens of the means to maintain themselves in decency and health.

Mass production under scientific processes, utilizing power machinery, has completely changed our whole industrial and social economy. The United States census for 1890 shows that at that time 75 percent of all our people over 65 years of age were gainfully employed. At the present time 80 percent of our citizens 60 years of age or over are not only not gainfully employed but are unable to obtain a minimum for decency and health. Notwithstanding this, our productive enterprise by reason of its great efficiency is able to produce an abundance of the necessities of life for all, and, in addition, luxuries heretofore undreamed of. During the decade through which we recently passed we inaugurated a program of scarcity of production in order to limit the total amount of goods produced and available for purchase, so as to maintain adequate price levels. At the same time millions of our citizens were in want.

An adequate Federal pension program will not only provide for the maintenance of our elder citizens in decency and health, but will also provide purchasing power to absorb the excess goods available from our productive enterprises.

We must not again adopt a policy of scarcity while millions of our aged people are in want, without even a minimum of the necessities of life. We must, on the other hand, after this devastating war is ended, make certain that our plans for rehabilitation and transition from war to peacetime activities will utilize our full resources of materials and manpower in production to full capacity. We must maintain our maximum financial income and mold our economic structure so as to provide purchasing power in the hands of all the citizens ample to meet their needs according to American standards of living.

Full employment and adequate annuities for our elder citizens will provide the necessary purchasing power to give uniform and sustained markets for full production under our American system of private enterprise. In enacting now the old-age pension program we will have made one important advance toward providing post-war security against the collapse of our industrial and social economy. Old-age security and full employment must be considered together in any formula designed to provide economic security for our people. I call attention to the following statement in the Hansen report, to which I have heretofore referred, which is of interest in the consideration of this phase of a post-war program:

The notion that we cannot finance our own production is quite without foundation. Every cent expended, private and public, becomes income for members of our own society. Costs and income are just opposite sides of the same shield. We can afford as high a standard of living as we are able to produce. We cannot afford to waste our resources of men and material. We cannot afford to use them inefficiently. But we cannot afford idleness. The idleness of the decade of the thirties was responsible for the loss of $200,000,000,000 of income. The public expenditures required to rebuild America, to provide needed social services, and to maintain full employment can be provided for out of the enormous income which the full utilization of our rich productive resources (material and human) makes possible. The costs of producing this income are merely payments to ourselves for the work done. There is not—there cannot be—any financial problem which is not manageable under a full employment income. From a $100,000,000,000 income we can raise large tax revenues—large enough to service any level of debt likely to be reached and to cover all other Government

outlays—and still retain for private expenditures more than we had left in former years under a $70,000,000,000 income with lower taxes. Taxes are merely one way of paying for social services and public-improvement projects which we need. But it is not necessary or desirable under all circumstances to finance all public expenditures from taxes. Whether taxes should equal, fall short of, or exceed expenditures must be decided according to economic conditions.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I submit that the present is an opportune time to adopt an adequate old-age pension program, among others for the following reasons:

First. While we are fighting for the four freedoms for the world we cannot ignore the freedom from want for our old people at home.

Second. Our annual national income is now approaching 100 billions or more, and we are better prepared than ever before to inaugurate the program.

Third. The President and Congress are seeking to curb inflation. This pension fund would aid materially in preventing inflation, because the funds would all be spent for consumer goods, food, clothing, shelter, and medical care, leaving durable goods for war needs.

Fourth. Four out of five of our people 60 years of age or over receive less than a minimum for decency and health. Under mass production and private enterprise with the profit system, industry as a whole has obligation to provide for the discarded workman over 60 years who can no longer participate in productive enterprise. This is a factor of cost to industry as much as the replacement for a discarded, outworn machine or repair or rehabilitation of the plant itself. A moderate tax, earmarked for pensions to be shared in by all reaching 60, will solve this acute problem, provide for our old people, and, by furnishing purchasing power for consumer goods, will gear into our war and post-war economy.

The program should be adopted and put into effect immediately.

Mr. Speaker, there is pending on the Clerk's desk petition No. 7, which has for its purpose the bringing out on the floor of the House for discussion and passage H. R. 1036, which is the bill embodying the Townsend national recovery plan. The procedure under this petition is broad and liberal and under it amendments may be made to meet the wishes of the House with respect to any provision of the bill. If one-half of the Members of the House will sign this petition, an old-age-pension program may be adopted now by the House which will conform to the desires of the majority of the Members of the House. I sincerely hope and most respectfully urge all of you, my colleagues, who have not signed this petition to do so to the end that we may be able to solve now this most important issue—namely, adequate care for our old people and relief from want and fear.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4845. An act to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $30 to $40 per month, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 315. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect to meat-packing establishments engaged in intrastate commerce only, in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat-food products by Federal agencies, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 319. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Bulgaria and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same;

H. J. Res. 320. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Hungary and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same; and

H. J. Res. 321. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Rumania and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 221. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Beacon Oyster Co., the Point Wharf Oyster Co., and B. J. Rooks & Son;

S. 244. An act for the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.;

S. 1044. An act for the relief of L. H. Goodman;

S. 1563. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard;

S. 1648. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Shaver Forwarding Co., of Portland, Oreg.;

S. 1732. An act for the relief of Max Miller and Vera Caroline Miller, and others;

S. 1756. An act for the relief of Franklin Benjamin McNew;

S. 1820. An act for the relief of Jerry McKinley Thompson;

S. 2037. An act for the relief of Edgar B. Dunlap;

S. 2069. An act for the relief of the Quimby-Ryan Engineering Sales Co., Inc.;

S. 2103. An act to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, so as to authorize citizens of foreign countries who are graduates of Air Corps advanced flying schools and Air Corps service schools to wear aviation badges;

S. 2235. An act for the relief of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher;

S. 2251. An act for the relief of Charles Brauch;

S. 2278. An act for the relief of Bob Sampley;

S. 2318. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo;

S. 2354. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George M. Legg and Loetta Trainer;

S. 2451. An act for the relief of Anthony W. Livingston;

S. 2452. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Coast Guard and the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

S. 2453. An act to authorize the obligation of funds of the Coast Guard for work or material at Government-owned establishments, and for other purposes;

S. 2469. An act for the relief of William Edward Fleming;

S. 2470. An act for the relief of Eileen Collins Treacy;

S. 2490. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941 (Public Law 8, 77th Cong.), as amended by section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1941 (Public Law 166, 77th Cong.);

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution for the relief of W. K. Richardson;

S. 2048. An act for the relief of Lt. William Stewart Walker; and

S. 2250. An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2730. An act for the relief of Dorothy Silva;

H. R. 3488. An act to provide that assistant or deputy heads of certain bureaus in the Department of the Interior shall be under the civil-service laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4999. An act to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by the Columbia Boat & Barge System, Inc.;

H. R. 5438. An act for the relief of the San Diego Gas & Electric Co.;

H. R. 5778. An act for the relief of Luther Herbert Tench and Mrs. Mildred Farmer Tench;

H. R. 6502. An act to change the name of the Black Warrior National Forest to the William B. Bankhead National Forest;

H. R. 6646. An act to provide that the unexplained absence of any individual for 7 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration;

H. J. Res. 319. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Bulgaria and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same;

H. J. Res. 320. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Hungary and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same; and

H. J. Res. 321. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Rumania and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned to Monday, June 8, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, June 9, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearing in connection with the Federal Communications Commission.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, June 16, 1942.

Business to be considered: H. R. 7002, to increase agricultural purchasing power and to meet the need of combating malnutrition among the people of low income by defining and making certain a reasonable definition and standard for nonfat dry milk solids.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, June 9, for consideration of war housing, room 1304, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 11, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 7105, to provide for the suspension during the war of operating differential subsidy agreements and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1718. A letter from the Administrator, Federal Security Agency, transmitting the third quarterly report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the education and training of defense workers, covering the period beginning January 1, 1942, and ending March 31, 1942; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1719. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue it in force during the existing war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WICKERSHAM: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 7115. A bill to promote the war effort by facilitating the planting of the full allotted acreage of cotton as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture as the Nation's war goal; with amendment (Rept. No. 2212). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CRAVENS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6401. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the incorporation of American War Mothers," as amended, and matters relating thereto; with amendment (Rept. No. 2213). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HARTER:

H. R. 7193. A bill to incorporate the Army Air Corps Mothers' Organization of America, Second World War; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7194. A bill to provide for the award of a special bronze medal to the heroic defenders of the Philippine Islands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 7195. A bill to establish additional commissioned warrant and warrant grades in the United States Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. R. 7196. A bill to amend the Judicial Code in respect to the original jurisdiction of the district courts of the United States in certain cases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 7197. A bill to provide that retired Regular Army officers called to active duty shall be entitled to retirement pay in accordance with the highest temporary grade attained by them; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 7198. A bill to provide for public hearings in connection with the rationing of gasoline; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma:

H. Con. Res. 69. House concurrent resolution to express the sense of Congress that rationing of gasoline should not be extended unless such extension is necessary in order to conserve the supply of gasoline; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of West Virginia:

H. R. 7199. A bill granting a pension to Mildred C. Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 7200. A bill to correct the military record of Herbert Horrell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3023. By Mr. LEONARD W. HALL: Petition of the Greenport Mission, Greenport, N. Y., in advocacy of the enactment of the Sheppard bill, S. 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic liquors in or near military or naval camps and bases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3024. Also, petition of "What-so-Ever" Club of the Baptist Church of Port Jefferson, L. I., in advocacy of Senate bill 860, to prohibit sale of alcoholic beverages on or near Army camps and naval bases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3025. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of F. D. Whitaker, of Topeka, Kans., and 25 others, appealing for legislation which will provide the largest possible protection for men in our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquors, and for the passage of Senate bill 860 and House bills 3371 and 4000; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3026. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of Bessie T. Kench and other citizens of Shannon City, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860 and any legislation which will provide the best possible protection for our men in the armed services against the influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3027. By Mr. McGREGOR: Petition of Frank L. Elliott and other residents of Newark, Ohio, protesting against gas rationing for the Middle West; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3028. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition signed by Mrs. Elsie M. Robinson, of Petersburg, Mich., and 48 other residents of Monroe County, Mich., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3029. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the national secretary, Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Dies committee; to the Committee on Accounts.

3030. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Resolution of the Townsend State convention resolution committee, Townsend Clubs of Wisconsin in convention at Marshfield, Wis., on May 23 and 24, expressing appreciation to all Wisconsin Congressmen for their cooperation in signing discharge petition No. 7, to bring House bill 1036 to the floor of the House; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3031. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Coach, Car Carriage & Automobile Painters Union, No. 1073, San Francisco, Calif., relative to House bill 6486, a bill to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 8, 1942

The Reverend Joseph Hillman Hollister, pastor of the Chevy Chase Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Eternal God, God of our fathers and our Nation's God, we look to Thee at the outset of another day, that we may prepare ourselves by looking beyond ourselves and seeing a whole in order that we may better see each part. We see a different world when we think of it as a world that belongs to Thee and when we see in it and at work a hand that is greater than ours. We see the responsibilities of office differently when we think of the servants of the people as the servants of our God. We dare to be ourselves just so long as we keep ourselves sensitive to Thy will and know that what we do we do with Thee, God, with us.

We ask Thy blessing this morning upon our world. We pray for the triumph of the right and the just and the true. We pray for our country, that, under strain, we may find our strength and again rise to the height of the stature of our fathers.

We pray for the President of the United States and for those at every

post of responsibility throughout our land, and we pray for our whole people, for their steadfastness and for their unquenchable loyalty to the best in the heart of America.

This we ask in the name of our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. Amen.

ATTENDANCE OF A SENATOR

STYLES BRIDGES, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, appeared in his seat today.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. THOMAS of Utah, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 4, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

DEATH OF BRIAN BELL

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I rise to call the attention of my colleagues to the death of a distinguished South Carolinian who for years has lived in Washington. I refer to Mr. Brian Bell, the late head of the Associated Press Bureau. I know that the people of South Carolina will be distressed to learn of his death. I wished to call the attention of the Senate to it at this time. He had many friends in the Senate, and was beloved and respected.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 1, 1942:

S. 2305. An act to relieve disbursing and certifying officers of the United States of responsibility for overpayments made on transportation accounts under certain circumstances.

On June 3, 1942:

S. 2508. An act to amend section 32 of the Emergency Farm Mortgage Act of 1933, as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2459) to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes," to permit payment of total compensation to certain employees of the Postal Service employed in a dual capacity.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 6802) making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Overton
Andrews	Hatch	Pepper
Austin	Hayden	Reed
Bankhead	Herring	Rosier
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Barkley	Holman	Schwartz
Bone	Hughes	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Bridges	Kilgore	Smith
Brooks	La Follette	Spencer
Bulow	Langer	Stewart
Burton	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McFarland	Tobey
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Vandenberg
Connally	Mead	Van Nuys
Davis	Millikin	Wagner
Doxey	Murdock	Walsh
Ellender	Murray	Wheeler
George	Norris	White
Gillette	Nye	Wiley
Glass	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained in his State on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are absent on important public business.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 4th instant,

The following message from the House of Representatives was received by the Secretary of the Senate during adjournment:

That the House had passed without amendment the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 144) designating June 13, 1942, as MacArthur Day, and authorizing its appropriate observance.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolutions, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 221. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Beacon Oyster Co., the Point Wharf Oyster Co., and B. J. Rooks & Son;

S. 244. An act for the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.;

S. 1044. An act for the relief of L. H. Goodman;

S. 1563. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard;

S. 1648. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Shaver Forwarding Co., of Portlandfi Oreg.;

S. 1732. An act for the relief of Max Miller and Vera Caroline Miller, and others;

S. 1756. An act for the relief of Franklin Benjamin McNew;

S. 1820. An act for the relief of Jerry McKinley Thompson;

S. 2037. An act for the relief of Edgar B. Dunlap;

S. 2048. An act for the relief of Lt. William Stewart Walker;

S. 2069. An act for the relief of the Quimby-Ryan Engineering Sales Co., Inc.;

S. 2103. An act to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, so as to authorize citizens of foreign countries who are graduates of Air Corps advanced flying schools and Air Corps service schools to wear aviation badges;

S. 2235. An act for the relief of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher;

S. 2250. An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes;

S. 2251. An act for the relief of Charles Brauch;

S. 2278. An act for the relief of Bob Sampley;

S. 2318. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo;

S. 2354. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George M. Legg and Loetta Trainer;

S. 2451. An act for the relief of Anthony W. Livingston;

S. 2452. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Coast Guard and the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

S. 2453. An act to authorize the obligation of funds of the Coast Guard for work or material at Government-owned establishments, and for other purposes;

S. 2469. An act for the relief of William Edward Fleming;

S. 2470. An act for the relief of Eileen Collins Treacy;

S. 2490. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941 (Public Law 8, 77th Cong.), as amended by section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1941 (Public Law 166, 77th Cong.);

H. R. 4845. An act to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $30 to $40 per month, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution for the relief of W. K. Richardson;

H. J. Res. 315. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect to meat-packing establishments engaged in intrastate commerce only, in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat-food products by Federal agencies, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 319. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Gov-

ernment of Bulgaria and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same;

H. J. Res. 320. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Hungary and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same; and

H. J. Res. 321. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Rumania and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same.

COMMITTEE REPORT FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 4th instant,

On June 5, 1942, Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 1443) thereon.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENTS

Under authority of the order of the 4th instant,

On June 4, 1942, during adjournment of the Senate, Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendments, namely:

On page 32, after line 22, to insert the following:

"Section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act, approved May 10, 1916, as amended, shall not apply from July 1 to September 15, 1942, to teachers of the public schools of the District of Columbia when employed by any of the executive departments or independent establishments of the United States Government."

On page 36, after line 24, to insert the following:

"The disbursing officer of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance to the superintendent of recreation upon requisitions previously approved by the auditor of the District of Columbia and upon such security as the Commissioners may require of said superintendent sums of money not exceeding $500 at one time to be used for the expense of conducting its activities under the trust fund created by the act of April 29, 1942, all such expenditures to be accounted for to the accounting officers of the District of Columbia within 1 month on itemized vouchers properly approved."

On page 71, line 21, to strike out "$208,460" and insert "$209,660."

On page 71, line 21, after the figure, to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That the employee of the Department of Vehicles and Traffic who is charged with the immediate responsibility for, and exercises supervision over, the issuance of tags and certificates of title and the registration of motor vehicles and trailers shall hereafter be known as the registrar of titles and tags, and so long as the present incumbent of the position for which a designation is hereby provided continues to hold such position it shall be classified in grade 10 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended."

Mr. O'MAHONEY also, during adjournment of the Senate, submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7041, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, 1943, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of the amendments referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE FOR THE NAVY DEPARTMENT AND NAVAL SERVICE (S. DOC. NO. 209)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation, fiscal year 1942, for the Navy Department and the naval service, amounting to $75,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 210)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1943, involving a net increase of $270,869, in the form of amendments to the Budget, for the fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

EDUCATION AND TRAINING OF DEFENSE WORKERS

A letter from the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, transmitting, pursuant to law, the third quarterly report of the United States Commissioner of Education on the education and training of defense workers, covering the period beginning January 1, 1942, and ending March 31, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Interior and Agriculture (7), the Civil Service Commission (3), Railroad Retirement Board, and Interstate Commerce Commission, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

Resolutions adopted by the annual meeting of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, at Philadelphia, Pa., relative to a congressional peace-aims commission, the creation of a United States commission on international economic policy, economic discrimination against women, preservation of the rights of labor, labor in Government industries, and sundry other subjects; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. WAGNER:

The petition of sundry citizens, members of the Darien and Alexander (N. Y.) Methodist churches, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Wichita and Genda Springs, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments: ordered to lie on the table.

PRICES FOR AND RATIONING OF SUGAR—RESOLUTION OF LOUISIANA LEGISLATURE

Mr. OVERTON. I present, and ask to have printed, under the rule, and appropriately referred, a concurrent resolution adopted by the Legislature of Louisiana with reference to sugar prices and sugar rationing.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 6

Senate concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to place a parity on sugar that will enable the sugarcane growers to realize a reasonable profit on their labor and investment and to liberalize the allotment of sugar under the rationing

Whereas the United States and its territorial possessions produces much more sugar than we normally consume; and

Whereas, due to rationing, the consumption of sugar has decreased to such an astonishing extent that the accumulated surplus will surely tend to decrease the price of the product; and

Whereas the Federal Government has established a minimum wage scale for labor on sugarcane farms which is much higher than that which is paid for labor employed for the production of other farm commodities; and

Whereas farm implements, fertilizers, etc., have increased in price while the price of sugar remains the same with a tendency to go lower with the results that a large established and essential war industry is not earning a reasonable return on its investment; and

Whereas the parity on sugar is unjust and unreasonable since the price was approximately the same in 1909 to 1914 as it is now while the prices of nonfarm products have increased from 100 to 1,000 percent; and

Whereas there exists no shortage of sugar now and the incoming crop is considered the largest sugarcane and sugar-beet crop ever grown in this country alleviating the fears of those who may worry over a sugar shortage: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Louisiana (the House of Representatives concurring), That we do respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States now in session that the authorities vested with the rationing of sugar be requested to liberalize

the allotment of sugar under the ration regulations and to raise the parity of sugar; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to the Vice President, Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Louisiana and Florida senatorial and congressional delegations, and the press.

MARC M. MOUTON,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

B. NORMAN BAUER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Mr. ELLENDER presented a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Louisiana, identical with the foregoing, memorializing the Congress of the United States to place a parity on sugar that will enable the sugarcane growers to realize a reasonable profit on their labor and investment and to liberalize the allotment of sugar under the rationing.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. O'DANIEL. Mr. President, I present a petition from the State of Texas for appropriate reference and ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD, in connection with the petition, a letter from Mrs. Claude DeVan Watts, of Austin, Tex. The petition is signed by 2,108 petitioners, and asks that the Congress give immediate attention and favorable consideration to Senate bill 860.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petition will lie on the table. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Texas?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXAS WOMAN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION,
Austin, Tex., May 20, 1942.

Senator LEE O'DANIEL,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The Woman's Christian Temperance Union in executive committee session, May 16, 1942, Austin, Tex., commends your consistent and determined stand for Senate 860.

We send you hearty greetings and pledge you our earnest efforts for the passage of the bill.

We are mailing the first instalment of 2,108 names of the Lone Star petition of 10,000 signatures we are endeavoring to send you within a few weeks.

The petition will be mailed to you by parcel post.

Many of the unions may send you the petitions direct. I suggest you place them with the roll I am sending you.

Enclosed is a picture of the executive committee and the petition.

The membership of the committee is 50 women from over the State.

With sincere wishes for your success.

Your friend,
Mrs. CLAUDE DEVAN WATTS.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a petition signed by 84 citizens of Tampa, Fla., calling on the Congress to enact Senate bill 860, for the protection of the boys in the training camps of America.

I also present for appropriate reference a petition forwarded to me by Mrs. Laura E. Holmes, president of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of my home city of Orlando, Fla., containing 826 names, calling on the Congress to enact Senate bill 860.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The petitions presented by the Senator from Florida will lie on the table.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a petition signed by divers citizens of Kentucky with reference to Senate bill 860. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached thereto.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached, as follows:

To the Congresmen and Senators representing the State of Kentucky:

We the undersigned citizens and legal voters appeal to you to give your influence and votes to secure the protection of our soldiers from the evil effects of beer and strong drinks; and in particular we urge the speedy enactment of the bill S. 860. We assure you that only in this way can you expect the support of citizens who have the welfare of our country and the success of our national defense at heart.

Mrs. O. H. CALLIS.
Rev. O. H. CALLIS.
HARLAN MAYS.
EVERETT ESTES.
(And sundry other citizens of the State of Kentucky.)

SHIPMENT OF COAL TO NEW ENGLAND, NEW YORK, AND NEW JERSEY

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I understand that the Office of Price Administration is working out a plan to pay subventions or rebates on Appalachian coal to New England, New York, and certain portions of New Jersey to compensate the buyers of southern coal for such differences in transportation costs as may be shown to be in effect today as compared with the cost of transportation in December 1941.

Mr. President, the differentials on coal produced in the southern and northern fields have been in effect for the past 15 years. It is now proposed that these be changed by administrative edict. There is no assurance that once these differentials have been wiped out they would ever be restored, and it is a matter of great importance to coal operators in Pennsylvania.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Walter A. Jones, secretary-treasurer of the Bituminous Coal Producers Board for district No. 1, Altoona, Pa., together with copies of letters written by him on May 7 and 11, to Hon. Leon Henderson, Price Administrator.

It is my intention to have a thorough investigation of this proposed plan, and I ask that these letters be referred to the Senate Committee on Mines and Mining.

I have just returned from a week-end trip. People talk about practically nothing but the war and the way it affects their lives. Comments on rationing of gas, sugar, and the cost of living are on every tongue.

I find that people generally are not convinced that the rationing of gas is necessary. Especially in areas where storage facilities are lacking, there is protest against the waste occasioned.

In regard to the rationing of sugar, there is difficulty in women obtaining necessary amounts for their usual summer canning, and this brings about other problems which might be avoided by a more liberal allowance of sugar for this specific purpose. If women used their glass jars and other canning equipment already on hand they could readily save additional calls on tin required for commercial canning.

Restrictions in one field, where attempts are made to solve shortages, lead to problems in other fields, possibly as grave and difficult. In all of this procedure, necessary as it may be, we should look before we leap.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the letters were referred to the Committee on Mines and Mining and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BITUMINOUS COAL PRODUCERS BOARD FOR DISTRICT NO. 1,
Altoona, Pa., May 13, 1942.

The Honorable JAMES JOHN DAVIS,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: You have my telegram of May 12 protesting the proposed plan of subvention to consumers of bituminous coal in New England and portions of New York and New Jersey who receive coal all-rail from southern mines.

In order to acquaint you with the action already taken in the matter by this district board, copies of two letters to Mr. Leon Henderson, Administrator, Office of Price Administration, dated May 7 and May 11, 1942, respectively, are attached. This correspondence shows conclusively the inequality to the northern coal producers of the plan and sets forth our reasons for vigorously opposing the proposed subvention.

In the interest of fair treatment to the northern coal producers, you are urged to do all possible to prevent the plan from being established.

Very truly yours,
WALTER A. JONES,
Secretary-Treasurer.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 7, 1942.*

Hon. LEON HENDERSON, *Administrator,*
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: As requested by you yesterday, I am writing you this statement of my views of the proposed plan, as far as I understand it, that is now being worked out by your office to pay subventions or rebates on southern coal to New England, New York, and certain portions of New Jersey to compensate the buyers of southern coal for such differences in transportation costs that may be shown to be in effect today as compared with the cost of transportation in December 1941. In other words, the costs of waterborne coal from the southern West Virginia mines here which went by rail increased as a result of submarine warfare along that coast. In order to avoid the possibility of submarine sinking as much as possible a great deal of this vessel water-borne coal has been diverted from going outside the Virginia Capes and instead is proceeding up Chesapeake Bay and thence via the Chesapeake and Delaware Canal to the Delaware River and from thence down the river to outside the Delaware Capes and then from Lewes, Del., to New York where the coal is delivered by vessel or is transported beyond New York through Hell Gate to destinations on Long Island Sound and beyond to Boston and other points east thereof. This has reduced the

carriage capacity of the fleet of vessels by about one-third and, of course, has increased the cost of carriage by reason of insurance rates, etc.

To supplement the above movement of coal, and in order to make up for the deficiency a considerably greater quantity of coal is now being moved all-rail from the southern West Virginia mines through Potomac Yard at Washington and Hagerstown, Md., to the Hudson River gateways for New England and to the New York dumping piers for delivery inside New York Harbor and Long Island Sound points.

These differentials have been in existence for many years and coal has moved thereon for the past 15 years. As I understand the proposition, it is now proposed that subventions will be paid by Government to a consumer in New England, New York, or New Jersey that takes in southern coal to reimburse him for the increase in transportation costs occasioned by this change in routing to the level that it cost him for moving the coal to Hampton Roads by rail and thence by vessel to New York last December. In other words, it is proposed that the differential in freight rates between northern and southern coal will be changed by the Government paying a rebate to receivers of southern coal based upon their rail and water combination last December thereby wiping out the established rate fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission some 15 years ago. This appears to be a back-handed way of reducing southern coal rail rates and contrary to lawfully established rates.

These all-rail rates on bituminous coal from the Pocahontas fields into eastern trunk lines and New England territory in effect at the present time were originally prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission in Docket No. 15006, 101 I. C. C.

The Commission prescribed these rates in an effort to meet an emergency in this territory brought about by the prolonged anthracite strike of 1925–26. The rates were originally published as a temporary measure, but upon subsequent review by the Commission were ordered in on a permanent basis effective June 5, 1928.

In that proceeding the Commission likewise gave consideration to the all-rail rates from the northern fields and the rates to New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Hampton Roads for tidewater.

The final decision of the Commission in its supplemental order No. 29 to Docket No. 15006 prescribed differentials from the New River-Pocahontas field into eastern trunk line and New England territories, the differentials ranging from $1.25 to $2.10 per gross ton over the rates from the Clearfield District. When prescribing these differentials, as well as passing upon the rate structure as a whole, the Commission's decision refers to the boat charges in effect in 1926 from Hampton Roads to New York harbor points as ranging from 60 cents to 75 cents per ton and from Hampton Roads to Boston, 75 cents per ton. In other words, the level of all-rail rates prescribed at that time take into consideration the very low boat rates then existing. (See 140 I. C. C. 23 for boat rates.)

Many of the all-rail rates from the Clearfield District to eastern New England are issued to meet water competition, including such points as Boston, Milton, Quincy, and Salem, Mass., and Portland, Maine, as well as Portsmouth, N. H.

The all-rail distances from the Clearfield District are very substantially shorter to New York and New England points than the all-rail distances from the corresponding fields in the South. As an illustration, the distance to Jersey City, where some of the New York piers are located, from the New River-Pocahontas field is approximately 240 miles greater, and to Boston approximately 215 miles greater than the distance to the Clearfield district. To interior New England points the spread is even greater.

Under the joint returns from the southern fields referred to above there has been a varying amount of coal moving each year, but during the period from October 15, 1925, until May 31, 1926, there moved via the Pennsylvania Railroad 21,049 cars, or in excess of 1,200,000 tons. This tonnage is reported in Docket No. 18034, 150 I. C. C. 534. Moreover, the report of the Commission indicates a very substantial movement via the routes other than the Pennsylvania Railroad, and it will thus be seen that there was a very large movement under the prescribed rates and since that time the movement has been on a smaller basis ranging from 100,000 to 200,000 tons annually up until the recent emergency. There is now a very large movement of coal under these rates via all-rail routes into New England and a substantial movement has begun to New York tidewater piers to which the rates became effective May 1. It is estimated that at the present time the all-rail movement into New England is from 250 to 300 cars daily. In addition, there is a substantial tonnage moving into eastern trunk-line territory.

Any proposal to subsidize the movement of all-rail bituminous coal from the southern field to New York and New England on the basis of rail and water transportation charges via Hampton Roads in effect in December 1941 would, in many instances, result in the elimination of the differentials prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission under which very large tonnages of coal are now moved. Moreover, it would mean that there would be no incentive for the consumers in New England or New York to examine the possibility of the northern fields in an effort to obtain coal from sources which would involve a minimum of all-rail transportation.

There would likewise be no incentive for the consumers or the southern operator to use the water route via Hampton Roads to the extent available, and therefore the rail carriers would be called upon to perform a greater rail service than at the present time, and by reason of the added haul severe strain would be placed upon the coal-car supply. It should not be forgotten that when coal from the southern fields moves into New England and New York all-rail that the added loaded distances over the haul from the northern fields is in excess of 200 miles, and as the empty cars must be returned to the mines, there is an excess car movement of over 400 miles. This places an added burden upon the available motive power of the carriers.

It is just possible as a result of the subventions that transportation charges from southern fields to the consumers in New England via the all-rail route might be less than the actual all-rail charges from the nearby Clearfield district. Using as an illustration the rate from the Clearfield district to Boston of $4.39 per gross ton, compared with the all-rail rate from the Pocahontas field of $5.75 per gross ton, the combination water and rail rate via Hampton Roads from Pocahontas would be $2.69 to Norfolk, plus 5 cents dumping, $1 boat rate, and 35 cents unloading charge, or a total charge of $4.09. Assuming that this combination would be used as a basis for subventions, this would mean that the consumer would pay $4.09 for the all-rail movement from the southern fields to Boston, as compared with the all-rail rate from Clearfield of $4.39, or, in reality, 3 cents per ton less for the added distance of more than 200 miles. Moreover it would be $1.66 lower than the prescribed all-rail rates from the Pocahontas district to Boston.

The anthracite producers who are located close to New England are urging consumers to use anthracite to meet the possible shortage of fuel, and because of their geographical location and to the extent that they are successful the desire for maximum movement of coal-carrying equipment and motive power is progressed in that the distance to New England from the anthracite fields is substantially less than from the northern and southern bituminous fields. Under the circumstances, it is my view that if there is to be any freezing of prices or subventions, the basis should be that of the published all-rail rates from the southern fields in effect during the month of December 1941, which were, as has been pointed out, prescribed by the Interstate Commerce Commission after exhaustive hearings involving not only the level of the rates but the relationship of the competing fields and which, in times of emergency such as the present times, have moved large tonnages of coal from the South.

Moreover, it is important that this basis be observed in the interest of efficient transportation because any subvention which will permit or encourage the movement of coal from the southern fields all-rail to the same consumers who have been receiving it via tidewater at exactly the same cost will have the effect of having these consumers ignore the water routes because of present hazards, and the nearby anthracite and bituminous districts as a source of supply, thereby placing on the railroads the burden of added transportation which, under existing conditions, may jeopardize coal-car supply in the whole country.

It is also proposed that where coal is shipped by water that the difference between the rates today and the rates in effect last December shall be rebated by the Government.

This can be a very serious matter and may result in an attempt to freeze markets or utilized to expand markets at the expense of northern mines. I was assured by the representative of the Government with whom I talked that this was not the intention. There is no valid objection to the fosterage by Government of the movement of coal by water. This should be accomplished by absorbing increased costs of water transportation to the critical area, which if it develop would be eastern New England. Subventions or rebates should be paid for water-borne deliveries east of New London, Conn. In this way a proper movement will be brought about. There is no question of coal supply west of such line. If southern coal is to receive rebates wherever it goes or ever has gone it will result in rank injustices and in many instances promote unsound movement of coal and wastage of transportation facilities. If a consumer can show that at some time he received coal at Springfield, Mass., and is rebated to equalize a combination of distress boat rates and mine prices the same result will be brought about as is illustrated in the case of Boston. Coal may be delivered at a lower rate for the longer haul. This is surely illogical under the present circumstances.

Government should not pay subventions against a rail rate that it fixed and found to be just and reasonable and thereby change a differential that has been in existence for years without at least giving the parties who may be affected a proper hearing.

Further, there is no such thing as a fixed rate on boats that carry coal from Hampton Roads to eastern coastal points. The boats are privately owned and privately contracted and have been subject to private negotiation and barter. My understanding is that a fair rate for December is to be set up by some agency.

The proposed subventions, as I understand it, are being confined at the present time to the New England, New York, and New Jersey area. There are many analogous situations in the country at the present time at such places as Baltimore, Buffalo, and many others are being considered by compelling the use of alternate routes at a higher cost of delivery.

If this plan is promiscuously applied it will result in great dispersion of railway

equipment also, resulting in slowing up movement of coal generally.

As a matter of overall policy rebates should not be granted on bituminous coal in any case to absorb costs out of Government prescribed rates unless all shippers are treated exactly alike under such policy of rebating.

On behalf of coal operators of Pennsylvania whom I represent, it is respectfully requested that our views in this matter be considered, and that opportunity be granted to us to criticize such rebates, and rules and regulation before these are made effective.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES O'NEILL,
President.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 11, 1942.*

Hon. LEON HENDERSON, *Administrator,*
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: Supplementing my letter to you dated May 7 concerning proposed plan to pay rebates on coal from southern mines shipped all-rail all distances, I wish to add the following:

1. So far as all-rail coal which moves from the northern mines, it is originated on the Pennsylvania Railroad, the Baltimore & Ohio and the New York Central, and these mines have always been the primary shippers of all-rail coal to the so-called subvention area. It may be said that the greater tonnage of coal going to New England for the past several years has been tidewater and ex-tidewater deliveries. However, the much greater proportion of the coal moving all-rail via Hudson River gateways has been from northern mines (not southern mines) and consideration should be given to this fact.

2. It is wholly illogical to haul coal hundreds of miles farther via an all-rail route that in the end means an extra turn-around car mileage of double the excess distance and pay a subsidy or grant a rebate to foster such a wasteful movement.

3. As much tonnage as possible should be moved to New England by water, because all of the coal necessary for New England cannot be moved all-rail and as much coal as is possible should be encouraged to move to eastern New England by water where the all-rail haul increases to great lengths from all fields, northern and southern bituminous as well as anthracite. A line drawn east of New London, Conn., and thence northeast of Worcester, Mass., would approximate the critical area.

4. It is agreed that to the extent it is necessary to provide coal by water for eastern New England, coal for the by-product coking plants in New York Harbor and possibly New Haven, Conn., may have to move all-rail from southern mines.

5. The whole proposition looks like an arbitrary one based upon some theoretical boat price, that is presently unknown, to protect a particular movement of coal whether substitute or alternate coals are now being used or whether satisfactory price relationships upon such coals have been established by consumers.

6. So far as the plan has been disclosed, the payment of subventions to move southern coal all-rail to points where it may be unnecessary to move it is all wrong, for instance, the proposition of delivering southern coal all-rail inland in New England at a lower rate than the all-rail rate from northern mines to such destinations (for example, Worcester, Mass.), violates every rule of common sense.

7. It would be just as unreasonable to pay a subvention to consumers all over the United States who have to use railroads and rail rates for the carriage of their goods in place of truck transportation if such rates are higher. Dr. Parmelee, famous railroad economist, estimates that there will be a diversion of 10 percent of the truck tonnage to railroads within a year. I think the situation presented in this case would be exactly the same, that is, to pay a subvention on southern all-rail coal to all northeastern destinations.

8. The analogous situations that have been called to your attention and those that may be compelled by shortage of marine transportation may amount to millions of tons and a great deal of money.

9. Such a scheme could only result in the protection of the maximum prices to the producing beneficiaries, regardless of the real situation marketwise. Certainly this cannot be the intention of the Office of Price Administration. A scheme of subventions or rebates that would foster a transportation shortage for the movement of coal would cause much damage to the country and should not be put into effect.

Respectfully submitted.

CHARLES O'NEILL, *President.*

RATIONING OF GASOLINE—LETTERS, RESOLUTIONS, AND TELEGRAM FROM KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I again rise to call the attention of the Senate to some things that should be carefully considered before gasoline rationing is applied to those sections of the Nation where gasoline is a surplus commodity and where rationing will mean still larger surpluses, unless the refineries are closed down. What the closing down of the refineries will do to other necessary war operations is something to think about.

The question, What can the refineries do with their surplus gasoline? is raised by the Wichita, Kans., Chamber of Commerce, in resolutions just received by me. The resolutions go into the entire matter very thoroughly, and I believe should be read and given careful consideration by every Senator. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolutions and the accompanying letter from W. L. Ainsworth, chairman of the oil and gas committee of the Wichita Chamber of Commerce, printed in the RECORD at this point; also a letter from Mr. Allen W. Hinkel, of Wichita, on the same subject, together with a telegram from the Argo Oil Corporation of Wichita on the same subject, signed by Lee Scott.

There being no objection, the letters, resolutions, and telegram were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WICHITA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Wichita, Kans., June 3, 1942.

To Senators and Congressmen of Oil Producing States.

GENTLEMEN: The Wichita Chamber of Commerce has been very much interested in your efforts to prevent the useless rationing of gasoline in the Middle West. I am certain that everyone who understands the true conditions in this part of the country thinks as we do in this matter.

At its regular meeting on June 2 the board of directors of the Wichita Chamber of Commerce adopted a resolution opposing gasoline rationing in the Middle West. I am enclosing a copy of this resolution.

If there is anything the Wichita Chamber of Commerce can do to help you in your effort to prevent gasoline rationing in this section of the country, please let us know as soon as possible.

Yours very truly,

W. L. AINSWORTH,
Chairman, Oil and Gas Committee.

RESOLUTION OF OIL AND GAS COMMITTEE OF THE WICHITA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, WICHITA, KANS.

Be it resolved by the oil and gas committee of the Wichita Chamber of Commerce:

The Office of Price Administration has under consideration the matter of rationing the consumption of gasoline in the Middle West. We urge that before any such action is taken, thorough consideration be given to the following facts:

1. Fuel oil as well as aviation gasoline, butadiene, and toluene, are byproducts in the manufacture of gasoline.

The amount of gasoline produced by refining a barrel of crude oil may be varied to a considerable extent. The refineries in this part of the country have already cut down the production of gasoline from a barrel of crude oil to about 40 percent of the total volume of products refined. This is about as low a percentage of gasoline as it is possible for our refineries to produce.

This gasoline must be disposed of in some manner. The consumption of gasoline in this area is certain to be greatly lowered if the board issues a rationing order. The rationing of gasoline along the Atlantic seaboard and the considerably reduced consumption of gasoline owing to tire rationing has already greatly curtailed the market for gasoline produced by Middle West refineries. The result is that these refineries have already very nearly exhausted their storage space. This condition exists as to the refineries located here at Wichita. If there is a further curtailment of consumption the refineries will be unable to continue to refine oil because of the impossibility of disposing of the gasoline necessarily produced as a byproduct in the production of fuel oil. Our local refineries are already shipping a very large percentage of their fuel oil to the Atlantic seaboard. A further curtailment of consumption of gasoline in the local market of these refineries will make it necessary for them to shut down over long periods of time until the gasoline in their storage tanks is disposed of. While they are shut down they obviously cannot produce fuel oil, aviation gasoline, butadiene, and toluene. It is hardly necessary to point out the necessity to our armed forces of such products as aviation gasoline and toluene or the importance of butadiene in the manufacture of synthetic rubber.

The situation above outlined will result in the operation of the refineries at a loss, but it is not the question of profit or loss which is important, the important question is, What can the refineries do with their surplus gasoline?

2. When the rationing of gasoline results in the shutting down of refineries as it will do, this means in turn a decreased production of oil. Storage facilities for crude oil are not sufficient to permit the continued operation of wells which are unable to dispose of their oil.

Oil is one of the most necessary products for the successful prosecution of the war. Unless great care is exercised in the regulation of all matters affecting its production, the United States may find itself confronted with an oil shortage at the most critical time in the further progress of the war.

3. The rationing of natural gas under War Production Board order L–31, which prevents gas companies in this area from taking on an additional heating load greatly increases the local demand for fuel oil. This fuel oil cannot be produced without the producing of a large quantity of gasoline at the same time.

4. Fuel oil is essential to many industries in this part of the country which are in their turn essential to our war effort. Nearly all railroad engines west of Kansas City burn fuel oil. To deprive the railroads of this fuel oil would greatly complicate the trans-

portation problem which is already a critical one. The only other possible fuels for industries and railroads are coal and coke, but to use such materials would not only greatly aggravate the already serious transportation problem, but require a complete rebuilding of their fuel-consuming equipment by many industrial plants and railroads. The necessary materials for such rebuilding are not available under present restrictions. It is also true that such rebuilding of fuel-consuming equipment would involve an enormous loss of time in industries essential to the prosecution of the war.

5. Throughout the western part of the United States there is almost a total lack of mass-transportation facilities of any character. In the past the private automobile has made up for this lack of such facilities. If the private automobile is taken off of the roads, the problems of the railroads and bus lines will be greatly augmented. There are practically no streetcar lines in the West and in cities large enough to have such lines they are entirely insufficient to meet the local problems of transportation of passengers unless augmented by private automobiles. Many good-sized cities have no streetcar lines at all and it is obviously impossible to construct them now in time to take care of the transportation problem. In Wichita there are 4 airplane plants located several miles from the city which have at this time about 25,000 employees and will soon double that number. These employees are now transported in private automobiles. Much thought has been given to the problem of transporting them in some other way but no feasible method has been found.

6. It is said that the object of gasoline rationing in the Middle West would be to conserve rubber. The only rubber it would conserve would be the rubber now on the cars. Obviously this rubber will wear out in time and when that time comes the problem will have to be met as best it can. But time is an important factor in our present war effort and we believe it is far more important that our refineries should continue to produce the necessary fuel oil to keep necessary war industries in operation and furnish the Army and the Navy with the gasoline and fuel oil which they need, than it is to consider what we are going to do when all the tires are worn out. A very large number of vehicles are equipped with rubbber which will last them for 2 years.

The exhaustion of the rubber on vehicles now in use will come gradually, and as that time approaches such action can be taken as the necessities of the case may demand. But of what use is it to preserve the rubber on a private vehicle if the consumption of gasoline by the vehicle is curtailed to a point where the usefulness of the vehicle is destroyed.

If it is necessary to place further restrictions upon the use of motor vehicles, we believe that a national speed limit of 40 miles per hour would go a long way toward preserving the rubber on motor vehicles now in use, and while it would to some extent curtail the consumption of gasoline we do not think that the results would be so disastrous as those which would be produced by the rationing of gasoline.

7. The extent of the damage which might be unwittingly done to the war effort by the crippling of Midwestern refineries and the consequent curtailment of Middle West production is apparent when we consider the extent of oil production in that area. The States of Kansas, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana, Illinois, and Indiana produce about 2,600,000 barrels of oil per day. The total production of oil in the United States is about 3,600,000 barrels per day.

8. The curtailment of the sale of gasoline will seriously affect an important source of revenue to the State and National Governments. The total State revenue of Kansas is $35,000,000 per year. Of this the gasoline tax furnishes $11,000,000.

9. We endorse the statement issued by Frank Phillips, general chairman of the petroleum industry for district No. 2, appointed by Petroleum Coordinator for War, Harold L. Ickes, which was issued from Chicago on May 24, 1942, and which discusses this matter.

10. What has been said above is based solely upon the consideration of what is best for the entire country in the prosecution of its war effort. We have not taken into consideration the financial effect upon oil companies or producers. However, the disturbance of our already burdened economy, which will be caused by the financial crippling of our refineries by the curtailment of the consumption of gasoline in the Middle West, is a factor which will still further retard the production of essential materials for the prosecution of the war. We appreciate the fact that the successful prosecution of the war comes first and that every inconvenience or damage to business and to the public must receive secondary consideration, but we firmly believe that considering the effect upon our war effort the rationing of gasoline in the Middle West would prove disastrous.

We urge that the most serious consideration be given to the matters suggested herein by the Office of Price Administration and all other agencies of the Government which are in any way concerned with this matter; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Office of Price Administration, the Army and Navy, War Production Board, Joseph B. Eastman of the Office of Defense Transportation, the Honorable Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Coordinator for War, the Members of Congress from Kansas, and such other officials and agencies as the executive officials of the Wichita Chamber of Commerce may deem advisable.

THE ALLEN W. HINKEL CO.,
Wichita, Kans., June 1, 1942.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator From Kansas,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Nation-wide gasoline rationing is apparently on the program for the near future, although there is certainly no shortage of gasoline imminent in the Middle West.

The argument appears to be that this is necessary to stop the use of tires. Let us examine the other side of the picture. For 10 years or more many Kansans interested in oil production, of which I happen to be one, have been unable to market their potential stocks of crude oil because of an oversupply which made necessary the proration laws. There is still an adequate supply.

The Nation-wide rationing of gasoline will seriously injure the oil companies, will destroy the small filling-station operator entirely, and will have a very destructive effect upon all other lines of business. If the farmer cannot get to town, the small merchants will suffer, and even in a city like Wichita, which is largely dependent on its trade territory, will be badly hurt.

I submit that Americans everywhere will stop at no sacrifice necessary to the winning of this war, but I also submit that unnecessary regulations injurious to the livelihood of ordinary folks will do more harm than good, and I raise my voice in protest against this action.

It seems to me that Mr. Leon Henderson, of the Office of Price Administration, has been granted too much power for any one man to wield, and I think it is time that the Members of Congress give some thought to matters themselves.

I shall appreciate your reaction of these ideas at your early convenience.

With kind regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ALLEN W. HINKEL.

WICHITA, KANS.,
June 3, 1942.

ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Gasoline rationing in Kansas and other oil-producing States would greatly retard oil development. We have plenty of gasoline in this section of country. Extremely foolish to penalize this part of country because eastern seaboard is short. Please pass this information to Kansas delegation.

ARGO OIL CORPORATION,
LEE SCOTT.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 538. A bill granting the Distinguished Service Cross to Raymond P. Finnegan; with amendments (Rept. No. 1444); and

H. R. 3337. A bill to provide for the issuance of a duplicate adjusted-service certificate to Andrew J. Bissinger; without amendment (Rept. No. 1445).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2558. A bill to further expedite the prosecution of the war by authorizing the control of the exportation of certain commodities; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1446).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 6899 A bill to exempt custodial employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education from the operation of the provisions of section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act approved May 10, 1916; with amendments (Rept. No. 1447).

By Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

S. 2412. A bill to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of civilians, and for the prevention and relief of civilian distress arising out of the present war, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1448).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

H. R. 6355. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to amend the act entitled 'An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes,'" approved June 28, 1940; with amendments (Rept. No. 1451).

H. R. 7036. A bill to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the fifty-second annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Chattanooga, Tenn., June 23 to 26, inclusive, 1942; without amendment (Rept. No. 1449);

H. R. 7159. A bill authorizing the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1450); and

S. Res. 259. Resolution authorizing the inspection of United States navy yards, air stations, and other naval activities; without amendment; and, under the rule referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 7182. A bill making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1452); and

H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 for the training and education of defense workers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1453).

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

On June 2, 1942:

S. 1637. An act to authorize the conveyance to the State of Illinois, for highway purposes only, a portion of the Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.:

S. 2088. An act to authorize aircraft flight rations for officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Navy and Marine Corps while engaged in flight operations;

S. 2097. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the board of trustees, School District No. 20, Charleston County, S. C., a parcel of land situated in the city of Charleston, S. C.;

S. 2229. An act to provide for the retirement, rank, and pay of heads of staff departments of the Marine Corps;

S. 2382. An act to amend the act approved June 24, 1926, entitled "An act to authorize the construction and procurement of aircraft and aircraft equipment in the Navy and Marine Corps, and to adjust and define the status of the operating personnel in connection therewith," so as to provide for the establishment of the designation of naval aviation pilot (airship), and for other purposes; and

S. 2446. An act to prescribe certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training, and for other purposes.

On June 5, 1942:

S. 2250. An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes.

On June 6, 1942:

S. 221. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Beacon Oyster Co., the Point Wharf Oyster Co., and B. J. Rooks & Son;

S. 244. An act for the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.;

S. 1044. An act for the relief of L. H. Goodman;

S. 1563. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard;

S. 1648. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Shaver Forwarding Co., of Portland, Oreg.;

S. 1732. An act for the relief of Max Miller and Vera Caroline Miller et al.;

S. 1756. An act for the relief of Franklin Benjamin McNew;

S. 1820. An act for the relief of Jerry McKinley Thompson;

S. 2037. An act for the relief of Edgar B. Dunlap;

S. 2048. An act for the relief of Lt. William Stewart Walker;

S. 2069. An act for the relief of the Quimby-Ryan Engineering Sales Co., Inc.;

S. 2103. An act to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, so as to authorize citizens of foreign countries who are graduates of Air Corps advanced flying schools and Air Corps service schools to wear aviation badges;

S. 2235. An act for the relief of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher;

S. 2251. An act for the relief of Charles Brauch;

S. 2278. An act for the relief of Bob Sampley;

S. 2318. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo;

S. 2354. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George M. Legg and Loetta Trainer;

S. 2451. An act for the relief of Anthony W. Livingston;

S. 2452. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Coast Guard and the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

S. 2453. An act to authorize the obligation of funds of the Coast Guard for work or material at Government-owned establishments, and for other purposes;

S. 2469. An act for the relief of William Edward Fleming;

S. 2470. An act for the relief of Eileen Collins Treacy;

S. 2490. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941 (Public Law 8, 77th Cong.), as amended by section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1941 (Public Law 166, 77th Cong.); and

S. J. Res. 24. Joint resolution for the relief of W. K. Richardson.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 2579. A bill to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (for himself and Mr. MAYBANK):

S. 2580. A bill to provide for reimbursing States for losses in gasoline-tax revenues sustained on account of the rationing of gasoline under the authority of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2581. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROSIER:

S. 2582. A bill to make Younghill Kang eligible for naturalization; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. MURRAY:

S. 2583. A bill to exempt from the provisions of section 404 of the Nationality Act of 1940 certain naturalized American citizens temporarily residing in certain foreign states in the Western Hemisphere; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 2584. A bill to permit appointment of White House police, in accordance with the civil-service laws, from sources outside the Metropolitan and United States Park Police forces; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

(Mr. BANKHEAD (for himself and Mr. RUSSELL) introduced Senate bill 2585, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2586. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue it in force during the existing war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. J. Res. 151. Joint resolution to create a commission for the emergency safeguarding of the Capitol and other buildings in the legislative group, and other buildings under the Architect of the Capitol; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

LOANS ON 1942 CROPS

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] and myself I introduce a bill, which I ask to have read, and with respect to which I wish to make a very brief statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be read.

The bill (S. 2585) to provide that loans on the 1942 crop of corn, wheat, rice, cotton, tobacco, and peanuts shall be made at a rate equal to the parity price, was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subparagraph (a) of paragraph No. 10 of the joint resolution entitled "Joint resolution relating to corn and wheat marketing quotas under the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended," is amended to read as follows:

"(a) To cooperators (except cooperators outside the commercial corn-producing area, in the case of corn) at a rate equal to the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year in the case of the 1942 crop of such commodities, and at the rate of 85 percent of the parity price for the commodity as of the beginning of the marketing year in the case of the crops of such commodities for the other years above specified;".

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. President, there is constantly expressed anxiety about an inflationary run-away in our price situation. There may be some signs of it in industrial commodities, but so far as agriculture is concerned the situation is exactly the reverse. It has been repeatedly charged by a number of newspapers and commentators that agricultural prices constitute an inflationary threat. The facts are exactly the opposite. If other prices are going up, resulting in inflation, an additional burden is placed upon agricultural producers, because their prices are going down.

In the past 10 days the prices of grains have suffered a very great decrease. Take the case of wheat. On Saturday the price of July wheat on the Chicago exchange closed at $1.17⅜ a bushel. About 2 weeks ago the price of wheat on the same market was about $1.30 a bushel. So within that short period there has been a reduction in the price of wheat of approximately 13 cents a bushel.

There has also been a reduction in the price of rye. On Saturday the price of July rye closed at 64½ cents. Only a few days ago it was above 70 cents.

The price of cotton has gone down within the last 10 days from $10 to $12 a bale without any apparent reason for the reduction. There has been no change in the supply. There has been an increase, if any change at all, in consump-

tion; but notwithstanding those facts, prices have been drifting down and are continuing down. Last Saturday was one of the worst days in the matter of price reductions. The price of cotton, for instance, went down $2.50 a bale—50 points—without any apparent reason to justify the decline.

That is in the face, Mr. President, of a fear of inflation. I am not arguing for inflation. I do not want to see it; but, according to the newspapers, we are about to appropriate a tremendous amount of money if we follow the requests made to Congress to prevent inflation. There is talk about 100,000 more employees for the O. P. A., and more than $100,000,000 is being requested in appropriations to prevent inflation; and yet we confront the situation I have described with the farm population constituting nearly one-fourth of the population of America. Their prices, instead of going up, are going down. Deflation, rather than inflation, is in effect in agriculture.

The farmers must pay the increased prices which are being brought about in industry. The effect of that situation, to prevent which so much money is being asked for and so many employees requested, bears down upon the farmers. Instead of their receiving more income with which to meet the increased expenditures, we learn, according to the figures I have cited and according to common knowledge, that just the opposite is happening. New crops are now coming into the market. Wheat will soon be harvested. In a few months cotton will be harvested, and so will corn.

When Mr. Herbert Hoover, the Food Administrator during the first World War, was before the Committee on Banking and Currency, he warned that committee that, instead of being anxious about price ceilings, it had better look after price floors. That was the question to be uneasy about and to be considered by that committee, and protection in some way secured. Now we find that his prediction has been proven.

I desire to make a short statement about the bill, and then I shall conclude. It is an amendment to the 85-percent loan bill. It provides for increasing the rate of loans upon this year's crop only to 100 percent of parity to parity prices. The only complaint I have heard made against the farmers is that they have been seeking an income above parity. The bill does not provide for more than parity; it merely provides a floor under which cooperating farmers, instead of receiving 85 percent of loans, may receive in order to meet the increased expenses they must bear, a floor of 100 percent of parity itself.

Therefore, I hope to have the cooperation of every Senator who is interested in having decent, fair treatment accorded to the farmers. We shall try to have a meeting of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I have just consulted the chairman of that committee, who sits beside me, and he assures me that at an early date he will call a meeting of the committee to consider this bill.

Mr. McNARY. I have read the bill now before the Senate. In it there is no request for reference to a committee. It appears to be an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act. I assume that the bill will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry rather than lie on the table.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 7182) making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely:

On page 2, after line 6, to insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Miscellaneous expenses, Navy, 1942: For the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the classification laws, or section 5 of the act of April 6, 1914 (38 Stat. 335), $75,000, of which amount $65,000 shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred since January 28, 1942."

Mr. McKELLAR also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 7182, making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

RATIONING OF GASOLINE

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I offer for the RECORD a letter from Estancia, N. Mex., written by George A. Sweetman, general manager of the Planters Mutual Insurance Co. The letter deals with Nation-wide rationing of gasoline. I offer this letter because of the pertinent facts and the information therein contained, in the hope that it will be read by someone having something to do with Nation-wide rationing of gasoline.

I also present for the RECORD a letter from Quemado, N. Mex., which deals with the subject of trucking. I hope that this letter also will be read by someone who is about to make orders that a truck making deliveries must carry a return load, in order that such officials may receive some information.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New Mexico?

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PLANTERS MUTUAL INSURANCE CO.,
Estancia, N. Mex., June 3, 1942.

Hon. CARL HATCH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: It seems at this time there is much being said relative to the rationing of gasoline throughout the United States. Perhaps it is essential in some parts, more so, I assume, on account of transportation than it is on account of shortage.

However, it does not seem that it should be general in our home State, at least where our wells are hobbled to hold down overproduction, in case it is needed for an essential purpose. Of course, we all agree that war necessities are essential, but there are some businesses that should have a little preference to the average layman's business or the pleasure seeker.

For instance, I wish to speak of my own case. I have the above company and organization incorporated in our State, the same which shows to be solvent, in addition to having a large volume of business, which is still growing, to look after, and due to the fact that the same is in the rural districts and in many cases 40 or 50 miles from the railroad or bus lines, a car is the only means of transportation to reach people in order to make adjustments in case of losses, etc.

Our case has already been hampered by the rationing of rubber, but due to the fact that I have only used my car directly for the purpose within mentioned, I have enough old tires that would not really be accepted by the Government for use for as much as 25 to 50 cents apiece as second-hand tires; yet by managing and being careful, by driving at moderate speeds, I can get to and from my work and get it attended to for at least this year, provided I could have gasoline. As most of my insurance—in fact, all—is rural districts on rural crops or grain stored, an essential product to the efforts of our cause, it seems to me that our business should be considered a necessity to the extent of taking care of our business, as we operate State-wide and have quite a lot of territory to cover.

Due to the fact that I have never been able to find any place where we have a right-of-way for getting even tires, it would pretty near ruin us to now cut us off from gasoline in the center of our business, which supplies work for agents, mostly of ages above the Government's consideration for help. In fact, I have men working up around 70 that are making a living for themselves and families, and I do not really have a young man on the staff.

We pay our taxes, we own our property in the State, we expect to buy our full quota of bonds, and should we be cut off from these essentials, it would be very hard to even live, let alone buy a single bond. And, for the very few dollars of essentials necessary to keep our business running, it seems to me like it would be good business to let a business continue that would continue to buy probably $50 worth of bonds for every $5 invested in such things as tires, or tires and gasoline together. It might not run quite that proportion, however, but I feel sure the favor would be on the side of the Government.

Yours very truly,
PLANTERS MUTUAL INSURANCE CO.,
GEO. A. SWEETMAN, *General Manager.*

QUEMADO, N. MEX., *June 1, 1942.*

Senator CARL HATCH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HATCH: We have been keeping in close touch with the proposed law of rationing gasoline, thinking and hoping that this would not come to pass; however, as time goes along it seems that it will become a law, and in view of our situation we wish you would cause as much protest against this measure as can possibly be at your command.

As you know, Senator HATCH, Catron County, as well as some others, doesn't have a railroad. Quemado, the largest town, doesn't even have telephone communication with the outside world. Our only means of communication is by mail, and only means of transportation is by automobile, truck, or bus.

Should this bill become a law as proposed, it would become necessary to haul all supplies to Catron County by wagon and teams from supply points reaching to over 100 miles; that is, if trucks must have some load for return trips, as there is nothing to load with, going out, except at stock shipping times.

There isn't a hospital in Catron County and only three doctors, widely separated; in emergency cases we take patients to hospitals in Albuquerque, a distance of 192 miles; other communities are even farther, and in several other States.

Most of our counties in our Western States are larger than many of the Eastern States, and, as you know, most of our people are engaged in the raising of cattle and sheep, most of them being many miles from points of supply; and should they be compelled to haul all ranch supplies and feed they need, would necessitate more time to this work alone than there is in 1 year.

Such a law, if passed, would mean many unnecessary hardships, much unnecessary sickness and many unnecessary deaths and much suffering on account of our inability of not having doctors and medicines. And we cannot think of any law being imposed on people of the United States of America which would impose the many unnecessary hardships as this one seems to us.

As to the loyalty of the people of New Mexico, our record in the present conflict speaks for itself, and we are proud of it, not only in the present war but in the first World War and others down in history.

Speaking for the majority of the Western States, should this proposed law be passed, it would mean the complete destruction of our cattle and sheep industry, our mining, lumber, coal, and oil industries, and would take thousands of men from employment, all because of having their honest means of support outlawed. After all, Senator HATCH, we believe it better to wear tires out we now have trying to make a living than to have them rot out sitting in sheds, and since tires are not to be had our people will use them as little as possible and for necessary trips and thereby do their own rationing, and, believe us, they will conserve their tires, for they realize now what it would mean to be without means of transportation.

Senator HATCH, we elected you to represent our interests in Washington, and we still believe in you, and we know you will use your very best efforts in representing us and to our best interests; we ask for nothing unfair, but since conditions in the West are so far from being the conditions in the East it becomes one question which cannot become universal and with the best interests of many thousands of people.

Just suppose, for instance, that some man or woman here at Quemado became ill and should be taken to a hospital and could get but 3 gallons of gas in each week, well, the best that could be done would be to reach Albuquerque in 3 weeks. As far as we in western New Mexico, eastern Arizona, and many other communities in the Western States, it is all too absurd to think of; therefore we appeal to you for what seems to us as our very existence.

Sincerely yours,

QUEMADO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE.
E. E. ENGLE, *Secretary.*

PUBLICATION OF PEACE CONFERENCE DOCUMENTS

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, Dr. Herbert Wright has been professor of international law at the Catholic University of America for the past 12 years. He is also chairman of the committee of the American Society of International Law on publications of the Department of State. He has written me a very interesting letter dealing with the publication of peace conference documents touching the activities of the Department of State in the first World War. I ask consent of the Senate that the letter of Dr. Wright be published as a part of my remarks, rather than in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 8, 1942.*

The Honorable HOMER T. BONE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR BONE: You will remember that in the middle of June 1938 you somewhat impatiently asked on the floor of the Senate, "When is the Department of State going to publish the peace conference documents?" And you pointed to the fact that other nations were printing portions of these documents which amounted to ex parte defenses of their activities at the Paris Peace Conference, whereas the United States was exceedingly slow in publishing the records of the conference giving the complete picture of the conference and the role played by the United States therein.

Action was taken by the Congress to speed up this publication, but now its continuation, as well as the continuation of the publication of the regular volumes of Foreign Relations and of the Department of State Bulletin, is being jeopardized, unintentionally, as I believe, by the action of the Senate Committee on Appropriations in subjecting the printing and binding appropriation for the Department of State to a blanket 40-percent reduction, as recently reported out by that committee and agreed to by the Senate on May 21.

If this reduction is left applicable to the Department of State printing, very probably it will fall heaviest upon the three publications mentioned. The object of the Senate committee amendment was stated by Senator PAT MCCARRAN on May 21, when, in reply to a query from Senator JOHN A. DANAHER on this point, he said that "the printing and binding can be curtailed in accordance with the desires of those in charge of the Department. That which is most essential can be produced and that which is least essential can be curtailed."

In practice, this would probably mean that the officials of the Department would feel obliged to use this appropriation primarily for the Proclaimed List of Blocked Nationals (the so-called blacklist), passports, letterheads, and forms used in the day-by-day business of the Department and (what is possibly not realized) of the far-flung Foreign Service in the field abroad (the total for which will probably run well over $100,000) and therefore the proposed reduction would necessarily fall on those publications which are not in the category of supplies for the routine operations of the Department. In fact, upon inquiry, I have been informed by officials of the Department that, if the appropriation is reduced from $254,000 to $152,400, and even if the Department is given the discretion suggested by Senator MCCARRAN, there will not be sufficient funds for the three publications named.

The item for printing and binding in the Department of State has always been very modest. In fact, almost 2 hours of the recent single-day meeting of the American Society of International Law were devoted to a discussion of the importance of these publications of the Department, in the course of which several members criticized me, as the chairman of their committee on publications of the Department of State, for not requesting a more expanded publication policy. I defended myself on the ground that, however desirable an expanded publication policy might be, during the war period we should ask for only those publications which we considered indispensable, even from the standpoint of economy, and I vigorously defended the House figures on that basis.

The fact that the Paris Peace Conference volumes have been long overdue, you yourself pointed out in 1938. As a result of your own interest and the interest of many others in the publication of these important documents, the Congress authorized and the Department of State embarked upon their publication, the first two volumes of which will probably appear this fall. The present plan is to proceed at the rate of four volumes a year. The material for volumes III and IV is already in galley proof and the material for volumes V and VI is being edited.

If your complaint was justified in 1938, and no one seriously doubts that it was amply justified, it would be doubly justified now, when we are engaged in another catastrophic world conflict with the prospect of many of the same problems arising in the peace conference that is bound to come. How are we to avoid the pitfalls of the Paris Peace Conference, which many, rightly or wrongly, believe left the way open for the outbreak of the present war, unless we know exactly what transpired there, unless we know precisely the role played by the delegates of each nation participating in that conference? The documents and records of that conference should prove of inestimable value in the conference to come. But if they are to be available then, their publication must not be interrupted now.

With regard to the regular foreign relations volumes, may I respectfully point out that, inaugurated in 1861, they have weathered the Civil War, the Spanish American War, and even the World War. At present, through no fault of the Department of State, there is a 15-year gap between the date of publication and the date of the documents contained therein. The Department, under constant urgings of the Congress, has been making every effort to cut down this gap. Two 1927 volumes have just appeared and there is a good prospect that the 1928 volumes will also appear during the present calendar year, thus cutting down the gap to 14 years. A suspension now would aggravate a situation now in process of being corrected. The specific volumes upon which the cut would presumably fall would be those for the year 1931, containing important documents relevant to Japan's embarkation upon her imperialistic spree.

The weekly bulletin, containing the more important releases of the Department, information concerning treaties to which the United States is a party and other information on foreign policy, is relied upon by the Congress itself, the Navy Department, the Department of Justice, the Office of Facts and Figures, the Office of the Coordinator of Information, the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and other agencies of the Government itself as well as professors

and practitioners of international law and related subjects to keep themselves accurately informed concerning the multitudinous relations of the United States with foreign nations.

Resolutions in urgent support of the above publication program of the Department of State have been adopted in recent years by the following scientific and professional organizations, in the interest of making the public more reliably informed of their Government's activities in international affairs and the reasons therefor: American Bar Association, American Branch of the International Law Association, American Society of International Law, American Historical Association, American Political Science Association, Conference of Teachers of International Law and Related Subjects. Copies of these resolutions will be furnished on request.

If the Government desires to retain the confidence of the people of the United States in the battle for the survival of democracy, surely now is not the time to take any steps that could justly be considered as a suppression of the record of its activities in the international field or as a reversion to the extremes of secret diplomacy. Therefore, as Chairman of the Committee on Publications of the Department of State of the American Society of International Law, may I respectfully request that the figures for printing and binding Department of State publications authorized in the original bill as it came from the House be restored and that the Congress make clear to the Department that in any event the publication of the Foreign Relations, the Department of State Bulletin and the Paris Peace Conference volumes should not be curtailed. Since the Department's publication program is of such limited character, our committee believe that even a compromise between the House and Senate figures would not provide a satisfactory solution of the problem, since it would jeopardize the publications mentioned and in the end would prove to be a false economy.

Any substantiation or amplification of the above points which you might desire will be cheerfully furnished upon request. For your information, may I identify the other members of our committee: Prof. Kenneth W. Colegrove, Northwestern University; Prof. Walter H. E. Jaeger, Georgetown University School of Law; Prof. Philip C. Jessup, Columbia University; Mr. Stanley C. Smith, member of the District of Columbia Bar; Prof. Graham H. Stuart, Stanford University; and Mr. Charles Warren, former Assistant Attorney General of the United States. The undersigned has been professor of international law at the Catholic University of America for the past 12 years. Copies of our annual reports for 1939, 1940, and 1941 are sent herewith for your convenience.

In adopting our 1942 report, which is now in press, and continuing our committee for another year, the American Society of International Law, of which Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS of Utah is a vice president, at its annual meeting on April 25, 1942, adopted a resolution containing the following preamble:

"Whereas this society has heretofore recorded and desires to record again its conviction of the importance of the publication of significant state papers at the earliest moment which the Department of State may consider to be possible, if not incompatible with the public interest; and

"Whereas this society would deprecate any delay in the publication of any document or information which the Department of State decides it is possible, without danger to the public interest, to release:

"*Resolved*, That the Society continue," etc.

The above information has been communicated to Senator MCCARRAN and Representative RABAUT of the conference committee on H. R. 6599, but I would appreciate it if you would have this letter inserted in the RECORD during the morning hour, so that it may be made available to all of the Members of both Houses of the Congress.

Very respectfully,

HERBERT WRIGHT,
Chairman, Committee on Publications of the Department of State, American Society of International Law.

RATIONING OF SUGAR

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, I desire to place in the RECORD a letter from Mr. H. A. Benning, of Ogden, Utah, president of the Amalgamated Sugar Co., one of the largest processors of sugar in the area which includes Idaho.

In Mr. Benning's opinion the present rationing of sugar is much too severe. It is his belief that stocks of sugar are sufficiently large to make any rationing unnecessary. He states that his own company is having difficulty in marketing its product, due to restrictions upon purchases by consumers, and may be forced to curtail operations, with serious consequences to the growers of sugar beets.

Mr. Benning thinks that both the weekly allowance of sugar per person and the annual allowance for canning are too small.

In offering Mr. Benning's views I have no desire to interfere with a proper control of commodities of which there may be a shortage. It appears, however, that there has been considerable bungling in the handling of supplies of many commodities required by our people.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Benning's letter be printed in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Idaho?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AMALGAMATED SUGAR CO.,
Ogden, Utah, May 19, 1942.

HON. JOHN THOMAS,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: The present sugar ration of 8 ounces per week per person for domestic use and 5 pounds per year per person for home canning is entirely too small both from the consumers' needs and the available sugar supply standpoint.

Take our particular case: We produced 2,133,336 bags of 100 pounds each during our last operating season. We still have 1,393,860 bags of this sugar unsold and at the present time, when sugar is supposed to be scarce, we are unable to make sales in anywhere near the quantity we should be selling in order to market our stock before new production comes on.

This means that during the 7-month period, since we began producing the 1941 crop, we have only marketed 740,000 bags of that crop, and we have over 65 percent of it left with only 5 months remaining to sell it. At the present rate of our sales, we will have between eight and nine hundred thousand bags unsold when the new crop comes on.

The 1942 production will be considerably greater than normal, and in our case we will be faced with a situation which may be very serious unless the Government gives us relief. This is the situation: We expect to produce 3,000,000 bags of sugar and, starting out with 850,000 bags on hand, makes a total of 3,850,000 bags on hand at the end of the operating period, less sales during that period. At the present rate of sales we can expect 3,500,000 bags on hand when we finish processing the 1942 crop.

We have storage facilities for 2,500,000 bags and are faced with the problem of moving 1,000,000 during the fall when railroad equipment is hard to get, and also the problem of obtaining outside storage, which is almost impossible to get under present conditions. Sugar cannot be stored outdoors; therefore, we may be faced with a situation where our plants may be forced to shut down with a perishable crop on our hands. In that case the grower is the loser, as our contract with them protects us in such cases.

I am sure that this same situation applies to other processors. It can be corrected by increasing the sugar ration, which should be done without delay. The loss due to the restricted consumption cannot be recovered, but consumption can be renewed upon a more normal basis by increasing the ration to 1 pound per week per person and 30 pounds per person for canning, which would be entirely safe considering the available supplies.

All of the reliable sugar statisticians are convinced that there is enough sugar available so that rationing is unnecessary. It is a certainty that, if the present rationing is continued, all of the present producing areas, including Cuba, will be faced with a very serious problem. It is true that difficulty is being experienced at the present time moving Cuban and Puerto Rican sugars to the mainland, but this situation will be met and when it is, it will be very unfortunate for all concerned to find a large surplus of continental sugars backed up.

Yours very truly,

H. A. BENNING, *President.*

SHORTAGE OF GASOLINE, FUEL OIL, AND PETROLEUM PRODUCTS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, on May 14, 1942, acting for the so-called Oil Shortage Committee of the Senate, I addressed a letter to Mr. Leon Henderson, head of the Office of Price Administration; one to Mr. Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Coordinator; and one to Mr. Joseph B. Eastman, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, in connection with two problems which are causing great concern throughout the country.

At that time I asked that the special committee of which I am chairman be advised concerning the rubber shortage and the shortage of gasoline transportation facilities, and that it be given whatever information was available on the question of gasoline rationing.

I now ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD at this point a copy of my letter and a copy of each of the replies which I received from the gentlemen I have just mentioned.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MAY 14, 1942.

HON. HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Coordinator,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: During the past few weeks I have received many urgent suggestions that the Special Committee to Investigate Shortages of Gasoline, Fuel Oil, and Petroleum Products undertake a more intensive study—and hold hearings—in connection with the rationing of gasoline and the shortage of petroleum products in the Eastern States area.

For obvious reasons, I am hopeful that public hearings may be avoided; but I am

particularly anxious, as are all of the members of our committee, that we make every possible contribution to the gasoline problem, which is at least partially due to the shortage of transportation facilities. I have not wanted to unnecessarily bother executives and department officials who are extremely busy, and have been hopeful that all worthwhile information available might be submitted to us by mail. Some members of the Senate have felt that our committee should hold hearings. The pressure is great, and there is a likelihood that it will increase.

Is it reasonable that I request that you delegate someone under your jurisdiction to furnish me and the committee, of which I am chairman, with all available information that you feel we should have and are entitled to? I am personally confident that you are doing and have done everything that you felt could be done to relieve the situation, but I likewise feel that if we are better informed we can be helpful. If there are prospects for increased transportation facilities by water, and particularly over inland waterways, we should like to know about it. Can you tell me anything of the immediate prospects for an increase in the use of barges or other shipping facilities? Can you tell me what is "news" concerning the greater use of tank trucks? Can you tell me what future promise there is in the pipe-lines situation? Can you tell me whether or not any pipe lines from the east-coast area are being used to transport petroleum toward the West, or whether or not all existing pipe lines in the "distressed" States are being used to transport petroleum products to the "rationed" area?

If you will give me the information available on these subjects, and such other information as you can, I shall be very grateful. For obvious reasons, I should like to have it at the earliest possible time.

I am writing a similar letter to Price Administrator Leon Henderson; Mr. Joseph B. Eastman, Director of Defense Transportation; and Admiral E. S. Land; and I know, of course, that certain inquiries herein should not be directed to you.

For the consideration you will give this request I shall be grateful.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS MALONEY.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 4, 1942.

The Honorable FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: In response to your letter of May 14, the fuel-rationing branch of the Office of Price Administration has prepared the enclosed study on Nation-wide Gasoline Rationing and the Conservation of Passenger Automobile Tires. This study may be of interest to your committee, since it demonstrates that gasoline rationing would be necessary even in the absence of a gasoline shortage.

If I can be of any further assistance to you, do not hesitate to call upon me.

Very truly yours,

LEON HENDERSON,
Administrator.

NATION-WIDE GASOLINE RATIONING AND THE CONSERVATION OF PASSENGER AUTOMOBILE TIRES

(Prepared by Office of Price Administration, Fuel Rationing Branch, Research and Analysis Section, for submission to the Special Senate Committee to Investigate Shortage of Gasoline, Fuel Oil, and Petroleum Products)

I. SUMMARY

1. A total of less than 5,000,000 new tires are available for use on private passenger automobiles during 1942, 1943, and 1944.

2. Present plans call for only 6,000,000 passenger car tires top-caps annually.

3. The 27,000,000 passenger automobiles equipped with tires that were put in service before January 1942, are the country's major source of passenger transportation for the next 3 years.

4. If 1941 driving habits continue, only 4.6 million passenger cars will be on the roads on January 1, 1945.

5. Nation-wide gasoline rationing would keep at least 8.5 million passenger automobiles in service through 1944.

6. No combination of tire conservation measures, that does not include Nation-wide gasoline rationing, can hope to avert a serious transportation crisis.

II. SUPPLY OF PASSENGER CAR TIRE REPLACEMENTS IS VERY LIMITED

For at least 2 years, the only passenger car tire replacements will be the tires which were in stock pile and on new cars on the first of this year, plus a limited quantity of reclaim for top-caps. Only an infinitesimal quantity of crude rubber can be released for passenger car use, and an excess of synthetic rubber production over military requirements is not yet assured.

Passenger car tires in inventory on January 1, 1942, are officially reported to number 8,000,000. However, this estimate is admittedly conservative. Rough calculations based upon Rubber Manufacturers Association reports produce a figure that is 1,600,000 higher. Accordingly, it is probable that the actual number of new tires in stock at the beginning of this year was in the neighborhood of 9,000,000.

Unfortunately, not all of these tires can be distributed to passenger-car owners. During the first 4 months of this year only 47.4 percent of the tires released by the Office of Price Administration, Tire Rationing Branch were put on passenger automobiles. The remainder went to the operators of small trucks. Expected stiffening of tire eligibility requirements and the fact that trucks consume tires at a faster rate than do passenger cars make it probable that only one-third of the January 1, 1942, inventory, or a total of 3,000,000 tires will be available for passenger-car use.

The Office of Price Administration, Automobile Rationing Branch, will release 400,000 passenger cars in 1942 and 135,000 in 1943. The proportion of these vehicles that will go to the Army is not known. A reasonable guess is that 75 percent of the cars rationed in 1942, and 50 percent of those released in 1943, will go to civilians. Using these percentages, a total of 368,000 new cars are available for nonmilitary use in the next 2 years. Since the tires on these automobiles were not included in the 9,000,000 tire inventory figure, the total of new tires for private passenger car use in future years must be revised upward to 4,840,000. This is less than one-sixth the number of tires sold for replacement purposes in 1941.

Present War Production Board plans call for supplying passenger car owners with 6,000,000 top caps per year. These caps, as provided by the new Victory Tire formula, contain 2 percent crude and 74 percent reclaimed rubber and will weigh on the average slightly less than 7 pounds each. The total of 13,875 tons of reclaim required annually by this program does not appear large when compared with this country's 350,000-ton reclaiming capacity. However, since 180,000 tons are needed each year for military purposes and for export, reclaiming plants must operate at greater than one-half their capacity before any reclaim can be supplied for civilian consumption. At any output less than 350,000 tons, top-capping requirements would probably be scaled down in order to meet other more pressing civilian needs.

If the rate of output achieved in January, February, and March is maintained, a little more than 300,000 tons of reclaim will be produced in 1942. This output would make possible fulfillment of most of the War Production Board top-capping program. However, reclaimers' stocks of scrap rubber declined by 45,821 tons from December 31, 1941, to February 28, 1942. Since total stocks on February 28, 1942, were only 154,747 tons, continuance of this rate of decline would cause complete cessation of reclaiming operations by the middle of September of this year. If the fall in stocks that occurred in February alone is projected into the future, an only moderately more cheering picture results. Continuance of the February rate of decline would postpone the shutting down of reclaiming plants until the middle of February 1943.

The drying up of the flow of scrap rubber to reclaimers may be due to either, or both, of two causes. Scrap dealers may be hoarding scrap in hope of rising prices; or current methods of collecting scrap from the public may be inadequate. It is unlikely that an actual shortage of scrap rubber now exists, or will exist for several years, since estimates of the amount of scrap in existence run from 800,000 to 10,000,000 tons. Even if the lower of these figures proves correct, rubber products scrapped in the future should prevent any real scrap shortage from arising (at the present rate of reclaiming), earlier than sometime in 1945. If the problem of reclaiming synthetic rubber has been solved by that time, the scrap shortage will be further postponed.

Even if improvement in the scrap situation were to make possible the top capping of 6,000,000 passenger-car tires this year and in future years, there is no reason to regard the motor transport problem as solved. Preliminary results of road tests being conducted by the National Bureau of Standards indicate that at speeds less than 40 miles per hour a 74-percent reclaim top cap will wear out in less than 6,000 miles. This means that at best the top-capping program will add 36,000,000,000 miles to passenger car mileage each year, which is only 15.17 percent of the distance traveled by passenger cars in 1940. Looked at another way, 6,000,000 top caps will equip 1,263,579 cars (at 4.75 tires per car) and allow them to run 6,000 miles per year. This number is 16 percent of the 7,500,000 cars which it is estimated are absolutely essential to the success of the war production program.

In short, fulfillment of present plans for top capping passenger-car tires will only slightly check the fall in the number of cars that can be kept in operation. The decline in scrap available for reclaiming makes doubtful the realization of even these modest plans.

Table I shows the crude and synthetic rubber position of the United Nations for 1942 and 1943. It was drawn up by the Office of the Coordinator for Rubber on the assumption that no synthetic rubber and only about 500 tons of crude (to be used in top caps) could be allotted to passenger-car owners in 1942 and 1943. The deficit shown at the end of 1943 indicates how impossible it would be to alter this assumption without curtailing some other type of use.

Such curtailment appears to be impossible. The requirement estimates shown in the table are in all cases either at or below the minimum amounts necessary to the prosecution of the war. Provision for the needs of most Latin-American countries has been eliminated. Estimates for Russia that were used by the War Production Board in March have been cut almost in half. American civilians are allotted, in 1942 and 1943 combined, only 39 percent as much rubber as they consumed in the single year 1941. Lend-lease, United States Navy, and Maritime Commission estimates represent absolute minima. And the figures used for the United States Army and Air Corps have not yet been accepted by the military authorities.

The supply side of the crude and synthetic picture likewise offers no hope of squeezing out some rubber for passenger cars. A significant improvement in the crude-rubber situation within the next few years can occur only if the Japanese are driven from south-

eastern Asia. Increased output in Brazil and other tropical rubber-producing areas accessible to the United Nations can be effected only after several years of intensive effort. Similarly little can be expected in the near future from native rubber plants, such as guayule. The synthetic supply picture is no better. Less than complete unanimity exists on the attainability of the 300,000-ton output planned for 1943. Recent action by the Coordinator for Rubber to raise synthetic production goals may result in an improved situation in 1944, but prospects for 1943 are not likely to be affected

TABLE I.—*Consolidated crude and synthetic rubber position of the United Nations for 1942 and 1943*

1942 (THOUSAND LONG TONS)	
Sources of supply:	
Stock pile Jan. 1, 1942	706
New crude, less sinkings	453
Synthetic production, United States of America	28
Synthetic production, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	54
Total supply, 1942	1,241
Requirements:	
U. S. Army and Air Corps	242
U. S. Navy and Maritime Commission	29
Lend-Lease	82
Civilian	150
Other countries	310
Total requirements, 1942	813
Surplus, end of 1942	428
1943 (THOUSAND LONG TONS)	
Sources of supply:	
Stock pile, Jan. 1, 1943	428
New crude, less sinkings	61
Synthetic production, United States of America	300
Synthetic production, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	72
Total supply, 1943	861
Requirements:	
U. S. Army and Air Corps	356
U. S. Navy and Maritime Commission	37
Lease-Lend	82
Civilian	120
Other countries	271
Total requirements, 1943	866
Deficit, end of 1943	5

Even if the estimates in table I were miraculously to prove pessimistic, only the prospective appearance of a 150,000-ton surplus at the end of 1943 could release any rubber for passenger-car tires or recaps. The Requirements Committee of War Production Board has declared that it is imperative that this amount of crude rubber be available for combining with synthetic in 1944 and subsequent years. The conclusion is inescapable that, until 1944, at least, no crude or synthetic rubber can be used to keep passenger cars in operation.

It is possible that sufficient synthetic rubber will be produced in 1944 to permit the manufacture of some passenger-car tires in that year. However, since this is merely a possibility, it is more prudent to assume that replacements for passenger-car tires for the years 1942 through 1944 will be limited to 4,840,000 new tires, plus 18,000,000 top caps. If the average top cap lasts 1 year and if the average new tire lasts 3 years, these two sources will keep 2,283,000 cars (at 4.75 tires per car) on the roads through 1944. All other cars in service at the end of that year will be using tires that were in use before January 1, 1942.

III. CONTINUANCE OF 1941 DRIVING HABITS WOULD RAPIDLY WEAR OUT EXISTING TIRES

Chart I [1] shows the decline in the number of passenger automobiles that could be kept in service if 1941 driving habits were continued. Comparison of the line depicting total cars on the roads with that for cars using tires received before January 1, 1942, indicates the relative unimportance of the tire replacements available after that date.

The seriousness of the threatened retirement of over five-sixths of our passenger cars by the end of 1944 can be appreciated upon consideration of the importance of the private automobile in the national economy. Estimates of the number of passenger cars that are essential to the operation of the economy run from as low as 7,500,000 to as high as 20,000,000. Differences between various estimates are probably the result of different assumptions as to the degree of control over automobile use that will be exercised in the future. Thus, the 20,000,000 figure may be applicable to a situation involving very little modification of present car-use habits. The 7,500,000 estimate might be appropriate if only essential driving were permitted and if drastic measures were taken to enforce the most efficient use of all transportation facilities.

If only 7,500,000 passenger automobiles are regarded as indispensable, insurmountable difficulties will not be encountered until the spring of 1944.

If the correct figure is 20,000,000, problems will arise as early as this summer. In either case, the picture presented is extremely serious. The necessity for vigorous action to conserve the disappearing stock of passenger-car tires cannot be questioned.

IV. METHODS OF DEALING WITH THE PASSENGER-CAR TIRE PROBLEM

The numerous suggestions for avoiding, postponing, or lessening the effect of the threatened disappearance of passenger cars from the highways may be classified under four heads:

A. Increasing the capacity and regulating the use of local public transit systems

Large-scale provision of new transit equipment is precluded by the shortages of metals. New busses have the special disadvantage of requiring, on the average, 90 pounds of crude rubber per bus for tires. Staggering hours to spread peak loads and limiting transit privileges to persons traveling in connection with war work would replace only part of the essential transportation service now provided by passenger cars. Private automobiles traveled almost 500,000,000,000 passenger-miles in 1939; busses and electric railways, under 50,000,000,000. If only 40 percent of the private automobile passenger-mileage were regarded as absolutely essential, and if busses and electric railways were to double their 1939 record—a practical impossibility—150,000,000,000 essential passenger-miles would be required of private automobiles. If each car averaged a load of 2½ persons—the present figure is 1.7—and traveled 10,000 miles per year, the services of 6,000,000 passenger cars would still be necessary. Improving local public transit facilities and planning for their more efficient use are indispensable projects but they fall short of solving the transportation problem.

B. Better tire care

It is demonstrated in appendix B that a 10-percent increase in tire mileage is easily attainable if methods can be found to induce car owners to take better care of their tires. A publicity campaign with this end in view is already under way, but more direct action seems called for. Specifically, a Nation-wide 40-mile-per-hour speed limit should be imposed at once. The advisability of a system of compulsory tire inspections, however, is debatable, in view of the tremendous administrative problem involved. The principal advantages of inspections would be to educate the car owner in approved methods of tire care and to make certain that tires are not worn beyond the point where recapping is still possible. Whether or not these advantages overbalance the administrative difficulties increased tire care is only one way to prolong tire life. The elimination of all nonessential mileage is a still more promising conservation move.

C. Requisitioning tires or automobiles

One way to curtail unnecessary driving is to retire a large number of cars from active use through Federal purchase of either the tires on such cars or the cars themselves. Both measures involve the same kind of difficulties—complex administrative problems, inadequate storage facilities, and possible inflationary effects of the financial outlay involved. The last two difficulties would be more acute in the case of cars than in that of tires. But this is counterbalanced by the fact that requisitioning tires would likely result in greater deterioration of the cars affected than would occur if entire cars were put under Government supervision. The advantage seems to lie with the automobile purchase plan, since the Government would thereby acquire stock piles of automobiles and automobile parts, as well as a large number of tires.

Requisitioning automobiles should not be regarded as an alternative to gasoline rationing, but as an invaluable supplement to such a program. Some cars are used solely for nonessential purposes. Gasoline rationing cannot completely immobilize nonessential automobiles without risking rapid deterioration of tires. Under an automobile requisitioning plan the Government can ensure proper storage of tires and reserve them for essential transportation needs. In view of the urgency of the tire problem, achievement of this end more than compensates for any difficulties entailed in a large-scale requisitioning program.

D. Elimination of unnecessary use of cars left in private hands

Gasoline rationing is the only satisfactory method of reducing unnecessary use of privately held automobiles. Local campaigns to encourage joint car use are desirable, but cannot have either the scope or the sanctions necessary for effectively dealing with the transportation problem. Tire rationing cannot regulate the use of tires in private hands.

The great advantage of gasoline rationing is that it is a means of continuous control over car use, which can be fitted to the essential driving requirements of each car owner. Moreover, it can be rapidly adjusted to conform to changes in the general transportation situation, or in the needs of individuals. Compared with its potentialities for enforcing conservation of tires, the administrative problems of a gasoline rationing system are insignificant.

The magnitude of the tire conservation that would be effected by establishing Nation-wide gasoline rationing on July 1 of this year is indicated in chart III. It should be noted that the only difference between the top line on this chart and the bottom line is that the former takes account of the estimated 15-percent reduction in mileage driven during the first half of 1942 and assumes the existence after July 1, 1942, of a national gasoline rationing system similar to the emergency plan now in effect along the Atlantic seaboard. No reductions of mileage are recognized beyond those enforced by gasoline rationing, nor is any increase in tire care over that prevailing in 1941 assumed. Both lines reflect the

[1] See appendix A for method used in calculating figures used in the chart.

anticipated results of tire, automobile, and top-cap rationing. In other words, the bottom line shows what would happen if car owners behaved in 1942, 1943, and 1944 exactly as they behaved in 1941; the top line depicts the radically different result that would obtain if mileage driven were curtailed by extension nationally of the present regional gasoline rationing system.

Chart III [1] indicates that even a relatively mild gasoline rationing system would maintain the number of passenger cars in use above 7,500,000 until the spring of 1945. Continuance of 1941 driving habits, on the other hand, would cause this danger point to be reached in the spring of 1944. The difference between 1944 and 1945 is more than merely a 1-year postponement of disaster. It is a 12-month period that may well be needed to solve the rubber problem and eliminate completely the threat of a transportation break-down. Synthetic rubber for passenger car tires is a probability in 1945; it is only a possibility in 1944.

Even if an optimistic view is taken of synthetic rubber prospects for 1944, the situation confronting the country in 1943 is more than serious enough to justify Nation-wide gasoline rationing. Continuance of 1941 driving practices would reduce the number of passenger automobiles on the roads to 8,672,000 by the end of 1943. If a national 40-mile-per-hour speed limit were to reduce tire wear for the year by 15 percent, if a publicity campaign for better tire care could save another 15 percent, and if voluntary mileage curtailment accounted for another 20 percent—all of which are very optimistic assumptions—only 15,000,000 cars would remain in service on January 1, 1944. This figure is scarcely more than one-half the cars that were in service at the outset of 1942. Moreover, it is 5,000,000 units under one estimate of the number of passenger automobiles that are essential to the operation of the national economy. It is certain that the country could not absorb so severe a cut in its major source of passenger transportation without production for war being adversely affected. Some workers would be unable to get to their present places of employment. Others would be late several times each week. Many would have their efficiency impaired due to the necessity of using inconvenient or exhausting means of getting to and from work.

Under the best circumstances that are conceivable, failure to institute national gasoline rationing in the middle of 1942 will produce in 1943 a situation which will seriously threaten the success of the war-production program. Gasoline rationing will result in at least the amount of passenger-car conservation indicated in chart III. If necessary it could be used to prolong further the life of existing tires. More nonessential driving could be eliminated. Also, the rationing system could enforce more efficient car use through making compliance with doubling-up plans a condition to the receipt of supplementary ration coupons.

The seriousness of the passenger-car tire situation justifies the use of all appropriate means to conserve tires and to improve the utilization of dwindling passenger transportation facilities. However, no combination of measures that does not include Nation-wide gasoline rationing can hope to avert a real transportation crisis before the end of 1943.

APPENDIX A. EXPLANATION OF CHARTS

Chart I. Passenger automobiles in service, with continuance of 1941 driving habits

1. Major steps in calculating figures used:

(a) Data on quarterly shipments of passenger-car tires were arranged in frequency distribution on basis of miles driven annually.

(b) Assuming average tire to last for 20,000 miles, expiration dates were calculated for each of the age and mileage classes set up in "a."

(c) The number of tires still in service on any given date was computed by subtracting from total tires sold before that date the number of tires that should be worn out by that date.

(d) Tires were converted to cars on the assumption that each car has 4.75 tires.

(e) Adjustment was made for tires released by ration boards on the assumption that—

(1) The present rate of release will continue.

(2) The proportion of tires going to passenger-car owners (as opposed to small-truck owners) will fall linearly from its present level of less than 50 percent at a rate consistent with the distribution of only one-third of the total tire inventory to passenger-car owners.

(3) All tires released will last at least 3 years.

(4) Each car has 4.75 tires.

(f) Adjustment was made for new cars released by ration boards on the assumption that—

(1) Seventy-five percent of the 400,000 cars to be sold in 1942, and 50 percent of the 135,000 to be sold in 1943, will go to civilian users.

(2) The tires on new cars will last at least 3 years.

(g) Adjustment was made for the 6,000,000 top caps planned annually on the asumption that—

(1) A top cap will last 1 year.

(2) Each car has 4.75 tires.

2. Assumptions implicit in the above process:

(a) The proportion of drivers in each of the annual mileage classes (1a above) is the same each year.

(b) Habits of tire care (speed, inflation, wheel alinement, etc.) do not change.

(c) Any given tire is driven the same distance each year of its life.

(d) If any car owner is reduced to fewer tires than are needed to operate his car, he will immediately turn over his good tires to another owner who will put them to use.

3. The apparent inconsistency of the results for April 1, 1943, with the general trend of decline is probably due to the cumulative effect of several operations in which figures were rounded off to the nearest thousand. It is almost certain that the combined tire mortality of the first two quarters of 1943 will be spread evenly over the entire 6-month period, instead of being concentrated in the second quarter year.

Chart II. Passenger automobiles in service, with Nation-wide gasoline rationing

Comment on chart I is applicable to chart II with the following exceptions:

1. A 15-percent reduction in driving during the first 6 months of 1943 was assumed.

(a) Note that a 15-percent reduction in driving, due to the distribution of tire-life expectancies, resulted in a slightly smaller decrease in tire retirements.

2. An annual mileage frequency distribution consistent with the present eastern gasoline-rationing system was used after July 1, 1942.

Chart III. Passenger automobiles in service

This chart presents, for purposes of comparison, the totals arrived at in charts I and II.

APPENDIX B. EFFECT OF CARE UPON TIRE LIFE

Significant increases in tire mileage may be obtained by universal adoption of approved methods of tire conservation.

1. Tires driven at 40 miles per hour will last 30 percent longer than those driven at 50 miles per hour. If one-half of all passenger-car mileage is at speeds above 40 miles per hour and if the average for this faster half of the total mileage is roughly 50 miles per hour, then the enforcement of a 40-mile-per-hour maximum speed limit would increase the lives of all passenger-car tires by at least 15 percent. The saving might be even greater because tire wear increases with speed more than linearly.

2. A driver who systematically changes the position of the tires upon his car will get at least 20 percent more tire mileage than a driver who does not make such changes. If one-half of all car owners do not today follow proper methods of tire rotation, a change in their habits could increase the mileage of all passenger-car tires by 10 percent.

3. Correction of tire underinflation of 10 percent will add 5½ percent to tire mileage. If one-half the tires are underinflated 10 percent over one-half the time, a 3 percent addition to the life of all passenger-car tires might be expected from correcting this condition.

4. The combined effects of the above improvements in tire care would add over 25 percent to the mileage obtainable from existing passenger-car tires. Certainly the results of vigorous measures directed at improving tire care could not fall below a 10-percent increase in tire mileage.

OFFICE OF PETROLEUM COORDINATOR FOR WAR,
Washington, May 29, 1942.

Hon. FRANCIS MALONEY,
Chairman, Special Committee to Investigate Shortages of Gasoline, Fuel Oil, and Petroleum Products, United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MALONEY: I have received your letter of May 14.

In response to the questions which you have asked therein relative to changes in the east-coast oil-supply situation, I am enclosing in duplicate a memorandum to me from E. B. Swanson, director of the Division of Research in the Petroleum Coordinator's office. This memorandum presents information as to the current status of the subjects about which you inquired.

In response to your request that I delegate someone in my office to furnish you and your committee with all available information which I feel you should have and are entitled to, I designate Mr. Swanson to act in this capacity. Appropriate arrangements should be made by you and your committee with Mr. Swanson for the submission of such information.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Coordinator for War.

OFFICE OF PETROLEUM COORDINATOR FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE—INTEROFFICE COMMUNICATION

From: E. B. Swanson.
To: Secretary Ickes.
Date: May 25, 1942.
Subject: Information requested by Senator MALONEY.

1. Prospects for increased transportation facilities by water, particularly over inland waterways: The facilities for transporting oil to the east coast are of four types: (a) Direct tanker or barge shipments through the Straits of Florida; (b) tanker or barge shipments along the Gulf coast to points in west Florida, from where further movement now is possible by tank car; (c) barge shipments up the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to western Pennsylvania and West Virginia; and (d) lake tanker and barge movements on the Great Lakes to western New York and eastward through the New York State Barge Canal.

Tanker movements depend upon the security which may be afforded. Because of diversions to military services and losses, damages, and delays through enemy action, it is indicated that tankers cannot be counted

[1] See Appendix A for method used in calculating figures in the chart.

upon for the regular movement of oil to the east coast.

Increased movement of oil to the east coast by barges must await the completion of certain pipe-line relaying and rerouting. There are not enough barges and towboats on hand or building to increase materially the present barge movements to the east coast. According to the final report of the Inland Barge Petroleum Transportation Committee, there are 851 steel barges in petroleum service, with a total cubic capacity of 6,423,298 barrels, and 76, with a total cubic capacity of 687,940 barrels, under construction. The same report shows that there are 329 towboats and tugs in petroleum service, with 2 building. In addition, there are 1,028 steel barges now used in various dry cargo services which are suitable for conversion to petroleum carriers. The use of these barges now is being analyzed by an industry committee to determine the possibility of substituting wooden barges and power therefor in order to release them for petroleum service.

If all of the 851 barges with related towing equipment, reported as now in constant use and service in carrying oil on inland waterways, could be and were put in a single service of moving petroleum from Texas to Pittsburgh (via Gulf Intracoastal Waterway, Mississippi and Ohio Rivers) allowing 47 days for a round-trip voyage, this entire equipment could deliver only 136,000 barrels per day to Pittsburgh (6,423,298 barrels divided by 47). Such a concentration would not be possible, as all of this equipment now is in constant use, a major part of which is essential. Further, some of the power equipment would not be suitable for use on the Ohio River.

Substantial rearrangement of normal facilities will be necessary before the present barge facilities can be expected to move much more oil to the east coast. For instance, barges now are used to transport gasoline from Gulf coast refineries to Baton Rouge, La., for movement eastward via the Plantation pipe line. Project 2b covers the construction from second-hand material of a 10-inch feeder line of 200 miles from Port Arthur to Baton Rouge, with a capacity of 60,000 barrels daily. This will eliminate the present need for barges or tankers in moving gasoline to Baton Rouge and make them available for other services. Those in charge of this project anticipate that 4 months will be required for its completion. There are other projects of a similar nature in which second-hand material will be used to lay or rearrange pipe lines to move oil overland to points on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, such as Helena, Ark., and Paducah, Ky., from where the oil will be moved east by a combination of barge and tank-car shipments. These changes will shorten the present inland-barge movements and enable the same number of barges to move larger quantities of oil over the shorter distances which then will be required for the barges.

Calculations made by the Transportation Division show that 350,000 tons of new steel will deliver the following quantities of crude oil per day from Port Arthur to the Philadelphia-New York refining area.

	Barrels per day
Tankers, normal conditions	505,500
Tankers, 75-percent efficiency	377,800
Tankers, present efficiency	302,500
Tank cars, including power	177,500
Pipe line	300,000
Barges, Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to Pittsburgh, thence by pipe line	176,200

Project 4 covers the rearrangement of supplies in the Great Lakes region, an increase in the Great Lakes pipe-line movement and a reduction of lake tanker shipments to Duluth, all of which will permit diversion of about 10,000 barrels daily from Chicago to Buffalo, by barge and lake tanker.

Attached is a report on the "Utility of Inland and Intracoastal Waterways for Movement of Petroleum and Petroleum Products," prepared by the Transportation Division.

2. The use of tank trucks: As of May 1, 1942, there were about 45,000 tank cars engaged in moving petroleum from Districts 2 and 3 into District 1. Of this number about 10,000 previously operated within District 1, 20,000 were taken from services within District 2, 13,000 from services within District 3, and 2,000 from services within District 4. Accordingly, 35,000 tank cars have been withdrawn from their normal services in Districts 2, 3, and 4 and placed in the east coast service. The transportation formerly supplied by these tank cars has been replaced largely by tank trucks.

Under Directive 50 and Office of Defense Transportation Orders Nos. 7 and 7B, it is estimated that an additional 15,000 tank cars will be withdrawn from their present services and diverted to the east coast service. Under these orders permits are required for tank-car movements within 100 miles of the shipping point. This will place an additional short-haul burden on tank trucks.

The tire situation is involved in the continued use of tank trucks to replace services previously performed by tank cars. Much of this service is to essential industries in the Middle West and, as the tires wear out and cannot be replaced, it is likely that a substantial number of the tank cars diverted to the east coast service may have to be recalled to the Middle West.

Accordingly, while it is estimated that the expected 60,000 tank cars may move 800,000 barrels daily to the east coast, other demands for some of the cars and other factors may limit the continued delivery of oil by tank car to the east coast to 600,000 barrels daily, according to competent opinion.

3. Reversal of eastern pipe lines: There are three pipe lines which previously transported gasoline westward from the Atlantic coast. All of these are being reversed.

The Tuscarora pipe line runs from the Bayonne, N. J., area to Midland, Pa., near the Ohio-Pennsylvania border, via Harrisburg, Pa. Gasoline now is pumped westward as far as Harrisburg, with the remainder of the line closed down. Pumps are now being set at Midland in order to pump gasoline east, which is expected to start about the middle of June. At that time it is planned to pump about 12,000 barrels daily from Midland to Harrisburg and possibly beyond.

The Susquehanna pipe line formerly moved gasoline from Philadelphia to Cleveland, but now is not pumping westward beyond York, Pa. At the western end of the line about 5,000 barrels daily of gasoline are being pumped eastward from Cleveland to Cessna.

The Keystone pipe line moved gasoline from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh, via Reading and Harrisburg. The line now is pumping small quantities of gasoline westward as far as Harrisburg and about 4,000 barrels daily eastward from Pittsburgh. Crude oil now is being accumulated in the Pittsburgh area to fill the line, after which it will move 19,000 to 20,000 barrels daily of crude oil from Pittsburgh to Philadelphia. It is expected that this crude oil movement will start this week.

Project 3 covers the laying of a connecting line between the Sohio system at Tiffin, Ohio, and the Susquehanna system near Akron. This, or an alternative proposal involving barges between Toledo and Cleveland, will supply the 10,000 barrels daily of gasoline for movement eastward over the Susquehanna pipe line.

E. B. SWANSON,
Director of Research.

OFFICE FOR EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT,
OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION,
Washington, D. C., May 23, 1942.

HON. FRANCIS MALONEY,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Your letter of May 14 is received.

I am asking my assistant, Fayette B. Dow, to call upon you and discuss some of the subjects referred to. Others, as you suggest, do not come within my immediate jurisdiction.

I have issued an order which contains the framework of a comprehensive control over tank cars. As a start, the application of the permit system is limited to hauls within 100 miles, for which in some instances tank trucks are available, with a view of getting as many of the cars as possible into long-haul service, for which they are indispensable. We are studying all of the short hauls for which permits are asked, and, as we deal with each industry through contact committees as well as individual shippers, are endeavoring to reduce cross hauling on the longer movements. In many instances it has been possible to replace tank cars with tank trucks, thus releasing the cars for the long hauls to the East. Tank trucks are so much more efficient for short hauls that often one will replace several tank cars.

Your inquiry relates particularly to petroleum and the shortage in the Eastern States. From 70,000 barrels daily in the week before Pearl Harbor the movement to this area has steadily grown to more than 684,000 barrels a day last week. How much this movement can be increased is uncertain, depending, as it does, upon a number of factors. Some of these are (a) the car supply that can be made available and the maintenance of the cars in serviceable condition; (b) the extent to which hauls can be shortened by taking supplies from origins closer than the Southwestern States; (c) greater consolidation of shipments through the organization of cooperative receiving agencies making possible the unloading of the cars at centrally located terminals, from which the further distribution may be made by tank truck; and (d) the ability of the railroads to handle the traffic together with increases in other important traffic, such as coal to New England.

I think it can fairly be said that with respect to the rate of increase and the volume itself an excellent job has been done by the railroads and the shippers up to this time, but I feel that a substantial further improvement can be made. If, however, we work on the assumption—which I hope future developments will prove incorrect—that the movement of petroleum by tanker is cut indefinitely, or that the volume by that agency will be small, the question of available tank-car supply becomes very important. This is because the rate of transportation by pipe line to the Atlantic seaboard area (now about 140,000 barrels per day) and by barge (now about 50,000 barrels per day) cannot be materially increased for some months at least.

Tank cars are needed for a large number of commodities essential to the war effort, such as vegetable oils, chemicals, and a growing volume of alcohol as a raw material for powder, although, of course, petroleum requires the largest number. Our surveys indicate an increased demand for tank cars for all of these important commodities. For example, data supplied by the Department of Agriculture indicate an increase in vegetable oils from 57,000 tank-car loads in 1941 to over 73,000 carloads in 1942.

Without burdening this letter with too much detail, the situation which we are facing clearly indicates the necessity of getting the greatest possible use out of a limited tank car supply. This can best be done in the case of oil to New England by train lot movements run solid from point of origin to a

single terminal at which the cars can be unloaded and started back empty, also in a solid block, within 24 hours. From this terminal the oil can be distributed by tank trucks. Several points within New England would, of course, be selected as terminals for such movements. Rapidity of turn around in railroading is gained mainly by avoidance of switching and reclassification in railroad yards. To accomplish this solid-train-to-one-terminal movement would require, I think, the organization of a single receiving agency by the New England oil companies. It was natural in the early stages of the unusual movement that the effort should have been made by the companies individually and that the carloads of petroleum products should have been billed to a diversity of destinations thus scattering the cars and delaying their return. But the fact that New England's requirements are several hundred carloads per day above the highest level yet reached calls now for a kind of planning which will enable the railroads to give the available cars the most rapid turn around that is practical.

Movement of oil in tank cars cannot be depended upon as a satisfactory agency of supply for any extended period of time, and will not meet all the needs even for a short period of time. Pipe lines are much more dependable and economical. A substantial enlargement of pipe-line capacity to the East should be made as rapidly as possible. While the shortage of steel is a factor which must be considered under immediate conditions, there is much that can be done by relaying existing pipe, and some steps are being taken in this direction.

The outlook for increased deliveries by pipe line to the East depends upon the accomplishment of two principal objectives:

First, the rearrangement and relocation of lines, including reversal of direction of flow, by the use of pipe available in present company and dealer stocks and additional footage obtained by removal of lines not presently being used to full capacity whose operations can be taken over by other companies having lines in the same general territory. This reconstruction is primarily dependent upon the correlated efforts of several pipe-line companies. No substantial progress has been made as far as actual construction is concerned, but these projects are well along in a final planned stage and more rapid progress can be expected from this point on.

Second. There are various projects still in the planning stages for the construction of lines which would require the allocation of new steel. One of these, for example, is a 20-inch line from east Texas to Salem, Ill., and another is the proposed 24-inch national defense line from east Texas to the eastern seaboard.

With reference to your question regarding westward movements of petroleum products from the east, there are no westward movements of crude oil. However, certain products lines are supplying the rationed area approximately as far west as the Susquehanna River. With these exceptions, lines which formerly pumped gasoline westward have either been reversed or are in process of reversal. Current plans call for completing the reversal of all of the west-bound gasoline lines.

So far as barge movements are concerned, oil is now being moved in this way up the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers to Pittsburgh at the rate of about 50,000 barrels per day. There are two possibilities for increasing the movement by barge to the east. One is by use of the Intracoastal Waterway along the Atlantic coast. The other is by further use of the Mississippi River system. Both will require the construction of new equipment.

The Intracoastal Waterway is capable of operations by vessels of at least 11-foot draught from Jacksonville, Fla., to Trenton, N. J. Below Jacksonville, there is a waterway along the coast to Port Everglades, and one thence across the State through Lake Okeechobee. These, however, will not permit the operation of vessels of much more than 6-foot draught. Along the Gulf coast, there is a good protected waterway from Texas to Port St. Joe, Fla., but none from there south. Apparently the best plan for moving oil by use of these waterways would be to operate barges to Port St. Joe, then carry the oil in a pipe line to Jacksonville, and thence by barge north.

It appears that by relaying pipe now unused in the Southwest, such a pipe line from Port St. Joe to Jacksonville could be built in a comparatively short time, of a capacity of something like 60,000 barrels per day.

So far as the Mississippi River system is concerned, the opportunities for moving oil northbound are unlimited, being dependent only upon the equipment which can be made available.

Both projects are dependent for any extensive use upon the construction of new barge and towing equipment. It appears that steel cannot be made available. The only alternative is wood. I enclose herewith a report from our Regulated River Carriers Committee which will be of interest. The whole subject, however, is being further explored by a committee which the President has appointed and of which I am a member. In addition to questions which must be resolved concerning the type and design of wooden barges and towboats, there are other questions in regard to motive power. Diesel engines, which would be the best power units, are not available. The alternatives are steam engines and gasoline engines. We are looking into these possibilities.

Very sincerely yours,

JOSEPH B. EASTMAN,
Director.

REGULATED RIVER CARRIERS COMMITTEE,
Pittsburgh, Pa., May 18, 1942.

MR. EDWARD CLEMENS,
Director, Division of Inland Waterway Transport, Office of Defense Transportation, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLEMENS: Attached to our letter of February 11, 1942, we forwarded to you and again recommended the adoption of the Regulated River Carriers Committee report of November 1, 1941, made to the Under Secretary of Commerce concerning the necessity of expanding the transportation facilities on the Mississippi River system, including a definite recommendation for the institution of an emergency river towboat and barge pool to be established by the Government of the United States for the purpose of building towboats and barges to be chartered or leased to regulated water carriers.

This report reached Director Eastman of the Office of Defense Transportation; Under Secretary of Navy Forrestal; Mr. Gilbert, former Director of Transportation in the Petroleum Coordinator's Office; and has been called to the attention of Mr. Donald Nelson of the War Production Board and others.

Since that time we have been advised that critical materials are not available for the recommended construction of all of the towboats and barges. In the light of this development, it is the desire of the committee to amend the recommendations of November 1, 1941, in order that construction of additional floating equipment requiring the use of a lesser amount of critical materials may be promptly undertaken.

The committee has considered the matter from all angles, including the following:

A. Possible conversion to liquid-carrying units of existing steel barges designed for the transportation of other war commodities.

B. The construction of towboats and barges with the use of a lesser amount of critical materials (steel, etc.).

The conversion of existing barges we find would entail the immediate withdrawal of barges from the service of carrying other commodities, principally war materials, in which they are now engaged. There are no surplus barges upon which conversion might be undertaken. The conversion to liquid-carrying units of standard steel barges known as Hopper type, 175 by 26 by 11 feet, which were built for the carrying of commodities not requiring protection from the weather would require approximately 50 tons of steel each, including piping and pumping equipment, and the steel Hopper barge 195 by 35 by 11 feet would require approximately 100 tons of steel, including piping and pumping equipment. Under existing conditions a period of approximately 45 days after the receipt of materials would be required for the conversion. If conversion were accomplished, it would be necessary to replace such converted barges in order to handle the vital war materials now being transported in them.

The original recommendation of the committee contemplated the building of towboats and barges according to the best design and practice obtaining on the rivers. It did not contemplate the use of wood in any hulls or in the superstructure of the boats except to a very limited extent. It did contemplate the use of Diesel engines for power. While it is admitted that barges can be constructed of wood, barges of such construction would require more power to handle than modern steel barges, and in the hauling of inflammable and combustible petroleum products they present a fire hazard to wharves, barges, cargoes, the accompanying towboats, and to locks and dams, if operating on rivers so equipped; the committee, therefore, recommends against the employment of wooden barges in the transportation of petroleum products in such stretches of the rivers.

Towboats with wooden hulls can be built, but it is the opinion of the committee that wooden boats powered sufficiently heavy to handle large tows would not be practical.

RECOMMENDATION

In view of the changed situation, particularly as to critical materials available for constructing river equipment, and the demand for the transportation of petroleum products, this committee recommends:

1. That there be constructed 100,000 tons capacity in wooden barges to be used for the transportation of petroleum products in bulk upstream on the Mississippi River as far as Cairo, Ill., for Ohio River, upper Mississippi River, and Illinois River destinations.

2. That the cargoes from the wooden barges be transferred to steel barges for transportation through the portions of the rivers which are slack watered by the use of locks and dams. It is recognized that direct transfer between wooden barges and steel barges could not be accomplished efficiently and without considerable towboat and barge delay except through a bulk storage plant erected in the vicinity of Cairo, Ill. This contemplates the withdrawal of an equivalent number of steel barges from service between New Orleans and Cairo to the service on the locked rivers.

3. That the wooden barges be loaded with the lower grades of petroleum products.

4. That there be constructed 150,000 tons capacity of wooden open barges for the handling of bulk commodities such as coal, sulfur, etc., which stow evenly over the surface of the barge.

5. That there be constructed the following towboats and tugs: Nine 2,000-horsepower towboats (steel hulls); nine 1,000–1,500 horsepower towboats (steel hulls); nine 600–750 horsepower boats and tugs (steel or wood hulls).

It is recommended that these boats be either stern-wheel or screw driven, dependent upon the character of the engines available and that steam equipment be used to the extent that Diesel engines cannot be provided.

Attention is drawn to the fact that additional towboats are even now of greater necessity than additional barges. There is

now enough power available to expeditiously move existing loaded barges up the waters of the Mississippi River System.

These recommendations are made with the knowledge that the available supply of skilled workmen, such as caulkers and ship carpenters, may not be adequate to accomplish such a comprehensive program with dispatch.

We have not attempted to go into the detailed design and the cost of the boats or barges, but if our recommendations meet with approval, the committee stands ready and willing to assist in this matter.

Very truly yours,

REGULATED RIVER CARRIERS COMMITTEE,
ANDREW P. CALHOUN, *Chairman.*

OIL PIPE LINE ACROS3 NORTHERN FLORIDA

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I present a letter from Petroleum Coordinator Harold L. Ickes which indicates that without the necessity of any legislation, and without the necessity of any direct appropriation, it is entirely possible to have an oil pipe line across northern Florida in operation within 120 days after construction begins. I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF PETROLEUM
COORDINATOR FOR WAR,
Washington, June 8, 1942.

Hon. ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR VANDENBERG: This will acknowledge your letter of June 5 asking to be advised as to the present status of the project endorsed by this office for the construction of a petroleum products pipe line across northern Florida from Port St. Joe to Jacksonville.

Two proposals have been submitted in connection with this project, each of which contemplates an 8-inch line which would deliver from 35,000 to 40,000 barrels of petroleum products daily to Jacksonville.

The first proposal for the construction of such a line, to cost approximately $3,000,000, was submitted by the American Liberty Pipe Line Co. On June 2, after studies had been conducted by my staff in collaboration with the Office of Defense Transportation, an appraisal of the proposal was submitted to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, from whom the American Liberty Pipe Line Co. is seeking a loan to finance the construction of the line. I have not as yet been informed of the decision of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on this matter. However, the company has assured me that it is ready to proceed with the construction of the line immediately if the Reconstruction Finance Corporation grants the loan, and that the line can be in operation within 120 days after the beginning of construction.

On June 1 this office received another proposal for the construction of a 10-inch line over substantially the same route. This proposal was made by the Sublik Oilbarge Co. and was amended on June 4, reducing to 8 inches the diameter of the proposed line because the company found that it would be unable to obtain second-hand 10-inch pipe and equipment. This proposal is now being appraised by my staff in collaboration with the Office of Defense Transportation. This proposal also contemplates Reconstruction Finance Corporation financing and our appraisal will be submitted to Reconstruction Finance Corporation within the next few days.

Because of the shortage of steel-barge equipment required to deliver products to Port St. Joe for movement through the line and to distribute the products from the Jacksonville terminus, it is the view of this office that only one products pipe line across Florida is justified at this time. If it is found that the two pipe-line proposals are equally satisfactory from the standpoint of this office, the decision as to which company should receive governmental financial assistance would be determined by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I wish to emphasize that the construction of a pipe line across northern Florida would provide only a small, although important, part of the necessary overland and protected waterways transportation facilities for moving petroleum to the shortage areas of the east coast. The various other measures advocated by this office and outlined by Mr. Parten to the Senate Committee on Commerce, including the relocation of existing pipe lines, the building of additional inland waterways equipment, and the construction of a 24-inch pipe line from Texas to the east coast, would, of course, remain essential to the successful solution of this critical problem.

My views on the proposal for a pipe line and a barge canal across central Florida are set forth in full in the report on S. 2426 which I submitted to Senator BAILEY, chairman of the Senate Committee on Commerce.

If you wish any further information on this matter I shall be pleased to furnish it.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Coordinator for War.

FREE LEGAL SERVICES TO OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN—LETTER BY SENATOR DANAHER

[Mr. McNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter addressed to him by Senator DANAHER, together with a newspaper article, relative to free legal services to officers and enlisted men, which appear in the Appendix.]

AMERICA'S LEADERSHIP IN THE WORLD'S CRISIS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject America's Leadership in the World's Crisis, delivered by him at the Holy Name breakfast of the postal employees, Buffalo, N. Y., on May 31, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

MESSAGES TO AMERICAN PALESTINE COMMITTEE

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD messages presented in behalf of many of the United Nations at the second annual dinner of the American Palestine Committee, Washington, D. C., May 25, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

PASTORAL LETTER OF MARCH 22, 1942, OF GERMAN CATHOLIC BISHOPS

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of the pastoral letter of German bishops of the Roman Catholic Church, read in the churches on Passion Sunday, March 22, 1942, published in the New York Times of June 7, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

STRAIGHT THINKING ON GASOLINE RATIONING—ADDRESS BY ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Hon. Alf M. Landon before the Executive Club, Chicago, Ill., Friday, June 5, 1942, on the subject Straight Thinking on Gasoline Rationing, which appears in the Appendix.]

IUS GENTIUM—ADDRESS BY MAX RADIN

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Ius Gentium," delivered by Prof. Max Radin at Boalt Hall, University of California, Berkeley, Calif., which appears in the Appendix.]

FUNDAMENTALS OF FREEDOM—ADDRESS BY E. E. WILSON

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by E. E. Wilson, president of the United Aircraft Corporation, delivered at the Union League Club of Chicago on May 28, on the subject Fundamentals of Freedom, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE YOUNG MAN'S MENTAL AND PHYSICAL APPROACH TO WAR—ADDRESS BY JAMES G. CONZELMAN

[Mr. BROOKS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by James G. Conzelman at the commencement exercises of the University of Dayton, May 10, 1942, on the subject The Young Man's Mental and Physical Approach to War, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN F. D. R. CELEBRATION—ARTICLE BY HERB GRAFFIS

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Herb Graffis, of the Chicago Times, entitled "An F. D. R. Celebration," which appears in the Appendix.]

FREIGHT-RATE DISCRIMINATIONS—EDITORIAL FROM LABOR RECORD

[Mr. OVERTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Labor Record, of New Orleans, La., of the issue of May 1942, relative to handicaps imposed on the South by the freight-rate structure, which appears in the Appendix.]

ANDREW JACKSON HIGGINS—EDITORIAL FROM THE LABOR RECORD

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "At the Citizen's Banquet," published in the Labor Record of New Orleans, La., of the issue of May 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. AUSTIN. I submit a conference report to accompany Senate bill 2025, the pay and allowances bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report will be read.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That, for the purpose of computing the annual pay of the commissioned officers of the Regular Army and Marine Corps below

the grade of brigadier general; of the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey below the grade of rear admiral; and of the Public Health Service below the grade of assistant to the Surgeon General, pay periods are prescribed, and the base pay for each is fixed as follows:

"The first period, $1,800; the second period, $2,000; the third period, $2,400; the fourth period, $3,000; the fifth period, $3,500; and the sixth period, $4,000.

"The pay of the sixth period shall be paid to colonels of the Army, captains of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade; to lieutenant colonels of the Army, commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, and lieutenant commanders of the line and Engineer Corps of the Coast Guard, who have completed thirty years' service; and to the Chief of Chaplains of the Army when not holding rank above that of colonel.

"The pay of the fifth period shall be paid to lieutenant colonels of the Army, commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the sixth period; and to majors of the Army, lieutenant commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed twenty-three years' service.

"The pay of the fourth period shall be paid to majors of the Army, lieutenant commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the fifth period; to captains of the Army, lieutenants of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed seventeen years' service.

"The pay of the third period shall be paid to captains of the Army, lieutenants of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the fourth period; to first lieutenants of the Army, lieutenants (junior grade) of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed ten years' service.

"The pay of the second period shall be paid to first lieutenants of the Army, lieutenants (junior grade) of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the third period; and to second lieutenants of the Army, ensigns of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed five years' service; and to contract surgeons serving full time.

"The pay of the first period shall be paid to all other officers whose pay is provided for in this section.

"Officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act temporarily appointed to higher grades or ranks shall, for the purposes of this Act, be considered officers of such grades or ranks while holding such temporary appointments.

"Every officer paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 per centum of the base pay of his period for each three years of service up to thirty years.

"For officers appointed on and after July 1, 1922, no service shall be counted for purposes of pay except active commissioned service under a Federal appointment and commissioned service in the National Guard when called out by order of the President and service authorized in section 2 (b) of the Act of January 19, 1942 (Public Law 402, Seventy-seventh Congress). For officers in the service on June 30, 1922, there shall be included in the computation all service which was then counted in computing longevity pay, and service as a contract surgeon serving full time; and also 75 per centum of all other periods of time during which they have held commissions as officers of the Organized Militia between January 21, 1903, and July 1, 1916, or of the National Guard, the Naval Militia, or the National Naval Volunteers since June 3, 1916, shall be included in the computation. Longevity pay for officers in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act shall be based on the total of all service in any or all of said services which is authorized to be counted for longevity pay purposes under the provisions of this Act or as may otherwise be provided by law.

"The provisions of this Act shall apply equally to those persons serving, not as commissioned officers in the Army or in the other services mentioned in the title of this Act, but whose pay under existing law is an amount equivalent to that of a commissioned officer of one of the above grades, those receiving the pay of colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, first lieutenant, and second lieutenant, being classified as in the sixth, fifth, fourth, third, second, and first periods, respectively.

"SEC. 2. The base pay of any enlisted man, warrant officer, or nurse (female) in the military or naval forces of the United States shall be increased by 20 per centum and the base pay of any commissioned officer of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act shall be increased by 10 per centum for any period of service while on sea duty as such duty may be defined by the head of the Department concerned, or duty in any place beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, which increases in pay shall be in addition to pay and allowances otherwise authorized: *Provided*, That the per centum increases herein authorized shall be included in computing increases in pay for aviation and submarine duty: *Provided further*, That this section shall be effective from December 7, 1941, and shall cease to be in effect twelve months after the termination of the present war is proclaimed by the President.

"SEC. 3. When officers of the National Guard or of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including Reserve officers, are authorized by law to receive Federal pay, those serving in grades corresponding to those of colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, first lieutenant, and second lieutenant of the Army shall receive the pay of the sixth, fifth, fourth, third, second, and first periods, respectively, unless entitled to the pay of a higher period under the provisions of section 14 of this Act. Such officers whenever entitled to Federal pay, except armory drill and administrative function pay, shall receive as longevity pay, in addition to base pay, an increase thereof at the per centum and time rates up to thirty years provided in section 1 of this Act. In computing the increase of pay for each period of three years' service, such officers shall be credited with full time for all periods during which they have held commissions as officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, or in the Organized Militia prior to July 1, 1916, or in the National Guard, National Guard of the United States, or in the Officers Reserve Corps, or in the Naval Militia, or in the National Naval Volunteers, or in the Naval Reserve force, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve force, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, when confirmed in grade and qualified for all general service.

"Members of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act who shall become entitled to Federal pay for a continuous period of less than one month at the rates fixed for the regular services shall receive such pay for each day of such period, and the thirty-first day of a calendar month shall not be excluded from the computation.

"Payments authorized under the provisions of the preceding paragraph may include the entire amount lawfully accruing to such persons as pay, allowances, and mileage on account of such service, and, including pay and mileage for their return home, may be paid to them during said period and prior to their departure from the camp or other place at which such service is performed.

"SEC. 4. The term 'dependent' as used in the succeeding sections of this Act shall include at all times and in all places a lawful wife and unmarried children under twenty-one years of age. It shall also include the father or mother of the person concerned provided he or she is in fact dependent on such person for his or her chief support: *Provided*, That the term 'children' shall be held to include stepchildren and adopted children when such stepchildren or adopted children are in fact dependent upon the person claiming dependency allowance.

"SEC. 5. Each commissioned officer on the active list, or on active duty, below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent, in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, shall be entitled at all times, in addition to his pay, to a money allowance for subsistence. The value of one subsistence allowance is hereby fixed at 70 cents per day. To each officer of any of the said services receiving the base pay of the first, second, third, or sixth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to two subsistence allowances, and to each officer receiving the base pay of the fourth or fifth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to three subsistence allowances: *Provided*, That an officer with no dependents shall receive one subsistence allowance in lieu of the above allowances.

"SEC. 6. Except as otherwise provided in this section, each commissioned officer below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent, in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, while either on active duty or entitled to active-duty pay shall be entitled at all times to a money allowance for rental of quarters.

"To an officer having a dependent, receiving the base pay of the first period the amount of said allowance shall be $60 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the second period the amount of this allowance shall be $75 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the third period the amount of this allowance shall be $90 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fourth period the amount of this allowance shall be $105 per month, and to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fifth or sixth period the amount of this allowance shall be $120 per month.

"To an officer having no dependents, receiving the base pay of the first period the amount of said allowance shall be $45 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the second period the amount of said allowance shall be $60 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the third period the amount of said allowance shall be $75 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fourth period the amount of said allowance shall be $90 per month, and to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fifth or sixth period the amount of said allowance shall be $105 per month.

"No rental allowance shall accrue to an officer having no dependents while he is on field or sea duty, nor shall any rental allowance accrue to an officer with or without dependents who is assigned quarters at his permanent station unless a competent superior authority of the service concerned certifies that such quarters are not adequate for the occupancy of the officer and his dependents, if any: *Provided*, That an officer although furnished with quarters shall be entitled to rental allowance as authorized in this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependents are prevented from occupying such quarters.

"Regulations in execution of the provisions of this section shall be made by the President and shall, whenever practicable, in his judg-

ment, be uniform for all of the services concerned, including adjunct forces thereof.

"SEC. 7. The annual base pay of a brigadier general of the Army or the Marine Corps, rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard, the Engineer in Chief of the Coast Guard, commodore of the Navy, an Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and an assistant to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, shall be $6,000; and the annual base pay of a major general of the Army or the Marine Corps and of a rear admiral (upper half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey or the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall be $8,000. Every such officer shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters authorized in sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the sixth period.

"Officers of the Navy serving in the grade of vice admiral, officers of the Army serving in the grade of lieutenant general, and officers of the other services mentioned in the title of this Act serving in corresponding grades, shall be entitled, while so serving, to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (upper half) and to a personal money allowance of $500 per year. Officers of the Navy serving in the grade of admiral or as Chief of Naval Operations, officers of the Army serving in the grade of general or as Chief of Staff of the Army, and officers of the other services mentioned in the title of this Act serving in corresponding grades, shall be entitled, while so serving, to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (upper half) and to a personal money allowance of $2,200 per year.

"SEC. 8. Warrant officers (junior grade) of the Army except first mates and assistant engineers of the Army Mine Planter Service, and warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, shall receive the base pay of the first period as established by section 1 of this Act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

"First mates and assistant engineers of the Army Mine Planter Service shall receive base pay at the rate of $1,950 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

"Chief warrant officers of the Army except masters in the Army Mine Planter Service, and commissioned warrant officers with less than ten years of commissioned service, of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, shall receive base pay at the rate of $2,100 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the second period: *Provided*, That a commissioned warrant officer or chief warrant officer promoted from the grade of warrant officer or warrant officer (junior grade) shall suffer no reduction of pay by reason of such promotion: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be held to affect the authority of the Secretary of War to designate permanent or temporary chief warrant officers of the Army to receive the base pay and allowances of the third and fourth pay periods as provided in section 3 of the Act approved August 21, 1941 (Public Law 230, Seventy-seventh Congress).

"Commissioned warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard with creditable records on the active list, after ten years of commissioned service, and masters in the Army Mine Planter Service, shall receive the base pay of the third period as established by section 1 of this Act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the third period.

"Commissioned warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, with creditable records on the active list, after twenty years of commissioned service, shall receive the base pay of the fourth period as established by section 1 of this Act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the fourth period.

"Every person paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 per centum of the base pay of his period for each three years of service, not exceeding thirty years. Such service shall be: active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act or Reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve: *Provided*, That commissioned warrant officers shall be credited only with all commissioned service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act including commissioned service in the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard.

"When the total pay and allowances authorized by this section for any person shall exceed the rate of $458.33 per month, the amount of the allowances to which such person is entitled shall be reduced by the amount above $458.33.

"SEC. 9. The monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be as follows: Enlisted men of the first grade, $138; enlisted men of the second grade, $114; enlisted men of the third grade, $96; enlisted men of the fourth grade, $78; enlisted men of the fifth grade, $66; enlisted men of the sixth grade, $52; and enlisted men of the seventh grade, $46. Chief petty officers under acting appointment shall be included in the first grade at a monthly base pay of $126.

"For purposes of pay enlisted men of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard shall be distributed in the several pay grades by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively.

"Every enlisted man paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 per centum of the base pay of his grade for each three years of service up to thirty years. Such service shall be active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act or Reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve.

"SEC. 10. To each enlisted man not furnished quarters or rations in kind there shall be granted, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, an allowance for quarters and subsistence, the value of which shall depend on the conditions under which the duty of the man is being performed, and shall not exceed $5 per day: *Provided*, That payments of allowances for quarters and subsistence may be made in advance to enlisted men under such regulations as the President may prescribe. These regulations shall be uniform for all the services mentioned in the title of this Act. Subsistence for pilots shall be paid in accordance with existing regulations, and rations for enlisted men may be commuted as now authorized by law.

"Each enlisted man of the first, second, or third grade, in the active military, naval, or Coast Guard service of the United States having a dependent as defined in section 4 of this Act, shall, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, be entitled to receive, for any period during which public quarters are not provided and available for his dependent, the monthly allowance for quarters authorized by law to be granted to each enlisted man not furnished quarters in kind: *Provided*, That such enlisted man shall continue to be entitled to this allowance although receiving the allowance provided in the first paragraph of this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependent is prevented from dwelling with him.

"Enlisted men entitled to receive allowances for quarters or subsistence, shall continue, while their permanent stations remain unchanged, to receive such allowances while sick in hospital or absent from their permanent-duty stations in a pay status: *Provided*, That allowances for subsistence shall not accrue to such an enlisted man while he is in fact being subsisted at Government expense.

"An enlistment allowance equal to $50, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the first three grades who reenlists within a period of three months from the date of his discharge, and an enlistment allowance of $25, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the other grades who reenlists within a period of three months from the date of his discharge: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not affect the provisions of the Act approved August 18, 1941 (Public Law 215, Seventy-seventh Congress): *Provided further*, That during the present war and for six months thereafter the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (Public Law 215, Seventy-seventh Congress), are hereby suspended.

"Hereafter the President may prescribe the quantity and kind of clothing which shall be furnished annually to enlisted men of the Navy, the Coast Guard, the Naval Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve, and he may prescribe the amount of a cash allowance to be paid to such enlisted men in any case in which clothing is not so furnished to them.

"SEC. 11. The pay and allowances of whatever nature and kind to be authorized for the enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts shall be fixed by the Secretary of War and shall not exceed or be of other classes than those now or which may hereafter be authorized by law for enlisted men of the Regular Army.

"The rates of pay of enlisted men of the insular force of the Navy shall be one-half the rates of pay prescribed for enlisted men of the Navy in corresponding grades.

"SEC. 12. Officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including Reserve components thereof and the National Guard, while on active duty in the Federal service, when traveling under competent orders without troops shall receive a mileage allowance at the rate of 8 cents per mile, distance to be computed by the shortest usually traveled route and existing laws providing for the issue of transportation requests to officers of the Army traveling under competent orders, and for deduction to be made from mileage accounts when transportation is furnished by the United States, are hereby made applicable to all the services mentioned in the title of this Act, but in cases when orders are given for travel to be performed repeatedly between two or more places in the same vicinity, as determined by the head of the executive department concerned, he may, in his discretion, direct that actual and necessary expenses only be allowed. Actual expenses only shall be paid for travel under

orders in Alaska and outside the limits of the United States in North America.

"Unless otherwise expressly provided by law, no officer of the services mentioned in the title of this Act shall be allowed or paid any sum in excess of expenses actually incurred for subsistence while traveling on duty away from his designated post of duty, nor any sum for such expenses actually incurred in excess of $7 per day. The heads of the executive departments concerned are authorized to prescribe per diem rates of allowance, not exceeding $6, in lieu of subsistence to officers traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty: *Provided*, That for travel by air under competent orders on duty without troops, under regulations to be prescribed respectively by the heads of the departments concerned, members (including officers, warrant officers, contract surgeons, enlisted men, aviation cadets, and members of the Nurse Corps) of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, and of the legally constituted Reserves of said services while on active duty, and of the National Guard while in Federal service, or while participating in exercises, or performing duties under sections 92, 94, 97, or 99 of the National Defense Act, shall, in lieu of mileage or other travel allowances, be allowed and paid their actual and necessary traveling expenses not to exceed $8 per day, or, in lieu thereof, per diem allowances at rates not to exceed $6 per day.

"Travel by personnel of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard while on active duty in the Federal service, on commercial aircraft, domestic or foreign, including travel between airports and centers of population or posts of duty when incidental to travel on commercial aircraft, shall be allowed at public expense when authorized or approved by competent authority, and transportation requests for such travel may be issued upon such authorizations. Such expense shall be allowed without regard to comparative costs of transportation by aircraft with other modes of transportation.

"Individuals belonging to any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including the National Guard and the Reserves of such services, traveling under competent orders which entitle them to transportation or transportation and subsistence as distinguished from mileage, who, under regulations prescribed by the head of the department concerned, travel by privately owned conveyance shall be entitled, in lieu of transportation by the shortest usually traveled route now authorized by law to be furnished in kind, to a money allowance at the rate of 3 cents per mile for the same distance: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to any person entitled to traveling expenses under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926.

"When any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man above the fourth grade, having dependents as defined in section 4 hereof, is ordered to make a permanent change of station, the United States shall furnish transportation in kind from funds appropriated for the transportation of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service to his new station for such dependents: *Provided*, That for persons in the naval service the term 'permanent station' as used in this section shall be interpreted to mean a shore station or the home yard or home port of the vessel to which the person concerned may be ordered; and a duly authorized change in home yard or home port of such vessel shall be deemed a change of station: *Provided further*, That if the cost of such transportation exceeds that for transportation from the old to the new station, the excess cost shall be paid to the United States by the officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man concerned: *Provided further*, That transportation supplied the dependents of such officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man, to or from stations beyond the continental limits of the United States, shall not be other than by Government transport, if such transportation is available as may be determined by the head of the department concerned: *Provided further*, That the personnel of all the services mentioned in the title of this Act shall have the benefit of all existing laws applying to the Army and Marine Corps for the transportation of household effects: *And Provided further*, That in lieu of transportation in kind authorized by this section for dependents, the President may authorize the payment in money of amounts equal to such commercial transportation costs for the whole or such part of the travel for which transportation in kind is not furnished when such travel shall have been completed.

"The words 'permanent change of station' as used in this section shall include the change from home to first station and from last station to home when ordered to active duty other than training duty, of any officer, warrant officer, nurse, or enlisted man of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including retired personnel and members of the Reserve components thereof, in a grade for which the transportation of dependents is authorized at Government expense, and the change from last station to home in connection with retirement, relief from active duty, or transfer to a reserve component.

"Personnel of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act performing travel on Government-owned vessels for which no transportation fare is charged shall be entitled only to reimbursement of actual and necessary expenses incurred.

"The head of the department concerned may determine what shall constitute a travel status and travel without troops within the meaning of the laws governing the payment of mileage or other travel expenses.

"SEC. 13. The annual base pay of female nurses of the Army and Navy shall be as follows: During the first three years of service, $1,080; from the beginning of the fourth year of service until the completion of the sixth year of service, $1,260; from the beginning of the seventh year of service until the completion of the ninth year of service, $1,440; from the beginning of the tenth year of service until the completion of the twelfth year of service, $1,620; from the beginning of the thirteenth year of service, $1,800.

"Superintendents of the Nurse Corps shall receive pay at the rate of $2,500 a year, assistant superintendents, directors, and assistant directors at the rate of $1,500 a year, and chief nurses at the rate of $600 a year, in addition to their base pay as nurses. Nurses shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

"The annual pay of a retired member of the Army Nurse Corps or the Navy Nurse Corps retired for other than physical disability shall be 3 per centum of the total annual active duty pay which she is receiving at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of complete years of service rendered prior to retirement, but not exceeding 75 per centum of such annual active-duty pay: *Provided*, That in computing the period of service for retired pay a fractional year of six months or more shall be considered a full year: *Provided further*, That for the purpose of computing eligibility for retirement and retired pay, there shall be credited active service in the Army Nurse Corps and in the Navy Nurse Corps, active service as contract nurse prior to February 2, 1901, and service as a Reserve nurse on active duty since February 2, 1901.

"SEC. 14. Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, when on active duty in the service of the United States, shall be entitled to receive the same pay and allowances as are authorized for persons of corresponding grade and length of service in the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or Public Health Service.

"Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard, when in the Federal service or when participating in exercises or performing the duties provided for by sections 94, 97, and 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended, shall receive the same pay and allowances as are authorized for persons of corresponding grade and length of service in the Regular Army.

"Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, officers of the National Guard, other than general officers, and warrant officers and enlisted men of the National Guard, shall receive compensation at the rate of one-thirtieth of the monthly pay authorized for such persons when in the Federal service, for each regular drill, period of appropriate duty, or other equivalent period of training, authorized by the Secretary of War, at which they shall have been engaged for the entire prescribed period of time: *Provided*, That such pay shall be in addition to compensation for attendance at field or coast-defense instruction or maneuvers. General officers of the National Guard shall receive $500 a year in addition to compensation for attendance at field or coast-defense instruction or maneuvers, for satisfactory performance of their appropriate duties. In addition to pay herein provided, officers of the National Guard commanding organizations less than a brigade and having administrative functions connected therewith shall, whether or not such officers belong to such organizations, receive not more than $240 a year for the faithful performance of such administrative functions under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply when such persons are on active duty in the Federal service.

"SEC. 15. On and after the effective date of this Act, retired officers, warrant officers, nurses, enlisted men, and members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve shall have their retired pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay, computed as now authorized by law on the basis of pay provided in this Act, which pay shall include increases for all active duty performed since retirement or transfer to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve in the computation of their longevity pay and pay periods: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this Act shall operate to reduce the present pay of officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men now on the retired list or drawing retainer pay, or personnel in an equivalent status in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act. Retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service and retired warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of those services, shall, when on active duty, receive full pay and allowances of the grade or rank in which they serve on such active duty and, when on active duty status, shall have the same pay and allowance rights while on leave of absence or sick as officers on the active list, and, if death occurs when on active duty status, while on leave of absence or sick, their dependents shall not thereby be deprived of the benefits provided in the Act approved December 17, 1919, as amended, and in the Act of June 4, 1920.

"In the computation of the retired pay of officers heretofore or hereafter retired with pay at the rate of 2½, 3, or 4 per centum of

the active duty pay received by them at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay on the active list, not to exceed a total of 75 per centum of said active duty pay, active duty performed by such retired officers subsequent to the date of their retirement shall be counted for the purpose of computing percentage rates and increases with respect to their retired pay. The increases shall be at the rate of 2½, 3, or 4 per centum for each year of active duty and a fractional year of six months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years: *Provided*, That the increased retired pay of such retired officers shall in no case exceed 75 per centum of the active duty pay as authorized by existing law.

"The retired pay of any officer heretofore retired under the provisions of section 24b, National Defense Act, June 3, 1916, as amended, who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, shall be 75 per centum of his active-duty pay: *Provided*, That no back pay, allowances, or other emoluments shall be held to accrue for any period prior to June 1, 1942, as a result of the enactment of this paragraph.

"The retired pay of any officer of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, hereafter retired under any provision of law, shall, unless such officer is entitled to retired pay of a higher grade, be 75 per centum of his active duty pay at the time of his retirement.

"SEC. 16. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard may receive additional compensation not less than $1 nor more than $5 per month, for special qualification in the use of the arm or arms which they may be required to use.

"SEC. 17. Cadets at the United States Military Academy, midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, and cadets at the Coast Guard Academy shall be entitled to pay at the rate of $780 per annum, and to allowances as now or hereafter provided by law for midshipmen in the Navy, and to transportation, including reimbursement of traveling expenses, while traveling under orders as a cadet or midshipman.

"SEC. 18. Officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act and members of the Reserve forces of such services, and the National Guard shall receive an increase of 50 per centum of their pay when by orders of competent authority they are required to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights, and when in consequence of such orders they do participate in regular and frequent flights as defined by such Executive orders as have heretofore been, or may hereafter be, promulgated by the President: *Provided*, That when personnel of the National Guard are entitled to armory-drill pay, the increase of 50 per centum thereof herein provided shall be based on the entire amount of such armory-drill pay to which they shall be entitled for a calendar month or fractional part thereof, and the required aerial flights may be made at ordered drills of an air-service organization, or at other times when so authorized by the President. Regulations in execution of the provisions of this paragraph shall be made by the President and shall, whenever practicable in his judgment, be uniform for all of the services concerned.

"Any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, not in flying-pay status, who is assigned or attached as a member of a parachute unit, including parachute-jumping schools, and for whom parachute jumping is an essential part of his military duty and who, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Treasury, has received a rating as a parachutist or is undergoing training for such a rating shall receive, while engaged upon duty designated by the head of the department concerned as parachute duty, additional pay of the rate of $100 per month in the case of any such officer or warrant officer, and additional pay at the rate of $50 per month in the case of any such enlisted man.

"SEC. 19. No person, active or retired, of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard, shall suffer, by reason of this Act, any reduction in any pay, allowances, or compensation to which he was entitled upon the effective date of this Act: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this Act shall be construed to deprive any enlisted man transferred to the Fleet Reserve on or prior to the date of enactment of this Act, or transferred from the Fleet Reserve to the retired list of the regular Navy for physical disability, of any benefits, including pay, allowances, or compensation, which he would be entitled to receive upon the completion of thirty years under laws in force on the date of enactment of this Act.

"The Act of June 10, 1922 (42 Stat. 625), as amended, subsections 12 (a), (b), and (c), of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), section 18 of the Act of March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, Seventy-seventh Congress), and section 8 of the Service Extension Act of 1941 (Public Law 213, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved August 18, 1941), and those portions of the Act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1217), and of the Act of June 30, 1941 (Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress), which authorize allowances for enlisted men on the retired list, and all other laws and parts of laws which are inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That Acts or parts of Acts incorporating directly, by implication, or by reference, the provisions of the Act of June 10, 1922, as amended, and not in conflict herewith, shall not be considered modified by the provisions of this Act, except that the pay, allowances, or compensation established herein shall be substituted for the pay allowances, or compensation set out in the Act of June 10, 1922, as amended.

"No back pay or allowances for any period prior to June 1, 1942, shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this Act.

"The provisions of this Act shall become effective as of June 1, 1942.

"SEC 20. Beginning June 1, 1942, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall every sixty days thereafter report to the Congress the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned during said period in the Army of the United States and in the Naval Establishment respectively from civilian life, who prior thereto has had no commissioned military service: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy shall not be required to report persons commissioned where such disclosure would in his opinion jeopardize the national interest or safety.

"SEC. 21. This Act may be cited as the 'Pay Readjustment Act of 1942.'"

And the House agree to the same.

EDWIN C. JOHNSON,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

A. J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. AUSTIN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I shall have no objection, under the assumption that it will be in order, after consent is granted, for me to make a motion to recommit, with instructions.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Such a motion will be in order.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I shall undertake to explain the agreement of the conferees on the pay readjustment act of 1942. It was agreed to by all the conferees on the part of the House, and by a majority of the Senate conferees.

The first section of the Senate bill contained a provision imposing a limitation of $479.17 a month on the base pay, plus pay for length of service of officers below the grade of colonel or a corresponding grade. The House amendment eliminated such provision, and the conference agreement conforms to the action of the House.

The first section of the House amendment added a provision that the time spent at the United States Military Academy, the United States Naval Academy, or the United States Coast Guard Academy, by any officer who was appointed to either of those academies after August 24, 1912, should not be counted for the purpose of computing the length of his service. Since this matter is already covered by existing laws with respect to the extent to which credit may be given for time spent at the academies, and since such laws are not repealed by Senate bill 2025, the conference agreement eliminates this provision.

Section 2 of the House amendment contained a provision authorizing the head of the Department concerned to define "sea duty" for the purpose of determining the entitlement of members of the military or naval forces to extra pay for such duty. The conference agreement adopts the House provision.

Section 3 of the Senate bill provided for allowing, in the computation of longevity pay of commissioned officers, full time for active duty under Reserve and National Guard commissions and one-half time for all other periods during which such commissions have been held. The House amendment provided for allowing full time for all periods during which such commissions have been held and included the National Guard of the United States and the Officers Reserve Corps in the list of organizations, commissioned time in which may be counted for longevity purposes.

The conference agreement adopts the House provision; that is, it allows full time for active duty under Reserve and National Guard commissions.

Section 4 of the Senate bill provided that the term "dependent" as used in the sections of the bill providing for rental and subsistence allowances should be deemed to include a mother dependent upon an officer for her chief support. The House amendment provided for including a father dependent for his chief support as well as the mother. The

conference agreement adopts the House provision.

Sections 6 and 7 of the Senate bill contained provisions imposing limitations upon the amount of allowances which might be received by officers in the grade of colonel, brigadier general, or major general, or in corresponding grades, in cases where their combined pay and allowance payments would be in excess of specified amounts. The House amendment eliminated such provisions. The conference agreement eliminates such provisions.

Section 9 of the Senate bill—this is one of the amendments in which every one has much interest—provided that the pay of enlisted men of the sixth grade should be $48 a month and the pay of enlisted men of the seventh grade should be $42 a month. The House amendment provided that the pay of enlisted men of the sixth grade should be $54 a month and the pay of enlisted men of the seventh grade should be $50 a month. The conference agreement provides that the pay of enlisted men of the sixth grade shall be $52 a month and the pay of enlisted men of the seventh grade shall be $46 a month. The conferees on the part of each House yielded ground in order to come to an agreement on those figures.

Section 9 of the House amendment provided for giving credit, for longevity pay purposes, to enlisted men for service in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army. The Senate bill contained no such provision. The conference agreement adopts the House provision.

Section 10 of the House amendment contained a provision suspending during the present war and for 6 months thereafter the provisions of all laws providing for payment of reenlistment allowances. The Senate bill did not contain such a provision.

The conference agreement provides only for a suspension of section 2. Let me digress long enough to say that this differs from the general character of the bill, thus making a temporary arrangement with respect to this subject, where the effect of the conference agreement was to make the whole bill a piece of permanent legislation. The conference agreement, as I started to say, provides only for a suspension of section 2 (providing for double enlistment allowances to enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard who reenlist during the war) of the act of August 18, 1941. The conferees deemed it inadvisable to suspend the provisions of all laws providing for reenlistment allowances, since such action would hinder the Navy in its efforts to secure reenlistments by men whose terms of enlistment expire during the war and might result in the Navy's being left at the end of the war without adequate personnel to man the ships of the two-ocean Navy which the Congress has authorized.

The House amendment contained a new section—section 12A—providing for reimbursing service men for actual and necessary medical and hospital expenses incurred by them after their induction into the armed forces and prior to the date of enactment of the bill. The Senate bill contained no similar provision. The conference agreement eliminates the section. The conferees deemed it inadvisable to include the section in the conference agreement because of information furnished to them by the War Department that adoption of the section would tend to promote absenteeism and was inadvisable in view of the fact that the laws with respect to the payment for medical care and treatment in private hospitals of military personnel had been liberalized by a provision in the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942. This provision—a similar one to that which it is proposed to include in the War Department Military Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1943—enables the War Department to pay for medical and hospital care, not of an elective nature, which is furnished in a private hospital to a member of the Army on leave of absence, even though such leave of absence is for more than 24 hours.

I now come to another controversial matter. Section 15 of the Senate bill contained a provision giving retired officers credit in the computation of their retired pay for all periods of active duty performed by them subject to retirement. The House amendment eliminated this provision, but included one providing that nothing in the bill should be construed as authorizing any increase in pay for any retired commissioned officer. The conference agreement adopts the Senate position with a clarifying amendment and eliminates the House provision.

The Senate bill contained a paragraph providing that the retired pay of officers heretofore retired under section 24b, National Defense Act, who served in the military or naval forces prior to November 12, 1918, should hereafter be 75 percent of active-duty pay. The House amendment eliminated such paragraph. The conference agreement adopts such paragraph. It may be that many Senators will recognize this better by its colloquial name—the Jackson amendment—and 24b relates to the retirement by a board called the B board.

Section 20 relates to what is commonly referred to as the Faddis amendment, a part of which is retained and a part of which is not retained. Section 20 of the House amendment prohibited the appointment, except under circumstances where military necessity requires the use of persons already possessing special knowledge, skill, training, or experience, of any person as an officer in the Army of the United States who had not had previous military or naval experience, or who had not completed a satisfactory course of instruction at the Military or the Naval Academy, or in military science and tactics in a college having a senior Reserve Officers' Training Corps unit, or in an officers' candidate school. The section provided for reports to Congress by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy with respect to the persons commissioned after May 1, 1942, who had no previous commissioned military service. The section also provided for the completion, prior to commissioning, of a course of indoctrinal training of persons hereafter commissioned in the Naval Reserve or the Marine Corps Reserve. The Senate bill contained no provisions similar to section 20 of the House amendment. The conference agreement retains so much of section 20 of the House amendment as requires the rendition of reports by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy with respect to commissions granted after June 1, 1942.

The House amendment added a new section to the bill providing that the legislation should cease to be in effect upon the expiration of 12 months after the termination of the present war. The Senate bill contained no provision limiting the effective period of the legislation. The conference agreement eliminates the House limitation on the effective period of the bill, thus making the proposal a permanent piece of legislation, with the single exception, if my memory is correct, to which I have called attention.

I shall now endeavor to break down the subject of controversy a little more than the statement I have made breaks it down. My understanding or interpretation of the bill as it is presented by this agreement on the subject of base pay of the seventh grade and sixth grade can be illustrated by taking the seventh grade and looking upon that alone, and taking the proposed act in the light most advantageous to the person in the seventh grade for the purpose of this examination of him. The agreement fixes the base pay at $46. It allows for service outside the continental limits of the United States, the matter in which the distinguished Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] was interested, an additional 20 percent. As applied to this grade, the seventh grade, and the base pay of $46, I compute the additional 20 percent to be $9.20.

The bill provides for the encouragement of special skill in marksmanship by providing a prize which may be awarded to persons who qualify for it by excellence in marksmanship. The prize may be any amount, from $1 to $5 a month. Taken in the light most favorable to the enlisted man, that adds $5. Thus, in exact figures, taken in this light, the bill provides for $60.20 a month.

That is not all that should be considered. The bill also contains a provision for an allowance to the enlisted man for quarters and subsistence, provided quarters and subsistence are not furnished to him in kind. Such allowance would be not to exceed $5 a day.

There is an allowance for clothing, provided the Government does not furnish the clothing. There is an allowance for travel at public expense on commercial and private aircraft at the rate of 3 cents a mile.

There should also be considered something which I read from a letter written by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs [Mr. WALSH] whose advice was sought and followed in many cases by the Military

Affairs Committee of the Senate. The letter is dated February 18, 1942, and is printed in part 3 of the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate. I read only one paragraph, in order to show what further should be considered as a part of the economic surroundings or conditions of the enlisted men if the conference report should be agreed to. I should expect these provisions to obtain whether this conference report or some other should be agreed to. I quote:

> Furthermore, the professional man in private life does not receive the benefits of sick leave, free medical attention for himself and family, 30 days' vacation per year, retirement privileges in case of disability or retirement provisions after a given number of years of service. And even when found unsuited and incompetent, they were given retirement pay if they have been 21 years in the service and those with less than 21 years of service are given 1 or 2 years' pay when discharged.

With respect to length of service, under the pending proposal enlisted men would be given longevity allowances of 5 percent of the base pay for each 3 years up to 30 years.

Mr. President, it is not my purpose at this time to argue about this bill. It is my purpose to give as clear an explanation as I can of the agreement. I think it is unnecessary for me to justify, or try to justify, the increases which are made throughout the bill, particularly with respect to grades 7 and 6. Those increases are quite large in percentage. On the assumption that every enlisted man whom we consider in making this calculation has been in service 4 months, he would be entitled to an increase of $9 a month for such service. The increase provided in the conference report is $16, that is, $46 as against $30. As I compute it, that is 53 and a fraction percent increase on the base pay, assuming it to be, not $21, but $30 a month. That is, assuming that by being in service 4 months the enlisted man has gained the advancement which comes under the existing law, so that he is now entitled to $30 a month, the proposed agreement would increase his monthly pay at the rate of 53 and a fraction percent. The spread between $21 and $46 would be still greater.

In its present form the bill does not represent increases in all the changes. Some of the changes cause decreases here and there. One of the primary purposes of Congress in undertaking to enact this legislation is to handle the very complicated and difficult matter of adjustment of pay of six different branches of the military department of the Government so that there will be an equitable relation between them as nearly as possible with respect to their pay, with respect to advancement by promotion, and with respect to recognition of increased responsibility, skill, wisdom, and leadership, by appropriate graded increases in pay in the several branches of the Army and Navy.

The conferees on the part of both Houses agreed to make the legislation effective on the 1st day of June 1942.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I move to recommit the conference report with instructions to the Senate conferees. First, to agree to a base pay of $54 a month for the sixth grade and $50 for the seventh grade, and second, to make all pay increases retroactive to June 1, 1942.

My purpose in making the motion is to preserve all the conference report upon which there has been agreement, relating to all the other sections which the Senator from Vermont has explained, and to narrow down the instructions to these two relatively simple matters of policy so that all the work of the conferees may be retained, including the so-called Jackson amendment and all the other things, thus narrowing the question down to a simple issue which, if the motion should prevail, could be agreed upon in a very few minutes.

This will be the result if my motion prevails because the House conferees are committed to $54 for grade 6 and to $50 for grade 7, and under my motion the Senate conferees would be under instructions to accept those rates of pay. All other matters having previously been agreed to, the conference should not take longer than it takes someone to write the provision on a piece of paper and bring it back to the respective Houses.

Furthermore, there could not be any loss to those who would be affected by the pay increases, because the instructions provide that the increases shall be made retroactive to June 1, 1942.

So, Mr. President, we come down to a simple question of whether a majority of the Senate wants to provide that enlisted personnel of the seventh grade, the lowest grade, shall receive a base pay of $50 a month, and enlisted men of the sixth grade, the next highest grade, shall receive $54 a month, or whether it wishes to agree to the conference report and thereby deprive those in the seventh grade of $4 a month and those in the sixth grade of $2 a month. Personally, this issue seems relatively simple to me. It is a matter of simple justice that we should be willing to go as far as the House of Representatives has twice gone in treating these men more generously than it is proposed to treat them by the conference report.

Let me underscore at the outset, Mr. President, that I do not believe there is any way in which Congress can compensate, in a monetary way, the young men of this Nation who go forth to fight and perhaps to die for this country; but we can, it seems to me, treat them more generously than we have treated them in the past. I think we should treat them as generously as soldiers of similar rank are being treated by any other nation on earth. Unless I am incorrectly informed, Australia pays her lowest-grade soldiers $48 a month. Certainly this, the richest Nation on earth, can afford to offer to its men a base pay which will be as generous as that provided by the Commonwealth of Australia, which, with all due respect to her heroic defense and her heroic sons, cannot be said to be as well provided with the power to create wealth as is this great Nation of ours.

Mr. President, let me say that in view of the fact that this Congress has not, so far as I know, blinked an eye at the authorization and the appropriation of billions upon billions of dollars, we should not have been willing to swallow the herd of appropriation camels that has gone through this Chamber since July 1, 1940, and strain at this gnat, which is to provide a small increase in pay to men who will be called upon by the thousands to die for this Nation.

In that respect, Mr. President, I think we should make a sharp distinction between those provisions in the bill to which I give my hearty accord and assent and which are designed more to take care of those who choose soldiering, or choose the Navy or Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, as a profession for life, and those provisions which affect those who are now being called in this war to go into the fighting services of this Nation and be ready to die in any number that may be required.

Mr. President, it is not appropriate to take into consideration what is offered here in the way of longevity pay, for, as I said when this matter was under debate a few days ago, unfortunately, many of these men, I fear, will never be in the service long enough to be interested in longevity pay. They will perhaps be called upon to make the supreme sacrifice before the longevity provisions in the bill could bring them any benefits.

Indeed, Mr. President, as I make a rough calculation, since July 1, 1940, the Congress has appropriated, or authorized the executive departments to enter into contracts, totaling more than $166,000,000,000. The $200,000,000,000 debt mark is readily in sight, and I have heard it whispered around that there is a $45,000,000,000 additional appropriation and authorization bill cooking somewhere on the Executive stove downtown. It has taken months to consider this pay-increase bill but if the $45,000,000,000 bill comes here, Mr. President, I do not expect to see it take the Congress 6 or 8 months to come to a conclusion as to whether by drawing their sights very fine they can shave off a little here or a little there. As a matter of fact, it will pass the House of Representatives in record-breaking time. It will come to the Senate, and here it will be augmented; it will be increased by afterthoughts of those in the executive branch between the brief time when it was introduced in the House of Representatives and when it reaches the Senate Appropriations Committee. I do not make these comparisons for any invidious purposes, but I say that a nation which through its legislative arm is willing to appropriate these huge sums of money—and I have joined in their appropriation—in record-breaking time should not, it seems to me, be overly cautious, or unreasonably parsimonious in providing compensation for the men whom we have called upon to go forth and offer the supreme sacrifice upon the altar of their country on the seven seas and on every continent of this globe.

Mr. President, my colleagues know I have fought to the best of my humble ability to prevent unconscionable profits from being accumulated in this war. I do not know that it is a logical argument, but certainly it is one that appeals to me. We have passed numerous tax

bills in contemplation of this huge defense effort and of the great enrichment which must come to the economy of this Nation as the result of the expenditure of untold billions of dollars. But efforts made to adopt drastic war-profits bills have failed. I wish to call attention in this connection to a statement taken from the United States News of May 8, 1942, with regard to corporation profits. In quoting the statement I do not feel that anyone can say that I have called upon a source of authority which is at all prejudiced against corporations. I quote from the yellow sheet of this issue called Newsgram—Tomorrow:

In the matter of taxes and of profits—

There's to be a leveling down of higher individual incomes. Not that a flat $25,000 will be fixed on personal income, after taxes. It won't be.

But Congress inevitably will hit hard against incomes over $10,000. There won't be many net incomes above $25,000 during, or even after, this war.

There's also to be a drain on corporation income. It won't be a drain that wipes out profits, particularly of large corporations. But Treasury goal is to get profits after taxes back to the 1939 or 1940 level. That means big taxes.

The reason why is this—

Listen to this:

Corporations with net income earned $6,700,000,000 in 1939, and out of that kept $5,553,000,000 after Federal taxes. That's on a moderate business volume.

Then corporations with net income earned $15,200,000,000 in 1941, and kept $8,270,000,000 after Federal taxes. It was a record profit before taxes.

It's figured that corporation net income may reach $18,500,000,000 in 1942, and under present taxes, $10,000,000,000 would be kept. That's a lot of profit.

In other words, the profit-making powers, the vitality of United States industry, in face of rising labor and raw material costs, is very great, greater than expected.

Mr. President, in this connection I also wish to read briefly from the statement made by the Secretary of the Treasury on the evening of May 28, 1942, before a specially called meeting of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation:

Company A makes an important airplane part. This corporation is owned by one man who hired himself as its sales representative. His compensation in 1941 was $1,656,000. By consolidating these earnings with those of the corporation, we have blocked this obvious attempt to divert profits, and we have increased the corporation's income tax by $1,117,000.

Company B makes steel. All stock in this corporation is held by three families. Excessive salaries were paid to officers who were also stockholders. The revenue agent has recommended disallowance of $82,000 in salaries, and the company has already agreed to a disallowance of $58,000.

Company C makes vital equipment for airplane pilots. This corporation paid $31,104 in rent in 1 year to the wife of the president for using property which had cost her $45,412. A brother of the principal stockholder, without special training or ability, drew a salary of $15,000 a year, and a son and daughter, just out of school, got $7,500 a year each.

Company D makes tools and dies. This company is owned by two brothers and their wives. It paid dividends of $40,000 in 1940 and $100,000 in 1941, while salaries totaling $128,000 were paid in 1941 to the president, his wife, and his brother.

Company E makes forgings. The stock is owned by three families. From 1938 to 1941 the salaries of employees who were stockholders and relatives of stockholders increased 523 percent. Excessive salaries for 1941 have been disallowed to the amount of $568,000.

Company F makes equipment for airplanes. Three principal officers of this corporation took salaries of $100,000 each, and the corporation claimed it had set aside over $575,000 in bonuses. Salary and bonus payments totaling $516,000 were found to be excessive. Other disallowed deductions included $16,000 paid for watches given to employees, $14,000 for banquets and picnics, $4,000 for photographs taken at banquets and picnics, and $1,900 for tickets to football games. Other important deficiencies were found in the tax return.

Company G makes a device important to aviation. This corporation is owned almost entirely by one man, his wife, and his brother. The two men increased their salaries from $12,000 and $15,000 in 1939 to $72,000 and $90,000 in 1941. The royalty rate on the patent jointly held by them was increased, with the result that with expanded sales for war purposes, the royalties paid to them increased from $87,000 in 1939 to $1,179,000 in 1941.

Mr. President, I cite these figures showing the enormous profits which are being made by corporations and which we are failing to recapture by taxation, as an argument in favor of our not sighting too finely when it comes to passing judgment on how generous or how parsimonious we shall be with the men whom we have called into the armed services of the United States.

As stated previously, these men are being called into the services to defend this Nation, and we are at this time arguing over whether we will give them a base pay in the seventh grade of $50 or give them a base pay of $46, and we are arguing over the question of whether we will give them a base pay of $46 in the grade 6, or a base pay of $52 in that grade as provided by the conference report.

It is important to remember that in dealing with these enlisted men we are dealing with men who are living on a very low income, so far as cash is concerned. While to those of us who draw $10,000 a year and sit here in comparative safety, $2 or $4 a month may not seem to be very important, it is of vital importance to men who receive only a few dollars a month in cash to spend.

I also wish to emphasize that it is commonly said here that the enlisted personnel receive great bounties and benefits, in kind and otherwise. I do not deny that; but that advantage has been exaggerated. From the standpoint of the enlisted men, it has been twisted all out of proportion. Let me call attention to the fact that there are many things which the enlisted personnel have to provide for themselves. They are often required to pay their laundry bills. I am informed by men who have been in the service and who are now in it that it is not unusual to find that they have been required to pay from $2 to $2.50 a month for laundry services and an additional $2 for cleaning their clothes.

It is also stated that if the laundry is operated on a concession basis, as many of the laundries are, the enlisted personnel have great difficulty in recovering garments which are carelessly destroyed or damaged beyond usefulness, in which case, if they have not been issued long enough to have been worn out in the natural course of service, the enlisted personnel have to dig down into their meager pay in order to replace the garments.

They also have to pay in many instances for the insignia worn to show their designation so far as battalions and regiments are concerned. I was informed by one who was in the Air Corps that in that corps, at the time he was in the service, the personnel had to provide their own insignia out of their own pockets.

Mr. President, let me point out that, as I said before, while $4 a month may seem like an insignificant amount to us, it amounts to $48 a year. The sum is enough to pay for $6,000 of insurance to an enlisted man. If he is on overseas duty, or on duty outside continental United States, where he gets his cigarettes tax-free for 6 cents a package, the $4 a month difference over which we are arguing here, would furnish every man in overseas service two packages of cigarettes a day. Forty-eight dollars per year may not seem like much money to us, who have the privilege of snapping our fingers and sending a page to the restaurant of the Senate to buy the tobacco which we desire to use, but I say that, from the standpoint of the enlisted personnel of our armed forces, such an expenditure is an important item.

I also wish to point out—and this of course applies largely to those who are on service at home stations—that although we have reduced the railroad fare for the enlisted personnel, nevertheless many of them are stationed long distances from their homes, and if they are fortunate enough to get a furlough for a sufficiently long time to enable them to proceed home to say good-bye to their loved ones before they leave for overseas, it may in many instances take more than an entire month's pay to provide them with transportation to and from their homes.

I am informed by persons familiar with the activities of the Travelers Aid Society that in many instances that society is finding it necessary to furnish money in order to get soldiers back to their camps. This shows that they have shaved their calculations so close as to how much it will cost them to spend a week end or a day or two in the Capital City that they find they do not have a sufficient amount of money, and must fall back on the Travelers Aid Society in order to get back to their camps.

Mr. President, it has been stated here that we are providing insurance to these men at a low premium rate. I grant that, but as I stated a moment ago, $5,000 of insurance would cost these men $40.20 each year.

Let me remind my colleagues that although we provided the same benefits in the last war, and I think it was wise and generous that we did so, unfortunately when the men came back from their service they found themselves in such financial plight that many of them had

to give up their insurance. If my memory serves me correctly, more than three and a half million of those who were in the last war had to give up their insurance during the hardship and depression which they suffered upon their return.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It was entirely natural and inevitable that such a situation should exist. We took these men, sent them overseas, and when they returned they were released with a discharge paper and $60, a sum barely large enough to buy a man a suit of civilian clothes. In a great many instances the men found that the job they had left when they went into the Army and were sent overseas had been filled, and inevitable millions of them were forced to drop their life insurance. I think it was a disgrace to the United States that such a situation was permitted to exist.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, let me emphasize that all the other provisions of the conference report can remain if my motion shall be agreed to. For example, the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] will apply to whatever base pay they draw, with 20 percent added for service outside continental United States. In voting for my motion we will not be depriving enlisted men of any of the benefits provided in the conference report as agreed upon. The issue presented by my motion narrows itself down to the question of what shall be the pay for the sixth and seventh grades of the enlisted personnel of the armed services.

Mr. President, in my judgment, we should be generous, as generous as possible, with these men. Let us not forget, as we sit here in comparative security, that we are the ones who exercised the great plenary power—the greatest power that lies in the hands of any government—to call upon these men to go forth and offer their lives in defense of this Nation. We did so unanimously, and I, for one, do not believe that a majority of the Senate will refuse to be as generous to the men in the armed services of the United States as the House of Representatives have been willing to be.

In short, Mr. President, this issue may seem somewhat insignificant to us, but let me venture the assertion that it is of vital importance to every man in the armed services of the United States, and it becomes even more important in the light of the passage of the allotment bill, which proposes to take out of the pay of enlisted men $22 a month for every one of them who has a wife.

I cannot but believe that in the light of this situation the Senate of the United States will be willing to act favorably upon my motion, and I wish to emphasize that an agreement can be obtained in 2 minutes after the conferees reassemble, for there will be nothing in controversy except the pay for grades 6 and 7.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah obtained the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Utah will yield for a moment, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted at this point in my remarks, after reading by the clerk, a telegram which I received from the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I wonder if the telegram referred to by the Senator from Wisconsin is not identical with the one I have received from the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs of the Senate, addressed to me, and which reads:

> I could not sign the conference report on the soldiers' pay bill because in conference I voted for the $50 minimum pay. Please state my position on the floor when the committee presents the conference report to the Senate on Monday. I am away for several days on official business inspecting some camps and would likewise appreciate your reporting my absence for that reason. In view of the position which I took in conference when I voted for the $50 minimum pay for soldiers and in further view of the fact that I have publicly stated to the press that I would stand by my position I shall naturally support by pair Senator LA FOLLETTE'S motion in the Senate on Monday. Thanks and regards.
>
> ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
> *United States Senator.*

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin?

There being no objection, the telegram was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> HOT SPRINGS, ARK., *June 6, 1942.*
>
> Senator ROBERT LA FOLLETTE,
> *Senate Office Building:*
>
> Am away several days on official business. As a member of the conference of House and Senate Military Affairs Committee today I refused to authorize the attaching of my signature to the conference report agreeing upon pay of $46 for privates, instead of $50 minimum. Since in a previous conference I voted for the $50 minimum pay as passed by the House. I have just wired Senator ALBERT THOMAS to that effect advising him that I would therefore support by pair your motion in the Senate next Monday. I am now wiring Leslie Biffle to please pair me in favor of your motion which I hope will carry. Best wishes for success. Regards.
>
> ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
> *United States Senator.*

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I shall vote for the motion submitted by my colleague, but I desire to say something in relation to the situation as I see it. I can agree with practically everything my colleague has said on the floor of the Senate, with respect to the pending motion. I can agree particularly that we have inadequately considered the field of taxation. We appropriate and spend with little correlation to the revenue-raising program. I can agree also that there are many economic inequalities and inequities in the whole picture in this country.

I shall vote for my colleague's motion, not because it provides adequate compensation for the services rendered by our men in the combatant forces, but rather because it has now become an issue which relates vitally to morale. In my opinion, it were better if this issue had not been interjected into the war picture as a political matter. This issue is one which should be considered on its merits rather than as political capital. Our boys who are fighting and dying for this country must not get the idea that Congress measures their services on a money basis.

In my opinion, the monetary basis or yardstick is not the way to measure or attempt to measure the services rendered by our armed forces. They are services of incalculable worth, and we must admit at the outset that any pay scale we might establish could not serve properly to evaluate their worth. Our consideration of the pay scale should have been in terms of the actual needs of our men—not only for their expenses but for the accumulation of at least a small reserve. Now, however, the issue has become distorted and confused so that the impression has been created that the pay levels we establish are a yardstick of what the boys' services are worth. That is unfortunate because in all probability the pay increase could have been won solely on its merits without creating the false idea that these wages are in any sense a measure of the true value of the services of our fighting men.

Our boys know they are fighting to preserve America. They know what has happened to other nations which have been overrun. Slavery is the lot of those nations. Our boys know that the French, the Norwegians, the Dutch, the Poles, the Czechs, the other peoples which have been conquered, might just as well be in slave pens. Our boys also know they are gladly fulfilling the obligation every male citizen owes to his country to defend it and to preserve it, and they know that the Nation can never adequately pay them in dollars alone.

Our boys know the tremendous cost of war, and the increased cost by reason of war's changed conditions and demands. They know what a paralyzed economic condition might mean to the Nation in the post-war period. When I say our boys know that, I mean boys with whom I have talked and who have indicated that to me. They want us here to cut out "frills" and useless expenditures. It is their own folks back home, their parents and their relatives, who will have to pay this bill, who will have to pay them what they are paid, and so they ask us to use our heads, and not to lose our heads.

Our boys know that the post-war period will be filled with post-war problems and they want us now, if possible, to create antidotes which will solve those problems.

Our boys know that when this war is over there will have to be a reconversion of our wartime industry into peacetime industry. Mr. President, I was talking with one of them the other day on the train between Philadelphia and New York. He called my attention to an item which appeared in a newspaper stating that a former employee of one of the Government departments in Washington, earning some $7,500 a year, had gone out for himself and cleaned up a half

million dollars in Government war contracts. The soldier made the suggestion: "Why do you not apply the excess profits war tax idea to the individual? In other words, why should a man ordinarily earning $7,500 a year who because of the war now makes a half million dollars, merely pay a tax under the ordinary tax provision?" The difference between his normal income and his wartime income represents an excess profit, and should be taxed as such. It is hardly fair to apply the same tax yardstick to this individual as is applied to the man whose small fixed income has not risen in the past 3 years, though his rising taxes and living costs and his fixed contractual obligations have cut deeply into his standard of living.

Mr. President, our boys are thinking the thing through. They do not want industry paralyzed. They want us, when we apply the tax program, to create reserves for industry and labor so that when they come back there will be jobs for them. They know that the Nation will have to assume the task of looking after the wounded and the sick on such a scale as we have never known before. The Nation will have to think in terms of pensions on such a tremendous scale as was never conceived of before. The boys know that. The Nation will have to look after the widows and the orphans of those who have paid the supreme sacrifice.

When the bill went through the Senate unanimously providing for $42 a month, there was no suggestion made of $50 a month. It is my understanding that the basis of $42, or an increase of 100 percent, was the result of study and conference between men who represent the armed forces and the committee and those who are thinking in the terms of the load the Government must meet through taxation; in other words, the load which must be imposed upon this people.

But now, after the House took its action, the newspapers and letters coming to our offices indicate, as was suggested by my colleague [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], that we cannot be penurious. It is now a matter or $46 or $50 in one grade, or $52 or $54 in another. This is an age in which many people are governed by their emotions.

Mr. President, arguments which have been advanced for the sum of $50 could also be advanced for an increase to $60, $70, $80, or $100. A wonderful demagogic appeal might be made for $100 a month. Yes; it has been suggested that Australia now pays its soldiers $48 a month. Our wealth is probably 50 times that of Australia, and based on the wealth of the two nations an appeal might well be made that we could pay 50 times as much as Australia pays.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. GURNEY. Let me read from the record, on page 132 of the hearings, a statement made by Major Smith of the United States Army. He said:

> In support of this bill I might point out that, liberal as it is, it still is below the schedule for privates in the Australian Army and the Canadian Army. In fact, as far back as the World War, the Australian Army paid $45 a month to enlisted men, where our pay was $30, with appropriate allowances by the Australian Government for family dependents.

A little further on he said:

> In the Canadian Army the pay, at this time, is $1.30 a day—roughly $39 a month.

So I conclude that the pay in the Australian Army now is $45 and in the Canadian Army $39. Therefore the bill as the conferees have reported it is above the Australian pay and also above the Canadian pay.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. President, I was making the statement that if we compared the wealth of the two nations someone, actuated possibly by political motives, might argue and a great appeal might be made to the effect that since we are 50 times richer than Australia we ought to pay our soldiers 50 times as much. But we are also the arsenal of democracy. We are also building up, as has been suggested, appropriations which may approximate $170,000,000,000 or $180,000,000,000, and probably an indebtedness running from between $200,000,000,000 and $300,000,000,000 before we are through and these boys of ours about whom we are now talking ask us not to rock the boat so that when they come back there will not be any boat. They want America to be safe, sound, and secure. They want America to be a place in which they can live, and that means that economic soundness in America must be retained.

So, Mr. President, I say a strong argument might be made for $100 a month, or probably twice the amount that Australia pays its soldiers, or if we take the ratio of wealth existing between the two nations we might advance the amount still further.

I am taking this opportunity to express my convictions on the subject, because it will be interesting to see the approach of this body, and the attitude taken by individual Senators when the tax bill comes from the committee. I have illustrated that with one instance. We know that there are corporations which have permitted great tax-evasion crimes to be committed. They have paid out great sums of money to various corporate officers. With the Senate's indulgence I might point out that on September 29, 1941, I introduced a measure which would have automatically provided for the disclosure of agents' fees. Such legislation would have discouraged and might have prevented excessive fees. In any event it would have made it unnecessary to ferret out the facts by special committees. But we must not lose our heads in that respect. We could stop that very easily if we followed the suggestion which the man in uniform made to me that we apply the war taxes to the individual. If an individual formerly received a salary of $50,000 a year, and by some means he now receives $1,000,000 or more a year, the tax on his war profits should be increased. Why not? We are talking now about spending $70,000,000,000 in the next fiscal year, and we are talking now in generalities about raising only some $21,000,000,000 to $25,000,000,000 in taxes.

Mr. President, it has not yet been determined what percentage of taxable income results directly from Government contracts or war production, but I can hazard a guess that probably we will have a national income in 1942 of $110,000,000,000. Probably 40 or 50 percent of that will result directly from war contracts, from our own spending. In other words, out of war contracts paid for by the people's money will come a large proportion of this tax.

In determining the amount of $50 on which we are now voting—and we have done it arbitrarily—I have not heard anyone say why it should not be $50, $70, or $80. The amount of $50 was determined upon arbitrarily. If we place 8,000,000 men in the armed forces of this country—and I heard a statement made last night that we would have 4,500,000 men in service by January—we have to think realistically about how they shall be paid. Eight million men at an average of $50 a month would equal an expenditure of $4,000,000,000, and to sustain such men in clothing, in food, and the other necessaries they will have to have, will require another $4,000,000,000. If we spend $70,000,000,000 a year and raise only approximately $22,000,000,000 by taxation, we shall have to think in terms of how to finance such a procedure.

Mr. President, the finest compensation we can give to the men in the armed forces, and the one which most clearly approximates the true value of their services, is as sound an America and as sound a financial structure on their return to civilian life as we possibly can give them. They want an America to live in which is sound economically, which is sound politically, and which is sound socially. That is the truest compensation we can give them. During this war period we can give them the real compensation that counts, by building at home the morale which makes for the support they want, support at home. We must tighten our belts, cut out the frivolities of Government, and pay as much of the war cost as possible out of war income.

Mr. President, in making this last suggestion, I repeat that I have visited six different camps and talked with men in charge, I have talked with the boys in the camps, and I have friends in the service, and I can sum up what they say in these short words:

> For God's sake keep America safe at home.

What would make her more unsafe than to create a paralyzed economic condition at home?

I am not indicting or impugning the sincerity of anyone, but I wish to point out that it can become increasingly simple to vote funds for reasons of political expediency. I make that statement not as a comment on the present measure, but on measures which may be presented in the future. This is no time for political expediency. This is a time for realism, and I feel very keenly that every affirmative vote for appropriation measures carries with it an obligation for an

affirmative vote on a realistic tax measure, however politically inexpedient such a vote may be.

I have talked with men in the services, and I am glad to say that while some of them have said they would welcome the proposed increase in cash, others said they would like to make sure of having a "nest egg" when they return.

All with whom I have talked have uttered the thought, "Keep America safe and sound. We want to come back to a place where we can earn a living, build a home, have a family, and live at peace." Mr. President, we cannot give them such assurance by upsetting the economic life or the economic apple cart of this Nation.

So the bill should at least make sure that the individual soldier has a right to elect whether he shall receive the money or have it deposited in bonds as a credit for him.

In this connection, if it were possible it might be interesting to have the concensus of the boys in the service as to what they think on the subject of increased pay. There may be some surprising results awaiting us back home. These boys are doing some thinking. They are taken from the best homes of America. They are ready to give their all, provided their America is still America when they come back. These men want a sound America to which to return. They want it a land of opportunities—a land where no chaotic conditions exist—economically, socially, or politically.

In my opinion, some of the best brains of America are in the services. They expect us, as trustees of great spiritual, political, and economic values, to preserve them and not measure everything by the yardstick of dollars. They want to come back to a nation that is not paralyzed by foreignisms, class or sectional hatreds, or prodigal and senseless spending.

Mr. President, we have a real job to perform here. Not only the boys in the service but the people back home are becoming very much exercised by the way we vote and appropriate money. The daily mail of every Senator is replete with letters indicating that the folks back home—the folks who have to pay—are terribly concerned with the manner in which the managers of government are running the affairs of state and the war.

Mr. President, I shall vote for my colleague's motion. Now that an impression has been created that this bill seeks to measure by wages the service of our men, it has become an issue involving morale and, of course, pay increases must be supported when they affect the morale of our men. I repeat, however, that no pay scale we can establish would properly evaluate the worth of the services of the men of the armed forces.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	Overton
Andrews	Hatch	Pepper
Austin	Hayden	Reed
Bankhead	Herring	Rosier
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Barkley	Holman	Schwartz
Bone	Hughes	Shipstead
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Bridges	Kilgore	Smith
Brooks	La Follette	Spencer
Bulow	Langer	Stewart
Burton	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McFarland	Tobey
Chandler	McKellar	Truman
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Vandenberg
Connally	Mead	Van Nuys
Davis	Millikin	Wagner
Doxey	Murdock	Walsh
Ellender	Murray	Wheeler
George	Norris	White
Gillette	Nye	Wiley
Glass	O'Daniel	Willis
Guffey	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, a member of the subcommittee considering the pay bill, and also a member of the conference committee, I feel that I should at least give the Senate the benefit of the few ideas which I had when we were considering the new pay schedule.

In the committee we started with the sincere purpose of first making a fair pay schedule for the boys in the service; next, to see that the pay schedule was equitable through all the services in the military forces, including the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard. We also wanted to start with fair pay for the rank of "buck private," with reasonable increases for each step up in grade, so that the pay in the various services would represent an equitable relationship and establish an incentive for each member of the armed forces to do his best. He should be compensated fairly in comparison with what members of the other services in corresponding ranks receive.

So we started with the premise that a 100-percent pay increase certainly should be fair. As the old pay was $21 per month, $42 would represent a 100-percent increase. Of course, I realize that privates who have been in the service for 4 months now receive $30 a month; and after they have been in the service for a year they now receive $40 a month. However, I start out on the basis that a 100-percent increase is provided for in the conference committee report which now is before us, because the pay used to be $21 a month, and under the bill which passed the Senate the boys coming into the service would receive $42 a month, which would represent a 100-percent increase.

The proposal now before us would give the boys at least a 120-percent increase over what they receive under the law which is now in effect, a jump from $21 to $46 a month.

The point I desire to bring out at this moment is that we have a rapidly increasing Army. We have the Tank Corps, the parachute troops, and the Air Corps. The members of these services are specialists, so to speak, and the Army recognizes that fact. They do not remain privates very long; they jump quickly into the grades of private first class, corporal, sergeant, staff sergeant, technical sergeant, and master sergeant. In fact, I know of one group in the Air Corps—a group composed of enlisted personnel, noncommissioned officers and all classes except commissioned officers—whose pay checks for the month of May averaged more than $100 per month. That was under the present law, not with the proposed increase which they would receive under the terms of the conference report which is before us today. They have been receiving on an average over $100 per month. I think we should recognize that fact, and also the fact that this is a mechanized war. Our boys take to the work rapidly, become experts, and receive increased rank and pay.

So let us not think that we are looking merely at the pay increase for privates and privates first class, on which the conference committee is reporting today. We are not considering merely those two grades. Literally hundreds of thousands of men having noncommissioned rank would receive sizable increases under the terms of the bill as it is reported by the conference committee. Let me call to the Senate's attention the fact that a corporal's pay has heretofore been $54. We propose to jump that to $66, an increase of $12. Sergeants in the Army, and men of corresponding rank in the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, have been receiving $60. We propose to give them an increase of $18 a month. Staff sergeants, the next grade, have been receiving $72, and we propose to jump them to $96. We propose to increase the pay of the men in the next higher grade from $84 to $114. In the Navy and in the Coast Guard chief petty officers have been receiving $99, and we propose to increase their pay to $126. Master sergeants are to be jumped from $126 to $138. Those are sizable increases.

Remember that in our Army as it is today there is a greater percentage of noncommissioned officers than there was in our Army of World War days. When our armed forces now in training go to the battle front we shall find that the percentage of noncommissioned officers will be double or perhaps triple what it was in World War days, when we depended upon infantrymen to win our battles. From now on we shall depend on specialists.

I hope Members of the Senate will take those matters into consideration when they are considering their votes on the motion to send the bill back to conference with instructions.

Let us look at the matter in another way. Let us remember that last week the Senate passed a bill providing that the dependents of an enlisted man, if

he has dependents—and many of them do not—shall be given $22 a month out of his pay. After deducting $22 from $46, the soldier will still receive more than the $21 per month which he used to receive. Moreover, if we give him $46 a month pay, the Government will also be obligated to pay $28 a month, if the man has a wife and, as I recall, $12 for each child. We shall reach the point at which the Federal Government will be paying the enlisted man and his dependents sizable amounts, which in many cases will total more than $100 a month.

I believe that the folks at home—and when I say "folks," I mean the parents of enlisted men and those folks at home who do not have men in the Army—would not like to see Congress go hog-wild on this question. I think the boys in the Army are anxious not to see us go hog-wild. I feel that when I cast my vote in the conference committee in favor of the compromise between $42 and $50 I at least put my nose under the hog-wild gate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to recommit the conference report with instructions to the Senate conferees.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, let me say just a word. I shall not delay the Senate. I am impressed with the attitude of the American Legion relating to this matter. I think that its representative, in testifying before the committee, justified the increase and justified the status of the increase in a most rational way. I think his statement should be called to the attention of the Senate. It is very brief. It is the statement of Francis M. Sullivan, acting director, national legislative committee of the American Legion. I shall read only one paragraph of his remarks, as it appears on page 105 of the hearings. Mind you, this statement was made on November 17, 1941, when the amounts carried for these two classes were those originally agreed to by the Senate by a unanimous vote.

This is what he said:

> We feel that it—
>
> Meaning the Johnson bill—
>
> would have a very beneficial effect on the members of the armed services, and we of the Legion urge its enactment.
>
> Under the proposed legislation compensation would be commensurate with the responsibility of the personnel and would provide a pay parity among the various services; compensation would prove to be more attractive in holding men of character and ability. Compensation would increase progressively with experience and responsibility, and encourage a career in the services; compensation would be sufficient to enable the personnel to devote his life and attention to his duties without worry in providing for his family and dependents.
>
> The new pay system would automatically apply in a just and equitable manner to all personnel, including those in the reserve forces while in the active service.
>
> For these reasons, we of the Legion respectfully urge the enactment of Senate bill 2025.

That was true then; it was true when the Senate agreed to the bill as it then stood; it is true today, in spite of all that has happened.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin to recommit the conference report with instructions to the Senate conferees.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I wish to say only a few words. It may not make any great difference whether the pay of the Army private is $46 or $50, and that is the question now. During the past few days it has been my privilege to talk with a number of private soldiers in the Army. All of them have said, "We are not concerned so much about whether it is $42, $46, or $50; but we should like to see it settled so we shall know what it is to be."

I shall not reveal the names of those private soldiers; but they are men in whose judgment and intelligence I have the utmost confidence. I think that we should settle the matter one way or the other. The Senate unanimously passed the bill providing for $42 a month. The House passed the bill providing for $50. Forty-six dollars, as represented by the conference report, seems to me to be a fair compromise. I am not urging how any Senator shall vote. I am merely expressing my own opinion, in view of the conversations which I have had with many private soldiers, that we should settle the matter definitely as soon as possible so that they may know what they are to receive. In view of all the circumstances, I myself shall vote to sustain the conference report, based largely upon the conversations and the information which I have received in the last few days from private soldiers in the ranks. I am not making this statement for the purpose of influencing any vote on this question, but simply as a brief explanation of the attitude I shall assume on the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin, for whom I have, as he knows, the most affectionate regard.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, at this time, when the greatest sea battle in all history is being fought, I do not know of any more concrete method of expressing our appreciation to the boys who are fighting that battle than by voting an increase in their pay. It is true the increase would be a token only of their worth, but it would be a very concrete manifestation of our appreciation of their services.

The majority leader has suggested that it might be in the interest of speed for us to accept the compromise of $46, but if the House should refuse to accept such a compromise, as I believe it would, then we would not have saved any time in settling this question. On the contrary, if we support the motion to recommit with instructions, it is possible that the question might be settled quicker.

Mr. President, in all businesses except war, pay is in proportion to danger; the greater the jeopardy the higher the pay. That cannot be in the case of war simply because it is on too grand a scale. We cannot reward in a monetary way any soldier for his efforts. The most we can do is to give him a token or an indication of our desire to reward him in proportion to his sacrifice. That is all, at most, that this would amount to. This increase to $50 would merely indicate a desire on the part of Congress to reward him better so far as we are able to do so.

Mr. President, I am a member of the Senate Military Affairs Committee; I happen to know that the personal feeling of every one of the members of the Senate conference committee is that the pay of the soldiers should be increased even more than the amount mentioned, and I feel that their present attitude is more the result of the parliamentary situation in which they find themselves than of their own belief. Therefore, I feel that the Senate in supporting the motion to recommit will not, in any way, be reflecting upon the members of the committee.

President Roosevelt, in one of his messages to the Congress, urged that in future wars the burden should be distributed as fairly as possible. This is just one more little effort toward a redistribution of the burden of war. War is a community effort, and, so far as is humanly possible, the burdens of war should be distributed. I believe that we have made progress in that direction; I believe we have limited considerably the profits of this war as against those made in the last war.

Now, Mr. President, let us add an increase of pay for the soldiers who fight the war, and we will thereby be taking still another step toward equalizing the burdens of this war. Almost any of the soldiers who are now fighting could earn $50 a week if he were not in the service; therefore by increasing his pay we can to some extent reduce the economic sacrifice which he is making in order to serve his country. If we take this step, I believe it will be cheering news to the men at the front when they learn that the folks back home are thinking about them and have voted them an increase in pay. Naturally, they will appreciate that, and it will be reflected by a stimulation of that American spirit of do or die.

So, Mr. President, I should like to see this body vote to recommit the conference report with instructions to the conferees to increase the pay of the men in the armed forces.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, I should like to say a few words in reference to the pending motion. Particularly I desire to refer to the situation in the Military Affairs Committee and to the situation in which the conferees who are members of the Military Affairs Committee find themselves today.

We have had before the Military Affairs Committee various measures attempting to deal, in one way or another, with soldiers' compensation. One of the bills which I favored originally would have doubled the pay of the soldiers but it would also have provided that half that pay should be held up until they were released from service, and then it was to be paid to them at the same rate as when they were in the service, until the fund was exhausted. That was intended so that when the soldiers returned home, if at that time the country was in the

throes of a depression, they would have money which they had earned coming to them for the number of months they were in the service. We were not able to secure action on that bill.

Finally, there came the pending bill, and it was the judgment of the Military Affairs Committee that $42 a month, to start with, doubling what they are getting now, was a fair bill. While, as my colleague who sits to my right, the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. LEE], says, I think probably most of the members of the Military Affairs Committee would like to see the soldiers paid even more money; yet the amount stated is what we agreed upon, and placed in the bill as reported.

It does not matter materially to the soldier whether he gets $46 or $50, and I believe that if anyone has the idea that $4 more or $4 less is going to make any difference in the morale of the American soldier he is just bothered and hot and mistaken, because the soldier's morale is all right; it is not going to be bought for $4 and it is not going to be discouraged by the loss of $4. I believe, however, that something should be said about the members of the conference committee, and I wish to say it.

The Senate passed the bill unanimously, and we expected our conferees to uphold as best they could the views of the Senate, and that is what they have been trying to do. They have not been attempting to ride roughshod over someone. If the conferees had come back to the Senate and said, "The other conferees wanted $50 a month, so we just consented to it," the Senate would have had a right to criticize the conferees. Ever since I have been a Member of the Senate I have considered that it was the duty of a conferee to endeavor to sustain in conference the views of the Senate to the best of his ability. Therefore I do not believe there is any excuse at all for criticizing the conferees in the matter before us. Much as I should like to vote to give the boys in the service $50 a month, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, in view of what has been said, and in view of the action of the conferees from that committee, I feel it is my duty to vote for the conference report, and that is what I intend to do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE].

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. GURNEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Brooks	Clark, Mo.
Andrews	Bulow	Connally
Austin	Burton	Davis
Bankhead	Byrd	Doxey
Barbour	Capper	Ellender
Barkley	Caraway	George
Bone	Chandler	Gillette
Brewster	Chavez	Glass
Bridges	Clark, Idaho	Guffey
Gurney	Maybank	Spencer
Hatch	Mead	Stewart
Hayden	Millikin	Thomas, Idaho
Herring	Murdock	Thomas, Okla.
Hill	Murray	Thomas, Utah
Holman	Norris	Tobey
Hughes	Nye	Truman
Johnson, Calif.	O'Daniel	Tunnell
Kilgore	O'Mahoney	Tydings
La Follette	Overton	Vandenberg
Langer	Pepper	Van Nuys
Lee	Reed	Wagner
Lucas	Rosier	Walsh
McCarran	Russell	Wheeler
McFarland	Schwartz	White
McKellar	Shipstead	Wiley
McNary	Smathers	Willis
Maloney	Smith	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] that the conference report be recommitted with instructions. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOXEY (when Mr. BILBO's name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is unavoidably absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. GLASS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], and will vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. TYDINGS (when Mr. RADCLIFFE'S name was called): My colleague the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] is unavoidably detained. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. BURTON (when Mr. TAFT's name was called). The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. BONE (when Mr. WALLGREN's name was called). My colleague the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] is unavoidably detained in the western section of the United States on important public business.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], and the Senators from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY and Mr. GREEN] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] would vote "nay," and that the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN] would vote "yea."

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained in his State on official business. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are absent on important public business. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from North Carolina would vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], are necessarily absent. I am informed that if the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] were present and voting he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is detained on official business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 58, nays 20, as follows:

YEAS—58

Aiken	Hill	Pepper
Andrews	Holman	Rosier
Bankhead	Hughes	Russell
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Shipstead
Brewster	Kilgore	Smathers
Brooks	La Follette	Smith
Bulow	Langer	Spencer
Capper	Lee	Stewart
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Tobey
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Van Nuys
Connally	Maybank	Wagner
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Doxey	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Murdock	White
Gillette	Murray	Wiley
Hayden	Nye	
Herring	O'Daniel	

NAYS—20

Austin	Guffey	Reed
Barbour	Gurney	Schwartz
Barkley	Hatch	Truman
Burton	Maloney	Tunnell
Byrd	Norris	Tydings
George	O'Mahoney	Vandenberg
Glass	Overton	

NOT VOTING—18

Bailey	Butler	Lodge
Ball	Danaher	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Downey	Reynolds
Bridges	Gerry	Taft
Brown	Green	Wallgren
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Willis

So Mr. LA FOLLETTE's motion to recommit the conference report, with instructions, was agreed to.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AUSTIN. In view of the statement by the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] that he raised a question only as to one point in the conference report, and did not raise any question as to the remainder of it, but wished the remainder to be left undisturbed as reported, I should like to have the RECORD show the parliamentary status of the report of the conferees on Senate bill 2025.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands that the conferees have not been discharged by the action of either House on the conference report. Therefore the motion recently agreed to by the Senate recommits the conference report and the bill to the same conferees, with instructions to the Senate conferees. As the Chair understands the instructions, they deal with specific items. The Senate conferees are instructed only with respect to the

items dealing with the seventh and sixth grades.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, another parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. AUSTIN. Is it true that the present parliamentary status makes it necessary to have a new agreement and a new conference report?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair so holds.

CIVILIAN WAR BENEFITS AND WAR RELIEF ACT OF 1942

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I hope I may with propriety call attention to the fact that Senators will find on their desks Senate bill 2412, which is the committee print of a bill which has been reported today to the Senate from the Committee on Education and Labor. As the Senator who reported the bill on behalf of the committee, I desired to give notice that tomorrow I expect to move that the Senate consider the bill. I think it is of public interest because it provides compensation to civilians who might sustain injury from enemy attack. It also provides Federal funds with which the duly established agencies could protect a community in case there was an attack upon it, and further the bill provides benefits for employees of the Federal Government in off-shore areas who are not now adequately provided for.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the chair). Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Kentucky?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Assuming that the District of Columbia appropriation measure is disposed of today, let me ask the Senator whether there is such emergency attaching to his bill that it could not go over until Thursday, instead of taking it up tomorrow?

Mr. PEPPER. I certainly should like to bring it up tomorrow if I can. I will state the situation. It is like being taken ill; one never knows when it is going to occur. This bill was recommended by the Bureau of the Budget, by the War Department, by the Navy Department, by the Office of Civilian Defense, by the Federal Security Administrator, and by the Employees' Compensation Commission. The Army and the Navy have been extremely anxious that the matter be disposed of, because with respect to some of their employees who are detained by the enemy or injured in offshore areas they are having to provide for them out of their construction funds. Naturally they want proper provision made in the regular way.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the bill been recommended by the President?

Mr. PEPPER. It has been recommended by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. McKELLAR. But not by the President?

Mr. PEPPER. All I know is that the Bureau of the Budget recommended and prepared the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. The measure seems to be very important. I have read only a few paragraphs of the report, and I should like to have time to study it and the bill. I hope it will not be taken up tomorrow.

Mr. PEPPER. The reason I rose was to call the Senate's attention to the fact that copies of the committee print of the bill and the report are on Senators' desks so they would have a chance to examine them. The bill was reported to the Senate only today, but the bill and committee report will appear tomorrow in exactly the same form. I called attention to the bill so if any Senator wanted to read it and the report he would have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's interest in the measure. I do not know that it will result in serious controversy or opposition. Inasmuch as the measure was reported only today, and is a matter of some importance, a number of Senators have suggested that instead of bringing it up tomorrow it go over until Thursday. I do not know that any particular disadvantage would accrue if it were to go over until Thursday. If we dispose of the District of Columbia appropriation bill today there will be no reason for the Senate to meet tomorrow, except for the purpose of taking up the Senator's bill, and if there is no urgency about it, so that it could be taken up Thursday, I think Senators might prefer that it go over until Thursday.

Mr. PEPPER. If it were to go over until Thursday, then, so far as I am personally concerned, I should have to let it go over until next week.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I may supplement the request made by the able majority leader [Mr. BARKLEY] that the bill go over until Thursday, or until next week. I have no objection to the bill so far as I know. I have not had time to read the bill, but I received a telegram from the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] saying that he will not be here until later in the week. He very much desires to be present when the bill is being considered. I am speaking now for the Senator from Ohio and expressing his hope rather than my own. It would be a very great accommodation to him if the matter not come up until Thursday, or until next week.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's situation. I sent a telegram to the Senator from Ohio last Saturday, and this morning received the following telegram from him:

> Did not realize you intended to take up bill Monday.

I asked him if there would be any objection to taking the bill up today if the situation in the Senate permitted.

> Cannot change plans now, but would agree to special order Tuesday or Wednesday.

Mr. President, I would not have asked to bring the matter up in the absence of the Senator from Ohio, because he has been very helpful to the committee in working out the bill, but he will be here tomorrow, and agreed to it being taken up tomorrow. I do not want to urge that that be done, however. I merely took the liberty of putting the committee print on the desks of Senators, together with a committee print of the report, in order that Senators could acquaint themselves with the matter, so that if there were a session tomorrow the bill could be taken up then, if the Senate were disposed to do so.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7041, the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, let me make a brief preliminary statement. The bill came to the Senate carrying appropriations of $56,137,711. The Senate committee has made several deductions. Since the action of the House, new estimates were received in the amount of $270,869. The additions made by the Senate committee result in a net increase of $185,110. So the amount of the bill as now reported to the Senate is $56,322,281. This is more than $1,000,000 under the appropriations of last year, and it is under the estimates for this year by the amount of $543,428.

The total of all the revenues received by the District of Columbia shows that the appropriations approved by the Senate committee are within the revenues by $393,117.

Mr. President, there is no controversial matter in the bill. I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments of the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The clerk will proceed to state the committee amendments.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "General expenses—Executive Office", on page 2, line 21, after the word "services", to strike out "$285,245" and insert "$289,245."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Municipal Architect's Office", on page 6, line 21, after the word "services", to strike out "$66,880" and insert "$70,080."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Utilities Commission", on page 7, line 15, after the word "services", to strike out "$71,120" and insert "$32,515."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Surveyor's Office", on page 8,

line 6, after the word "including", to strike out "$12,700" and insert "$6,560"; in line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "two" and insert "one", and in the same line, after the word "field", to strike out "parties" and insert "party."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Contingent and miscellaneous expenses", on page 13, line 21, after the word "immediately", to insert "for payment of 1942 obligations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Central Garage", on page 15, line 22, after the words "total of", to strike out "$12,375" and insert "$17,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Free public library", on page 17, line 7, after the word "librarian", to strike out "$456,120" and insert "$480,358."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 17, line 12, after the word "recordings", to strike out "$50,000" and insert "$57,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 1, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$46,125" and insert "$51,625."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 18, line 4, after the word "in", to insert "Anacostia,"; in the same line, after the name "Chevy Chase", to insert a comma; and in the same line, after the name "Woodridge", to strike out "$5,760" and insert "$7,560."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Sewers", on page 20, after line 2, to strike out:

For payment of rental of property occupied by the District of Columbia for the storage of construction materials in square 3584, for the period beginning May 1, 1942, and ending June 30, 1943, $5,040.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Collection and disposal of refuse", on page 21, line 3, after the word "available", to insert "for payment of 1942 obligations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Electrical Department", on page 21, line 17, after the word "items", to strike out "including not to exceed $3,800 for the purchase (including exchange) of one non-passenger-carrying motor vehicle, $74,340" and insert "$70,540."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public schools", on page 23, line 10, after the word "employees", to strike out "$221,035" and insert "$226,975."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 15, after "(45 Stat. 998)", to strike out "$42,700" and insert "$44,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 23, line 21, after the word "teachers", to strike out "$7,602,240" and insert "$7,589,840."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 24, line 6, after the words "day schools", to strike out "$35,045" and insert "$38,045."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 25, after line 3, to strike out:

COMMUNITY CENTER DEPARTMENT

For all expenses necessary for the operation and maintenance of the Community Center Department, including the expense of keeping open the public-school playgrounds during the summer months, such expenses to include personal services of the director, general secretaries, and community secretaries in accordance with the act approved June 4, 1924 (43 Stat. 369); clerks and part-time employees, including janitors on account of meetings of parent-teacher associations and other activities; directors, supervisors, and other playground personnel at rates of pay to be fixed by the Board of Education, without reference to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; special and temporary services, directors, assistants, and janitor service during the summer vacation, and in the larger yards, daily after school hours during the school term; supplies; medals; trophies; awards; lighting fixtures; and equipment, $281,320: *Provided*, That such public-school playgrounds shall be kept open for play purposes in accordance with the schedule heretofore maintained for playgrounds while under the jurisdiction of the playground department: *Provided further*, That the activities provided for under this appropriation shall be operated under the joint control, supervision, and direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Board of Education.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Care of buildings and grounds," on page 26, line 7, after the word "building", to strike out "$1,039,827" and insert "$1,041,987."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Miscellaneous", on page 26, line 10, after the word "pupils", to strike out "$4,300" and insert "$4,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 12, after the word "pupils", to strike out "$16,400" and insert "$17,100."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 22, after the word "courses", to strike out "$78,240" and insert "$81,240."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 1, after the word "immediately", to insert "for the payment of 1942 obligations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, after line 2, to insert:

The unexpended balance of the appropriation of $34,190 for completely furnishing and equipping buildings and additions to buildings, contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942, is continued available for the same purpose in the fiscal year 1943.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 28, line 22, after the word "and", to insert "not to exceed $700", and in line 24, after the word "therewith", to strike out "$4,800" and insert "$5,000".

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, line 10, after the word "hazards", to strike out "$598,350" and insert "$595,150".

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment to the committee amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Idaho in the chair). The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 29, line 10, in the committee amendment, after the word "hazards", it is proposed to insert "and including $2,000 for painting and decorating inside Brookland elementary school, Tenth and Monroe Streets Northeast", and in the same line to strike out "$595,150" and insert in lieu thereof "$597,150".

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter very slightly with the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator in charge of the bill. The proposed appropriation is for the purpose of painting an old school house in Brookland which has not been painted or taken care of for many years. The item is only $2,000, and I hope it may be agreed to and go to conference.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the amendment, and I shall be glad to have it approved so that it may go to conference.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to the committee amendment on page 29, in line 10.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 29, after line 21, to strike out:

For improvement of various municipal playgrounds and recreation centers, including erection of shelter houses, $25,000, of which not exceeding $1,000 shall be immediately available for the preparation of architectural and landscaping plans.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "The Deaf, Dumb, and Blind", on page 32, after line 22, to strike out:

No part of the appropriations herein made for the public schools of the District of Columbia shall be used for the free instruction of pupils who dwell outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to pupils who are enrolled in the schools of the District of Columbia on the date of the approval of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 33, after line 3, to insert:

The children of officers and men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and children of other employees of the United States stationed outside the District of Columbia shall be admitted to the public schools without payment of tuition.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Buildings and grounds", on page 34, after line 13, to insert:

The appropriation of $45,000 for the completion of six unfinished classrooms at the Lafayette School, contained in the Sixth

Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, is made available also for furniture and equipment for those rooms.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 15, to insert:

RECREATION DEPARTMENT

For all expenses necessary for carrying out the provisions of the act of April 29, 1942 (Public Law 534), including personal services, $364,894.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 36, after line 19, to insert:

For improvement of various municipal playgrounds and recreation centers, including erection of shelter houses, $26,500, of which not exceeding $1,000 shall be immediately available for the preparation of architectural and landscaping plans.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Metropolitan Police—Salaries," on page 39, after line 5, to insert:

For the erection of a new precinct station house on land owned by the District of Columbia, at Forty-second Street and Benning Road NE., $40,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, line 9, after the word "For", to strike out "purchase and" and insert "purchase,"; and in line 12, after the word "condemned", to strike out "$103,929" and insert "$115,892, of which $11,963 shall be available immediately for the payment of 1942 obligations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Policemen and Firemen's Relief," on page 40, line 5, after the words "by law", to strike out "$1,360,000" and insert "$1,355,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 6, to strike out the colon and the following provisos: "*Provided*, That in order to carry out the purposes of this appropriation, the Treasury Department shall make a study to determine the proper proportionate contributions of the members of the participating forces and the District of Columbia, and report the results thereof to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, including necessary legislative recommendations: *Provided further*, That the Commissioners are hereby authorized to expend from this appropriation not exceeding $5,000 for necessary expenses in carrying out these provisions, including actuarial advice."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Fire Department—Miscellaneous", on page 41, line 16, after the word "immediately", to insert "for payment of 1942 obligations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$2,200" and insert "$3,000", and in line 2, after the word "automobile", to strike out "$58,625" and insert "$59,425."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, after line 2, to insert:

For a new fire-engine house to be constructed on a site owned by the District of Columbia in the vicinity of North Capitol and Crittenden Streets, including furniture and furnishings, and necessary instruments for receiving alarms, and connecting said house with fire-alarm headquarters, $110,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Health Department", on page 42, line 11, after the word "services", to strike out "$107,515" and insert "$111,775."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 42, line 21, after the word "rent", to strike out "$704,830" and insert "$725,510."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 6, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$63,450" and insert "$66,510."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, line 16, after the word "travel", to strike out "$178,490" and insert "$201,310."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 43, after line 23, to strike out:

For completing the construction of a building for a health center in northwest Washington, $130,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the top of page 44, to insert:

Not to exceed $4,600 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation of $120,000 for beginning the construction of the Northwest Health Center, contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942, is reappropriated and made available for repairs, alterations, and improvements to the Polk School Building to make it suitable for use temporarily for enlarged clinical services.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, after line 24, to insert:

Tuberculosis Hospital: For repairs, alterations, and improvements to the Tuberculosis Hospital at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets NW., to make it suitable for use temporarily during the present emergency for the care and treatment of tuberculosis patients, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, after line 4, to insert:

For all expenses necessary for operation and maintenance of the Tuberculosis Hospital at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets NW., $136,920, including not to exceed $73,545 for personal services; not to exceed $18,750 for necessary furniture and equipment; and not to exceed $1,500 for repairs and improvements to buildings and grounds.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 45, line 16, after the word "labor", to strike out "$900,827" and insert "$908,647."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "The Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia," on page 49, line 19, after the word "available", to insert "for payment of 1942 obligations."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Public Welfare—Board of Public Welfare," on page 50, line 4, after the word "service", to strike out "$162,095" and insert "$174,015."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Division of Child Welfare", on page 51, line 21, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$23,260" and insert "$25,740", and in line 22, after the word "services", to strike out "$42,505" and insert "$43,745."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Jail", on page 52, line 12, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$1,250" and insert "$1,500."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Training School for Boys", on page 55, line 25, after the word "committed", to strike out "$76,000" and insert "$90,600."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Home for Aged and Infirm", on page 58, line 10, after the figures "$149,640", to strike out the comma and "including a superintendent at $4,600 per annum, to be appointed without reference to civil-service requirements."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public assistance", on page 59, line 14, after the name "District of Columbia", to strike out "$850,000" and insert "$775,000, together with not to exceed $75,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for this purpose contained in the District of Columbia Appropriation Act, 1942,"; in line 20, after the word "services", to strike out "including the employment of one general superintendent of public assistance services at $5,600 per annum, one assistant superintendent of such services at $4,600 per annum, and one stenographer-typist (secretary) at $2,000 per annum, to be appointed without reference to civil-service requirements, not to exceed $35,000 may be expended for the distribution of surplus commodities and relief milk, including not to exceed $22,040 for personal services, which shall be in addition to such services herein authorized, and not to exceed $49,960 for personal services, which shall be in addition to such services herein authorized, to certify persons eligible for work relief and surplus commodities" and insert "and for the distribution of surplus commodities and relief milk and to certify persons eligible for work relief and surplus commodities, such sums as may be necessary may be expended, including personal services as necessary in addition to such services herein authorized:"; and on page 60, line 14, after the word "appropriation", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That all auditing, disbursing, and accounting for funds administered through the Public Assistance Division of the Board of Public Welfare, including all employees engaged in such work and records relating thereto, shall be under the supervision and control of the Auditor of the District of Columbia."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 60, line 25, before the word "for", to strike out "$18,000" and insert "$24,000"; and on page 61, line 1, after the word "Columbia", to strike out "$388,000" and insert "$298,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 13, after the word "expenses", to

strike out "$760,465" and insert "$685,465."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, line 18, after "(49 Stat. 744)", to strike out "$60,000" and insert "$64,800."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 61, after line 18, to strike out:

In expending appropriations contained in this act under the caption "Public assistance," not more than the following monthly amounts shall be paid therefrom: Emergency relief of residents: Single persons, not more than $24; family of two persons, not more than $30; and for each person in excess of such number under 16 years of age, not more than $6; and not to exceed a total of $60 to any one family. Home care for dependent children: Family of two persons, not more than $30, and for each person in excess of such number under 16 years of age not more than $6; and not to exceed a total of $60 to any one family. Assistance against old-age want: Not more than $30 per month shall be paid therefrom to any one person. Aid for needy blind persons: Not more than $40 per month shall be paid therefrom to any one person.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Sponsor's contributions to Work Projects Administration," on page 62, line 21, after the figures "$155,000," to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That should the projects herein set out be not operated by the Work Projects Administration of the District of Columbia, such amount of this appropriation as may be necessary may be expended by the Board of Public Welfare for housekeeping aides and for free lunches and milk for necessitous school children, including the purchase of food, supplies, streetcar and bus fares, rent, equipment, rental of equipment, personal services, and other necessary expenses."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 63, after line 21, to insert:

NATIONAL LIBRARY FOR THE BLIND

For aid and support of the National Library for the Blind, located at 1126 Twenty-first Street Northwest, to be expended under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, $5,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Transportation of indigent nonresident persons", on page 65, line 18, after the word "families", to strike out "$20,000" and insert "$17,000", and in line 19, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$7,100" and insert "$7,265."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Militia", on page 66, line 8, after the word "services", to strike out "$9,440" and insert "$10,800"; in the same line, after the amendment above stated, to strike out the comma and the words "including compensation to the commanding general at the rate of $3,600 per annum"; and on page 67, line 11, after the words "in all", to strike out "$18,000" and insert "$19,360."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "National Capital parks—Salaries public parks, District of Columbia", on page 68, in line 3, after the word "services", to strike out "$370,000" and insert "$364,400."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Highway fund, gasoline tax and motor vehicle fees—Department of Vehicles and Traffic", on page 71, line 21, after the words "clerk hire", to strike out "$202,300" and insert "$208,460."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, after line 15, to strike out:

MOTOR VEHICLE PARKING AGENCY

For all expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the District of Columbia Motor Vehicle Parking Facility Act of 1942, approved February 16, 1942 (Public Law 454), including personal services and printing and binding, $16,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 83, after line 21, to strike out:

RENTAL OF STORAGE SPACE

For the payment of rental of property occupied by the District of Columbia for the storage of construction materials in square 3584, for the period beginning May 1, 1942, and ending June 30, 1943, $3,360.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Water service—Water Department," on page 89, after line 7, to strike out:

The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to sell United States securities now held for and on account of the water fund of the District of Columbia in such amounts as may be certified by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia as necessary to meet deficiencies in revenues for the fiscal year 1943 in the water fund and credit the proceeds of such sale to the said water fund of the District of Columbia.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This completes the committee amendments. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I offer two legislative amendments which I have been authorized by the committee to offer. I send the first amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 32, after line 22, it is proposed to insert the following:

Section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act, approved May 10, 1916, as amended, shall not apply from July 1 to September 15, 1942, to teachers of the public schools of the District of Columbia when employed by any of the executive departments or independent establishments of the United States Government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Under the law, teachers of the public-school system of the District of Columbia are employed for a 12-months period, and are prohibited from accepting employment by other branches of the Government. However, there is no such limitation upon school teachers employed in the various States, many of whom can come to Washington during the war emergency and obtain employment here It was the unanimous belief of the committee that this prohibition should be removed at the present time. It was removed during the World War. I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming, on page 32, after line 22.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk the other legislative amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 36, after line 24, it is proposed to insert the following:

The disbursing officer of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance to the superintendent of recreation upon requisitions previously approved by the auditor of the District of Columbia and upon such security as the Commissioners may require of said superintendent sums of money not exceeding $500 at one time to be used for the expense of conducting its activities under the trust fund created by the act of April 29, 1942, all such expenditures to be accounted for to the accounting officers of the District of Columbia within 1 month on itemized vouchers properly approved.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this amendment is made necessary in order to carry out the provisions of section 4 of the act approved April 29, 1942, creating a new recreation board. It is a purely formal amendment, and raises no controversial issue. I hope it may be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming, on page 36, after line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which was not agreed to by the committee. I ask that the amendment be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 47, after line 24, it is proposed to insert the following new paragraph:

Columbia Hospital and Lying-in-asylum: For general repairs, including labor and material to be expended in the discretion and under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol, $11,500.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, this is an amendment in which the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] was very much interested inasmuch as he is a member for the Senate of the board of trustees of the Columbia Hospital for Women. The Honorable Mary T. Norton, Representative from the State of New Jersey, and formerly chairman of the District of Columbia Legislative Committee of the House, is the member of the board for the House of Representatives. The House Committee on Appropriations did not see fit to approve this item because the Columbia Hospital apparently is operated principally as a private hospital. It does accept patients who probably are not able to make the payment for hospital services which might be made in other private hospitals; but, be that as it may, the House committee was not impressed with the need

at this time of authorizing public expenditures for repairs.

The Architect of the Capitol, who, under the law, has jurisdiction of the hospital, appeared before the Senate committee and justified, from the architectural point of view, the appropriation which is the subject of this amendment. It was the understanding of the committee that the Senator from Maryland would present the amendment. In his necessary absence, and at his request and at the request of Representative NORTON, after consultation with several members of the committee, I have called the matter to the attention of the Senate; and I express the willingness, if the Senate agrees to the amendment, to take this item to conference and have it worked out there.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Wyoming, on page 47, after line 24.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in connection with the amendment, I ask that a letter from Representative NORTON be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The letter referred to is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON LABOR,
Washington, D. C., June 8, 1942.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: May I respectfully urge you to offer an amendment to the District Appropriation Committee to include the item of $11,200 for care and repair of Columbia Hospital?

I regret that I did not have the opportunity to appear before the House Appropriations Committee to testify. I am a member of the board of directors of the hospital, appointed by Speaker Longworth in 1929. I believe it to be one of the best managed hospitals in the District. An annual appropriation has been provided by Congress for the care and repair of the hospital buildings and mechanical equipment under the direction of the Architect of the Capitol. Since 1934 the annual appropriation has been $5,000. Last year the hospital paid $14,000 for the replacement of one elevator alone. The earnings for the calendar year 1941 were $358,282.14. Expenses for that period were $342,946.05, leaving a balance of $15,336.09.

Normally, the hospital finds it impossible to collect all accounts receivable. This, I believe, is true of every hospital. For 1941 it is anticipated that the hospital will probably break even. The cash balance on December 31, 1941, was about $52,000. Anyone who has had any experience with hospital work realizes that it is absolutely necessary to preserve a working balance of an amount of money adequate to take care of the contingencies which may arise. For instance, at the present time, due to the war conditions, it is a fact that the help problem is very acute, particularly with regard to nurses. As you know, nurses are leaving hospital work for more lucrative employment. This is a very serious situation in a maternity hospital.

I am particularly interested in this hospital because it is doing a great work in the interest of women and doing it efficiently, conscientiously, and with a minimum of overhead. It is, also, the only strictly woman's hospital in the District of Columbia. It is serving a great group of mothers who do not want to be classed as paupers. The arrangement of the hospital to fit the burden of payment, however small, to the exigencies of the case, would seem to make for better sense of responsibility and self-respect. I earnestly urge that this item be reconsidered by the Senate and that the bill be amended to include this small item for a great cause.

I believe this is no time to effect drastic economies, particularly where these economies may mean the life or death of a mother and child. It is a fact that Washington is now the center of war activities and women are coming here in such great numbers that the demands made upon Columbia Hospital are greater than at any tme in its history. Therefore, it would seem the obvious duty of Congress to accept part of the tremendous responsibility confronting Columbia Hospital during the war emergency.

Thanking you for bringing this matter before the Senate, I am

Sincerely,

MARY T. NORTON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] has an amendment to offer for the committee.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which has been authorized by the committee and which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 71, in line 21, it is proposed to strike out "$208,460" and insert "$209,660"; and on page 71, line 21, after the figure it is proposed to insert the following:

Provided, That the employee of the Department of Vehicles and Traffic who is charged with the immediate responsibility for, and exercises supervision over, the issuance of tags and certificates of title and the registration of motor vehicles and trailers shall hereafter be known as the Registrar of Titles and Tags, and so long as the present incumbent of the position for which a designation is hereby provided continues to hold such position it shall be classified in grade 10 of the clerical, administrative, and fiscal service under the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I regard this amendment as a most deserving one, and I think every Member of the Senate who is conversant with the work in the particular department will treat it in the same light. The present occupant of the position referred to has been employed there for some ten years and previous to that employment was employed elsewhere in the Government service. The amendment would provide an increase of $1,200 a year in salary. In light of the efficient service which has been rendered and the large responsibility which is carried by this employee, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota, on page 71, in line 21.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer an amendment for which notice of the suspension of the rule has been given. I send the amendment to the desk and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the proper place in the bill it is proposed to insert a new section reading as follows:

SEC. 12. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3678 of the Revised Statutes, in any case in which the Senate or the House of Representatives by resolution has authorized, or hereafter authorizes, any of its committees to make an investigation relating to the activities of any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government, or relating to matters within the jurisdiction of any such department or agency, and the resolution providing for such investigation, or a supplemental resolution, either authorizes such committee to request the use of personnel of any such department or agency, or contains a provision under which the head of any such department or agency is requested to detail or assign to the committee such personnel (including legal assistants, experts, and investigators) as the committee may deem necessary, the compensation of any person detailed or assigned to the committee pursuant to any such request shall be paid out of the appropriations available to the department or agency by which such person was employed at the time of such assignment or detail.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I desire to say in fairness that the amendment is decidedly a rider on the bill. It may or may not belong on the bill; but the bill being the one appropriation bill before the Senate, and the necessity for the legislation being such, I deemed it proper to offer the amendment to the committee. I was permitted by the committee to present it to the Senate under a suspension of the rule, under notice duly given.

The history back of the amendment is that the Comptroller General very recently issued an order the effect of which is that no investigator loaned to an investigating committee of either House of Congress can be paid out of the appropriation for the Department from which such investigator was loaned, unless there was some particular significance or relationship between such department and the work which the investigator would perform for the legislative committee, or unless the work for the committee was directly in connection with the work of the department from which the investigator was loaned.

That being the ruling of the Comptroller General, it practically put a stop to some of the investigations going on at the present time. For the sake of enlightenment, let me use as an illustration a committee of which I have the privilege of being chairman; and I use it only as an illustration: A subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys has been doing work in the field and in Washington for a year and a half. It has been working with an investigator now loaned to the committee by the Department of Agriculture. The ruling of the Comptroller General is such that the work of that committee, of which I have the honor to be chairman, would have to be suspended so far as the investigation might go forward with the investigator loaned to us by the Department of Agriculture.

In order to go forward with the investigation, it is quite necessary to have the

competent persons familiar with the land laws, the land rulings, the land regulations, and in all respects free and independent to make a proper investigation for my committee. I make mention of that simply to give an illustration to the Senate, for what is true with reference to the committee acting under Senate resolution 241 and having the subject of the administration of the open public domain in hand, is true with reference, I will say, to the Truman committee, for instance. In other words, the investigators loaned by the Department to the Truman committee must, under the ruling of the Comptroller General, now be withdrawn from the Truman committee. I am making that statement in the presence of the Senator from Missouri, and I feel certain it is a correct statement.

Let me say further that the Senate and House of Representatives have for a long time created investigating committees, which by authority of the legislative body creating them, have sent down to the departments and asked for investigators who have been loaned to the committees. Valuable services have been rendered by such investigators from the departments. I do not know what the Senate of the United States would do unless it were to receive information first-handedly from investigators loaned by the departments. If we do not do this, then out of the contingent fund of the Senate we must appropriate vast sums of money. It seems to me that there is greater economy to be wrought by using those who come from the departments than there would be by increasing the appropriations or allowances from the contingent fund of the Senate, and, at the same time, we obtain more efficient investigators and more efficient help.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. As a member of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I wish to question the Senator for a moment or two. The Senator says there will be greater economy if an investigator is paid out of the department funds than if he is paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate. I cannot agree with the Senator at all in that, because it costs just as much on one pay roll as on another.

The only objection I have to this proposal—and it seems to have been partially cured, as I read it—is that if what is proposed is to be done the Senate should know about it when the resolution of investigation or any supplemental resolution is brought up for consideration in the Senate. If it is represented that there is to be an investigation, so far as the contingent fund of the Senate is concerned, it will cost very little, but there will be a large expense entailed on the Treasury by the use of department clerks and other personnel to assist investigating committees. The Senate should know that at the time it adopts an investigatory resolution. I am the last one in the world who would in any way interfere with the use of experts to aid investigating committees or in any way interfere with the power of the Senate and House to conduct investigations, but as I read the amendment, it is not confined to experts; it includes any kind of personnel, so that a committee could obtain clerks, stenographers and typists, and any other character of employees it needed. Such employees certainly should not be taken from the departments.

I should like to inquire of the Senator whether instead of using the word "personnel," as it appears in the resolution, it would not be well to say "experts, including legal assistants and investigators"? Does the Senator think it desirable that clerks, stenographers, and typists be taken from the departmental pay rolls in order to carry on investigations authorized by either House of Congress?

Mr. McCARRAN. I will say, in answer to the last query of the Senator, that any employee loaned by a department to an investigating committee of the Senate would, in my judgment—and I go back to my first statement—be less expensive, in the long run, than one employed by an investigating committee, because the departmental employees are under the civil-service schedule of salaries, whereas if an appropriation is made from the contingent fund of the Senate and the chairman and other members of the committee are permitted to fix the salaries, then, the salaries are whatever the chairman may make them. If an investigating committee desires to obtain an expert or a clerk or a stenographer or any other employee from a department, of course, if the department has not such employees available, it cannot loan them, but if it has such employees available, and can loan them, they come under the civil-service regulations and civil-service schedule of salaries.

Mr. HAYDEN. Without losing their status.

Mr. McCARRAN. Without losing their status.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator seems to think that would be advantageous.

Mr. McCARRAN. It would be to my way of thinking.

Mr. HAYDEN. I note that according to the amendment it must appear at the time it is adopted, that—

> the resolution providing for such investigation, or a supplemental resolution, either authorizes such committee to request the use of personnel of any such department or agency, or contains a provision under which the head of any such department or agency is requested to detail or assign to the committee such personnel (including legal assistants, experts, and investigators) as the committee may deem necessary.

Mr. McCARRAN. That gives notice that the body authorizing the investigation or setting up the committee, to the Senate, for instance, that the committee when set up will ask for and receive, if possible, assistance from the departments downtown.

Mr. HAYDEN. But it does not advise either the Senate or the House as to the extent of that assistance; that is, whether it shall be one, two, or three experts or four or five or a dozen clerks.

Mr. McCARRAN. And neither, if the resolution were referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, would the Senate know when the resolution was adopted how many clerks would be necessary or how long the investigation would last.

Mr. HAYDEN. It would be the duty of the committee to inquire as to how many clerks would be employed, because upon such information would depend the amount of money to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate.

Mr. McCARRAN. In the long run all the money comes from the Treasury anyway, and my theory is—and I suggest it to the Senator—that if we use the regular civil service employees we will curtail the expense materially.

Mr. HAYDEN. There were at one time over 200 departmental employees engaged in various House and Senate investigations. Naturally the departments complain that if their employees are taken away from them then they cannot perform the work for which Congress has appropriated money, and so they come back to the Appropriations Committee for deficiencies and say, "So many of our employees have been taken away that we cannot do the work the law requires, and, therefore, you must give us more money in order that we may obtain clerks."

Mr. McCARRAN. After all it comes through Congress, and if we provide for it in the least expensive way that is better to my way of thinking.

Mr. HAYDEN. One other point I wish to make. There have also been instances after a committee of investigation was established of persons having been placed upon a departmental pay roll for the sole purpose of detailing them to the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot answer as to that; I do not know anything about it.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is why I should like to offer a suggestion about an amendment to the amendment. As it reads now, toward the end the amendment provides that—

> the compensation of any person detailed or assigned to the committee pursuant to any such request shall be paid out of the appropriations available to the department or agency by which such person was employed at the time of such assignment or detail.

Any such person certainly ought to have been employed by the department prior to the time of the investigation. Would the Senator object to amending the amendment by striking out the word "at", in line 11, and inserting the words "prior to", and then striking out the words "such assignment or detail" and inserting the words "passage of such resolution", so that it would read:

> available to the department or agency by which such person was employed prior to the time of the passage of such resolution.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the Senator's suggestion is a good one, and I should be glad to accept it.

Mr. HAYDEN. I offer that as an amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE and Mr. McKELLAR addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield first to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I merely wish to make a brief observation, growing out of quite a long experience with one investigating committee of the Senate. If committees are denied the right, after it has been expressly given in the resolution authorizing the original investigation, to have the loan of persons from the executive departments, the inevitable result is that the committee must pay more money or get inferior personnel, for the simple reason that anyone coming into the employ of an investigating committee knows that the activity is bound to be of limited duration. In other words, it is part-time employment, so to speak, and does not have continuity, whereas persons who are on loan from the executive branch of the Government know that they are not losing their civil service status. They are annual employees. Therefore, in my observation, making possible the loan of employees from the departments will in the long run cost the Treasury of the United States less, and will provide for the various investigating committees of the Congress a higher type of personnel at a lesser outlay of money.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. With the general purpose of the Senator's amendment I am in hearty sympathy; I think something of this kind should be provided. However, it seems to me the Senator may cover a little too much territory. His amendment reads "all personnel." It seems to me it should be confined to experts, such as legal experts. To take a great many clerks from a department might seriously cripple the department, and I was wondering whether the amendment could not be limited to some extent. What does the Senator think of that?

Mr. McCARRAN. First, I should not like to have the term "expert" employed. Not many will agree on exactly what an expert is. A man may be an expert in the estimation of some, and not in the estimation of others. Secondly, it is assumed that no committee of the Senate will call for more assistants than it actually needs. We must trust each other.

Mr. McKELLAR. There is something in that.

Mr. McCARRAN. This comes back to the very matter referred to by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE]. If it becomes necessary to have a clerk or typist, it seems to me getting a clerk or typist with civil-service status and drawing a civil-service salary is very much less expensive than getting one at a higher salary. This is hardly a time when it is possible to employ a typist or stenographer outside the civil service at less than $1,800 a year, whereas many of the Government typists are working for $1,440 or $1,680 a year.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I should like to add my voice to that of the Senator from Wisconsin in stating that it is almost impossible to get the necessary personnel in order to make a proper investigation if we have to go outside and engage them, for the simple reason that at this time personnel of the right type are scarce, and they much prefer to be on a permanent pay roll, if they can get on one. We have been extremely careful about the uses we have made of those we have had from the various departments in Washington. We have used them as little as possible. But it will be a very serious handicap to the committee of which I happen to be chairman if the ruling of the Comptroller General is allowed to stand, unless the Senate is in a frame of mind to furnish the necessary funds to continue the investigations on which we are now at work.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me to ask the Senator from Missouri a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand from the Senator from Missouri that at this time the departments are prohibiting him from using any of the so-called experts who have been heretofore attached to his committee for investigation purposes?

Mr. TRUMAN. That is the situation. I have had notice from the Comptroller General that he would not pay them after a certain date.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Comptroller General takes that position, it means, if I understand it correctly, that unless we amend the law in some way, all clerks, experts, or whatever they may be called, who have been heretofore loaned to the various committees of the Senate, will be denied the right to participate, at the request of any committee, in any of such proceedings hereafter.

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator is correct, and we will have to employ others.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the amendment of the Senator from Nevada attempt to cure that situation which now exists?

Mr. McCARRAN. It attempts to give authority to the Comptroller General, so that he will not be bound by the ruling which he has sought to enforce.

Mr. TRUMAN. The ruling of the Comptroller General is based on an amendment to an appropriation bill heretofore enacted, which prohibited the use of personnel in Washington, when it was found that there were some two hundred clerks and typists employed by the various committees of both the House and the Senate. The amendment of the Senator from Nevada, as I understand, merely repeals that prohibition in a former appropriation act.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will yield for one further observation, Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate I agree with the theory of the amendment, and I am satisfied that the personnel from the various departments now being discussed are much better qualified to go into the field and make a complete investigation than one whom some committee would have to employ and break in, so to speak.

In addition to that, let me state what would confront the Committee to Audit and Control in the event none of this personnel were available to the various committees of the Senate. It would merely mean that extended hearings might have to be held in order to ascertain or develop exactly the scope of the investigation to be pursued by the committee requesting the assistance, and the total amount to be used in connection with all the various employees.

While I am on this subject, Mr. President, let me repeat a statement I have made once before on the floor of the Senate, and I take this opportunity, with the consent of the Senator from Nevada, to make it once again. The Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate is constantly confronted with resolutions reported by some committee asking the Committee to Audit and Control to authorize expenditure of money, without the semblance of a hearing or without any evidence to support the request for the authorization found in the resolution.

Our committee is in charge of the purse strings, so far as the contingent expenses of the Senate are concerned, and it is our duty to pass upon whether or not we will grant $10,000, or $15,000, or $20,000, or whatever amount may be requested. We can increase or decrease the amount. In a number of cases there is not a scintilla of evidence upon which the Committee to Audit and Control can base a proper finding as to whether or not the investigating committee is entitled to any sum.

We have to speculate and guess. Once before I asked on the floor of the Senate that the committees presenting resolutions, instead of seeking to pass the responsibility to the Committee to Audit and Control, go into the question thoroughly. Evidence should be taken and a report made. That would give the Committee to Audit and Control the evidence. We would then have a basis upon which to allow the sums necessary to carry on the investigation. In other words, it does not seem to me to be fair to the Committee to Audit and Control to follow the present system, and we are at the point where the committee will be compelled to hold hearings in order to determine the necessary sum an investigating committee is entitled to in order to enable it to carry on a proper investigation.

There is at this time before the Committee to Audit and Control a resolution which the members of a standing committee involved merely O. K.'d by polling, the majority of the committee endorsing their signatures upon the resolution. No evidence of any kind has been furnished us to support that kind of a resolution. No evidence is before us to justify spending the taxpayers' money. Obviously we may be compelled to carry on a hearing

of our own before the matter is concluded, or perhaps refer the resolution back to the committee with a request that hearings be held.

A number of resolutions have come to the Committee to Audit and Control from time to time, and whatever complaint I am making, I make in what seems to me to be in the best interests of the taxpayers, who are furnishing the money to the Senate to be spent upon these various investigations. We merely ask for some enlightenment as to the reasons back of the request for the sum stated in the resolution.

I thank the Senator from Nevada for the opportunity to make this statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Since I interrupted the Senator a few moments ago, I have made an examination of the amendment more particularly. I think it will effect the purpose the Senator has in mind, and with that purpose I am in hearty accord. I think it would never do for either the Senate or the House not to be able to call on the various departments for the loan of such employees as we have been discussing, and I give the amendment my hearty approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, that concludes the consideration of the amendments; but the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada makes it necessary for me to ask unanimous consent that the clerks may be authorized to renumber the sections, and that the totals may also be changed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill (H. R. 7041) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be printed with the amendments made by the Senate numbered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I shall not ask for the appointment of conferees on the part of the Senate until after the House shall have acted.

ATTENDANCE OF MARINE BAND AT THE FIFTY-SECOND ANNUAL REUNION OF THE UNITED CONFEDERATE VETERANS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7036, which was sent over to the Senate last week and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. The bill was reported this morning without amendment. It provides authorization for the attendance of the Marine Band at Chattanooga, Tenn., in late June, at the fifty-second annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans, and provides for the appropriation of a sufficient amount to defray the expenses incident thereto.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, may I inquire what the calendar number of the measure is?

Mr. STEWART. The bill was reported earlier today. It is not yet on the calendar, as I understand.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Idaho in the chair). The bill will be reported by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7036) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the fifty-second annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Chattanooga, Tenn., June 23 to 26, inclusive, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7036) to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the fifty-second annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Chattanooga, Tenn., June 23 to 26, inclusive, 1942, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Idaho in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

James O. Day, of Mississippi, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Mississippi, vice George T. Mitchell, term expired.

By Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Spencer C. Young, of New York, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of New York, vice Arthur G. Jaeger, term expired.

By Mr CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Wainwright Abbott, of Pennsylvania, and Karl deG. MacVitty, of Tennessee, now Foreign Service officers of class 4 and secretaries in the Diplomatic Service, to be also consuls general.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

THE ARMY

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, from the Committee on Military Affairs, I report certain Regular Army transfers, promotions, and one new appointment. I have consulted the majority and minority leaders and I ask unanimous consent that the transfers, promotions, and appointment be immediately considered and confirmed, and that the President be immediately notified.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed, and the President will be immediately notified.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Ernest K. Kai, of Hawaii, to be judge of the circuit court, fifth circuit, Territory of Hawaii.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John B. Colpoys to be United States marshal for the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Adrian Pool to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John H. Hoover to be vice admiral, to rank from May 25, 1942, and to continue during his assignment as commander of the Caribbean Sea frontier.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Oscar C. Badger to be rear admiral, to rank from April 24, 1942.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 27 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, June 11, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 8, 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Charles J. Pisar, of Wisconsin, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary

in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

Reginald S. Kazanjian, of Rhode Island, now a Foreign Service officer of class 8 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Lynn R. Edminster, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 16, 1943, vice Raymond B. Stevens, deceased.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Dwight H. Dexter	Edwin J. Roland
Edward W. Holtz	Peter V. Colmar
Herbert F. Walsh	George H. Bowerman

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Harold L. Wood
Arthur W. Johnsen

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Douglas B. Henderson to be a lieutenant in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 1st day of April 1942.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 25th day of May 1942:

Robert Wilcox	Julius E. Richey
Chester R. Bender	Benjamin B. Sherry
Richard R. Smith	Frederick J. Statts
Samuel G. Guill	James S. Muzzy
Paul E. Trimble	Raymond W. Blouin
Russell R. Waesche, Jr	Fred F. Nichols
Joseph P. Martin	Theodore F. Knoll
George W Playdon	Nelson C. McCormick
Thomas F. Epley	Frank M. McCabe

The following-named ensigns to be lieutenants (junior grade) in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 29th day of May 1942:

Robert D. Brodie IV	Harry F. Frazer
Robert W. Goehring	Julian J. Shingler
Harry L. Morgan	Warner K. Thompson, Jr.
John D. McCubbin	
Ross P. Bullard	William R. Riedel
Orvan R. Smeder	Lewis B. Kendall
Victor Pfeiffer	Ralph M. West
William L. Morrison	Charles E. Sharp
David W. Sinclair	Charles W. Schuh
Robert R. Russell	Lynn Parker
Charles E. Masters, Jr.	Claude G. Winstead
Robert H. Prause, Jr	Thomas G. Byrne
James N. Schrader	

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Capt. Walden L. Ainsworth to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 2d day of December 1941.

Capt. Norman Scott to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 11th day of May 1942.

Capt. Howard H. Good to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 14th day of May 1942.

Capt. Mahlon S. Tisdale to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 16th day of May 1942.

MARINE CORPS

Col. (temporary) Omar T. Pfeiffer to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942.

The following named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 16th day of February 1942:

Benjamin T. Owens, a citizen of Oklahoma.
Henry W. Seeley, Jr., a citizen of Connecticut.

The following named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 31st day of March 1942.

Rora T. Musselwhite, Jr., a citizen of North Carolina.
William B. Allison, a citizen of Pennsylvania.
Dannitte M. Beattie, a citizen of South Carolina.
Gordon S. Calder, a citizen of New York.
Charles W. Churchill, a citizen of Missouri.
Bert Davis, Jr., a citizen of Louisiana.
Alan F. Dill, a citizen of Ohio.
Thell H. Fisher, a citizen of Oklahoma.
Joseph G. Hall, a citizen of Connecticut.
Richard E. Hall, a citizen of California.
John R. Howell, a citizen of New York.
Samuel W. Kirkpatrick, a citizen of Texas.
Francis H. Bergtholdt, a citizen of California.
Walter H. Cuenin, a citizen of Massachusetts.
Walter M. Goldsberry, Jr., a citizen of Indiana.
Joseph L. Harrington, a citizen of Maine.
Bertram L. Menne, Jr., a citizen of Kentucky.
Marion G. Mickelson, a citizen of Iowa.
Lyle Q. Petersen, a citizen of Wisconsin.
Robert E. Rain, Jr., a citizen of Texas.
James B. Whitfield, Jr., a citizen of Alabama.

Burtin L. Hedin, a citizen of New Jersey, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 20th day of April 1942.

John E. Semmes, Jr., a citizen of Maryland, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of May 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 8, 1942:

CIRCUIT COURTS, TERRITORY OF HAWAII

Ernest K. Kai to be judge of the fifth circuit, circuit courts, Territory of Hawaii.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

John B. Colpoys to be United States marshal for the District of Columbia.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

Adrian Pool to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 24, with headquarters at El Paso, Tex.

POSTMASTERS

GEORGIA

Don W. Pettitt, Nelson.

MISSISSIPPI

Ben H. Bacon, Schlater.

NORTH CAROLINA

Clarence W. Boshamer, Gastonia.
N. Hunt Gwyn, Lenoir.
Erma S. Lancaster, Rural Hall.

PENNSYLVANIA

Anna C. DeHart, Ivyland.
Joseph A. Zalot, Langhorne.
Bertha E. Weaver, Terre Hill.

SOUTH CAROLINA

John B. O'Neal, Fairfax.
Earle M. Wharton, Ware Shoals.

TENNESSEE

Hugh B. Milstead, Hornsby.

VIRGINIA

Henry C. Swanson, Danville.

WASHINGTON

Clinton L. Byers, Longview.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

John H. Hoover to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue during his assignment as commander of the Caribbean Sea frontier.

Oscar C. Badger to be rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service.

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS, AND APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Jess Franklin Gamble et al., for appointment, promotion, or appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, which appear in full in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 4, 1942, under the caption "Nominations," beginning on page 4893.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 8, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most holy and gracious God, the Father of mankind and the refuge of Thy children in every age, Thou dost wait to be merciful. We pray that we may adorn the teaching of our Lord by wholesome speech and quickening footsteps in the paths of duty; bless us with the promise, the enchantment, and with the prophecy of spring.

Under Thy fatherly benediction defend us from all perils and wanton adversaries and be unto all our fellow countrymen an immeasurable might, calling us by night and by day, rejoicing that the glory of freedom is deathless and the pall of tyranny is fleeting. Elected to fulfill the greatest task of any race, forbid that we should ever traffic in human misery nor wear the mantle of self-pride. We pray for growing strength and endurance to bless our workers in shop and field; Oh, let us meet them on the heights of their life and being, where all men are brothers and where the jarring notes of discord are caught up into a symphony of mutual service and understanding. For the sake of Him who ever enfolds us in His love. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, June 5, 1942, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that, on June 3, 1942, the President approved and signed a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6979. An act to authorize an increase of the number of cadets at the United States Military Academy and to provide for maintaining the Corps of Cadets at authorized strength.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from a local paper in my district.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an original oration by John Randolph Bibb, of Nashville, Tenn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

THE LATE BRIAN BELL

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I have just learned with deep regret of the sudden death this morning of Brian Bell, chief of the Washington bureau of the Associated Press.

The passing of a man like Brian Bell in a day when the world badly needs true and tried journalists even as it needs stalwart statesmen is, indeed, a grievous loss.

Mr. Bell had been with the Associated Press for many years and had been chief of the Washington bureau since January 1939. He directed the activities of that bureau during all the feverish days of the second World War. The responsibilities of that position became heavier and heavier, and his kind, stout heart broke under the strain.

I knew Mr. Bell for a good many years and I pay to him the tribute reserved for the truly great in the profession of journalism. He was a good reporter. By his faithful allegiance to the highest standards and ethics of his profession Brian Bell made an important contribution to the life of his times.

He is another victim of the war, and appropriately taps may be sounded along with "30."

LEONORA TOLAND

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 501), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Leonora Toland, widow of Edmund Toland, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary compensation, and an additional amount not to exceed $250 to defray funeral expenses of the said Edmund Toland.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMORIAL SERVICES FOR DECEASED MEMBERS

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 502), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That on Wednesday, the 24th day of June 1942, immediately after the approval of the Journal, the House shall stand at recess for the purpose of holding the memorial services as arranged by the Committee on Memorials, under the provisions of clause 40-A of rule XI. The order of exercises and proceedings of the service shall be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and all Members shall have leave to extend their remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD until the last issue of the RECORD of the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, on the life, character, and public service of the deceased Members. At the conclusion of the proceedings the Speaker shall call the House to order and then, as a further mark of respect to the memories of the deceased, he shall declare the House adjourned; and be it further

Resolved, That the necessary expenses connected with the memorial services herein authorized shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House upon vouchers signed by the chairman of the Committee on Memorials and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON ILLEGITIMATE LABOR PRACTICES AND OUTLAWING RACKETEERING

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report back favorably (Rept. No. 2215), without amendment, a privileged resolution (H. Res. 500), providing for the printing of 3,000 additional copies of the hearings held before subcommittee No. 3, of the Committee on the Judiciary, relative to injunctions against illegitimate labor practices and outlawing racketeering.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 3,000 additional copies of the hearings held before Subcommittee No. 3 of said committee on the bill (H. R. 7067) relative to injunctions against illegitimate labor practices and outlawing racketeering.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JARMAN. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. This resolution has the approval of the entire Committee on Printing?

Mr. JARMAN. It does; yes.

The resolution was agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON REVENUE REVISION OF 1942

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Printing I report back favorably (Rept. No. 2216), without amendment, a privileged resolution (H. Con. Res. 67), providing for the printing of 3,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Ways and Means on the bill entitled "Revenue Revision of 1942," and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 3,000 additional copies of the hearings, held before said committee, on the bill entitled "Revenue Revision of 1942."

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from the magazine America.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SYNTHETIC RUBBER NOW

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and extend my remarks by the insertion of a newspaper article in the Appendix.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, there appeared in the Bay City (Mich.) Times of Friday, June 5, an article regarding a new synthetic rubber and an interview with Dr. Willard H. Dow, president of the great Dow Chemical Co. regarding it. That organization is now producing this product which is called thiokol. It has practically all the advantages of natural rubber and some very desirable qualities which the natural product does not possess.

I have been familiar with the development of the Dow Chemical Co. since its inception. I have watched its growth with amazement. It has been and is a most conservative and a very successful organization. It promises nothing which it cannot fulfill, and when Dr. Dow casually predicts, as he did, that the tire industry will be revolutionized by the new substitute, and that we will never go back to natural rubber after the war, it indicates the contribution this company is making to the welfare of this country at this time.

Mr. Speaker, the Dow Chemical Co. has contracts with the Government to produce enough thiokol with which to retread 1,000,000 tires per month. This product is just as suitable for new tires as it is for retreads. It can increase production to any point desired and at comparatively little expense. Hundreds of millions of dollars with which to build synthetic rubber plants are not involved, as one can readily see by reading the article. If the story which follows is only one-half true, it completely destroys the theory that we must ration gasoline throughout the country in order to conserve rubber.

POST-WAR CONDITIONS

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, following the World War for victory in which we are now engaged, there is no more important task before the country than the matter of post-war conditions, and I present the words of a celebrated American citizen on this point:

> We know now that we can never again retire to the presumed security of peace and complacently closet ourselves from the rest of the world. We must do sentry duty for peace. Peace calls for vigilance fully as alert as the vigilance of war.
>
> Winning the war is our first task. But even while we are fighting it, we are determined that the values we are fighting for shall not be sacrificed in the exhaustion, relief, and general let-down of the early days of peace. Our new conception of ourselves as a part of the world has led us to understand that, just as no nation can escape war after it becomes total and global, so no nation can enjoy peace until it becomes total and global. And we have, I believe, gone one step further in our thinking. We now know that to maintain world peace is not merely a task of policing the world. It is even more importantly a task of making a world in which peace can exist.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ex-

tend my remarks in the RECORD and include a recent address which I made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio address by Justice James F. Byrnes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEFENSE HOUSING

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago the President sent to the House of Representatives a message suggesting additional authorization for appropriations for defense housing in congested industrial areas. I have asked for this time to give notice that the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds will conduct hearings on this subject tomorrow morning at 10 o'clock in the committee room of the Committee on Agriculture.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of a statement by public officials of the State of Texas.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that "necessity is the mother of invention." The truth which this statement reflects explains the fact that periods of war have in the past accounted for many great advances in the mechanical field. It seems that it is not enough that the scientists should labor in the laboratories. Their ideas and ideas fresh from the masses of the people must be tried out under conditions of actual use. The actual trials are encouraged and hastened by the needs of the people.

Presently we need rubber. We apparently have an adequate supply of natural crude rubber to supply our military needs for some time to come but the supply for civilian use is precariously small. I think we will all agree that our armed forces should be absolutely assured of an adequate supply. That can and is being accomplished by denying civilians the opportunity to use from the stock piles of new natural rubber. So far there has been no claim on the part of any responsible representative of the administrative agencies that the Government needs the tires now on private automobiles for military purposes. If they are so needed all that is necessary is to say so and the American people will gladly turn them over to the Government. So long as privately owned tires are not needed by the military forces their use is properly a matter to be determined by their owners. The American people know well enough that if they wear out their present tires they will have to depend on their own ingenuity for new ones. Even today various substitutes are being tried out. They may not be all that we would like but the average American is going to provide himself with wooden tires, cotton tires or even run on the rim until some day one of these substitutes will prove its usability. The very necessity of the situation is the best guaranty that it will be met, and if perchance no improvement is made on existing substitutes the Army will still have all the new rubber we have. To stop the movement of private cars where gasoline is plentiful would not put a single new tire on a single Army vehicle, but it would strike at the very heart of the inventive initiative of the American people. To ration gasoline where gasoline exists in abundance would be but to deny ourselves the advantage of the self-interest of millions of motorists. So long as these motorists can get fuel for their cars they are going to try to devise some substitute for rubber, but if the bureaucrats make it impossible for these motorists to get gasoline the Nation loses their aid in solving the really serious rubber problem.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture may have until midnight tonight in which to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include a statement by the Fraternal Order of Eagles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article on China.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therewith a letter addressed to me.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Mr. Arthur Sears Henning, which appeared recently in the Times-Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LAKE MICHIGAN FISHERMEN

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, may I have the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH] chairman of the Rules Committee. I know your Chicago folks like fish. We have been sending you just tons of fresh fish, fine whitefish and trout, from Lake Michigan and Lake Superior. This morning from the Dowagiac Daily News, of Dowagiac, Mich., I have information that the New Dealers in Michigan are following the same course that they are in Washington. No other group of planners would think of such a course.

The editorial is as follows:

It is reported from Lansing that the budget director has sprung a mighty plan for the State to go into the commercial fishing business to supply State institutions with fresh fish as an economy measure. It is needless to comment upon the starry-eyed impracticability, to use respectful language, of this idea. But it is all a part of the scenery at Lansing to set up such visionary plans to camouflage places where real results could be obtained.

They propose to go into the fish business and put out of business all of those honest, hard-working commercial fishermen who have been giving you your fish every Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. You ought to do something about it. You cannot, directly, but a letter from you to the New Dealers of Michigan might get those fellows off of the idea of putting those fishermen out of business. There are enough other people out of business in Michigan without sending the fishermen along with the others.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in connection with the pending deficiency bill having to do with W. P. A. appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two editorial paragraphs from the Keota (Iowa) Eagle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from the Cincinnati Times-Star of June 3.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, and to include excerpts from the Christian Science Monitor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks to include part of a radio address by Dr. Yap on Pleading China's Cause.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a radio program of June 1, 1942, notwithstanding the fact that it is two-thirds of a page over the customary two pages, and the excess cost will be $30.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. TRAYNOR and Mr. ARENDS were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include letters written by me to Secretary Ickes and to Mr. J. J. Pelley, together with Mr. Pelley's reply.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on two subjects and in one to include a short excerpt, and in the other an article about Alaska.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement made by the Governor of Pennsylvania on how they are trying to change the system of voluntary ration boards by substituting for them boards made up of paid Government political henchmen. I think the Members of Congress should read it. The voluntary system should be continued.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes on Tuesday, June 9, after the conclusion of the legislative business and any other special orders that may have been entered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a commencement address I delivered last Thursday evening.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks, and to include certain newspaper and magazine articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

FEDERAL LAND BANK AND COMMISSIONER LOANS

Mr. FULMER submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 6315) to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans, for printing under the rules:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6315) to extend for two additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate; and agree to the same.

H. F. FULMER,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.,
WALTER M. PIERCE,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
J. ROLAND KINZER,
Managers on the part of the House.

J. H. BANKHEAD,
CLYDE HERRING,
D. WORTH CLARK,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6315) to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The House bill and the Senate amendment both extended for 2 additional years, or from July 1, 1942, to July 1, 1944, the 3½ per centum annual interest rate on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans. The Senate amendment also provided that the same reduced interest rate should be applicable to interest on so-called purchase-money mortgages and on real estate sales contracts taken by Federal land banks which is payable on installment dates occurring after June 30, 1942, except that the rate of interest on such mortgages and contracts should be one-half of 1 per centum per annum in excess of the rate paid by borrowers on mortgage loans made through national farm loan associations. The Senate amendment also provided that in the case of such mortgages and contracts taken by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, the rate of interest payable thereon should not exceed 4 per centum per annum for all interest payable on installment dates occurring on and after July 1, 1942, and prior to July 1, 1944. There were no corresponding provisions in the House bill. The House recedes.

H. P. FULMER,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, JR.,
WALTER M. PIERCE,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
J. ROLAND KINZER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6315) to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans, and ask that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, this bill was passed by the House some few days ago. It extends the 3½ percent interest rate for 2 years. The Senate added an amendment which would include contract and purchase-money mortgage transactions not to exceed an interest rate of 4 percent.

The Federal land banks and the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation acquire real estate in the liquidation of loans which break down. When the bank or the Corporation resells the property they acquire in this way, ordinarily the buyer does not pay the full amount of the purchase price in cash; ordinarily he makes a part payment in cash and secures the balance of the purchase price either with a purchase-money mortgage or under a real-estate sales contract. Whether the transaction will take the form of a purchase-money mortgage or a real-estate sales contract depends to a large degree upon local laws and customs.

Where a purchase-money mortgage is given, the buyer becomes the owner of the property and gives back a purchase-money mortgage to secure the unpaid balance of the purchase price. Where a real-estate sales contract is given, rather than a purchase-money mortgage, the bank or the Corporation retains title to the property, but agrees to convey title to the buyer when he has paid a specified amount upon the purchase price.

The rate of interest specified in a purchase-money mortgage or real-estate contract to be paid by the buyer upon the unpaid portion of the purchase price may be 5 percent a year or higher. The bill as amended by the Senate would provide a 4-percent rate for these real-estate purchase obligations during the period from July 1, 1942, until July 1, 1944. Under the present law there is not a reduced rate which applies to purchase-money mortgages or real-estate sales contracts held by the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation or to real-estate sales contracts held by the Federal land banks, although the 3½-percent rate applies to purchase-money mortgages held by the bank. These amendments would place all of these purchase obligations on the same bases, and, in providing a 4-percent rate for them, would place them on the same basis, so far as interest rates are concerned, as are direct borrowers from the Federal land banks, who under the present law also pay a 4-percent rate.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FULMER. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. Does this amendment meet with the approval of the entire Agriculture Committee of the House?

Mr. FULMER. That is right; also, the conferees on the part of the House and the Senate are unanimously for it.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Kansas is here. I wonder if the gentleman would yield to him.

Mr. FULMER. Certainly.

Mr. HOPE. I may say that I think the amendment is very desirable. It offers the benefits of the reduced rate of interest to purchase-money mortgagors and holders of contracts of sale where lands have been purchased from the Federal land bank. It provides that the reduced rate shall not be 3½ percent but

4 percent, which is in harmony with other provisions of farm-credit legislation. Under existing law, where the loan is made directly instead of through a farm-loan association, the rate of interest is one-half of 1 percent higher than the regular rate. The conferees felt that the same distinction should be made here.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and it is not my purpose to object, but I feel that at this period of the session when we are in no hurry, when there is no emergency, the least we can do is to abide by the rules of the House, print conference reports in the RECORD, and not attempt to call them up until the following day so Members may have an opportunity to learn what is in the conference report. This conference report is just submitted, it has not been printed, and there are Members of this House, other than the conferees, who might be interested, but they do not know what the conference report contains. I think that the proper way is to follow the rules, print the conference report in the RECORD and not call it up until some succeeding day, rather than to call it up at the time the conference report is submitted. At the end of the session it would be all right to call a conference report up immediately, or it would be all right to do so if there were an emergency, but there is no emergency in connection with this legislation.

Mr. FULMER. I may state to the gentleman that this act expires on the 30th day of this month, and we are desirous of securing final passage at the earliest date possible.

Mr. COCHRAN. But that leaves 22 days.

Mr. FULMER. It will take only a few minutes to dispose of and it has the unanimous support of the conferees, both the Senate and the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. But there is somebody else in the House of Representatives besides the conferees who have an equal responsibility.

Mr. FULMER. I appreciate that.

Mr. COCHRAN. Inasmuch as the gentleman has 22 days before the law expires I think he has ample time to print the conference report in the RECORD and let it be called up tomorrow; then we would all know more about the matter and if there is anything in the conference report that is objectionable we could oppose it. That is the point I make. Not only in reference to this report but all conference reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The conference report was agreed to. A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTINUANCE OF FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Joint Resolution 311, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation is hereby continued as an agency of the United States, under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture, until the Congress shall otherwise direct.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "the Congress shall otherwise direct" and insert in lieu thereof "June 30, 1947."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER]?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the same bill that was on the calendar the other day to which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], one of the objectors, did object?

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman is correct. The gentleman from Michigan stated at that time he had not had a chance to look over the report and that he would be glad to do so and report to me. The next day he came over and stated that it was perfectly all right with him and that he had no objection.

This bill was reported unanimously by the committee. This corporation will expire on the 20th of this month and is now in the midst of transactions in connection with our lend-lease operations and the war effort, as well as the farm program, and it is very necessary that we get this bill through so that the corporation can continue its splendid work.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I notice this has been extended to 1947. In all other cases we have extended the life of these various corporations and activities for 2 years. Why is it necessary to extend this for 5 years up to 1947? What will the extension do and what additional power does it give the Corporation?

Mr. FULMER. May I say to the gentleman that the committee talked this over and came to the conclusion that during the war emergency at least 5 years would be a proper period. The bill was introduced without any limit whatsoever, but the committee cut it down to 5 years to be sure that it would operate within the time of the war and perhaps the emergency following the war. This does not carry an appropriation of any kind and, as stated a while ago, it is very necessary to extend the life of the Corporation in connection with operations under the lend-lease bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman a question. In view of his statement to the effect this Corporation is conducting purchases for export under lend-lease, may I ask the gentleman if he has had any report submitted to him showing the extent to which the Surplus Marketing Corporation is going to go in taking food out of this country, not only for lend-lease operations but for shipment to all other parts of the world during the post-war period? In other words, is the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, and his committee making a study as to the shortage of food that may develop in this country due to the program which we are now proceeding under, namely, to remove hunger from the other parts of the world without first taking care of the situation in the United States?

Mr. FULMER. May I say to the gentleman that we have not had any reports along that line except it was stated that they are proposing in connection with the surpluses of this country to utilize some of these in connection with lend-lease operations and to look into the matter of getting any other products that they may need under the program so as to be helpful along that line.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What I am thinking about mostly right now is the enormous amount of publicity that has been given the last 10 days to the proposal of Vice President Wallace, to the proposal of Under Secretary of State Welles, Secretary Wickard, and to other proposals, along the line of those broadcast last night over the radio on the Forum of the Air conducted by Mr. Theodore Granik, wherein it is proposed to take the food of this country to all other parts of the world to the point of removing hunger from those other countries. That is a pretty big undertaking and something we have not yet been able to do in the United States, to say nothing about all the other parts of the world. I just thought I would bring that up at this time to see if the Committee on Agriculture has made or is making a study of that program which is now being prosecuted so aggressively by the post-war planners, let me say, for the lack of another name.

Mr. FULMER. That is a very important matter and I feel sure the Secretary of Agriculture, those at the head of this Corporation, and those connected with the war program will try to keep well posted. In the meantime I agree it would be well for our committee to look into the matter.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman this question: In connection with these foodstuffs that are being sent under lease-lend, as it were, does the gentleman know whether this country is going to receive any pay whatsoever for any of the foodstuffs which it is sending to all the nations of the world, as requested?

Mr. FULMER. I cannot answer the gentleman's question. I imagine he knows as much about that as I do, just what we will get out of our operations under the lend-lease program.

Mr. RICH. The committee does not know anything about it, and I do not know anything about it because I have been trying to find out whether lease-lend means that the American people are going to receive any compensation or remuneration of any kind for the things that they are giving away to these other nations, and I cannot find where we have contracts that call for repayment on the merchandise which we have shipped to these other nations, and which

we will in the future ship to these other nations.

It is a fine thing to be a good neighbor, but just remember that the American taxpayers are going to have to pay for everything that is sent out by this country. If you think it is not going to be a hardship on the American people, just remember that all those nations as long as they can come to Uncle Sam and say, "Give me this, Uncle Sam," and you pass it out, it is all right as far as the other nations are concerned, but someday the American people are going to weep when they have to pay the taxes for this administration.

The administration is paying no attention to it. They are good neighbors now, and it is a good policy, but it will be a mighty hard one on the American taxpayers, do not forget that.

Mr. FULMER. What the members of my committee are concerned about is the winning of this war at the earliest date possible.

Mr. PIERCE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania whether he wants this paid in gold or in bonds? He has many times called the attention of the Congress to the fact that foreigners are getting these goods. Has he thought the question through? How does he want this to be paid, in gold or in goods? You have to do one or the other.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman from Oregon does not want us to get any pay. He says we are going to repudiate our debts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The commitee amendment was agreed to.

The House joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RETIREMENT WITH ADVANCED RANK OF CERTAIN OFFICERS OF THE NAVY

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2285) to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank, of certain officers of the Navy.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MICHENER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The purpose of the bill is to provide that any officer of the Navy who may be retired while serving as the commander of a fleet or a subdivision thereof in the rank of admiral or vice admiral, or who has served or shall have served 1 year or more as such commander, may, if such rank was conferred pursuant to the provisions of section 18 of the act of May 22, 1917, in the discretion of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, when retired, be placed on the retired list with the highest grade or rank held by him while on the active list.

The purpose of the bill is to permit officers who have had the rank of admiral, in view of certain military assignments, to retire with that rank when they do retire.

Mr. MICHENER. If this bill becomes law, will it affect the retirement pay of anyone retired under this law?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am happy to say that the Navy Department has advised the committee that the enactment of this bill will not result in any increased cost to the Government.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the retirement of certain officers of the Navy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It provides for the retirement of officers of the Navy who have had the rank of admiral or vice admiral in view of certain positions they have held.

Mr. HOFFMAN. May I ask whether the officers who would get the benefit of this bill have anything to do with or pass upon this situation? What I mean is this: According to PM, on March 3, 1942, Lieutenant Commander Winchell said when he was asked about his status:

> Sorry, that's a Navy secret. It's a funny feeling after all these years as a free citizen not to be able to talk, but that's the way it is now that I'm in uniform. I'm not free to say what I want now. I might get thrown in the brig. Even my radio broadcast has to be passed by a board before I go on the air.

Are these admirals who are to be retired on that board which passes on Walter's broadcasts?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. This bill has reference to fighting admirals.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know, but even fighting admirals might suffer the humiliation of detefmining whether Walter's broadcast is all right or not.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I would say that no officer who comes within the purview of this law will ever have anything to do with the broadcasts of Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, if this bill passes would these admirals or high Navy officials receive the same pension as if this bill did not pass?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes. No pay is involved in this at all. When an officer is given a certain command he temporarily carries the rank of admiral, but on the permanent list he is not an admiral, usually a rear admiral. Therefore, if he has served in that rank for 1 year, when he retires, if the President nominates him and if the Senate confirms the nomination, he retires with the rank of admiral. However, no money is involved in this.

Mr. RICH. What advantage does this give to those officers? Why should we pass this measure?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. For instance, Admiral Hart, who has just come back after a campaign, now goes on the retired list. It would apply to Admiral Hart. It would apply to other admirals when they go on the retired list, provided two things happen, first, that the President nominates them for that rank; and second, that the Senate confirms them. This is an honor given them in recognition of their distinguished service, that is all.

Mr. RICH. I appreciate that, but why should we retire anyone now when men of this type are so badly needed?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We are not retiring anyone who has not reached the retirement age unless certain conditions, such as poor health, force him to retire.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, apart from the subject but simply for the record, may I say that the gentleman is speaking about these admirals and their distinguished service. I hope that in the future we will not have admirals of the type we had up until 2 years ago, who have been saying it is impossible to sink a battleship with a bombing plane.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That any officer of the Navy who may be retired while serving as the commander of a fleet or subdivision thereof in the rank of admiral or vice admiral, or who has served or shall have served 1 year or more as such commander, may, if such rank was conferred pursuant to the provisions of section 18 of the act of May 22, 1917 (40 Stat. 89; U. S. C., title 34, sec. 212), or the act of July 17, 1941 (Public Law No. 180, 77th Cong.), in the discretion of the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, when retired, be placed on the retired list with the highest grade or rank held by him while on the active list: *Provided*, That no increase in retired pay shall accrue as the result of such advanced rank on the retired list: *Provided further*, That the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, may in his discretion extend the privilege herein granted to such officers as have heretofore been retired and who satisfy the foregoing conditions.

SEC. 2. The President is further authorized, without reference to the power conferred upon him by this act, to continue with the rank of admiral on the retired list the officer who, as commander in chief of the Asiatic Fleet, rendered conspicuous and distinguished service in operations against the enemy in the Far East from December 7, 1941, until February 14, 1942.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, beginning on line 9, strike out section 2.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs, we ask that the House disagree to the committee amendment so that section 2 will appear in the bill, if it is enacted, just as it passed the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OR ACQUISITION OF ADDITIONAL NAVAL AIRCRAFT

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2496) to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill deals with the construction of blimps. When we had this bill before the committee there was pointed out the valuable assistance this type of lighter-than-air craft has rendered in the prosecution of the defense against submarines. The committee in the House bill struck out the word "nonrigid" and left in the bill that I have now called up "lighter than air." I am offering an amendment to correspond with the House bill, as I have been informed by the chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee that the House bill is satisfactory.

When we passed this bill in the committee and through the Senate, it was recommended that there be 72 blimps authorized in all. Up to date we have already authorized 48. These 48 blimps are in process of being built now. A great many of them are going into commission.

Under previous legislation we have appropriated $25,000,000 for the establishment of blimp bases. These bases have practically all been established. One was established a few days ago in the Puget Sound area, one up in Massachusetts, one down in Florida, one on the North Carolina coast, two of them will probably be put on the Gulf Coast, one will probably be sandwiched in between Miami and the North Carolina base, and Admiral King, the commander in chief of the fleet, sent word to the committee by Captain Rosendahl, that he wanted the number changed from 72 to 200. So therefore the committee agreed with Admiral King, in view of the importance of blimps in connection with the submarine warfare, and I shall offer an amendment at the proper time if unanimous consent is given for consideration of the bill.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill implements the legislation which the Congress passed within the last year, providing for the establishment of these blimp bases?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct, and I may say that the testimony is that the blimps are rendering a worth-while service in the submarine campaign. They are armed, they carry depth bombs, they cruise out over the waters, and in their cruising radius they can and have rendered outstanding service. If the commander in chief of the fleet, Admiral King, thinks we have got to have them to combat the submarines, then I, for one, am going to give them to him so far as I am concerned.

Mr. MICHENER. As I understand, these blimps are very valuable in the detection of submarines, provided our country has control of the air in such localities.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. MICHENER. In other words, they are of no value if the enemy has heavier-than-air craft in the locality.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct. They would be absolutely useless in a submarine campaign in the British Isles, because there are too many land-based planes, but on our own coast line they do meet our military needs.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman how many of these blimps have been built under the act that we passed at the last session of the Congress?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, to answer the gentleman's question would disclose a certain amount of military information which we are requested not to disclose, but I can answer the question in this way. The program was for 48 and they are making very rapid progress in completing the program.

Mr. SABATH. Are any of them in use now?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, yes. I could state definitely the number, but suffice it to say that over a dozen are in use today.

Mr. SABATH. Is a great deal of rubber used in the construction of these blimps?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am unable to answer any question as to the material, but if there is such material used, we have got to have them and we will have to have priority for rubber if that is necessary, because these blimps, up to date, have a record of accomplishing a worth-while objective in the submarine campaign.

Mr. SABATH. So far I have not seen any favorable results. Are these the same blimps that Captain Rosendahl recommended?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. These are the blimps that Captain Rosendahl recommended and that Admiral King, the commander in chief of the fleet, has recommended.

Mr. SABATH. So Rosendahl sold them to King, I presume.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Anyhow, they are sold to the committee to the extent that they have demonstrated their effectiveness.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I desire no inside information. I simply want to say that increasingly the Navy, as well as the Army, is realizing that control of the air is necessary to the control of land or sea forces.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I want to thank the gentleman from West Virginia for his contribution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to acquire or construct nonrigid lighter-than-air craft, and spare parts and equipment, as may be necessary to provide and maintain the number of useful nonrigid lighter-than-air craft at a total of 72.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment to the Senate bill, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia to S. 2496:

In lines 4 and 6, strike out the words "nonrigid."

In line 7, strike out "72" and insert in lieu thereof "200."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RESTRICTIONS ON CERTAIN MARINE CORPS OFFICERS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 3152) to remove restrictions upon the service of certain officers of the Marine Corps in the Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C., which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill is presented to the House by the distinguished minority member of the committee, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS], and I shall ask him to explain the bill.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is simply to remove, during the war emergency, and for 1 year thereafter, a restriction that prohibits any officer in the Marine Corps from serving in the city of Washington more than 4 years out of any 8. We consider that desirable legislation; but during the emergency there are certain specialists and officers engaged in the program, and it would disrupt the program to maintain this prohibition. We are proposing to suspend it, and the Marine Corps assures us that they will carry on as usual.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of the act of May 29, 1934 (48 Stat. 812), as amended by section 1 of the act of May 1, 1936 (49 Stat. 1249; 34 U. S. C. 667 (e)), is hereby further amended by deleting therefrom the second proviso.

With the following committee amendment:

Line 6, after the word "hereby", strike out "further amended by deleting therefrom the second proviso" and insert in lieu thereof "suspended for the duration of the present war and for 1 year thereafter."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to suspend restrictions during the present war and for 1 year thereafter upon the service of certain officers of the

Marine Corps in the Marine Corps headquarters, Washington, D. C."

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

AWARDING OF MEDALS OF HONOR

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 2456) to amend the act approved February 4, 1919 (40 Stat. 1056), entitled "An act to provide for the award of medals of honor, distinguished-service medals, and Navy crosses, and for other purposes," so as to change the conditions for the award of medals, and for other purposes, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, this bill is presented to the House by the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. IZAC], and I ask that gentleman to answer the question of the acting minority leader and explain the bill.

Mr. IZAC. Mr. Speaker, the reason for this bill at this time is to provide a uniform method in the awarding of medals and decorations. For distinguished service we give now only one medal, a Distinguished Service Medal. For heroism not in combat with the enemy, we give a Congressional Medal of Honor in the Navy and the Marine Corps. Then for extraordinary heroism in combat with the enemy, there are three different awards, the Congressional Medal of Honor, the Navy Cross and, third, the Silver Star. Does that explain the matter?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; that explains what the bill does. I think we ought to be careful in amending the law providing for these medals. For instance, the other day it was rumored that in a certain instance where medals of some type had been distributed, the authorities in Washington determined upon a given number, like 6 or 10 medals, to be given to those participating in the particular engagement or mission. The commanding officer at the station was so advised. Then it was a question of determining who would get those 6 or 8 medals.

Now, if that is true, there should be something done about it. Distinguished medals of honor given for heroism in war should not be determined by lottery or by number. These awards should be determined by the duties performed and the unusual conduct of the indviduals honored by the awards.

Mr. IZAC. I believe whenever instances of that kind arose it was due to the fact that the medal was given by the commanding officer. He had the authority and power delegated by the President—not the Congressional Medal of Honor, for instance, but some minor medal. Of course, it was the effect of not reducing the value in case they gave it promiscuously. So I suppose they limited the number and told the commanding officer, "Now, don't be too generous with these medals." But outside of campaign medals there should be no medal given and will not be given as far as the Navy is concerned, except in accordance with this law, if it is passed here today. We finally grouped this service into three different categories, and they have a certain function and are intended to be given only for that purpose. Of course, the determination of the value of the duty performed is up to somebody. That is usually the commanding officer. He must determine if the service was of great enough value to the country to warrant a Silver Star or the Navy Cross or the Congressional Medal of Honor. I know of no way we can have it otherwise than for somebody to have that authority.

Mr. MICHENER. Were hearings held on this bill?

Mr. IZAC. Oh, yes. The committee passed it unanimously.

Mr. KEAN. Reserving the right to object, there is nothing in this bill to include handing out a lot of medals to a lot of foreign attachés and people who do not belong to our Navy, is there?

Mr. IZAC. Oh, no. This is just for the members of the Navy and the Marine Corps.

Mr. KEAN. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object not for the purpose of asking any question. Today we have had several bills coming from the Committee on Naval Affairs, considered by the House. It seems to me a very appropriate occasion to make a few remarks in relation to the heroism of the United States Navy since our entry into this war.

Every American is proud of the wonderful work done by the men of the air, both in the Army and the Navy, by the men of the Navy and the men of the Army; but on this particular occasion I think we might pause to pay special tribute, in view of recent happenings, to the heroism of our men of the Navy.

I know I speak the sentiments of every Member of the House and I know I speak the sentiments of every American in sending to Pearl Harbor, to Midway Island, and other places in the Far East our congratulations not only to Admiral Nimitz, who is a great naval leader, but to every one of his officers and enlisted men of the United States Navy. Our people take great pride in their achievements and victories.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withdraw the bill for today?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I withdraw the bill, Mr. Speaker.

ADJUSTED PAY AND ALLOWANCE OF PERSONNEL OF THE ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, AND PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. THOMASON, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

MAJORITY WHIP

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago a very sad event happened, in the loss of one of our distinguished and beloved Members, the late majority whip, Patrick Boland. Of course, the legislative duties of the House must continue. It is a regrettable incident to me, as majority leader, to be compelled, as a result of the untimely death of our late colleague and my personal friend, to consider the selection of his successor. However, this has to be done.

I know the House will be pleased to hear of the selection I have made. I am pleased to announce to the House that I have selected, designated, and appointed as majority whip one of the most likable Members of the House, one of the most efficient Members of the House, one whom I predict will make a great majority whip, our distinguished friend from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

LEGAL GUARDIAN OF JOHN LESNIAK—VETO MESSAGE (H. DOC. NO. 768)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States, which was read by the Clerk:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 4723, a bill for the relief of the legal guardian of John Lesniak.

It appears that John Lesniak, a boy 12 years of age, while playing on a vacant lot in Elizabeth, N. J., found some dynamite percussion caps buried in some cinders inside a sewer pipe lying on the ground. He took the caps home. Unfortunately, upon striking some object, the caps exploded and injured the boy. It is proposed by the bill under consideration to authorize the payment of the sum of $2,750 to the boy's legal guardian, as compensation for the personal injuries so sustained by him.

Near the spot where the boy picked up the percussion caps there was located a tool shed of the Work Projects Administration and apparently an inference is drawn that the caps belonged to the Work Projects Administration and were negligently left lying around by one of its employees. An investigation made by the Work Projects Administration demonstrates, however, that no explosives of any kind were used or kept on the project conducted by it at that point and that, consequently, the caps must have been the property of some third person. There does not appear to be a scintilla of evidence to the contrary.

While I regret the occurrence of this accident and extend my sympathy to the boy for the painful injuries which he has sustained, I, nevertheless, feel, in the light of the circumstances involved in the case, that there is no legal or moral obligation on the part of the Government to compensate him.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 8, 1942.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and the bill and accompanying document referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, after the disposition of the regular business and any other special orders, I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include an address entitled "The Human Side of the Presidents," by Dr. Wilson. I have an estimate from the Public Printer to the effect that it exceeds the limit by about one-sixth of a page; notwithstanding this, I ask unanimous consent to extend it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the extension may be made.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders, I may address the House for 40 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects, and in each to include editorials.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. O'HARA] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PADDOCK] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include some correspondence.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES FOR THE DEPENDENTS OF ENLISTED MEN OF THE ARMED FORCES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up a privileged resolution, House Resolution 496, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7119) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, as you have heard, the rule allows 2 hours of general debate on the bill H. R. 7119, known as the Edmiston bill, which provides allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes. I know each and every Member is in favor of this legislation. It is legislation in the right direction. It provides allowances to our brave men who have demonstrated to the world that they deserve to have their dependents financially assisted by this Government.

For your information I may say that this bill originally provided for the following allowances: For a wife $20; for a wife and one child $30, and for each additional child an additional $10; for one child where there is no wife $15, two children $25, with $10 per month for each additional child. However, in view of the Senate bill providing for the following increases and the House committee having agreed, I hope it meets with the approval of all Members. These increases were: $28 for a wife but no child; $40 for a wife and one child with $10 per month additional for each additional child; $20 if there be no wife but one child; and $30 if there be no wife but two children, with $10 per month additional for each additional child.

To a divorced wife to whom alimony has been decreed it provides an allowance of $20. To one dependent parent it provides an allowance of $15; for two dependent parents $25; to each disabled and dependent brother or sister, $5. Family allowance to class B dependents, payable only while the member is dependent upon the enlisted man for chief support, total allowance payable to class B shall not exceed $50 per month. If total exceeds $50 it shall be apportioned between the dependents.

The bill also provides that the enlisted man shall have deducted from his pay $20 a month for class A or class B dependents, and $25 for class A and class B dependents.

I believe the committee recommending and concurring in this bill has acted judicially and wisely.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZIMMERMAN). The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule. There is no objection to either the rule or the bill.

The bill aims to liberalize family allowances. In the last war the basic allotment was $30, $15 taken out of the pay of the enlisted man and $15 supplied by the Government.

I understand the Committee on Military Affairs intends to offer a committee amendment which in effect would make the pending bill conform to the bill passed by the Senate which is far more liberal. I am in favor of the Senate bill providing a basic allotment of $50 for the wife of an enlisted man. This is much-needed legislation and nothing more than a simple act of justice to the wives and dependents of our soldiers, sailors, marines, and Coast Guard. It will help fortify the morale of our armed forces and the families at home.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield.

Mr. ANDREWS. As I understand the committee amendment, it will include all of the figures having to do with allotments. The committee amendment will cover that portion of the Senate bill.

Mr. FISH. I thank the gentleman, as I have not seen the committee amendment which has not yet been released.

In the House bill it is proposed to have the enlisted man deduct $20 from his pay, the Government to give $20, making a total of $40 for a dependent wife.

Under the Senate bill which will be the committee amendment, the enlisted man will pay $22 and the Government $28, making a total of $50 as against $40 as provided in the original bill from the Military Affairs Committee.

This is a war measure to build up the morale of the veterans who have dependents back home. Naturally, no Member of Congress wants to have a soldier or sailor fighting for his country, while his wife or his children are on the verge of starvation or enduring unnecessary privations and hardships. Congress if it passes this bill will have gone way beyond the amounts that were alloted in the last World War and will make it possible for the draft boards to take married men with wives and dependent children into our armed forces.

Mr. RUSSELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. RUSSELL. Under the terms of this bill, is the allotment compulsory?

Mr. FISH. I will have to ask the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, because this is virtually a Senate bill we are about to consider.

Mr. THOMASON. The allotment applying to class A, which covers wives and children, is compulsory. Under class B dependents, meaning fathers and sisters, it is not compulsory but within the option of the soldier.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have an inquiry this morning from a wife who has three children. She is not divorced, but she was deserted a year or two ago by her husband, who is now in the personnel of the Navy, and she wants to know whether or not he would be compelled to make this allotment to his wife and three children.

Mr. FISH. Yes. He would come under class A. A wife comes under class A and children come under class A, so it is compulsory and that wife would get $22 from the husband and $28 from the Government and $12 for the first

child and $10 apiece for the other children.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in my remarks the schedule provided by the Senate bill for the payment of allotments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH]?

There was no objection.

The following table indicates the amounts payable in the most typical cases:

	Government contribution	From soldier's pay	Total
To class A:			
Wife, if no child	$28	$22	$50
Wife with 1 child	40	22	62
Wife with 2 children	50	22	72
To class B if there is no class A dependent:			
1 parent	15	22	37
2 parents	25	22	47
1 parent and 1 sister	20	22	42
1 parent and 2 sisters	25	22	47
To class B if there is also a class A dependent:			
1 parent	15	5	20
2 parents	25	5	30
1 parent and 1 sister	20	5	25
1 parent and 2 sisters	25	5	30

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

I am in favor of paying our enlisted men $50 a month and shall vote for that amount no matter what action the conference committee may take. There should be no further delay in passing the bill providing for $50 a month as pay for our Army and Navy in the midst of the greatest war in the history of our country. I am glad it also contains increases for the noncommissioned officers and for the second lieutenants. The latter have been underpaid for years.

Mr. Speaker, this ought to be an appropriate place, in view of the remarks made by the majority leader [Mr. MCCORMACK] in reference to the heroism of our victorious fleet at Midway Island and the fine leadership of Admiral Nimitz, to state that our soldiers, both officers and enlisted men, are the equal if not superior to any in the world. They are undergoing a program of intensive training and are now being provided with modern equipment that compares favorably with the best our enemies have produced. Our soldiers are superior in character, intelligence, and physique, and equal to any soldiers in courage and sacrifice. When our Army meets the enemy, no matter where it may be, we should have faith that it will defeat the enemy wherever it meets them in Europe, Africa, or Asia.

I have repeatedly expressed my faith in our Navy, that we have now and have had for a long time past the most efficient, the finest, and the best Navy in the world. Wherever and whenever our Navy meets the Japanese Navy on equal terms we will be victorious.

Under the heroic leadership of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, our Army cannot lose in the Pacific, and under the brilliant leadership of Admiral Nimitz, our Navy will win battles in the Pacific every time it encounters the Japanese Fleet.

The Congress should take every opportunity to uphold the faith of the American people in our Navy. Some timorous people began to lose faith in our Navy as a result of Pearl Harbor. That dastardly attack occurred before war was declared, and might have happened to any nation in the world with the same result. Our Navy today, under the best possible leadership, man for man, gun for gun, and ship for ship, will always defeat the enemy. It is time that the faith of the American people in our Navy be fully maintained and that they have absolute confidence that we will win this war, both on land and on sea. The Axis Nations have reached their apex of power and every day America is getting more powerful and is already nearing its peak of production, which means final victory for our armed forces throughout the world.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, in considering dependents, what is more important to these fathers and mothers, wives, and children than insurance if their loved ones give their lives and make the supreme sacrifice for their country or become totally disabled?

I have requested these few minutes to discuss an amendment which I propose to offer when the proper point, immediately following title 1, is reached.

This amendment is not hastily conceived, but is only presented after study of the subject of automatic Government insurance since November, prior to Pearl Harbor and our entrance into the war.

Last November I suggested to General Hines, of the Veterans' Administration, in committee that it was fundamentally sound and just that any man or woman entering any branch of our armed services should be automatically covered on entrance into the service by insurance. I contended at that time that our Government should pay for at least $5,000 of this coverage, not as a bonus to our service men or women, but simply as a matter of justice.

In line with that study and contention, and after consultation with the Veterans' Administration as to the wording of the bill, I introduced on February 2, 1942, H. R. 6512. Hearings on this was requested of the Ways and Means Committee without success.

Today I am offering a new title to the present bill, containing the substance of H. R. 6512, and sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Members of the House will give this proposal careful analysis and attention.

This amendment provides that all commissioned officers and enlisted men in the active military or naval service on April 20, 1942, and all persons hereafter entering upon active service during the present war, shall be issued, without examination, national service life insurance in the amount of $5,000 under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended. While such persons continue in the active service, and for 6 months after separation from active service, or 6 months after termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, whichever is the earlier date, the premiums of such insurance shall be paid by the Government out of the current appropriations for pay and allowances pertaining to the particular organization under which the active service is performed.

The reason for employing the date of April 20, 1942, is that the act of December 20, 1941, Public, No. 360, Seventy-seventh Congress, in section 10, provided for automatic insurance of $5,000 under the National Service Life Insurance Act covering death or total disability over the period from October 8, 1940, to the expiration of 120 days after December 20, 1941.

In view of the fact that this bill might be enacted into law at a date subsequent to April 19, 1942, it provides insurance for any person who has died in or been discharged from active service since April 19, 1942, and prior to date of enactment of the proposed act where such death or discharge resulted from injury or disease incurred in line of duty.

While the Government pays the premiums the insurance would continue as term insurance. However, provision is made whereby the person may convert the $5,000 or any part thereof in any multiple of $500 but not less than $1,000, upon payment by the insured of the excess premium resulting from the conversion.

The issuance of $5,000 insurance under this bill will not affect the right of any person, otherwise eligible, to apply for or carry additional insurance under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, except that the aggregate amount of insurance under either or both such acts together with the $5,000 insurance issued under section 1 of this amendment shall not at any time exceed $10,000.

The provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of the bill would be for application under the bill if enacted into law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As I understand, the gentleman's amendment provides that the Government shall pay the premium on $5,000 worth of insurance for each man who is in the armed forces?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Each man or woman who is in the armed forces today.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And that insurance would continue in operation until 6 months after the war terminates?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Or 6 months following that person's severance from active service.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I think the gentleman's amendment is very good.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I know the distinguished gentleman has given much consideration to this question: What has been the attitude of the ex-service men's organizations, the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, with respect to the amendment the gentleman proposes to offer?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I have in my files letters from many Legion posts throughout the Seventh District of Minnesota. I shall quote later to the House from letters from 12 Legion posts when we are in general debate. These are samples of dozens of similar letters that have come to me which express wholehearted approval of this amendment. There is not a single Legion post in the Seventh Congressional District of Minnesota which has written to me on this subject which has not given its unanimous support to this provision. I compliment the men of the Legion, and particularly my own home posts, on being big enough to give willingly to the boys of this war what they themselves did not receive in 1917.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. GRANT of Indiana. As a member of the Committee on Invalid Pensions, I can vouch for the intense interest the gentleman has shown all along the line in the matter of insurance for the members of our armed forces. Had the recommendations of the gentleman been followed, we would have had such a provision placed in the law many months ago.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I take this time merely to call to the attention of the Members, for their study, certain provisions in the bill which it seems to me should be amended.

Under the bill as it is today, if a soldier should have a dependent sister only, let us say, she would get $5 from the Government, but his pay would have to be docked $20. There is no provision in the bill that his pay shall be docked an equal amount not to exceed $20, so that soldier would be put in this position: He has a dependent. He would like that dependent to be helped. It is optional with him whether or not he will request that an allowance be made to her. He is faced with this situation, however: If he should request the Government to pay her $5 a month, then he is immediately obligated to pay and there is immediately deducted from his pay $20. He might say, "If you pay her $5, I will pay her $5 or I will pay her $10, but I would not want $20 deducted from my pay just to get a $5 contribution from the Government for my sister."

The same situation might arise in the case of one parent. One parent would get $15, but the soldier's pay would immediately be cut $20. In such cases, in many instances, the soldier would be paying from twice to four times as much as the Government.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the gentleman's point is well taken. As the gentleman has pointed out, the bill as written apparently is not quite fair to the borderline cases where the soldiers do not totally support the parents but would like to and should give partial help.

Mr. PACE. My suggestion is that the language be changed so that from the soldier's pay can be deducted an equal amount, but not to exceed $20.

The other comment I wish to make on the bill is that it would put you in this position—whether or not you want to be there I do not know, and you can decide that for yourselves: You specify particularly how the contribution the Government makes shall be paid. The wife gets $20, the child gets $10, the parent gets $15, the sister or brother gets $5. But then you say that $20 shall be deducted from the soldier's pay, but you do not provide in the bill how this $20 shall be distributed. You merely provide that the $20 taken from the soldier's pay shall be distributed in such manner as the regulations to be issued may provide.

I cannot for the life of me understand why we should take such care as to say that the money the Government puts up shall be paid this way and that way, so much to the wife, so much to the child, so much to the parent, and so much to the sister or brother, when as to the $20 the soldier puts into the pot you have no voice and the soldier has no voice. Some departmental head issues a regulation, changeable overnight, and says that the $20 the soldier puts into the pot can be paid all to the wife, all to the child, all to the parent, all to the brother, or all to the sister.

It certainly seems to me that enacting legislation of this importance, affecting the welfare of millions of soldiers, if you are going to compel them to take $20 out of their pay and put it into a pot for distribution among their dependents, either the Congress or the soldier himself, one or the other, should say how it shall be distributed, and not fall into the error we have been guilty of so many times, of saying, "Oh, that can be handled by a regulation"; when you have no idea who will issue the regulations or how often the regulations will be changed. Certainly, the soldier is entitled to that protection.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL].

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, it is my purpose to support the bill which this rule makes in order, H. R. 7119, which has for its purpose the providing of family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States. It is my information that the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, which has the bill in charge, will offer amendments when the bill is read, raising the allotments enumerated in section 102 (c) for class A dependents, which amendments I will support. Under these amendments in the case of a service man the allotment to the wife with no child will be raised to $28; to a wife and one child, $40, with $10 per month additional for each additional child. If there be no wife but one child, $20, and if there be no wife but two children $30, with $10 per month additional for each additional child.

The War Department has announced as a fixed policy of the Department that it does not contemplate calling to the service as enlisted men any more eligible persons with dependents than the present emergency actually requires. In other words, it is the purpose of the War Department to limit enlistments so far as practicable to those men who do not have dependents. However, there are a number of enlistments where dependency exists. The statistics show, according to the information furnished me, that from 9 to 10 percent of men enlisted in the service have dependents and will come under the provisions of this act.

The class A dependents are the wife and children of the service man. The wife will receive a minimum of $50 per month, being $22 contributed by the soldier or sailor and $28 by the Government. This payment is mandatory and is received as a matter of right, without dependency. The class B dependents, however, will not be entitled to payments unless requests therefor have been made by the soldier or sailor or by someone in his behalf.

We all realize that the financial burden for carrying the war is enormous and is going to fall heavily upon the taxpaying public. However, we realize too that the men who are called to the service and who have no choice but must burn their bridges behind them and deprive themselves of all opportunity to carry on their occupations and must, in addition, subject themselves to the hazard of the battle line, are entitled to every consideration by their Government. They certainly are entitled to have reasonable allowances provided for their families where dependencies exist. The morale of the American Army is high and it must be kept so, and proper and adequate treatment for the wives and children of soldiers is essential in building and maintaining morale. I feel that the American public will approve the action we are taking today in making suitable provision now for the dependents of our fighting forces, and I am glad to give my support to this bill and to the amendments which will be offered.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL].

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, there is no question but that the Seventy-seventh Congress stands out as the whipping boy upon whom has been subjected a ceaseless barrage of criticism, insult, and abuse. Yet after the history of the Seventy-seventh Congress is fully written, it will stand out as the one agency which brought home to the people the necessity of taking care of the armed forces of the United States.

Probably no Congress in the history of the Nation has given more consideration to the needs of the men in the armed forces than this Congress. For the past 2 years, ever since the trouble in Europe

began to involve the United States and it became necessary for us to build a great Army and Navy for our national defense, the House has repeatedly considered measure after measure, until now the benefits which have been given to the soldiers and the sailors are comparable to those possessed by the forces of Australia and other parts of the British Empire who are now seeing service overseas.

For instance, about a year and a half ago, after the Selective Service Act was introduced and passed, although the original proposal was $5 a month for men in the armed forces, discussion immediately came up about raising the pay of those men from $21 to $42 and from there on up until last week the House approved $50 a month for every soldier and sailor. It is my hope that as time goes on further benefits for these men who are doing so much in the service of their country will be considered favorably by the Congress as a whole.

Some of the other proposals which have been made in the Seventy-seventh Congress include free transportation during furlough for all the soldiers and sailors in our armed forces. Although this question has been before the House and has been rejected several times, it is my fond hope that as time goes on and it becomes more and more evident to the House and to the Congress that the parents back home want to see other steps like these taken, so their boys can get home when they are on furlough, such a measure eventually will be approved and passed by the House.

I want to take this opportunity to congratulate the distinguished members of the House Military Affairs Committee for the very fair consideration they have given, time after time and occasion after occasion, to the constructive proposals that have been made by individual Members of the House. I think it is a tribute to them and the House as a whole that measures and propositions of this kind will come before the House for our consideration. I think the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] should be given particular notice at this time for his determination to offer an amendment proposing $5,000 of free insurance for every man in the armed service. Certainly his proposal is well worth the consideration of the House, and I hope it will be agreed to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad indeed that Congress is going to do something for the dependents of the men who are in the service. I think one of the things that makes a good soldier is that he does not have to worry about his family back home. If we would just let this bill now in conference pass now, which will give the soldiers $50 a month, and also takes care of his dependents, we are going to increase the morale of the Army to a very large extent, and the men will have their minds then on winning this war instead of thinking about what is going to happen to their families while they are away, because they know when they get back home themselves they can be taken care of.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of the time to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, once more may I have the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], the chairman of the Rules Committee? I do this because I want to enlist his influence in support of this proposition which we are going to have before us in a few days with respect to pay for the fighting men. You know, the administration all through has been going along with union leaders, both Green and Murray, and on occasion with John Lewis. I do not know which one it is going to decide to follow, whether Lewis, Murray, or Green, or whether it will finally see that the unorganized worker gets justice. Perhaps the gentleman has that knowledge. But the administration has gone along with the union politicians and some of their union activities, which compel every American citizen to pay tribute to one or the other of these labor organizations in order to work in defense of this country. The support which is asked now is on this conference report which is coming back here where the other body has cut down that amount of $50 which we thought the soldiers were entitled to receive to $46 per month. I hope the gentleman will join with the minority Members, although I do not speak for them, but join with those who want to pay the fighting men this increase, and do it now. I have heard the gentleman from Illinois talk very often about increases in pay. Now I hope he will stand by the proposition that the House decided was right and fair and pay these fighting men this $50 a month and not vote for the conference report, which, as one gentleman on the other side of the Capitol said, would "chisel" them out of $8. That may be the administration's measure, but let us here go this time with our fighting men.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, when I originally explained the bill, I was not aware of the fact that the House Committee on Military Affairs had agreed to the Senate amendments increasing the allowances and, therefore, I shall correct my previous remarks and give the correct changes.

Earlier in the day the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] called my attention to a condition affecting the good fishermen of his State which he claimed they received at the hands of what he terms "New Dealers." Of course, I am obliged to say that I do not know anything about the matter. However, I do know that the fishermen of Michigan could perhaps obtain larger hauls if Michigan industries would not pollute Lake Michigan which is responsible for the diminishing supply of fish in that lake.

I hope he will call attention to many of the manufacturers who are responsible for this pollution of Lake Michigan and urge that they desist in violating the health regulations and the laws not only of the Federal Government but of their own State.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I will tell the gentleman about that. If you Chicago fellows did not want to suck all the water out of the Great Lakes and out of Lake Michigan especially, and run it down through the Chicago drainage canal to take care of the filth of the city of Chicago, and also if the Booth Fish Co. did not put prices down to a point where men could not make a living, we would still have more fish.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman uses an expression which I suppose is common in Michigan, but we are not sucking out any of the water that we are not entitled to. We have taken what was allocated to us by the War Department, and later on by the Supreme Court of the United States, and I say to the gentleman, notwithstanding that we are taking 1,500 cubic feet per second, the levels of the lakes are higher than they ever were before, and since our diversion we have spent $200,000,000 on the sanitary canal to purify the water, and make possible water transportation between the Great Lakes and the southern and Gulf sections of our country.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What the gentleman means is that the more water you take out of the lakes, the more there is left, just like this New Deal economic policy, that the more you spend the more you have.

Mr. SABATH. And I say to the gentleman that he is pretty resourceful, but we spend more, yes; but we take in more, and where our national income was only $40,000,000,000 in 1933, the national income today is $100,000,000,000 a year, so you can spend more when you get it in, and we have been getting it in because the country is prosperous, and I hope it will continue to be prosperous under this administration, under the New Deal that the gentleman is so displeased with. The gentleman stated something about his hoping that I will vote for the House provision of $50. I say to him that in my desire to secure the increased pay to the boys from $21 I was hopeful we might be able to double it, and when we got it to $42 I was tickled pink.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not mean pink, does he?

Mr. SABATH. I never dreamed that the House would be as liberal as it was, and, therefore, I rather would be satisfied with $42 than to delay the consideration of the bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to call attention to a statement made by the majority leader and by a few other gentlemen who are congratulating the Navy upon its efficiency, as well as the Army. Somehow or other they have omitted to say anything about the Air Corps, and I think that is the department that is entitled to equal or a greater deal of congratulations, and the thanks on the part of the country for the wonderful service which they have rendered. As to the Navy, permit me to call the attention of

those who refuse to see and who refuse to hear, that it was President Roosevelt who from the very moment he took office, started to build up our Navy, and had it not been for him and his advocacy in 1933, 1934, and 1935, and every year thereafter, of bringing about efficiency in the Navy and an increase in our Navy and merchant marine, I regret to say that perhaps these congratulations to the Navy and the Army would not have been in order today. If there is one man who is entitled to be congratulated and to whom the country should be grateful, it is to his great Commander in Chief, our President, who foresaw the danger to our country, and notwithstanding that it is generally known to all, yet unfortunately some of these gentlemen who for some reason or other like to find fault with the New Deal, never give the President the cooperation or credit to which he is entitled; but the future historians and a sincere people will undoubtedly recognize the great and valuable service which the President has rendered to our country and to the democracies the world over.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. THOM. Is it not a fact that during the early days when we were making public-works appropriations the President was criticized for allocating some of the money from that fund to the building up of warships?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, yes; but I do not wish now to say anything that might be displeasing to the gentlemen who have been criticizing all the time, because most of them are beginning to recognize the mistakes that they have made, and they are going along now with the administration and the President, because they realize that they made a mistake in not doing so in the early days, and, therefore, I would not say anything that would be construed by them as being unkindly and unfair.

I am mighty glad to see them cooperate and aid in every possible way. We have witnessed it today on the bills that were passed by unanimous consent. I think they will continue to cooperate in the future. We need this unity and I do not want to say anything that would create the slightest possible disunity in the House or in the country, and I hope that these gentlemen, including the gentleman from Michigan, will realize that we are at war and that it is necessary to strengthen the hands of our President and not find fault which, after all, may impede his efforts to an early and successful conclusion of the war.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the American people will continue to appreciate and recognize and realize the great service that these armed forces of ours, under the leadership of our great President, have rendered to America and made possible the victories that have been ours in the past few days and those that I hope will be ours in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7119) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7119, with Mr. BULWINKLE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, before I make a brief statement about the general provisions of this bill I should like to concur in some of the very fine and deserved tributes that have today been paid to my long-time friend, Admiral Nimitz. I am sure we all thoroughly appreciate the fine work that the Navy has done ever since the war began, and even before, but particularly in the Pacific during the last few days.

It so happens that when I first became a Member of this body nearly 12 years ago, the town of Fredericksburg, Tex., where Admiral Nimitz was born, was in the congressional district that I had the honor to represent for 4 years. I know Admiral Nimitz well. I know some of his family. Above all, I know the high esteem and affection in which he is held by the people of the historic old town of Fredericksburg, Tex., and likewise by the people all over southwest Texas. In fact, if you ever have the good fortune to visit that old town you will see a famous hotel, one of the oldest in Texas and in the Southwest, named for his distinguished grandfather. It was from that very town that Admiral Nimitz was appointed a midshipman to the United States Naval Academy. From that day until this his record has been replete with distinguished service not only to the Navy but to his country. We are all praying for him and his men today, and I feel sure they will achieve a glorious victory.

Mr. Chairman, it so happens that today I am acting chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs because the distinguished chairman, Mr. MAY, is unavoidably absent from the city on important business, and I am in charge of the bill. Therefore, it has fallen to my lot to make a brief statement regarding the bill and to allot such time as those desiring to speak shall request.

I may say that the committee has given a lot of time and a lot of serious thought and consideration to this legislation. That is particularly true of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON], who is the author of the bill, and who has been giving it study ever since he has been a Member of this body, and I think ever since the last war, in which he played an important part.

I believe you will find, when the committee has offered committee amendments which were unanimously agreed to in committee this morning, that there are in fact very few, if any, matters of controversy remaining. So I should like, at the outset of my remarks, to say that the committee this morning, by unanimous vote, changed the figures on page 3 of the bill, if you will be kind enough to refer to it, so as to conform to the figures in the bill passed by the Senate last week.

The House bill originally provided for payment to a dependent wife of $20 per month, and we propose to offer an amendment at the proper time raising that to $28.

The House bill provided for a wife and one child, $30. We propose to raise that to $40, with the same provision for $10 additional for each child.

In line 11, section 3, of the House bill we originally provided that if there be no wife, but one child, the payment should be $15. We propose to raise that to $20 to conform to the Senate figure.

Likewise in section 12 where the House bill provided that if there be no wife but two children, the payment should be the sum of $25. We raised that to $30.

The only other substantial difference is that the House bill provided that the soldier should have taken from his monthly pay the sum of $20 and that the Government should match that with $20 for a dependent wife and with $10 for each child. But if the amendment which the committee proposes later to offer is accepted, then there will be taken from the soldier's pay the sum of $22, and the Government will contribute $28 to the dependent wife, making the total allowance to the dependent wife $50, and substantially the same amounts then for dependent children, and likewise for those mentioned in class B, such as dependent fathers and mothers and brothers and sisters.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What would the gentleman say with regard to the question which I think has been raised here possibly informally, as to whether or not a soldier could make a partial dependency allotment?

Mr. THOMASON. That is a matter for the consideration of the House. The same question was given consideration by the committee. The Members will understand, of course, that when it comes to class A dependents, meaning a wife and dependent minor children, or a former divorced wife who is still drawing alimony, it is compulsory; but when you get down to the question of dependent parents and dependent brothers and sisters, it is within the discretion and only upon the request of the soldier himself that any allowance is made.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am thinking of some instances in which only a partial dependency may exist; it may be that the dependent has some little income from an additional source.

Mr. THOMASON. I appreciate the point raised by the gentleman. I believe that point was made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]. Perhaps some amendment should be offered placing a limitation on the sol-

dier's contribution, so that the soldier should not contribute as much as $22 in a case such as the gentlemen mentioned; and perhaps it should not be made compulsory that he has to contribute $22 to a dependent brother, a class B dependent, when the Government contributes only $5. I appreciate the force of the gentleman's suggestion.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman spoke of compulsory allotments in the case of class A dependents. Would that also hold as to class B dependents where there are no class A dependents?

Mr. THOMASON. In any event, under the provisions of the bill, before class B dependents get an allowance the soldier must request it. The Government pays nothing to class B dependents unless the soldier has requested it and dependency is established. It is therefore reduced to a matter of whether or not the soldier feels like contributing to the support of the brother or sister or father or mother. He has the option, if he wishes to exercise it.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Would that apply where there are no class A dependents?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; I think the same rule would prevail.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. One other question: Why is the time delayed for 4 months before the bill goes into operation? The gentleman has doubtless received many letters, just as I have, dealing with this subject.

Mr. THOMASON. I believe one of the principal reasons was that the War Department and the Navy Department, who are to administer the law, felt that the matter is such a big job and so complicated that it might take them perhaps that long to set up the proper accounting system and records. There is another thing that ought to be considered and I am sure will be by the membership just as it was by the House Committee on Military Affairs, and that is the committee felt they ought not to make the payments so large or the attraction so great that married men would rush to enlist or that draft boards would hasten to begin the more or less wholesale induction of married men with dependents so long as unmarried men were available.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Did we not have legislation similar to this during World War No. 1?

Mr. THOMASON. We had substantially this same legislation except at that time the soldier contributed $15 and the Government $15. This time there will be a minimum of $50, but it might go to very much more than that if the man had several dependent children.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. The rates are changed somewhat because the compensation of the soldiers will be changed soon. Is not that also a reason?

Mr. THOMASON. That might have been one consideration, because it is now certain that within the next week or two the private soldier is going to receive $46 or $50. In the other war the soldier received a maximum of $30. He will soon get $46 and very likely $50. In the other war the private married soldier received an allotment of $15 to his wife, and his own $15, making a total of $30. Now she will receive an allotment of $28 from the Government and $22 from her husband, making a total of $50. So in the judgment of the committee the differential has been pretty well taken care of.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Can the gentleman give us any figures as to the prospective numbers of men this legislation will make available?

Mr. THOMASON. I believe it has been estimated that it would be approximately 9 percent.

Mr. EDMISTON. From 9 to 12 percent, if the gentleman will permit an interruption.

Mr. THOMASON. I am advised by the gentleman from West Virginia that it is between 9 and 12 percent. As I recall the hearings there are 161,000 in service now who have dependents, and I may say this covers the Regular Army and the National Guard. Of course, this number is going to increase, and probably very rapidly.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I may say this bill covers every enlisted man in the service, whether a Regular soldier, a National Guardsman, or an inductee. It does not include commissioned officers. Up to this time the relative percentage of inductees with dependents has been very small, and certainly it is to be hoped that the war situation may improve so that not too many inductees will be called who have dependents. But that is the real justification for this law.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Has the committee considered whether this would give enough additional strength that the legislation would have any effect in changing the lower age limit for the draft?

Mr. THOMASON. No. The committee gave that no consideration. It is my own personal feeling that while it does have a material bearing on it, it should not be taken into consideration at the present time in connection with this legislation. This is purely an allotment and allowance bill.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Will the gentleman tell me whether the compulsory feature with regard to class A dependents applies with equal force to cases where there is an estrangement between husband and wife?

Mr. THOMASON. So long as she is his legal wife, certainly she will receive a total of $50, or if there has been a divorce and she still draws alimony she is protected.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Regardless of the fact they are estranged?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; so long as she is his legal wife.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Going over to the language on page 5 of the bill, line 9, if I understood the gentleman correctly there is an amendment coming through where that amount of $20 a month will be increased to $22?

Mr. THOMASON. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then applying that back to page 3, would the wife be paid $50; that is, $22 being taken out of the soldier's pay and the Government contributing $28?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. What will be the situation on the wife and child?

Mr. THOMASON. The child then would receive $12, as provided in both the Senate and House bills, in addition to the $50 received by the wife.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Those figures on page 3 are to be changed?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes. On page 3, I have already called the attention of the committee to the fact that in line 9 a wife and one child would receive $40. The other figure is not changed. In line 11, a soldier with no wife and one child would receive $20 instead of $15.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That explains it.

Mr. THOMASON. In line 12, if there be no wife but two children, the two dependent children would receive $30 instead of $25.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Assuming then that the other bill goes through that has been compromised on the basis of $46 a month, the maximum taken out of a serviceman's pay would be $22 a month?

Mr. THOMASON. With this exception: That $22 is taken off the soldier's pay for a dependent wife. Should he elect to ask for some contribution to those in class B, like a father, mother, brothers, or sisters, his total contribution would then be $27, because he must contribute $5 in order to come under the class B provision. If I am not right about that I hope the gentleman from West Virginia will correct me.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That brings up another question on page 3, class B. Of that $15 and $25 the soldier puts up only $5?

Mr. THOMASON. That is right.

Mr. CURTIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. As I understand this bill, a soldier having one dependent parent, the parent will receive how much?

Mr. THOMASON. Five dollars from the soldier and $22, making a total of $27.

Mr. EDMISTON. No. That is not correct.

Mr. THOMASON. Pardon me. He would receive a total of $22 plus $15 or $37.

Mr. CURTIS. Suppose that same parent has two sons in the Army, can they divide that and each contribute $11 of their pay?

Mr. THOMASON. There is no specific provision in the bill to cover that,

but I think it might well be left to the fairness and discretion of the War Department.

Mr. CURTIS. It is entirely reasonable that the one allowance would be all that the parent should have.

Mr. THOMASON. I may say to my friend it is almost impossible to cover in a bill like this every possible contingency that may arise; so we have given the War and Navy Departments full authority and jurisdiction in the matter in order that justice may be done in cases like the gentleman has just mentioned.

Mr. CURTIS. Is it the intent of the committee that rules shall be made so the boy can allot less than $22?

Mr. THOMASON. That question was raised a few minutes ago by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE], and I think there is considerable force in his contention. Perhaps there ought to be an amendment of some sort that he shall not be required to contribute more than $22. If the Government is only contributing $15, perhaps the soldier should not be required to contribute more than the Government. I repeat, though, you must lodge discretion and authority somewhere. You just cannot write everything into the law.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. A moment ago you mentioned your committee agreed on the amount of $22 instead of $20 now carried in the bill. No doubt the increase of $2 is made possible by the increased pay the private and seaman will receive under the pay bill Congress is about to pass?

Mr. THOMASON. That was taken into consideration, I may say. May I also say that the committee has given a lot of serious thought and consideration to this bill for the past 3 months, but in view of the fact that it is now certain the soldiers will receive at least $46, and most likely $50, base pay, it was thought only fair for the Government to put up $28, so the wife would receive a total of $50, and that it was fair and equitable for the soldier to put up $22.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Right.

Mr. THOMASON. I am glad to hear somebody approve what the committee has done, because we do not always meet with that response. We have worked very hard and we think have done a fine job.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I want to add my word of approval of the substance of this measure.

Do I correctly understand the gentleman to say now that this provision is about on a par as to liberality with the provision made in the first World War?

Mr. THOMASON. It is substantially the same legislation, but I would say much more liberal. As far as the policy of the law is concerned, it is exactly the same, but I repeat that in World War No. 1 the soldier had $15 taken from his pay and the Government contributed $15. His base pay was $30. In a few days the base pay of the present soldier will be $50, and instead of his wife receiving $30 she is going to receive $50, so I would say we are being very liberal along all fronts.

Mr. MURDOCK. Before taking my seat, may I say specifically that I believe the committee has done a good piece of work on this subject. I listened to what the gentleman from El Paso, Tex., had to say about our victorious admiral from Texas, and I led the applause which followed it. However, I think there may be more than one way to show our applause for our fighting men. The liberal provisions of this bill are another way to show applause of our fighting men. I congratulate the committee upon its work.

Mr. THOMASON. Everybody is applauding Admiral Nimitz, but it certainly is a little unusual for anybody to applaud the House Committee on Military Affairs. I will say for myself and my colleagues on the committee that we very much appreciate your generous compliment.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am talking about applause for our fighting men and their dependents who are covered in this bill, and I also congratulate the committee on its splendid work.

Mr. THOMASON. I am glad to know the high opinion that the Members hold for the Committee on Military Affairs during the present crisis when so much military legislation is necessary.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Does the gentleman feel the amount of allotment provided in this bill will be adequate for these dependents to exist on when taking into consideration the increased cost of living?

Mr. THOMASON. As was said the other day in connection with the pay bill, you cannot pay a fighting soldier what he deserves. It is impossible to adequately reward patriotism and bravery. Certainly you cannot pay dependent members of the fighting man's family what they deserve. However, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] so frequently asks, "Where are you going to get the money?" I would like to pay them 10 times the amount carried in this bill. You have to draw the line somewhere if you are going to have any Treasury left at all. If the Government is going to have any credit or survive after this war is over, we must use good judgment and exercise business sense. We have certainly leaned to the liberal side. All doubts have been resolved in favor of the soldier and his family.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad to see the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] in charge of the time on this side. A great deal of the work of the Committee on Military Affairs is done by subcommittees in these days, and many men do not receive credit for the painstaking work and study that they put in on these bills. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ARENDS] and others on the majority side who have worked on subcommittees are chiefly responsible for a good deal of the legislation that is brought out.

I wish to pay my respects also to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON], the author of this bill.

As the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] has said, a committee amendment has been agreed upon which in effect adopts somewhat higher rates of allotment than the provision of the House bill. This amendment is to be offered at the appropriate time.

I would also like to submit a few observations on the question of war-risk insurance. I was one of those who favored the theory of war-risk insurance, the expense thereof to be shared jointly if possible by the soldier and the Government. I, like many other Members of both the House and the Senate Committees on Military Affairs, discovered with amazement what we would be up against in this war if we attempted to write into a bill $10,000 worth of war-risk insurance, the expense of which would be borne by the men and the Government.

The gentleman from Illinois has some very illuminating and informative figures on this question. I may say that in the last war, while it was assumed that the soldier put up an amount equal to that contributed by the Government, the experience of the last war, after it was all over, showed that the Government paid for the insurance five times the comparatively small sum the soldier put up. The ratio was about five to one, yet our casualty list was comparatively small in the last war, approximately 50,000 men.

We have today voluntary insurance. The figures submitted by the authorities show that any attempt to impose, on top of the voluntary insurance which a large majority of our soldiers and sailors now carry, additional war-risk insurance in the amount of $10,000 might very easily, in view of a higher casualty list in this war, would result in a cost to the Government out of reason and into many billions.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the author of the bill, the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON], 10 minutes.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, I want first to explain to you, as has been done before. If you are looking at the House bill I am afraid it may be somewhat confusing to you, inasmuch as the committee this morning adopted the figures of the Senate bill. If you will send for the Senate report you will find in there a table on these figures which is very clarifying. The number of the Senate report is 1475.

Under this bill, the dependents of soldiers and sailors are divided into two classes, class A and class B. The allotment to be made by soldiers with class A dependents, that is, a wife and children, or either, is compulsory under the bill. The soldier with a wife or children or both must provide for them under this bill.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. The gentleman from Texas made a splendid statement. As I understood his statement, if a man is legally married to a woman and she is dependent he will have to make the contribution. I wonder if there is any provision in the bill, or if the agency administering this law would have the right to do it, that would prevent a dissolute woman, say, although she may be poor and dependent, from receiving the benefit a soldier at the front is contributing to her.

Mr. EDMISTON. As long as she is legally his wife, he must make the allotment, as the bill is written, as I understand it.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. As I understood, the gentleman said that relationship, not dependency, governs in class A. Is it not true, however, that if neither the wife nor the soldier applied, or if neither of them wanted to get it, there would be no allotment made? For instance, there might be a couple where the wife was well fixed and did not want the money and the soldier did not want her to have it, and neither of them put in an application for it. There would be no compulsion in that case.

Mr. EDMISTON. The way the bill is written, if his record showed that he was married he would have to make the allotment. The wife could send it back to him, but the allotment would be compulsory if he has a wife.

I wish to bring out here that, for example, a soldier or sailor with just a wife would allot $22 under the amendment that was adopted in committee this morning. The Government would add $28, making a total of $50 as a monthly allotment to the wife.

As another example, take the case of a man with a child, but no wife, the soldier or sailor would allot $22 and the Government would pay $20, and the child would receive $42. In the case of a wife with three children the total would be $82 to the family of the soldier or sailor with a wife and three children.

The gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] asked a moment ago about a comparison with World War No. 1 provisions. These are much more liberal than the allotment and allowance bill of World War No. 1.

I have some figures compiled in the consideration of this bill which I think are interesting. In World War No. 1, with 4,700,000 men in the armed forces of our country, approximately 45 percent of that number made dependent allotments, and of the 45 percent making allotments, 26.8 percent made class A allotments to wives and children; 68.2 percent made class B allotments to dependent parents, grandparents, brothers, sisters, or an additional parent.

The Hous bill differs from the Senate bill with respect to class B dependents, in that under class B dependents in the House bill there are only included father, mother, and dependent brother or sister.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS. I think the gentleman made a misstatement there. Brother and sister of a soldier or sailor must be both disabled and dependent.

Mr. EDMISTON. Yes; the gentleman is correct. I thank him for the correction.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EDMISTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Does that mean that a small child, a little boy or a little girl, who has in fact been dependent on the man who is going to war, will not be entitled to anything unless that little boy or girl is disabled?

Mr. EDMISTON. The language of the House bill refers to a dependent parent or a disabled and dependent brother or sister.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. So if a soldier is supporting his little brother, that little brother will have to be disabled before he is entitled to any benefits?

Mr. EDMISTON. I am glad the gentleman brought out that point.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Is that the intention?

Mr. EDMISTON. That would be my interpretation of the language of the House bill. The Senate bill does not have it that way.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. That seems unfortunate.

Mr. EDMISTON. Sixty-eight and two-tenths percent in World War No. 1 made class B allotments, which shows a far greater number of men made allotments to parents rather than to wives and children. In World War No. 1 only 4 percent made allotments to combined dependents of both class A and class B.

Both the War and Navy Departments favor the enactment of this legislation. Both branches of the service appreciate the fact that the morale of the soldier or sailor, when he knows he is contributing at least something to the support of his loved ones at home, is greatly improved.

One point where there is a difference between the House bill and the bill as passed by the Senate last week is title II of the Senate bill, which I would like to talk about for a few moments. In the House report we clearly state just what the Senate has in their bill with respect to title II, and I think title II of the Senate measure should go into this bill. The closing paragraph of the House report says——

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from West Virginia 5 additional minutes.

Mr. EDMISTON. The closing paragraph of the House report states:

> Your committee is cognizant of the fact that the amounts set forth in this bill may not be wholly adequate in all instances. However, it is in full accord with the views expressed by Maj. Gen. Lewis B. Hershey, Director of the Selective Service System, in hearings before the committee, that said amounts should not be wholly adequate. Your committee believes that it would be injurious to the welfare of our country to have local draft boards feel that men with families can be freely inducted into the armed services. There is certainly a genuine social reason for preserving established families. Neither does your committee feel that it would be to the best interests of our Nation to enact legislation which might give the impression to local draft boards that financial considerations are the only basis upon which families are established and maintained. In other words, established families should not be indiscriminately uprooted and torn from their mooring solely because of the fact that their financial needs have been taken care of, and we certainly do not, by the passage of this legislation, wish to give either the local draft boards or the American public such an impression.

This is the language of the report accompanying the bill and to put this language into existing law title II, as passed by the Senate, should be included in this legislation. I certainly hope the conferees on the part of the House will bear this in mind and go along with the Senate and the intent of the House Committee of Military Affairs as contained in the report accompanying this bill.

I shall now read to you the only change in the existing law that title II of the Senate bill puts in, which is as follows:

> For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of men is advisable because of their status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support, any allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the land or naval forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration but the fact that such allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents.

They go further than that with this language in the Senate:

> The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this act in the land and naval forces of the United States of any or all categories of those men who have wives or children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes.

That language as put in the Senate bill to my mind does just what we say in the report that we want to do and intend to do, so I think title II of the Senate bill should be in the House bill. That last paragraph provides under existing law that you cannot take a man whose family is not financially dependent upon him if the draft board raises the issue. Just last week an appeal case was taken to the President on those grounds, and under the law he could not defer that man, although he was married and had several children. Under this law those cases can be taken care of under title II of the Senate bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes. I think the Military

Affairs Committee, of which I am a member, has done a very fine job in reporting this bill to the House. There seems to be little difference of opinion in the membership as to the benefits that will be derived from this piece of legislation. The time is here when the problems of dependency of those in the service must be faced. I am glad that we brought this bill out for immediate consideration. The bill will give to those boys who are taken into service a little bit of comfort in the days that they are serving their country, and will give to them a better feeling of security knowing that their dependents are receiving allotments and allowances which will help to tide such dependents over until the soldier or sailor is again earning his pay check in civilian life.

I call your attention to the amendment of the gentleman from Minnesota and read to you from a letter I have that gives additional information regarding the insurance features of World War No. 1 policies, the cost to the individual in service and the cost to the Government. Likewise the letter sets forth the possibilities of what might happen if every individual were granted free insurance in this war.

The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN], stated that he would offer his amendment to this bill making the life-insurance features compulsory. I stand opposed to that for the reasons which I shall emphasize in reading to you several paragraphs from this letter, information that came from the Veterans' Bureau. Let me read:

Premiums on war-risk insurance were fixed on the basis of the American experience table of mortality which, of course, was intended to cover only a peacetime hazard, and provision was made for the United States to pay all administrative expenses and bear the entire losses traceable to the extra hazards of the military and naval services. The insurance was issued on a step-rate yearly renewable term plan. Under this so-called war-risk insurance program net premiums were collected in the amount of $454,045,605.35, whereas the losses aggregated $2,264,866,202.96, the ratio of losses to premiums being approximately 5 to 1. The premium charge for a man 26 years of age was $6.70 per month for $10,000 insurance, which turned out to be nothing greatly more than a token payment since on the basis of losses suffered if the insurance were to have been self-sustaining the premium charge should have been for the same man approximately $33.50 per month, or $3.50 in excess of his entire pay were he a private and entitled to no additions to the base pay. It will be perceived from this explanation that in fact the burden of paying the premium was distributed one-fifth to the man and four-fifths to the United States. It is hardly to be expected that during this war a more favorable experience will be encountered; in fact, a much less favorable one would not be unlikely.

The very basic theory of insurance comprehends that a group will together bind themselves to make contributions in ratio to the respective risks so that the aggregate of all the natural premiums will balance out the losses. This, of course, did not and was not expected to take place in war-risk insurance, otherwise the Government would not have entered the field, because commercial insurers would have probably been willing to accept the risks were adequate premiums payable. However, it is obvious that it would have been impossible for all but a relatively few of the members of the armed forces to have contributed $30 or $35 per month, which would have been the minimum necessary premium charge were the insurance to have been operated in the customary manner.

In summarizing, it may be said that war-risk insurance was principally a gratuity not dissimilar to pensions. While it may be contended that the payment of token premiums for war-risk insurance cause it to partake of some slight semblance of an insurance program, such similarity completely fades as far as automatic insurance is concerned. Even were the fiction to be indulged in of the insurer paying the premiums to itself still the cost would be the aggregate paid out so that the total amount paid as losses would represent a pure and unadulterated gratuity. Were $5,000 of the so-labeled automatic insurance to be authorized for each individual in an army which suffered a million fatalities, and this would seem to be a modest loss when cognizance is taken of the fact that during the last war Germany with a population of approximately 65,000,000 alone lost over twice that number, the cost to the insurer would be $5,000,000,000 exclusive of any administrative expenses. Were the number of losses to approximate those of Germany in the last war the cost on the same basis would exceed $10,000,000,000. This is cited so that a clear understanding may be had of the large amounts involved.

It is realized that no monetary payments can ever indemnify those who have had their dear ones taken from them, but aside from insurance the Government has provided a system of disability and death pensions for all cases in which disability or death occurs in line of duty, and it may be conservatively said that under this system now in effect the Federal Government will find itself obligated to pay many billions of dollars to the veterans of World War No. 2. As a matter of information it may be generally said that this pension system covers all those disabled or dying while in the military or naval services (excluding only those whose disability or death were occasioned as the result of their own misconduct). As an example, if the service person is totally disabled entitlement thereby is established to receive $100 per month during the entire period of the existence of such disability, or if the person dies of a service-connected disability leaving a dependent parent, $45 per month is payable to such dependent if such dependency continues during the entire period of life.

With this argument, I feel if the House understands the situation, it will refrain from adopting the amendment to be offered by the gentleman from Minnesota. From the standpoint of the possible prohibitive cost to the Government I feel that this matter of giving free insurance to the boys should be passed up, and particularly so since we are now increasing the pay of the buck private to $50 per month and also making possible the rather liberal and fair allotments and allowances under this bill. If the boys want the insurance they have the right to purchase such insurance at rates far below what it will cost the Government. I do not think that we should make a compulsory matter of it at all.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, it would seem as though it came somewhat as a surprise a moment ago when I, together with one or two other members, had something good to say about this committee drafting the bill. You know, Mr. Chairman, we meant what we said. This is a complicated measure and it is impossible for all members to know whether all these details have been worked out properly. But with all the study which the committee members have put on it, we will assume that details have been well worked out. It is a general principle involved here however, which I think all of us approve. How much of this deduction for relatives is compulsory and how much optional? I understand that the allotments that the soldier makes to his wife and children are obligatory.

Mr. THOMASON. Provided they are dependents.

Mr. MURDOCK. Provided they are dependents.

Mr. THOMASON. The allotment to the wife and children would be compulsory in any event.

Mr. MURDOCK. They would be obligatory, but all other allotments are voluntary, and that I think has good features. We are probably soon increasing the pay of the common soldier to $50 per month and increasing his opportunity to show his own attitude and obligation toward his loved ones by making these allotments. Thus the Government is really encouraging that proper attitude. It is a fine thing and will help the morale of the soldier as well as the morale of the country in general.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Mississippi in regard to this, as well as in regard to many other matters concerning our country's defenders.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I want to state to the gentleman from Arizona that the Senate has just instructed the conferees to accept the $50 base pay for the men in the service. This was done by a vote of 58 to 20.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am delighted to hear that report from the gentleman from Mississippi. He is alert to the interest of our soldiers in wars past and present. I approved of his amendment several days ago to increase the base pay to $50 per month when he offered it to the bill that was before the House. I had also favored the same proposition when offered by the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] many months ago in the original Selective Training and Service Act.

Now, with reference to one other matter. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], in opening the argument on this bill, spoke of the remarkable work for victory done in the Pacific by his fellow citizen from Texas, Admiral Nimitz—a worthy tribute. That is fine indeed but there is a more practical way we can applaud our fighting men.

Let me illustrate a practical attitude. I remember as a small boy going to a burning farmhouse of a neighbor. The house had been destroyed by fire. Hundreds had gathered around and were helping

save a few things. All were shaking their head and saying how sorry they were. But an old fellow who was not known particularly for his religious connections took off his hat and went around among the neighbors and said, "I am sorry, too. I am sorry $5 worth. How sorry are you?" He collected quite a sum of money from those neighbors who showed their sympathy by liberal donations.

We talk a lot on the floor of this House and in the press and over the radio about our fighting men. Fine words are fitting and proper and well deserved. I want to say to the gentleman from Texas this proper legislation is the best kind of applause you can furnish the fighting men. That is what I meant awhile ago when I did not have time to finish a statement—provision made in legislation, suitable financial provision, symbolic of our attitude toward those fighting men and their dependents, such as this measure makes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. I am very much in favor of this bill. Concerning what the gentleman said a moment ago, I have such great faith in the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], who is handling this bill, that I am satisfied it is a good bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is one of my reasons for supporting it entirely, without knowing all the details, I may say.

Mr. Chairman, the present generation of American youth, mostly men who have been born since 1910, are bearing the brunt of this war. No pay that we can vote them as soldiers, no provision such as in this bill we can make for their dependents, will quite show our appreciation and America's debt to those finest young people who are fighting for the survival of our country and Christian civilization as we know it. Many times we have talked about a war to end all wars. It is too much to be hoped for in human affairs. We know that the other World War did not do what we contemplated it would do. I have confidence that in this case—this war will not end all wars, human nature being what it is—I do think that great wars in the future will be forestalled much longer and spaced much farther apart than the life of a single generation through the efforts of the men who are now fighting this conflict. Let us oldsters do the right thing by them now and later.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I have here samples of letters received from American Legion posts in my home congressional district, the seventh of Minnesota, in reference to an amendment I intend to offer providing for an automatic life-insurance policy of $5,000. I shall read some of these letters into the RECORD. They are letters which express the opinions of veterans of the last war. These Legion posts are wholeheartedly behind the principle of the Government—your Government and mine—providing $5,000 insurance to the boys that enter the armed services, free coverage in case they give the supreme sacrifice and lay down their lives, so that their families may have something on which to live; in other words, that their dependents, if you please, may continue to live as they are supposed to live—the father, the mother, or perhaps the wife and children of the man who willingly gave his life for his country. I want to compliment my Legion posts for their unselfishness in urging that the young men of the present war receive free insurance to the extent of $5,000, even though they, the veterans of the war of 1917, were not so favored.

I read, Mr. Chairman, from a few of these letters as follows. The first one is from Dr. W. W. Larsen, a dentist at Starbuck, Minn., service officer of American Legion Post, No. 325:

A reading of H. R. 6512 at our Legion meeting last Thursday evening brought a unanimous vote for it. It seems a sensible solution for a neglected problem.

Now listen to this:

We have buried two draftees. The last one, of a destitute family, was buried by the county, a $60 burial.

What do you think of that? Calling these boys into the service and then the county must bury them if they die just because they did not happen to carry insurance.

To continue Dr. Larsen's letter:

Had an honorable discharge. Got an infection while in service, spent 5 weeks in Walter Reed Hospital, had leg amputated, was sent home to die, which he did a month later. I called the Veterans' Administration in Minneapolis, but they said no provision had as yet been made for this soldier to be buried by the Government, so the county did it.

Is this, Members of the House, our American way of taking care of our service men and women?

Look into your souls and search for the truth. Do you not think that insurance on our people in the service should be automatic upon entrance, compulsory, and paid for by the Government, by the people these boys are willing to die for, to the amount of $3.35 premiums per month?

Can we ask these men to go to the swamps of Burma, the jungles of India, the desert heat of Libya, the stinging cold of Alaska, without giving them the assurance that their wives and children will not suffer physically from the want of bare necessities of life if the worst happens? I ask you again, "Look into your souls."

At this point I wish to insert certain portions of the letters from the Legion posts and from which I have read to you Members today:

STARBUCK, MINN., *February 14, 1942.*
Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A reading of H. R. 6512 at our Legion meeting last Thursday evening brought a unanimous vote for it. It seems a sensible solution for a neglected problem.

We have buried two draftees; the last one, of a destitute family, was buried by the county—a $60 burial. Had an honorable discharge. Got an infection while in service, spent 5 weeks in Walter Reed Hospital, had leg amputated, was sent home to die, which he did a month later. I called the Veterans' Administration in Minneapolis, but they said no provision had as yet been made for this soldier to be buried by the Government, so the county did it.

Your bill would have made it different for this family. More power to you.

Very truly yours,

W. W. LARSON,
Service Officer,
American Legion Post, No. 325.

SANBORN STATE BANK,
Sanborn, Minn., February 26, 1942.
Representative H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Congress of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSEN: At the last meeting of Colburn Post, No. 286, Sanborn, Minn., H. R. 6512, introduced by you, received the unanimous endorsement of the post, and I was instructed to convey this information to you.

* * * * * *

Yours truly,

W. D. YAEGER,
Treasurer, Colburn Post, No. 286.

OSCAR LEE POST, NO. 177,
AMERICAN LEGION,
Dawson, Minn., February 20, 1942.
Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Thank you very much for the bulletins on veterans' benefits, also a copy of your bill, H. R. 6512, which we feel should be enacted into law at once. Though the veterans of World War No. 1 realize that our boys in the service today are much better provided for than we were, the best is none too good for them, so it is our earnest desire that any legislation of benefit to them should receive special consideration. The members of Oscar Lee Post, No. 177, appreciate your interest in veterans' affairs and wish you success in your efforts to have H. R. 6512 passed.

Sincerely yours,

S. E. GREENE,
Adjutant.

KENDALL P. STONE POST, NO. 237,
AMERICAN LEGION,
Balaton, Minn., March 14, 1942.
Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. ANDERSEN: At the March 3, 1942, meeting of the above-named Legion post the membership voted unanimously to endorse H. R. 6512.

Yours truly,

FLOYD PARROTT,
Adjutant.

KANTHAK-MATTHIES POST, NO. 441,
AMERICAN LEGION,
Bellingham, Minn., March 30, 1942.
Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We have discussed your bill providing insurance in the amount of $5,000 to all persons in the active armed forces of the United States with premiums to be paid by the Government during active service.

We favor passage of this bill.

We believe that the men of the ranks are underpaid and believe that any relief of the situation you can provide either by increased pay, gratuities, or both is very much to be desired and has our support.

* * * * * *

Yours truly,

ARTHUR J. GLOEGE,
Adjutant.

GARVIN, MINN., *March 10, 1942.*

H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Tyler, Minn.

DEAR FRIEND: Post No. 273 of Garvin is all for this bill. It would be a nice thing for the boys in service. Hope that they get it.

Yours truly,

CARL NYQUIST.

CITY OF MORRIS, MINN.,
February 11, 1942.

Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member of Congress,
Seventh District, Minnesota.

DEAR MR. ANDERSEN: At our Legion meeting last night we endorsed your bill, H. R. 6512, with our entire membership of 210, and trust that you will have little difficulty in having it passed.

* * * * *

Very truly yours,

J. A. MIELKE.

SANBORN SENTINEL,
Sanborn, Minn., February 12, 1942.

Congressman H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Seventh Congressional District, Minn.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: A copy of your recent bill, H. R. 6512, relative to an insurance policy for all present service men was read at our last Commercial Club meeting and, to say the least, it met with the unanimous favor of the membership.

A motion was made, seconded, and carried that the secretary write you of this vote of confidence and to extend the club's full endorsement of such good legislation. It is their hope that you will succeed in its ultimate passage and that it will meet with the approval of both houses of our Government for enactment.

Yours truly,

F. H. HARDER,
Secretary, Sanborn Commercial Club.

GRANITE FALLS POST NO. 69,
AMERICAN LEGION,
Granite Falls, Minn., February 11, 1942.

Hon H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ANDERSEN: Enclosed please find copy of a resolution passed by our local post No. 69 of the American Legion in support of H. R. 6512 which you have introduced before Congress.

Very truly yours,

R. A. BERG, *Adjutant.*

"Whereas H. R. 6512 provides for payment by the United States Government of premiums on wartime insurance on the lives of men in the military forces of the United States of America: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the Granite Falls Post No. 69 of the American Legion does hereby endorse and recommend the immediate passage of said bill; be it further

"*Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be sent to Congressman H. CARL ANDERSEN, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

"Dated, February 9, 1942.

"GRANITE FALLS POST NO. 69,
AMERICAN LEGION,

"By G. B. LARSON, *Commander.*

Attest:

"R. A. BERG, *Adjutant.*"

RALPH M. SPINK POST NO. 97,
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Ortonville, Minn., February 10, 1942.

Hon H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Congressman From the Seventh District,
Minnesota, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSEN: Received your letter a short time ago in regards to your bill H. R. 6512. At our post meeting last evening I read this letter to the post members and there was a motion passed instructing me to write you as follows:

"That the Ralph M. Spink Post No. 97, Department of Minnesota, go on record as favoring H. R. 6512, but that it should be made retroactive as of December 7, 1941, that being the date of the beginning of the war, unless the men that were in the service on that date were otherwise provided for."

The members of our post expressed the feeling that due to the fact that the boys in actual service receive very little pay compared to people in defense work or private employment, they should be entitled to this extra security, and urged the passage of this bill.

* * * * *

Very truly yours,

J. A. JACOBSON,
Post Adjutant, City Clerk.

LEE-OSBORN POST, NO. 59,
AMERICAN LEGION,
Montevideo, Minn., February 24, 1942.

Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Lee-Osborn Post, No. 59, American Legion, Montevideo, Minn., endorses your bill, H. R. 6512, in its entirety, and the post extends their appreciation and commend you for introducing this legislation.

With best wishes for your continued good health and success.

Respectfully and sincerely yours,

LEE-OSBORN POST, NO. 59,
S. S. MICHAELSON, *Adjutant.*

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
J. BEN JOHNSON POST, NO. 169,
Clarkfield, Minn., February 20, 1942.

Hon. H. CARL ANDERSEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The members of American Legion Post, No. 169, Clarkfield, Minn., have gone on record registering their approval and are very much in favor of bill H. R. 6512, which you have introduced, and we will welcome same to become law.

Very truly yours,

C. O. LILLJESTRALE,
Adjutant.

Mr. Chairman, it has been brought up here that this is going to cost the Government an awful lot of money if we have a million casualties. Naturally it is going to cost the Government money if we have a million casualties. This war is going to cost us money. It is going to cost us two hundred or two hundred and fifty billion dollars or more. Can we not spend $20,000,000,000 to take care of the dependents of those killed in action or to take care of the boys themselves when they are totally disabled? You all know we passed an act giving free coverage for property destroyed by bombings and war action. Are not the lives of these men as precious as property? Oh, yes; it will cost money to win this war. We will win it, but let us take care of the dependents of the boys, men, and women who will give up their lives by the hundreds of thousands to assure us victory.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 4 additional minutes.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. The gentleman has just read several letters from posts of the American Legion and Veterans of Foreign Wars in the gentleman's congressional district. Has he received any letter from any of these veterans' organizations which opposes the amendment the gentleman proposes to offer?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I have not received a single letter in opposition thereto. I would like at this time to quote a sentence from a letter received from the legislative representative of the Veterans of Foreign Wars:

Personally, I favor the purpose of your bill, but cannot permit my personal convictions to speak for our entire organization.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman's amendment provide for the payment of a premium by the Government or by the soldier?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. My amendment provides for automatically covering these boys or women when they go into the service to the extent of $5,000. The Government takes care of that premium, which is $3.35 per month at the present cost.

Mr. DONDERO. The Government pays the premium under the gentleman's amendment?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Yes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS. The cost of the gentleman's plan would be far in excess of $3.50. It would be more like $20.50.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I disagree with the gentleman. Suppose that only 90 percent of the boys who are in the service under the present voluntary system take out this insurance, and 10 percent do not for some reason or another, are you going to say to this 10 percent or to their dependents that just because they did not know enough to do so, they cannot receive benefits from the Nation they fought to save? Or are you going to say to the dependents, the fathers and mothers, wives and children, the dependents of this 10 percent—or portion thereof who were killed—"No, just because he did not sign an application you are not eligible. You have no cause to receive insurance payments even though your neighbor may"?

I do not think that is what the House intends to do. It may cost $25,000,000,000 if enough of our boys are slaughtered and we know we are in a war of survival, but Mr. Chairman, if these boys are slaughtered—if they do give their lives that we may live—are we not going to pay the bill anyway, regardless of whether or not they pay this puny $3.50 per month or make application fo- insurance? What better can we do for the service man than to try to see to it that his loved ones back home are taken care of should he pass to the great beyond?

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this Act may be cited as the Emergency Family Allowance Act of 1942.

TITLE I—FAMILY ALLOWANCES

SEC. 101. On and after the first day of the fourth calendar month following the date of

enactment of this act, and during a period of war formally recognized by Congress, and for a period of 6 months after such war shall have ceased to exist, the dependents of each enlisted man of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grade of the Army of the United States, United States Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, including any and all retired and reserve components of said services, in the active military or naval service of the United States shall be entitled to monthly family allowances as hereinafter provided.

SEC. 102. (a) A monthly family allowance shall be granted and paid by the United States upon written application to the department concerned by any enlisted man having a dependent or dependents or by or on behalf of any dependent of any enlisted man in accordance with and subject to the conditions, limitations, and exceptions hereinafter provided.

(b) For the purpose of facilitating the administration of this title, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may, by regulations, prescribe the dates of commencement and termination of allowances and reductions provided herein: *Provided*, That such dates of commencement and termination shall not vary by more than 1 month from the dates prescribed in section 102 (c) hereof: *And provided further*, That no family allowance shall be paid for any period preceding the effective date of this title, as provided in section 101 hereof.

(c) The monthly family allowance shall be paid from the date of filing of application therefor to include the month of notice of change in status, discharge from, or death in the service, but not for more than 6 months after the war shall have ceased to exist, and shall be for the purpose and, subject to the provisions of section 103, in amounts stated as follows:

Class A. In the case of a man to his wife and to his child or children—

(1) if there be a wife but no child, $20;

(2) if there be a wife and one child, $30, with $10 per month additional for each additional child;

(3) if there be no wife but one child, $15;

(4) if there be no wife but two children, $25, with $10 per month additional for each additional child; and

(5) a former wife divorced to whom alimony has been decreed, $20.

Class B. In the case of a man to a dependent parent, or a disabled and dependent brother or sister—

(1) if there be one dependent parent, $15;

(2) if there be two dependent parents, $25; and

(3) for each disabled and dependent brother or sister, $5.

(d) Allowances shall be paid to such persons of the above classes as the enlisted man may designate, or on their behalf. In the absence of an application by the enlisted man, when a relationship of dependency as provided in subsection (c) of section 102 hereof is found in fact to exist, authorized payments may be made to the dependents or as prescribed by section 209 of this act, whichever is appropriate.

(e) The family allowances to members of class B shall be subject to each of the following conditions:

(1) The family allowance to members of class B dependents shall be granted only if and while the member is, in fact, dependent upon the enlisted man for chief support, as determined upon applicable regulations, and then only if and while the enlisted man requests that such family allowance be paid, except that in cases where it is determined by the head of the department concerned, or by such subordinate as he may designate, that it is impracticable for the enlisted man to request the payment of a monthly family allowance as herein provided the head of such department, or such person as he may designate, is authorized, upon application of the person of the relationship specified in class B for the family allowance, to direct the payment of the monthly family allowance.

(2) The total allowance to be paid to the beneficiaries of class B shall not exceed the sum of $50 per month.

(3) Where the total amount of allowances computed under section 102 (c) of this title to members of class B exceeds $50 per month, the family allowance shall be reduced in such amounts and apportioned as between the members of class B as may be prescribed by regulation.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. THOMASON:

On page 3, line 8, strike out "$20" and insert in lieu thereof "28."

On page 3, line 9, strike out "$30" and insert in lieu thereof "$40."

On page 3, line 11, strike out "$15" and insert in lieu thereof "$20."

On page 3, line 12, strike out "$25" and insert in lieu thereof "$30."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. THOMASON: On page 3, line 25, strike out "of" and insert "or."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARNESS: On page 2, line 11, after "a" strike out "dependent or dependents" and insert "wife, or wife and child, or children."

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment to clarify the language of the section. From the debate today it is obvious that many Members are confused as to whether or not the soldier or sailor could make an allotment to his wife and children, or wife and child, or to his wife regardless of whether the wife or children were dependent on him. This will clarify the language so that the enlisted man could make an allotment to his wife, or wife and child, or wife and children, regardless of dependency. If the enlisted man does not elect to make a written application for the allotment, then the wife or the children will have to prove that they are actually dependent on the soldier. I believe that is the way the legislation was intended to be drafted originally.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky: On page 1, line 6, strike out "fourth" and insert "second."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I am very glad indeed to have an opportunity to speak in support of the allotment bill (H. R. 7119) for the relief of the dependent wives, children, parents, brothers, and sisters of our soldiers and sailors. I understand from our able and distinguised friends the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON] that the fact of a marriage of a soldier or sailor creates dependency on the part of his wife and their children. I was inclined to think, under section 102 of the bill, as drawn, that the wife and children had to be dependent in fact.

Mr. HARNESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I would like to hear from the gentleman from Texas or the author of the bill the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. EDMISTON].

Mr. THOMASON. I would say in answer to the gentleman that certainly it is presumed and assumed that there is dependency; but frankly, under class A, it is the relationship that establishes the marriage relationship, and certainly we cannot set up in this bill just what individual instances will be covered. It is a question of whether or not a woman is a man's legal wife.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. That is just what I wanted to get to. Section 102 (a) says:

A monthly family allowance shall be granted and paid by the United States upon written application to the department concerned by any enlisted man having a dependent or dependents or by or on behalf of any dependent of any enlisted man in accordance with and subject to the conditions, limitations, and exceptions hereinafter provided.

The wife and children are entitled to support from the husband and father, and I think it is a good policy to assume that the wife and children are dependent. I was wondering if the poor husband of a millionaire wife would have to contribute to her support while he is in the service, or if he would have to contribute to a wife who had proved to be untrue and leading a dissolute life while her husband was in the service.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. HARNESS. I believe the gentleman is mistaken when he says that the millionaire wife of a soldier could draw this money regardless of whether the soldier made an allotment. She could not get it unless the soldier volunteered to make an allotment to her or unless she could prove that she was dependent.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. There is another matter that has been raised here, and I hope some amendment will be offered to correct it if the administrative agency does not have the power to regulate this. For instance, where parents have 3 or 4 sons in the Army, who is going to make the contribution? Should it not be so arranged that each son contribute his proportional part of the $22? I know of 1 father and mother in my district, and they are not very well to do, who have 5 sons in the service. It has been reported to me recently that another father and mother have 9 sons in the service. If this is true, no doubt this is the record in the United States. I have the honor, however, of representing a great, patriotic, fighting people.

Perhaps 90 percent of the people in my district were not in favor of getting into the war; but since we are in, they are united and determined to win and help to destroy forever the power and influence of the Axis and the war lords of Germany, Italy, and Japan. Mr. Chairman, I have received a great many letters from dependent wives, children, and parents of our soldiers and sailors. The bill provides that nothing can be paid until 4 months after the passage of this act. The war has been going on 6 months, and if this 4-month provision remains in the bill, it will be October before any relief can come to the dependent wives, children, and parents covered by this bill. I have offered an amendment to reduce this 4 months to 2 months. I realize it will require some time to set up the necessary organization and personnel to handle these claims. This ought to be done in 2 months. We have, according to the records, 160,000 soldiers and sailors now in the service who have dependents.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. I am in sympathy with the worthy objective of the gentleman's amendment. It seems to me this resolves itself into a practical proposition. I am inclined to the belief that 4 months is too long, but the War Department and the Navy Department have said that they must have a reasonable time in which to set up the machinery and the accounting system to carry this act into effect. It seems to me that on the whole the gentleman's amendment is very fair. As far as I am personally concerned, I am willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] who has charge of this bill for the acceptance of my amendment. Now the payments can begin after 2 months from the passage of this act. This will bring relief likely to 200,000 or more dependents of soldiers and sailors 2 months earlier than it would otherwise have been under the bill.

News came to the floor of the House a few moments ago that the Senate had voted 58 to 20 instructing its conferees to agree to the $50 a month entrance or base pay for our soldiers and sailors as provided in the bill we passed in the House. This means, of course, that the measure will now go through promptly providing for the base or entrance pay of $50 per month for our soldiers and sailors, $54 per month for first class privates, $66 for corporals, and increases for sergeants up to the highest rank of sergeants and petty naval officers of $138 per month and also an increase for second lieutenants. This action is very, very pleasing, indeed, to me.

THE BILL PROVIDES

I thank the Military Affairs Committee for agreeing to the increases provided for in the Senate bill. The following table indicates the amounts payable in the most typical cases which also shows the contribution made by the Government and the contribution made by the soldier or sailor and the total amount that will be received:

	Government contribution	From soldier's pay	Total
To class A:			
Wife, if no child	$28	$22	$50
Wife with 1 child	40	22	62
Wife with 2 children	50	22	72
To class B if there is no class A dependent:			
1 parent	15	22	37
2 parents	25	22	47
1 parent and 1 sister	20	22	42
1 parent and 2 sisters	25	22	47
To class B if there is also a class A dependent:			
1 parent	15	5	20
2 parents	25	5	30
1 parent and 1 sister	20	5	25
1 parent and 2 sisters	25	5	30

In other words, the Government will pay to the wife with no child $28 and the soldier will contribute $22, making a total of $50 a month.

A wife with one child will receive $40 from the Government and $22 from the soldier or sailor, making $62 a month in all.

A wife with two children will receive $50 from the Government and $22 from the soldier, making $72 a month in all.

Where there is more than one child, each child will be allowed an additional $10 a month.

Wife and children belonging to class A dependents and the contribution by the soldier or sailor is obligatory. If there are parents, brothers or sisters, and no class A dependents, the soldier will still make contribution of $22 per month but, as I understand it, this is voluntary on his part.

One parent will receive $15 a month from the Government, two parents $25 a month. One parent and one sister, $20 a month; one parent and two sisters, $25 a month. These sums will be added to the contribution made by the soldier.

If there are class B and also class A dependents, the parents and the sisters will receive the same from the Government but the soldier's contribution will only be $5 a month and it, too, will be voluntary. Contributions by service men are purely voluntary as to parents, brothers, sisters.

The word "child" includes an adopted child and an illegitimate child of the service man, if it has been so adjudged by the courts or the father has sworn to the child. The bills include stepmother or stepfather or foster parents.

There is no limit as to the number of children of the service man for which the Government will pay $10 a month.

There is a limit of $50 Government contribution to class B dependents.

I am very happy indeed that the Congress has given substantial increases to our gallant defenders and is making reasonable provision for their dependents. Congress has already passed measures that will provide benefits for those who are wounded or whose health is impaired and care for the widows, and orphans, and dependent parents of those who give their lives in defense of our country and to win the great war in which we are engaged.

There are those who complain about these measures. We are giving billions of dollars in war equipment, supplies, and in money to other countries. Our soldiers and sailors leave their homes, their families, relatives and friends, also opportunities to make money, to go to school and prepare for their future. In my opinion we cannot do too much for them or their dependent wives, children, parents, and we should not neglect those who went forth and heroically fought and won our other war and defended our country through the years or their dependents.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Page 3, line 20, strike out "disabled and."

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the bill proposes benefits for dependent brothers or sisters if they are disabled. The purpose of my amendment is to make a dependent sister or brother eligible for $5 per month without requiring that they be disabled. It seems to me that if the fact of dependency exists it should not also be required that they be disabled.

While I was home recently there was a funeral for a parent of some boys who are in the service. In the family are some minor brothers and sisters. The boys now in the service have become the sole support of that family, so dependency would clearly exist. It seems to me that with dependency existing there is no justification for requiring disability. Therefore, I suggest the adoption of the amendment.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The language with reference to disabled and dependent brothers and sisters would include minors because they are under a legal disability.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. In the case cited, that might cover the situation, but in others it might not, and my amendment is to strike out the requirement of disability and leave simply the question of dependency to be established.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Your minors would be included under the law as it is written here and they would get the allotment.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. May I say to the gentleman that I think the language in the printed bill is too restricted and I am very glad to accept the amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Would not the gentleman also wish to strike out

the same words in line 17 as well as in line 20?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; and if the pending amendment should be adopted, I will ask to have that done.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

During the formulation of the bill the committee gave careful consideration to this particular phase of the problem. It should be pointed out here that the scope of the measure as offered by the committee has been determined very largely upon the past experience of the Veterans' Administration and the suggestions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, Brig. Gen. Frank T. Hines, and Assistant Administrator in charge of finance and insurance, Mr. Harold W. Breining.

It was pointed out that similar provision for class B dependents was made during the last war and that as a result it took the Veterans' Bureau until 1925 to clear those claims after the war. There were many difficulties in determining dependency in those groups of class B relatives. As a matter of fact, they were never fully determined. The matter was finally disposed of by an act of Congress which authorized validation of payment simply upon the basis of relationship.

The present measure provides for wives, children, and dependent parents. It also goes beyond to provide for disabled and dependent brothers and sisters. If this amendment is adopted, it will open the door for thousands upon thousands of claims which will arise following the war. This will impose a tremendous and confusing burden upon the Veterans' Administration, for there are almost as many different definitions of dependency as there are claims of dependency. I think it would be extremely unwise and shortsighted to broaden this provision in the manner contemplated by this amendment, in view of all the actual experience with dependents' claims which advises against it.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, the gentleman recalls that the soldiers' pay itself would also have a reduction of $5, and, therefore, it would amount to $10.

Mr. HARNESS. That is right, but I think we ought to limit it to the fewest persons we can, thereby eliminating, after the war is over, this trouble we had before. I believe we should follow the recommendation of the Veterans' Administration that has handled these matters.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be rejected.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ELSTON. May I ask the gentleman if the amendment should prevail, is it not a fact that you would impose upon both the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy a considerable amount of work to determine whether or not dependency existed as to countless brothers and sisters who might make such application?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman will permit, that certainly would not impose any additional burden on the Army or the Navy because the language as it exists in the bill requires the determination of dependency, and this would relieve the additional burden of determining disability.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill a question. I notice this allowance is to be granted on the application of the enlisted man. Are there any special provisions in the bill in reference to the men who are now out of the country?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; that is fully covered. Men in the foreign field service are fully protected, because an application may be made for and in their behalf.

Mr. COCHRAN. The only reason I ask this is that I happen to remember the administration of the Allotment Act during the last war. Our men were in France, were in the trenches, and were very active at the time. Before the administrators of the law would pay 5 cents to any wife or mother or any other dependent, they demanded that the application be signed by the man who was in the trenches. They sent the papers to France to the men on the firing line, and had them fill out and sign the papers. Remember, not a dime was paid to those dependents until that was done, and many of them were on the verge of destitution.

I express the hope that there is some kind of a provision in this bill that will not require these men in the various parts of the world, and God knows they are in all parts of the world from what we hear, to have to go through that process. Undoubtedly we will make some mistakes paying money that should not be paid; but if it cannot be recovered, we can make provisions by law to take care of such payments as we did during the World War; but I would rather do that than deprive immediate aid to those who are in need of the aid.

Mr. COSTELLO. The application may be made by any soldier or any dependent of a soldier. So that if the soldier is disabled or is unable to make application the dependents may make application here.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is what I want to bring out, as I knew it was there. I am talking now for the benefit of those who will administer the act. I do not want them to think when the application is filed by a dependent, Congress expects them to wait before they pay until the soldier approves. If you accept the application of the dependents, especially the wife or the mother, then they should go ahead and pay. It takes 50 or 60 days for a transport to go over to Australia or some other place in the Far East and 120 days at least to get the papers back here, so we are providing for immediate payments in this bill.

Mr. COSTELLO. I refer the gentleman to the language on page 2 of the bill, section 102 (a):

SEC. 102. (a) A monthly family allowance shall be granted and paid by the United States upon written application to the department concerned by any enlisted man having a dependent or dependents or by or on behalf of any dependent of any enlisted man in accordance with and subject to the conditions, limitations, and exceptions hereinafter provided.

In other words, the application is to be made by the soldier or his dependents.

But in the case of class B, if the dependent applies for an allowance, and it is made, the soldier has the right to stop that, if he does not want it to be made, but the soldier could not cut off a class A dependent.

Mr. COCHRAN. Now let this be known. It is the intent of the Congress in passing this act to notify the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard, that we want this money paid without unnecessary delay and not handled like it was in the World War. Let them take notice of that when they administer the law, not to delay payments over a period of many months. Thousands never did receive their allotments until after the World War was over. That is a fact.

Mr. THOMASON. We specifically provide that the payments shall bear the date of application, and it is also provided that if the soldier cannot make application, the same can be made by dependents.

Mr. BROOKS. And in line with that, I call attention to the bottom of page 3, subparagraph (d):

Allowances shall be paid to such persons of the above classes as the enlisted man may designate, or on their behalf. In the absence of an application by the enlisted man, when a relationship of dependency as provided in subsection (c) of section 102 hereof is found in fact to exist, authorized payments may be paid to dependents or as prescribed by section 209 of this act, whichever is appropriate.

Mr. COCHRAN. The point I make is that it is going to take 5 months to get an application to the Far East and back, and I want to impress on the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps and the Coast Guard now, it is the intent of the Congress to pay the dependents just as soon as possible after the passage of the act. If I am in error then let someone say so now. There being no correction I take it our intent is made plain to those who administer the law

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 103. (a) The pay of any enlisted man of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grade, in the active military or naval service of the United States, having a class A or a class B dependent or dependents as defined in section 102 (c) with respect to whom the head of the department concerned has determined that a monthly allowance is payable, shall be reduced by, or charged with, the amount of $20 per month: *Provided*, That where

monthly family allowances are to be paid to both class A and class B dependents an additional reduction of $5 per month to be paid to class B dependents shall be made: *Provided further*, That the amount of the reduction in the monthly pay, together with the family allowance to be paid to a wife or a child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or written agreement, or to a former wife divorced, shall not exceed the amount specified to be paid to such person in the court order, decree, or written agreement; and the amount of the reduction in monthly pay and the family allowance shall be adjusted and apportioned for this purpose as may be prescribed by regulation.

(b) The family allowances provided in section 102 (c) shall be increased by an amount equivalent to the reduction in, or charge to, pay required by this section, distributed among the beneficiaries in such manner as may be prescribed by regulation.

(c) In cases where an allotment in favor of a dependent who is a member of class A or class B as defined in section 102 (c), or in favor of any other allottee, is already in effect, such allotment shall, in accordance with regulations of the head of the department concerned, be modified or continued in order to achieve the purposes of this title.

(d) Nothing contained in this act shall be construed as modifying the act approved March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, 77th Cong.).

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMASON: Page 5, line 9, strike out "$20" and insert in lieu thereof "$22."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a corrective amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. THOMASON: Page 5, line 14, after the word "pay" strike out the comma.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CURTIS: Page 5, line 22, after the word "regulation," strike out the period, insert a colon, and add: "*Provided further*, That any enlisted man may elect to have his pay reduced by or charged with a lesser amount than $22 and in such case the amount to be paid by the Government of the United States shall be proportionately reduced."

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chairman, the intent of my amendment is merely this: That the soldier or sailor does not have to elect to have his own salary reduced by $22 to come under this bill, but that he may elect to give his dependents a lesser amount than $22, and in such case the amount that the Government shall pay to those dependents shall be proportionately reduced.

I have in mind certain cases where perhaps no claim of dependency was even made before the selective service board, yet as a matter of justice and fairness those dependents should receive something. Under my amendment the man in the service could elect to have his own pay reduced by $10, the Government's contribution added to that, and it would be paid to his mother or father or other dependents. This will also take care of those cases where perhaps there are two or three boys in the service from the same family, and each one of those boys wants to have a part in providing for his parents or other dependents.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be accepted.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. Is the gentleman making his amendment apply to both class A and class B dependents?

Mr. CURTIS. I think as I have it prepared, perhaps it would. What I had in mind more particularly was the class B dependents.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman's amendment, as I understood it, applied to both class A and class B dependents. If the gentleman's amendment should prevail would you not in effect destroy the very purpose desired by this bill?

Mr. CURTIS. I think not.

Mr. ELSTON. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. Would not the gentleman's amendment include the case of a man who went into the service and for no reason at all except ill feeling toward his wife or a desire to neglect his children, decided he did not want to pay more than $1 a month, and that is all he would have to pay?

Mr. CURTIS. I think not.

Mr. ELSTON. The way the gentleman's amendment reads, he could allot whatever amount he saw fit.

Mr. CURTIS. At the present time he does not have to allot anything.

Mr. ELSTON. At the present time it is mandatory that $22 be allotted as to class A dependents.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. Your amendment, as I understand it, would permit the soldier to suggest an allotment to a person who was not wholly dependent. Is that correct?

Mr. CURTIS. Not necessarily.

Mr. BROOKS. But he could do it, could he not?

Mr. CURTIS. No. It does not waive any of the rules of dependency laid down in this bill.

Mr. BROOKS. But I understood the gentleman to say in cases of partial dependency or in cases where there were several brothers, one of whom might be taking care of the dependents, he could still make an allotment although there were no dependents. Is that right?

Mr. CURTIS. I think not.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. CURTIS. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think if the gentleman would break his amendment into two separate amendments he would get what he wants to get at.

The gentleman wants to do certain other things under class B. I certainly would not want to go along with the gentleman's amendment the way it is written because it sets up a conflict in that it cuts across both A and B.

Mr. CURTIS. I believe there is no conflict.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I hope this amendment is not adopted. Some very nice compliments have been paid to the committee concerning this bill. It seems to me the amendment would absolutely disrupt the entire program.

The provisions must be uniform if the bill is going to be effective. You cannot leave it up to a soldier to say, "I want to give but $5 of my $22 to a certain relative." To do that would be to distinguish between men in the service with some forced to contribute $22 and others not. It seems apparent the soldiers are going to get $50 a month base pay. This would leave $28 to the soldier for his personal needs. He, of course, gets free food, clothing, housing, and some other things; so this amendment would be very damaging to this bill.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. ELSTON. If this amendment should be adopted would it not greatly impede the efforts of the selective service boards in selecting men for military service?

Mr. THOMASON. There is no doubt about it.

Mr. ELSTON. If this bill should pass, the Selective Service Director and the draft boards would know definitely how much money a family would have for their support while the soldier or the sailor is in the service; but if this amendment should be adopted they would not know whether a man's family, his wife or children or other dependents, would be taken care of at all.

Mr. THOMASON. I thank the gentleman. I repeat, it would be most confusing if the amendment were adopted.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. BROOKS. It would simply multiply the amount of bookkeeping, addition and calculations in all of the boards that handle this matter. In the case of partial dependency referred to by the gentleman who just spoke there would be the question of whether there was dependency at all. Bringing in the question of partial dependency nullifies the whole thing.

Mr. THOMASON. If a soldier who has a dependent wife is not willing to contribute $22 when the Government contributes $28, he is not entitled to an allotment.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Is it not possible that in the case of partial dependency set forth by the gentleman from Nebraska, the dependent should return some part of what he received?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; if his conscience hurts him, he can hand it back.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I want to ask a question that is bothering some of us back here: Whether or not under this bill you can pay a wife and children of an existing marriage and also pay former wives and their children.

Mr. THOMASON. As long as they are children they will all receive the amount provided for in this bill.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nebraska.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE: Line 9, page 5, strike out the words "the amount of" and insert "an amount equal to the allowances provided in section 102 (c) but not to exceed."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I believe this amendment is acceptable to the committee.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to have it again reported. I cannot speak for the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the amendment.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the Pace amendment.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, as I explained during the debate on the rule, as the bill is now amended it would require deduction from a soldier's pay of $22 per month even though the Government is paying only $5. In the case of a sister or brother the Government payment, is $5, but as the bill is drawn no consideration is given to the amount the beneficiary is receiving.

The effect of my amendment would be that if a parent is drawing $15 from the Government, a like amount would be deducted from the soldier's pay, thus matching the payment made by the Government. In the case of a sister, if the Government's payment is $5, as the bill is drawn, the deduction from the soldier's pay would be $22.

There are many instances, I am sure, where a soldier would want to help his sister and be willing to put up $5 or $10 to match a like amount paid by the Government, but he might hesitate at having $22 deducted from his pay in order to get a $5 contribution from the Government. That is the amendment, and I understood it was acceptable to the members of the committee. It is simply to provide that the total of $22 will not be deducted unless comparable payment is made by the Government.

Mr. COSTELLO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. COSTELLO. According to that, then, the gentleman is going to make some changes in the amount which persons are going to receive. I do not know whether this has been placed in the RECORD or not, but I believe it is taken from the Senate report on its bill. In the case of the class B dependents, where there is only one parent, the Government contribution will be $15. Under the language of the gentleman's amendment only $15 will be deducted from the soldier's pay and, as a result, the parent will receive $30?

Mr. PACE. That is right.

Mr. COSTELLO. Whereas under the present arrangement the parent would receive $37, $22 plus $15. In the case where there is one parent and one sister, the payment would be $20. There you would reduce it to $40 instead of $42.

Mr. PACE. At the same time I am sure the gentleman would not support a provision in the bill whereby a sister would get a contribution from the Government of $5 and you require that the soldier have $22 deducted from his pay?

Mr. COSTELLO. The gentleman will observe that is not the situation, because you run into the fact the Government contributes, plus the soldier's allotment, which gives the full amount.

Mr. PACE. I am quite sure the gentleman must agree, if he will think about it a moment, that that would cause many soldiers to decline to make contributions to a brother or sister, where the Government contribution was only $5 and he would be required to put up $22. Surely the gentleman from California would not argue in support of such a provision as that.

Mr. Chairman, every member of the committee I have talked with said that my amendment was the way the bill was intended to be drawn. The gentleman from California is the first member of the committee who has raised any question that it was the intention of the committee to require no greater payment from the soldier than the Government was putting up itself. Every member of the committee, including the chairman of the subcommittee, stood me down, as the fellow says, that that is what the bill does now. Unhappily it does not; and my amendment, I respectfully submit, provides what the members of the committee told me it was intended to do—that is, if a dependent received only $5 the soldier should only be required to put up $5. If the dependent received $20, the soldier should put up the $20. Certainly it was not intended by the committee, from their own declarations made to me, that the Government would put up $5 and you would deduct $22 from the pay of the soldier.

It seems simple justice to require no greater contribution from the soldier than the Government makes. In fact, under the amendments now adopted, if I correctly understand the situation, the Government is putting up $28 and the soldier is putting up $22. Here you have gone into reverse; the Government is putting up $5 and the soldier is putting up $22. Certainly it was not the intention of the committee, and it should not be the intention of the Congress, to do that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. Chairman, the amendment which the gentleman offers in general would have little or no effect upon the proposal in this legislation. It would not change the amounts which are to be paid to the dependents, because in the majority of cases more than $22 is actually to be paid out. The only exception to that which he singles out is where there would be only a brother or a sister as a dependent, and in that case the Government would only contribute to such brother $5; however, if the soldier were to have his pay deducted only in the amount of $5, it would mean that brother or sister would receive payment of $10 per month.

Under the existing language of the bill, the Government would only give $5 to such dependent brother, but the soldier would still contribute $22, which would mean a total payment of $27 to a brother or sister who is according to the language of the bill disabled or a dependent. As a result, the amendment here would cut down the allotment in that case to $5 on the part of the soldier and $5 on the part of the Government, a total of $10. That is really the only particular case in which the gentleman's amendment would have any effect.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Why, it would have exactly the same effect on a man who has one parent. Under the bill as now drawn, the parent would get $15 from the Government and $22 from the soldier. My amendment would provide he would get $15 from the Government and $15 from the soldier.

Mr. COSTELLO. I agree with the gentleman on that illustration, the $15 would be deducted from the soldier's pay for a parent. The only case in which the gentleman's amendment would have any effect is in the case of class B dependents, and the language of the bill makes it plainly mandatory that class B persons must be dependent. In the case of the class A group, dependency need not be shown. Under the class B group they must be dependent. The full effect of his amendment is where dependency is shown and proven, then the soldier is able to give less than the $22 a month as an allotment from his pay.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the gentleman is making a very strong point. Let me ask him this question: If the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia should prevail, then this dependent would be receiving only $10 per month, is that correct?

Mr. COSTELLO. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And the taxpayers must go into their pockets and make up the difference to bring that up to a subsistence level for the dependent?

Mr. COSTELLO. The gentleman is quite correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We have already raised the salary and wages of the soldier who could make that contribution

himself. It seems to me that the amendment strikes at the very foundation of the increase in pay that we voted the other day.

Mr. COSTELLO. I think the gentleman is quite correct in his statement, because the primary purpose of that class B group is that you are making an allowance to them because of their dependency, yet we are going to make it possible for the soldier to make a contribution of less than the full amount in that particular case.

Actually, what we are requiring the soldier to do is to make an allotment of $22 and, if there are both class A and class B dependents, we are asking the soldier then to make an additional allotment of $5, so that the Government will not be called upon to pay out too large an amount where there are several dependents who would be receiving these allotments of pay.

I hope the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PACE) there were—ayes 8, noes 34.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PACE: On page 6, lines 3 and 4, strike out "in such manner as may be prescribed by regulation" and insert "in the same ratio in which they share the allowances provided in section 102 (c), unless the enlisted man shall otherwise direct."

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, on page 3 of the bill there are itemized the payments the Government makes—so much to the wife, so much to the child, and so much to the parent. Further on you provide that in such cases $22 shall be deducted from the soldier's pay, but you make no provision in this bill as to how that $22 shall be paid, to whom, or under what circumstances. You simply provide in the third and fourth lines on page 6 that it shall be distributed among the beneficiaries in such a manner as may be prescribed by regulation. That is, the Congress has not one word to say as to how the soldier's $22 shall be paid and the soldier has not one word to say as to how his $22 shall be paid.

I presume that this was detected in the Senate and it has been corrected in the Senate bill. The amendment which I now propose states that this $22 which the soldier puts into the pot to match the $28 the Government puts in shall be paid the same way, in the same proportion, or in the same ratio, as you set up on page 3, unless the soldier otherwise directs.

This is my reason for adding these last few words. Take the case of a soldier whose wife is an invalid and requires considerable medical care. The soldier may say, "I would like my wife to have my entire $22." Say the soldier has two or three children, one of whom is an invalid. He may say, "I would like Johnny to have my $22."

Certainly, either the Congress or the soldier, one or the other, should have some voice in what you are going to do with his $22, and not leave it entirely, as we have already done in so many bills passed by this Congress, subject merely to regulations issued by the head of some department. That is all you have in the bill at this moment, that the head of some department under a regulation that may be changed overnight can take the soldier's $22 and pay it out as he pleases, to whomever he pleases. It is left entirely subject to regulations.

The Senate has corrected this error. You find in the Senate bill the language I have used, that is, that the soldier's $22 shall be paid in the same ratio as are the payments made under section 102 (c), which you find on page 3.

I have added as my own language, which may be objectionable to the committee, "unless the soldier otherwise directs." As I say, that is in keeping with my view that in the absence of direction from the soldier, the wife, if she is alone, gets it all; if there is a wife and child, she gets two-thirds of it and the child gets one-third; and if there is a wife and two children, the wife gets one-half and the children get $11 each.

Under the circumstances, certainly the man himself should have some right to say what shall be done with his own money. You are telling him what you will do with the Government's contribution, but he should be given some voice as to what to do with his $22 that you take in order to match the Government's contribution.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. EDMISTON. I think the gentleman's amendment is good and sound. I think the man should have something to say as to what is done with the money he allots out of his pay. I feel that the War Department would administer it as the gentleman intends and feels it should be administered, and pay the money to those dependents who need it the most, but, personally, I cannot see any objection to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. PACE. I thought that if there was any objection I would ask that the amendment be submitted in two parts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEFINITIONS

SEC. 104. As used in this title—

(a) The term "wife" means a lawful wife.

(b) The term "former wife divorced" means a former wife divorced who has not remarried and to whom alimony has been decreed.

(c) The term "child" includes—

(1) a legitimate child;

(2) a child legally adopted;

(3) a stepchild, if a member of the man's household, including a stepchild who continues as a member of the man's household after death of the mother or termination of the marriage; and

(4) an illegitimate child, but only if the man has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to such child's support, has been judicially decreed to be the putative father of such child; or, has acknowledged under oath in writing, that he is the father of such child.

(d) The term "child" is limited to unmarried persons either (1) under 18 years of age, or (2) of any age, is incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect.

(e) The term "parent" includes father and mother, grandfather and grandmother, stepfather and stepmother, father and mother through adoption, either of the person in the service or of the spouse, and persons who, for a period of not less than 1 year prior to a man's enlistment or induction, stood in loco parentis to the man concerned: *Provided*, That not more than two within those named herein may be designated to receive an allowance, and that where the designation is made by the head of the department as provided in section 102 (e) (1) preference shall be given to the parent, or parents not exceeding two, who actually exercised parental relationship at the time of or most nearly prior to the date of the enlisted man's entrance into active service: *Provided further*, That if such parent or parents be not dependent or waive an allowance, preference may be extended to others within the class who at a more remote time actually supported the enlisted man prior to entrance into service.

(f) The terms "brother" and "sister" include brothers and sisters of the half blood as well as those of the whole blood, stepbrothers and stepsisters, and brothers and sisters through adoption.

(g) The terms "pay" and "base pay" mean base pay and longevity pay, only.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: On page 6, line 19, after "decreed" strike out the period and insert "and is still payable."

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of the amendment is to make the language of this particular section conform to that which is in the Senate bill. Under the language here, the definition of a "former wife divorced" would be a former wife divorced who has not remarried and to whom alimony has been decreed. I add the words "and is still payable," so that the court decree must not only have been made but must still be in effect at the time the payments are being made. I think it merely helps to clarify the language and make the bill more definite.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: On page 7, line 3, strike out "allegitimate" and insert "illegitimate." Line 5, after "support" strike out the comma and insert a semicolon.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, these are merely clarifying amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is on the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts: Page 7, line 8, after the word "child", strike out the period and insert a semicolon and the following: "and (5) a

minor, if a member of the man's household, who is a brother or sister of the man and dependent upon him for support."

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, we treat as a beneficiary of this bill under the definition of "child" a man's adopted child. Now, like the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], I know of situations where men have gone or are going into the service who have no children of their own, who have not adopted any children, and yet are bringing up their younger brothers and sisters. They are orphans and so are the little brothers and sisters, and the older brother has stood as the head of the family. He, of course, has not resorted to legal adoption and yet stands to those children in loco parentis. They are dependent upon him for support and at least have as much claim on him as a waif he might have adopted had he been minded so to do.

In this bill we treat as parents people who are not actually the parents of the soldier, but who have been standing for a period of time in loco parentis to the soldier. My amendment would simply mean that in a similar fashion we would treat as children those youngsters, brothers, and sisters of the enlisted man, to whom he has been standing in loco parentis.

This does not open the field wide to all claims from brothers and sisters of whatever age and wherever they may be. It is simply designed to protect those children who have made their homes with the man who is going into the service and who have been brought up by him and have had to look to him, even though he is only their older brother, in place of a father whom they have lost.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. COSTELLO. While I think there is considerable merit in what the gentleman has said, I question whether his amendment ought to go in at this particular place. Does the gentleman think it is a proper thing to offer in the bill as a definition of "child" minor brothers and sisters of the soldier? It seems to me the purpose which the gentleman wishes to accomplish could be accomplished some other way than trying to change the definition of the word "child" which the gentleman's amendment, of course, might do.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. It would simply include within the scope the particular people to whom a soldier stands in loco parentis.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The effect of putting in such brother or sister as a child and torturing the family relationship in that way would mean that all brothers and sisters may be thrown into the A classification instead of the B classification.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Only those brothers and sisters who were being supported and brought up by the enlisted man and under age. I agree that it is a difficult thing to do, and I do not like to torture language any more than the gentleman from California, but I have not seen how the bill can conveniently be amended to accomplish this purpose except by these means.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 105. (a) The family allowance provided for in section 102 (c) shall continue to be paid irrespective of the pay status of the enlisted man concerned prior to the termination of his service as an enlisted man.

(b) In case of desertion or imprisonment the payment of the family allowance and the reduction in or charge against the pay of the individual provided for in this title shall be subject to such regulations as may be prescribed by the head of the department concerned.

(c) For the purposes of this title an enlisted man of the military or naval forces shall be considered as in a pay status whenever entitled to be credited with pay and allowances under the provisions of the act approved March 7, 1942 (Public, No. 490, 77th Cong.).

SEC. 106. This title shall be administered by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy for personnel of their respective departments. They shall prescribe regulations necessary to effectuate the purposes of titles I and II of this act and make final and conclusive determinations in the administration thereof.

SEC. 107. The determination of all facts under the provisions of this title, including the fact of dependency shall be made by the head of the executive department concerned, or by such subordinate as he may designate, and such determination shall be final and conclusive upon the accounting officer of the Government for all purposes: *Provided*, That any overpayments made by disbursing officers of the United States in carrying out the provisions of this title may be passed to their credit by the General Accounting Office in the audit of their accounts if it appears that such overpayments were made in the exercise of due and ordinary diligence, except that no such credit shall be passed when such overpayments are due to gross negligence, fraud, or criminality on the part of such disbursing officer.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: Page 9, line 10, after the word "dependency", insert a comma, and in line 12, strike out the word "subordinate" and insert "subordinates"; also strike out the word "determination" and insert "determinations"; in line 13, strike out "officer" and insert "officers."

Mr. COSTELLO. That merely clarifies the language of the section.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 108. The appropriations made to the department concerned for the payment of the pay of enlisted men shall be available for the payment of the family allowances authorized herein.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN: On page 10, after line 2, insert the following as a new title:

"TITLE II

"SEC. 1. That all commissioned officers and enlisted men in the active military or naval service on April 20, 1942, and all persons hereafter entering upon active service during the present war shall be issued, without examination, national service life insurance in the amount of $5,000 under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended: *Provided*, That while such persons continue in the active service, and for 6 months after separation from active service, or 6 months after the termination of the present war as proclaimed by the President, whichever is the earlier date, the premiums on such insurance shall be paid by the Government out of the current appropriations for pay and allowances pertaining to the particular organization under which the active service is performed: *Provided further*, That any person who has died in or been discharged from active service since April 19, 1942, and prior to the date of this enactment, and such death or discharge resulted from injury or disease incurred in line of duty, shall be deemed to have been granted $5,000 national service life insurance effective as of April 20, 1942, or the date of entry upon active duty, whichever is the later date.

"SEC. 2. Upon termination of the period during which premiums are payable by the Government the insured shall have the option of continuing or converting the insurance issued under section 1 hereof, or any part thereof in any multiple of $500 but not less than $1,000, at his own expense: *Provided*, That during the period while premiums are payable by the Government, such insurance shall be continued as term insurance notwithstanding the provisions of section 602 (f) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, except that during the period while premiums are payable by the Government, the $5,000 insurance provided for in section 1 of this title, or any part thereof in any multiple of $500 but not less than $1,000, may be converted under the provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, upon payment by the insured of the excess premium resulting from such conversion.

"SEC. 3. The issuance of $5,000 insurance under section 1 shall not be construed to affect the right of any person otherwise eligible to apply for or carry additional insurance under the National Service Insurance Act of 1940, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, except that the aggregate amount of insurance carried under either or both such acts together with the $5,000 insurance issued under section 1 hereof shall not at any one time exceed $10,000.

"SEC. 4. The provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, insofar as they are not inconsistent with the provisions of this title shall be for application under this act."

On page 10, line 3, strike out the numeral "II" and insert the numeral "III."

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the amendment that it is not germane.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman withhold his point of order?

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Texas

for reserving his point of order, but at the same time I do not concede that the amendment is subject to the point of order. I think it is germane to this bill. I shall discuss that later after asking permission of the Chair to speak upon the point of order.

On December 20 last we passed the very same bill that I am asking the House today to adopt. My amendment simply takes off where that left, April 20, and continues to the men in the service the same provisions that you people here by unanimous consent gave on December 20. That simply provided that if any boy or man is killed in the service or permanently disabled, he is presumed, though he has not applied for life insurance, to be covered to the extent of $5,000. This amendment has not been hastily conceived.

It has been worked out after deliberation with the Veterans' Administration. I do not claim that they have O. K.'d it, but neither have they rejected it. Yes; it is going to cost money, and as I stated before, are you not, you Members of the House, willing to do the same for the children and the wives and the fathers and mothers of these men who give up their lives that our Nation may live—are you not willing to give at least that same amount if necessary of money, billions it may be, as you have done in the lend-lease appropriations?

There are many places we can economize and we must economize but we cannot allow the dependents of our service men killed or disabled in action suffer because of these men performing their duty to our country.

That is simply the question before you. Some say that in case we lose a million men, the cost will be terriffic. I reiterate what I stated before today. If we lose a million men or more, this Nation is going to see to it anyhow that the dependents of that million men, more or less, are going to be taken care of. So, in the name of common sense, why should we provide 2,000 stenographers to sit up here in some Government building, to write out these eight or ten million policies, which would be unnecessary under this amendment. This plan would be operated exactly as Public, No. 360 has operated from December 20 to April 20 on the basis of bookkeeping. Bookkeeping starts when the War and the Navy Department certifies to the National Service Life Insurance that a certain man has been killed or totally disabled. That is where the bookkeeping starts, rather than having no one knows how many women writing out policies, checking monthly collections from every unit in the services, and filling out forms without number. If you want to cut red tape, this will do it. Let us give to the service men's children this money instead of to unnecessary office workers.

Mr. EDMISTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. One more point and I shall be glad to yield. I am asking you again, those of you who did not hear this letter which I received from one of my Legion posts to listen to it while I read it again:

DEAR SIR: A reading of H. R. 6512 at our Legion meeting last Thursday evening brought out a unanimous vote for it. It seems a sensible solution for a neglected problem. We have buried two draftees, the last one of a destitute family was buried by the county, a $60 burial. Had an honorable discharge. Got an infection while in service, spent 5 weeks in Walter Reed Hospital, had leg amputated, was sent home to die, which he did a month later. I called the Veterans' Administration at Minneapolis and they said no provision had as yet been made for this soldier to be buried by the Government so the county did it. Your bill would have made it different for this family. More power to you.

Dr. W. W. LARSEN,
Starbuck, Minn.

Oh, yes, it is going to cost money. I admit it. If we lose a million men it is going to cost just a lot of money. The question is here, and I repeat it, even if it did cost ten or fifteen billions, are you not willing to do just as much for the fathers and mothers and wives and children of these soldiers who will lay down their lives for our country that you have done in the form of lease-lend for foreign nations, for strangers?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I renew my point of order, that the amendment is not germane to this bill, because this is a bill to provide family allowance for dependents of enlisted men of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard of the United States. The amendment which the gentleman is offering amends the National Life Insurance Act, so it seems to me it is apparent on its face that it is not germane. This amendment should be offered to the proper bill and at the proper time when it can have the full and fair consideration its importance deserves. This is an allowance and allotment bill and life insurance is not even referred to remotely.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would like to ask, Mr. Chairman, what has more to do with dependency in case these men do not come back than life insurance? After all, my particular amendment provides, Mr. Chairman, that such insurance shall be paid by the Government out of the current appropriations for pay and allowance, pertaining to the particular organization under which the active service is performed; the very same provision, Mr. Chairman, as is in this particular bill. I contend that this is germane. Certainly, if it is not germane there is nothing germane as far as the dependents of the service men is concerned.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. BULWINKLE). The Chair is ready to rule.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN] deals with national service life insurance, which is a creature of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota adds additional and different benefits to the allowances made under the proposed bill before the House.

On December 18, 1918, when the House was considering the bill H. R. 13366, authorizing the retention of the uniforms and personal equipment by discharged soldiers, Mr. Frank Mondell of Wyoming proposed an amendment as follows:

And all persons honorably discharged from the military or naval service shall receive 1 month's extra pay on discharge.

This amendment was held not to be germane to the bill under consideration. (Cannon's Precedents VIII, 2983.)

The Chair holds that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is not germane, and therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

TITLE II—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 201. As used in this act the terms "man," "enlisted man," and "enlisted men," mean any enlisted individual of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grade, of any of the services mentioned in section 101 of this act while in active military or naval service of the United States.

SEC. 202. The provisions of this act shall not apply to members of the Philippine Army, the Philippine Scouts, the insular force of the Navy, the Samoan native guard and band of the Navy, and the Samoan reserve force of the Marine Corps.

SEC. 203. The Director of the Selective Service System shall cooperate with the head of the executive department concerned, or such subordinate as he may designate, to provide such information as may be required in the administration of this act.

SEC. 204. The family allowances, and assistance payable under this act, shall not be assignable; shall not be subject to the claims of creditors of any person to whom it is paid; shall not be liable to attachment, levy, or seizure by or under any legal or equitable process whatever, whether the same remains with the Government, or any officer or agent thereof, or is in the course of transmission to the beneficiary entitled thereto, but shall inure wholly to the benefit of such beneficiary.

SEC. 205. Whoever shall obtain or receive any money, check, family allowance, or assistance under this act, without being entitled thereto, with intent to defraud, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000, or imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 206. Whoever in any claim for family allowance, or assistance, or in any document required by this act or by regulation made under this act, makes any statement of a material fact knowing it to be false, shall be guilty of perjury and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000, or imprisonment for not more than 2 years, or both.

SEC. 207. If any person entitled to payment of family allowance or assistance under this act, whose right to such payment ceases upon the happening of any contingency, thereafter accepts any such payment with the intent to defraud, he shall be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

SEC. 208. No part of any amount paid pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with any claim arising under this act, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any

person violating this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not less than $100 nor more than $1,000.

SEC. 209. When any payment under this act is to be made to a minor or to a person mentally or physically incompetent, such payment shall be made to the person who is constituted guardian or curator by the laws of the jurisdiction in which the beneficiary resides, or to the person who is legally or otherwise vested with the responsibility of care of the beneficiary as may be determined by the head of the department concerned.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker, having resumed the chair, Mr. BULWINKLE, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7119, to provide family allowances for the dependents of the enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 496, he reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en grosse.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2467) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes, strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert in lieu thereof the provisions of the bill H. R. 7119, as amended, just passed.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The Senate bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

By unanimous consent, the proceedings by which the bill, H. R. 7119, was passed were vacated, and the bill H. R. 7119 was laid on the table.

READJUSTMENT OF PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF PERSONNEL OF THE ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, COAST GUARD, COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY, AND PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the conference report which I filed this morning on the bill S. 2025, to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. JENKINS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter received from the War Department.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an extract from speeches made by Mr. Sumner Welles, Mr. Steffanson, and Dr. Westphal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole this afternoon and to include therein certain letters.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today upon the conclusion of other special orders I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] is recognized for 30 minutes.

A "LAME DUCK'S" REPORT TO CONGRESS

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, this is a "lame duck's" report to Congress. A few days ago I left these Halls to go into Alabama for the purpose of attending my safe return to the Congress of the United States. Promptly on arrival there I launched my boat on the political waters and soon realized that my bark was being tossed on an unfriendly and stormy sea. The result was that I never made port. A new Congressman will be here next January, and may he serve well. Meanwhile, for the next 6 months I will be here. "Those also serve who only stand and wait." During that time I expect still to be the Representative of the district and I am going to do my best to represent it and shall do all I can to help the man who defeated me. I do not blame him for making a "lame duck" of me. He comes here as I did 6 years ago representing the same people, quite as anxious, I am sure, to represent them well. Had the people of the district not felt they had proper cause they would never have voted me out, but we cannot afford too much of that over the country in this hour of national trial. Mr. Speaker, I think it is the patriotic duty of each of us who was defeated to do all in his power to prevent other Members of this Congres from suffering the same fate. No one man is indispensable, but every man lost from a war Congress weakens that Congress. The voters do not grasp the importance of holding a war Congress intact. I fear the press does not comprehend it. Through the past years they have been deciding congressional campaigns greatly on local and domestic issues, and they are not inclined to change even for a war program.

There is not a man in this Congress, Democrat or Republican, whom I would want to help defeat. I fear there is this danger for several good men, however. There is the danger that Congressmen whom the Nation can ill afford to lose may be lost from this Congress in this solemn hour of our Nation's peril. Can it be that we are unable to get it over to our people that men who have brought this program thus far are the proper ones to carry it on through this war? Is it possible that our contact is so weak or so remote that we are unable to make our people see that local issues or personal dislikes are dwarfed when a dangerous war is on our Nation? My voting record was never attacked, yet I was voted out of the next Congress.

We speak of a need for an understanding between different branches of labor and between employer and employee, but in the interest of national security and for the sake of popular understanding and confidence in this crucial hour we ought to have an understanding between the press of the United States and the Congress of the United States if that is possible to be reached. The manner in which the press reported and handled, for example, the social security bill, calling it a congressional pension bill, dealt this whole Congress a weakening blow. Every Member here who has opposition will lose votes because of that bill. I did not vote for the bill, as you know, but was charged by many voters with having done so. Even this would have done no injury had the press conveyed the facts so the bill could have been understood. There should be a mutual feeling of good will and understanding between the press and the Congress, certainly in these perilous days, such a feeling that that sort of thing could not occur. The public in my district was never given to know that the fund from which the so-called pension was to come was to have been money the Congressmen themselves paid.

They were always surprised when they were given the information. It is so hard to get facts to people on matters of that kind. There exists today much feeling over this, and it is one matter that cost many votes, thought I voted against it,

and though it was not a pension. An understanding between the press and the Congress would have prevented that injustice.

Other examples could be given, and I merely give this as one example. The Congress bears a tremendous responsibility to the people of the country, but so does our great free press. There should be a meeting of some kind between the Congress and the press, and it should come about quickly, and should be entered into seriously, unselfishly, and with patriotism as its aim. Of this there is no doubt. And there should be brought about by some means an understanding between the Congress and the people.

There is entirely too much distrust and skepticism in the minds of the populace toward this Congress. To blame the public is foolish. Congress must be able to blame itself, find the trouble, and find some way to overcome it. There must be some way to bring about among the people a feeling of trust and reliance toward this body, and this also should be done quickly, and the more quickly it is done, if it can be done, the better it will be for some who are sitting here today. Of that I have no doubt.

The people feel that vital information they are entitled to have is being withheld by this Congress. They do not know what it is, to be sure, but they are uneasy, and some even resentful.

Of course, I am giving you this as a report from my particular district, but my district is a representative one, and the experiences I have gone through and the facts I have found in my district will obtain, no doubt, in most districts throughout the United States, and it will be most vital to those of you who will have opposition between now and election time.

The vagueness of their unrest makes it all the more serious. Ask them what it is they wish to know and they will say, "You tell us." You will be talking to a crowd, and they will ask these vague questions. You will say, "Gentlemen, what is it you wish to know, what is your question?" And they say, "You tell us. Open the door. Congress is holding something back that we ought to know and we citizens of the United States are entitled to it." They continue in that darkened trend of thought. No door I was able to open seemed to throw any light on it. It is distant, it is hard to approach, and it leaves the Congressman at a disadvantage, while his opposition is at no disadvantage on that score.

When you go to your district they will confront you with questions and many of their questions will be very sharp and, by their nature, hard to answer.

Let me give you a few examples of these questions: "What about that agreement between Standard Oil and the German Chemical Trust?" I heard that a number of times. "What about Leon Henderson?" Now, how are you going to answer a question like that? "Is he not an agent of Congress and are you not a Member of Congress?" "What have you done for the small businessman?" It seems that there are so many small businessmen. "What about that congressional pension you voted for yourself out of the taxpayer's money?" There go 20 minutes of your time taken up in answering that question right there, time that you can ill afford to spare from a restless people. "What about the Smith amendment against the workers of the country?" Oh, how often I heard that one, and I did vote for the Smith amendment.

"What about gasoline rationing against all of us while Congress has all the gas it wants, on the floor and off?" "Why did not Congress do something about heading off this rubber shortage?" They feel that Congress could have done something. I suppose there is a connection there with the Standard Oil matter. They keep talking about that. Many feel we ought to have enough foresight to look down the road and see what is coming and that we could have prepared this Nation so there would not be a rubber shortage.

"What about the lag and drag in Congress on preparedness and war legislation?" "Why have you not been around to see us?" And let me dwell a minute on that. Oh, how many times I heard that in the drug stores, on the street, in the filling station, and at the country store—everywhere. They asked, "Have you gone high hat, have you gone national? We have not seen you for 2 or 3 years." I said, "We have been tied to a desk, we have been at work, we have been trying to do something for that length of time. For 3 years straight we have been tied down in Congress." "Well," they said, "there is no law against you coming down to see us once in a while. We want to talk to you and tell you what to do. We want you to talk to us and tell us what you are doing."

In my district they have not forgiven me for not being more frequently seen down there, as the vote shows. I believe I heard that more than any other one thing, Mr. Speaker, and it is serious; it is one of the main reasons why I took this time to speak to the House today. If the Members of this Congress are coming back here in future years, and unless there is going to be a tremendous turnover each 2 years in the Congress of the United States, it is going to have to work out some way so that it can be here and do its business in 6 or 7 months and spend the remaining months of the year amongst the people. You cannot have your ear to the breast of your community and hear its beat if you are away. You need to know what your people are thinking about. It qualifies you to represent your district and keeps you from becoming a stranger. If they do not see and hear you, they are going to vote for somebody they do see and hear; that is what they are going to do. I am not blaming the man who beat me. He just had more campaigning sense than I did. As a matter of fact, he had the noses counted before I got there. I did not have a chance; I was licked before I got home.

Yet before when I would go down there they would ask, "Is not Congress in session? You get back on your job." And I would catch a plane and zoom right back up here—all at my own expense. No doubt they think the trips home and back are borne by Mr. Taxpayer.

If Congress is held in session you cannot go home. They will condemn you for being down there, so the only way to do is to have Congress in vacation so that you can do it and keep face while you are home. That is one thing that helped retire me, not being around to see the folks and talk with them. The other man can be making hay while the sun shines and you are in the darkness; it is not shining for you. That is the case. They do not forgive you. They may want you up here all along and you may feel that you are doing your necessary part in the work. Therein lies the tragedy of it.

At this serious time we do not need any turn-overs in Congress, in this time when if possible we need here every man who has had the education and the experience, who has had the advantage of the hearings and knows the past, some matters that involve military secrets. Every man that is in this House who can be kept here ought to be kept here. I do not mind if he was a stark isolationist before Pearl Harbor, if he is going down the road doing his duty now, voting as he sees it and helping carry on the program, he can do a better job on the floor of this Congress than any new man they can possibly send here, because he knows what he is doing and knows what it is all about, and no new man can do that.

So, if we are patriotic, we will forget whether we are Democrats or Republicans, and we lame ducks will do everything in the world we can to get every man that is on this floor and not already defeated back here again to carry on the program that is before us.

There is the problem. When we are staying here month after month, are growing to be strangers to the folks in our districts, they are growing to be strangers to us, yet they are the ones who vote and determine who comes to the Congress of the United States.

Now, a few more questions:

"What about you fellows being asleep at the switch when the Japs hit us at Pearl Harbor?"

"Why haven't you got further along on our war program?"

"Why haven't you as our Congressman brought more industries into this district?"

My district is a potential bomb target. Akron, Chicago, New York, Birmingham, Pittsburgh, and a few others, have been marked off. They do not worry about that. They say, "It is your duty to keep it from being a war target. We want all those things to come here." That is a very touchy subject. Of course, we know that cannot be changed under any circumstances.

"Why don't you let us in on what is going on in Congress?"

"We ought to know. Why didn't you have your fighting planes and trained fighters ready when war came?"

I heard that over and over. If any of you remember, I was out here fighting for that, one of the first ones on the floor to start that sort of fight, but that did not mean anything. They think of

you collectively and vote on you individually. That is what they do. They blamed me for anything anybody in Congress said or did, because they say, "If you can't convince your own men in Congress, how do you expect to convince us here?"

Let me drop back:

"Why didn't you have more fighting planes and trained fighters ready when war came? Had not this question been brewing for years? Why did Congress have to listen to Lindbergh and others when it ought to have been listening to us"?

I had one man ask me that. He said, "Why were not you listening to us instead of listening to Lindbergh"? I said, "I never listened to Lindbergh, only just to listen to what he said in hearings." He said, "Why, you had him up there testifying before your committee and letting him take up your time, our time."

"Why were you up on the radio doing a commercial broadcast when you should have been looking after business in Congress?"

That will not worry the rest of you. They asked me that because I sometimes appeared here on a program.

They asked me why I was taking up time to peel potatoes at the White House. They thought it took me 6 months to peel a few potatoes up there. I peeled a handful of potatoes over there one afternoon for the Communists to look at. I was just giving those Communists a lesson in a little potato-peeling work, but I heard plenty about that, too.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Does the gentleman recommend commercial broadcasts for other Members of Congress who want to come back?

Mr. PATRICK. I do not. However, I did not get any money for any broadcasting, and I did not do it on the people's time. Whenever Congress was going on or anything I did not do any radio broadcasting. I merely passed that out because while you may not be doing radio broadcasting you will be doing something else, and the man that runs against you will seize on anything. I invite you to study that, and anything you have to do, as a matter of relaxation, do it privately. Do not do it where they can catch records on you.

They have a record of one of my broadcasts, and they played it all over the district and played it on the radio until I had nightmares about it. Congress had adjourned, and I just passed a little joke out on the radio that afternoon. I never fish or hunt or play golf or anything; about the only recreation I have had is running down and speaking on the radio once in a while when I could, when it did not interfere. So I got up there one afternoon. We had a big appropriation bill up here. I said over the radio right down here on station WWDC:

Ladies and gentlemen, we passed some kind of an appropriation bill up there awhile ago. I voted for it. You know how it is with Congressmen, we vote a bill out today, and then buy a paper tomorrow to see what it was.

I thought it was a pretty clever joke, but it did not sound so funny to them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COLMER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. But when I heard that played back to me a dozen times down in my district over the radio, at home where the voters listened, I did not think it was a bit clever. But I have no kick coming; he did not hit me with anything except what I provided him with.

I am not mad at my adversary, so help me. We are friends and get along. Of course, I had rather he had not beaten me, but I am not sore at him. It was not my intention for him to beat me, however, I can assure you of that.

He said, Why was he up there doing commercial broadcasting when he should have been looking after your business in Congress? Of course, I did not do any of that when I should be doing anything for them. I tried to explain that I did this only on off time and did not let it interfere with my work at all, but they reserved to themselves the right to pass on that, and the vote reveals that they did pass on it; and, fellow Members of Congress, this brings me to a very serious angle, and that is a matter with which you will be confronted yourselves—but I believe I will give you two or three more questions before I come to that.

"When are we going to invade the continent of Europe?" They will ask you that, or they did me. Oh, yes; that is a military secret, you can tell them, but there are too many secrets from us they seem to feel. "How many fighting men do we have in the Far East?" That is the kind of question they will ask you. "How long does Congress think the war will last?" "When are you going to settle down to a tax program that we can depend upon?"

I wish I could think of all the questions they asked me about taxation. By the way, there are quite a number of questions ready for you on that subject of taxation, I can tell you that. They do very little complaining about heavy taxes. They do not expect to do anything except pay heavy taxes, but they feel that they are not any too clear on what to expect and they think you can enlighten them in a few short sentences and then they will know.

But back to the serious angle to which I referred a while ago and with which I think you will probably be confronted. They seem to feel that your every waking hour should be spent in congressional work. They doubt if the Congress is taking the war as seriously as they are. You would be surprised to find that, wouldn't you? I have heard asked here when the people in the districts are going to wake up to the fact that there is a serious war on. They seem to think we do not take it seriously and the papers seem to convey the same idea. Are the papers right about it? I do not think so. You would not think that could be so in my case, would you? As you know, there is no Member here who became alarmed at an earlier date and announced his alarm more consistently, but that fact did not save me. As I told you a while ago, they think of Congress collectively and whatever conclusion they reach they vote upon him individually. Many do not like Leon Henderson. They cannot vote against him, but they can vote against the Congressman. They do not like a great many things that have been done here. Each Congressman gets blamed for the whole program. In my case I was the only man who was running they could get at. There was one United States Senator who ran but he did not have any opposition. Leon Henderson did not run for any office; Nelson did not run for any office. None of the men whose names are seen in the papers ran. The only man whose head bobbed above the horizon holding and running for any Government office is the Congressman, so they just take a pop at him. I do not mind being a lame duck in this Congress if by so doing I can be of any help in keeping together the rest of this Congress, so our preparedness and war program for the Nation will not be disrupted by domestic and local issues. One of the severest issues with which I was confronted was the recent seating of a postmaster and fault was not found with the man, but with how it was done, and yet it was regular in every respect, but it was one of these well-known changes by appeal. The Senators recommended my nomination and the man was seated. And if it can be avoided do not let the civil service at you to throw a post-office recommendation in your lap just before election. I cite this to show how the voters are still inclined to follow local issues. Something undoubtedly should be done to give the people confidence in Congress. With the war on and the paper a daily diet, they are quick to read and take seriously all that the present news carries and, on the whole, the press is not friendly to the Members of Congress.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 more minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Something ought to be done about it. It is doing the country no good and threatens to contribute to a very serious condition, dangerous to our security and national welfare.

So if we can, by some means, get an understanding and a feeling of mutual interest and patriotic desire between the Congress of the United States and the press of the United States in this hour of trial and peril, when the Nation's welfare may be hanging in the balance and when its security is at stake and when a war is being fought, this should be done. Of all times there should now be a national unity and there should be a confidence on the part of the people in its law-making body. As it is now, it is dangerous for any man coming before the people for a vote. Two years ago I had no difficulty at all in returning. I went down home this time with only 3

weeks before the first primary, with no doubt I would have any great difficulty. To my astonishment I was headed for defeat, headed to be taken out of the Congress of the United States.

I do not want to bring any painful apprehension to the Members of Congress today here on the floor. You have been working hard and have been working early and late. I do not believe there was ever a more sincere, earnest, hard-hitting, conscientious Congress assembled than is right here at this time, and it is a most unfortunate thing that there has been coming from the press and certain other sources a tendency to tear down the confidence of the people of the United States in its law makers. This is lamentable, and this is more important today than at any other time in the history of our Nation. The people read the papers every day and their boys are going across the ocean and are getting killed. They see many being drafted and they are on the paper's side and when the paper gives a picture that is not entirely clear or gives a picture that is lopsided they can only take that for what it seems to them to be worth, and as a result any condemnation that is felt against any agency or branch of the United States or against some act of the Government of the United States or against the general administration, will be wreaked upon the head of the Congressman, the one lone Congressman who raises his head to run in order to be returned to office from that district. This is unfortunate, it is unfair, it is unhappy and it threatens to weaken the Congress of the United States when it should be at its strongest.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has again expired.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute more.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. So, Mr. Speaker, if there is anything a "lame duck" can do to help I come before you to contribute my part, be it ever so small, in stopping that floodtide, in overcoming that danger, and I shall be glad to make my little sacrifice at the altar of this Nation's security. I thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. JONKMAN] for 15 minutes.

RUBBER AND GASOLINE

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, for several weeks I have opposed in various ways the proposed national rationing of gasoline. Contacts with the Office of Price Administration, individually and jointly with our Michigan delegation, seeking information on different phases and rumors brought no information not to mention results. I did my best to secure some assurance from the O. P. A. that the Middle West would not be rationed until fall, or a reason why such assurance could not be given, but it got me nowhere. I therefore have been interested in and heartily approve of the aims and work of the committee recently formed to take action in this matter.

Letters and telegrams keep pouring in from my district and State protesting against Nation-wide gasoline rationing. Individuals, service clubs, chambers of commerce, and other organizations emphatically express their willingness to voluntarily conserve rubber and make any other sacrifice which will contribute in any degree to our war effort. But they would like to be shown, at least, even a remote connection between gasoline rationing and the war effort.

The Middle West is drowning in oil. Michigan, for instance, is served by refineries in Detroit, Chicago, and Toledo, which in turn are supplied in abundance by pipe lines from the southwestern oil fields. We could get the gas to filling stations without the use of tank cars. The argument that because inadequate transportation facilities have created a shortage of gasoline on the Atlantic seaboard, that therefore the Middle West, which is drowning in oil, should be muzzled to starve to an equal degree has already been exploded. It would have been just as sensible to say that if a certain number of people in New York had unfortunately broken their legs, we must break the legs of a similar number of people in Michigan.

The argument that gasoline rationing is necessary to conserve road surfaces for military use was even more weak, and died aborning.

So now Mr. Henderson is reduced to the belated argument that this drastic, yes, destructive measure is necessary to conserve rubber and that is to stand willy-nilly. Well, what was the objective of the tire-rationing order? Isn't it reasonable to believe that the vast majority of Americans, knowing no further rubber may be available for the duration will make their rubber last for from 3 to 5 years? And assuming their tires are on the average half worn down, isn't that possible? Must they be put in a straitjacket because of a small percentage who will not so conserve? And does the O. P. A. believe that by gasoline rationing it will have this small percentage in the straitjacket?

Mr. Henderson has publicized the statement that on the Atlantic seaboard those who conserve gasoline—I think he should have said rubber—may legally use what they save from their allotment for recreation or pleasure driving. I repeat, this is Mr. Henderson's statement. Assuming that driving 2,880 miles a year, the amount indicated by Mr. Henderson, is a conservative allotment; that persons who live in cities are willing to walk and use street cars all the year around to gratify their all-year dream of a few weeks of recreation in northern Michigan; that in those few weeks they use one-quarter, one-half, or all their year's allotment so to recreate themselves for the battles of life, does this in any way violate the letter, the spirit, or the program of Mr. Henderson's tire rationing as explained by him? Emphatically it does not.

I am addressing myself to the needs and survival of the resort industry which is the second largest industry in Michigan. The folly of unnecessarily rationing gas for workers to and from war industries or of the farmer in his war production needs no argument for it is obvious that depriving them of gas is scotching the war effort. Yet, this will be the inevitable result of national gas rationing.

It is true that Michigan's resort business is of secondary importance in the war effort as compared with transportation of war workers and farm production. But it is of tremendous importance nevertheless as a medium which will permit the defense worker, as well as those engaged in essential civilian activities, to enjoy the vacations that will so desperately be needed, as England's experience has so palpably shown, to maintain shop productivity and national morale.

In addition to this contribution, the tourist industry is the second largest industry in Michigan, with a total annual volume in normal times exceeding $400,000,000. It is the main dependence for livelihood of the majority of people living in the northern half of the State.

It is a business that does not require priorities and does not deplete the raw materials or labor necessary for war production and therefore offers one of the very few opportunities of normal activities compatible with all-out war effort.

The proposed national rationing of gasoline will eliminate three-fourths of this business. It will mean ruin and destruction to thousands of small business men in western and northern Michigan.

This should not be done unless it is to some degree necessary for the war effort. Should such relation be shown to exist, the people of Michigan will gladly make the sacrifice, and any and every other sacrifice necessary for that end. If such reason exists, the people should be taken into the administration's confidence and given the facts.

For instance, the layman might speculate that, with the splendid progress being made for superiority in air power by our aviation personnel, our coming armada of the air demands the creation of a gasoline stock pile. However, it is well known that in making high-grade octane gasoline for the American air forces our refineries produce as a by-product a low-grade gasoline that must be either consumed in the ordinary way or destroyed. Storage facilities are already overtaxed and civilians could get along on that low-grade gas if the high grade ran short. This contingency, if it did face us, could not possibly materialize until late in the fall. However, no such claim is made by the Price Administrator, nor has he said that his tire-rationing program is a failure. Of course, the rubber situation defies check or analysis, but even that does not affect the problem of rational use of tires on the cars of John Q. Public.

Congress should take immediate steps to survey the Midwest gasoline situation and oppose the national rationing of gasoline unless Mr. Henderson and others show that it is in some degree necessary for the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include with my remarks one of the telegrams received by me on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GRAND HAVEN, MICH., *June 8, 1942.*

Congressman B. J. JONKMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

We, the undersigned, find that the people in our locality resent any proposal to ration gasoline presumably for the purpose of conserving rubber. Our people have curtailed speed and car use voluntarily. We ask that you, as our elected representative, make known in Congress the wishes of your constituents.

WM. L. STRIBLEY,
Officer, Chamber of Commerce.
JAMES VAN ZYLEN,
Officer, Kiwanis Club.
FRANK MASON,
Officer, Rotary Club.
GEORGE M. JOHNSON,
Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PROGRAM TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, the program tomorrow will be the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill, and after that the conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATRICK). Under a previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] for 5 minutes.

OUR SPEAKER

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of Washington's papers recently carried an article under a 3-column, black-face lead, RAYBURN's Grip on House Appears To Be Weakening.

Following that came the statement:

No one has protested current criticism of Congress more loudly than SAM RAYBURN, Speaker of the House.

Now the Speaker himself is coming in for criticism, because of the rebuff to his leadership early this week when the House deserted him and rejected the Texas-Florida pipe line and barge line bill which Mr. RAYBURN had espoused personally to the point of taking the floor in its support—rare for a Speaker.

That blow to his prestige is being talked of, not as an isolated incident, but as symptomatic of a situation.

Mr. RAYBURN's stout defense of Congress as an institution, and his own recent failure as leader are being linked by certain critical observers.

It has been my privilege to serve under but three Speakers—Speaker Byrns, Speaker Bankhead, and the present occupant of the chair. While life lasts, the memory of the dignity, the kindliness, the fairness, the devotion to duty of Speaker Joseph W. Byrns, Speaker William B. Bankhead, and Speaker Sam Rayburn will be always with me.

Being a member of the opposition party, being sincerely opposed to many of the New Deal policies, never having hesitated to express in unmistakable terms, and sometimes vigorously, my opinion of proposed legislation, it is but natural that the Speaker of the House, the representative of the party in power, should be somewhat critical of my efforts. It would not be at all strange if, in the heat of debate, in the justifiable striving for party advantage, I should tax the patience, disturb the equanimity of the presiding officer.

Doubtless, on many occasions, I have given adequate reason for a short answer. But let me, as one of the most outspoken opponents of administration domestic policies, pay my tribute here and now to the Speaker of this House.

If any think that the Speaker's control of this House has in any way weakened or is less than it should be, they should revise their opinion. The present Speaker, as the two preceding him, whom I knew, never made any attempt to stifle the action of this House.

True, the Speaker has endeavored, as he has the right and as he should, because of his official position, to direct and to control the House procedure. That he has done with an iron hand, even though he wore the velvet glove.

It is true that, on occasion, the present Speaker has taken the floor, as Speakers in the past have taken the floor, as was their right, their duty, and urged the adoption of legislation handed down by the administration.

Equally true is it that, on occasion, the House has refused to follow that request. When speaking from the floor, the Speaker of the House represented his district and he did not assume to speak as one occupying the chair. The Speaker has not sought to use the influence of his high position to override the judgment, the conscientious objections of any Member of this House. For that he is to be commended—not criticized.

Never within my recollection has the present Speaker for one single instant, while acting as Speaker, lost control of this body. Never has he been charged from the floor with unfairness, with favoritism. Always the Members of this House have acknowledged his fairness, his kindliness, and his authority.

Today, as one opposed to the follies of the New Deal, pledging continued opposition to its economic fallacies, to its wasteful spending, I pay tribute to the ability, the sincerity, the fairness, the kindliness of the Speaker of the House and hail him as the just and kindly ruler of this body.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars, one to include an address by Attorney General Biddle and the other a radio address by the Minister of New Zealand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE] for 40 minutes.

SILVER

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I have spent considerable time in preparing a list of the inconsistencies being presented through the columns of the press from time to time in respect to the matter of silver. Some time ago I made a statement and inserted in the RECORD a pronouncement of some 65 economists, and answered it individually. In reply I have here a letter from the Economists National Committee on Monetary Policy under date of May 12, being an open letter signed by Prof. Walter E. Spahr, professor of economics of New York University, addressed to me, in reply to a statement I made in answer to a previous letter issued by this committee.

I shall insert that as a part of my remarks before going on with my reply. In answer to this open letter on silver I addressed a letter to Mr. Spahr under date of July 5, with which I follow Mr. Spahr's open letter, and I do this for the consideration and information of the House:

AN OPEN LETTER ON SILVER

A REPLY TO A LETTER FROM HON. COMPTON I. WHITE, MEMBER OF CONGRESS FROM IDAHO, READ INTO CONGRESSIONAL RECORD OF APRIL 30

(From Walter E. Spahr, professor of economics, New York University, and secretary, Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy)

MAY 12, 1942.

Representative COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress from Idaho.

MY DEAR MR. WHITE: I should like to reply to your letter and other observations, directed to the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy, with respect to our Government's silver policy. My comments are solely my own, since no member of this committee may speak for another.

One of your major contentions is that the millions of dollars of profit to the Government arising out of the actual and potential seigniorage on our Treasury silver since 1934 serves as an important answer to the objections of monetary economists to the Government's silver program You say (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 30, p. 3856, column 2) that "you—economists—object to our Government making this little profit in the present emergency, at a time when every monetary thread in the national financial fabric is strained to the utmost."

My objection to that profit is that it is not as large as it should be. I object to the Government paying 71.11 cents per ounce for domestic silver, when it should be bought, if the Government buys silver for currency purposes, at the uncontrolled market price which at present apparently would not exceed 35 cents per ounce and might be much less if the Silver Purchase Act of 1934 were repealed—unless war demands of industry raise the price abnormally. I know of no valid reason why the Government, when buying a metal for nonstandard or subsidiary monetary purposes, should pay more than its value in a free, open, world market.

If our Government had pursued this policy, then its profit would have been very much larger and the burdens on the American people, which you contend are lessened by the Government's present silver policy, would have been reduced still further and correspondingly.

Your argument, therefore, should be reversed: The American people, through their Government, are deprived of a profit, which otherwise they would have had, because the Treasury has been compelled to pay a price for silver far above its market price in order to subsidize the silver interests. What could

have been greater gains for the people in general have been reduced by this subsidy, and their financial burdens have been and are increased, not lessened.

You write of silver coin and silver certificates yielding a profit, being interest free and, therefore, superior to Federal Reserve notes which, you allege in various paragraphs, involve an interest cost. For example, you say "it would be interesting to know if the members of your committee have calculated the difference in cost on the item of interest between the expense of using Federal Reserve money and the use of interest-free silver money. * * *"

This is, to say the least, a peculiar argument. If the seigniorage feature with respect to silver is to be regarded as the determining factor in weighing the cost of one currency against another, then one would be forced to advocate an irredeemable paper money on which the seigniorage to the Government would be 100 percent.

Silver coin and certificates cost the Government what it contributes to the cost of minting the coin and the cost of the paper and printing of the silver certificates, less the seigniorage. But silver money and certificates cost the seller of silver what it costs him to produce the silver. Federal Reserve notes cost the Government the price of the paper, printing, overhead, and so on—a negligible amount. They cost the user nothing more than any other money costs him, which may be nothing at all. Federal Reserve notes today are gold certificates in Nature; those in actual circulation are secured by approximately 107 percent gold certificates which, in turn, are fully secured by gold. There is certainly no more of an interest factor here than in the use of gold certificates. In more normal times, when Federal Reserve notes might be secured by the minimum of 40 percent of gold or gold certificates plus not less than 60 percent of additional assets in eligible paper or Government securities, they pass into circulation in accordance with people's demands on the banks. It is merely a question of people's preferences for notes as against metallic currency and checks, and the member banks get from the Reserve banks whichever is demanded. Once silver certificates find their way into the banks and into the Reserve banks as reserves against the latter's deposits, they are drawn out substantially as are Federal Reserve notes. Both may pass into circulation as a consequence of bank loans or investments. Therefore interest can be related to either one as well as to all our other currency.

Consequently, in the last analysis, if cost of silver money and Federal Reserve notes is to be considered, it is more accurate to compute the cost to the producer of getting the silver and to compare it with the infinitely smaller cost to the Government of providing Federal Reserve notes. It is not accurate to relate loans and investments to Federal Reserve notes but not to silver coin and certificates, if one wishes to relate interest to the different kinds of money in use. And, if seigniorage is to be the determining factor, then we would be forced to irredeemable paper money.

You write of silver certificates being "as good as gold" (for example, p. 3856). That, simply, is not true. At 35 cents per ounce of silver, the market value of silver in a silver dollar is approximately 27 cents. In foreign trade, silver has to pass at this world market value, at 27 cents for each dollar of gold. Therefore, the Treasury uses gold in lieu of this cheap, overvalued silver. Domestically, all our currency is interchangeable—paper money, silver, minor coins, bank deposits. But they all stop at the international boundary line, and gold picks up the burden from there on. Since the domestic nongold currency stops at the border, and since gold becomes the international settling agent, paper money, if convertible into gold, will do the job just as well as silver, and it is much cheaper.

The program of expanding our supply of silver currency is, therefore, throwing an ever-increasing burden on our gold supply. In future years, when peace comes, and when our gold supply is reduced through its export, which may reasonably be expected, this silver load on our gold will become of increasing importance because silver cannot do in foreign trade what gold must and does do. The silver-purchase program forces the Treasury to expand this load on gold, quite apart from any needs of business and the possible future supply of gold. Paper currency, on the other hand—for example, Federal Reserve notes and gold certificates—would expand and contract with some relation to the gold supply and, as a consequence, would not be throwing a load on the gold which the gold would not automatically meet. This is not the case with silver under the present silver-purchase program; the load on gold is steadily mounting and there is no reason to expect a contraction as the gold base grows narrower in years to come. In this connection, there is something of a lesson to be found in our experiences under the Sherman Silver Purchase Act of 1890–93. Now is the time to stop laying the groundwork for another such unpleasant episode at some future date.

It is substantially accurate to say that today there is no better reason for buying silver, storing it, and issuing certificates against it than there would be for buying any other metal worth 35 cents per ounce and issuing certificates against it or coining it at $1.29 per ounce. And, when silver is badly needed in industry in time of war, it is little short of criminal to indulge in such an enterprise. To this is to be added the fact that we not only do not need this additional currency but would be safer with much less. Conclusive proof is provided in the fact that when our price level was 167 in June 1920 (1926 prices equal 100 percent), the supply of money in circulation was only $5,181,000,000, whereas in February 1942, with the price level at approximately 96, the supply of money in circulation was $11,485,000,000. Furthermore, while the Government is trying to prevent runaway prices, the supporters of the silver program insist on contributing to a rise in prices by feeding the expansion in our money supply.

In the last paragraph of your letter you say to the monetary economists who oppose this silver program: "Gentlemen, be patriotic; lend your knowledge and your ability to your country; help the Members of Congress representing the people to right the financial ship of state * * *," and so on. Precisely! The members of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy certainly have no other purpose. They have no personal, private interests in any of these issues. They merely hope that their accumulated knowledge may be put to some good use in this country.

But can the supporters of the silver program, which was forced upon the Treasury, say the same for their position, past and present?

Briefly and in summary this is their position: They force the Treasury to pay an artificial price for silver so that the silver interests shall be subsidized. They have taken for the silver interests profits which should have gone to the people as a whole. They cause the currency to be expanded when it should not be expanded. They insist upon contributing to rising prices while the Government is attempting to hold them down. They deprive the country of a much-needed metal even in time of war. They cause the Treasury to create an expensive money when a cheaper and good one is readily available. They pile up a future and possibly dangerous burden on gold. They wrecked the metallic money base of China and threw her into an inconvertible paper currency system at a most dangerous period in her history, and now she is reaping tragic results in a runaway depreciation of her currency at the very time that she should be strongest. They unsettled currencies in other countries with consequences that have been uniformly deplorable.

It is a sorry picture and a sad commentary on our dealings with our own people and other nations of the world—particularly struggling China.

This crude meddling with delicate monetary standards and systems is to be explained on no better ground than that the currency expansionists and silverites, in their efforts to serve their own interests, either had little understanding of the implications of their acts or had little regard for the welfare of their fellow countrymen and other nations.

The members of the Economists' National Committee warned Congress and the Administration as to what the consequences to China, other countries, and ourselves would be if this program were pursued. There is no satisfaction to be found in reminding the silverites and the public of this fact. All that we can do now is to urge Congress to end this disgraceful business and to return as rapidly as possible to sounder monetary policies.

Since you raised the question of patriotism with respect to the silver issue, it would seem appropriate to point out that the needs of our country for silver in industry while we are at war should alone be sufficient to compel you and all your associates to abandon this silver program and to return the silver to its more appropriate and profitable use.

Sincerely,

WALTER E. SPAHR.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION
AND RECLAMATION,
Washington, D. C., June 5, 1942.

MR. WALTER E. SPAHR,
Secretary, Economists' National
Committee on Monetary Policy,
New York City, N. Y.

MY DEAR MR. SPAHR: The sustained interest of yourself and your Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy in the Government's silver purchase program and the use of silver as money, as explained in your open letter of May 12, is appreciated.

In dealing with this subject, it is my earnest wish that the position of yourself and the members of your committee could be made to square with the facts and that you and the 65 associated economists could be united in recognizing and supporting this most profitable fiscal operation of the United States Treasury. While I am somewhat reluctant to take issue with yourself and the eminent members of your committee, the interest of the American people in the workings of their monetary system compels me to recite for your consideration certain facts.

In order to approach the subject of the use of silver in our monetary system and to clear the issue of misunderstandings and uncertainties, certain fundamental principles of economic law should be recognized and accepted. In this connection, it would be interesting to know if you and your associated economists subscribe to the fundamental principle of the basic need for a monetary unit of stable value.

Do you accept the principle laid down by the United States Monetary Commission?—

"It is the volume of money keeping even pace with advancing population and commerce and in the resultant steadiness in prices that the wholesome nutrient of healthy vitality is to be found. The highest material development of nations is prompted by the use of money of unchanging value."

And do you subscribe to the same principle stated by President Roosevelt in another way when he said?—

"The United States seeks the kind of a dollar which a generation hence will have the same purchasing and debt-paying power as the dollar value we hope to attain in the near future."

Do you and your committee approve the kind of a dollar demanded in the platform of the National Grange?—

"Agriculture demands a monetary system providing an honest dollar—one just to the debtor and creditor alike, with constant purchasing power preventing uncontrolled inflation and the disastrous effects of deflation."

If we are in agreement on these simple principles, we can make a better approach to the question at issue, namely, the profits made by the Government, which in a broader sense is the American people, on its silver-purchase program. Now with the Treasury's seigniorage table before you, and it is before you, having been inserted in my letter which you have answered, can you point to any money transaction by any government in any period in history where a government has made such a large profit by acquiring money metal and exercising its money-creating prerogative in revaluing this metal and using the metal for the creation of money? Not even the recent fiscal operations of the British Government in debasing its silver coinage, when it extracted 90,000,000 ounces of silver from its subsidiary coins by reducing their silver standard from .925 fine to .500 fine and following this up by withdrawing silver money from circulation in India and dumping it on the world market with disastrous results to our economic standards, has gained by this destructive use of silver an amount equal to the profits that have accrued to our Government in its beneficial use of silver as money.

From a factual standpoint in dealing with the silver items presented in the United States Treasury statement before us, in doing your bookkeeping, particularly in making the credit entry of silver seigniorage taken from the table on page 76 of the April Treasury Bulletin, you must put down the item of $195,000,000 seigniorage (profit) on the minting of the minor coins and also add the other item of $807,200,000 seigniorage on silver dollars and silver certificates; making a total seigniorage on silver of $1,002,500,000. Coming to Federal Reserve notes, the other kind of money, there isn't any profit item to the Government. As a cost item you have to set down, as you state, "Federal Reserve notes cost the Government the price of the paper, printing, overhead, and so on, a negligible amount." (P. 3 of your open letter on Silver, May 12, 1942.) In casting up accounts we will leave out entirely the last silver seigniorage item appearing in the Treasury table under the heading "Potential seigniorage on silver bullion at cost (unrevalued) in the General Fund." To reduce this monetary accounting to accepted standards for our understanding, it might be advisable to engage a certified public accountant. The difficulty would then be, as I see it, to find one that could prepare and bring in a financial statement that would support your contention.

As the burden of your argument was directed to the past record and future effect of the use of silver money on our national economy, it is important that we proceed to analyze the facts presented in the long record of the use of the metal as money in light of your contention.

I am sure you recognize the fact that our currency in the form of Federal Reserve notes is exclusively issued by the Federal Reserve banks, and the further fact that the gold stock in the possession of the United States Treasury and nominally in the ownership of the Government is in reality owned by the Federal Reserve banks, with the exception of the gold in the stabilization fund and a small item of gold held for the redemption of paper currency long since recalled but still unaccounted for, the Federal Reserve ownership of the gold being represented by the gold certificates issued to and held by these banks.

In using their bank credit and gold holdings as a basis for creating money—i. e., Federal Reserve notes—it is clearly apparent that for anyone to get new Federal Reserve money issued of necessity must borrow from their bank—and pay interest. If the borrower is to conduct a profitable business, he must pro rate the interest item on the goods he sells as a part of the cost of doing business, and this interest cost in the general run of business is paid by the ultimate consumer.

Under the bank plan for creating and putting money in circulation, when the supporting note becomes due, not only the money must come back to the bank but the interest money along with it, and, when the money is paid to the bank, it remains in the bank unless another borrower is on hand or comes along to repeat the money-circulation operation by securing another bank loan. In this respect our Government is no different from an individual, and in order to get money or credit the Government must borrow it—and pay interest.

In view of this fact, just how do you explain your statement, "Federal Reserve notes cost the Government the price of the paper, printing, overhead and so on—a negligible amount"? If your statement is correct it must be news to the United States Treasury officials who have been exchanging good interest-bearing Government bonds for these self-same Federal Reserve notes in equal amount ever since the Government has been borrowing money.

In considering the interest factor as a cost of circulating money, you say, "They (Federal Reserve notes) cost the user nothing more than any other money costs him—which may be nothing at all." In some cases this might be a factual statement but in most cases it does cost him more. The amount of the interest added to what he buys—more. When he exchanges his money for goods owned by the borrower of Federal Reserve money—the maker of the supporting eligible paper—the note that got the money out of the bank in the first place, he pays the interest item which has been prorated and added to the price of the merchandise he buys.

You say, "There is certainly no more interest factor here than in the use of gold certificates, in more normal times when Federal Reserve notes might be secured by a minimum of 40-percent gold or gold certificates plus not less than 60 percent of additional assets in eligible paper or Government securities they pass into circulation in accordance with the people's demand on the banks." To paraphrase your remarks, "This is, to say the least, a peculiar argument," when you compare the way the gold miner gets his gold certificate or the silver miner gets his silver certificate for the gold or silver he deposits with the mint and spends this money for the things he buys, and then compare the method by which new Federal Reserve notes are put out in making loans. Do you seek to imply the interest factor is the same in both cases? What you have said may be repeated, "There is certainly no more interest factor here." There certainly is. The banks hold the monetary gold stock—all of it—gold which is indispensable under the law governing the creation and issuance of money, with the sole exception of silver money, and the banks are collecting interest for the use of the currency they issue against their gold certificates or any credit they extend. On the other hand, the gold and silver certificates—currency the miner gets and puts into circulation—passes in and out of the banks who make their profit in doing a banking business on the basis of dealers in money and credit which they lend at interest in conducting a regular banking business. I contend that banks are not entitled to make a special profit as creators of money as they are now doing under the present money system.

As the law stands our supply of money must come from the banks, a plan which you and your associates insist on broadening to the exclusion of all other kinds of money, a plan so unstable that when the least little tremor of financial fear shakes the confidence of these money creators, the flow of money dries up, as the American people have learned to their sorrow.

We all know that the money manufacturing banks exact interest for the use of the money they create and you and I and the rest of us to obtain the necessities of life will have to pay that interest, and good, old Uncle Sam, which is another way of saying the United States, will have to pay his share of interest which is a big item when you compute the interest on the $72,000,000,000 he now owes. It would be difficult to convince the average income taxpayer and defense-bond subscriber that it isn't costing the Government anything to use Federal Reserve money, because it always has cost to use bank money and always will, or the banks would go broke.

Noting your reference to the preference of the public for paper money, this may be the result of convenience or bank policy, or both, due to the custom of the banks here, as the banks do in India, by taking in deposits of coin and rigidly adhering to a policy of issuing paper money in return whenever the money is paid out again. By following this method, in time all the coins in circulation can be retired and replaced with paper money as was done in India in retiring silver rupees; and when we consider that $150,000,000 of this cheaply manufactured paper money, referred to in the first part of your letter, failed to come back for redemption at the time the Secretary of Treasury, Mr. Mellon, called in and retired all the bills of larger dimensions, we find one of the reasons for the banks' preference for paper money, a preference that has been a settled banking policy ever since the advantage and profits obtainable from the use of bank paper money came to be recognized and understood after the invention of national bank notes under the provisions of the National Bank Act of 1863 which accounts for the motive responsible for the emergence of the political issue between paper money versus silver money.

Naturally, with the banks receiving a dual-interest income for the use of their paper money, one the interest on the Government bonds placed on deposit in the Treasury against which the national bank notes were issued and the other the interest on the national bank notes themselves loaned into circulation at current rates of interest, why shouldn't the banks fight silver and the creation of new silver money that encroaches on their interest-gathering prerogatives?

I am sure every thoughtful person understands the need for banks and the value of their services to their community and to the country. In transacting a banking business as dealers in money and credit, the flow of currency of all kinds is their stock in trade on which they are entitled to make a legitimate profit and a fair return on their investment and fair compensation for their banking service, albeit a full measure of profit for the exercise of good judgment and business acumen in the conduct of their business, but they are not entitled to the concession to create and put out new money.

In considering the application of existing laws providing for the purchase of money metals—gold and silver—gold is being bought at its full monetary value of $35 per ounce and domestic silver at 71.11 cents or 55 percent of its monetary value of $1.29⅓ per ounce for which the metal is being used. You apparently approve the gold price which yields no profit to the Government, but in speaking of the silver miners in our country

you complain, "They force the Treasury to pay an artificial price for silver so that the silver interests shall be subsidized," when in fact the Government is simply following its long-established policy of protecting our domestic industries from cheap foreign competition and reduced living standards by allocating to the silver miners a small share of the Government's profits made in converting the metal into money above the world price, a plan which has the most stimulating and beneficial effect on our national economy from which, in the case of the silver-mining industry, both the Government and business receive manifold benefits, particularly when you consider the industry's contribution to the national tax income and the Nation's business.

It would be difficult to find a more prolific source of Government tax income with streams of tax money flowing to the Government from all sources all along the line from the miners' wages up to the salaries of mine officers and a whole galaxy of taxes paid by the mining companies on their own account—corporation income taxes, capital stock taxes, franchise taxes, severance taxes, real-estate taxes—not to mention the long list of taxes flowing from other business supported by the mining industry.

We also find that by establishing a stable market for silver, we are indirectly financing the production of many and much of the related metals vitally needed in our national industries. Naturally, the monetary scheme insisted upon by your committee would stop all this and divert this source of revenue to foreign gold fields and the accruing tax revenue to the treasuries of foreign governments.

It would be with extreme regret that I would find myself forced to resort to sophistry to sustain an argument. Were you referring to the Government in the abstract when you said, "In the last analysis, if cost of silver money and Federal Reserve notes is to be considered, it is more accurate to compute the cost to the producer of getting the silver and to compare it with the infinitely smaller cost to the Government of providing Federal Reserve notes." The fact is that the Government per se makes profit acquiring domestic silver which is definitely fixed in the provisions of the Domestic Silver Purchase Act of July 6, 1939, 55 percent of the money minted from the silver is turned back to the producer and 45 percent is retained by the Government; and in buying foreign silver the Government makes the difference between the world price for silver and its face value when minted or placed in circulation in the form of silver certificates. On the contrary in creating Federal Reserve money the Government is paid for the bare cost of the paper and the engraving. However, in this democracy the people are the Government and the people must borrow and pay interest on Federal Reserve money to use it; and when you make that the only kind of money in circulation, as you are attempting to do, naturally the people and the Government must borrow to have it created and pay interest to the banks to keep it in circulation.

If the Secretary of the Treasury elects to use only a part of the silver he purchases, or "up to the cost of the silver," under the provisions of the law, that is the people's loss; if instead of keeping this excess silver idle it were used in any way, it would still represent a clear profit to the Government wherever you put it, so when you come to compare the cost of silver money with Federal Reserve money, it will take a more convincing argument than any that has yet been presented to prove the fact that the Federal Reserve money is cheaper to use than silver money.

I maintain that silver certificates as presently used are "as good as gold." This kind of money is doing everything that gold could do; it is performing perfectly the three functions of money—a measure of value, a medium of exchange, and, when laid away, is a store of wealth ready for immediate use—and these silver certificates are more convenient to handle and cheaper to transport than gold.

As for financing our foreign trade, when the volume of gold proves to be insufficient and unavailable to finance international business transactions, we have been forced in recent times to go back to the primitive system of barter. Now, I hope your committee will not try to convince anyone that barter is superior to the use of money in financial transactions with all its unwieldiness and extra expense and avenues for middlemen's profits. What you say of gold, now overvalued, and silver, purposely undervalued, was recognized by our national leaders and the Congress in passing and placing on our statute books sections 311 and 313 of the United States Code, which is copied here for your information, a law which still stands on our statute books:

"Sec. 311. It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to continue the use of both gold and silver as standard money and to coin both gold and silver into money of equal intrinsic and exchangeable value, such equality to be secured through international agreement, or by such safeguards of legislation as will insure the maintenance of the parity in value of the coins of the two metals, and the equal power of every dollar at all times in the markets and in the payment of debts. And it is hereby further declared that the efforts of the Government should be steadily directed to the establishment of such a safe system of bimetallism as will maintain at all times the equal power of every dollar coined or issued by the United States in the markets and in the payment of debts."

"Section 313: International bimetallism. The provisions of sections 146, 313, 314, 320, 406, 408, 429, 455, and 751 of this title and sections 51, 101, and 178 of title 12, Banks and Banking, are not intended to preclude the accomplishment of international bimetallism whenever conditions shall make it expedient and practicable to secure the same by concurrent action of the leading commercial nations of the world and at a ratio which shall insure permanence of relative value between gold and silver (May 14, 1900, ch. 41, p 14, 31 Stat. 49)."

Doubtless your committee knows that international bimetallism was tried and worked with a standardization of the coinage under an international agreement by France, Italy, Belgium, and Switzerland until it was destroyed by Germany when that country defeated France in the War of 1870.

A great orator, a great Republican, and a great statesman, James G. Blaine, said:

"The two metals have existed side by side in harmonious, honorable companionship as money ever since intelligent trade was known among men. Silver and gold (have) reigned supreme as representative of value. The dethronement of each has been attempted in turn and sometimes the dethronement of both; but always in vain."

Today under your very eyes the dethronement of both gold and silver as money is being tried anew at the frightful cost to our country of a national debt of $75,000,000 when all the attendant loss and expense is piling up on the taxpayers. Just as the minute men flew to the rescue of the Colonials, let your 65 economists come to the service of their country. Let us free the American people from the fetters of an unworkable, depressing money system and loosen this unbearable interest load before it is too late

Your statement that the use of silver currency "is throwing an ever-increasing burden on our gold supply," when we consider the Government's silver-purchase program in its application, it appears "that your argument should be reversed." The Congress to provide for the "more economical use of gold" has made Government bonds eligible security for the issuance of Federal bank currency. Now, by putting silver to use as security for the issuance of silver-certificate money, we have relieved the strain on gold as a backing for the issuance of money just to that extent.

In advocating an elastic currency, you say "for example, Federal Reserves notes and gold certificates would expand and contract with some relation to the gold supply." By this you mean a fluctuating currency; this goes to the very core of our monetary problems. Hasn't experience and your observation of the last 12 years demonstrated to your complete satisfaction the disastrous effect of a fluctuating currency and the adverse effect of money contraction on credit and the depressing effect of impaired credit on values of every kind—and do you advocate this kind of money as a sound principle in a monetary system that will subject the security of business and the integrity of future commitments to the vagaries of a shifting gold supply and the instability of bankers' confidence?

In the efforts of your committee to assist the Congress and our country in attempting to devise a better monetary system conforming more closely to the principles of economic law "in the interest of a sounder currency and the public welfare," it should be clearly apparent that the national monetary system based on a volume of currency—money of ultimate redemption—automatically controlled that increases evenly with the growth of population and commerce, money that will remain in existence and on deposit in banks in times of business contraction and subject to the call and use of its owner in time of financial stress is a safer monetary system than the more elastic plan of retiring and writing off currency and leaving business dependent on the confidence of the banks for the re-creation and issuance of money under the credit scheme of the Federal Reserve banking system? You must have witnessed the almost complete failure of the plan you advocate in the closing days of the Hoover administration to the ruin of business and the consternation of our bankers and financiers.

Is it your considered opinion that at a time when the public debt is around $72,000,000,000, and increasing daily that there is too much cash in circulation, as stated in your letter, "To this is to be added the fact that we do not need this additional currency but would be safer with much less"—how safer? And can the same formula be applied to ordinary business? Big debts and little money. Many a businessman and farmer has lost out under this condition.

Is it substantially accurate to say that today there is no better reason for buying silver, storing it, and issuing certificates against it and thereby increasing the volume of redeemable money in circulation than to approve, as it may be assumed you have, an increase of $2,000,000,000 unredeemable new money issued by the Federal Reserve banks, which has been done since last June, which is far more money than all the silver we have would make if it were revalued and put in circulation in the form of silver certificates?

Evidently you condemn the silver miner as being responsible for a moderate increase in our currency when you say "they cause the currency to be expanded when it should not be expanded." In saying this, have you kept in touch with the present money situation? Is it possible that you condemn the miner and at the same time approve the action of the Federal Reserve banks by expanding the currency by over $2,000,000,000 between last June and this March, which has been followed by adding another $200,000,000 during the month of April? Can this be consistent?

Noting your reference to the lesson learned from past financial experience, particularly "the lesson to be found in our experience under the Sherman Silver Purchase Act of 1890–93," must we go back and review all the fallacious arguments put out as to the effect and responsibility of the Sherman Sil-

ver Purchase Act of 1890 for the depression of 1893 of past and unpleasant memories? As long as you have brought that up, the facts will be briefly stated to set you straight.

When you are sitting in judgment and weighing the issues in this case, on one side of the scale you must weigh the effect of the purchase of silver on the national economy of that day and on the other side you must weigh the effect of the manipulations of the financiers of that time to embarrass the Government for the purpose of discrediting silver to the end that silver money would be discarded and replaced with bank-created interest-bearing currency. It took a terrific financial jolt to the country to secure the adoption of their plan but it was managed and bank money triumphed over silver money. In reviewing the facts in this case we find that there was nothing disturbing in our financial system by adding $400,000,000 a month to the money stream paid out for the purchase of new silver. The plan had worked from the time of the passage of the Bland-Allison Act in 1878 up to 1890, during a period of one of the greatest eras of development this country has ever experienced and business in this country grew and thrived at the same time. But, like humans, the banks were never satisfied.

Naturally, if the creation of bank currency, secured by interest-bearing Government bonds on which the banks collected dual interest the operation of a monetary scheme by which money could be created and loaned into the channels of trade and business at current bank interest rates, which at the time was rarely less than 8 percent, was so profitable, why let all of this new silver be coined and be put into circulation to reduce a good market for the bankers' money product—national bank-note currency?

After establishing the motive that led up to the financial debacle of 1893, we can proceed to consider the facts as they developed; the decline in the value of silver that was produced in excess of the Government purchases and the steady lowering of prices of our basic commodities of that period coupled with the demands of the silver advocates for the restoration of bimetallism which were partly mollified by the increase in the purchase of silver from 4,000,000 ounces per month under the provisions of the Bland-Allison Act to 4,500,000 ounces per month under the Sherman Silver Purchase Act to be paid for by issuing Treasury notes—mind you, not silver-certificate currency redeemable in silver dollars, but Treasury notes supported as to their money value by gold under the provisions of section 311 of the United States Code at a time when it was necessary for the Government to maintain a gold reserve of sufficient quantity to pay its bonded indebtedness and interest in gold, the Government, or to be more specific its Treasury, having been manipulated into this position, it was a simple matter for the financial manipulators to bring back to the United States Treasury the new Treasury notes being paid out for silver as fast as they were issued and by demanding and receiving gold in redemption of this kind of currency embarrass the Government by thus draining away the Treasury gold reserve. The coup in discrediting silver money was completed by a concerted contraction of bank credit. The financial jolt was successfully administered to the country and the issue was won—silver was discredited and the Sherman Act was repealed. Bank money under the gold standard scheme at last was supreme, and to this good day every school child and many of our economists have been made to see the fallacy of the so-called silver heresy. Many of these so-called economists, in spite of all demonstrated facts revealing the instability of the bank-money scheme, still cling to their illusions and solemnly proclaim the fallacy of bimetallism. What can we say to the pronouncement of Joseph Caillaux, the eminent French financier who was entrusted by his Government in stabilizing the French franc, when he announced:

"There is one remedy. It is not that there should be any redistribution of gold, as is being childishly suggested. Gold has its own law which it obeys. What must be done is that another monetary metal should be joined to it. Platinum has been suggested. I would prefer that silver, which was stupidly demonetized, should be rehabilitated."

In the second paragraph of page 4 of your letter we are again subjected to the argument relied upon to explode the so-called quantitative theory of money and disprove this principle of economic law which in its modern and broader application is still controlling. In contravention of your attempt to controvert this theory, let me say at the outset that the volume of money coupled with the volume of credit controls the average commodity price level. The two periods of abnormal conditions selected to prove your point are unique in our country's financial history. Solemnly it is pointed out that on some particular day when the volume of money was some fixed amount, the average commodity price was at some certain level, and later when the volume of money was increased substantially, the average of commodity prices was found to be at a lower level, thereby proving and settling forever the falsity of the proposition of price relation with the money volume which you attempt to demonstrate by pointing to the $5,181,000,000 in circulation in June 1920 with the price level averaging 167, and then by turning to the $11,485,000,000 in circulation in February 1942, with an average price level that had declined to 96, and thereby as far as you are concerned the quantitative theory of money is completely exploded. But, my good and eminent economist, to reach any proven result we must consider all of the factors in our equation. The effect of bank credit supplemental to the money volume does control the average commodity price level.

In making a determination as to the relation between the money volume and the average commodity price level all the factors at work in the periods you have selected must be taken into account. The buoyant effect on our prices of English and French securities dumped into the channels of trade and business in this country in financing the World War and our own war financing, which even submerged the value and influence of gold for a time, had an effect which had not then subsided to be closely followed by pouring out $200,000,000 in purchasing domestic silver under the provisions of the Pittman Silver Purchase Act—all of these credit and financial factors contributed to establishing the high average of the commodity price level at the period selected by you to prove the disassociation of the money volume with the commodity price level. On the other hand, the second period selected was during a time of severe credit contraction, a condition that the doubling up of the currency could not overcome. In making your equations, it would be interesting to know whether you gaged all the factors contributing to this financial condition and if you followed the financial record as indicated in the press reports appearing from time to time in the metropolitan papers for a long period preceding the last date selected for your example. Evidently the reduction of business loans of from nineteen to twenty million dollars a week, month after month, with a corresponding reduction in brokers' loans running up to $20,000,000 a week over the same period exerted a depressing effect on the average commodity price level responsible for the variation at the period of time you have selected.

Now that credit has become the larger factor in our financial structure due to the fact that the money function has been shifted from a cash basis to a credit basis under a managed currency system, it develops that in time of financial stress when credit fails and the volume of cash comes back into control of prices—commodity prices must be violently readjusted, which causes the conditions that destroys equities and destroys business.

In speaking of the silver miners, you state "they cause the Treasury to create an expensive money when a cheaper and good one is readily available"—very interesting if you can indicate the kind of money you have in mind and demonstrate how it is cheaper. Who would get the saving on its manufacture and use? In light of the facts as to the mechanics and expense of creating and circulating Federal Reserve money, is the use or fiat or printing press money proposed? Russia and Germany tried that with disastrous results.

Noting your reference to China and the oriental countries, evidently you deplore our favorable balance of trade with China and the flow of Chinese money to this country in financing this business. The fact that Japan has stripped China of its metallic money and forced the Japanese so-called Federal Reserve currency into circulation in China is not our responsibility, nor can the disastrous results be blamed on our Government nor by inference on the silver miners.

It seems that the world is at the mercy of its financiers and bankers and poor China is no exception to the rule.

Could you, and would the kind of a money system you advocate permit you to favor a plan to replace this paper currency by restoring China's silver money to circulation and how would you suggest doing it?

If a metallic money base is necessary for the stability of the national economy of China and an incontrovertible paper system is dangerous, as you say, for the Chinese commonwealth, what about this country and our incontrovertible paper currency, when we are afast on the shoals of an unpayable public debt and engaged in financing a world-wide war?

Recognizing the efforts of the members of your committee to safeguard the general welfare by warning "Congress and the administration as to what the consequences to China, other countries and ourselves would be, if this program were pursued" and the effect of "crude meddling with delicate monetary standards and systems," if this program were pursued, when we come to consider financial events in recent oriental history in this connection and their bearing on the affairs of this country in light of your condemnation of the disturbance of the Chinese metallic money system by the operation of our domestic monetary program, it would be extremely interesting to have your reactions to the British manipulation of the money system in India subsequent to the World War when they withdrew silver money from circulation in India and at the same time levied an 8-percent duty on silver importations and proceeded to dump the retired silver on the world market with the effect of depressing the price of silver to 25 cents an ounce, a plan that practically destroyed the purchasing power of our oriental customers with all the disastrous world-wide effect this reduction in purchasing power entailed.

In witnessing the effect of this monetary manipulation, I wonder what your economists have ever done or said about it? Did it or did it not upset the world's financial economy?

If your recommendation to "Congress to repeal the Silver Purchase Act" and "end this disgraceful business" was accepted and all the silver money was retired and the silver stocks of the Government were dumped on the market, tell us, as an economist in light of your observation and experience, when the British "meddled with the delicate monetary

systems" to upset the national economy of India by withdrawing their silver rupees from circulation and dumping the silver on the market, what would be the effect of the plan you and the members of your committee now advocate on our national economy and the stabilization of our Government credit at a time when we, like China, "are at the most dangerous period in our history"?

In concluding this statement in support of our Government's silver-purchase program, I direct your attention to three incontrovertible facts:

1. The Government is making a substantial profit on the purchase and use of silver as money.

2. The American people are effecting a real saving in using silver money placed in circulation by the Treasury in paying the operating expenses of the Government instead of using a like amount of Federal Reserve notes borrowed into circulation.

3. The Government tax income is materially increased by the operation of the silver-mining industry, and industry as a whole is benefited by the production of related useful metals indirectly financed by mining silver.

I defy you or any member of your committee to successfully dispute these facts.

Surely, if there ever was a time when our Government and the Congress needed the steadying hand and advice of informed money experts, it is now when the members of the Economists' National Committee on Monetary Policy should have a singleness of purpose and be influenced by "no personal, private interest in any of these issues" and unite in directing their efforts so that "their accumulated knowledge can be put to some good use."

If the members of the Economists' National Committee for Monetary Policy are sincere in their desire to safeguard our country's financial structure and protect the welfare of the American people, let them come to the assistance of the Government and the Congress in devising and putting into operation a stable monetary system with a dollar of unchanging value fair to the debtor and the creditor alike, let these eminent educators unite in leading the American people in a movement to give this country a system of sound money based on redemption by the use of the precious metals, gold and silver, sufficient in quantity to supply the money function in transacting both domestic and international business.

To the end that we may continue to be a better and more prosperous Nation secure in our liberties and the ideals of our Government, I stand ready, anxious, and willing to render you and the members of your committee a full measure of support.

Sincerely,

COMPTON I. WHITE,
Member of Congress.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Has it not now developed that this silver which has been purchased by the Government is going to be a very vital element in the war industry? You were present at a hearing when you heard the request made by Mr. Nelson for permission to use this silver, some 100,000 tons, now in the Treasury.

Mr. WHITE. That is correct. Some silver can be used as a substitute for the baser metals. Of the 100,000 tons in the Treasury, 47,000 is what they call free silver. As a matter of fact, all of the other silver is pledged in the same way that gold has been pledged throughout the world, for the redemption of silver currency in the form of silver certificates. It is now proposed to remove that silver, the backing for the $2,000,000 of silver certificates, which would make our silver certificates purely fiat money, just as they did in Canada. The coverage there has all been removed and their currency is fiat money.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Will not that silver be in the nature of a loan to be returned after the emergency is over?

Mr. WHITE. I believe some plan of that kind has been suggested. Any way you take it, the Government is fortunate, indeed, to be able to acquire 1,300,000,000 ounces of silver at no cost to the taxpayers. Mr. Morgenthau himself testified in response to questions that I propounded, and he has previously stated repeatedly that there is no provision of law that prevents the Treasury from doing with the silver, the idle silver, the excess silver, what has been done with the other silver that has been put into circulation. I want to get it across to the people of the United States that this free silver, this 1,361,000,000 ounces of free silver reposing in the United States Treasury, has not cost Uncle Sam a single penny. Not only has it not cost the Government any money, but it has saved the American people—the certificates that have been issued against the silver now held for redemption has saved the people thousands of dollars in the form of interest, because the Government puts the money into circulation in paying its running expenses, and does not borrow this money. It goes through the tills and pockets of the people of this country without the interest feature attached to it, as would be necessary if it obtained and used Federal Reserve notes.

Mr. CHENOWETH. The fact that it now develops that there is industrial use for silver strengthens the gentleman's argument; does it not?

Mr. WHITE. Yes; the silver obtained as seigniorage can be put to industrial use in defense work.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the gentleman feel that those to whom he has given answer now, these economists, would have our silver relegated to a subordinate position in our monetary system, perhaps used only for minor coins, if at all? If silver is no longer to be considered a "precious metal," how about gold? What else can serve as a basis for our money, other than bank credit?

Mr. WHITE. I will say to the gentleman that the leader of these economists, Mr. Kemmerer, economist at Princeton University, who put the South American countries on the gold standard, as well as China, makes a very definite proposition, invites the Congress and the Government to retire the silver certificates and dispose of the silver. I will say to the gentleman that in another brochure being put out now by this committee of economists ridiculing the monetary policy of the Government, that the speaker is preparing a very definite answer, taking the gentleman to South Africa so they can make a comparison between the mining conditions under which the blacks of South Africa work and live, in compounds and sleeping on cement blocks. I am making that comparison and I am bringing that forward to show what those gentlemen would do to our beautiful centers of the mining industry in this country, in discarding our silver money and going to the South African gold fields for all our money metal as they propose to do.

Mr. CHENOWETH. One further question: What is behind the attitude of this group on the silver question? What is prompting it to take such action?

Mr. WHITE. They take a very odd attitude as educators, and it is certainly very unique and discouraging to find 65 of the best educated people, the highest authorities in our universities, bringing forward such specious—and I use that word "specious" in the full import of the term—such specious arguments against the most constructive and financially profitable fiscal operation that the Treasury of the United States or any other country ever engaged in.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. DITTER (at the request of Mr. KINZER), for this week, on account of illness.

To Mr. KILBURN, for 1 week, on account of illness.

To Mr. CLAYPOOL, for today, on account of important business.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6802. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2459. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes," to permit payment of total compensation to certain employees of the Postal Service employed in a dual capacity; and

S. J. Res. 144. A joint resolution designating June 13, 1942, as MacArthur Day, and authorizing its appropriate observance.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On June 6, 1942:

H. R. 4845. An act to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $30 to $40 per month, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 315. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect of meat-packing establishments engaged in intrastate commerce only, in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat food products by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

On June 8, 1942:

H. R. 6802. An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TRAYNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 18 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 9, 1942, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, June 9, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearing in connection with the Federal Communications Commission.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, June 16, 1942.

Business to be considered: H. R. 7002, to increase agricultural purchasing power and to meet the need of combating malnutrition among the people of low income by defining and making certain a reasonable definition and standard of nonfat dry milk solids.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, June 9, for consideration of war housing, room 1324, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, June 10, 1942, for consideration of H. R. 2119, H. R. 2914, H. R. 4222, H. R. 6350, and H. R. 6858.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 11, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 7105, to provide for the suspension during the war of operating differential subsidy agreements and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1720. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for the War Department, for military activities, amounting to $39,417,827,337 (H. Doc. No. 769); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1721. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of Civilian Defense of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $7,447,075 (H. Doc. No. 770); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1722. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, House of Representatives, for the fiscal year 1943–44, amounting to $250,000 (H. Doc. No. 771); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1723. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Public Roads Administration in the amount of $5,000,000, and proposed authorization for the expenditure of $93,160 of the funds appropriated by the Public Works Administration Appropriation Act of 1938 (H. Doc. No. 772); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1724. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs of the Office for Emergency Management, fiscal year 1943, of $28,638,000 (H. Doc. No. 773); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1725. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Office of Defense Transportation of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $7,216,515 (H. Doc. No. 774); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1726. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for the emergency supplies for Territories and possessions in the amount of $15,000,000, to remain available until 6 months after the termination of the unlimited national emergency declared by him on May 27, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 775); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1727. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the War Production Board of the Office for Emergency Management for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $73,467,300 (H. Doc. No. 776); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1728. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a draft of a proposed provision pertaining to the appropriation "Printing and Binding, Bureau of the Budget, 1942" (H. Doc. No. 777); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1729. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1730. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 501. Resolution granting a gratuity to Leonora Toland; without amendment (Rept. No. 2214). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Resolution 500. Resolution authorizing the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before Subcommittee No. 3 of said committee on the bill (H. R. 7067) relative to injunctions against illegitimate labor practices and outlawing racketeering; without amendment (Rept. No. 2215). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. JARMAN: Committee on Printing. House Concurrent Resolution 67. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill entitled "Revenue revision of 1942"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2216). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 7201. A bill amending section 3460 of the Internal Revenue Code; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 7202. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940 (50 Stat. 1009), to continue it in force during the existing war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 7203. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Unemployment Compensation Act to provide for unemployment compensation in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 7204 (by request). A bill to permit appointment of White House Police, in accordance with the civil-service laws, from sources outside the Metropolitan and United States Park Police forces; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

H. J. Res. 323. Joint resolution to create a commission for the emergency safeguarding of the Capitol and other buildings in the legislative group, and other buildings under the Architect of the Capitol; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. J. Res. 324. Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943; to the Committee on Appropriations.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 6, relative to the rationing of sugar; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANGELL:

H. R. 7205. A bill for the relief of Thomas Patrick Heaney; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 7206. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Lelia E. Colvin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. R. 7207. A bill for the relief of Florence B Hutchinson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 7208. A bill granting an increase of pension to Margaret C. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3032. By Mr. ANGELL: Petition of sundry citizens of Portland, Oreg., asking for the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3033. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Lawrence County (Pa.) Pomona Grange, favoring the enactment of Senate bill 860, known as the Sheppard bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3034. Also, petition of the Mahoning Valley Garden Club of Lawrence County, Pa., opposing the destruction of Cook's Forest, Clarion County, Pa.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

3035. Also, petition of the Lawrence County (Pa.) Pomona Grange, urging the immediate suspension of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, the Civilian Conservation Corps, National Youth Administration, and others, and the liquidation of their assets as fast as economically possible, thus saving millions of dollars to our hard-pressed United States Treasury as well as releasing thousands of employees for more important war work; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3036. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Automotive Machinists, No. 1305, at San Francisco, Calif., relative to House bill 6486, a bill to increase the salaries of certain postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3037. By Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Petition of Ida L. Dye, of Findlay, Ohio, and the signatures of 65 of my constituents of Hancock County, Ohio, urging passage of the late Senator Sheppard's bill, S. 860, as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and so give the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917, viz, legal protection from the traffic in all alcoholic beverages and from commercialized prostitution in camp areas which threaten the health, morale, and efficiency of our defenders; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3038. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Emmet H. Bozel, of Washington, D. C., and Leavenworth, Kans., petitioning consideration of his resolution with reference to his constitutional rights; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 9, 1942

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m., and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

In joy and in sorrow, in victory or defeat, in all times and occasions, be Thou our confidence and strength as we pray, our Father, in the name of our Master. As Thou art one with all sufferers, the perplexed, and all in need, help us, O Lord, to walk in Thy ways. Waken in our breasts the unutterable silences and may we follow the Good Shepherd into the green pastures of love and by the streams of blessed quietness.

Enable us to meet every demand with a just purpose and with a simple directness, pledging ourselves, in all fidelity, to serve courageously and even to endure every challenge involved in our high calling. O Thou, who dost set keepers to guard the city of the soul, give Thine angels charge over our sons of freedom on other soils and their sleepless mothers. Grant that the whispers of the divine voice may make the chambers of affection so holy that all gloom shall be softened and great peace attained under the tutelage of our Saviour. In Thy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 5, 1942:

H. R. 69. An act to authorize the adjustment of land-ownership lines within the General Grant grove section of the Kings Canyon National Park, Calif., in order to protect equities established by possession arising in conformity with a certain survey, and for other purposes;

H. R. 488. An act for the relief of Kathryn O. Sweeney and others;

H. R. 1162. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to accept the final homestead proof submitted by Henry Martin Coffman;

H. R. 1595. An act to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Plumas National Forest, Calif.;

H. R. 1736. An act for the relief of Lillian Last;

H. R. 1757. An act for the relief of James D. G. Alexander;

H. R. 2307. An act validating a certain conveyance, heretofore made by the Southern Pacific Railroad Co., a corporation, and its lessee, Southern Pacific Co., a corporation, involving certain portions of right-of-way in the town of Indio, in the county of Riverside, State of California, acquired under section 23 of the act of March 3, 1871 (16 Stat. 573);

H. R. 2427. An act for the relief of George P. Crawford;

H. R. 2730. An act for the relief of Dorothy Silva;

H. R. 2925. An act for the relief of Wiley W. Watkins;

H. R. 2934. An act for the relief of L. H. Martin;

H. R. 3201. An act for the relief of Walter B. Williams, Jr.;

H. R. 3488. An act to provide that assistant or deputy heads of certain bureaus in the Department of the Interior shall be appointed under the civil-service laws, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3937. An act to change the designation of the Fort Marion National Monument, in the State of Florida, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4213. An act for the relief of persons in connection with the extraction of gold-bearing ore from the Ruck-a-Chucky Dam site;

H. R. 4347. An act to authorize the sale of certain public lands in Alaska to the North Pacific Union Conference Association of Seventh-day Adventists;

H. R. 4476. An act providing for sundry matters affecting the Military Establishment;

H. R. 4526. An act for the relief of Joseph Donatelli and Rose Donatelli;

H. R. 4629. An act for the relief of Alfred Smith;

H. R. 4676. An act to accept the cession by the Commonwealth of Kentucky of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Mammoth Cave National Park; to authorize the acquisition of additional lands for the park in accordance with the act of May 25, 1926 (44 Stat. 635); to authorize the acceptance of donations of land for the development of a proper entrance road to the park, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4733. An act to add certain lands to the Boise National Forest, the Salmon National Forest, and the Targhee National Forest in the State of Idaho;

H. R. 5013. An act for the relief of James P. Crawford;

H. R. 5016. An act to amend section 1 of the act approved August 19, 1937 (50 Stat. 700), entitled "An act to direct the Secretary of the Interior to notify the State of Virginia that the United States assumes police jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Shenandoah National Park, and for other purposes";

H. R. 5142. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate the claims of any landowner or water user on the Owyhee reclamation project, Oregon, arising in 1940 by reason of a break in the North Canal of such project;

H. R. 5210. An act for the relief of E. M. Conroy;

H. R. 5287. An act relating to the transfer to the Secretary of War of certain lands owned by the United States;

H. R. 5394. An act to authorize the lease or sale of public lands for use in connection with the manufacture of arms, ammunition, and implements of war, etc.;

H. R. 5438. An act for the relief of the San Diego Gas & Electric Co.;

H. R. 5484. An act for the relief of the Tlingit and Haida Indians of Alaska;

H. R. 5490. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to quitclaim to the States of Oregon and California, respectively, all the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the lands of Goose Lake in Oregon and California;

H. R. 5527. An act for the relief of Gerney M. Claiborne;

H. R. 5636. An act to expedite the settlement of claims and accounts incident to certain agricultural adjustment programs, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5680. An act for the relief of James M. Hays;

H. R. 5687. An act for the relief of Edwin L. Wade;

H. R. 5713. An act for the relief of George W. Lyle under the jurisdiction of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission;

H. R. 5723. An act for the relief of Anna Danielson and Betty Tiedeman;

H. R. 5772. An act for the relief of Glenn A. Hoss;

H. R. 5778. An act for the relief of Luther Tench and Mrs. Mildred Farmer Tench;

H. R. 5847. An act for the relief of Mrs. Julia Campbell;

H. R. 5910. An act for the relief of the legal guardian of Rudolph Treiber, Jr., a minor;

H. R. 6102. An act confirming the claim of Augustin Dominique Tureaud for the Church of St. Jacques to certain lands in the State of Louisiana, parish of St. James, said claim being listed as No. 392;

H. R. 6365. An act for the relief of Commander Cato D. Glover;

H. R. 6625. An act granting the consent of Congress to an amendment to the Constitution of the State of New Mexico, providing a method for executing leases for grazing and agricultural purposes on lands granted or confirmed to the State of New Mexico by the act of Congress approved June 20, 1910;

H. R. 6646. An act to provide that the unexplained absence of any individual for 7 years shall be deemed sufficient evidence of death for the purpose of laws administered by the Veterans' Administration;

H. R. 6748. An act for the relief of Fred Farner and Doris M. Schroeder;

H. R. 7008. An act to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue notes, bonds, and debentures in the sum of $5,000,000,000 in excess of existing authority;

H. R. 7097. An act to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the Philadelphia, Baltimore & Washington Railroad Co. to extend its present track connection with the United States navy yard so as to provide adequate railroad facilities in connection with the development of Buzzards Point as an industrial area in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved June 18, 1932 (47 Stat. 322), as amended by the act approved June 20, 1939 (53 Stat. 849);

H. J. Res. 314. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the marine and war-risk insurance fund;

H. J. Res. 319. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Bulgaria and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same;

H. J. Res. 320. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Hungary and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same; and

H. J. Res. 321. Joint resolution declaring that a state of war exists between the Government of Rumania and the Government and the people of the United States and making provisions to prosecute the same.

On June 6, 1942:

H. R. 2685. An act to authorize the disposition of recreational demonstration projects, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6502. An act to change the name of the Black Warrior National Forest to the William B. Bankhead National Forest; and

H. R. 6797. An act for the relief of the estate of Tom Gentry.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7036. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the fifty-second annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Chattanooga, Tenn., June 23 to 26, inclusive, 1942.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7041. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Interior.
3. Civil Service Commission.
4. Interstate Commerce Commission.
5. Railroad Retirement Board.

PREFERENCE RIGHT TO CERTAIN OIL AND GAS LESSEES

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 6071, to grant a preference right to certain oil and gas lessees, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. ROBINSON of Utah, WHITE, and ENGLEBRIGHT.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an address by Commissioner John C. Page before the National Rivers and Harbors Congress at the Congress Hotel, Chicago, on May 30, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a statement I made before the joint committee in the hearing on the Columbia River power bill, H. R. 6889, this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HILL].

There was no objection.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article by a former Member of this House, William S. Bennet, of New York, president of the Empire State Society, Sons of the American Revolution. His article is on Flag Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech of the president general of the American Irish Historical Society.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

INDIANA LEADS IN OVERSUBSCRIPTION OF MAY WAR BONDS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, if members of the Hoosier delegation are strutting a bit today, or if our chests are somewhat expanded, there is a very good reason for it. For the announcement has just been made that Indiana led all other States of the Union in War Bond sales for May, oversubscribing its quota by 15 percent.

The following news story, which I believe should be printed in the RECORD in capital letters, is a source of pride to all Hoosiers and a challenge to the patriotism and generosity of all other Americans:

[From the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News-Sentinel of Saturday, June 6, 1942]

INDIANA LEADS IN OVERSUBSCRIPTION OF MAY WAR BONDS

INDIANAPOLIS, June 6.—Indiana led all other States in the Nation's May War Bond sales by exceeding its quota 15 percent, Wray E. Fleming, State administrator of the war saving staff, announced today.

With the highest percentage of oversubscription, the State marked up a sales total of $14,252,399.26. One of the 116 reporting units still must be added to this total. The May quota for the State was $12,894,300.

The State's quota for June has been set at $14,876,200, almost $2,000,000 higher than that for May, Fleming said.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short article on the Alaskan Highway by Richard Neuberger.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement I made before the House Committee on the Civil Service, and also a letter and a telegram from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I delivered last night.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address I made with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT] last night, in opposition to the repeal of the poll tax.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last, at the observance of the one hundred and thirty-fourth birthday of Jefferson Davis, I delivered an address in the rotunda of the Capitol. I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein that address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial relating to the fact that four sons of President Roosevelt are on the fighting front.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article which appeared in the Washington Daily News of June 5, written by William Philip Simms. It is entitled "Finland's Status."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent editorial appearing in the Saturday Evening Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 29, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, and 83.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 6, 10, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 35, 38, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 112, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, and 123, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$534,422: *Provided*, That no part of the funds appropriated under this item shall be used for the performance of any functions or duties other than the functions heretofore authorized by law to be performed by the Federal Employment Stabilization Board"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"National defense activities: For expenses necessary for the planning activities of the National Resources Planning Board in the interest of national defense, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; contract stenographic reporting services; purchase of books of reference and periodicals; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with development, conservation, and use of the resources of the Nation; traveling expenses; transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the Act of October 10, 1940, and regulations promulgated thereunder; payment of actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving, while away from their homes without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Board; purchase of office equipment and supplies without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes when the amount involved in any case does not exceed $50, and not to exceed $50,000 for temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to said section 3709, or classification laws, $200,000, of which not to exceed $20,000 shall be available for printing and binding.

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,394,632"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert $119,788,628"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and in line 3 of the restored matter strike out "$270,535" and insert in lieu thereof "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$854,998"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That not exceeding $90,000 of the sum herein authorized shall be expended in the District of Columbia for purposes of the Public Relations and Education Division"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$13,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert the following "$600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted insert the following: "*Provided further*, That except for the limitations in amounts hereinbefore specified, and the restrictions in respect to travel expenses, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Corporation shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of said Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1461–1468)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$10,311,292"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out amended to read as follows: ", and not to exceed $500 for periodicals and newspapers"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$135,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "law books, books of reference, and not to exceed $100 for periodicals"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,068,677"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,504,192"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "for traveling expenses not to exceed $16,200,"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "purchase as provided by section 6 of the Act approved April 28, 1942 (Public Law Numbered 527),"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 5. Where appropriations in this Act are expendable for travel expenses and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for travel expenses may not exceed the amount set forth therefor in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 6. Where appropriations in this Act are expendable for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures therefor under each such appropriation may not exceed the amount of $50, but this limitation shall not apply to the Office of Government Reports and the Selective Service System: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to the purchase of scientific, technical, trade, or traffic periodicals necessary in connection with the performance of the authorized functions of the agencies for which funds are herein provided."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 7, 9, 11, 13, 17, 18, 24, 30, 32, 34, 113, 114, and 115.

C. A. WOODRUM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
JOE STARNES,
JOE HENDRICKS,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

CARTER GLASS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
GERALD P. NYE,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 6430, making appropriations for the executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendment No. 1: Eliminates the proposal of the Senate providing for the salary of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget at the rate of $12,000 per annum.

Amendments Nos. 2, 3, and 4, relating to the National Resources Planning Board: Appropriates $534,422 for salaries and expenses of the Board, instead of $400,000, as proposed by the Senate and $668,845, as proposed by the House, and includes the language of the Senate restricting the functions of the Board to work authorized by law to be performed by the Federal Employment Stabilization Board. Funds for national defense activities, proposed by the House, and eliminated by the Senate, are restored to provide $200,000 for this purpose, including not to exceed $50,000 for temporary employment without regard to certain laws; and $20,000 for printing and binding.

Amendments Nos. 5 and 6, relating to the Office of Government Reports: Appropriates $1,075,000 for salaries and expenses, and $18,730 for printing and binding, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,475,000 and $25,000, respectively, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 8: Corrects a total.

Amendments Nos. 10, 12, 14, 15, and 16, relating to the Civil Service Commission: Limits the amounts which may be expended for travel from the regular appropriation for salaries and expenses to $130,356, and from national defense funds to $412,020, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $5,500,000 for salaries and expenses under the regular salary appropriation, instead of $5,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and $5,861,527, as proposed by the House; provides $7,446,128 for salaries and expenses, national defense, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $7,491,908, as proposed by the House; and corrects the total of funds appropriated to the Civil Service Commission.

Amendments Nos. 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, and 25, relating to the Federal Communications Commission: Limits the amount which may be expended for travel from regular salaries and expense funds to $52,110, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $2,000,000 for regular salaries and expenses, of which $1,218,260 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,300,000, of which $1,401,500 may be expended in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House; limits the amount which may be expended for travel from the appropriation for salaries and expenses, national defense, to $11[illegible],140, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $2,655,159 for salaries and expenses, national defense, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,667,619, as proposed by the House; and corrects the total of funds appropriated to the Commission, as proposed by the Senate,

Amendments Nos. 26, 27, and 28, relating to administrative expenses, Office of the Administrator, Federal Loan Agency: Provides $241,575, for administrative expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $250,000, as proposed by the House; eliminates funds for the purchase of newspapers and attendance at meetings, as proposed by the Senate; and provides $10,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $15,000, as proposed by the House, for temporary employment without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes.

Amendment No. 29, relating to the Electric Home and Farm Authority: Provides $200,000 for salaries and administrative expenses, as proposed by the House, instead of $150,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 31, relating to the Export-Import Bank of Washington: Restores the paragraph proposed to be eliminated by the Senate and amends the amount made available for administrative expenses so as to provide $200,000 for such purpose, instead of $270,535, as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 33, relating to the Federal Home Loan Bank Board: Appropriates $1,375,000 for administrative expenses, instead of $1,500,938, as proposed by the House, and $1,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 35, 36, and 37, relating to the Federal Housing Administration: Provides $14,621,499 for administrative expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $15,041,343, as proposed by the House, limits the amount which may be expended for travel expenses to $854,998, instead of $806,837, as proposed by the Senate; restores the language of the House limiting the amount which may be expended for public relations and education division work in the District of Columbia, amended to provide that not exceeding $90,000 shall be expended for such purpose; strikes out the proposal of the Senate prohibiting the use of any funds in the District of Columbia for public relations and education work; and eliminates the provision of the House making $50,000 available for tests by the Bureau of Standards in connection with the development of suitable materials for low cost housing.

Amendment No. 38, relating to the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation: Provides $400,000 for administrative expenses of this agency, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $450,443, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 39, 40, and 41, relating to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation: Provides $13,500,000 for administrative expenses, instead of $15,153,712, as proposed by the House, and $12,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; limits the amount which may be expended for travel expenses to $600,000, instead of $580,000, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the proposal of the House making $50,000 available for tests by the Bureau of Standards in connection with the development of materials for low cost housing, as proposed by the Senate; restores the provision of the House setting forth the statute

under which the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Corporation shall be incurred, etc., eliminating the proposal of the Senate with reference thereto; and strikes out the proposal of the Senate prohibiting the use of funds for the maintenance of regional offices.

Amendments Nos. 42, 43, and 44, relating to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation: Provides $10,311,292 for administrative expenses, instead of $10,335,292, as proposed by the House, and $10,310,792, as proposed by the Senate; limits the amount which may be expended for travel expense to $207,000, as proposed by the Senate; and restores the language of the House with reference to the purchase of periodicals and newspapers, limiting the amount available for that purpose to $500.

Amendments Nos. 45, 46, 47, 48, and 49, relating to the Federal Power Commission: Limits the amount which may be expended for travel expenses from regular appropriations to $166,500, provides $2,000,000, for salaries and expenses of which $1,000,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $2,303,125, and $1,217,500, respectively, as proposed by the House; and corrects two totals; all as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment Nos. 50, 51, and 52, relating to the Federal Trade Commission: Limits the amount which may be expended for travel expense to $124,360, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $2,252,224, as proposed by the House, for salaries and expenses; and corrects the total.

Amendments Nos. 53, 54, 55 and 56, relating to general administrative expenses, Public Buildings Administration: Limits the amount which may be expended for travel expenses to $135,000, instead of $225,000, as proposed by the Senate; strikes out the authorization for the use of funds for attendance at meetings, as proposed by the Senate; and appropriates $1,100,000 for this activity, of which not to exceed $600,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $1,226,540 and $707,090, respectively, as proposed by the House, and $1,000,000 and $500,000, respectively, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 57, relating to salaries and expenses, public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia and adjacent area: Appropriates $19,656,500, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $17,656,500, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 58, 59, and 60, relating to the Public Roads Administration: Appropriates $16,700,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $22,000,000, as proposed by the House, for elimination of grade crossings, strikes out the paragraph in the House bill providing $500,000 for public lands highways, as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the total.

Amendments Nos. 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67 and 68, relating to the United States Housing Authority: Provides $4,277,132 for salaries and expenses, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $4,526,930, as proposed by the House; limits the amount available for traveling expenses to $243,993; strikes out provisions in the House bill for the purchase of automobiles, the purchase of books, etc., attendance at meetings, the preparation and transportation of exhibits, the employment of persons or organizations without regard to Section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, the use of funds for informational and educational purposes, and for tests in connection with the development of materials for use in low cost housing, and prohibits the use of funds for informational service functions, all as proposed by the Senate. The sum of $13,000,000 is provided for annual contributions, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $15,000,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 69, 70, 71, 72 and 73, relating to the General Accounting Office: Limits the amount which may be expended for travel expenses to $145,845, as proposed by the Senate; restores the language of the House with reference to the purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals, amended to provide that not to exceed $100 may be expended for periodicals; makes $100,000 of the appropriation for contingent expenses and $12,000 for printing and binding immediately available as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the total.

Amendments Nos. 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, and 91, relating to the Interstate Commerce Commission: These amendments place specific restrictions on the amounts which may be expended for travel expenses. The House conferees have agreed to such limitations with the exception of amendments 78 to 83, inclusive, with reference to safety of employees, signal safety systems, and locomotive inspection and the restrictions are eliminated in connection with these items.

Amendments Nos. 92, 93, 94, 95 and 96, relating to the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics: Limits the amount available for travel expenses to $59,328, and adjusts the total amount available for salaries and expenses due to such limitation, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $7,071,000 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $3,000,000, as proposed by the House for an aircraft engine research laboratory; strikes out the provision in the House bill increasing the limit of cost of such laboratory; and corrects the total.

Amendments Nos. 97, 98, 99 and 100, relating to the National Archives: Limits the amount available for travel expenses to $4,400, and strikes out the authorization of funds for expenses of attendance at meetings, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $1,032,725, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,134,325, as proposed by the House, for salaries and expenses; and corrects the total.

Amendments Nos. 101, 102, and 103, relating to the National Capital Park and Planning Commission: Appropriates $200,000 for this activity, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $900,000, as proposed by the House.

Amendments Nos. 104, 105, and 106, relating to the Securities and Exchange Commission: Limits the amount available for travel expenses to $270,000, as proposed by the Senate, appropriates $4,850,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,380,000, as proposed by the House, and corrects the total.

Amendments Nos. 107, 108, and 109, relating to the Tariff Commission: Limits the amount available for travel expenses to $16,200, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $853,200, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $810,000, as proposed by the House, for salaries and expenses, and corrects the total.

Amendments Nos. 110, 111, 112, relating to the Tennessee Valley Authority: Provides for the construction of terminals on the Tennessee River, as proposed by the Senate; restores the provision of the House permitting the purchase of automobiles amended to require compliance with section 6 of the act of April 28, 1942; and limits the amount expendable for travel to $615,236, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 116, 117, 118, and 119: Provides that the construction fund of the United States Maritime Commission shall be available for loans to contractors and subcontractors in accordance with and to carry out Executive Order 9112; provides funds for the support of a marine school in Maine; and corrects a total; all as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 120: Excepts citizens of the Philippines from the requirements of section 3 of the bill relating to citizenship.

Amendment No. 121: Inserts the provision of the Senate limiting expenditures for travel to the Budget estimates submitted therefor.

Amendment No. 122: Inserts the provision of the Senate limiting expenditures for newspapers and periodicals, amended so as to permit the purchase of scientific, technical, trade, or traffic periodicals necessary in connection with performance of the authorized functions of the agencies involved.

Amendment No. 123: Corrects a section number.

Amendments reported in disagreement

The following amendments are reported in disagreement by the committee of conference:

Amendment No. 7, providing that appropriations in the bill for the Office of Government Reports shall not be supplemented from any other source by funds in excess of $600,000.

Amendments Nos. 9, 11, and 13, relating to the Board of Legal Examiners, Civil Service Commission.

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18, relating to the Alley Dwelling Authority.

Amendment No. 24, relating to payment of compensation to Goodwin Watson, an employee of the Federal Communications Commission.

Amendment No. 30, relating to the Electric Home and Farm Authority.

Amendment No. 32, relating to travel expenses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board.

Amendment No. 34, relating to the laws under which expenditures of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board shall be administered.

Amendments Nos. 113 and 114, relating to the Tennessee Valley Authority.

Amendment No. 115, relating to the use of funds of the Maritime Commission for the construction of barges to be used in the transportation of oil, gasoline, and so forth.

C. A. WOODRUM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
JOE STARNES,
JOE HENDRICKS,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, there is no controversy, so far as I know, about anything embodied in the conference report. It is a unanimous report. There are several amendments that will come up afterward about which there will probably be some discussion, but, so far as the conference report is concerned, I do not see why we should not dispense with the further reading of the statement, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the statement be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

VETO MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 778)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 5329, a bill "for the relief of J. J. McIntosh."

It is the purpose of the bill to pay the sum of $300 to J. J. McIntosh, of Bexley, Miss., in settlement of his claim against the United States on account of the damage to his automobile as a result of an accident which occurred on April 12, 1940, near Leakesville, Miss.

The claimant was appointed as a census enumerator in his locality in Mississippi on April 9, and on April 12 he received a request from his supervisor to report at Leakesville, some 12 miles distant from his home, for a conference. At the conclusion of the conference, while the claimant was en route to his home, his automobile was run into by a drunken driver, resulting in the complete demolition of the claimant's car, and resulting in a certain injury to the claimant. The claim was filed with the Employees' Compensation Commission for the personal injury sustained, as a result of which the claimant was paid an amount of $144.44.

The contract of employment of the claimant did not require the use of his privately owned automobile. Since he could have employed other means of transportation, he was using his car on the night in question as a matter of personal convenience. Obviously, the Government is neither legally nor morally responsible as the insurer of the private property of an employee, especially when the property is used for the convenience of the employee.

I regret, therefore, that I do not feel that I would be justified in giving the bill my approval.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 9, 1942.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and the message, together with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

COLUMBIA BOAT & BARGE SYSTEM, INC.
(H. DOC. NO. 779)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 4999, a bill to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon to determine and render judgment for any losses suffered by the Columbia Boat & Barge System, Inc.

It appears to be claimed by the Columbia Boat & Barge System, Inc., that early in 1933 its representatives made inquiries of the United States district engineer at Portland, and of the Superintendent of Lighthouses, whether it was feasible for the company to engage in transportation by boat and barge to and from the upper Columbia River district. The claimant asserts that it received assurances in the affirmative, and that it proceeded to expend moneys in building up an organization for that purpose and to obtain contracts for the transportation of wheat.

It further appears from the War Department reports that on April 11, 1933, a break occurred in the Dalles-Celilo Canal, which empties into the Columbia River. Navigation was not restored in the canal until November 1934. It is asserted by the claimant that this circumstance prevented it from transporting wheat by barge from the upper part of the State of Washington. The claimant seems to contend that there were negligence and undue delay on the part of the Government in repairing the break in the canal, and asserts a claim against the Government for moneys expended by it in preparing to operate, and for profits which it failed to make because of the closing of the canal.

The bill under consideration, unlike other private jurisdictional bills, would not merely waive the immunity of the United States to suit and afford a judicial remedy on the same basis as though the United States were a private individual or corporation but would go as far as establishing and assuming liability on the part of the Government and remitting the matter to the Court of Claims merely for the purpose of computing the amount due.

The alleged losses said to have been sustained by the claimant were similar to those that might have been suffered by any member of the public who had expected and planned to use the canal for the purposes of navigation and found it impossible to do so because of the closure of the canal resulting from a break. Even if it were the fact that the Government could have repaired the canal much sooner than it did, as is contended by the claimant, this fact is not sufficient to justify the payment of losses to a prospective user of the waterway. Were it to assume liability in this instance, the Government might be confronted with other similar claims on the part of other prospective users of the canal, and might also be presented with claims on the part of other individuals who claim to have suffered by reason of delay of governmental action. The situation presented in claims of this type is entirely different from that involved in claims for personal injuries of property damage caused by the negligence of a Government officer or employee under circumstances in which a private employer would be liable for the acts of his agents or employees.

In view of the foregoing circumstances, I am constrained to reach the conclusion that the Government should not assume the liability contemplated by this legislation.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 9, 1942.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal and the message, together with the accompanying documents, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein a telegram which I have today received from Walter L. Pierpont, president of the Association of Omaha Taxpayers, and the reply I have sent to the telegram.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Senate adopted about 123 amendments to the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill. We have worked them over very carefully and have agreed on all but 13, which come back in disagreement and will be considered after we have disposed of the conference report.

The bill, as it passed the Senate, was $16,150,459 above the Budget estimate. If the motions which the House conferees shall make with respect to the bill are adopted by the House and the bill enacted in that form, it will be $19,002,303 below the Budget estimates. So far as I know there are no controversies embodied in the conference report itself. As I previously stated, there are several other matters in technical disagreement which we will take up after the conference report is disposed of.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I will take just a minute for the purpose of emphasizing my satisfaction in the fact that this bill, as recommended by the conferees to the House, is some $14,000,000 below the House figures and over $19,000,000 below the Budget figures.

It seems to me this is about the first time in the memory of man that an important appropriation bill has come back to the House with substantial reductions below the House figures. It is not a long step, but, certainly, it is a step in the right direction. We may say it is at least a short step in the direction of the elimination of nonessential expenditures in order that every possible dollar may be available for our all-out war effort.

The following figures give the picture:

The bill, as passed by the House, was under Budget $5,119,115.

The bill, as passed by the Senate, was under Budget $19,964,653.

The bill, as recommended by the Conferees, is under Budget $19,002,303.

The amount of Budget estimates, $2,109,887,431.66.

Amount of bill, as recommended by Congress, $2,090,885,128.66.

Bill is under Budget estimates by $19,002,303.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 7: Page 7, line 10, insert "The appropriations herein made for the Office of Government Reports shall not be supplemented by funds from any source aggregating in excess of $600,000 during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the pending amendment deals with the Office of Government Reports. The House gave this agency $1,475,000 for operating purposes, and $25,000 for printing and binding. The Senate reduced it to $1,075,000, or by $400,000, and reduced the amount for printing and binding to $18,730. The Senate also wrote into the bill a limitation to the effect that the Office of Government Reports appropriation shall not be supplemented from any other source by more than $600,000. Obviously the Senate had the idea that the O. G. R. could obtain funds from the President's fund, if he were disposed to make allocations therefrom. I merely want to make the record clear, because it occurs to me that there are certain abuses in the matter of overdoing publicity in the way of movies, radio, and lecture material, and so forth. Recently I made a reexamination of the reports that came from the Budget Bureau to the Committee on Appropriations, dated June 25, 1941, a rather interesting document of 163 pages long, which deals with 153 agencies, which have 2,895 full-time and 31,618 part-time persons in its employ, at a cost of $27,700,000, people engaged in press releases, publications, scripts, speeches, movies. The number of people so engaged is equivalent to 11 infantry regiments. It occurs to me that there is opportunity here for Congressional debate and investigation in respect to informational and publicity expenditure. Let me remark in passing that in 1941 there were 300,000,000 publications issued, 283,000,000 of which were not required by law. There were 12,000,000 copies of rulings, and 5,500,000 house organs, and a great deal of music can be had from 5,500,000 house organs, let me say. There were 4,000,000 manuals and handbooks, and 13,000,000 technical publications, 14,000,000 programs and study outlines, and 95,000,000 popular publications.

It occurs to me that sooner or later the Congress will have to come to grips with this matter and consolidate a great many of these agencies in the interest of more efficient, more economical, and more adequately supervised operations.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment and on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, amendments numbered 9, 11, and 13 relate to the Board of Legal Examiners. They are all involved in the same subject, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 9: Line 16, page 11, strike out "$2,500" and insert "$7,500."

Senate amendment No. 11: Page 11, line 21, after the word "commission", insert "and including actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of members of the Board of Legal Examiners serving as such while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States."

Senate amendment No. 13: Page 13, line 17, strike out the following: ": *Provided further*, That no part of any appropriation in this act shall be available for the salaries and expenses of the Board of Legal Examiners created in the Civil Service Commission by Executive Order No. 8743 of April 23, 1941."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to further insist upon the House disagreement to Senate amendments 9, 11, and 13, and state in that connection also that these three amendments inserted by the Senate have the effect of reinstating funds made available for the Board of Legal Examiners, which we have debated on the floor of the House many times, and in the committee. Neither the committee nor the House has ever seemed willing to embark on this unless some substantive legislation is passed on the subject.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK].

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I was very much interested in the statement of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], which recalls to me an important matter which was brought to my attention. I believe there is a crying need in these trying times for the establishment of a bureau of propaganda analysis in order that we may counteract the propaganda that is coming to this country by way of Nazi propaganda agents and the Goebbels propaganda machine. A professor of Concordia College came to me a short while ago and discussed this very subject with me. He said that he was editing a very fine publication that was going into millions of homes, and could be of real help in our effort to fight this menace. What is happening? He said on one side of his desk every day pro-Nazi literature and pro-Nazi propaganda flowed in so that it stacked up 4 or 5 feet high, and that on the other side of his desk he received little or nothing from the Government here by way of facts or assistance to rebut that propaganda. He suggested a conference with the Director of the Bureau of Facts and Figures. I arranged that conference, and Mr. MacLeish agreed with him that it was absolutely necessary that we refute this Nazi propaganda, but informed him that he did not have the proper funds to operate with.

The appropriations limited him in funds so that he had only one stenographer and a mimeograph machine, with nobody to operate it.

I am firmly convinced, as I have stated many times, that what is needed most in our war program is a bureau of propaganda analysis. We are winning victories with our armed forces on land, on sea, and in the air, but losing ground on our home front because the Nazi propaganda artists are carrying on to such an extent that we, as a people, are being divided on issues vitally necessary to the winning of the war and the peace to follow.

Every time we try to appropriate money to combat this Nazi propaganda we are told that it will be used politically and some of you are misled.

It is not true that a bureau of propaganda analysis would be a political bureau. It would protect free speech but educate the people to recognize pure propaganda and not be misled by it. We must win this propaganda battle in order to win the war. Obstructionist groups will oppose a bureau of propaganda analysis because it will defeat their actions and bare the facts to the public. They cannot stand being brought out in the open. Wake up on this propaganda fight before it is too late.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to amendments 7, 9, 11, and 13, relating to the Board of Legal Examiners.

A motion has been made by the chairman of the House conferees to insist upon their opposition to the amendments, and that the conferees be instructed accordingly. My support of this particular amendment lies in the fact that from July 1, 1941, to May 1, 1942, the Government has engaged about 1,300 lawyers. Thirty-one percent of those attorneys have been engaged from the leading eastern law schools. Twelve percent have been engaged from the District of Columbia law schools. The big eastern colleges supplied 43 percent, or over 550, of these attorneys.

We have an excellent law school in Wisconsin, one of the foremost of the Nation. Minnesota and other Western States have good law schools. Our western lawyers are as good as those from the eastern cities. However, out of 1,300 new appointments, Wisconsin only received 28, or 2 percent of all the attorneys hired during that period.

It seems to me we ought to have some system whereby the lawyers in Wisconsin, Minnesota, and other distant States may have an opportunity to qualify and receive some of the appointments. That is the purpose of the amendments—to give the lawyers of all the States an equal opportunity to enter the Federal service.

I would say that this Board of Legal Examiners and the provisions made for it have been endorsed by resolution of the American Bar Association under date of March 3, 1942. I would also like to add that the June issue of the American Bar Association Journal has an editorial heartily favoring the idea of a Federal Board of Legal Examiners, and the development of a system which will permit the attorneys of all the States to be fairly treated in the matter of such appointments.

I have not the time to discuss the matter more fully, but it seems to me the House should concur in the Senate amendments and not reject them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include the resolution and editorial to which I referred.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY HOUSE OF DELEGATES, AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION, MARCH 3, 1942

Resolved, That the association approves the principle of establishing a Federal Board of

Legal Examiners for the purpose of ascertaining by competitive and noncompetitive examinations the competence of persons to be engaged in the Federal legal service—for the establishment of a panel of persons eligible for appointment; further

Resolved, That the association believes that such procedure is in the public interest and represents an advance over the engagement of public legal services by methods having no uniform standard for ascertaining the competence, the extent of legal experience, and the repute of applicants for legal positions.

[From the American Bar Association Journal of June 1942]

THE FEDERAL BOARD OF LEGAL EXAMINERS

As the independent offices appropriation bill for 1943 passed the Senate on May 6, it carried authorization for the Federal Board of Legal Examiners to proceed with its work of developing a merit system for the selection of attorneys in the Federal service. The Senate followed the recommendation of its Appropriations Committee and removed from the bill a provision inserted by the House barring the use of funds for the Board after July 1, 1942. The bill is now in conference. It is hoped that the House conferees will acquiesce in the view that the Board should be permitted to develop the program which the President has committed to its charge.

The establishment of the Board by Executive order in April 1941 derives from the report of the distinguished Committee on Civil Service Improvement headed by Mr. Justice Reed. The primary functions of the Board are to hold competitive examinations for the establishment of registers of attorneys available for the Government service and, pending the establishment of registers, to pass noncompetitively on the qualifications of persons selected for appointment by the various departments and agencies. Only in the lower grades will written examinations be employed, and even there they will be designed to test capacity rather than memory. In all instances the examining process will lean heavily upon oral interviews before examining committees drawn from the profession itself. Most important of all, the examination and the interviews will be conducted throughout the country, with the result that recruitment for the Government legal service will proceed on a Nation-wide scale. This is a matter of considerable importance under ordinary circumstances. It is uniquely important at the present time when experienced lawyers everywhere are eager to serve the Government, if only for the duration of the war.

The Board of Legal Examiners has been at work for less than a year, but the record of the appropriation hearings leaves no doubt that it has made substantial progress. It has the confidence of the Attorney General and of the various Government counsel upon whose appointees it must pass. It has the support of the American Bar Association and the approval of the law schools. The Civil Service Commission, originally partial to a different program, has expressed complete satisfaction with the administration of the present plan. These are solid achievements which will be wasted unless the Senate's view prevails.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am happy that the chairman has moved to further insist. I do not believe that either the conferees or the House has taken an arbitrary attitude in this matter.

Back in 1938 the President issued an Executive order to cover in all attorneys under civil service. That order was to be effective as of February 1, 1939. Meantime, they began to conduct an investigation and held hearings and studies on this whole problem regarding legal personnel. A committee was set up consisting of eight men, appointed by the President. When the committee finished its deliberations it filed a report in 1941. Oddly enough, that report showed considerable diversity of opinion. Four members of the President's committee favored plan A. Three members favored plan B, and one member favored plan C. It has been the opinion of the subcommitte that in view of this controversy the matter ought to be further studied and there should be substantive legislation on the subject.

That is the broad foundation upon which we stand in further insisting upon the position of the House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri to make a unanimous consent request.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATION

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order to consider tomorrow under the general rules of the House, House Joint Resolution 324, the W. P. A. bill; that general debate be limited to 3 hours, one-half the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, although I did not hear the gentleman's entire statement, I understand that it simply provides that this bill be given a privileged status and that it may be in order to call it up tomorrow, and fixing the time for debate?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under the general rules of the House.

Mr. TABER. Yes. While I am opposed to the bill, I can see no necessity of asking the gentleman from Missouri to go to the Rules Committee and ask for a rule. I think the limit of debate is sufficient to permit the discussion which I have found is demanded by the membership. I shall, as I have in the past, oppose the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the bill which the gentleman from Missouri is bringing in amounts to $314,000,000, and $7,405,000 for the set-up. Are you going to permit in that bill construction by the W. P. A. of more golf courses, more orchestras, and things of that kind that are unnecessary at this day when we are in war? If you are going to permit things of that kind, we ought not to permit you to even bring a bill of that kind on the floor without getting a rule. It seems to me the membership ought to be here tomorrow to nip this bill in the bud, and put it off the map like we did the C. C. C. That is what the membership ought to do. The gentleman from Missouri ought not bring a bill of that kind in here.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will say in response to the very pertinent inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] that this bill decreases the amount from $875,000,000 to $280,000,000, a reduction of 68 percent, and that a large part of it will be spent for war projects.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman and I did not even know that the W. P. A. was permitting these things, or we would have tried to stop them. I know the gentleman would have, and I know I would have. The fact of the matter is you cannot control W. P. A. unless the Congress tells them to stop a thing.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We are assured there will be no ineffectual projects. On the contrary, the expenditures will contribute materially to the war program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments Nos. 17 and 18 which relate to the same subject matter, the Alley Dwelling Authority, be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 17: Page 15, strike out all of lines 22 to 25, inclusive, and on page 16 strike out all of lines 1 to 5, inclusive.

Senate amendment No. 18: Page 16, line 6, insert the following:

"THE ALLEY DWELLING AUTHORITY

"For the maintenance and operation of properties under title I of the District of Columbia Alley Dwelling Authority Act, $12,000: *Provided*, That all receipts derived from sales, leases, or other sources, after July 1, 1942, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States monthly: *Provided further*, That any unexpended balance on June 30, 1942, of the 'Conversion of inhabited alleys fund,' established pursuant to such act shall also be covered into the Treasury."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 17 and 18, and concur in the same; and on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 24: Page 18, line 22, strike out the proviso in lines 22 to 24, inclusive.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further

insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 24; and on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 30: Page 21, in line 9, after the word "elsewhere", insert ": *Provided*, That all necessary expenses not exceeding $150,000 in the aggregate (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, care, repair, and disposition of any security or collateral now held or acquired on or before June 30, 1943, by the Authority shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof: *Provided further*, That necessary expenses in collecting monthly installments on contracts and repossessing appliances in case of default, not to exceed $2.50 per year per contract, shall not be considered as administrative expenses."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, No. 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: ": *Provided*, That all necessary expenses not exceeding $200,000 in the aggregate, including not exceeding a total equal to $2.50 per year per contract (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, care, repair, and disposition of any security or collateral now held or acquired on or before June 30, 1943, by the Authority, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Virginia advise us what the object is of increasing the amount from $150,000 to $200,000?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is the amount agreed upon after careful consideration by the conferees. It gives them an opportunity to handle contracts in liquidation.

Mr. RICH. Will the administration be more economical because of this larger fund?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The conferees thought that was a fair compromise of the situation.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I might observe, if the gentleman would yield, that this amendment restores the amount to the figure allowed by the House.

Mr. RICH. But we are increasing it $50,000 over the Senate amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; we are retaining the amount originally written into the bill by the House which we think is the proper amount under the circumstances.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 32: Page 23 after the word "elsewhere", in line 7, insert "Not to exceed $189,000 for."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement with the amendment of the Senate No. 32, and on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 34: Page 24, strike out all of lines 12 to 17, inclusive, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "*Provided further*, That such sum shall be so apportioned and distributed by the Board over the fiscal year 1943, and shall be so administered during such fiscal year, as to (1) constitute the total amount that will be required for such expenses during such fiscal year and (2) prevent expenditures which will necessitate making additional sums available for such expenses during such year; and a failure to comply with the requirements of this proviso shall be deemed to be a violation by each member of the Board, and by any other person responsible for such failure, of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (31 U. S. C. 665)."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur with an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia moves that the House recede from its amendment of the Senate No. 34 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and add thereto the matter inserted by said amendment."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, amendments 113 and 114 relate to the same matter, the Tennessee Valley Authority, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the two amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 113: Page 73, line 6, strike out "$136,100,000" and insert "$172,220,112."

Amendment No. 114: Page 73, strike out lines 7 to 16, inclusive, and to the word "that", inclusive, in line 17.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments, and I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, let me make a very brief but what I deem to be a rather pointed presentation of the issue raised between the Senate and the House in connection with T. V. A. The Tennessee Valley Authority, as you know, operates under the act of 1933, and the total capital expenditures for that function have now reached a total of about $615,000,000. It exceeds the original estimate by about $172,000,000.

The T. V. A. gets funds from three sources: First of all, from direct appropriations by Congress; secondly, from unexpended balances that remain from one year to another; and third, from receipts of operations, such as the sale of fertilizer, the sale of power, the sale of miscellaneous services, and so forth.

There was written into the basic Tennessee Valley Act an amendment to the effect that they shall have full discretion in the expenditure of the money that they derive from the sale of power, and so forth. The Senate has contended all along that all of the money, whether receipts or not, ought to be covered into the Federal Treasury and that it ought to be reappropriated from one year to another, as provided by the Constitution relating to appropriations. That, as I see it, is about the only issue involved. It was the matter of the disposition of receipts. In the Grand Coulee Act, in the matter of Fort Peck and Bonneville, we make those agencies, which are proprietary institutions of government, cover their funds into the Treasury and secure a full appropriation from one year to another. So in this controversy that we have with the Senate, to which the Senate itself has devoted a considerable amount of time, was the question of the disposition of receipts, whether or not they should have discretionary power to allocate those receipts and cover the balance into the Treasury, or whether the entire amount should be subject to review and supervision by the Congress.

I had in mind proposing today a motion to concur with an amendment, but I shall not do so. In the first place, I am persuaded that an appropriation bill is not the place to do it and, secondly, if there is to be a better supervision by the Congress, if there is to be a closer supervision by the General Accounting Office, and if these funds are to be covered into the Treasury, the matter ought to be handled by the Congress through legislation rather than by a proviso in an appropriation bill. For this reason I do not propose today to disturb the House language, nor to register any opposition, but I do say that since 1933 the receipts of Tennessee Valley Authority have become very substantial. As late as 1939 the entire receipts amounted to only $5,500,000, but they are up to $36,000,000 at the present time, and the amount will grow as the years go by.

It is not only within the purview of the people's representatives, but I think it is their sworn duty to see that that money goes into the Treasury and is appropriated after full and fair justification. I shall foreswear any opposition today to the motion that has been proposed, the restoration of the House language, and I merely make emphatic to the House that this matter must have attention within the immediate future because all of the so-called power agencies generating, selling and transmitting power will increase in the size of their receipts, and that becomes a proper responsibility for the Congress.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. What is the object of increasing this amount $36,120,000?

Mr. DIRKSEN. If you are going to strike out the revolving fund, then obviously you have to give them the amount

of the receipts from sales and certain interdepartmental sales, plus certain miscellaneous revenues, which amounted to a little over $36,000,000 and add that to their appropriation because it was so set up that they take into account the money derived from the sale of power. If you are going to strike that from the bill, you will have to supply an equivalent amount of money in their appropriation.

Mr. RICH. Are we going to have the Accounting Office look over their receipts and expenditures and audit them?

Mr. DIRKSEN. They are being audited by the General Accounting Office at the present time. Insofar as I know now their relationships are reasonably sweet.

Sometimes I have contended in the past—I am not so sure that I feel that way even now—that perhaps we ought to go a little further with this matter of accounting. However, it is provided for in the basic Tennessee Valley Authority Act and in the amendment that was added a year or two ago.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I take it the gentleman is in full sympathy with the objective the Senate has sought in proposing this amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Definitely so, but this is not the way to reach it. Moreover, you run into a real parliamentary difficulty, for it would be difficult to fashion language that would be germane and not subject to a point of order to accomplish the thing the Senate subcommittee had in mind.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I personally am in full accord with that point of view. I hope the subject can be worked out and that, as the gentleman suggested, it will accomplish a full accounting by the T. V. A. in accordance with the general practice of other agencies.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I appreciate the gentleman's observation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I wish to elaborate for just a moment on what the gentleman from Illinois has said about the importance of the Congress taking cognizance of the situation that is developing in these large business enterprises in which the country has become engaged. It seems to me that the Congress has the responsibility for examining the system of accounting, the handling of funds and their disbursement, of all the large governmental enterprises—the Panama Canal Zone, the Alaska Railroad, the Alaska Signal System, Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and the T. V. A. Today, each has a law unto itself. We should formulate and adopt as a national policy a uniform method of handling these enterprises. That is the only way we are going to be able to discharge our responsibility and justify the appropriations and answer the questions that are going to be asked concerning the operation of the large business enterprises which the Government has undertaken.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, if this motion is carried, and the Senate concurs in it, that will mean the wiping out of the McKellar amendment to the T. V. A. Act.

As has been pointed out, this amendment, while it might not do what some of its proponents expect, it would seriously embarrass the Tennessee Valley Authority in carrying on its program, and, in my opinion, there would be no corresponding benefits to the Government to offset the injury the amendment would produce.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is doing a wonderful job. No agency of this Government is rendering a greater service during these perilous times than is the Tennessee Valley Authority. And I am unwilling to take any chances of injuring or handicapping or embarrassing the T. V. A. in any way by adopting an amendment which I regard as unnecessary, and probably injurious in the extreme.

Mr. Speaker, I trust I may be pardoned for saying that I have a deep and abiding personal interest in the success of the Tennessee Valley Authority. As you all know, I was coauthor of the bill that created the T. V. A. in 1933. While the measure carried the number of the bill that came from the Military Affairs Committee of the House, the Senate struck out all after the enacting clause and inserted the bill introduced by Senator NORRIS in the Senate and by me in the House. It was enacted into law and is known as the T. V. A. Act.

Many of you remember the battle I went through here to secure the passage of that measure and the approval of the conference report which created the T. V. A. and started it on its course. I do not hesitate to say that the creation and development of the T. V. A. is the greatest accomplishment of this administration up to the present time. I will go further and say that it is the greatest development of its kind in history, and its benefits to the American people simply cannot be measured.

The T. V. A. and its yardstick rates are responsible for forcing reductions in electric light and power rates throughout the entire Nation. The savings to the American people in rates alone amount to more every year than the entire T. V. A. development has cost or will have cost when it is finished. Those reductions are largely traceable to the T. V. A., its yardstick rates, and the example it has given the Nation in rate reductions and in supplying electricity to the homes and business establishments in that area at rates based upon the cost of generation, transmission, and distribution.

I know what this means, because the district I represent touches the Tennessee River and extends southward for about 150 miles, and every person in that district who uses electricity gets T. V. A. power at T. V. A. rates. It not only means a saving of something like $2,000,000 a year in rates to the people in that one district, but it has increased the use of electricity manyfold. It has also increased the use of those electrical appliances necessary to relieve the drudgery and increase the comforts and conveniences in the homes as well as in every business establishment throughout the territory.

I do not hesitate to say that nothing else that has ever been done for the people of that area compares with the benefits they are now receiving through the use of T. V. A. power.

In addition to that the T. V. A. is developing one of the great rivers of the Nation, making it navigable from its mouth to its source, and in that way transforming it into a great artery of transportation and commerce. It is helping to conserve the soil, and also to replenish it.

In other words, it is making the entire T. V. A. area a richer and a better place in which to live.

Out of this T. V. A. development grew our rural electrification program. I organized the first rural electrification cooperative associations in my own district, and through the assistance of the T. V. A. they were able to work out their program and to build the lines that gave us the first demonstration in real rural electrification, and set the example for the rest of the Nation.

I have told you many times of the experiment in Alcorn County, Miss., where the entire cooperative association for the county was paid out in 5 years, and where their rates have been reduced even below the T. V. A. yardstick rates. These rural power lines have now been spread all over that territory, until today the people who have electricity in their homes would not think of giving it up, and the ones who do not have it are appealing to us to help them get it. Of course the copper shortage at this time has slowed down the rural electrification program everywhere, but when that shortage is relieved it is my hope, and the hope of the gentlemen around me here who feel as I do on the power question, that the rural electrification program may be extended to reach every farm home in America.

We are in the beginning of an electric age. From this day forward our domestic, our commercial, and our industrial life will be geared to a power economy. The importance, the desirability, and the prosperity of every community, from the large metropolitan center to the country crossroads, will be measured by the availability of electric power and the rates the people have to pay for it.

Twenty years ago the American people used only 40,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year. When the T. V. A. program is finished it will produce about 18,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year, or almost one-half as much as the entire Nation used 20 years ago.

Last year we used 160,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity in this country,

and this year it will probably run well above 200,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours. I predict that long before the turn of the next century, probably within the next 25 years, the American people will be using a trillion kilowatt-hours of electricity a year.

That will mean a great reformation in our way of living. Electricity will be used for all purposes. It will not only be used to light our halls and our homes, to run our industrial machinery, and for purposes of refrigeration, water pumping, washing machines, milking machines, hotbeds to sprout vegetables—it will not only be used for all these purposes, but the time is coming when every home and every business establishment will be heated with electricity, and when railroad trains and other transportation facilities will be electrically driven.

That will not mean throwing coal miners out of work, as some people would have you believe. Coal will be consumed at the mouth of the mine, and the electricity generated by it will be transmitted for hundreds of miles around. The gas that is now going to waste in our oil fields will be used to produce electric energy, as will much of the oil that is now going to waste.

There are 230,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of annual production of undeveloped water power in this country that is now going to waste. There are other methods of generation that will be developed as time goes on, such as harnessing the tides of the ocean and utilizing the heat from the sun in arid areas, that will supply the world with all the electricity it can use not only now but for unnumbered centuries to come.

This electricity can be generated, transmitted, and distributed to every section of the Nation at the standard T. V. A. yardstick rates without financial loss to the Government or the agency that controls it, and those rates can be reduced as time goes on.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we are in the beginning of the electric age and have spread out before us and our children the prospect of the most glorious period in all the economic history of mankind.

That program had its birth in the creation of the Tennessee Valley Authority, which set the example and blazed the way for this onward march of modern progress. It has worked perfectly. To put it mildly, its success, its great accomplishments have been most gratifying to those of us who fought to create it and who have borne the battle for its protection and development throughout the years.

For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I would be reluctant to accept any change that might in any way threaten to impede its progress or to handicap its development, or to embarrass its operations.

I therefore trust that the motion of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] will be adopted and the McKellar amendment be removed from the bill.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion made by the chairman of the subcommittee to further disagree with the Senate amendments 113 and 114 and insist upon the House language. The House language is the same which has been used since the Congress began to make its first direct appropriation for the T. V. A. It is the language which was agreed upon after conferences which involved the President, the Director of the Budget, and the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. Under this language the T. V. A. has carried on a wide and varied construction program in the operation of its power, flood control, fertilizer, and chemical programs and of the related activities of the Authority. The operations and the program of the T. V. A. have been carried out with dispatch, economy, and efficiency. A gigantic construction program in the Tennessee Valley area is being carried out ahead of schedule and under the original estimate of cost. This is a program of efficiency and economy never equaled by any governmental agency.

There has been no suggestion of fraud or waste in connection with the operations of the program. At all times the Authority has followed the mandate of the Congress with reference to its program. Under such circumstances it is strange to understand why anyone should seek to disturb the harmonious development and completion of the program. Especially is this true when we learn that practically all of the funds provided herein are directly related to the war effort. More than 65 percent, approximately 70 percent, of the power being developed by the T. V. A. is going directly into the war effort. This area is one of the greatest aluminum-producing areas of the Nation.

The House language provides for a single fund and a great degree of flexibility necesary in the operation and conduct of the affairs of the T. V. A. The effect of the House language is to make one fund for accounting and disbursing purposes of—

First, unexpended balances from previous fiscal years; second, the new appropriation for the ensuing fiscal year; and third, the receipts from all sources by the T. V. A. as the result of all of its operations. Without this language in the annual appropriation act the T. V. A. would be required to account from three appropriation accounts, as follows: First, from unexpended balances of the previous fiscal year for obligations incurred during that fiscal year; second, from the new appropriation for the ensuing fiscal year; and third, from the receipts of the T. V. A. which it is authorized to expend pursuant to section 26 of the T. V. A. Act, as amended, without annually appropriating them, for certain power and fertilizer operations.

The adoption of the Senate language would increase the amount of new money by $36,120,112 over the amount of new money provided by the House bill, destroy the single fund and the reappropriation of unexpended balances, and complicate the accounting of funds. The Senate amendments would require that appropriated funds and revenue be kept in separate accounts with complete accounting systems for each fund, but would not in any manner restrict the right of the Authority to use its revenues for the purposes set out in section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act.

Senate amendment No. 114 strikes from the House bill the language appearing in lines 7 to 17 on page 73. The omission of this language has but two effects: First, it eliminates the unexpended balance as previously explained, and, second, it abolishes the fund in the Treasury of the United States designated as the "Tennessee Valley Authority fund." This fund is simply a convenient accounting device established in 1935 upon the recommendation of the Treasury and the Bureau of the Budget, and with the active support of the Appropriations Committee of the House. The language relating to this fund stricken by the Senate confers no power upon the T. V. A.—it was adopted originally solely because of the obvious convenience in having all of the funds available for expenditure by the T. V. A. in any given fiscal year placed in a single fund in the Treasury. Under this system all funds appropriated and all receipts from all sources have been placed in this fund and accounted for as a unit. The practice has been to reappropriate any balance remaining in this fund at the end of the fiscal year and to add to that balance whatever new money was needed to meet the requirements during the next year. It is this system that Senate amendment No. 114 destroys. The attempted justification for this ill-considered blow at orderly administration is that by this move the Congress will be enabled to exercise more stringent control over the operations of the Authority. The sponsor of the amendment has stated that adoption of this amendment would in some mysterious way deprive the Authority of the right to use its current receipts for the payment of operating expenses. There is nothing in the amendment that accomplishes any such purpose. The right of the Authority to use its own receipts springs not from any language in the appropriation bill but from the clear grant of power contained in section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act.

That section confers upon the board of directors of the Authority the discretionary power to determine what part of the power revenues and other receipts of the Corporation shall be used for the following purposes: First, the operation of dams and reservoirs; second, conducting the business of generating, transmitting, and distributing electric energy; and, third, conducting the business of manufacturing, selling, and distributing fertilizer and fertilizer ingredients. So long as that section remains the law the board of directors has undoubted authority to utilize the receipts of the Corporation for any of those stated purposes. There is nothing in any of the Senate amendments before the conference committee that in any way affects that authority.

Statements that the T. V. A. accounts have never been audited are not in accord with the facts and record. From the very beginning the accounts of the T. V. A. have been audited by the General Accounting Office. The T. V. A. has

pursued the practice of having additional auditing of its funds by employing the services of a reputable accounting firm. Furthermore, in order to clear up some dispute as to procedure, and so forth, the present Comptroller General, who is one of the most able and distinguished men ever to serve in this honorable body, asked and received legislation at the hands of the Congress in November 1941 which has served to bring about an even more satisfactory and helpful procedure for the auditing of the T. V. A. funds.

In view of the foregoing, I sincerely hope the House will agree to the motion made by the chairman.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. JENNINGS].

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY IS A WAR AGENCY MAKING A VITAL AND INDISPENSABLE CONTRIBUTION IN THE DEFENSE OF OUR COUNTRY—IT SHOULD NOT BE HAMPERED, HOBBLED, OR CRIPPLED IN THE CONTRIBUTION THAT IT IS MAKING FOR VICTORY

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, the question presented on the Senate amendment to the provisions the House made for the Tennessee Valley Authority in this bill presents this question for our determination: Shall we utilize to the fullest extent the Tennessee Valley Authority and the power which it is producing in our war efforts?

It is not a question of whether, in the first instance, you might or might not favor the Tennessee Valley Authority as an original proposition. It is an accomplished fact. The Tennessee Valley Authority is a Government corporation, the instrumentality, the organization through which the people of the United States are operating the greatest public-owned, coordinated power system in the world. All of the dams, the two great steam-generating plants, all of the transmission lines, all of the other properties involved, are owned by the people of the United States. Title to these properties is in the United States of America.

The Senate, by its amendment, deprives the Tennessee Valley Authority of its revolving fund, deprives it of the right to use in this hour of emergency, in the vigorous, uninterrupted production of power, which is in turn used for the production of war materials—

any unexpended balance on June 30, 1942, in the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1942, and the receipts of the Tennessee Valley Authority from all sources during the fiscal year 1943 (subject to the provisions of section 26 of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933, as amended), and prevents these funds from being covered into and accounted for as one fund, to be known as the Tennessee Valley Authority fund, 1943.

As the result of the removal of these provisions for the benefit of the Tennessee Valley Authority from the act now being considered the Tennessee Valley Authority is denied the right, in time of war, to use these funds as it has heretofore used them in times of peace. Under the act, as amended, these funds are no longer available for the payment of its current expenses, and are no longer available to meet an emergency.

Let us see what this means. The Tennessee Valley Authority now has in active operation and is now producing power at 10 great dams and at 2 steam plants. It has just closed 2 great storage dams and it has under construction 8 additional dams for the production of power.

Size of present Tennessee Valley Authority system.

The installed capacity of the T. V. A. system is, as of June 4, 1942, 1,325,000 kilowatts. Over seven and one-half billion kilowatt-hours of energy will be supplied in the current fiscal year over more than 5,150 miles of high-voltage transmission lines which carry the power from the generating plants to major distribution points throughout the area. Two hundred and fifty-two substations operated by the Authority make this power available to customers at distribution voltages.

More than 1,700 persons are employed in the operation and maintenance of these facilities alone.

At the present time there are 147 men patrolling the more than 5,000 miles of transmission lines owned and operated by the Authority. These men are constantly engaged in line switching, in maintenance work, and in guarding this great transmission system against breakdown through accident or sabotage.

More than 2,500,000 people in parts of 6 States are wholly dependent upon electricity from the T. V. A. system, and many essential war-production industries rely on it for power and for their continuous operation.

Within a radius of 75 miles of the city of Knoxville the Tennessee Valley Authority is furnishing indispensable electrical energy to the Aluminum Co. of America, at Alcoa, where 70 percent of the aluminum used in our fighting aircraft is manufactured, and where more than 11,000 men are employed. At Copper Hill and at Ducktown, in Polk County, Tenn., the Tennessee Copper Co. employs thousands of men producing vast quantities of copper and acid for use in our war efforts. At Mascot, in Knox County, Tenn., and at New Market and at Jefferson City, in Jefferson County, Tenn., the American Zinc Co. and other zinc companies are producing vast quantities of zinc. Within this radius the Fulton-Sylphon Co., of Knoxville, Tenn., is producing vital war supplies, without which our submarines could not operate and without which our offensive forces would be without depth bombs. All of these plants and scores of other plants in this area engaged in the production of munitions and supplies of war obtain the electrical energy, without which they could not operate one day, from the Tennessee Valley Authority.

The continued uninterrupted operation of these plants is vital to our victory. A little more than a year ago, by sabotage, on three different occasions, the transmission lines and towers over which and by means of which the Tennessee Copper Co. was supplied with electric energy were dynamited. This sabotage may be repeated by enemies within our border. It may be carried to us by the enemy through bombing from the air. If, through any unforeseen disaster, it becomes necessary to rebuild or to repair the far-flung facilities of the Tennessee Valley Authority, it must have the money available with which to do it without the delay incident to coming to Congress for an authorization and for an appropriation.

The Tennessee Valley Authority is just as much an instrumentality of warfare as are our war craft now plowing the waves of the seven seas and as our aircraft which have just dealt out defeat and destruction to the Japanese at Midway.

This amendment, which we are now proposing to get rid of, denies the T. V. A. the right to use these funds to carry on its work—to perform its mission.

This is wartime—when an assault from the enemy from the air, when by sabotage the lines, substations, dams, and generating plants of the T. V. A. may be wrecked—and this is no time to tie the hands of the Authority.

The enactment of the Senate amendment would stand as the last expression of the legislative will and would shackle, in my opinion, the war efforts of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and it should be eliminated from the bill.

I sincerely hope that the membership of this House, without regard to party lines, will stand firmly in favor of the provisions of the act as originally written and adopted by this House.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I hope the position of the House conferees on the T. V. A. amendments in the conference report will be sustained. The language and the procedure contained in the original House bill follow in exact terms and principle the system under which the T. V. A. has been operating for a number of years. I have recently examined independent offices appropriation bills for the past 4 or 5 years. The Appropriation Committees and the officials of the Bureau of the Budget and of the Treasury felt that the T. V. A. could most effectively operate under the terms of the language as originally written by the House in this appropriation bill. The same procedure has been followed for a number of years. I can see no earthly reason for changing this arrangement. This system insures a continuity of electrical supply by the T. V. A., and if it is to continue to fill the place contemplated in our war effort and if it is to continue to be a great national asset, it must be guaranteed a continuity of operation. If it is placed on a year-to-year basis, which is contemplated by the Senate amendment, then certainly it cannot fulfill its full purpose. No industry or munitions plant would feel justified in making a contract with the T. V. A. for electrical energy unless such plant could be assured that the T. V. A. would be able to supply the needed power on a continuing basis.

There is absolutely nothing in the record to show justification for the Senate amendment. The T. V. A. is successfully furnishing power to two and one-half million people in a large area of this country. Eighty percent of this power is

used directly by industries manufacturing munitions of war. Long-term contracts have been made. It would undermine the solemn obligations to change the provisions of law which might put the T. V. A. on a year-to-year basis.

T. V. A. has now been operating for 9 years. Its predictions as to the need for power supply have proved to be right. It has never failed to meet its promise to Congress as to when a dam would be completed. It has never spent more on a dam than it told Congress the project would cost. In fact, it is the one agency that has invariably bettered its commitments to Congress on the amount of time and funds required for construction.

The T. V. A. has consistently reduced its unit cost of operation and has drastically diminished from year to year its overhead administrative costs until they now stand at less than 4 percent, which is a remarkable record for any similar enterprise. The T. V. A. has been subjected to severe and throughgoing investigations, and no embezzlement, fraud, or mishandling of funds has ever been shown. The part it is playing in the war effort is creditable, and certainly during a time of war when the resources of this agency are being taxed to the limit, no change in its operation should be made unless a very good showing is made. No showing has been made. On the contrary the change would do the T. V. A. much harm.

A great deal has been said about the auditing and reporting of the affairs of the T. V. A. The Senate amendment of course has nothing to do with auditing, and I am advised that any substitute amendment dealing with this question would not be germane. But since the question has been raised, I think it fair to say that the T. V. A. has at all times been very open and full in making its reports to the public and has cooperated in every way possible in furnishing the General Accounting Office with such information as it may desire. I have recently had occasion to examine the annual reports of the T. V. A. for the years 1940 and 1941. These reports contain a very full commercial audit which gives the minutest details of the T. V. A.'s financial situation and of the way it has handled the public's money. Section 9 b of the T. V. A. Act authorizes the General Accounting Office to make an audit whenever it desires.

Shortly after the present Comptroller General assumed office a bill was filed in the House by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] which placed the T. V. A. under the provisions of the Budget and Accounting Act. The T. V. A., by virtue of the fact that it is operating a large utility where certain emergency expenditures are necessarily made, felt that it should be given some leeway in the operation of its business. The T. V. A. and the Comptroller General worked out a system which placed the T. V. A. under the Budget and Accounting Act, but at the same time gave the Authority certain latitude. This compromise was satisfactory to the Comptroller General and to the T. V. A. I am sure that it is working out satisfactorily at the present time. There is nothing in the record to cause one to reach a different conclusion. This being the situation, I can see no reason why any thought should be given to changing the arrangement.

As a matter of fact most of the Government-owned corporations and some of the Government-owned agencies which are engaged in business, have wider latitude in the handling of their own affairs than does the T. V. A. Undoubtedly this is necessary because frequently situations must be met immediately; contracts must be entered into to meet an emergency; and therefore, some latitude must be given such agencies.

I wish to call your attention to parts of the acts describing the latitude given other agencies in the handling of their affairs, and by comparison it will be seen that the T. V. A. is more restricted than most of them. In 1933, the Congress enacted this authority for the Home Owners' Loan Corporation:

The Corporation shall be entitled to the free use of the United States mails for its official business in the same manner as the executive departments of the Government, and shall determine its necessary expenditures under this act and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid, without regard to the provisions of any other law governing the expenditure of public funds.

The Employees' Compensation Commission, act of June 5, 1924:

In the absence of fraud or mistake in mathematical calculation, the finding of facts in, and the decision of the Commission upon, the merits of any claim presented under or authorized by this act if supported by competent evidence shall not be subject to review by any other administrative or accounting officer, employee, or agent of the United States.

The Federal Housing Administration, act of June 27, 1934:

The Administrator may delegate any of the functions and powers conferred upon him under this title and titles II and III to such officers, agents, and employees as he may designate or appoint, and may make such expenditures (including expenditures for personal services and rent at the seat of government and elsewhere, for lawbooks and books of reference, and for paper, printing, and binding) as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this title and titles II and III, without regard to any other provisions of law governing the expenditure of public funds.

Act of September 1, 1937, United States Housing Authority:

Such financial transactions of the Authority as the making of loans, annual contributions, and capital grants, and the acquisition, sale, exchange, lease, or other disposition of real and personal property, and vouchers approved by the Administrator in connection with such financial transactions, shall be final and conclusive upon all officers of the Government; except that all such financial transactions of the Authority shall be audited by the General Accounting Office at such times and in such manner as the Comptroller General of the United States may by regulation prescribe.

Veterans' Administration, act of October 17, 1940:

SEC. 11. Notwithstanding any other provisions of law, except as provided in section 19 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, and in section 817 (617) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, the decisions of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs on any question of law or fact concerning a claim for benefits or payments under this or any other act administered by the Veterans' Administration shall be final and conclusive and no other official or any court of the United States shall have power or jurisdiction to review any such decisions.

Soil Conservation, act of February 16, 1938:

SEC. 385. The facts constituting the basis for any Soil Conservation Act payment, parity payment, or loan, or the amount thereof, when officially determined in conformity with the applicable regulations prescribed by the Secretary or by the Commodity Credit Corporation, shall be final and conclusive and shall not be reviewable by any other officer or agency of the Government.

World War Adjusted Compensation Act, section 310, July 3, 1926:

SEC. 310. The decisions of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Director, on all matters within their respective jurisdictions under the provisions of this act (except the duties vested in them by title VII) shall be final and conclusive.

For the United States Maritime Commission, the following:

SEC. 207. The Commission may enter into such contracts, upon behalf of the United States, and may make such disbursements as may, in its discretion, be necessary to carry on the activities authorized by this act, or to protect, preserve, or improve the collateral held by the Commission to secure indebtedness, in the same manner that a private corporation may contract within the scope of the authority conferred by its charter. * * * *Provided*, That it shall be recognized that, because of the business activities authorized by this act, the accounting officers shall allow credit for all expenditures shown to be necessary because of the nature of such authorized activities, notwithstanding any existing statutory provisions to the contrary.

The T. V. A. has always pursued the course set for it by Congress. The fact that the Comptroller General who has been continuously auditing the books of the T .V. A. has not reported any irregularities, indicates conclusively that there are none. Why, then, should the arrangement which is generally satisfactory be upset? It would only lead to uncertainty and harm to our war effort and to the future service of one of the finest enterprises owned by the people of the United States. I sincerely ask you to stand behind the committee.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. May I ask the gentleman from Virginia if he thinks additional legislation should be enacted in order that the Tennessee Valley and the General Accounting Office may iron out any differences that now exist, in order that the accounts of the T. V. A. will come under the General Accounting Office, just as those of all other departments of the Government should, so that the House of Representatives can feel sure that under the supervision Lindsay Warren would give it every dollar that is appropriated for this item of expenses or any other item will be handled in a proper way?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I may say to the gentleman that under the act we passed November 21, 1941, we defined the powers of the General Accounting Office with reference to the rendition and settlement of accounts of the Tennessee Valley Authority. This act was passed after a great deal of consideration in both branches of the Congress. It was for the purpose of doing just what the gentleman has in mind, and what I have always felt should be done, to have the affairs of the Tennessee Valley Authority carefully scrutinized by the General Accounting Office. That is being done now. There is not a complete audit, but a system of audit is set up under this act of November 21, 1941, and I am told that it is entirely satisfactory to the Comptroller General. As far as I am concerned, I feel that that is as far as we can or should undertake to go right now, when the Tennessee Valley Authority is one of the very important war agencies. None of us wants to do anything that will interfere with it in its war effort.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I just came on the floor from a committee meeting and do not quite understand what the proposal here is. I understand that the gentleman has made a motion to insist on the position of the House with respect to the McKellar amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. MAY. What does the McKellar amendment provide, generally speaking?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The McKellar amendment, generally speaking, undertook to repeal the organic law which permitted the Tennessee Valley Authority to have the use of its receipts, but the parliamentary situation was such that the effect of the McKellar amendment was not to do that but to give them an additional $36,000,000, and they would also have been permitted to continue to use their receipts as a rotating fund. It got into such a shape that the objective of the McKellar amendment would not have been carried out under the parliamentary situation, even if everyone had agreed that that was the thing to do.

Mr. MAY. As chairman of the House Committee on Military Affairs, in which the Tennessee Valley Authority legislation originated, and through which it has all come, particularly the legislation of 1941, when the question arose as to whether or not they should be controlled by the Accounting Office, I may say that we had quite extensive hearings on that question and the representatives of this agency were perfectly arbitrary and resistant to the proposal. They said their affairs ought not to be audited by anybody, that their accounts ought not to be subject to supervision except in their own agency, and that they ought to be permitted to spend any money they got hold of from their returns from any source just as they pleased.

Of course, as a legislator responsible to the people of my section of the country I am interested in knowing whether or not there is going to be some fair provision put in the appropriation bill, either to broaden or limit the functions and authority of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and if there is I think it should go through the legislative committee which has created this authority and has studied the proposition.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is the position which the conferees took, that it is a matter that the legislative committee ought to consider rather than try to work it out piecemeal fashion in an appropriation bill.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. To further emphasize the matter, and for the encouragement of the House, will the gentleman restate the expenditures in full as well as the full amount of receipts of the T. V. A.?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not know that I clearly understand what the gentleman wants to know. Does the gentleman want to know the amount of money involved as the appropriation for T. V. A.?

Mr. GIFFORD. What does it cost us this year, and what will be their receipts?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is estimated that approximately $36,000,000 will be available for expenditure during the fiscal year 1943 from receipts from their power and fertilizer operations.

Mr. GIFFORD. What are their total receipts from power and other things?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The amount I have just stated, $36,000,000 for the next fiscal year.

Mr. GIFFORD. What is their expense?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Of course, their expense has been a tremendous construction program and they are just now getting to the point where they are having large sales of power, hence the interest in the disposition of their receipts.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman himself feels somewhat encouraged that the receipts sometime will very nearly reach the outgo?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That would involve considerable optimism, I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, but I think much encouragement can be had from the fact that the receipts will amount to $36,000,000, and undoubtedly are going to increase very much from year to year.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman understands my question is asked because I am seeking encouragement in the matter for the House.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I can offer the gentleman some degree of encouragement, I will say to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Simply for the purpose of keeping the record straight, the total receipts for power sales were $36,938,000 and $1,411,112 from miscellaneous revenue, from which there must be deducted $2,229,000 for interdepartmental sales. So they have an available balance of $36,120,000.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 115: On page 75, line 12, after the word "Statute", insert: "*Provided*, That the sum of not less than $20,000,000 from the said construction fund shall be available for the construction of towboats and barges adapted for use in the transportation of oil, gasoline, fuels, and other commodities over the inland or coastal waters of the United States."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. I want to say to the gentleman that I think the committee should agree to this amendment because it is going to do what many of the Members have discussed from time to time about the construction of these barges in order that they may transport oil and gasoline along the intercoastal waterways. I think it would be a wise move to agree to this provision.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It may be a wise policy, I will say to the gentleman; but I will call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the language put in by the Senate is merely permissive. It permits the Maritime Commission to do something that they already have the power to do, but it is really a function of the Office of Defense Transportation. That is the situation in a nutshell. We have set up a special agency for defense transportation and it is peculiarly their function to provide for this barge transportation, and it is not the function of the Maritime Commission to do it. The Maritime Commission has a letter which I wish the gentleman would refer to. It is in the RECORD of May 6, at page 3995, a letter from Admiral Land, in which he states he does not think the Maritime Commission should be further burdened with this matter when it is peculiarly the function of the Office of Defense Transportation.

Mr. RICH. I understood from a reading of the amendment that it was for the construction of these barges and that their operation might be under any other organization. Is that correct?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It calls for the construction of these boats, and it is merely permissive language, and does not compel anybody to do anything. There is a right way to do it, and it is not the right way to put it in this bill in this way.

Mr. RICH. I believe it ought to be handled in this way, but if you gentlemen who have gone into the matter

think otherwise, we are willing to trust your best judgment.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BLAND. I will say to the gentleman from Virginia that I am in thorough accord with the position taken by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. It does not make any difference whether this is permissive or not. I do not see why in the name of heaven the Maritime Commission should be objecting to some permissive authority. If the question is one of conflict between them and Eastman's administration and others, in the name of heaven why can they not get together and settle that conflict? I have no sympathy with the position taken by the Maritime Commission in connection with this item.

Mr. RICH. And if we adopted this amendment now, we would get these barges constructed at once?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Oh, no. That is the point. We would not get them constructed at once, because the Maritime Commission does not think they ought to build them.

Mr. BLAND. And if the Congress thinks so, why in the name of heaven cannot the Commission bow to the will of Congress?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the Congress think so, the Congress ought to pass a substantive act, and not play with the matter by making a permissive amendment in respect to it.

Mr. BLAND. If there is a conflict between these two agencies, and authority is given, then, cannot they be gotten together possibly by the President of the United States and resolve their difficulties?

Mr. RICH. Would it not be a wise thing to ask somebody in authority to go ahead and direct this Commission to do that?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If this motion prevails, the matter goes back to conference again, and we will give it further consideration.

Mr. RICH. We have faith in what the gentleman from Virginia is trying to do, and I hope the gentleman will get action upon it, because if we are going to have action, we should get it at once.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I want to ask this question. As I understand it, it is the intention of the committee that $20,000,000 shall be available for the construction of towboats, barges, for the transportation of oil and gasoline, fuels, and other commodities over the inland or coastal waterways in the United States. What effect upon the use of that money for that purpose will the adoption of the gentleman's position have?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The Senate inserted an amendment such as the gentleman has indicated, making $20,000,000 of the funds of the Maritime Commission available for the purpose which the gentleman has indicated. The Maritime Commission objects to that for two reasons. In the first place, they have not got $20,000,000 that they can devote to that. Their funds are allocated for a shipbuilding program, and we are continually being called upon for more funds by the Maritime Commission. The second reason is that the Maritime Commission, according to the letter they have inserted in the RECORD under date of May 6, at page 3995, say that if the policy is to be inaugurated, it ought to be inaugurated and set into motion by the Office of Defense Transportation, that they have jurisdiction of it, and that the Maritime Commission already has more than it can do and ought not to be further saddled with the matter of building and operating barges. It may be that this is the right thing to do, but if it is, it ought to be given to the agencies that we set up for that purpose.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Regardless of the controversy that exists between the two agencies, as to which one shall control the appropriation, it is the province of Congress to indicate its desire that $20,000,000 shall be used for this purpose.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. What effect will the adoption of the gentleman's motion have upon the indication which Congress has made?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Congress has made no such indication.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I refer to the indication implicit in this amendment, that it is desired that $20,000,000 be used for this purpose.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If the motion that I have made is adopted, the amendment will still be in disagreement, and it will go back to a further conference.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Without instructions?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Without instructions.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. And without any indication from the House as to how the conferees shall proceed?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the conferees as well as most Members of the House who have expressed themselves feel that there is much merit in the use of these barges. I would personally hope that a proper program should be agreed upon between these two agencies.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. It would seem to me at this time, when transportation is of such importance, that $20,000,000 should be used for the construction of these barges, and I hope the gentleman may have that in mind.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think that is true. I would like to see a direct appropriation of that amount of money made to some agency and specific authority given, and not approach it indirectly.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman probably is not aware of the fact that there has been a great deal of difficulty with the defense transportation group in getting adequate facilities for the inland waterways. It is only natural, of course, that those in charge of the defense transportation are more friendly to railroad transportation than they are to river transportation. I think it would be very advisable to retain this provision in the bill so that there would be some definite indication on the part of Congress that we want to get these additional facilities for water transportation, and thereby bring the supplies that we need into this and other sections of the country.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am sure the conferees are glad to have had these expressions from Members of the House. If this motion is adopted we will go back to conference and see what we can do.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I do not know of anyone that we have any more confidence in than the gentleman from Virginia. If he finds that this is going to give us immediate construction, then I hope the committee will act in that manner, in order that we may get them at the quickest possible moment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is there any case of record where the Maritime Commission has ever built and operated barges?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I cannot answer that. My colleague the gentleman from Virginia, Judge BLAND, probably can tell you.

Mr. BLAND. Not on inland waterways, as far as I can recall. The barges or boats on the Warrior River system, I think, was an independent operation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It seems to me the gentleman is sound in the position he has taken. We should keep them out of the Maritime Commission. It is a technical problem and I do not think the Maritime Commission should be brought into that field at all.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We will do what we can and see what we can work out of it.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The Government does operate barges on the Mississippi River.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is a special set-up. It is not the Maritime Commission, I am sure.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Virginia.

The motion was agreed to.

On motion by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, a motion to reconsider the votes by which the various motions were agreed to was laid on the table.

SILVER

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, one chief newspaper read by the Members of Congress and the members of our Government, the Washington Post, in editorial this morning gives a Tip for Congress, heading a long article against the administration's silver-purchase program. Day after day this paper and many leading publications of the country subject the people and the Congress to a barrage of propaganda of misrepresentation concerning the use of silver as money. What is the reason? I have studied this question and I presented the reason for this vicious campaign in my reply to the 65 economists made on the floor of the House yesterday which appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD this morning. I hope every Member of both branches of Congress will read it and get the facts.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman favor increasing the price of silver?

Mr. WHITE. If we could permit the law of supply and demand to play the price of silver would rise—the price of silver is in a vise and has been for a long time. I did not know of this situation until a friend of mine tried to buy $40,000 worth for commercial purposes. I tried everywhere to help him but you cannot buy silver at any price. I have the telegrams and letters from the big silver dealers to prove this fact. The price of foreign silver in this country is rigidly controlled.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Idaho has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is heard. The Clerk will read the conference report.

The Clerk read the conference report.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 16, 24, 29, 30, 32, 34, 49, 52, 56, 57, 58, 61, 64, 69, 70, 75, 77, and 92.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 33, 39, 53, 55, 59, 62, 63, 65, 67, 68, 72, 73, 78, 80, 82, 84, 89, 94, 93, 99, 100, 103, and 104, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: ": *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics shall be used for State and county land-use planning"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$242,580"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$301,403"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,133,110"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$323,733"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$897,484"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$382,275"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$374,395"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,142,239"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,785,512"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,339,429"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$22,427,204"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

"SEC. 4. Of the total amount available under this Act for traveling expenses, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, on or before August 1, 1942, to cover into the surplus fund of the Treasury the sum of $1,500,000, which shall be in addition to reductions in amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in the appropriations made by this Act below the Budget estimates."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 31, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 79, 81, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 90, 91, 93, 95, 98, 97, 101, and 102.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHARLES H. LEAVY,
D. D. TERRY,
ROSS A. COLLINS,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
E. D. SMITH,
GERALD P. NYE,
CHAS. L. MCNARY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report, as to each of such amendments, namely:

Correction of totals, allocations, etc.

The following amendments are in adjustment of totals, allocations, clarifications of text, etc.: Nos. 4, 8, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29, 37, 51, 52, 66, 71, 73, 76, 80, 82, and 100.

Office of the Secretary

Amendment No. 1 relating to the prohibition against predictions or forecasts with respect to future prices of cotton or the trend of same: The Senate proposes to permit forecasts "as to damage threatened or caused by insects and pests", to which the House agrees.

Office of Information

Amendment No. 3, salaries and expenses: The House appropriated $490,144; the Senate, $400,144; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 5, display of exhibits at State and other fairs: The House allotted $70,832; the Senate, $60,832; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 7, printing and binding: The House appropriated $1,000,000; the Senate, $1,300,000; the House recedes.

Special research fund, Department of Agriculture

Amendment No. 13, removal of soybean chemical investigations from Urbana, Ill., to Peoria, Ill.: The Senate struck out the House provision for the removal to the Northern Regional Laboratory at Peoria, Ill., of the chemical phases of the soybean investigations heretofore conducted at Urbana, Ill.; the Senate recedes.

Extension Service

Amendment No. 16, Puerto Rico: The House appropriated $100,000; the Senate, $128,000; the Senate recedes.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Amendment No. 20, agricultural program formulation: The Senate inserted a limitation prohibiting the use of the appropriation for

cooperative agricultural program formulation, to which the House agrees with a clarifying amendment limiting the prohibition to work at the State and county levels.

Bureau of Animal Industry

Amendment No. 22, animal husbandry: The Senate provided an increase of $16,920, to which the House agrees. The poultry experiment station at Glendale, Ariz., is restored in the sum of $13,500, and the beef cattle management investigations at Ardmore, S. Dak., are restored in the sum of $3,420.

Amendment No. 25, diseases of animals: The Senate reduced the allocation for swine erysipelas in the sum of $6,500, to which the House agrees.

Amendment No. 26, eradicating cattle ticks: The House appropriated $270,000; the Senate, $276,000; the House recedes.

Bureau of Dairy Industry

Amendment No. 30, studies of dairy herd improvement records: The House made a cut of $20,000 in the Budget increase of $40,320; the Senate restored $15,000 of the cut; the Senate recedes.

Bureau of Plant Industry

Amendment No. 32, bindweed and other noxious weeds: The House provided $25,000; the Senate, $37,685; the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 33, forage crops and diseases: The Senate provided an increase of $50,000 for turf-grass investigations, to which the House agrees.

Amendment No. 34, forest pathology: The House appropriated $15,000 for sap-stain-control investigations, which the Senate struck out. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 35, plant exploration, introduction, and surveys: The House appropriated $293,903; the Senate, $308,903; the conference report provides $301,403.

Forest Service

Amendment No. 39, forest influences: The House appropriated $124,350; the Senate, $133,000. The House recedes as to the amount appropriated; the Senate recedes from its cut of $350 in the allocation to the station at Iron Forks, Ark.

Bureau of Agricultural Chemistry and Engineering

Amendments Nos. 49 and 50, agricultural engineering investigations: The Senate provided an increase of $10,000 for prevention and control of dust explosions and fires, from which it recedes; the Senate provided an increase of $5,000 for rural-electrification investigations relating to the developing of low-cost egg coolers on the farm, to which the House agrees.

Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine

Amendment No. 53, fruit insects: The Senate provided increases totaling $23,345 for work on pecan insects, peach insects, and grape insects, and a decrease of $5,000 for Japanese-beetle investigations, to which the House agrees.

Amendment No. 54, Japanese-beetle control: The House appropriated $82,275; the Senate, $432,275; the conference report provides $382,275.

Amendment No. 55, Japanese-beetle control: The Senate inserted a provision prohibiting the use of the appropriation to pay the cost or value of trees or other property injured or destroyed, to which the House agrees.

Amendments Nos. 56, 57, 58, and 61, gypsy and brown-tail moth control, Dutch elm disease eradication, phony peach and peach mosaic eradication, and barberry eradication: The action of the conferees on these amendments disallows the Senate increases for technical supervision of W. P. A. employees assigned to these projects. The cost of such supervision has heretofore been paid from the respective Federal W. P. A. allotments. It is the opinion of the conferees that work of this type, which was begun under relief appropriations, should not be transferred to the regular departmental appropriations, but that, if it is to be continued as an emergency matter, consideration thereof should be accorded in connection with further relief appropriations or other legislation.

Amendment No. 59, forest insects: The Senate provided an increase of $15,000 for continuation of studies on insect vectors of the Dutch elm disease, to which the House agrees.

Amendment No. 60, cereal and forage insects: The Senate provided an increase of $50,000, of which $40,000 was for strengthening the investigations on the European corn borer and $10,000 for continuation of studies on the Mormon cricket. The conference report provides an increase of $25,000 for these two investigations.

Amendment No. 61, barberry eradication: See amendments Nos. 56, 57, 58, and 61, above.

Amendment No. 62, cotton insects: The House appropriated $123,895; the Senate, $148,439; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 63, bee culture: The House appropriated $75,100; the Senate, $82,100; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 64, insects affecting man and animals: The Senate provided an increase of $6,000 for investigations of the Clear Lake gnat at Clear Lake, Calif. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 65, foreign plant quarantines: The House appropriated $716,300; the Senate, $719,550; the House recedes.

Agricultural Marketing Service

Amendment No. 67, Cotton Quality Statistics and Classing Acts: The Senate provided an increase of $10,000, to which the House agrees.

Amendment No. 68, United States Cotton Futures and United States Cotton Standards Act: The Senate restored a Budget cut of $15,000, to which the House agrees. This will provide the same amount for the fiscal year 1943 as is appropriated for the fiscal year 1942.

Amendment No. 69, United States Warehouse Act: The House appropriated $456,415; the Senate, $481,415; the Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 70, Packers and Stockyards Act: The House appropriated $389,544; the Senate, $397,665; the Senate recedes.

Enforcement of the Commodity Exchange Act

Amendment No. 72, salaries and expenses: The House appropriated $569,587; the Senate, $469,587; the House recedes.

Soil Conservation Service

Amendment No. 74, Soil and moisture conservation and land-use investigations: The House appropriated $1,314,429; the Senate, $1,364,429; the conference report provides $1,339,429.

Amendment No. 75, Soil and moisture conservation and land-use operations, demonstrations, and information: The House appropriated $20,510,812; the Senate, $19,510,812; the Senate recedes.

Agricultural conservation program payments

Amendment No. 77, the so-called Andrews amendment: The Senate inserted a provision requiring that seed purchased for delivery to farmers for use in connection with soil conservation compliances be bought through regular seed dealer channels except where such sources are not available. The Senate recedes.

Amendment No. 78, limitation of $1,000 on payments to any one person or corporation: The House inserted a provision limiting agricultural conservation payments to $1,000. The Senate struck out the provision, to which the House agrees.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 84, relating to commodities for the manufacture of which grain may be sold below the parity price: The House provided that grain may be sold below parity for the manufacture of "alcohol." The Senate struck out "alcohol" and inserted in lieu thereof the words "ethyl alcohol, butyl alcohol, acetone, or rubber", to which the House agrees.

International production control committees

Amendment No. 89: The Senate inserted a new item authorizing the expenditure of $17,500 from funds available to the Agricultural Adjustment Administration for the share of the United States as a member of the International Wheat Advisory Committee, the International Sugar Council, or like bodies, to which the House agrees.

Land utilization and retirement of submarginal lands

Amendment No. 92: The House appropriated $1,591,182; the Senate, $795,575; the Senate recedes.

Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation

Amendment No. 94, migratory labor camps: The House made no appropriation; the Senate appropriated $1,400,000; the House recedes.

Amendment No. 98, maximum loan to any individual farmer: The House provided $1,000; the Senate, $2,500; the House recedes.

Rural Electrification Administration

Amendment No. 99, salaries and expenses: The House appropriated $3,750,000; the Senate, $3,500,000; the House recedes.

Requirement of affidavit by employees

Amendment No. 103: The Senate inserted a provision exempting persons employed for less than 60 days for sudden emergency work involving the loss of human life or the destruction of property from the requirement to make affidavits of nonmembership in organizations advocating the overthrow of the United States Government by force or violence, to which the House agrees.

Travel expenses

Amendment No. 104: The Senate struck out the House provision limiting travel expense to $8,000,000, to which the House agrees.

Amendment No. 105: The Senate inserted the following:

"SEC. 4. Of the total amount available under this Act for traveling expenses, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, on or before August 1, 1942, to cover into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts the sum of $1,500,000, which shall be in addition to reductions in amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in the appropriations made by this Act below the Budget estimates."

The conference report strikes out the Senate language and inserts in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 4 Of the total amount available under this act for traveling expenses, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, on or before August 1, 1942, to cover into the surplus fund of the Treasury the sum of $1,500,000, which shall be in addition to reductions in amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in the appropriations made by this act below the Budget estimates."

Amendments in disagreement

The committee of conference failed to reach any agreement as to the following amendments:

Totals, allocations, clarifications of text, etc.

The following amendments relate to the adjustment of totals, allocations, clarifications of text, etc.: Nos. 11, 12, 17, 18, 21, 36, 40, 41, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48 and 93.

Office of the Solicitor

Amendment No. 2: Fixes the salary of the Solicitor at $9,200. The managers on the part of the House will recommend that the House concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment fixing the salary at $9,000.

Office of Information

Amendment No. 6: Permits the reimbursement of the appropriation on account of duplicating and photographic work done for the other bureaus and offices of the Department from the appropriations of such bureaus current at the time such work is done. The managers on the part of the House will recommend that the House concur.

Office of Experiment Stations

Amendments Nos. 9 and 10, title I, Bankhead-Jones Act: Appropriates $2,463,708, instead of $2,263,708 as proposed by the House, and provides that $63,708 shall be so allotted as to prevent any State or Territory from receiving less than it received in the fiscal year 1942. The managers on the part of the House will recommend that the House concur.

Extension Service

Amendments Nos. 14 and 15, additional cooperative extension work: Appropriate $555,000 instead of $203,000 as proposed by the House, and is for the purpose of preventing certain of the States and Territories from receiving allotments reduced in amount on account of change in the plan of allotment from a rural population basis to a farm population basis, or on account of relative reduction in population as evidenced by the Census of 1940 compared with the Census of 1930. The managers on the part of the House will move to concur.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Amendment No. 19, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $778,798, instead of $278,798 as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Plant Industry

Amendment No. 31: Appropriates $572,580, instead of $575,475 as proposed by the House. The managers on the part of the House will recommend that the House concur with an amendment fixing the amount of the appropriation at $579,895. This will be for the purpose of restoring $20,000, proposed by the House and stricken out by the Senate, for hybrid corn investigations in the South; it will accept the Senate increase of $4,420 for seed flax investigations, and will eliminate the Senate increase of $12,685 for investigations of bindweed and other noxious weeds.

Forest Service

Amendment No. 38, national forest protection and management: Provides an increase of $3,000,000 to strengthen forest fire control and an increase of $20,000 for expansion of recreational facilities at Mount Charleston near Las Vegas, Nev.

Amendment No. 42, forest-fire cooperation: Appropriates $5,000,000, instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Forest roads and trails

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates $7,500,000, instead of $6,500,000 as proposed by the House.

Agricultural conservation program payments

Amendment No. 79: Provides that tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government who comply with the program shall be entitled to the same payments for such compliance as other producers. The managers on the part of the House will recommend that the House concur.

Parity payments

Amendment No. 81: Provides that the agricultural conservation payments shall be taken into account and added to the farmer's market returns in determining the amount of the parity payment to which he may be entitled.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 83, relating to Government-controlled stocks of grain which may be sold for less than parity for feeding purposes or for manufacture of alcohol, etc.: The House provided that grain may be sold below parity if it "has substantially deteriorated in quality *and* is sold for feeding purposes or the manufacture of alcohol"; while the Senate provided that grain may be sold below parity if it "has substantially deteriorated in quality *or* is sold for the purpose of feeding or the manufacture of" certain industrial alcohols, acetone, and rubber. The question of merit in the Senate amendment lies in its substitution of the word "or" for the word "and".

Amendment No. 85: The Senate proposes that not more than 125,000,000 bushels of wheat be sold for feeding purposes.

Amendment No. 86: The Senate proposes that "no grain shall be sold for feed at a price less than 85 per centum of the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made."

Exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities

Amendments Nos. 87 and 88: Strikes out the House language authorizing the use of $775,000 for administrative expenses and inserts language reappropriating the unexpended balance (estimated to be approximately $44,500,000) of the funds made available for the purposes of "section 32" for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942. These amendments involve the school-lunch program, the food stamp plan, etc.

Farm Tenant Act

Amendment No. 90, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $2,000,000, instead of $1,250,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 91, loans: Authorizes $40,000,000, instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation

Amendment No. 95, rehabilitation services and assistance: Appropriates $50,319,557, instead of $25,319,557 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 96, loans: Authorizes $125,000,000, instead of $70,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 97, land-purchase program: Authorizes the completion of commitments outstanding on June 30, 1942.

Interchange of appropriations

Amendments Nos. 101 and 102: Authorizes interchange within bureaus of not to exceed 10 per centum, instead of not to exceed 5 per centum of the amounts appropriated as proposed by the House; and authorizes the addition of not more than 10 per centum to any one item, instead of not more than 5 per centum as proposed by the House.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
D. D. TERRY,
ROSS A. COLLINS,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the Senate adopted 105 amendments to the Agriculture Appropriation bill. The pending conference report represents the agreement of the conferees of the two bodies on, as I recall, 54 of those amendments. In part, agreement has been reached so far as the conferees are concerned, on other amendments where because of the parliamentary rules it is necessary that the amendments be brought back to the House and motions made to recede and concur in the Senate action. Certain other amendments which are reported in disagreement have relation to totals, and action upon them will follow whatever disposition is made of the amendments which are really in controversy.

The amendments relating to the increases provided for the Forest Service, for the Farm Security Administration, and relating to the limitation provided by the House upon the administrative funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the amendments of the Senate to the parity provisions of the bill, with the sole exception of the one relating to the use of grains in the manufacture of ethyl alcohol, butyl alcohol, and acetone for rubber, are in disagreement. There are, however, only some six or seven items of major disagreement.

The appropriations carried in the bill, insofar as the conferees of the two Houses have been able to reach agreement and as represented by the position of the managers on the part of the House as to amendments in disagreement are substantially below the figures of the bill as it passed the Senate.

The clerk of the subcommittee has not yet been able to complete his computation to show exactly the amount by which the conference report and motions to be offered by House managers would reduce the amounts allowed in the Senate bill in connection with these amendments.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may insert in the RECORD at this point the statement of the Clerk relative to that subject matter after the statement has been completed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

The conference report involves a net increase of $1,449,636 above the amount of the bill as it passed the Senate, due to the fact that the Senate had made reductions in House items totaling $1,810,607, which were restored in conference. Offsetting the foregoing items, the Senate conferees receded from several increases, totaling $360,971.

Should the House agree to the motions of its managers respecting the Senate amendments still in disagreement, there will be a net reduction under Senate figures, covering the entire bill, of $29,991,049 in appropriations from the Treasury and a reduction of $55,000,000 in loan authorizations.

Mr. TARVER. The amendments which have been agreed upon and with relation to which a complete statement is made in the conference report do not as a rule involve the expenditure of a very considerable amount of funds; many of them are of a very minor nature. The House Membership has had opportunity to examine the conference report and to advise itself as to the action which has been taken by the conferees. It would be a fruitless matter for me to undertake to discuss in detail all of the 54 amendments with regard to which agreement has been reached, and I shall not undertake to do so, but

at this time desire to offer to answer to the best of my ability any question which may be propounded by the members of the committee with reference to those amendments. I hope that the gentlemen at this time will not interrogate me with reference to the amendments which are in disagreement.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wish to ask the gentleman about amendment No. 94, which deals with migratory labor camps. This is a matter in which certain sections of the country, notably my own, are at present very seriously concerned because of the shortage of agricultural labor. We ought especially to have mobile labor camps and to have enough money to operate the camps that are already constructed. It seems to us in California a very important thing that sufficient funds be provided for this purpose. I notice that the conferees have agreed to grant really the Senate appropriation, which is $1,400,000, and I thank the conferees for so doing; but the question I desired to ask the gentleman is whether he thinks this amount will in the long run be sufficient to take care of this problem.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman will no doubt recall that on the passage of the bill through the House I undertook to sustain the action taken by the subcommittee insofar as I could do so by argument.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I do remember that.

Mr. TARVER. The House disagreed with the position of the gentleman and with the position of myself. The Senate by amendment provided $1,400,000 for the operation and maintenance of existing migratory labor camps. The House conferees could go no further.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I understand.

Mr. TARVER. We agreed to the increase over the figures in the House bill suggested by the Senate. This is done in the conference report.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to know if the Clerk has had sufficient time to compute the total as carried in the House bill and compare it to the increases which the other body added so as to give us a picture of the difference in the two bills?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman evidently did not hear my statement a few moments ago when I asked permission to insert that in the RECORD as soon as it is prepared by the Clerk.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TALLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TALLE. My question has to do with the Bureau of Plant Industry, under vegetables and fruits. I understand that the amounts appropriated for potato breeding and onion breeding, or rather for research in those two fields, are the same as were allowed in the House bill. Is that not correct?

Mr. TARVER. To what amendment does the gentleman refer?

Mr. TALLE. I believe the House figures are intact. I want to be sure no changes have been made, and I see no amendment in the conference report that would indicate changes in the two items involved.

Mr. TARVER. If there is no amendment, of course, the provisions remain as in the House bill.

Mr. TALLE. I thank the gentleman for his assurance that these figures remain intact.

Mr. HAINES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HAINES. May I inquire if the gentleman has touched on the question of the wheat storage proposition?

Mr. TARVER. No. There is nothing in the conference report involving that problem, as far as I know.

Mr. HAINES. I thought the gentleman was taking up this conference report as it relates to wheat stocks.

Mr. TARVER. No. The gentleman has reference to the limitation proposed in the House bill on the sale of Government-owned commodities by the Commodity Credit Corporation. That amendment is in disagreement and is not involved in the conference report. It will be taken up later.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. As I recall, the House wrote in a limitation of $1,000 on conservation payments. My understanding is that the Senate struck out that limitation of a thousand dollars. If that is the case, we are back operating under the old law where we would have a limitation of only $10,000; is that correct?

Mr. TARVER. The limitation provided in the House bill did not prevent the making of payments to landlords in excess of $1,000 in cases where the landlords were operating a farm through tenants or sharecroppers and in connection with which operation they adopted methods determined by the local committees to be in accordance with fair and customary standards of renting and sharecropping prevailing in that locality. In other words, the House limitation was entirely without effect in the cases of landlords operating farms through tenants and sharecroppers where the landlord dealt fairly with the tenants.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

While the House limitation was not as far reaching as some of its advocates seemed to think it should have been, in the opinion of the House conferees, and even in the opinion of some of them who had supported the limitation in question, the subject matter is one which ought to be dealt with by legislation, amending and revising legislation which is now on the statute books governing such payments and ought not to be handled or undertaken to be handled in an appropriation bill, and largely for that reason the House conferees have receded and agreed to the Senate amendment striking the limitation from the bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We are operating under the general law then of $10,000?

Mr. TARVER. Under the statute law as it has existed prior to the passage of this bill by the House of Representatives.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is a limitation of $10,000?

Mr. TARVER. That is right.

Mr. MONRONEY Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. In amendments numbered 104 and 105 I understand the House has receded from the $8,000,000 travel limitation and is recommending almost verbatim the Senate limitation which provides for a refund of only one and one-half million dollars in the travel account. That is on page 8 of the conference report. The parliamentary situation is such, is it not, that there can be no separate vote on this $8,000,000 travel limitation that the House passed?

Mr. TARVER. No. Of course, the House could reject the conference report and send the whole matter back to conference, but there is no way under the rules of the House by which the gentleman could get a vote on that particular amendment alone.

May I say to the gentleman with reference to that amendment that, of course, the members of the subcommittee on appropriations and the conferees on the part of the House in connection with this bill have appreciated the gentleman's interest in undertaking to reduce the travel-expense item in the Department of Agriculture. The effect of the gentleman's amendment, however, which was adopted on the floor of the House, while it would have restricted to $8,000,000 the amount of expenditure of appropriations carried in the bill for travel expenses would not have reduced the amount appropriated in the bill by one single penny. It would have left the amount carried in the bill for travel expenses in the appropriation for the various bureaus and divisions of the Department, and those amounts might have been spent by the administrative authorities for other purposes. The amendment of the gentleman made no reduction whatever in the total of the amount appropriated in the bill.

The Senate amendment does effect such a reduction. It effects a reduction not only of $1,500,000 in travel expenses but, in addition to that, amounts resulting from reductions in amounts available for travel expenses in decreases in appropriations made to the various bureaus and divisions of the Department. Our clerks who made some investigation of the subject matter advised us that the amount of the reduction provided in the Senate amendment in travel expenses for the Department will be approximately $2,100,000, $600,000 in excess of the $1,500,000 which is specifically stated

in the Senate amendment. So, whereas the amendment adopted in the House effected no saving whatever, the amendment adopted in the Senate, to which the House conferees have agreed, or recommended that the House agree, will effect a saving of $2,100,000.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman advise me what the total travel expense will be approximately? My figures show there will still be about $14,000,000 that will be left in the bill for the Department of Agriculture to spend in connection with its various travel activities.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

I think that is probably true. I want to say this further, that in my judgment it is a very unwise thing to do merely to cut the travel expenses of the men who are hired to travel, such as men who carry on the Bang's disease and tuberculosis work in the Bureau of Animal Industry, and not cut out the positions of the men who are hired to travel and who cannot travel unless you provide them with the travel expenses. The only successful method of economy in that connection that I can conceive of would be that if you wished to deny to these employees the means by which they can travel, you ought to go further and cut out the jobs and cut out the money with which to pay their salaries. Simply to cut out their travel expenses and in effect provide that they could continue on the pay roll of the Government, continue to draw their salaries, and yet not be able to do any work to earn those salaries, is to my mind a rather foolish thing to do.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I notice that on amendment No. 24, the Andrews amendment, the Senate recedes.

Mr. TARVER. That is correct.

Mr. BULWINKLE. It is out of the bill.

Mr. TARVER. That is right, if the conference report is adopted.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What will be the status with respect to the handling of seed, and what will be the policy of the Department with respect to the jobbers who deal in seed and who have complained that the Andrews amendment is necessary in order to protect them in their operations?

Mr. TARVER. The policy of the Department, I assume, will be what it has been heretofore. It has, as the gentleman knows, been a policy of allowing to seed dealers reasonable profits for handling these seeds in connection with the A. A. A. program. However, since the amendment is out of the bill and the Senate has receded with reference to it, I cannot conceive of any benefit from discussing the matter at length at this time.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY. What provision was made with regard to the Johnson amendment as to the $1,000 limit, and the Hope amendment?

Mr. TARVER. I discussed that in answer to the question of the gentleman from Montana only a moment ago. I assume the gentleman was not on the floor.

Mr. MURRAY. I was telephoning.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Did the conferees give any consideration to the question of permitting domestic wheat held by the Commodity Credit Corporation to be used for milling purposes and export purposes?

Mr. TARVER. May I say to the gentleman that that is not involved in the conference report. It is involved in an amendment which is in disagreement and which will be called up for discussion after the conference report is acted upon.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, as the bill passed the House it carried substantially $648,000,000 for agriculture. The Senate added $32,000,000, but some of those items will be diminished by action of the conference.

I think the gentleman from Georgia did an excellent job in conference. I think all of the Members of the House did an excellent job in conferring with the Senators, presenting our position, and standing pretty well by the House position. I want to pay testimony to the gentleman from Georgia, Judge TARVER, today for what I think was a very good job on the part of the House of Representatives.

Let me call your attention briefly to the approximately 14 substantial amendments that are in disagreement, other than amendments regarding legislative language. There is the one on experiment stations, which would provide an increase of $200,000, written in by the Senate, which would give those States that would take smaller allotments by virtue of the 1940 census a diminution of what they received in 1942 and 1941.

Then there is the amendment on the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. You recall that on the House floor we chopped out $1,050,000 for administrative expenses. The Senate restored $500,000 of that amount, and that amendment is in disagreement at the present time.

The Senate also wrote in $20,000 for recreational facilities at Mount Charleston in Nevada. It seems they have a magnesium plant out there, and about 35 miles away is this little mountain—if it is a mountain—with a forest on it. It is at an altitude of 6,000 or 7,000 feet. They thought they would build it up for recreational purposes. They wanted $20,000, but they are going to use most of it for the purchase of toilet equipment, if you know what I mean, and some 2-inch pipe and 1-inch pipe, and a lot of other things. It occurs to me that it is, properly speaking, a job for the War Department, because it is more nearly germane to their activities than it is to those of the Department of Agriculture or the Forest Service.

The Senate wrote in $3,000,000 for emergency forest fire control. That amendment is in disagreement. They also wrote in $2,500,000 for cooperative forest fire prevention. There is no authority in law for that increase today, and that was the House position in the course of the conference.

We gave the forest roads and trails item $3,300,000, which was the Budget figure, in the House. The Senate increased that by $1,000,000.

Then there is this rather troublesome question of including the so-called agricultural conservation payments as a part of the parity payments. An agreement was consummated last year by which they were so included. I do not know whether any informal agreement was particularly binding on the House of Representatives, although the House took that position last year, but it is in controversy at the present time and must be disposed of. My own personal idea is that they should not be so included.

The most controversial item, of course, is the language written in by the Senate with respect to the authority of Commodity Credit Corporation to sell grains below parity. There were several provisions proposed and the way the Senate set the thing up they cannot only sell for relief purposes, but they can sell deteriorated and nondeteriorated grain for alcohol, for butyl alcohol, for acetone for the manufacture of rubber, and for feed, and for a great many other items. My own opinion is if the House ever embraces that theory you have destroyed the farmer market. So we should stand by the House position, and return this amendment to conference for close study.

On surplus commodities the Senate increased the amount for school lunches by a substantial amount. They restored most of the things we deleted in respect of farm tenancy, rural rehabilitation, loans and grants, and increased the amount over the Budget figure. After the bill left the House there was a supplemental Budget estimate for a substantial amount. So the Senate granted part of that and restored the House cut and it is a rather substantial amount.

Finally, there is language in the bill which would put the seal of approval upon what the Farm Security Administration has done with respect to purchasing large blocks of land for the purpose of relocating farm families who have been dislocated as a result of Government acquisitions of land where defense projects were constructed. Of course, the action is illegal. It was illegal from the outset and if you adopt the Senate language it occurs to me, and I think to the other members of the conference, that we would be putting the stamp of approval on an illegal procedure which will involve in its total about $23,000,000. That, too, is in disagreement.

I thought I would just give you a general, broad, and sketchy picture of the 14 basic amendments in disagreement at the present time.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOOK. I was surprised at the gentleman's statement that the House conferees took the position that there was no authority of law for an appropriation of money for the strengthening of forest-fire control.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois 1 additional minute.

Mr. DIRKSEN. For cooperative fire control in connection with State operations, and I think the chairman of the committee will bear me out in the statement that there was no legal authority for that item in the bill, an item of $2,500,000.

Mr. TARVER. No authority for any amount exceeding the $2,500,000.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. I notice in amendment 31 there is $20,000 included here for investigation in the South to increase the production of hybrid corn.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. Is there an equal amount to increase cotton and tobacco in the North, or are we left out?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No; I should say to my friend from Iowa, since he and I both come from the corn section, that they have got to develop special hybrid strains for States like Tennessee, Alabama, and elsewhere, and since the pioneer in the whole field embraces most of the country in the Corn Belt, at the present time I believe we should provide for further studies by the Department of Agriculture and I think this is a very proper item.

Mr. JENSEN. I do not think so.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 2: Page 7, line 18, after the word "Solicitor", insert "including salary of the Solicitor at $9,200 per annum, and."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by the said amendment, insert "including salary of the Solicitor at $9,000 per annum, and."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 6: Page 10, line 22, after the word "amended", insert the following: "*Provided further*, That in the preparation and distribution of duplicated and photographic material for the Department, the appropriation "Salaries and expenses, Office of Information," current at the time such services are rendered or when payment therefor is received, may be reimbursed (by advance credits or reimbursements based on estimated or actual charges) from the applicable appropriations, to cover charges for personal services, materials, equipment (including depreciation, maintenance, and repair) and other necessary expenses."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment; and in explanation of that motion I may say that the House conferees unanimously approve the language of the amendment, but the situation is such in a parliamentary way that it could not be included in the conference report. It relates to a matter of bookkeeping, and will, in the judgment of the conferees, result in some economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 9: Page 16, line 1, after the parenthesis and comma, strike out "$2,263,708" and insert "$2,463,708."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, amendments Nos. 9 and 10 relate to the same subject matter, and I ask unanimous consent that they be considered together.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report amendment No. 10.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, after the figures in line 2, insert the following: ": *Provided*, That of this amount $63,708 allotted in the fiscal year 1942 to prevent reduced allotments because of changes in relative rural population shall be apportioned in the fiscal year 1943 in the same amounts and to the same States and Territory which received allotments from such sum in the fiscal year 1942."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, these amendments and other amendments to be considered later on, relating to the Extension Service, involve a question which has been debated on this floor in connection with the last several agricultural appropriation bills. That is, as to whether or not when a provision has been made by statute law for the distribution of certain types of funds, such as those distributed under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act, for cooperative agricultural extension work, and so forth, and the provision of law is that funds shall be distributed upon the basis of farm population, whether States, which, according to the census figures have either lost in farm population or have not had an increase in farm population comparable to the increase in population of other States, and on that account would receive less in funds on account of the method of distribution provided by law than they have received heretofore, should have these deficits made up by extra appropriations not authorized by law. This subcommittee has always taken the position that it was not proper for the Congress to make extralegal appropriations, but every year, after the matter has been thoroughly threshed over in debate in the House, the House has finally agreed to the Senate action in providing additional funds; so, under these circumstances, it has been felt by the conferees that the House has well indicated what it thinks ought to be done on this particular issue, and while the motion I have made is not in accordance with the views of the conferees, we feel that it is in accordance with the views of the House, as those views have been frequently expressed heretofore by legislative action, and that further pursuance of their efforts would be fruitless. It is for that reason that the House conferees have instructed me to move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman think $63,708 is a frivolous item?

Mr. TARVER. I certainly do not think the gentleman should credit me with any statement as to its being a frivolous item. I made no such statement.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman said not to concur with the Senate amendment would be frivolous at this time.

Mr. TARVER. I have not used the word "frivolous" in the discussion this morning.

Mr. RICH. Then I misunderstood the gentleman. I understood the gentleman to say that if we did not agree to the Senate amendment, since the House conferees have agreed to it, it would be frivolous on the part of the House. If any item that provides for $63,708 is frivolous, I want to know it.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman should not put words in my mouth and then proceed to attack the language which he says I used, but which I did not use.

Mr. RICH. I am not charging the gentleman with being frivolous in his statement, but I do say that an item involving that much money is a considerable sum of money. Now, it seems to me that if we agree to this amendment that we are going to give to certain people the same amount of money they got last year, just because we want to do something for some farmers. We do it again just because we did it last year, whether it is right or wrong.

Mr. TARVER. I am sorry the gentleman did not understand me clearly. That was undoubtedly due to my inability to express myself clearly.

Mr. RICH. Nobody can express himself better than the Judge, I will say that.

Mr. TARVER. I did not say that the amendment was frivolous. I said that the House conferees had maintained the attitude for several years that this particular item of appropriation should not

be made since it was not authorized by law, and that the question should be addressed to the legislative committee having jurisdiction, if the law were to be changed; but that since we had debated the matter in connection with several appropriation bills heretofore, and the House had always agreed to this provision, therefore we thought it would be fruitless—not frivolous—for the House conferees to undertake to insist on the position which they had maintained heretofore, and for that reason the House conferees had unanimously requested that I, as chairman, should move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. RICH. Do you not believe in your own heart that this amendment should not be adopted?

Mr. TARVER. I believe, as I said awhile ago, that it is a matter which should be addressed to the discretion of the legislative committee and not dealt with on an appropriation bill, but I also believe that a large majority of the membership of the House disagree with me.

Mr. RICH. Well, let us find out whether they do. I think the House will sustain you. If you come in here with a little fight on this we will just knock this $63,000 out of this bill.

Mr. TARVER. Oh, we have had a fight on this year after year, and we have never been sustained. The House has always disagreed with us. We are servants of the House. It is our business, insofar as we can, to carry out the will of the House. If anything has been conclusively demonstrated in this House, it is that the House desires this particular item carried in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

Mr. RICH. Does not the gentleman know that the House is in a different temper today? That we are here to economize? Now, let us put the fellows to a test and see if they will not sustain you. Let us disagree to this amendment and take it back.

Mr. TARVER. As I said awhile ago, I think that would be a fruitless proposition. I am almost moved to say it would be frivolous.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. What is necessary for us to do in order to get the House vote on this?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has moved the previous question and the Chair must put that question. If the House votes down the previous question, other motions may be made.

The question is on ordering the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 11: Page 16, line 9, strike out "$6,726,208" and insert "$6,926,208."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment, which is merely a correction of the total.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 12: Page 17, line 24, strike out "$6,982,705" and insert "$7,182,705."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. This is merely a correction of the total.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments 14 and 15 may be considered together, as they involve the same subject matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 14: Page 19, beginning in line 3, strike out down through line 3, on page 20.

Amendment No. 15: Page 20, after line 3, insert "Additional cooperative extension work: For additional cooperative agricultural extension work in agriculture and home economics, to be allotted and paid by the Secretary of Agriculture to the several States and the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico, in such amounts as he may deem necessary to accomplish such purposes, $555,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendments Nos. 14 and 15.

Mr. Speaker, this is the same subject matter that was discussed a few moments ago, in which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] was interested. The other items related to the apportionment of funds under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Act. This item relates to the apportionment of funds for cooperative extension work. The question involved is exactly the same. The House conferees are unanimously of opinion that the House should be asked to recede and concur.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 17: Page 21, line 9, strike out "$13,806,950" and insert "$14,186,950."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 17 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,158,950."

Mr. TARVER. This is merely the correction of a total.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 18: Page 22, line 3, strike out "$14,453,408" and insert "$14,833,408."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 18 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$14,805,408."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, again, this is merely the correction of a total.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 19: Page 22, line 20, strike out "$278,798" and insert "$778,798."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 19.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 21: Page 24, line 15, strike out "$25,612,730" and insert "$26,902,730."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 31: Page 34, line 19, strike out "$575,475" and insert in lieu thereof "$572,580."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment No. 31 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$579,895."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 36: Page 38, line 17, strike out "$5,130,277" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,177,382."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 36 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$5,192,197."

Mr. TARVER. This is merely the correction of a total, Mr. Speaker.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 38: Page 43, line 23, strike out "$11,266,446" and insert in lieu thereof "$14,286,446."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 38.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEAVY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 38 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$14,266,446."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY].

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, as one of the House conferees, to offer a motion that would seem to be in conflict with the position of the majority of my fellow conferees, at first blush might appear to put me in an inconsistent position; but we have disagreements in these matters, and we did have some substantial disagreement upon this item.

There are a number of items in this conference report which I feel are of tremendous consequence. I feel that the Senate probably was in a position to give more mature consideration to the changed conditions that came from the time we passed the bill in the House until the time it was considered in the Senate. There are three items here dealing with forests. There is this amendment, No. 38, and amendments 42 and 45.

The particular amendment that is now under discussion is one wherein I think it would be the part of sound judgment and in the interests of public welfare that the House accept the Senate position with one exception. Amendment 38 is properly divided into two parts, and I want to make an explanation so that no one can say we are voting for two different activities. One part of it is $3,000,000 for forest-fire protection and prevention. The other is a $20,000 item for recreational facilities in a national forest down in Nevada. I have offered my preferential motion eliminating the $20,000 item because it has no very direct relevancy to the $3,000,000 item, though it does have merit when considered by itself. But the $3,000,000 item is one of paramount importance, not alone to those who come from the Western States where the great forests exist but to the Nation as a whole—to the New England States, to the Great Lakes States, to the Southern States, to every part of this great country. Every American and every member of my committee will admit that this year we are confronted with a fire hazard in our forests far beyond anything that we have ever had, even considering the last war period.

Just the other day the House, unwisely I think, took out of the forests the C. C. C. That organization goes out on July 1 if the action of the House stands. Seventeen thousand young men will be taken out of 200,000,000 acres of the public forest land and will no longer be available for fire-protection and fire-prevention work, which they have so magnificently carried forward.

Let me tell you what this $3,000,000 item does. It supplements an item of $5,000,000 previously granted and supplements the general appropriations. We have for the national forests a statutory provision that the Congress will appropriate, and it does annually, $100,000 for fire protection, and then if a fire breaks out and it is required by reason of the emergent conditions to spend ten, twenty, or thirty million dollars, it is spent and provided for in a deficiency appropriation; but the $5,000,000 heretofore appropriated and the $3,000,000 that we seek to add to that sum is only $8,000,000 of the $18,000,000 that the forest people think we need to meet the greatly increased fire hazard.

This money is not money in any way involved with the unlimited expenditure for checking a fire that has once gotten beyond control. This $3,000,000 is for the sole purpose of preventing fires and when they do break out of controlling them. The Forest Service has demonstrated in its history that it is one of the most remarkably complete and perfect fire-fighting organizations that has ever been developed, but they must be allowed sufficient funds to keep in operation their lookout stations, their smokechaser crews, and all these other facilities that go with fire protection.

Let me give you one illustration that ought to convince anyone of the efficiency of this Forest Service as an agency, if you will permit them to function properly by giving them sufficient money. Last year in one forest in my congressional district lightning late in August set 117 fires in one night. By reason of the Forest Service efficiency, aided by the C. C. C., every fire was extinguished before it had burned over 10 acres of ground. In 1933 when we were lax in forest fire protection, a fire broke out in western Oregon that swept over the crest of the Cascade Mountains into eastern Oregon and destroyed $265,000,000 worth of fine merchantable timber, because we did not have the men and the boys to put out the fire when it started.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I sincerely hope that the gentleman's amendment will be adopted by the House because in the four States of Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Oregon we have over 100,000,000 acres of fine timberland. We have in addition to the hazards heretofore mentioned the hazard of sabotage. Bombs may be dropped which are incendiary in nature and it might result in sweeping out that entire Northwestern country. In addition, our manpower today in that western country is depleted because of enlistments, war work, and because they are taken into various industries that are offering larger pay. The result is that we have not the manpower to stop and arrest fires that we had formerly. Then we are denied the C. C. C. help that we had heretofore for putting out those fires. We are in danger—more than ever. I have frequently pointed this out on the floor.

Mr. LEAVY. I agree with everything the gentleman said.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. Does this $3,000,000 provide for the operation of towers, the construction of fire lines, and so forth?

Mr. LEAVY. In national forests. There is another item of two and a half million dollars, an amendment referred to by the gentleman from Illinois as being a sum that there is no authorization for, but it is perfectly legal if Congress sees fit to provide the item. That is the cooperative fire-fighting fund, where the National Government cooperates with State organizations and private agencies.

To show you that this is not merely a local matter that affects the west coast and the west coast alone—and if it were that even it would justify itself a thousandfold—may I refer to headlines that have appeared in the papers during the last 60 days.

Fire menaces 200 homes in New Jersey—"Forest fires hamper U Boat."

RALEIGH, N. C., May 6.—Fly plane in fire area. Smoke from burning forest suggests volcanic eruption.

That is from down in North Carolina.

Martial law decreed as forest fire hits three Rhode Island towns.

That is May 1 of this year.

This is only the first stage of the forest-fire hazards. We have an estate beyond calculation in dollars and cents in our forests—national, State, and private. We have an increased hazard this year, certainly on the west coast, and we have it everywhere, because unfortunately every one of our 130,000,000 American citizens are not as patriotic and as loyal as they should be. Here and there we must grant that in this great population of 130,000,000 there are some who are against the position of the Government in this mighty struggle for survival. No easier method of sabotage and of destruction exists than by setting fires in the national forests and on other forest lands.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. What is done with this amendment will perhaps to some extent govern what may be done with the next one, where the private holdings and the State holdings may jointly cooperate, and likewise with the $1,000,000 amendment that would maintain the roads and trails.

May I say in conclusion that the sum involved is insignificant compared with the sums this Congress is appropriating. The possibilities of damage are tremendous. They would run into the billions of dollars if we had another fire as we had in 1910. The loss of life possible is beyond calculation. The hindering of our war program that is possible is terrible even to consider.

I say without criticism of anyone who disagrees with me that I cannot for the life of me see either the economy, the statesmanship, or the wisdom of denying this insignificant fund. God help us if one of those 1910 or 1933 fires should again get loose and go beyond the control of man, and that danger exists in a high degree.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If this money is appropriated, if the amount is increased as provided in the amendment, will it be necessary the money be spent unless there is a forest fire?

Mr. LEAVY. No; this money is not to be used to fight a fire that has gotten out of control. It is to be used to prevent fires from getting out of control.

Mr. RICH. I do not believe the gentleman understood my question. Will it be necessary to spend this money if we appropriate it?

Mr. LEAVY. No; if we do not need it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, it is not often that I come to the floor of the House to ask an increase in appropriations. I have a 3,000,000-acre forest area in my district and I know something about forest-fire protection.

You will recall that the other day when we debated the C. C. C. I quoted Mr. Morrell, who has charge of the C. C. C. in the forest areas, under the Department of Agriculture. I asked Mr. Morrell—

Is not it a fact, Mr. Morrell, that if we were to give you one-third to one-half of the money spent by the Civilian Conservation Corps, you could give us as much forest-fire protection?

Or words to that effect.

He replied:

That is true.

I want to see the forests protected. I know their value. I know just what they mean not only in terms of timber but in terms of fish and game and recreational areas.

This appropriation provides for money to hire men to man the fire towers and to build the fire lines. The forest-fire forces operate something like this: The man in the fire tower watches a certain area, and when a fire occurs in that area he refers to the map he has in the tower, from which he can tell exactly where that fire is. He can locate the quarter of a section where the fire is. He calls up the fire warden of that area, who rushes out with a car carrying fire extinguishers, water, and so forth. In 9 cases out of 10 they will put the fire out before it burns over more than a quarter of an acre, and sometimes a space not more than a hundred yards square. That is the kind of service that gives real forest-fire protection.

If you turn this money over to the Forest Service to handle as they see fit, with their own crews, you will get as near value received for every dollar spent as you can get from any agency of the Government. The Forest Service is very efficient if you permit it to operate in its own way.

My candid opinion is that you will get more value out of this $3,000,000 than you will out of spending two or three times that amount on C. C. C. work. I have talked to a number of men, State foresters as well as regional and national foresters, and every one has told me, that if we will give them one-third to one-half the money we have been spending on the C. C. C. they will give the same amount of protection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Has any estimate been made of what it would cost to put these fire towers and the other fire-prevention machinery in all the forests of this country?

Mr. ENGEL. I do not know of any. There are 170,000,000 acres of forest lands under the Department of Agriculture, as I recall, in addition to park lands under the Department of the Interior. Whether or not it is advisable to put this fire-prevention service all over I do not know. That would be a question for the Forest Service to determine. It certainly should be in the forest areas where there are real forests, young forests which should be protected.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This hazard will exist just as long as you have forests.

Mr. ENGEL. As long as you have forests you will have fire hazards, and you should cooperate with the States and the States should cooperate with private owners and the two should cooperate with the national-forest officials.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the motion of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY], and for reasons which I am sure the entire House can readily understand. From this time of year on until November or December the entire area along the coast of California, from above San Francisco Bay to the Mexican border, is literally a tinder box. Our hills, covered with dried grass and low-lying brush, can be set afire most readily from a number of different causes. I believe no precaution could be too great to prevent the kind of catastrophe that could take place if even a few enemy aircraft should get over that area. Fires in those regions spread with tremendous rapidity. They are extremely difficult to combat. There are all kinds of important national defense installations all up and down our coast. We are doing, perhaps, as big a job in that respect as any other section of the country. All we ask is a chance to stop this destruction before it gets started, and that is what this money is for.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to say to the gentleman that I concur in the remarks he has made and also the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL], because when the hearings were had on the C. C. C. before our committee it appeared conclusively that if funds were provided for the Forest Service they would be able to take care of this situation, and here is an opportunity to provide in some measure, at least, funds that will enable the Forest Service to provide the necessary equipment for preventing fires from getting started.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, this bill was on hearing before the Subcommittee on Agricultural Appropriations in January and February. When it came to us in the form of a Budget estimate there was nothing included for the item of emergency forest-fire control, which is the item presently before us. The parliamentary situation now is this: The House provided nothing, the Budget estimated nothing for it, and the House therefore made no provision for this item. When it went to the Senate the Senate wrote in $3,000,000, the conferees disagree and bring it back. Our good friend, Judge LEAVY, now offers a preferential motion to recede and concur with an item of $3,000,000. It is rather singular that while this bill was on hearing before the Senate subcommittee in the month of May, just a month ago, somebody in the Budget or somebody in the administration did not go before Senator RUSSELL's committee with a supplementary estimate and say, "You must put in this $3,000,000." Pearl Harbor was then behind us. The talk of sabotage was behind us. The matter of whether or not this constituted a tremendous hazard was considered at the time and could have been handled in the form of a supplementary estimate that might have gone before the subcommittee. Such, however, was not the case. Frankly, I certainly would be the last to stand in the way of adequate appropriations for forest-fire control, but it is rather interesting that the whole matter must have been ventilated before the Budget at one time or another, but in all this time up to now there is still no supplemental estimate on the part of the Budget, the President, or any other agency to indicate that this fund is necessary.

My notion is, perhaps, the House ought to further disagree and let this matter go back to conference, at which time we can work it out, I think, in a satisfactory manner and probably take some additional testimony. It may be that certain moneys will be allowed, or maybe the full amount will be allowed; but at least it seems to me it warrants further examination because it does involve $3,000,000.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY].

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that from the newspaper accounts that we have seen in the last several months the protection of our forests is one of the vital things before us today. We hear about the fires in North Carolina, and we hear about the fires in the great Northwest, and yet we are cutting down this needed appropriation to assist in that vital protection. It seems to me that it is unwise not to appropriate the money necessary for this vital need. I

am in favor of the motion of the gentleman from Washington to recede and concur in the Senate amendment, with an amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of the Leavy motion to recede and concur, because I think we ought to preserve the forests of this country. It is true, as the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] has said, that nothing was suggested by the Budget Bureau in respect to this, nor was anything said by the other committees about this protection of the forest. However, since I have been here I do not remember that any of these agencies have ever before been wiped out, and I do not suppose anybody anticipated that the C. C. C. would be wiped out. However, it has been. Fire protection was one of the chief duties of the C. C. C., and as long as that protection has been wiped out through the wiping out of the C. C. C., then I think this $3,000,000 should be granted at this time.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNS. Yes.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. But the C. C. C. wiping out has not yet passed the Senate.

Mr. JOHNS. But the chances are that it will, and we will know some more about that when it happens. This $3,000,000 is essential to protect the forests that we have remaining, because at the present time there is a scarcity of metals in this country, and we are going to use more timber in nearly everything. Also, we need to be prepared for another war in the next 25 years, because we have always had one in about that length of time and probably always will, and we have to prepare for it now, and we ought to do what we can to preserve the remaining forests we have in this country. I hope that the motion will prevail.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I take this time for a question of fact. I ask my friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] whether he does not think the reason the Budget did not say anything about this $3,000,000 is that it believed that the C. C. C. camps, which have done much of this work, would be passed by the House without being wiped out. Is that a reasonable assumption?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I feel sure it could not have contemplated that the C. C. C. would be abolished, because that was a matter that was entirely in the power of the Congress.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I grant that; but I still think the subject was under consideration by the Bureau of the Budget, and I think that very largely answers the position the gentleman has taken. Mr. Speaker, we on the west coast, who are the front line of the Pacific combat area, feel that we are in jeopardy because our country has been specifically described as a combat area, and a large amount of combat divisions of the Army and the Navy are now centered on the protection of the Pacific coast. We feel this $3,000,000 is going to be a highly important factor, particularly if San Francisco and Los Angeles were to be attacked. To evacuate the people from those two communities would be very difficult, if not impossible, if forest fires were started prior to the attack. It would be almost impossible to get them out. The $3,000,000 in controversy, for the protection it could give the Pacific States alone, let alone the other States, in my opinion, would be money well expended, and I ask sincere and favorable consideration of this proposal made by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. NELSON].

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I am in full accord with the suggestion made by Judge LEAVY. I recall a few years ago, when I was in the Superior National Forest, one morning with my family we started out and our guide remarked that there was a little fire over on the left of the lake. We moved over there in our boat, thinking that we could put it out in a few minutes. We worked several hours. The fire would have spread over a vast acreage but for the fact that from the tower, which was several miles away, it was sighted, and men were notified of the situation and it was taken care of. Big fires start from little fires. It is economy to stop them in time.

It has been suggested that the C. C. C. would have taken care of this situation, but they are at least temporarily out. I recall in a great fire in the Superior National Forest I saw those boys work. They did a wonderful job. A former Member of this House who sat on the Republican side, who had been in the Forestry Service and who after his retirement went back into the Forestry Service, said to me, "NELSON, one boy trained in the C. C. C. service is worth a half a dozen boys that we can hire out of Duluth or elsewhere to fight these fires."

But the C. C. C. is out. We must make further provision for forest protection. This proposition represents good insurance. I hope it prevails.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD].

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the $3,000,000 additional appropriation asked here would be a mere drop in the bucket in comparison with what the Nation might suffer as a result of one fire in a vital forest area.

Some of that timberland is worth hundreds of dollars per acre as it stands. When you get into an area where they lose 1,000 or 1,500 acres of timber all in one fire, you can readily see that the small amount asked in addition to what is already in the bill is a mere pittance in comparison with the hazard to the timber that is endangered.

Then, too, timber is becoming more of a strategic war material every day. Let us protect it.

I hope the House in its wisdom will not refuse to vote this additional $3,000,000, because it is desperately needed. If you defeat this, you are simply saving a few pennies comparatively and risking the loss of hundreds of thousands of dollars.

The motion of Mr. LEAVY should and I hope it will prevail.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, the gist of this whole thing is that this $3,000,000 would not be asked for except for the extra hazard from sabotage and invasion. The point is if we are in any actual danger of sabotage from the Japanese $3,000,000 would only be a pittance for security. Ten times that amount probably would not be adequate. If this $3,000,000 is to guard against sabotage it is no guard at all. If that is the only excuse for it, if we are going to do this thing adequately, that amount is not sufficient. If you put a C. C. C. camp on every hilltop in the West we would not have adequate protection. It is the only excuse for it. This $3,000,000 is not worth considering because of that argument.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RICH. Every time we add a million or two or three million to each of these appropriation bills it increases our deficit. I have asked the Democrats from time to time where they are going to get the money, and they cannot tell me. Do you know anybody on the Republican side who can tell us where we are going to get the money?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. No; I cannot.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the most valuable asset in Government ownership in the way of natural resources is the great forest stands in the Northwest.

I happen to represent a district which contains the most valuable timber that the Government owns, great stands of white pine in the State of Idaho. I have lived with those forests all my life. The gentleman speaks of $3,000,000. To protect those forests we have created in the Forestry Service a great organization. It is conducted along scientific lines. They are handling this business in a scientific way. They have lookouts on the tops of the mountains. They have experienced men. They have their smoke chasers, patrolmen. They have their central organization. They have great supply depots. When a forest fire breaks out they must be vigilant to protect the forests. They may charter a whole string of busses. They may go into the reservoirs of labor and take firefighters from the cities like Spokane or Portland, and load them in these busses and take them across the State to fight these fires.

I have seen one fire in the State of Idaho that consumed more than $3,000,000 worth of timber. So when you are talking about saving, this is not any saving to cut out this little appropriation. The Forestry Service is protecting you and your interests and the things that

you own, those beautiful stands of timber that you must depend upon for everything that goes into industry in the way of timber.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If you call $3,000,000 a little appropriation, what do you call a big appropriation?

Mr. WHITE. Let me tell the gentleman from Pennsylvania when he is talking about $3,000,000, that the Forestry Service is conserving this timber and selling it and getting the money back.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should try to get clearly in our minds the facts about this Senate amendment to which your House conferees are asking you to continue your disagreement.

I come from an area which includes a part of a great national forest. All of my personal interest is in favor of the protection to the fullest extent possible of our national forests. I certainly would regard it as calamitous for the Congress not to provide sufficient funds for that purpose. But merely to say that we have a great problem, that we have a tremendous national forest acreage which ought to have fire protection, is not to say that we ought to have $10,000,000 for that purpose for the next fiscal year, for example, or to say that we ought to have any other particularly stated sum.

We have administrative agencies whose duties require that they evaluate the necessities for adequate fire protection for our forests. What have they done? They came in not without any Budget estimate, as has been stated, but with a Budget estimate for $2,265,693 for this purpose for the next fiscal year, which is the identical amount that was appropriated for this purpose for the present fiscal year.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I cannot yield at this point. I will yield to the gentleman later.

In this item as it passed the House, $11,266,446, there are $2,265,698 for forest-fire protection in our national forests. After that estimate was submitted the Budget submitted an additional estimate of $2,000,000 for use during the remainder of the present fiscal year and to be carried over into the next fiscal year insofar as it might be unexpended, and this House approved the additional Budget estimate in a deficiency bill. The bill went to the Senate, where, I believe, some $18,000,000 was added instead of the $2,000,000 for which a Budget estimate had been had and which the House provided, and in conference between the House and the Senate the figure was placed at $5,000,000, thereby adding to this $2,265,000 plus, $5,000,000 for the purpose of fire protection, giving a total of more than $7,265,000 plus, or more than three times as much as had been had for the present fiscal year. In connection with the conference report on that bill the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Deficiency Subcommittee and a member of this subcommittee, stated to the House when the House approved this conference report which fixed the amount of these additional funds at $5,000,000 that the conferees had regarded, from the evidence they had, the sum provided as amply sufficient, but that Congress would be continuously in session for the remainder of the year, and if any need developed for the appropriation of additional funds, that provision could be promptly made.

The Senate amendment proposed to add $3,000,000 for the purposes which have already been provided for in the regular bill as it passed the House and in the supplemental appropriation of $5,000,000, bringing the total to $10,265,000 or some approximate amount as against two million, two hundred and sixty-five thousand dollars plus, which we had for the present fiscal year.

It is just a question of whether you want to be extravagant, whether because you have a good objective and because you value our national forests as I do you want to provide four times as much money as you have ever provided heretofore for fire protection in the national forests. Every argument I have heard used here today could be used just as well in support of a $50,000,000 appropriation as in support of a $3,000,000 appropriation. The question is only one of how much money is necessary to effectuate the purpose to be carried out.

Members say that the C. C. C. has been abolished. The C. C. C. has not been abolished, and it is my earnest hope that after action is completed by the Congress on the pending labor-Federal security appropriation bill, it will not have been abolished. In my judgment much of the work this money would pay for could be done by C. C. C. camps.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLLINS. The Department itself, according to the records before the House and Senate committees, did not ask the Budget for any additional money.

Mr. TARVER. That is undoubtedly true. This drive for additional funds did not originate with the Department; it did not originate with the Budget, and it is not justified by any evidence submitted to the committees of the House or Senate which have had charge of the preparation of this bill.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. PLUMLEY. It occurs to me to be a very strange situation when the Budget does not seem to appreciate the fact so much money may be needed, nor do we think it necessary that the billions we have appropriated for national defense should be covered into this particular situation. It may be if, as it is suggested, this is so vital to national defense that $300,000,000 as against the $50,000,000 limit the gentleman put would not be a sufficient protection against all the threats of sabotage.

Mr. TARVER. I believe I get the gentleman's point. Whatever money is necessary ought to be provided; whatever money is necessary Congress will provide, but simply to say that you have 166,000,000 acres of national forest land, that the danger of fire is very great, and that the value of the timber to be protected is enormous is not to justify an appropriation 4 times as much as has ever been found necessary heretofore any more than it would justify providing 10 times as much or 100 times as much. Surely you ought to use some discretion and not go ahead and provide large amounts of funds that are not necessary.

I hope the House will permit its conferees to have further consideration of this matter with the Senate conferees and that the motion will be rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be reread.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Leavy motion.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. LEAVY) there were—yeas 58, noes 58.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum and ask for tellers.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, we might as well have a roll call now. Evidently we are going to have it anyway. While the gentleman from Washington has demanded tellers, I object to the vote on the ground no quorum is present, and make the point of order that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 172, nays 174, not voting 84, as follows:

[Roll No. 67]

YEAS—172

Allen, La.	Byron	Eberharter
Andersen, H. Carl	Canfield	Elliot, Mass.
Anderson, Calif.	Cartwright	Elliott, Calif.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Case, S. Dak.	Engel
Andresen, August H.	Chenoweth	Englebright
Angell	Cochran	Fitzgerald
Beam	Coffee, Wash.	Fitzpatrick
Beckworth	Colmer	Flaherty
Beiter	Costello	Flannagan
Bloom	Courtney	Fogarty
Boehne	Cravens	Forand
Boykin	Creal	Ford, Thomas F.
Bradley, Mich.	Curtis	Gearhart
Bradley, Pa.	Davis, Tenn.	Gehrmann
Brooks	Day	Granger
Buck	Delaney	Grant, Ala.
Byrne	Dingell	Gregory
	Domengeaux	Harris, Ark.
	Downs	Healey
	Dworshak	Hendricks

Hill, Colo.	Magnuson	Sanders
Hill, Wash.	Manasco	Sauthoff
Hinshaw	Merritt	Schuetz
Hook	Mills, Ark.	Scrugham
Hope	Mills, La.	Shafer, Mich.
Houston	Mitchell	Shanley
Hull	Mott	Sheppard
Izac	Mundt	Short
Jackson	Murdock	Smith, Maine
Jacobsen	Murray	Smith, Pa.
Johns	Nelson	Smith, Wash.
Johnson, Calif.	Nichols	Somers, N. Y.
Johnson, Okla.	Norrell	Sparkman
Johnson, W. Va.	Norton	Spence
Keefe	O'Brien, Mich.	Starnes, Ala.
Kefauver	O'Connor	Steagall
Kelley, Pa.	O'Hara	Stefan
Kelly, Ill.	O'Toole	Stevenson
Kennedy, Martin J.	Pace	Sweeney
	Patman	Talle
Kennedy, Michael J.	Patrick	Tenerowicz
	Patton	Terry
Keogh	Peterson, Fla.	Thill
Kirwan	Pierce	Thom
Klein	Pittenger	Thomas, Tex.
Knutson	Poage	Tolan
Kopplemann	Priest	Traynor
Lanham	Ramsay	Voorhis, Calif.
Larrabee	Rankin, Miss.	Wasielewski
Lea	Rankin, Mont.	Weaver
Leavy	Reece, Tenn.	Weiss
Lesinski	Richards	Welch
Lewis	Rivers	West
McGehee	Robinson, Utah	Whelchel
McGranery	Robsion, Ky.	White
McIntyre	Rogers, Okla.	Whitten
McKeough	Rolph	Wickersham
Maciejewski	Romjue	Woodruff, Mich.
Maciora	Sabath	Wright

NAYS—174

Andrews	Geriach	May
Arends	Gibson	Meyer, Md.
Arnold	Gifford	Michener
Baldwin	Gilchrist	Monroney
Barden	Gillette	Moser
Barnes	Gillie	O'Brien, N. Y.
Barry	Gore	O'Neal
Bates, Mass.	Gossett	Pearson
Baumhart	Graham	Peterson, Ga.
Bender	Grant, Ind.	Pheiffer, William T.
Bennett	Guyer	
Blackney	Gwynne	Plumley
Bland	Haines	Powers
Boggs	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Rabaut
Bolton		Ramspeck
Bonner	Halleck	Reed, Ill.
Boren	Hancock	Reed, N. Y.
Brown, Ga.	Hare	Rees, Kans.
Brown, Ohio	Harness	Rich
Bryson	Harter	Rizley
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Robertson, Va.
Burgin	Hébert	Rockefeller
Butler	Heidinger	Rockwell
Camp	Hess	Rogers, Mass.
Cannon, Mo.	Hoffman	Russell
Carlson	Holbrock	Sasscer
Chapman	Holmes	Secrest
Chiperfield	Hunter	Simpson
Clason	Imhoff	Smith, Va.
Claypool	Jarman	Snyder
Clevenger	Jenkins, Ohio	South
Coffee, Nebr.	Jennings	Springer
Cole, N. Y.	Jensen	Sullivan
Collins	Johnson, Ill.	Sumner, Ill.
Cooley	Johnson, Ind.	Sumners, Tex.
Cooper	Johnson, Luther A.	Taber
Cox		Talbot
Crawford	Jones	Tarver
Crowther	Jonkman	Thomas, N. J.
Cunningham	Kean	Thomason
D'Alesandro	Kerr	Tibbott
Davis, Ohio	Kilday	Treadway
Dewey	Kinzer	Van Zandt
Dickstein	Kleberg	Vincent, Ky.
Dirksen	Kunkel	Vorys, Ohio
Disney	Lambertson	Wadsworth
Dondero	Landis	Ward
Doughton	Lanham	Wheat
Douglas	LeCompte	Whittington
Duncan	Ludlow	Wigglesworth
Edmiston	McCormack	Williams
Elston	McGregor	Wilson
Faddis	McLaughlin	Winter
Fenton	McLean	Wolcott
Fish	McMillan	Wolfenden, Pa.
Folger	Maas	Wolverton, N. J.
Fulmer	Mahon	Woodrum, Va.
Gamble	Mansfield	Young
Gathings	Martin, Iowa	Zimmerman

NOT VOTING—84

Allen, Ill.	Bell	Buckler, Minn.
Bates, Ky.	Bishop	Buckley, N. Y.
Burch	Harrington	Randolph
Burdick	Harris, Va.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Cannon, Fla.	Hart	
Capozzoli	Heffernan	Rodgers, Pa.
Carter	Hobbs	Sacks
Casey, Mass.	Howell	Satterfield
Celler	Jarrett	Scanlon
Clark	Jenks, N. H.	Schaefer, Ill.
Cluett	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Schulte
Cole, Md.		Scott
Copeland	Kee	Shannon
Crosser	Kilburn	Sheridan
Culkin	Kocialkowski	Sikes
Cullen	Kramer	Smith, Ohio
Dies	Lynch	Smith, W. Va.
Ditter	Marcantonio	Smith, Wis.
Drewry	Martin, Mass.	Stearns, N. H.
Durham	Mason	Stratton
Eaton	Myers, Pa.	Sutphin
Ellis	O'Day	Tinkham
Fellows	O'Leary	Vinson, Ga.
Ford, Leland M.	Oliver	Vreeland
Ford, Miss.	Osmers	Walter
Gale	Paddock	Wene
Gavagan	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Worley
Green		Youngdahl
Hall, Leonard W.	Plauché	
	Ploeser	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Gavagan for, with Mr. Ploeser against.

Mr. Youngdahl for, with Mr. Ditter against.

Mr. Buckley of New York for, with Mr. Vreeland against.

Mr. Gale for, with Mr. Cluett against.

Mr. Celler for, with Mr. Tinkham against.

Mr. Cullen for, with Mr. Eaton against.

Mr. Lynch for, with Mr. Allen of Illinois against.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer for, with Mr. Kilburn against.

Mr. O'Leary for, with Mr. Bishop against.

Mr. Capozzoli for, with Mr. Culkin against.

Mr. Heffernan for, with Mr. Jarrett against.

Mr. Michael J. Kennedy for, with Mr. Rodgers of Pennsylvania against.

Mrs. O'Day for, with Mr. Osmers against.

General pairs:

Mr. Vinson of Georgia with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Drewry with Mr. Copeland.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Carter.

Mr. Harris of Virginia with Mr. Oliver.

Mr. Burch with Mr. Leland M. Ford.

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Green with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.

Mr. Durham with Mr. Stratton.

Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.

Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Paddock.

Mr. Randolph with Mr. Howell.

Mr. Crosser with Mr. Fellows.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Kee with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Smith of Wisconsin.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

Mr. Sutphin with Mr. Marcantonio.

Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Hart.

Mr. Plauché with Mr. Harrington.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. Scanlon with Mrs. Byron.

Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.

Mr. Kramer with Mr. Sacks.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Kocialkowski.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Walter.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Wene.

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 40: Page 46, line 16, strike out "$14,321,425" and insert "$17,350,075."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 40, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment, insert "$14,330,075."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, that is simply a correction of the total.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 41: Page 46, line 23, strike out "$879,730" and insert "$892,337."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 41.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 42: On page 47, line 18, strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 42.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 43: On page 47, line 19, strike out "$68,800" and insert "$74,830"

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 43.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 44: On page 48, line 3, strike out "$17,175,635" and insert "$22,704,285."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 44 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$17,184,285."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, this is merely a correction of the total.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 45: On page 48, line 11, strike out "$6,500,000" and insert "$7,500,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 45.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 46, 47, and 48 be considered together, as they relate to the same subject matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 46: On page 48, line 14, strike out "a part" and insert "parts."

Senate amendment No. 47: On page 48, line 15, strike out "amount" and insert "amounts."

Senate amendment No. 48: On page 48, line 15, strike out "year 1942" and insert "years 1942 and 1943."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 46, 47, and 48.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 79: On page 77, line 9, after "payments", insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, persons who in 1942 carry out farming operations as tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government and who comply with the terms and conditions of the 1942 agricultural conservation program, formulated pursuant to sections 7 to 17, inclusive, of the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, shall be entitled to apply for and receive payments, or to retain payments heretofore made, for their participation in said program to the same extent as other producers."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division of the motion.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Has this provision any connection with the amendment adopted by an overwhelming vote of the House, limiting the soil conservation payments to $1,000?

Mr. TARVER. No; indeed. This has no relationship whatever to that amendment. This relates to an entirely different subject matter. This is a provision which has been carried in the bill heretofore, which would permit the payment of soil-conservation benefits to men who farm as tenants on Government-owned lands. There are a great many tenants within forest areas owned by the Government, and some on lands owned by the Soil Conservation Service, who carry on their own farming operations. Without this provision in the bill they could not secure pay for carrying on soil-conserving practices which redound to the benefit of the Government and improve Government-owned lands, although other farmers located on privately owned lands can receive that type of payment.

As I have said, this is simply a provision that gives simple justice to these men. It has been carried in the bill in prior years, and would have been inserted in the bill by the subcommittee in connection with reporting the bill to the House except that it is legislative in character and, therefore, under the House rules we could not include this provision.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the gentleman for the explanation.

Mr. TARVER. Does the gentleman from South Dakota desire some time?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I should like to have the gentleman yield me some time when I offer my amendment, after the motion to recede is agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. I have nothing further to say at this time, and shall be pleased to yield the gentleman some time if he wishes to address the House now.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then I will explain the situation right now.

Mr. Speaker, the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia was a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. I asked for a division of the question for the purpose of offering an amendment when we reach that stage. I propose to offer this amendment at line 13 on page 77. The language of that proviso, beginning on line 10, reads:

That notwithstanding any other provision of law, persons who in 1942 carry out farming operations as tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government who comply—

And so forth—

shall be entitled—

And so forth. My amendment would insert after "by the United States Government" the words "or by any State," so as to make it possible for those who rent from States to qualify the same as those who rent from the United States Government.

This amendment is designed to take care of the situation that is created by the scrapping of amendment No. 78, the latter part of which took care of share-renters on lands owned by States such as Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, and other States that own and rent lands. Unless such an amendment should be adopted we would have a discriminatory situation where one man renting from the United States Government would be entitled to qualify for payment while his neighbor across the road, renting from a State as landlord, would not be.

Mr. TARVER. I wish to say to the gentleman that I think his position is eminently fair, that if under this proviso in connection with existing law the tenants of State-owned land could not obtain these soil-conservation payments for carrying out soil-conservation practices they are entitled to them, and if his amendment is necessary in that connection I think it ought to be adopted. I confess the question has never been called to the attention of our subcommittee and I have made no study with reference to it to determine whether these tenants are entitled under existing law to secure these benefits or not; at any rate I do not think they ought to be done an injustice, and so far as I am concerned I am willing to agree to the gentleman's amendment so that when we take up the matter in conference we can determine whether its final adoption would be wise or necessary.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I appreciate the gentleman's position and his fine sense of justice. This situation arises from the fact that noncompliance by one share renter from a multiple landlord throws the other share renters out of compliance. A landlord renting on shares is held to be an operator and if he is out of compliance on one farm he is out of compliance on all of them. The landlord may not care but it is hard on his tenants if they cannot pay cash rent and become the sole operator. I believe the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], who is rising, is familiar with the situation.

Mr. HOPE. I would like to ask the gentleman a question. As I understand the situation in South Dakota and in some adjoining States, the $10,000 limitation upon payments discourages and in some cases prevents the States from going into the program, which also prevents the tenants from participating in the program. If this amendment were adopted the $10,000 limitation could still apply as far as the States were concerned, and the States as landlords could go into the program or stay out as they choose, but their tenants could go in and would be entitled to receive their payments notwithstanding the fact that the States might choose not to come in.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman is correct. Many States have become large landlords. My State has owned 7,000 farms which it rents to farmers. The amendment as offered does not change the $10,000 limitation on payments to any one operator. It will not help the State treasury or the State as a landlord, but it will give the tenants on State-owned land the same opportunity to participate as tenants on lands owned by the United States Government as is provided by the Senate language.

Mr. TARVER. I am sure no member of the conference on the House has any objection to the gentleman's amendment and I hope we may have a vote on the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, having waited patiently for an opportunity early in the debate, and speaking generally with respect to the report, I take this belated opportunity to say with respect to it, in the first place, your Subcommittee on Appropriations for Agriculture spent some 90 to 110 days listening to everybody who wanted to talk to it. Then we passed the bill. It went to the Senate. It came back with over a hundred amendments. We went into conference.

Of course, if I could have had my way, probably I would have increased certain appropriations a little, and you may be sure I would have very decidedly decreased others. But I could not have my way.

For example, if I could have put the Monroney amendments into full, practical force and effect, I would have been inclined so to do. There is no sense or rhyme or reason in the representatives of 15 departments all traveling to the same place and undertaking to do what 1 should be able and ought to do. However, I could not see the practical way to accomplish what MONRONEY was endeavoring to do, and what I would like to do, without doing serious damage to some things I favored and thought ought to be done. So I compromised.

The report pretty well speaks for itself. Insofar as it does not, I am sure that there are those who are perfectly competent to do it who will make their positions very clear.

I admit I assented to some proposals and suggestions of compromise almost against my own better judgment, except for the fact that I would always rather have half a loaf than none at all.

The results of the impact of the opposing forces are evidenced in the conference committee report we have brought out. I have no alibi. I did all that I could do from the standpoint of the minority to sustain the position of the House in regard to the really important and money-spending items. Insofar as I could do it, I made the best trades I could in negotiation, if and when a trade was involved.

If the Department of Agriculture needs more money to provide for the necessities of the Department and of the people, in order to promote the winning of the war, more than we need it otherwise to defend ourselves, and if the Department is able to convince us that this is so, then I will go along with them on a deficiency bill. Otherwise not.

I am going to support the report and defend the position of the House. Such action really should not be called defense, for taken all in all it is, as I see it, the common-sense attitude with regard to the situation as it confronts us.

Not to suspend, without damage to anyone, the farm-tenancy program for the duration is an indefensible expenditure of the taxpayers' money.

The House proposal for Farm Security loans and the program is protective, sufficient, and an adequate sum has been provided.

As to the sales of Government-owned or controlled agricultural commodities, the position of the House is and will be justified for that we must have parity for all or none. And there are other reasons which appeal to those who think and are not pressed to vote by selfish minority groups under threat of reprisal.

Despite all alleged gratuities and subsidies, the farmer is the first man who suffers from the effect of extravagant spending of his hard-earned dollars extracted from him as taxes. He is for justice to all and economy in all things. So am I.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion that the House recede from its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion to concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CASE of South Dakota moves to concur in the Senate amendment with the following amendment: On page 77, between lines 12 and 13, after the phrase "by the United States Government", insert "or by any State."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 81: On page 79, after the figures at the end of line 14, insert "and the applicable rate of the payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the purposes of the 1942 agricultural conservation program."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments Nos. 83, 85, and 86, which relate to the same subject matter, be considered together. These are the amendments relating to the limitations proposed on the administrative expenses of the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 83: Page 81, line 13, strike out the word "and" and insert the word "or";

Amendment No. 85: Page 81, line 18, after the word "agriculture", insert ": *Provided further*, That not more than 125,000,000 bushels of wheat may be sold for feeding purposes."

Amendment No. 86: Page 81, line 20, after the period insert ": *Provided further*, That no grain shall be sold for feed at a price less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments 83, 85, and 86.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following preferential motion which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN moves to recede and concur in amendments Nos. 83, 85, and 86.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes. When the agricultural appropriation bill passed the House it was with this proviso which prohibited the use of any of the funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the purpose of selling Government-owned or controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price, as defined by the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. The Senate made five amendments to this proviso. One of them is a mere technical change of language, and has been agreed to in the conference report. One of them, No. 84, involves the striking out of the word "alcohol" in the House language permitting the sale of deteriorated grain for purposes of feeding or of manufacturing alcohol, and the insertion of the words "ethyl alcohol, butyl alcohol, acetone, or rubber." The House has already agreed to amendment No. 84 in the conference report. The question involved here is whether or not the House will agree to this amendment, which would permit the sale of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat, not deteriorated wheat, for feeding purposes at a price which shall not be less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made.

The amendment proposed by the Senate—and to which, I believe, the unanimous feeling of the conferees on the part of the House is that the House should refuse to agree—is, in my judgment an amendment which would absolutely destroy the parity principle. It is not an amendment in which either I or the district from which I come have any direct interest, except that my district might be more interested from the standpoint of the consumer in a lower price for wheat than it would be in a higher price for wheat because, while some wheat is raised in my district, it is not a producer of wheat for commerce, and the larger portion of my constituents are consumers of wheat and of wheat products, and, therefore, it might be thought that from a selfish interest alone I would favor the House agreeing to the Senate amendment, which is an amendment undoubtedly calculated to bear the price of wheat, but I shall adopt no such selfish view. I think those of us in this House who represent farm constituencies must stand together, if we are ever going to be able to carry out any beneficial program in the interest of agriculture. The just rights of the wheat and corn farmer are of interest to the cotton farmer and ought to be of interest to every fair-minded citizen. Nothing has been done by the Senate to this proviso which in any way affects the interest of cotton unless cotton is affected by the decline in the price of other agricultural commodities, which I conceive to be true, but whenever the Representatives from cotton areas in this House undertake to take the position that because legislation is not of a character which directly affects cotton or cotton producers, and fail to stand by their colleagues in the wheat- and corn- and tobacco- and rice-producing areas of the country, when their interests become vitally involved and when their position is right, simply because cotton is not directly concerned, we are going to cease as Representatives of agricultural areas to be a force in this House which is capable of accomplishing anything, either in behalf of the cotton grower, the corn grower, the wheat grower, or in behalf of any other segment of agriculture. Every Member of the House should be interested in maintaining the just rights of all citizens on all occasions.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does my distinguished friend want to leave the record that he is appealing to the House on this occasion to support his position on the basis that those who represent farming districts must stand together? I am sure the gentleman, knowing him as I do, does not want the record to stand that he is appealing to the Representatives of farmers to stand together when

we are here as Representatives of the United States.

Mr. TARVER. I think the gentleman will understand me clearly before I conclude.

May I say to the gentleman that unless the Representatives of the agricultural areas of the country do stand together in support of simple justice—not in support of any grab from the Treasury of the United States; not in support of any extravagance for the benefit of agriculture, but unless they do stand together in support of those things which are fair to agriculture, it is my conception that those things will never be achieved.

We talk about trying to keep down the cost of living. That is the object of these amendments. The object of these amendments is to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to manipulate the farm markets so as to depress the prices of agricultural commodities. I do not make that statement inadvisedly, because if you will examine pages 40 and the following pages of part 1 of the hearings held in the House on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill you will find that the Secretary of Agriculture frankly avowed that to be his program, and in the course of his evidence at that time he did not spring this business about selling a quantity of wheat for feeding purposes. That was an afterthought. All that he had in mind then was being allowed, when he thought the price of wheat was too high or the price of corn was too high, even though it had not reached parity, to feed quantities of these Government-owned stocks of wheat and corn into the market, for what purpose? Not for stock-feeding purposes but to depress the price and prevent an increase in the cost of food products manufactured from wheat and corn to the consuming public of this country.

Now, for years we have professed the purpose to try to bring about in some way parity prices for agricultural commodities. We have been led to believe that because of current conditions in the United States the time might be approaching when farmers' prices, if they are not interfered with in some way such as this, may approach and in some cases exceed parity. When we are about to come onto the threshold of our hopes and dreams during this long period of years we are met by the proposition that the markets are to be manipulated by the Government or agencies of the Government, so as to prevent the achieving of that goal, parity, which we have so long sought. And that that is to be done in the interest of holding down the cost of living to the consuming public of this country, most of whom are on a far better basis with reference to parity conditions in their incomes than the farmer is with reference to parity conditions in his income.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. RAMSPECK]. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

These Representatives from the industrial areas of the country in the main have been standing by in this fight to obtain simple justice for our agricultural population. They have not voted against parity for the farmer. That is, most of them have not, even though somebody in their districts might raise the specious claim that if a few cents more were obtained by the farmer for a bushel of wheat it would increase the cost of bread. As a matter of fact, the cost of bread to their constituents is usually about 10 cents a loaf, whether wheat is selling for 50 cents a bushel or for $1.50 a bushel. There is very little connection between the price of the raw product, wheat, as it leaves the farm and goes to the market, and the cost of the finished product, bread, as it enters the home of the average consumer. But the industrial worker of this country wants the farmer to obtain a fair price for his product. If the average industrial worker of the country, according to statistics which have been submitted to our committee, were comparing his condition with the 1909–14 level he would be getting over 300 percent of what he got in the period from 1909 to 1914, and here is the farmer still struggling trying to get 100 percent of what he got back there. Under those circumstances, no one can convince me that the fair-minded industrial worker wants to hold the farmer's price down below even 100 percent of parity, simply in the hope that some dealer in foodstuffs may slightly reduce the price of his bread below what it would otherwise be, which would probably be a forlorn hope.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. HAINES. As the gentleman knows, I represent both agricultural sections and industrial sections. The thing that bothers me is this tremendous surplus of wheat on hand. I am told there are 200,000,000 bushels of the 1940 crop stored away; about 400,000,000 bushels of the 1941 crop, and there is an estimated crop of 800,000,000 bushels for 1942. In my district they cannot even find available space to store the wheat. I do not see why we could not permit those farmers to use this wheat as feed.

Mr. TARVER. This proposal, if the gentleman understands the Senate amendments correctly, is not to let the farmers use their wheat as feed, but to let the Government of the United States use wheat that belongs to it, the Government, which has professedly been trying to bring about parity conditions in agriculture, to depress the price of wheat. I do not think that the adoption of these amendments would result in a considerable increase in the consumption of wheat. I think the country is going to consume about the same amount of wheat whether the Congress insists on a continuance of the conditions that will bring about parity prices or not.

This is simply a provision which is intended to depress below parity levels the price of wheat and corn. I cannot see how its adoption would in any way tend to get rid of the wheat surplus to which the gentleman has referred. Let me make this further observation, nobody knows at this time when the war conditions which now obtain are going to be ended. There are some of us at least who hope there may be a chance they will be ended within the next year. Whenever they shall be ended there will be hundreds of millions of people in this old world of ours who are now in destitute circumstances and who will then be starving, who will want your tremendous surplus of wheat, and the humanitarian spirit of this country is going to insist that those people shall not be allowed to starve; so I am unable to agree that in the present state of the world you are able to say that you have too much wheat or that you will have too much wheat. After the present crop is harvested it may well be that despite this huge surplus to which you refer you still will not have the wheat necessary to relieve the human suffering which will exist among so many hundreds of millions of people after this war is over. I am unable to believe that at that time it is going to be a calamity to have too much bread.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Why should they insist upon reducing the price of grain for industrial alcohol when we all know that the producers of this industrial alcohol are making the most unconscionable profits of any manufacturer in the war effort?

Mr. TARVER. I quite agree with the gentlewoman and shall be pleased to yield her a couple of minutes in which she may expand her idea.

I certainly hope the House will send these matters back to conference in order that if possible agreement may be reached with the Senate. I sincerely hope that the Congress of the United States will never consent to the destruction by the Government itself of the parity principle.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. In the event this bill goes back to conference will it be possible for the conferees to work out a proviso whereby domestic wheat could be supplied to our domestic millers at a competitive price with Canadian wheat to permit those millers to export that flour? Under present conditions they can buy Canadian wheat in bond and export that wheat without paying duty; as a result they purchase wheat from Canadian sources rather than domestic sources.

Mr. TARVER. All matters which are within the differences represented by the language of the House bill and the language of the bill as it passed the Senate would be within the scope of the conference. As to just what language different from that which now appears in the bill might be worked out I, of course, am not in position to say. I may say, however, there exists a very well-defined notion on the part of some of us that this anxiety to receive huge quantities of Government-owned wheat for feed pur-

poses may be a desire on the part of the millers of feedstuffs to procure cheaper supplies for the manufacture of their products and that if they should succeed in doing that, their having done so would not necessarily be reflected in any lower price to the consumers of their products.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I do not like either provision.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of my amendment is to provide cheaper feed for the farmer's livestock from this huge surplus. The Department of Agriculture is in favor of the amendment; the administration is in favor of the amendment. Who is going to get the benefit? The farmer. It is the farmer who is going to get cheaper food for his livestock. Farmers will be encouraged by this cheaper feed to raise what is needed.

Further, the operation will stabilize the price of meat, and so forth, to the consumer, but do not forget that at the same time we are going to pay the farmer fair, or parity, prices for what he puts on the market. It cannot be denied that the House amendment requires the farmer to pay a higher price for feed. If it does not, let somebody correct me.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. As a matter of fact, the farmers who buy this wheat as feed do not get it at any lower price, because the wheat is sold to the processor and he sells it out at the regular old price to the farmer.

Mr. COCHRAN. Why does not the farmer buy it himself?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The farmer does not buy it from the Government.

Mr. COCHRAN. He should, and it is the intent of the amendment that the farmer get cheaper feed. I want the farmer to get the benefit. The trouble with the farmer is that he does not get a fair share of the price the consumer pays; it is the middleman who gets the money. That has always been the trouble, but Congress has never by legislation sought to cure it.

If the farmers are going to be foolish enough, when the Government sells this wheat below parity, to let somebody buy it and resell it to them at a higher price, then they do not deserve any sympathy. We do not want them to do that.

Give the farmers this opportunity and, in my opinion, they will extend themselves. They are patriotic, they want to do everything they can to help win this war, and they are doing it. If we cannot feed our soldiers they cannot fight. We need this food. We need it for those in the armed forces.

The administration is appealing for this legislation and have been appealing for it all the time. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania asked, and I have had letters to the same effect, where are you going to store this year's crop of wheat if you do not get rid of some of the surplus?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman says the administration is appealing for this amendment. Can the gentleman point out where the administration has made any such demand that the farmers produce food at less than cost? When he produces wheat at 85 percent of the parity price of corn, as provided in the pending amendment, he is producing it at less than 71 cents per bushel, and that is less than the cost of production.

Mr. COCHRAN. This is not taking it away from the farmers. This has nothing to do with production. It solely refers to sale of the surplus which belongs to the Government.

Mr .CANNON of Missouri. Where has the administration ever made any such request? The administration has never asked that the farmer be compelled to sell $1.13 wheat for 71 cents? The administration is always willing for the farmer to have a fair price. The administration endorses farm parity, and that is $1.13 for wheat and 84 cents for corn.

Mr. COCHRAN. We want to give the farmer a fair price. I have voted for that ever since I have been here and will continue to do so.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman does not answer the question. He says the administration is for the amendment. Will he point out where the administration has announced that it is for the amendment?

Mr. COCHRAN. That question is not involved here at all.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman raised the question. He urged the passage of his amendment, because he says the administration is for it. Will he point out where the administration has asked for it?

Mr. COCHRAN. I read a letter from the Department of Agriculture submitting an argument in favor of it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman does not quote the letter or give its author. And who in the Department of Agriculture is authorized to commit the administration to so astounding a reversal of policy?

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can assure the gentleman that the administration is in favor of the Senate amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I shall be glad to have the gentleman submit documentary substantiation of such an epoch-making commitment. This administration is for a fair deal for the farmer.

Mr. COCHRAN. Please speak in your own time. You can get it. You are a member of the committee. I have only 5 minutes.

We are going to put our hands into the Treasury of the United States and show a loss upon the surplus wheat that we have in storage by letting the farmers have the feed at a lower price than the Government paid for it. The gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] is just as stanch a friend of the farmer as there is in this House and he agrees with what I say. I am willing to go along with the gentleman from Oregon. He is a wheat farmer and he represents nothing but farmers. When the Government wants to give something to the farmers, how can those who represent the farmers stand up and say, "No; we are not going to let the Government do anything for the farmers"? Why, it is absurd to say that. I am trying to help the farmers by getting them cheap feed, although I come from the city. I have tried ever since I have been here.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get into a controversy with those who represent the farmers in this great body. I am very sorry to hear the argument advanced and the appeals made in this body that those who represent farming districts must stick together.

I have not a farm in my district. I spoke for the Bankhead cotton bill when it passed this House by six or seven votes. I spoke in favor of the farmer-tenant legislation when it passed this House by a very few votes. I spoke in favor of all legislation in the past 10 years that was beneficial to the farmers of this country and I did that not as one who represents a farming district but as an American, trying to view the farm problem from a national angle. It was the problem of my people just the same as it was the problem of the people of the rural districts. May I state, and I do not say this in any critical sense, that I hope the appeal to blocs and groups will not be made because the reaction to that is to appeal to the city group, and under no conditions will anyone condone that and under no condition would I make such an argument. I like to look at this from a broad angle. Certainly this Government is not trying to destroy parity. The very administration that created parity trying to destroy it? Why, I cannot follow such an argument.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I have the utmost respect for the gentleman and I could not refrain from yielding to him.

Mr. GILCHRIST. Why does this bill say that the farmer shall get only 85 percent of parity if the gentleman favors full parity?

Mr. McCORMACK. Because the bill also provides that the farmer in any event shall receive parity. Oh, yes. This grain may be sold for 85 percent of parity to the farmer on the poultry farm, the man who produces meat, eggs, and milk, or the dairy farmer. The Government may sell this for 85 percent of parity, but, if I

understand it correctly, the Government pays the farmer the parity price.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. McCORMACK. For a correction.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. This bill permits the wheat to be sold for 85 percent of the corn parity; in other words, 53 cents under the wheat parity, if the gentleman from Massachusetts would like to know the fact.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is not so.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I ask the gentleman to discover the facts and know what he is talking about.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman is rather dogmatic, but certainly no one intends that. I am not so strong in my convictions that I would say the gentleman is wrong, but I think he is wrong.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I ask the gentleman to ask other gentlemen here from the committee if I am not right on that point. Read the bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. The language of the amendment is—

That no grain shall be sold for feed at a price less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made.

Therefore, the amendment would permit the sale of wheat at 85 percent of the parity price of corn.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Now, I will accept the gentleman's correction.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman from Georgia construe it to be the intent of the administration that that should exist, or is that a mistake in the amendment inserted by the Senate, in all frankness?

Mr. TARVER. I would not undertake to interpret the mind of the administration, but I am quite sure that it is the intent of the authors of the amendment in the Senate that this should be the provision, and the Senate itself, as I understand, rejected a proposal that it should be limited to 85 percent of the parity price of wheat.

Mr. McCORMACK. I merely wish to observe that this motion to recede and concur takes into consideration the interests of the entire country, not only the farmer but the consumer. Certainly it is wrong to prohibit the Government from selling this excess grain and compel it to sell it at 100 percent of parity.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, June 6, 1942.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McCORMACK: Enclosed is a statement explaining the issues involved in the difference between the Senate and the House versions of the current agricultural appropriation bill with respect to sales of Government-owned and Government-controlled grain. This statement is being sent in order to facilitate discussion of this matter at the meeting to be held Monday morning, June 8.

Copies of this statement have been sent to the President and to Hon. SAM RAYBURN.

Sincerely yours,

THOMAS J. FLAVIN,
Assistant to the Secretary.

[Enclosure.]

GOVERNMENT SALE OF GRAIN FOR LIVESTOCK FEED AND ITS RELATION TO THE COST OF LIVING

AN ANALYSIS OF HOUSE AND SENATE PROVISIONS OF THE 1943 AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL RELATING TO SALE BY THE GOVERNMENT OF GRAINS FOR LIVESTOCK FEED

The facts

1. The Nation has abundant feed in the ever-normal granary.

2. The Nation needs to convert this surplus feed into needed meat, milk, eggs, and similar products.

3. To encourage farmers to make the conversion, the Department of Agriculture is selling grain for feed at moderate prices.

4. To be fair to grain producers, payments are made to them to make up the difference between the sale price and parity price. The effect of the whole operation is to stabilize the prices of meat, milk, and eggs to consumers, and at the same time to pay farmers fair (or parity) prices.

5. The 1943 agricultural appropriation bill as it passed the House would jeopardize this program by forcing the Department to sell feed grains to farmers at higher prices. This would either increase the cost of living and increase the danger of inflation, or it would cut down food production. Whichever happened, the war effort would be hampered.

6. The Senate version of the bill would enable farmers to go ahead full speed with the wartime production program, and would help stabilize living costs of consumers.

The situation

The 1943 agricultural appropriation bill, as passed by the House, contains a provision which has the effect of prohibiting the sale of Government-owned or Government-controlled stocks of farm commodities at less than parity price.

Senate amendments permit grain to be sold at less than parity, limiting sales of wheat to 125,000,000 bushels for feed.

The present and prospective large Government holdings, which have been built up in ever-normal-granary storage, make the price at which the Government sells these accumulated stocks an important factor in the whole feed-price situation. As of May 30, Commodity Credit stock totaled 63,000,000 bushels of corn and 315,000,000 bushels of wheat. Probably most of the approximately 100,000,000 bushels of wheat still under loan will also be acquired by the Commodity Credit Corporation. These stocks are the equivalent of about one-fifth of an average corn crop.

As of May 15, the average farm price of corn was 81 cents a bushel, or 83 percent of parity. As of the same date the average farm price of wheat was $1 a bushel, or 74 percent of parity. The House proposal would force the Government to raise its prices on corn to around $1 a bushel and on wheat to around $1.35 a bushel. Because the Government holds such a large part of the supply, the price of feed grains would go to the parity price of corn.

Effect of the House provisions

Stated in its simplest terms, the effect of the House version would be:

(a) To increase the cost of living by making food costs go up; or

(b) To force farmers to cut down on the production of foods needed to help win the war.

How the House provision would force up the cost of living

Forcing the Government to sell at parity would drive up all corn and wheat prices. This would raise the cost of feeding cows, chickens, and hogs. This would increase the cost of the foods most needed for the war. It would mean higher prices for milk, for meat, for eggs, for butter, for lard; in fact, for all livestock, dairy, and poultry products.

How much the cost of living would be affected

If legislation is passed which causes corn prices to advance to parity, the maintenance or further increase of livestock production can be obtained only by a substantial increase in the prices to consumers of milk, meat, and eggs. In order to maintain the present increase in the production of these livestock products with higher feed costs it might be necessary to increase the consumers' annual food bill by a billion dollars.

How the House provision would cut down on production

The most important factor encouraging farmers to maintain and increase livestock production is the relationship between feed prices and livestock prices. This leads to one simple conclusion which sums up the whole present problem. When feed is low in relation to livestock prices, farmers expand livestock production. When feed is high in relation to livestock prices, farmers cut down or go out of livestock production.

To make successful war, we need the largest possible production of meat, milk, and eggs. The prices of hogs and cattle are somewhat above parity and those of eggs and milk, about at parity. Corn is the basic livestock feed grain. With prices of corn at 85 percent of parity, feeding ratios are favorable to expanded production of livestock and livestock products without consumers having to pay exorbitantly high prices for them. Expansion is taking place. For example, the number of pigs raised in 1942 will be the largest on record—nearly 100,000,000 head.

These favorable feeding ratios have been maintained in considerable part because of the policy of the Department of releasing corn and wheat for feeding purposes at about current corn prices, or 85 percent of corn parity. The Senate version of the agricultural appropriation bill would permit the Department to continue this practice. The House version has the effect of prohibiting the sale of corn at less than the corn parity, and of wheat for feed at less than wheat parity. Such prohibition can have only one result; namely, a steady and probably rapid advance in corn prices and corresponding declines in feeding ratios and in livestock production.

The taxpayer would pay several times as much under the House proposal as under the Senate proposal, but the farmer's income would be the same

It is estimated that under the House bill costs to consumers of milk, meat, and eggs might go up as much as $1,000,000,000. Under the Senate bill the costs to consumers will tend to be held at the present levels. But the incomes of farmers will be the same under either bill. Maintenance of corn prices at the current level, or 85 percent of parity, will not reduce the income to corn growers. Any difference between parity prices for corn and the price at which corn sells on the market will be made up to them through parity payments, for which the pending agricultural appropriation bill carries authorization. Wheat growers are likewise protected.

If the Department is permitted to continue its current practice in the disposal of corn and wheat, the cost to the Treasury of making sure that grain growers receive fair or parity prices would amount to perhaps $125,000,000 to $150,000,000. Thus the Senate version of the bill gives farmers the same return as the House version, but the Senate version will cost the public only a fraction as much. Additionally the Senate version retards inflation; the House version promotes inflation.

Higher food costs will threaten labor's position

The House measure has in it the seeds for prolonged controversy over labor. If food prices rise materially, wage earners will inevi-

tably ask for wage increases to match the food costs. This in turn will bring further pressure to restrict labor's earnings, causing disunity at a time when unity is essential.

There is no surplus of the livestock products this legislation would affect

We do not have surpluses of meats, dairy, and poultry products. We need all of these that we can produce.

Wheat may spoil for lack of storage

We do have large supplies of wheat and corn that can be turned into meat, milk, and eggs. As a matter of fact, the United States wheat supply for the coming season promises to be the greatest in our history, nearly a billion and one-half bushels. This is double a normal supply. Our storehouses are already nearly full. Millions of bushels of wheat will be on the ground this fall for lack of storage. The House provisions would aggravate this situation by slowing up the consumption of this wheat for livestock feed.

Our surplus wheat and corn can be used to produce the livestock and dairy and poultry products we need, but to do this prices of feed must not be so high as to discourage farmers from producing.

The wheat and corn we have has been stored in our "ever-normal granary" for use in an emergency. The emergency is here. It is folly now to tie the Nation's hands so that we cannot make the best possible use of our feed reserves in the crisis against which we stored them up.

Dairy farmers especially endangered

Dairy farmers in the big milksheds would suffer especially from the effects of the House provisions. The prices they receive are set under various State and Federal marketing agreements and orders. Changing prices under these agreements is a lengthy process. Under the House version of the bill, the feed prices of dairymen would rise rapidly, but it might be a much longer time before their prices could be adjusted to meet these costs.

If milk prices were maintained at present levels while feed costs went up sharply, many farmers would simply be forced out of production. Both—they and the consumers—would lose in the process.

The present situation is one of reasonable balance. It assures an incentive to full production. It protects farmer's income. It stabilizes prices to consumers. This situation can be maintained under the Senate version of the appropriation bill.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN].

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, here before us today we have this question: Are you for parity for the farmer or are you not? This bill calls for the possible sale of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat at a price not below 85 percent of corn parity. This means that the Government can sell wheat in the neighborhood of 50 cents a bushel under wheat parity. This amendment, unfortunately adopted by the Senate, means that every bushel of that wheat sold for feed gives the speculator in Chicago an opportunity to hold down the price of corn to 85 percent of its true value.

You have all seen the market crumble lately due to this manipulation by the Senate. You have seen the price gradually go down. It is not a question of the farm bloc against any other bloc. I personally have voted for every section of the country and am willing to give them all a square deal. This is simply the question, Do you want to give the farmer of the Nation the same square deal that everybody else is entitled to?

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ARENDS. I wonder if the Members of the House know exactly the true market condition of corn today. Out in our district the corn price today is 74 cents, and the parity price of corn is 95 cents.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In my district, next to the Dakota line, corn sells for 67 cents and 68 cents a bushel today. We have cold, wet weather. It appears as if we are not even going to make a profit on the farming throughout that large section of the country this year.

Let us refuse to agree to the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] and let us say to the farmer of the Nation that at least he is entitled to 100 percent of parity, 100 percent of a square deal, the same thing we want to give to each and every group in America.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. MURRAY. If the powers that be are interested in the consumers, can the gentleman reconcile that interest with the fact that they let the price of pork, for example, be around 125 or 130 percent of parity—despite the fact that there is a law on the books under which Henderson any day he wants to can put on a ceiling of 110 percent of parity—and turn around and ask your neighbors to furnish the corn to feed the hogs at 85 percent of parity?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That is unfair.

Here is another point. We in our country pay 30 percent more for farm labor today, yet the price of corn on the farm today is exactly the same as it was last year. Is that fair? Are you through the acceptance of the sale of this 125,000,000 bushels of wheat going to keep corn below 85 percent of parity?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I am fully in accord with all that has been said this afternoon upon the principle of maintaining parity prices for farm products. However, I believe that some who have spoken have misconstrued the effect which the adoption of the Senate amendment would have on prices. I think the whole matter has been much exaggerated.

In discussing a problem like this we ought to be practical and realistic. In the present instance we cannot shut our eyes to the fact that we will have on hand when this present crop is harvested an estimated total of 1,440,000,000 bushels of wheat in this country, whereas no one can figure out how we are going to consume more than 700,000,000 bushels next year unless we feed a part of it. The only way we can feed wheat is to get the price down where it is competitive with other feed grains.

So the only chance I see for us to get rid of this tremendous surplus of wheat, or even keep it from piling higher and higher, is for us to adopt the Senate amendment which will permit the sale of at least 125,000,000 bushels of wheat for livestock feed at a price which will be competitive with corn and other feed grains. Then if we can sell a reasonable amount for alcohol, that will further assist in getting rid of this surplus.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I am sorry I cannot yield just now.

The statement has been made that this wheat may be needed sometime. This may be true, but we are in a situation now where the storage problem is a most serious one. Practically every bushel of commercial storage in this country is filled. Seventy-five or 80 percent of the wheat crop, the one that is about to be harvested, is going to have to be stored on the farms. Some of it will have to be stored under conditions which will result in deterioration and loss. So there is not much use in our trying to preserve and store this wheat on the theory that we are going to need it in 2 or 3 years to feed hungry people somewhere in the world, because if we store it under those conditions much of it will spoil before that time. We had better take it now, feed it to livestock, produce needed livestock and dairy products and use them for ourselves and our allies in winning the war. After we use all that can be consumed for feed and alcohol there will still be a large carryover if it can be safely stored for feeding hungry people. furthermore, Canada, Argentina, and Australia have large supplies available for that purpose.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. Very briefly.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to support what the gentleman is saying. The farmers in my section of the country are back of this Senate amendment. They want to be able to purchase this wheat for feed purposes.

Mr. HOPE. The farmers in my section are for it and I represent the largest wheat-growing district in the United States. The wheat farmers of this country, I think, are for the Senate amendment for the further reason they realize that unless we can get rid of some of this wheat for feed we are going to have to further reduce wheat acreage and cut the average wheat farmer down to where his acreage permitted for wheat will be so small it will not pay him to produce wheat. That is the situation we are up against.

I realize there are Members here representing corn-growing areas, who take a different view of the situation, but I believe in the long run it is to the interest of all grain producers to get rid of this enormous surplus of wheat because, unless we do, it is going to bog down the market for all grain products.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. What is the gentleman's justification for cutting the grain price below parity in order to add to the profits of the industrial alcohol profiteers?

Mr. HOPE. I do not believe that question is involved in this discussion.

I now yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. What is the relative feeding value for livestock of wheat and corn per bushel?

Mr. HOPE. I think the relative value is about the same, but most feeders are accustomed to feeding corn and, consequently, if you are going to sell wheat for feed, ordinarily, it is necessary to sell it at a little lower price than corn.

Mr. HINSHAW. Why not sell it at equal prices if they are of equal feeding value?

Mr. HOPE. That is what this bill proposes.

Mr. HINSHAW. I thought it was 85 percent.

Mr. HOPE. This bill provides that no Government-owned corn or wheat shall be sold for less than 85 percent of price of corn. In other words, both corn and wheat may be sold at 85 percent of the parity price of corn.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. ARENDS. Following the gentleman's line of reasoning, I suppose if we were to make permissible the selling of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat, then it will necessarily follow we will not produce that much corn, and we will have to keep on cutting down on the amount of corn acreage.

Mr. HOPE. I do not believe we are going to have any great surplus of livestock feed in this country if we continue to carry out the food program that is now in effect.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some question raised as to the position of the farm organizations on this subject. As far as I know, only two of these organizations have expressed themselves on this amendment. These two organizations are not in agreement. The Farmers' Union represents a large proportion of the wheat producers of this country. It is for the Senate amendment. I submit herewith as a part of my remarks a wire which I understand has been received by all Members of the House from that great organization:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 8, 1942.*

Today's votes on farm appropriation conference report place a great responsibility on you. What the House sows today the Nation will reap next year. House conferees are still recommending greatly reduced Farm Security program. Such economy of dollars is no economy of manpower and land resources of our many underemployed low-income farm families. Farmers in our organizations resent the attempt to dispossess many thousands of these families by cutting off Farm Security Administration aid so that big commercial farm operators may have cheap labor. We hope you will vote with the President and with the Senate in sustaining an adequate production-loan program through Farm Security Administration. We urge also the adoption of tenant-purchase funds at Senate figure. This program contributes to increased production also. We hope you will vote for the Senate proposal to increase the worthwhile school-lunch program through reappropriations totaling $45,000,000. This amount will still leave our underfed children far behind British children who are receiving our lend-lease food. Some Congressmen are worried lest granting authority to Commodity Credit to sell grain below full parity establish a precedent. We see no cause for alarm on the part of any section of farmers. Maintenance of farm prices in their present relationships is guaranteed by terms of Senate amendment. However, attempts to force up farm prices can bog down all our livestock feeding plans and do great harm to wheat and small-grain producers. We must move at least the amount of grain provided by Senate if disaster is not to befall wheat producers. Otherwise much grain will not qualify for loans because of lack of any storage space and wheat acreage will perforce be cut next fall. Agriculture's war contribution depends in large part on turning down this conference report. The Nation will not soon forget any selfish efforts to restrict its vital food supply in wartime. The amount of food which will be lost if the House conferees are not voted down would feed an army of approximately 3,000,000 men. We hope you will weigh these issues carefully before voting.

Respectfully,

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.
M. W. THATCHER,
President, National Federation of Grain Cooperatives.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I favor the motion of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN], not because the administration is for it, but because it is the right thing to do and that is why I am asking the membership of this House to vote for it.

Eighty-five percent of the corn crop of this Nation is disposed of or fed in the county of its origin. Eighty percent of it is fed on the farms where it originates. The price of corn is going to run to parity. The price of hogs is going to carry it there. There is not going to be any such thing as trouble in getting parity for corn.

This matter of the price of wheat is a tremendously serious one. The wheat farmer has got to get his wheat out of storage. At the present time there is not even any storage where it can be put unless the Commodity Credit Corporation goes to work and gets rid of this grain for feeding purposes for which there is a demand. In view of the tremendous demand for pork, in view of the tremendous demand for cattle, in view of the tremendous demand for dairy products and poultry, we must not have that wheat piled up, a continuing and ever pressing menace to the price of wheat.

Let us get rid of it while the chance is here to get rid of it, and not fool around any longer. It is the right thing to do. We can turn it into something now where it will be used. Let us turn not only all of the spoiled wheat but 125,000,000 bushels of the other wheat into something that can be used for the war effort. Let us support the war effort instead of imagining something that does not exist. Those people who are disturbed about the price of corn are needlessly disturbed. There can be no substantial sale of corn below the parity price, because the feed demand will put it there. It says that no grain shall be sold for less than 85 percent of the parity price for corn.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield at this time.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. But corn is grain.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GILCHRIST].

Mr. GILCHRIST. Mr. Speaker, I represent a district in Iowa that raises more corn than any other district in the country.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I do not want to yield. The purpose here is to make a market for wheat and to raise hell with the market for corn. There is no other explanation of it. We had disaster and bankruptcy in the corn-farming areas of our country after World War No. 1 when we had to sell corn for 8 cents a bushel. We burned corn in our homes in order to keep warm, rather than sell it for 8 cents and then buy coal with the money. We burned corn in the courthouse in the county where I live. Foreclosures swept away the homes of our farm people. Since then there have been many attempts to help and many failures, and corn farmers remained in submergence and economic loss and failures. We had the McNary-Haugen proposition, but it was twice vetoed by President Coolidge. Then we tried the Farm Board ideas of the Hoover administration, but this was worse than useless, because its final result was to give $500,000,000 to grain speculators and nothing to farmers. We then passed the processing tax bill, but this was held to be unconstitutional and void by the Supreme Court in 1936. We now have the A. A. A. program under which we warehouse grain on the farm and under which farmers get parity payments and conservation allowances. Now the present proposal seeks to do away with the parity principle for which we have been fighting all of these years. We have told the farmer that he ought to have parity. Does anyone believe that he ought to be placed below parity or to be on a level less than parity with other people, or that farmers in Iowa should be lower and not on a par with the people of Massachusetts or of Kansas, or that the corn farmer is not entitled to as fair treatment as the wheat farmer? Shall such a disparity be enacted into law by this vote? Shall Congress by law

kick one farmer down and raise the other up by this vote?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILCHRIST. I do not think I will yield to the gentleman. He fully agrees with me, but I cannot yield for lack of time.

The parity principle is the thing that we have taught, that we believe in, that we have prayed for, that has been promised, but this motion simply provides that wheat shall come into the corn areas and be sold for prices away below the corn parity price and thus put corn off of the market. I do not object to the language that was in the bill as it passed the House several weeks ago. That was fair language, but now they say that the parity principle shall be done away with, and that wheat be sold for feed and that the corn people be forgotten. If this bill passes there will be no commercial price for corn, because the price will be exactly that which the Secretary of Agriculture happens to want it to be. He made a speech at Atlanta on February 28 and said at that time that he could sell pool wheat and other commodities at prices below parity, and corn went down the next day 5 cents a bushel in the Chicago market. That is what the Secretary of Agriculture might again do to you if this motion passes. However, I hold him in respect, but I know that this is unfair class legislation of a vicious type. It will not reduce feed surpluses, as now claimed, because every bushel of wheat sold for feed will displace other feeds and leave surpluses exactly as before. That argument is spurious. You have no right to rob Peter in order to pay Paul.

I know what the cattle barons of the West want. They want cheap feed and to force down corn prices, but they have no regard for the tenant farmers or the farmers on the ordinary farm homes and lands throughout the country. They seem to think that these farmers should be mendicants and live on the alms that Congress might vote as parity payments to them. These parity appropriations will cease some day. We nearly lost the parity appropriation 4 years ago. Farmers would like to sell their products for good prices and for parity prices, and for cost of production or profit prices without regimentation, and in the open markets. And if this motion carries, then parity as a principle is lost, and it is lost forever. Outside of the war effort, we have no more momentous question before Congress. I cannot make a full statement in the 3 minutes given to me but thank the chairman for a chance to say this much.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I am a farmer, living on my farm, and I have raised in my time 2,000,000 bushels of wheat. I sold it as low as 18 cents a bushel and as high as $2.50 a bushel. We are faced with a serious condition in the wheat world. If we do not harvest a single bushel of wheat this year, on the 1st of October we will have an ordinary carry-over. We have to do something about it. Our foreign markets are entirely gone. The Government gives us 85 percent of parity on a loan. The farmers take advantage of that and sell their wheat to the Government. The Government today has millions of bushels on hand. If wheat is used for feed, it must compete with the price of corn. It must be sold for 85 percent of the parity price of corn. It has about the same value as corn for feeding. I have fed thousands of bushels of it, and I know something about it. It is in the interest of the wheat farmer, as well as of the livestock producers, to allow the Government to dispose of these millions of surplus bushels.

The world today has a 3-year supply on hand. There is now no market for it. Allow the Government to dispose of this at the parity price for corn. I saw my section go broke from end to end on 25-cent wheat. If the control of the Government should be removed from the price of wheat today, it would not be worth 25 cents a bushel. You could not sell it. Nobody would dare put any money into it. There is no warehouse room for it. There is a tremendous supply.

Now, let us consider this matter from the point of view of the stockmen. We are going to need greatly increased production of livestock in the United States if we are going to be able to furnish our own people with their average amount of meat and at the same time furnish our Allies with a substantial amount.

Livestock production can only be increased when the ratio of livestock prices to feed grains is favorable. At the present time we have a fair supply of feed grains, but a very large increase of livestock is on the way, and to bring this livestock to maturity will take a larger amount of grain than is or will be available.

To make up for the shortage in feed grain it is extremely desirable that wheat be made available to livestock feeders at a price comparable to corn. We have a very large surplus of wheat. If this can be made available to livestock feeders at prices about equal to corn at 85 percent of parity, most feeders would turn to wheat whenever their feed supply of corn or other grains ran short.

This 125,000,000 bushels, which we ask the privilege of selling, is the product of about 10,000,000 acres. A few years ago we had 80,000,000 acres in wheat. This year we have 55,000,000 acres. If we cannot dispose of the surplus, we may expect the wheat acreage to be cut one-third. The total allowance is already greatly reduced and the wheat farmer now faces legislation for a further cut.

The Senate Appropriations Committee approved a provision that would enable the Commodity Credit Corporation to sell not more than 125,000,000 bushels of wheat to livestock feeders at prices not lower than 85 percent of parity for corn. If we are to obtain maximum livestock production, it is extremely important that the House conferees accept this provision.

Vote for the Cochran amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, first let me observe that I share with our majority leader the belief that this should not be couched on sectional grounds. As a matter of fact, there is involved the principle, there is involved the faith, there is involved the whole question of the general welfare. How singular it is that in the page preceding the page on which these amendments appear we wrote into this bill before it left the House this language:

> The Under Secretary is authorized and directed to make such additional commitments or incur such additional obligations as may be necessary in order to provide for full parity payments.

That is the language of the bill as passed by both the House and the Senate. You will find it recorded on page 78. Now we propose, by considering a motion to concur in the Senate amendment, to torpedo the principle which has been assured to the rice farmer, the tobacco farmer, the cotton farmer, the corn farmer, the wheat farmer ever since 1933. Are you going to run out on them? Maybe you will. I do not propose to do so today.

Let me observe also, and meaning no effrontery whatsoever, that it is rather regrettable that this amendment has not been carefully read. What does it say? First, let us look at it in terms of what we wrote in on the House side. We provided that sales could be made below parity on four different bases. The first one was if a sale was exclusively for relief. Secondly, a sale could be made below parity if it was deteriorated grain, for feed. Third, you could sell below parity if it was deteriorated grain, for alcohol; finally, if it was normal grain which was being used for seed.

Now comes the Senate with its language, and let us examine what it will do, because there is much misapprehension today. Here is what the Senate language will do: Any kind of grain can be sold for less than parity if it is for relief. That is identic with the House language.

Secondly, if it is deteriorated grain and is sold for feed or for alcohol.

Third, if it is any grain—any grain, corn, or wheat, except there is a limitation that when you sell wheat for that you are limited to 125,000,000 bushels and the price must be not less than 85 percent of corn parity. Is it not paradoxical, is it not ridiculous that the same farmer can take a wagon over here and put his wheat into a loan and get $1.15 as a loan from the Federal Government, and take another wagon and buy some of this same wheat for grain at 80 cents a bushel? You had better read the language. You are going to torpedo the farmers; and I will say to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], not only the corn farmers but the wheat farmers as well. Read the limitation. It says "not more than 125,000,000 bushels," for what? For feeding purposes. They are mixing corn and wheat in proportions of 50–50 for alcohol. We are charged with the production of 575,000,000 gallons of high-proof alcohol for the dehydration of

powder. It takes a half a pound of alcohol to dehydrate a pound of smokeless or TNT powder. They will use corn. They will use wheat below parity because the limitation of 125,000,000 bushels applies only to feed wheat.

What is going to happen to our corn farmers? Our distilleries are not manufacturing gin and whiskey today. They are going to start producing for Uncle Sam.

Mr. Jones appeared before the Gillette Committee and said, "We allocated 200,000 tons of rubber out of a program of 1,000,000 tons to grain alcohol." It will take an awful lot of alcohol, and all of it, under the provisions of this bill, can be sold for any price that you can get for corn and wheat. What is going to happen to the farmers' market? Butyl alcohol, acetone, ethyl alcohol, and rubber are all exempted in the Senate language. That will include not only wheat from Kansas and Oklahoma, but it will include corn as well, and your market will be gone, and nothing can stop it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. HOPE. Is it not a fact that for the last 3 years the price of both corn and wheat has not been made on the open market, but solely by means of Government loans, and is it not further the fact that those sales will not in any way affect the Government loan price?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The only way you can get a market price on corn is corn that goes into industry; the Corn Products Refining Co. and the distilleries. That is all that establishes the market price unless you have a loan. But look at what this language says:

Provided further, That not more than 125,000,000 bushels of wheat may be sold for feeding purposes.

That is the language. Does it say anything about any industrial use? Does it say anything about use for any other purpose for less than the other limitation which is 85 percent of the parity price of corn? If they are equivalent in food value, as the gentleman from Oregon has indicated, why should you want to sell wheat for 85 percent of corn parity and penalize the corn farmers of the country?

Mr. PIERCE. Because you have such a tremendous surplus of wheat and you have not of corn. We just want to get into your feed yard awhile.

Mr. DIRKSEN. We will take a loss anyway, but if you follow this language of the motion on the desk today you are going to torpedo the whole agriculture-adjustment program; that is what you are going to do.

Mr. PIERCE. The gentleman knows as well as I do that it is a fixed price, a legislated price; we have abolished and suspended the law of supply and demand on wheat, cotton, and corn.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. FULMER. The pitiful thing is that it is all in the name of the farmer when as a matter of fact the profit is going to the manufacturer of mixed feed and the manufacturer of alcohol at the expense of the consumers in the last analysis.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I may say to the gentleman from South Carolina that under the Senate language 125,000,000 bushels of wheat may be used for feed at a price which is below parity. The grain that will go into the production of 200,000 tons of rubber will be sold without regard for parity; whatever goes into relief will go without regard to parity; whatever goes into powder—600,000,000 gallons of alcohol, which means 250,000,000 bushels of grain—will be without regard for parity. What will happen to the farmer?

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Has the gentleman given any consideration to the fact that Henderson has placed a price ceiling on cattle and now is about to amend that order by lowering it to the extent of possibly 75 cents a hundred pounds? This means it will be impossible for corn feeders to receive parity for the corn if Henderson is going to insist on breaking the price ceiling.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let us not be in the ridiculous position appearing on page 78, "full parity," but on page 80 saying, "Disregard parity."

Mr. TARVER. I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized for 8 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, let us not approach this proposition under any misapprehension. Of all the votes cast in this session of Congress none is more significant or so far reaching in consequences and future implications. And of all the votes cast in this Congress, from the day it convened until now, there is none of deeper political import than the vote you are about to cast on this amendment.

We have heard a great deal of surmise as to who favors the amendment. But there can be no doubt about who is against it.

Every member of the conference committee representing the House on both sides of the aisle, comprising the entire subcommittee on agricultural appropriations, after a study of the question covering months, after taking testimony from all departmental representatives, and after hearing from the farmers and the country, are unanimously against it. Every farm organization in the United States is against it. As difficult as it is to get unanimity of action on the part of groups from all sections of the country, they are a unit on this question.

The National Grange, the Council of Farm Cooperatives, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the Farmers' Union, the Missouri Farmers Association, all present a united front against this insidious effort to submarine the principle of parity with which the farmer's one hope of bare remuneration for his indispensable part in the war program is inextricably linked—every farm organization in the United States is against this amendment. Every farm journal, every farm paper in the United States which has carried a statement on the subject is against it because they know the devastating effect such a law would have on the individual farmer, on American agriculture, and on the economics of the Nation as a whole.

And who is for the amendment? Why, you have had the opportunity to observe for yourself here this afternoon. My friend, for whom I have the warmest regard, the gentleman from Massachusetts, the majority leader, tells us frankly that he has not a farm in his district. My good friend from Missouri, one of the most lovable men in the House, JACK COCHRAN, has not got a farm in his district.

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, yes; he has.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Oh, yes. I overlooked the county poor farm. And my colleague on the committee, the able and distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], who so ardently champions the amendment—what is his normal attitude toward farm legislation? Never in his life, never in his entire service in this Congress has he supported parity payments or any other measure to insure farm parity, never has he voted for any proposal to increase the price of farm products. It would be an amazing reversal of form if he should at this late date take any other position. He is sound on most questions, he has rendered invaluable service in preparation for the war and in the prosecution of the war, but he belongs to that school of thought which wants to fight the war at the farmers' expense while everybody else revels in the highest wages and highest profits the world ever saw.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I deeply regret that my time is so limited. I hope the gentleman will excuse me.

Much has been made of the statement that the different branches of agriculture should stick together—that they have a common cause in their opposition to this amendment. The wisdom of such a course is self-evident. Those who are endeavoring to take the farmer's wheat from him without consulting him on the price have sedulously endeavored to leave the impression with the producers of other farm products that this legislation will affect wheat prices only—that the price of other agricultural commodities will not be affected. The course of the markets belie such conclusions in a remarkable manner. The prices of all farm products have been slowly advancing as parity advanced in response to the precipitous rise of all factors on which computations of parity are based. But following the drafting of this amendment the price of all farm products dropped uniformly in sympathy with the drop in the price of wheat. Here is a market report from the Journal of Commerce of June 9:

GRAIN QUOTATIONS CONTINUE DECLINE

Wheat tumbled more than 2 cents, rye more than 3 cents, and soybeans 3 and 3½ cents.

Wheat came within about 1 cent of the 8 months lows posted last week. July oats equaled last week's 1942 low, some soybean

futures were at new bottom figures for the season, and all rye contracts hit lows not quoted here since November.

NEW LOWS REACHED IN COTTON FUTURES—WEEK'S LOSSES $6 A BALE

Prices reached new lows since early January, with the July and October positions selling well below 18 cents. Since a week ago Monday the market has declined 119 to 125 points.

The prices of farm products are so related that when you vote to depress the price of one you vote to eventually wreck the price of every farm commodity grown.

Mr. Speaker, although the farmer is doing more to win this war than any other worker in America, agriculture has received less legislative consideration than any other industry in the land. Congress has voted wages, prices, profits, and income for every other group. We gave the railroads the Transportation Act guaranteeing them returns on watered stock. We gave labor the wages-and-hours law and the National Labor Relations Board, and placed a floor under wages and a ceiling over hours. We gave the industry a law guaranteeing both wages for their labor and profits for their investors. We stabilized the oil industry with the hot-oil bill. And the farm Congressmen voted for all of them, because the farmer believes in fair wages and fair prices and a decent standard of living.

But when the farmer asked for his turn at the legislative mill to enable him to pay the increased costs of living and production imposed by the laws enacted for other groups, he was shouldered aside. The only response to his importunities for enough to pay for his shipping costs, his labor products, his coal, oil, and gas for his tractor and other items artificially priced by law, was the grudging grant of bare parity where others were receiving as much as three and a half times parity. And now it is proposed by this amendment to take away from him even the hard-won principle of parity.

And here let me disabuse the minds of many who are constantly making the statement that the basic period of parity was the period in which farmers received high prices. The period of 1909–14 was a period of inadequate farm prices. No farmer was able to make a competence in those years. If he made ends meet and held onto his farm in those years the steady increment in the price of land permitted him to retire in his old age. But it was not on his earnings. It was on the gradual increase in the value of his land. The period of high farm prices was in 1919 and 1920 and again in 1929. Prices were two or three times higher in those years than during the basic period of parity.

But what is the specific proposition embodied in this amendment? It is a proposition to take away from men the products of their labor without consulting them as to the price. It is Government confiscation in that they are allowed no voice whatever in dictating the terms under which their property is sequestered. It is a proposition to fix the wages of labor because the price of agricultural products is the farmer's wage. They propose to send men out into the field to labor all long days at a wage which is fixed by law. The law says how much he shall get for his labor and the farmer gets that much and no more, regardless of the fact that every other wage earner negotiates his pay. There is no other class in America subject to such arbitrary impressment. American labor universally has the right of collective bargaining, and no one has made a stronger fight for labor's right to collective bargaining than I have.

It is an old fallacy. It goes back to medievalism. They tried that back in the ill-starred reign of Richard the Second. In the year 1350 Parliament passed a law in which they fixed the price the farms, and the farmers alone, should receive for their products and the wage the farms and the farmers alone should receive for labor.

And now this amendment proposes to go back 600 years and try it all over again. It did not work then and it will not work now. The farmer will make any sacrifice anybody else will make, but he refuses to be made the exception. The farmers of 1776 protested the fixing of taxes without representation and the farmers of 1942 will protest just as vigorously the fixing of wages and prices without representation. There was a day when the farmers, isolated and unorganized, knew little of the factors affecting their economy. But today, thanks to radio and the press, the people of the agricultural sections of the country are as well informed as anybody and at last they are organizing. And you may expect to hear from them in no uncertain terms when the news of today's proceeding is broadcast from this floor.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] may be again reported.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Cochran motion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the nays had it.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The question was taken; and on the division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—yeas 57, noes 125.

So the motion was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question recurs on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments 87 and 88, which involve the same matter, be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 87: Page 82, strike out lines 3 to 11, inclusive.

Amendment No. 88: Page 82, after line 11, insert the following: "To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to further carry out the provisions of section 32, as amended, of the act entitled 'An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes,' approved August 24, 1935, and subject to all provisions of law relating to the expenditure of funds appropriated by such section, there is hereby reappropriated for the fiscal year 1943 the unobligated balances of the funds made available for the purposes of such section 32 for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942. Such sums shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, other appropriations made by such section or for the purposes of such section."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 87 and 88 and concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 90: On page 84, line 19, strike out "$1,250,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 90 and 91 be considered together, since they involve the same subject matter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment numbered 91.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 91: On page 84, line 22, strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$40,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 90 and 91 and concur therein.

Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the House Committee on Appropriations reported this bill to the House with provision for making available by loan $45,000,000 for the farm-tenant land purchase program. This amount was $5,000,000 in excess of the Budget estimate. The House later in the consideration of the bill on the floor reduced the amount of the proposed loan program to $25,000,000. The Senate has restored the amount to $40,000,000, which is exactly the Budget estimate.

In the fund provided for the administration of these loan funds, the Senate figure of $2,000,000, in which in the motion I have made I have asked the House to concur, is $500,000 under the Budget estimate. Therefore, if you should agree to the motion I have submitted, the net result would be that the money made available for this program would be $500,000 less than the Budget estimate.

I do not want at this late hour of the day to enter into a detailed discussion of the farm-tenant land-purchase program, because we have discussed it here

so many times that it is unlikely that any Member, certainly not I, would be able to add anything to the store of knowledge the House may have on that subject.

This is a program which is paying for itself. It is a program where the percentage of repayments of current liabilities of borrowers is in excess of 99 percent, a much higher percentage than the percentage of repayments of loans made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to business in this country.

When the overpayments or prepayments are taken into consideration the amount which has been repaid is, as I recall it, approximately, 120 percent of the obligations which have become due. It is not a program which is as widespread as some of us would like to have it because of the comparatively small amount of money involved, but it certainly has accomplished a great deal in aid of a class of people in this country who are urgently in need of assistance and it is not costing the Government of the United States anything like as much as the Government is suffering in financial loss in the extension of aid to the business interests of the country through the instrumentality of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I do not care to discuss the matter at any greater length. The authorization for this program is $50,000,000. The Senate has provided only the amount of the Budget estimate which is $5,000,000 below the amount which was approved by the Appropriations Committee in the House and I certainly hope there can be a settlement of the issue here involved for this session of the Congress at least by receding and concurring in the Senate amendments.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. I wonder if the gentleman would not make it plain that this does not involve an appropriation of money to be paid out to somebody, but this is loaned for the purpose of buying these farms and the Government has been getting the money back.

Mr. TARVER. I think the House understands that that is the situation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, first I am a little amused that my chairman of the subcommittee should ask to have all the rules and precedents of the past set aside. Here in the House and in every committee when a motion is only tied, it is always defeated and that ought to hold good even when it gets down to where it is hot.

If there is any argument for setting anything aside in these war times, it is for setting aside the land-purchase-tenant program. It has nothing to do with the emergency, nothing to do with defense. It is entirely outside of that. Here we are buying small farms or large farms for farmers. This is a bad time to buy farms. There is a little inflation in land values now and it is a poor idea for anybody to buy a farm who expects to farm in the future, because when this war is over we know they are going to be cheaper.

Another thing involved is that labor is in demand on the farms. Buy a farm or furnish the money for a tenant to buy a farm in a period of depression and it is easy to help him. He is occupied on his own farm, but today he can get a job, and it is just as dignified to be an honorable hired man and to support your family that way as to be a poor landowner and owe the Government and everybody else. He can get a job on the farm, he can get a job any place today, and it is just like the W. P. A., or it is just like the C. C. C. They were to provide for unemployment and they were organized during the depression. This is less justified than the C. C. C. because they rendered some public service, as did also the W. P. A. Yet we have cut them in two or cut one out entirely and another in two. Land tenancy has nothing that would dovetail in with defense or with the emergency, nothing at all. Every argument and every reason is against buying these farms and putting these fellows to farming when the Government can use them all in the emergency for absolutely other things.

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield.

Mr. SOUTH. I do not understand the gentleman's statement that this is a relief measure. The gentleman knows, does he not, these tenant farmers are paying back this money and paying interest on it? How is that a relief measure?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. It is in the same category as the relief measures. It is to help people along by providing Government aid in loans. That was done when we were down in a depression, but there is less justification for this because this is a poor time to get them in debt. They can find good jobs otherwise, and in my country, as I have said before, it has always been just as dignified to be a hired man as to be an owing tenant. All of our good farmers today have been hired men, or half of them at least, in the years gone by.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman tell us about when the Budget made up these figures that the chairman has referred to? He puts great emphasis on the fact that the figures here presented are in conformance with the Budget. When were those Budget figures made up?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I think the most of them were made up last fall.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, they were made before Pearl Harbor?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Before we declared war?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Before we got into this trouble, this terrible catastrophe that is world-wide?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. And if there is anything we can do constructively to help the war effort, it is to eliminate some of these things which add to inflation, about which the whole country is burning up today. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. It is fine. I challenge anybody to present anything that we could more beneficially get rid of during this emergency than this farm tenancy program. If anyone knows of anything that could be more effectively submerged in this emergency, I challenge him to mention it.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Yes.

Mr. HULL. I suggest possibly the $65,000,000 loan made to the Argentine farmers. That might be eliminated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY].

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in favor of the adoption of the motion of the chairman of the subcommittee to recede and concur in the Senate amendments. This tenant farm purchase program was debated very thoroughly in the House several years ago, and we adopted the principle of making annual appropriations to assist in this program. We afterward changed from appropriating funds for the purpose to authorizing loans from the R. F. C. We have legislative authorization for $50,000,000. This authorization for loans is $10,000,000 under that, or $40,000,000. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON], who preceded me, said that this program is like the W. P. A., or other relief programs. This is essentially not a relief program. It is one to further the aspirations of the poorer class of farmers of our country, to offer them a chance of becoming the owners of their own farms. That is the American ideal, and this bill is in furtherance of the American ideal, so that every man may be given the opportunity to own land in his own right.

Secretary Wickard is asking the farmers of the country to assist in the food-for-victory program. It is recognized that the larger farms of the country are producing probably up to their limit, and that the increase in production will come from the small farms of the country. Therefore, this program will assist in the food-for-victory program. This is a most democratic program. The tenants who are considered for the purchase of these farms are carefully looked over by local committees of farmers, as you probably know. These are not grants handed out from Washington but are loans made by the R. F. C. to these farmers. They are paid back over a period of 40 years, with an interest rate of 3 percent. As was told you when this bill was before the House in March, these loans have been repaid 99 percent. That was emphasized by the distinguished chairman of this subcommittee. Certainly, when the record is examined and it is found that these loans are repaid 99 percent

and when the tenants are selected by local committees, and when the program has been endorsed by this Congress by due legislation, it seems to me that we should go ahead and should not curtail the program that brings to every farmer in this country the hope that ultimately he may aspire to be an owner of his own land.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, let us find out what we are going to do. When this matter of farm-tenant loans was before the House before, it carried an administrative item for salaries, expenses, traveling, and so forth, of $2,500,000. I offered an amendment to reduce it to $1,250,000. We came in with an item for the farm-tenant purchases of $40,000,000. That was reduced to $25,000,000, the House cutting out $15,000,000. Now, the action of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] proposes to concur in the Senate amendment which would restore $750,000 of the administrative item for personnel, salaries, expenses, supplies, and so forth, and would restore $15,000,000 that has been deleted by the House for farm-tenant purchase loans. My motion is that we ought to stand by the original action of the House for many reasons. In the first place, the figures submitted to the committee at the time would indicate that if you are going to buy a farm for everybody who wanted a farm and was in need, it would take 250 years, simply because more people are going into tenancy, and you will never quite catch up. If it is a 250-year program, certainly we can afford to suspend a portion of it for a while at a time when land values are going up.

The Secretary testified before our committee that land values had appreciated from 5 to 13 percent in different sections of the country. Are we going to carry on this program with more money to buy farms where values have appreciated and gone up, when in the post-war period we may take another loss? It seems to me we should hold this down to the bare minimum for a while.

They have had $175,000,000 altogether for this purpose in the form of R. F. C. loans and direct appropriations. They have purchased close to 24,000 farms. Let us look at the farm credit situation. I have stated before that of the 3,600 farm associations, over 2,000 of them today are delinquent. They cannot make loans. What is the reason for it? It simply means that you have got a bad situation in farm credit, and you are going to throw good money after bad. Most of these loans are maturing at the present time. Let a few more years of experience pile up and then see what the situation will be. That is when we will come to grips with this real problem.

Oh, they say this is R. F. C. money. Is it not strange that every time Mr. Jesse Jones runs out of money or runs out of the limit of borrowing or issuing debentures he comes over to Mr. STEAGALL'S committee and says, "I need a larger allowance for the issuance of notes, bonds, and debentures. I need more money with which to operate." So ultimately it gets back to the people, and if there are any losses they have to be absorbed out of the Federal Treasury.

Finally, there is enough money in the bill now with which to make 4,500 farm-tenant loans in 1943. Certainly in a crucial period like this the making of 4,500 loans, and a slight diminution of this program, would be ample for all purposes.

So I respectfully submit, in deference to the position that we have taken before and in deference to the fact that the conferees were split 4 and 4, the motion of the gentleman from Georgia should be voted down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I shall only take a minute for the reason that this question was fully debated in the House when the bill was passed, and this identical question decided by an overwhelming vote.

It is not merely that this plan does not solve the question of tenancy, because tenancy has increased steadily all the time it has been in effect, but even if it were effective, the proposition involves a nonessential expenditure. It is the predominant conviction of this House and certainly the predominant conviction of the country that for the present we should eliminate all nonessential expenditures; that we should devote every resource in this time of national peril to winning the war. This appropriation will not help to win the war. It offers no contribution to the national military program. It is a nonessential expenditure. It can wait until after the armistice. Let us win the war and then take up these minor domestic problems. I submit that we should again, as we did the last time the question was before the House, decisively reject this proposition to spend $42,000,000 in nonessential philanthropy.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SOUTH].

Mr. SOUTH. Mr. Speaker, I think we should look very carefully into this matter before we vote against the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]. In the first place, we are talking about cutting down expenditures and saving money, yet we are undertaking it in a manner that would do neither. The $15,000,000 involved in the amendment is money that will be loaned to the farmers at 3 percent interest. Will it be paid back? We can only look at the history of the program to determine that. The history of the program justifies us in believing that it will all be repaid.

To my way of thinking, there is more involved here than a few million dollars. Throughout the world today the men who are fighting for their various homelands are fighting pretty much in proportion as the people in those countries own the homes for which they are fighting. In other words, a man becomes a better citizen; he becomes a more loyal citizen; he becomes a better soldier during a time of crisis if he owns his home. He has more to fight for. For instance, today in Russia the Russian peasant is fighting as few men have ever fought before in the history of the world, because he loves the soil and is a part of the soil, and he will pay any price, even to that of his life, to defend it from an invading foe.

I certainly do not say that the outcome of this war, so far as America is concerned, depends upon the Tarver amendment, but I should like to point out to you that there is something of value involved in this thing. You cannot compare it with N. Y. A., C. C. C., or W. P. A. There is no comparison, so far as our public debt is concerned. The money this Congress appropriated a few days ago for N. Y. A. is money that will not be repaid. I am not criticizing that, but I do say to you that the money involved in this amendment is money that will be lent to the various deserving farmers of this country for the purpose of acquiring homes and that every dollar of it will be paid back with 3 percent interest. The only way it can be an expense to the Government is for the Government to have to pay more than 3 percent for its money, or if this money is not paid back, but the money is being paid back and the Government is borrowing its money for less than 3 percent. I say to you, in all candor and in all fairness, that it will not cost the Government any money; that it is a good thing and the amendment should be adopted.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUTH. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Will it not be necessary with this increase of funds for the Federal Government to borrow this $15,000,000 in order to be able to release it to the farmers?

Mr. SOUTH. It has to borrow the money, certainly.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Then it increases the burden of borrowing money for the Government at this time when we are selling bonds to prosecute the war.

Mr. SOUTH. Does the gentleman think it will be paid back?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Even though it may be paid back, the gentleman knows we shall have to borrow every dollar for it, as well as to prosecute the war.

Mr. SOUTH. Does the gentleman mean to say these loans are not being paid back into the Treasury?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It is a little difficult to follow all the gentleman's questions.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SOUTH. I yield.

Mr. POAGE. The Government is borrowing money for considerably less than 3 percent and lending it at 3 percent, and the money is being paid back, so there is actually a profit on the deal.

Mr. SOUTH. That is absolutely correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I have been thinking about this quite a bit. Everybody, I believe, realizes that I am rather conservative, and I do not like to see this Government borrow any more money than it has to borrow, but I have been impressed with this one fact: That we can borrow money and give it or lend it to every foreign country in the world, but we cannot take care of $50,000,000 to lend to the people of this country. I read in the newspaper last night where we had not even been asked by certain countries for help but we had offered to extend this lend-lease program to Poland, Belgium, and Greece. If we can borrow money to give to these foreign countries, or lend to them, we ought to be able to raise $50,000,000 to look after the third of the people of this country who are underclothed, underfed, or do not know what they are going to do.

When this war is over—it does not make any difference how soon—some of these men are going to come back and be very glad to have a little bit of land, because there will not be any business left in this country and many people have got to go back to the farm.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNS. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. Do I understand the gentleman to say that he is going to publicly subscribe to a loan program with a 40-year repayment period at a 3 percent interest rate when the rest of the farmers have to pay 3½ percent and that farm loans under certain administration-proposed legislation is going to be more than 3½ percent?

Mr. JOHNS. I do not know anything about that; there is nothing said about that here or how much they are going to be charged for it. My contention is that if we can lend all kinds of funds to foreign countries we certainly can find a way to raise funds to take care of our own people; and I believe the gentleman from Wisconsin realizes that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin has presented an unanswerable argument when he calls attention to the fact that we are lending millions of dollars to foreign governments, which we do not pretend to even express the hope that we will get back, and at the same time refusing to lend money to our own American farmers, whose sons are now defending us and our liberties, in order that they might purchase homes for themselves and their families.

Maybe it is necessary to make these vast loans to foreign governments. If such loans are essential to win the war, then the American people will offer no objection to them. The winning of the war at this time is more important than any other consideration, but I submit in all seriousness that to make such foreign loans which will not be repaid and refuse loans to the thousands of tenant farmers who are clamoring for an opportunity to own their own homes just does not make sense.

As was pointed out by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], the record of the Farm Security Administration in administering these loans has been outstanding. The record of collections is almost unbelievable. More than 99 percent of the loans have actually been collected, a record unequaled in the history of any other agency of government. That not only speaks well for the Farm Security Administration, but it is also a glowing tribute to the 18,000 farmers who have been able to purchase farms under this program. It is a guaranty that the 8,000 additional farmers who may be able to purchase farms if the Senate amendment is agreed to will also pay back to the Government every dollar borrowed with interest. The fact is I am advised that many farmers under this program have paid 3, 4, and 5 years in advance in order to cut down the principal and save the interest. Yet, despite this remarkable record, there are Members who continue to stand on the floor of this House and refer to the farm-tenancy program as a gift or as wasteful extravagance.

I am glad of the part I have played in the initiation of this farm tenancy program. Some of us recall that it was not an easy task to get Congress to appropriate the first $10,000,000 to start the program. It is well known that the able gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], and many other gentlemen, especially on the minority side, were bitterly opposed to this program from its very inception. With these gentlemen I have no quarrel. Considering the fact, however, that more than 60 percent of all the farmers in the State of Oklahoma do not own the land they till and that every one of them has a yearning in his breast for an opportunity of tilling his own soil, sitting under his own roof and by his own fireside, and the fact that a mighty forward step has been made in the direction of home ownership, I am proud of the active part I had in formulating the farm tenancy program and securing funds with which to operate. It occurs to me that the least this House could do would be to accept the Senate amendment, which is not a dollar above the Budget estimate and, if I remember correctly, $10,000,000 below what was actually expended during the past fiscal year for this worth-while program.

I hold in my hand a telegram from Tom Cheek, president of the Farmers' Union of Oklahoma, in which he expresses the hope that Congress will adopt the Senate amendment and follow the President of the United States in this matter of giving aid and assistance to the American farmer and thus make sure that there will be no shortage of foods during this war. That is what this amendment proposes to do.

Please bear in mind that on the shoulders of the farmers of America rests the responsibility of feeding our vast Armies as well as our Allies in many of the far-flung parts of the world. Regardless of the guns, the planes, and the battleships that are so essential to the winning of the war, we must not forget that a good army must be well fed and well clothed. This program will encourage the farmers to stay on the farm or return to the farm and grow the countless farm commodities that are so essential to the winning of the war.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri, our distinguished chairman.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Does not my good friend, who has always been a tower of strength for all beneficial agricultural legislation, believe that we could defer this legislation until after the war and then buy this land cheaper and thereby place a smaller burden upon the man who buys it and must ultimately pay for it?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I thank the chairman for his compliment. Answering his question, I would say, first, that it is only a matter of conjecture as to how long this war will last or what will happen to land prices when this war is over. However, if I recall correctly, for several months, maybe a year or so, after World War No. 1, the price of land actually advanced.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include as a part of my remarks three statements issued by the Treasury under date of May 9, June 1, and June 8.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD]?

There was no objection.

WASHINGTON, D. C., May 9, 1942.—Sale of United States Savings bonds for the first year of the defense savings program—from May 1, 1941, through April 30, 1942—totaled $5,389,350,000, as compared with sales of $935,191,326 of the old United States Savings bonds ("baby bonds") during the corresponding 12 months from May 1, 1940, through April 30, 1941, the Treasury Department announced today.

Comparative sales by months follow:

May 1940 through April 1941

1940:	
May	$61,171,766
June	45,253,723
July	65,838,577
August	49,411,194
September	43,142,160
October	48,402,306
November	46,320,821
December	76,486,179
1941:	
January	178,599,971
February	115,571,959
March	126,340,398
April	78,652,272
Total	935,191,326

May 1941 through April 1942

1941:	
May	$349,818,127
June	314,527,308
July	342,131,533
August	265,606,084
September	232,327,486
October	270,713,177
November	233,487,123
December	528,598,694
1942:	
January	1,060,546,352
February	703,200,345
March	557,891,869
April	530,501,925
Total	5,389,350,023

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 1, 1942.—May sales of War Savings Bonds were $634,357,000 or 5.7 percent more than the $600,000,000 quota set for the Nation during the month, Secretary Morgenthau announced today. In announcing that the first national monthly quota had been exceeded, the Secretary said the sale of War Bonds, by series, was divided as follows:

Series E bonds, $421,831,000; series F, $42,465,000; and series G, $170,060,000.

The War Savings Bond quota for the Nation for June will be $800,000,000, while the monthly quota for July and thereafter will be $1,000,000,000.

Total cash deposits at the Treasury for all three series of bonds by months: May 1941, $349,818,000; June $314,527,000; July $342,132,000; August, $265,606,000; September, $232,327,000; October, $270,713,000; November, $233,487,000; December, $528,599,000; January, $1,060,546,000; February, $703,200,000; March, $557,892,000; April, $530,502,000; May, $634,357,000. Total, May 1, 1941, through May 31, 1942, $6,023,707,000.

All figures are rounded to nearest thousands, and will not necessarily add to totals.

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 8, 1942.—The Treasury Department today announced the break-down by States in the sales of War Savings Bonds for the month of May.

The national quota for the month of May was $600,000,000. National sales for the month were $634,356,000, or more than 5.7 percent above the amount set. A table showing State sales for May follows:

Comparison of actual sales of War Savings bonds, series E, F, and G, by States, May 1942, with quotas established for the month

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Actual sales	Quota	Difference	Percent actual sales to quota
Alabama	5,285	3,787	1,498	139.6
Arizona	1,966	1,358	608	144.8
Arkansas	3,556	2,682	874	132.6
California	41,225	40,011	1,214	103.0
Colorado	4,327	4,086	241	105.9
Connecticut	16,518	13,228	3,290	124.9
Delaware	1,649	1,861	−212	88.6
District of Columbia	5,958	6,179	−221	96.4
Florida	6,716	5,794	922	115.9
Georgia	6,439	5,365	1,074	120.0
Idaho	2,208	1,451	757	152.2
Illinois	52,227	49,300	2,927	105.9
Indiana	14,910	10,926	3,984	136.5
Iowa	13,870	9,000	4,870	154.1
Kansas	5,290	4,617	673	114.6
Kentucky	6,177	5,558	619	111.1
Louisiana	5,875	4,944	931	118.8
Maine	4,146	3,295	851	125.8
Maryland	8,392	9,079	−687	92.4
Massachusetts	28,738	28,771	−33	99.9
Michigan	26,240	21,647	4,593	121.2
Minnesota	12,574	11,657	917	107.9
Mississippi	3,698	2,905	793	127.3
Missouri	18,713	17,075	1,638	109.6
Montana	2,156	2,785	−629	77.4
Nebraska	4,590	3,286	1,304	139.7
Nevada	692	581	111	119.1
New Hampshire	2,168	1,895	273	114.4
New Jersey	22,889	26,727	−3,838	85.6
New Mexico	1,185	1,055	130	112.3
New York	106,671	125,000	−18,329	85.3
North Carolina	8,190	5,889	2,301	139.1
North Dakota	2,059	1,393	666	147.8
Ohio	35,899	31,769	4,130	113.0
Oklahoma	5,919	5,389	530	109.8
Oregon	5,676	5,611	65	101.2
Pennsylvania	53,514	53,814	−300	99.4
Rhode Island	4,404	5,352	−948	82.3
South Carolina	3,097	2,453	644	126.3
South Dakota	1,731	1,239	492	139.7
Tennessee	6,484	5,141	1,343	126.1
Texas	22,479	18,594	3,885	120.9
Utah	2,057	1,201	856	171.3
Vermont	1,449	1,205	244	120.3
Virginia	9,092	8,965	127	101.4
Washington	11,082	7,581	3,501	146.2
West Virginia	4,032	4,103	−44	98.9
Wisconsin	12,280	11,977	303	102.5
Wyoming	984	1,003	−19	98.1
Alaska	492	198	294	248.5

Comparison of actual sales of War Savings bonds, series E, F, and G, by States, May 1942, with quotas established for the month—Continued

[In thousands of dollars]

State	Actual sales	Quota	Difference	Percent actual sales to quota
Canal Zone	190		190	
Hawaii	5,985	992	4,993	603.3
Puerto Rico	183	214	−31	85.5
Virgin Islands		9	−9	
Total	634,356	600,000	34,356	105.7

NOTE.—Figures in this table are based on preliminary telegraphic reports and are subject to revision.

Source: Office of the Secretary of the Treasury Division of Research and Statistics June 6, 1942.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the language of the pending bill provides that the money shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at 3 percent per annum. In order for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to get the money, it has to go to the Treasury of the United States. The Treasury has to go to the people and the banks of this country. At the present time the Treasury has a tremendous drive under way to have our people purchase a billion dollars worth of securities per month. In the month just closed we touched a fraction over $600,000,000. The Treasury is calling for $800,000,000 for June and $1,000,000,000 per month from there on.

This is no time to increase the farm-tenant operations. When the price-control bill was before our committee, I interrogated Secretary Wickard in regard to this question of increased farm land prices, and I asked him what he thought the people of this country would do when they were driven out of the speculative market by the fixing of prices through the Price Administrator. He said in substance he had not given that too much thought. I told him, "You will see land values go up considerably." That was during last August that we were discussing this. Since then land values have gone up, and they will continue to go up as investors and speculators move out of these commodity markets into farm real estate. You are pitting the future of the farm tenant against the bids of the men who have the money to put into farms. This is no time to indulge in this program, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, if we have any economic sense of balance at all it is high time we began to use some of it. Any man who wants to be sensible and who can comprehend the gravity of a situation can well afford to heed the circumference of the $200,000,000,000 war undertaking we are imposing upon the Nation and the financing problem which now confronts the Treasury of the United States. The forthcoming tax bill will necessarily impose burdens upon our people which they do not now comprehend but which will bear heavily upon their economic backs in the months to come. The financing burden that will rest upon the Treasury after its receipt of the greatly increased tax revenue will be the most staggering any Treasurer has ever had to manage. It is not yet too clear just what type of program the Treasury will be forced to follow. We can well afford to eliminate from present financing every nonessential and nonwar project that is presented to us for consideration.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. HULL].

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, my views regarding action on this amendment are similar to those expressed by my colleague from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Congress has increased the limit of lending for the R. F. C. to approximately $15,000,000,000. We have already appropriated about $161,000,000,000 for war purposes and we are going to appropriate in a few days, probably without a dissenting vote, another $39,000,000,000. It is all necessary to win the war.

While that has been going on, our Government has been extensively lending money to people in other nations. We have lent $110,000,000 to Argentina, much of which is still in the banks of Argentina, not used. We lent them another $65,000,000 for a farm program for Argentine farms. They made some use of that. Argentina recently sold 10,000 tons of corn at $4 per ton to Uruguay to be used for fuel. We have loaned Mexico $25,000,000 or $30,000,000 and we are getting ready to lend them more. The papers today announce a loan of $34,000,000 to develop the steel industry in Brazil. These are only a few of hundreds of such loans.

The only place where the shoe pinches, the only place in which we are called to account by some economy advocates regarding the extension of credit is when some poor farmer here at home wants to get a loan to buy a little piece of land out in my section or in some other section of the country. Then is when Congress commences to talk about the necessity of restricting loans.

Let me call your attention to this one fact in connection with those farmers. There are over 4,000,000 farmers in the United States who have an average income of less than $500 a year, right in these times when everybody is talking about the increased cost of living, just as though the cost of living has not gone up on the farm.

According to departmental estimates the gross income of all the farmers for 1941 was less than 12 percent of the national income. The gross income of the small farm owners and tenant farmers was approximately two billions of dollars, or less than 2 percent of the national income, although they comprise 16 percent of the total population and certainly, the Senate amendment under discussion should be concurred in. The food supply of our Nation comes from small farms as well as larger plantations. The loans proposed will aid in insuring that food supply in the future as well as during the war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. GEHRMANN].

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the House will concur in the motion that has been offered by the gentleman from Georgia to increase the farm tenant loan provision from $25,000,000 to $40,000,000. I certainly concur in what both my colleagues who preceded me from my State have said. We evidently have money enough and never squabble about lending it to any group, including farmers in South America. Certainly the farmers of the Argentine or any other countries of the world are no more important than our own farmers. While I favor friendly relations with other countries, it seems to me that our own farmers should come first. I have not heard anybody objecting to providing a loan for other countries, and they were not for war purposes either.

When this bill was under consideration earlier, I read parts of hundreds of letters concerning this matter and noted the contentment those writers expressed over the fact that now they were able to own their own little homes, that they were making progress, that they felt happy about it and were contented. Then I have received dozens of letters, and I have no doubt that many of you are also getting them right along, from people trying to get a loan but who find there is no more money available for that purpose. This is not a gift but a loan, and the record of repayment is nearly perfect.

After all we must make progress to stem this tide of absentee ownership. We must do it. I think our duty first is to our own farmers, before we think about farmers in other sections of the world, as much as we approve of the good-neighbor policy. Therefore, I hope we will not turn down this motion because this program is self-sustaining, and it is not costing the Government any money. Certainly we ought to make it possible to continue the program so our tenants can get this assistance and become farm owners.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the House divided, and there were—ayes 47, noes 90.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the vote just had, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 90 and 91.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 93: On page 86, line 16, strike out "$3,341,182" and insert "$3,295,575."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 95 and 96 be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 95: On page 87, line 3, strike out "$25,319,557" and insert "$50,319,557."

Senate amendment No. 96: On page 88, line 9, strike out "$70,000,000" and insert "$125,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 95 and 96.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 97: On page 89, line 7, after "program" insert "except for the completion of commitments outstanding on June 30, 1942."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 97.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments numbered 101 and 102, which involve the same question, be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 101: On page 93, line 13, strike out "5" and insert "10."

Senate amendment No. 102: On page 93, line 18, strike out "5" and insert "10."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendments numbered 101 and 102.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions in the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6709) today, and lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members speaking on the Agricultural Appropriation bill today have permission to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

EXTENDING AND AMENDING CERTAIN EMERGENCY LAWS RELATING TO THE MERCHANT MARINE

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 130) to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes, for the consideration of which a rule has been granted.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the provisions of each of the following acts and resolutions, and all authority thereunder, are hereby continued in full force and effect until 6 months after the termination of the present war shall have been proclaimed or, in the case of any one or more of such acts and resolutions, until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate: Public Resolution No. 74, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved May 14, 1940; Public Resolution No. 82, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved June 11, 1940; Public, No. 831, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved October 10, 1940; Public Law 46, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 2, 1941; Public Law 101, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved June 6, 1941; Public Law 173, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved July 14, 1941; and all authority of the Commission under such acts and resolutions, insofar as the same pertains to functions and duties of the Commission transferred to the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration by the President's Executive order of February 7, 1942 (No. 9054; 7 Federal Register 837), shall be performed by such Administrator in conformity with such Executive order.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, this bill simply extends the effective time of some existing laws that are scheduled to expire on certain dates as emergency legislation.

As to the first law there was some confusion about the expiration date as no definite date was fixed. The others contain the date of June 30, 1942, except one law which expires June 30, 1943. This measure brings uniformity as to the time prescribed for this particular legislation. There was no opposition to the joint resolution in committee, and no opposition to the granting of a rule in the Rules Committee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLAND. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, after the committee had heard the explanation of the gentleman from Virginia when appearing before the Rules Committee, they unanimously agreed that a rule should be granted, and I am pleased that unanimous consent has been granted the gentleman to call up the measure without the rule. It is a meritorious bill and should be passed.

The Senate joint resolution was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended.

A similar House joint resolution (H. J. Res. 492) was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. TENEROWICZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made this afternoon and to include therein a communication received from the Assistant to the Secretary of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Fresno Bee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks which I made this afternoon by including a telegram from the president of the National Farmers' Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the other special orders for today I may proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a short editorial from the Mansfield News-Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a telegram from the Governor of Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOMENGEAUX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include two resolutions passed by the Legislature of the State of Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article in the Washington Post this Sunday last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, after the special orders today I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 7041, making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the government of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. The Senate added a legislative rider to this bill. The Comptroller General rendered a decision which prevented select committees of the House from calling on all departments and independent agencies for certain help in connection with their investigations. They have been running wild, even going so far as to demand that the heads of some of the departments and agencies appoint men. They would insist they be put on their pay roll, and then delegate them to serve with the select committees. The Comptroller General very properly held he would take exceptions to the paying of such men and also went much further in saying who could and who could not serve on select committees. The Comptroller General rendered a real public service. In my opinion this is a matter for the legislative committees of the House.

If it is to be done it should be done by joint resolution, and should come to the Committee on Expenditures for hearings. This is legislation on an appropriation bill, and if it had been presented on the floor of the House it would have been subject to a point of order. In view of that, I ask the gentleman from Texas if he will not bring the amendment back for a special vote in the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the amendment to which the gentleman refers is very far reaching indeed, and applies not only to matters affecting the District of Columbia, but to all other appropriation bills, and is so far reaching that I think he can be assured that the conferees will give due consideration to the matter and if we should decide to agree to it that we will certainly bring the matter back for a separate vote in the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is perfectly satisfactory to me. I will say it does not apply to the District of Columbia, but applies generally to Government departments and independent agencies, and has no place on this bill.

Mr. MAHON. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. MAHON, Mr. HOUSTON, Mr. BEAM, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. LAMBERTSON.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. COSTELLO. I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Military Affairs have until midnight to file a conference report and statement upon the pay bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

WAR-DAMAGE INSURANCE

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY] for 5 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time so that I might bring to the attention of the House a matter which I consider important. The Secretary of Commerce, in a press release dated June 2, in explanation of the coverage provided by a war-damage insurance policy, states that the policies will be issued for a 12-month period, to cover physical loss of real and personal property which may result from enemy attacks or action of our own forces in resisting enemy attacks.

I am sure it was the intention of Congress to protect the people against all sorts of damage arising out of our military activities. For example, over our country today there are flying Canadian planes. Canada is a friendly nation, but that does not prevent them from having plane accidents. Bombs might fall from their carriers or the plane might fall. Under the language of the War Damage Insurance Act, a person whose property is damaged by one of these Canadian planes might find it impossible to collect one penny for his damages. Should our planes, while flying over the United States on a false alarm, have trouble and damage property, the property owners might find their claims contested on the grounds that there was no "enemy attack or action of our own forces in resisting enemy attack."

I am inclined to believe that the War Damage Insurance Corporation and the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Jones, should be willing to amend that provision in the policy so as to meet contingencies of the sort I suggested, but unfortunately, the interpretation of the policy coverage as given by the War Damage Corporation seems to exclude any damage except damage resulting from actual enemy attack or resisting enemy attack.

Because there are thousands of planes flying over our cities, and the number of accidents which are occurring, it is our duty to restate for the benefit of the War Damage Corporation, on behalf of our constituents, that it was the intention of Congress to cover every home owner whose property was damaged as a result of war activity not specifically excluded.

Under this act, unless we are resisting attack, your constituent might not be covered. If that plane, flying over from Canada on a peaceful mission should do any damage, there would also be the possibility that liability would be denied under the act.

I have discussed these problems with folks in the War Damage Insurance Corporation and, as a result of those discussions, I am of the opinion that there is a sympathetic feeling to my proposal to extend the language so as to specifically include the damage I have described. I ask every Member of Congress to give this subject his special attention, and if

you agree with me, communicate your views to the War Damage Insurance Corporation.

The policy form is now being prepared and millions of copies will go out in the next few days, as the insurance goes into effect July 1. We should have this matter settled before that time.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. Would the gentleman explain how it would be possible for this damage to occur by planes flying over New York?

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Let us assume there was a false air-raid alarm; a plane went out and something might happen to its mechanism from which great damage might ensue. Under the interpretation given the existing law by the War Damage Insurance Corporation there might be some question as to coverage. Let us take a plane crossing from Canada, through some mishap it might fall. There would be serious doubt as to liability under this policy, and still no one would say this was not in connection with our war activities.

Mr. JENSEN. Would it not be rather difficult to determine whether the damage was caused on account of a false alarm?

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Oh, I do not want to restrict it to a false alarm. If damage results from the operation of an Army or Navy plane in the ordinary course of its duty in connection with war activities—and they are all war activities now—the owner of that property should be covered by war damage insurance, because after all it is part and parcel of our war activities. Let us give as much protection to the home and property owner as possible and not seek to limit it in any way or make doubtful his right of recovery because of an unhappy choice of language.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. THILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THE RADIO

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, the invention of the radio has perhaps done more to bring back home life and home entertainment than any other single force generated in the last 50 years. The automobile and many other inventions did much to disrupt home life. The automobile, in particular, was an agency that took people from their homes and led to a great extent in the development of mass centers of entertainment, such as the roadhouse and similar institutions.

The radio made it possible for people to gather in the evenings in their homes and listen to varied forms of entertainment that seemed to improve as the life of radio extended. People were provided with both entertainment and knowledge. Learned professors and savants in all fields of human endeavor lectured to our people and helped to improve their intellectual standards. The finest actors of the spoken stage portrayed the great roles of the theater. The comedian gave that degree of lightness and froth that was necessary to bring about a well-established and balanced life.

The American standards of broadcasting both as to quality and quantity were far beyond the wildest dreams of any European network. Lately, however, there has been a great reduction in quality. There has been a tendency on the part of the so-called comedians to engage in salaciousness at the expense of humor. Anyone who knows the theater in America is well aware that its decline was brought about by the introduction of lewdness, obscenity, and salaciousness. The introduction of these factors made it almost impossible at certain times for people who respected each other to attend a theatrical performance jointly. A few of the old-time managers and producers, such as the great George M. Cohan, endeavored to carry on for a clean stage, but they were not very successful. Now if radio intends to turn the same corner that led the stage to destruction, I think we must protest.

Broadcasting is not a natural right. It is a licensed privilege, and as a privilege it should be treated with respect by those who have been given this license and who have made fortunes for themselves, their sponsors, and their writers. While I do not desire censorship of the radio, being too great a believer in the privilege of free speech, I cannot fail to take cognizance of the fact that no man, no matter how strong the guaranty of free speech, can walk the streets of our cities and towns and call out indecent and salacious statements. Neither have these companies or sponsors the right to pump into our homes that which is not clean. We, who buy the products, are assembled fathers and mothers, boys and girls, young and old, and we insist that the sanctity of our homes be preserved. Can it be that these funny men have such a limited intellect that they have already exhausted all fun-making possibilities, and must now go back to the filth of their burlesque-house beginnings? Are they admitting to the world their intellectual limitations?

I know what their response will be. They will say that they are good, patriotic Americans. That at the present time they are traveling from camp to camp giving entertainment to the men in service. Do not be misled by this hiding behind the flag, for these sponsored programs given in the various camps are the best form of advertising for both the sponsors and the performers. They are all receiving exactly the same salaries that they received when the programs emanated from commercial studios. If these performances did not have the additional advertising value, they would not be made.

If the broadcasting industry does not attempt to clean its stables, I can assure them that the effort will be made from other sources. I do not promise them this, I pledge it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). Under the previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois [Miss SUMNER] is recognized for 2 minutes.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, if, as the President has said, the purpose of gasoline rationing in the Midwest is to conserve tires, I suggest that there is a better way to do it.

Leon Henderson's repeated threats that he may requisition tires and automobiles so as to save rubber, is doing more to encourage nonessential driving in our part of the country than any other circumstance.

Quite a few of our people instinctively distrust Mr. Henderson. Some of them even think he would like to deprive them of their cars so as to make them "feel" the war. To put the Midwest, where gasoline is plentiful, under the same rationing rules as the East, where it is done because of the gas scarcity, they point out, seems heartless, unjust, and incompetent. Like the fable of the fox who lost his tail in a trap and then tried to persuade other foxes to cut off their tails also.

In our part of the country distances between towns are so much greater, business is so much more dependent upon automobiles that the effect of rationing will inevitably be more devastating economically than here where most of us who are deprived of our automobiles can hop a bus or taxicab and take rides on unlimited gasoline.

If the President or Henderson will see fit to assure the people that in the Midwest there will be no seizure by the Government of motorcars which are used chiefly for essential business purposes, farming, delivering, and so forth, giving the people a clear idea of what should be considered essential driving, I believe that you will see soldierly cooperation. Our midwestern citizens are exceeding quotas in enlistments, war savings stamps, and other expressions of patriotism, and they will do the same with their tires.

Even now there is much less nonessential driving there than Mr. Henderson seems to believe. It is only that they are too sensible and too American to want to make unnecessary sacrifices, and nobody wants to be forced to give up his car to some politician to be used, perhaps, for "boondoggling."

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentlewoman yield?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to compliment the gentlewoman for saying "ray-tioning" instead of "rash-ioning." Let us take all the rats out of this thing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. ROLPH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

PATRIOTISM OF THE WOMEN OF AMERICA

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, the American women are doing a wonderful job. In every crisis the womanhood of this country always rises to the occasion. The present situation is a repetition of those earlier chapters of the history of the Republic. Washington, Lincoln, Jefferson Davis, McKinley, and Woodrow Wilson all received unstinted and wholehearted support from the mothers of America. President Roosevelt is receiving it now. What a thrill almost a week ago when 13,500 women applied in 1 day for 450 officer-training enlistments.

San Francisco is the scene of intense activity. San Francisco is the focal point for the entire war picture on the west coast. Women volunteers are on 24-hour service at the Fourth Interceptor Command. Each woman works on a 6-hour shift and reports for duty every third day. Day and night other women furnish hot coffee to the soldiers on guard duty. Convenient kitchens are maintained at various places throughout the city. Then still other women meet incoming transports, seeing that the evacuees are properly cared for and speeded on their way to various destinations. Many cases are reported of women and children arriving from the Tropics not suitably clothed for our climate. In each case, without costing the recipient a penny, full outfits are furnished by the San Francisco chapter of the Red Cross.

Then we have Hospitality House, located in the Civic Center. These attractive clubrooms were built by volunteer labor, assigned by the San Francisco building trades without cost, and with materials furnished gratis by the city. Men from every section of the country visit Hospitality House. The various women's groups take turn in acting as hostesses. San Francisco is justly proud of the reception given to our boys in uniform.

Women from all walks of life are keenly interested to do whatever they may to help. On June 2, 1942, the San Francisco Call Bulletin published an editorial entitled "Women Train for Defense." In tribute to the women of San Francisco I am pleased to include this article as part of my remarks:

WOMEN TRAIN FOR DEFENSE—THROUGH THE AMERICAN WOMEN'S VOLUNTARY SERVICES, SAN FRANCISCO WIVES AND MOTHERS NOW MAY LEARN TO PROTECT THEIR HOMES

San Francisco branch of the American Women's Voluntary Services has initiated a program that may well become one of its finest contributions to the war effort.

It has arranged a series of lectures in neighborhood theaters throughout the city designed to acquaint San Francisco's mothers and housewives with the parts they can, and in fact must, play in civilian defense.

The lectures will be delivered by authorities on various subjects concerning home defense.

The women attending will be instructed on how to reorganize their households so that their families may enjoy the maximum of comfort and happiness under the conditions imposed by the war; how to cooperate with their air-raid wardens in equipping blackout and gas retreats and in combating incendiary bombs and the consequent fires; they will learn diet and nutrition, and how to cooperate in conservation and salvage campaigns.

IMPORTANT PROGRAM

The importance of this program cannot be overemphasized. Every woman should consider it a privilege and make it a duty to attend the lectures in her community.

The role of wives and mothers in defending their homes and families is a vital one, but one to whose significance San Francisco women, unfortunately, are not yet fully awake.

The organized civilian-defense services can go only so far, and when they have reached the limits of their capabilities, it is the women in their homes who must carry on from there.

It is the women, after all, who must maintain the morale in their homes.

And home morale is the heart of all morale.

It is the women who must arrange family budgets and family diets to maintain their families' health and spirits at the highest possible level.

It is the women who must take over many of the duties of air raid wardens during daytime, when their men are at their work.

ROLE OF WOMEN

It is the women who must minister to the sick and disabled, the aged and the infirm and the handicapped.

It is the women, in short, who must execute the details of civilian defense in all its many phases. In these things the trained and organized services can only direct them.

It is gratifying, then, that the American Women's Voluntary Services has arranged this program, that San Francisco's women may be acquainted with their responsibilities and taught how to discharge them.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include therein the article to which I referred.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. SHANLEY, for 2 days, on account of death in family.

To Mr. MAAS, indefinitely.

To Mr. BAUMHART, for 6 days, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two respects: First, to insert a resolution by the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York on the question of life-insurance premiums being deducted from income-tax returns; and, second, to include a resolution by the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York on war morale.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, since obtaining unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the addresses of Lt. Gen. Hugh A. Drum and Dr. Dixon Ryan Fox, delivered at the commencement day luncheon at Columbia University on June 2, 1942, I have been informed by the Public Printer that these addresses will fill 3 pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $135. I therefore renew my unanimous-consent request at this time to insert these addresses in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 5 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 10, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Wednesday, June 10, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearing in connection with the Federal Communications Commission.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, June 16, 1942.

Business to be considered: H. R. 7002, to increase agricultural purchasing power and to meet the need of combating malnutrition among the people of low income by defining and making certain a reasonable definition and standard of nonfat dry milk solids.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 10, for consideration of war housing, room 1324, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, June 10, 1942, for consideration of H. R. 2119, H. R. 2914, H. R. 4222, H. R. 6350, and H. R. 6858.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 11, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 7105, to provide for the suspension during the war of operating differential subsidy agreements and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1731. A letter from the adjutant general, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, transmitting a set of proceedings of the forty-second national encampment of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, held in Philadelphia, Pa., August 24–29, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 537); to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed, with illustration.

1732. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1733. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the executive office of the President, Office for Emergency Management, for the fiscal year 1943, in the amount of $70,000,000, to cover the expenses of the War Relocation

Authority in performing the functions placed upon it by Executive Order No. 9102 (H. Doc. No. 780); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 324. Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943; without amendment (Rept. No. 2219). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. S. 2066. An act to make permanently effective the act regulating interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products; without amendment (Rept. No. 2220). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Revision of the Laws. H. R. 7112. A bill to codify and enact into absolute law, title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration"; without amendment (Rept. No. 2221). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Revision of the Laws. H. R. 7113. A bill to codify and enact into absolute law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and seal, seat of government, and the States"; with amendment (Rept. No. 2222). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KEOGH: Committee on Revision of the Laws. H. R. 7120. A bill to codify and enact into absolute law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds"; with amendment (Rept. No. 2223). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2368. An act to amend the joint resolution approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 858), as amended, and the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), as amended, so as to remove the requirement that medical statements shall be furnished to those persons performing military service thereunder; without amendment (Rept. No. 2224). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 7152. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 to preserve the nationality of citizens residing abroad; with amendment (Rept. No. 2225). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BARRY:

H. R. 7209. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 7210. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 7211. A bill to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAPMAN:

H. R. 7212. A bill to amend section 13 (d) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 7213. A bill to provide for the attachment, garnishment, execution, or trustee process, of wages and salaries of officers and civil employees of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. J. Res. 325. Joint resolution to establish the third week of September as National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JARMAN:

H. Res. 503. Resolution authorizing the printing of a revised edition of the Rules and Manual of the House of Representatives for the Seventy-eighth Congress; to the Committee on Printing.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3039. By Mr. BEITER: Petition of the United Brethren in Christ Sunday School, Clarence, N. Y., in behalf of Senate bill 860, to prohibit sale of alcoholic beverages on or near all Army camps and naval bases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3040. By Mr. HANCOCK: Petition of Alta M. Orr and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Commitee on Military Affairs.

3041. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition of Rev. J. L. Summers and 63 others, residents of Carmi, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 860 and any legislation which provides the best possible protection for our men in the armed forces against the influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3042. Also, petition submitted by K. McDonald and signed by 242 representative citizens of Cave-in-Rock, Ill., and surrounding community, urging the passage of Senate bill 860 as a part of our national defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3043. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the City Council of the city of Los Angeles, relative to legislation granting compensation benefits to civilian defense volunteers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3044. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Mrs. A. M. Russell and 47 others of the Highland Park Methodist Church, Topeka, Kans., appealing for legislation which will provide the largest possible protection for men in our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; also urging the passage of the Sheppard bill (S. 860); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3045. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the Western Confectioners Association, at convention held at Santa Barbara, Calif., relative to candy as a food of high energy building content and not as a luxury, and therefore should not be subject to tax on luxuries; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3046. By Mr. SMITH of Ohio: Petition of Rev. George P. Kehl and members of two Sunday-school classes of the St. Paul's Evangelical and Reformed Church, St. Marys, Ohio, supporting Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3047. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the George P. Vanderveer Post, No. 129, the American Legion, Toms River, N. J., urging the office of the War Production Board or such officials as may have jurisdiction to raise the ceiling price on scrap iron; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 10, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Most gracious God, the Father of all mercies, we pray that Thy spirit of truth may rule and direct our hearts. As our fathers have left us a heritage of trial and sacrifice, may we realize that we have been appointed to a potent ministry to protect the weak and comprehend the problems of this modern, broken world; it is a deathless reality that the immortal soul is nourished by the bread of tears. Oh, clothe us with the strength of righteous purpose with Thy companionship on the one hand and the fellowship of man on the other.

Teach us, dear Lord, that victory does not come to the conquerors but to the saviors of mankind; to be satisfied with anything less is to be spiritually bloodless and sightless. We rejoice that with our inspirational faith we need not despair of the human race with the divine optimism of our blessed Master who ever inspires hope in the ultimate fulfillment of the great picture of man. Heavenly Father, call us to our labors with morning faces and with morning hearts, eager to work, and if the day be marked with hard toil make us strong to bear it. For the sake of Him who became poor that we might become rich. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem written by Annie Laurie Rankin, daughter of Congressman JOHN E. RANKIN of Mississippi, entitled "Wonder."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] made the statement that all the farm organizations were opposed to the sale of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat for feed at 85 percent of corn parity, an amendment that had been written into

the agricultural appropriation bill by the Senate. I want to correct the gentleman on that because he is in error. The Farmers' Union was in favor of that amendment. I have here a telegram from the Montana Farmers' Union, signed by D. W. Chapman, president, and Harold Brown, secretary, that the Farmers' Union favored that amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. DOWNS and Mr. WEISS asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

ADJOURNMENT FROM THURSDAY UNTIL MONDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns tomorrow it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Commonweal on the Tolan committee report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein an address delivered by Senator WALSH at Canisius College last Sunday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

[Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem relating to pensions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD with respect to the so-called Union for Democratic Action.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from a constituent.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include therein a table furnished me by the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PIERCE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered by Maj. Laurence R. Melton, national commander of the Disabled Veterans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech which I delivered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

THE CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HISTORY OF CONGRESSIONAL REPORTING

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, on March 3 of next year our CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has a birthday. It will be the ninetieth birthday of the verbatim report of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD printed by the Government.

At the conclusion of these remarks I am going to ask permission to include in the Appendix of today's RECORD a historical article, written by Elizabeth Gregory McPherson, of the Library of Congress, which gives a very interesting background concerning the reporting of debates here in the Congress. I believe the Members will be especially interested because of the recent discussions about the difficulties the Congress has been having with the press, because prior to the time when the Congress started publishing its own RECORD, the press was relied upon entirely to report the debates.

I think this will also show that Congress today is deporting itself with considerably better demeanor and a higher degree of statesmanship than it was in the earlier days of the institution known as the Congress of the United States.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MUNDT. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If I recall correctly, it was published back in those days by what was called the Globe.

Mr. MUNDT. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. That was really a private publication, but it was looked upon at that time as the Government mouthpiece.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman is correct; and the earlier proceedings were printed by private printers who were doing it for profit, and the Members complained about the mistakes and the inaccuracies of the RECORD at that time and were in constant conflict with the press.

I think we should all be proud of the accuracy of the men who are now reporting the debates. These men probably have the most difficult job of stenographic reporting in the world and they deserve our commendation and gratitude for the remarkable accuracy of their work. By the same token, I want to add a word of commendation to the unseen and unknown workmen in the Government Printing Office who print the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with such unerring accuracy that typographical errors and misslips are practically unknown.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the Appendix of the RECORD the article on reporting the debates of Congress, by Elizabeth Gregory McPherson, to which I have referred. It may run a little beyond the limit, but because of its importance I ask that it may be printed as an extension of remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

(Mr. MCGREGOR asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

LABOR AND PRODUCTION OF WAR MATERIALS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

[Mr. JENKINS of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

WAR EXPENDITURES

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure at this time to further substantiate my recent defense of the Hoosier State and her patriotic participation in our war effort. In spite of Cecil Brown's disparaging remark that "Indiana does not know we are in the war," Indiana sold 15 percent over her May quota of war bonds and stamps. The country as a whole only went 5.7 percent over the national goal; but Hawaii sold six times her quota.

This would seem to indicate that Indiana is more aware of the existence of a state of war than the Nation as a whole. It would also indicate that Hawaii, with 3,000 Pearl Harbor heroes' graves to remind her, is the most aware of our need.

The District of Columbia, incidentally, is lagging behind in its quota of bond and stamp purchases, yet she has the biggest pay roll in her history. Could it be that the people in Washington who can see how our defense money is being used are just not as interested in contributing as they could be?

Maybe Washington employees, who have seen war-time contributions going to build unnecessary information centers, to pay political parasites on the administration's coattails, and to mend the administration's political fences, are just not feeling as patriotic as the people back in the States? Back home the people have not a chance to see Washington's political philandering, and so think their money is being wisely used.

Benjamin Franklin said that, "A good example is the best sermon." Washington's bureaucrats preach thrift and urge unselfish war contributions; I wonder if they think their responsibility for spending it wisely is less than the people's responsibility to contribute liberally?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an article in the current edition of Collier's magazine on the menace of forest fires in the western forests.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday Donald M. Nelson went back to Columbia, Mo., and there delivered the commencement address before the graduating class of the University of Missouri from which he was graduated in 1911.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include the address delivered by Mr. Nelson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Fort Worth Star-Telegram by Mr. A. G. Carter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday, at the conclusion of the regular business and any other existing special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

UNITY OF THE PEOPLE FOR WAR

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the people of this country are beginning to wake up to the fact that we are at war. But there is a little unrest in this country, and that unrest comes because of the waste and extravagance that we have in the operation of the various departments of the Government. If we want the people to get behind this war effort 100 percent, to win this war, then the responsibility is upon the Members of Congress to restore confidence. One way to aid in that is to cut out and weed out and eliminate all of these expenses that are no part of and have no reason for existence now in the work of conducting the war. We cannot get all the people behind the war effort until Congress gets a lot of common sense and stops nonessential waste—till we restore confidence by our own efforts and acts. We are going to have here this afternoon for consideration a bill continuing the W. P. A. The W. P. A. was all right in its day, but today it is not going to help us win the war. The people of this country can get jobs everywhere. Let us put the people back to work in the wheels of industry and in agriculture. Let people go out and get a job and let us cut out the W. P. A. Save the several hundred millions of dollars and we will not have to go in the red these millions. We will stimulate confidence if we pass no more pension laws, if we do not increase everybody's salary, if we practice the economy that is necessary in war as well as in peace, especially when the Treasury statement each year is billions in the red.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a poem.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FIFTY DOLLARS BASE PAY FOR SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AND MARINES

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, in a short time the conference report upon the soldiers' pay bill will be taken up. Both Houses have now agreed to my amendment to raise the base pay of the enlisted men in our armed forces to $50 a month.

I have heard from men from every section of this country, boys in the rank and file, officers, mothers and fathers, and taxpayers who have no sons in the service, and practically every one of them is unqualifiedly in favor of this provision. There will be a roll call on the conference report, which will register the vote of Congress on whether or not we want the pay of these boys raised. There may have been some difference of opinion as to the amount of this pay raise, but I am sure when this roll is called, there will not be a dissenting vote among the Members of this House.

This has been a long fight and has resulted in a great victory for the enlisted men in our armed forces.

I am gratified beyond expression.

CONFERENCE REPORT—SOLDIERS' PAY BILL

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the conferees may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk reported the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky that the statement be read in lieu of the report?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That, for the purpose of computing the annual pay of the commissioned officers of the Regular Army and Marine Corps below the grade of brigadier general; of the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey below the grade of rear admiral; and of the Public Health Service below the grade of assistant to the Surgeon General, pay periods are prescribed, and the base pay for each is fixed as follows:

"The first period, $1,800; the second period, $2,000; the third period, $2,400; the fourth period, $3,000; the fifth period $3,500; and the sixth period, $4,000.

"The pay of the sixth period shall be paid to colonels of the Army, captains of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade; to lieutenant colonels of the Army, commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, and lieutenant commanders of the line and Engineer Corps of the Coast Guard, who have completed thirty years' service; and to the Chief of Chaplains of the Army when not holding rank above that of colonel.

"The pay of the fifth period shall be paid to lieutenant colonels of the Army, commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the sixth period; and to majors of the Army, lieutenant commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed twenty-three years' service.

"The pay of the fourth period shall be paid to majors of the Army, lieutenant commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the fifth period; to captains of the Army, lieutenants of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed seventeen years' service.

"The pay of the third period shall be paid to captains of the Army, lieutenants of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the fourth period; to first lieutenants of the Army, lieutenants (junior grade) of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed ten years' service.

"The pay of the second period shall be paid to first lieutenants of the Army, lieutenants (junior grade) of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the third period; and to second lieutenants of the Army, ensigns of the Navy,

and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed five years' service; and to contract surgeons serving full time.

"The pay of the first period shall be paid to all other officers whose pay is provided for in this section.

"Officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act temporarily appointed to higher grades or ranks shall, for the purposes of this Act, be considered officers of such grades or ranks while holding such temporary appointments.

"Every officer paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 per centum of the base pay of his period for each three years of service up to thirty years.

"For officers appointed on and after July 1, 1922, no service shall be counted for purposes of pay except active commissioned service under a Federal appointment and commissioned service in the National Guard when called out by order of the President and service authorized in section 2 (b) of the Act of January 19, 1942 (Public Law 402, Seventy-seventh Congress). For officers in the service on June 30, 1922, there shall be included in the computation all service which was then counted in computing longevity pay, and service as a contract surgeon serving full time; and also 75 per centum of all other periods of time during which they have held commissions as officers of the Organized Militia between January 21, 1903, and July 1, 1916, or of the National Guard, the Naval Militia, or the National Naval Volunteers since June 3, 1916, shall be included in the computation. Longevity pay for officers in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act shall be based on the total of all service in any or all of said services which is authorized to be counted for longevity pay purposes under the provisions of this Act or as may otherwise be provided by law.

"The provisions of this Act shall apply equally to those persons serving, not as commissioned officers in the Army or in the other services mentioned in the title of this Act, but whose pay under existing law is an amount equivalent to that of a commissioned officer of one of the above grades, those receiving the pay of colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, first lieutenant, and second lieutenant, being classified as in the sixth, fifth, fourth, third, second, and first periods, respectively.

"SEC. 2. The base pay of any enlisted man, warrant officer, or nurse (female) in the military or naval forces of the United States shall be increased by 20 per centum and the base pay of any commissioned officer of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act shall be increased by 10 per centum for any period of service while on sea duty as such duty may be defined by the head of the Department concerned, or duty in any place beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, which increases in pay shall be in addition to pay and allowances otherwise authorized: *Provided*, That the per centum increases herein authorized shall be included in computing increases in pay for aviation and submarine duty: *Provided further*, That this section shall be effective from December 7, 1941, and shall cease to be in effect twelve months after the termination of the present war is proclaimed by the President.

"SEC. 3. When officers of the National Guard or of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including Reserve officers, are authorized by law to receive Federal pay, those serving in grades corresponding to those of colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, first lieutenant, and second lieutenant of the Army shall receive the pay of the sixth, fifth, fourth, third, second, and first periods, respectively, unless entitled to the pay of a higher period under the provisions of section 14 of this Act. Such officers whenever entitled to Federal pay, except armory drill and administrative-function pay, shall receive as longevity pay, in addition to base pay, an increase thereof at the per centum and time rates up to thirty years provided in section 1 of this Act. In computing the increase of pay for each period of three years' service, such officers shall be credited with full time for all periods during which they have held commissions as officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, or in the Organized Militia prior to July 1, 1916, or in the National Guard, National Guard of the United States, or in the Officers Reserve Corps, or in the Naval Militia, or in the National Naval Volunteers, or in the Naval Reserve force, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve force, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, when confirmed in grade and qualified for all general service.

"Members of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act who shall become entitled to Federal pay for a continuous period of less than one month at the rates fixed for the regular services shall receive such pay for each day of such period, and the thirty-first day of a calendar month shall not be excluded from the computation.

"Payments authorized under the provisions of the preceding paragraph may include the entire amount lawfully accruing to such persons as pay, allowances, and mileage on account of such service, and, including pay and mileage for their return home, may be paid to them during said period and prior to their departure from the camp or other place at which such service is performed.

"SEC. 4. The term 'dependent' as used in the succeeding sections of this Act shall include at all times and in all places a lawful wife and unmarried children under twenty-one years of age. It shall also include the father or mother of the person concerned, provided he or she is in fact dependent on such person for his or her chief support: *Provided*, That the term 'children' shall be held to include stepchildren and adopted children when such stepchildren or adopted children are in fact dependent upon the person claiming dependency allowance.

"SEC. 5. Each commissioned officer on the active list, or on active duty, below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent, in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, shall be entitled at all times, in addition to his pay, to a money allowance for subsistence. The value of one subsistence allowance is hereby fixed at 70 cents per day. To each officer of any of the said services receiving the base pay of the first, second, third, or sixth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to two subsistence allowances, and to each officer receiving the base pay of the fourth or fifth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to three subsistence allowances: *Provided*, That an officer with no dependents shall receive one subsistence allowance in lieu of the above allowances.

"SEC. 6. Except as otherwise provided in this section, each commissioned officer below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent, in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, while either on active duty or entitled to active-duty pay shall be entitled at all times to a money allowance for rental of quarters.

"To an officer having a dependent, receiving the base pay of the first period the amount of said allowance shall be $60 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the second period the amount of this allowance shall be $75 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the third period the amount of this allowance shall be $90 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fourth period the amount of this allowance shall be $105 per month, and to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fifth or sixth period the amount of this allowance shall be $120 per month.

"To an officer having no dependents, receiving the base pay of the first period the amount of said allowance shall be $45 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the second period the amount of said allowance shall be $60 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the third period the amount of said allowance shall be $75 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fourth period the amount of said allowance shall be $90 per month, and to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fifth or sixth period the amount of said allowance shall be $105 per month.

"No rental allowance shall accrue to an officer having no dependents while he is on field or sea duty, nor shall any rental allowance accrue to an officer with or without dependents who is assigned quarters at his permanent station unless a competent superior authority of the service concerned certifies that such quarters are not adequate for the occupancy of the officer and his dependents, if any: *Provided*, That an officer although furnished with quarters shall be entitled to rental allowance as authorized in this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependents are prevented from occupying such quarters.

"Regulations in execution of the provisions of this section shall be made by the President and shall, whenever practicable, in his judgment, be uniform for all of the services concerned, including adjunct forces thereof.

"SEC. 7. The annual base pay of a brigadier general of the Army or the Marine Corps, rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard, the Engineer in Chief of the Coast Guard, commodore of the Navy, an Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and an assistant to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, shall be $6,000; and the annual base pay of a major general of the Army or the Marine Corps and of a rear admiral (upper half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey or the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall be $8,000. Every such officer shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters authorized in sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the sixth period.

"Officers of the Navy serving in the grade of vice admiral, officers of the Army serving in the grade of lieutenant general, and officers of the other services mentioned in the title of this Act serving in corresponding grades, shall be entitled, while so serving, to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (upper half) and to a personal money allowance of $500 per year. Officers of the Navy serving in the grade of admiral or as Chief of Naval Operations, officers of the Army serving in the grade of general or as Chief of Staff of the Army, and officers of the other services mentioned in the title of this Act serving in corresponding grades, shall be entitled, while so serving, to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (upper half) and to a personal money allowance of $2,200 per year.

"SEC. 8. Warrant officers (junior grade) of the Army except first mates and assistant engineers of the Army Mine Planter Service, and warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, shall receive the base pay of the first period as established by section 1 of this Act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

"First mates and assistant engineers of the Army Mine Planter Service shall receive base pay at the rate of $1,950 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

"Chief warrant officers of the Army except masters in the Army Mine Planter Service, and commissioned warrant officers with less than ten years of commissioned service, of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, shall receive base pay at the rate of $2,100 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the second period: *Provided*, That a commissioned warrant officer or chief warrant officer promoted from the grade of warrant officer or warrant officer (junior grade) shall suffer no reduction of pay by reason of such promotion: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be held to affect the authority of the Secretary of War to designate permanent or temporary chief warrant officers of the Army to receive the base pay and allowances of the third and fourth pay periods as provided in section 3 of the Act approved August 21, 1941 (Public Law 230, Seventy-seventh Congress).

"Commisioned warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard with creditable records on the active list, after ten years of commissioned service, and masters in the Army Mine Planter Service, shall receive the base pay of the third period as established by section 1 of this Act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the third period.

"Commissioned warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, with creditable records on the active list, after twenty years of commissioned service, shall receive the base pay of the fourth period as established by section 1 of this Act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the fourth period.

"Every person paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 per centum of the base pay of his period for each three years of service, not exceeding thirty years. Such service shall be: active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act or Reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve: *Provided*, That commissioned warrant officers shall be credited only with all commissioned service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act including commissioned service in the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard.

"When the total pay and allowances authorized by this section for any person shall exceed the rate of $458.33 per month, the amount of the allowances to which such person is entitled shall be reduced by the amount above $458.33.

"SEC. 9. The monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be as follows: Enlisted men of the first grade, $138; enlisted men of the second grade, $114; enlisted men of the third grade, $96; enlisted men of the fourth grade, $78; enlisted men of the fifth grade, $66; enlisted men of the sixth grade, $54; and enlisted men of the seventh grade, $50. Chief petty officers under acting appointment shall be included in the first grade at a monthly base pay of $126.

"For purposes of pay enlisted men of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard shall be distributed in the several pay grades by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively.

"Every enlisted man paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 per centum of the base pay of his grade for each three years of service up to thirty years. Such service shall be active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act or Reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve.

"SEC. 10. To each enlisted man not furnished quarters or rations in kind there shall be granted, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, an allowance for quarters and subsistence, the value of which shall depend on the conditions under which the duty of the man is being performed, and shall not exceed $5 per day: *Provided*, That payments of allowances for quarters and subsistence may be made in advance to enlisted men under such regulations as the President may prescribe. These regulations shall be uniform for all services mentioned in the title of this Act. Subsistence for pilots shall be paid in accordance with existing regulations, and rations for enlisted men may be commuted as now authorized by law.

"Each enlisted man of the first, second, or third grade, in the active military, naval, or Coast Guard service of the United States having a dependent as defined in section 4 of this Act, shall, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, be entitled to receive, for any period during which public quarters are not provided and available for his dependent, the monthly allowance for quarters authorized by law to be granted to each enlisted man not furnished quarters in kind: *Provided*, That such enlisted men shall continue to be entitled to this allowance although receiving the allowance provided in the first paragraph of this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependent is prevented from dwelling with him.

"Enlisted men entitled to receive allowances for quarters or subsistence, shall continue, while their permanent stations remain unchanged, to receive such allowances while sick in hospital or absent from their permanent-duty stations in a pay status: *Provided*, That allowances for subsistence shall not accrue to such an enlisted man while he is in fact being subsisted at Government expense.

"An enlistment allowance equal to $50, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the first three grades who reenlists within a period of three months from the date of his discharge, and an enlistment allowance of $25, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the other grades who reenlists within a period of three months from the date of his discharge: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not affect the provisions of the act approved August 18, 1941 (Public Law 215, Seventy-seventh Congress): *Provided further*, That during the present war and for six months thereafter the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (Public Law 215, Seventy-seventh Congress) are hereby suspended.

"Hereafter the President may prescribe the quantity and kind of clothing which shall be furnished annually to enlisted men of the Navy, the Coast Guard, the Naval Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve, and he may prescribe the amount of a cash allowance to be paid to such enlisted men in any case in which clothing is not so furnished to them.

"SEC. 11. The pay and allowances of whatever nature and kind to be authorized for the enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts shall be fixed by the Secretary of War and shall not exceed or be of other classes than those now or which may hereafter be authorized by law for enlisted men of the Regular Army.

"The rates of pay of enlisted men of the insular force of the Navy shall be one-half the rates of pay prescribed for enlisted men of the Navy in corresponding grades.

"SEC. 12. Officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including Reserve components thereof and the National Guard, while on active duty in the Federal service, when traveling under competent orders without troops shall receive a mileage allowance at the rate of 8 cents per mile, distance to be computed by the shortest usually traveled route and existing laws providing for the issue of transportation requests to officers of the Army traveling under competent orders, and for deduction to be made from mileage accounts when transportation is furnished by the United States, are hereby made applicable to all the services mentioned in the title of this Act, but in cases when orders are given for travel to be performed repeatedly between two or more places in the same vicinity, as determined by the head of the executive department concerned, he may, in his discretion, direct that actual and necessary expenses only be allowed. Actual expenses only shall be paid for travel under orders in Alaska and outside the limits of the United States in North America.

"Unless otherwise expressly provided by law, no officer of the services mentioned in the title of this Act shall be allowed or paid any sum in excess of expenses actually incurred for subsistence while traveling on duty away from his designated post of duty, nor any sum for such expenses actually incurred in excess of $7 per day. The heads of the executive departments concerned are authorized to prescribe per diem rates of allowance, not exceeding $6, in lieu of subsistence to officers traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty: *Provided*, That for travel by air under competent orders on duty without troops, under regulations to be prescribed respectively by the heads of the departments concerned, members (including officers, warrant officers, contract surgeons, enlisted men, aviation cadets, and members of the Nurse Corps) of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, and of the legally constituted Reserves of said services while on active duty, and of the National Guard while in Federal service, or while participating in exercises, or performing duties under sections 92, 94, 97, or 99 of the National Defense Act, shall, in lieu of mileage or other travel allowances, be allowed and paid their actual and necessary traveling expenses not to exceed $8 per day, or, in lieu thereof, per diem allowances at rates not to exceed $6 per day.

"Travel by personnel of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard while on active duty in the Federal service, on commercial aircraft, domestic or foreign, including travel between airports and centers of population or posts of duty when incidental to travel on commercial aircraft, shall be allowed at public expense when authorized or approved by competent authority, and transportation requests for such travel may be issued upon such authorizations. Such expense shall be allowed without regard to comparative costs of transportation by aircraft with other modes of transportation.

"Individuals belonging to any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including the National Guard and the Reserves of such services, traveling under competent orders which entitle them to transportation or transportation and subsistence as distinguished from mileage, who, under regulations prescribed by the head of the department concerned, travel by privately owned

conveyance shall be entitled, in lieu of transportation by the shortest usually traveled route now authorized by law to be furnished in kind, to a money allowance at the rate of 3 cents per mile for the same distance: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to any person entitled to traveling expenses under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926.

"When any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man above the fourth grade, having dependents as defined in section 4 hereof, is ordered to make a permanent change of station, the United States shall furnish transportation in kind from funds appropriated for the transportation of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service to his new station for such dependents: *Provided*, That for persons in the naval service the term 'permanent station' as used in this section shall be interpreted to mean a shore station or the home yard or home port of the vessel to which the person concerned may be ordered; and a duly authorized change in home yard or home port of such vessel shall be deemed a change of station: *Provided further*, That if the cost of such transportation exceeds that for transportation from the old to the new station, the excess cost shall be paid to the United States by the officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man concerned: *Provided further*, That transportation supplied the dependents of such officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man, to or from stations beyond the continental limits of the United States, shall not be other than by Government transport, if such transportation is available as may be determined by the head of the department concerned: *Provided further*, That the personnel of all the services mentioned in the title of this Act shall have the benefit of all existing laws applying to the Army and Marine Corps for the transportation of household effects: *And provided further*, That in lieu of transportation in kind authorized by this section for dependents, the President may authorize the payment in money of amounts equal to such commercial transportation costs for the whole or such part of the travel for which transportation in kind is not furnished when such travel shall have been completed.

"The words 'permanent change of station' as used in this section shall include the change from home to first station and from last station to home when ordered to active duty other than training duty, of any officer, warrant officer, nurse, or enlisted man of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including retired personnel and members of the Reserve components thereof, in a grade for which the transportation of dependents is authorized at Government expense, and the change from last station to home in connection with retirement, relief from active duty, or transfer to a Reserve component.

"Personnel of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act performing travel on Government-owned vessels for which no transportation fare is charged shall be entitled only to reimbursement of actual and necessary expenses incurred.

"The head of the department concerned may determine what shall constitute a travel status and travel without troops within the meaning of the laws governing the payment of mileage or other travel expenses.

"SEC. 13. The annual base pay of female nurses of the Army and Navy shall be as follows: During the first three years of service, $1,080; from the beginning of the fourth year of service until the completion of the sixth year of service, $1,260; from the beginning of the seventh year of service until the completion of the ninth year of service, $1,440; from the beginning of the tenth year of service until the completion of the twelfth year of service, $1,620; from the beginning of the thirteenth year of service, $1,800.

"Superintendents of the Nurse Corps shall receive pay at the rate of $2,500 a year, assistant superintendents, directors, and assistant directors at the rate of $1,500 a year, and chief nurses at the rate of $600 a year, in addition to their base pay as nurses. Nurses shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

"The annual pay of a retired member of the Army Nurse Corps or the Navy Nurse Corps retired for other than physical disability shall be 3 per centum of the total annual active-duty pay which she is receiving at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of complete years of service rendered prior to retirement, but not exceeding 75 per centum of such annual active-duty pay: *Provided*, That in computing the period of service for retired pay a fractional year of six months or more shall be considered a full year: *Provided further*, That for the purpose of computing eligibility for retirement and retired pay, there shall be credited active service in the Army Nurse Corps and in the Navy Nurse Corps, active service as contract nurse prior to February 2, 1901, and service as a Reserve nurse on active duty since February 2, 1901.

"SEC. 14. Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, when on active duty in the service of the United States, shall be entitled to receive the same pay and allowances as are authorized for persons of corresponding grade and length of service in the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or Public Health Service.

"Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard, when in the Federal service or when participating in exercises or performing the duties provided for by sections 94, 97, and 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended, shall receive the same pay and allowances as are authorized for persons of corresponding grade and length of service in the Regular Army.

"Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, officers of the National Guard, other than general officers, and warrant officers and enlisted men of the National Guard, shall receive compensation at the rate of one-thirtieth of the monthly pay authorized for such persons when in the Federal service, for each regular drill, period of appropriate duty, or other equivalent period of training, authorized by the Secretary of War, at which they shall have been engaged for the entire prescribed period of time: *Provided*, That such pay shall be in addition to compensation for attendance at field or coast-defense instruction or maneuvers. General officers of the National Guard shall receive $500 a year in addition to compensation for attendance at field or coast-defense instruction or maneuvers, for satisfactory performance of their appropriate duties. In addition to pay herein provided, officers of the National Guard commanding organizations less than a brigade and having administrative functions connected therewith shall, whether or not such officers belong to such organizations, receive not more than $240 a year for the faithful performance of such administrative functions under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply when such persons are on active duty in the Federal service.

"SEC. 15. On and after the effective date of this Act, retired officers, warrant officers, nurses, enlisted men, and members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve shall have their retired pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay, computed as now authorized by law on the basis of pay provided in this Act, which pay shall include increases for all active duty performed since retirement or transfer to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve in the computation of their longevity pay and pay periods: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this Act shall operate to reduce the present pay of officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men now on the retired list or drawing retainer pay, or personnel in an equivalent status in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act. Retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service and retired warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of those services, shall, when on active duty, receive full pay and allowances of the grade or rank in which they serve on such active duty and, when on active duty status, shall have the same pay and allowance rights while on leave of absence or sick as officers on the active list, and, if death occurs when on active duty status, while on leave of absence or sick, their dependents shall not thereby be deprived of the benefits provided in the act approved December 17, 1919, as amended, and in the Act of June 4, 1920.

"In the computation of the retired pay of officers heretofore or hereafter retired with pay at the rate of 2½, 3, or 4 per centum of the active duty pay received by them at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay on the active list, not to exceed a total of 75 per centum of said active duty pay, active duty performed by such retired officers subsequent to the date of their retirement shall be counted for the purpose of computing percentage rates and increases with respect to their retired pay. The increases shall be at the rate of 2½, 3, or 4 per centum for each year of active duty and a fractional year of six months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years: *Provided*, That the increased retired pay of such retired officers shall in no case exceed 75 per centum of the active duty pay as authorized by existing law.

"The retired pay of any officer heretofore retired under the provisions of section 24b, National Defense Act, June 3, 1916, as amended, who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, shall be 75 per centum of his active-duty pay: *Provided*, That no back pay, allowances, or other emoluments shall be held to accrue for any period prior to June 1, 1942, as a result of the enactment of this paragraph.

"The retired pay of any officer of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, hereafter retired under any provision of law, shall, unless such officer is entitled to retired pay of a higher grade, be 75 per centum of his active duty pay at the time of his retirement.

"SEC. 16. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard may receive additional compensation not less than $1 nor more than $5 per month, for special qualification in the use of the arm or arms which they may be required to use.

"SEC. 17. Cadets at the United States Military Academy, midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, and cadets at the Coast Guard Academy shall be entitled to pay at the rate of $780 per annum, and to allowances as now or hereafter provided by law for midshipmen in the Navy, and to transportation, including reimbursement of traveling expenses, while traveling under orders as a cadet or midshipman.

"SEC. 18. Officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act and mem-

bers of the Reserve forces of such services, and the National Guard shall receive an increase of 50 per centum of their pay when by orders of competent authority they are required to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights, and when in consequence of such orders they do participate in regular and frequent flights as defined by such Executive orders as have heretofore been, or may hereafter be, promulgated by the President: *Provided*, That when personnel of the National Guard are entitled to armory-drill pay, the increase of 50 per centum thereof herein provided shall be based on the entire amount of such armory-drill pay to which they shall be entitled for a calendar month or fractional part thereof, and the required aerial flights may be made at ordered drills of an air-service organization, or at other times when so authorized by the President. Regulations in execution of the provisions of this paragraph shall be made by the President and shall, whenever practicable in his judgment, be uniform for all of the services concerned.

"Any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard of the United States, not in flying-pay status, who is assigned or attached as a member of a parachute unit, including parachute-jumping schools, and for whom parachute jumping is an essential part of his military duty and who, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Treasury, has received a rating as a parachutist or is undergoing training for such a rating shall receive, while engaged upon duty designated by the head of the department concerned as parachute duty, additional pay of the rate of $100 per month in the case of any such officer or warrant officer, and additional pay at the rate of $50 per month in the case of any such enlisted man.

"SEC. 19. No person, active or retired, of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard, shall suffer, by reason of this Act, any reduction in any pay, allowances, or compensation to which he was entitled upon the effective date of this Act: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this Act shall be construed to deprive any enlisted man transferred to the Fleet Reserve on or prior to the date of enactment of this Act, or transferred from the Fleet Reserve to the retired list of the regular Navy for physical disability, of any benefits, including pay, allowances, or compensation, which he would be entitled to receive upon the completion of thirty years under laws in force on the date of enactment of this Act.

"The Act of June 10, 1922 (42 Stat. 625), as amended, subsections 12 (a), (b), and (c), of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), section 18 of the Act of March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, Seventy-seventh Congress), and section 8 of the Service Extension Act of 1941 (Public Law 213, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved August 18, 1941), and those portions of the Act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1217), and of the Act of June 30, 1941 (Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress), which authorize allowances for enlisted men on the retired list, and all other laws and parts of laws which are inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That Acts or parts of Acts incorporating directly, by implication, or by reference, the provisions of the Act of June 10, 1922, as amended, and not in conflict herewith, shall not be considered modified by the provisions of this Act, except that the pay, allowances, or compensation established herein shall be substituted for the pay, allowances, or compensation set out in the Act of June 10, 1922, as amended.

"No back pay or allowances for any period prior to June 1, 1942, shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this Act.

"The provisions of this Act shall become effective as of June 1, 1942.

"SEC. 20. Beginning June 1, 1942, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall every sixty days thereafter report to the Congress the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned during said period in the Army of the United States and in the Naval Establishment respectively from civilian life, who prior thereto has had no commissioned military service: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy shall not be required to report persons commissioned where such disclosure would in his opinion jeopardize the national interest or safety.

"SEC. 21. This Act may be cited as the 'Pay Readjustment Act of 1942'."

And the House agree to the same.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the part of the House.
ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The first section of the Senate bill contained a provision imposing a limitation of $479.17 per month on the base pay plus pay for length of service of officers below the grade of colonel or a corresponding grade. The House amendment eliminated such provision. The conference agreement eliminates such provision.

The first section of the House amendment added a provision providing that the time spent at the United States Military Academy, United States Naval Academy, or the United States Coast Guard Academy by any officer who was appointed to either of such academies after August 24, 1912, should not be counted for the purpose of computing his length of service. Since this matter is already covered by existing laws with respect to the extent to which credit may be given for time spent at the academies and since such laws are not repealed by S. 2025, the conference agreement eliminates this provision.

Section 2 of the House amendment contained a provision authorizing the head of the Department concerned to define "sea duty" for the purpose of determining the entitlement of members of the military or naval forces to extra pay for such duty. The conference agreement adopts the House provision.

Section 3 of the Senate bill provided for allowing, in the computation of longevity pay of commissioned officers, full time for active duty under Reserve and National Guard Commissions and one-half time for all other periods during which such commissions have been held. The House amendment provided for allowing full time for all periods during which such commissions have been held and included the National Guard of the United States and the Officers Reserve Corps in the list of organizations, commissioned time in which may be counted for longevity purposes. The conference agreement adopts the House provision.

Section 4 of the Senate bill provided that the term "dependent" as used in the sections of the bill providing for rental and subsistence allowances should be deemed to include a mother dependent upon an officer for her chief support. The House amendment provided for including a father dependent for his chief support as well as a mother. The conference agreement adopts the House provision.

Sections 6 and 7 of the Senate bill contained provisions imposing limitations upon the amount of allowances which might be received by officers in the grade of colonel, brigadier general, or major general, or in corresponding grades, in cases where their combined pay and allowance payments would be in excess of specified amounts. The House amendment eliminated such provisions. The conference agreement eliminates such provisions.

Section 9 of the Senate bill provided that the pay of enlisted men of the sixth grade should be $48 per month and the pay of enlisted men of the seventh grade should be $42 per month. The House amendment provided that the pay of enlisted men of the sixth grade should be $54 per month and the pay of enlisted men of the seventh grade should be $50 per month. The conference agreement adopts the provisions of the House amendment with respect to the pay of enlisted men of the sixth and seventh grades.

Section 9 of the House amendment provided for giving credit, for longevity pay purposes, to enlisted men for service in the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army. The Senate bill contained no such provision. The conference agreement adopts the House provision.

Section 10 of the House amendment contained a provision suspending during the present war and the six months thereafter the provisions of all laws providing for payment of reenlistment allowances. The Senate bill did not contain such a provision. The conference agreement provides only for a suspension of section 2 (providing for double enlistment allowances to enlisted men of the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard who reenlist during the war) of the act of August 18, 1941. The conferees deemed it inadvisable to suspend the provisions of all laws providing for reenlistment allowances, since such action would hinder the Navy in its efforts to secure reenlistments by men whose terms of enlistment expire during the war and might result in the Navy's being left at the end of the war without adequate personnel to man the ships of the two-ocean Navy which the Congress has authorized.

The House amendment contained a new section, section 12A, providing for reimbursing service men for actual and necessary medical and hospital expenses incurred by them after their induction into the armed forces and prior to the date of enactment of the bill. The Senate bill contained no similar provision. The conference agreement eliminates the section. The conferees deemed it inadvisable to include the section in the conference agreement because of information furnished to them by the War Department that adoption of the section would tend to promote absenteeism and was inadvisable in view of the fact that the laws with respect to payment for medical care and treatment in private hospitals of military personnel had been liberalized by a provision in the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942. This provision, a similar one to which it is proposed to include in the War Department Military Appropriation Act for

the fiscal year 1943, enables the War Department to pay for medical and hospital care, not of an elective nature, which is furnished in a private hospital to a member of the Army on leave of absence, even though such leave of absence is for more than 24 hours.

Section 15 of the Senate bill contained a provision providing for giving retired officers credit in the computation of their retired pay for all periods of active duty performed by them subsequent to retirement. The House amendment eliminated this provision but included one providing that nothing in the bill should be construed as authorizing any increase in pay for any retired commissioned officer. The conference agreement adopts the Senate provision with a clarifying amendment and eliminates the House provision.

The Senate bill contained a paragraph providing that the retired pay of officers heretofore retired under section 24b, National Defense Act, who served in the military or naval forces prior to November 12, 1918, should hereafter be 75 percent of active duty pay. The House amendment eliminated such paragraph. The conference agreement adopts such paragraph.

Section 15 of the House amendment contained a provision providing that the retired pay of officers hereafter retired under any provision of law and who served in the military or naval forces prior to November 12, 1918, should be 75 percent of active duty pay. The Senate bill contained no similar provision. The conference agreement adopts the House provision.

Section 20 of the House amendment prohibited the appointment, except under circumstances where military necessity requires the use of persons already possessing special knowledge, skill, training, or experience, of any person as an officer in the Army of the United States who had not had previous military or naval experience or who had not completed a satisfactory course of instruction at the Military or the Naval Academy, or in military science and tactics in a college having a senior Reserve Officers Training Corps unit, or in an officers candidate school. The section provided for reports to Congress by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy with respect to persons commissioned after May 1, 1942, who had no previous commissioned military service. The section also provided for the completion, prior to commissioning, of a course of indoctrinal training by persons hereafter commissioned in the Naval Reserve or the Marine Corps Reserve. The Senate bill contained no provisions similar to section 20 of the House amendment. The conference agreement retains so much of section 20 of the House amendment as requires the rendition of reports by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy with respect to commissions granted after June 1, 1942.

The House amendment added a new section to the bill providing that the legislation should cease to be in effect upon the expiration of 12 months after the termination of the present war. The Senate bill contained no provision limiting the effective period of the legislation. The conference agreement eliminates the House limitation on the effective period of the bill.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FADDIS. I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is no quorum present.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 68]

Andrews	Ford,	Osmers
Baldwin	Leland M.	Paddock
Bates, Ky.	Ford, Miss.	Pierce
Baumhart	Gale	Plauché
Bell	Gossett	Ploeser
Bishop	Grant, Ind.	Rivers
Blackney	Green	Robertson,
Buckler, Minn.	Harrington	N. Dak.
Burdick	Hart	Schaefer, Ill.
Byrne	Holmes	Schulte
Byron	Houston	Scott
Clark	Howell	Shanley
Cluett	Jarrett	Shannon
Coffee, Nebr.	Jenks, N. H.	Sheridan
Cole, Md.	Johnson,	Sikes
Copeland	Calif.	Smith, Ohio
Courtney	Johnson,	Smith, Pa.
Crowther	Lyndon B.	Smith, W. Va.
Culkin	Kerr	Stratton
Cullen	Kilburn	Tinkham
Dies	Kirwan	Vreeland
Dirksen	Kocialkowski	Wadsworth
Ditter	Kramer	Walter
Drewry	Maas	Wene
Durham	Mason	White
Elliott, Calif.	Mitchell	Worley
Ellis	Norton	Youngdahl
Fellows	O'Day	
Fenton	Oliver	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 348 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PAY AND ALLOWANCE FOR ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, ETC.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, this is the conference report which, for the information of the House, I would like to say is known as the report on the Army-Navy pay bill. Every Member of the House knows the road over which this legislation has traveled. It was reported by the House Military Affairs Committee with a unanimous report. It came to the floor of the House and after discussion and debate there was one amendment agreed to in particular that is now a matter of controversy. All other questions have been settled.

The report as presented by the conference committee is a unanimous report. One amendment which the House wrote into the bill provided for $50 a month to the enlisted man as base pay. On top of that they will receive a 20-percent increase for foreign service, which will make those who receive the exact base of $50 a month, $60 for foreign service.

There is only one provision now that is controversial, or objected to by any of the members of the House Military Affairs Committee, or anybody else. That is the provision relating to some 120 or 125 retired Army officers of the World War, known as those who were retired under the provisions 24b of the National Defense Act of 1917 by what was known as the B board. On that question there are four or five gentlemen who have asked for some time, and I will yield to both sides for a discussion of that, but I hope the matter will be disposed of as rapidly as possible.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the distinguished chairman of the Military Affairs Committee advise the House what was done with reference to the provision put into the bill by the committee when the bill was originally here in regard to making this legislation temporary instead of permanent?

Mr. MAY. The conference eliminated that provision and provided that the legislation should be permanent.

That was done, may I say to the gentleman from Georgia, with the idea that we have had only two Army pay bills in the history of the country during two wars. That was the World War pay bill and the present bill. Due to the unprecedented increase in the cost of living, high rents, and the advanced wage scales of the country, and the fact that we all know that when this war is over we are going to have to start retrenchment, which should have been started several years ago and should have been kept up, and that it is going to be a rigid retrenchment and a trend toward economy, it was felt that the fighting forces of this country ought to have reasonable pay and that it ought to be put on a permanent basis, because it will be a career army from now on.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is the theory, then, upon which the conferees rejected the House provision to make it temporary?

Mr. MAY. On that theory and the further fact that the House conferees could not have their way about it.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Do I understand that the conferees have agreed to retain the reenlistment gratuity for reenlistment in the Army and Navy?

Mr. MAY. As far as the Army and Navy is concerned, we have reduced that 50 percent. With that modification we agreed to it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. With reference to the suggestion made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], if the cost of living continues to rise, or even if it should rapidly decline, is it not entirely probable that all this legislation will have to be readjusted after the war, at any rate?

Mr. MAY. Certainly, and then will be the proper time to do it.

Now, with this explanation I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] 5 minutes.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, when this legislation was before the House two very important amendments were added to it: One was an amendment which took away from the bill, as reported to the House by the Committee on Military Affairs, that provision which increases the pay of officers who have been dismissed by reasons of findings of a class B board; the other amendment was that the legislation was made temporary instead of permanent.

Certainly I believe that in legislation of this kind, or, indeed, in legislation of any kind, no provision should be inserted which increases the pay of officers who were dismissed from the Army because of the findings of a class B board. Those officers were dismissed from the Army because their services were found to be unsatisfactory; they were dismissed because it was determined by the findings of a board that in time of a national emergency, when the Nation would look to them for services in return for the money which had been spent upon them in the past, those officers would be unable to return value received. Because of a lobby on the part of these men who have been dismissed on account of the findings of a class B board, the pay of something like 125 of them has been increased an average of more than $100 a month. It is something to which they are not entitled; it is something which this Nation does not owe them; it is something which this committee wants rejected, but because of the continuance and existence of this lobby it has been placed in the bill again.

There is no reason why today when we are in war we should write permanent legislation in regard to a pay bill any more than we should write permanent legislation in any other respect. Although this House voted to make this legislation temporary, and although they struck out of it the provision raising the pay of class B officers these provisions have been reinserted. At the proper time, therefore, I am going to offer an amendment to recommit the bill to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to strike out paragraph 3 under section 15, which is the paragraph raising the pay of those officers dismissed under the provisions of a class B board, and to insist upon section 21 of the House amendment which made this legislation temporary.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RAMSPECK). The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe there has ever been a provision before this House which has been as badly misrepresented or as badly misunderstood as the provision with reference to the officers retired under section 24 (b). However, first I want to say this to you: No matter what may have been your idea of the amount of increase in pay which should be given to the enlisted men, we should give it to them now. I am supporting the provision for a minimum of $50 per month, and I think it should be settled without any further delay. If this bill goes back to conference, it means loss of time. If the motion to be made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania prevails, it means that the whole bill, including the pay raise for enlisted men, must go back to conference with an additional meeting of the conferees. We have no way of knowing that they are going to agree to eliminate the provisions for the 24 (b)'s, because the Senate originally placed it in this bill; it came to us in the bill from the Senate. We took it out in the House, but the Senate conferees have insisted that it be placed back in the bill, so you have no way of knowing, even if you insist on taking it out, that it will be taken out. That is the parliamentary situation, and delay must ensue if the matter is recommitted.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. PACE. But the enlisted men will not lose anything, because the bill has already been made retroactive to June 1.

Mr. KILDAY. But we have no way of knowing when we shall get the bill back for completion if it goes to conference again, because the gentleman knows as well as I that the Senate conferees will do their insisting. They put the provision in the bill originally and they will probably insist, and their insistence would mean further delay. No one knows when the conference report would be adopted and the increase of pay made effective.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield.

Mr. MAY. May I say to the gentleman from Texas on the subject of misrepresentation that when I first considered this legislation I was under the impression there was a large number of officers against whom discrimination was being made, but I find now there are only 126. If that is right, I would like to know.

Mr. KILDAY. There are only 121 involved in this whole legislation, but that is not the only point on which you have been misled. May I say that there has been positive misrepresentation on this. The War Department did not come before the committee with any character of attack on these men. It is attempted by statements incorporated in the RECORD by the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] to reflect upon the character and the integrity of these men. Not one of these men was ever retired on account of any character of misconduct. Every one of these men has been investigated and a specific finding made by the board, approved by the War Department, and approved by the President of the United States that their inefficiency was not due in any manner to their own misconduct.

Now, what have you done here? These are the only 121 retired World War officers to whom you are refusing to give 75 percent of their pay. It was ridiculous when we had this up on the 13th of May to strike out the provision with reference to class B officers, who were all World War officers, then within 5 minutes adopt an amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS], appearing on page 55 of the bill, in which you say that hereafter any officer who served in the World War and is retired under any provision of law shall receive not less than 75 percent of his pay. Whether it be due to his own misconduct or whatever the situation may be, any World War officer who is retired will get 75 percent of his base pay. I offer that as another evidence that you did not fully understand what you were doing when you eliminated the men retired under the provisions of 24 (b).

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Did any of these dismissals involve moral turpitude on the part of the officers dismissed?

Mr. KILDAY. None of these dismissals involved moral turpitude. The boards were required by law to find that the inefficiency for which they were being retired was not the result of their own misconduct. There were many officers retired without pay because their inefficiency was found to be the result of their own misconduct. These men have nothing of that kind in their records. Most of them were retired because of an inability to get along with their superior officers. That is the situation we have.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Speaker, these men averaged 15 years service. They all served during the World War. Many of them served in the front lines. Included is a man who commanded a battalion in the front lines in France and was awarded the Legion of Honor for bravery at the front. That is one of the situations you find here.

The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] will address the House on this proposition. He will refer to some of his remarks that he placed in the RECORD, including a supposed transcript from the War Department about some of the records of these men. I call your attention to the fact that that was never brought before the Committee on Military Affairs when you sent us out to get the evidence on this bill. The War Department stated there was some merit to this contention but it ought to be in separate legislation. I would like to know which one of those appearing in this ex parte record, where they reflect on the character and integrity of these men, is the one with the Legion of Honor. I would like to know how many of them were actually relieved because their commanding officer said they were incapable of going along with him. Of course, being the junior, out the junior went. It may have been that the superior should have been retired at that time. Nobody has had any chance to say.

You are referring to 121 men who served in the battles of this country, who served for an average of 15 years, who have given the best part of their lives and find themselves now at about 50 years of age without a means of livelihood because they were trained as soldiers. You have taken the best part of their lives, yet to everybody else in their same situation you are paying 75 percent of their pay. It is wrong and a positive injustice if you should not give these men that consideration, that you should not give them exactly the same consideration

that you give to other men retired who served in the World War. You did it 5 minutes after you refused to do justice for this little group of 121 men. You are now asked to delay the prospect of final passage of this legislation that you are so anxious to pass increasing the pay of enlisted men in order that somebody may eliminate a provision with which he does not agree.

Mr. COOLEY. These 121 officers are not now drawing their 75-percent pay, are they?

Mr. KILDAY. They are not. All other World War officers retired from the Army do.

Mr. COOLEY. The very purpose of this legislation is to provide authority for them to receive 75 percent of their pay?

Mr. KILDAY. That is right. That applies to this little group of 121. All others by the next provision of the bill and who may be hereafter retired and who served in the World War, no matter why they are retired, will receive 75 percent of their pay, but these will not unless this provision remains in the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, this is a very controversial bill. It came out of the subcommittee by a 1-vote margin. I was a member of that subcommittee. It came out of the Committee on Military Affairs on a vote of 9 to 8 after a little debate. There has not been an adequate hearing on this provision to incorporate it nor to justify it as a war measure.

The sponsors of this legislation have at no time justified raising the retired pay of these misfit officers from $123 to $227 as a means of saving the Nation in our war effort. These men will not go on duty. They were retired for inefficiency and on account of various charges, including everything up to drunkenness, financial irregularities, and deadbeating their bills. You cannot get one of them on duty today because the War Department does not want them on duty and does not want them creating trouble in our war forces and in our war effort.

When they prove to our committee by proper hearings that it is necessary to raise these inefficient retired officers who served an average of 15 years of commissioned service to an average retired pay of $227 a month for doing nothing while we are at war, then I am willing to listen to reason; but they have not made that showing.

I put in the RECORD the summary of the findings of 98 different boards. Immediately I became the defendant, and that is in keeping with the whole history of the 24 (b) officers. I have served with some of them. I know what I am talking about. Just as soon as you lift your finger against one of them, they pounce upon you like a gang of wolves. They came into my office, in violation of Army regulations, and tried to get my favor for this bill. They were singing sweet, honeyed phrases when they came in. As soon as they found out I was opposed to the bill, they showed their fangs. One of them told me I did not know this legislation, and I ordered him out. That is not an experience peculiar to me. Other Members had similar experiences with them. They are willing to defy anyone or anything for $227 a month for doing nothing while the Nation is at war.

Is that a war measure? Is that necessary to save the Nation today? I took a stand on this bill before the House that no retired officer should ask for a cent in the way of increase in his retired pay while not on duty and while our Nation is at war.

Study what the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], and I put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on May 11, and then go out and face your constituents and prove to them that you are justified in lifting the retired pay of this group of misfit officers to $227 a month for doing nothing in wartime. I think they should be ashamed of themselves for demanding a cent more than the $123 they are now drawing, on the average.

They say they want equality with other officers, but they are asking more retired pay for length of service than any other officer can get under our laws except for physical disability. They want 75-percent pay for an average of 15 years' service. Under Public Law 190 you offer 75-percent pay to those officers still serving in the Army who have World War experience, and you find, of course, that the World War officers still on duty have now more than 25 years' average length of active service. Furthermore, are you going to promise every Regular Army officer today taking part in this present war the privilege of thumbing his nose at the War Department and walking out with 75-percent pay if he succeeds in evading class B classification for a period of 10 years? You are setting just such a precedent if you keep this provision in this bill.

I brought out on this floor, when the bill was before us earlier, that this provision got into the bill in the Senate but was not mentioned in the committee report nor printed under the Ramseyer rule. We knocked it out on the floor of the House. It went to conference and was not in the bill when it came back from conference the first time, but when the bill went to conference again they found out that under the parliamentary procedure they could slip it back in, and they did slip it back in after a deadlock in the conference committee, and it came slipping back over here.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I have been watching this floor to know when this bill was coming up again on the conference report. I am glad they rang the bell to call a quorum here. I came over here thinking another bill was under consideration, and I am glad I found out in time, because they did not have this provision in the bill when it came here before. I want you to realize what you are voting on when you include this group of men.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I do not think the gentleman wants to leave the impression that I have been unfair about the matter, because I had the gentleman called to the floor of the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. The gentleman is very, very fair about it.

I want to make this point: That 125 misfit, irregular, retired, inactive officers of the Regular Army should not run in here under the wing of one or two decorations. Some of these boys never got any closer to France than this country. Do not let them stampede you on that.

Further, do not let them stampede you on the matter of the necessity for speed in passing the bill. The bill contains a provision making retroactive to June 1 this matter of pay for our present active Army, so you are not going to beat the boys of the active Army out of any pay raise if you send this bill back to conference and have them reconsider the matter one more day. I know the proponents of this provision boosting retired pay of misfit officers would like very much to have it stampeded into immediate action and approval.

The pay raise for our active soldiers is needed and needed badly, and I am for it. However, it is retroactive, and that takes out that argument against sending this bill back to conference. Also, do not let them march 125 or any other number of misfit officers in here under 1 or 2 or 3 decorations. This provision will increase the inactive retired pay of a great many class B retired officers who never saw combat of any kind except in fighting the War Department and their superior officers in defense of their own shortcomings.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I think this conference report should be adopted just as it is brought back to us. I know the feelings of some of the Members. I know the sentiments of the gentleman who has just spoken to you. I served on the subcommittee along with the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS], the gentleman from Iowa, and other members of the subcommittee. The subcommittee recommended and the full committee recommended that this provision be in the bill.

I am surprised at some of the things the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] has said.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HARNESS. May I ask the gentleman if the Senate voted on this provision as the House did?

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct; it was in the Senate bill originally.

Mr. HARNESS. The House rejected it when we had the bill here originally, and the conferees put it back in.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. It was in the bill as it passed the Senate.

I am surprised that the gentleman from Iowa should raise objection to these men, who are citizens of the United States, coming up here to a congressional

office to speak to the representatives of the people.

Oh, he gets around it by saying they are members of the Army on the retired list. That is true, but I want to remind him that about 2 years ago he joined me in drawing a minority report on a bill from the Military Affairs Committee in which we condemned just as strongly as we could the Army regulation which forbids Regular Army officers from taking matters up with Members of Congress. He helped me draft that protest, and I cannot understand how, today, he can come in and condemn these poor devils who have been thrown out, but who still are citizens of the United States, when they exercise their right to come in and petition Members of Congress.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me get along. The gentleman did not yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

The gentleman brings out the point also that these officers cannot be called back on active duty. He knows that these officers who were retired under Public, No. 190, cannot be called back to active duty, and I know two today who were engineer officers, the finest engineer officers I think I have ever known. One of them was graduated from Leavenworth with an excellent rating and was recommended to be retained there as an instructor and within 30 days he got his notice that he was being separated from the service by reason of inefficiency. He immediately got a job in the building of one of these war plants, working for the engineers, making approximately $600 a month, while the Government was paying him $300 a month, or $900 to do the same job that the Army could have ordered him to do at the regular Army pay of approximately $600 a month. I know another one who was in exactly the same shape.

These officers want to be called back to active duty, but the Army will not call them back and they will not call back any of those who have been let out under these circumstances. Now, he says that retired officers ought not to take pay. Oh, I grant you that is a very fine argument, but it is idealistic. Go down here and see about your major generals and your brigadier generals and your lieutenant generals and all the others who are being retired because of age, and see if they are turning down their pay simply because we are at war. Go to any of the others who are regularly retired. Let us look realistically at this proposition.

The gentleman said something about the list that he put in the RECORD on May 11. I wish you would get that RECORD and read some of the excuses under which these people were let out of the service. If there ever was such a thing as ex parte hearings, it was the insertion of these records in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that the gentleman referred to, where the officer is not identified by name, but simply by number. Listen to this one. I do not know who he is, but he is No. 52:

> During his service he has performed his services satisfactorily, was conscientious, industrious, and energetic, and has received several commendatory letters for the results he has obtained with his command.

But he was let out.

There are lots of them in here as lacking in judgment and placed in class B, because his record does not come up to the standard or "slow to learn," "lacking in basic education," "judgment below the average and often misdirected."

Did you ever hear such a set of general charges and general excuses for getting officers out of the Army?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Alabama 2 additional minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Now, I happen to have an efficiency report here on one of these officers who was let out. I do not know what his number is in here and I cannot look it up, but this is the last efficiency report that was given on this particular officer.

The Army has five different classifications for efficiency—unsatisfactory, satisfactory, very satisfactory, excellent, and superior—superior is the highest. This officer got superior in every single one except one and he got excellent in that. His commanding officer, in commenting on him, said:

> He is a courageous, honorable man, especially well adapted to the profession of arms. I would be satisfied to have this officer serve under my command in peace or war in his present grade.

Yet within 30 days' time this man was turned out under 24 (b). This is the class of officer he lumped in with all of these officers.

I say to you one of the greatest injustices that has ever been done to a small group of men in our whole Government has been done to this small group, and three times the Congress has taken the same group of officers that they served with and has given them the full benefits of retirement; that is, 75 percent of their pay. The last time was 5 minutes after you turned down this particular class. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. MARTIN] helped me in preparing the promotion bill 2 years ago, which gave to every World War officer on retiring the benefit of 75 percent retirement pay. Public, 190, which this Congress passed, did the same thing.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted beyond measure that the conferees have finally agreed upon the $50 base pay for enlisted men of the Army and Navy. I supported that provision as vigorously as anyone, and it is naturally with regret that I find myself in the position where I must support the motion to recommit. When this bill passed the House it contained section 21, which reads as follows:

> This act shall remain in effect until the termination of the present war, as proclaimed by the President, and for 12 months thereafter.

Section 22 reads as follows:

> This act may be cited as the Temporary Pay Readjustment Act of 1942.

The conferees have stricken out both of those sections. If you adopt this report as it comes to you, it will mean that you are voting these retirement increases for officers, these quarters increases for officers, these subsistence allowance increases for officers, all as permanent legislation. The argument is made that there will be a Congress here after the war, which, of course, is true, but you know and I know if the Army and Navy are powerful enough today to take these temporary provisions out of this bill they will be just as powerful after the war is over, after they are back in the safety and comforts of peacetime, to prevent any reduction in these pay and retirement increases carried in this bill. Do not be afraid that the individual soldier will lose one dime. If you will turn to section 12 of the conference report, you will find that the conferees have inserted this provision:

> The provisions of this act shall become effective as of June 1, 1942.

So, 2 or 3 days, 4 or 5 days more spent in conference eliminating these objectionable provisions will not cost a single officer, a single enlisted man in the Army, the Navy, or the Marine Corps one single penny; and for my part I cannot voluntarily support a provision placing upon the taxpayers of this Nation, with the enormous debt we will have after this war is over, the numerous increases carried in this bill.

I think these increases in pay are more than justified under present conditions, in time of war. In fact, it is impossible to compensate a man—private or officer—for going to a foreign land, under unknown conditions, and offering his life in defense of his homeland. Any amount we voted would be inadequate.

But I do not think we are justified at this time, when we need every dollar for present defense, when every citizen will be groaning under the tax burden, in voting the increases carried in this bill for the retirement pay of officers who have already retired from service in the Army and Navy and who are not called upon to render any service or take any risk. The bill the conference committee brings here not only provides for these increases, but it makes them permanent for all time. Nor are these officers required to contribute one penny toward the retirement fund, although every Government employee must deposit 5 percent of his salary every month in their retirement fund.

In this bill you provide substantial increases in the officers' quarters allowance. Why? Because rents have gone up during the war. Also substantial increases in officers' subsistence allowances. Why? Because the cost of living has gone up during the war. There are other increases in this bill for the same reason. And when the war is over and these costs come down, then these increases in this bill should come down. They should not be made permanent for all time. That part of this bill should be changed.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, this conference report should be adopted and adopted today. Almost 9 months ago this legislation originated in the Senate of the United States. It went through the Senate committee and Senate subcommittees, and it passed the Senate and

came to the House. It went through the House subcommittee and the House committee and finally passed the House. It has been to conference. It came back from conference to the full House. We sent it back again to conference, and here it is finally today before us with everyone agreed on the proposed measure except as to 125 officers under section 24 (b). It is a matter of simple justice to the soldiers and the sailors of the United States Army and Navy and to those millions of men serving their country at the present time in this war, that we settle this matter and settle it as quickly as possible. They are entitled to the pay raises which we have set forth in the conference report. They are entitled to a quick decision on this matter and to a final disposition of this legislation, which has run the gamut of committees of the House and Senate over a period of many months.

It is said that the matter of 125 officers, the destinies of this number of men, is important enough to delay this vitally important bill for the officers and men now defending the Nation during this war. This cannot be the case. This measure should be disposed of by the House today. It should be given to the President as quickly as possible and signed by him, so that the Nation's defenders may receive the pay benefits included in this measure.

As to the temporary features of the bill, the bill contains provisions for longevity pay. With the provisions which will affect the careers of the men in the Army and the Navy over many years, the conditions should be made permanent and they should be set forth in such manner that those officers, those men, those soldiers and sailors covered by the terms of this bill, may know what they can depend on 3, 5, 10, or 15 years from now in the way of longevity pay benefits. They should know what they can depend upon when they have devoted their energies and abilities to the service of this Nation over a period of a lifetime.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. ROBSION].

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I arise in support of the conference report and in opposition to the motion that is to be made by our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS] to recommit the conference report to the conference committee of the House and Senate on the soldiers' and sailors' pay bill.

This measure has now been before the House three times. When the bill was first before the House for consideration we adopted, by a vote of 10 to 1, the Rankin amendment to the Senate bill to fix the base or entrance pay of our soldiers and sailors at $50 a month instead of $42 and the base pay of first-class privates of the Army at $54 instead of $48 and substantial increases for the various grades of sergeants and for petty officers of the Navy and also increases for second lieutenants in the Army and ensigns in the Navy, with 20 percent increase for foreign service and additional increase for combat flying service.

The conferees for the House and Senate submitted their report the other day ignoring the increases granted by the overwhelming vote of the House. The House then, by a vote of 10 to 1, sent the conference report back to the committee, with instructions for the House conferees to insist upon the House amendments to the Senate bill. Since that time the Senate has reversed itself and, by a vote of 58 to 20, adopted the House amendment, and the conferees of the House and Senate have reached a unanimous agreement in the report before us today, and this report upholds the increases voted by the House.

There are about 100 World War officers who were retired some years ago when the Army was reduced. Many Members of the House feel they have been unfairly treated in regard to retirement pay. This bill will give them a small increase in retirement pay.

A motion will be made in a few minutes to recommit this bill to cut out those 100 or so retired officers of the first World War.

This legislation was first introduced in the Senate about last December. It has been delayed from time to time. Why hold up the just pay for several million of our soldiers and sailors on account of this small increase for a few retired officers? Therefore, I am urging each Member of the House to vote against the motion to recommit the conference report and urge each one of you to adopt the conference report and bring this legislation to an end.

Our gallant and heroic defenders are fighting on the seven seas, on five continents, and on the islands of the seas, and they are doing a wonderful job—offering their lives and in giving their lives for our country. I want each one of them to know that we are granting these increases gladly, willingly, and not grudgingly. The American people want them to have these increases. They need them to meet their own expenses and hundreds of thousands of them need them in order to help pay allotments to dependent wives, children, and parents.

Under legislation passed by Congress at the behest of the President and signed by him, the President can give to other countries in equipment, war materials, supplies, food, and credits to the amount of about $50,000,000,000.

The Australian soldiers' and sailors' base pay is $62.10 a month. Of course, we cannot pay our defenders all they are entitled to, but why delay and act niggardly toward them?

Let us vote down the motion to recommit the conference report, and adopt the report and place the finishing touches on this important and splendid measure. I know that it will bring joy and happiness to millions of our loyal and patriotic defenders everywhere on the face of the globe.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. FADDIS. I am in its present form.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. FADDIS moves to recommit the conference report to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to strike out paragraph 3 in section 15, and insist upon section 21 of the House amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on that I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. FADDIS) there were—ayes 41, noes 101.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present, and I object to the vote on that ground.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 38, nays 318, not voting 74, as follows:

[Roll No. 69]

YEAS—38

Bradley, Mich.	Halleck	Moser
Buck	Hancock	Pace
Cole, N. Y.	Harness	Reed, N. Y.
Crawford	Hess	Rich
Crowther	Hoffman	Rockefeller
Curtis	Jenkins, Ohio	Smith, Va.
Dondero	Jones	Taber
Elston	Knutson	Thom
Engel	Lambertson	Vorys, Ohio
Faddis	LeCompte	Wasielewski
Fulmer	Lewis	Whittington
Gearhart	McLean	Woodruff, Mich.
Haines	Martin, Iowa	

NAYS—318

Allen, Ill.	Capozzoli	Eliot, Mass.
Allen, La.	Carlson	Elliott, Calif.
Andersen, H. Carl	Carter	Englebright
	Cartwright	Fenton
Anderson, Calif.	Case, S. Dak.	Fish
Anderson, N. Mex.	Casey, Mass.	Fitzgerald
	Celler	Fitzpatrick
Andresen, August H.	Chapman	Flaherty
	Chenoweth	Flannagan
Angell	Chiperfield	Fogarty
Arends	Clason	Folger
Arnold	Claypool	Forand
Barden	Clevenger	Ford, Thomas F.
Barnes	Cochran	Gamble
Barry	Coffee, Wash.	Gathings
Bates, Ky.	Collins	Gavagan
Bates, Mass.	Colmer	Gehrmann
Beam	Cooley	Gerlach
Beckworth	Cooper	Gibson
Beiter	Costello	Gifford
Bender	Courtney	Gilchrist
Bennett	Cox	Gillette
Bland	Cravens	Gillie
Bloom	Creal	Gore
Boehne	Crosser	Graham
Boggs	Cunningham	Granger
Bolton	D'Alesandro	Grant, Ala.
Bonner	Davis, Ohio	Gregory
Boren	Davis, Tenn.	Guyer
Boykin	Day	Gwynne
Bradley, Pa.	Delaney	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Brooks	Dewey	
Brown, Ga.	Dickstein	Hall, Leonard W.
Brown, Ohio	Dingell	
Bryson	Disney	Hare
Buckley, N. Y.	Domengeaux	Harris, Ark.
Bulwinkle	Douglas	Harris, Va.
Burch	Downs	Harter
Burgin	Drewry	Hartley
Butler	Duncan	Healey
Camp	Dworshak	Hébert
Canfield	Eaton	Heffernan
Cannon, Fla.	Eberharter	Hendricks
Cannon, Mo.	Edmiston	Hill, Colo.

Hill, Wash.	May	Sauthoff
Hinshaw	Merritt	Scanlon
Hobbs	Meyer, Md.	Schuetz
Holbrock	Michener	Scrugham
Hook	Mills, Ark.	Secrest
Hope	Mills, La.	Shafer, Mich.
Houston	Mitchell	Sheppard
Hull	Monroney	Short
Hunter	Mott	Simpson
Imhoff	Mundt	Smith, Maine
Izac	Murdock	Smith, Wash.
Jackson	Murray	Smith, Wis.
Jacobsen	Myers, Pa.	Snyder
Jarman	Nelson	Somers, N. Y.
Jennings	Nichols	South
Jensen	Norrell	Sparkman
Johns	Norton	Spence
Johnson, Calif.	O'Brien, Mich.	Springer
Johnson, Ill.	O'Brien, N. Y.	Starnes, Ala.
Johnson, Ind.	O'Connor	Steagall
Johnson, Luther A.	O'Hara	Stearns, N. H.
	O'Leary	Stefan
Johnson, Okla.	O'Neal	Stevenson
Johnson, W. Va.	O'Toole	Sullivan
Jonkman	Patman	Sumner, Ill.
Kee	Patton	Sumners, Tex.
Keefe	Pearson	Sweeney
Kefauver	Peterson, Fla.	Talbot
Kelley, Pa.	Peterson, Ga.	Talle
Kelly, Ill.	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Tarver
Kennedy, Martin J.	Pheiffer, William T.	Terry
Kennedy, Michael J.	Pierce	Thill
Keogh	Pittenger	Thomas, N. J.
Kerr	Plauché	Thomas, Tex.
Kilday	Poage	Thomason
Kinzer	Powers	Tibbott
Kirwan	Priest	Tolan
Kleberg	Rabaut	Traynor
Klein	Ramsay	Treadway
Koppleмann	Ramspeck	Van Zandt
Kunkel	Randolph	Vincent, Ky.
Landis	Rankin, Miss.	Vinson, Ga
Lane	Rankin, Mont.	Voorhis, Calif.
Lanham	Reece, Tenn.	Ward
Larrabee	Reed, Ill.	Weaver
Lea	Rees, Kans.	Weiss
Leavy	Richards	Welch
Lesinski	Rivers	West
Ludlow	Rizley	Wheat
Lynch	Robertson, Va.	Whelchel
McCormack	Robinson, Utah	White
McGehee	Robsion, Ky.	Whitten
McGranery	Rockwell	Wickersham
McGregor	Rodgers, Pa.	Wigglesworth
McIntyre	Rogers, Mass.	Williams
McKeough	Rogers, Okla.	Wilson
McLaughlin	Rolph	Wolcott
McMillan	Romjue	Wolfenden, Pa.
Maciejewski	Russell	Wolverton, N. J.
Maciora	Sabath	Woodrum, Va.
Magnuson	Sacks	Wright
Mahon	Sanders	Young
Manasco	Sasscer	Zimmerman
Mansfield	Satterfield	

NOT VOTING—74

Andrews	Gale	Ploeser
Baldwin	Gossett	Plumley
Baumhart	Grant, Ind.	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bell	Green	
Bishop	Harrington	Schaefer, Ill.
Blackney	Hart	Schulte
Buckler, Minn.	Heidinger	Scott
Burdick	Holmes	Shanley
Byrne	Howell	Shannon
Byron	Jarrett	Sheridan
Clark	Jenks, N. H.	Sikes
Cluett	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Smith, Ohio
Coffee, Nebr.		Smith, Pa.
Cole, Md.	Kean	Smith, W. Va.
Copeland	Kilburn	Stratton
Culkin	Kocialkowski	Sutphin
Cullen	Kramer	Tinkham
Dies	Maas	Vreeland
Dirksen	Marcantonio	Wadsworth
Ditter	Martin, Mass.	Walter
Doughton	Mason	Wene
Durham	O'Day	Winter
Ellis	Oliver	Worley
Fellows	Osmers	Youngdahl
Ford, Leland M.	Paddock	
Ford, Miss.	Patrick	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Doughton with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.

Mr. Gossett with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Copeland.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Grant of Indiana.

Mr. Coffee of Nebraska with Mr. Ditter.

Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Cullen with Mr. Baumhart.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Smith of Ohio.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Ploeser.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Cluett.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Holmes.

Mr. Durham with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Bell with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Green with Mr. Wadsworth.

Mr. Sutphin with Mr. Heidinger.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Youngdahl.

Mr. Harrington with Mr. Gale.

Mr. Kramer with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Shanley with Mr. Kean.

Mrs. Byron with Mr. Oliver.

Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Wene with Mr. Howell.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Leland M. Ford.

Mr. Patrick with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Schulte with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.

Mr. Kocialkowski with Mr. Stratton.

Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania with Mr. Fellows.

Mr. Shannon with Mr. Bishop.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 363, nays 0, not voting 67, as follows:

[Roll No. 70]

YEAS—363

Allen, Ill.	Camp	Dondero
Allen, La.	Canfield	Doughton
Andersen, H. Carl	Cannon, Fla.	Douglas
	Cannon, Mo.	Downs
Anderson, Calif.	Capozzoli	Drewry
Anderson, N. Mex.	Carlson	Duncan
	Carter	Dworshak
Andresen, August H.	Cartwright	Eaton
	Case, S. Dak.	Eberharter
Andrews	Casey, Mass.	Edmiston
Angell	Celler	Eliot, Mass.
Arends	Chapman	Elliott, Calif.
Arnold	Chenoweth	Elston
Barden	Chiperfield	Engel
Barnes	Clason	Englebright
Barry	Claypool	Fenton
Bates, Mass.	Clevenger	Fish
Beam	Cochran	Fitzgerald
Beckworth	Coffee, Wash.	Fitzpatrick
Beiter	Cole, N. Y.	Flaherty
Bender	Collins	Flannagan
Bennett	Colmer	Fogarty
Blackney	Cooley	Folger
Bland	Cooper	Forand
Bloom	Costello	Ford, Thomas F.
Boehne	Courtney	Fulmer
Boggs	Cox	Gamble
Bolton	Cravens	Gathings
Bonner	Crawford	Gavagan
Boren	Creal	Gearhart
Boykin	Crosser	Gehrmann
Bradley, Mich.	Crowther	Gerlach
Bradley, Pa.	Cunningham	Gibson
Brooks	Curtis	Gifford
Brown, Ga.	D'Alesandro	Gilchrist
Brown, Ohio	Davis, Ohio	Gillette
Bryson	Davis, Tenn.	Gillie
Buck	Day	Gore
Buckley, N. Y.	Delaney	Graham
Bulwinkle	Dewey	Granger
Burch	Dickstein	Grant, Ala.
Burgin	Dingell	Gregory
Butler	Disney	Guyer
Byron	Domengeaux	Gwynne
Haines	McGranery	Sacks
Hall, Edwin Arthur	McGregor	Sanders
	McIntyre	Sasscer
Hall, Leonard W.	McKeough	Satterfield
	McLaughlin	Sauthoff
Halleck	McLean	Scanlon
Hancock	McMillan	Schuetz
Hare	Maciejewski	Schulte
Harness	Maciora	Scrugham
Harris, Ark.	Mahon	Secrest
Harris, Va.	Manasco	Shafer, Mich.
Harter	Mansfield	Sheppard
Hartley	Marcantonio	Short
Healey	Martin, Iowa	Simpson
Hébert	May	Smith, Maine
Heffernan	Merritt	Smith, Va.
Heidinger	Meyer, Md.	Smith, Wash.
Hendricks	Michener	Smith, Wis.
Hess	Mills, Ark.	Snyder
Hill, Colo.	Mills, La.	Somers, N. Y.
Hill, Wash.	Mitchell	South
Hinshaw	Monroney	Sparkman
Hoffman	Moser	Spence
Holbrock	Mott	Springer
Hook	Mundt	Starnes, Ala.
Hope	Murdock	Steagall
Houston	Murray	Stearns, N. H.
Hull	Myers, Pa.	Stefan
Hunter	Nelson	Stevenson
Imhoff	Nichols	Sullivan
Izac	Norrell	Sumner, Ill.
Jackson	Norton	Sumners, Tex.
Jacobsen	O'Brien, Mich.	Sutphin
Jarman	O'Brien, N. Y.	Sweeney
Jenkins, Ohio	O'Connor	Taber
Jennings	O'Hara	Talbot
Jensen	O'Leary	Talle
Johns	O'Neal	Tarver
Johnson, Calif.	O'Toole	Tenerowicz
Johnson, Ill.	Pace	Terry
Johnson, Ind.	Patman	Thill
Johnson, Luther A.	Patrick	Thom
	Patton	Thomas, N. J.
Johnson, Okla.	Pearson	Thomas, Tex.
Johnson, W. Va.	Peterson, Fla.	Thomason
Jones	Peterson, Ga.	Tibbott
Jonkman	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Tolan
Kean		Treadway
Kee	Pheiffer, William T.	Van Zandt
Keefe		Vincent, Ky
Kefauver	Pierce	Vinson, Ga.
Kelley, Pa.	Pittenger	Voorhis, Calif.
Kelly, Ill.	Plumley	Vorys, Ohio
Kennedy, Martin J.	Poage	Wadsworth
	Powers	Ward
Kennedy, Michael J.	Priest	Wasielewski
	Rabaut	Weaver
Keogh	Ramsay	Weiss
Kerr	Ramspeck	Welch
Kilday	Randolph	Wene
Kinzer	Rankin, Miss.	West
Kirwan	Rankin, Mont.	Wheat
Kleberg	Reece, Tenn.	Whelchel
Klein	Reed, Ill.	White
Knutson	Reed, N. Y.	Whitten
Koppleмann	Rees, Kans	Whittington
Kunkel	Rich	Wickersham
Lambertson	Richards	Wigglesworth
Landis	Rivers	Williams
Lane	Rizley	Wilson
Lanham	Robertson, Va.	Winter
Larrabee	Robinson, Utah	Wolcott
Lea	Robsion, Ky.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Leavy	Rockefeller	Wolverton, N. J.
LeCompte	Rockwell	Woodruff, Mich.
Lesinski	Rodgers, Pa.	Woodrum, Va.
Lewis	Rogers, Mass.	Wright
Ludlow	Rolph	Young
Lynch	Romjue	Zimmerman
McCormack	Russell	
McGehee	Sabath	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—67

Baldwin	Ellis	Kocialkowski
Bates, Ky.	Faddis	Kramer
Baumhart	Fellows	Maas
Bell	Ford, Leland M.	Magnuson
Bishop	Ford, Miss.	Martin, Mass
Buckler, Minn.	Gale	Mason
Burdick	Gossett	O'Day
Byrne	Grant, Ind.	Oliver
Clark	Green	Osmers
Cluett	Harrington	Paddock
Coffee, Nebr.	Hart	Plauché
Cole, Md.	Hobbs	Ploeser
Copeland	Holmes	Robertson, N. Dak.
Culkin	Howell	
Cullen	Jarrett	Rogers, Okla.
Dies	Jenks, N. H.	Schaefer, Ill.
Dirksen	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Scott
Ditter		Shanley
Durham	Kilburn	Shannon

Sheridan	Smith, W. Va.	Vreeland
Sikes	Stratton	Walter
Smith, Ohio	Tinkham	Worley
Smith, Pa.	Traynor	Youngdahl

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Martin of Massachusetts.
Mr. Gossett with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Copeland.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Grant of Indiana.
Mr. Coffee of Nebraska with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Baumhart.
Mr. Worley with Mr. Smith of Ohio.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Ploeser.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Holmes.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Youngdahl.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Gale.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Oliver.
Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Faddis with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
Mr. Green with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Jenks.
Mr. Kocialkowski with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Kramer with Mr. Bishop.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Jarrett.
Mrs. O'Day with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Traynor with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.
Mr. Shanley with Mr. Tinkham.
Mr. Rogers of Oklahoma with Mr. Paddock.
Mr. Plauché with Mr. Buckler.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF, FISCAL YEAR 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 324, making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 324, making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the joint resolution was dispensed with.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, it is my understanding that under the order of the House, debate shall extend not to exceed 3 hours, half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New York and half by myself. I believe we can complete general debate within 1 hour if this would be agreeable to the gentleman from New York, and then begin the reading of the joint resolution.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have requests for the full hour and a half and am not able to take care of the demand, so I am inclined to believe we shall use all the time allotted to us. I have no objection to getting the joint resolution through as quickly as possible, but, frankly, I do not believe it would be fair to the membership to start reading this joint resolution at 5 o'clock.

The CHAIRMAN. In response to the inqury of the gentleman from Missouri, the Chair will state that the gentleman has correctly stated the situation, as the Chair understands it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, we are nearing the end of a decade of Federal philanthropy. It is a brilliant and successful chapter in American history. At the beginning of this decade we found our streets and highways thronged with unemployed. Their ranks were made up largely of competent men who had never experienced any particular difficulty in providing for their families. Conditions over which they had no control had unexpectedly thrown them out of employment and the Government was faced with the necessity of supplying charity or providing work. The only alternative was anarchy. To meet this situation the Work Projects Administration was evolved and solved the problem effectively and humanely.

From the beginning it was understood to be a temporary expedient, to be contracted or expanded as the burden of unemployment increased or declined, and to be discontinued at the close of the emergency when no longer needed. With that in view we have provided year by year as the volume of unemployment indicated. We provided for 1936, $1,258,000,000, and increased the amount the next year, 1937, to $1,818,000,000. In 1938 there was a decline in unemployment and the appropriation that year dropped to $1,427,000,000, but in 1939, the period of greatest need, we reached the peak both in appropriations and Federal employment under W. P. A. Three million men were given employment and $2,230,000,000 was expended. Expenditures declined with the steadily lessening load of unemployment to $1,500,000,000 in 1940 and to $1,000,300,000 in 1941; and the estimated expenditure this year is about $858,000,000.

This summer there has been a great reduction in unemployment due to unprecedented demand for labor in the war activities. So much so that many have been led to believe that there is no further need for W. P. A. work. A study of the situation reveals, however, that the bulk of the war employment is localized in 12 States. The result is that there are many unemployed in other States who are not accessible to these centers of employment, who on that account are yet without work. In addition to this there has been a tremendous economic shift in industry. We have discontinued in large part manufacture for domestic consumption and turned all possible facilities to war production.

In this process hundreds of thousands necessarily have been thrown out of employment, for whom there is no place in the war production industries.

In addition to that, we are employing today 1,200,000 women who have come into the employment market in the last year. Also, an unprecedented number of young people, who normally would remain in school or in nonindustrial employments, and, in particular, vast numbers from the farms, who ordinarily would be employed in agricultural pursuits have been drawn into plants, factories, and shops. The result is that we find after a careful study, as the hearings before the committee indicate, that we still have large numbers of unemployed aggregating in April, the last month on which figures are available, about 3,000,000 men, without employment, requiring an opportunity to earn support for their families.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. As a matter of fact, the W. P. A. has built up a fine engineering and administrative organization, and at this time the War Department is depending heavily on the W. P. A. to build access roads and to build strategic roads for use of the War Department in our national defense.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. The gentleman refers to a very important phase of the W. P. A. work schedule. A large part of the work is in connection with the war program.

By way of résumé, work must be provided for a minimum of 400,000 men. To meet this situation the President advised the Congress that $280,000,000 is required for the coming fiscal year. This is a reduction of 68 percent under the current year, and is the lowest estimate yet received for the purpose.

The committee therefore reports the full Budget estimate to the House with favorable recommendation.

In view of the fact that this bill has been annually before the House for the last 9 years and has been so fully debated, it is unnecessary to discuss it further, and unless there is some question I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, in his Budget message the President said this in the last sentence of the message:

> The action to be taken by the Congress in the near future on such proposals will determine the extent to which we can move toward the further reduction or the possible elimination of the Work Projects Administration.

Eventually, why not now?

This program comes to us at a time when any man or woman who is able to work can find work, and when it is not necessary to provide relief employment.

It comes to us at a time when our farmers are crying aloud for help, when the demand for labor in the factories is going up by leaps and bounds, when millions of our boys are being taken for the armed forces of the country, and at a time when every dollar of credit that the United States has is needed for the carrying out of the war program to bring this country to victory.

Why should we have this program continued? The only possible reason I can see is so that those administrative employees who are estimated by the head of the organization, Colonel Dryden, to total 7,500 next year, may continue to have a job on the public pay roll, so that those misfits who have made such a mess of the W. P. A. program over the years may continue to remain upon the public pay roll.

The relief load has dropped 50 percent in less than a year and it continues to drop. Colonel Dryden gave us figures concerning the items of increase in the requirements for labor and increases in the armed forces. I am unable to check his figures on the requirements for additional help in industry, but I am able to check his figures on the additional requirements for the armed forces. In the statement that he gave us, he was two and a half million short of the proposed estimate that is now before the Congress for increases in the personnel of the Army; he was 500,000 short of the estimates that have been passed by the House for increases in the personnel of the Navy for the fiscal year for which we are providing funds; he was a hundred thousand short in the estimates that have already been passed by this House for increases in the Navy, which makes a total of increase in jobs amounting to 3,100,000, and when he got all through his estimate of unemployment was two and one-half million, without taking into consideration Mr. Dryden's mistake of over 3,000,000.

With that kind of a statement before us, containing manifest inaccuracies, I do not see how there can be any possible excuse for a continuance of this organization. True, it is reduced from estimates of approximately $1,025,000,000 last year, including an unexpended balance, to approximately $336,000,000 for the fiscal year that is to come, including the unexpended balances which are estimated to be available.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman says there is no use continuing this organization. The gentleman recognizes the fact, however, that through long experience it has built up a fine engineering and administrative organization?

Mr. TABER. Oh, I recognize the fact that they have built up a very poor organization and that they have and are expected to have 7,500 administrative employees, which I am sorry to say it appears the gentleman from Idaho would like to keep on the Federal pay roll, judging from the way he talks. For my part, I believe that these misfits should be eliminated from the Federal pay roll. There is absolutely no relief reason for continuing it. There will be none on the rolls who are employable, and there is absolutely no excuse whatever for continuing it.

Mr. WHITE. If the gentleman will come out to Idaho, I think I can show him the efficiency and the good work they are doing.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman has a relief problem out there that he wants this continued for, let him present it on the floor. The gentleman from Missouri has plenty of time to give him if he wants it.

Mr. WHITE. They have given us our best relief.

Mr. TABER. There is no excuse for this thing, except for relief purposes.

Mr. WHITE. They are helping the Army and Navy.

Mr. TABER. They are not helping the Army. The Army would be better off, and they would get better results, and the morale of the people who are employed on those projects would be better if they were employed at regular wages upon a regular job, and more would be done. The trouble with that situation is that it is a fake. This is brought up to continue an undesirable organization on the Federal pay roll.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PEARSON. Is it not a fact that the conditions among the unemployed of this country were the primary reason for ever starting out on a relief program?

Mr. TABER. That is what we were told.

Mr. PEARSON. Is it not a fact that this one reason which justified bringing into existence the W. P. A. has now vanished, because unemployment is at an all-time low in this country?

Mr. TABER. It is, and it is getting lower.

Mr. PEARSON. It is also a fact that there are now more people employed than have ever been employed in the history of this country?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. PEARSON. I would go further and suggest to the gentleman that if we ever expect or hope to get rid of the W. P. A. as a permanent agency, now is certainly the time to do it, when unemployment has gone out of existence in this country.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman has stated the exact situation that confronts us today.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Can the gentleman tell us just what plans he may have to offer in the event the W. P. A. is abolished, to protect the interests of the taxpayer where his community and the Federal Government are cosponsors of an incompleted W. P. A. project?

Mr. TABER. The law requires that when any project is adopted by the W. P. A., funds be in sight to complete it. If some projects have been started illegally, the local divisions should take their grief. If they have started to build a part of a highway, that should be completed so that it is done, as far as it goes, before the 1st of July.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman spoke about the W. P. A. being set up as a temporary measure. May I read three lines from the President's message of May 25, which is published in the committee report:

> The Work Projects Administration and its predecessor organizations were created to meet a temporary relief and employment need for millions of persons out of work during the depression years.

If this organization was set up at that time for that reason, why continue it now when we can very well afford to eliminate it and take care of the people on W. P. A. in industry and in agriculture?

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. Language is one thing, and facts are quite another. In September 1941 total employment was 52,414,000, and in April 1942 it was down to 50,913,000. The nonagricultural employment in September 1941 was 40,710,000, and in April 1942 it was up to 40,773,000. The agricultural employment in September 1941 was 11,704,000, and in April 1942 it was down to 10,140,000.

Some may say that we had a different condition before than we have now, but the very ones who are talking against the W. P. A. now talked against it before, and talked just as vehemently against this program before.

Mr. TABER. I am glad the gentleman has brought that out, because I do not believe there is a man in this House who believes that employment figures are lower now than they were last fall. I know that all through my territory they have increased tremendously.

On top of that, the armed forces of this country have already been increased upward of 1,500,000 men. Today the Army totals over 2,750,000 men, the Navy 500,000, and the Marine Corps 100,000, and the program is running along by leaps and bounds so that by the end of the fiscal year 1943 the Army will have 7,500,000 men, the Navy 1,000,000 men, and the Marine Corps 200,000. These figures and the figures that Mr. Dryden gave us absolutely prove that he is wrong and that there will be no unemployment whatever of employables by the time this appropriation works out. I am glad the gentleman has brought that up because we all know employment has increased tremendously.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is not half as pleased that I brought it up as I am because these figures come from the Bureau of Labor Statistics and from the Department of Agriculture, and there could not be figures from any better source than those which have been quoted.

Mr. TABER. They may come from those agencies, but, on the other hand, the figures the gentleman from the administration brought up indicate only 2,500,000 unemployed, according to the estimates of the C. I. O., including unemployables. How we can figure there are fewer people on the employment rolls today than there were last fall, regardless of what the Bureau of Labor Statistics tells us, I cannot understand. There has been an increase in employment in the industries employing war workers of upward of 5,000,000 in that period, and I do not believe there has been any such cut in other employment as would match that figure. I cannot go along with any theorist who figures that employment is down. When we all know it is up, when you know things and can see them and can feel the temper of the people who are out seeking employees all the time, you know there is a shortage of labor and not a surplus.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentlewoman from Montana.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Many things the gentleman has said about employment are true, but is it not true that the employment has increased for certain age groups and among certain people and in certain sections of the country? But there are other people who are unemployed because of the shifts in industry. For instance, we have such a very large number of women between 60 and 65 years of age who are unemployed and come under no other classification except the W. P. A.

Mr. TABER. Are they unemployed?

Miss RANKIN of Montana. They are unemployed. They are not employed because there are no war industries, and peacetime industries are cutting down. The bill to provide for the conversion of small industries into war industries has not been signed. These women have no jobs, and there are no jobs that can be foreseen. They do not come under the pension provision because of their age. Many have dependents that are not provided for.

Mr. TABER. I want to say to the gentlewoman from Montana that I have investigated all sorts of cases of that kind, and I have found that such people can get employment if they have a mind to do so, because there is a demand for labor all over the country that you cannot supply. Yet on top of all this the people in the W. P. A. are today pretending to supply people for war industries and at the same time they are putting people in these vocational schools who are over 60 years of age. They did that in my community, and they are doing it in other places all over the country. They are just making a travesty of this whole situation.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield any further, because there are two or three other things that I want to cover. The gentleman can get plenty of time.

On page 60 of the hearings there is a break-down of tables showing the number of relief cases and the number of employments upon other Federal projects. You will see there that these figures run down very rapidly.

We were told that upward of 200,000 of the 400,000 proposed to be employed by the W. P. A. for next year would be on war projects, and what do we find? I look on pages 84 to 91, inclusive, and I find that $36,000,000 out of $1,000,000,000 available was spent upon war projects or was earmarked for war projects out of a total of $1,000,000,000, or approximately three and a half percent. This is the kind of stuff we have got to operate on.

The W. P. A., in a territory where the largest war contracts have existed, has not gone down in proportion to what it should in those territories. For instance, in Illinois, where they have 3.8 percent of the war contracts, the W. P. A., in April of 1942, was 6.8 percent. In New York, where they have 9.3 percent, the W. P. A. was 8.7 percent. It is perfectly ridiculous that these figures cannot be reduced.

Mr. Dryden, on page 125 of the hearings, told us that all of these folks who had worked on war projects were employable. You know they would be an awful lot better off if this war work was done in the regular way and these people were employed at regular wages, just like regular folks.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to ask the gentleman if he can tell me what percentage on the W. P. A. are still nonrelief.

Mr. TABER. I have not that figure right at hand.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I think it would be very interesting to have that developed.

Mr. TABER. It is quite a substantial figure. It would run, probably, 60,000 or 75,000, I would think, because there are a great lot of these projects and a great many of these people are employed on constructon projects and that sort of thing where relief labor is not available to fit into such jobs. I would think that it would probably amount to nearly 10 percent. I will try to get that figure for the RECORD.

They are going ahead on such foolish projects as the Jefferson Memorial performance in St. Louis, where they spent last year somewhere around $400,000. They have had a tremendous expenditure for so-called music projects of something like $8,000,000 or $10,000,000. They had several projects totaling $900,000, and they have had instances in the last year where they have had allocated more than the community had asked for.

We have here on page 19 a break-down of the percentage of the total funds on different types of projects. They have an expenditure estimated at something like 25 percent for the service division. This means arts, education, and historical research, and a lot of that kind of stuff. These figures are absolutely ridiculous at this time. These people ought to be at the point right now where they were put to work that would contribute to the war effort instead of nursing them along at a time when they could get other employment.

The expenditures in the other different items that might be used are altogether out of line with 50 percent of the work being on war work.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want the gentleman to explain what a war project is. I had a letter the day before yesterday about it, and I have observed the same thing with discouragement for months. I refer to 2 miles of railroad through a camp close to my home—a W. P. A. project, a war project, with 6 inches of black loam on the side of that railroad setting, brought 10 miles away by truck, and they call it a war project. It is wasteful extravagance. All of the people are employables, and they are about 40 miles from a city where the city has to put up the truck hire and use up gasoline and rubber.

Mr. HOUSTON. Was the project not sponsored by local authorities?

Mr. GIFFORD. It had to be sponsored to get the trucks, to get them there, and if the city would pay that money for the trucks they could easily take care of that.

Mr. TABER. That is the kind of stuff that we are asked to carry along. I don't think we ought to carry along a bit of it, and I hope that when the time comes this House will refuse to go along. Eventually, why not now? Let us throw this thing down and get rid of it at a time when there is no substantial unemployment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, the Work Projects Administration has done and is doing much important and valuable work. The people on the W. P. A. average over 50 years of age; they are not readily employed in private industry. If the W. P. A. is abolished, thousands of them will go back onto relief—onto the welfare—a tragedy for them and a blow to the finances of the cities and towns where they live.

I have said before, here in the House, that I cannot see how it helps win the war to have poor people's income diminished to something around a dollar a day. I cannot see how it helps win the war to discontinue the activities of the W. P. A., which are nearly a hundred percent war projects. For a picture of the fine work the W. P. A. is doing I urge you to read the articles by our splendid State administrator in Massachusetts, Denis W. Delaney, which are printed in the Appendix of the RECORD for June 5, on page A2092.

I am frankly disturbed by the amount of the reduction in the proposed appropriation. I hope it will not mean that old people, and blind people, and untrained older women will go by the thousands back onto city-supported charity—meager relief, without the dignity of work

and self-support. But I am much more disturbed by the suggestion that the W. P. A. should be abolished altogether. That would be a devastating tragedy for thousands of American families, for thousands of Americans who are ready and eager to work, and who are working today on projects which strengthen their communities and their country.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox].

CONGRESS, THE VOICE OF THE PEOPLE

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I am going to undertake the performance of a task for which any number of my colleagues are better prepared. I am going to answer the smear brigade that has launched a campaign against Congress.

Individuals are not important but the institution of Congress is a coordinate branch of the Government and when it falls the Government falls with it.

To abuse and misrepresentation I am accustomed and make no protest but to conspiracy in mass I am not acquainted and the effort to destroy Congress by corrupting the public mind I regard with deep concern. The authority of Congress cannot be wounded without injury to the Republic and to save the Republic is the first and supreme law.

The people of the United States are engaged in the most dangerous and desperate war this country ever faced. It is a war of forces which would enslave the peoples of the world under incredibly brutal taskmasters, against the people who are fighting for liberty, progress, continued enlightenment, spiritual, mental, cultural, and material freedoms. It is impossible to imagine what the state of the world would be if the forces of wickedness and slavery were to gain the victory.

A condition that disturbs me is that there is still too much of a spirit in this country that we can do other things besides fight this war.

There can be not the slightest excuse on the part of anybody, in any branch of the Government, for trying experiments under cover of our war efforts. The issue of winning this war as quickly as possible and so decisively that we will dictate the terms of the peace, and be able afterward to enforce those terms, is the whole, sole issue which should occupy the attention and engage the efforts of every official and every citizen to the full extent necessary to win the war in the shortest possible time. Anybody who fails to follow that issue is disloyal and a menace to the welfare of this Nation.

This war will not be won by anybody trying to change our form of government at this time.

This war will not be won by anybody trying to sneak over a change in our economic structure at this time.

This war will not be won by anybody trying to discredit and render impotent the legislative branch of the Government.

This war will not be won by criticism of the executive branch of the Government.

Mistakes can be avoided, or at least a repetition of mistakes can be avoided by honest, constructive, intelligent criticisms of both the executive and the legislative branches of the Government.

This war will not be won by the creation of cleavages between classes or sections or political parties.

I have no sympathy with attempts by any individuals or any groups to discredit or to decry the honesty and the integrity and the patriotism of citizens because they happen to belong to one or the other political party. I would resent and denounce any attempt to lead the people to believe that our Republican colleagues have been anything other than earnest, honest, and patriotic. There have been differences of opinion, it is true, as to the methods to be followed and the powers to be granted. These differences of opinion have been honest differences. These conflicting views have been sincere views. I want to remind the Members of this House and the people of this Nation that it is on just such honest, sincere differences of views that democracy is based and stands. If sincere and honest differences of views were not permitted in this Congress and in the press and in the expressions of the people of this Nation, this would not be a democracy; it would be a tyranny. If and when such honest differences of view are proscribed or forbidden, we shall have ceased to be a democracy.

This war will not be won by the American people having to divide their efforts between conducting the war and trying to prevent the building up of some form of fascistic or communistic government, economy, and social system at this time.

This war will be won by all our citizens getting into it with heart, soul, and body; with all they are, all that they have, and all they can do.

It will be won by the American people operating as a unit.

It will be won by the American people being convinced that the paramount, single vital issue is to pull together to win it.

That unity, which is the very first requisite of this war effort, can be achieved only by an administration which is frank with the people, which convinces the people that its sole objective is to win the war, and then return its vast and extraordinary war powers to the people through their Congress, and again take up our American way of life with a will to mend our broken and war-torn structure.

This war will be won by the people trusting the executive department of the Government and by the executive department of the Government trusting the people—all of the people.

Public confidence in public officials is necessary to give effect to the legal administration of public affairs. This does not mean, however, that confidence should be so complete as to silence all fears for the safety of human rights and constitutional procedure. But confidence between sections, between classes, between races, between parties, is essential to the winning of this war and our capacity to survive the peace which will come with the exhaustion of one or the other contesting groups of nations.

Reasonable confidence, fair dealing, and evidence of intention to deal fairly is essential between capital and labor, between labor and agriculture, between government and the people in every way. To such degree as that confidence is lacking, to just that degree our strength to fight and win this war is not what it should be. To just the degree that we waste our efforts opposing one another by sections, by classes, by creeds, or by political mud slinging, to just that degree do we aid and comfort the enemy.

This does not mean that we can win the war by blind, unquestioning submission to the bureaucracy which necessarily has to handle the details of conducting the war effort. Such a blind submission could lose us the war—lose it without our knowledge until our forces and those of our Allies had surrendered on the far-off battle fronts—and then it would be too late for us to mend the situation. We would be enslaved by our ruthless conquerors.

We cannot win this war by resorting to the absolutism of a one-party government and the silencing of all criticism of the administration, the Congress, or the agencies handling the details of the war effort.

A curious situation has arisen which indicates a grave blind spot on the part of some of our leading newspapers, commentators, and administrators. To illustrate just what I mean, I want to quote two paragraphs from the same editorial in a newspaper which is strongly pro-administration. A few days ago this newspaper said in an editorial:

> In time of war many people believe it is unpatriotic to criticize the President, who is also the Commander in Chief.

Now, further along in this same editorial this language appeared:

> In the long run it is the truth about Congress which hurts the most, and, of course, criticism based upon fact cannot be suppressed without scuttling the democratic process.
>
> Criticism of Congress has naturally been loudest when that body has failed to measure up to public expectations.

Thus we have a curious line of editorial reasoning which says that while the executive department of government must not be criticized, even though it fails to measure up to public expectations, democratic processes would be scuttled if criticism of the Congress were silenced.

The fact is democratic processes will be scuttled if fair criticism of any department of government or of those officials conducting the war is silenced.

This editorial writer fell into another error which has fooled some people. Criticism of the Congress at this time is the loudest not because Congress has failed to measure up to public expectations, because Congress has given the President every dollar and every atom of extraordinary power he has demanded

for the conduct of the war. The criticism of the Congress is loudest at this time, because as many, if not most, of the Washington observers and other students of current events clearly perceive there is a determined, challenging, well-planned propaganda program under way to smear the Congress and to so discredit the legislative branch of the Government in the minds of the people as to destroy their confidence in it and leave the executive branch the sole remaining department of government having the confidence of the people. And the war will not be won that way, either.

Let it be said, my colleagues, here and now, that if and when, even under the pretense of it being a war necessity, we abandon our biparty system of constitutional government we will have lost the war, no matter what the outcome of the clash at arms may be.

If we submit to any plan for the undue continuance of the dictatorial war controls—and they are necessary for the practical conduct of the war—after the war has ended, and we have won a decisive victory, we shall have lost the very ideals for which our boys are now risking or surrendering their lives on the fighting lines to defend.

England has more and more found that constructive criticism of the way the war is conducted is necessary to prevent laxity, let-down, incompetence, waste, and corruption. Strangely enough, some of the very persons who uphold the British practice of criticizing mistakes and wrong methods condemn the right of the American people to do the same thing. It does not make sense and it will not win the war.

On the other hand, if we spend our time looking for things to criticize we will lack just that much war effort which we should put into a determined, never-say-die spirit of fighting through to a victorious finish.

Constructive criticism does not mean running around with a magnifying glass looking for chances to grumble and accuse and berate. On the other hand, intelligent war effort does not mean shutting our eyes to all mistakes, or worse, and continuing to repeat disastrous errors simply because those who make them cry that it is unpatriotic to criticize.

If, as a people, we are able to distinguish between constructive criticism and destructive criticism; if, as a people, we are able to see and correct our own mistakes, while pulling together in unity to fight the war, we will win the victory, and be able to lead the world to new paths of progress, new ways of peace, and new heights of accomplishment. If, on the other hand, we are unable to distinguish between constructive and destructive criticism; if we are unable to see and correct our mistakes without fighting among ourselves and if we are unable to compel our administrators to devote their whole attention and effort to the sole business of winning the war, without trying any social or economic experiments by the way, then we may lose the war—and our liberties as well.

I am convinced the American people can and will be able to distinguish between constructive and destructive criticism and choose the former. I believe the American people will visit a dreadful wrath upon any who try, under cover of this war, to break down our economic system, overturn our Government and our social system. The American people are a patient people. They are slow to anger. But heaven help those who incur their righteous anger when they find out they have been betrayed.

It must be apparent to any clear-thinking person that if we were to lose this war there would be no political parties. There would be no labor unions. There would be no churches. There would be no universities. There would be no agriculture. There would be no Congress, no Governors, no State legislatures. There would be only the brutal, bestial, depraved, power-mad conquerors and their lustful, tyrannical, brutal gauleteirs, each one a petty despot in his own way. There would not be left a vestige of any of the ideals we in America have cherished, upheld, sacrificed, and worked for. There would not be left a vestige of the rich heritage our forefathers fought for, and worked for, and sacrificed for, to hand on to us in trust for our posterity. There would not be a vestige of decency, progress, culture, spiritual or mental independence left in the whole of America. There would be just the ruthless will of the conquerors and their legion of brutal, despotic minions. That is what the loss of this war would mean to America. It would be better, my fellow citizens, for every man, woman, and child in this Nation to die in his efforts to drive back these assaults upon the decency and the honor and the progress and the very civilization of the world than to surrender to the evil forces of brutality. It would be better for us all to die fighting and leave to the conquerors only a lifeless, uninhabited continent of North America rather than to suffer defeat and the loss of every ideal, of every decent, wholesome aspect of our lives.

How it can be that some of our citizens can let the issue of winning this war be divided in their efforts with social experiments or campaigns for financial or organizational gains, becomes a mystery when we realize what utter ruin would come to us with the loss of this war. The only explanation for the courses pursued thus far by some is that they must believe the chance of our defeat is so remote as to be negligible.

If any citizens think that they had better wake up quickly. There is a great possibility—a horrible possibility that we could lose this war. And we must take no chances on such a terrible defeat. We ought to make not doubly sure, but sure many times over that we cannot lose. We must be sure beyond any possibility of doubt that the decisive victory will be ours. Until that assurance is times over assured we should not rest; we should not divide our efforts; we should not quarrel among ourselves; and we should not attempt far-reaching governmental, economic, or social changes which will shake the confidence of the people and impair their most earnest and determined efforts to do all they can to win the war.

All we are, all we have, all we hope for are at stake in this conflict. We must drop every other consideration until this war is won. Any who try to divide the American people at this time are dangerous to our cause. Any who try to seize this moment of national peril to change our Americanism to some form of fascism or communism or socialism are dangerous to our cause.

This assault on the Congress of the United States is no chance thing. It has not just merely happened. The earmarks of a careful plan are too plain to be ignored.

There could be but one purpose in the minds of those who want to discredit the legislative branch of the Government in the estimation of the people, and that is to weaken, render impotent, and finally to destroy the legislative branch of the Government.

The Congress is peculiarly the people's branch of the Government. The founding fathers arranged that the Government should be composed of three coequal, independent branches, each a check on the others. The Congress is peculiarly the people's branch of the Government, because after judges of the Supreme Court are appointed by the President, by and with the consent of the Senate, they pass beyond the people's direct control. They are appointed for life. The people have no control over their actions, except by the process of impeachment, in case of flagrant abuse of power or position; but the impeachment process is long, slow, and very difficult.

Aside from their vote on Presidential candidates every 4 years the people have no control over employees of the Government except through their Congress. These employees, composing a vast, self-seeking bureaucracy never run for office. They never submit themselves, their policies, or their records to the electorate for approval or disapproval. The only control the people have over these bureaucrats, entrenched in positions where they can involve the Government in commitments and expenditures which may call for military duty on the part of the citizens, and for heavy taxes, is through the Congress.

On the other hand, the legislative branch of the Government must be the voice and the will of the people at all times. It is their instrument of control of the other two departments of Government. It has been well said that if the people lose the lawmaking power, and the control of the purse strings, they have lost their control of Government and their liberty. If these propagandists can persuade the American people to lose their confidence in their Congress, their representatives in the Government, then the people will have lost their control over the lawmaking powers and their control over the purse strings, and they will soon find that they have lost their liberties as well.

It cannot be that any Americans, descendants of those brave pioneer men and women who carved out this great, rich Nation from the primeval forests, the trackless wilderness, and the waterless plains, could be blind to the issues of this war.

So let us then drop all differences. Let us bury all sectional, and class, and political controversies. Let us carry on constitutional government, our democracy within a republic, and win this war.

Whatever issues may arise after the war is ended cannot be foreseen now. We must try as best we can as time goes on, and developments come to pass, to foresee what our issues and problems may be after the war, because, at best, the transition from a war to a peace basis will bring portentous problems which will try us, even as war tries us.

Those problems are in the future. The job of stopping the aggressors is in the present. Readjustment to victory is in the days to come. Winning the victory is our present problem.

As Americans let us all labor together. Let us look frankly at our own mistakes and correct them for the good of all. Let us all realize we are soldiers in the common good, fighting for the same ideals and the same ends, defending the same priceless possessions. Let us join the prayer: "Please God give us right vision, good hearts, correct understanding, and an undying determination to save this, our beautiful America."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I think it is unnecessary for me to repeat my views in respect to W. P. A. as a method of relief.

However much it may have contributed in the past to those in need, I am confident that in the pages of history it will stand condemned, condemned for its inefficiency, for its corruption, for depriving the needy of millions upon millions of dollars appropriated for their benefit, for its ruinous competition with private industry, for its practical partisan politics.

Two years ago a committee of this House conducted an investigation of W. P. A. That investigation developed irregularities of many kinds as well as scandalous conditions, notably in Louisiana, Indiana, Kentucky, Tennessee, and Pennsylvania. It is a sad commentary to my mind, Mr. Chairman, that no fundamental, constructive changes have been made in the method of affording relief, in the light of that investigation; that little or no follow-up has been conducted in respect to the scandalous conditions developed, and that today three State administrators of W. P. A., who were on the job at that time in Louisiana, Indiana, and Kentucky, Mr. Crutcher, Mr. Jennings, and Mr. Goodman, are still on the job, and apparently in good standing.

Mr. Goodman is apparently in such good standing that, according to the press, he is being considered as a very likely appointee as State administrator in Kentucky in the new set-up under Mr. Henderson in the O. P. A.

In my opinion we should long ago have resorted to a system of grants-in-aid, with proper financial and administrative responsibility in the several States and local communities. We should have done this, in my judgment, in fairness to the needy themselves and to the country as a whole.

I am afraid that the chance of changing to this method of administrating relief at this time is about as good as the chance of the proverbial snowball. The chance is no doubt decreased, both because of the reduced program which we have under consideration at this time, and because the President in his Budget message states that:

> For the period beyond the fiscal year 1943, the problem must be considered as a part of comprehensive measures for social security and public assistance.

The hope is at least held out of getting away 12 months hence from the W. P. A. form of relief under which we have suffered in recent years.

The problem before us today, from a practical standpoint, is one not only of method but of amount.

Everyone of us must realize that every possible dollar must be made available for our all-out war effort. Everyone of us must realize the vital necessity for this reason of reducing nonessential expenditure. We must determine, against that realization, in the light of economic conditions at the moment, what appropriation is fair as the Federal share in taking care of our needy employables.

What is the proposal that confronts us? In a word it is a proposal to appropriate $337,000,000 as compared with $915,000,000 in the current fiscal year, a reduction of 62 percent. It is a proposal to carry on the rolls an average number of 400,000 beneficiaries as compared with an average of 1,000,000 beneficiaries in the present year, a reduction of 60 percent. It is a proposal to expend for administrative expenditure $16,000,000 as compared with $35,420,000 in the present year, a reduction of 55 percent.

In the present year 215 offices were maintained for administering W. P. A., with 13,334 administrative workers and 40,000 supervisory workers, a total personnel of 53,334. For the coming fiscal year the agency is apparently unable to furnish the number of offices which it considers it will require but it requests authority to carry a total of 5,600 administrative workers and 20,000 to 25,000 supervisory workers, or a total of say 30,600 workers all told, an average of 1 administrative or supervisory worker for every 13 beneficiaries.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. At another time the gentleman pointed out how the administrative staff was expanded by using men on relief for work purposes. Is that practice still continuing?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think the gentleman has in mind the practice of reducing the so-called administrative personnel and adding workers to the supervisory personnel on the projects.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. This year I think there is to be a reduction in both classifications, but in my judgment not a sufficient reduction.

The program also contemplates construction projects to the extent of 56 percent of the total; education, recreation, and research projects to the extent of 22 percent of the total; vocational training projects to the extent of 11 percent of the total; and other projects to the extent of 11 percent of the total. Army and Navy projects, so-called, are contemplated to the extent of 38 percent of the entire program. The waste and inefficiency of construction projects has been clearly established. The benefits to the Army and Navy of W. P. A. operated projects is not apparent.

The question before us is, What Federal appropriation is justified for the coming fiscal year? I quote in this connection one paragraph from the committee report as follows:

> Casual thinking in the light of the tremendous industrial effort being put forth in the Nation to produce the goods needed for the war erroneously arrives at the conclusion that the demand for employment will be such as to provide a job in private industry for every employable person. A close examination of the factors involved—the shift from production for civilian needs to war production, the concentration of war production in a relatively restricted area, the disinclination of industry to hire older workers, the increase in the normal labor force by the influx of women, youths, and casual workers, and the inability of some workers to shift to locations where jobs are available—indicates that there will continue to be considerable unemployment in the coming fiscal year.

This is the conclusion of the majority of the committee. For my part, Mr. Chairman, I want to say that the hearings on this measure are both unsatisfactory and inconclusive. At best, all we have is the guess of the W. P. A. officials. The hearings lasted only about a day and a half. The marking up or rubber stamping of the bill took place immediately after the conclusion of the hearings, without waiting for the material requested from W. P. A., in the absence of important members of the committee, and over the personal protest which I made at the time.

From the record, such as it is, I give the following evidence bearing on what may be said to be the two sides of the question before us.

On the one hand, we have, first, the statement that employment today is running about two and a half million ahead of a year ago.

Second, we have the estimate as compared with a total average unemployment of 4,000,000 during the past fiscal year, that the Army and Navy will absorb 2,000,000, that the war effort outside of the Army and Navy will absorb 2,000,000 during the coming year.

Third, we have the obvious demand for labor, emphasized by the statement of the President himself in his Budget message, which I quote, as follows:

> To meet labor shortages the recruitment of workers from every available source will be required, and possibly even organized migration in some instances.

Fourth, we have a statement of the reduction in the number of general relief cases from 1,210,000 a year ago to 783,000 today.

Fifth, we have the steady increase in the Federal Reserve index of production which is up about 30 points to 174 as compared with a year ago.

And, finally, we have the enormous appropriations, the expenditure of fifty or more billion dollars contemplated in the next year, and loans over and above that, probably in the hundreds of millions of dollars by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

On the other hand, we have first the estimate for the fiscal year 1943 that there will be a minimum unemployment of from two to two and one-half million people and that 400,000 in this total should be cared for by W. P. A.

Second, we have the fact that the older and handicapped people must be cared for either by W. P. A. or by the States and localities.

Third, we have the concentration of war industry in restricted areas, about 72 percent of the industry being in 12 States.

Fourth, we have the difficulties for some of moving to locations where jobs are available.

Fifth, we have the enormous increase estimated in the normal labor force due primarily to the influx of women and younger workers, based on the experience of the last war and on actual experience in the present year, the total over normal increase for the fiscal year 1943 being estimated at about 3,600,000.

Finally, we have the enormous dislocation involved in the changing over from civilian employment to war employment and the impossibility of estimating the net effect of that process. The best guess that W. P. A. can give us is that while 10,000,000 additional jobs may be provided, some 8,000,000 people now employed in civilian work will probably be thrown out of work.

The evidence submitted, Mr. Chairman, as I have stated, is both unsatisfactory and inconclusive.

The proposal calls for a 60-percent reduction, roughly speaking, in the appropriation made for the current fiscal year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Massachusetts 3 additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Personally, I think the amount proposed can be further reduced without injury to anyone concerned.

I am prepared to support a reasonable reduction in the Budget estimate, particularly in respect to administrative expenditure. I am prepared to support a 50-percent reduction on a 6-month basis, with a saving for the time being of $170,000,000 and an opportunity to reappraise the effects of the industrial dislocation 6 months hence. I am prepared, of course, to support the proposal, which I have supported for years in the past, for a system of grants-in-aid to the States and localities with proper responsibility, both financial and administrative in the States and localities with the resulting reduction in the total required for relief purposes.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that the time is not far distant when in the interest of the needy themselves and of the country as a whole, W. P. A., as a method of relief, will be nothing but an unhappy memory.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I take this minute in order to find out from the majority leader what the program will be for next week.

Mr. McCORMACK. Monday the Unanimous Consent Calendar will be called; then the House will be honored by receiving a very distinguished visitor and guest, the King of Greece. The necessary unanimous-consent request will be made at the proper time that the House take a recess for the purpose of receiving this visitor.

Tuesday omnibus private bills will be considered.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And may I state, for the benefit of the House, that these generally are controversial bills.

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

Wednesday the probabilities are that the House will consider the veto on the longevity bill. Then the pipe-line bill will come up under a rule; and I am informed by our distinguished friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] that a resolution will come out of the Appropriations Committee carrying a few emergency items which will not take long to pass.

Any conference reports will be disposed of as quickly as possible after their receipt, and after their consideration is in order. For instance, we may have a conference report on the State, Justice, Commerce, Judiciary bill, but I have no definite knowledge as to any others.

I am not prepared to state anything further at this time on the program. This carries us through Wednesday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Could the gentleman tell us whether there will be any debate on the longevity bill or will it be just a vote on the question of overriding or sustaining the veto?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to inform the gentleman; that, of course, rests entirely with the committee. I am sorry not to be able to give the gentleman from Massachusetts more definite information, but I have none myself.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I should like to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts when we may expect the tax bill? The gentleman knows we are spending money so much faster than we are getting in revenues.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds more time to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. McCORMACK. I welcome the gentleman's inquiry. I am unable, of course, to give him any information, but I do hope the matter will be expedited, and I urge the Committee on Ways and Means expedite action as quickly as possible, because not only are we losing taxes by longer delay but it is important for business to know as soon as possible just what the nature of the tax bill will be. I welcome the inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and regret I cannot give him any information.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman will remember that last November we were promised a tax bill early this year. We ought to get it as quickly as possible.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to call the attention of the committee to something that probably many of you know very little about, and it is something that is very, very important at this time. I appeared before the Appropriations Committee concerning this project and my statement appears on page 201 of the hearings. I would respectfully ask the committee to read what I said at that time, as 5 minutes will not give me very much of an opportunity to explain all to you that I would like to explain.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I am deeply interested in this project. Could not the gentlewoman's remarks or testimony given before the committee be placed in the RECORD?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes; I will be glad to have that done.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to bring you back to the first World War. At that time, as you all know, we had very little governmental help for projects that were not considered important to the progress of the war, and one of the things that we found very necessary was to help the children of working mothers employed in the factories of our cities. If you will permit me to do so, I will have to bring myself into the picture, for I with a number of other women organized a day nursery to take care of the children of working mothers at that time. That is, a nursery provided to care for the children of working mothers from early in the morning until whatever time in the evening the mother was finished with her job.

We had no particular rules as to age. We took in children from 6 months up to 8 years and we knew by doing that the mothers had a very much easier mind to give to their work. It was purely a voluntary venture. We had to beg the funds for the nursery. We were not very long engaged in the work until we were asked to open a second nursery, which we did, also begging the funds. We had voluntary help in those nurseries and took care of at least 100 children a day.

Today your Government provides that help in nearly every State in the Union, and I think it is a service that is not very well known. At this time it is very much needed. I cannot in 5 minutes tell you many of the stories that have come to me from working mothers. If I could put them in the RECORD I know it would not be difficult to get you to consent to increase the appropriation $6,000,000 in

order to give these nurseries money that is absolutely necessary if this work is to be continued and enlarged.

I can recall, and I think you will be interested to know the story of one mother who came to us with a little child. Her husband had gone to the front, and he was killed in action.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from New Jersey 5 additional minutes.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, her husband was in the last war. She came to us and asked if we would take care of her child. She said, "I have never had to do this before, and I want to leave 10 cents additional to buy milk for my child because she has always been used to having milk." I assured her it was not necessary, that we provided all the milk necessary for the children, but she insisted on leaving the 10 cents.

In a few moments we heard a commotion outside. We went outside and we found that the lady had fainted. She was carried into the nursery and on investigation we found she had not had anything to eat for 2 days. Yet she was willing to give us 10 cents to provide extra milk for her baby. We also found she was living in a furnished room. We asked her if she would like to stay in the nursery and help us, that we would pay her for her services and she would be near her baby. She was very grateful and we took her in as an auxiliary nurse. She continued with us and is now in the employ of the W. P. A. nursery in our city doing the same kind of work. The child grew up, she is now married and has two children of her own. That is just a typical case. I could tell you of many others, even more appealing.

My purpose today is to impress upon you the necessity for these nurseries. I cannot tell you how important it is for a mother who is working all day in a factory to know that her children are being properly cared for. If she does not know that they are being properly cared for, she certainly cannot turn out the kind of work she should turn out for her Government. Every day hundreds and thousands of women are going into the factories and are doing all kinds of work; giving all that they have to give to the war effort. Their minds naturally are divided unless they know that their children are being cared for properly.

I asked the committee to please enlarge this appropriation, but I find that the committee has not done so. I am terribly disappointed. I am grateful to the Committee, however, for giving me this time in which to present my case.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Appropriations Committee was very sympathetic toward the project sponsored by the gentlewoman, and her presentation of it, but the committee does not earmark specific funds in the relief bill for specific purposes. Her remedy, of course, is to apply to the W. P. A. after the funds are appropriated, in order that in their allocation they may provide for the work in which she is so properly interested.

Mrs. NORTON. I thank the gentleman. But how can they allocate more funds when the funds have been so drastically reduced? I find that the funds have been reduced from $172,900,000 to $69,200,000. How would it be possible for them to allocate the amount necessary?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course, as the burden of unemployment decreases, there must be, in keeping with the policy of the administration, a corresponding reduction in the appropriations for W. P. A. Many admirable projects must be discontinued if there is no surplus labor to be assigned to them.

Mrs. NORTON. I can understand that, Mr. Chairman, but would not the committee consider adding $6,000,000 to this fund? I think that would take care of this nursery project adequately.

Let me say to you, Mr. Chairman, that every State in the Union should be interested in this project. I do not know whether the gentleman from Missouri knows it or not, but his own State has nursery schools.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I thoroughly agree with the gentlewoman that every State is interested—every State has a vital concern in it—and I think every member of the committee was deeply interested. But as commendable as it is, the committee did not feel justified in exceeding the Budget estimates by any amount for any purpose.

Mrs. NORTON. Would not the committee consider this $6,000,000 additional for this project? Otherwise, I know that this project cannot be carried on or enlarged. I have been advised that it is utterly impossible. The children of the last war, the children that we took care of voluntarily, and the hundreds of thousands of other children throughout America are now the men and women upon whom our country depends to win the war. They are the ones who are fighting this war today. If it were not for the fact that those children got the right care and sufficient nourishment and that their mothers had at least some peace of mind during their working hours, where would we be today, and where would a large part of our Army come from?

That is what I want the members of the committee to consider, and I beg of you when the time comes to consider it favorably. I am going to ask the chairman of the committee to offer that amendment. I would much prefer that he do it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman one-half minute additional in order to say that the chairman of the committee, under the rules of the House, is not permitted to offer any amendment not authorized by the committee. However, the gentlewoman from New Jersey is at liberty to do so. I do not think anyone could present it more effectively or is in position to secure more favorable consideration for it than the gentlewoman from New Jersey.

Mrs. NORTON. I thank the gentleman. I shall be very glad to offer that amendment.

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION NURSERY SCHOOLS

The Work Projects Administration nursery-school program, serving children from low-income groups, has been extended to serve the needs of children in defense areas in all parts of the country, sometimes caring for the children of men in the armed forces, sometimes for children of industrial workers engaged in essential production of war materials. The following are typical instances:

In Childersburg, Ala., the nursery school is housed in a portable building on the public-school grounds. It was built in the Work Projects Administration warehouse in Birmingham and taken out on a truck. There was no possible housing for a nursery school in the vicinity of the area needing the service. There are between 40 and 50 children enrolled. They come from trailer camps, from trailers in the village, and from low-income homes in the village. This nursery school supplies only a small part of the need. Within a radius of one-half mile, 173 children under 6 years of age were found. Childersburg is only one of several small villages in the defense area. Trailers stand in many of the back yards in these villages and they are scattered through the countryside between the villages. There is a nursery school in Talladega which serves both trailer families and village families. In both Childersburg and Talladega there is a center for family life education in connection with the nursery school. This provides facilities for the mothers to come to sew and the leader gives them help in remodeling clothing or making new garments for their children. There are sewing machines and a cutting table. There are classes for the parents in care of children and in feeding the family on a limited budget.

In Grand Prairie, Tex., the nursery school is in one wing of the community building on the defense housing project built for workers of the American Aircraft factory. Some of the children come from homes of the workers, others come from the village of Grand Prairie. There are many low-income homes in Grand Prairie and the nursery schools can give service to only a limited number of those who really need it.

In Long Beach, Calif., there is a nursery school which was set up quickly to meet the emergency in caring for children evacuated from Pearl Harbor. Each of the 22 children first enrolled had lost his father in the Pearl Harbor disaster. The mothers are all working in the aircraft industry. The children are all white American citizens. The nursery school operates on hours which fit the mothers' working schedules.

In Choteau, Okla., a new plant is going up and the housing shortage is already seriously acute. A request has been made for a nursery school and plans are under way to try to provide one. There is already one in Muskogee, about 15 miles away, where many of the workers live in temporary shelters, trailers, or any kind of place they can get. This nursery school has about 40 children enrolled, but there is space which will permit opening another unit and this is being planned.

In Starke, Fla., the nursery school serves children from the village and from families of the armed forces at Camp Blanding. There are about 40 children enrolled but this is only a very small part of the number needing service. Housing shortage is acute. Families, even of officers, live in trailer camps and small temporary shacks. Many of the children needing the service the most live too far from the nursery school to come to it.

In the areas surrounding the Army camps, naval bases, aviation fields, and industrial

plants, the needs of children are very acute. Many more requests are received than can possibly be filled. Families are crowded into small space. There is often neither indoor nor outdoor space for the children to play. If the father works nights and sleeps during the day, there is no place in the one-room trailer or the small shack for the young child. Often the mother is so harassed with trying to adjust the living conditions of the family to their need that both she and the child are better off if they are not together all day. Increasingly both father and mother may be working and there is no one at home to care for the child and the nursery school fills the need.

The Work Projects Administration also operates nursery schools on a number of the Farm Security Administration camps for agricultural workers. In Florida there are two for Negroes and two for the whites. The Negro pickers start to work as soon as the de wis off the fields, and since this varies each day the children come to the nursery school at varying times in the morning—usually around 8: 30 or 9 in the morning—and stay until the parents come in from the field in the afternoon, which time also varies. Usually the children have their supper at the nursery schools and go home about 8 in the evening. The white workers do the packing and must begin to pack just as soon as the vegetables are brought in which means that they often work most of the night. The nursery school keeps the children through the night.

In California, there is a mobile nursery school on one of the Farm Security Administration migratory mobile camps. The nursery school has its tent, and when it comes time to move the camp, the nursery school and the workers move with it.

In practically all of the Farm Security Administration camps for agricultural workers, where there are nursery schools, the workers live at the camp and are a part of the community life of the camp.

The services above described are an extension of the service which has been given to low-income families by the nursery schools since they were first organized under the Federal Emergency Relief Administration in October 1933. The need among low-income families is still very acute throughout the country. There are many very low-income workers—domestic workers, laundry workers, restaurant helpers, unskilled laborers—and the increased cost of living is making their needs very acute. There are also large numbers of workers who have been thrown out of employment because of war conditions, such as taxi drivers who cannot replace their tires; auto service workers who are no longer needed; roadside stand operators whose business has fallen off; unskilled laborers who do not fit into the war industry activity; and the many who are not where the employment opportunities are and who have no means of moving themselves and their families there. It is believed that care for children in these low-income families is a significant wartime service, since through such care children may be protected from conditions which threaten their health and well-being.

All of the nursery schools operate on a minimum 6-hour day which includes indoor and outdoor play, morning fruit juice and cod-liver oil, noon meal, afternoon nap. The day is lengthened to meet the needs of the families. Some nursery schools operate on an 8-, 10-, or even 12-hour day as the need indicates.

Health care is provided with the assistance of the local communities. Physical examinations are given by county health doctors, city health departments, private physicians, local hospital staffs, or whatever other arrangements may be feasible locally. Remedial treatment and follow-up care is provided through Public Health Service or local contribution when the families are not able to give it. Morning inspection of children immediately upon arrival is a regular part of the day's routine. Careful attention is given to the planning of the noonday meal which is often the only full meal many of the children get. Fruit juice is served in midmorning and milk in the midafternoon. Cod-liver oil is considered a part of the daily food provision. Breakfast is served to the children who come from homes where it is known the family income is too low to provide suitable breakfasts.

The playtime of the children is just as carefully provided for as any other part of the day, since healthy play is as necessary for little children as food. Play equipment is made by the fathers, or high-school boys, or furnished by the townspeople.

Parent education is a vitally important part of every nursery-school program. Parents come to classes to talk over the ways of helping children learn the things they need to know; to learn how to remodel and repair the children's clothes; to cook the food that is good for the family; to plan how to stretch a limited income to take care of the family needs. They come to observe in the nursery school, to watch how the teacher helps the child, who has had a bottle until he was 3 and refuses solid food, learn to eat; how she helps the one who fights his way through the world to learn to live peaceably with the other children; how she brings out confidence in the timid child who feels that every adult is a potential enemy; how she brings joy to the child who has never smiled. In many nursery schools, mothers who are not working come to the schools regularly to help with the children.

Volunteers throughout the country are helping to carry on the nursery-school program. The number is steadily increasing as more and more demands are made for services to children. Now, as mothers are going to work in defense industries in large numbers, these demands for services to children far exceed the facilities for giving the service even with the use of volunteer help. Since the Work Projects Administration is the only national agency with an operating program for young children, the available personnel is being divided and supplemented with volunteers in order to try to meet the most acute needs. Even more intensive training of workers than before is being done, in order that the available staff will know how to use the help of volunteers effectively and will know how to adjust the nursery-school program to meet continually changing needs.

It is natural that communities which have had Work Projects Administration nursery schools for the past several years shall turn to it now in the emergency to provide care for more and more children. The confidence of the communities where nursery schools operate is expressed in continuously increasing financial support. In 12 States all of the food costs of the nursery schools are borne locally. In the remaining States at least 50 percent of the food cost is carried locally and the percentage is increasing steadily. Rent, heat, light, facilities for cooking, much of the equipment, laundry, health service—all are provided by the communities in which the nursery schools operate.

All nursery schools operate under the sponsorship of the public education authorities with assistance from different cooperating agencies, such as health, welfare, local professional and lay groups and interested individuals. A large number of nursery schools are housed in public school buildings. In a number of cases school facilities provided for defense areas through Public Law No. 137 (Lanham Act) have included facilities for the nursery schools. Many communities have already considered ways of eventually absorbing the nursery schools into the regular school program. Many of the nursery school teachers have found employment in the public school system, after having worked in the nursery schools under the supervision of the superintendent who, becoming familiar with their work, has seen them as valuable persons for his own staff.

Work Projects Administration nursery schools operate in each of the 48 States, the Virgin Islands, and Puerto Rico. There are approximately 1,500, with the largest number in Massachusetts and the smallest number in Nevada.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield one-half minute to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. May I ask the gentlewoman from New Jersey if it is not true that some arrangement must be made, either through the W. P. A. or some other agency, to take care of the children of working mothers during this war in order to have production go on in the industries? I know in my own city of Lowell and in Somerville, and in some other communities in my own State, this day nursery work is done by volunteers. But I think that whether it is done as a humane matter or as a matter of absolute practical necessity, this work will have to be done on an increasingly large scale as war production increases and as more and more mothers are employed, and they will have to have help as time goes on.

Mrs. NORTON. That is absolutely true. The answer is obvious.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

ISSUE RETREAD PERMITS—A WAY TO COLLECT RUBBER

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, the biggest threat to the employment situation today comes from the gasoline and rubber problem. For most of the country the gasoline problem is a problem of rubber; that is, the prospect of Nation-wide rationing is brought about by the shortage of rubber, not by a shortage of gasoline. I do not need to point out the threat of paralysis to business, income, tax receipts, and war production itself if this problem is not solved. We are told that the rubber problem for private cars can be solved by using one-tenth of the scrap rubber in the country and less than 1 percent of the crude-rubber stocks to retread or recap existing tires. To use this scrap rubber we must collect it.

The R. F. C. has posted a price of $25 a ton, which is about a cent and a quarter a pound. On that basis an average old tire may bring 25 cents. But people with thin tires cannot travel very far to deliver an old casing for 25 cents. I read an item in a South Dakota paper the other day which related that one of my rancher friends had a load of scrap he was taking to town, and he blew out a casing and ruined the casing and the inner tube. His comment was that there was not very much profit in selling scrap. Yet we are told one old casing contains enough scrap rubber to retread a set of

tires. That ought to suggest a simple and direct way to get in the old rubber.

Let the Office of Price Administration and the War Production Board be instructed to issue retread permits and give a 25-cent war stamp to everyone who brings in an old casing or its equivalent in scrap rubber. The delivery could be made to, and the stamp and retread permits issued by, the post offices throughout the country, just as the car-use stamps are sold there. The Rubber Reserve Company could collect the tires from the post offices.

This plan, Mr. Chairman, might have the virtues of economy and workability. It would not require any expensive setup, it would not call for the employment of a lot of new people, but it would work, because if any person having an old casing around the farm or around the garage knew that he could turn that in and get a permit that would enable him to get retreads for the tires on his car he would get busy and get that old casing in. He should also get a 25-cent war stamp, which would be approximately the value of the casing based on a price of $25 a ton, the price posted by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I believe that such a plan as this would bring in the old rubber. It would permit the recapping and retreading of enough tires to keep 20,000,000 cars on the road. That will save a lot of unemployment and calls for relief.

Unless this job is done, unless the rubber problem is solved, there will be a serious threat to the employment situation throughout the country and to the war production effort itself.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, the question before us this afternoon not only takes into consideration the extension of the W. P. A. but brings us to the point of realization that the amount of money we are spending now for relief through the W. P. A. is diminishing, as is shown by the report, because as employment in this country increases the amount of unemployment decreases. We have gotten ourselves to the point where there is practically no unemployment except for those people on W. P. A. who want an easy berth and do not want to get a job in industry, because they know if they get a job in industry or on the farm they will have to work.

I am of the old school. I believe in work. I think this country was founded on freedom of religion, freedom of work, and freedom of action. Those are the fundamentals of this country. They are what made this country what it is today. Look what the people who got out and worked have done for this country of ours in 150 years. They have made this the greatest country on the face of the earth. But in the last 10 years if we have not put a crimp in the desire of the American people to go out and do things, then I do not know anything about work.

We have got too many people in this country who do not want to work. I have no sympathy with such men. I have sympathy for the old people who are decrepit and cannot get a job because they cannot do the things in industry that they would be required to do. I also sympathize with the people back on the farms who cannot earn money because they cannot do a full day's work. You cannot expect them to be paid for a day's work if they are not able to work. These people we have a right to look after. I am talking now about the man who wants to hang on to W. P. A. simply because he does not want to work.

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. FENTON. Of course, the gentleman is familiar with the conditions existing in the anthracite regions as his district borders on that region. The gentleman would not, for one minute, have this House believe that such favorable conditions as he refers to exist in the anthracite region.

Mr. RICH. I have been told by people in the anthracite region, who are in the coal business, that they have all the business they can handle from the mines. I was told that last Saturday.

Mr. FENTON. The gentleman is fully aware of modern conditions and modern methods of mining and knows that the slack in unemployment cannot be taken up by reason of modern methods of mining and, of course, the gentleman also knows that anthracite mining is the major industry in that region.

Mr. RICH. Then I would say that if you have not enough mining business for the people in the anthracite region to get all the work they can do in the mines, we have got to have some other industry go in there. We have got to furnish industries that will give these people work or we will have to move these people to the places where they are hollering for workers. If you go up into my district, and the gentleman's district borders on my district, you can hardly get a man to go on the farms to work and you cannot get enough men to go into the industries there. The gentleman and I should discuss these matters because I am anxious to help people in the gentleman's district and in my opinion we should send some industries that want to locate in my district over into the gentleman's district.

Mr. FENTON. Does not the gentleman know that not one war industry has been placed in the anthracite region during all this war effort? I am speaking now on W. P. A. and with respect to the continuance of W. P. A. and how else can you take up the slack?

Mr. RICH. Let me say to the gentleman and to the House, in reference to his statement, that they have not put any industry in there; in my district they are building a great depot and they took the best land we had up there on which to build this depot. We did not want it up there and we tried to get rid of it. Why did not the Government build it in the gentleman's district? You have lots of flat land in your district where they could have built that depot.

Mr. FENTON. That is quite true.

Mr. RICH. And I would have done everything I could to get them to build it on some of those flats around Hazleton or some other place in that district where the land is sagebrush land with coal under it. If we had put it in some of those valleys up there, we would have helped the gentleman's district, and my district would have been able to retain some of its good farming land. However, the Government did not see fit to do that, and that is where the Government is wrong.

Mr. FENTON. I wish the gentleman would tell that to the W. P. B. and the War Department.

Mr. RICH. I tried to show them other places where they could put these very things, and we did tell the War Department. The gentleman and I view these things in the same light. I want to help my people, and the gentleman wants to help his people, but if the War Department does not do the things that are going to be best for all the districts in this country, then they are not functioning properly, and the country generally is going to be the loser.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I cannot yield to the gentleman now.

Mr. RABAUT. I want to ask the gentleman a question about the W. P. A. bill.

Mr. RICH. I want to say this to the gentleman about the W. P. A. You have got to stop a lot of other things that are being advocated here as well as W. P. A.

That is only a week ahead of us. Now you come in here with this W. P. A. bill, and I shall talk about it. We are coming in here with this bill, after these other things that I have tried to show you and you want us to give you $314,400,000, and for what? For public recreation facilities to the amount of $3,100,000. Why, we have enough recreation facilities in this country to keep everybody busy with all of the pleasure and enjoyment that they can possibly want, and yet, nevertheless, in New Mexico right now you are building golf courses. It is ridiculous to spend this money for building golf courses. I like to play golf myself, but we do not have to build a golf course every time some locality happens to want it, and we ought to stop this, and stop it now.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I cannot yield. I know that the gentleman from California does not want to build a lot of these things now for recreational purposes, when we ought to do everything we can to win this war, and you are not going to win this war by playing golf.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 minutes more.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me now?

Mr. RICH. I cannot yield to the gentleman now. There is so much in this bill that you fellows ought to strike out that I do not believe you even see it, and I want to point it out to you. You have

educational and professional and clerical projects. What do you have in your educational projects? I wish I had time to read you the letters I have here which show that you are having a lot of orchestras, a lot of musical organizations and dance projects, and you are having them right now in 1942, and it is high time to stop this fan dancing and high dancing and hijacking. You know that is in here, and if you do not, then I will take up some of these letters and read them to you, or put them in the RECORD, so that you can look at them some other time. Of course, there are only 8 or 10 people in the room this afternoon. On the majority side there are 8 people who are listening to the spending of this money—$314,000,000—8 of you on that side of the House.

Wait until tomorrow, when we have a roll call and all of you will be in here, and I am afraid that the majority of you will vote for this bill. You ought to throw the whole thing out of the window, as Al Smith says, and the quicker you do it the better it will be. Then you have the sewing circles, sewing projects, $18,900,000. During the last war we had women and they all knitted and they knitted because of their love of country, because they wanted to help the soldiers, but today you have to pay the women to knit. They do that because you taught them those tricks during the last 4 or 5 years when you tried to put everybody on the Government pay roll. You ought to close them up. Then there is vocational training for national defense in the W. P. A., $35,000,000. In your school set-up you have vocational education, and I am for that 100 percent, because there you have the State organizations and the national organizations trying to work on this vocational education. That is fine, and you create in the minds of boys and girls of high-school age the desire to work, and they learn a trade, and they will stay back on the farm or go into industry.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I would love to yield to the gentleman, but I do not have the time. If you put this money for vocational education into your schools and teach these people—they have the facilities, and they can get high-school educations—you will save every dollar, and you can eliminate the W. P. A. organization entirely, and that $35,000,000 can be extended to vocational education in the schools, and the money will be more wisely and more judiciously spent. It is very important that we eliminate a lot of these unnecessary expenses, if you want the people of this country to become wholeheartedly 100 percent for this war effort, and that is the great effort that confronts you and me. The American people are faced with the ordeal of fighting the Axis at all corners of the earth. From here to Australia it is 12,000 miles, and from here to Japan, 9,000 miles. That is a terrible distance, and it is going to cost millions and billions of dollars, and we ought to conserve everything we can. We ought to take these people on the W. P. A. projects and put them back on the farms, where they can help the farmers who need labor today, and where their labor will count to the best advantage. Then we will cut out this overhead. You know that 5 percent or more of this bill is for overhead. That can be eliminated. Let those fellows who are looking after W. P. A. go out and earn an honest dollar by doing something wisely and judiciously.

I take this occasion, Mr. Chairman, to call to the attention of the Congress and the country two bills which are now before the House Committee on the Civil Service, which, in my opinion, demonstrate how completely this administration is failing to put first things first in the winning of this war. I refer to H. R. 7144 and H. R. 7071, by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], the new Democratic whip of the House, both of which are intended to provide juicy salary grabs for workers in the army of bureaucracy while the men who are fighting the battles of democracy all over the world are cheerfully giving their all that America may survive.

Mr. Chairman, it is with the fervent hope that the House Committee on the Civil Service, which recommended the ill-advised bill to pension Congressmen, will not again recommend preferential legislation for a favored few that I call attention to these grab-bag bills at this time. H. R. 7071 provides for a flat increase of $25 per month in the salaries of all civilian employees of the United States Government for the duration of this war and for 6 months thereafter; H. R. 7144 provides for the payment of time and a half for all Government civilian employees for the duration and for 6 months thereafter, provided their total annual income does not thereby exceed $3,800 per annum. Both of these bills are unjustifiable and indefensible at a time when our Nation is at war, when our Ways and Means Committee cannot even find tax revenues to pay the colossal expenses of war, and when hundreds of thousands of small business men, salesmen, teachers, professional people, and ordinary tax-paying citizens are finding their incomes seriously reduced by the economic consequences of the war.

Mr. Chairman, are we to set up an aristocracy of government in America? Are we to create an entrenched army of bureaucracy which is to be safeguarded against all sacrifice and to be surfeited with favors while the soldiers and sailors of America and their fathers and mothers outside of Government service are making sacrifice after sacrifice? By what logic or reason does the Civil Service Committee of this House contend that those who work in safe and secure Government positions, far from scenes of danger, and frequently in air-conditioned offices here in Washington, should be given juicy bonuses at this time when so many Americans in private life are having their incomes severely reduced and their taxes sharply raised?

If this Congress is to secure and retain the confidence and respect of the people of America, we must resist the selfish pressure groups now flooding us with telegrams and letters asking us to vote these increased salaries and overtime payments to the bureaucrats. Surely there is no easier way to start the spiral of inflation than for the Government to set the pace by giving $300 per year salary increases to those who serve in safety and security and who are today undergoing neither the physical danger of battle, nor the economic hazards of a wartime economy. Such a blanket increase in pay would stimulate labor unions to ask for additional benefits, and they could not be blamed for asking for themselves what the Government would be giving to its selected servants.

Mr. Chairman, the boys at Bataan and the heroes of Corregidor did not ask for time and a half while fighting to their last ounce of strength for Uncle Sam. Millions of American men and boys are working far into the night, day after day, wearing the colors of American uniforms and fighting in this war of survival; hundreds of thousands of American businessmen are finding their inventories frozen and their shops and stores closed; millions of citizens are sacrificing and economizing to pay their rapidly increasing taxes. Surely this is no time to vote away big sums of the taxpayers' money to give pay increases to the vast army of civilian Government employees who already are the envy of many Americans who work much longer hours for much smaller rates of pay.

The Office of Price Administration has fixed the cost of living; rents are fixed; food prices are fixed; prices of clothing and transportation are fixed. By what logic then would those who now propose to reward these bureaucrats with rich war bonuses defend such salary increases? A far more appropriate type of legislation would be a bill to reduce the salaries of Government favorites by 5 or 10 percent for the duration in order to help get the dollars needed to buy the bullets to whip the Axis. Definitely this is no time to vote salary increases to America's army of entrenched bureaucrats.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, just so those who read the RECORD may have the facts, I will ask that my remarks be extended at this point in the RECORD, and I will ask later when we go back into the House that the projects set forth in the table on page 6 of the report, setting forth the actual estimates for 1942 and the corresponding reduction in most items for 1943, as well as the increase in the amount for vocational training for national defense over the 1942 estimate, showing the dovetailing of the activities of the W. P. A. with the war effort be placed in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The following are the categories of Work Projects Administration projects and the amounts allocated to each category for the fiscal year 1942 together with the proposed

allocation under the Budget estimate for the fiscal year 1943:

Projects	Estimate, 1943	Estimate, 1942
Highways, roads and streets, and related facilities	$100,000,000	$241,800,000
Public buildings	12,600,000	92,500,000
Public recreational facilities	3,100,000	27,600,000
Conservation work	3,100,000	16,200,000
Water and sewage systems, etc	36,800,000	75,500,000
Airports and other transportation facilities	20,000,000	77,100,000
Educational, professional, and clerical projects	69,200,000	172,900,000
Sewing and other goods	18,900,000	44,600,000
Sanitation and health	3,100,000	8,100,000
Vocational training for national defense	35,000,000	26,800,000
Other	12,600,000	28,394,093
Total Work Projects Administration projects	314,400,000	811,494,093

It will be noted from the foregoing table that the only class of projects which is proposed to be increased is that of vocational training for national defense.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, as usual, in the debate on a W. P. A. bill, we debate about the hole all afternoon and never talk about the doughnut at all. We pick out the things that are at fault in this administration that would inevitably be in existence under any circumstances where you try to set up an organization to employ people who are wholly unable to secure employment elsewhere or who have the hardest time to get employment, and to organize types of projects that will pass muster before the bar of public opinion and before the bar of opinion of the House. It is no easy job.

I am not for golf courses, but I am for many of the things that are contained in the recreation program in W. P. A. I would be willing to wager that 99 percent of that money is spent on things like this: It is spent to pay the salaries of people who are organizing community recreation activities on school grounds in the afternoons and evenings, who, in many cases today, will be taking the places of men who used to do that type of work and who have now gone to war.

Now, the matter of women's sewing projects was mentioned, and it was suggested that women ought to knit instead of having these sewing projects. Of course, the purpose of the sewing project is twofold. In the first place, they can produce much more material for the Army or the Navy or the hospitals or what not than people can produce if they knit. In the second place, every woman employed on the W. P. A. sewing projects can only be there because she has to have some means of earning a living for some kids who are dependent upon her. Most of them are elderly women. The average age of people employed on W. P. A. in Los Angeles County is over 50 years. For the country as a whole, I believe it is 47, but in our section 56.8 percent of all the people employed on W. P. A. are more than 50 years of age.

Mr. RABAUT. And there has been an increase, too, in the older groups?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; a very marked increase.

I have a rather exhaustive report here which I asked for on the W. P. A. in my own section, and it reveals a number of things that are very interesting.

I want to say a few words about this whole history of W. P. A. appropriation bills. In the past I supported W. P. A. appropriation bills and in some instances I supported attempts to raise the amount that was involved. In those days there was a twofold purpose in those appropriations. The first purpose, and I believe from a national standpoint one might say it was the primary purpose, was to pay wages to a group of people who were unemployed, in order to increase consumer demand of the country and to help business as a whole. That element is completely absent from this bill today. I cannot say a word and no one else can say a word on behalf of this bill because we need to put money out in order to stimulate business, but I want to say we have soon found as we came up against the international crisis and drew closer and closer to war and finally got into war, that it is true that if there is a sufficient volume of expenditure flowing through the hands of the people of the Nation unemployment will be sharply reduced, and you will have a condition of what is called business prosperity.

I agree and always did agree that there are better ways to do this than W. P. A. My own choice would be things that I believe can be done in the general fields of old-age pensions, social security, taxation, and control of the monetary situation. Nevertheless, I supported the W. P. A. bills and supported them enthusiastically, because I do not want this country to face a situation of economic distress and widespread unemployment.

The other purpose of W. P. A. from the very beginning, and it is a purpose that remains today and it is the heart and soul of the bill before the House, was the purpose of enabling people to have a chance whereby they could work for a living instead of having to accept direct relief.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The fact of the matter is that we have at present on the W. P. A. rolls very very largely a group of people who for one reason or another cannot get jobs in the high-speed defense industries. The percentage of women employed today is considerably greater than it was before; the percentage of older people employed is very much greater. For my part I would be willing to limit the W. P. A. to people beyond 45 years of age and say no one else should be employed by them. I am seriously concerned for the older men, men who have raised families, men who have tried like everything to get along, who have written to me to try to get jobs in aircraft factories, shipyards, or some place else, but they could not mak the grade because there was some kind of physical defect. What is the wise thing to do? Heavens and earth! America is in a total war. Are you for the sake of a theory going to say we are not going to make use of the employees we have, even if all of them are not 100 percent effective or efficient?

It seems perfectly evident to me that the thing to do is to make the very best use of all the manpower and womanpower you have in this country. I have in mind, for example, these people who have lost their jobs because the automobile business has been curtailed. What are W. P. A. workers doing? I tried to find out something about that. A lot of them are feeding children, which is hospital aid; a lot of them are being used in organizing recreational activities for people who otherwise could not have them. In many places that is a very important thing today. Juvenile delinquency has increased, especially since wartime for reasons that should be obvious to anybody, one of which is that the recreation workers have in many cases gone into the Army or Navy. Another use that is being made of the unemployed is to furnish clerical help to rationing boards, a lot of these clerical people who are not able to get jobs elsewhere. Why should they not be used in some of these rationing boards? It is national defense work.

I have one more thing I want to say: We are fighting a war for the defense of democracy. One of the "four freedoms" that the President gave is freedom from want. Freedom from want means a whole lot more than being given a handout from county charity; it means that a man has a right to feel he has earned something for his wife and family, because want can be mental and spiritual just the same as it can be physical.

I disagree with those gentlemen who say that this bill is too big. This bill will entail the laying off in the course of the next year of 400,000 people who are now employed by W. P. A. I think that now, if ever, we ought to say whether we are going to have every single person in this country that can be in useful labor employed at that useful labor and doing his part.

The question of agricultural labor is serious; it is serious in California for a variety of reasons. In my case, the main reason is that the United States Employment Service for various reasons, of which I think one may be lack of funds, has not been able to mobilize the labor supply that does exist. Upon inquiry, I was told there are a thousand counties in the United States where the W. P. A. has been completely abandoned. They said this action was taken so there could be no question of W. P. A. interference with agricultural labor. I think the committee has brought in a very modest bill, and I think it is important to remember that its purpose at this time is quite different from what its purpose has been in years past, and I think we shall in voting tomorrow for a bill to do a modicum of justice to certain groups of

the people—women, older men, people partially physically handicapped—in effect say, "Yes; you can have a part in America's war effort today; you can do something of value; there are a number of things you can do that are mighty useful. You can take your place in this program not so much for your own sakes as for the sake of the Nation as a whole." We do not want to give them a feeling of humiliation by putting them on direct relief rolls.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PEARSON].

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the generosity of my friend on the majority side. It is somewhat humiliating to have the chairman of the great Committee on Appropriations decline to give me 5 minutes to discuss this bill because I made known to him the fact that I opposed it. I say to him now that if during the reading of the bill it takes 40 times 5 minutes to express the opposition I feel to the bill the time will be taken.

Mr. Chairman, the speech made by my distinguished friend, the gentleman from California who just preceded me, is typical of the speeches which have been made on W. P. A. bills ever since I have been a Member of this House. We have been promised year in and year out that it would be brought to an end, but with each approaching new fiscal year we are told it is absolutely essential that we carry it on for another 12 months.

I am opposed to W. P. A. in principle. It is the darkest blot upon the history of American government, and it has made the sorriest record of any organization or agency which ever functioned as a part of the United States Government. It has destroyed the initiative of the American people who wanted to work and would have worked had they not had handed to them some little meager job that made it possible for them to tide over their personal affairs by relieving them of the responsibility of earning a living.

You talk about scores and scores of people who need help. I am willing to concede they are in every section of this country, but, on the other hand, there are literally thousands of Americans on W. P. A. today who have been on it since 1934 and have no intention of leaving the rolls if it is possible for them to keep their names on them and draw this subsidy from the Government. Mr. Chairman, there is not a man in this House who does not know deep down in his heart that W. P. A. is wrong in principle, and if you will stop to realize you will know that the day of accounting is bound to come to the men who are responsible for this agency and the manner in which it has carried on its activities.

It is a disgrace to this Government. It has squandered millions upon millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money by boondoggling and through other extravagant and useless things which should never have been countenanced by this great Government of ours. We got along for 155 years without W. P. A., yet in 1930 we were told that because of the great unemployment in this country we should and must do something to relieve that situation. There were twelve to fifteen million people unemployed when W. P. A. was created, and we were told by the leaders that this organization was necessary in order to relieve that condition, and that there was no other reason for it.

What are the facts today? Unemployment has reached an all-time low for this country. There are fewer unemployed people in America today than we have had at any time in the past 25 years. There are more people gainfully employed than we have ever known in our history. The Labor Review on May 1 says that over 52,000,000 people are employed in this country, whereas just a fraction over 3,000,000 are unemployed, slightly over 2 percent.

We have had the unemployed and unemployables in this country in the past, and we will always have them. The way to take care of that situation is for the local communities to take care of those who cannot take care of themselves and stop the people from coming to the Federal Government for relief that is unfairly distributed and the money not judiciously spent.

What did the President of the United States say to the Congress in 1935 when we were asked to vote $4,800,000,000 for relief? Let me read you what he said. It is as true today as it was then.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Chairman, when the President sent his message to Congress in 1935, this was the premise upon which he asked for relief:

> The lessons of history, confirmed by the evidence immediately before me, shows conclusively that continued dependence upon relief induces a spiritual and moral disintegration fundamentally destructive to the national fiber. To dole out relief in this way is to administer a narcotic, a subtle destroyer of the human spirit. It is inimicable to the dictates of sound policy. It is in violation of the traditions of America. Work must be found for able-bodied, destitute workers.

Those men have been given employment and today those who are left unemployed are for the most part unemployables and people who have always been dependent, either upon their local communities or upon their own families for sustenance.

This bill at that time was handled by the great chairman of the Committee on Appropriations of that day, James Buchanan, of Texas, who dealt fairly with the Members of the House, who laid the cards on the table and played generously with those who wanted to espouse or oppose the legislation. This is what he said when he presented this bill to the House:

> What do we ask here? We ask $4,000,000,000 in this appropriation. Add to that the processing taxes that will be expended as a part of the recovery plan, add to that the $112,000,000 that is unexpended in past appropriations but obligated, and this will make a grand total for 1936 and 1937 of $4,582,000,000.
>
> Some man may say, "They will spend all this money in the next fiscal year and come back to us at the next Congress for another relief appropriation." My Democratic colleagues, and I am talking to you now, it is confidently expected that this $4,582,000,000 will complete the job, and if we have any appropriation to make for relief at the next Congress it will be infinitesimal compared with the amount we have spent in the past and the amounts we are carrying in this bill.

I am sure Mr. Buchanan spoke at that time in good faith, but, as a matter of fact, the infinitesimal amount which we have spent since that bill passed Congress is over $18,000,000,000 taken from the pockets of the taxpayers of this country.

Mr. Chairman, if ever in the history of America we expect to abandon the dole system, based upon needs and brought about through unemployment, that time has arrived, and if we do not vote down this bill you just can put it in your pipe and smoke it that W. P. A. is here to stay and is going to be a permanent agency of this Government. God forbid the day that we adopt it as a permanent policy and continue the administration of narcotics which are destroying the very fiber and the mentality and the able-bodiedness of the American citizens.

I hope this Congress will rise up in the consideration of this bill and defeat it and let W. P. A. be what the gentleman from Massachusetts has suggested, an unpleasant memory.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I will take only a few minutes because I have a project up in my district which has been started, but they cannot find enough people on W. P. A. to complete it. If there is anyone who has a surplus number of people in his or her district any place, they can come up and help finish this project in my district. That is my principal reason for speaking at this time.

There are one or two questions I would like to ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], if he can answer them. I want to know about all this traveling and who does it, that costs a million dollars?

Mr. TABER. Well, they have all sorts of State administrators, clerks, inspectors, and so forth, to go out from Washington. It makes kind of a good joy ride, it fills up sleeping cars, and keeps the railroads on a profitable basis.

Mr. JOHNS. I find an item here of $100,000 for the Division of Information. Will the gentleman explain that to me?

Mr. TABER. The $100,000 is for defunct reporters who need a job. It makes a nice way of providing for those who have not been able to get along.

Mr. JOHNS. Here is an item of $160,000 for printing. What is to be printed?

Mr. TABER. They have lots of printing, but the $160,000 is a minor factor in what they spend. Most of it is mimeographing that they do themselves. The $160,000 is just the money that goes to the Government Printing Office.

Mr. JOHNS. May I call the attention of the Committee to something that I found in the hearings that I believe is very valuable. A survey was made by W. P. A. and the Agriculture Department and they found that there were 900,000 old automobiles in junk yards in this country which could be salvaged for the purpose of getting steel and rubber. When I heard the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] speak of the amount of rubber in a tire, I thought that if you could just add this up you would find there is a lot of steel there—I think 135,000 tons—and you would also find there are a great many million pounds of rubber there that can be salvaged from these old cars.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Chairman, during the life of the W. P. A. up to the time we became involved in the war there was need for it, and there is at the present time a need for the continuation of sewing projects throughout the United States, but as far as the rest of the program is concerned, I believe that if we are to win this war, we must start cutting out some of these agencies from the top down, and be as conservative as possible, and make as much labor available for agriculture as possible.

Agriculture played a large part in the last World War, and it will do the same in this war, yet we find ourselves today confronted with a situation in the State of California, a large agricultural State, where we have a labor shortage of 21,000 people. The Department of Agriculture has asked the farmers to increase the production of fiber and food products for war purposes, yet many acres are being plowed under at the present time because of the scarcity of labor. On the other hand, we have labor on the W. P. A. rolls that is doing project work and leaving the farmer without help. The farmer may have spent as much as $75 to $100 an acre to plant his crops, yet now he must plow those crops under. We have a sugar shortage, yet in my State at this time, because of the lack of labor to thin the sugar beets, we are plowing some of that crop under in order to keep the weeds from taking the land.

Does it sound reasonable that we shall continue the W. P. A. program at this time when we are striving to win a war, and at the same time plow under agricultural products for the want of labor?

I received this telegram under date of June 4:

Whereas there is an acute shortage of agricultural labor in San Joaquin Valley at the present time; and

Whereas our labor requirements in crop production and harvest will increase as season advances; and

Whereas farmers cannot be expected to plant and grow crops when they know there will be insufficient labor to harvest them: Now, Therefore, be it

Resolved, That Mexican agricultural labor be made available immediately to American farmers for the duration of the labor shortage.

I have other telegrams along the same line.

At the same time that this labor shortage exists, a check shows that in an agricultural area of five California counties there were 2,119 people on W. P. A. relief case load in the period from May 18 to 23 of this year. The counties are Fresno, Kern, Kings, Madera, and Tulare.

I was one of a committee that went to the Department of Agriculture this morning asking that 25,000 to 30,000 Mexicans be sent immediately into the State of California to save our crops, yet in this one locality over 2,000 people are on the W. P. A. rolls.

I do not know how you are going to ask the farmers of this Nation to give their sons to the armed forces and then turn around and plow under their crops for the lack of labor, and at the same time come into this House of Representatives and ask for an appropriation to carry on the W. P. A. I think there is a time for everything, and this is one time that the American people should ask of this Congress to be conservative and use good judgment—not leave it to a group of bureaucrats to come up on the hill and tell us what to do. After the war there is a probability that the W. P. A. will be needed again, but at this time it should be reduced to a minimum, maintaining only the sewing projects.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I have minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FENTON].

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the Members of the House speaking for and against the continuation of the W. P. A. I rather envy those of you who represent districts that are so prosperous and bulging with defense plants that you are able to take up the slack of unemployment in your districts. Personally, coming from one of the most distressed areas in the United States, I am in favor of continuing the W. P. A. at least for work relief. Anyone familiar with the anthracite coal-producing area will agree with that statement. We have a larger relief load than any other section of the United States.

Why is this, you might ask? In the first place, anthracite coal mining is our major industry and we all realize the difficulties in that industry. In the second place, we have not been given any consideration in the war effort. For instance, of all the many, many billions of dollars appropriated by this Congress for the war effort and in which the great State of Pennsylvania has participated generously, I will admit, yet the anthracite region of Pennsylvania in general, and my congressional district in particular, has not been given a chance in helping to produce or manufacture implements of war.

We have in the city of Shamokin, for instance, a large factory building known as the Eagle Silk mill, now owned by the Government itself, and which I have been begging the War Department and the W. P. B. to utilize in the war effort and, perhaps, take up some of our unemployed. But to date I have been unsuccessful. This is a fine, well constructed, six-story building with something over 300,000 square feet of floor space. The people in the Shamokin area are resentful that such a condition should be permitted, and I believe they are absolutely right.

This afternoon I had an interview with representatives of the W. P. B. and they state that they are trying to do all they can. It is the same old story. Let me emphasize again that the Government owns this building and despite the fact that all we hear is about priorities and restrictions, yet here is a Government building, a Government-owned plant, and still this Government fails in its duty to place it in the war effort.

Furthermore, the report issued by the Federal Anthracite Coal Commission, of which the late Mr. Boland, our former majority whip, and myself were members, will show what the distress is in our area. I want to read you a part of the report of the Commission made to President Roosevelt under date of April 2, 1942:

In accordance with these instructions the report and the recommendations are concerned with both long-term and short-term problems and remedial measures. Because, however, of the urgency of the national defense phases of our investigation, we have given special attention to the posibilities of utilizing the idle resources of the anthracite area for war-production purposes. We wish, therefore, to call to your special attention the following salient facts which we have obtained in our hearings and from special reports from Federal, State, and local governmental agencies, civic organizations, and private citizens.

First, the anthracite industry has suffered continued depression despite unprecedented industrial activity in the country generally.

Second, the chief manufacturing activity in the area has been the production of silk and rayon goods. This industry has been dealt a crippling blow by the war emergency.

Third, no Government-financed war plants have been located in the anthracite-producing counties, and no major Government supply contracts have been placed there. We believe that, in the application of the strategic-zone rule, inadequate weight has been given to the fact that the anthracite area is well protected on all sides by mountains and is at all points more than 100 miles from the Atlantic coast.

Fourth, the anthracite area has, through its vocational-training programs, trained thousands of workers in war ocupations, but these workers have been forced to seek jobs in war plants outside the area, despite the congestion in those areas and despite the increasingly serious problems of transportation because of the rubber shortage.

Fifth, the anthracite area still has almost 500,000 families on relief and many thousands on part-time or substandard jobs. In addition to idle manpower, the area has underutilized housing and community facilities at a time when manpower and critical materials are being diverted from war production to build such facilities in the congested centers of industry.

Underutilization of the resources of the area becomes increasingly evident as the Nation approaches exhaustion of its reserve productive capacity in an effort to meet war objectives. It seems to us that the productive power of more than a million people in the midst of the chief manufacturing section of the country should not be neglected when in so many areas overcrowding and labor shortages deter the expansion of war production. Accordingly we urge your thoughtful consideration of the attached recommendations, in which all members of the Commission concur, and particularly of the suggestions relating to the war program.

Mr. Chairman, as long as such conditions exist, as long as so many people in the anthracite region are idle through no fault of their own, and in view of the necessity to use every available unit of power that we have, including manpower, I am forced to support a continuation of the W. P. A.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER].

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, the tremendous cost of modern military equipment and matériel is making it necessary for every American citizen to put his pocketbook on the firing line. It is necessary for every man, woman, and child in the country to take a hitch in his belt. There is no complaint about that from any quarter. There is no complacency among the American people. They are willing to make every needed sacrifice in this time of crisis when the fate of our Republic hangs in the balance, but they are entitled to receive value for every dollar of their money, and, mark you, it is their money that is being spent by the Government of the United States.

Our Committee on Ways and Means is working diligently and conscientiously day and night these days in an effort to devise ways and means of completing a fairly balanced tax bill which will bring in the stupendous sum of about $9,000,000,000, which the Treasury says will be necessary for the next fiscal year. This afternoon we are considering the expenditure of at least one twenty-seventh of the amount of money that is going to be raised by that unexampled tax bill, for the continuance of a work relief agency. Therefore it behooves us to examine the facts scrupulously and find out whether work relief is actually necessary in the light of the fact that the existing abnormal conditions have created an unprecedented market for labor, and that employers are going to great lengths to find employable men and women. I have here some documentation that was not introduced in the committee, naturally, but it is documentation that you may find interesting. I believe that one of the most compelling, one of the most relevant pieces of evidence that we have dealing with current conditions are our daily newspapers. Here is a page from the want-ad section of one of the Washington papers of today, picked out at random. I call your attention to the boxes which are seen, in which men and women are sought to be employed in all kinds of jobs.

Please observe that these are not just the usual classified ads. We find them in large boxes—expensive ads—seeking employable men and women. Here is one seeking men 35 to 45 years of age; another holds out jobs for waiters and bus boys; here is another box where even rat exterminators are wanted; here is another calling for laundry workers; and then there are many others. The same situation obtains, of course, in every city and town in the country. Consequently, is it not reasonable to say, as has been said this afternoon, that the need for a work-relief measure is no longer present. Of course, we will always have unemployables, and we always have had since the beginning of this country, and we have to take care of them. That responsibility originally rests on the family, and if the family cannot discharge it, then it rests with the community, and looking at the matter quite objectively, I unhesitatingly say that if the community is not in a position to do it, then the State and Federal governments of course must step in and lend a helping hand. I am not maintaining that we should kill W. P. A. entirely this year, because I realize that it would be impractical to do so. However, I do maintain that we should terminate the system of manufactured work and work relief as soon as possible and practical, for the good not only of the needy themselves, but for the good of the various communities. It is not only breaking the backs of the taxpayers, but it is taking the starch out of the backbones of those who are the recipients of relief. We have heard this afternoon about the value of the W. P. A. in our war effort in the matter of building roads, airports, and so forth. In that connection, I have selected at random several official descriptions of W. P. A. projects which have been approved since the first of this year for my home city of New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Would the gentleman yield me 1 minute more?

Mr. TABER. I am sorry, but I have no more time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 more minute.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. In this additional minute I can read to you the description relating to only one of these projects, and you may draw your own conclusions as to its value in our war effort. The card designating it for inclusion in the W. P. A. program is dated January 22, 1942. It reads as follows:

> Microphotograph essential municipal records, including surveying material to be processed, preparing material, finishing films and restoring original materials to required form and order, and performing appurtenant and incidental work, * * *.

Its cost is given as $485,431.

I submit that it is absolutely unnecessary, if not positively absurd, to spend a half million dollars on a project of that sort at any time, and certainly not in these times. We should adopt as our guide in considering this bill tomorrow, when it is read, what the President himself has said in his letter to the committee, namely, that it is urgent that our labor reserve be fully utilized, and that productive labor now on the rolls of Work Projects Administration be engaged in other productive employment. No truer words were ever spoken.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER] who has just preceded me, seems to base his argument that W. P. A. is no longer necessary upon the fact that he saw some want ads in a Washington newspaper, where certain individuals might receive employment. It seems to me before you deprive 500,000 unfortunates of their jobs you should have a more substantial reason.

I was prompted to take the floor at this moment by reason of what an employee of this House told me a few hours ago. He said, "Do you know that there is no place outside of here that I can get a job unless it is on W. P. A.?" I asked why. He said, "It is because of my disability." The man is a veteran, and he has a disability. You can look at him and it is not disclosed. Nevertheless, he told me that he has gone to place after place seeking employment, and because of the employers' liability insurance, the insurance company would not approve him, and therefore he could get no work. I have had many such cases. Defective hearing, eyesight, hernia, and many other disabilities of no more a serious nature are sufficient to reject applications for work with private corporations.

Of course, I do not come from quite as large a city as the gentleman from New York comes from, but I do come from one of the largest cities in the United States. The people who are working on W. P. A. in my city of St. Louis are what are termed "unemployables." They cannot get a job anywhere else because of disabilities, or because of the fact that they have not had any kind of training that will enable them to get work.

I know that whenever a man who is working on W. P. A. is offered employment in St. Louis and he does not accept it, he does not remain on W. P. A. Any man working on W. P. A. who can earn twice as much off of W. P. A. as he can on W. P. A. certainly would not stay there. That stands to reason.

I have been in the gentleman's city and if there is any one city in this country that has benefited as a result of W. P. A., it is the city of New York. No matter which direction you go you see new improvements. Your beautiful roads, bridges, playgrounds, and improvements at city institutions are a lasting monument to W. P. A. Yes, 75 percent of the new city improvements is due to W. P. A. I will admit that at the outset there were some projects initiated that were subject to criticism, but that is water over the dam. They have settled down. They are now working on useful and lasting projects. Within the last few weeks I have received complaints from home that certain projects could not be initiated due to the ruling of the W. P. A. itself that just as much national defense work as possible must be taken care of first.

When you take into consideration that this appropriation has taken a larger cut than any appropriation we have made I cannot see why you complain. This appropriation is practically 70 percent less than it was last year. If you will look at the report, you will find the number of people who will be unemployed in this country this year. You watch the building mechanics and see where they are going to get work in the next few months. When all of those great projects for the Army and Navy are com-

pleted, the building mechanics do not go inside and operate the machines. They are not trained to do that. They go looking for a job on some other building. But where are the other buildings going to be when, due to the rulings of the War Production Board, the material is not available. You cannot get hardware; you cannot get steel; you cannot get lumber. Building will be at a standstill. See what the Bureau of Labor Statistics has to say in the report with reference to unemployed. They fix the number at 8,000,000. It is in the report. That is where I read it. It is all right to get up here and criticize W. P. A. and tell about the tax bill that is coming in, and so forth, but I am telling you that if the Government does not, through the instrumentality of an agency of this character, do something for the people who are now employed on W. P. A. who have not yet reached the age where they can get old-age benefits, then your community and your State are going to be required to take care of them.

I voice the assertion the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER] does not express the opinion of the officials and the people of New York City in attacking this organization, and urging its abolition.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 324, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein an editorial entitled, "A Great Industry Threatened," reproduced in the Shreveport Journal, June 8, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a press release issued on April 6, 1942, by the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in committee today and insert some extracts from the hearings and the report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein an address by Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., issued to the Republican State convention in Pierre, S. Dak.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

A SOLDIER AND HIS SWEETHEART

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to include in my remarks a brief quotation from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I hold here a copy of the Philip (S. D.) Pioneer-Review on which you see the picture of Virginia Peterson, the sweetheart of Pvt. Marvin Sonny O'Neal, first soldier to land from the large American convoy that reached Ireland recently. The Chicago Sun, recognizing Virginia as representing the girl the soldier left behind him, invited her to Chicago as its guest for 10 days.

On the trip, the Pioneer-Review reports, Virginia received her first orchid, rode her first streamliner train, got her first facial at a Chicago beauty parlor, stopped at her first hotel, appeared on her first radio program, saw her first stage play, and then returned to her home in South Dakota, as the Sun editor wrote:

> The symbol of all the millions of other American girls who are sweethearts of soldiers and sailors. And Marvin O'Neal, who is going to marry Virginia after the war, is a symbol, too—symbol of all the American soldiers who march away to fight for the kind of life they hope to live, each with his own Virginia later on.
>
> * * * Democracy, real democracy, the kind of democracy that all the Marvins are fighting for, and all the Virginias are praying for, results in that kind of soldiers and that kind of sweethearts for them. And that is why America, without knowing how long the war will last, does know who is going to win it.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein certain extraneous matter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the relief bill today may be permitted to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. HINSHAW, for 3 days, on account of a death in the family.

To Mr. GREEN, indefinitely, on account of illness in the family.

To Mr. HOBBS, for today, on account of important business.

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER. The Chair designates the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX] to serve as Speaker pro tempore tomorrow, Thursday, June 11, 1942.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 11, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, June 11, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearing in connection with the Federal Communications Commission.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, June 16, 1942.

Business to be considered: H. R. 7002, to increase agricultural purchasing power and to meet the need of combating malnutrition among the people of low income by defining and making certain a reasonable definition and standard of nonfat dry milk solids.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Thursday, June 11, 1942, for consideration of war housing, room 1324, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 11, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 7105, to provide for the suspension during the war of operating differential subsidy agreements and attendant benefits, under title VI of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1734. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the fire which destroyed the administration building, Naval Operating Base, Norfolk, Va., on January 26, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

1735. A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting a

report of irregularities in the construction by the United States Maritime Commission of certain vessels under contracts with the Tampa Shipbuilding & Engineering Co. and in the sale thereof to the Navy Department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

1736. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the War Department to pay a claim for damages due to military operations, amounting to $1,000 (H. Doc. No. 781); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1737. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, in compliance with section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (5 U. S. C. 266), an estimate of appropriation for payment of certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office amounting to $124.54 (H. Doc. No. 782); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1738. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, in compliance with section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (5 U. S. C. 266), an estimate of appropriation for payment of certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to $29,429.93 (H. Doc. No. 783); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1739. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation in the amount of $171.58, submitted by the Department of Justice to pay claims for damages to any person or damages to or loss of privately owned property caused by employees of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of March 20, 1936 (5 U. S. C. 300 b), and which require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 784); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1740. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, in compliance with section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (5 U. S. C. 266), an estimate of appropriation for payment of a certain claim allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to $15.49 (H. Doc. No. 785); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1741. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, in compliance with the provisions of the act of September 30, 1890 (31 U. S. C. 226), and the act of April 27, 1904 (31 U. S. C. 583, par. 2), a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which have been submitted by the Treasury Department and require an appropriation for their payment, amounting to $412,805.74 (H. Doc. No. 786); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1742. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, in accordance with the provision contained in the Deficiency Act of April 27, 1904 (31 U. S. C. 583, par. 2), records of judgments rendered against the Government by the United States district courts, as submitted by the Treasury Department and which require an appropriation for their payment amounting to $14,064.07 (H. Doc. No. 787); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1743. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Treasury Department to pay a claim for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of vessels of the Coast Guard, in the sum of $50 (H. Doc. No. 791); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1744. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a schedule of claims amounting to $971,434.40, allowed by the General Accounting Office (H. Doc. No. 788); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1745. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of vessels of the Navy, in the sum of $1,792.47 (H. Doc. No. 789); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1746. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the several executive departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages to privately owned property, in the sum of $73,295.60 (H. Doc. No. 790); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2227. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2228. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers. House Report No. 2229. Report on the disposition of records by sundry departments of the United States Government. Ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 7214. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 7215. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 to provide for compensation for members of local boards and for other persons assisting in the work of such boards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEAGALL:

H. R. 7216. A bill to establish the War Petroleum Corporation and to define its functions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7217. A bill to amend Revised Statutes, section 876, as amended, relating to issuance of subpenas in civil cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 7221. A bill to implement article 28 of the convention signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, and proclaimed by the President on August 4, 1932 (47 Stat. 2074, 2092), by making it a criminal offense for any person to use the emblem and name of the Red Cross or the coat of arms of the Swiss Confederation for commercial or other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GERLACH:

H. R. 7218. A bill authorizing the naturalization of Fred Joseph Tobias; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. MILLS of Louisiana:

H. R. 7219. A bill for the relief of Leonard Lewis Gay; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey:

H. R. 7220. A bill for the relief of A. Davis & Sons, Inc.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3048. By Mr. DOUGLAS: Petition of members of the Methodist Church of Waterville, N. Y., favoring the passage of Senate bill 860, prohibiting the sale of alcoholic beverages on or near all Army camps and naval bases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3049. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition of Cornelius Robinson and sundry other citizens of White, Edwards, and Wabash Counties, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 860, to prohibit the sale of alcoholic beverages in or near military or naval camps and bases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3050. Also, petition of Lyle H. Boyd and 63 other residents of Carmi and Crossville, Ill., supporting Senate bill 860 as a part of our national defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3051. Also, petition of Stephen E. Staley and 83 other residents of Carmi and surrounding community, appealing for legislation which will provide the largest possible protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the influence of vice and intoxicating liquors, and urging the early passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committe on Military Affairs.

3052. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, regarding postal employees reclassification bill (H. R. 6486); to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3053. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the George P. Vandarveer Post, the American Legion, Toms River, N. J., protesting against discrimination of the sale of gasoline in the United States with regard to the eastern seaboard; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3054. By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of Rev. Russell H. Crane and others, of Darien and Alexander, N. Y., favoring the enactment of Senate bill 860, known as the Sheppard bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3055. By Mr. WHEAT: Petition of members of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, Decatur, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 860, and the enforcement of the May bill enacted into public law eliminating prostitution near military camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 1942

The Reverend Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, professor of ethics and sociology at Mount St. Mary's Seminary and College, Emmitsburg, Md., offered the following prayer:

Omnipotent God, Creator of the universe, Father of all men, look down with favor upon Thy servants charged with responsibility for our country's welfare. Witness this daily new consecration of conscience, energy, and talent to ideals of public service.

Remembering that Thy Only Begotten Son suffered the little children to come unto Him and forbade them not, do Thou strengthen the hands of men of good will in their efforts to bring larger opportunities, a fuller life, and the riches of happiness to the youth of our land.

Bless, we beseech Thee, the President of the United States and all the people of the world who pray for a victorious peace with justice.

May deeds of love and mercy go forth from this assembly unto the farthest ends of the earth. Grant the Graces necessary for good works. Prepare our hearts for those sacrifices of wealth, power, and pleasure inseparable from genuine service. In the name of Thy Divine Son, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 8, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 5, 1942:

S. 1637. An act to authorize the conveyance to the State of Illinois, for highway purposes only, a portion of the Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill.;

S. 2088. An act to authorize aircraft flight rations for officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Navy and Marine Corps while engaged in flight operations;

S. 2097. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to grant to the board of trustees, school district No. 20, Charleston County, S. C., a parcel of land situated in the city of Charleston, S. C.;

S. 2229. An act to provide for the retirement, rank, and pay of heads of staff departments of the Marine Corps;

S. 2382. An act to amend the act approved June 24, 1926, entitled "An act to authorize the construction and procurement of aircraft and aircraft equipment in the Navy and Marine Corps, and to adjust and define the status of the operating personnel in connection therewith," so as to provide for the establishment of the designation of naval aviation pilot (airship), and for other purposes; and

S. 2446. An act to prescribe certain allowances for cadets of the United States Military Academy undergoing flight training, and for other purposes.

On June 6, 1942:

S. 1732. An act for the relief of Max Miller and Vera Caroline Miller, and others;

S. 1756. An act for the relief of Franklin Benjamin McNew;

S. 2103. An act to amend section 125 of the National Defense Act of June 3, 1916 (39 Stat. 216), as amended, so as to authorize citizens of foreign countries who are graduates of Air Corps advanced flying schools and Air Corps service schools to wear aviation badges;

S. 2235. An act for the relief of Harriett Boswell, guardian of Betty Fisher;

S. 2251. An act for the relief of Charles Brauch;

S. 2278. An act for the relief of Bob Sampley;

S. 2354. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. George M. Legg and Loetta Trainer;

S. 2451. An act for the relief of Anthony W. Livingston;

S. 2452. An act to provide for the advancement on the retired list of certain officers of the United States Coast Guard and the Coast and Geodetic Survey;

S. 2453. An act to authorize the obligation of funds of the Coast Guard for work or material at Government-owned establishments, and for other purposes;

S. 2469. An act for the relief of William Edward Fleming;

S. 2470. An act for the relief of Eileen Collins Treacy; and

S. 2490. An act to amend the Coast Guard Auxiliary and Reserve Act of 1941 (Public, No. 8, 77th Cong.), as amended by section 10 of the act entitled "An act to amend and clarify certain acts pertaining to the Coast Guard, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1941 (Public, No. 166, 77th Cong.).

On June 9, 1942:

S. 221. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of the Beacon Oyster Co., the Point Wharf Oyster Co., and B. J. Rooks & Son;

S. 1044. An act for the relief of L. H. Goodman;

S. 1563. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Albert M. Howard; and

S. 2048. An act for the relief of Lt. William Stewart Walker.

KING GEORGE II OF GREECE

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, the valiant Greek is known in all the annals of history. He is known to us today in the person of King George II. This high-spirited leader has served his people well, and in time of their adversity continues to remain steadfast to their cause.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial on King George II which appears in the Evening Star, Washington, D. C., June 10, 1942.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KING GEORGE II

Washington today pays homage to the man who led his courageous people in one of World War No. 2's epic stands against Axis invaders. He is King George II of Greece, who, as a reluctant refugee from his stricken homeland, has not for one moment relaxed his fight for eventual liberation of his gallant subjects.

King George symbolizes the glorious Greek. Had he chosen the easy way out rather than face the virtually inevitable consequences of honorable resistance he might today still be in his palace. But he would have been a helpless puppet of unconscionable masters, and his people's burning hopes for freedom would have been ruthlessly smothered. Instead King George chose to stage another Thermopylae, which, though temporarily disastrous, has assured him of an honored place in the history of free men and has assured his unfortunate country of an honored place at the council tables when the day of reckoning comes.

The Greek monarch stayed with his people to the very last, urging them on even when all hope of victory long since had gone. Indeed, he would not leave until convinced by his aides that his own personal capture by the Nazis was imminent. German parachutists were dropping all around him at Crete when he finally slipped through the lines, disguised as a peasant, and succeeded in escaping to Egypt.

Today Washington proudly welcomes him as a King in deed as well as title, whose example is an inspiration not alone to his own people but to liberty-loving men everywhere.

VISIT TO WASHINGTON OF UNITED NATIONS FLYING HEROES

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, during the past weeks we have all been inspired by the magnificent achievements of the intrepid airmen of the United Nations. Not one of us but has been stirred as our newspapers and radios described the deeds of these men who, in bomber and in fighter plane, have advanced our common cause toward the day when mastery of the air will be ours in every part of the globe, and the downfall of Hitler and his satellites will be an accomplished fact.

Most of us have wished more than once that it were possible for us to express to these men our admiration for what they have done. This week end we have such an opportunity. On Saturday, June 13, 14 British and American flyers—each one a hero of these new battlefronts in the skies—will be the guests of the Nation here in Washington.

Brought here during the course of a flying tour they are making of 21 American cities, these men will be our guests all day, filling a busy schedule of appearances arranged by the United States Treasury Department. I need not emphasize how much good their appearances are doing, as they bring the home front and the battlefront together, as they bring our Nation into closer unity, and as they provide a dramatic proof of what our fighting men can do if we citizens at home, through our continued purchases of War Bonds and stamps, provide them with the weapons of war.

We have all read in the press of the acclaim these men have received in New York and other cities, and I know, Senators will want to see them while they are in Washington. I therefore invite their attention to the citizens' rally which is to be held at the Water Gate, near the Lincoln Memorial, Saturday evening at 8 o'clock.

The program will give us a chance to hear from their own lips the stories of men who were decorated for achievements in raids on far-flung battle fronts of this global war—heroes from Rostock, Lubeck, Norway, the Bandoeng Strait, Pearl Harbor, Tobruk, southern Germany, and other vital fronts. There is the young man from Rochester, Minn., whose dramatic wireless—"Sighted sub, sank same"—has become a national byword. And there are others whose achievements are all a part of the glowing record of this war of wings.

The Secretary of the Senate advises me that a special section of seats for the rally has been reserved for the Members of this body, and that he is holding two tickets for each Senator. I know all Senators will desire to be present, to pay their tribute to these men, and by their presence to encourage the District citizens, most of them theater men, whose experience has been called upon by the Treasury Department, and who have given of their time most freely in order that this Washington rally may be a great success.

Let us all attend to pay tribute to the flyers and the hundreds of fighting men they represent, the men at the battle front who are bringing victory closer every day.

I wish to state also that at 12:30 o'clock Saturday these flying heroes will be received by Members of the Senate in the Senate reception room, and I hope that as many Senators as possible will come over to the Capitol at that hour to greet them. The Senate will not be in session; therefore Senators will have to charge their memories with this notice. I do hope that all Senators will be here at 12:30 o'clock Saturday.

I trust also that Senators will not overlook the fact that Colonel Halsey, the Secretary of the Senate, has two tickets for each Senator for the Water Gate celebration, where it is expected an enormous crowd will assemble to do honor to these men.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REPORT RELATIVE TO THE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN VESSELS UNDER CONTRACTS WITH THE TAMPA SHIPBUILDING & ENGINEERING CO., ETC.

A letter from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting report of an investigation by representatives of his office of the contracts and other records of the United States Maritime Commission, the Navy Department, and the Tampa Shipbuilding & Engineering Co., and its successor, the Tampa Shipbuilding Co., Inc., relative to the partial construction of seven vessels by the said companies under contracts with the United States Maritime Commission and the sale of said vessels to the Navy Department prior to completion (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

S. R. BRACKIN *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to order of the court, a certified copy of the special findings of fact and opinion filed by the court in the case of *S. R. Brackin* v. *The United States*, No. 17766 Congressional (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

BOLIVAR COTTON OIL CO. *v.* THE UNITED STATES

A letter from the Chief Clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting, pursuant to order of the court, a certified copy of the special findings of fact and opinion filed by the court in the case of the *Bolivar Cotton Oil Co.* v. *The United States*, Congressional No. 17464 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A concurrent resolution of the Legislature of Louisiana, memorializing Congress to place a parity on sugar that will enable the sugarcane growers to realize a reasonable profit on their labor and investment and to liberalize the allotment of sugar under the rationing; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. OVERTON on the 8th instant, p. 4969, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

By Mr. WAGNER:

Petitions of sundry citizens and religious organizations, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Kansas City, and of Rush and Miami Counties, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"House Concurrent Resolution 7

"Memorializing the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Harold Ickes, to conduct an investigation into the widespread damage being done to crops in southwest Louisiana by the purple gallinule (commonly called the blue peter, blue rail, or ricebird) and urgently requesting him to issue a permit allowing all residents of said section to shoot said migratory bird

"Whereas the Secretary of the Interior, by virtue of authority vested in him by sections 3 and 4 of the Migratory Bird and Treaty Act of July 3, 1918 (40 Stat. 755), as amended by the act of June 20, 1936 (49 Stat. 1555), the administration of said act, as amended, having been transferred to said Secretary of the Interior on July 1, 1939, pursuant to the Reorganization Act of 1939 (Public, No. 19, 76th Cong.), has established regulations, which have been promulgated by the President of the United States on August 11, 1939, by Proclamation No. 2345; and

"Whereas it was established in regulation 1 that by definition the gallinules and other rails are migratory birds included in the terms of the conventions between the United States and Great Britain and the United Mexican States, respectively; and

"Whereas Regulation 10 deals with the issuance of permits to kill migratory birds injurious to property; and

"Whereas many farmers, tenants, sharecroppers, and other residents of southwest Louisiana are aggrieved because of the widespread damage to crops being done by these rails; and

"Whereas the bird is seriously harmful to agriculture and other interests in southwest Louisiana; and

"Whereas it is impossible for the general public to assist the farmer in his fight against these birds under present regulations and permits, since they are forbidden to shoot them: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of Louisiana*, That the Secretary of the Interior, Hon. Harold Ickes, be, and he is hereby, memorialized to conduct a complete investigation as to the nature and extent of the injury, the specie of bird doing the damage, and the nature of the remedies, and to issue a permit allowing all interested persons to kill the gallinule (or rail); be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this concurrent resolution be immediately forwarded by the Secretary of the Senate to the Honorable Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, the Louisiana senatorial and congressional representatives in Washington, and to the press."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Education and Labor:

"House Concurrent Resolution 11

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Louisiana Members of the Congress of the United States of America to work for more Federal aid for the public schools of Louisiana and the other Southern States of the Union

"Whereas public education in America is based upon the democratic principle that all American children have an equal right to an education regardless of wealth or residence; and,

"Whereas due to inadequate industrialization, absentee ownership of wealth and freight-rate differentials, the Southern States of the Union have a disproportionately small share of the wealth of the Nation; and

"Whereas the obligation of educating a relatively large number of the future citizens of America has fallen upon these Southern States; and

"Whereas greater aid from the United States of America is vitally necessary to enable the Southern States of the Union to discharge such obligation: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of Louisiana*, That the Louisiana Members of the Congress of the United States be, and they are hereby, memorialized to work toward the securing of more financial aid from the United States of America for the public schools of Louisiana and the other Southern States of the Union, with control by the Federal Government limited to the general field within which the funds so provided are to be spent: Be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded immediately to the Louisiana Members of the Congress of the United States of America and to the press.

"Adopted at the regular session of the Legislature of Louisiana for the year 1942."

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House Concurrent Resolution 9

"Concurrent resolution memorializing the Office of Defense Transportation, an agency of the Federal Government, to exempt from the effects of order No. 5, or any similar order, motor vehicles operated in the transportation of sea food and the products of waters of the State of Louisiana

"Whereas the Office of Defense Transportation, a Federal agency, has issued its order No. 5 restricting or prohibiting the use of certain motor vehicles, and affecting those transporting food products taken from the waters of Louisiana, and unless such vehicles can be so utilized as to carry full loads at all times; and

"Whereas the laws of Louisiana, particularly section 3 of act 301 of 1938 relating to exemptions from classification of motor vehicles for hire, place such motor vehicles transporting water products in the same classification as those engaged in transporting soil products; and

"Whereas such sea food and water products must be loaded at remote, unpopulated, dead-end places; and

"Whereas it is impossible to secure full loads to such dead-end points; and

"Whereas such order, if not modified, will be highly prejudicial and will tend to discourage transportation to market of Louisiana sea foods; and

"Whereas the efficient cultivation, conservation, and use of our natural food resources is urgently required during the war emergency: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved by the Legislature of Louisiana*, That the Office of Defense Transportation be, and hereby is, memorialized to modify its order No. 5, or any similar order, so as to place motor vehicles transporting sea food or water products in the same classification as vehicles transporting products of the soil; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forthwith forwarded to the Office of Defense Transportation, Washington, D. C., to the congressional Members from Louisiana, and to the press."

RESOLUTION OF GREAT LAKES HARBORS ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY presented a resolution adopted by the Great Lakes Harbors Association, which was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas this war has proven that the United States can never adequately defend itself from future attacks without gradually shifting to the Central West many of the major war industries where they will be much safer from aerial attack;

Whereas it has also been demonstrated that need of adequate defense requires that the Great Lakes develop facilities for the building of large ocean-going vessels as well as those of smaller design;

Whereas this war has again demonstrated that Germany's power of aggression, most particularly its ability to move large armies east and west, north and south, is based upon her ability to relieve the railroads from the carriage of heavy freight by use of a great system of inland waterways;

Whereas even a blind man can see that should the railroads ever face the task of conveying the additional burden that would grow out of actual warfare on our soil, our Nation would be woefully handicapped in making a defense of this country unless the country's major waterways are completed to their full draft requirements;

Whereas the war has demonstrated that the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence water systems could now be more fully employed for the benefit of agriculture and industry to greatly relieve the strain on our transportation system if the 38 miles of bottleneck on the international Canadian boundary were deepened; and

Whereas all these reasons indicate how necessary it is to approve this project and start work on it at once: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we authorize our officers to send a copy of this resolution expressing our sentiments to all the Members of Congress of both Houses from the States in the Middle West.

GREAT LAKES HARBORS ASSOCIATION.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS, ETC.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I present a group of 17 petitions from 18 communities in 16 counties, all in the State of Ohio, bearing the signatures of approximately 755 citizens, asking for the enactment of Senate bill 860.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The petitions presented by the Senator from Ohio will lie on the table.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference and printing in the RECORD a resolution from my home town of Clovis, N. Mex., concerning the liquor traffic, especially as it relates to soldiers.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas the growing evils of alcohol consumption in military-encampment and defense-project areas are so apparent; and

Whereas in this time of national crisis when individuals and groups are being urged to conserve for the defense effort and cooperate in the rationing of consumers' goods; and

Whereas more than 2,000,000,000 gallons of hard liquor is in storage for civilian use; and

Whereas the liquor interests use 150,000,000 pounds of sugar annually for that which gives no returns in health, efficiency, or morals but becomes a sabotaging agent in the defense preparation; and

Whereas the brewing industries are given priority rights in tire rationing over other essential businesses: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the First Methodist Church of Clovis, N. Mex.—

1. That the congressional delegation in Washington representing the State of New Mexico be urged and recommended to exert every effort to secure the passage of the Sheppard bill, S. 860.

2. That the President of the United States and the Honorable Leon Henderson be requested to convert the present hard liquor now in storage for civilian use into products required in defense industries as one means of alleviating the sugar rationing.

3. That the Honorable Leon Henderson be requested to greatly restrict and curtail the use and sale of hard liquor by the same system of rationing that has been inaugurated affecting other essential products.

4. That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the official minutes of the Woman's Society of Christian Service of the First Methodist Church of Clovis, N. Mex., and that a copy of the same be mailed to the Honorable Franklin D. Roosevelt, the Honorable Leon Henderson, the Honorable Carl A. Hatch, the Honorable Dennis Chavez, and the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson.

Given under the hand of the president and attested by the secretary of the Woman's Society of Christian Service.

Dated this 4th day of June A. D. 1942.

Mrs. BERT MCCULLOUGH,
President.

Attest:

Mrs. MORGAN T. JONES,
Secretary pro tempore.

RESOLUTIONS ON THE NATIONAL LIVESTOCK EXCHANGE, CHICAGO, ILL.—BEEF PRICE CEILINGS AND TRUCK TRANSPORTATION

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I present for printing in the RECORD and appropriate reference resolutions unanimously adopted by the National Livestock Exchange in convention assembled at Chicago on Saturday, June 6, 1942.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL LIVESTOCK EXCHANGE RESOLUTION URGING RELIEF TO CATTLE FEEDERS FROM BEEF-PRICE CEILINGS

Whereas the desire of the Office of Price Administration in endeavoring to prevent undue inflation during this war period is commendable. The public should be protected from the disastrous effects of commodity prices soaring to unwarranted and abnormal heights.

However, the Government agencies in their effort to hold down prices to the consumer have set the ceilings for beef at levels that will result in tremendous losses to the beef-cattle finishers of the country.

It is obvious, therefore, that such a policy on the part of the Government would drive thousands of stockmen out of business, cause a great falling off in the available supplies of beef in the near future, and set back our cattle industry for many years to come. Once the Nation's cattle supply is depleted it cannot be restored within a year as are grain crops.

The National Livestock Exchange in convention assembled urge that Price Administrator Henderson make a full and complete study of the beef-cattle situation and take such prompt steps in amending his beef ceilings as will relieve the intolerable situation in which the cattle finishers of the country find themselves, thus helping them to survive and in the long run better protecting the true interests of the consumer.

As the sole representatives in the public markets of the growers and feeders of livestock, with a half century of experience, we contend that this action on the part of price-fixing agencies with respect to beef-cattle prices is decidedly inconsistent with utterances of other officials forecasting such a scarcity of fats and oils as to likely lead to rationing.

THE NATIONAL LIVESTOCK EXCHANGE RESOLUTION URGING THAT LIVESTOCK TRUCK OPERATORS BE EXEMPTED FROM PROVISIONS OF OFFICE OF DEFENSE TRANSPORTATION GENERAL ORDERS 3, 4, AND 5

Whereas attainment of a full and complete victory over our country's enemies can only be brought about through a continuous flow of meat and meat products to our armed forces and our allies; and

A steady flow of meat and meat products can only be obtained through the maintenance of a continuous flow of live animals into public markets; and

Approximately 75 percent of all livestock from farm to market now moves by truck, and an even flow of livestock into public markets can only be maintained by trucks—

The Office of Defense Transportation has issued General Orders 3, 4, and 5 prohibiting the operation of said trucks unless loaded to capacity in one direction and at least 75 percent of capacity on the return trip.

The livestock truck operators and the public livestock market interests are willing and anxious to have the said trucks return to their country headquarters with loads of 75 percent or more all the time.

The peculiar characteristics of the livestock truck and the movement of livestock by truck are such as to make the attainment of so great a degree of return loaded movement impossible.

There is necessarily no similar requirement covering railroad livestock cars.

The enforcement of Orders 3, 4, and 5 to livestock truck operators will at least seriously curtail or quite likely entirely stop the movement of livestock by truck to public markets.

The stoppage of such movement will seriously endanger the orderly marketing, processing, and flow of meats to our armed forces and our allies: Be it therefore

Resolved, That it is the sense of the members of the National Livestock Exchange in convention assembled in Chicago these 5th and 6th days of June 1942.

That the Office of Defense Transportation be urged to issue at the very earliest possible moment amendments to said orders that will completely exempt livestock trucks from the application of said provisions requiring 75 percent loads on the return move.

RESOLUTION OF UPPER MISSISSIPPI WATERWAYS ASSOCIATION AND OTHERS RELATIVE TO THE TRANSPORTATION OF OIL, FUEL, AND COAL

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a resolution adopted by the Upper Mississippi Waterways Association and various municipal officials and others on the question of the transportation of oil, fuel, and coal. I request that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on

Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas there exists an acute and serious situation affecting vitally the welfare of the millions of American citizens residing on the upper Mississippi River and the territory tributary thereto; and

Whereas it is imperative that immediate steps be taken in order to assure an adequate supply of liquid petroleum and solid fuels to prevent severe suffering and hardship during the ensuing winter; and

Whereas these millions of people will gladly make any necessary sacrifice in order to assist the Nation in this war of survival; and

Whereas the upper Mississippi Valley has been designated as a defense area and there are many plants in operation and being constructed herein to assist in providing adequate and sufficient supplies for the use of our fighting forces; and

Whereas these plants and the people living in this area must have fuel in sufficient quantities to enable them to continue their operations and subsistence: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved and urged by the members of the upper Mississippi Waterways Association, the city of Minneapolis, through and by its committee on commerce, markets, and harbors, the members of the upper Mississippi and St. Croix River Improvement Commission, the Port Authority of St. Paul, the majority of the shippers of essential commodities in our war effort, and the many consumers of these commodities assembled here in Chicago on May 30, 1942, That—

1. Steps must immediately be taken to maintain the present river transportation equipment in full operation on the upper Mississippi River so that the vital war industries located on the Mississippi, Minnesota, and St. Croix Rivers, will not be forced to curtail operations.

2. All Members of the Congress and other governmental representatives are requested and urged to use their influence and every means at their disposal to obtain for these industries and the people of this area, a fair and equitable proportion of the construction and allocation of any new equipment used in the transportation of essential commodities by river that is or will be built.

3. Because of the serious shortage of railroad transportation equipment resulting from the removal of cars ordinarily assigned to this territory and in order to secure an uninterrupted flow of liquid petroleum and solid fuel to our essential war industries, we request and urge the United States Coast Guard to extend the navigation period on the upper Mississippi River to December 31. This is feasible by the use of ice breakers.

4. Owing to our severe climatic conditions it is most important that all Senators and Congressmen representing the upper Mississippi River Valley and the Northwest, the delegates here assembled, and the groups and organizations which they represent, keep in constant touch with all of the bureaus and commissions charged with the duty and responsibility of rationing fuel products so that a shortage of liquid and solid fuel will not jeopardize the morale and health of our citizens, including particularly those engaged in war industries and agriculture.

5. Because it is essential to have representation of the upper Mississippi River on the Inland Waterways Committee of the Office of Defense Transportation, we recommend that Herman Mueller, secretary of the Port Authority of the City of St. Paul, and Arthur W. Kleinschnitz, commissioner of the Mississippi and St. Croix River Improvement Commission, both of whom are recognized traffic authorities, be placed on said committee.

RESOLUTION OF EASTERN STATES GASOLINE RETAILERS CONFERENCE—GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks and appropriately referred, a resolution concerning gasoline rationing which was adopted at the June 4 meeting of the Eastern States Gasoline Retailers Conference, held in New York City.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas gasoline rationing will be necessary for the duration of the war; and

Whereas such rationing brings with it the possibility of unfairness to the dealer and inequities of distribution to the public, and

Whereas we feel it our duty to suggest the following method for correction of evils and the operation of fair and equitable distribution: Be it

Resolved: (1) That the United States Senate establish immediately a permanent petroleum committee to inquire into and make recommendations concerning the regulation in control of the production and distribution of petroleum products;

(2) That the determination and administration of all regulatory policies affecting petroleum products, except as to price, as provided in the Emergency Price Control Act, be centered in the O. P. C., and that the O. P. C. be granted all necessary power and authority for that purpose;

(3) That in order to equalize the burden of necessary curtailment of the sale of gasoline, it is recommended that rationing of gasoline be extended to all areas of the United States and thus make available additional overland transportation facilities for those areas further removed from the source of supply;

(4) That the Government require the immediate utilization of all alternative transportation facilities such as additional tank-car use, inland waterways, barges, reversing of pipe line flow to bring additional gasoline into the eastern seaboard, and either to grant supplying companies a sufficient increase in price to compensate for the additional cost of overland transportation, as compared to tanker transportation, or to subsidize the railroads to the extent of such difference in cost;

(5) That the present plan of card rationing is thoroughly unsound and has already led to wholesale charges of cheating on the part of the motoring public, will result in economic pressure by the customer on the gasoline retailer to evade its provisions, and will not secure an equitable distribution of gasoline to the motoring public; that dealer rationing for the 2 months since March 19, has worked fairly and adequately, that there have been no complaints from any source concerning its operation, that the Office of Price Administration has itself conceded that the success of rationing is dependent entirely upon the retailer, and that dealer rationing offers the only fair method of rationing, and should be continued as the exclusive method.

JOHN DRESSLER, *President.*

RATIONING OF GASOLINE — PROTESTS FROM CHAMBERS OF COMMERCE IN KANSAS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a protest from the Chamber of Commerce of Neodesha, Kans., against rationing of gasoline in the Central States, where there are surplus supplies of gasoline and more than adequate refining facilities to meet all demands.

This statement points out that drivers in this section of the Nation already are voluntarily cutting down driving mileages, thereby conserving rubber.

Voluntary rationing already is in effect, both on tires and gasoline.

The statement reads:

It now appears that instead of appreciation being shown of this patriotic cooperation on the part of the public, they are to be punished in the States where gasoline is plentiful to soothe the spirits of our eastern brothers, where everybody understands there is sound reason for rationing.

There being no objection, the communication was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Neodesha, Kans., June 1, 1942.

Hon. HAROLD L. ICKES.
Hon. THOS. D. WINTER.
Hon. CLYDE M. REED.
Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER.
Mr. LEON HENDERSON.
Mr. DONALD NELSON.

DEAR SIRS: Under date of March 10, 1942, we addressed a letter to most of you whose names appear in this heading, protesting the rationing of gasoline in centrally located States, where a surplus of gasoline is in storage and where refineries are not now in operation nearly up to capacity.

Through the courtesy and, we believe, sound judgment of Senator CAPPER, our letter was read and discussed before the Senate and made a matter of record.

At a special called meeting of the Industrial Committee of the Neodesha Chamber of Commerce, it was unanimously voted to communicate again with you concerning the matter of gasoline rationing in the Central States.

Because of recent statements accredited to Leon Henderson's office and other administrative offices to the effect that rationing of gasoline might become general in the near future, we again wish to offer our objections to such a move and to assure you that nothing has been said or done to convince us that such restriction is justified here. It has been said that its purpose is to conserve rubber. We have not been told ofr what purpose the rubber is to be conserved. No announcement has been made that the Government expects to take the tires away from motorists in the East, where gasoline is now being rationed. The tires motorists are using are for the most part unfit for Army vehicles. A vast amount of used rubber is now in storerooms or junk yards; estimates run as high as a million tons.

We predicted in our letter of March 10 that the rubber shortage would result in a fast decline in the number of passenger cars in service. To a great extent that has already come true. But what is more evident as a matter of record is that voluntary rationing is already in effect, both on tires and gasoline. It now appears that instead of appreciation being shown of this patriotic cooperation on the part of the public, they are to be punished in the States where gasoline is plentiful to soothe the spirits of our eastern brothers, where everybody understands there is sound reason for rationing.

In the more thinly settled sections of the Midwest, transportation by automobile is depended on to a much greater extent than in the more densely populated eastern States. We believe it would result in lowering the morale of the people in Kansas.

Finally, we believe that rationing of gasoline in these States, where refineries cannot dispose of the gasoline they must make if they are to produce critical war materials, more especially fuel oil, will result in economic loss; that it will be very unpopular in this area, therefore difficult to administer. We again ask your influence to prevent this from actually being put into effect.

Very respectfully yours,

J. B. OWENS,
Chairman, Industrial Committee.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I also present and ask unanimous consent to

have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a telegram from the chamber of commerce, of Winfield, Kans.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINFIELD, KANS. *June 10, 1942.*

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Our board of directors has instructed me to inform you that they are unanimously against the rationing of gasoline in the Middle West oil-producing States, and respectfully request that you use your influence to prevent such action by our Federal Government.

R. A. BROOKS,
Secretary, Chamber of Commerce.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. GURNEY, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2442. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag; with amendments (Rept. No. 1454).

By Mr. HUGHES, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 2195. A bill conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Charles E. Salmons; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1458);

H. R. 1349. A bill for the relief of Annie Brown; without amendment (Rept. No. 1455);

H. R. 5610. A bill for the relief of G. H. Condon, M. E. Cannon, W. J. Esterle, C. C. Gasaway, James F. Retallack, and L. G. Yinger; without amendment (Rept. No. 1456); and

H. R. 6184. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. E. P. Ball; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1457).

By Mr. ROSIER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 2363. A bill for the relief of Percy Ray Greer, a minor; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1461);

S. 2461. A bill for the relief of Minnie C. Sanders; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1462);

H. R. 6410. A bill for the relief of Alex Gamble; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1460); and

H. R. 6598. A bill for the relief of Leanna M. Stright; without amendment (Rept. No. 1459)

By Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 780. A bill for the relief of Harvey C. Artis; without amendment (Rept. No. 1463);

H. R. 3173. A bill to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to Mrs. Charles O. DeFord; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1467);

H. R. 3402. A bill for the relief of Catherine R. Johnson; without amendment (Rept. No. 1464);

H. R. 6597. A bill for the relief of A. Mack Dodd and Henry Dodd; without amendment (Rept. No. 1465); and

H. R. 6676. A bill for the relief of F. A. Holmes, former United States disbursing clerk for the State of Illinois; without amendment (Rept. No. 1466).

By Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R 5526. A bill for the relief of James E. Savage; without amendment (Rept. No. 1468);

H. R. 6077. A bill for the relief of Edward P. Reilly; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1470); and

H. R. 6349. A bill for the relief of Jeff Roberts; without amendment (Rept. No. 1469).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 2551. A bill for the relief of Vernon Van Zandt; without amendment (Rept. No. 1471);

H. R. 3352. A bill for the relief of Alice W. Miller; without amendment (Rept. No. 1472); and

H. R. 5938. A bill for the relief of A. H. Larzelere; without amendment (Rept. No. 1473).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 481. A bill to regulate and codify existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and usage of the flag of the United States of America; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1476); and

H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America; with amendments (Rept. No. 1477).

By Mr. BURTON:

From the Committee on Immigration:

H. R. 2419. A bill for the relief of Chan Tsork-ying; without amendment (Rept. No. 1474); and

H. R 5870. A bill to amend section 24 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917; without amendment (Rept. No. 1475).

From the Committee on the District of Columbia:

H. R. 6953. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1480).

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2545. A bill to promote the war effort by facilitating the planting of the full allotted acreage of cotton as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture as the Nation's war goal; without amendment (Rept. No. 1478).

By Mr. BANKHEAD, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2585. A bill to provide that loans on the 1942 crop of corn, wheat, rice, cotton, tobacco, and peanuts shall be made at a rate equal to the parity price; without amendment (Rept. No. 1479).

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2322. A bill to remove the time limit for cooperation between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Farm Security Administration in the development of farm units on public lands under Federal reclamation projects; without amendment (Rept. No. 1487).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the District of Columbia:

S. 1622. A bill to authorize payment to janitors and custodians of the public schools of the District of Columbia for services rendered for local boards of the Selective Service System; without amendment (Rept. No. 1481);

S. 2316. A bill to provide for the placing in Gallinger Hospital of a memorial to George Earle Chamberlain; without amendment (Rept. No. 1482);

S. 2500. A bill relating to the assessment of tangible personal property in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1486);

S. 2502. A bill relating to the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia; without amendment (Rept. No. 1483);

H. R. 6386. A bill to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, to conform with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia, and also to conform with wages paid in many cities of the Nation; without amendment (Rept. No. 1484); and

H. R. 6925. A bill to provide additional compensation for Joseph Sharfsin, Esq., for professional services rendered the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1485).

REPORTS ON DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Mr. BARKLEY, from the Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers, to which were referred, for examination and recommendation, three lists of records transmitted to the Senate by The Archivist of the United States, which appeared to have no permanent value or historical interest, submitted reports thereon pursuant to law.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 2587. A bill relating to the computation of retirement pay of personnel of the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHIPSTEAD:

S. 2588. A bill for the relief of certain persons who suffered losses as the result of a fire in the State of Minnesota (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HOLMAN:

S. 2589. A bill relating to the garnishment of salaries or other compensation of civil officers and employees of the United States, its Territories or possessions, or the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHANDLER (for himself and Mr. BARKLEY):

S. 2590. A bill to amend section 13 (d) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2591. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2592. A bill to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps during the existing war, and for other purposes; and

S. 2593. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the fire which destroyed the Administration Building, Naval Operating Base, Norfolk, Va., on January 26, 1942; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL:

S. J. Res. 152 (by request). Joint resolution designating the third week of September of each year as "National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

RELIEF OF VIOLA DALE—RECOMMITTAL OF BILL

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senate bill 2186, for the relief of Viola Dale, now on the calendar, be recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 3152. An act to suspend restrictions during the present war and for 1 year thereafter upon the service of certain officers of

the Marine Corps in the Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution continuing the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation as an agency of the United States; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, ETC.—AMENDMENT

Mr. LA FOLLETTE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed, as follows:

On page 51, line 1, beginning with the figures "$8,101,050", to strike out down through line 4, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "$15,000,000, of which (1) not to exceed $142,212 may be transferred to the appropriation 'Pay, etc., Commissioned Officers, Public Health Service,' and (2) not to exceed $195,000 may be transferred to the appropriation 'Traveling Expenses, Federal Security Agency,' for the traveling expenses of the personnel of the Division of Venereal Diseases, which shall be in addition to the sum contained in such appropriation for such Division."

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE GASOLINE AND FUEL-OIL SHORTAGES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, as chairman of the Special Committee to Investigate Shortages of Gasoline, Fuel Oil, and Petroleum Products, I desire to make a brief statement on the subject of gasoline rationing, and particularly dealing with the petroleum shortage in the eastern and northeastern part of the United States. Senators will recall that last fall this committee undertook an investigation of the gasoline shortage, and, after brief hearings, submitted a report to the Senate.

The committee has since that time continued its work. We have made a survey of the tank-car situation of the country, and have been constantly engaged in the search for additional transportation facilities. The benefits of our study have been made available to the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator and the Office of Defense Transportation. We think that we have been helpful. Our work is not quite completed. Upon its completion, the committee will make a further report to the Senate.

Because of the seriousness of existing conditions, members of our committee feel that there is need for an immediate and careful examination of the oil and gasoline situation as it applies to the entire country. All Members of the Senate know of the widespread differences of opinion on this subject. Conflicting statements have been issued by various officials of the Government. The opinion of Congress on the question of gasoline rationing on a national scale is divided. Those engaged in the petroleum industry, including producers, wholesalers retailers, and refiners, are at a loss as they attempt to make plans for the future. There is a threat to our national economy, and especially to thousands of people engaged in this industry. Operators of plants engaged in war production and men employed in war plants are greatly affected. There is danger that certain sections of the country may be denied sufficient fuel for the heating of homes.

Many committees of Congress have considered the matter, but the confusion of opinion continues. As a result of this, our committee feels duty bound to advise the Senate that it is prepared to undertake an immediate and careful study of the petroleum situation and the question of the rationing of gasoline on a national scale. In an attempt to ascertain whether or not the Senate desires such a study by our committee, I am offering a resolution which would provide additional funds for the committee. If these funds are denied we will assume that the Senate does not desire the investigation at this time. If the funds are provided, we are prepared to start work immediately.

Mr. President, I submit a resolution with the request that it be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be received and referred as requested.

The resolution (S. Res. 264) was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under S. Res. 156, Seventy-seventh Congress, agreed to August 28, 1941 (providing for an investigation with respect to shortages of gasoline, fuel oil, and other petroleum products), is hereby increased by $10,000.

CURTAILMENT OF WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION FUNDS

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, an editorial referring to the need for a curtailment of Work Projects Administration funds, which appeared in the Hartford Times.

I desire to call particular attention to the last paragraph of the editorial, wherein the statement is made that—

A progressive and humane people must hope there will be no reestablishment of town farms or any other recognition of pauperism. Whatever may be said in criticism of the Work Projects Administration—and plenty can be said—it has offered the unemployed opportunities to maintain themselves without sacrifice to self-respect, for they have earned what they received—it was not charity.

It is only because I am completely in accord with that language that I am willing to consider appropriating further funds for the W. P. A. at this time. It seems to me, although I confess that I am not fully informed as to other sections of the country than my own, that the W. P. A. has pretty much, for the time being, served its purpose. I should be willing to have it abolished, at least temporarily, excepting for the fact that men from other parts of the country advise me that under such circumstances some people would be subjected to pauperism. I do not want to participate in any such step. I feel that the States and municipalities are, under existing conditions, able to provide work relief for those people within their borders—and should do it. The almshouse and pauperism belong to the pagan past and should not be permitted to return. Some men are physically unable to obtain private employment, and they should not be subjected to pauperism. Only a fear of the return of such conditions induces me to give sympathetic consideration to the request for further funds for the aforementioned agency of Government. In the instance of other relief agencies, which have provided funds for younger and physically able people, I think that they should be suspended, at least for the time being.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the editorial referred to by the Senator from Connecticut will be printed in the RECORD.

The editorial is as follows:

END OF WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION IN SIGHT

A tentative reduction of the budgeted appropriation for the Work Projects Administration for 1943 from $465,000,000 to $280,000,000 indicates the extent to which formerly unemployed labor has been absorbed by industry, commerce, and agriculture. The appropriation for the next fiscal year contemplates some 400,000 Work Projects Administration workers per month, as compared with 795,000 this year. Presumably there are many thousands who, for various reasons, will be dependent on public support for years to come. These people must be maintained, and the question is how best to do it.

In his message to the Congress discussing Work Projects Administration, the President says he expects to make recommendations later for expansion of the social security program to provide for those who now look to the Work Projects Administration as a means of keeping body and soul together. The President does not say what he intends to recommend, but from Washington come reports that under consideration is a proposal that the Federal Government match whatever payments, up to $20 a month, may be made by the States in support of those now on Work Projects Administration.

Presumably such a program would cost the States and communities no more than now is expended by them as their share of the cost of Work Projects Administration projects, assuming that the majority of those temporarily out of work after the end of the war do not become public charges. In normal times, by which must be meant times when there is no great difficulty in able-bodied persons obtaining jobs, there will be unemployables under 65, because of infirmities, undesirability, or discrimination.

If Work Projects Administration or its like is abolished, there may be a return to direct relief, to money payments to the indigent. A progressive and humane people must hope there will be no reestablishment of town farms or any other recognition of pauperism. Whatever may be said in criticism of the Work Projects Administration—and plenty can be said—it has offered the unemployed opportunities to maintain themselves without sacrifice of self-respect, for they have earned what they received—it was not charity.

NOMINATION OF THOMAS MEANEY TO BE FEDERAL DISTRICT JUDGE

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, in order that my colleagues of the Senate may see the politics back of the opposition to the Meaney appointment, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an A. P. press release, pub-

lished in the New Jersey newspapers, of a statement made by the Reverend Dr. Lester Clee, of Newark, N. J.

This "pious" gentleman is so full of politics—personal political ambition—that he says in this statement that he cannot decide whether he will run for the United States Senate and use the opposition to the Meaney appointment as a campaign issue, or wait until next year and run for Governor, using the fight between Governor Edison and Mayor Hague as his springboard.

The Reverend Dr. Clee was the first one to issue a broadside attack on President Roosevelt after the Meaney appointment was made. We now find from this statement, that the high and motivating influence which actuated this broadside, was politics—personal political ambition.

My hope is that he will decide that this is his year of "political stardom."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the article will be printed in the RECORD.

The article is as follows:

CLEE MAY NOT RUN FOR SENATE

NEWARK.—The Reverend Lester H. Clee said Friday he might not run for the United States Senate nomination in the Republican primary this fall, but seek the party's gubernatorial nomination in 1943.

Dr. Clee said some of his chief supporters had suggested the battle between Gov. Charles Edison and Mayor Frank Hague, of Jersey City, both Democrats, offered the Republicans a fine chance to win the governorship next year. Edison is ineligible to succeed himself.

Already in the field for the Republican senatorial nomination is James Joseph A. Bower, of Montclair, banker, and there has been talk of others, notably the Newark clergyman who was once before the party's nominee for Governor.

HOLDING OFF ON SENATE

"I have been holding off on the Senate," Dr. Clee said, "because H. Alexander Smith, Republican State chairman, and other leaders, have been endeavoring to avert a primary fight and reach agreement on a single candidate.

"Personally, I think if the Republicans can agree on a single candidate he almost certainly will be elected. Senator SMATHERS (Democratic incumbent) will have much to answer for because of his part in selection of Thomas F. Meaney for Federal judge. I'm certain the voters will resent Senator SMATHERS going along with Mayor Hague's candidate.

"However, time is getting short and I'm disposed to make a decision within 10 days or 2 weeks regardless of what the State leadership decides."

Smith said efforts to agree on a single candidate were finding the going hard. A substantial element of the party, he said, believed in every man's right to run in the primary. Geographical and factional differences also enter into the picture.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, at this point I also desire to call to the attention of the Senate the fact that several professors of dear old Harvard recently sent a telegram of protest to the Senate or to the President of the United States against the confirmation of Thomas F. Meaney as district court judge for the district of New Jersey.

In this connection, I wish to say that history repeats itself. In January 1916 a telegram of protest was sent from Boston, Mass., carrying some of the same names that appear on the Meaney protest. The 1916 project was sent to the Senate of the United States, and reads as follows:

We, the undersigned citizens of Massachusetts, are opposed to the appointment of Louis D. Brandeis to the vacancy in the Supreme Court of the United States, etc.

At this point, I ask that the full protest, together with the reasons alleged and the names attached thereto, be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The blue bloods of Harvard, the bourbons of Boston, in the light of the great humane and saintly services Justice Brandeis rendered his country as Supreme Court Justice, I should think, would hang their heads in shame; but, instead, they are now advocating the destruction of democracy by asking this great deliberative body to go into New Jersey and take sides in a political factional struggle which is now going on there. I want their Brandeis protest of 1916 and their protest of today to repose in the RECORD alongside of each other.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the protest referred to by the Senator from New Jersey will be printed in the RECORD.

The protest is as follows:

ACT AGAINST BRANDEIS

We, the undersigned citizens of Massachusetts, are opposed to the appointment of Louis D. Brandeis to the vacancy in the Supreme Court of the United States. An appointment to this Court should only be conferred upon a member of the legal profession whose general reputation is as good as his legal attainments are great. We do not believe that Mr. Brandeis has the judicial temperament and capacity which should be required in a judge of the Supreme Court. His reputation as a lawyer is such that he has not the confidence of the people. For these reasons we express the hope that the Senate will not confirm his appointment.

Charles S. Rackemann, Joseph Sargent, Harrison M. Davis, A. Lawrence Lowell, John Noble, Charles F. Adams, I. Tucker Burr, C. Minot Weld, Nathaniel H. Stone, Felix Rackemann, George K. Gardner, Henry S. Grew, Roger Wolcott, Pierpont Stackpole, Henry Ware, Julian Codman, Richard C. Storey, F. C. Bowditch, W. L. Putnam, Roger S. Warner, Malcolm Donald, James M. Newell, William Paul, Clifton Bremmer, Laurence Minot, Hollis R. Bailey, Edward S. Dodge, F. Walker Jackson, Harold Jefferson Coolidge, H. T. Jackson, Jr., Augustus P. Loring, William W. Vaughan, Samuel Vaughan, Samuel D. Carter, Thomas N. Perkins, R. W. Boyden, Henry L. Shattuck, A. R. Graustein, Frank Peabody, Edward K. Arnold, Willard B. Luther, Charles A. Williams, Moses Williams, J. L. Thorndike, Reginald H. Johnson, George B. Dabney, Francis P. Boyden, J. A. Lowell Blake, Louis Bacon, Lawrence P. Bodel, George P. Harris, Eugene J. Fabens, Charles H. Fish, Jr.

WHY DID GOD MAKE AMERICA?—ADDRESS BY VICE PRESIDENT WALLACE (S. DOC. NO. 211)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document an address delivered by the Vice President on June 8, 1942, at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York City. The title of the address was "Why Did God Make America?"

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADDRESS BY GOV. FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT AT THE COMMONWEALTH CLUB, SAN FRANCISCO

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt, of New York, at the Commonwealth Club, San Francisco, on September 23, 1932, which appears in the Appendix.]

RADIO BROADCAST TO JAPAN BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH

[Mr. GILLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an open message to the people of Japan, broadcast by Senator THOMAS of Utah in the Japanese language, on June 7, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY GENERAL MARSHALL TO GRADUATING CLASS AT UNITED STATES MILITARY ACADEMY

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff, U. S. Army, to the graduating class at the U. S. Military Academy, West Point, N. Y., on May 29, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY—ADDRESS BY DAVID E. LILIENTHAL

[Mr. NORRIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Tennessee Valley Authority, before the Chattanooga Rotary Club, at Chattanooga, Tenn., on May 21, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

RATIONING OF GASOLINE—EDITORIAL FROM THE LEAVENWORTH (KANS.) DAILY TIMES

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Leavenworth (Kans.) Daily Times relative to the Nation-wide rationing of gasoline, which appears in the Appendix.]

POWERS OF SENATE SPECIAL SILVER COMMITTEE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 261) to confer additional authority on the Senate Special Silver Committee created pursuant to Senate Resolution 187, Seventy-fourth Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I have had an understanding with the Senator from Nevada that this resolution should go over.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I have an understanding with the leader that the resolution may go over until the next session of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over.

PAY ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL—MOTION COMING OVER UNDER THE RULE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a motion, coming over under the

rule from a previous day, of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] to discharge the Senate conferees on Senate bill 2025, the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in view of the action taken by the Senate on this matter in connection with another motion which I made, I ask that this motion may be indefinitely postponed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The routine morning business is concluded.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2285) to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank, of certain officers of the Navy.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 2467. An act to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2496) to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6315) to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land-bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 17, and 18 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 30 and 34 to the bill, and concurred therein, each with an amendment in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, 13, 24, 32, 113, 114, and 115 to the bill.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 87, and 88 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 17, 18, 31, 36, 40, 44, and 79, and concurred therein, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 19, 21, 38, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 81, 83, 85, 86, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, 97, 101, and 102 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAHON, Mr. HOUSTON, Mr. BEAM, Mr. HARRINGTON, Mr. THOMAS of New Jersey, Mr. STEFAN, Mr. CASE of South Dakota, and Mr. LAMBERTSON were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6071) to grant a preference right to certain oil and gas lessees; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. WHITE, and Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3152. An act to suspend restrictions during the present war and for 1 year thereafter upon the service of certain officers of the Marine Corps in the Marine Corps Headquarters, Washington, D. C.; and

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution continuing the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation as an agency of the United States.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill entitled "Revenue revision of 1942", in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and it was signed by the Vice President:

S. 2459. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes", to permit payment of total compensation to certain employees of the postal service employed in a dual capacity; and

S. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution designating June 13, 1942, as MacArthur Day, and authorizing its appropriate observance.

PRINTING ADDITIONAL COPIES OF HEARINGS ON 1942 REVENUE REVISION BILL

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 67, just received from the House.

There being no objection, the resolution (H. Con. Res. 67) was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That, in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the Printing Act approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, authorized and empowered to have printed for its use 3,000 additional copies of the hearings, held before said committee, on the bill entitled "Revenue Revision of 1942."

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY—NOMINATIONS CONFIRMED

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, as in executive session I report favorably from the Committee on Naval Affairs various routine nominations of officers of the Navy, and ask for immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nominations? The Chair hears none, and the nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. TYDINGS. My reason for making the request for the consideration of these nominations today is that one of the nominations will not be effective unless it is completed today, because of the age of the nominee. He is only a second lieutenant, but the boy has worked and earned his way, and in my opinion no technicality should be allowed to delay the confirmation. I ask unanimous consent that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Maryland? The Chair hears none, and the President will be notified forthwith.

TRAINING AND EDUCATION OF DEFENSE WORKERS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1497, House Joint Resolution 316, making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 for the training and education of defense workers.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this joint resolution makes an appropriation of $9,500,000, the estimate for which was submitted in House Document No. 726, and is to supplement the appropriation of $52,400,000 contained in the regular Labor-Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1942. The purpose of the additional appropriation is to enable the Office of Education to continue during the remainder of the present fiscal year, on an accelerated basis, the program of education and training in vocational courses of less than college grade both in preemployment and supplementary training.

The original appropriation was made at a time when it was not anticipated that there would be any other than a normal growth in the program, but with the declaration of war in December the courses were very decidedly increased in number, especially the preemployment courses. It is now found that the original appropriation is insufficient to meet the payments to the States for the remainder of the fiscal year, and without additional funds it will be necessary to discontinue the courses before June 30, 1942.

In view of these conditions, the House has passed a joint resolution providing additional funds for this purpose in the amount of nine and a half million dollars, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate has recommended that the joint resolution be passed by the Senate. I ask for a vote, if there are no questions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

SEVENTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION, 1942

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1496, House bill 7182, making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7182) making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the bill be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered. If there are any questions, I shall be glad to answer them.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it is quite in order, and conforms with the practice, of course, to consider committee amendments first. I am not at all familiar with the proposed legislation or its general purposes. I think the Senator who has the bill in charge should make a statement about the objectives of the proposal.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr. McNARY. I should like to have the Senator give us some information about the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, this is a bill making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service. The amount carried in the bill as passed by the House was $654,999,740. To this sum the Senate was asked to add a number of additional appropriations, a list of which is found on pages 1 and 2 of the report. The items are as follows:

	1941	1942	1943
Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard personnel (recruiting, training, pay, subsistence, transportation, clothing, recreation, etc.)		$158,815,000	$38,640,000
Medical and hospital materials			15,183,822
Defense installations on merchant vessels		15,000,000	
New ship construction		16,760,000	
Port security work, including special craft		38,480,000	
Fuel for vessels		10,000,000	
Transportation of equipment and supplies	$650,000	3,574,000	
Defense articles, Marine Corps			101,000,000
Capital increase, naval supply account fund		200,000,000	
Training merchant marine personnel			48,000,000
Administrative expenses		9,426,000	6,616,178
Miscellaneous expenses Coast Guard		2,300,000	

Mr. President, those are the various items. Several amendments have been recommended by the committee. For instance, under the Bureau of Ships the amount provided for defense installation on merchant vessels was $15,000,000, and the Department wanted it to remain available until expended.

I call the attention of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and other Senators who are interested to the amendment on page 5 of the bill. There the bill provides 500,000 additional tons of auxiliary vessels. As the bill came from the House it contained the following proviso:

Provided, That Public Law 72, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 24, 1941, as amended by Public Law 353, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 17, 1941, is further amended by deleting the words "one million, three hundred and fifty thousand tons" and inserting the words "one million, eight hundred and fifty thousand tons" in lieu thereof.

Mr. WALSH rose.

Mr. McKELLAR. That provides for 500,000 additional tons of auxiliary vessels. In the meantime the House considered and passed the so-called Vinson bill. That bill has been favorably reported by the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs. It provides for 500,000 additional tons of auxiliary vessels. If the pending bill were to pass, however, and the Vinson bill also were to pass, then the Congress would authorize 1,000,000 additional tons, and that was not intended, as I understand. The only purpose was to provide for 500,000 additional tons of auxiliary vessels at this time. Therefore our committee has inserted on page 5, in line 8, after the word "vessels," the words "subject to authorization thereof by other law," which means the measure to which the Senator from Massachusetts, I am sure, is about to address himself at this moment, and has stricken out the House proviso entirely from the bill.

I now yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Navy Department originally asked an authorization for 500,000 tons for auxiliary vessels. The bill containing that authorization has passed the House, and a similar bill has been reported by the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, and is on the calendar. In the meantime the Navy Department has suggested to the Committee on Naval Affairs that it would like to increase the authorization from 500,000 to 1,000,000 tons. That suggestion has not yet cleared the Bureau of the Budget. Therefore I am holding up the Senate bill until that time shall come.

In view of that situation, the Senate Committee on Appropriations has very properly anticipated that there would be an increase of 500,000 tons, and has added as an amendment the words "subject to authorization thereof by other law," and the other bill will next week be presented increasing the authorization from 500,000 tons to either 750,000 or 1,000,000 tons, whatever the Bureau of the Budget may recommend. Therefore the amendment proposed by the Senate Committee on Appropriations is perfectly appropriate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, I understand the Senator from Massachusetts has no objection to the amendment?

Mr. WALSH. Not at all. In fact, it is very appropriate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee that the bill be considered for amendment and that committee amendments be first considered? The Chair hears no objection, and the clerk will proceed to state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first committee amendment was, under the heading "Naval Establishment—Bureau of Ships", on page 3, line 5, after the word "vessels", to strike out "1942", and in line 6, after "$15,000,000", to insert "to remain available until expended."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subheading "Bureau of Supplies and Accounts", on page 3, line 22, after the word "fund", to strike out "1942", and in line 23, after the word "fund", to strike out "1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subheading "Increase and replacement of naval vessels", on page 5, line 8, after the

word "vessels", to insert "subject to authorization thereof by other law", and in line 9 to strike out the following proviso:

Provided, That Public Law 72, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 24, 1941, as amended by Public Law 353, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 17, 1941, is further amended by deleting the words "one million, three hundred and fifty thousand tons" and inserting the words "one million, eight hundred and fifty thousand tons" in lieu thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subheading "Coast Guard (Navy)", on page 5, after line 21, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That existing limitations with respect to the detail of personnel to officers' quarters and messes ashore shall not apply to the Coast Guard Academy, the Coast Guard Yard, the New London Base, Coast Guard and merchant marine officers' training stations, and in addition, not to exceed 95 in number at such stations as shall be designated by the Commandant of the Coast Guard with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy;

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 6, after line 6, to insert the following proviso:

Provided, That existing limitations with respect to the furnishing of equipment for officers' messes ashore shall not apply to the Coast Guard Academy, the Coast Guard Yard, Coast Guard bases, and Coast Guard and merchant marine officers' training stations;

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. I send to the desk an amendment which the committee has authorized me to submit.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, after line 6, it is proposed to insert:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Miscellaneous expenses, Navy, 1942: For the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contracts or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the classification laws, or section 5 of the act of April 6, 1914 (38 Stat. 335), $75,000, of which amount $65,000 shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred since January 28, 1942.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee on behalf of the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I also send to the desk an amendment to take care of the situation to which the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] has just called attention.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 5, line 7, after the words "construction of", it is proposed to strike out "500,000"; in the same line, after the word "additional", to strike out "tons"; and at the beginning of line 8 to strike out the word "of."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, that is agreeable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR].

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on Senate bill 2025, the Army pay and allowances bill, and shall make a brief statement in connection with it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That, for the purpose of computing the annual pay of the commissioned officers of the Regular Army and Marine Corps below the grade of brigadier general; of the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Coast and Geodetic Survey below the grade of rear admiral; and of the Public Health Service below the grade of assistant to the Surgeon General, pay periods are prescribed, and the base pay for each is fixed as follows:

"The first period, $1,800; the second period, $2,000; the third period, $2,400; the fourth period, $3,000; the fifth period, $3,500; and the sixth period, $4,000.

"The pay of the sixth period shall be paid to colonels of the Army, captains of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade; to lieutenant colonels of the Army, commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, and lieutenant commanders of the line and Engineer Corps of the Coast Guard, who have completed thirty years' service; and to the Chief of Chaplains of the Army when not holding rank above that of colonel.

"The pay of the fifth period shall be paid to lieutenant colonels of the Army, commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the sixth period; and to majors of the Army, lieutenant commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed twenty-three years' service.

"The pay of the fourth period shall be paid to majors of the Army, lieutenant commanders of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the fifth period; to captains of the Army, lieutenants of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed seventeen years' service.

"The pay of the third period shall be paid to captains of the Army, lieutenants of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the fourth period; to first lieutenants of the Army, lieutenants (junior grade) of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed ten years' service.

"The pay of the second period shall be paid to first lieutenants of the Army, lieutenants (junior grade) of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade who are not entitled to the pay of the third period; and to second lieutenants of the Army, ensigns of the Navy, and officers of corresponding grade, who have completed five years' service; and to contract surgeons serving full time.

"The pay of the first period shall be paid to all other officers whose pay is provided for in this section.

"Officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act temporarily appointed to higher grades or ranks shall, for the purposes of this Act, be considered officers of such grades or ranks while holding such temporary appointments.

"Every officer paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 per centum of the base pay of his period for each three years of service up to thirty years.

"For officers appointed on and after July 1, 1922, no service shall be counted for purposes of pay except active commissioned service under a Federal appointment and commissioned service in the National Guard when called out by order of the President and service authorized in section 2 (b) of the Act of January 19, 1942 (Public Law 402, Seventy-seventh Congress). For officers in the service on June 30, 1922, there shall be included in the computation all service which was then counted in computing longevity pay, and service as a contract surgeon serving full time; and also 75 per centum of all other periods of time during which they have held commissions as officers of the Organized Militia between January 21, 1903, and July 1, 1916, or of the National Guard, the Naval Militia, or the National Naval Volunteers since June 3, 1916, shall be included in the computation. Longevity pay for officers in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act shall be based on the total of all service in any or all of said services which is authorized to be counted for longevity pay purposes under the provisions of this Act or as may otherwise be provided by law.

"The provisions of this Act shall apply equally to those persons serving, not as commissioned officers in the Army or in the other services mentioned in the title of this Act, but whose pay under existing law is an amount equivalent to that of a commissioned officer of one of the above grades, those receiving the pay of colonel, lieutenent colonel, major, captain, first lieutenant, and second lieutenant, being classified as in the sixth, fifth, fourth, third, second, and first periods, respectively.

"SEC. 2. The base pay of any enlisted man, warrant officer, or nurse (female) in the military or naval forces of the United States shall be increased by 20 per centum and the base pay of any commissioned officer of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act shall be increased by 10 per centum for any period of service while on sea duty as such duty may be defined by the head of the Department concerned, or duty in any place beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska, which increases in pay shall be in addition to pay and allowances otherwise authorized: *Provided*, That the per centum increases herein authorized shall be included in computing increases in pay for aviation and submarine duty: *Provided fur-*

ther, That this section shall be effective from December 7, 1941, and shall cease to be in effect twelve months after the termination of the present war is proclaimed by the President.

"SEC. 3. When officers of the National Guard or of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including Reserve officers, are authorized by law to receive Federal pay, those serving in grades corresponding to those of colonel, lieutenant colonel, major, captain, first lieutenant, and second lieutenant of the Army shall receive the pay of the sixth, fifth, fourth, third, second, and first periods, respectively, unless entitled to the pay of a higher period under the provisions of section 14 of this Act. Such officers whenever entitled to Federal pay, except armory drill and administrative function pay, shall receive as longevity pay, in addition to base pay, an increase thereof at the per centum and time rates up to thirty years provided in section 1 of this Act. In computing the increase of pay for each period of three years' service, such officers shall be credited with full time for all periods during which they have held commissions as officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, or in the Organized Militia prior to July 1, 1916, or in the National Guard, National Guard of the United States, or in the Officers Reserve Corps, or in the Naval Militia, or in the National Naval Volunteers, or in the Naval Reserve force, Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve force, Marine Corps Reserve, Coast Guard Reserve, and the Reserve Corps of the Public Health Service, when confirmed in grade and qualified for all general service.

"Members of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act who shall become entitled to Federal pay for a continuous period of less than one month at the rates fixed for the regular services shall receive such pay for each day of such period, and the thirty-first day of a calendar month shall not be excluded from the computation.

"Payments authorized under the provisions of the preceding paragraph may include the entire amount lawfully accruing to such persons as pay, allowances, and mileage on account of such service, and, including pay and mileage for their return home, may be paid to them during said period and prior to their departure from the camp or other place at which such service is performed.

"SEC. 4. The term 'dependent' as used in the succeeding sections of this Act shall include at all times and in all places a lawful wife and unmarried children under twenty-one years of age. It shall also include the father or mother of the person concerned provided he or she is in fact dependent on such person for his or her chief support: *Provided*, That the term 'children' shall be held to include stepchildren and adopted children when such stepchildren or adopted children are in fact dependent upon the person claiming dependency allowance.

"SEC. 5. Each commissioned officer on the active list, or on active duty, below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent, in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, shall be entitled at all times, in addition to his pay, to a money allowance for subsistence. The value of one subsistence allowance is hereby fixed at 70 cents per day. To each officer of any of the said services receiving the base pay of the first, second, third, or sixth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to two subsistence allowances, and to each officer receiving the base pay of the fourth or fifth period the amount of this allowance shall be equal to three subsistence allowances: *Provided*, That an officer with no dependents shall receive one subsistence allowance in lieu of the above allowances.

"SEC. 6. Except as otherwise provided in this section, each commissioned officer below the grade of brigadier general or its equivalent, in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, while either on active duty or entitled to active-duty pay shall be entitled at all times to a money allowance for rental of quarters.

"To an officer having a dependent, receiving the base pay of the first period the amount of said allowance shall be $60 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the second period the amount of this allowance shall be $75 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the third period the amount of this allowance shall be $90 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fourth period the amount of this allowance shall be $105 per month, and to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fifth or sixth period the amount of this allowance shall be $120 per month.

"To an officer having no dependents, receiving the base pay of the first period the amount of said allowance shall be $45 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the second period the amount of said allowance shall be $60 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the third period the amount of said allowance shall be $75 per month, to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fourth period the amount of said allowance shall be $90 per month, and to such an officer receiving the base pay of the fifth or sixth period the amount of said allowance shall be $105 per month.

"No rental allowance shall accrue to an officer having no dependents while he is on field or sea duty, nor shall any rental allowance accrue to an officer with or without dependents who is assigned quarters at his permanent station unless a competent superior authority of the service concerned certifies that such quarters are not adequate for the occupancy of the officer and his dependents, if any: *Provided*, That an officer although furnished with quarters shall be entitled to rental allowance as authorized in this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependents are prevented from occupying such quarters.

"Regulations in execution of the provisions of this section shall be made by the President and shall, whenever practicable, in his judgment, be uniform for all of the services concerned, including adjunct forces thereof.

"SEC. 7. The annual base pay of a brigadier general of the Army or the Marine Corps, rear admiral (lower half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey, the Assistant Commandant of the Coast Guard, the Engineer in Chief of the Coast Guard, commodore of the Navy, an Assistant Director of the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and an assistant to the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service, shall be $6,000; and the annual base pay of a major general of the Army or the Marine Corps and of a rear admiral (upper half) of the Navy, the Coast Guard, or the Coast and Geodetic Survey or the Surgeon General of the Public Health Service shall be $8,000. Every such officer shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters authorized in sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the sixth period.

"Officers of the Navy serving in the grade of vice admiral, officers of the Army serving in the grade of lieutenant general, and officers of the other services mentioned in the title of this Act serving in corresponding grades, shall be entitled, while so serving, to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (upper half) and to a personal money allowance of $500 per year. Officers of the Navy serving in the grade of admiral or as Chief of Naval Operations, officers of the Army serving in the grade of general or as Chief of Staff of the Army, and officers of the other services mentioned in the title of this Act serving in corresponding grades, shall be entitled, while so serving, to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral (upper half) and to a personal money allowance of $2,200 per year.

"SEC. 8. Warrant officers (junior grade) of the Army except first mates and assistant engineers of the Army Mine Planter Service, and warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, shall receive the base pay of the first period as established by section 1 of this Act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

"First mates and assistant engineers of the Army Mine Planter Service shall receive base pay at the rate of $1,950 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

"Chief warrant officers of the Army except masters in the Army Mine Planter Service, and commissioned warrant officers with less than ten years of commissioned service, of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, shall receive base pay at the rate of $2,100 per annum and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the second period: *Provided*, That a commissioned warrant officer or chief warrant officer promoted from the grade of warrant officer or warrant officer (junior grade) shall suffer no reduction of pay by reason of such promotion: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall be held to affect the authority of the Secretary of War to designate permanent or temporary chief warrant officers of the Army to receive the base pay and allowances of the third and fourth pay periods as provided in section 3 of the Act approved August 21, 1941 (Public Law 230, Seventy-seventh Congress).

"Commissioned warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard with creditable records on the active list, after ten years of commissioned service, and masters in the Army Mine Planter Service, shall receive the base pay of the third period as established by section 1 of this Act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the third period.

"Commissioned warrant officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, with creditable records on the active list, after twenty years of commissioned service, shall receive the base pay of the fourth period as established by section 1 of this Act and shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the fourth period.

"Every person paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 per centum of the base pay of his period for each three years of service, not exceeding thirty years. Such service shall be: active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act or Reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the Naval Reserve, Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve: *Provided*, That commissioned warrant officers shall be credited only with all commissioned service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act including commissioned service in the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard.

"When the total pay and allowances authorized by this section for any person shall exceed the rate of $458.33 per month, the amount of the allowances to which such person is entitled shall be reduced by the amount above $458.33.

"SEC. 9. The monthly base pay of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard shall be as follows: Enlisted men

of the first grade, $138; enlisted men of the second grade, $114; enlisted men of the third grade, $98; enlisted men of the fourth grade, $78; enlisted men of the fifth grade, $66; enlisted men of the sixth grade, $54; and enlisted men of the seventh grade, $50. Chief petty officers under acting appointment shall be included in the first grade at a monthly base pay of $126.

"For purposes of pay enlisted men of the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard shall be distributed in the several pay grades by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Secretary of the Treasury, respectively.

"Every enlisted man paid under the provisions of this section shall receive an increase of 5 per centum of the base pay of his grade for each three years of service up to thirty years. Such service shall be active Federal service in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act or Reserve components thereof; service in the active National Guard of the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia; and service in the enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army, the Naval Reserve, the Marine Corps Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve.

"SEC. 10. To each enlisted man not furnished quarters or rations in kind there shall be granted, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, an allowance for quarters and subsistence, the value of which shall depend on the conditions under which the duty of the man is being performed, and shall not exceed $5 per day: *Provided*, That payments of allowances for quarters and subsistence may be made in advance to enlisted men under such regulations as the President may prescribe. These regulations shall be uniform for all the services mentioned in the title of this Act. Subsistence for pilots shall be paid in accordance with existing regulations, and rations for enlisted men may be commuted as now authorized by law.

"Each enlisted man of the first, second, or third grade, in the active military, naval, or Coast Guard service of the United States having a dependent as defined in section 4 of this Act, shall, under such regulations as the President may prescribe, be entitled to receive, for any period during which public quarters are not provided and available for his dependent, the monthly allowance for quarters authorized by law to be granted to each enlisted man not furnished quarters in kind: *Provided*, That such enlisted men shall continue to be entitled to this allowance although receiving the allowance provided in the first paragraph of this section if by reason of orders of competent authority his dependent is prevented from dwelling with him.

"Enlisted men entitled to receive allowances for quarters or subsistence, shall continue, while their permanent stations remain unchanged, to receive such allowances while sick in hospital or absent from their permanent-duty stations in a pay status: *Provided*, That allowances for subsistence shall not accrue to such an enlisted man while he is in fact being subsisted at Government expense.

"An enlistment allowance equal to $50, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the first three grades who reenlists within a period of three months from the date of his discharge, and an enlistment allowance of $25, multiplied by the number of years served in the enlistment period from which he has last been discharged, shall be paid to every honorably discharged enlisted man of the other grades who reenlists within a period of three months from the date of his discharge: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not affect the provisions of the Act approved August 18, 1941 (Public Law 215, Seventy-seventh Congress): *Provided further*, That during the present war and for six months thereafter the provisions of section 2 of the Act of August 18, 1941 (Public Law 215, Seventy-seventh Congress) are hereby suspended.

"Hereafter the President may prescribe the quantity and kind of clothing which shall be furnished annually to enlisted men of the Navy, the Coast Guard, the Naval Reserve, and the Coast Guard Reserve, and he may prescribe the amount of a cash allowance to be paid to such enlisted men in any case in which clothing is not so furnished to them.

"SEC. 11. The pay and allowances of whatever nature and kind to be authorized for the enlisted men of the Philippine Scouts shall be fixed by the Secretary of War and shall not exceed or be of other classes than those now or which may hereafter be authorized by law for enlisted men of the Regular Army.

"The rates of pay of enlisted men of the insular force of the Navy shall be one-half the rates of pay prescribed for enlisted men of the Navy in corresponding grades.

"SEC. 12. Officers of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including Reserve components thereof and the National Guard, while on active duty in the Federal service, when traveling under competent orders without troops shall receive a mileage allowance at the rate of 8 cents per mile, distance to be computed by the shortest usually traveled route and existing laws providing for the issue of transportation requests to officers of the Army traveling under competent orders, and for deduction to be made from mileage accounts when transportation is furnished by the United States, are hereby made applicable to all the services mentioned in the title of this Act, but in cases when orders are given for travel to be performed repeatedly between two or more places in the same vicinity, as determined by the head of the executive department concerned, he may, in his discretion, direct that actual and necessary expenses only be allowed. Actual expenses only shall be paid for travel under orders in Alaska and outside the limits of the United States in North America.

"Unless otherwise expressly provided by law, no officer of the services mentioned in the title of this Act shall be allowed or paid any sum in excess of expenses actually incurred for subsistence while traveling on duty away from his designated post of duty, nor any sum for such expenses actually incurred in excess of $7 per day. The heads of the executive departments concerned are authorized to prescribe per diem rates of allowance, not exceeding $6, in lieu of subsistence to officers traveling on official business and away from their designated posts of duty: *Provided*, That for travel by air under competent orders on duty without troops, under regulations to be prescribed respectively by the heads of the departments concerned, members (including officers, warrant officers, contract surgeons, enlisted men, aviation cadets, and members of the Nurse Corps) of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, and of the legally constituted Reserves of said services while on active duty, and of the National Guard while in Federal service, or while participating in exercises, or performing duties under sections 92, 94, 97, or 99 of the National Defense Act, shall, in lieu of mileage or other travel allowances, be allowed and paid their actual and necessary traveling expenses not to exceed $8 per day, or, in lieu thereof, per diem allowances at rates not to exceed $6 per day.

"Travel by personnel of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard while on active duty in the Federal service, on commercial aircraft, domestic or foreign, including travel between airports and centers of population or posts of duty when incidental to travel on commercial aircraft, shall be allowed at public expense when authorized or approved by competent authority, and transportation requests for such travel may be issued upon such authorizations. Such expense shall be allowed without regard to comparative costs of transportation by aircraft with other modes of transportation.

"Individuals belonging to any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including the National Guard and the Reserves of such services, traveling under competent orders which entitle them to transportation or transporation and subsistence as distinguished from mileage, who, under regulations prescribed by the head of the department concerned, travel by privately owned conveyance shall be entitled, in lieu of transportation by the shortest usually traveled route now authorized by law to be furnished in kind, to a money allowance at the rate of 3 cents per mile for the same distance: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to any person entitled to traveling expenses under the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926.

"When any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man above the fourth grade, having dependents as defined in section 4 hereof, is ordered to make a permanent change of station, the United States shall furnish transportation in kind from funds appropriated for the transportation of the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, the Coast Guard, the Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service to his new station for such dependents: *Provided*, That for persons in the naval service the term 'permanent station' as used in this section shall be interpreted to mean a shore station or the home yard or home port of the vessel to which the person concerned may be ordered; and a duly authorized change in home yard or home port of such vessel shall be deemed a change of station: *Provided further*, That if the cost of such transportation exceeds that for transportation from the old to the new station, the excess cost shall be paid to the United States by the officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man concerned: *Provided further*, That transportation supplied the dependents of such officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man, to or from stations beyond the continental limits of the United States, shall not be other than by Government transport, if such transportation is available as may be determined by the head of the department concerned: *Provided further*, That the personnel of all the services mentioned in the title of this Act shall have the benefit of all existing laws applying to the Army and Marine Corps for the transportation of household effects: *And provided further*, That in lieu of transportation in kind authorized by this section for dependents, the President may authorize the payment in money of amounts equal to such commercial transportation costs for the whole or such part of the travel for which transportation in kind is not furnished when such travel shall have been completed.

"The words 'permanent change of station' as used in this section shall include the change from home to first station and from last station to home when ordered to active duty other than training duty, of any officer, warrant officer, nurse, or enlisted man of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including retired personnel and members of the Reserve components thereof, in a grade for which the transportation of dependents is authorized at Government expense, and the change from last station to home in connection with retirement, relief from active duty, or transfer to a reserve component.

"Personnel of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act performing travel on Government-owned vessels for which no transportation fare is charged shall be entitled only to reimbursement of actual and necessary expenses incurred.

"The head of the department concerned may determine what shall constitute a travel status and travel without troops within the

meaning of the laws governing the payment of mileage or other travel expenses.

"SEC. 13. The annual base pay of female nurses of the Army and Navy shall be as follows: During the first three years of service, $1,080; from the beginning of the fourth year of service until the completion of the sixth year of service, $1,260; from the beginning of the seventh year of service until the completion of the ninth year of service, $1,440; from the beginning of the tenth year of service until the completion of the twelfth year of service, $1,620; from the beginning of the thirteenth year of service, $1,800.

"Superintendents of the Nurse Corps shall receive pay at the rate of $2,500 a year, assistant superintendents, directors, and assistant directors at the rate of $1,500 a year, and chief nurses at the rate of $600 a year, in addition to their base pay as nurses. Nurses shall be entitled to the money allowances for subsistence and for rental of quarters as established by sections 5 and 6 of this Act for officers receiving the pay of the first period.

"The annual pay of a retired member of the Army Nurse Corps or the Navy Nurse Corps retired for other than physical disability shall be 3 per centum of the total annual active duty pay which she is receiving at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of complete years of service rendered prior to retirement, but not exceeding 75 per centum of such annual active-duty pay: *Provided*, That in computing the period of service for retired pay a fractional year of six months or more shall be considered a full year: *Provided further*, That for the purpose of computing eligibility for retirement and retired pay, there shall be credited active service in the Army Nurse Corps and in the Navy Nurse Corps, active service as contract nurse prior to February 2, 1901, and service as a Reserve nurse on active duty since February 2, 1901.

"SEC. 14. Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the Reserve forces of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, when on active duty in the service of the United States, shall be entitled to receive the same pay and allowances as are authorized for persons of corresponding grade and length of service in the Regular Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, or Public Health Service.

"Officers, warrant officers, and enlisted men of the National Guard, when in the Federal service or when participating in exercises or performing the duties provided for by sections 94, 97, and 99 of the National Defense Act, as amended, shall receive the same pay and allowances as are authorized for persons of corresponding grade and length of service in the Regular Army.

"Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, officers of the National Guard, other than general officers, and warrant officers and enlisted men of the National Guard, shall receive compensation at the rate of one-thirtieth of the monthly pay authorized for such persons when in the Federal service, for each regular drill, period of appropriate duty, or other equivalent period of training, authorized by the Secretary of War, at which they shall have been engaged for the entire prescribed period of time: *Provided*, That such pay shall be in addition to compensation for attendance at field or coast-defense instruction or maneuvers. General officers of the National Guard shall receive $500 a year in addition to compensation for attendance at field or coast-defense instruction or maneuvers, for satisfactory performance of their appropriate duties. In addition to pay herein provided, officers of the National Guard commanding organizations less than a brigade and having administrative functions connected therewith shall, whether or not such officers belong to such organizations, receive not more than $240 a year for the faithful performance of such administrative functions under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe: *Provided*, That the provisions of this paragraph shall not apply when such persons are on active duty in the Federal service.

"SEC. 15. On and after the effective date of this Act, retired officers, warrant officers, nurses, enlisted men, and members of the Fleet Reserve and Fleet Marine Corps Reserve shall have their retired pay, retainer pay, or equivalent pay, computed as now authorized by law on the basis of pay provided in this Act, which pay shall include increases for all active duty performed since retirement or transfer to the Fleet Reserve or Fleet Marine Corps Reserve in the computation of their longevity pay and pay periods: *Provided*, That nothing contained in this Act shall operate to reduce the present pay of officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men now on the retired list or drawing retainer pay, or personnel in an equivalent status in any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act. Retired officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health service and retired warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of those services, shall, when on active duty, receive full pay and allowances of the grade or rank in which they serve on such active duty and, when on active duty status, shall have the same pay and allowance rights while on leave of absence or sick as officers on the active list, and, if death occurs when on active duty status, while on leave of absence or sick, their dependents shall not thereby be deprived of the benefits provided in the Act approved December 17, 1919, as amended, and in the Act of June 4, 1920.

"In the computation of the retired pay of officers heretofore or hereafter retired with pay at the rate of 2½, 3, or 4 per centum of the active duty pay received by them at the time of retirement multiplied by the number of years of service for which entitled to credit in the computation of their pay on the active list, not to exceed a total of 75 per centum of said active duty pay, active duty performed by such retired officers subsequent to the date of their retirement shall be counted for the purpose of computing percentage rates and increases with respect to their retired pay. The increases shall be at the rate of 2½, 3, or 4 per centum for each year of active duty and a fractional year of six months or more shall be considered a full year in computing the number of years: *Provided*, That the increased retired pay of such retired officers shall in no case exceed 75 per centum of the active duty pay as authorized by existing law.

"The retired pay of any officer heretofore retired under the provisions of section 24b, National Defense Act, June 3, 1916, as amended, who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, shall be 75 per centum of his active-duty pay: *Provided*, That no back pay, allowances, or other emoluments shall be held to accrue for any period prior to June 1, 1942, as a result of the enactment of this paragraph.

"The retired pay of any officer of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act who served in any capacity as a member of the military or naval forces of the United States prior to November 12, 1918, hereafter retired under any provision of law, shall, unless such officer is entitled to retired pay of a higher grade, be 75 per centum of his active duty pay at the time of his retirement.

"SEC. 16. Under such regulations as the President may prescribe, enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard may receive additional compensation not less than $1 nor more than $5 per month, for special qualification in the use of the arm or arms which they may be required to use.

"SEC. 17. Cadets at the United States Military Academy, midshipmen at the United States Naval Academy, and cadets at the Coast Guard Academy shall be entitled to pay at the rate of $780 per annum, and to allowances as now or hereafter provided by law for midshipmen in the Navy, and to transportation, including reimbursement of traveling expenses, while traveling under orders as a cadet or midshipman.

"SEC. 18. Officers, warrant officers, nurses, and enlisted men of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act and members of the Reserve forces of such services, and the National Guard shall receive an increase of 50 per centum of their pay when by orders of competent authority they are required to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights, and when in consequence of such orders they do participate in regular and frequent flights as defined by such Executive orders as have heretofore been, or may hereafter be, promulgated by the President: *Provided*, That when personnel of the National Guard are entitled to armory-drill pay, the increase of 50 per centum thereof herein provided shall be based on the entire amount of such armory-drill pay to which they shall be entitled for a calendar month or fractional part thereof, and the required aerial flights may be made at ordered drills of an air-service organization, or at other times when so authorized by the President. Regulations in execution of the provisions of this paragraph shall be made by the President and shall, whenever practicable in his judgment, be uniform for all of the services concerned.

"Any officer, warrant officer, or enlisted man of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps or Coast Guard of the United States not in flying-pay status who is assigned or attached as a member of a parachute unit, including parachute-jumping schools, and for whom parachute jumping is an essential part of his military duty and who, under such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or the Secretary of the Treasury, has received a rating as a parachutist or is undergoing training for such a rating shall receive, while engaged upon duty designated by the head of the department concerned as parachute duty, additional pay of the rate of $100 per month in the case of any such officer or warrant officer, and additional pay at the rate of $50 per month in the case of any such enlisted man.

"SEC. 19. No person, active or retired, of any of the services mentioned in the title of this Act, including the Reserve components thereof and the National Guard, shall suffer, by reason of this Act, any reduction in any pay, allowances, or compensation to which he was entitled upon the effective date of this Act: *Provided, however*, That nothing in this Act shall be construed to deprive any enlisted man transferred to the Fleet Reserve on or prior to the date of enactment of this Act, or transferred from the Fleet Reserve to the retired list of the regular Navy for physical disability, of any benefits, including pay, allowances, or compensation, which he would be entitled to receive upon the completion of thirty years under laws in force on the date of enactment of this Act.

"The Act of June 10, 1922 (42 Stat. 625), as amended, subsections 12 (a), (b), and (c), of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), section 18 of the Act of March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, Seventy-seventh Congress), and section 8 of the Service Extension Act of 1941 (Public Law 213, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved August 18, 1941), and those portions of the Act of March 2, 1907 (34 Stat. 1217), and of the Act of June 30, 1941 (Public Law 140, Seventy-seventh Congress), which authorize allowances for enlisted men on the retired list, and all other laws and parts of laws which are inconsistent with the provisions of this Act, are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That Acts or parts of Acts incorporating directly, by implication, or by reference, the provisions of the Act of June 10, 1922, as amended, and

not in conflict herewith, shall not be considered modified by the provisions of this Act, except that the pay, allowances, or compensation established herein shall be substituted for the pay, allowances, or compensation set out in the Act of June 10, 1922, as amended.

"No back pay or allowances for any period prior to June 1, 1942, shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this Act.

"The provisions of this Act shall become effective as of June 1, 1942.

"SEC. 20. Beginning June 1, 1942, the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall every sixty days thereafter report to the Congress the name, age, legal residence, rank, branch of the service, with special qualification therefor, of each person commissioned during said period in the Army of the United States and in the Naval Establishment respectively from civilian life, who prior thereto has had no commissioned military service: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy shall not be required to report persons commissioned where such disclosure would in his opinion jeopardize the national interest or safety.

"SEC. 21. This Act may be cited as the 'Pay Readjustment Act of 1942'."

And the House agree to the same.

ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

A. J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. AUSTIN. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, as I understand, the Senator from Vermont intends to explain the effect of the report?

Mr. AUSTIN. Yes. I wish to make a brief statement with respect to it. Only one matter was submitted to the conferees, although they had jurisdiction of the whole subject matter.

Mr. President, I have been requested by the leader of the majority to allow the report to rest for a short time, for a very good reason.

Mr. BARKLEY. I make that request, Mr. President, because certain Members of the Senate who are now absent desire to be present when the report is considered. Action on the report will be delayed only for a very brief period.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the consideration of the report will be temporarily deferred.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I submit a conference report on the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office, and sundry independent boards, and so forth, and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the report.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 29, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, and 83.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 5, 6, 10, 14, 15, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 35, 38, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 54, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 84, 85, 86, 87, 89, 90, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 112, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, and 123, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following "$534,422: *Provided*, That no part of the funds appropriated under this item shall be used for the performance of any functions or duties other than the functions heretofore authorized by law to be performed by the Federal Employment Stabilization Board"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 4: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate Numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows:

"National defense activities: For expenses necessary for the planning activities of the National Resources Planning Board in the interest of national defense, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; contract stenographic reporting services; purchase of books of reference and periodicals; expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with development, conservation, and use of the resources of the Nation; traveling expenses; transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940, and regulations promulgated thereunder; payment of actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving, while away from their homes without other compensation from the United States in an advisory capacity to the Board; purchase of office equipment and supplies without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes when the amount involved in any case does not exceed $50, and not to exceed $50,000 for temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to said section 3709, or classification laws, $200,000, of which not to exceed $20,000 shall be available for printing and binding."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate Numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,394,632"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate Numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment Numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate Numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$119,788,628"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and in line 3 of the restored matter strike out "$270,535" and insert in lieu thereof $200,000; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$854,998"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That not exceeding $90,000 of the sum herein authorized shall be expended in the District of Columbia for purposes of the Public Relations and Education Division"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$13,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment, insert the following: "$600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out and inserted insert the following: "*Provided further*, That except for the limitations in amounts hereinbefore specified, and the restrictions in respect to travel expenses, the administrative expenses and other obligations of the Corporation shall be incurred, allowed, and paid in accordance with the provisions of said Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended (12 U. S. C. 1461–1468)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$10,311,292"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out amended to read as follows: ", and not to exceed $500 for periodicals and newspapers"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 53: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 53, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert: "$135,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 55: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "law books, books of reference, and not to exceed $100 for periodicals"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,068,677"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,504,192"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 107: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 107, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "for traveling expenses not to exceed $16,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 111: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "purchase as provided by section 6 of the Act approved April 28, 1942 (Public Law Numbered 527)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 121: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 121, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 5. Where appropriations in this Act are expendable for travel expenses and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures for travel expenses may not exceed the amount set forth therefor in the budget estimates submitted for the appropriations."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 6. Where appropriations in this Act are expendable for the purchase of newspapers and periodicals and no specific limitation has been placed thereon, the expenditures therefor under each such appropriation may not exceed the amount of $50, but this limitation shall not apply to the Office of Government Reports and the Selective Service System: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to the purchase of scientific, technical, trade, or traffic periodicals necessary in connection with the performance of the authorized functions of the agencies for which funds are herein provided."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 7, 9, 11, 13, 17, 18, 24, 30, 32, 34, 113, 114, and 115.

CARTER GLASS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
GERALD P. NYE,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

C. A. WOODRUM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
JOE STARNES,
JOE HENDRICKS,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
FRANCIS CASE,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to consideration of the conference report? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Tennessee if this is the bill which by specific amendment adopted in the House prohibited the employment of a certain individual by the Federal Communications Commission?

Mr. McKELLAR. That provision is still in disagreement, and there will be another conference on it.

I now ask that the Chair lay before the Senate the message from the House of Representatives as to its action on certain amendments of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives, which was read:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 9, 1942.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 7, 17, and 18 to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: ": *Provided*, That all necessary expenses not exceeding $200,000 in the aggregate including not exceeding a total equal to $2.50 per year per contract (including legal and special services performed on a contract or fee basis, but not including other personal services) in connection with the acquisition, care, repair, and disposition of any security or collateral now held or acquired on or before June 30, 1943, by the Authority, shall be considered as nonadministrative expenses for the purposes hereof;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows:

Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment and add thereto the matter inserted by said amendment; and

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, 13, 24, 32, 113, 114, and 115 to said bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 30 and 34, and that the Senate further insist on the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, 13, 24, 32, 113, 114, and 115.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me ask the Senator from Tennessee what is the status of the Senate amendment dealing with the Tennessee Valley Authority?

Mr. McKELLAR. The House refused to agree to that amendment, and it will go back to conference. That is true of the other amendments to which the House refused to agree.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendments still in disagreement, ask for a further conference with the House, and that the Chair appoint the same conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. GLASS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. NYE, and Mr. WHITE conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL submitted the following conference report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6709) making apropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 13, 16, 24, 29, 30, 32, 34, 49, 52, 56, 57, 58, 61, 64, 69, 70, 75, 77, and 92.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 22, 25, 26, 27, 28, 33, 39, 53, 55, 59, 62, 63, 65, 67, 68, 72, 73, 78, 80, 82, 84, 89, 94, 98, 99, 100, 103, and 104 and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert: ": *Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated or made available to the Bureau of Agricultural Economics shall be used for State and county land-use planning", and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$242,580"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$301,403"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,133,110"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$323,733"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$897,484"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$382,275"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$374,395"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,142,239"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 71: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 71, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,785,512"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 74: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,339,429"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 76: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 76, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$22,427,204"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 105: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 105, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

"SEC. 4. Of the total amount available under this Act for traveling expenses, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized and directed, on or before August 1, 1942, to cover into the surplus fund of the Treasury the sum of $1,500,000, which shall be in addition to reductions in amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in the appropriations made by this Act below the Budget estimates."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 31, 36, 38, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 79, 81, 83, 85, 86, 87, 88, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, 97, 101, and 102.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
MILLARD E. TYDINGS,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
E. D. SMITH,
GERALD P. NYE,
CHAS. L. MCNARY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
D. D. TERRY,
ROSS A. COLLINS,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, before action is taken on the conference report, will the Senator kindly state what matters are still in disagreement?

Mr. RUSSELL. Practically all the important items in the bill are still in disagreement. I think the only exception is the Senate amendment relating to the reappropriation of the unexpended balances for the Surplus Marketing Administration. The House accepted that amendment.

There were 105 Senate amendments to the bill. In the conference report all those are disposed of with the exception of 25. Four of those represent totals which are dependent upon the action on other amendments.

There are still in disagreement all the amendments relating to the Farm Security Administration, appropriations to the Forest Service for the purpose of combating forest fires, and the Senate amendment providing for the disposal of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat for feed. The amendments which have been finally agreed upon, while important, do not involve large sums of money.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I thank the Senator for his statement. I simply wish to make sure that a number of amendments in which I am particularly interested are not being disposed of by the present action.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not know all the amendments in which the Senator from Wisconsin is interested. There are 105 amendments to the bill. The principal items of controversy are still in disagreement; and I reluctantly state that there is likely to be some further disagreement as to those amendments.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. More power to the strong right arm of the Senator from Georgia and his fellow conferees.

Mr. RUSSELL. I thank the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. This is a very minor matter in connection with the conference report, but I am interested in the soybean laboratory at Champaign, Ill., which it is proposed by the House to move from Champaign to the regional laboratory in Peoria, Ill. As I recall, the Senate decided adversely to the view taken by the House. We said that the laboratory should remain in Champaign. I am wondering what happened to that item. Will the Senator be good enough to tell me?

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret to advise the Senator that the Senate conferees receded on that amendment. The House conferees had received a statement from the Department of Agriculture that all the personnel now engaged in this work at Champaign, or Urbana, were being transferred to the regional laboratory, and that therefore there would be no delay in the investigations. The Senate amendment was predicated upon the idea that to transfer the laboratory to the regional laboratory for the western region would occasion some delay in the research work. It had further been understood by some of the Senate conferees that the employees engaged in the work at Urbana were State employees, or employees of the Extension Service or the agricultural college. The representations in the conference committee were that that was not the case, but that all such employees were Federal employees, paid 100 percent from Federal funds. That being the case, the conferees could see no reason why the work should not be done in the regional laboratory, as it is being done in all other regions of the country.

Mr. LUCAS. If I correctly understand the Senator, from the evidence submitted to the conferees he is perfectly satisfied that it is in the best interests that the laboratory be transferred from Champaign.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not say it is in the best interests, but I say it cannot possibly occasion any delay or harm. I think the work will be carried on just as well after the transfer into the regional laboratory, and a slight saving of funds will result. As the Senator knows, we have provided $1,000,000 for each of the regional laboratories. Those funds could not be used at Urbana. If the laboratory which is investigating soybeans should remain at Urbana, an appropriation of $75,000, in addition to the $1,000,000, would be required to carry on the work. It was represented that the $1,000,000 available for the regional laboratory at Peoria is ample to finance the work, and that it can be done just as well there, with a saving of approximately $75,000.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the Senator kindly repeat what he said about the appropriation for forest-fire prevention? I was unable to hear what he said.

Mr. RUSSELL. I stated that the amendment relating to the forestry appropriations is still in disagreement, and when the conference report shall have been agreed to it is my purpose to move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments and request another conference with the House on those items.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 9, 1942.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 6, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 87, and 88 to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert: "including salary of the Solicitor at $9,000 per annum, and";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert: "$14,158,950";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert: "$14,805,408";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert: "$579,895";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert: "$5,192,197";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert: "$14,330,075";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$17,184,285";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "Government" insert: "or by any State"; and

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 19, 21, 38, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 81, 83, 85, 86, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, 97, 101, and 102 to said bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 17, 18, 31, and 36.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 40, 44, and 79.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendments numbered 19, 21, 38, 40 to 48, inclusive, 79, 81, 83, 85, 86, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, 97, 101, and 102; request a further conference with the House of Representatives on the amendments remaining in disagreement; and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. MCNARY conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

AMENDMENT OF ACT TO EXPEDITE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar 1495, House bill 6355.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6355) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1940, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs with amendments, on page 1, at the beginning of line 6, to insert "inserting after the word 'Act' a comma and the following: 'as heretofore or hereafter amended or modified,'; and by"; and on page 2, after line 3, to insert:

SEC. 2. Section 4 of Public Law No. 100, Seventy-seventh Congress (approved June 3, 1941), is amended by striking out therefrom "June 30, 1942," and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1944."

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person (1) in connection with any claim against or settlement with the United States under a contract with the United States or any department or agency thereof knowingly to make or cause to be made any material false statement to any officer, agent, department, or agency of the United States with respect to the number or identity of persons employed in the performance of such contract or any part thereof, the time such persons are or were engaged in the performance of such contract or part thereof, the compensation paid to such persons for such time, the amount or cost of materials or supplies used in the performance of such contract or part thereof, or any item of costs incurred in the performance of such contract or part thereof; (2) with the intent of defrauding the United States or wrongfully benefiting any person at the expense of the United States, to make or cause to be made any unreasonable, exorbitant, or unnecessary expenditure for labor, supplies, materials, or services used in the performance of any such contract or any part thereof; or (3) with the intent of defrauding the United States, to make or cause to be made any false record, entry, account, voucher, certificate, affidavit, or deposition with respect to costs incurred in the performance of any such contract or any part thereof.

(b) Any person who violates any of the provisions of subsection (a) shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both, and, in case such violation occurred in time of war, shall be adjudged by the court to have forfeited his United States citizenship and all rights thereof.

SEC. 4. The provisions of section 3 of this act shall be set forth in every contract to which such provisions are applicable; and every such contract shall require that the provisions of such section be kept conspicuously posted during the time such contract is being performed where they will be seen by the persons engaged in the work required to perform such contract and by the persons engaged in making or keeping records with respect thereto. Any contractor with the United States or any department or agency thereof under any such contract who fails or refuses to keep such provisions so posted shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the bill would extend to June 30, 1944, an existing law which was passed 2 years ago, entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes." Unless the bill is enacted into law before June 30, the expedition of national defense will be seriously interfered with. The bill has already passed the House and has been approved by the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs.

The major features of the act which was approved 2 years ago, and which the bill would extend, are:

First. It authorizes the Navy and War Departments to negotiate contracts instead of contracting by competitive bidding.

Second. It authorizes the establishment of priorities in the allocation of essential materials for War and Navy contracts and subcontracts, and for lease-lend orders.

Third. It fixes the regular hours of work in the Navy Department and Coast Guard and in their field services at 40 hours per week; and authorizes compensation for overtime to monthly, per diem, hourly, and piece-work employees, and certain professional, subprofessional and technical employees of the CAF service.

Fourth. It authorizes the War, Navy, and Treasury Departments to cause the immediate removal of any employee whose removal is, in the opinion of the Secretary concerned, conducive to the furtherance of the national security.

All those features are now in the present law, and the bill would merely continue them.

I will now explain the committee amendments:

Public Law No. 100, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved June 3, 1941, authorized compensation for employment in excess of 40 hours in any administrative workweek computed at a rate of one and one-half times the regular rate to be paid to per annum employees in the field services of the War Department, the Panama Canal, the Navy Department, and the Coast Guard whose overtime services were essential. It also provided that employees of the field service of the War Department and the Panama Canal Zone could be employed during the time they would otherwise be on vacation without deprivation of their vacation pay for the time so worked. This act expires on June 30, 1942. Section 2 of the bill extends the date of this expiration from June 30, 1942, to June 30, 1944. By the enactment of this section some per annum employees, as well as per diem employees, will be allowed overtime compensation.

The other amendment deals with fraud on the part of contractors. During the hearings on the bill it was brought to the attention of the committee that certain firms that possessed Government as well as private contracts were charging to the Government time spent by employees on private contracts.

The committee understands that in one instance it is alleged that a firm which possessed a contract to manufacture parts of a vessel for the Navy actually charged as a part of the cost of performing such contract materials used and labor employed on a job which was being performed for a private party. It appears that the purpose of this procedure was to avoid returning to the Treasury the excess profits in accordance with the profit-limitation provision of the Vinson-Trammell Act.

The purpose of section 3 is to provide that persons convicted of fraudulent practices of this nature shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or by both such fine and imprisonment; and that in case such fraudulent practices occurred in time of war the person or persons shall be adjudged by the court to have forfeited their United States citizenship and all rights appertaining thereto. This is the punishment fixed by law for deserters or draft evaders.

Section 4 provides that the provisions of section 3 shall be set forth in every contract and shall also be conspicuously posted during the time such contract is being performed where they will be seen by the person engaged in the work required by the contract.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendments reported by the committee.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

GASOLINE RATIONING AND CONSERVATION OF RUBBER

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a very illuminating article from the Los Angeles Daily News of Thursday, June 4, 1942, under the heading "Views of the News," by Manchester Boddy, proprietor and editor of that newspaper.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VIEWS OF THE NEWS

(By Manchester Boddy)

United Press dispatch: "The War Production Board's plans for Nation-wide gasoline rationing to conserve rubber are at a stage where only President Franklin D. Roosevelt's approval is needed to begin the program."

Other reports, however, indicate that the entire matter may be referred to War Production Board's rubber experts.

If so, the public will have a last chance to be heard—through their Representatives in Congress.

The public wants to cooperate in every way possible with the war effort.

Current indignation over the pending threat of gasoline rationing arises from the fear that such a step is unnecessary and arbitrary, and will seriously curtail and may even paralyze civilian cooperation with the Government's all-out war effort.

This feeling is particularly acute in sections where gasoline is abundant and may be dumped back into the ground if not used.

The public will make any necessary sacrifice, but it will not submit to rationing of gasoline in sections where it can see the gasoline actually going to waste—unless there is some evidence that gasoline rationing is desirable as a means of saving rubber.

Is it?

For many days this newspaper has pleaded with officials in Washington to give the people the truth about rubber.

We have stated time and time again that if facts justify the proposed rationing we would devote our space and energy toward explaining drastic orders calculated to take civilian automobiles off the highways.

Our appeal for facts has brought an avalanche of information.

Officials of the largest rubber companies—lobbyists in charge of agriculture's demand that farm products be used in making synthetic rubber—officials of rubber reclamation plants, junk dealers, and many others have contributed.

Scientists, statisticians, and lay observers have sent in their contributions.

The most authentic balance sheet is a condensation of the actual testimony given by Leon Henderson himself only a month or so ago.

Here are the figures (long tons of 2,240 pounds):

1942 supply

Total stocks, Jan. 1	693,000
Crude-rubber shipments	434,000
Synthetic rubber	25,000
Total	1,152,000

1942 demand

[After arbitrary 25-percent cuts by War Production Board]

United States military, lend-lease, South American export	306,750
United States civilian (essential)	150,000
Rest of non-Axis world	198,750
Total	655,500

1943 supply

Carry-over from 1942	496,500
Crude-rubber shipments	135,000
Synthetic rubber	350,000
United States grown guayule	1,000
Total	982,500

1943 demand

[After arbitrary 25-percent cuts by War Production Board]

United States military, lend-lease, South American export	462,750
United States civilian (essential)	123,750
Rest of non-Axis world	198,750
Total	785,250

1944 supply

Carry-over from 1943	197,250
Crude-rubber shipments	98,000
Synthetic rubber	800,000
United States grown guayule	5,000
Total	1,100,250

1944 demand

[After arbitrary 25-percent cuts by War Production Board]

United States military, lend-lease, South American export	462,750
United States civilian (essential)	123,750
Rest of non-Axis world	198,750
Total	785,250

According to Henderson's testimony there will be an oversupply of rubber after furnishing all that is needed for the United States military program, for all United States lend-lease commitments, for export to South America, for essential United States civilian demands, and for export to the rest of the non-Axis world.

This surplus continues right through 1944.

Other testimony accepted without contradiction establishes the fact that adequate synthetic production for all purposes can be under way even sooner than the end of 1944.

Now we come to the all-important problem of keeping the civilian population rolling toward an ever increasing war effort.

We have checked and double checked statistics and opinions with respect to the actual supply of scrap rubber, and have taken the lowest common figure—700,000 tons.

This scrap is composed almost entirely of old tires, tubes, and other reclaimable rubber, and omits the scrap that has already gone through the reclamation process.

With this figure as a base, the problem narrows down to this:

Can reclaimable scrap be converted into enough recapped tires during the next 24 months to keep civilian cars rolling?

The answer is "Yes."

Existing reclamation facilities—factories that do not need a single square foot of new equipment—are capable of converting the scrap rubber into material that will supply 126,000,000 recapped tires for civilian use.

This statement is authentic and verified.

These recapped tires will augment the 120,000,000 tires now serving the Nation's civilian cars.

To these figures must be added approximately 3,000,000 new and 10,000,000 recaps now in reserve.

In short, it is easily possible to provide 289,000,000 tires over and above all of the requirements listed in Leon Henderson's testimony—289,000,000 tires to service the requirements of the civilian population's 30,000,000 automobiles.

Here, then, is the picture:

We have balance sheet No. 1 as presented by Leon Henderson, covering all of the needs for the United States military purposes, lend-lease commitments, export to South America, essential civilian needs, and export to the rest of the non-Axis world.

That budget balances and leaves an adequate surplus on hand without touching a single ounce of scrap.

Balance Sheet No. 2 shows it is possible to maintain 289,000,000 tires for civilian needs—and again keep an abundant surplus on hand.

If these balance sheets are not substantially correct, our Congressmen and Senators had better put the finger on each item that is wrong and explain where and why it is wrong.

If the balance sheets are correct, then the Government should say:

"We admit the balance sheets are correct but we just don't want the civilian population to ride in automobiles."

If the Government has a supportable reason for wanting to do away with civilian transportation, let it present that reason to the public.

But certainly it should not attempt to accomplish an undisclosed objective through misrepresentation of the rubber situation.

If this presentation seems logical to you, we suggest that you clip it—in fact, clip half a dozen copies, if possible—and send them to your Congressman with the suggestion that he pass along the extra copies.

Here is the list:

Senator HIRAM JOHNSON, Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY, Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

Representative BERTRAND W. GEARHART, 1135 Sixteenth Street, Washington, D. C.

Representative JOHN Z. ANDERSON, 5509 Grove Street, Chevy Chase, Md.

Representative ALFRED J. ELLIOTT, The Carroll Arms, Washington, D. C.

Representative CARL HINSHAW, 9600 Jones Mill Road, Chevy Chase, Md.

Representative JERRY VOORHIS, 3307 Carolina Place, Alexandria, Va.

Representative CHARLES KRAMER, The Mayflower, Washington, D. C.

Representative THOMAS F. FORD, The Roosevelt, Washington, D. C.

Representative JOHN M. COSTELLO, 2737 Devonshire Place, Washington, D. C.

Representative LELAND M. FORD, The Shoreham, Washington, D. C.

Representative WARD JOHNSON, The Broadmoor, Washington, D. C.

Representative HARRY R. SHEPPARD, 110 Maryland Avenue NE., Washington, D. C.

Representative ED. V. IZAC, 2923 Cathedral Avenue, Washington, D. C.

These Congressmen constitute the people's lobby.

We suppose they have refrained from open criticism of the impending gasoline rationing because they hope the situation can be straightened out before it becomes a public issue.

Apparently no straightening out has been done.

The issue is before the public, and something must be done—and done at once.

(P. S.—Information has just been received that in one large warehouse in Los Angeles the Government has stored a vast pile of new tires in such a clumsy, unworkmanlike manner that many of the new tires at the bottom of the heap have been crushed into uselessness.)

FEES FOR LIVESTOCK BRAND INSPECTION

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of calendar No. 1469, House bill 5204. I have consulted the majority leader and the minority leader, and there is no objection to the present consideration of the bill. It is a small bill reported unanimously by the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and I do not think there will be any objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 5204) authorizing the charging of fees for brand inspection under the Packers and Stockyards Act of 1921, as amended.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 5204) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXTENSION OF EMERGENCY LAWS RELATING TO THE MERCHANT MARINE

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 130) to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes, which was to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution to extend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes."

Mr. BAILEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment. The difference is only in the omission of the words "to amend." The title read "To extend and amend," and the House deleted the words "and amend." I do not think the amendment changes the meaning at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from North Carolina.

The motion was agreed to.

LIVESTOCK FEED REQUIREMENTS, 1942–43

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill is now in conference between the two Houses of Congress. One of the important amendments written in by the Senate related to the use of feed and the possible sale of wheat for feed. Yesterday I asked the Department of Agriculture to prepare a statement showing the present feed situation and what it will be in the immediate future. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point the statement prepared for me by the Department of Agriculture, which shows that as of October 1 of last year the carry-over of corn was 646,000,000 bushels. This year it will be 518,000,000 bushels. This year, on the basis of the estimated crop production, we shall produce 2,600,000,000 bushels of corn; but in the 12 months beginning October 1, we shall consume 2,975,000,000 bushels, or 375,000,000 bushels in excess of the crop this year. Therefore, on the 1st of October 1943, the excess carry-over of corn will be reduced to 143,000,000 bushels, which is below the margin of safety in such times as these.

The statement shows three tables: Estimated supply and disappearance of corn, 1940–41 to 1942–43; livestock numbers on farms, January 1, 1940–43; and total marketings of livestock for slaughter and milk production, 1940–42. I ask unanimous consent that the table be printed in the RECORD at this point; and I describe it as being prepared by the Department of Agriculture yesterday, and sent to me this morning.

There being no objection, the statement and accompanying tables were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIVESTOCK FEED REQUIREMENTS IN 1942–43

Livestock production in 1941 amounted to about 36.3 billion pounds (live-weight basis), 4½ percent more than in 1940 and the largest annual total on record. Production in 1942 is expected to exceed the 1941 figure by about 5 percent, and with favorable production conditions, a similar increase is in prospect for 1943. (This refers to production, number of pigs raised, etc.; marketing will lag behind production.) In addition, the record 1941 milk production of 115.5 billion pounds is expected to be stepped up about 3 percent this year and another 2 percent in 1943. Poultry and egg production in 1942 and 1943 also are expected to set new high records.

These large increases in the production of livestock and livestock products are sorely needed to meet the lend-lease and military needs of this year and next. Recent estimates of lend-lease and military requirements for meat over the next 12 or 18 months call for purchases at an annual rate of about 5½ billion pounds, or roughly one-fourth of our total meat output in 1941. In addition, domestic demand for meats is the greatest in many years. The actual food needs of the civilian population are not only increased by the war effort but the amounts which consumers are anxious to buy at prevailing ceiling prices have expanded greatly because of the increase in consumer purchasing power. Any material reduction in supplies of foods available for civilian consumption would likely lead to shortages which in turn would require rationing. Hence the need for maintaining adequate supplies of feed for livestock is apparent.

The feed requirements of the sharply expanded 1942 livestock production are being met without serious trouble by the large 1941 corn crop and the large carry-over of corn last fall. Even so, local shortages in grain supplies may develop before the end of the marketing year, and the corn carry-over next October 1 probably will be about 150,000,000 bushels smaller than it was a year earlier.

Estimates based upon average corn yields and conservative assumptions concerning the corn to be fed and used for non-feed purposes indicate a further reduction of at least 300,000,000 bushels in the carry-over during 1942–43. These assumptions take into account the possibility of a reduction in cattle feeding because of the currently unfavorable relationship between prices of feeders and fat cattle. But they assume little or no feeding of wheat to livestock. The sharp increase in the 1942 spring pig crop, and a possible further increase in this year's fall pig crop, together with expansion in the production of dairy and poultry products, account for most of the estimated increase in the 1942–43 disappearance over that indicated for the 1941–42 feeding season.

On the basis of these estimates, it appears that the corn carry-over on October 1, 1943, may be reduced below 200,000,000 bushels, which is about the average carry-over for the several years prior to the 1934 drought. If corn supplies are reduced below this amount, skimpy feeding and an advance in corn prices relative to livestock prices would probably occur, both of which would tend to reduce the production of livestock and livestock products.

It should be noted that these estimates assume normal growing conditions for the 1942 corn crop. The weather has not been entirely favorable for planting this spring, and the crop is far from made. A reduction of only 1 or 2 bushels in the average yield of corn per acre could result in a total supply of corn smaller than that which appears to be needed in the 1942–43 feeding season.

Estimated supply and disappearance of corn, 1940–41 to 1942–43

[In millions of bushels]

Disposition	1940–41	1941–42	1942–43 [1]
Carry-over Oct. 1	695	646	518
Production	2,461	2,672	[2] 2,600
Total supply	3,156	3,318	3,118
Nonfeed uses	247	300	[3] 325
Feed	2,263	2,500	2,650
Total disappearance	2,510	2,800	2,975
Carry-over end of year	646	518	143

[1] Assumes no feeding of wheat.
[2] Based upon an indicated acreage of 91.3 million acres and an average yield of 28.4 bushels per acre.
[3] Assumes some further increase in the production of corn alcohol.

Livestock numbers on farms Jan. 1, 1940–43

[In millions]

Species	1940	1941	1942	1943 forecast
Horses and mules	14.5	14.1	13.7	13.4
Milk cows	24.9	25.5	26.3	27.0
Other cattle and calves	43.3	46.0	48.3	50.0
Hogs	61.1	54.2	60.5	68.5
Sheep and lambs	52.4	54.3	56.0	57.0
Chickens	438.3	422.9	473.9	520.0
Grain-consuming animal units	138.5	133.5	142.7	153.0

Total marketings of livestock for slaughter and milk production, 1940–42

Items and unit	1940	1941	1942 forecast
Cattle, million head	15.0	16.5	17.9
Calves, do	9.1	9.3	9.7
Sheep and lambs, do	21.6	22.3	23.6
Hogs, do	77.6	71.4	83.0
Chickens [1], do	351.0	384.0	422.0
Total milk production, billion pounds	109.5	115.5	119.0

[1] Excludes commercial broilers.

CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL NAVAL AIRCRAFT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2496) to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other

purposes, which were on line 4, to strike out "nonrigid"; on line 6, to strike out "nonrigid"; and on line 7, to strike out "seventy-two" and insert "two-hundred."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

CONSTRUCTION OF NAVAL AUXILIARY VESSELS—BILL RECOMMITTED

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, in view of the passage of the bill making additional appropriations for the Navy, I move that calendar No. 1494, House bill 7159, authorizing the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, be recommitted to the Committee on Naval Affairs for further study.

The motion was agreed to.

NEWSPAPER CRITICISM OF CONGRESS AND THE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, during the past 10 years the Congress has debated and decided some of the most momentous constitutional questions ever to come before the American people.

Whether it has decided wisely or not, and I think that in most instances it has decided wisely, there can be no doubt that its legislative programs have been formulated and executed in the midst of the greatest critical uproar the world has ever known.

We know the story of the bitter personal invective and abuse which were heaped upon George Washington, the desperate attacks upon Jefferson, the scurrilous gossip campaigns against Jackson, and the jibes and mockeries that were Lincoln's lot.

Many here, like myself, carry burning personal recollections of the propaganda campaign which martyred Woodrow Wilson while he fought for a peace formula which would have avoided the catastrophe now upon us.

Yet all the criticisms of these great men in our history, bitter as they were, could not compare with the avalanche of abuse which has descended upon the administration and the majority in Congress during the past 10 turbulent years.

This is so because never before in history have the propagandists of militant minorities had available such weapons and techniques as modern invention has placed at their disposal.

The public-address system now magnifies the squeak of the pettifogging critic to a reasonable facsimile of the lion's roar. Through the genius of advertising the snapping of executive fingers in the corporation board room reverberates through the Nation with the thunder of Divine revelation.

What is today the daydream of the Roosevelt hater may be spread far and wide tomorrow, by press and radio, as nothing short of revelation, the true word from on high.

Because we have seen this thing happen, because we have watched elections go one way while this supposed "public opinion" went the other, we have not been impressed heretofore by the shrieks and yells from the ivory towers of the columnists and commentators, nor have we been stampeded by fake telegrams, printed post cards, or form letters. I recall that I received 10,000 telegrams in 2 days, and more than 100,000 letters, demanding that I vote against the holding-company bill. I voted for it, and several years later when I campaigned for reelection, both in the primary and in the general election, not one of the thousands to whom I talked ever mentioned the bill or my vote.

I am sure that every Member of Congress has had similar experiences. Most conscientious Members have found they can do their full duty only by following their own consciences rather than the flying-trapeze policies of their newspaper constituents.

The late Calvin Coolidge used to advise that the best way to keep one's perspective and sense of values in a campaign was not to read the newspapers that were against you.

Certainly, the enmity of the press, while it may be personally unpleasant, is not necessarily cause for apprehension. It seems to have had little effect upon the political fortunes of President Roosevelt. Many of us will recall the sage observation of our late and well-beloved colleague, Senator J. Hamilton Lewis, that he was indifferent to what the newspapers might say about him so long as they said it on the front page.

I know that my own election in 1934 was assisted considerably by the constant reiteration in newspapers and over the radio of the statement of the then Republican Governor of Pennsylvania, "I can't stand GUFFEY."

Since this attitude of indifference to newspaper criticism has hardened under 10 years of "pressure" from the anti-administration press. It is significant that the Members of Congress at the present time are taking a serious view of current newspaper attacks which would have been considered piddling and inconsequential only a few months ago.

In the early days of the New Deal the Congress was pictured as an aggregation of wild-eyed radicals led by a "starry-eyed dreamer." Later the press discovered that the Members of Congress were not radicals at all, but just "rubber stamps" without minds of their own. Today the scene has shifted again, and they are portrayed as clowns and buffoons, time-servers and demagogues. This has come about because it is no longer safe to make a direct frontal attack upon the Congress; that would be too obviously sabotage of the war effort in which the Congress is now engaged. So the "movement" has gone "underground." The sappers and miners are at work.

Speaker RAYBURN, in an address at the Muhlenberg Historical Celebration in my own State just the other day, described this movement as—

> A studied effort to destroy the faith and confidence of the American people in their elected representatives.
>
> A great many people cry out against dictatorships. There has never been a dictatorship built up in any land until the faith and confidence of the people had been destroyed in the legislative branch, and the legislative branch itself had been destroyed.

It may be that there have been greater Congresses than this. Only history can determine that point with certainty.

Without a doubt, every Congress has had its share of clowns and demagogues. In this connection, some observations in a recent book by a veteran newspaperman—not, however, a columnist—are highly pertinent:

> Let it never be forgotten that for 8 years it has been politically, and sometimes financially, profitable to paint the New Deal as black as possible and when blackening is profitable no one need doubt that a good job will be made of it.
>
> Surely it is not mere Democratic propaganda to point out, at this time, those features of the Roosevelt administration which even its opponents admit are not bad, and which shine brilliantly when contrasted with the regime which it now opposes. There have been many things in Washington during the last 8 years in which any American can take pride, no matter what ticket he votes, and which he can justifiably emphasize when it is a matter of his country against any other.
>
> Certainly now is the time to remember them, without regard to our domestic differences.
>
> The first and greatest of them all is, in fact, to be credited only in part to the New Deal. This is the sharp rise in the level of political debate during the last 8 years.
>
> The New Deal, simply because it has challenged many long-established concepts, has forced a reconsideration of the fundamentals of our political system, which has been reflected in all public debates, but especially in those on the floor of the United States Senate.
>
> It is doubtful that the intellectual level of the present Senate is conspicuously higher than that of the Senates of the 20 years prior to the New Deal, but its debates have been markedly above that level.
>
> The answer is that a Senator of mediocre intellectual attainments, when he is talking about something important, talks better than a brilliant man who is talking without anything to say.
>
> For the last 8 years the Senate has had before it a succession of great constitutional questions which could not be discussed at all without some cerebration, and which could not be discussed adequately without long and severe mental effort. As a result, the Senate has talked well.
>
> We have had some dreadful exhibitions at Washington within these years, yet it would be no bad gamble to tear a leaf at random out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for any day in the past 8 years, and bet on it containing more evidences of reasoning power than a set speech by any high party official of the Nazi regime.

This appraisal, in "Roosevelt—Dictator or Democrat," is by Mr. Gerald W. Johnson, editor of the Baltimore Sun, who appears to have written from honest conviction and honest research based upon long experience, rather than upon the basis of any predetermined editorial policy.

I might say that I have known many such newspapermen, but they rarely are sent to Washington, or if they are, they are soon recalled.

However, I have never known any columnist for a large newspaper or chain who did not, by some coincidence, faith-

fully mirror the prejudices and opinions of his boss.

I say this because it seems fruitless to protest against the voice without looking to the brain behind it.

If we had been paying attention, we would have seen the present attack coming, because labor was the first in the line of fire. It was castigated on the 40-hour issue, which was one of the most contemptible frauds that ever shamed the American press, at the very time when labor was not only fighting to prod industry into war production but also abrogating its greatest weapon of all, the right to strike, in order to promote the war effort.

This was clearly an attempt by the diehards, who have been fighting labor for years, to discredit the working men and women of America in order to deny them their proper voice in the production policies of a nation at war.

There can be no doubt that the object of this antilabor drive was private gain for labor's foes, but it is also equally true that the fomenting of labor turmoil at such a time, had the patriotism of labor not defeated it, could have seriously disrupted war production.

Such a disruption would have been a greater victory for our enemies than they have yet gained on the field of battle.

Similarly, the uproar over inclusion of Members of Congress in the pension bill, itself an insignificant matter, normally would have been nothing more than a routine attack, similar to innumerable others which the Roosevelt haters have launched at every pretext in the past 10 years.

Normally, also, it would have been treated with the contempt it deserved. But such blind opposition provided an opportunity to discredit, not merely the Members of Congress but the legislative process itself.

It was therefore not surprising to learn—although not from the supposedly vigilant daily press—that one of the leaders of the "Bundles for Congress" movement was a representative of Japanese business interests in this country, while another was at one time an accredited representative of one of the Axis nations.

The moral of this is clear. There has always been a blind, unreasoning, bitter opposition to the President and the majority in Congress. This opposition was consistently isolationist up to the very moment that the guns thundered at Pearl Harbor.

Without any reflection whatever upon sincere isolationist Members of Congress who have loyally and patriotically supported the war effort in recent months, I say that many of their former associates in isolationism are today playing the Axis game, perhaps not consciously but simply because their patriotism has been obscured by their undying hatred of the administration and its policies, both foreign and domestic. A fine example is the case of Col. "Bertie" McCormick, of the Chicago Tribune.

The Axis has taken advantage of this bitterness, as its short-wave broadcasts testify. And the dupes in its game are none other than our press friends who continue to pander to that type of mentality which still relishes club car Roosevelt jokes.

I consider these irresponsible rattlebrains of the press dangerous only because they are unwittingly the tools of deadly forces which they could not be expected to understand. They are bad little boys playing with dynamite, and what they need is not repressive legislation but a trip to the woodshed.

I think the least we can ask of the press is that it send to Washington as commentators and analysts men of sufficient maturity and judgment to know the potentialities for good or evil of the newspaper white space they use.

Perhaps they should not be expected to know this any more than the publishers who send them, but this does not excuse them.

Congress has demonstrated over the past 10 years that it can take criticism. It has taken plenty. But it will not, and it should not, tolerate criticism intended to destroy the prestige of the legislative process in time of war.

It should not ignore criticisms which in the aggregate evidence a design to undermine public confidence in representative government.

We must realize that we are fighting a war against Axis propaganda as well as Axis bombs and bullets, and we must act accordingly.

PREFERENCE RIGHT TO CERTAIN OIL AND GAS LESSEES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6071) to grant a preference right to certain oil and gas lessees, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HATCH. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. HATCH, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I understand the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] desires to take the floor, and I wish to announce that it is proposed that, as soon as he shall conclude, the conference report on the soldiers' pay bill will be taken up. There will in all likelihood be a roll call on the conference report, and I am sure all Senators will desire to be present and vote.

PROPOSED INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE OF PARLIAMENTARY REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, under ordinary circumstances I should consider the presentation of the brief statement I have prepared as something less than discreet and wise, but within the past 2 days my attention has been called to at least five editorials covering the subject matter of my statement, which I feel is justification for presenting it at this time.

About 10 days ago news agencies throughout the Nation carried a front-page story to the effect that some time in the near future an informal invitation would probably be received by our congressional leaders, requesting them to send to England a delegation, composed of Members of the Congress, for the purpose of holding a conference with a similar group of parliamentary leaders from the Parliaments of Great Britain and her Dominions; that there would probably be present by invitation a group representing the U. S. S. R., and that probably there would also be in attendance representatives of certain occupied European States. It has been stated the general purpose of the conference would be to discuss problems relative to the prosecution of the war, and problems pertinent to the post-war era. The news stories further reported that the invitation would probably emanate from the British Parliament, and bear the signatures of the presiding officers of the respective Houses of the British Parliament, that the invitation would probably come early this fall after the passage of our new revenue bill, and during the probable succeeding lull in the business of the Congress. I do not know the source from which these news stories came, but because of their simultaneous appearance generally in the press of the Nation, and in the comments of our radio commentators, there is a suggestion that the plan was authentic, and had been carefully conceived and worked out.

Since reading these news stories, Mr. President, I have spent some time reviewing in my own mind and thinking over the possible advantages which might accrue to the United States from such a proposed conference, and my conclusions have been so definitely and overwhelmingly against the proposal that I feel justified in making a brief statement before the Senate as to some of the reasons which have led me to those conclusions.

First. Under the limitations of our Federal Constitution, and under our divisions of powers and responsibilities, a delegation such as that proposed could not by any legal possibility be an official one. It must of necessity be a strictly unofficial group, with no representative powers of action or commitment whatsoever.

Second. The groups with whom the conference would be held would not, in most instances, be subjected to these limitations, and, as a consequence, it would be unusually difficult for these groups from our Allies to draw the line of distinction and demarcation between their powers and responsibilities under their governmental and parliamentary systems, and the limited powers of our congressional group. Is it not reasonable to conclude that they would assume that our congressional group would be clothed with sufficient authority to justify the representatives of other nations in reading into statements and opinions by our Members such dependability of commitment and course of action as might well be the source of grave future misunderstandings? Is it not further reasonable to suppose that these misunderstandings might be the occasion for deep resentments in the future if and when our

executive and legislative departments failed to follow, abide by, ratify, and support these assumed commitments based on mere statements of opinion on the part of our group membership?

Third. If unwilling to concede that there is a possibility of misconception on the part of our allied conferees as to the powers of our group, then what should be or what will be the proper subject matter of these contemplated conversations, which are to have no real substance, no power of commitment, and no responsibility for policy, conclusion, or action?

Fourth. Is it the purpose of the conference to discuss the strategy and conduct of the war? Most certainly this is not the case. Our joint boards of strategy, naval and military, have been set up for months, are functioning efficiently and well, and certainly should not be handicapped or influenced or interfered with in any way by irresponsible discussions by such groups as are now suggested.

Fifth. Are they to discuss problems of food, matériel, or supply? Most certainly not. Thoroughly efficient groups have been set up under Executive authority, and these groups are now doing a marvelous job in cooperation with and in conjunction with similar groups representing our allies. Within the past few days there have been set up two special joint boards, one dealing with the service of supply and procurement and the other with the food supply for the United Nations. Certainly there is no reason for such a conference as now suggested to usurp the field so fully and efficiently occupied by these functioning joint agencies.

Sixth. Are the discussions to enter the field of international relations? Are we so wanting in faith in our own State Department and its competency? Could we properly flout the letter, intent, and spirit of our Constitution by the attempted bypassing, limiting, or circumventing the full executive freedom of action in this field of international relations? What possible excuse could there be for setting up such a group which might well seriously impede or hamper the work of our own State Department?

Seventh. Would the discussions enter the field of post-war economy? If so, on what basis? No living man can possibly conceive, envision, or prophesy when, where, and under what circumstances of military, political, economic, commercial, or financial exhaustion the peace negotiations will be staged. No human mind can now conceive what specific problems are to be met or under what conditions they will be solved. Such situations do, and probably will, continue to change almost weekly, and what human prescience is broad enough to anticipate particular and specific situations which can be considered for future solution? It is not sufficient to say that the discussions might be general where they could not be specific, for the field of general policy and the defining of the general goals has been clearly conceived, fully discussed, and wholly crystallized in the Atlantic charter and its supplemental discussions.

Eighth. Could the discussions by any stretch of the imagination properly enter the field so fully, firmly, and properly occupied by Pan American unity of action so carefully worked out and predicated on the conclusions reached by the series of conferences which have so firmly welded the future hopes and aspirations of the American republics? How would these coworkers of ours in the field of Pan Americanism, many of whom are members of the United Nations war effort, view a conference such as proposed in which they did not have an equal participation, and if invited to participate, what would be the subject matter for discussion, and what would be the reaction of our other copartners in the Pan American Union who are not committed to the war effort of the United Nations?

Ninth. The proponents of the projected conference are reported to have stated emphatically that nothing is further from its purpose than writing a program for peace or for the discussion of a peace treaty. This must, of necessity, be so, because no such authority could possibly exist under the treaty-making power provided by the Constitution. It might be argued that inasmuch as the United States Senate must ratify a peace treaty at the conclusion of the war, it would be advantageous if some of the Members of the Senate could have some preconception of what the provisions of the peace treaty might involve. To this I may say, as I stated but a few moments ago, that no mortal man can conceive of what the specific provisions of a peace treaty will be, and that, even if possessed of the power of divination, a peace treaty will come to the United States Senate as a negotiated and completed instrument which they must accept or reject when and as presented to them.

In conclusion, I wish to say that I can see that members of such a congressional delegation might secure information of personal value to themselves from such a trip and such a conference, and which might be of value to all of us, if and when relayed to us, but I cannot conceive of any information which they could secure which cannot be made available to us by our military, naval, diplomatic, and other departmental representatives, and I feel strongly that there could conceivably result from such a conference misunderstandings, embarrassments, and resentments, which might well involve us in serious controversies with the friendly nations with whom we are now cooperating. I venture to express the hope that the projected invitation to the American Congress be not forthcoming, and the further hope that, if it should come, the Congress will courteously and in all kindness, but in all firmness, explain our inability to accept it.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES FOR THE DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN ENLISTED PERSONNEL

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2467) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I move that the Senate disagree to the amendment of the House, request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. LEE, Mr. HILL, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE CHANGES IN TARIFF POLICIES

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, under cover of general war powers, a fundamental change in tariff policies is being accomplished. Recent tariff developments offer a striking instance of the tendency of Congress to allow the executive branch of the Government to usurp legislative functions. Because of this tendency, Congress has only itself to blame for growing criticism by the public.

By a stroke of the pen the President has virtually wiped out our tariff wall for the duration of the war. This is the effect of the recent Executive order allowing Government departments and agencies to import war materials free of duty. In Executive agreements with other nations, in which Congress has had no part, our Government has pledged itself to a general leveling of tariff barriers after the war is over.

Neither with respect to the present war situation nor the post-war period has the executive branch asked Congress to establish a basic tariff policy. The executive branch persists in its program in the face of the power vested in Congress by the Constitution to impose duties and to regulate commerce with foreign nations.

Not only has the administration ignored Congress, but its action has had the effect of nullifying provisions of the Price Control Act which were intended to prevent a weakening of the protection accorded by present tariff laws to domestic industry and agriculture. The Price Control Act specifically prohibited the purchase of foreign commodities when a sufficient domestic supply was available. It also stipulated that none of its provisions should be construed to modify or suspend any part of the tariff laws. Under the recent Executive order both of these safeguards have been made meaningless.

Mr. President, I have supported and shall continue to support measures vesting broad powers in the President in connection with the conduct of the war. If Congress is to function at all, however, it should at least prescribe the general principles to govern the executive branch in the war program. Otherwise, Congress might as well be abolished or stripped of its powers in the same manner as the legislative bodies of Germany, Italy, and other dictator-controlled countries have been.

When Congress created the flexible tariff system in the Tariff Act of 1922, it laid down the rule that changes in duties by the President should be designed to

equalize differences in costs of production here and abroad. Similarly in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act of 1934, Congress prescribed a general rule, even though somewhat vague, to govern the negotiation of reciprocal trade agreements with other countries. In both laws the President was prohibited from increasing or decreasing duties by more than 50 percent and from transferring articles from the dutiable to the free list.

Under the recent Executive order, based on general war powers legislation having nothing to do with tariff, it has been made possible for Government departments and agencies to import foreign commodities entirely free of duty. Under such authority it becomes an easy matter to depress prices of protected domestic commodities or to destroy a protected industry.

I grant that under present war conditions control of domestic industry is unavoidable and in a large degree desirable. When, however, the action means an entering wedge for free trade, attainment of which is being pledged for the post-war period, it is important that all the implications of such a fundamental change in tariff policies should receive the consideration of Congress.

The Executive order of May 30, 1942, deserves study as an example of the manner in which the executive branch of the Government has usurped legislative powers. The only statutory provision cited as the basis of the order is title I of the First War Powers Act, approved December 18, 1941. Title I of that law authorizes the President during the war and for 6 months thereafter to make such redistribution of existing functions among executive agencies as he may deem best for the successful prosecution of the war. It does not authorize the broadening of present functions or a creation of new powers.

Under the Executive order the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiary corporations are authorized to exercise the functions, powers, and duties heretofore vested only in the Secretary of the Navy by an act of June 30, 1914.

The Secretary of the Navy, by the act of June 30, 1914, was authorized to make emergency purchases of war material abroad and to bring this material into the United States free of duty.

Upon examination of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of the year 1914, I find that the brief statute cited in the Executive order was an inconspicuous clause in an annual naval appropriation bill. It was a third proviso at the end of a paragraph appropriating $5,800,000 for procurement of ordnance material. The proviso appears to have been mentioned only once in the debates of either the House or Senate during the consideration of the appropriation bill. That was in the House on April 28, 1914, when Representative Green, of Iowa, inquired of Representative Padgett, who was in charge of the bill, as to its significance.

Mr. Padgett briefly explained that under the law then existing a naval vessel requiring emergency material could buy it in this country, but not abroad. The proviso, he said, simply meant that in case a ship was abroad and an emergency arose such materials as were needed could be bought and brought back to the United States free of duty. This explanation satisfied the House and the proviso was not even mentioned on the floor of the Senate.

Despite this very limited significance of the clause, it is the basis of the authority under which the function of the Secretary of the Navy, in making emergency purchases of a small amount of war matériel abroad, is shifted to several other departments and agencies and made to apply to a vast range of commodities of unlimited value, including strategic and critical materials and farm products. Certainly Members of Congress never dreamed, in enacting the First War Powers Act that it would be the basis for the elimination of duties or a medium for broadening the functions of executive agencies. No mention of anything of the sort appears in the committee reports or debates in Congress. Two years earlier the Senate had been advised by the Attorney General, in response to a resolution of inquiry, that the only powers possessed by the President over customs duties, in a national emergency or state of war, was the authority to admit free of duty food, clothing, and medical, surgical, and other supplies for use in emergency relief work.

In considering the effect of the Executive order, it must be remembered that all trade with other countries is now under the complete control of the Government. The matter of revenue is not important, as any duties paid on Government imports would come out of the Treasury. What must be considered is the power that is given to Government officials, and possible effects upon domestic industry and agriculture.

Materials imported by the Government free of duty may be supplied to private war contractors as a substitute for domestic materials. Foreign wool and other farm products may be placed on the market by the Government with a view to depressing prices, which the President has said are too high, but which, in the opinion of agricultural authorities, actually no more than cover costs of production. Our domestic producers of strategic and critical materials, who in normal times have not been able to compete with foreign production, cannot be sure of continued protection intended for them in existing tariff laws. Under a pooling of the resources of the allied nations, both now and after the war, it may be decided that certain of our industries should be displaced by those of other countries. Again, it may be the opinion of our high officials that justification is lacking for the tariff protection accorded the domestic beet-sugar industry. There are many dangers in the exercise of such broad authority as provided in the Executive order, which should have been carefully considered and guarded against by Congress.

There would be less occasion for concern over the effects of the Executive order if it were not for the avowed purpose of the administration to encourage a general reduction or elimination of world tariff barriers after the war.

The so-called Atlantic Charter, signed by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill in August 1941, stated it to be the purpose to further the enjoyment by all nations, victor or vanquished, of access on equal terms to the trade and raw materials of the world. A joint declaration signed by 26 nations in January 1942 pledged common action in behalf of the principles of the Atlantic charter. An economic pact entered into between the United States and Great Britain in February in connection with a post-war settlement of accounts under the lend-lease program pledged the two nations to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers.

The resolutions of the Conference of Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American Republics, at Rio de Janeiro in February, were a step closer toward inclusion of the Latin-American nations in a post-war program of free trade. A very recent lend-lease agreement with China includes the same promise of the elimination of all forms of discrimination in international commerce and a reduction in tariff barriers, which is in the other documents. Similar agreements are in process of negotiation with six other nations.

None of these agreements has been considered by or will be submitted to the Senate or to Congress.

Notwithstanding our very friendly relations with Canada, it has been desirable in past years to protect our agriculture and industry against her competing products.

Last December the President announced his approval of a recommendation of the Joint War Production Committee of the two countries for the elimination of all tariff barriers for the duration of the war. In effect, the recent Executive order accomplishes what was then in contemplation, but for which it was supposed legislation would be necessary. Canada, one of the 26 countries subscribing to the joint declaration of last January, hopes to have the advantage of unrestricted access to our markets after the war.

I fully recognize the desirability of measures to promote international trade when peace is restored. Undoubtedly our tariff laws will require a complete overhauling. In such a program the executive branch of the Government will have an important part to play. Its actions, however, should follow the lines of policies established by Congress.

As a representative of the State of Idaho, whose development has been furthered by the protection accorded to such products as livestock, wool, sugar, grains, beans, dairy products, lumber, and minerals, I consider it my duty to protest against the inauguration of new tariff policies by the executive branch without consideration and action by Congress.

Unless the chosen representatives of the people in the Senate and in the House of Representatives may be trusted

to evolve a tariff program fair to our industries, agriculture, and the general public, and in the interest of world trade, it is idle to expect the survival of our boasted democracy.

PAY AND ALLOWANCES OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, a short while ago the Senate temporarily laid aside consideration of the pay and allowances conference report. I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate resume the consideration of the report.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2025) to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service.

Mr. BARKLEY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Hatch	Overton
Austin	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bailey	Herring	Reed
Bankhead	Hill	Rosier
Barkley	Holman	Russell
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Schwartz
Brewster	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bridges	La Follette	Smith
Bulow	Langer	Spencer
Burton	Lee	Stewart
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Tydings
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Davis	Maybank	Van Nuys
Doxey	Mead	Wagner
Ellender	Millikin	Walsh
Gerry	Murdock	Wheeler
Gillette	Murray	White
Guffey	Nye	Wiley

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are detained from the Senate on important public business.

The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained in his State on official business.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement. The report now under consideration is in all respects save one like the report which was submitted on June 8, which is recorded at page 4983 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The difference is that the conference agreement reported on June 8 provided that the pay of enlisted men of the sixth grade should be $52 a month, and that the pay of enlisted men of the seventh grade should be $46 a month, whereas the conference report now pending provides that the pay of enlisted men of the sixth grade shall be $54 a month, and that the pay of enlisted men of the seventh grade shall be $50 a month.

I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point a table showing the relative pay bases for all of the grades from 1 to 7 in the different branches of the service, and showing also some additional detailed information.

I conclude, Mr. President, by merely saying that the agreement on this report was entered into by all the members of the conference on behalf of the House and all the members of the conference on behalf of the Senate, save one.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the statement submitted by the Senator from Vermont will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement is as follows:

Pay Readjustment Act of 1942

Grade	Present base pay	Present pay if man has more than 1 year's and less than 2 years' service	Proposed base pay under S. 2025
1. Master sergeant; chief petty officer	$120	$136	$138
2. First or technical sergeant; petty officer, first class	84	94	114
3. Staff sergeant; petty officer, second class	72	82	96
4. Sergeant; petty officer, third class	60	70	78
5. Corporal; seaman, first class	54	64	66
6. Private, first class; seaman second class	36	46	54
7. Private; apprentice seaman	0	40	50

Seventh grade men with less than 4 months' service receive $21 per month. This subgrade is eliminated by S. 2025.

As the conference agreement reports, enlisted men with more than 1 year's service and less than 3 years' service would receive pay increases as follows:

Grade 1	$2
Grade 2	20
Grade 3	14
Grade 4	8
Grade 5	2
Grade 6	8
Grade 7	10

Add 20 percent for service without continental United States. After each 3-year period of service, up to 30 years, pay is increased by 5 percent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

Mr. AUSTIN. I understand the yeas and nays have been ordered?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOXEY (when Mr. BILBO's name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. HATCH (when the name of Mr. CHAVEZ was called). My colleague [Mr. CHAVEZ] is necessarily absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. ANDREWS (when Mr. PEPPER's name was called). My colleague [Mr. PEPPER] is necessarily absent. If he were present, I understand he would vote "yea."

Mr. BURTON (when Mr. TAFT's name was called). The senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is unavoidably absent. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. BONE (when Mr. WALLGREN's name was called). My colleague [Mr. WALLGREN] is unavoidably absent because he is engaged in the performance of important public duty. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. My colleague the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is unavoidably detained from the Senate today. Were he present, he would vote "yea" on the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. TUNNELL. My colleague [Mr. HUGHES] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] is absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained in his State on official business.

The Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] are absent on important public business.

The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] is detained on important business at the War Department.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is a member of the Committee to Investigate National Defense and is, therefore, necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL] are necessarily absent.

I am advised that if present and voting, all of the Senators whose absences I have announced, would vote "yea."

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr.

BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

I am advised that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] would vote "yea," if present.

The result was announced—yeas 69, nays 0, as follows:

YEAS—69

Aiken	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Hatch	Overton
Austin	Hayden	Radcliffe
Bailey	Herring	Reed
Bankhead	Hill	Rosier
Barkley	Holman	Russell
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Schwartz
Brewster	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bridges	La Follette	Smith
Bulow	Langer	Spencer
Burton	Lee	Stewart
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Tydings
Connally	Maloney	Vandenberg
Davis	Maybank	Van Nuys
Doxey	Mead	Wagner
Ellender	Millikin	Walsh
Gerry	Murdock	Wheeler
Gillette	Murray	White
Guffey	Nye	Wiley

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—27

Ball	Danaher	O'Daniel
Barbour	Downey	Pepper
Bilbo	George	Reynolds
Brooks	Glass	Smathers
Brown	Green	Taft
Bunker	Hughes	Tobey
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Truman
Chavez	Lodge	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	Norris	Willis

So the report was agreed to.

PREVENTION OF PUBLICATION OF INVENTIONS IN THE NATIONAL INTEREST

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2427) to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes, which was in line 6, after "and" to insert ", together with the provisions of the act of August 21, 1941 (Public Law 239, 77th Cong., 1st sess., ch. 393),".

Mr. BONE. Mr. President, the House amendment is entirely satisfactory, and I move that the Senate concur therein.

The motion was agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. GLASS, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

W. K. RICHARDSON—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 213)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, Senate Joint Resolution 24, a resolution for the relief of W. K. Richardson.

Some years ago W. K. Richardson brought suit against the United States in the Court of Claims to recover the sum of $10,000,000 for the alleged use by the Government of an invention covered by a patent relating to projectiles. The Court of Claims, after taking voluminous testimony and hearing the case at length on the merits, made comprehensive and detailed findings of fact and rendered judgment dismissing the petition. While sustaining the validity of the patent, the court held in the light of earlier developments that the patent should be narrowly construed and limited to projectiles of the exact proportions and dimensions specified in one of the claims.

The court further held that the projectiles used by the Government did not infringe the patent.

The purpose of the present resolution is to authorize and direct the Court of Claims, in effect, to reopen and reconsider the case on prior testimony and findings of fact heretofore made, subject to the limitation that the amount of any judgment should not exceed 3 percent of the sum for which suit was originally brought.

On July 22, 1937, in my message returning without my approval a similar resolution relating to the same claimant, I made the following statement:

> The claimant has had his day in court. After a full hearing on the merits, the tribunal to which the law gave him recourse reached the conclusion that his claim was not well founded. Reasons of policy, as well as appropriate regard for orderly judicial procedure, would seem to require that the parties should abide by the result of the litigation. Sufficient reason does not appear for reversing the decision of the court by legislative action.

The foregoing observations are equally applicable to the legislation under consideration.

In the light of the foregoing circumstances, I am constrained to return the joint resolution without my approval.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 11, 1942.*

CLAIM OF SHAVER FORWARDING CO.—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 212)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 1648, a bill "Conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the District of Oregon, to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the Shaver Forwarding Co., of Portland, Oreg."

As an incident to the construction of the Bonneville Dam, the Columbia River was intermittently closed to navigation at the site of the dam during certain periods between January 1936, and January 1938. Public notices were issued by the United States District Engineer at Portland, Oreg., concerning probable future interruptions to water-borne commerce past the dam.

It appears that the Shaver Forwarding Co. was organized in April 1933 to conduct transportation business from Portland to inland points in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. It claims to have sustained loss of revenues and other similar damages by reason of inability to navigate the Columbia River resulting from the closing of the water course, as stated above.

The alleged losses said to have been sustained by the claimant were similar to those that might have been suffered by any member of the public who had expected and planned to use the river for the purposes of navigation, but found it impossible to do so because of the pending construction of the Bonneville Dam. Were it to assume liability in this instance, the Government might be confronted with other similar claims on the part of other prospective navigators of the river, and might also be presented with claims on the part of other individuals, who may contend that they have suffered by reason of the exercise of governmental powers, such as its power over navigation. The situation presented in claims of this type is entirely different from that involved in claims for personal injuries or property damage caused by the negligence of a Government officer or employee under circumstances in which a private employer would be liable for the acts of his agents or employees.

Under existing law, when the Government takes property for public use, it pays just compensation for the property. It is not, however, required to pay consequential damages for losses to business or even for its destruction, resulting from the construction of public works. No reason appears discernible for making exception to the general law in this instance.

In view of the foregoing circumstances, I am constrained to reach the conclusion that the Government should not favorably entertain the claim contemplated by this legislation.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 11, 1942.*

PROGRAM FOR MONDAY—ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in all likelihood on Monday, soon after the Senate convenes, at about 12:20 or 12:30 o'clock, King George, of Greece, will be the guest of the Senate, and may address the Senate briefly. Following the routine morning business on Monday, I hope the Senate will agree to consider bills on the calendar, beginning where we concluded at the last call.

I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate concludes its business today it adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

NOTICE OF ADDRESS BY SENATOR LA FOLLETTE

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to give notice that at the conclusion of the routine morning business on Monday next I shall endeavor to obtain recognition from the Chair for the purpose of addressing the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable committee reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Frederick C. Sherman to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 3d day of April 1942;

Capt. Walden L. Ainsworth to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 2d day of December 1941;

Capt Norman Scott to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 11th day of May 1942;

Capt. Howard H. Good to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 14th day of May 1942; and

Capt. Mahlon S. Tisdale to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 16th day of May 1942.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Charles J. Pisar, of Wisconsin, now a Foreign Service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America; and

Reginald S. Kazanjian, of Rhode Island, now a Foreign Service officer of class 8 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

ARMY SPECIALIST CORPS—NOMINATIONS REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee on Military Affairs certain nominations in the Army Specialist Corps, and ask for their immediate consideration. I have conferred with my colleague the majority leader and with the distinguished Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], and there is no objection. The Army Specialist Corps, headed by Mr. Dwight F. Davis as Director General, is unable to function until these appointments are confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the junior Senator from Kentucky for the immediate consideration of the nominations reported favorably by him from the Committee on Military Affairs?

The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army Specialist Corps.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James O. Day to be United States attorney for the northern district of Mississippi.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Spencer C. Young to be United States marshal for the eastern district of New York.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Wainwright Abbott to be consul general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Karl deG. MacVitty to be consul general.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be notified immediately of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of the confirmations just made.

THE SERIOUS PROBLEM OF THE DEFICIT

The Senate resumed the consideration of legislative business.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senate for a few moments while I speak on the serious problem of the deficit.

The saying that "We must win the war and then win the peace" has become almost axiomatic.

In contemplating the winning of the war we are generally thinking in terms of production and manpower. In contemplating the winning of the peace we are generally thinking in terms of creating some kind of a new order—an association of nations that will tend to make war impossible.

Mr. President, we will lose the war even if we win it, and will as well lose the peace, if we do not properly handle the problem of the deficit. Every day brings new evidence to us of the rapidly rising cost of war and the tremendous financing problem facing this country. The revised Budget figures indicate that for the next fiscal year we will spend $70,000,000,000. The deficit for 1942 will run about $20,000,000,000, and for the fiscal year of 1943, $50,000,000,000. So we face the problem, How will Government get the money?

Of course, we will find the way—we must find the way—but we must make sure that the way we find will not lose us the war. We must see to it now that we do not create great credit disorders and grave currency problems which will affect the war effort, and complicate tremendously the problem of peace and post-war recovery.

To find the answer to the question as to how we shall meet this great financial demand calls for extreme realism. Postponing the day will only postpone and magnify our troubles.

I am sincerely convinced that the American people are ready to pay more taxes because they realize they will not have the privilege of paying taxes in a free land if we lose the war. Therefore we must reach out as we have never reached before to obtain the maximum amount by taxation, and then cover the balance by borrowing.

This borrowing of necessity must come from savings and income that would otherwise be spent. We must watch our bank expansion, and make sure that we do not create a lot of fiat money.

We know that civilian goods are becoming more scarce, and if we do not by taxation curtail purchasing power we will create a force for inflation that will be difficult to overcome. We have not forgotten the aftermath of inflation in other countries, bringing demoralization and ruin.

There is great need, Mr. President, for a campaign of education in the line of saving. America needs a Benjamin Franklin who will talk straight to the reason of our people. We know that if the people save their money and buy bonds this will provide the best brake possible on inflationary tendencies. There are in this country vast pools of idle balances possessed by men and women and by business interests. These pools must be tapped by the bond-sales program. Such procedure will also add a brake to an inflationary runaway movement. When I say that these pools must be tapped I mean just that. They are not now being tapped. Last month we sold only $650,000,000 worth of bonds, and, as the President has indicated, we are spending at the rate of $3,000,000,000 a month.

In this program we cannot forget the need for the elimination by government of unnecessary expenditures. The distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has pressed that subject for a long time, but it is all important that we do not forget what he has taught, and we must see to it that what he has taught is put into actual practice, so that unnecessary expenditures shall actually be eliminated.

Today on the floor of the Senate we passed a bill appropriating about $700,000,000, which, it is said, is but a drop in the bucket. Since I spoke a few days ago about the cost of maintaining the Army it has been stated that my estimate of $4,000,000,000 to pay for an Army of 8,000,000 men was about $3,000,000,000 too low.

All waste and extravagance and useless spending must be done away with. Government costs should be cut down wherever they can be without prejudice to the war effort. Everybody says that, and it is true, but we are not acting according to the way we talk; we are not following the preachment of those seers who see what tomorrow has in store for the Nation. I repeat, we must raise every dollar possible by taxation, providing such taxation does not injure the morale and the production of our country. We must study thoroughly the character of taxes which are to be imposed, taxes which will have the result of reducing consumption and preventing inflation. When we compare our present financial problem with that of the last war we realize the extent of the job we have to undertake. In the last war there was a gross debt increase of about $24,000,000,000. The public took about nineteen and one-half billion dollars of this, and the banks about four and one-half billion dollars. As we look at that picture we realize that we must do some real planning. We should not plan to sell more than thirty or forty billion dollars in bonds in 1943. At the present rate of bond sales we will sell about seven or eight billion dollars of bonds. In 1943 we should provide the rest by taxation.

In the months which are ahead we shall see Government controls affecting our people more than ever before. Civilian goods and services will have to meet many inroads because of war. We shall undoubtedly see more and more rationing, and more and more regulations because of the shrinking of consumers' goods. Of course, the supplies on hand will postpone scarcities for some time to come, and American resourcefulness, inventiveness, and ingenuity may take care of shortages. We shall see the plants and labor of more industries which have been producing durable goods taken over in the war effort. When the War Production Board prohibited the use of iron and steel in over 400 manufactured articles, we saw the handwriting on the wall for many industries.

In my State, and in every other American Commonwealth, we saw plants closed. The remarkable thing is that in spite of everything the Government is doing America is taking it very graciously. Of necessity, Government has priority. The war effort demands it, and the Government is receiving loyal cooperation and support. All America has been proud of our production record, and the spirit of America is really wonderful. The people know that if the war continues any length of time they will have to get along with less because the war industries and the armed services will be using what they give up.

If the new world, the world of tomorrow, in which you and I are to live, is to be the world we would have it be, if this Nation is to be the lighthouse for tired, worn, and war-ravaged humanity, we must see to it that the economy of the Nation remains sound.

Mr. President, that is why I have talked on this subject today. Our boys who are fighting the war do not want to find on their return a Nation with a paralyzed economy. They want, as all of us want, America to remain safe and sound and secure. This means economically sound, and you and I, all of us, public officer and layman, must take a hand in planning for it.

The finest thing we can do now for this land of ours is to dig down deep into our jeans and pay the tax bill to make sure that America will remain sound economically. We will dig down into our jeans, as has been suggested time and time again by the distinguished junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], and we will cut out unnecessary expense. We will curtail those things we thought we had to do, but which are not necessary now in the war effort. When the Government is sound economically we can make sure it is sound politically and socially, but if the Government becomes unsound economically, if we do not face the question of deficits now, and meet it head-on, we shall find after the war that a diseased financial economy means a diseased political economy and a diseased social economy. When America is sound financially, however, we can make sure that there will be no break in her morale.

It has been stated—and I believe it to be a fact, for it has been demonstrated time and time again in history—that the nation whose morale first breaks will lose the war. How can we lose the war? We can lose the war if we keep on spending, and if we do not realistically approach the matter of deficits. Mr. President, I am very seriously concerned about that matter.

Yes; it is a time to tighten our belts and meet the mounting problem of the deficit in a realistic way. I am not on the Finance Committee of the Senate. Many times I have wished I were. For 30 years I have been in that line of work. We are facing extraordinary challenges, and consequently we must apply extraordinary remedies. We have done so in the field of production. We must now do so in the field of taxation. We must get the money. We must, like men, unafraid and courageous, face this problem the same as our boys on every battlefield and on every sea are facing their problem. We have no right to postpone payments which should now be made. We have no right to load upon this and future generations the load we should now bear. God knows that the next generation in America and the one following that will have problems enough of their own to solve without having to undertake the solution of those which we now should solve.

Mr. President, we have no business "passing the buck." Our obligation is definite and certain, and I believe all America is willing to assume that obligation. But no; we talk about a tax bill practically as usual. We talk about raising $20,000,000,000 in taxes, resulting in a deficit in the next fiscal year of $50,000,000,000, as if that were realistic. Our own experience in the last 12 months has indicated that we cannot sell bonds at the rate of $10,000,000,000 a year unless some special provision is made. The situation is challenging to my mind for, as I suggested on the floor of the Senate the other day, if we continue our present course we shall face a national indebtedness of $300,000,000,000. We shall face a dangerous economic situation which could be prevented by providing the proper antidote now.

Yes, extraordinary problems demand extraordinary solutions. Those who have must pay. One hundred and thirty-two million of us in this country possess in common the great American values—and they are great values now because we appreciate them. This war is being fought that we may retain those values. In that sense we all owe all we are and all we have to our country. Among those values can be listed the right to property, the right to sell one's own efforts and collect one's compensation or wage. While we possess these great intangible values in common we do not possess material values in common. While we possess all the great values, there are those among us who possess more of the material values than others possess. There are involved in this fight for freedom, this fight for existence, for the preservation of the Nation, those great material and those great intangible values.

Speaking of the material values, let me tell the Senate what the rich men of Britain did. In Britain the men of means recognized what was at stake, and they were instrumental in having a law passed which provided that all above an income of approximately $28,000 should go to the exchequer. These Britons are realistic. They believe that, while the capitalistic system is not perfect, because men are not perfect and no system is perfect, it has produced more real values for the race, and has given more impetus to growth and development, than any other system. It has built for freedom and liberty. So they have been willing to pay, knowing that if they lost the war they would lose everything, including freedom and property. It is for us to make the new world ahead of us a world fit for our boys to live in, a place of opportunity, when they return home from their service.

Mr. President, a few days ago I was talking with a very wealthy individual

who said, "I am ready to do what was done in Britain. If during this war period I can make any sacrifices that will make possible the maintenance of the American way of life I shall be happy to do so. After all," he said, "it is no sacrifice if we pay all our income and get only our living, if after this war is over we shall still have our capital intact." This individual, thinking in a realistic manner, appreciated something of what was involved.

Mr. President, the problem of the deficit calls for drastic measures by Congress. It does not permit of any fooling around, of trying to apply old, outmoded taxation methods, but calls for a realistic approach to a problem which will get results. The time for political expediency has long since gone. The time is here for a realistic tax measure to do the job.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE REPORTS, SIGNING OF BILLS, ETC.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session, the Presiding Officer of the Senate be authorized to sign enrolled bills; that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives, and that the Committee on Appropriations be authorized to report bills.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, in accordance with the order previously entered, I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned, the adjournment being, under the order previously entered, to Monday, June 15, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 11, 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Walter W. Orebaugh, of Kansas, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Alexander Murchie, of New Hampshire, to be United States attorney for the district of New Hampshire. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 10, 1942.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Neale D. Murphy, of Rhode Island, to be United States marshal for the district of Rhode Island. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 9, 1942.

Donald A. Draughon, of Puerto Rico, to be United States marshal for the district of Puerto Rico. He is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 10, 1942.

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS

Michael Francis Prendergast, of Maryland, to be State director for the Office of Government Reports for Maryland.

The following-named persons to be State directors for the Office of Government Reports:

Charles W. Hardesty, for Delaware.
Louis F. Hutchinson, for Indiana.
Rexford C. McCullough, Jr., for Louisiana.
Oliver Jenkins, for New Hampshire.
William Freiday, for New Jersey.
Harry L. Griffin, for North Carolina.
John E. Walsh, for Vermont.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The following-named cadets to be ensigns in the Coast Guard, to rank from the 19th day of June 1942:

Arthur Arnold Atkinson, Jr.
Harvey Niell Joseph Moore Aviles
Roger Hicks Banner
George Thomason Beemer
George Franklin Breitwieser, Jr.
Fletcher Webster Brown, Jr.
Ernest Hill Burt, Jr.
Joseph Lawrence Butt
Peter Joseph Butvidas
Leroy Allen Cheney
James William Christman
Robert Johnson Clark
Robert Paul Cunningham
Ward Jackson Davies, Jr.
Opie Lloyd Dawson
John Everard Day
Charles Dorian
Robert Eugene Emerson
George Clayton Fleming
Hersey Cecil Forehand, Jr.
Sherman Kendall Frick
Richard Lindley Fuller
Frederick August Goettel
Harry Eugene Haff, Jr.
Eugene Lewis Hall
John Locke Haney
John Hjalmar Hanninen
Roderick Lynn Harris
Albert Aal Heckman
Harold Thompson Hendrickson
Wells Frederick Impson
Gerhard Karl Kelz
George Hiram Lawrence
Urial Herbert Leach, Jr.
Bainbridge Bradley Leland
James David Luse
Hugh Ferrel Lusk
Donald Harry Luzius
Clinton Earl McAuliffe
Marcus Harper McGarity
James Walter McGary
James Walter Moreau
William Clement Morrill
Frederick Clarke Munchmeyer
Charles Edward Norton
Theodore Somerville Pattison, Jr.
Curtis Roderick Peck
Julian Robert Raper, Jr.
Jerry Koller Rea
Stanley Herbert Rice
Francis Xavier Riley
Billy Richard Ryan
Charles William Scharff
Edward Donald Scheiderer
Frank Close Schmitz
Charles Martin Shepard 3d
Stanton Duane Smith
John Wallace Sutherland
William Perley Thoman
Lewis Walter Tibbits, Jr.
Louis Aelred Volse
Douglas Davis Vosler
John Mayo Waters, Jr.
Kenneth Eugene Webb
Richard Herbert Welton
Robert James Wescott
Kenneth Evans Wilson
David William Woods
Walter Alden Wright
George Jacob Yost
Richard William Young
Charles Zelinski

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY SPECIALIST CORPS

Dwight Filley Davis to be Director General at $8,000.

Henry Peter Seidemann to be Deputy Director, General Administration (Executive), at $8,000.

William Otis Hotchkiss to be Deputy Director, Engineering and Technical (Personnel), at $8,000.

Charles Steele Cheston to be Deputy Director, Commercial and Business (Personnel), at $8,000.

Ferdinand John Conrad Dresser to be Head Occupational Analyst at $6,500.

John Murray Mitchell to be Chief of Field Service at $6,500.

Elwood Julian Way to be Assistant to Deputy Director, General Administration (Executive), at $5,600.

Harold Andrews White to be Liaison Officer at $5,600.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

Capt. Frank T. Leighton to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 22d day of November 1941.

MARINE CORPS

Col. Allen H. Turnage to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps, for temporary service, from the 29th day of March 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 11, 1942:

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

James O. Day, to be United States attorney for the northern district of Mississippi.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Spencer C. Young, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of New York.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Wainright Abbott
Karl deG. MacVitty

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

MARINE CORPS

To be a colonel

Omar T. Pfeiffer

To be second lieutenants

Benjamin T. Owens
Henry W. Seeley, Jr.
Rora T. Musselwhite, Jr.
William B. Allison
Dannitte M. Beattie
Gordon S. Calder
Charles W. Churchill
Bert Davis, Jr.
Alan F. Dill
Theil H. Fisher
Joseph G. Hall
Richard E. Hall
John R. Howell
Samuel W. Kirkpatrick
Francis H. Bergtholdt
Walter H. Cuenin
Walter M. Goldsberry, Jr.
Joseph L. Harrington
Bertram L. Menne, Jr.
Marion G. Mickelson
Lyle Q. Petersen
Robert E. Rain, Jr.
James B. Whitfield, Jr.
Burton L. Hedin
John E. Semmes, Jr.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY SPECIALIST CORPS

Dwight Filley Davis to be Director General.

Henry Peter Seidemann to be Deputy Director, General Administration (Executive).

William Otis Hotchkiss to be Deputy Director, Engineering and Technical (Personnel).

Charles Steele Cheston to be Deputy Director, Commercial and Business (Personnel).

Ferdinand John Conrad Dresser to be Head Occupational Analyst.

John Murray Mitchell to be Chief of Field Service.

Elwood Julian Way to be Assistant to Deputy Director, General Administration (Executive).

Harold Andrews White to be Liaison Officer.

POSTMASTERS

KENTUCKY

Dora Mae Miller, Magnolia.

NEW YORK

Claude O. Weidman, Hartwick.

OKLAHOMA

Jennie R. Whittet, Freedom.
James Travis Watson, Wetumka.

PENNSYLVANIA

Margaret A. Helfrich, Bruin.
George E. Diehl, Chambersburg.
Loy W. Oligher, Clymer.
Mary E. Honsberger, Eagleville.
Norman B. Gregory, East Stroudsburg.
Earl M. Rynier, Gordonville.
Albert A. Schutte, Harborcreek.
Mabelle G. Creen, Mountainhome.
Frank G. Christopher, Smithton.
Mark B. Rickabaugh, Wayne.
Nancy L. Hawthorne, West Bridgewater.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 11, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. COX].

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in Heaven, who sendest us the mercy of dawn and dusk, we pray Thee to make us godly for man's sake and manly for our country's sake. In the great court of life, enable us to take our essential place; keep us free from the clatter of the world and lift us into the open presence of the Son of God.

We would praise Thee most devoutly for the flag of our country. As it sweeps the fields of our Constitution, our ideals, our achievements, and our destiny, it symbolizes much that is good and great in the being of man. In its glorious folds are gathered up the eternal rights of the individual which cannot be computed nor extinguished. Wherever they are desecrated may it wave in power, prestige, and in defiance as the hands and hearts of a free people are clasped in unyielding unity, pledging undying fealty to those principles to which our democracy is dedicated. Here in our Nation's Capitol may a holy God inspire in us a bitter loathing for things superficial, selfish, and evil. We pray that Thy gracious care and strength may encircle and preserve the valiant ruler sojourning in our midst. Blessed Lord, comfort his people who are being so wantonly and cruelly persecuted and yet are so valorous in the defense of their historic homeland. In the name of our Saviour, the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and also to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include a column of Walter Lippmann's.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. FADDIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SPRINGER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a petition from the Escanaba (Mich.) Kiwanis Club on the subject We, the People, Want the Government To Wake Up.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a telegram received this morning.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the people of the great Middle West, particularly the people of Michigan, and more especially of upper Michigan, in the tourist and resort country, are very much cheered by the announcement of yesterday that the President is going to suspend gasoline rationing in the Midwestern area until he has been convinced by an actual collection of the scrap rubber now in the country that there now is a very definite shortage of rubber, sufficient, at least, to demand the rationing of gasoline.

The resort industry of northern Michigan is the second largest industry in Michigan. Normally it annually brings into our State about $400,000,000. It is our bread and butter in northern Michigan. If we have gasoline rationing in the Middle West all of us up there will witness the complete economic strangulation of one of the largest sections of the country.

The resort industry wants an opportunity to cooperate in the collection of this scrap rubber. This is shown by the following telegram which I received this morning:

MARQUETTE, MICH., *June 10, 1942.*

Congressman FRED BRADLEY,
Washington, D. C.:

Recent news that if the President can be shown there is sufficient scrap rubber in the country, plans for gas rationing will be deferred. Satisfactory to us. You may assure the proper department that the tourist associations of Michigan will do everything possible to aid in a campaign to salvage rubber.

GEORGE E. BISHOP,
United States Development Bureau.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter and a telegram from a constituent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves correctly, one of the outstanding slogans enunciated at the beginning of our present system of government was that it provided for equal rights to all and special privileges to none.

I do not profess to know a great deal about the gasoline business because I do not come from a section of the country where gasoline and oil are obtained, but I am convinced that if the defense requirements of this country are such as to necessitate the rationing of gasoline in order to conserve it for defense purposes the rationing should apply to every person in the United States. That is, it should apply to every section of the country alike. Of course, persons engaged or employed in different activities may require a different amount in the process of rationing, but I cannot conceive why a person in one State should be called upon to conserve gasoline for defense purposes while another person in another State is allowed an unlimited supply. If the defense needs are such as to require rationing, then the policy adopted should apply to all persons throughout the country, otherwise it will be an unwarranted discrimination and will be equivalent to making special concessions to some, and I have asked for this 1 minute to express my strong conviction against the establishment of such a policy.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address I delivered under the auspices of the Nonsectarian Anti-Nazi League, together with the remarks of the chairman, Prof. James H. Sheldon.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the capital-gains tax, and further to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Maj. Bill O'Dwyer.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Hartford Times.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

OBLIGATIONS OF THE STATES, CITIES, COUNTIES, AND POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that so many States, cities, and political subdivisions are losing their sources of revenue, I believe the House Committee on Ways and Means, which is now considering a tax bill, should seriously consider taking over those obligations under some fair and equitable formula. They amount to about $14,500,000,000. The amount is large, but small compared to the national debt. They involve 197,000 different taxing units. No. 1 is the Federal Government, and then there are the 48 States, with 3,070 counties, and the rest are political subdivisions, school districts, levee districts, and so forth. I would not have these obligations taken over except under some fair and equitable rule, but some consideration should be given to the problem in view of the fact that most of their sources of revenue are now being destroyed. I just wish to invite the attention of the committee to the problem and ask for consideration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article entitled "Congress and the War," written by John A. Heffernan, which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle on June 2, 1942.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Mr. John Reno, engineer, of the National Lumber Manufacturers Association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a report on the Work Projects Administration program in Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article appearing on June 4, 1942, in the New York Sun, written by George Sokolsky.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

GAS RATIONING

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WICKERSHAM addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two topics and in one to include an article from the June issue of Asia and in the other to include an article from the Minnesota Union Advocate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I have two unanimous-consent requests.

First, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a treatise on the monetary policy of this country, adopted under the Constitution; and, second, that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of profits made under the Government's silver policy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

GAS RATIONING

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] says that, because there is rationing of gasoline on the east coast, it ought to be made Nation-wide. I just want to make this simple observation. We do not have snow and ice and blizzards in southern California, but you do have them in Washington, D. C., and therefore, under his reasoning we ought to be forced to have snow and ice and blizzards in California because there are snow and ice and blizzards in Washington, D. C.

I am happy to observe that the proposed Nation-wide gasoline proposal has been shelved, pending an investigation of the scrap-rubber situation.

Once the scrap-rubber problem is solved, gas rationing, excepting in those areas where transportation is a problem, will be forgotten as one of the bad dreams of a little group of bureaucrats who would solve all our problems by statistical formula without regard for the fact that human beings object to being treated as guinea pigs.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD in two respects—in one to include an address by Manuel Giron-Cerna, delivered at Lyons, Kans.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial tribute to King George II, of Greece, whom we welcome in the Capital at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a statement on dry milk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the St. Lawrence seaway and to include a letter from the President of the United States, as well as some correspondence on the Great Lakes-Tidewater Association.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include some correspondence.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF ACT OF 1940

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7164) to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the relief and benefits provided therein to certain persons, to include certain additional proceedings and transactions therein, to provide further relief for persons in military service, to change certain insurance provisions thereof, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there is nothing controversial in this measure and that it can be passed in a few minutes.

Mr. MAY. That is my understanding.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this is the bill the gentleman from Kentucky spoke to me about the other day. It is a unanimous report from his committee, and the gentleman from Kentucky has conferred with the minority members of his committee, and they are agreeable to the request. Has the gentleman conferred with our minority leader, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is the first I have heard of it.

Mr. McCORMACK. That is the reason I asked the question. I know the gentleman from Kentucky has conferred with the assistant of the gentleman from Massachusetts in his absence.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] that I think he has forgotten the fact that I spoke to him about this matter in the Well of the House yesterday morning and discussed the measure one day last week with the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]. It is a bill relating to the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act and carries amendments that the House committee has been studying for many months. It was agreed by the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] that it should be taken up today, and we went to the floor leader, and he agreed to it.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What is the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. MAY. It is for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 7164.

Mr. HARNESS. Can the gentleman tell me about how much time will be consumed in its consideration?

Mr. MAY. It is my understanding that if the unanimous consent is granted, it would pass without debate. I would be willing to make a statement if that is requested on the bill.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, while I want this bill to come up as soon as possible, and would like to see it considered today, it is too highly complicated to pass by unanimous consent. I believe we should have at least 1 hour for debate, so that the bill could be fully explained.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS. Yes.

Mr. MAY. I would like to make an explanation for a moment or two of how this bill came to the House. The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 was passed and the country operated under it for about 15 months. There have been hundreds of thousands of soldiers taken into the service under the provisions of the Selective Service Act since this act went into effect. Certain matters arose relating to the right of action of a landlord against a tenant, or of the holder of a note against the payee and the endorser. There are many complicated technical matters in it, but in order to avoid any difficulty in those matters, I appointed a special committee of three members of the House Military Affairs Committee, consisting of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], and directed them to make a careful and considered study of the whole subject. They did that for several weeks. I understand that they called into conference experts, lawyers, representatives of the Veterans' Administration, of the War and Navy Departments, of the American Bankers Association, and every activity and every branch of the service.

Mr. HARNESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Just one moment. They had those hearings, and brought back to the whole committee this bill, with the recommendation that it be agreed to. Then, in order to be sure that everybody was heard, and that no mistakes were made, I set it down for further hearings and the whole committee conducted extensive hearings, and after those hearings the bill was unanimously reported by the House committee with the recommendation that it pass. It is a complicated matter, but I doubt that debate would add anything to the perfection of the measure.

Mr. HARNESS. I decline to yield any further. Unless we can have at least an hour's debate, I shall be obliged to object to the consideration of the bill. It is most complicated and far reaching in its effect upon the business of the country. I am in favor of the bill and want it enacted as soon as possible but it is too important and too complicated to be passed without debate.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. One moment. I have no objection to an hour's debate, but I do not want to run ahead of the present bill, the matter of the W. P. A. If it is agreeable, Mr. Speaker, I shall ask now that the bill be in order to come up immediately after the completion of the bill under consideration, respecting the W. P. A., and that there be general debate of 1 hour on the measure, to be controlled by myself as chairman of the committee and by the gentleman from Indiana, representing the minority.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object. I have no objection, but I feel that on a request of that kind, the minority members of the committee being agreeable, and the leadership on both sides agreeable, that at least the chairman and the ranking member of the Committee on Rules should be consulted, if only as a matter of courtesy. I suggest to my friend from Kentucky, that before he submit the unanimous-consent request, which can be done later in the day, he consult with the chairman of the Committee on Rules, and the ranking member, because it is only fair and proper that that should be done.

My views on this are known, because I expressed that a few days ago, so that it does not constitute any element of surprise, as far as the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] is concerned.

Mr. HARNESS. I sincerely hope the bill can be considered and debated today. It is vitally important to the men in the service, as well as to their dependents, and should not be delayed any longer than necessary.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman understands my position, does he not?

Mr. HARNESS. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am anxious for it to come up, but on the other hand I think before any action is taken which, as far as this bill is concerned, takes jurisdiction away from the Rules Committee, the members of the Rules Committee, or at least the chairman and the ranking minority member should be consulted. That can be done very easily.

Mr. HARNESS. Yes.

Mr. THOMASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARNESS. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. I always try to go along with my chairman, and I am very anxious to see this bill come up for consideration just as soon as possible, because it does mean much to the men of the service. However, I think in the interest of orderly procedure and fair and full consideration the membership ought to know that it is not only complicated, but it affects the entire contract life of the country. Notes, mortgages, real-estate transactions, bank transactions are all affected. It does seem to me that some agreement should be reached by which there could be a reasonable amount of debate and the bill carefully read for amendment.

Mr. MAY. Let me say I do not care whether it comes up today or not, as far as I am concerned.

Mr. THOMASON. Well, I do.

Mr. MAY. If there is going to be objection to it, all right, but I have made a

reasonable request that unanimous consent be given that it be in order to take this bill up after the completion of the W. P. A. appropriation bill now pending, and that 1 hour be allowed for general debate, the time to be divided and controlled by the ranking member on the minority side and the chairman of the committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the Chair understand that the gentleman from Kentucky is pressing his unanimous-consent request?

Mr. MAY. I am asking unanimous consent that consideration of the bill may follow the pending appropriation bill and that it be understood there be 1 hour of general debate, the time to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS], who stands in the place of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman temporarily withdraw his unanimous-consent request, to follow out the suggestion of the majority leader?

Mr. MAY. I will be glad to withdraw it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think the position of the majority leader is absolutely correct. I think it would be well to withdraw the request at this time.

Mr. MAY. I will be glad to withdraw the request.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a letter jointly addressed to the Secretary of Agriculture by the National Grange, the National Farmers' Union, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the National Council of Farmers' Cooperatives, relative to the exercise of the powers conferred upon the Secretary by section 3 of the Price Control Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a sermon by Dr. John A. Redhead, Jr., of Charlotte, N. C., at the commencement exercises of the University of North Carolina.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Miss RANKIN of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a resolution from the women of the Methodist Church.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include an editorial from the Chicago Tribune and a separate address of a constituent of mine made on Memorial Day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EVACUATION OF FARMERS IN FRANKLIN COUNTY, PA.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, because of an ordnance project being erected in Franklin County, Pa.—part of my congressional district—it became necessary to evacuate 239 farmer families in this area. I am advised that about 30 percent of the farmers were relocated by assistance given to them in the form of loans and grants by the Farm Security Administration.

I want to point to the self-sacrificing patriotism these farm people have displayed in their willingness to cooperate in every manner, for I would not have you forget that many of these fine people have lived in this area for several generations and that they did this without complaint and that they are grateful as well to a Government which tried in every manner to make this evacuation as pleasant as possible.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. HOOK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is no quorum present.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 71]

Baldwin	Ford, Leland M.	Ploeser
Bates, Ky.	Ford, Miss.	Plumley
Baumhart	Gale	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bell	Grant, Ind.	Sacks
Bishop	Harrington	Schaefer, Ill.
Blackney	Holmes	Schulte
Buckler, Minn.	Howell	Scrugham
Burdick	Jarrett	Shanley
Byrne	Jenks, N. H.	Shannon
Clark	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sheridan
Cluett	Kilburn	Sikes
Coffee, Nebr.	Kocialkowski	Smith, W. Va.
Cole, Md.	Kramer	Stratton
Cole, N. Y.	Maas	Sweeney
Copeland	Mason	Tinkham
Culkin	Merritt	Vreeland
Cullen	Mitchell	Walter
Dies	O'Day	Ward
Dirksen	Oliver	Weaver
Ditter	Osmers	Worley
Durham	Paddock	Wright
Ellis	Patrick	Youngdahl
Fellows	Plauché	
Fish		

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and sixty-one Members are present, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered in Chicago by Major General Reybold, Chief of Engineers of the United States Army, before the thirty-sixth annual convention of the National Rivers and Harbors Congress, on Friday, May 29, 1942.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF, FISCAL YEAR 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of House Joint Resolution 324, making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of House Joint Resolution 324, making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, with Mr. WHITTINGTON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. Ordinarily, bills from the Committee on Appropriations are read by paragraphs. This bill, however, contains legislative provisions. I felt that the House ought to know the procedure which is to be followed in reading the bill, whether it will be read for amendment by sections or by paragraphs.

The CHAIRMAN. In response to the parliamentary inquiry of the gentleman from New York, the Chair will state that the gentleman has correctly stated that general appropriation bills are considered by paragraphs. The bill under consideration, however, is not only an appropriation bill but contains legislative authorizations and is being considered under the general rules of the House. The bill therefore will be considered by sections and not by paragraphs.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That this joint resolution may be cited as the "Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1943."

FEDERAL WORKS AGENCY

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION

SECTION 1. (a) In order to continue to provide work for employable needy persons on useful public projects in the United States and its Territories and possessions, there is hereby appropriated to the Work Projects Administration, of the Federal Works Agency, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, $280,000,000, together with all balances of appropriations under section 1 (a) of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1942, which remain unobli-

gated on June 30, 1942, including such unobligated balances of funds transferred to other Federal agencies for nonconstruction projects under the provisions of section 6 (a) of such act for the fiscal year 1942 or set aside for specific purposes in accordance with other law: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds heretofore irrevocably set aside for the completion of Federal construction projects under authority of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of 1938 and 1939, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1941, as amended and supplemented, and the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1942, shall remain available until June 30, 1943, for such completion, and any such funds which remain unobligated by reason of the completion or abandonment of any such Federal construction project shall be returned to this appropriation.

(b) The funds provided in his section shall be available for (1) administration; (2) the prosecution of projects approved by the President under the provisions of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of 1938 and 1939, and the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1941, as amended and supplemented by Public Law 9, Seventy-seventh Congress, and the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1942; and (3) the prosecution of the following types of public projects, Federal and non-Federal, subject to the approval of the President, namely: Highways, roads, and streets; public buildings; parks, and other recreational facilities, including buildings therein; public utilities; electric transmission and distribution lines or systems to serve persons in rural areas, including projects sponsored by and for the benefit of nonprofit and cooperative associations; sewer systems, water supply, and purification systems; airports and other transportation facilities; facilities for the training of personnel in the operations and maintenance of air navigation and landing area facilities; flood control; drainage; irrigation, including projects sponsored by nonprofit irrigation companies or nonprofit irrigation associations organized and operating for community benefit; water conservation; soil conservation, including projects sponsored by soil conservation districts and other bodies duly organized under State law for soil-erosion control and soil conservation, preference being given to projects which will contribute to the rehabilitation of individuals and an increase in the national income; forestation, reforestation, and other improvements of forest areas, including the establishment of fire lanes; fish, game, and other wildlife conservation; eradication of insect, plant, and fungus pests, the production of lime and marl for fertilizing soil for distribution to farmers under such conditions as may be determined by the sponsors of such projects under the provisions of State law; educational, professional, clerical, cultural, recreational, production, and service projects, including training for manual occupations in industries engaged in production for national-defense purposes, for nursing and for domestic service; aid to self-help and cooperative associations for the benefit of needy persons; and miscellaneous projects: *Provided*, That all persons employed on work projects shall, so far as practicable, be employed on projects nearest their respective homes.

(c) The funds appropriated in this section, exclusive of those used for administrative expenses, shall be so administered that expenditure authorizations for other than labor costs for all the work projects financed from such funds in any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia shall not exceed an average for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, of $6 per month per worker, except that the Commissioner of Work Projects (hereinafter referred to as the "Commissioner") may authorize an increase in the average in cases where the increased cost of materials would have the effect of raising such average above $6 but in no event shall the increase in such average exceed the amount necessary to meet such increase in material costs and in no event shall such average exceed $7: *Provided*, That the funds appropriated in this section shall not be used for the purchase of any construction equipment or machinery in any case in which such equipment or machinery can be rented at prices determined by the Commissioner to be reasonable, and his determinations, made in conformity with rules and regulations prescribed by him, shall be final and conclusive: *Provided further*, That the unobligated balance of the $45,000,000 in section 1 (c) of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1942, may be used by the Commissioner to supplement the amounts so authorized for other than labor costs in any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia in connection with the prosecution of projects which have been certified by the Secretary of War, and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, as being important for military or naval purposes.

(d) In administering the funds appropriated in this section, not to exceed three-fourths of the total cost of all non-Federal projects approved after January 1, 1940, to be undertaken within any State, Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, with respect to which any such funds are used, shall be borne by the United States, and not less than one-fourth of such total cost shall be borne by the State and its political subdivisions, or by the Territory, possession, or the District of Columbia, as the case may be: *Provided*, That the provisions of this subsection shall not apply to projects (1) which have been certified by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, as being important for military or naval purposes, or (2) which authorize necessary temporary measures to avert danger to life, property, or health in the event of disaster or grave emergency caused by war, flood, storm, fire, earthquake, drought, or similar cause. The facts constituting compliance with the requirements of this subsection shall be determined by the Commissioner, and his determinations, made in conformity with rules and regulations prescribed by him, shall be final and conclusive.

(e) The funds appropriated in section 1 (a) hereof shall be available to provide, under regulations to be prescribed by the Commissioner, for medical and hospital facilities for work-camp-project employees and burial expenses of deceased work-camp-project employees, including the transportation of remains to place of burial: *Provided*, That deductions shall be made from the earnings of all project employees quartered in such camps in an amount sufficient to offset the estimated cost to the United States for furnishing the foregoing.

(f) When it is found that as a result of bad faith, fraud, or misrepresentation on the part of the sponsor, any land, building, structure, facility, or other project, or any part thereof, upon which funds appropriated in this joint resolution have been expended, is used, transferred, or disposed of without retention and control for public use, the sponsor of the project and the person or organization to which the land, building, structure, facility, or project has been sold, leased, or given, shall be liable, jointly and severally, upon demand of the Commissioner or his duly authorized representative, to pay over to the United States an amount equal to the amount of Federal funds expended on such land, building, structure, facility, or project.

(g) The amount which may be obligated for administrative expenses of the Work Projects Administration in the District of Columbia and in the field shall not exceed in the aggregate the sum of $16,000,000 during the fiscal year 1943, of which sum the amounts so to be obligated for the following respective purposes shall not exceed these sums: Salaries, $14,380,000; communication service, $310,000; travel, $1,000,000; and printing and binding, $160,000: *Provided*, That 5 percent of the foregoing amounts shall be available interchangeably, but not more than 5 percent shall be added to any one limitation: *Provided further*, That not to exceed a total of $100,000 of the foregoing sum of $16,000,000 may be expended for salaries for the Division of Information, or for equivalent services in the central office, and for like services in field offices, and for other costs of preparation of exhibits, radio broadcasts, press releases, bulletins, and other public informational material.

(h) The Work Projects Administration is hereby extended to June 30, 1943, to carry out the purposes of this joint resolution and the Commissioner, with the approval of the Federal Works Administrator, is authorized to prescribe such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out its functions in connection therewith.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 2, line 2, strike out "$280,000,000" and insert "$112,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the total amount carried in this bill on page 2 which I seek to amend is $280,000,000 of direct appropriation plus fifty-six million and some hundred thousands of reappropriations. The total of these two items is $336,000,000. Half of this is $168,000,000. The $112,000,000 which I have proposed plus the reappropriation of the $56,000,000 will make $168,000,000. What I am proposing is to cut the appropriation exactly in two.

I have offered this amendment because I believe that W. P. A. has no useful function to perform at the present time and that this item will give them more than enough money under all circumstances, having regard for those who desire to have the sewing projects, which cost about $12,000,000, and the nursery projects, which cost five or six millions, go on; this will give them more than enough money to do anything they really ought to do.

The relief load is steadily going down. There are people in these statistical organizations who report that the general employment in the country was not as high in April as it was in January. Notwithstanding a general reduction in all relief loads the general relief cases fell nearly 40 percent in that period, indicating that general employment was better. Those figures are still falling; they are falling so rapidly that there is no question in the world but what the country would get along a great deal better without any trimmings of this kind. The farmers cannot get help; people who live in the cities cannot hire help; they cannot find women to clean their houses at 50 cents an hour. People who want to get men to work cannot find men to work at 50 cents an hour. What does this mean? This means that we have a situation where people able to work will not

work because they are on W. P. A. This ought to be corrected. These people ought to go to work on the farms and in the cities where there is something for them to do.

There is not any age limit anywhere any more. I hope that the House will show good sense in this matter; I hope it will show an ability to vote its convictions and vote to cut this down. A vote to cut it down is in favor of the war effort. A vote to keep it up is a vote to squander funds that are needed to maintain our war effort.

Mr. Chairman, it is time that we begin to meet our responsibilities and try to get rid of these encumbrances that are upon the Nation and that are a menace to it. I hope the amendment will be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section be limited to 40 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be controlled by the committee.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, will that give 5 minutes to each Member whose hand is raised?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No. It will give each Member about 4 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, I object. We have not spoken on this bill and those who have not spoken will have the right to make some observations concerning it, especially on the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section be limited to 1 hour, the last 5 minutes to be controlled by the committee.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair take down the names of those whose hands were raised?

The CHAIRMAN. The names of those standing will be taken down. The gentleman from Missouri will restate his request.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour, the last 5 minutes to be allotted to the committee.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, that would preclude any other amendment to this section. Why could not the gentleman confine the request to this particular paragraph, and then take up amendments afterward which will not take very long.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I accept that amendment. I ask that all debate on this amendment conclude in 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the gentleman's request?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I suggest that the request be limited to the pending amendment and amendments thereto. I think there may be other amendments offered to the paragraph.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I accept the suggestion. I ask that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 1 hour, the last 5 minutes to be controlled by the committee.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I would like at least 5 minutes on this matter.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Has the gentleman's name been taken down by the Chair?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman was not standing when the names were taken down of all those who desired recognition on this amendment and amendments under this subsection.

Mr. REED of New York. There was so much confusion I admit I did not realize what was being done.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman's name be included.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, does that mean that each Member whose name has been tabulated will have 5 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Each Member will have 4 minutes. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all debate on any amendments to subparagraph (a) of section B be concluded in 1 hour.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. On the pending amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman did include subsection (a)?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. In response to the gentleman from Massachusetts, I amended my request to include debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment and all amendments thereto be limited to 1 hour. Is there objection?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, may I ask if that limits each speaker to only 4 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent request as propounded, that would limit each speech of those standing to 4 minutes. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] for 4 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, the committee has reported a bill for the appropriation of funds to the Work Projects Administration that will force the reduction of W. P. A. rolls by approximately 60 percent. Under this bill the W. P. A. will be able to maintain only 400,000 people on its rolls throughout the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I should like to point out that 400,000 is the number of unemployed that there are at present in New York City alone. I repeat, the appropriation contained in this bill would be just sufficient to take care of the present unemployed in New York City alone.

The justification advanced for reducing W. P. A. appropriations for 1941 from $875,000,000 to $280,000,000 is that the great expansion of our war industries has resulted in a considerable increase in employment and has thus reduced the need for W. P. A.

I should like to discuss this point as it affects New York City. It is true that on a Nation-wide scale there has been a reduction in the total number of unemployed. While we have by no means put every American to work, a larger number of the laboring people of this country, in the factories, mills, and shipyards of our Nation are turning out the arms and munitions that will smash the Axis Powers. But even on a Nation-wide scale certain factors of great importance are counteracting this increase in employment. There has been, and there will continue to be a substantial decrease in the number of men employed in the consumer goods industries. The conversion of the resources of our Nation to the war effort has already seen the almost complete abolition of those consumer durable goods industries which in past years have provided more employment than any others. The auto industry, the radio industry, the refrigerator and washing machines industries are virtually closed down and hundreds of thousands of workers are unemployed as a result. This factor is a strong pull in the opposite direction of full employment.

Now, in certain sections of the country, we may say that this situation is a temporary one, entailed in the still incomplete shift from consumer industries to war industries. The dislocations caused by this conversion are nonetheless serious for the present, but we may hope to see in the near future, for example, the majority of workers from the auto industry centers using their skills on tanks, planes, and the like.

But what has happened in a city such as New York, which has also suffered a decrease in employment because of the closing down or curtailment of certain consumer goods industries which can no longer get the necessary materials to continue operation.

Shocking as this may seem, it is nevertheless true that the city of New York has to date received only 2 percent of all the prime contracts awarded in connection with our war program. Two percent! This great city, which harbors so many skills and facilities that could help to win this war on the production front, has to date been denied the opportunity of making that contribution. There is no war boom in New York City, far from it. The unemployment situation is still critical, and I warn you that it will become even more critical as more consumer industries must close down, if New York City is not given an opportunity to participate in the vital work that must win the war. I am confident that every Member from the city of New York will bear me out on this point—that if there is not a drastic change in this situation New York City must look to an unemployment figure of between five and six hundred thousand when winter sets in.

Now, clearly, the solution for this is not simply W. P. A. New York must be given the opportunity to use these 400,000 workers who are ready and anxious to toil in the interest of our victory program.

However, the fact remains that at the present time these 400,000 are without means of support. And we here are considering a bill that would necessitate cutting W. P. A. rolls by more than one-half.

I quote from the testimony of Acting Commissioner of the W. P. A., Mr. F. H. Dryden, who told the Subcommittee on Appropriations:

> The program proposed for next year will entail the separation of 370,000 workers from Work Projects Administration employment in the very near future.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot emphasize too strongly the serious results that such a slashing of the rolls will cause in the city of New York.

Commissioner George A. Sloan, of New York City's department of commerce, in his recent report to Governor Lehman predicted that—

> More than 100,000 workers now engaged in nonwar industries in New York City face loss of their jobs because of shortage of materials and purchasing restrictions.

Let us assume that the fight to include New York City in our war-production program gains momentum and that we do succeed in utilizing the resources of that city to a greater extent for war work. Even under the best of circumstances we cannot hope, in the immediate future, to put the 400,000 presently unemployed to work and the 100,000 additional unemployed which Commissioner Sloan has predicted. What is to happen to these people if, regardless of the need, you slash the funds for W. P A.?

The working people of New York want nothing more than to take their places on the production lines in war work. I have hundreds of letters in my office from men presently employed on W. P. A. who are seeking employment in private industry, who want to do their part to win this war. But in New York City private industry is not absorbing them. I hope that it will do so in the future. But we cannot throw families out into the streets on a hope. We cannot, while we are fighting a war, one of whose aims is freedom from want, allow honest men and women to starve.

I had hoped that I would be able to concur in a lowering of W. P. A. appropriations. I had hoped that our production machinery would be operating at such high gear throughout the country that there would be very little need for continued W. P. A. appropriations. But such is not the fact. The fact is that the appropriations contained in this bill for the entire Nation are sufficient for the needs of New York City alone, if the entire amount were used in that city at the present time.

Therefore, in the interest of winning the war, may I advise my colleagues that you cannot conduct a war with men, women, and children who are hungry through no fault of their own.

The CHAIRMAN The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER] for 4 minutes.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, the so-called Taber amendment would reduce the appropriations recommended by the Appropriations Committee from $280,000,000 to $112,000,000. The Appropriations Committee has recommended a 68-percent reduction. The gentleman from my State offers an amendment which would reduce the reduced amount by almost 60 percent. That, indeed, in a city like New York, where I come from, would be tragic.

Mr. TABER. It is only a 50-percent reduction in my program.

Mr. CELLER. $280,000,000 down to $112,000,000.

Mr. TABER. There is a $56,000,000 unexpended balance that is reappropriated.

Mr. CELLER. Whatever it is, I am not going to quarrel with the gentleman as to the exact percentage of the reduction. I say the reduction would be tragic as far as the city of New York is concerned. We have a very desperate situation there. It is said that all those who are unemployed can easily get employment. I tell you they cannot.

If you come to my home on a Sunday, when I usually return to New York, you will find that my home is filled with veterans, men who are beyond the draft age, men who beg and importune me to get some work for them so they can take care of their starving children, their loved ones. I go down into the navy yard and the Army base and war production plants and implore the officials there to put these men on, but I am told that they are beyond age, that they have physical disabilities, that they cannot give the jobs my constituents yearn for.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Is it not a fact that because of the priorities on materials many firms in New York cannot get materials?

Mr. CELLER. Yes, indeed. That is a very grave cause of unemployment. Many of those who are in the cloak and suit business in New York City are folding up day by day by the hundreds because of the ceilings on prices and their inability to get necessary materials. Their employees, laid off and furloughed, cannot get jobs in the Government services in any of the departments, in the war effort, in the Army, in the Navy, or in the Air Corps. What are you going to do with them? You must give them the relief that is contemplated by W. P. A. They do not want charity. They do not want welfare aid. They want work. The situation in my city is intolerable.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CELLER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Did the gentleman ever inquire into the question of what Federal revenues are collected from the State of New York and what you get back in return, and whether or not the State of New York would be much better off if there were no W. P. A. in the country?

Mr. CELLER. I disagree emphatically with the gentleman. The country needs the continuance, even the reduced continuance of W. P. A. We must consider the country as a whole. It would be selfish to consider New York as an isolated section. New York may put into the Government coffers far more than it takes out. But that is not a proper viewpoint.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. The facts show it.

Mr. CELLER. We have pleaters, stitchers, and embroiderers who are precluded now from doing homework because of the regulations of some of the bureaucrats down here. They cannot get substituted employment anywhere. What are we going to do with them? Are you going to dump them into the East River in New York? You must give some aid to them. They must have work.

We have carpenters, hod carriers, electricians, enginemen, and steam fitters who are too old to go into the Government services, who are too old for the Army or the Navy, the navy yard, and the Army base. They are told there is no private building, there is no private construction, and they cannot get jobs on public construction. What are you going to do with them?

I ask you sincerely and honestly, what are you going to do with those men and their families? There are retail salesmen who are without jobs because their employers have no stocks, no goods, no merchandise and cannot get materials, and cannot operate because of the ceilings on prices. We have vast numbers of exporters and importers in New York, who employ large numbers of men. These businesses are in the doldrums. You must give relief to their employees. Auto salesmen and auto mechanics and repairmen, filling-station men—all are without work because of orders from the W. P. B. or O. P. A. They cannot ipso facto go to farms and become farmers over night. Even if they did the Members from the agricultural States would yell like "blue" murder.

The New York City Board of Education, because of lack of money, are laying off and dismissing large numbers of teachers. These group dismissals are creating great havoc and will have an unfavorable repercussion in every section of the country. Following New York City's example, other cities will begin to reduce their educational service. This means more unemployment havoc, not only in New York City, but elsewhere.

The President's statement on relief mentioned 3,000,000 unemployed. A large number of these unemployed are restricted to the so-called depressed areas, of which New York City is the most prominent. In a report to Governor Lehman, Commissioner George A. Sloan, head of New York City's department of commerce, indicated that—

> more than 100,000 workers now engaged in nonwar industry in New York City face loss

of their jobs because of shortage of materials and purchasing restrictions.

Already 300,000 persons in New York City are registered as unemployed with the United States Employment Service. That this number is greater than the total employment in all the war industries in New York City was indicated in Commissioner Sloan's report to Governor Lehman. It is estimated that this number will increase to from 500,000 to 600,000 in the coming period unless the bottleneck in this city is lifted.

Realizing the seriousness of the unemployment problem in the depressed areas, a series of conferences were called by Governor Lehman to discuss the possibility of utilizing surplus available labor and production facilities in New York City.

Governor Lehman said:

We have compared figures, and we see eye to eye in regard to the fact that there is a very large reservoir of surplus unemployed labor in New York City and a large supply of unused production facilities. We intend to lay the facts before responsible Federal officials who are charged with the duty of procurement and production. We also expect to call the facts to the attention of President Roosevelt.

That this is a serious problem has been recognized by responsible Government authorities, and it can readily be seen that as long as this problem exists it would be impractical and unjust to cut the rolls of the Work Projects Administration until the situation is satisfactorily cleared up. It is highly improbable that by July 1, when the new appropriation for Work Projects Administration takes effect, the problem of unemployment in the depressed areas will be completely solved.

I herewith append a letter received from the W. P. A. teachers-of-homebound-children program, New York City, N. Y., as follows:

WORK PROJECTS ADMINISTRATION TEACHERS-OF-HOMEBOUND-CHILDREN PROGRAM, NEW YORK CITY

Whereas—

1. The teaching of homebound children of the Work Projects Administration teachers, working in conjunction with the New York City Board of Education, has been a necessary and vital program rather than a supplementary one; and has, since 1935, provided instruction for over 2,500 physically handicapped children suffering from chronic medical diseases. During this time we have provided for children who suffer from epilepsy, diabetes, poliomyelitis, cardiac conditions, hydrocephalus, cerebral palsy, lukemia, nephritis, bronchial asthma, osteomyelitis, etc. An enriched program which includes not only academic education, but recreation, health instruction, arts and crafts, vocational preparation, physical therapy, mental hygiene, and medical social service.

During the summer vacation period of the board of education, the project service is made available to all homebound children of New York City, including those regularly under the supervision of the board of education. This is of particular value to the underprivileged children who are forced to spend long, hot summer days in the noisy, dusty city. These visits of the project teacher maintain the level of rehabilitation of the child during this period. His physical welfare is guarded, his educational achievement is sustained, and, above all, the morale of the child is maintained. A suspension of instruction for cases of cerebral palsy, poliomyelitis, retarded and over-aged children would cause a noticeable set-back in their rehabilitation.

In addition to the prevention of maladjusted lives, the service of the project makes possible a more tangible saving. Under the instruction of project teachers, these children advance in their studies in accordance with their capacity. Many of these children accomplish more than a term's work during the 5-month period of instruction. When they reenter school, they are returned to classes which closely approximate their age level. Each child brought up to grade represents the elimination of a potential "left back" and cost of a repeated grade.

The New York City educational budget is being cut rather than expanded during this time of war emergency, and has not as yet provided for teachers for these children.

There exists at present in New York City a large waiting list of physically handicapped children without instruction. Abandoning the Work Projects Administration home instruction project will greatly augment the present waiting list.

Our children are, and must be, our first line of defense. May we, the teachers of Work Projects Administration physically handicapped children of New York City, respectfully urge that this project be declared essential to defense and be retained as a "vital and necessary program" for the duration.

I also attach herewith my reply to the above letter:

MAY 29, 1942.

Dr. O'BRIEN,
Acting head, Board of Education,
Brooklyn, N. Y.

MY DEAR DR. O'BRIEN: I am interested in the homebound children program which is being carried out by Work Projects Administration teachers in conjunction with the New York City Board of Education.

Instruction is being provided for over 2,500 physically handicapped children, and the program not only involves academic instruction, but recreation, health instruction, arts and crafts, vocational preparation, physical therapy, mental hygiene, and medical social service. About 35 teachers engage in this work. The services rendered are indeed invaluable.

Certain appropriations for the Work Projects Administration, as you know, will be cut. Drastic curtailments will be made, curtailments that will cut off the salaries of these teachers, and the homebound children program will suffer unless the New York City Board of Education interferes to supply funds for its continuation. It is indeed hoped that the New York City education budget can be expanded for continuation of this project.

There exists in New York City a large waiting list of physically handicapped children. Complete abandonment of this homebound children program will be calamitous. Is there not some way by which New York City might find the ways and means of continuing this project?

I am vastly interested and want to be of help. I do indeed invite your interest.

Yours truly,

EMANUEL CELLER.

Failure to provide W. P. A. funds for these teachers, catering to physically handicapped children, is a most serious situation.

These children will be without medical and educational attention. Every effort should be made to provide the funds so that their needs will be satisfied.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], who just addressed you, has been an ardent New Dealer. The other gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] makes complaint of the same situation. Admitting all that both say is true, two complaints are made, one against the administration for not giving New York City war contracts or letting you have raw materials so your industries can operate in the city of New York. That is one complaint you make. We on the minority side do not have anything to do with that. The New Deal politicians control that situation. Why do you not go to the administration, to those who are administering this war program and spending these billions of dollars, and make your complaint to them and get relief if you are entitled to it?

The other complaint you make is that your people are out of work and threatened with starvation. Admitting the truth of that, who is to blame? We all realize there are many new adjustments which must be made and that some will cause serious suffering.

Take the situation in our own little towns throughout the Middle West. We are not getting war contracts. They are going into the big cities, Detroit, Pontiac, Lansing, and similar places. In addition, the little industries we have are being destroyed, because of lack of raw material, which leaves our people in exactly the same situation in which you of New York City find your people.

All of us throughout this country depend for what we eat upon the crops which in the first instance come from the land. Day by day we add to the number of Federal employees. Day by day, month after month, and year by year, we increase the number of those who are drawing compensation from the Federal Government, of those who are receiving subsidies, gratuities, relief in other forms, all the money, billions upon billions, being taken by some process from the working taxpayers.

We are being asked every few months to appropriate billions upon billions of dollars for national defense, for the carrying on of the war, for aid to our Allies.

It may be there is no limit to the amount which can be appropriated. It may be that by borrowing, by issuing bonds, or, in the last instance, by printing money, we can obtain the billions needed, or asked and appropriated. There are those of us, however, who believe that some day will come the time when printed money or bonds may mean nothing and that we shall be forced to depend upon what we can produce from the land, upon what we can create by machines. Our war efforts, our efforts to care for our own needy and unfortunate, are doomed to failure unless every last resource of our Nation, of our people, be utilized.

It is heartbreaking to realize that the picture painted by the two gentlemen from New York [Mr. CELLER and Mr. MARCANTONIO], who just preceded me, may be all too true. But let me repeat, the situation of their people is no worse than that of hundreds of thousands who live in towns, the smaller cities in the rural districts of this country.

The businessmen in those small towns and cities have been forced out of existence by the thousands, yes, by the hun-

dreds of thousands, because they have no more automobiles to sell; because their supply of rubber goods, of tires, of essential oils, a hundred and one articles of merchandise, has been either curtailed or shut off entirely. Many a mechanic has lost his job because the factory in which he worked, engaged in peacetime production, is now closed. It may be that because of conditions over which he has no control he is unable to get to the city and work on a war job.

Farms have been stripped of the young men who formerly cultivated them. Yes; our people, too, let me say to you gentlemen from New York City, have lost their businesses. They have been forced out of their jobs, and they, too, do not know where to turn from day to day, to find the money to purchase the food, the clothing, and the shelter, which they need to pay the taxes which are imposed upon their humble homes and which they must pay or be thrown out into the streets. And so what are our people doing?

The people in towns, the old folks and the children are cultivating their gardens. They are doing odd jobs They are scrimping and saving and doing without many of the things which, before December 7, were considered necessities. Many of them, old men and children, are joining the farmers in the surrounding countrysides, and as you drive through the country in my district you will find these old men and women and these children, many, many times down on their knees in the muck, on the land, weeding sugar beets, mint, wormwood, vegetable crops of all kinds.

You will find others, men and women both, on tractors cultivating the fields, keeping the crops free from weeds. Farmers' wives and women from the towns riding the tractors during the daytime; their husbands or the old superannuated men or children, some I have seen were no older than 14 years, driving tractors in the fields by night by the aid of headlights they carry.

The folks in the country, in the small towns, are getting along. They are getting along by hard work. No 30 hours per week for them. The cows must be milked at least twice a day and no cow has yet learned anything about time and a half and overtime or double time for holidays or Sundays. These people get along because they deny themselves; because they sacrifice; because they work long hours, and they are contributing out of their meager earnings all they can by the purchasing of stamps and bonds. They can, and they will, support themselves and they can, and they will, aid the Government in defeating its enemies. But they cannot, no matter what their desire, support in the big cities of our country, cities like New York, hundreds of thousands of people, who, even though they are without fault, have no jobs.

Our people just cannot, because it is a physical and an economic impossibility, support all those who heretofore have lived in the cities, who now, deprived, through no fault of their own, of their jobs, of their businesses, of their incomes, still choose to live in those cities.

As in other lands, the day may come, it may be here now, when the people in the cities, whether they will or not, must go back to Mother Earth and there, from her breast, through their efforts, however difficult it may be, gain their livelihood.

Help the needy—give them work, but do it through appropriation to the States to be spent by the local authorities and put an end to the unjustifiable administrative expenses which eat up the money which should go to those who deserve assistance.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. ROBINSON of Utah). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. THOM] for 4 minutes.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Chairman, the appropriation as recommended by the committee, contemplates a reduction of the W. P. A. rolls from 785,000 to 400,000 persons. To cut this appropriation in accordance with the amendment of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] would further reduce the committee quota of 400,000 men and women after July 1. If I were the rankest conservative in this House I would not champion such an inhuman proposal. It would mean not only throwing the men out of jobs but also leaving their families helpless. Perhaps most of them would be forced to go on general relief.

In my home district I no longer have any large W. P. A. rolls. I am happy about this, but I live in a defense area. Just incidentally, I may say, that we had rolls of 6,000 or 7,000 men on W. P. A. A great many men on this floor, again and again, said that these rolls would never be reduced because we had demoralized the W. P. A. workers, and they would not return to private industry. The events in this defense area have just proved the contrary.

But in opposing this cut I have in mind those sections where there are no defense industries. If you examine the records you will find that the State of Missouri has 33,000 on the W. P. A. rolls, more than the State of New Jersey. The State of New Jersey is a manufacturing State, with large numbers of industrial plants that are fabricating war materials. Missouri is not a State in which defense industries predominate and therefore the unemployment problem remains in the State of Missouri.

Oh, they say the unemployed can get a job house cleaning. Well, let us analyze that. That means a day or 2 days of work a week and it gives no stability. If a person doing that work depends upon it for a livelihood it is very possible that she will find herself working a few days a week and then will be idle for the balance of the week. I believe those men and women ought to have some stability in their lives not provided by odd jobs.

Unemployment is an inescapable and, of course, wholly undesirable byproduct of the profit system as we know it. When you move to relieve the unemployed you directly and effectively strengthen the business economy we now maintain.

This is a simple doctrine that has been slow of acceptance because a supreme indifference on the part of many has inclined them to accept what is, rather than risk what might be.

The first large international business crisis occurred in 1847.

The Second Republic of France, in 1848, as a result of this catastrophe, laid down certain principles relating the state to the problem of unemployment, as follows:

> The Government of the French Republic pledges itself to guarantee the livelihood of the worker by labor.
>
> It pledges itself to guarantee work for all citizens.

In its machinery to realize these ideals it resorted to drastic steps that were impractical and visionary.

Since that pronouncement, the United States, until the Roosevelt administration came to power, has shied away from attempting in any sensible way to alleviate unemployment.

The laissez-faire advocates always insisted that with free enterprise permitted to function without government interference there would be no appreciable unemployment.

We had an era from 1920 to 1930 that found the investing public subscribing lavishly to corporation shares, with a Government that looked kindly on business, good or bad, and yet, out of this period of laissez-faire, we inherited the greatest mass unemployment in our history.

Since public-works programs have been criticized as an answer to unemployment, let me read you another approach that was once but no longer pursued in Ohio to solve the problem.

The Ohio State Archaeological and Historical Society has in its exhibit a poster of the year 1866 that describes how the indigent were treated.

Headed "Sales of paupers," the broadside read as follows:

> There will be sold on Wednesday, May 16, 1866, Mary Hauk and Della Hengst, paupers, of Polk Township, Crawford County, Ohio, to the lowest responsible bidders for 1 year. Terms of pay for keeping said paupers—half in 6 months from day of sale and the remainder at the expiration of the year.

We now send such persons to the Work Projects Administration for the opportunity of honest employment.

After a hundred years of national neglect of this problem, the Democratic Farty, in its platform of 1936, adopted in spirit the philosophy of the French Republic of 1848, when it declared:

> We believe that unemployment is a national problem and that it is an inescapable obligation of our Government to meet it in a national way.

In my opinion, that pronouncement is not only a milestone in political thought and action but it is a policy that no party, in times of mass unemployment, will dare to deviate from.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] for 4 minutes.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I can think back to 1933 and succeeding years,

to the lengthy discussions relating to this sort of relief. I am looking at my friend the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] who said here yesterday that he did not at all disagree but that there were better ways than this to take care of the needy. He believes in pensions and social security and not in the humiliation of accepting relief. Is there no humiliation in pensions at 60 years of age and the taxpayers taking care of them? To force my neighbors to pay me a pension simply because of age would be humiliating to me and might anger the taxpayers.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Would the gentleman want me to answer?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; very quickly.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think that is very different, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. GIFFORD. You have answered the question. I am glad, however, that you agree there are better ways than this W. P. A. method. I believe if a man is out of a job he should, perhaps, be taken care of for a time. We have this unemployment insurance. Relief is somewhat different. We seem to be teaching our boys and girls in the schools that it is humiliating to accept certain jobs. Housewives in this country can get but little assistance nowadays in the way of domestic servants. Good ways and easy conditions do not attract. They lose self-respect if they render domestic service. But these young ladies will join in groups for sewing under W. P. A. I could approve of these sewing projects if anything of that sort is proven necessary. Let us see if you can employ one of them at $4 a day or $17 a week and found for housework. Of course there are exceptions. No; it is "humiliating." They lose their self-respect if they do that sort of work. But work under W. P. A. supervision seems not to be so regarded.

You have often promised that you would do away with this form of relief. You apparently will cut off the dog's tail little by little, thinking that will make it easy for him. It would be easier for him to cut it off entirely and have it over with.

We should adopt proper relief methods, taking this burden from the Federal Government, under which plan some of the States "sponge" on the others. Every State should take care of its own relief problem by this time. Do not further deceive as to so-called war projects. Often lately I have passed by a railroad leading to a military camp where they are bringing soil for some 10 miles and putting it on some 4 to 6 inches deep and seeding to beautify the banks of this road. Trucks are carrying men 80 miles a day—and it is a W. P. A. project. Is this saving gasoline or saving rubber? We are now hearing from the taxpayers in no uncertain tone of remonstrance. This is an expensive and extravagant form of relief, and it must be stopped.

Visit community centers with only the W. P. A. supervisors left to be taken care of. These projects are continued long after they ceased to attract customers. How many crimes these days are committed in the name of relief!

I have pleaded every year for a house cleaning. It is not a question of whether a community needs help. A wealthy town will say, "We have a project, we are entitled to our share," and they take it. Massachusetts can take care of its own and she would. New York City, the richest city in the world, is constantly pleading for these funds. Can they not take care of their own? Under the present methods of taxation New York not only pays for their own share but the share of many others who will not take care of their own.

Passing strange that so many of our Representatives from New York plead so eloquently for this method which forces that State to such added expense. Even at the sum contemplated in this bill it is not so persuasive for vote getting as formerly.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I have but 4 minutes; I cannot yield. Even our liberal President says that this is a narcotic, and it should be stopped. If we are ever to stop, now is the time, with the present 25-percent increase of all time in employment. If we cannot stop now we never will. So many desire relief to be a Federal matter so that many States profit greatly thereby. But why not try to save money in so many of these superfluous and extravagant projects? Of course the administrators and supervisors will plead eloquently for its continuance.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, let me say to those gentlemen who advocate the almost complete elimination of the W. P. A. program, that they are seeking to accomplish, in the name of economy, a goal that is fraught with dangerous possibilities for many communities and tragic consequences for hundreds of thousands of unfortunate individuals.

Let me call your attention that there are even now hundreds of thousands of automobiles being taken off the Nation's highways with the result that countless millions of dollars in gas tax is being lost.

Many of these communities have used this gas tax to implement their meager revenues. In this way they were enabled to make vitally necessary public improvements. With the loss of this revenue they would naturally turn to W. P. A. for aid. Eliminate W. P. A. and they are left stranded. This is of itself bad policy and penny-wise and pound-foolish economy.

But there is a human side to this matter. We all know that there are millions of men and women too old, or physically unfit, to secure work in private enterprise. What is to become of these people? Are we going to turn them back on impoverished communities? If we do, there is but one answer, untold suffering and want and misery. Do not do this, gentlemen. It will be a blot on the escutcheon of this great body for all time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, it was stated by the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] that this would reduce the relief roll 50 percent. I do not think that that is the case at all. It seems to me that if we cut this down to $112,000,000, with the surplus they have left over from last year, you will not reduce the number of employees by that amount. The situation as I see it is just this. Wherever we can eliminate any expenditure of funds that are not essential and absolutely necessary now for the prosecution of this war, we ought to do it. That is your duty, and that is your responsibility, and that belongs to me as well. Why should we not cut this down, when the Government today is spending the fabulous sums it is spending for the prosecution of the war. It can be done without harm to the country. We are creating in practically every center of this country so many new jobs that the people of the country are not able to fill the jobs in certain locations. In those locations where they want to continue the W. P. A., we should in some way try to transfer the people from unemployment in those locations to the districts that are requiring additional help. Up in my district we have more jobs than we have people to fill them. That applies not only to the farms, but as well to industry, and you cannot get people up there for work now, because we have so much doing, so many jobs created by agriculture and other work created.

What we want to do is to go to these other districts and, if necessary, where there are no jobs, take the people and import them into these other districts where they need workers, and make every dollar count.

You know that I have been bringing to your attention every day the statement of the Treasury. I have the June 8 statement here. You know that I said that by the 30th of June we would be in the red $18,000,000,000. Here it is now, the 8th of June, and let me show you where you are. You are in the red now $18,537,537,502.70—over half a billion dollars more than $18,000,000,000—and we have only reached the 8th day of June. By the 30th of June, at the rate you are going now, you will be a billion and a half more in the red. Next year $30,000,000,000 will be added to this national debt, and with a national debt now of $75,000,000,000, where will you get the money? Do you know how you are going to be able to keep this country afloat, when the Ways and Means Committee are over there sweating blood trying to find ways of taxing the people, even to give some semblance of approaching in collections the amount that we are spending? It is getting to be a desperate situation. What ought we to do with the W. P. A.? I think that the States and the local communities in some way ought to find some way to take care of these people and to get some jobs for them. We have created in the minds of the people of this country today the idea that the Federal Government will keep them and that they do not have to go out and hunt for a job. We have put wishbones in the backs of the American people where their backbones ought to be. That is not the way we were brought up in years gone by. Men then had to go out and they had to strive and hunt a job and work, they had to try every way they could to get a job to earn a

livelihood, and that is what we want them to do today.

This business of creating jobs in orchestras, bands, and sewing circles, as well as professional dancers, has become a racket. It is not essential to our national security. It will not win the war. Why, in the name of heaven, do we not get some common sense and strike out these nonessentials? You want people to buy bonds; will they have confidence in you in keeping on spending so foolishly? Certainly not. Then, why not stop it? You will not create confidence in the American people until you do. Do it now before it is too late. Win the confidence of the American people if you are to win the war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] referred to the struggle of the Ways and Means Committee in its endeavor to raise $8,700,000,000. That is true. We have been going through that struggle since the 3d day of March, and it is no small job to try to find that amount of money to superimpose on the legislation already existing, which carries over $16,500,000,000 a year, and then, when you figure that the people must carry a burden of $10,000,000,000 a year in State and local taxes, or over $35,000,000,000 annually, and that is for only 1 year, perhaps you will then get some idea of whether it is necessary or not to cut down these unnecessary expenditures.

Mr. Chairman, the time has come when all the frills and fancies of the New Deal will have to yield to a paramount national necessity, which is to win the war, win it quickly, and to do so with the least possible sacrifice of American soldiers and sailors.

We cannot effectively husband our resources for an all-out world-wide war unless the Congress acts now to dispense with the New Deal political foibles and fads which have no place whatever in a national defense program. I take this opportunity to call attention of the House to the present fiscal situation of our Government as an urgent reason why this amendment reducing W. P. A. $168,000,000 should prevail. I remind you, Mr. Chairman, that when President Roosevelt took office on March 4, 1933, the public debt of the United States stood at slightly less than $21,000,000,000.

By June 30 of this year it will have risen to a level of, roughly, seventy-seven and one-half billions, counting both direct obligations of $71,800,000,000 and the fully guaranteed obligations of Government corporations and lending agencies amounting to $5,700,000,000.

Thus in the course of a little over 9 years the national debt will have been increased over three and a half times.

Not all of this increase has been due to the defense program, which was not inaugurated until the summer of 1940. On the contrary, a large part of it was incurred during the New Deal boondoggling period. By June 30, 1940, the debt had already been increased to approximately forty-three billions, not including some five and one-half billions of guaranteed obligations. Thus up to that time there had been a $22,000,000,000 increase in direct obligations alone before a single dollar had been spent under the emergency defense program. This debt is all we have to show for the New Deal spending spree.

Just as all of the increase in the debt prior to July 1, 1940, was the result of New Deal extravagance, a part of the debt incurred since that time may still be attributed to nonessential spending, since up to the present time the administration has failed to curtail the high level of nonmilitary spending which has prevailed throughout all the New Deal period.

What is the situation we face as to the future? While the administration will have added some twenty-two billions to the national debt during the current fiscal year, which ends June 30, it will add some fifty billions more in the ensuing year, even if seven billions of new taxes are imposed. By June 30 next year, the direct debt of the United States will have risen to one hundred and twenty-five and one-half billions, to which must be added the guaranteed debt of five and one-half billions, making a total of one hundred and thirty-one billions.

The public debt can be expected to rise still further in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944. Up to the present time, Congress has appropriated some one hundred and sixty-four billions for war purposes. Additional requests of thirty-five billions now pending will bring the war program, since June 1940, to approximately two hundred billions.

During the fiscal year 1941 we spent for defense purposes approximately six billions.

In the current fiscal year we will spend some twenty-six billions.

In the next fiscal year, beginning July 1, we will spend an estimated sixty-seven billions.

Thus by June 30, 1943, our total expenditures for war purposes out of the total program of $200,000,000,000 will be roughly one hundred billions, leaving another one hundred billions still to be expended without any further increase in the war program.

If we actually spend sixty-seven billions on the war effort next year, it will involve about 60 percent of our productive facilities. The likelihood of our spending any more than sixty-seven billions in 1944 is remote. Also, it seems unlikely that we would be able to raise much more revenue in 1944 than in 1943. Thus it would seem fair to assume that the public debt in the fiscal year 1944 will increase by approximately the same amount as in 1943, or about fifty billions. At this rate, our national debt should reach about $180,000,000,000 by June 30, 1944. It is not safe to make conjectures beyond that date.

I know it is a difficult matter to grasp exactly what is involved in a national debt of the size with which we are faced. The figures are too astronomical in size for the human mind to comprehend. According to the last agricultural census, the total value of agricultural land and buildings in this country in the year 1940 was about thirty-three and one-half billions. Our national debt at the end of next month will be about 2⅓ times that amount, and at the end of the ensuing fiscal year it will be four times that amount.

The World Almanac estimates that the total assessed value of all real estate in this country, urban and rural, is about $112,000,000,000, and by June 30, 1943, the national debt will exceed that amount by nearly twenty billions.

The per capita debt burden in the United States has increased rapidly in the last several years. On March 4, 1933, it was $176. By June 30, 1941, it had increased to about $360. On June 30, this year, it will be about $580, and by the same time next year it will be $1,000 for each man, woman, and child in the country, or $4,000 per family of four.

The interest on the national debt is mounting at a tremendous rate. In 1933, it was $742,000,000 a year, which is about what it cost to run the entire operations of the Government just before World War No. 1. By 1941, the interest burden had increased to $1,218,000,000 annually. On the basis of a current average interest rate of 2.4 percent, the annual interest charge on the direct debt of the Government will be about $1,720,000,000 by June 30 of this year, and approximately three billions by June 30, 1943. This latter figure compares with a total cost of Government in 1927 of $3,400,000,000.

The tremendous Federal debt, present and prospective, is not only a great burden on the taxpayers by reason of the heavy interest charges, but it constitutes an increasing threat to national solvency, and as it continues to increase it carries with it a further step down the road of inflation, which may mean printing press money and ultimate repudiation.

While we must at all costs finance our war program, the administration should hold additional borrowing to a minimum and it ought to eliminate all waste, extravagance, and all forms of boondoggling in the expenditures of Government. Unless the administration does this we are faced with the terrible consequences of a ruinous inflation such as occurred in Germany, Russia, and France after the first World War.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] for 4 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, in offering brief comment on the speech of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED], who just preceded me, I may say that of the national debt of the United States it happens that on August 1, 1941, $22,000,000,000 was the amount of that debt which had been acquired by the sale of interest-bearing obligations of the American people to private banking institutions for credits on those bank bonds where the banks created the money and the people pay interest on it. No sovereign government ever should pay interest to any private

agency for the use of credit of the nation itself. That portion of the national debt ought never to have been national debt at all.

In his speech awhile ago my good friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] made mention of my remarks of yesterday. In my speech yesterday I made the statement that there were, in my opinion, other ways that would be better as an approach to the solution of the problem of unemployment than the W. P. A. I do believe that. I believe a universal social-security and old-age-pension system whereby we would retire people who have passed a certain age in a direct, orderly and decent manner, and thus and by other corollary methods make it possible for all people in the prime of life to have jobs. I have supported W. P. A. bills before because they constituted the principal method we had at hand to combat unemployment.

But this bill comes before us today under very different circumstances from those under which W. P. A. bills have come before us heretofore. We do not need more money in circulation at the present time in order to stimulate business. Quite the contrary is the case. This bill comes before us and presents Members of the House with the necessity of answering this question: Do you believe it better to make use of the labor of at least a part of the people who are not equipped for the high-speed war industry jobs in certain types of work that will be of direct assistance to our Nation at the present time and will give those people an opportunity for self-respecting employment, or do you think it is better to have those people on county and State relief rolls? Now that is the question.

Under the committee bill there will be some 350,000 such people now employed by W. P. A. who will have to be laid off. Under the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York there will be 550,000 who will have to be laid off. What are the things that those people can do? A very large percentage of those people are women, white-collar workers, or older men. Does anybody really think that American citizens in their right minds are going to deliberately remain on W. P. A. at $55 a month when they can make the wages they can make in a lot of the war industries? Some of the gentlemen who want to kill this bill have been the very ones who have been talking about these big wages. It simply does not make sense.

Furthermore, I am strongly of the opinion that no W. P. A. administrator in this country would permit people to remain on W. P. A. if there were need for their employment elsewhere. In a total of 1,000 counties throughout this country W. P. A. has been done away with in order that there should be no possibility of it conflicting with the need for agricultural labor. There are a number of things where people who are now employed by W. P. A. can be used, and they are not people who have been able to catch on to the high-speed defense industries. It is a case of utilizing the labor of certain people that cannot be used any other way. My plea is that it is better to do that than it is to put them on direct relief. I agree with the people who talk about the fact that it is bad to give hand-outs to people. That is the reason I support this bill. I am against giving hand-outs to the people. I believe it is better for them and for the Nation if they are at work.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS] for 4 minutes.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I supported W. P. A. I have always voted for the amount that the President of the United States said was necessary to take care of W. P. A. I recall very distinctly my own home being picketed because I would not vote for $350,000,000 more than the President said was necessary. But I think we have reached the point in this country at the present time when the States should take care of the unemployed.

I think if I took it up with the Governor of the State of Wisconsin, and said to him, "I think we ought to take care of the unemployed in the State of Wisconsin," he would be very glad to say, "We will do it."

I want to pay my respects to the administrator of W. P. A. in the State of Wisconsin for reducing the rolls there by telling men who are on the W. P. A., and they were without jobs, that they had to go out and help the farmers take care of their farms. Many of them refused to do it; but when they were taken off the rolls and told they would have to work or they would not eat, they went out and went to work.

In a county in my district there is this situation where over 50 percent of the people were on W. P. A. a few years ago. This letter comes from the mayor of a city up there, and I think it might be well for every Member to listen to what this man has to say, because what applies there in that county which has had the relief they had applies to other places.

He said:

Hon. JOSHUA L. JOHNS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This appeal is made to you in an effort to keep the city of Crandon out of bankruptcy.

Here is the situation: About 16 months ago this city began, with Work Projects Administration assistance, the construction of a waterworks and sewage-disposal system. In order to raise the city's share of the projects, bonds in the aggregate amount of $55,000 were issued and sold. Under the existing policy of the Work Projects Administration, which is sending every possible registered man to vocational school for the alleged purpose of economic rehabilitation, it is becoming impossible to complete either project. This fact renders increasingly evident the proposition that the city will derive no income from incomplete utilities and will have to pay interest and premium on the bond issue out of general taxation.

If any intelligence were used in the selection of men for this vocational training, I would be in hearty accord with the project. However, such is not the case. To illustrate, men in the 60- to 65-year age group are being assigned for vocational training when it is almost universally recognized that these men cannot have any chance of securing employment in private industry. One Work Projects Administration employee of a younger group was assigned for vocational training and within a short time thereafter was discharged from induction into the Army because of mental deficiency.

A further fact bearing out the contention of persons who seem to know is that none of the personnel who have completed courses in Work Projects Administration vocational training from this county have secured employment in a vocation in which they took training. A committee from this city visited the district Work Projects Administration headquarters at Green Bay yesterday and cited cases of four employees, all in the age group of 60 to 65 years who had been assigned for training, and none of whom could either read or write.

I have been informed that the present Work Projects Administration policy, above detailed, has been instituted with only one thing in view. The reported purpose is to have on the vocational-training roster the maximum number of persons when the Work Projects Administration appeals to Congress for a continuance of its efforts.

Will you kindly use your best efforts to assist this community in maintaining on the two projects in this city a sufficient number of persons to complete the utilities mentioned?

Very truly yours,

ALFRED KALKOFEN.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] made the statement that people have a wishbone where their backbone ought to be. Yes; they were wishing back about 1933, and then along came the New Deal of the Democratic Party and put in their hearts hope where despair had been before—took the wish out and gave substance to the things their hearts desired; took them out of starvation and soup lines and gave them work and food.

The W. P. A. has done great good in this Nation. I do not believe any program has ever been undertaken by any country in the world that has accomplished so much good for the country, the Nation, in both physical and humane value. Certainly the kind of work and the number of projects that have been carried on have brought criticism for mistakes, because nobody can do things on such a big scale and not make some mistakes. I am proud of the fact that there has been very little, if any, scandal connected with the W. P. A. It has been honest, and the Democratic Party may well be proud of that. The W. P. A. program, nevertheless, will go down in history as one of the greatest accomplishments of the world in the interest of the common man.

It is necessary to remember—and I say this advisedly—that there is a definite move to wipe out all the New Deal agencies, those agencies that have done such great good for this Nation because they have helped the common man. A group of conservatives who have no use for the common man have for a long time now been trying to wipe out everything that has been done for the common good of the average man Oh, yes. They practically wiped out the C. C. C. camps, but who were the boys who went to the C. C. C. camps? They were the

sons of the common men. They cut down N. Y. A. and would like to wipe it out. Who were the boys who received help from the N. Y. A.? They were the sons of the common men of America. I note that they voted in favor of training men for industry because it was help for the big industrialist but voted against helping boys remain in school and college because it would be help for the poor boy; yes, and it was the common man who received help from the W. P. A. During the time those agencies were so popular the very men who now criticize them dared not do so when it was unpopular to do so. Now they feel they can hide behind the war program and use that as a reason to ease their conscience. Their hearts were always against the poor man but they needed the poor man's vote so they at least kept quiet and did not work openly against the measures.

Let me warn you that those very men, the common men of this Nation, who were helped by the New Deal, are the men who will cast the votes in this election as they have in other elections. Let me call attention to the fact that if it were not for the W. P. A. you would have had malnutrition running rampant in this Nation. There are many young men whose health would have been ruined because of lack of food if it were not for the New Deal agencies. You would not have the fine boys you have today to make up the Army we are sending to the front to fight the Axis if it were not for the W. P. A. and other New Deal agencies. It was because of the foresight of the Democratic Party and the foresight to meet the issue, and some of you progressive Republicans who helped us, that we have been able to bring these boys into the fighting forces, happy to know they are not broken down in health through malnutrition; we are happy to know we have helped the farmer, and we have helped the common man of this Nation to live a better life, and to now be in a position to call on them to help win this war. They feel they have something to fight for.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER] is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor today for the purpose of rejoining to the remarks made by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] immediately following my remarks of yesterday on this resolution. I notified the gentleman from Missouri that I intended to make this rejoinder, and I am glad he is present to hear what I have to say.

In speaking yesterday I called attention first to the fact that in this time of national crisis every man, woman, and child in our country is being required to put his pocketbook on the firing line. I stated further that the American people are entitled to receive full value for every dollar of their money spent by the Government. I made the point, the incontrovertible point, that many of these W. P. A. projects are absolutely useless, that they simply amount to digging holes and filling the holes up again.

I maintained, and now earnestly maintain, that it is distinctly for the welfare of the country and for the good of the recipients of this relief to terminate the work relief system as soon as possible and to use the productive capacity of the employable men and women now on the W. P. A. rolls in constructive, useful work. The gentleman from Missouri, however, concluded that I was attacking the W. P. A. and asking for its abolition. In that connection, I refer to this excerpt from my remarks of yesterday:

> I am not maintaining that we should kill Work Projects Administration entirely this year, because I realize that it would be impractical to do so. However, I do maintain that we should terminate the system of manufactured work and work relief as soon as possible and practical, for the good not only of the needy themselves but for the good of the various communities.

I cannot let go unchallenged the statement of the gentleman from Missouri that the work now being done by the W. P. A. in my home city of New York is of useful and lasting good. I have the documentation here to refute that statement, but in the 4 minutes at my disposal it is, of course, impossible to present a full and clear picture.

I may say, however, there are 54 projects that have been approved for inclusion in the program for New York City since the beginning of the Seventy-seventh Congress. I have before me here on the lectern the official notification cards giving a description of each of these projects. I regret that time does not permit me to read to you all these descriptions, as I am sure you would find them interesting and illuminating. However, you will gain some idea of their general nature when I tell you that 10 of them have to do with the indexing, sorting, cleaning, salvaging, microfilming, and other processing of current and obsolete public records and records of discontinued Federal relief programs in the city of New York.

In other words, taking these old records, sorting and salvaging them, making pictures of them and putting most of them back in storage. Do you know what that project is costing? One hundred thousand dollars? No. A half a million dollars? Wrong again. It is costing $2,263,928. Of that sum just one project is costing $700,350. That is for the salvaging, sorting, indexing, microfilming, and preserving of the records of discontinued relief agencies and projects in the city of New York.

Broken down into terms of military equipment and matériel which we so vitally need on our far-flung battle fronts, we find that this sum of $2,263,928 would buy 84 light tanks costing $27,000 each, or 34 medium tanks costing $67,000 each, or 20 heavy tanks costing $114,000 each. I might say to the gentleman from New York, who spoke earlier today, that, of course, the city of New York and the State of New York are going to take care of those people who are unable to obtain jobs in private industry, or with the Government because of age, physical disabilities, or other circumstances beyond their control.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I cannot yield now, my time has almost expired.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Tell us how they will take care of them.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. In conclusion, let me say that I cannot conceive of my good friend from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK] or any other member of the New York delegation or any Member of this House for that matter seriously and sincerely objecting to going through the W. P. A. rolls with a fine-tooth comb and weeding out the employables and giving them such aid as we properly can in taking their rightful places in private industry to the end that their productive effort may be utilized to good avail and to the further end that they may enjoy to the fullest extent the heritage of self-reliance and independence handed down to us by those generations of stalwart, hard-working Americans who so well and so strongly builded our country to its present eminence and, in so doing, provided us with a pattern to go by.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], for 4 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, first, I wish to say that I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. I know that every Member of this House fully realizes that the storm is breaking all over the world on a scale never before recorded in the pages of modern history. No one can read the billboards of today and fail to recognize that the military and international political stakes in this fantastic drama of 1942 are very high, uncommonly high for all concerned. Never before in the history of the United States have they been any higher. Their magnitude is inevitable for the United States and each hour it all grows more involved for all of our people.

Here we are in June 1942, posing as the savior of the world, politically, economically, and spiritually. In a period of 10 years we have not licked the unemployment problem of this country and although we are assuming the dollar obligation, as so delicately outlined by the gentleman from New York a few moments ago, we have before us this bill today asking for these hundreds of millions of dollars with which to carry on so-called relief work. Is there any way the United States can save the world before it first learns how to save itself? Can a man be a leader in the affairs of men until he first learns how to control his own affairs? I think those questions answer themselves.

All over this country mercantile houses are closing counters because they cannot get employees. Throughout the Central West and the Pacific Coast States they are without ample workers today and propose to import people from old Mexico to do the work of saving food, for instance. We have hundreds of millions of people who will call upon us for food and we will either furnish them food or go down cursed by all the people of the earth. We have assumed this obligation.

We have the situation here where my friend from California says that we either do this particular thing or put them on direct relief. He sets up a straw man and knocks him down. I disagree with that philosophy 100 percent.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. You do not have to put them on direct relief. You can put them to doing private work outside the W. P. A. program and that is what you ought to do.

Mr. VOOHIS of California. Does the gentleman think that can be done in the case of men 60 years old and older?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think it, I know by actual experience, that men 60 years of age can be profitably used to themselves and their community. Good gracious, let my friend go through the farming communities and witness the enormous performance of heavy labor by men and women past 60 years of age. Continuing W. P. A. only adds to the burdens of these very people. My colleagues, the day is not too far distant when we shall have to travel tough roads. The honeymoon is drawing to a close. Pay day is coming. The laws of God Almighty cannot be forever ignored without the people having to pay the consequences.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. Under the order of the House, a certain time was agreed to in addition to the 5 minutes allotted the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. Because Members have not used all the time, there remain 4 minutes. The suggestion has been made that this time be divided between two gentlemen who were not standing, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON]. These two gentlemen will be recognized for 2 minutes apiece. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] for 2 minutes.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Chairman, a good deal has been said here this afternoon about New York. May I say that half of the ills of this country are due probably to New York. She has hung it on us with her labor standards, through Madam Perkins and others, the Wages and Hours Act, and other labor acts trying to vindicate the New York super standard. All these things of New York have influenced the Nation. While a fan dancer may not always be able to get pupils, they insist on staying around Ninety-eighth Street and being on W. P. A. or relief.

What about the men in the country who used to run livery stables? What would they have done had they waited for Uncle Sam to have taken care of them? They did not do that; they went out and found jobs. What are the tire men and auto men doing today? They are not going on W. P. A. They are going out and finding these new jobs. Let these people in New York go out and find jobs. They will not let a farmer come in there and distribute his food. They are stopped from doing that. We are more generous.

We welcome these unemployed New Yorkers to come out and join the farmers' unions—harvest is just at hand, and we will not charge them $25, $50, or $100 to start to work. We will let them work. Let them come from New York; those men who want to work. We will not charge a fee. While we cannot furnish time and a half for overtime we will furnish plenty of work. The draftees are leaving New York by the thousands to enter the armed forces for a lot less pay than the union scale of the first city. If these men can leave New York, why cannot the unemployed leave, or a large percent of them; when they have their choice as to where they can go and what they shall do. There is plenty of labor in the United States of America today for the unemployed.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few observations. We do not want to let our minds be beclouded by the appeal about the city of New York. It is one of the great cities of our country. I do not like to see an appeal made trying to divide men in this Chamber on whether they represent city districts or agricultural districts.

The fact remains that the W. P. A. has rendered a great service. Of course, mistakes have been made. Any human agency makes mistakes. However, the W. P. A. has rendered a wonderful service. The fact remains that there is a need for its continuance, to some extent. The fact remains that the President has cut last year's appropriation to the bone, $280,000,000, with what remains over from last year's appropriation that is not obligated, which I understand to be approximately $60,000,000. There is a demand for the continuation of the W. P. A. Without making any appeal to emotion but appealing to reason, I say there is a necessity for its continuance. I urge the Committee to vote down the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York, and I hope the House will pass the bill as recommended by the President and as reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Looking at the over-all picture of the Nation as a whole, from a national angle, not from a sectional or group angle, there is a necessity for this bill. I hope it will not be cut in the manner proposed by the gentleman from New York, and I hope the action of the Committee on Appropriations will be carried through.

This is a situation that should appeal to our rational mind and not to our emotional mind. In response to the appeal to our rational mind, there is a necessity for the passage of the bill as reported out by the committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one question?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Who wrote this bill?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman from Pennsylvania participated in its preparation with the rest of the committee, of which he is a distinguished and influential member.

Mr. RICH. No; I did not. I was against it all the way.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, my good friend from New York [Mr. TABER], for once in his life is just a little illogical. If this bill is as bad as he says it is, he ought to vote to strike out all of it.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, we ought to make it as little bad as we can by reducing it as far as possible.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is shirking his duty; if he thinks it is as bad as all that, he ought to eradicate it root and branch, but he only moves to strike out a part of it. He is departing from consistency.

Of course, I understand the gentleman is from a favored State. As we know, the bulk of these war contracts and war employment is largely segregated in 12 States. By a happy coincidence, New York gets the largest amount of contracts, the largest amount of money, and the largest amount of employment, of any State in the Union. Of course if New York is taken care of the rest of the country can take care of itself. But there are 36 States aside from the 12 favored States, in which unemployment is still a problem.

How can this problem be met? The gentleman from New York offers no remedy, no alternative. Let them starve.

This bill offers the only solution. It has been tried for 9 years and has proven remarkably effective. It has met every need.

The only tenable objection that can be made to the bill before us is that it does not provide sufficient funds to care for a larger percentage of the unemployed.

Three million men are without work according to the latest computation. This bill provides for only one-sixth of them.

The President drastically reduced the amount recommended to Congress. As it comes to the House, the bill carries an appropriation 68 percent lower than the current year, providing employment for less than one-sixth of the unemployed.

It is in that respect wholly inadequate. Due to the shift in industry from domestic production to war production vast numbers of men have been thrown out of employment who cannot be placed in war production plants. They are not accessible to such plants, or they are too old, or are otherwise not adapted to the specialized requirements.

In addition, there are men in every community—in oil, automobile, sales, and small merchandising business unexpectedly thrown out of employment with no place to get back. This is not a surmise. It is not an estimate. It is a careful scientific computation made by the nonauthoritative Government agencies, including statistical bureaus from the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Labor.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the author of this amendment, has voted year after year to appropriate millions of dollars for these agencies to enable them to compile statistics, but now when in response to his direction and with the appropriations he has voted, they report these statistics, he denies the accuracy of their figures. Of course if, as he contends, their findings are erroneous, he is justified in his opposition, but their reports are the most authoritative available and show that the unemployment of men upon whom families are dependent, the unemployment of men whose children need bread, is so great at the present time that even on the basis of the appropriation carried in this bill the W. P. A. can take care of only one-sixth of them. In the face of this situation the gentleman from New York offers an amendment which would make it possible to care for less than one-twelfth of these unemployed workmen, and one-twelfth of the families in need of sustenance. If W. P. A. is to be continued at all, it ought to be maintained at least on the minimum scale recommended by the President. We ought to vote the full amount or we ought to vote nothing, and the gentleman's amendment does neither.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 102, noes 104.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. TABER.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 119, noes 123.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman; I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HARE: On page 4, line 4, after the semicolan, strike out the remainder of line 4, and down to line 8, including the comma following the word "purposes."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, the request refers to debate on this amendment?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Just on this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike out the following language on lines 4, 5, 6, and 7 on page 4: "Educational, professional, clerical, cultural, recreational, and production projects for defense purposes," but leaves lines 8 and 9 which provide for "miscellaneous projects," such as sewing rooms, school lunches, nursing, and so forth. My primary objection to this provision is that by way of its adoption we would be setting up an entirely different program for the W. P. A. and one which would be duplicating work already provided for in other agencies. Only last week we provided $49,000,000 to be used by the N. Y. A. for training people to work in defense activities, and there were upwards of $90,000,000 granted to the States to be used for the same purpose in vocational training schools, and there were more appropriations for three other distinct agencies for the identical purpose.

Now we come to a sixth agency asking an appropriation to train men and women in industry. All the appropriations referred to are predicated upon the theory there is a great demand for labor in industry, and in order to meet that demand people must be trained for it. I am not prepared to deny that there is a shortage to some extent, and I am not averse to providing money to train people for the highest possible degree of efficiency in industry, but the point I am making is there is no necessity for making appropriations for every Government agency for this purpose. As I have said, we provided last week for training men in the Department of Labor for apprenticeship training in plant training, and then the National Youth Administration, all of them training men and women to go into industry. The Office of Education also has an appropriation, as well as the War Production Board. These appropriations were all approved last week and I am not criticizing them. I supported the most of them, but I think we have gone far enough, and I am now wondering whether this idea of training people for industry is not a little overworked. There may be some shortage in industry. Everyone who has come here to justify such an appropriation has said there is a great deficiency.

I do not know whether there is great shortage or not, but they say so, and I am not prepared to deny it. However, the Secretary of Labor, head of the Department charged with the responsibility of finding out and reporting whether or not there is a sufficient supply of labor, said before your committee less than 90 days ago, on page 5 of the hearings:

There has not been as yet a shortage of labor. There are spots where there are stringencies, difficulties in getting the people you want the day you want them, but we have not developed a shortage of labor, not even of skilled labor. And the reason for it has been the intelligent use of this training on the job both in apprenticeship and in other forms of in-plant training.

Mr. Chairman, on page 70 of the hearings it is shown that $104,200,000, out of the $280,000,000 asked for in the bill, will be used for teaching and training men and women for employment in industry, leaving only about $18,000,000 for sewing room projects as compared with approximately $91,000,000 last year, and there will be a corresponding reduction in the lunchroom projects. In other words, in this amendment to strike out the projects named, your sewing room and lunchroom projects will not get a "taste," or even a "smell" out of this bill, and it will not be 60 days before most of them will be discontinued.

There are many people who by reason of age are not able to secure employment in industry and there is justification in giving consideration to them, but there will be very few if any in my section of the country who will receive any benefit from this bill. I again refer to the hearings upon which this bill is based and there find that 72 percent of the war industries are located in 12 States and I find further that more than 50 percent of this appropriation will be spent for relief work in those 12 States. That is in the States where you have the greatest amount of war industries and where the opportunities for employment should certainly be the greatest you will take more than one-half of this appropriation to take care of the unemployed in those States.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment proposes to strike out one of the most valuable provisions of the bill. It proposes to strike out the appropriation for adult education, nurses' training, sewing projects, training for national defense work, and so forth.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? No; it does not strike that out at all.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There can be no doubt about it. I am reading from the bill in my hand.

Mr. HARE. I know the gentleman does not mean to misquote.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It proposes to strike out training for manual occupation in industries engaged in production for national defense, and so far as duplication is concerned, there can be no duplication because there is a material distinction between the two provisions cited by the gentleman. This item provides for those who are unable to support themselves and must have subsistence at the time they are taking training, as contrasted with those who are to be given training only.

The great need of the day is for trained workers to man our war industries.

The multiplication of plants and the tremendous expansion taking place in factories producing war materials is so rapid that there are no reservoirs of trained men from which experienced workmen can be drawn to operate them, either in the clerical departments or the shops. This amendment would not only deprive industry of needed personnel but it would deny men the training which would make them self-supporting. It would make impossible the acquisition of knowledge and experience which would insure the opportunity of getting jobs and becoming self-dependent, self-respecting, self-supporting citizens. The most convincing evidence of the need of this fund is that W. P. A. is steadily graduating from these courses men who are going into industry every day. No more unfortunate change could be made in the bill than to strike out this provision. I trust the amendment will be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARE) there were—ayes 70, noes 66.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. HARE to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 86, noes 106.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I have sent to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mrs. NORTON: Page 4, line 10, after the word "projects", insert "not less than $6,000,000 of the funds made available in this act shall be used exclusively for the operation of day nurseries and nursery schools for the children of employed mothers."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate upon this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, yesterday I addressed the Committee and asked additional support of the day nurseries and the nursery schools throughout the country, carried in this appropriation bill. I can well understand the necessity for curtailing funds for unnecessary projects which, during the depression years, were absolutely essential. However, because of the great number of women in industry on account of the war, it becomes increasingly evident provision must be made for the care of children of working mothers of the Nation.

Unless the mothers are assured of the welfare of their children, it will be impossible for them to extend their best efforts to the production of those essentials necessary to win the war.

I can speak of nursery schools with authority, having organized a voluntary day nursery in Jersey City during the World War, in which we provided for 100 children a day, at a time when there was no Government help in this endeavor. The Work Projects Administration has been conducting 1,500 nursery schools throughout the country, in every State of the Union, and I refer Members to my speech on page 5107 of the RECORD of yesterday, where they will find an interesting story of the nurseries that are operating at the present time, of the great benefit they are to the children of working mothers and their consolation in the knowledge that their children are safe and properly cared for. The W. P. A. has done a splendid work in this regard. They are doing a great job, and they could do better if they had more funds to enlarge the work and open more nurseries, particularly in the districts where extensive war work makes it necessary to employ many mothers, with small children. These nurseries provide food, recreation, medical care, rest periods—everything necessary for the comfort and welfare of children.

Mr. Chairman, I had hoped to offer an amendment to increase the amount carried in the bill under the heading of education, and so forth, but I have been advised that such an amendment would not be accepted by the committee, and in view of the fact that the Appropriations Committee has been most considerate of my requests, and because I understand the handicaps they are under and the great amount of work they are responsible for, I am reluctant to force this issue. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment, which does not increase the amount carried in the bill and earnestly hope it will be adopted, in order to secure the continuation and if possible the enlargement of the nursery work for the needy children of the Nation; and at this time, Mr. Chairman, may I thank the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and all of the Members on the committee who have been most courteous and considerate of me in the requests that I have made for aid to the nurseries.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I rise in favor of the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The debate has been limited to 5 minutes. One minute remains. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 minute.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in favor of the amendment of the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON], who has made such a study of day nurseries and who has rendered such valuable service in having them established. I would like to state also that this is very appealing from a humane and kindly point of view, but it is imperative, when judged by the experience of our Allies. It is an absolute necessity to have day nurseries if we are going to have women in industry for war production. And in order to win the war, women will be needed in industry in increasing numbers. Women cannot work unless their children are cared for.

I know that in Massachusetts and all over the country work done by W. P. A. women in the school nutrition projects has been extremely valuable. The children have gained in weight and health. It is even more necessary to have day nurseries because our war work cannot progress unless the children of working mothers have a place to stay.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment proposed by the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. NORTON) there were—ayes 59, and noes 74.

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mrs. NORTON to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 74, noes 73.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: On page 2, lines 1 and 2, after the word "appropriated", strike out the words "for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, $280,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof the words "for the period ending December 31, 1942, $100,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Reserving the right to object, am I to be recognized for 5 minutes?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is entitled to 5 minutes.

Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, the committee recommendation calls for an appropriation on a 12 months' basis of $337,000,000, or about 40 percent of the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year.

It also calls for the carrying of an average of 400,000 beneficiaries on the rolls of W. P. A., as compared with an average in the current fiscal year of about 1,000,000. This also represents about 40 percent of this year's program.

I call attention, however, to the fact that administrative expenditure for the current fiscal year amounted to $35,420,000, and that 40 percent of that figure is $14,000,000, and not $16,000,000 as recommended by the committee or $17,000,000 as recommended by the Budget.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. My time is very limited. I am sorry.

The record shows that W. P. A. plans to operate something less than 215 separate offices, and to maintain a personnel of something like 30,600 during the coming fiscal year, or one administrative or supervisory employee for every 13 beneficiaries.

My amendment accomplishes two things: First, it takes $3,000,000 out of the amount recommended in the Budget for administrative expenditure. It provides $14,000,000, exactly the same percentage of this year's total as the percentage recommended in the Budget for the over-all program.

Secondly, it appropriates not for 12 months, but for 6 months, on about the same basis that is recommended by the Budget. The $100,000,000, recommended by the amendment would, of course, be added to the $56,000,000 unexpended balance, giving the total of $156,000,000 to be expended during the 6 months between now and December 31, 1942.

The amendment makes no substantial reduction in the amount of the appropriation available for relief during the 6 months' period.

It realizes for the time being, however, a saving of $170,000,000; and it permits

a reappraisal of the entire situation, a reappraisal of the effects of the industrial dislocation which is now facing us, at the end of the 6 months' period, December 31, 1942.

If the amendment is adopted, Mr. Chairman, I shall ask unanimous consent that certain figures and language be changed to conform to the proposal.

I hope the committee will adopt the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on the pending amendment.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH) there were—ayes 66 and noes 91.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. CLASON: On page 3, line 11, after the semicolon, insert "Pipe lines for petroleum products."

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON], is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for the construction of various types of public projects, including highways, roads, public buildings, parks, public utilities, and various other structures. It seems to me that at this particular time the one thing which is needed most perhaps is a proper system of pipe lines to bring petroleum products from the fields to the east coast and to the large cities of the Midwest. For this reason I have offered this amendment.

This morning's newspaper brings us the story that there really is no sugar shortage in the United States, and that, as a matter of fact, in August the authorities will undoubtedly make some changes and relax their rationing, perhaps give it up altogether. We are also told that there is no shortage of gasoline and petroleum products. We are told there is some question if there is any shortage of rubber. The President is now making a check to determine the facts. There is, however, one kind of shortage about which we are certain, and that is the fact that there is a shortage of transportation for petroleum products to the most important munitions-producing area of the Nation, the east coast.

New England will suffer first and foremost, because winter strikes New England first, and there will be the freezing of the rivers, and there will be the need for a tremendous amount of fuel oil for heating as well as industrial purposes. I feel that if any money can be used for public projects construction under this bill it might well be used for that of constructing pipe lines. Today's paper brings us the news that a pipe line is going to be built of steel from Texas to Illinois. I would like to know why it is that with a statute on the books, passed nearly a year ago, no work has yet started on the pipe line across Florida. The head of our transportation in this war is Joseph B. Eastman, of the Interstate Commerce Commission. He tells us that tank cars do not provide an economical or satisfactory method of supplying petroleum products; that if they are all used for this purpose they cannot meet other needs for which they must be used. He states further that pipe lines are much more dependable and economical. A substantial enlargement of the pipe-line capacity to the East should be made as rapidly as possible. Mr. Eastman also states there is no reason why we should fool around with a barge canal across Florida in connection with the carrying of this petroleum. For these reasons, it seems to me, we should do as Mr. Eastman says, and at once build a pipe line from St. Joe on the Gulf coast to Jacksonville. He assures us that at the present time there is a good protected waterway to both terminals.

This being so, I should like to see this amendment adopted so that if any money is going to be made available as a W. P. A. project for public-works construction, it can be devoted in this time of real need to the relief of what is admitted to be a real shortage. To this end they need pipe lines. They should be constructed.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. JOHNS. I take it the gentleman knows that the President of the United States has the authority to build a pipe line if he wants to.

Mr. CLASON. The gentleman is right and as I pointed out, he can do it under this law which we placed on the statute books about a year ago.

What I would like to have done is to have the work initiated, and if money is to be made available to make work for people who need W. P. A. work, I should like to see the work done on what everybody in the United States would recognize as a worth-while project, the construction of a pipe line wherever it might be located.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. ARNOLD. Does the gentleman want to take the responsibility of having such important work done by W. P. A. labor?

Mr. CLASON. I may say to the gentleman from Illinois that I have seen a great deal of W. P. A. work that is satisfactory. I have seen plenty of good projects constructed by W. P. A. labor in my own city, at air fields and on other projects.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in response to the very able argument offered by my friend from Massachusetts it is only necessary to call attention to the fact that the authorization which he seeks to incorporate in the bill is already provided for in the provision for public utilities. The gentleman knows, of course, that W. P. A. money cannot be spent on any private enterprise; that if the pipe line to which the gentleman refers is built by private capital then no W. P. A. money can be made available for it under any circumstances; but if the pipe line is a public enterprise then it comes within the provision here for public utilities.

However, Mr. Chairman, the whole question of pipe lines, regardless of any provisions we may make or may not make in this bill, boils down to the question of priorities. There is nothing in the priority regulations that more stringently affects materials than the priorities on steel, and therefore on pipe-line construction. It is impossible to get a single foot of pipe without a high priority rating. So any action taken here would be ineffective, even if money were available, whether for public or private enterprise. But, in any event, the bill already carries ample authorization and the gentleman's amendment amounts to mere surplusage.

Mr. CLASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. The gentleman states that the words "public utilities" cover pipe lines. It would be just as easy to argue that it also covers sewer systems, water supply, airports, and other transportation facilities. I see no reason why pipe lines should be excluded from the enumeration if, as the Chairman says, it cannot do any damage to put the words in. Certainly somebody else put a more narrow construction on public utilities in view of the fact these other items are listed. I would like to see this put in the bill in order that there can be no confusion or denial.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman merely proposes to include in the bill what is already there. His amendment is pure surplusage. It is always the policy of every committee to relieve a bill of unnecessary verbiage and redundant provisions. I ask that the amendment offered by the gentleman be rejected.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CLASON) there were—ayes 49, noes 65.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENNETT: Page 8, line 2, strike out the period at the end of the line, insert a colon and add the following: "*Provided further*, That no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for purchase of automobiles for use by an administrative official of the Work Projects Administration or for the employment of any chauffeur."

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I realize that in a time like this when our Government is spending several thousand dollars every time the clock ticks, the amount of money that would be saved by my amendment appears infinitesimal, but it is also true that in a time when the people are being taxed as never before in the history of the Republic, it is the duty of Congress to save every dollar that can be saved. Further, I do not like the principle of furnishing bureaucrats automobiles and chauffeurs at the expense of the taxpayers.

Many bureaucrats who could not be elected dog catcher in their home precinct have been given jobs by the administration at salaries equal to those paid to Members of Congress. These bureaucrats are out nothing to secure their jobs and the value of their services is not subjected to approval or disapproval by the voters.

I can see no good reason why these men should receive better treatment than elected officials who buy their own cars and act as their own chauffeurs.

More than 40 Federal officials here in Washington now ride in Government-provided automobiles driven by chauffeurs paid by the taxpayers.

As a rule, these automobiles are not the moderately-priced kind driven by Members of Congress. Many are Cadillac and Lincoln limousines. I do not know the cost of the various automobiles, but I think it would be reasonable to assume that they have cost on an average of $2,500 each. At this figure, 40 would cost $100,000. If you will figure the annual depreciation on these cars, the cost of gasoline, oil, tires, and upkeep, you will find that it would run in the neighborhood of $30,000 a year. The chauffeurs are paid an average of about $1,800 per year, or $64,000 per annum. This makes a total of $94,000 per year.

Taxicab fares in Washington are 30, 40, 60, and 80 cents, depending on the zone. If we take the highest fare of 80 cents for each of the 40 now using Government-owned cars and allow them two trips per day for 300 working days per year, we find that the cost per official would amount to $480 annually. For 40 officials the cost of taxicabs on this basis would run $19,200 a year, which, subtracted from the $94,000, would leave a balance of $74,800 in favor of the taxpayers. However, I contend that they should pay for their own transportation as low-salaried Government workers do.

I realize, Mr. Chairman, that this amendment would affect only one agency, but if it is adopted, I will offer similar amendments to appropriation bills as they are submitted to the House.

I find that some officials in the executive department have more than one Government-owned automobile. In February, Jesse Jones was provided with two automobiles—a Buick sedan and a Cadillac limousine and two chauffeurs, each of whom was paid $1,800 a year. He had one car in his capacity as Secretary of Commerce and the other as Federal Loan Administrator. He lost the latter job February 28, and I am not advised whether or not he still has both automobiles and both chauffeurs.

Federal Security Administrator McNutt and Secretary of the Treasury Morgenthau have two chauffeurs each. McNutt's drivers receive $1,320 and $1,200 annually, and Morgenthau's $2,000 and $1,320. Frances Perkins, Secretary of Labor, is more liberal with the taxpayer's money in the matter of pay for chauffeur than any other public official. Her driver is paid $2,500 a year. I am not advised as to the number of hours her chauffeur gives to the job, but I would venture the assertion that a farmer would not consider them burdensome.

Here is a partial list of bureaucrats and Cabinet members with chauffeurs and the salaries paid their drivers by the Government:

Secretary of Agriculture Claude R. Wickard	$1,320
Farm Security Administrator C. B. Baldwin	1,500
Agricultural Adjustment Administrator R. M. Evans	1,200
Budget Director Harold D. Smith	1,320
Bureau of Standards Director Lyman J. Briggs	1,620
Bureau of Census Director J. C. Capt	1,620
Civil Aeronautics Administrator Charles I. Stanton	1,200
Deputy Civil Aeronautics Administrator A. S. Koch	1,200
Coordinator of Information William J. Donovan	1,320
National Youth Administrator Aubrey Williams	1,500
Federal Works Administrator Philip Fleming	1,400
Public Roads Commissioner T. H. MacDonald	1,500
Work Projects Administrator Howard O Hunter	1,860
Secretary of the Interior Harold L. Ickes	2,100
Deputy Petroleum Coordinator Ralph K. Davies	1,800
Attorney General Francis Biddle	1,500
Assistant Secretary of Labor Daniel W Tracy	1,320
Federal Housing Commissioner Abner H. Ferguson	1,680
Postmaster General Frank C. Walker	1,320
Railroad Retirement Board Chairman M. W. Latimer	1,320
Member M. R. Reed	1,500
Member L. M. Eddy	1,500
Director Selective Service, Gen. Lewis B. Hershey	1,320
Secretary of State Cordell Hull	1,680
Treasury Director of Procurement Clifton E. Mack	1,440
Veterans' Administrator Frank Hines (plus a $1,560-a-year messenger who also acts as a chauffeur)	1,680

Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks, because I want to include a list of bureaucrats and others who are driving automobiles paid for by the taxpayers of this country and who are using tax-supported chauffeurs.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman may have permission to revise and extend his remarks. He will have to secure permission in the House for the inclusion of any extraneous matter.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, in this amendment, we are asked to go through the superfluous, useless motion of considering a provision which is already in the bill. If the gentleman will turn to page 20, he will find in lines 13 and 14 the item which effectuates the very thing he proposes in his amendment. He will note that under this language no automobile can be purchased. There is no authority to buy a single car and there is no money in this bill anywhere for new automobiles. There are no funds in this appropriation anywhere that may be spent under any circumstances for the acquisition of automobiles, either new or old.

Mr. BENNETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BENNETT. Does the gentleman know that the W. P. A. Administrator today is using a car that is furnished by the taxpayers and that he is using a chauffeur paid for by the taxpayers?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Certainly, he has an automobile. How else could he discharge the duties of his office? But the gentleman's amendment does not touch it. Even if the gentleman's amendment is agreed to, it will not affect that automobile. The proposition submitted in the gentleman's amendment relates to the purchase of cars, the procurement of new cars, and there is no authority in this bill to buy a single new car, there is no money in the bill to buy new cars, there is no provision in this bill under which a new car could be procured at all, in any way or under any circumstance.

Mr. BENNETT. Would not my amendment save the tires, the gasoline, and the chauffeurs at a time when tires and gasoline are necessary?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It would not save an ounce of rubber, it would not save one gallon of gasoline, it would not save a thing. The prohibition against purchases which he seeks to effect is already in the bill. There is no authority in the bill for the purchase of automobiles, no money for the purchase, and no provision under which the new automobiles to which his amendment refers could be secured. Not only that, Mr. Chairman, but the W. P. A. reported that it was discontinuing a number of the cars already on hand. They are reducing the number of cars they now have. They did not ask for new cars, and, of course, the committee did not give them any.

The gentleman's amendment is futile, inapplicable, and mere surplusage. It could not have any effect in the world except to add useless verbiage to the bill. We ough. not to encumber any bill with unnecessary provisions, and the time of

the committee ought not to be taken with proposals to insert propositions already in the bill. I ask that the amendment be rejected.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNS: On page 7, line 16, after "service", strike out "$310,000" and insert "$100,000."

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, this $310,000 is for the sole purpose, of course, of advertising W. P. A. in its communications. I feel that this is a place where we can save some money. There is $310,000 provided here for communications. Then out of the $16,000,000 there is $100,000 more to be expended for information. That makes $410,000.

I feel that we can save the taxpayers of this country $210,000. One hundred thousand dollars is sufficient for any publicity purposes. If there is anyone who does not know anything about the W. P. A. after the time we have had with it and after so many people have been on its pay roll, then nobody else ought to find out anything more about it. I feel that the $200,000 is sufficient, and that is the reason I offer this amendment. I hope the Members of the House will see it that way and vote accordingly.

Mrs. BYRON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of retaining the appropriation for Work Projects Administration as it is very essential in the Sixth District of Maryland which I have the honor to represent. We have many projects started in the district very necessary to the defense program and if these had to be abandoned it would endanger our war effort. Our nursery schools are caring for the children of workers and in some places communities with W. P. A. aid are expanding present facilities to care for the additional workers.

Mr. Chairman, I have received the following telegrams from the mayor of Hagerstown and the mayor of Cumberland:

HAGERSTOWN, MD., *June 10, 1942.*

Representative KATHARINE BYRON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Curtailment of the Work Projects Administration program for the next fiscal year beginning July 1, 1942, to a program that would limit workers assigned to projects to 130 hours per month and nonlabor funds to $6 per man per month would not permit the city of Hagerstown to expand projects vital to the war effort inasmuch as the city of Hagerstown could not take care of the full burden. Will you please use your good office to formulate a program whereby projects essential to the war effort would be granted exemptions to 192 hours per month as deemed necessary and that nonlabor funds could be available from Federal funds to take care of the portion that the sponsoring bodies could not meet? It is contemplated filing with the Work Projects Administration within the week a project for the expansion of our airport, of which certain useful units of work are scheduled for completion by June 30 under a project now operating in conjunction with the Work Projects Administration. If this project can be approved it would give the city of Hagerstown not only additional facilities deemed necessary by the civilian pilot training school as well as the testing of planes produced by Fairchild Aircraft Corporation for the Army and Navy.

RICHARD H. SWEENEY, *Mayor.*

CUMBERLAND, MD., *June 8, 1942.*

Mrs. WILLIAM D. BYRON,
Member House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Mayor and council of Cumberland has pledged $200,000 to the support of a municipal airport to be built by Work Projects Administration with their promise that the remaining amount be paid by them to the completion of the master plan. This master plan embraced four runways, the first of which is not completed. It has been endorsed by the Government as a defense project. Should Work Projects Administration funds not be allocated for its completion the city will be unable to complete same ready for use. I, therefore, most earnestly request that you use your good offices to make available such Government funds as will support the completion of this project together with any other defense projects.

THOMAS F. CONLON, *Mayor.*

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, my good friend is laboring under a misapprehension. He has the impression that this item refers to the information service. As a matter of fact it has no relation to the information service. It does not touch it in any way. It provides exclusively for the communication service, that is, to telephone, telegraph, and switchboard rental. It has no connection at all with the matters which the gentleman has just discussed in the committee. I ask, therefore, that the amendment be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNS) there were—ayes 46, noes 51.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer a further amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNS: On page 7, line 17, strike out "$1,000,000" and insert "$500,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, this item of $1,000,000 is for traveling expenses. Since this bill was brought in, of course, everybody realizes they are cutting down the traveling in this country, or at least they are cutting down travel in the East and are going to cut it down every place else. You can wear out a good many tires and a good deal of rubber with a million dollars' worth of traveling. This item ought to be cut down. If you give this agency $500,000 to spend, in view of the amount you are going to appropriate here that is certainly a reasonable amount for travel. The W. P. A. ought to be willing to cut down its travel, just as other people of the country are being asked to do. For that reason, I ask that this $500,000 be voted as sufficient to take care of the traveling expenses of the W. P. A. during the coming year.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this item already has been drastically reduced. It has been cut from $2,800,000 to $1,000,000. In this amount it provides for certain essential travel by employees of the agency who, unless they are given funds for transportation, may as well be dismissed. They can perform their duties only if they are allowed to visit the projects over which they exercise supervision. Therefore, in view of the fact that the item has already been cut to the irreducible minimum if this branch of the service is to function at all, I ask that the amendment be rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. PEARSON moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken out.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Chairman, this motion is offered in good faith, not with any desire to be facetious or capricious. I think if this objectionable legislation can be nipped in the bud at the beginning, without wasting a whole afternoon reading this bill, we may as well dispose of it now.

On the amendment offered previously today to cut the appropriation for the W. P. A. in half, many Members of the House would have voted to strike out the entire amount, but they hesitated to cut the amount provided and leave the program in an uncertain state. Therefore, I am offering this motion, which carries with it preferential consideration, to strike the enacting clause from this bill and determine now whether or not we want to appropriate anything for the continuation of the W. P. A.

In connection with this motion, may I say that on March 11 I introduced a bill to abolish the W. P. A. and discontinue any appropriations for it after June 30 of this year. Immediately upon the introduction of this bill I received over 500 letters from every section of the United States, I dare say as many as 1 from every congressional district, and in some

districts letters from almost all the counties, congratulating me on the introduction of this bill and urging and insisting that a stubborn fight be made to obtain action on it. I received from New York City over 20 letters from persons employed by W. P. A. telling me how rotten the situation was inside the organization and urging me to do something toward a discontinuance of the favoritism, the injustice, and the injudicious expenditure of money, or else bring the W. P. A. to an early end.

That is the situation all over this country. Many people on W. P. A. rolls have no respect for the organization. Many laugh about what they are getting as subsidies from this Government for doing nothing, and Congress is the laughing stock of the country for the continuation of such an agency as this. It is holding us up to public scorn, and the one regret that I have during 8 years of service in this House is that I was inveigled into supporting the $4,725,000,000 appropriation that was presented within 10 days after I became a Member of this House. I was inveigled into supporting it on the promise that that money would be allocated to useful projects and would complete the job, but every January since I have been here, from 1935 up until now, we have been confronted with the same promise, and here we are again today trying to appropriate over $300,000,000 to carry on a project for which there is no earthly excuse; unemployment at an all-time low, employment at an all-time high. There is plenty of gainful employment for the people in this country, and there is no excuse for carrying on this organization and wasting millions and millions of dollars belonging to the taxpayers of this country on projects that are useless, obnoxious, objectionable, and objects to ridicule from one end of this country to the other. Let us put an end to W. P. A. I ask for a vote on this motion in all good faith.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PEARSON] to strike out the enacting clause.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PEARSON) there were—ayes 66, noes 90.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. PEARSON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported—ayes 60, noes 109.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 7, line 13, strike out "$16,000,000" and insert "$14,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that all debate upon this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, in all good regulated business you should not let your overhead eat up the profits of the operation of your business. That is just as essential as anything can be in any business that is operated by private individuals. Private individuals look after every dollar, and when the individual finds that the overhead is too much, that the work can be done for less, and with less overhead he cuts overhead expenses and necessarily makes deductions. This amendment of mine is to cut down the overhead management of the W. P. A. organization. If you will note, they have 280 officers and 30,600 personnel to take care of 400,000 people, which is about 1 to 13. My amendment will reduce this amount by $2,000,000, and by a proportionate amount you can reduce the personnel. If you can reduce the personnel, why not cut down on your overhead? If you want a good sound business in government, then let us adopt this amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. What the gentleman is trying to do is to cut down on some of this administrative expense on the part of these bureaucrats that are traveling around in Pullman cars.

Mr. RICH. Absolutely. Let us stop fooling around, let us let the people of this country know that the House of Representatives is at least a good business organization. That cannot be done, if you do not put a little business into Government, and where you find there is too much overhead, as we have in the operation of the W. P. A., we should do what a successful business organization would do, cut overhead and do it now. To eliminate a number of the employees will not lose anything from the efficiency of the employees, I guarantee that, because too many times I have wondered where the efficiency is anyway. When we have too many men in an organization that are supposed to be leaders who are standing around talking, naturally the employees will do likewise, and if we want to get a dollar's worth of work out of a dollar expended, and if you want to help those people you are bound to keep on the W. P. A., then let us, you and I, cut down this administrative expense so that we can eliminate the expenditure of some of this money in administrative offices and put these men back in industry, and get a little efficiency out of the organization. It is time we do some sound business. Will you help? I hope so. By your vote here you will talk.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 47, noes 53.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. RICH and Mr. CANNON of Missouri to act as tellers.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 62, noes 70.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that there has been any more ardent New Dealer in Congress since I came here than I am myself. I do not believe there has been any man who has been more ardently for the work of the W. P. A. I may differ in philosophy and ideas with some gentleman, but I say here that I know of no man that I told in higher respect than I do the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PEARSON]. He is a real Christian gentleman. I know that he is held in high esteem, deep in the hearts of not only Democrats but of Republicans in this House. Just because he happens to oppose something that I might be for is no reason why I should hold him in less respect than he deserves. He has been a faithful and valuable Member of this Congress. He has given much, not only to his district, but to his Nation. I believe that the people of his district should be congratulated on sending a man of his type to this Congress. I hope that as time goes on, his district will continue to be represented in this Congress by men of his type. When men of his type are sent to this Congress our Nation is safe. He is the type of man who will labor honestly and truly and efficiently for the things he stands for, whether you are with him or not.

It is the very opposite to what the newspapers have been saying. The newspapers claim that this is a rubber-stamp Congress. This has never been a rubber-stamp Congress and the best illustration I know of is when Democrats will stand up and fight other Democrats when they think they are right. That has gone on and that is the reason we have a democracy in this country today. As long as they send men of the type of my colleague the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PEARSON] to this House you may rest assured that democracy is safe.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not propose to take the entire 5 minutes. All I want to do is to correct an error which was made in my statement yesterday on this bill.

During the course of my remarks I quoted from a letter sent to the President by the Federal Anthracite Coal Commission. It was stated in that letter:

The anthracite area still has almost 500,000 families on relief.

Obviously that is incorrect. I checked up with the Department of Mines today and the reporter of the Commission. I also checked up with the secretary of the Commission and I find that the original script read 50,000 families and not 500,000 families.

So that is the reason for taking this time to explain the error to the House and to report the typographical error.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, do I understand you to say all amendments to this entire section?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All amendments to this section.

Mr. JONES. I have an amendment which I would like to present.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I modify the request, Mr. Chairman, and ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Ohio may have 5 minutes to present his amendment, and that at the conclusion of that time all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close.

Mr. JONES. Further reserving the right to object, I would like 5 minutes on my own amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That was included in my request.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri that all debate on this section and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I would like the attention of the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in charge of this bill in order that I may ascertain whether the opinion which I am about to express coincides with the facts and the opinion of the committee.

Am I correct in the assumption that the operations of W. P. A. generally provide for two types of projects, namely, those that are designated as Federal projects and those that are designated as non-Federal projects? Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is correct; Federal and non-Federal public projects. Of course, no private projects are included.

Mr. KEEFE. Now, as to the Federal projects, am I correct in the assumption that allocations for the completion of those projects designated as Federal projects are made out of funds appropriated and at the time the allocation is made sufficient funds are set aside to complete the project in its entirety?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Under the law which has been in effect for several years, a Federal project cannot be started unless the necessary funds are set aside for its completion.

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, I do not think that is an answer to the question. I wish the gentleman would please pay attention to what I am asking, because I know many Members are in confusion on the subject. When a Federal project is approved by the President and funds are allocated, are the funds necessary for the entire completion of that project allocated out of current funds available?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. On page 9 of the bill, if the gentleman will follow me, section 5, paragraph (b), provides:

> No Federal construction project, except flood control and water-conservation projects authorized under other law, shall be undertaken or prosecuted under the appropriations in this joint resolution unless and until there shall have been allocated and irrevocably set aside Federal funds sufficient for its completion.

That answers the gentleman's question without further comment.

Mr. KEEFE. Then the answer of the gentleman is "Yes," that the funds are irrevocably set aside.

Now, as to non-Federal projects such as the Winnebago County airport now under construction in my district. Am I correct in my assumption that as to non-Federal projects, the allocation is simply to carry on the work to the end of the fiscal year, and that if funds are withdrawn and no other funds provided for the completion of the project in the next fiscal year, the burden of completing such projects would necessarily fall entirely upon the municipality that sponsors it?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is right in his assumption; there is no provision to cover such cases. There is no commitment for completion.

Mr. KEEFE. So that as to all non-Federal projects in the districts of the various Members of Congress that are not now completed and which the local municipalities, or the State, or the sponsors have provided, unless funds are provided in this appropriation bill those projects will either have to stop or funds necessary for their completion will have to be provided by the sponsoring authorities.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is entirely correct.

Mr. KEEFE. May I also say in this connection that while there may be great criticism of many of the projects that have been undertaken by the W. P. A. I think those who make that criticism must necessarily be criticising the local authorities, because with the exception of Federal projects all projects must have local sponsorship, and the law provides that the Federal Government cannot assume more than three-quarters of the expense of such non-Federal projects. If there is fault in the character of the projects, it is with the local municipalities that sponsor them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. JONES: On page 2, line 20, after the word "appropriation", strike out the period, insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That none of these funds shall be expended for projects sponsored by any department, agency, or independent establishment of the Federal Government unless specifically authorized by Congress."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment obviously is for Congress to have control over what projects shall be sponsored by the Federal Government. We go through the motions of listening to justifications for every agency, establishment, and department of Government. Presumably we vote the appropriations necessary for the specific job to be done. To illustrate my point let us assume that the Maritime Commission is given an appropriation to erect a building. If my amendment is defeated, they may not use that money to build the building under contract as we anticipated when we appropriated it, but use the money to sponsor a W. P. A. project. Thus the W. P. A. can supplement the funds we voted for the Maritime Commission to complete the building under contract. It is not fair to the Congress of the United States after we get through with these appropriation bills for the W. P. A. to furnish a slush fund in addition. W. P. A. should be reduced to absolute bare essentials. If we are going to continue it at all, we should adopt this amendment so we shall not have any Federal agency sponsoring a W. P. A. project that has not been authorized by Congress. As a specific example let me remind you of the Jefferson Memorial in St. Louis. Twice Congress turned this project down. What do you think happened? The National Park Service sponsored W. P. A. projects to do the very job that Congress determined on two occasions should not be done. This is a sample of the mischief I want to eliminate by this amendment, and I hope it has the support of the gentlemen of the committee today. I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee what objection there is to this amendment which prohibits the use of money on projects which Congress has not given specific approval.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, apparently the gentleman has overlooked the fact that his amendment would prevent the Federal Government from sponsoring projects to expedite the war effort. If the gentleman's amendment were adopted we could not promote work around airports, navy yards, cantonments, or Government reservations; we could not do, unless specifically authorized by Congress, work on access roads now so necessary in these strategic areas. The Federal Government should not have its hands tied in this way by such a law at a time when we are so desperately in need of the many war project facilities which can be provided with this money but which would be denied or delayed under the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has cited laudable Federal war projects, but the thing I want to get at is the foolish expenditure for boondoggling projects. Certainly it would not take long to get a bill through Congress to outline the nature and type of projects for which the W. P. A. funds can be used for national defense. Perhaps Congress will scrutinize more carefully than the bureaucrats have in the past.

Certainly we can eliminate all that would be sponsored by the "spend as usual" agencies of the type that put the fan dancers on the Federal pay roll and projects of the type of the Jefferson Memorial at St. Louis that Congress on two occasions turned down. Certainly the

gentleman would want Congress to determine what should be handled by contract and what should be handled by W. P. A. I want to get at the nonessential expenditures.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman would eliminate or retard those things in which W. P. A. can be most effective in helping win the war.

Mr. JONES. I understand the gentleman's proposition, but I am sure the gentleman wants to cut the boondoggling. Let us put W. P. A., if it is to be continued, within the control and within the hands of Congress. It will not be done without this amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will permit me to answer his question, there is no boondoggling in the W. P. A. program either in the current year of 1942 or for the coming year of 1943. That was very carefully inquired into in the course of the hearings. There is nothing in the bill which could be interpreted as authorizing boondoggling or providing funds for boondoggling by any stretch of the imagination. You may be certain nothing of the sort could have escaped the eyes of the vigilant gentlemen from New York and Massachusetts—not to mention the majority members of the committee.

Mr. JONES. Certainly the gentleman will not contend this amendment is bad legislative policy. Certainly the gentleman wants Congress to determine what W. P. A. projects shall be sponsored by the Federal Government. I do not think it is honest for the funds of Federal agencies to be supplemented with W. P. A. funds. The gentleman knows that Congress has not turned down a single request for the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission. Let the Congress determine whether it wants defense and war work of other Federal agencies to be done by W. P. A. This amendment is sound and ought to be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES.]

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 30, noes 67.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

ADMINISTRATIVE AGENCIES

SEC. 2. (a) In order to provide for administrative expenses incidental to carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution, the following sums are hereby appropriated to the following agencies, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943: (1) General Accounting Office, $625,000; and (2) Treasury Department: (a) Procurement Division, $1,000,000; (b) Division of Disbursement, $457,000; (c) Office of the Treasurer, $150,000; (d) Secret Service Division, $52,000; (e) Bureau of Accounts, $300,000, to remain available until December 31, 1942, for administrative accounting; total, Treasury Department, $1,959,000.

(b) The appropriations in this section shall not be used to pay the compensation of persons employed entirely upon the regular work (as distinguished from emergency work under appropriations in this section) of any department or agency, nor to pay the compensation of employees engaged partially upon such regular work unless, in the determination of the head of such department or agency (which determination shall be conclusive), offsetting employment upon such emergency work of such department or agency is performed by employees paid from the regular funds thereof.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Page 8, line 19, strike out "$300,000" and insert "$285,000", and in line 20, after "1942", insert "and $15,000 for the period commencing on January 1, 1943, and ending June 30, 1943."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is largely a technical amendment. It does not change the amount of the bill, nor does it change the amount provided for this specific purpose. The only difference is that it make $285,000 of the $300,000 available for the first 6 months of the fiscal year and $15,000 for the last 6 months.

The amendment has the approval of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. JOHNS: Page 8, line 21, after the words "Treasury Department", strike out "$1,959,000" and insert "$1,225,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNS. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that the amendment which he proposes merely affects a total and does not affect any appropriation in the bill?

Mr. JOHNS. If the gentleman is perfectly willing to accept this $1,225,000, we will not argue the question.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We always ask unanimous consent at the close of the consideration of a bill authorizing the Clerk to correct all totals in the bill. So even if the gentleman's amendment were agreed to, the Clerk would correct the total following the passage of the bill and the gentleman's amendment would mean nothing. The gentleman does not propose to strike anything from the bill. His amendment merely refers to a total and leaves everything in the bill that is untouched and in the form in which it is reported to the House. In other words the gentleman's amendment means nothing whether it is adopted or rejected.

Mr. JOHNS. I ask that this be reduced.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that this section here adds $1,959,000 to this appropriation. I do not know whether the Members realize it or not, but this is separate entirely, and I want to read subsection (b):

(b) The appropriations in this section shall not be used to pay the compensation of persons employed entirely upon the regular work (as distinguished from emergency work under appropriations in this section) of any department or agency, nor to pay the compensation of employees engaged partially upon such regular work unless, in the determination of the head of such department or agency (which determination shall be conclusive), offsetting employment upon such emergency work of such department or agency is performed by employees paid from the regular funds thereof.

It seems to me that we could get along here with $1,225,000 for disbursing this amount here, whatever it may be, when we finally get through with this bill, and the purpose is to cut that amount down $775,000. Just which one of these agencies it will be taken out of I am not particularly interested in. That is up to the Treasury, and these other agencies how they are going to disburse this money, but if they only have the $1,225,000 to disburse, then they will have to live within that appropriation.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will be agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNS) there were—ayes 33, noes 56.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

GENERAL AND SPECIAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 3. Funds appropriated in this joint resolution to the various Federal agencies shall be so apportioned and distributed over the period ending June 30, 1943, and shall be so administered during such period as to constitute the total amount that will be furnished to such agencies during such period for the purposes herein set forth.

SEC. 4. The funds made available by this joint resolution shall be used only for work relief for employable persons in need except as otherwise specifically provided herein.

SEC. 5. (a) Not to exceed $100,000 of the appropriation contained in section 1 (a) hereof may be allocated, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, for administrative expenses of Federal agencies incident to the planning and review of Work Projects Administration projects.

(b) No Federal construction project, except flood-control and water-conservation projects authorized under other law, shall be undertaken or prosecuted under the appropriations in this joint resolution unless and until there shall have been allocated and irrevocably set aside Federal funds sufficient for its completion.

(c) No non-Federal project shall be undertaken or prosecuted under appropriations under this joint resolution unless and until the sponsor has made a written agreement to finance such part of the entire cost thereof as the Work Projects Administration determines under the circumstances is an adequate contribution, taking into consideration the financial ability of the sponsor. The Commissioner shall prescribe rules and regulations relating to the valuation of contributions in kind by sponsors of projects through

furnishing the use of their own facilities and equipment and the services of their own employees, which shall represent an actual cash value, and such rules and regulations shall also allow credit only to the extent that the furnishing of such contributions represents a financial burden which is undertaken by the sponsors on account of Work Projects Administration projects, or other sponsored projects.

SEC. 6. None of the funds made available by this joint resolution shall be expended on the construction of any building (1) the total estimated cost of which, in the case of a Federal building, exceeds $100,000 from Federal funds, or (2) the portion of the total estimated cost of which payable from Federal funds, in the case of a non-Federal building, exceeds $100,000, unless the building is one (a) for which the project has been approved by the President on or prior to May 15, 1940, or for which an issue of bonds has been approved at an election held on or prior to such date, or for which a State legislature has made an appropriation on or prior to such date, or (b) for the completion of which funds have been allocated and irrevocably set aside under prior relief appropriation acts: *Provided*, That the provisions of this section shall not apply to any projects which have been certified by the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy, respectively, as being important for military or naval purposes.

SEC. 7. (a) The Work Projects Administration is authorized to receive from sponsors of non-Federal projects contributions in services, materials, or money, such money to be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States. Such contributions shall be expended or utilized as agreed upon between the sponsor and the Work Projects Administration.

(b) All receipts and collections by reason of operations in consequence of appropriations made in this joint resolution, except cash contributions of sponsors of projects and amounts credited to revolving funds authorized by this joint resolution, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

(c) Except as authorized in this joint resolution, no allocation of funds shall be made to any other Federal agency from the appropriation in this joint resolution for any Federal agency. No such allocation shall be made for the exercise of the functions of the Radio Division or the United States Film Service transferred to the Office of Education of the Federal Security Agency.

SEC. 8. (a) The Commissioner, subject to the approval of the Federal Works Administrator, shall fix a monthly earning schedule for persons engaged upon work projects financed in whole or in part from funds appropriated by section 1 which shall not substantially affect the current national average labor cost per person of the Work Projects Administration. Such monthly earning schedule shall not be varied for workers of the same type in different geographical areas to any greater extent than may be justified by differences in the cost of living. The Commissioner shall require that hours of work for all persons engaged upon work projects financed in whole or in part by funds appropriated by section 1 shall (1) be 130 hours per month, except that the Commissioner, in his discretion, may require a lesser number of hours of work per month in the case of relief workers with no dependents and the earnings of such workers shall be correspondingly reduced, and (2) not exceed 8 hours in any day, and (3) not exceed 40 hours in any week.

(b) The Commissioner may authorize exemptions from the above limitations of monthly earnings and hours of work on projects certified as hereinbefore provided as being important for military or naval purposes; to protect work already done on a project; to permit making up lost time; in the case of an emergency involving the public welfare; and in the case of supervisory personnel employed on work projects.

SEC. 9. (a) In employing or retaining in employment on Work Projects Administration work projects, preference shall be given to veterans of any war, campaign, or expedition in which the United States has been engaged (as determined on the basis of the laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, except that discharged draft enrollees other than those with service-connected disability shall not be considered as veterans for the purposes of this subsection), and unmarried widows of any such veterans, and the wives of any such veterans who are unemployable, who have been certified as in need of employment by the Work Projects Administration or by any agency designated by it to so certify: *Provided*, That if the total monthly income from all sources of any such veteran or of the unmarried widow of any such veteran, or if the total combined monthly income from all sources of any such unemployable veteran and his wife, as determined by the Commissioner (whose determination shall be final and conclusive), is less than the monthly earnings the veteran, unmarried widow, or wife would receive if employed as a project worker of the Work Projects Administration, then such veteran, unmarried widow, or wife, as the case may be, shall be certified as in need of such employment, and when assigned to such employment he or she shall be employed for such period as will permit the total monthly income of such veteran or unmarried widow, or the total combined monthly income of such unemployable veteran and his wife, to be approximately equal to the amount which would be obtainable by full-time employment on any such project. Thereafter preference in such employment shall be given on the basis of relative needs, as far as practicable, to other American citizens, Indians, and other persons owing allegiance to the United States who are in need.

(b) There shall be removed from employment on Work Projects Administration projects all relief workers, excepting blind persons, veterans, unmarried widows of such veterans and wives of such veterans as are unemployable, who have been continuously employed on such projects for more than 18 months, and any relief worker so removed shall be ineligible to be restored to employment on such projects until after (1) the expiration of 20 days after the date of his removal, and (2) recertification of his eligibility for restoration to employment on such projects: *Provided*, That such workers shall be removed only in the numbers necessary to provide employment for employable persons with the same or similar job qualifications who have been certified for a period of 3 months or more as in need of Work Projects Administration project employment and who have not in such period been given employment on work projects.

(c) In considering employment of persons upon work projects prosecuted under the appropriations contained in this joint resolution, the Work Projects Administration shall determine whether such persons are able to perform the work on work projects to which they can be assigned and no person shall be employed or retained for employment on any such project whose work habits are such or work record shows that he is incapable of performing satisfactorily the work to which he may be assigned on the project.

(d) There shall be removed from employment on Work Projects Administration projects all relief workers whose needs for employment have not been certified by, and except as provided in section 9 (a) or in section 10 (b), no relief worker shall be employed on such projects until after his need for employment has been certified by (a) a local public certifying agency or (b) the Work Projects Administration where no such agency exists or where the Work Projects Administration certifies by reason of its refusal to accept certification by local public agencies.

(e) No blind person receiving aid under the Social Security Act, as amended, shall be prohibited from temporarily relinquishing such aid to accept employment on a Work Projects Administration project.

(f) No alien, no Communist, and no member of any Nazi bund organization shall be given employment or continued in employment on any work project prosecuted under the appropriations contained in this joint resolution and no part of the money appropriated in this joint resolution shall be available to pay any person who has not made or who does not make affidavit as to United States citizenship and to the effect that he is not a Communist and not a member of any Nazi bund organization, such affidavit to be considered prima facie evidence of such citizenship, and that he is not a Communist and not a member of any Nazi bund organization.

(g) The Commissioner shall cause a periodic investigation to be made of the rolls of certified employees on work projects, and shall eliminate from the rolls those not in actual need, such investigation to be made so that each case is investigated at least once in every 12 months.

SEC. 10. (a) No person in need who refuses a bona fide offer of private or other public employment under reasonable working conditions which pays the prevailing wage for such work in the community where he resides and who is capable of performing such work shall be employed or retained in employment on work projects under the funds appropriated in this joint resolution for the period such private or other public employment would be available.

(b) Any person who takes such employment shall at the expiration thereof be entitled to immediate reemployment with the Work Projects Administration if he is still in need and if he has lost such employment through no fault of his own, and if he has first drawn all the benefits of unemployment compensation that shall have accrued to him during his term in private employment and which are available to him.

SEC. 11. (a) No person shall be employed or retained in employment in any administrative position, or in any supervisory position on any project, under the appropriations in this joint resolution unless such person has previously subscribed or before engaging in such employment subscribes to the following oath:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office (or employment) on which I am about to enter (or which I now occupy). So help me God."

(b) No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of

an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further,* That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation contained in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further,* That the above penal clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

(c) The Commissioner and the head of any other agency receiving an appropriation hereunder is authorized to designate employees, administrative and supervisory, as he may deem necessary to administer such oaths as are required by this joint resolution and such other oaths as may be required or necessary in the operation of the Work Projects Administration or other agency, which oaths shall be administered without charge or fee; such oaths shall have the same force and effect as oaths administered by notaries, justices of the peace, and other Federal and non-Federal officers qualified to administer oaths.

SEC. 12. In carrying out the purpose of the appropriations in this joint resolution, the Secretary of the Treasury, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, is authorized to prescribe rules and regulations for the establishment of special funds in the nature of revolving funds for use, until June 30, 1943, in the purchase, repair, distribution, or rental of materials, supplies, equipment, and tools.

SEC. 13. The provision of section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) shall not apply to any purchase made or service procured in connection with the appropriations in this joint resolution when the aggregate amount involved is less than $300.

SEC. 14. The appropriations in this joint resolution for administrative expenses and such portions of other appropriations in this joint resolution as are available for administrative expenses may be obligated in the amounts which the agency, with the approval of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, shall have certified to the Secretary of the Treasury as necessary for personal services, in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, and for contract stenographic reporting services, supplies, and equipment; purchase and exchange of lawbooks, books of reference, directories, and periodicals, and newspapers; travel expenses, including expenses of attendance at meetings of officials and employees of the agency on official business and including transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940 (Public, No. 839, 76th Cong.), and regulations promulgated thereunder; rental at the seat of government and elsewhere; operation and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; printing and binding and such other expenses as may be necessary for the accomplishment of the objectives of this joint resolution.

SEC. 15. (a) The appropriations contained in section 1 of this joint resolution and any administrative allocations thereof shall not be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws; except that this limitation shall not apply in the case of any person who is employed by any agency of the Government (other than the Work Projects Administration) on the date of enactment of this joint resolution.

(b) In carrying out the purposes of this joint resolution the agencies receiving appropriations under section 1 hereof or allocations under such appropriations are authorized to accept and utilize such voluntary and uncompensated services, appoint, without regard to civil-service laws, such officers and employees, and utilize, with the consent of the head of the Federal agency by which they are employed, such Federal officers and employees, and with the consent of the State such State and local officers and employees at such compensation as shall be determined by the head of the agency involved, as may be necessary, and prescribe their authorities, duties, responsibilities, and tenure, and, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, to fix the compensation of any officers and employees so appointed.

(c) Appointments to Federal positions of an administrative or advisory capacity under the appropriations in this joint resolution in any State shall be made from among the bona fide citizens of that State so far as not inconsistent with efficient administration.

SEC. 16. In making separations from the Federal service, or furloughs without pay to last as long as 3 months, of persons employed within the District of Columbia, under the provisions of this joint resolution, the appointing power shall give preference, as nearly as good administration will warrant, in retention to appointees from States that have not received their share of appointments according to population: *Provided, however,* That soldiers, sailors, and marines, the widows of such, or the wives of injured soldiers, sailors, and marines, who themselves are not qualified, but whose wives are qualified to hold a position in the Government service, shall be given preference in retention, in their several grades and classes, where their ratings are good or better.

SEC. 17. The provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (48 Stat. 351), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation and benefits shall apply to persons (except administrative employees qualifying as civil employees of the United States) receiving compensation from the appropriations in this joint resolution for services rendered as employees of the United States: *Provided,* That this section shall not apply in any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death: *Provided further,* That any funds appropriated under the head "Employees' Compensation Fund, Emergency Relief," shall be available for carrying out the provisions of this section.

SEC. 18. None of the funds made available by this joint resolution shall be used (a) for the operation of any theater project, (b) for the operation of any project sponsored solely by the Work Projects Administration, or (c) for radio broadcasting in an amount exceeding $10,000 or for the acquisition, rental, or distribution of motion-picture films.

SEC. 19. The Commissioner is authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, and pay from the appropriation in section 1 hereof any claim on account of damage to or loss of privately owned property caused by the negligence of any employee of the Works Progress Administration or the Work Projects Administration while acting within the scope of his employment. No claim shall be considered hereunder which is in excess of $500, or which is not presented in writing within 1 year from the date of accrual thereof. Acceptance by a claimant of the amount allowed on account of his claim shall be deemed to be in full settlement thereof, and the action upon such claim so accepted by the claimant shall be conclusive.

SEC. 20. The Commissioner is authorized to call to the attention of the city, county, and State governments the unemployment situation of that city, county, or State, and to seek the cooperation of the State or any subdivision thereof in meeting the unemployment problem.

SEC. 21. Any person who knowingly and with intent to defraud the United States makes any false statement in connection with any application for any work project, employment, or relief aid under the appropriations in this joint resolution, or diverts, or attempts to divert or assists in diverting, for the benefit of any person or persons not entitled thereto, any portion of such appropriations, or any services or real or personal property acquired thereunder, or who knowingly, by means of any fraud, force, threat, intimidation, or boycott, or discrimination on account of race, religion, political affiliations (except as may be authorized or required by law), or membership or nonmembership in a labor organization, deprives any person of any of the benefits to which he may be entitled under any such appropriations, or attempts so to do, or assists in so doing, or who disposes of, or assists in disposing of, except for the account of the United States, any property upon which there exists a lien securing a loan made under the provisions of this joint resolution or the Emergency Relief Appropriation Acts of 1935, 1936, 1937, 1938, and 1939, the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1941, as amended and supplemented, and the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1942, shall be deemed guilty of a felony and fined not more than $2,000 or imprisoned not more than 2 years, or both. The provisions of this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law, or of this joint resolution.

SEC. 22. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person knowingly to solicit, or knowingly be in any manner concerned in soliciting, any assessment, subscription, or contribution for the campaign expenses of any individual or political party from any person receiving compensation or employment provided for by this joint resolution.

(b) Any person who knowingly violates any provision of this section shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. The provisions of this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law, or of this joint resolution.

SEC. 23. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person, directly or indirectly, to promise any employment, position, work, compensation, or other benefit provided for or made possible by this joint resolution, or any other act of the Congress, to any person as consideration, favor, or reward for any political activity or for the support of or opposition to any candidate in any election or any political party.

(b) Except as may be authorized or required by law, it shall be unlawful for any person to deprive, attempt to deprive, or threaten to deprive, by any means, any person of any employment, position, work, compensation, or other benefit, provided for or made possible by this joint resolution, on account of race, creed, color, or any political activity, support of, or opposition to any candidate or any political party in any election.

(c) Any person who knowingly violates any provision of this section shall be guilty of a felony, and upon conviction shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both. The provisions of this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of law, or of this joint resolution.

SEC. 24. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person employed in any administrative or supervisory capacity by any agency of the Federal Government, whose compensation or any part thereof is paid from funds authorized or appropriated by this joint resolution, to use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the results thereof. While such per-

sons shall retain the right to vote as they please and to express privately their opinions on all political subjects, they shall take no active part, directly or indirectly, in political management or in political campaigns or in political conventions.

(b) Any person violating the provisions of this section shall be immediately removed from the position or office held by him, and thereafter no part of the funds appropriated by this joint resolution shall be used to pay the compensation of such person. The provisions of this section shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law, or of this joint resolution.

SEC. 25. No part of any appropriation in this joint resolution shall be used to pay the salary or expenses of any person in a supervisory or administrative position who is a candidate for any State, district, county, or municipal office (such office requiring full time of such person and to which office a salary or per diem attaches), in any primary, general, or special election, or who is serving as a campaign manager or assistant thereto for any such candidate.

SEC. 26. Reports of the operations under the appropriations in this joint resolution and the appropriations in the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1942, including a statement of the expenditures made and obligations incurred by classes of projects and amounts, shall be submitted to Congress by the President on or before the 31st of January in each of the next two regular sessions of Congress.

SEC. 27. No funds appropriated in this joint resolution, whether administered by the Federal Government or by the States or local governmental agencies from funds contributed in whole or in part by the Federal Government, shall be used by any Federal, State, or other agency to purchase, establish, relocate, or expand mills, factories, stores, or plants which would manufacture, handle, process, or produce for sale articles, commodities, or products (other than those derived from the first processing of sweetpotatoes and naval stores products) in competition with existing industries.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 28, line 5, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be allocated to or used in the construction of any project not now under construction, except such project as the Secretary of War or Navy or Chairman of the Maritime Commission may determine to be in furtherance of the war effort."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, the unanimous consent request of the gentleman from Missouri to close the time, gives me a chance to say what is to be said about this amendment without anybody else having an opportunity to say anything about it, and that is really unfair, but I really think this is a good amendment. I offer it in the face of the fact that I have never yet voted against a W. P. A. appropriation bill.

This amendment would merely do this. It would prohibit the administrative agents of W. P. A. from going out into the country and starting a new project, for instance, and, when the time for appropriation was approaching, come back to the Congress and say, "We have a certain thing under way and it must be completed." That is just the way the bureaus in the Government of the United States manage to impose upon the Congress.

My whole purpose in offering this amendment is to provide a way by which we can gradually and intelligently, and without harm, do away with the W. P. A. in an orderly manner. I do not know that I will vote for or against this bill, but I want to get it in the very best shape I can so I can afford to vote for it.

This amendment will say "Complete your project and then come back to us for more appropriations to start other projects, but tell us what you are going to do and do not come back and say, 'We have a schoolhouse half built and we have no more money to finish it or to put the roof on it.'" Let them finish the jobs as they go and come back to Congress with a definite plan.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. May I say to the gentleman that I have prepared an amendment to follow section 29 which is very similar to the gentleman's amendment. And I have a somewhat similar thought in mind the gentleman has in offering his amendment, that we do not want some of these in charge to be perpetuating themselves, but we do want to complete the projects that are under construction, and to take care of worthy relief.

Our amendments are practically the same except that my amendment contains this language, which I think the gentleman may want to include in his amendment:

Unless such projects are authorized or directed by the War Production Board.

There may be some projects which the War Production Board may be interested in having the W. P. A. handle.

Mr. MAY. I have undertaken to cover those cases by providing that they shall be completed projects except where the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy or the Chairman of the Maritime Commission, who handles the question of improvements around shipyards, shall determine that it is essential to the war effort that they be done. I have no objection to the objective of the gentleman's amendment.

I am not trying to harm the W. P. A. I am trying to provide a means by which they will be limited in their activities so that the Congress can have a check on them. I think the amendment ought to be adopted, and I ask that it be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MAY) there were—ayes 70, noes 60.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. MAY and Mr. CANNON of Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the motion that the vote has already been ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri moved that the Committee do now rise, and that motion was submitted before the actual count was begun.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. If the motion of the gentleman from Missouri prevails on a vote of "aye," which means a vote for the motion, then the Committee will rise and the House will be in session again, and cannot adjourn without the disposition of this amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The vote will recur de novo when the House goes back into the Committee of the Whole.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri that the Committee do now rise.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. CANNON of Missouri) there were—ayes 68, noes 93.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. MAY.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MAY. As I understand, Mr. Chairman, the vote about to be taken is the vote on whether or not the Committee shall rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has answered his own inquiry, and stated the parliamentary situation correctly.

The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri, on which tellers have been ordered.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 78, noes 107.

So the motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now recurs on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky, on which tellers have been ordered.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 101, noes 84.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 28. None of the funds appropriated by this joint resolution shall be used for the manufacture, purchase, or construction of any naval vessel, any armament, munitions, or implement of war, for military or naval forces, and no funds herein appropriated or authorized shall be diverted or allocated to any other department or bureau for such purpose.

SEC. 29. No part of the funds made available in this joint resolution shall be loaned or granted, except pursuant to an obligation incurred prior to the date of the enactment of this joint resolution, to any State, or any of its political subdivisions or agencies, for

the purpose of carrying out or assisting in carrying out any program or project of constructing, rebuilding, repairing, or replanning its penal or reformatory institutions, unless the President shall find that the projects to be financed with such loan or grant will not cause or promote competition of the products of convict labor with the products of free labor.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I intend when the time comes to offer a motion to recommit reducing the amount that can be available under this bill from the total of $336,000,000 to $225,000,000 or a one-third reduction.

This motion will also provide for the allocation of the funds to the States, so that the operation can be done as a relief proposition and not as a Federal construction proposition with the maintenance of a tremendous Federal force.

The opportunity to vote against the entire W. P. A. will come on the roll call on the passage of the bill. Those who wish to vote against the whole thing can vote "no" on the passage of the bill. I expect to be one of those who will vote "no."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman include in his statement that there will be a $2,000,000 reduction in the overhead at least, and probably more, if his amendment is agreed to?

Mr. TABER. That should be in there because there is no doubt about it.

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PEARSON. I would like to inquire whether the motion to recommit and bring about a reduction in the total amount also provides a method for allocating the funds to the various States.

Mr. TABER. There is no method provided in the amendment, leaving it to the Committee to go into that matter.

Mr. PEARSON. If that is the case, then it would be on the basis of population?

Mr. TABER. That is correct.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Would not the substance of the gentleman's motion to recommit be that this national octopus of W. P. A. with respect to its administrative overhead, would be removed but we would still have a substantial amount left to assist in the matter of the relief needs of the various States and subdivisions?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct, and we would get rid not only of 7,500 administrative employees, but 40,000 project supervisors.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go on record as supporting the motion which the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] intends to offer to recommit the bill and provide for the return to the States of all forms of relief.

I have had considerable experience with W. P. A. and have seen the wasteful administrative practices resulting from Federal control of this agency. Everyone knows that the farther away the control of any governmental agency is from such agency the greater must be the waste, extravagance, and inefficiency attending its operation. I am convinced that if this relief is turned back to the States it can be operated for much less money than Federal operation requires. Furthermore, I am certain that those deserving of relief will get more relief under State control than they are getting under Federal control.

It cannot be denied that politicians have preyed upon the distress of the people through this agency to further their own interests. Politics will still play a part in the operation of relief, even if it is turned back to the States, but it will not be as bad as it is now under Federal control.

With the States in control more of the funds will go to the needy and less to the politicians.

The recommittal motion provides for Federal grants-in-aid to the several States for relief but must be supplemented by State funds, the entire amount, however, being under State control.

I am quite certain the people of this country are desirous of having this relief program turned back to the States. They know of the great amount of waste and extravagance that has taken place in W. P. A. because of Federal operation. They know of its high administrative costs under Federal control. State administrators of W. P. A., for example, receive salaries of $10,000 a year, and they belong to the group of 250,000 political job holders to whom this Congress recently provided pensions up to $5,000 a year. I say to you that in this hour, when everyone in this country is being asked to sacrifice to the limit, we should seriously consider whether it is right and proper to continue this relief program under Federal control.

Unless the recommittal motion passes and the administration of relief is returned to the States, I will be compelled to vote against the final passage of the bill. I cannot vote to continue the exorbitant overhead costs, the wasteful practices, and the political exploitation of the poor that attend Federal operation of this agency. The need for economy and conservation of our resources and integrity in Government is too great to permit me to do this.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words, and I ask unanimous consent to speak out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

MASSACRE OF THE CZECH PEOPLE

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, your newspapers this morning told you of the massacre of Lidice. Yesterday we had with us a number of Americans who have been interned in Europe. Their stories confirm our fears regarding the determination of the Nazis to enslave free people. Their stories confirm the reports of the bloody campaign of the late Reinhard Heydrich—the terrorist who has been responsible for the murders of hundreds of Czechs and many Germans. Although Heydrich is dead the program of murder of Czech people has broken out again with even greater diabolical fury.

The Asscciated Press story from London reaching us today telling of Wednesday's massacre of the Czechs in Lidice is a horrible confirmation of the terror program which is being continued against these people. The story is a leaf torn out of the Dark Ages. Lidice was a village of nearly 500 hard-working, God-fearing, patriotic people. It was located about 40 miles west of Prague. The Press tells us the almost unbelievable story of how all of the men of that village were executed; how the women were removed to some unknown locality; and how the children were removed to some place. The village was entirely destroyed. This horrible act confirms our belief that the Nazis have concentrated on a deliberate and premeditated program to wipe out entirely all of the Czech intelligence; all Czech culture, and especially to destroy those great inspirations and aspirations for which the Czech people have fought for hundreds of years.

To President Benes; to Minister Masaryk, and those Czech officials who are clinging strongly to keep together the exiled Czech Government comes the task to inform the Christian world of what is happening to their people. We know that the Czech people will continue to follow the inspiration of their leaders to keep illuminated the spirit of freedom in spite of the fact that today they live in fear and in slavery under the yoke of oppressors.

Mr. Chairman, the dead Heydrich began his career by taking as his first victims his own fellow countrymen, who loved liberty more than they loved Hitler. Heydrich headed the terror campaign against all the people in Germany who opposed him. He was sent to continue his campaign in other oppressed countries, ending his bloody activities in Prague. The murders committed there at his command have horrified the entire Christian world. His successor, Delauge, already has a bloody record. He is the terrorist who helped to assassinate Nazi leaders in Germany who had fallen out with Hitler in the blood purge of 1934.

Mr. Chairman, the Czech people will never give up their fight for freedom. These bloody programs will never succeed. The list of names of Czechs who have given up their lives in the cause of liberty is a very large one. The history of Czechs who have fought for liberty all over the world will never be forgotten. The Czech spirit and the Czech determination for liberty can never be killed by the hangmen or the firing squads. Instead of making themselves stronger in occupied countries by killing and killing, the Nazis are merely instilling a stronger determination into their victims to fight on until freedom comes back to them again.

I am sure that I speak for millions of American people when I say that the

hearts of millions of American people are bleeding today, and that they send word of deep sympathy across the seas to their Czech allies in this hour of their great suffering. I am sure millions of American people want these brave Czech people to know that their American allies are determined that their sufferings will be avenged and that the freedom for which they so bravely fight will be returned to them.

Mr. Chairman, it is certain now that the Nazis have selected the Czech race for complete extermination. The records we now have indicate that the Czechs have been selected for family extermination. A horrible campaign which has not yet come to our attention from other countries occupied by these oppressors. I give you here a confirmation of that campaign.

During the first week of executions, 21 families were murdered by the Gestapo.

Families in Lidice; town destroyed; males executed.

Nine families in Prague.

Eight families in Brno.

Two families in Rokycany.

Two families in eastern Bohemia.

There were three families of four members each in Rokycany; Václav Stehlik, his wife Rurena, and their two sons Václav, 27, and Frantisek, 17 years old. Executed on Wednesday, May 27.

In Brno, Josef Kolarik, teacher; his wife, Josefa; their son, George, a physician; and their daughter-in-law, Jaroslava, both 26 years old. Executed on Saturday, May 30.

In Prague, Josef Mikula; his wife, Teresie; their son, Josef, 35; and daughter, Blazena.

Four families of three members each: Three in Brno, one in Litomysl.

Fourteen families of 2 members each, among them husband and wife, 10; mother and son, 1; father and son, 2; father and daughter, 1.

Up to June 4, 177 names were announced, among them 32 women.

Prominent intellectuals executed:

Dr. Vladislav Vancura, a well-known Czech writer, at Prague.

Dr. Victor Felber, professor of the Czechoslovak Institute of Technology, with his son Julius, 34 years old.

Judr. Bohumir Hanosek, counselor of the Czechoslovak Ministry of Agriculture.

Ing. Karel Ludvik and Dr. Josef Trcka, directors of the cooperativa, a purchasing unit of the Economic Association.

Rndr. Jaroslav Storkán, professor of zoologie at the Charles University at Prague.

Jan Mazanec, counselor of the Ministry of Agriculture at Prague.

Dr. Ladislav Rasin, son of the first Czechoslovak Minister of Finances and a member of Parliament.

Dr. Bohumil Baxa, professor of the law faculty of Masaryk University at Brno.

Dr. Jaromír Sámal, professor of the College of Agriculture and Forestry Engineering.

What Heydrich did in Prague

Many of my colleagues have asked for information regarding the Heydrich activities in Prague. In order to reply to some of these questions I include here with my brief remarks a brief summary from E. V. Erdly's report on Prague Braves the Hangman:

Heydrich has introduced a new system of penal justice which sanctions every injustice in advance and sets up a new kind of martial law, the so-called civil martial law (Zivilstandrecht). He has brought under civil martial law offenses which only the day before still fell within the sphere of the ordinary civil police and which—even in Nazi Germany and even in wartime were punished by fines or moderate sentences of imprisonment. To punish these offenses, which incidentally, were not legally defined (the measures preliminarily set out in Heydrich's decree were very vague and so were the grounds for death sentences passed), Heydrich created a new kind of court formerly unknown in the Czech protectorate. The civil summary court is something new. It has never been stated what are the qualifications of the judges presiding in these courts, whether they give their verdicts alone or if there is a bench of judges; it is not stated whether the accused is allowed legal aid for his defense, whether he is informed of the charge before the trial—all this is left unsaid. It is merely decreed that the names of the judges, of the accused and the most important witnesses for the prosecution, the action of which the prisoner is accused (and in accordance with paragraph 2 this can be paraphrased in a very vague fashion), as well as the date of the verdict, should be laid down in writing. Such are in the main the conditions for the recording of a police protocol in a civilized state where a mere traffic offense or disturbance of the peace is concerned. It is, however, characteristic of the relationship of the Germans to the peoples of their new Europe that almost the same regulations were issued for the summary courts which had to deal with natives in the former German colonies in Africa during the first World War.

On the other hand, Heydrich's decree defines precisely the type of judgment that must be passed by the civil summary court. Apart from the death sentences and acquittal, which are the normal findings of such courts, there are two other types of punishment: the complete or partial confiscation of property, even in a case in which the accused is not condemned to death, and further—and this is even more characteristic of the new type of German justice—it provides for the complete handing over of the case to the secret state police, i. e., to an authority which is not subject to any legal regulations and is not subordinate to any kind of control on the part of any other authority or person, with the single exception of Adolf Hitler. In other words, accused persons against whom even this infamous type of civil summary court, which itself satisfies a bare minimum of the necessary legal conditions for such a tribunal, cannot find sufficient evidence on which to base a verdict, are handed over to an authority which is able without regard for any formalities whatsoever to imprison them for life or kill them out of hand.

A further legal monstrosity is the stipulation that there is no appeal against the verdicts of the civil summary court. Even military courts martial in wartime must present their decisions to the superior military commander for his confirmation. Heydrich's civil court, situated a thousand miles away from the nearest theater of war, can decide on life and death without being subject to any control.

Heydrich's summary courts in Prague and Brno began to function on the morning of September 28. Nothing is known about the composition or the procedure of these so-called law courts, and the few Czechs who had experience of them as the accused and were acquitted by them have been careful not to tell anybody about their experience. As the summary courts sit in the buildings of the local Gestapo headquarters and they are not bound to follow the normal regulations of criminal-law procedure, it is not difficult to conclude that there is no question here of law courts in the western sense of the word, nor yet of any legal justice at all; rather are they a mere legalized form of the brutal summary justice of the Gestapo. This conclusion is also strengthened by the number of the accused on whom sentence is passed daily. In 20 days of session [up to October 31] the two summary courts "dealt" with 1,396 cases and passed 312 death sentences. That means 70 verdicts, on an average, daily, with 15 to 16 death sentences and no acquittals. There were, however, days [September 30, October 1, 2, 3] when 315, 271, 131, and 141 verdicts were pronounced. It is self-evident that there could be no question here of any civilized legal procedure. Defense was not permitted. The accused perhaps did not even know that their being brought before a couple of S. S. officials in black uniform was a regular trial and not one of the usual questionings. One may reconstruct the course of the "hearing" from the evidence of those who have undergone the hell of the Gestapo proceedings as follows:

The accused were brought into the courtroom in groups. The Gestapo officials sat at a long table. One of them read the names of the accused, each of whom had to state his presence with a loud "Here." That was enough to establish the identity of each individual accused. Then the statement on the basis of which the accused had been arrested was read by the Gestapo agent. The accused was asked whether the statement was correct, and had to say either yes or no. In the first case his guilt was confirmed beyond doubt. If he dared to say no, or tried to offer any explanation, an account of the hearing concerning him, or any other prisoner accused together with him, was read.

Should there be no such account to hand, the Gestapo agent who had dealt with the case was asked whether the accusation was correct. His answer was always in the affirmative, for the accusation was, of course, nothing but a verbal repetition of his own report to the Gestapo station. By this the accusation was proved and the giving of the evidence closed. There may have been individual cases when the accused were confronted with one another so that they should incriminate each other. In agreement with the practice of the Gestapo, fictitious statements of persons deceased or executed shortly before were brought forward as incriminating material. The German magistracy has always a greater faith in an official document than in the protest of the suspect, and a report made by a police officer—and even more a so-called account of the hearing by two police officials—is an official document.

Thus, the fate of the accused was generally sealed. Scarcely 3 in 200 accused people were acquitted—not a single one of the so-called political and military criminals—but they were, almost without exception, market women, fruit sellers, aged men; viz, people who had committed a trifling offense against orders about prices or registration and whom one could not, even with the worst ill will, condemn, or those who normally would have been charged a fine of a couple of pence, if that, or those who were brought before the court as a result of the bad temper of a market policeman, on account of the gossip of malicious neighbors, or in consequence of the jealousy of competitors.

The official German reports from the very beginning revealed serious contradictions as to the proceedings of the summary courts established by Heydrich's decree. Summary

courts have usually been set up to deal with emergency situations as quickly as possible. German official circles asserted that a conspiracy had been discovered which recently endeavored to separate the Czecho Protectorate from the Reich. But how could the Generals Bělý and Vojta, who have been for more than 18 months in a Gestapo prison, threaten the security of the German Reich? How could it be threatened by the Communist Deputy Otto Synek, who was arrested actually on September 1, 1939, the day on which the German war with Poland began? Or by the Brno University Professor Vladimir Groh, who was arrested 9 months before on February 6, 1941? How could the Prague mayor, Dr. Klapka, commit treason himself, and how could he convict Prime Minister Eliáš of subversive activity when he had been in prison since July 9, 1940, i. e., for 14 months? These facts were generally known to the Czech public and the Prague paper Ceské Slovo was chosen by Heydrich to deal with the unspoken questions asked by them.

"The uninformed public may well ask why people are now being sentenced who have previously been under arrest for long periods," wrote the paper on October 19. "The reply to this," it continued, "is that irrefutable evidence of their offense has only now been secured."

The verdict might be pronounced immediately after the bogus giving of evidence. There is every reason to assume that the decision of the summary court judges, whom Heydrich brought with him from the Reich, had been made before the trial began. In accordance with the German mentality, those judges made a sadistic difference between the methods of execution, which were announced together with the verdicts.

In their opinion, it is more honorable to be shot than to be hanged. Therefore, they sentenced to be shot, as a rule, such victims whose alleged crime had to do with any political or military activity, while the peasants, workers, and trades people, and especially those of Jewish extraction, were to be hanged. (The Jews are always described expressly, in addition to their names, as Jews, or half-Jews, according to the Nuremburg racial laws.)

After the death sentence was pronounced the condemned had only a few minutes more to live. The Gestapo are not sentimental, and the New Order of National Socialism is very far indeed from seeing a human being in an enemy, especially an enemy sentenced to immediate death. The verdicts were carried out at once by the Gestapo hangmen, and it is not known, so far, whether the condemned had any opportunity of writing a few words of farewell to their relatives. In no single case was there any hope of a personal farewell. The relations did not know where the prisoners were. Moreover, nobody is allowed to enter a Gestapo building unless he has received a written summons or is taken there as a prisoner himself.

The executions were carried out in the court building itself. The condemned men awaiting their turn could hear the firing and see the gallows. The sentence of death by shooting is not carried out under the Nazis by a party of 4 to 12 men, but 2 S. S. men shoot the condemned in a corner. The hanging, too, is carried out by S. S. men. This infamous task falls to young boys, none of whom can rise to a higher rank until in his conduct paper a certain number of legal murders are entered (executions, killing fugitives, causing death through energetic examination, etc.).

Besides the verdict of death, there were more than three times as many verdicts of being handed over to the Gestapo. This is also a new expression in the German legalistic phraseology.

The people of the Czech Protectorate—the parents, children, and wives of the executed and of those condemned to the Gestapo's treatment—learned the names, though not all the names, first through the broadcast of the Prague radio and on the following morning from the daily papers. The Gestapo introduced an especially cruel method in announcing the sentences; they gave only a certain number of names at a time, while the rest of the victims were referred to in a round figure, as if the activities of a slaughter-house were being recorded. Only 2 or 3 days later the papers reported semiofficially the names of more victims, together with a demagogic, biased, and malicious account of the actions for which the executed had been convicted. This is a Gestapo way of expressing contempt for a despicable race—and they regard the Czechs and also all the Slavs merely as such. Heydrich's summary courts showed their scorn of the whole Czech population further, and thus increased the feeling of insecurity. They would not publish all the executions on the day they took place. Sometimes the courts sat both in the morning and afternoon, but only the decisions of one of the two sessions were published. Sometimes the reports of the court in Prague only were made known, another day only those of the court in Brno. Only several weeks later could an approximately complete list of the executions be drawn up.

On Sunday, September 28, the feast of St. Wenceslas, the courts began to publish the first verdicts; every night the voice of the announcer of the Prague radio was heard giving as it were inconspicuously, in the middle of the war commentary and home and foreign news, the daily ration for the horror-stricken Czech public of the death sentences of the arrested patriots and the much-higher number of those given over to the handling of the Gestapo. The newspapers had to print the reports on the following morning in the same way, inconspicuously, among other news items.

"By the decision of the Reich Protector in Bohemia and Moravia," so the announcement began, "were sentenced at the summary courts in Prague and in Brno for high treason and sabotage; for preparing to commit high treason, for economic sabotage and unauthorized possession of weapons; for preparing to commit high treason, for sabotage and illegal possession of weapons; for contemplated economic sabotage; for listening in to foreign broadcasts; (and, on October 26) for giving support to saboteurs who entered the Protectorate by parachute, X, Y, and Z, as well as 15 other persons, to death by shooting, A, B, and C, as well as 5 Jews, to death by hanging. The sentence was carried out today. Further, the courts ordered to be handed over to the Gestapo, 256, 131, 43, 55, other accused."

On the first day the voice of the Czech announcer quivered. He was obviously upset. The next evening the man was replaced by another announcer whose stronger, unshaken voice held out indifferently through the weeks of blood, and did not tremble even when, on November 28, he announced the three hundred and ninety-fourth execution.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, following the remarks of our distinguished friend from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], I desire to make a brief announcement that on Saturday next there will come to the city of Washington, as I have been informed, 14 heroes of the United Nations, who have already appeared in New York, Boston, and other cities, and who will appear in 20 other cities of our country.

These young men are intrepid heroes of this war, who have made records of heroism fighting for their country and fighting for the forces of decency in this conflict. Five of these young men are American heroes. On Saturday next they will visit Washington. I know the people of Washington will give them the splendid reception that they richly deserve and consistent with the wonderful receptions they have already received from the people of the great city of New York and from the people of my own great city of Boston.

On Saturday afternoon at 12:30 those heroes will come to the Speaker's office to be our guests, and I invite all Members of the House who are in Washington on Saturday next to be present from 12:15 to 12:30 p. m. to meet these heroes.

In the evening there will be a large citizens' rally held at the Watergate near Lincoln Memorial. I am informed by the Sergeant at Arms that a special section of the seats for the rally at the Watergate has been reserved for Members of the House and each Member will receive two tickets. Those who desire tickets to that vast meeting at which these young men will speak can obtain those tickets from the Sergeant at Arms. This announcement, I think, appropriately follows the stirring remarks of our colleague from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN], who preceded me, and I know we all join with him in extending to the conquered peoples of all nations of the world our heartfelt sympathy during the period of temporary conquest. Also, the fact that our great country after victory comes to the cause of the United Nations, stands for a future decent world, and for bringing back to the people temporarily conquered those freedoms that they so richly deserve.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 30. Any administrator or other officer named to have general supervision at the seat of government over the program and work contemplated under the appropriations contained in this joint resolution and receiving a salary of $5,000 or more per annum from such appropriations, and any State or regional administrator receiving a salary of $5,000 or more per annum from such appropriations—except persons now serving as such under other law—shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate: *Provided*, That the provisions of section 1761 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any such appointee and the salary of any person so appointed shall not be increased for a period of 6 months after confirmation.

SEC. 31. The provisions of section 501 of the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942 (Public, No. 353, 77th Cong.), approved December 17, 1941, shall be applicable to appropriations under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939 (53 Stat. 927), which lapse for expenditure purposes on June 30, 1942, and there shall be transferred to the "Emergency relief liquidation fund" from appropriations under the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1939 sufficient amounts to meet unliquidated obligations incurred thereunder: *Provided*, That claims certified for payment by the Comptroller General of the United States, chargeable to the "Emergency relief liquidation fund," shall be paid without regard to project allocations.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the resolution back to the House with sundry amendments, with

the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the resolution as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. Cox having assumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. WHITTINGTON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration House Joint Resolution 324, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the resolution as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Missouri is recognized.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, when the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] offered his amendment it was so sweeping, so far-reaching, and so devastating in its effect upon the bill that it was not taken seriously at the table here, and I did not consider it necessary to discuss it. I think no one can read the gentleman's amendment without realizing that it was offered for the purpose of destroying in a great measure the purpose and effect of the bill.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the author of the amendment.

Mr. MAY. I had no such intent. I am only trying to improve the legislation the gentleman is sponsoring here in an effort to provide an orderly way in which W. P. A. may function.

In answer to the gentleman's remarks that it would destroy the bill: The only thing in the world it does is to require that they complete existing projects with this money and not start new ones except in such cases as the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Chairman of the Maritime Commission may certify to W. P. A. in furtherance of the war effort.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I appreciate the gentleman's position and particularly in view of his continuous and consistent opposition to the vital provisions of the bill this afternoon. The effect of the gentleman's amendment, nevertheless, is practically to emasculate the measure.

It prohibits the use of funds for projects that are not under way on July 1, 1942, unless they are found necessary to the war effort by the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, or Chairman of the Maritime Commission.

Construction projects account for a very large proportion of the appropriation provided by the joint resolution. Construction projects are of many types, large and small, scattered all over the United States. As a general rule the larger the community the larger the project and the longer time it takes to build. If no new projects can be built it means that many communities throughout the United States will have no work relief for the unemployed. The war effort has centered employment of that character in a relatively few States. Many States that have no war industry or military or naval activities will have lost much industry because of the curtailment of civilian goods. There will be unemployment but no relief can be furnished under this amendment because new projects cannot be started.

Many projects, both in cities and in urban areas, are not large projects. Roads, streets, sewers, water mains, and so forth, are in the main projects that do not take a long time to complete. The uncompleted projects that could be carried on would be in many instances large projects in populous sections. The amendment penalizes the areas where unemployment relief is badly needed and tends to aid the areas where private employment has been stimulated by the war effort.

The fact that new projects can be started does not commit the United States Government to anything beyond the amount of money in this bill or beyond the fiscal year 1943. If any Federal project is started that cannot be completed in 1943 enough money to complete it must be allocated from this appropriation and set aside for that purpose. If any non-Federal project is approved that cannot be finished within the fiscal year with the money allocated to it, there is no commitment by the Federal Government to complete it and the sponsor—be it State, county, or city—would have to finish it.

The amendment offered prevents an equitable distribution of W. P. A. employment in the areas where work relief will be most needed, and will tend to concentrate it in the areas where war work is most pronounced and private employment stimulated thereby. If the program under this bill is to be one for relief of unemployment, then the pending amendment should be defeated.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the motion and yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the gentleman——

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order. The previous question has already been moved.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question if there is going to be any controversy about it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment reported by the committee?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I request a separate vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is a separate vote demanded on any other amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the May amendment.

The Clerk read as follows: Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: On page 28, line 5, strike out the period and insert a colon and the following proviso:

Provided, That none of the funds herein appropriated shall be allocated to or used in the construction of any project not now under construction, except such projects as the Secretary of War or Navy or Chairman of the Maritime Commission may determine to be in furtherance of the war effort.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the May amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 133, nays 184, not voting 113, as follows:

[Roll No. 72]

YEAS—133

Anderson, Calif.	Gathings	Mott
Andresen, August H.	Gifford	Murray
	Gilchrist	Norrell
Andrews	Gillie	O'Brien, N. Y.
Arends	Gore	O'Hara
Bates, Mass.	Graham	Pace
Bender	Guyer	Pearson
Bennett	Gwynne	Peterson, Ga.
Bland	Hall, Leonard W.	Pheiffer, William T.
Bolton		
Boren	Halleck	Rankin, Mont.
Brown, Ohio	Hancock	Reed, Ill.
Bulwinkle	Harness	Reed, N. Y.
Burch	Harris, Ark.	Rees, Kans.
Butler	Harris, Va.	Rich
Carlson	Hartley	Rizley
Carter	Hess	Robertson, Va.
Case, S. Dak.	Hill, Colo.	Rockefeller
Chapman	Hoffman	Rockwell
Chenoweth	Hope	Rodgers, Pa.
Ciason	Jenkins, Ohio	Rogers, Mass.
Clevenger	Jennings	Satterfield
Colmer	Jensen	Scott
Cooley	Johns	Simpson
Cooper	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Ohio
Costello	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, Va.
Courtney	Jones	Smith, Wis.
Cox	Jonkman	Springer
Cravens	Kean	Stearns, N. H.
Crawford	Keefe	Sumner, Ill.
Cunningham	Kinzer	Taber
Curtis	Knutson	Talle
Davis, Tenn.	Kunkel	Thomas, N. J.
Dewey	Lambertson	Tibbott
Disney	Lanham	Treadway
Dondero	LeCompte	Vorys, Ohio
Doughton	McGregor	Wadsworth
Douglas	McLean	West
Drewry	McMillan	Whittington
Dworshak	Martin, Iowa	Wigglesworth
Eaton	Martin, Mass.	Winter
Elliott, Calif.	May	Wolcott
Elston	Michener	Wolverton, N. J.
Engel	Mills, Ark.	Woodruff, Mich.
Faddis	Monroney	
Gamble	Moser	

NAYS—184

Allen, Ill.	Camp	Eberharter
Allen, La.	Canfield	Englebright
Anderson, N. Mex.	Cannon, Fla.	Fenton
	Cannon, Mo.	Fitzgerald
Angell	Capozzoli	Fitzpatrick
Arnold	Cartwright	Flaherty
Barnes	Celler	Flannagan
Beam	Chiperfield	Fogarty
Beckworth	Claypool	Folger
Beiter	Cochran	Forand
Bloom	Coffee, Wash.	Ford, Thomas F.
Boggs	Creal	Fulmer
Bonner	Crosser	Gehrmann
Boykin	D'Alesandro	Gerlach
Bradley, Mich.	Davis, Ohio	Gibson
Bradley, Pa.	Day	Gossett
Brooks	Delaney	Granger
Brown, Ga.	Dingell	Grant, Ala.
Bryson	Domengeaux	Green
Buck	Downs	Gregory
Burgin	Duncan	Haines

Hall, Edwin Arthur	McKeough	Scanlon
Hare	McLaughlin	Schuetz
Harter	Maciora	Sheppard
Healey	Magnuson	Smith, Maine
Hébert	Mahon	Smith, Pa.
Heidinger	Manasco	Smith, Wash.
Hendricks	Mansfield	Snyder
Hill, Wash.	Marcantonio	Somers, N. Y.
Hobbs	Meyer, Md.	South
Hook	Mills, La.	Sparkman
Houston	Mundt	Spence
Hull	Murdock	Steagall
Imhoff	Myers, Pa.	Stefan
Jackson	Nelson	Stevenson
Jacobsen	Norton	Sullivan
Jarman	O'Brien, Mich.	Sumners, Tex.
Johnson, Ind.	O'Leary	Sutphin
Johnson, Luther A.	O'Neal	Tarver
Johnson, Okla.	Patman	Tenerowicz
Johnson, W. Va.	Patrick	Terry
Kee	Patton	Thill
Kefauver	Peterson, Fla.	Thom
Kelley, Pa.	Pierce	Thomas, Tex.
Kelly, Ill.	Pittenger	Van Zandt
Kerr	Poage	Vincent, Ky.
Kirwan	Powers	Vinson, Ga.
Klein	Priest	Voorhis, Calif.
Kopplemann	Rabaut	Ward
Landis	Ramsay	Weaver
Lane	Ramspeck	Weiss
Larrabee	Rankin, Miss.	Welch
Leavy	Richards	Wene
Lesinski	Rivers	Wheat
Lewis	Robinson, Utah	White
Ludlow	Rogers, Okla.	Whitten
Lynch	Rolph	Wickersham
McCormack	Romjue	Williams
McGehee	Russell	Wright
McGranery	Sabath	Young
McIntyre	Sanders	Zimmerman
	Sasscer	
	Sauthoff	

NOT VOTING—113

Andersen, H. Carl	Gavagan	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Baldwin	Gearhart	Plauché
Barden	Gillette	Ploeser
Barry	Grant, Ind.	Plumley
Bates, Ky.	Harrington	Randolph
Baumhart	Hart	Reece, Tenn.
Bell	Heffernan	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bishop	Hinshaw	Robsion, Ky.
Blackney	Holbrock	Sacks
Boehne	Holmes	Schaefer, Ill.
Buckler, Minn.	Howell	Schulte
Buckley, N. Y.	Hunter	Scrugham
Burdick	Izac	Secrest
Byrne	Jarrett	Shafer, Mich.
Byron	Jenks, N. H.	Shanley
Casey, Mass.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Shannon
Clark	Kennedy, Martin J.	Sheridan
Cluett	Kennedy, Michael J.	Short
Coffee, Nebr.	Keogh	Sikes
Cole, Md.	Kilburn	Smith, W. Va.
Cole, N. Y.	Kilday	Starnes, Ala.
Collins	Kleberg	Stratton
Copeland	Kocialkowski	Sweeney
Crowther	Kramer	Talbot
Culkin	Lea	Thomason
Cullen	Maas	Tinkham
Dickstein	Maciejewski	Tolan
Dies	Mason	Traynor
Dirksen	Merritt	Vreeland
Ditter	Mitchell	Walter
Durham	Nichols	Wasielewski
Edmiston	O'Connor	Whelchel
Eliot, Mass.	O'Day	Wilson
Ellis	Oliver	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fellows	Osmers	Woodrum, Va.
Fish	O'Toole	Worley
Ford, Leland M.	Paddock	Youngdahl
Ford, Miss.		
Gale		

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Burdick against.

Mr. Shafer of Michigan for, with Mrs. O'Day against.

Mr. Youngdahl for, with Mr. Holbrock against.

Mr. Baumhart for, with Mr. Cullen against.

Mr. Baldwin for, with Mr. Stratton against.

General pairs:

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Randolph with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Ditter.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Cluett.

Mr. Boehne with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Durham with Mr. Bishop.

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Kilburn.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Culkin.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.

Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Gale.

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Traynor with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Collins with Mr. Copeland.

Mr. Shanley with Mr. Grant of Indiana.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Holmes.

Mr. Secrest with Mr. Ploeser.

Mr. Coffee of Nebraska with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Thomason with Mr. Crowther.

Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Fellows.

Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Howell.

Mr. Kilday with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. Eliot of Massachusetts with Mr. Oliver.

Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Gearhart.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Wilson.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Leland M. Ford.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Lea with Mr. Tinkham.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Paddock.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Jarrett.

Mr. Hunter with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.

Mr. Edmiston with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

Mr. Whelchel with Mr. Barry.

Mr. Cole of Indiana with Mr. Plauché.

Mr. Harrington with Mrs. Byron.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Dickstein.

Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Kocialkowski.

Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Byrne.

Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Merritt.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Maciejewski.

Mr. Kramer with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.

Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Walter.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Bell.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. TABER. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TABER moves to recommit House Joint Resolution 324 to the Committee on Appropriations with instructions to report the resolution back to the House with the following changes in those parts of the joint resolution relating to relief and its administration: Provide for an appropriation, including reappropriations, of not exceeding $225,000,000 and for allocation of the appropriated funds to States, Territories, municipalities, and the District of Columbia by grants-in-aid to enable them to carry out relief and work-relief programs determined and administered by them, in which they participate through reasonable financial and other contributions.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And on the question I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 139, nays 184, not voting 107, as follows:

[Roll No. 73]

YEAS—139

Allen, Ill.	Gifford	Monroney
Anderson, Calif.	Gillie	Moser
Andrews	Gossett	Mott
Arends	Graham	Murray
Bates, Mass.	Guyer	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bender	Gwynne	O'Hara
Bennett	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Pearson
Bland	Hall, Leonard W.	Pheiffer, William T.
Bolton	Halleck	Poage
Boren	Hancock	Rankin, Miss.
Brown, Ga.	Hare	Rankin, Mont.
Brown, Ohio	Harness	Reece, Tenn.
Bryson	Harris, Va.	Reed, Ill.
Bulwinkle	Hartley	Reed, N. Y.
Burch	Heidinger	Rees, Kans.
Camp	Hess	Rich
Carlson	Hill, Colo.	Rizley
Carter	Hoffman	Robertson, Va.
Case, S. Dak.	Hope	Rockefeller
Chapman	Jenkins, Ohio	Rockwell
Chenoweth	Jensen	Rodgers, Pa.
Clevenger	Johns	Rogers, Mass.
Colmer	Johnson, Calif.	Satterfield
Cooley	Johnson, Ill.	Scott
Costello	Johnson, Luther A.	Simpson
Courtney	Jones	Smith, Ohio
Cox	Jonkman	Smith, Va.
Cravens	Kean	Smith, Wis.
Crawford	Kefauver	Springer
Cunningham	Kinzer	Starnes, Ala.
Curtis	Knutson	Stearns, N. H.
Day	Kunkel	Sumner, Ill.
Dewey	Lambertson	Sumners, Tex.
Disney	Lanham	Taber
Dondero	LeCompte	Talle
Doughton	McGregor	Thomas, N. J.
Douglas	McLean	Tibbott
Drewry	McMillan	Treadway
Dworshak	Mansfield	Vorys, Ohio
Eaton	Martin, Iowa	Wadsworth
Elliott, Calif.	Martin, Mass.	West
Elston	May	Whitten
Engel	Michener	Wigglesworth
Faddis	Mills, Ark.	Winter
Fulmer	Murdock	Wolcott
Gamble	Nelson	Woodruff, Mich.
Gerlach	Norton	
Gibson	Patton	

NAYS—184

Allen, La.	Delaney	Jackson
Anderson, N. Mex.	Dingell	Jacobsen
Andresen, August H.	Domengeaux	Jarman
Angell	Downs	Jennings
Arnold	Duncan	Johnson, Ind.
Barnes	Eberharter	Johnson, Okla.
Beam	Edmiston	Johnson, W. Va.
Beckworth	Englebright	Kee
Beiter	Fenton	Keefe
Bloom	Fitzgerald	Kelley, Pa.
Boggs	Fitzpatrick	Kelly, Ill.
Bonner	Flaherty	Kennedy, Martin J.
Boykin	Flannagan	Keogh
Bradley, Mich.	Fogarty	Kerr
Bradley, Pa.	Folger	Kirwan
Brooks	Forand	Klein
Buck	Ford, Thomas F.	Kopplemann
Burgin	Gathings	Landis
Butler	Gavagan	Lane
Canfield	Gehrmann	Leavy
Cannon, Fla.	Gilchrist	Lesinski
Cannon, Mo.	Gore	Lewis
Capozzoli	Granger	Ludlow
Cartwright	Grant, Ala.	Lynch
Celler	Green	McCormack
Chiperfield	Gregory	McGehee
Clason	Haines	McGranery
Claypool	Harris, Ark.	McIntyre
Cochran	Harter	McKeough
Coffee, Wash.	Healey	McLaughlin
Cooper	Hébert	Maciora
Creal	Hendricks	Magnuson
Crosser	Hill, Wash.	Mahon
D'Alesandro	Hook	Manasco
Davis, Ohio	Houston	Marcantonio
	Hull	Meyer, Md.
	Imhoff	

Mills, La.	Robinson, Utah	Tenerowicz
Mundt	Rogers, Okla.	Terry
Murdock	Rolph	Thill
Myers, Pa.	Romjue	Thom
Nelson	Russell	Thomas, Tex.
Norrell	Sabath	Van Zandt
Norton	Sanders	Vincent, Ky.
O'Brien, Mich.	Sasscer	Vinson, Ga.
O'Leary	Sauthoff	Voorhis, Calif.
O'Neal	Scanlon	Ward
O'Toole	Schuetz	Weaver
Pace	Sheppard	Weiss
Patman	Smith, Maine	Welch
Patrick	Smith, Pa.	Wene
Patton	Smith, Wash.	Wheat
Peterson, Fla.	Snyder	White
Peterson, Ga.	Somers, N. Y.	Whittington
Pierce	South	Wickersham
Pittenger	Sparkman	Williams
Powers	Spence	Wilson
Priest	Steagall	Wolverton, N. J.
Rabaut	Stefan	Wright
Ramsay	Stevenson	Young
Ramspeck	Sullivan	Zimmerman
Richards	Sutphin	
Rivers	Tarver	

NOT VOTING—107

Andersen, H. Carl	Ford, Miss. Gale	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Baldwin	Gearhart	Plauché
Barden	Gillette	Ploeser
Barry	Grant, Ind.	Plumley
Bates, Ky.	Harrington	Randolph
Baumhart	Hart	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bell	Heffernan	Robsion, Ky.
Bishop	Hinshaw	Sacks
Blackney	Hobbs	Schaefer, Ill.
Boehne	Holbrock	Schulte
Buckler, Minn.	Holmes	Scrugham
Buckley, N. Y.	Howell	Secrest
Burdick	Hunter	Shafer, Mich.
Byrne	Izac	Shanley
Byron	Jarrett	Shannon
Casey, Mass.	Jenks, N. H.	Sheridan
Clark	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Short
Cluett	Kennedy, Michael J.	Sikes
Coffee, Nebr.	Kilburn	Smith, W. Va.
Cole, Md.	Kilday	Stratton
Cole, N. Y.	Kleberg	Sweeney
Collins	Kocialkowski	Talbot
Copeland	Kramer	Thomason
Crowther	Larrabee	Tinkham
Culkin	Maas	Tolan
Cullen	Maciejewski	Traynor
Davis, Tenn.	Mason	Vreeland
Dickstein	Merritt	Walter
Dies	Mitchell	Wasielewski
Dirksen	Nichols	Whelchel
Ditter	O'Connor	Wolfenden, Pa.
Durham	O'Day	Woodrum, Va.
Eliot, Mass.	Oliver	Worley
Ellis	Osmers	Youngdahl
Fellows	Paddock	
Fish	Pearson	
Ford, Leland M.	Peterson, Ga.	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Davis of Tennessee for, with Mr. Cullen against.

Mr. Shafer of Michigan for, with Mrs. O'Day against.

Mr. Short for, with Mr. Burdick against.

Mr. Ditter for, with Mr. Michael J. Kennedy against.

Mr. Baumhart for, with Mr. Secrest against.

Mr. Culkin for, with Mr. Merritt against.

Mr. Baldwin for, with Mr. Larrabee against.

Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania for, with Mr. Buckley against.

Mr. Cole of New York for, with Mr. Dickstein against.

Mr. Kleberg for, with Mr. Holbrock against.

Mr. Kilburn for, with Mr. Barry against.

Mr. Stratton for, with Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer against.

Mr. Cluett for, with Mr. Heffernan against.

General pairs:

Mr. Randolph with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Boehne with Mr. Dirksen.

Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Mason.

Mr. Durham with Mr. Bishop.

Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.

Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Gale.

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Traynor with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Smith of Washington with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Collins with Mr. Copeland.

Mr. Shanley with Mr. Grant of Indiana.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Holmes.

Mr. Whelchel with Mr. Ploeser.

Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Plumley.

Mr. Thomason with Mr. Crowther.

Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Fellows.

Mr. Plauché with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Nichols with Mr. Howell.

Mr. Kilday with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. Eliot of Massachusetts with Mr. Oliver.

Mr. Harrington with Mr. Gearhart.

Mr. Tolan with Mr. Leland M. Ford.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Hinshaw.

Mr. Byron with Mr. Tinkham.

Mr. Izac with Mr. Paddock.

Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Jarrett.

Mr. Hunter with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Casey with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.

Mr. Kocialkowski with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

Mr. Sweeney with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.

Mr. Byrne with Mr. Youngdahl.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Maciejewski.

Mr. Kramer with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.

Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Walter.

Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Bell.

Mr. Barden with Mr. Hart.

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Schulte.

Mr. Coffee of Nebraska with Mr. Bates of Kentucky.

Mr. Shannon with Mr. Mitchell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 279, nays 52, not voting 99, as follows:

[Roll No. 74]

YEAS—279

Allen, Ill.	Chenoweth	Gavagan
Allen, La.	Chiperfield	Gehrmann
Andresen, August H.	Clason	Gerlach
Andrews	Claypool	Gibson
Angell	Cochran	Gilchrist
Arends	Coffee, Wash.	Gillie
Arnold	Colmer	Gore
Barnes	Cooper	Gossett
Barry	Costello	Graham
Bates, Mass.	Cox	Granger
Beam	Cravens	Grant, Ala.
Beckworth	Creal	Green
Beiter	Crosser	Gregory
Bender	Cunningham	Guyer
Bennett	D'Alesandro	Haines
Bland	Davis, Ohio	Hall, Edwin Arthur
Bloom	Day	Hancock
Boggs	Delaney	Harness
Bolton	Dewey	Harris, Ark.
Bonner	Dickstein	Harter
Boren	Dingell	Hartley
Boykin	Domengeaux	Healey
Bradley, Mich.	Dondero	Hébert
Bradley, Pa.	Douglas	Heffernan
Brooks	Downs	Hendricks
Brown, Ga.	Duncan	Hess
Brown, Ohio	Dworshak	Hill, Colo.
Bryson	Eberharter	Hill, Wash.
Buck	Edmiston	Hobbs
Buckley, N. Y.	Elliott, Calif.	Hook
Burgin	Elston	Hope
Butler	Engel	Houston
Camp	Englebright	Hull
Canfield	Fenton	Hunter
Cannon, Fla.	Fitzgerald	Imhoff
Cannon, Mo.	Fitzpatrick	Jackson
Capozzoli	Flaherty	Jacobsen
Carlson	Flannagan	Jarman
Carter	Fogarty	Jenkins, Ohio
Cartwright	Folger	Jennings
Case, S. Dak.	Forand	Johns
Celler	Ford, Thomas F.	Johnson, Calif.
Chapman	Fulmer	Johnson, Ill.
	Gathings	

Johnson, Ind.	Murray	Smith, Maine
Johnson, Okla.	Myers, Pa.	Smith, Pa.
Johnson, W. Va.	Nelson	Smith, Wash.
Jonkman	Norrell	Smith, Wis.
Kee	Norton	Snyder
Keefe	O'Brien, Mich.	Somers, N. Y.
Kefauver	O'Hara	South
Kelley, Pa.	O'Leary	Sparkman
Kelly, Ill.	O'Neal	Spence
Kennedy, Martin J.	O'Toole	Springer
	Patman	Starnes, Ala.
Kennedy, Michael J.	Patrick	Steagall
	Patton	Stearns, N. H.
Keogh	Peterson, Fla.	Stefan
Kerr	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Stevenson
Kirwan		Sullivan
Klein	Pheiffer, William T.	Sumners, Tex.
Kopplemann		Sutphin
Landis	Pierce	Talle
Lane	Pittenger	Tarver
Lanham	Poage	Tenerowicz
Lea	Powers	Terry
Leavy	Priest	Thill
Lesinski	Rabaut	Thom
Lewis	Ramsay	Thomas, Tex.
Ludlow	Ramspeck	Tibbott
Lynch	Randolph	Treadway
McCormack	Rankin, Miss.	Van Zandt
McGehee	Rankin, Mont.	Vincent, Ky.
McGranery	Reed, Ill.	Vinson, Ga.
McGregor	Rees, Kans.	Voorhis, Calif.
McIntyre	Richards	Vorys, Ohio
McKeough	Rivers	Ward
McLaughlin	Rizley	Weaver
Maciora	Robinson, Utah	Weiss
Magnuson	Rockwell	Welch
Mahon	Rodgers, Pa.	Wene
Manasco	Rogers, Mass.	Wheat
Mansfield	Rogers, Okla.	White
Marcantonio	Rolph	Wickersham
Martin, Mass.	Romjue	Wigglesworth
May	Russell	Williams
Merritt	Sabath	Wilson
Meyer, Md.	Sanders	Wolcott
Michener	Sasscer	Wolfenden, Pa.
Mills, La.	Satterfield	Wolverton, N. J.
Monroney	Sauthoff	Woodruff, Mich.
Moser	Scanlon	Woodrum, Va.
Mott	Schuetz	Wright
Mundt	Schulte	Young
Murdock	Sheppard	Zimmerman

NAYS—52

Anderson, Calif.	Hoffman	Reed, N. Y.
Bulwinkle	Jensen	Rich
Burch	Johnson, Luther A.	Robertson, Va.
Clevenger		Rockefeller
Cooley	Jones	Scott
Courtney	Kean	Simpson
Crawford	Kinzer	Smith, Ohio
Curtis	Knutson	Smith, Va.
Disney	Kunkel	Sumner, Ill.
Drewry	Lambertson	Taber
Faddis	LeCompte	Thomas, N. J.
Gamble	McLean	Wadsworth
Gifford	McMillan	West
Gwynne	Martin, Iowa	Whitten
Hall, Leonard W.	Mills, Ark.	Whittington
	O'Brien, N. Y.	Winter
Halleck	Pearson	
Hare	Peterson, Ga.	
Harris, Va.	Reece, Tenn.	

NOT VOTING—99

Andersen, H. Carl	Ditter	Kramer
	Doughton	Larrabee
Anderson, N. Mex.	Durham	Maas
	Eaton	Maciejewski
Baldwin	Eliot, Mass.	Mason
Barden	Ellis	Mitchell
Bates, Ky.	Fellows	Nichols
Baumhart	Fish	O'Connor
Bell	Ford, Leland M.	O'Day
Bishop	Ford, Miss.	Oliver
Blackney	Gale	Osmers
Boehne	Gearhart	Pace
Buckler, Minn.	Gillette	Paddock
Burdick	Grant, Ind.	Plauché
Byrne	Harrington	Ploeser
Byron	Hart	Plumley
Casey, Mass.	Heidinger	Robertson, N. Dak.
Clark	Hinshaw	
Cluett	Holbrock	Robsion, Ky.
Coffee, Nebr.	Holmes	Sacks
Cole, Md.	Howell	Schaefer, Ill.
Cole, N. Y.	Izac	Scrugham
Collins	Jarrett	Secrest
Copeland	Jenks, N. H.	Shafer, Mich.
Crowther	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Shanley
Culkin		Shannon
Cullen	Kilburn	Sheridan
Davis, Tenn.	Kilday	Short
Dies	Kleberg	Sikes
Dirksen	Kocialkowski	Smith, W. Va.

Stratton	Tolan	Whelchel
Sweeney	Traynor	Worley
Talbot	Vreeland	Youngdahl
Thomason	Walter	
Tinkham	Wasielewski	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Blackney for, with Mr. Baldwin against.
Mr. Holbrock for, with Mr. Kleberg against.
Mr. Larrabee for, with Mr. Pace against.
Mr. Burdick for, with Mr. Short against.
Mr. Cullen for, with Mr. Shafer of Michigan against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Boehne with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Durham with Mr. Bishop.
Mr. Barden with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Gale.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Collins with Mr. Copeland.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Holmes.
Mr. Whelchel with Mr. Ploeser.
Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Thomason with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Plauché with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Kilday with Mr. Talbot.
Mr. Eliot of Massachusetts with Mr. Oliver.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mrs. Byron with Mr. Tinkham.
Mr. Shanley with Mr. Grant of Indiana.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Paddock.
Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Jarrett.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. Kocialkowski with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Youngdahl.
Mr. Worley with Mr. Baumhart.
Mr. Maciejewski with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Kramer with Mr. Ditter.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Heidinger.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Bell with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Coffee of Nebraska with Mr. Davis of Tennessee.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Traynor.
Mr. Anderson of New Mexico with Mrs. O'Day.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

On motion of Mr. CANNON of Missouri, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2467) entitled "An act to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. LEE, Mr. HILL, Mr. AUSTIN, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

A CALL FOR STATESMANSHIP TO HASTEN THE DAWN OF A BETTER WORLD

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for a quarter of a minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, never before in history has there been such a call for statesmanship as there is now. The demand is for that kind and quality of statesmanship that is capable of changing the horrifying cosmic picture from bloodshed and agony to a new concept of international friendship and cooperation envisioned in the Atlantic Charter.

There will be no possible or conceivable obstruction of the prosecution of the war if our statesmanship also will get into action to supplement our military effort, and will take up the problem of building a new and better world—a world of peace and mutual understanding—out of the ashes of the present conflict. Our military and naval men are doing their part gloriously.

The statesmen of America and of the world should now rally to the colors.

It has well been said that winning the peace is even more important than winning the war.

It is none too soon to be thinking about these matters. A sound and fundamental basis for a new order cannot be arrived at overnight and it is encouraging to note that some of our straight-thinking leaders are already at work on post-war problems.

WELLES SOUNDS A SIGNIFICANT NOTE

The most important utterance so far on the subject and one which reveals far-seeing vision was the address delivered by Under Secretary of State Sumner Welles at Arlington on Memorial Day. I quote the following passages from that admirable speech:

This is in very truth a people's war. It is a war which cannot be regarded as won until the fundamental rights of the peoples of the earth are secured. In no other manner can a true peace be achieved.

The problem which will confront us when the years of the post-war period are reached is not primarily one of production. For the world can readily produce what mankind requires. The problem is rather one of distribution and purchasing power; of providing the mechanism whereby what the world produces may be fairly distributed among the nations of the world; and of providing the means whereby the people of the world may obtain the world's goods and services. Your Government has already taken steps to obtain the support and active cooperation of others of the United Nations in this great task; a task which in every sense of the term is a new frontier—a frontier of limitless expanse—the frontier of human welfare.

If this war is in fact a war for the liberation of peoples, it must assure the sovereign equality of peoples throughout the world, as well as in the world of the Americas. Our victory must bring in its train the liberation of all peoples. Discrimination between peoples because of their race, creed, or color must be abolished. The age of imperialism is ended. The right of a people to their freedom must be recognized, as the civilized world long since recognized the right of an individual to his personal freedom. The principles of the Atlantic Charter must be guaranteed to the world as a whole—in all oceans and in all continents.

Mr. Welles spoke with wisdom and prescience when he pointed to the Atlantic Charter as the ground work on which the minds of statesmen of all nations may meet in forming the fundamentals of an agreement for the future peace of the world.

The Atlantic Charter is the rallying point for the forces of human freedom. It is well, I think, to review the text of the Atlantic Charter to which the faith of America and Great Britain is committed, as follows:

THE ATLANTIC CHARTER

Joint declaration of the President of the United States of America, and the Prime Minister, Mr. Churchill, representing His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, being met together, deem it right to make known certain common principles in the national policies of their respective countries on which they base their hopes for a better future for the world.

First, their countries seek no aggrandizement, territorial or other;

Second, they desire to see no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned;

Third, they respect the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live; and they wish to see sovereign rights and self-government restored to those who have been forcibly deprived of them;

Fourth, they will endeavor, with due respect for their existing obligations, to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity;

Fifth, they desire to bring about the fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing, for all, improved labor standards, economic advancement, and social security;

Sixth, after the final destruction of the Nazi tyranny, they hope to see established a peace which will afford to all nations the means of dwelling in safety within their own boundaries, and which will afford assurance that all men in all the lands may live out their lives in freedom from fear and want;

Seventh, such a peace should enable all men to traverse the high seas and oceans without hindrance;

Eighth, they believe that all of the nations of the world, for realistic as well as spiritual reasons, must come to the abandonment of the use of force. Since no future peace can be maintained if land, sea, or air armaments continue to be employed by nations which

threaten, or may threaten, aggression outside of their frontiers, they believe, pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security, that the disarmament of such nations is essential. They will likewise aid and encourage all other practicable measures which will lighten for peace-loving peoples the crushing burden of armaments.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.

AN EXALTED CONCEPT

To my mind, the essence of the Atlantic Charter, which makes it of incalculable value as a logical basis of peace negotiations, is that it pledges a free world economy. Every nation in the world and every person in the world has by Divine sanction the right to live, which means the right of access to the things that sustain life.

There is enough land lying uncultivated and fallow to support all human beings on the earth if they would but agree to the principles of the Atlantic Charter, forget their hatreds, lay down their guns, and go to work. When the present cataclysm is over there must inevitably be a large-scale readjustment that will take into consideration the economic needs of the entire human family.

It is a time, I think, for sober reflection on what appear to finite minds to be the aims and purposes of creation.

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth," says the first sentence of the first chapter of Genesis.

That sentence is the most startling and meaningful utterance to be found in all literature. The greatest story of all time is told in exactly 10 words, the story of cosmos emerging from chaos.

It is the story of God the Architect, the loving Father of us all, creating a cosmic commonwealth of infinite beauty and making it ready for His children. Vast, fertile plains to yield the things that sustain life, great rivers that flow in majesty to the seas, cascades that dance and sparkle in the sunlight, mountain slopes that rise in towering grandeur to the very feet of the Creator. In the depths of the earth God deposited untold billions of tons of coal to warm the human family, in the waterfalls he placed power without limit to drive the wheels of commerce. All things that make for prosperity, welfare, and happiness of the human race are embraced in God's gift to man on the morning of creation.

A COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS

The Atlantic Charter, as I interpret it, takes into consideration this concept of creation. It visualizes as the ultimate ideal a commonwealth of free nations to which all peoples are admitted on terms of equality. It says to all nations that they shall "live and let live." It guarantees to all nations, to the little as well as to the big, access to the raw materials that are necessary to sustain life—in other words a free economy.

The statesmen of the Allied Nations should make more of the Atlantic Charter than they are making of it now. It is an admirable basis for peace efforts. They should see that it is indelibly vignetted on the minds of all peoples, everywhere, all around the earth, and especially the peoples of Germany, Italy, and Japan, who, unless I am greatly mistaken, when once convinced that there is a prospect of a true world peace, based on the humanitarian principles of the Atlantic Charter, will listen gladly. The tyrants who rule them and ride over them have been able to hold them in leash only by convincing them that an Allied Nations' victory would mean their political and economic annihilation. If it can be got across to them that an allied victory would really mean their liberation from tyranny; their emancipation from suffering and want and their right to live in a world of free economy, conditions will become ripe for a revolution in Germany, Italy, and Japan. I think it is true that only a minority of Germans are sincere adherents of the Nazi ideology and that if it can be made plain to them that in the event of an allied victory the peace that will follow will be based on justice and not on retribution many of them will be about ready to sabotage Hitler and all of his iniquitous works. I think the same feeling bordering on revolution could easily be developed in Italy and Japan and the little stooge countries that Hitler holds in the hollow of his hand, for it is clear as noonday that the people of all of these countries are weary of war; weary of its burdens, its griefs and heartaches; weary of the pain it puts in the hearts of mothers.

A RAIN OF LEAFLETS PROPOSED

With this inflammable situation existing in the Axis countries, ready to be touched off with a match, it seems to me that statesmanship has its rare opportunity. It appears that conditions are ideal for a peace movement—I do not like the word "offensive"—on our part that might be more deadly to Axis domination and prestige than big battleships and flying fortresses. Why would it not be perfectly feasible for our able statesmen like Cordell Hull and Sumner Welles to detail the concrete offer which the Allied Nations are able to make to the German, Italian, and Japanese people when once they have gotten rid of their infernal governments? And why would it not be possible for allied airplanes to scatter millions of leaflets over enemy countries giving the text of the Atlantic Charter and apprising them of the peace on terms of justice that awaits if the Allies win? I personally wish that that could be done. And why should not such information be broadcast throughout the entire world by short wave? Propaganda has its legitimate place in warfare when it is founded on right and justice, and I believe that when the peoples of the enemy countries learn that an allied victory would not mean their doom, but would open the way to a better world they would take matters in their own hands and the cruel despotic governments that now enslave them would begin to crumble like houses of cards. While prosecuting the war with the utmost vigor on the military front I believe that victory can be hastened if we make an attack also on the peace front. The war cannot end yet, but a program based on justice might help to end it with victory to the allied cause. If such a peace drive can hasten the doom of nazidom, fascism, and Japanese terrorism only for a single day it would be politically, humanely, and morally justified.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the text of the Atlantic Charter and some excerpts from the speech delivered by Secretary Welles.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

LIFTING OF OIL DRILLING RESTRICTIONS IN ILLINOIS WILL PROVIDE IMMEDIATE RELIEF TO THE EAST

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one-quarter of a minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, there has been announced the decision to construct a 24-inch pipe line from the oil fields near Longview, Tex., to the oil fields of Illinois, near Salem, Ill., in the district I have the honor to represent. It is planned to complete this by December 1, 1942. The purpose of this project is to reduce the distance of rail transportation of oil and oil products to the East. It is absolutely necessary that rail transportation of oil be shortened.

It is my hope that the line can be in operation by the 1st of next December. However, that is not certain, because of the vital materials required and the shortage thereof. In any event, a large amount of fuel oil will be needed prior to that time. By lifting Regulation M-68 with respect to the nearby Illinois fields, it is estimated production of oil can be increased by 200,000 barrels per day during this summer. No new pipe for drilling is needed, because a recent exhaustive survey disclosed enough in the hands of the contractors to last for a year. All that is needed is the go-ahead sign. Oil will flow from the Illinois basin and can be transported to the East 2½ times as rapidly as from the West and Southwest. By adopting this procedure the East will be more adequately provided for during this interim. Let us be realistic in these difficult and stringent war times, and adopt those measures that are necessary to produce the required results.

The Illinois oil fields prorate themselves, as I have outlined in a prior speech. The production is largely from lime formation, and has dropped 113,000 barrels daily, or almost one-third, because of the restricted drilling since December 23, 1941, when M-68 became effective. Production is approximately

35,000 barrels daily below the amount Secretary Ickes has set as a maximum. We can rapidly bring up this nearby and transportable production if given the opportunity. Magazine Time in its issue of June 8, 1942, has this to say:

They might need to have restrictions lifted on new drillings in the Illinois fields, where drilling of new wells has been virtually stopped.

I say that they must immediately unshackle Illinois production if the serious situation in the East is to be met.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include some newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a telegram.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Freeport Journal entitled "Awaiting Clarification."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the Chicago News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 7 minutes after any previous special orders have been taken care of.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the extension of remarks I made on the Czech massacre, I be allowed to include therein a brief chapter from the book on Heydrich courts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

REPORT FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The report (No. 2231) is as follows:

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following report to accompany House Resolution 433:

The Committee on Rules, having had under consideration House Resolution 433, reports the same to the House with the recommendation that the resolution do pass.

The resolution (H. Res. 433) is as follows:

Whereas due to the present world crisis a number of heretofore unknown major problems dealing with the alien situation in the United States have arisen which require the attention of the Congress; and

Whereas so that the Congress, in whom is vested responsibility for enacting legislation governing the problem, may be better informed as to how to approach that important duty: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization be, and it is hereby, authorized to hold hearings for the purpose of making a careful survey and study of the various problems relating to the alien situation in the United States, such as (1) the question of the proper handling of the thousands of cases of aliens who are temporarily in the United States but who cannot depart because of world conditions; (2) the question of the disposition of aliens, principally criminals, insane, and other highly undesirable types, under order of deportation but who cannot at present be deported; (3) the extremely serious alien enemy situation; (4) the possible necessity of amending the naturalization laws to meet the emergency situation; (5) other studies of the general situation not only as it applies to the present but also with a view to looking forward to a post-war policy; and (6) all other questions in relation thereto which would assist Congress in the enactment of necessary remedial legislation.

The House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to request and secure, for the purposes of this resolution, the cooperation of, the production of records and rules and regulations of, and the assistance of such personnel under the Attorney General, and the services, bureaus, or offices under his jurisdiction, as may be deemed necessary by the committee.

For the purposes of this resolution, the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to sit and act at such time and places within the United States, whether the House is sitting or recessed or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, to take such testimony or records, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Speaker of the House at the request of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by the Sergeant at Arms of the House or by such person or persons as may be designated by him. The chairman of the committee or any member of the committee may administer oaths to witnesses. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of such committee or any subcommittee thereof, or having been required to produce necessary books or papers or documents or vouchers by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the study and investigation heretofore authorized, or who fails to produce such books or papers or documents or vouchers as required by subpenas, shall be held to the penalties provided in section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 192), as amended.

FAMILY ALLOWANCE FOR DEPENDENTS OF ENLISTED MEN OF THE ARMY, NAVY, AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 2467, with House amendments, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and without objection appoints the following conferees: Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. HARTER, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. ARENDS.

SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF ACT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it shall be in order on next Monday for the Speaker to recognize me as chairman of the House Military Affairs Committee to call up the bill (H. R. 7164) to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the relief and benefits provided therein to certain persons, to include certain additional proceedings and transactions therein, to provide further relief for persons in military service, to change certain insurance provisions thereof, and for other purposes, and that the time for general debate on the bill be fixed at 2 hours, the time to be equally divided and controlled by myself and the ranking member on the minority side.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman's request that that bill be taken up on Monday?

Mr. MAY. That it may be in order that the Speaker recognize me. It is understood that the Speaker will recognize me after certain other business. If that business is not concluded, it will be taken up on Tuesday.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair is reluctant to recognize the gentleman to make that unanimous-consent request at this time in view of the fact that the Speaker will be here on Monday. The Chair understands that arrangements have been made to consider other matters. I believe the gentleman has made an arrangement with the majority leader and with the minority leader.

Mr. MAY. I have, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will recognize the gentleman.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not quite hear the gentleman's request, so that I feel that any business of importance should be held over unless there is some agreement between the majority leader and the minority leader.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, let me make a statement about this matter. I called it up today and asked unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. The majority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK], appeared here and raised a question about it. The gentleman from Massachusetts

[Mr. MARTIN] raised a question about it and it was discussed at length. A request was made by the majority leader that I communicate and discuss the matter with the chairman of the Rules Committee and the ranking member of the Rules Committee. I did all of that. I have an agreement and understanding with the ranking Member on the minority side, with the minority leader, with the majority leader, and with everybody concerned that it will be taken up on next Monday.

Mr. STEFAN. Of course, I do not want to object to anything that should be taken up, but here is a matter of great importance and there are not so many Members on the floor at this time. I feel that we can do this without delay on Monday and I feel I should protect the minority on that basis.

Mr. MAY. Let me say to the gentleman that I have an understanding with the minority leader.

Mr. STEFAN. Was it understood by the minority leader and those on the minority side and the majority side that you would make this unanimous-consent request tonight?

Mr. MAY. Yes; and before they left here it was agreed that I should do it.

Mr. STEFAN. It is perfectly all right with me. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Did the gentleman's request indicate the time of general debate?

Mr. MAY. Yes; 2 hours of general debate to be equally divided between the two sides.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask leave of absence for today for the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], who has been called away.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD on the observance of United Nations' Day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] is recognized for 7 minutes.

RUBBER AND GASOLINE SITUATION

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the mystery surrounding the rubber and gasoline situation in the United States continues to deepen. Confusion, contradiction, inconsistency, and downright prevarication all contribute to produce this air of mystery which has unsettled the Nation and strained the confidence of the people in the administration more than anything else that has happened since the shroud of mystery was thrown about the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor.

One day the East is going to be rationed on gasoline, because enemy U-boats have sunk so many tankers. The next day it is not a shortage of gasoline causing the rationing, but a shortage of rubber. The next day the whole Nation is going to be rationed on gasoline, because the supply of gasoline is so short. The next day we learn there is such an abundance of gasoline that the United States refineries are having to "put it back in the ground" to find storage space for it. The next day the whole country is to be rationed not to save gasoline but to save tires.

This is a picture of the utter confusion in which bureaucratic activities have thrown the country. The result is that today no Member of Congress, no citizen—and it is to be doubted whether very many bureaucrats—can say how much of an actual rubber shortage really exists. It is already overwhelmingly established that there is no shortage of gasoline. The almost limitless possibilities of fuel alcohol has not yet even been mentioned.

Meanwhile, the Dow Chemical Co., of Midland, Mich., one of the major chemical companies of the country, is prepared for the establishment of a million-dollar plant in which a substitute rubber known as thiokol can be manufactured in sufficient quantities to be furnishing retreads for a million automobile tires a month by the end of 1942. Manufactured in these quantities, this rubber substitute can be produced as cheaply as natural rubber. It has been amply demonstrated by the company that tires made of thiokol will be good on private passenger cars for 10,000 miles. The ingredients entering into thiokol are all procurable in practically unlimited quantities in the United States. The production of this product can be expanded to any degree necessary to meet civilian needs.

The Dow Chemical Co. readily agrees that thiokol is not as good for heavy-duty work as buna-s. The Germans are using buna-s. The advantage of thiokol is that it can be put into quantity production so much sooner than buna-s.

There has been a singular hidden resistance somewhere in the administration to the development of synthetic rubber or rubber substitute plants in the United States. Somebody in high authority in the bureaus handling this proposal did not want a gigantic new industry which would make the United States self-contained for its rubber supply. If the American people could be sure of the identity of the man or men who have been willing to risk the security of this Nation for selfish purposes of business gain, those men would be hounded out of America as traitors, or prosecuted as such.

In any event, the Dow Chemical Co. now has the "go" signal from Jesse Jones' Rubber Reserve Co. Unless the same mysterious force, which for so long successfully resisted efforts to establish synthetic rubber and rubber substitute plants in this country are able to stalemate or impede the Dow Chemical Co.'s plans, the people can look forward confidently to a supply of thiokol which will enable the citizens of this country to have tires and gasoline for all essential purposes.

If there is interference with the Dow Chemical Co.'s plans to save the rubber situation in America, there is a group of men in Congress who are determined to probe this situation to the bottom, and who will not rest until they have exposed to the wrath of the American people those responsible for this inexpressibly wicked and unpatriotic interference with the satisfaction of a vital military and civilian need in this country.

The American people will do well to be on guard, as Members of Congress will be on guard, to watch developments and to see that no further queer and inexplicable interferences are thrown in the way of a rubber supply for America which is perfectly feasible and waiting to be put into successful execution.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. COCHRAN, for 1 week.

To Mr. THOMASON, at the request of Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, for today, on account of important official business with Military Affairs Committee.

To Mr. KILDAY, at the request of Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON, for today, on account of important official business with Military Affairs Committee.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; thereupon (at 6 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to its previous order, adjourned until Monday, June 15, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Friday, June 12, 1942.

Business to be considered: The hearing in connection with the Federal Communications Commission.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, June 16, 1942.

Business to be considered: H. R. 7002, to increase agricultural purchasing power and to meet the need of combating malnutrition among the people of low income by defining and making certain a reasonable definition and standard of nonfat dry milk solids.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Friday, June 12, 1942, for consideration of war housing, room 1324, House Office Building.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1747. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriation for the Office of the Liaison Officer, the Division of Central Administrative Services, and the War Manpower Commission, of the Office for Emergency Management, for the fiscal year 1943, in the aggregate amount of $15,605,719, and a draft of a proposed general provision applicable to the Office for Emergency Management as a whole (H. Doc. No. 792); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1748. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1943, amounting to $175,000 (H. Doc. No. 793); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1749. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to $87,009 (H. Doc. No. 794); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PACE: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 7137. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to marketing quotas for peanuts, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2230). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 433. Resolution authorizing the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to make a study of the alien situation in the United States, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2231). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DIMOND: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 4635. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to incur obligations for the benefit of natives of Alaska in advance of the enactment of legislation making appropriations therefor; with amendment (Rept. No. 2233). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigraton and Naturalization. H. R. 7225. A bill for the relief of sundry aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 2232). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KING: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 6350. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Gabriela Redondo Ayson; with amendment (Rept. No. 2234). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 7222. A bill to provide that loans on the 1942, 1943, 1944, 1945, and 1946 crops of corn, wheat, rice, cotton, tobacco, and peanuts shall be made at a rate equal to the parity price; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RAMSAY:

H. R. 7223. A bill to provide for a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the States of their residence and serving within the continental United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. HÉBERT:

H. R. 7224. A bill to secure prompt payment and adjustment of just claims for loss of or damage to property received by laundries and dry cleaning and dyeing establishments in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H. R. 7226. A bill to amend the laws of the District of Columbia relating to the recorder of deeds; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GOSSETT:

H. R. 7227. A bill for the relief of Oscar Zimmer; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NICHOLS:

H. R. 7228. A bill for the relief of Iona Cazenave; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 7229. A bill to correct the military record of Herbert Horrell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3056. By Mr. BROWN of Ohio: Petition favoring Senate bill 860, a bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3057. Also, petition favoring Senate bill 860, a bill to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3058. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 87 residents of Butler County, Pa., urging legislation to give the men in the Army and Navy the greatest possible protection against vice and liquor, and especially to ban beer and liquor from Government commissaries and the immediate vicinities of the camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3059. By Mr. MICHENER. Petition transmitted by Harriet E. Brunt, of Temperance, Mich., and signed by 59 other residents of Monroe County, Mich., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3060. By Mr. RAMSAY: Petition of Mrs. Fannie Woomer, Allen S. Fields, Mrs. Clarence Robert, and other residents of Hancock County, W. Va.; Rev. A. R. Mansberger, W. W. Steel, Russell Ogg, and other residents of Hancock County, W. Va.; members of the Church of God of New Martinsville, W. Va.; and members of the Presbyterian Church of New Martinsville, W. Va., supporting House bill 3371 and Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3061. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Grand Parlor of the Native Sons of the Golden West, San Francisco, Calif., relative to Japanese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3062. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 13 qualified voters and members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Columbiaville, Mich., expressing interest in House bill 3371; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 15, 1942

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Father, who art man's unfailing friend, we pray that in all our thoughts and toils during this day we may have the constant inspiration and confident companionship of Thy presence.

May we daily live by that standard of the better self which Thou hast revealed in the Christ, our Lord, and help us in pure and steadfast devotion to bear witness that our spirits are akin to His spirit.

Bless our President and these, Thy servants, who are striving to open for struggling humanity the Master's way of the more abundant life, and may the social order for which we are laboring be in conformity unto His ideal of brotherhood and good will among men.

Grant that in our prayers we may remember more frequently and fervently all who are giving themselves so sacrificially for those garnered treasures of life which we are privileged to enjoy.

To Thy name shall be the praise and the glory. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 11, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on June 11, 1942, the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

S. 244. An act for the relief of the San Francisco Mountain Scenic Boulevard Co.;

S. 1820. An act for the relief of Jerry McKinley Thompson;

S. 2037. An act for the relief of Edgar B. Dunlap;

S. 2069. An act for the relief of the Quimby-Ryan Engineering Sales Co., Inc.;

S. 2250. An act to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interests of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes;

S. 2459. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes," to permit payment of total

compensation to certain employees of the Postal Service employed in a dual capacity, and

S. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution designating June 13, 1942, as MacArthur Day, and authorizing its appropriate observance.

TRIBUTE TO GEN. CLARENCE L. TINKER

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, it was announced by the Army on June 13 that its air force commander in Hawaii, Maj. Gen. Clarence L. Tinker, was lost in action in the recent battle of the Pacific off Midway Island. It is my desire, and I am sure the wish of those who best knew and admired him, that the account of his courageous deeds in the face of danger shall be recorded indelibly in the history of our Nation.

General Tinker lost his life while on a mission requiring great courage, skill, and experience. General Emmons, Military Governor of Hawaii, and commander of the Hawaiian Department, stated yesterday that because General Tinker would not ask his subordinates to undertake risks he himself would not take, he selected himself as flight leader of an important combat mission. He died knowing that he had an important part in winning a great naval victory. His leadership was an inspiration to his command, and his loss a deep personal one to all who knew him.

One is more impressed as he reviews General Tinker's career when he reflects that he was part Osage Indian. He was born in Oklahoma, and was a graduate of the Wentworth Military Academy at Lexington, Mo. At an early age he entered the Army, where he served almost continually until his death. He was 54 years of age, and was the first American general reported lost in action since we went to war, after Pearl Harbor.

I knew General Tinker personally, and was with him and participated in the ceremonies at the commissioning of MacDill Field at Tampa, Fla., on which occasion he presided. Soon thereafter he was named to command the third interceptor command at Drew Field, Fla., and little more than a month later was ordered to Hawaii, after the tragedy of Pearl Harbor.

He was a man of few words, and always had a pleasant smile. He had eyes like the bald eagle, and led his squadron of flying fortresses into the battle where he fell knowing the seriousness of his mission. He fell in one of the most dramatic sea and air battles in history, and died as he would have desired.

The Associated Press account of the deeds and death of General Tinker appeared in the Washington Post on June 14, and I ask that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAWAIIAN AIR FORCE CHIEF IS LOST IN BATTLE

(By William F. Frye)

The Army announced yesterday that its Air Force commander in Hawaii, Maj. Gen. Clarence L. Tinker, was lost in action in the mid-Pacific battle of Midway Island 5 days ago.

A remote possibility existed that Tinker and the crew of his plane might still be alive, but the War Department said the ocean area in which they disappeared had been searched thoroughly without finding a trace of the plane or its occupants.

As the beaten Japanese Fleet retreated from its disastrous attack on Midway, Tinker led a flight of his Army bombers from that Pacific outpost June 7 to attack the enemy east of Wake Island. When last seen by men in other planes of the formation, the general's bomber was descending rapidly.

Tinker, 54, was the first American air general reported lost in action since the war started, although two others, Maj. Gen. Herbert Dargue and Brig. Gen. Harold H. George, died in accidents, the latter in Australia.

NATIVE OF OKLAHOMA

Part Indian, and a native of Oklahoma, Tinker had commanded the Army Air Forces in Hawaii since shortly after the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor December 7. When Lt. Gen. Delos C. Emmons, also an air officer, was ordered to replace Lt. Gen. Walter C. Short in command of the Hawaiian Department, Tinker accompanied him as air commander, relieving Maj. Gen. Frederick L. Martin.

After graduation from the Wentworth Military Academy at Lexington, Mo., in 1908, Tinker entered the Philippine constabulary as a second lieutenant. Four years later he was commissioned in the Regular Army as an Infantry officer, remaining in this branch of the service until 1920, when he enrolled in the flying school at March Field, Calif.

In 1926 he went to London as assistant military attaché, and while there was injured in the crash of a plane, which burst into flames. Despite his own serious injuries he rescued his companion, a naval officer, trapped in the flaming cockpit, and was awarded the soldier's medal for heroism.

SERVED IN OTHER POSTS

In 1927 he returned to the United States for duty in the office of the Chief of the Air Corps, later going to Kelly Field, Tex., as assistant commandant of the advanced flying school.

Tinker became chief of the aviation division of the National Guard Bureau in Washington in February 1937. Subsequently he served as commanding officer of the Twenty-seventh Bombardment Group at Barksdale Field, La., and as base commander at MacDill Field, Fla.

Last November 6 he was named to command the Third Interceptor Command at Drew Field, Fla., and a little more than a month later was ordered to Hawaii.

GENERAL TINKER DIED ON IMPORTANT MISSION

HONOLULU, June 12.—Maj. Gen. Clarence L. Tinker, commander of the Hawaiian air force, lost his life while on a mission requiring "great courage, skill, and experience," Lt. Gen. Delos C. Emmons said today.

General Emmons, Military Governor of Hawaii and commander of the Hawaiian Department, issued this statement:

"The entire Hawaiian Department mourns the loss of Major General Tinker and his gallant crew.

"Because General Tinker would not ask his subordinates to undertake risks he himself would not take, he selected himself as flight leader of an important combat mission requiring great courage, skill, and experience.

"He died knowing that he had had an important part in winning a great victory. His leadership was an inspiration to his command, and his loss is a deep personal one."

The Army listed the following as members of General Tinker's crew (addresses not available):

Capt. Raymond Salyarulo, First Lt. Gilmer H. Holton, Jr., Second Lt. Walter E. Gurley, Sgt. Arond Shank, Technical Sgt. James M. Turk, Corp. Will J. Wagner, Sgt. Thomas E. Ross, Sgt. Franz Moeller, Sgt. George D. Schied.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 11th instant,

The following message from the House of Representatives was received by the Secretary of the Senate during the adjournment:

That the House had insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 2467) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MAY, Mr. THOMASON, Mr. HARTER, Mr. ANDREWS, and Mr. ARENDS were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

That the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 324) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

OPERATIONS UNDER THE LEND-LEASE ACT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H. DOC. NO. 729)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, transmitted to the Secretary of the Senate on June 12, 1942, under authority of section 5 of Public Law No. 11, Seventy-seventh Congress, which, with the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

This is the fifth 90-day report to the Congress on operations under the Lend-Lease Act.

For the 3 months ending May 31, 1942, lend-lease aid amounted to more than $1,900,000,000. For the 15-month period from March 1941 through May 1942 aid totaled $4,497,000,000 in goods and services. We are now making aid available at a monthly rate equivalent to $8,000,000,000 per year.

Dollar figures do not portray all that is happening. The Congress has wisely set few limits to the types of aid which may be and are being provided. Food—over 5,000,000,000 pounds—and medicine have helped to sustain the British and Russian and Chinese peoples in their gallant will to fight. Metals, machine tools, and other essentials have aided them to maintain and step up their production of munitions. The bombardment planes and the tanks which were ordered for them last spring and summer are now putting their mark on the enemy. The British pilots trained in this country have begun their work at Cologne and Essen.

And lend-lease is no longer one way. Those who have been receiving lend-lease aid in their hour of greatest need have taken the initiative in reciprocating. To the full extent of their ability they are supplying us, on the same lend-lease basis, with many things we need now. American troops on Australian and British soil are being fed and housed and equipped in part out of Australian and British supplies and weapons. Our allies have sent us special machine tools and equipment for our munitions factories. British antiaircraft guns help us

to defend our vital bases, and British-developed detection devices assist us to spot enemy aircraft. We are sharing the blueprints and battle experience of the United Nations.

These things, invaluable as they have proven, are not the major benefit we will receive for our lend-lease aid. That benefit will be the defeat of the Axis. But the assistance we have been given by our partners in the common struggle is heartening evidence of the way in which the other United Nations are pooling their resources with our own. Each United Nation is contributing to the ultimate victory not merely its dollars, pounds, or rubles, but the full measure of its men, its weapons, and its productive capacity.

Our reservoir of resources is now approaching flood stage. The next step is for our military, industrial, and shipping experts to direct its full force against the centers of enemy power. Great Britain and the United States have together set up expert combined bodies to do the job, in close cooperation with Russia, China, and the other United Nations. They are equipping the United Nations to fight this world-wide war on a world-wide basis. They are taking combined action to carry our men and weapons—on anything that will float or fly—to the places from which we can launch our offensives.

By combined action now we can preserve freedom and restore peace to our peoples. By combined action later we can fulfill the victory we have joined to attain. The concept of the United Nations will not perish on the battlefields of this terrible war. It will live to lay the basis of the enduring world understanding on which mankind depends to preserve its peace and its freedom.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 11, 1942.*

JOURNALS OF THE SENATE AND HOUSE, LEGISLATURE OF THE TERRITORY OF HAWAII

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of Hawaii, transmitting through the Governor of Hawaii and the Department of the Interior, copies of the Journals of the Senate of the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, regular session of 1941, and of the House of Representatives, regular and special sessions of 1941, which, with the accompany documents, was referred to the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A paper in the nature of a petition from a citizen of Oakland, Calif., praying for the enactment of legislation granting increased compensation to postmen; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Petitions of sundry citizens of Cuba and Hinsdale, N. Y., praying for the prompt enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mrs. CARAWAY:

Petitions, numerously signed, by sundry citizens of Stuttgart, Ark., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of McCune, Osage City, and Barber County, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

GOVERNMENTAL ECONOMY AND ALL-OUT WAR PRODUCTION—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I present and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached thereto, and appropriately referred, a petition signed by numerous citizens of Arkansas City, Kans., urging economy in Government and all-out war production through the cooperation of all concerned.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without all the signatures attached, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C.

To the Senators and Representatives from Kansas.

GENTLEMEN: We, the undersigned citizens and taxpayers of Kansas, address this letter to you because at the present time we feel deeply alarmed over the safety of our country. You are our legally elected representatives and alone possess the power to voice our sentiments in the councils of the Nation. This being the case, we want you to know how we feel about certain things.

First. We feel that both Congress and the President have been too slow to settle the labor question. We want every factory in America to work 7 days a week and 7 nights a week in order to produce ships, guns, tanks, planes, and other supplies that are needed by our armed forces. No individual or group is bigger than the Nation as a whole, and we think that the Government should establish fair and honest wage levels, stop all strikes, and see to it that all important industries work to the limit of their capacity.

Second. We think that all the money necessary to carry out a successful war should be appropriated and spent in a proper manner, but we think all unnecessary expenses should be immediately curtailed or abolished. We are perfectly willing to give up all we possess to win this war, but we do not consider it patriotic or even sensible to waste money on nondefense projects which could be dispensed with.

Third. We think that any individual, no matter how big or little, who hinders the successful organization of the entire force of this Nation against its enemies should be promptly removed from office. We want speed. The Germans and Japs are conquering the world faster than anyone ever dreamed was possible.

At a time like this we expect you to be true leaders and not politicians. Instead of the Government wanting the people to wake up, we, the people, want the Government to wake up. Our enemies say this is a war to the death. If so, we do not propose to be the side which dies.

In the name of our loved ones and of our country, we sign:

C. H. SANDERSON,
M. S. SINER,
N. J. REYNOLDS,
(And sundry other citizens, all of Arkansas City, Kans.)

RATIONING OF GASOLINE AND COLLECTION OF SCRAP RUBBER

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I regard it as extremely fortunate that the protests against the untimely, unnecessary, and arbitrary proposed rationing of gasoline in the midcontinent and Southwest have resulted in the postponement of such rationing at least until some investigations can be made as to the need for it.

Also, I desire to call attention to the fact that the introduction of the bill S. 2560 by the Senate Small Business Committee, of which I am a member, has resulted in a Nation-wide drive to collect scrap rubber for reclamation and use. This measure, we believe, will furnish the machinery to keep tires on 20,000,000 civilian automobiles which are absolutely necessary in order to keep our domestic economy functioning behind the war effort.

It is my belief, Mr. President, that these protests and this action by the Senate Small Business Committee have been largely instrumental in bringing more sanity into the rationing program, which was getting far beyond the needs of the present situation by neglecting to discover what supplies are and could be made available.

In this connection I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point and appropriately referred statements and resolutions from the chambers of commerce of the following Kansas cities: Newton, Arkansas City, Coffeyville, and El Dorado. These cities are in the center of the oil fields of the midcontinent and are familiar with conditions there. I bespeak the attention of the Senate to these statements in opposition to unnecessary gasoline rationing.

There being no objection, the statements and resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Newton, Kans., June 9, 1942.

RESOLUTION OF THE LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE OF THE NEWTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Be it resolved by the legislative committee of the Newton Chamber of Commerce, That the Office of Price Administration has under consideration the matter of rationing the consumption of gasoline in the Middle West.

1. We, as a chamber of commerce, earnestly oppose gasoline rationing in the Middle West because the extent of the damage which might be unwittingly done to the war effort by crippling of midwestern refineries and the

consequent curtailment of Middle West production is apparent when we consider the extent of oil production in this area. The States of Kansas, Oklahoma, Nebraska, Texas, Arkansas, Mississippi, Louisiana, Illinois, and Indiana produce about 2,600,000 barrels of oil per day. The total production of oil in the United States is about 3,600,000 barrels per day.

2. The curtailment of the sale of gasoline will seriously affect an important source of revenue to the State and National Governments. The total State revenue of Kansas is $35,000,000 per year. Of this, the gasoline tax furnishes $11,000,000.

3. When the rationing of gasoline results in the shutting down of refineries, as it will do, this means in turn a decreased production of oil. Storage facilities for crude oil are not sufficient to permit the continued operation of wells which are unable to dispose of their oil.

Oil is one of the most necessary products for the successful prosecution of the war effort. Unless great care is exercised in the regulation of all matters affecting its production, the United States may find itself confronted with an oil shortage at the most critical time in the further progress of the war.

4. It is said that the object of gasoline rationing in the Middle West would be to conserve rubber. The only rubber it would be necessary to conserve would be the rubber on the cars now in use. But time is an important factor in our present war effort, and we believe it is far more important that our refineries should continue to produce the necessary fuel oil to keep necessary war industries in operation and furnish the Army and Navy with the gasoline and fuel oil which they need so desperately than it is to consider what we are going to do when all the tires are worn out. A very large number of vehicles are equipped with rubber which will last them for at least 2 years.

If it is necessary to place further restrictions upon the use of motor vehicles we believe that a national speed limit of 40 miles per hour would go a long way toward preserving the rubber on motor vehicles now in use, and while it would to some extent curtail the consumption of gasoline, we do not think that the results would be so disastrous as those which would be produced by rationing gasoline.

5. We endorse the statement issued by Frank Phillips, general chairman of the petroleum industry for district No. 2, appointed by Petroleum Coordinator for War Harold L. Ickes, which was issued from Chicago on May 24, 1942, and which discusses this matter.

We urge that the most serious consideration be given to the matters suggested herein by the Office of Price Administration and all other agencies of the Government which are in any way concerned with the matter; Be it further

Resolved, That copies of the resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, the Office of Price Administration, War Production Board, Joseph B. Eastman of the Office of Defense Transportation, Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Members of Congress from Kansas, and Governor Ratner.

NEWTON CHAMBER OF COMMERCE
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE,
J. RODNEY STONE, *Chairman.*
FRED ICE.

ARKANSAS CITY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Arkansas City, Kans., June 11, 1942.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND ARTHUR: We gather through the newspapers and radio that there is an attempt being made to ration gasoline throughout the Middle West in the near future.

Of course, we people out in the oil-producing centers realize that such legislation would be very injurious as well as inconvenient, to our section of the country. While shipping has been badly handicapped to the eastern centers we can readily see why it was necessary to ration gasoline in those districts, but we see no reason why our refineries and oil-producing institutions in the Middle West should be brought under the same restrictions when our wells are shut in and the storage capacity full and running over.

I am sure that this letter is not necessary, as you have the same information as we, and trusting and feel sure you are doing everything to care for our interests when the time comes. While I have been requested to forward this communication, that your attention might be brought to the matter, I am thoroughly convinced that you understand our problem better than I.

Yours very respectfully,
ARKANSAS CITY CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
W. F. WALKER, *Secretary.*

COFFEYVILLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Coffeyville, Kans., June 11, 1942.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: The special gas rationing committee of the Coffeyville Chamber of Commerce has prepared the following statement of policy representing our views regarding the proposed national gas rationing program.

"We do not see any occasion for the rationing of gasoline in the Central, Midwest, and Southwest sections of the United States. We have an oversupply of gasoline and the theory that rationing gasoline in these areas will save rubber is all 'bunk.' We hope you will use your influence to keep gasoline rationing from being extended."

This statement and letter was authorized by a unanimous vote of the board of directors of the Coffeyville Chamber of Commerce on June 11, 1942.

Very truly yours,
COFFEYVILLE CHAMBER
OF COMMERCE,
D. A. WILLBERN, *President.*
A. R. LAMB,
Chairman, Special Gas
Rationing Committee.
ELTON WEEKS, *Manager.*

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
El Dorado, Kans., June 5, 1942.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: The matter of rationing the consumption of gasoline in the Middle West oil-producing States was considered at a meeting of our board of directors today.

Our board is unanimously of the opinion that such restrictions for this area are not necessary or desirable. They have instructed me to convey to you an expression of their approval of your action in opposing the gasoline rationing in Kansas. They urge your continued opposition to this proposal.

Again with our appreciation and thanks for all you are doing, we are

Sincerely yours,
EDGAR GOLDEN,
Secretary of El Dorado
Chamber of Commerce.

CONSERVATION OF RUBBER TIRES—BY RATIONING

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present a resolution adopted by members of the Farmers' Union, Bowen Local, No. 1168, Cogswell, N. Dak. I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COGSWELL, N. DAK., *May 29, 1942.*

Hon. WILLIAM LANGER.

GENTLEMAN: We, Farmers' Union members of the Bowen Local, No. 1168, at a regular meeting held on May 19, 1942, discussed the tire rationing as it affects us farmers here in North Dakota, as it is getting more serious every day. We fully realize that the Government needs rubber and must have it. We realize the position the rationing boards are in, and they are having a tough job of it, and they are doing the best they can and to the best of their judgment. We also are in agreement that tire rationing is the only way to conserve rubber and make it last longer. It is the only thing to do, but putting all the farmers in the United States in one class is going to work injustice in many places, and especially here in North Dakota.

Now, do not get us wrong. We do not intend to belittle the small farmers in the South and East where they farm from 20 to 60 acres apiece, which is just a mere patch out here; where they are not raising the amount of foodstuff we are, and especially flax; where they live possibly only 4 or 5 miles from town where they market their products; where one truck could haul all the produce out of a whole community in a few short trips; where they have better communications and are living closer together they can many times double up and get by with the rubber rationing without much hardship or delay that would not only be costlier but in many instances disastrous out here. Here in the Northwest, take North Dakota for example, where the average farm is over 500 acres apiece, where we live as high as 25 miles from where we get parts for our machines, which is mighty urgent at times, and also the same distance to market our produce in many places; where we market many thousands of bushels of grain apiece, and thousands of pounds of cattle, likewise hogs, and that holds true in regard to dairy and poultry products—and what have you—where in thousands of instances there is not a horse on the place but the chore team and the majority of them are way past the useful age; where 1 man today is producing as much as 5 men did 20 years ago; where just 3 men today, with a modern combine of a good size, will go out and harvest and thresh as much in 1 day as 20 men did just 15 years ago; where we are producing foodstuff, not only for ourselves, but for millions of others as well, and especially so with flax, which is very vital to our Government. We are all short-handed, working in many instances night and day—Sundays as well as Mondays. We are not asking overtime or double pay. Now understand, we are not slapping the factory worker by that remark. They are doing a good job. Out here when the work is being done it has to be done with a certain amount of speed or in many instances it wouldn't get done at all. Now do not get this wrong. We are not quibblers or quitters. We stand ready to do the job and we have been doing our level best, but we just can't do it on foot or horseback. It takes a certain amount of rubber.

Now be it

Resolved, That the tire rationing be done according to the size of the individual farm unit and in accordance with the amount of produce raised or marketed. And let it also be resolved that if there is rubber for beer trucks, coca-cola trucks, busses hauling dance band orchestras around, rubber for a half dozen bread trucks serving these towns where one could do the job as well, and a lot of tires for pleasure cars and pleasure driving in the bigger cities—and what have you—there certainly should be tires for the farmers' trucks, and also for their cars. The latter is used for business 90 percent of the

time, which many times includes their only means of marketing what they produce by pulling a trailer and hauling out supplies. This latter statement may be questioned, but in checking you will find the figures very close. Now we believe that those of us who are producing the very necessities of living and producing it in the volume we are, in all fairness to us we should be given a priority or a higher rating than we have at the present time. We may also add that to alleviate the labor shortage, take these men off these vehicles heretofore mentioned and put them doing something. They would never whip the Japs or Germans with what they are doing if they drove those vehicles for a thousand years. We do not care if their ages are 16 or 60.

We recommend that a copy of this resolution be sent to our Governor, to our Congressmen, our Senators, and also to the National Rationing Board.

OSCAR WAHLUND,
President, Bowen Local.
EMIL BENTSON,
WALTER ORTH,
REX BELL,
VICTOR ANNEN,
RUDOLPH ORTH,
Resolution Committee.

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

The following reports of the Committee on the Judiciary were submitted:

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 2579. A bill to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1488).

By Mr. MURDOCK:

S. Res. 237. Resolution providing for an audit of the accounts of the Cherokees for lands sold to the United States under the treaty of 1846; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1489).

SPECIAL ASSISTANT TO COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report back favorably from that committee without amendment Senate Resolution 247 and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 247) submitted by Mr. REYNOLDS on May 14, 1942, was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Military Affairs hereby is authorized to employ, during the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1942, a special assistant to be paid at the rate of $3,300 per annum from the contingent fund of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the resolution is agreed to.

THE DISADVANTAGED STATUS OF UNORGANIZED LABOR IN CALIFORNIA'S INDUSTRIALIZED AGRICULTURE (PT. 3 OF REPT. 1150)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Education and Labor, pursuant to Senate Resolution 266, Seventy-fourth Congress, I submit part 3 of a report on employers' associations and collective bargaining in California, which deals with the subject of the disadvantaged status of unorganized labor in California's industrialized agriculture.

Mr. President, I ask that a short digest of this part 3, which will include some of the salient excerpts from the report, be printed as a part of my remarks, so that the Members of this body may have a readily available outline of the subject matter to be covered in this part of the report.

The volume submitted today is the third of a 10-part report based upon field investigations which were the last of the committee's 4-year inquiry. Subsequent parts will be tendered as they become available from the Printing Office. The volume submitted today is a 250-page analysis of the status of agricultural labor in California, and particularly that group which operates on a seasonal, part-time, casual, or migratory basis in the great industrialized portions of California's agriculture. Later parts of the committee's report will deal with individual and specific violations of the civil rights of these people to organize and bargain collectively and exercise their rights of free speech and assembly in connection therewith. This part of the report, however, deals with the more significant, economic, and social background out of which these specific difficulties arose.

Collective bargaining cannot flourish or function effectively where there is a complete lack of status in the economic or social position of labor and a thoroughly disorganized system of employer-employee relationships. The committee felt that any investigative approach to the problem of protecting agricultural labor's rights of association and collective bargaining that was not accompanied by an exploration of related intelligent and constructive public policies would be an inadequate treatment of this subject. The part of the report submitted today contains not only the results of this economic and social survey but also the committee's conclusions on the appropriate public policies which should be promoted to alleviate that situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report submitted by the Senator from Wisconsin will be received and printed, and the digest presented by him will be printed in the RECORD.

The digest is as follows:

DIGEST OF PART III OF SENATE REPORT 1150 (77TH CONG., 2D SESS.)

A new long-term national policy for the treatment of the Nation's millions of agricultural laborers and their families was proposed in a report filed today with the United States Senate by the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, composed of Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR., of Wisconsin, and Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, of Utah. In the report, the third of a series based upon the committee's prewar investigation in California, it was recommended that this new public policy "assure the enjoyment of the same rights, standards of living, and status to labor in California's agricultural industry as is afforded by our laws and customs to other labor."

The report was a 250-page analysis of the unfortunate plight of labor in what the committee described as California's "industrialized agriculture." It included a detailed account of a half century of economic misery and repression for the California agricultural wage laborer, attributing this situation in part to their inability to exercise effectively their rights of free speech, association, and collective bargaining. In this connection the committee stated:

"The committee believes that this labor problem in California's industrialized agriculture, so described and analyzed, in part is attributable to the absence of the effective exercise of political and economic rights by the agricultural laborers involved, which has resulted in their having little or no voice in fixing the terms, conditions, and techniques of employment. That the employers and their associations have a complete monopoly in controlling labor relations is the most important, but often obscured, aspect of California's agricultural labor problem. There has been little pressure to adjust the disadvantages of labor's position. The potentialities of employee association and collective bargaining and the application of accepted labor legislation is sometimes passed over even by economic theorists and social workers. Too often it has been the tendency to confine suggested measures of solution to raids on the taxpayers' purse or the stimulation of employer sentiment to put their house in order. This recourse to theories and practice of paternalism rather than economic and industrial democracy has resulted in years of futile and feeble efforts to solve this situation.

"Employee organization and collective bargaining are more than a means of promoting industrial peace and avoiding strikes. The right of workers to associate themselves together in a lawful effort to better their economic, social, and political status is more than an abstract civil liberty. It has a fundamental bearing upon the economic, social, and political welfare of the people to whom the right is confided by our institutions of law and government. It is by the exercise of that civil right that the workers' disadvantaged status may be corrected and their relationship with employers and the agencies of government adjusted to provide better opportunities for living" (p. 157).

One of the significant features of the report was the committee's conclusion that the protection of civil rights of this laboring group must include a complete rehabilitation of its economic, social, and political status. After a painstaking examination of the system of agriculture characteristic of California and its similarity to the industrial pattern, the committee's report recounted the characteristics of employment and the mode of living apparent from its observations of the California agricultural scene. The unhappy relationship between the level of annual wages for agricultural laborers and health and decency budgets was only one factor. In addition to this disadvantage, the committee's report developed the following phases of the California agricultural labor problem: The absence of job security, underemployment, oversupply, unfair competition from relief and joint labor, low hourly wage and piece rates, the absence of a fair and democratic procedure for negotiating wages, the lack of social security, bad housing and dependence upon private labor camps by migratory workers, the lack of adequate medical attention for migratory farm workers, the lack of educational advantages for children of agricultural workers, inadequate protection from industrial accidents, the absence of minimum-wage and maximum-hour regulations for agricultural workers, the lack of any voice to agricultural workers in the method of payment and determination of working conditions, the abuses of the labor-contractor device, and, finally, the comparatively unorganized status of agricultural labor with the accompanying lack of any legal protection of their right to organize and bargain collectively.

Promising to explore in subsequent reports the overt acts of violation of civil rights and

the organized attempts to obstruct the development of collective bargaining in this field, the committee addressed its conclusions in the current report to these related phases of the problem, saying:

"Any thorough attempt to solve California's agricultural labor problem must include the elimination of 'undue interference' with employee organization and collective bargaining. But a verbal chastisement of those responsible for these interferences will not suffice. Collective bargaining cannot flourish or function effectively at a given instant where there is weakness in economic and social position of the workers, economic desperation on the part of employers and employees alike, and a thoroughly disorganized system of employer-employee relationships. The solution to California's agricultural labor problem must include the protection of labor's rights of association and collective bargaining, but that protection must be accompanied by other intelligent and constructive aids from the public, the employers, and the various agencies of government. There must be an appraisal of relevant social legislation which might be rationally extended to cover certain classes of agricultural employers and employees. There must be an evaluation of the public aid which might be employed, at least over a substantial period of adjustment, to alleviate the unhappy economic and social aspects of the present situation, until the employer-employee relationship in agriculture is stabilized and provides a respectable livelihood and status for the agricultural laborer" (p. 158).

In following out this approach it was announced that:

"This committee has reached the definite conviction that it is the present responsibility of our Government, Federal, State, and local, to make democracy work in California's industrialized agriculture. A program of definite content, including a well-rounded and cohesive group of legislative and executive measures, is necessary" (p. 394).

The report expressed the view that such a corrective program should be launched at the present time in order to alleviate the problem exemplified by the wandering "Okies" in the years preceding the war and threatening again in any post-war period. Defending this position, it was stated:

"This decade may be a decisive one for democratic rights here at home. In the midst of a vast international effort to defend democratic institutions, the Nation cannot ignore the plight of those within our own borders who are outside the pale of economic democracy. The battle to extend democratic standards of human relationships must be waged here as well as abroad. The civil rights of agricultural labor in California to speak freely of its problems, to assemble, organize, and bargain collectively do not now exist because of its highly disadvantaged status" (p. 394).

The essential elements of the new public policy proposed by the committee's report, insofar as it was derived from the analysis of California's agricultural labor problem, included:

(1) Legislation protecting the rights of agricultural labor to organize and bargain collectively.

(2) Legislation providing for the decasualization of the agricultural labor market, through a public employment exchange clothed with powers adequate—

(a) To lengthen the period of annual employment for regular farm laborers.

(b) To concentrate scattered employment on the smallest number of workers.

(c) To provide job security and seniority for regular laborers.

(d) To regulate the flow of employment.

(e) To reduce or eliminate unnecessary migration of farm labor and encourage migration related to the foregoing purposes.

(3) Legislation regulating the private recruiting of agricultural labor, interstate and intrastate.

(4) Legislation regulating the use of children as agricultural wage laborers away from the family farm. A bill (S. 2057) amending the Fair Labor Standards Act to accomplish this purpose has already been introduced in the Senate by Senator LA FOLLETTE and Senator THOMAS.

(5) Legislation extending the benefits of social security, both old-age and unemployment, to agricultural labor in "industrialized agriculture."

(6) Legislation extending minimum-wage and maximum-hour laws to cover agricultural labor in "industrialized agriculture."

(7) Legislation establishing a system of agricultural wage boards for the purpose of determining fair wages for the employment of labor in "industrialized agriculture."

(8) The expansion of housing programs for agricultural labor now conducted by the Farm Security Administration primarily in the direction of a "labor home" program.

(9) An expansion of the health and medical cooperative work of the Farm Security Administration.

(10) An extension of workmen's compensation laws to cover employment in "industrialized agriculture."

(11) The planning of a national program of full employment, taking into account not only the idle wage earners but also the plight of those whose unemployment is disguised by their apparent subsistence on an inadequate plot of land. It is this group that, in periods of national depression, floods the agricultural labor market, bringing increased misery to themselves and those already employed as agricultural laborers.

(12) The administration of reclamation and public-land projects to provide an outlet for rural population surplus that may follow a decasualization of the agricultural labor market in the western areas or the further dispossession of small farmers in the States to the East.

While the committee's report was devoted to the agricultural labor problem and policies in the State of California, it asserted that, "There are developing counterparts in other regions of the Nation." Referring to its observations on the national scene subsequent to the California inquiry, the committee stated:

"The threatened break-down of the family farm system in many of its strongholds seems to indicate that the pattern of agricultural labor problems that marks California will become dominant elsewhere. In the wake of large-scale operation, specialization of function, mechanization and multiple or chain farming, there is coming to our national agriculture the labor problems that an industrial revolution produces" (p. 398).

The report, while noting that similar patterns of agriculture were developing in many other areas of the Nation, drew a sharp distinction between the so-called industrialized agriculture and the family farm system which it asserted was commonly but erroneously held up as the background of any farm labor question. The distinction was drawn in these terms:

"The development of large-scale agricultural operations, sometimes highly specialized, requiring large outlays of capital and the employment of gangs of wage labor, oftentimes on a seasonal, periodic, intermittent, and casual basis, has resulted in a departure from the usual ties between the land and those who tend and cultivate it. Indeed, it has produced employer-employee relationships markedly different from the close personal tie between the traditional farmer and his hired man. The relationship between employers and employees in California more generally approaches the industrial or factory pattern but, as will be shown, without the usual and ordinary safeguarding of the rights and welfare of the wage earner which is common in other industries. This pattern of industrial operation has grown to a remarkable degree in California, but it is of more than purely local significance because the development of similar patterns in other sections of the Nation is becoming apparent.

"Throughout this report the characterization of California agriculture as industrialized is intended to give emphasis to the existence of large-scale operations, the high degree of concentration of ownership, the dominance of large employers in terms of production and payments for labor, and the use of gangs of workers by a single employer on a factory pattern, sometimes with a considerable division of labor. The term has come into increasing use as students in the field of agriculture and agricultural labor explore the role of large employers who are engaged in farming as a business rather than as a "way of life" (p. 161).

The continued emphasis which the report made on the point that a large amount of agricultural production was carried on by large or commercial farm operators, frequently incorporated, who employ large amounts of wage labor on a basis similar to that in industry, indicated that the committee saw no particular problem in the relationships between the average working farmer and his hired man. Indeed, at one point the report stressed the fact that even in California at least one-half of the farm operators either hire no labor or hire it in such small amounts that their true economic interest is more in higher than in lower wage rates for the agricultural workers, with whom they must necessarily work in competition. Pointing out the relatively large number of agricultural wage workers and small working farmers, whose returns for their own work were necessarily tied to the costs of hired labor on the larger competing farms, the committee concluded that—

"Indeed, the welfare and future of perhaps as many as nine-tenths of those whose livelihood comes from the agricultural industry of California may be said to be directly dependent upon the type of employer-employee relationships which prevails there.

"The national implications of this analysis are clear. The existence of industrialized agriculture in any substantial form, with possibilities for growth because of inherent economic and mechanical advantages, makes it necessary to determine the adjustments which will permit employers and employees in the industry to live and let live in some degree of peace and prosperity. Industrialized agriculture should not be permitted to escape such adjustments by assuming the role of the family farmer whom it is replacing. It must accept the responsibilities that our democracy exacts from industry in the equitable and democratic conduct of employer-employee relationships" (p. 169).

In this situation the committee found a national problem and a new legislative issue which is summarized in these terms:

"In exploring intensively the nature and character of this problem in a single State, the committee recognizes only a mere beginning in a broader task. Our democracy must embark upon the job of making the adjustments that are necessary when men who work and live on the land become largely separated from rights of property in it" (p. 398).

In appraising this field as one transcending the borders of an individual State, the committee considered in a preliminary fashion the question of lodgment of responsibility between the State and Federal Governments, saying:

"The adequacy of the powers of the State of California to cope with this problem, its inclination to do so, and the relationship of certain facets of the problem to national policy all must be considered. It is characteristic of our tradition, and rightfully so,

that where action by government is necessary, intervention by State or local government is preferred to national action in order that there shall not be any undue and unnecessary centralization of governmental power. However, in a problem as broad and complex as the status of agricultural labor in our society, a definitive program must call for the exertion of both Federal and State powers in the common field. Moreover, our preference for State and local action does not go so far as to preclude Federal action, where constitutional, when the State or local authorities refuse to act or function in an entirely ineffective or incomplete manner.

"The record of the last 50 years speaks eloquently of the failure to achieve a solution or alleviation of the California agricultural labor problem on a State or local level. The misery, poverty, and repression of the last decade were only another chapter in a record of events that reaches back through the years. Hence the committee can only conclude that the situation demands a much larger assumption of responsibility on the part of the Federal Government. It must become the continuing business of the Congress of the United States to concern itself with some of the problems outlined here" (p. 398).

In its conclusion, the report indicated that the committee was far from dismissing the subject which was the basis of the first extended official pronouncement on agricultural labor made in modern times by a committee of the United States Senate. That it expects the whole question to be increasingly important as a current or post-war legislative issue was indicated by the following statement:

"In part X the types of corrective action mentioned here will be discussed in greater detail and more precise recommendations will be offered. Wherever national legislation seems necessary, it will be offered in the form of concrete measures. This present volume serves only to sharpen the issue along definite, specific lines in the light of evidence. This issue, stated broadly, is whether or not this Nation will continue to countenance standards for labor in agricultural industry vastly inferior to those established for labor in other industries. A national decision on that issue will determine the future of civil rights of agricultural labor in California or wherever similar conditions exist" (p. 399).

A considerable portion of the report was devoted to a painstaking examination of the system of agriculture characteristic of California, and its relationship to the labor problem. Apparently, it was this type of farming which the committee described as "industrialized agriculture," which it deemed worthy of continued observation. It described the genesis of the labor problem in these terms:

"California's agricultural economy is so constituted that a substantial number of its farms, which produce a considerable portion of the crops, function on a wage-labor system. Because of the large scale or specialized character of the operations, particularly in fruits, vegetables, and certain specialty crops, the usual family labor force of an individual farm operator is often inadequate to meet periodic labor demands that accompany various stages of cultivation and harvesting.

"Of those listed as gainfully employed in agriculture in California, a highly preponderant number are classified as hired laborers as distinct from farm operators. The number of hired laborers in California agriculture has increased with each succeeding census.

"Even more significant than their growth in numbers is the concentration of their employment. A relatively small percentage of agricultural employers provides an unusually high percentage of the jobs. In this type of agriculture, the laborers work in gangs with a casual relationship to various employers. The similarity of this system of employment to the factory pattern justifies the common characterization of California's agricultural economy as 'industrialized'" (pp. 155–156).

The next point to receive extended treatment was the character of employment in California industrialized agriculture, concerning which the committee noted:

"A vast majority of the wage workers in California agriculture do not enjoy regular employment. They are drawn periodically from a pool of fluid, mobile, and otherwise unemployed labor to perform particular operations. Employment is characterized by seasonality, intermittency, and mobility, and is often a casual relationship" (p. 170).

The committee's observations in this connection, while not expressly pointed at the current farm-labor problem produced by the manpower demands of the war program, nonetheless have a very important bearing upon that subject. They reveal clearly at least part of the reason for the escape of the usual supply of migratory farm workers to the urban factories and indicate the tremendous waste of labor that is involved in the existing methods of agricultural employment. The report described the situation as follows:

"The labor market which has developed to conform to this structural organization is one in which a vast majority of the laborers do not enjoy relatively permanent or satisfactory employment. To achieve the obvious economies inherent in a system of agriculture which supports labor only when it is needed, a peculiar pattern of employment has evolved. It is characterized by temporary hiring from a mobile labor pool of otherwise unemployed workers. Except for a minor portion of full-time laborers, employment for the worker is the piecing together of many varied jobs of short duration, made available by the seasonal, intermittent, and shifting demand. There is no job security or regularity of employment. The worker must migrate from employer to employer, crop to crop, and area to area. This migration gives fluidity and mobility to employment. The lack of job security, underemployment, the necessity of keeping 'on the move' and the general disorganization of the labor market handicap the laborer severely. All of these disadvantages have been magnified during substantial periods of time by the overcrowded and oversupplied character of this market. The presence of an excess labor supply has, inevitably, worked to the disadvantage of the laborers' efforts to better their wage rates and working conditions" (p. 156).

While the report emphasized the disadvantages of this system of disorganized employment to the laborers and to the public welfare both in times of labor shortage and labor surplus, it did not offer any hope that the conditions would be corrected in absence of substantial public intervention. In this connection, the report traced the historical efforts of California agricultural employers over the last 70 years to maintain an excess supply of labor in order to preserve their favored method of employing seasonal, migratory, and casual labor. Referring to the background and aftermath of the famous Wheatland riots in 1913, the failure of agricultural employers to meet the economic and social aspects of the farm-labor problem before the first World War was noted. The report's description of this period is somewhat striking because of its analogy to the present situation in which great emphasis is being placed upon the necessities of securing adequate supplies of farm labor. Except for minor changes in dates and a reference to the prospects of importing labor from the Philippine Islands, the discussion of the first World War farm-labor problem is applicable today:

"The problems produced by the war emergency rapidly absorbed public attention and submerged the social aspects of the farm-labor problem as revealed by the Wheatland riot. No broad frontal attack was carried forward. Agricultural production was expanded in California and there was a sharp increase in the demand for farm labor. In the drive to secure more workers, the operators generally supported the importation of labor from outside the United States, the closing of saloons, liberal exemption of farm labor from military draft, development of potential home supplies—that is, children, women, city dwellers, better distribution and utilization of the existing supply, use of the vagrancy laws, and conscription of labor.

"School children and boys from State detention schools were used. Various school authorities cooperated, together with children's organizations. The so-called Women's Land Army was organized and employed. A small supply of Mexican labor was imported and attention and emphasis given to the prospects of importing labor from the Philippine Islands, the Hawaiian Islands, Puerto Rico, and Mexico. There was considerable pressure for a more widespread importation, and a reopening of the Chinese immigration question was advocated. In concluding his report of the 1918 season, Prof. R. L. Adams, who was designated as a State farm-labor agent, said:

" 'A growing realization arising from various studies and investigations is that the State has a great potential labor power in women, school children, and city dwellers, many of whom are farm reared or farm trained, and a large majority of whom can be drawn upon to aid in any real emergency; but at the same time great reliance should, emphatically, not be placed upon such classes of labor to meet the constant demands of California's specialized agriculture for a kind of labor able to meet the requirements of hard, stoop, hand labor, and to work under the sometimes less advantageous conditions of heat, sun, dust, winds, and isolation. Either sufficient capable labor must soon be available to do the work or else the character and methods of many important California agricultural enterprises must undergo a substantial and far-reaching readjustment. The amount of labor available of this class has a very definite bearing upon the character and extent of farming operations in the sugar-beet industries, in the industries of the Imperial Valley, and of the San Joaquin and Stockton deltas, and, to some extent, in the fruit industry.'

"This statement was somewhat prophetic of the later developments in the direction of Mexican importation" (p. 253).

The committee's conclusions indicate that it feels that long-term measures to correct the abuses and disorganized character of employment in agriculture would go far in meeting not only the problem of post-war period when labor surplus may be the cause of the difficulty, but also the problem in the war period where carefully organized use of available labor supply is important. The report indicates, however, that opposition to any such measures and a strong effort to build up the usual labor surplus pool may be expected. At least this is the lesson of history. As the report recounts it:

"California's agricultural industry has made a consistent and deliberate effort to maintain this system of employment and the unemployed pool. The history of California agriculture reveals an enduring vigilance and unending attempts on the part of organized employers to keep open the channels of foreign and domestic immigration which constantly poured into this labor market—Chinese, Japanese, Hindus,

Mexicans, and Filipinos, and the domestic migrants during recurring national depressions. These efforts overpowered several feeble attempts to begin a process of stabilization by settling a portion of employed labor force on the land" (p. 174).

Coupled with this system of employment, the committee's report developed in considerable detail the methods by which organized employers control the hiring of agricultural labor in California and the fixing of their wages. This situation was traced historically with especial emphasis placed upon the methods which characterize the last decade. The roles of labor contractors, privately operated labor recruiting agencies, and the various State and National public employment services in the 1930's were critically appraised. In addition, the committee outlined in specific terms some of the organized wage fixing carried on on an ex parte basis by tightly knit employer groups.

The impact of these various factors upon the economic and social status of California's farm laborers was traced historically with a more complete description of the situation in recent years. The situation—year in, year out—was summarized in the following terms:

"An analysis of the substantive plight of California's agricultural laborers discloses an inadequate annual income for many workers and their families. This is due both to substantial periods of unemployment in each year and low levels of earnings during the periods of employment. Supplementary funds from public-relief sources, dispensed on a broad scale, are necessary to maintain even a subsistence level for a great majority of them. Many are not eligible; relief funds are not always adequate. The natural result of a low level of income and a considerable mobility and uncertainty of employment is bad housing and living conditions. There may also be a loss of the advantages of public health and educational facilities available to persons with a fixed community and job status. There is no fair and democratic process for fixing arrangements for hiring, recruiting, wages, hours, working conditions, housing, and settling labor disputes. This tremendous disadvantage to the laborer is magnified by the absence of any protective social legislation, such as that commonly applied to industrial labor. There has been an almost uniform exemption of agricultural labor even from recently enacted labor legislation by the Congress" (pp. 156–157).

An entire chapter was given over to the controversial question of wage levels for California agriculture. It was pointed out that the average hourly or piece-rate wage was no accurate reflection of earning power because of the long periods of idleness and intermittent employment. The report gave particular attention to the oft-repeated contention that California wage rates were higher than those in the rest of the States, observing that such comparisons are based largely on the monthly or daily wage basis which is not applicable to the great bulk of the workers who are paid on an hourly or piece-rate basis.

Another chapter considered the relationship of the great migration during the 1930's of the "Okies" and "Arkies" from the agricultural areas of the regions east of California to the agricultural labor problem there. While acknowledging that economic depression and advancing technological farm mechanism and drought in the Southwest and Great Plains area were the primary causes of the movement of large numbers of these migrants, the report placed a considerable share of the resulting misery incurred in migrations, typified vigorously by the story of the Joads in John Steinbeck's Grapes of Wrath, upon the maintenance of the unfortunate pattern of employment of labor in California agriculture. In this connection it stated:

"The fact remains, however, that California's particular system of casual haphazard employment in agriculture acted as a magnet to draw desperate folk from Oklahoma, Arkansas, Texas, and Missouri, and others of the twenty-odd States which have contributed substantially to recent migrations to California. Certainly it may be fairly stated that the maintenance of the present employment pattern in California agriculture is, in large measure, responsible for the continuance of the aimless, disorganized migration of large groups of workers and their families in that State with its consequent problems of housing, health, education, and relief. Were it not so, there would be little or no reason to follow a nomadic existence in search of employment. California agriculture supplies a great bulk of the irregular, temporary, periodic, casual employment that is available in the State. When that employment is organized and stabilized and job security is provided on the basis of seniority, then one of the major sources of this chaotic and unnecessary migration, interstate or intrastate, will be eliminated. Migration will not cease, but it will be useful, not disorganized" (p. 200).

A separate chapter analyzed the special problems of migratory agricultural laborers in the fields of housing, health, and education. The system of Farm Security camps was strongly commended, not only because of the physical advantages they provided for otherwise helpless families of the laborers, but also because it afforded a considerable protection to the civil rights of the persons employed. The health program of that agency was also praised.

The evidence concerning the changing economic status of agricultural labor laid before the committee by its economists was summarized on a long-term basis as follows:

"For more than a decade the major trends in California agriculture and its labor market have reflected the increasingly depressed conditions and the growing insecurity of agricultural labor. Despite the recovery beginning in 1933 and the improvement in conditions in the State's agriculture, the position of agricultural labor failed to improve correspondingly. By 1938 the economic status of agricultural labor in California was much inferior to what it had been late in the 1920's.

"From the late 1920's to the present, the following major developments have been taking place in California agriculture and its labor market: (1) The volume of employment available for agricultural workers, measured in terms of aggregate man-hour labor requirements, has declined somewhat, while physical production (crops and livestock) has increased greatly; (2) the labor supply has increased absolutely, whereas employment opportunities in the agricultural labor market have decreased; (3) the agricultural wage bill, or the amount of wages paid to labor, has declined both absolutely and in proportion to gross agricultural income, lagging far behind gross agricultural income after 1932; and (4) labor productivity has increased sharply, while wage rates have decreased. As employment opportunities contracted and the labor supply was enlarged, and as the wage bill decreased, competition for employment increased and employment and earnings became spread more thinly over a greater number of workers" (p. 383).

In analyzing the unorganized status of agricultural labor in California, the committee's report traced the historical course of trade-union development, pointing out the traditional hostility of organized agricultural employers to trade-unions in industrialized agriculture. In promising to explore, in subsequent parts of the California report, the sources of dominant employer-labor policies in California agriculture and the means and methods by which they have been made effective, the committee drew attention to the fact that:

"There are powerful industrial interests in California agriculture which may or may not, depending upon the facts, share in the making of its labor policies. First, there are industrial firms and corporations, such as large banking, real-estate, processing, and shipping interests, which own, operate, or lease agricultural land, and which are directly interested in making the operation of that land highly profitable to the entrepreneur and hence to themselves. Second, there are many individuals active in urban industry, who have invested or assumed responsible roles in the operation of agricultural corporations or individual enterprises. Third, there is the interest of the credit, manufacturing, mercantile, and transportation industries, which supply goods and services to California agriculture. Naturally, their desire is to obtain a maximum or fixed share of the income of the farm operator. If wage labor is used, they as well as the operator must share that income with employees. The less the labor cost or the feebler the pressure on the agricultural employer for more wages, the less the pressure upon these suppliers. This is particularly important in times of declining prices when some item in the balance sheet must be squeezed. If labor costs are kept flexible and within the control of the employer, or better, within the control of the railroads, utility companies, fertilizer and farm-machinery companies, credit institutions, oil companies, and processing and shipping interests, then these industrial interests stand to preserve or add to their stake in the agricultural dollar. Finally, all of these groups have an interest in preventing interruptions in the production, processing, and shipment of agricultural commodities. Under these conditions it is not surprising to find the attitudes and policies of urban industry reflected in and related to agricultural industry" (pp. 216–217).

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 11, 1942, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bill and joint resolution:

S. 2459. An act to amend the act entitled "An act for the relief of present and former postmasters and acting postmasters, and for other purposes," to permit payment of total compensation to certain employees of the Postal Service employed in a dual capacity; and

S. J. Res. 144. Joint resolution designating June 13, 1942, as MacArthur Day, and authorizing its appropriate observance.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK of Idaho:

S. 2594. A bill for the relief of the State of Idaho; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PEPPER:

S. 2595. A bill to promote the general welfare through the appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in providing more effective programs of public kindergarten or kindergarten and nursery-school education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LEE:

S. 2596. A bill relating to the appointment of former deputy marshals of the United States as honorary deputy marshals of the

United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUGHES (for Mr. REYNOLDS):

S. 2597. A bill to provide for the appointment of chiropody (podiatry) officers of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 324) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

RELIEF OF CIVILIANS AND CIVILIAN DISTRESS ARISING FROM THE WAR—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TAFT submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2412) to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of civilians, and for the prevention and relief of civilian distress arising out of the present war, and for other purposes, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

MISSISSIPPI SOUND IN VICINITY OF PASS CHRISTIAN, MISS. (S. DOC. NO. 214)

Mr. BAILEY presented a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a report dated March 13, 1942, from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of the report on Mississippi Sound in the vicinity of Pass Christian, Miss., with a view to determining whether improvement of channel conditions is advisable, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed, with an illustration.

ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN PERSONNEL — CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, I submit the conference report on the service men's dependents allotment bill, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The report will be read for the information of the Senate.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2467) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942.

"TITLE I

"SEC. 101. The dependent or dependents of any enlisted man of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grades in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, including any and all retired and reserve components of such services, shall be entitled to receive a monthly family allowance for any period during which such enlisted man is in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after June 1, 1942 during the existence of any war declared by Congress and the six months immediately following the termination of any such war.

"SEC. 102. The monthly family allowance payable under this title to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall consist of the Government's contribution to such allowance and the reduction in or charge to the pay of such enlisted man.

"SEC. 103. The dependents of any such enlisted man to whom a family allowance is payable under the provisions of this title shall be divided into two classes to be known as "Class A" and as "Class B" dependents. The Class A dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the wife, the child, or the former wife divorced of any such enlisted man. The Class B dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the parent, grandchild, brother, or sister of such enlisted man and who is found by the Secretary of the department concerned to be dependent upon such enlisted man for a substantial portion of his support.

"SEC. 104. A monthly family allowance shall be granted and paid by the United States to the class A dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man upon written application to the department concerned made by such enlisted man or made by or on behalf of such dependent or dependents. A monthly family allowance shall be granted and paid by the United States to the class B dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man upon written application to the department concerned made by such enlisted man, or upon written application to the department concerned made by or on behalf of such dependent or dependents in any case in which the Secretary of the department concerned finds that it is impracticable for such enlisted man to request the payment of such allowance. The payment of a monthly family allowance to any class B dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall be terminated upon the receipt by the department concerned of a written request by such enlisted man that such allowance be terminated.

"SEC. 105. (a) The amount of the Government's contribution to the family allowance payable to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall be the aggregate of the amount of the Government's contribution to the class A dependent or dependents of such enlisted man and the amount of the Government's contribution to the class B dependent or dependents of such enlisted man.

"(b) The amount of the Government's contribution to the class A dependent or dependents of such enlisted man shall be at a monthly rate of—

"(1) $28, if such enlisted man has a wife but no child;

"(2) $40, if such enlisted man has a wife and one child, and an additional $10 for each additional child;

"(3) $20, if such enlisted man has no wife but has one child;

"(4) $30, if such enlisted man has no wife but has two children, and an additional $10 for each additional child; and

"(5) $20, in addition to the amounts, if any, payable under clauses (1), (2), (3), or (4) of this subsection, if such enlisted man has a former wife divorced.

"(c) The amount of the Government's contribution to the Class B dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall be at a monthly rate of—

"(1) $15, if such enlisted man has only one parent who is a Class B dependent, and an additional $5 for each grandchild, brother, or sister which such enlisted man has who is a Class B dependent, but not more than $50 in the aggregate;

"(2) $25, if such enlisted man has two parents who are Class B dependents, and an additional $5 for each grandchild, brother, or sister which such enlisted man has who is a Class B dependent, but not more than $50 in the aggregate; and

"(3) $5, if such enlisted man has no parent who is a Class B dependent, for each grandchild, brother, or sister which such enlisted man has who is a Class B dependent, but not more than $50 in the aggregate.

"In any case in which the amount of the Government's contribution to the Class B dependents of any enlisted man would be greater than $50, if there were no limitation upon the aggregate amount of the Government's contribution to such dependents, the amount contributed by the Government to each such dependent shall be reduced in the same proportion as the aggregate amount of the Government's contribution to all such dependents is reduced.

"SEC. 106. (a) For any month for which a monthly family allowance is paid under this title to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man the monthly pay of such enlisted man shall be reduced by, or charged with, the amount of $22, and shall be reduced by, or charged with, an additional amount of $5 if the dependents to whom such allowance is payable include both Class A and Class B dependents. The amount by which the pay of any such enlisted man is so reduced or with which it is so charged shall constitute part of the monthly family allowance payable to his dependent or dependents.

"(b) In any case in which the family allowance is payable to more than one dependent of any such enlisted man, the amount by which the pay of such enlisted man is reduced or with which it is charged shall be apportioned among and paid for the benefit of such dependents in the following proportions:

"(1) If such dependents are all Class A dependents or are all Class B dependents, such amount shall be apportioned among such dependents in the same ratio in which they share the total Government contribution payable to them under section 105.

"(2) If one or more of such dependents are Class A dependents and one or more of such dependents are Class B dependents, $22 of such amount shall be apportioned among such Class A dependents in the same ratio in which they share the total Government contribution payable to such Class A dependents under section 105 and $5 of such amount shall be apportioned among such Class B dependents in the same ratio in which they share the total Government contribution payable to such Class B dependents under section 105.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, in any case in which a family allowance is granted under this title to a wife or a child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or a written agreement, or to a former wife divorced, the amount of the family allowance payable to such wife, child, or former wife divorced shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree or in the written agreement as the amount to be paid to such wife, child, or former wife divorced. In any case in which the application of the provisions of the preceding sentence results in a reduction in a family allowance which would otherwise be payable under this title, the amount by which the pay of the enlisted man is reduced or with which it is charged and the amount of the Government contribution to such family allowance may each be reduced in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the department concerned.

"SEC. 107. Any monthly family allowance provided for by this title shall be paid for

the period beginning with the day on which application therefor is filed or the day on which the dependent or dependents first become entitled thereto under section 101, whichever is later, and ending with the day on which the disbursing officer paying the allowance receives notice of a change in status of the enlisted man concerned which terminated the right of his dependent or dependents to receive such allowance or notice of the discharge from or death in the service of such enlisted man: *Provided*, That in the case of any dependent of an enlisted man in active service on the date of enactment of this Act, if application is filed for a monthly family allowance within six months after such date of enactment or within such longer period as may be prescribed in special cases by the Secretary of the department concerned, the period for which such family allowance shall be paid shall begin with the date on which such dependent first becomes entitled thereto under section 101: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may, by regulations prescribed by them jointly, fix the dates of commencement and termination of any such family allowance on any dates not more than one month before or one month after the dates above prescribed. Such regulations shall in no event provide for the payment of such allowances for any period prior to the first day of the first calendar month following the date of enactment of this Act or for any period when the United States is not engaged in a war declared by Congress and which is more than six months later than the date of termination of any such war. Any allowances which accrue under this title for the period preceding November 1, 1942, shall not be actually paid until after November 1, 1942.

"SEC. 108. In any case in which any allotment from the pay of an enlisted man is already in effect at the time a monthly family allowance becomes payable under this title to a dependent or dependents of such enlisted man, such allotment may be continued, modified, or discontinued in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the head of the department concerned.

"SEC. 109. Any family allowance to which any dependent or dependents of any enlisted man is entitled under the provisions of this title shall be paid on behalf of such dependent or dependents to any person who may be designated by such enlisted man unless the Secretary of the department concerned determines that the person so designated is not an appropriate payee. In any case in which the Secretary of the department concerned determines that the person so designated is not an appropriate payee or in any case in which the enlisted man has not designated a payee, such allowance shall be paid on behalf of such dependent or dependents to such person as may be designated in regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the department concerned.

"SEC. 110. (a) Any family allowance granted under the provisions of this title to the dependent or dependents of any enlisted man shall continue to be paid irrespective of the pay accruing to such enlisted man.

"(b) In case of the desertion or imprisonment of any enlisted man to the dependent or dependents of whom a family allowance has been granted under the provisions of this title, the family allowance thereafter payable to such dependent or dependents and the reduction of or charge to pay of such enlisted man shall be determined in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the department concerned.

(c) In any case in which an enlisted man is entitled to receive or to have credited to his account pay and allowances for any period under the Act of March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, Seventy-seventh Congress), such enlisted man shall be deemed to be an enlisted man during such period for the purposes of this title.

"(d) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to modify the Act approved March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, Seventy-seventh Congress).

"SEC. 111. This title shall be administered by the Secretary of War in its application to enlisted men of the Army of the United States and the dependents of such enlisted men and shall be administered by the Secretary of the Navy in its application to enlisted men of the United States Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard, and the dependents of such enlisted men. Said Secretaries are authorized to prescribe jointly or severally such regulations as they may deem necessary to enable them to carry out the provisions of this title and to delegate to such officers or employees of their respective departments as they may designate any of their functions under this title.

"SEC. 112. The determination of all facts, including the fact of dependency, which it shall be necessary to determine in the administration of this title shall be made by the Secretary of the department concerned and such determination shall be final and conclusive for all purposes and shall not be subject to review in any court or by any accounting officer of the Government. The Secretary of the department concerned may at any time on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause reconsider or modify any such determination, and may waive the recovery of any money erroneously paid under this title whenever he finds that such recovery would be against equity and good conscience. The General Accounting Office shall not refuse to allow credit in the accounts of any disbursing officer for any erroneous payment or overpayment made by him in carrying out the provisions of this title unless such erroneous payment or overpayment was made by him as the result of his gross negligence or with the intent to defraud the United States. No recovery shall be made from any officer authorizing any erroneous payment or overpayment under this title unless such payment was authorized by him as the result of his gross negligence or with the intent to defraud the United States.

"SEC. 113. Any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made to the department concerned for the pay of enlisted men shall be available for the payment of the family allowances payable under the provisions of this title.

"SEC. 114. The Director of the Selective Service System is authorized and directed to cooperate with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy by providing them with such information in the possession of, or available to, the Selective Service System as may be necessary to enable them to efficiently administer the provisions of this title.

"SEC. 115. The monthly family allowances payable under the provisions of this title shall not be assignable; shall not be subject to the claims of creditors of any person to whom or on behalf of whom they are paid; and shall not be liable to attachment, levy, or seizure by or under any legal or equitable process whatever.

"SEC. 116. Whoever shall obtain or receive any money, check, or family allowance under this title, without being entitled thereto and with intent to defraud, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

"SEC. 117. Whoever in any claim for family allowance or in any document required by this title or by regulation made under this title makes any statement of a material fact knowing it to be false, shall be guilty of perjury and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.

"SEC. 118. Any person who has been entitled to payment of a family allowance under this title and whose entitlement to payment of such allowance has ceased shall, if he thereafter accepts payment of such allowance with the intent to defraud, be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

"SEC. 119. No part of any amount paid pursuant to the provisions of this title shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with any family allowance payable under this title, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not less than $100 nor more than $1,000.

"SEC. 120. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'wife' means a lawful wife.

"(b) The term 'former wife divorced' means a former wife divorced who has not remarried and to whom alimony has been decreed and is still payable.

"(c) The term 'child' includes—

"(1) a legitimate child;

"(2) a child legally adopted;

"(3) a stepchild, if a member of the man's household, including a stepchild who continues as a member of the man's household after death of the mother or termination of the marriage; and

"(4) an illegitimate child, but only if the man has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to such child's support; has been judicially decreed to be the putative father of such child; or, has acknowledged under oath in writing, that he is the father of such child.

"(d) The term 'grandchild' means a child as above defined of a child as above defined, and is limited to persons to whom the enlisted man has stood in loco parentis for a period of not less than one year prior to his enlistment or induction.

"(e) The term 'parent' includes father and mother, grandfather and grandmother, stepfather and stepmother, father and mother through adoption, either of the person in the service or of the spouse, and persons who, for a period of not less than one year prior to the man's enlistment or induction, stood in loco parentis to the man concerned: *Provided*, That not more than two within those named therein may be designated to receive an allowance, and in the absence of a designation by the enlisted man preference shall be given to the parent, or parents not exceeding two, who actually exercised parental relationship at the time of or most nearly prior to the date of the enlisted man's entrance into active service: *Provided further*, That if such parent or parents be not dependent or waive an allowance, preference may be extended to others within the class who at a more remote time actually supported the enlisted man prior to entrance into service.

"(f) The terms 'brother' and 'sister' include brothers and sisters of the half blood as well as those of the whole blood, stepbrothers and stepsisters, and brothers and sisters through adoption.

"(g) The terms 'child', 'grandchild', 'brother', and 'sister' are limited to unmarried persons either (1) under eighteen years of age, or (2) of any age, if incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect.

"(h) The terms 'pay' and 'base pay' mean base pay and longevity pay only.

"(i) The terms 'man' and 'enlisted man' mean any enlisted individual of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grade in any of the services mentioned in section 101 of this Act, but does not include any member of the Limited Service Marine Corps Reserve, the Philippine Army, the Philippine Scouts, the insular force of the Navy, the Samoan native guard or band of the Navy, or the Samoan reserve force of the Marine Corps.

"(j) The term 'department concerned' means the War Department or the Navy

Department, whichever may be the appropriate one in the particular case.

TITLE II

"SEC. 201. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this Act in the land and naval forces of the United States of any or all categories of those men whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose activity in other endeavors, is found in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this Act in the land and naval forces of the United States (1) of any or all categories of those men in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those men found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of men is advisable because of their status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the land or naval forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this Act in the land and naval forces of the United States of any or all categories of those men who have wives or children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual, and no such deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups or of groups of individuals in any plant or institution. Rules and regulations issued pursuant to this subsection shall include provisions requiring that there be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those men who have been classified by such local board.'

"(b) Section 15 of such Act, as amended, is amended by striking out subsection (c) thereof."

And the House agree to the same.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
JOSH LEE,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the report is agreed to.

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF HUNTSVILLE, TEX.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2309) for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex., which were, on page 2, line 10, to strike out all after "her" down to and including "$1,000" in line 18; on page 2, after line 18, to insert:

SEC. 2. That the Canton Exchange Bank, of Canton, Miss., is hereby relieved of all liability to the United States in connection with 10 checks drawn on the Treasurer of the United States, aggregating $791, which were negotiated during the years 1936 and 1937 through such bank by J. C. Harris, then county agent of Madison County, Miss., who had fraudulently obtained such checks and forged the endorsements of the payees thereon. Any subsequent endorsers of such checks are hereby relieved of any liability arising out of their endorsements, and the Treasurer of the United States shall be entitled to credit in his accounts for any sums paid out by him on account of such checks.

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to such Canton Exchange Bank, a sum equal to the amount, if any, paid by such bank to the United States, or any officer thereof, on account of its liability in connection with such checks.

SEC. 4. That the First National Bank, of Canton, Miss., is hereby relieved of all liability to the United States in connection with three checks drawn on the Treasurer of the United States, aggregating $234, which were negotiated during the years 1936 and 1937, through such bank by J. C. Harris, then county agent of Madison County, Miss., who had fraudulently obtained such checks and forged the endorsements, and the Treasurer of the United States shall be entitled to credit in his accounts for any sum paid out by him on account of such checks.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to such First National Bank, a sum equal to the amount, if any, paid by such bank to the United States or any officer thereof, on account of its liability in connection with such checks: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000: *Provided further*, That nothing herein contained in sections 2 to 5, inclusive, shall be construed to relieve the said J. C. Harris of any liability to the United States on account of any amounts improperly received by him.

And to amend the title so as to read: "An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex., and the Canton Exchange Bank, of Canton, Miss., and the First National Bank of Canton, Miss."

Mr. BROWN. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

POWERS OF SENATE SPECIAL SILVER COMMITTEE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 261) to confer additional authority on the Senate Special Silver Committee created pursuant to Senate Resolution 187, Seventy-fourth Congress.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution go over until later in the day. I wish to examine a previous act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the resolution will be passed over.

FLAG DAY SPEECH BY SENATOR LUCAS

[Mr. RADCLIFFE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by Senator LUCAS at the annual Flag Day celebration at Baltimore, Md., June 14, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

OUR FLAG OF VICTORY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GREEN

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Our Flag of Victory," delivered by Senator GREEN at the Flag Day celebration in Roger Williams Park, Providence, R. I., June 14, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD BEFORE B'NAI B'RITH AND JEWISH WAR VETERANS

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Why We Fight," delivered by him on Flag Day before members of the B'nai B'rith and Jewish War Veterans of Brooklyn, N. Y., which appears in the Appendix.]

CITATION OF SENATOR BROWN FOR HONORARY DEGREE OF JURIS DOCTOR

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by the dean of the Detroit College of Law on June 9, on the occasion when the degree of juris doctor was conferred upon Senator BROWN, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE DANCE OF THE BILLIONS—ARTICLE BY SENATOR SPENCER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Senator SPENCER entitled "The Dance of the Billions," as printed in the magazine Finance on May 28, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES' PAY PROGRAM

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the script for Government Employees' Pay Program, broadcast over the Mutual Broadcasting System on June 11, 1942, and participated in by Senator LA FOLLETTE and Mr. William Green, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESSES ON UNVEILING OF PORTRAIT OF HON. HENRY B. STEAGALL

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD addresses delivered on the occasion of the unveiling of a portrait on June 10, 1942, of Hon. HENRY B. STEAGALL, chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, which appear in the Appendix.]

FLAG DAY ADDRESS BY HON. ALF M. LANDON

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Keeping Our Heads," delivered by Hon. Alfred M. Landon, former Governor of Kansas, at the Elks Lodge Flag Day meeting, Marshalltown, Iowa, on June 14, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

LEADERSHIP—ADDRESS BY MAJ. C. A. BACH, UNITED STATES ARMY

[Mr. SHIPSTEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Maj. C. A. Bach, of the United States Army, to the officers graduating at Fort Sheridan, on March 25, 1918, on the subject Leadership, which appears in the Appendix.]

CONSERVATION OF RUBBER—ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. BARKLEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address by the President on Friday, June 12, 1942, with reference to rubber, which appears in the Appendix.]

MAIL SERVICE FOR THE ARMED FORCES

[Mr. MCKELLAR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Postal Bulletin of June 15, 1942, entitled "Mail Service for Our Armed Forces," which appears in the Appendix.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Glass	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Green	Overton
Bailey	Guffey	Pepper
Bankhead	Gurney	Radcliffe
Barbour	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Herring	Rosier
Bone	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Schwartz
Bridges	Hughes	Shipstead
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Burton	La Follette	Spencer
Butler	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lee	Taft
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tobey
Connally	McNary	Truman
Davis	Maybank	Tunnell
Doxey	Mead	Tydings
Ellender	Millikin	Vandenberg
George	Murdock	Van Nuys
Gerry	Murray	Wheeler
Gillette	Norris	White

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent from the Senate.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained in his State on official business.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. DOWNEY] is detained in his State on official business.

The Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] is a member of the Committee to Investigate National Defense, and is therefore necessarily absent.

The Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] is absent because of illness in his family.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. NYE] is absent from the city attending the funeral services of a friend.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF HIS MAJESTY, GEORGE II, KING OF GREECE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in a few moments His Majesty George II, King of Greece, will be the guest of the Senate. I ask that the Chair appoint a committee of four Senators to greet the King and to escort him into the Chamber; and I ask that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Chair appoints the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] as the committee to greet the King and escort him into the Chamber.

Pursuant to the unanimous-consent agreement, the Senate will now stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate being in recess, at 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.

His Majesty, George II, King of Greece, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, consisting of Mr. BARKLEY, Mr. MCNARY, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. CAPPER, entered the Senate Chamber, accompanied by His Excellency Emmanuel Tsouderos, the Prime Minister of Greece; Col. Demetrios Levidis, Marshal of the Court; Capt. Petros Stathatos, aide-de-camp to the King; Mr. Cimon P. Diamantopoulos, Minister to the United States from Greece; Col. Louis Fortier, United States Army, military aide to the King; Capt. Andrew S. Hickey, United States Navy, naval aide to the King; and H. Charles Spruks, Division of Protocol, Department of State.

The King of Greece, having been escorted to a place on the rostrum in front of the Vice President's desk and the distinguished visitors accompanying him having been escorted to places assigned to them,

The VICE PRESIDENT said: For centuries Greece has held aloft the torch of freedom, and never more than now. I present His Majesty, the King.

[Applause; Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.]

ADDRESS BY HIS MAJESTY, GEORGE II, KING OF GREECE

Mr. Vice President, Members of the United States Senate, I am proud to be in your midst and to bring to you the greetings of fighting Greece.

By your side, by the side of Great Britain, and of the other United Nations of freemen, I continue and shall continue—no matter what the hardships, whatever the cost—the struggle for the liberation of Greece [applause]—a nation which over a span of 5,000 years survived vicissitudes and force, and which today is much less disposed than ever to surrender its great heritage of civilization and to languish a prisoner of the powers of darkness and of evil.

When we took up arms first against the Italians and then against the Germans, we knew very well what misfortunes awaited our country and how difficult it was going to be for our friends immediately to come to our assistance. France then lay prostrate and most of the smaller nations of Europe, one after the other, had bowed to the might of the invader. But no Greek doubted for an instant where his honor lay. With the help of God and knowing that every Greek was ready and willing to die in defense of his freedom and his honor, I assumed the responsibility to history and to the Greek people to lead them forward in the full performance of their duty. At one of the most critical crossroads of human history, when the fate of civilization hung in the balance, Greece proved by her stand that no price was too high to pay for human freedoms and international decency. [Applause.]

Fortunately the sacrifices of my country were not in vain. Due to the resistance of the Greek people in continental Greece and in Crete, 7 precious months were gained at a most crucial stage of the war, and the plans of the invader went awry. The Greek victories in Albania shattered irretrievably Italy's prestige and our resistance to Germany saved precious time for other fronts.

In this struggle Greece is proud to find herself a second time within a quarter of a century by the side of the powerful and generous American democracy. In the United States my country always has found support and sympathetic understanding. The valuable aid which you have given us during this war will never be forgotten. The initiative which you took along with Great Britain, to bring relief to the starving people of Greece, is a tribute to your civilization, which is characterized by a Christian spirit of helpfulness. I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

I know that the people of the United States by long and arduous effort have earned the right to be and are a living example of the best in contemporary civilization, and that they are inspired by those nobler feelings and ideals which distinguish civilized man from the barbarian. Your prosperous democracy by long and persistent application has utilized for the benefit of the working masses the numerous technological means which human intellect today contributes to civilization, and has given us tangible proof of fairness and of justice.

You have not employed the power of your great country to attack weaker nations. You have given an example of self-restraint, and shown how a most powerful country can impose justice upon itself first so that it may rightly exact it of others. The great ideals with which the United States today inspires the peoples of the world will contribute not only to the happier conclusion of the current war but, after the war, will provide the foundations of the happier and

more harmonious life which humanity expects.

Decency and justice must govern relations between people in the post-war world which must not be left a prey to vandalism a further time. In order to achieve this result the machinery of international cooperation must be strengthened so as to utilize in order under law the tremendous resources of peace-loving peoples. The economic life of the nations must be reorganized in a manner which shall secure to all the well-being to which the plain men and women of the world are entitled. Above all else it is vital that those who have fought the battle of right be secured against invasion, and the wrongdoers—including those who either for ulterior motives or simply because of weakness permitted themselves to become tools of the Axis—be impressed that predatory policies do not pay. The preservation of freedom is not the obligation of any single people in any one part of the world; it is an obligation of all peace-loving peoples throughout the world. This simple truth is the base rock of international understanding and the cornerstone for cooperation between free men in the world to come.

Greece, with her limited resources, is wholeheartedly at the service of these ideals. Today when more than ever victory is clearly discernible on the flaming horizon, she is determined to contribute whatever she can toward that victory. Knowing the boundless resources which the American people are placing in motion for the common effort, I feel duty bound to speak with great modesty of my country's contribution to the same cause. However small that contribution may appear to be in contrast with what you are doing, it is everything we have. With all our free fighting men who have survived, with all our ships which have not been sunk, we will fight on land, we will fight on sea, and we will fight in the air, to the very end, by your side and by the side of the other United Nations, until barbaric violence is put down and a new world is established—a world for free men, not for slaves.

[Prolonged applause; Senators, distinguished visitors, and occupants of the galleries rising.]

Following his address, the King of Greece and the distinguished visitors accompanying him were escorted from the Chamber.

At 12 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled, when it was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. LUCAS in the chair).

INTERIM REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent out of order to submit an interim report by the Senate Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program on the gasoline situation in California. It will take only a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri is recognized for that purpose.

Mr. TRUMAN. In March of this year a complaint was made to this committee and to the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] that petroleum deliveries in the Northwest section of the United States were being hampered by a policy pursued by the Standard Oil Co. of California. The committee took the matter up with the Petroleum Coordinator by correspondence. I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the correspondence which passed between the Petroleum Coordinator, the Standard Oil Co. of California, and the chief counsel of the committee. There is a letter to Mr. Collier, president of the Standard Oil Co. of California, from the Petroleum Coordinator, dated June 6; a letter to the committee dated June 8, signed by the Petroleum Coordinator; a telegram dated June 13, addressed to the President of the Standard Oil Co. of California by the committee; and a reply from the president of the Standard Oil Co. of California addressed to the committee dated June 15.

I want to compliment Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Coordinator, for the firm stand he has taken in this proceeding. The Standard of California was quick to disclaim any relationship to the New Jersey company when the special committee was exposing their dealings with the Nazis.

The Standard Oil Co. of California was very strenuously endeavoring to choke off the small refiners and distributors of gasoline during the emergency, and very frankly so admitted to the Petroleum Coordinator's investigator. I am of the opinion that perhaps the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey may also wish to publish an advertisement similar to the one which was published by the Standard Oil Co. of California, which I ask also to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the correspondence and advertisement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 6, 1942.

Mr. H. D. COLLIER,
President, Standard Oil Co. of California, Standard Oil Building, San Francisco, Calif.

MY DEAR MR. COLLIER: In March of this year a complaint was made to the United States Senate Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program that Standard Oil of California was seeking to monopolize the gasoline market of the Pacific Northwest. A thorough investigation was made by members of this office, and the report of the investigation compels the conclusion that the charge was not without foundation. This conclusion is based upon Standard's failure to cooperate in carrying out the provisions of Recommendations No. 11 and No. 29, issued by this office under dates of September 17, 1941, and January 14, 1942, respectively.

It appears that during the period following Pearl Harbor, the transportation problem of moving petroleum products from California to Oregon and Washington became very critical, due principally to the withdrawal of tankers from that service. It also appears that as a result of such withdrawals Standard was left in a more favorable position than other companies marketing in that area. In fact some companies were almost wholly without transportation facilities. To alleviate such a condition this office issued Recommendations No. 11 and No. 29, but despite repeated attempts by other members of the industry to formulate plans pursuant to the provisions of these recommendations for the pooling of transportation facilities, namely, tankers, Standard refused either to participate in such a plan or to grant tanker space to competitors. The record indicates that other members of the industry considered it useless to present a plan to this office which lacked the support of your company. Consequently, conditions which the recommendations sought to prevent arose, and there were periods of scarcity of petroleum products in Oregon and Washington. In fact, I am advised that some companies were actually without products, particularly fuel oils, for a time.

I realize that Standard was also affected by the shortage of transportation facilities, but the effect on that company was not proportionately as great as on some of the other companies. Therefore, solely as a result of the emergency, Standard was placed in a more favorable competitive position, which, under the circumstances, became an unfair competitive position. Other than the loan of products, Standard did nothing to correct that position, although requests from this office in the form of recommendations were made of your company to do so. The lending of products, while commendable, was not enough. The borrower is at the mercy of the lender and his competitive position is tenuous, to say the least.

Moreover, I am concerned with the manner in which loans of products are repaid. Unless the parties stand on an equal basis, such loans should not be turned into sales under any circumstances. If the borrower is unable to return the products to Standard in Oregon and Washington, then Standard should accept products at such place as the borrower is able to make the return, with the difference in freight rates accounted for, of course. The reason for my concern in this respect is quite obvious. If such loans are turned into sales, outlets for their products are denied the borrowers. This is especially serious in the case of refiners who do not market directly in the Northwest but who sell through distributors or jobbers.

Members of my staff and I have from the very beginning taken the firm position that it would be our aim, insofar as it should prove possible, to have the operations of the petroleum industry so conducted that the burdens of the war would be shared equally by large and small alike and no company permitted, by virtue of wartime conditions, to improve its position at the expense of its competitors. I am, therefore, requesting that your company take steps to assist this office in carrying out that aim. In order that past inequities be corrected, I specifically request that you accept return of products loaned by you, at the location of the borrower's refinery or in the case of a distributor at the location of his supplier's refinery; or if you desire that the loans be repaid in the Northwest, tanker space should be made available by you for such return. So that there shall not be a repetition of the conditions hereinabove referred to, I further request that your company do everything possible to carry out the recommendations issued by this office, with particular reference to the formulation of plans to carry out the provisions of Recommendations No. 11 and No. 29.

I should appreciate receiving your personal assurance that my requests will be followed. However, if you have any reasons why it will be impossible to comply with any or all of the requests, I shall be pleased to receive them.

Sincerely yours,

_____,
Petroleum Coordinator for War.

OFFICE OF PETROLEUM
COORDINATOR FOR WAR,
Washington, June 8, 1942.

MY DEAR MR. FULTON: Pursuant to my instructions as set forth in my memorandum of March 6, 1942 to Dr. John W. Frey, Director of Marketing, Office of Petroleum Coordinator for War, I have now had completed a thorough investigation of the complaint made to Senator MON C. WALLGREN of Washington, and yourself, to the effect that the Douglas Oil & Refining Co., of Los Angeles, has been prevented from supplying gasoline to the Maxwell Petroleum Corporation of Tacoma, Wash., and that the Standard Oil Co. of California in this and other respects was seeking to monopolize the gasoline and other markets for petroleum products in the Pacific Northwest. A copy of this memorandum was filed with you on March 6, 1942, and shortly thereafter Dr. Frey left for the Pacific coast where he spent approximately 1 month conducting a survey of the entire situation. Since his return, the material which Dr. Frey collected has been exhaustively reviewed, and I now wish to submit to you the following conclusions:

1. Contract between Douglas and Maxwell: On October 18, 1940, Douglas entered into a contract with Maxwell to supply all of Maxwell's requirements of gasoline from and after the completion of the Douglas refinery, which was then building, until April 1, 1951. The contract provided that Maxwell should take delivery of products in Los Angeles thereby placing the obligation to provide transportation to the Northwest upon Maxwell. The contract also contained a cancelation clause giving either party the right to terminate on 1 year's written notice after April 1, 1942. Although it was expected that deliveries would commence in April of 1941, the final completion of the refinery was delayed until December 1941, and no shipments were made from such refinery until September 27 of that year. During the interval Douglas acted as a broker for Maxwell by purchasing gasoline for their account in the Los Angeles market. Although the prices which Douglas had to pay for this gasoline were generally somewhat higher than those provided in the contract, Douglas absorbed the difference. Subsequently, when the refinery was completed, open market prices for gasoline in Los Angeles had generally declined below those provided in the Douglas-Maxwell contract and have remained depressed ever since. According to Douglas, this condition caused Maxwell to become dissatisfied with the contractual arrangement and led to numerous threats on the part of Maxwell to serve notice of cancelation of the contract. It appears that because of this feeling between the parties, Douglas expected Maxwell to follow practices which would make it unnecessary for that company to purchase from Douglas. Accordingly, when Maxwell liftings were reduced materially in the early months of this year, Douglas suspected that company of purchasing its requirements elsewhere.

During the months of January, February, and March Maxwell's liftings from Douglas averaged only 189,000 gallons per month, whereas, the liftings for the last 4 months of 1941 averaged 641,000 gallons per month. This sharp reduction in liftings was due to the lack of tanker transportation facilities. Immediately following Pearl Harbor, the transportation situation on the west coast became critical. The Hillcone Steamship Co., which carried Maxwell's gasoline, lost the service of one of its two tankers in January, and the sailings of the remaining tanker were not as frequent as prior to the war. Other relatively small companies using this service were in the same position as Maxwell. Maxwell's greatest concern during this period appears to have been the difficulty of obtaining fuel-oil supplies which, however, did not concern Douglas because its contract was for gasoline only. Stocks of fuel oil were extremely low and some marketers were without these products for several days. Neither Maxwell nor the others were ever completely out of gasoline, however.

Dr. Frey called on Mr. G. W. Stratton, president of Douglas, and other officials of that company, and reports that they had been under the impression that the companies marketing in the Northwest were operating under a pooling arrangement whereby the major companies, including Standard Oil of California, were selling to Maxwell and others. This conclusion led to the fear on the part of Douglas that their Maxwell outlet would be lost. According to Maxwell, however, although he did borrow from companies in the Northwest during the period of acute tanker shortage, none was purchased. Insofar as Dr. Frey was able to determine, this was true and he so advised Mr. Stratton.

Summarizing the Maxwell-Douglas phase of this matter, the following facts have been established:

(a) The interruption of Maxwell's tanker service to the Northwest, caused directly by the outbreak of the war, was the primary cause of diminished liftings of gasoline from Douglas.

(b) Since Standard of California was possessed of relatively greater tanker carrying capacity in proportion to its then existing sales outlets in the Northwest, it could, had it followed our direct request as set forth in recommendation No. 11 (a copy of which is enclosed), have done much to alleviate this condition by providing cargo space to Maxwell for lifting gasoline from Douglas. This Standard refused to do, electing instead, and then only after pressure from my office, to loan products to the smaller marketers in the Northwest.

(c) The foregoing product loans did prevent the elimination of Maxwell and others in the Northwest as independent marketers of petroleum products, but there can be no question that such loans did not protect Douglas and could have protected Douglas only if Standard had been willing either to carry cargoes from Douglas to Maxwell for repayment of the loans, or if Standard had been willing to receive repayment from Douglas in Los Angeles rather than in the Northwest.

(d) Douglas can be kept whole as of the present date if repayment for the products borrowed by Maxwell are made with Douglas products received either in Los Angeles by the loaning company or in the Northwest through tanker transportation made available to Maxwell for lifting Douglas products in Los Angeles. I am addressing such a request to Standard, a copy of which is enclosed.

(e) It should be noted that Maxwell is likely not to be too anxious to repay its borrowings with Douglas products for the reason that Maxwell may well be able to settle these loans by purchasing gasoline from the loaning company at prices below those provided in the Maxwell-Douglas contract. Moreover, in order to avoid any misunderstanding about the conduct of Douglas as a refining organization, I consider it my duty to point out that that organization has itself flagrantly violated recommendation No. 19 of this office which requests all California companies to transport and purchase only crude oil produced in accordance with those principles of conservation necessary to maintain our supplies for the duration of the war. I am enclosing a copy of the recommendation and desire to state that I have positive evidence that Douglas has, within the past few months, purchased tens of thousands of barrels of so-called hot oil produced by a single hot-oil operator by the name of Heise in the Ventura Avenue field.

2. Activities of Standard Oil Co. of California: Dr. Frey's report leaves no room for doubt that up until very recently the conduct of Standard of California in relation to the war effort of the petroleum industry and the effort of my office has been anything but helpful. The position which it took in the Pacific Northwest, of which the Douglas-Maxwell incident is but one example, is illustrative of what seems heretofore to have been its attitude and which I hope is now being corrected.

Apparently this Standard company saw in the wartime situation what it believed to be an opportunity to use its superior physical and economic resources to improve its sales position at the expense of its competitors, who were less fortunately situated. Both the Deputy Coordinator and I have from the very beginning taken the firm position that it would be our aim, insofar as it should prove possible, to have the operations of the petroleum industry so conducted that the burdens of the war would be shared equally by large and small alike and no company permitted, by virtue of wartime conditions, to improve its position at the expense of its competitors. This was one of the reasons for the issuance of recommendation No. 11, signed by me, and for recommendation No. 29, signed by the Deputy Petroleum Coordinator.

In my judgment, it would be hard to find a more clear-cut case of what the Deputy Coordinator and I have had in mind in establishing the foregoing policy than that exemplified in this tanker situation on the Pacific Northwest. Prior to the war, Standard of California built and acquired a tanker fleet of its own to move its products. No doubt this was a sound thing for it to do. There were others, however, who depended upon chartering boats in the open market. This for them was the sound thing to do. But neither those who owned their own fleets nor those who chartered from others did what they did in contemplation of war. Rather, each did what he thought best for himself at that time. Then came the war, and the Government virtually commandeered tankers on a percentage basis. Standard of California, having a greater surplus of tankers in relation to its Northwest markets than did others, was thereby put in a position, through no action of its own but purely as a result of the war, to supply not only all of its own sales outlets but also to take over some of those of its competitors. Indeed, some of Standard's officials even went so far as openly to avow that they would use their relatively more plentiful transportation facilities to accomplish this very result, and its marketing vice president pridefully said to Dr. Frey that he had become what he called competitive. As I see it, he might more properly have characterized his acts as setting a course to eliminate competitors, either in whole or in part, at a time when, because of the war, such competitors were unable to protect themselves.

During the past few weeks, as a result of constant pressure which has been exerted both by my Office, including myself, the Deputy Coordinator, and Dr. Frey, as well as by various members of industry committees on the west coast, appointed by me, Standard of California appears to have demonstrated a somewhat more cooperative attitude. Certainly, it has come a long way since that time late last fall when, as reported to my Office by the chairman of the industry marketing committee and two of its members, the Standard representative on such committee flatly stated that it was his view that the committee should sit passively by awaiting the recommendations of the Petroleum Coordinator and thereafter fight them.

In conclusion, may I say that Standard's refusal to cooperate with my Office has not resulted in driving Maxwell, Douglas, or others out of business, but it did create unnecessary hardship, and it is quite apparent

that such a policy, if continued, might result in very serious consequences. No satisfactory explanation was given Dr. Frey by Standard officials for their past lack of cooperation, and the other companies quite naturally believed it useless to submit a plan for sharing tanker space in accordance with the provisions of recommendations No. 11 and No. 29 when the largest owner of tankers refused to join in this effort. I sincerely trust that the request which I am now addressing to Standard will cause it to cure whatever past inequities have occurred and that henceforth we shall have no repetition of such incidents as you have brought to my attention. Of course, you realize that my Office, as created by the President, is only an office of coordination and consequently there are no statutory penalties which could be invoked to deal directly with an offending company. We have been compelled, therefore, to accomplish a correction of this situation through persuasion and such influence as could be brought to bear by the vast majority of those within the petroleum industry who have from the beginning given my Office complete support.

I appreciate the helpful interest which the committee, Senator WALLGREN, and yourself have taken in this matter. If you desire any further information, I will be glad to furnish it.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD L. ICKES,
Petroleum Coordinator for War.

Mr. HUGH A. FULTON,
Chief Counsel, Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, United States Senate.

JUNE 13, 1942.

Mr. H. D. COLLIER,
President, Standard Oil Co. of California, Standard Oil Building, San Francisco, Calif.:

Please inform Special Senate Committee Investigating National Defense Program by telegram today whether Standard Oil of California is prepared to give unqualified acceptance to request of Petroleum Coordinator in letter June 6 to you. If Standard Oil of California is not prepared to do so, please inform committee exact action Standard Oil of California contemplates and reasons why it will not follow recommendations of Petroleum Coordinator.

HUGH A. FULTON,
Chief Counsel, Special Committee Inmittee Investigating the National Defense Program.

JUNE 13, 1942.

HUGH A. FULTON,
Chief Counsel, Special Senate Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, Washington, D. C.:

Replying your telegram today, while not accepting Petroleum Coordinator's criticisms of company's conduct, Standard Oil Co. of California is prepared to give unqualified acceptance to specific requests of Coordinator in his letter June 6 to me, except that relating to recommendation No. 11. Since recommendation No. 11 was issued, our tankers have been requisitioned by United States, and matter now rests solely within jurisdiction of War Shipping Administration. Concerning recommendation about return of borrowed products, Standard is quite willing to accept repayment in kind at points convenient to borrowers. None has asked Standard to accept repayment at any point different from that where loan was made. Concerning recommendation No. 29, Standard has been active in compliance with this recommendation in all respects and will continue this policy. Complete reply to Coordinator's letter has been delayed pending collection of data and review by executives, whose time last week has been much occupied by meetings of local committees under Coordinator, but I hope to transmit written reply Tuesday.

H. D. COLLIER.

[From the Los Angeles Examiner]

The Standard Oil Co. of California is in no way whatsoever involved in the assertions of the Department of Justice concerning relationship between the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey and Axis countries. This company is not in any way interested in the patents for the manufacture of synthetic rubber under discussion.

STANDARD OIL CO. OF CALIFORNIA.
MARCH 27, 1942.

THE ALUMINUM CRISIS—CONFUSION CONTINUES TO BE THE KEYNOTE OF THE ALUMINUM PROGRAM

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I desire to discuss what appears to be a crisis in the production of aluminum, a strategic material which has a very great bearing upon the success of our war effort.

At the outset I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks certain newspaper clippings which support, in part, some of the statements which I shall make in the course of this address.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wisconsin? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, dreamy optimism will not win the war, nor will vague, misleading generalities end our shortage problems. The oldest bottleneck of the war production program—aluminum—is still plaguing the aircraft and other war industries. Glenn L. Martin told the press recently that his production of bombers was 20 percent below capacity because he cannot get all the aluminum he needs. But the same day Jesse Jones assured the Senate Banking Committee that "it looks like we are going to have ample aluminum." Alcoa added to the confusion with the retort, "if Glenn Martin isn't getting his aluminum, the fault lies somewhere else," intimating that the aircraft scheduling unit of W. P. B. is at fault. Bombers are too important for us to be content with buck passing. We must find out now what is wrong while we can still remedy the situation and not wait for disaster to give birth to a post mortem.

Ever since the summer of 1940 when the national defense program was initiated, the aluminum program has suffered from confusion and the kettle-calling-the-pot-black sort of faultfinding. Attempts have been made in the past to explore the situation, but they never went far enough. Some improvements resulted from the Truman committee hearings but, as the investigations subsided, old evils returned and basic deficiencies remained untouched. Take for example the fact that although the aluminum section was one of the most severely censured branches of the old O. P. M., it was carried over into W. P. B. lock, stock, and barrel.

ALCOA IS STILL IN CONTROL OF THE ALUMINUM INDUSTRY

The principal objection to O. P. M.'s handling of the aluminum program was that it put its trust in Alcoa and almost completely ignored, and even discouraged, Alcoa's competitors. While under attack by the Truman committee, O. P. M. announced with much fanfare in the summer of 1941, that there were to be four independent aluminum producers under the new Government financed expansion program. But there was no public announcement when two of the four decided not to enter this field; nor has there been a frank disclosure of the fact that the further expansion announced in February of this year has been assigned 100 percent to Alcoa. Consequently, if the present arrangement prevails, Alcoa will operate about 90 percent of the aluminum capacity in this country. With the independents accounting for less than 10 percent of the total capacity, Alcoa's monopolistic control has been strengthened rather than curtailed by the war production program. Criticism of past practices was not enough to bring about lasting changes. Alcoa and its friends appear to be sufficiently influential and resourceful to survive these temporary storms of criticism.

What is needed is a thoroughgoing analysis of current conditions and a basic, constructive reorganization of the governmental machinery for administering the aluminum program, not another set of committee hearings. Once and for all let us nail down the causes of Glenn Martin's aluminum shortage and get rid of them. For 2 years now we have muddled along, practically letting Alcoa direct the program. This may have made it easier for the defense agencies back in 1940, but now that we are at war I am convinced it is a policy fraught with danger for the country. Why should we be so largely dependent on the judgment of a single private corporation for the supply of so essential a war material as aluminum? Such a course is particularly reckless, in view of the fact that maximum output is the goal of the war production drive, while this particular corporation, Alcoa, has for 50 years successfully pursued the policy of restricting production to that level which would enable it to remain a monopoly. Unrestricted expansion and distribution, therefore, run counter to the natural and acquired characteristics of Alcoa.

ALCOA'S MONOPOLISTIC POLICY DEPRIVED US OF ADEQUATE WAR PREPAREDNESS

The aluminum bottleneck is neither an act of God nor an inevitable disaster, as some would have us think. It is largely a corporation-made catastrophe, born of monopoly. In two respects the aluminum situation is worse than that prevailing in any other basic war industry. First, only one corporation, Alcoa, is experienced in the production of aluminum and that same company dominates the most strategic fabricating branches of the industry, such as aircraft sheet, forgings and extrusions. Second, its available facilities were being used at capac-

ity even before the defense program got under way 2 years ago. Both conditions are directly attributable to Alcoa's historic policy of keeping the industry unto itself and preventing the rise of competition.

For half a century Alcoa maintained a constant vigil against the intrusion of independent producers. It bought them out or discouraged them by one device or another so that they gave up before long. The net consequence is that, due to Alcoa's policy, the Government has the dismal choice of either putting its entire faith in this one corporation or entrusting part of the expansion program to inexperienced and untried producers. Instead of having the benefit of concurrent expansion by a number of seasoned operating companies, the war agencies have found it necessary to limit themselves primarily to what Alcoa can do by itself.

On the second count, that of spare capacity, Alcoa is equally responsible. Aluminum was the only basic war industry without extra productive facilities when the defense program began 2 years ago, because it was one of the very few cases of perfect monopoly. When there are no competitors, a monopoly can keep its capacity down to the abnormally low level which guarantees it an easy sale at a fat profit for all it produces. Alcoa did just that and thereby deprived this country of that safety margin of surplus capacity which is a byproduct of real competition and a godsend in times of emergency.

Alcoa's traditional high-price policy brought in its wake particularly disastrous results from the viewpoint of war production. Unreasonable prices during the past two decades discouraged the use of aluminum by the automotive industries. Under normal competitive conditions they would have used huge quantities of this modern, light metal. To meet their needs the aluminum industry would have had to increase substantially its facilities for producing and fabricating aluminum. If Alcoa had not halted this trend toward a bigger aluminum industry, these extra facilities would have been available for defense or war production when the emergency arose, thereby reducing, and perhaps even eliminating, the aluminum bottleneck.

In view of the way monopoly has warped and repressed the aluminum industry, it can be asserted that but for the policy of Alcoa the aluminum crisis would be far less serious and much easier to conquer than is actually the case today.

ALCOA HAS DEFAULTED ON ITS PROMISES TO MEET THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY

The events of the past 2 years show that Alcoa has not dealt adequately with the aluminum problems which arise during a national emergency. When the defense program was inaugurated 2 years ago Alcoa promised that it would meet all requirements, both civilian and military, and that it would provide all the additional capacity required by the program. On both counts it has failed miserably. It appears to have made these promises recklessly in order to dissuade the Government from creating independent sources of aluminum.

Shortages and priorities developed in aluminum before they appeared in any other industry. Civilian requirements have not been met since February 1941 when priorities were established. From all indications, such as complaints of aircraft manufacturers and the change-over to plywood planes, even military needs are not being satisfied. These shortages and priorities necessitated a sudden and ruthless curtailment by civilian aluminum manufacturers which meant unemployment for cooking utensil workers in my State, as well as for many others throughout the Nation. Shortages, priorities, and unemployment—these were Alcoa's first contributions under the defense program.

Alcoa has also failed with respect to the financing of new plants. Since the summer of 1941, the Federal Government and not Alcoa has paid for substantially all the expansion of aluminum productive capacity, to the tune of $568,000,000 of public funds. Whether or not defense officials were justified in 1940 and 1941 in putting their full trust in Alcoa is of historical interest only and I do not want to waste time arguing that question. As a practical matter, even if they were justified then, developments during that time and right down to date clearly establish that there is no good reason for continuing to put nearly all the Government's aluminum eggs in Alcoa's basket. An initial error is understandable, even though not justifiable, but to persist in this course is worse than stupidity.

Not only did Alcoa fail to keep its promises but it went further and tried to cover up its deficiency with overoptimistic, misleading advertisements and public announcements. It minimized the shortage, describing it as a pinch in the supply which was more or less a temporary matter. Analysis of the testimony of its officials before investigating committees would also show that Alcoa has customarily confused rather than clarified the issues under inquiry. Despite this situation the Federal Government has in effect placed the aluminum program almost completely at the mercy of this one company without providing itself with adequate means for checking Alcoa's performance and good faith.

ALCOA'S POLICIES HELPED TO GIVE WORLD LEADERSHIP IN ALUMINUM AND MAGNESIUM TO NAZI GERMANY

Recent disclosures of Alcoa's friendly ties with the Nazi government's principal stooge in the business world, I. G. Farben, accentuate the need for a thorough reappraisal of Alcoa's role in the war-production drive. In 1931 a world cartel in aluminum was formed, including the Germans as a direct member and Alcoa as an indirect member. Essentially the cartel protected the United States market from foreign competition but in return Alcoa had to limit its production and capacity to domestic requirements. Simultaneously with the consummation of the aluminum cartel, Alcoa entered into an agreement with I. G. Farben covering magnesium. An American partnership was created by Alcoa and I. G. Farben to enforce this agreement, the terms of which prohibited Alcoa from participating in the development of the magnesium industry in the United States, directly or indirectly, without the consent of I. G. Farben.

Let me say, Mr. President, that magnesium is only a little less important and vital to our war effort than is aluminum. Back in 1931 Alcoa thus gave the Germans effective control over the development of our magnesium industry and a powerful voice in the determination of the growth of our aluminum industry.

After Hitler came into power the Germans insisted that the aluminum cartel permit them to expand productive capacity and output without restraint. The other cartel members agreed to this modification for Germany, provided it did not result in the export of German aluminum to their protected home markets.

In other words, Mr. President, under the agreement those who were either directly or indirectly in the aluminum cartel granted the German manufacturers, after Hitler came into power, the right fully to expand productive capacity in Germany, provided they would not export any of their increased capacity and thus unset the domestic monopoly control of the other constituent members of the cartel.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one observation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ANDREWS in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator is making a most interesting argument, and many of the facts which he is now discussing were brought out before the Committee on Patents. After Hitler came into power in Germany, those contracts, as I understand, with the American concern and the English concern were renewed, and Hitler had complete information as to the contents of all the contracts between I. G. Farben and the different groups in this country. I desire to make the observation—and I am sure the Senator will bear me out as to this fact, which seems to me to be so important in connection with what was going on at that time—that, while Hitler and the Nazi group apparently knew everything that was going on, the Government of the United States and the Government of Great Britain were absolutely in the dark as to any of the contents of various international cartel agreements. That has seemed to me to be one of the most detrimental things which could happen to a country which was about to go to war, as Great Britain was at that time, and as we ourselves did later on. In other words, Hitler had the advantage. He took advantage under those contracts, to the disadvantage of this country, when this country was not in a position to know anything about the contents of the agreements.

That is the point which we have discussed in the committee, and I desired

to bring it out at this particular juncture in the Senator's able argument, and to say that from now on, so far as the Senator from Illinois is concerned, no international cartel arrangement can ever be made unless the State Department or some other governmental agency in Washington shall approve or endorse or register such agreement, so that the responsibility can ultimately be laid right at the door of our own Government, if anything of that sort should ever happen again.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I appreciate very much the Senator's comment, and it serves to buttress the point I am attempting to make. I agree with him 100 percent in the statement he has made concerning the disadvantage to our Government vis-à-vis the Nazi government because of this situation. I also desire to add a further comment in a slight digression; and that is—and the Senator will well remember it if he had an opportunity to be present, or I am sure he has read it—to refer to the able analysis of the utilization of cartels and corporations as a part of the Nazi economic war policy presented to the Senate Patents Committee.

Early the Nazis did an unusual thing, from a legal standpoint. They, of course, maintained and declared that all German companies owned in Germany were nationals of Germany, and would be treated as such, but they also announced a new doctrine, so far as corporate law is concerned, in my ken, namely, that American-owned companies in Germany were to be brought on all fours with the wholly owned companies situated in Germany, and that German-owned American companies, incorporated under the laws of the States of the United States, were to be placed on the same legal footing as wholly owned companies in Germany.

If Senators will pause to consider what that meant they will realize that the companies which were formed by I. G. Farben, or other great German trusts, in connection with American corporations, were, so far as German law was concerned, and so far as the activities of the German Government were concerned, regarded as being on the same basis and were treated in the same way as if they had been corporations wholly owned by German citizens and incorporated under the laws of Germany.

With Germany free to expand its production while all other producers, including Alcoa, continued to operate under cartel restrictions, the Nazis had the opportunity to become the world's largest aluminum producers.

How the cartel played right into the hands of Hitler is shown by a comparison of German and United States production for 1930, the year before the cartel was formed, and 1938, the year before the war broke out. In 1930 Germany produced less than one-third as much aluminum as did the United States, the figures being 31,000 and 104,000 metric tons, respectively. But by 1938 the Nazis had shot ahead of this country. Germany then produced 167,000 tons as against our 130,000—the relative increases in output from 1930 to 1938 being 439 percent for Germany and 25 percent for the United States. This contrast in relative development is all the more remarkable in view of the fact that Germany had neither domestic bauxite deposits, such as we have, nor the vast waterpower resources of this country.

Due to Alcoa's cooperation, the Nazis were able to exert even greater influence over our magnesium industry. It was kept pitifully small, a mere fraction of Germany's. I. G. Farben representatives were executives of the American Magnesium Corporation and the Magnesium Development Corporation, the partnerships set up here by Alcoa and I. G. Farben to operate their magnesium business. If Senators will bear in mind the doctrine of corporate law enunciated by the Nazis which I outlined a few moments ago they will see the added significance of this statement.

Alcoa was as much a partner of I. G. Farben in magnesium as Standard Oil of New Jersey was in synthetic rubber and the results were equally disastrous in both cases. Despite our anti-Axis prewar sentiments, and despite our declaration of war against Germany in December 1941, not until April of this year, 1942, were these intimate and dangerous ties between Alcoa and the Nazis broken. And even then, it was brought about only after a long investigation by the Antitrust Division and a Federal grand-jury indictment. It is significant that Alcoa preferred to pay fines and accept a consent decree rather than try to prove its innocence in a court of law.

Despite Alcoa's record, it has enjoyed a greater latitude under the war-production program than any other corporation of which I know. Because it was a perfect monopoly when the defense program began in 1940, Alcoa was the Government's only source of technical data on aluminum within the industry itself. Substantially, that situation has remained unchanged down to this very hour. During these 2 years the defense and war agencies have neglected to build up competent, independent staffs which could reach decisions and appraise conditions independently of Alcoa. As a result, we never had, and we do not have now, any machinery for checking up on what Alcoa is doing or what Alcoa proposes the war agencies of the Nation shall do. The urgent need for the Federal Government to step in and shoulder responsibility for the operations as well as for the financing of the aluminum program is indicated not only by what Alcoa has done in the past few years but also by the dangerous trend of the current expansion program. The goal of the war-production drive, maximum output right now, appears to be ignored whenever it conflicts seriously with the private business interests of Alcoa and other affected corporations. Illustrative of the general pattern are the arrangements which have been made for the mining of the ore of aluminum, bauxite, and its chemical purification.

BAUXITE

Government plants are unjustifiably being denied high-grade bauxite

The present plan of W. P. B is to use low-grade bauxite in the Government aluminum plants. Until now only high-grade bauxite has been used by Alcoa and it will continue to use high-grade bauxite in its own private plants. The Aluminum Section of W. P. B. contends that low-grade bauxite has to be used in the Government plants because domestic reserves of high-grade ore are limited and imports from South America are restricted by the shipping bottleneck. There can be no dispute about the shortage of ships but there is serious doubt as to whether domestic deposits of high-grade bauxite are as limited as Alcoa and other private mine owners would have us believe. This whole question of high-grade versus low-grade ore is important because the low grade requires more processing, more labor, and more chemicals than does the high-grade variety. If we turn to low-grade bauxite while high-grade ore is still available, we are wasting men, materials, and time, and are slowing down the war-production drive, insofar as aluminum is concerned, which is essential to the success of that effort. It is essential, therefore, to make certain that there is not sufficient high-grade bauxite to supply the new Government plant before deciding to run it on low-grade ore.

No such precautions were taken by the Aluminum Section of W. P. B. Long before it even knew what the high-grade bauxite reserves were, it decided to use low-grade ore in the Government plants. On September 15, 1941, Arthur H. Bunker, Chief of the Aluminum Section, told the Truman committee that—

> Our program suggests that not one single ton of high-grade bauxite enter into the production of aluminum metal—not 1 ton—because the demands on this country for high-grade bauxite, for which there are no substitutes at all, are very great.

That statement was made before any comprehensive survey of bauxite resources of this country had been completed, and so Mr. Bunker could not have known whether or not there was enough high-grade bauxite here for use in aluminum production. The first Nation-wide bauxite survey was released by the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey on November 1, 1941, a month and a half after Bunker's statement, and even that survey was inadequate. The Aluminum Section's decision to use low-grade bauxite for the manufacture of aluminum was, therefore, necessarily based on what they were told by Alcoa and other bauxite owners and not on independently ascertainable facts as to available reserves.

Private owners of bauxite deposits are palming off on the Government their low-grade ore

The views and recommendations of the private bauxite industry should not be taken at face value, because they have every incentive to minimize the utilization of high-grade bauxite and to maximize the consumption of low-grade ore during the war period. Until now low-grade bauxite has had very little marketability in this country. After the war, with the superabundance of ships, high-grade bauxite from South America will come into this country at low enough prices to drive low-grade domestic

bauxite out of the market. Consequently, the war period is the only time when the owners of low-grade deposits can realize any attractive profits on these otherwise worthless ores. Naturally, while the war market lasts, bauxite owners will do all in their power to dispose of the inferior bauxite.

As for high-grade bauxite, the situation is entirely different. Relatively speaking, the available supply of high grade is considerably less than that of low grade, while the market for it is larger and more stable. Domestic high-grade bauxite commanded profitable prices before the war and is likely to do so after it is over. At least domestic high-grade bauxite will be better able to compete with South American bauxite than will low-grade ore. That is clear and plain on the face of it. Furthermore, the rising tax rates are constantly cutting the net profits so that the mining of high-grade bauxite may well be less profitable during the war than it will be afterward. Perhaps the most important influence bearing down on the owners of bauxite deposits is their fear that the unrestrained use of high-grade bauxite during the war will leave them without any high-grade ore for the post-war period in their own plants.

Mining is a "wasting asset" industry which means that every ton of high-grade bauxite mined and sold during the war depletes the supply available for sale during later years. Mine operators are particularly sensitive to this fact, when, as is the case with high-grade bauxite, their reserves may be exhausted by the war program. They naturally try to save themselves from the possibility of being put out of business. They urge the greatest use of low-grade bauxite, thereby reducing the demand for their precious high-grade ore, and, incidentally, reap windfall profits on the ordinarily worthless low-grade ore. Obviously, it is to the selfish interest of the private seller of bauxite to overstate the advantages of using low-grade ore and to play down the disadvantages of such a procedure.

Government officials have catered too much to private bauxite interests

Under these circumstances those responsible for the aluminum program should have found out what the extent of our high-grade reserves was, independently of the private owners. Instead, the defense officials have relied on Alcoa and other mine operators and have given prime attention to their interests and wishes. For example, Mr. Bunker told the Truman committee that bauxite deposits are one-third high grade and two-thirds low grade, and "since we want to operate that field by taking a cross-section of ore out," it will be necessary to mine two tons of low-grade bauxite along with every ton of high grade. What he failed to state is that there is no technological necessity for "taking a cross-section of the ore" in any such ratio.

For over 40 years high-grade bauxite has been mined in this country without anyone finding it necessary to extract twice as much low-grade ore in the process. The only excuse for the kind of operations suggested by Mr. Bunker is that it nets the mine operators the largest possible profit. This war is not, or at least should not be, run to secure for private interests the largest possible profits. Instead of catering to the appetite for fat profits, W. P. B. should plan bauxite operations on the basis of the availability of reserves and nothing else. As long as there are high-grade deposits in existence, the use of low-grade ore is gross inefficiency. The crucial question is, therefore, how much high-grade bauxite is there in this country and how long is it likely to last?

High-grade bauxite reserves are ample at least until 1946 or 1947

Since Government officials were willing to rely on the data and advice supplied by private industry, no thorough check up has been made of this country's high-grade bauxite reserves. Alcoa, however, did make a survey of the Arkansas resources in connection with the recent antitrust trial. Its experts estimated that Arkansas had between 20 and 30 million tons of high-grade bauxite on May 1, 1940. This estimate probably tends to understate rather than exaggerate the size of these domestic deposits because Alcoa was interested at the time in proving that it had to go abroad to assure itself of an adequate supply of raw material. Mining operations between May 1, 1940, and January 1, 1942, probably reduced the Arkansas reserves about 1,000,000 tons. We, therefore, started 1942 with nineteen to twenty-nine million tons of Arkansas high-grade bauxite, as yet unmined.

Taking the minimum estimate of 19,000,000 tons, Arkansas could supply all the needs of this country, as they are now estimated until late in 1946 even if there were no accumulated stock piles or importations from South America. If Alcoa's more optimistic estimate is used as the basis of calculation, these deposits would last until 1950. A more realistic computation would take into account the fact that a substantial stock pile of high-grade bauxite was available at the beginning of this year and considerable quantities of Guiana bauxite are still reaching our ports. Recognizing these factors, the date of exhaustion would probably be postponed until late 1947 or 1948 even if Alcoa's estimates are taken at their minimum.

The sharp contrast between Alcoa's estimates and Mr. Bunker's statements indicates how badly the elemental question of bauxite reserves has been handled by the responsible Government agencies. It appears from the information available to me that either the public officials are the innocent dupes of the private interests, or they are consciously helping the corporations preserve their best ores for more profitable post-war operations. Whichever is the reason, the situation is intolerable, and responsibility should be placed in more competent hands.

The country has been confused with respect to the bauxite program

Some of Mr. Bunker's statements on the bauxite situation make one wonder whether he was misled by private industry. For example, his statement was misleading when he flatly asserted, before the Truman committee that "our program suggests that not one single ton of high-grade bauxite enter into the production of aluminum metal—not one ton * * *." Mr. Bunker should have known when he made the statement that it was misleading. He knew that only the Government alumina plants were going to operate exclusively on low-grade ore while the private plants of Alcoa and Reynolds were to continue to use principally high-grade bauxite. He must have known these facts because such was the unfair and lopsided arrangement which he approved and helped put into force.

These misleading statements regarding the true state of affairs by the chief of W. P. B.'s aluminum section are inexcusable but they are understandable. Mr. Bunker was in an awful predicament. If he revealed all the facts, he would have had to run the gantlet of public denunciation and attack for applying the bauxite shortage to Government plants only. He would have been hard put to find the answers to such embarrassing questions as to why it was decided that no high-grade bauxite would be available for the Government plants, while, at the same time, it was decided to expand Alcoa's private plants to enable them to use even greater quantities of high-grade ore than they had ever used before.

Equally misleading were other assertions by Mr. Bunker about high-grade bauxite. He claimed that there were no substitutes for high-grade bauxite in the abrasive and chemical industries, implying that there was a substitute in the aluminum industry. As an engineer, Mr. Bunker should know better than that. High-grade bauxite is as essential to aluminum manufacture as it is to the production of certain abrasives and chemicals.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. THOMAS of Utah in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I am reluctant to interrupt the Senator's fine address.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I welcome the interruption.

Mr. MURDOCK. In connection with the discussion of bauxite, however, I wonder if the Senator's investigations have led him into the alunite field?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I am going to mention that as I go along, and if I do not touch upon it sufficiently I wish the Senator from Utah would supplement anything I have to say.

Mr. MURDOCK. I agree with the Senator as to much that he said with reference to Mr. Bunker, and I should like to add a great deal to it. I have run into the same barriers and the same obstructions which have confronted everyone else who has tried to interfere in any way with the aluminum program.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And, of course, the Senator's State, if he will pardon me, has a great interest in the subject because of the large deposits of alunite in Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true, and I think before the war is over the country

will find out that the high-grade alunite deposits of Utah are just as good and efficient for the production of aluminum as is high-grade bauxite.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. And yet, Mr. President, the only plant, as the Senator well knows, for the use of that process will produce only about one-half of 1 percent of the total program as it has been thus far outlined.

Mr. MURDOCK. That is true; and we had the greatest difficulty in the world even in getting Mr. Bunker to approve that small amount.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. You had to blast your way in to get one-half of 1 percent.

All three industries, that is the aluminum industry, the abrasive industry, and the chemical industry, require substantially the same quality of bauxite. When any of them resort to inferior grades of ore, preliminary purification becomes necessary. So no matter what Mr. Bunker says, the abrasive and chemical industries would be at no greater disadvantage than the aluminum industry if they had to use lower grades of bauxite.

As a matter of fact, the abrasive industry, at least, can curtail its consumption of domestic high-grade ore more advantageously than can the aluminum industry. In the manufacture of abrasives, the bauxite must be thoroughly dried first, it being heated preliminarily to the point where all the chemically combined water is driven off from the ore. The aluminum industry, on the other hand, uses a partially dried bauxite. Consequently, the ore boats bringing high-grade bauxite from South America to this country for the aluminum industry carry as cargo a substantial amount of water contained in the ore. If, however, the abrasive industry were to use this imported bauxite, the water could be dried out completely before shipment. The boats, the ships—and every Senator knows how precious every one of them is at this hour—used to meet the needs of the abrasive trade would then be able to carry 40 percent more bauxite than they do now. This shift from domestic to foreign bauxite by the abrasive industry would thus result in a more efficient use of our ships in the war-production program.

Neglect of alunite process aggravates raw-material shortage

The insincerity of W. P. B.'s position on the bauxite shortage is also revealed by its unreasonable, protracted, persistent, and dogged opposition to the alunite process. This process makes it possible to substitute alunite for bauxite as the raw material for aluminum. At first the Aluminum Section refused to have anything to do with it and did everything possible to discourage its sponsors. Yet I reemphasize that Mr. Bunker, chief of the section, before the Truman committee tried to defend himself on the ground that there was such a shortage of high-grade bauxite that he had to use low-grade ore in the Government's plant. However, the alunite people refused to give up, and, finally, after laying their case before the Truman committee and getting the approval of the Bureau of Mines, Government defense officials reluctantly agreed to include an alunite plant in the Government expansion program. This recognition is more of a moral victory than a material one, because the plant finally authorized is insignificant in size, accounting for only one-half of 1 percent of the industry's capacity.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wisconsin yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I should also like to make the observation that, in my opinion, Mr. Bunker in allowing only the construction of a very small, impracticable unit for alunite, hoped to demonstrate the high cost of alunite, and thereby discourage its use in the production of aluminum.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes. And what do Senators suppose the record will be with respect to the Government aluminum plants when the post-war period comes? I was here, Mr. President, and saw the valiant Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who sits next to me, fight here an almost single-handed battle for years to save Muscle Shoals, and finally, as the result of that fight, because of his efforts, the great Tennessee Valley Authority under President Roosevelt was developed.

Mr. President, can you not hear Senators 4 or 5 or 10 years from now—God knows how long it will be, when the war is over—thundering in the Senate Chamber, telling that the Government's aluminum operation was a complete failure? They will say, "Look at the high cost of these Government plants. We must turn them over to Alcoa, or someone else who really knows how to operate this business." I can hear them all now, Mr. President. They will say the same thing about alunite.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator doubt that that is one reason why the Government plants are using only the low-grade bauxite, so that the cost will run high and so that the high cost can be pointed to to illustrate the inefficiency, the waste, and the incompetency of anything that smacks of Government operation?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Of course, Alcoa is running these plants, but it will not bother them much to be in an inconsistent position, because all the way through they have been in an inconsistent position in this situation. Furthermore, there is the other reason I have suggested, namely, that because there is an admitted limit to the amount of high-grade bauxite in this country, it is to the advantage of the private operators to keep as much of the high-grade for themselves and for the post-war period as possible, because they know, or at least they have every reason to believe, that they can successfully compete with the high-grade bauxite from South America with their own high-grade bauxite, whereas they might find it difficult to compete with—indeed, they probably could not compete with—the low-grade ore unless there is technological advance, which there undoubtedly will be. I am not, however, touching on that question in this particular speech.

The excuse given for keeping the plant so small is that the reserves of alunite do not warrant a larger plant. According to the Bureau of Mines, Utah reserves alone could keep a plant six times as large as the one authorized running at capacity for 10 years. On the basis of the size of the plant they have permitted to be established the Utah reserves alone will make it possible to operate that plant for 40 years.

There are also alunite deposits in the State of Washington and, in addition, the process can be applied to aluminum-bearing clays which are abundant in the West. But most important of all is the basic contradiction in the W. P. B. Aluminum Section's attitude. If the shortage of high-grade bauxite is so severe that there is none available for Government plants, why has W. P. B. failed to make greater use of the alunite deposits? The answer is that, when it comes to discussing alunite, "we have planned that if the emergency so require, we can take care of this country's needs on the fully expanded program for a great many years from Arkansas." That is what Mr. Bunker told the Truman committee.

This kind of smart-aleck double talk on the part of the public officials in charge of the aluminum production program is intolerable. If there is enough bauxite for a great many years, why waste valuable shipping space to bring bauxite from Dutch and British Guiana? If, as is the case, ore reserves are limited and can be exhausted by a long war, the alunite process should be utilized to the maximum as a precautionary measure.

More direct and independent governmental action needed to rehabilitate the bauxite program

These and similar defects will permeate the bauxite program as long as a private monopoly continues to dominate public war policy in this field. There is a basic conflict between the narrow profit interests of the private corporations which mine bauxite and the welfare of the war-production drive. As has been shown, the pressure of the private operators is against a too rapid exploitation of our best bauxite deposits even though such a course is essential if maximum production is to be attained at the earliest possible moment. Private operators are also unhealthily interested in putting the Government plants on such an uneconomic basis as to prevent their being operated competitively after the war, although, as I have stated, the public already has $536,000,000 invested in aluminum plants.

The improvement of the bauxite program cannot wait until a private monopoly gets a broader and less selfish view of its role in this war. Government must step in firmly and tell this private monopoly in clear and unmistakable terms what is to be done in the public interest and in the interest of winning the war.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not want to divert the Senator from his very interesting discussion of the subject, but

does he not know that exactly the same situation exists with respect to other strategic materials, such as magnesium, iron, and steel? I do not think it can be successfully contradicted that there are in high Government places representatives of private industries in various strategic materials, who are acting as policemen to prevent exactly what the Senator said about aluminum—any possible competition of Government plants with private production after the war is over. They are willing to hamstring the Government effort at this time for that purpose.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I appreciate the statement of the able Senator from Missouri. I have not made the study of other materials which I have tried to make, with able assistance, in connection with the aluminum situation. In the future I intend to discuss further aspects of the aluminum situation, as time permits.

Production schedules for each mine should be determined on the basis of the need for the ore and not according to the owner's preferences. Instead of giving Alcoa and its friends all the wheat and the Government plants all the chaff, all should share alike. Everybody is in this war and must share equally in its obligations and sacrifices, so far as that is humanly possible. There is no reason why good and bad bauxite should not be allotted proportionately to private plants as well as public plants. As a matter of fact, since the new Government plants are more modern than Alcoa's plant at East St. Louis, a good argument could be made for giving the public plant more than its proportionate share of the high-grade bauxite. Under present war conditions, bauxite supply is a Government responsibility; and since private monopoly interests have failed to live up to the requirements of the situation and their promises, Government must accept all the burdens which go with that responsibility.

RECOMMENDATION

A centralized integrated Federal aluminum authority is needed

Other phases of the aluminum program have been handled as badly as bauxite has been and are as seriously in need of correction. Ever since the defense program began in the summer of 1940, the officials responsible for the aluminum branch have been excessively sensitive to the desires of private monopoly in this industry and inexcusably indifferent to the public welfare. Deposing the head man does not seem to make much difference, that device having been tried twice without producing any material improvement in the situation. What is needed is a reorientation of the entire aluminum program to cope with the peculiar conditions prevailing in a monopoly-dominated industry. It may be sufficient in other industries to concentrate primarily on the task of getting the companies already in the business to operate at top speed. In the case of aluminum, it is not enough since it is primarily a one-corporation industry. A specific formula must be devised to meet the situation, particularly since new companies have not penetrated the monopoly ring to any substantial degree.

Government must recognize that today aluminum is a war necessity, dominated by monopoly; and consequently its supply and distribution have become a Government responsibility. It must also face the fact that newcomers are loath to enter this industry because of its monopolistic atmosphere and pressures. Consequently Government has had to provide the funds for expansion ever since the summer of 1941. The direct investment of the United States Government in aluminum plants now totals $568,000,000. Mr. President, that is not chicken feed, even in these days of huge expenditures.

The public power developments which supply the electric power for almost all the public and private aluminum plants constitute a substantial indirect investment of public funds in the aluminum industry. All told, about three-quarters billion dollars of public moneys have been put into aluminum plants and auxiliary facilities. In contrast, the total assets of the private aluminum companies are about half a billion dollars, and a good share of that will be paid back to the companies through the special amortization provisions. Thus, even from a financial point of view, the Federal Government is the largest and most important factor in the aluminum industry today.

Whether we like it or not the Government is in the aluminum business in a big way. We have been driven into it as a result of the policies of a monopoly and as a matter of practical necessity, and not pursuant to any ideology. Alcoa forced us into it, not the radicals. The problems facing this unusual kind of public enterprise should therefore be met on the basis of business realities, and not theoretical objectives.

The question is merely, Shall we run our aluminum business in a way to win the war or continue the anomalous situation of having our most serious competitor, Alcoa, run our business? Is it at all reasonable to expect Alcoa to run the Government's aluminum enterprise efficiently and economically, and thereby create for the post-war years a formidable competitor? After battling for half a century to prevent the establishment of a competitor, is there much likelihood that Alcoa will voluntarily reverse its efforts and unstintingly devote itself to the task of locating, designing, and operating publicly owned plants as best it can? Yet, that is the premise on which the Government's aluminum program has been founded and has continued to operate down to the present hour. It is high time that this problem is faced squarely and the Government assumes full responsibility for its aluminum plants.

This new approach is meaningless unles it is implemented with appropriate machinery for putting the new policy into practice. Whatever may be the virtues of the present diversification of authority and responsibility among the various war agencies when it comes to other materials, it is unsuitable for aluminum. The Government's aluminum busines should be as integrated as Alcoa's enterprise. This means one comprehensive and cohesive unit, instead of a dozen different agencies dabbling in the Government's aluminum program. A Federal Aluminum Authority should be set up with full responsibility and equally broad authority. This all-inclusive organization could then staff itself with competent technical people who will enable the Government to stand on its own feet and not be dependent on Alcoa for the determination of executive policy in the aluminum field. Unless a centralized organization of the scope suggested here is set up, I venture the prediction that the war-production program as far as aluminum is concerned will continue to be warped by the overweening desire of private corporations to protect their post-war business and economic interests. A firm, independent attitude on the part of the Government in concept and in deed will be a powerful stimulus to the aluminum program. It will make possible, for the first time, the realization of the full potentialities of our country in this strategic war industry.

More fighting planes will reach our battle fronts when the aluminum crisis is ended

Every day the aluminum crises is allowed to continue we are failing to produce planes, and the United Nations are losing brave fighting men, who died unnecessarily for lack of them. The shortage of aluminum forgings has already lost for us one out of every five Martin bombers from this year's output, to mention only one large manufacturer. In the recent giant air raids over Germany the British lost only 3 to 4 percent of their bombers, according to reports, while because of this aluminum policy war we are losing 20 percent of them before they even go into action. This is no time for patience, excuses, and promises. Such strategic losses on the production front are intolerable, especially in light of the fact that because of the mishandling of the aluminum problem half such a loss is considered prohibitive on the fighting front.

Even more serious than the known losses is the inhibiting and paralyzing effect which the aluminum shortage has had on military developments and design. There have been promising reports on a 52-knot destroyer, but the fact that it required large amounts of aluminum—300 tons per destroyer—was considered a serious objection to its adoption. Likewise, development of aluminum-hulled torpedo boats has been hampered by the scarcity of aluminum. In the aircraft field, too, because of these shortages, there is a concerted desire to get away from aluminum.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. In yesterday's newspaper we read that because of the shortage of aluminum the Government had already contracted with a certain firm, the name of which I forget, for the production of airplanes from stainless steel.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. The Senator has given an example in point. I appreciate

the Senator's help in buttressing my argument.

Training and cargo planes have been designed out of aluminum into plywood and steel. Whatever the relative merits of these materials, any change of design at this time means less output, a waste of valuable manpower, and a needless sacrifice of brave men fighting for the cause of the United Nations on the far-flung battlefront of this global war.

The shift is not an improvement but merely an effort to make more aluminum available for combat planes and bombers. Even fighting planes are being redesigned in some details, I am informed, to circumvent aluminum bottlenecks. All such redesigning to save critical materials means a loss of output without any compensatory gains in improved design or in production. Substitutions of materials will not win our production battles here any more than evacuations will win military battles abroad. An end to the aluminum problem will mean not only more planes but also better ones for our fighting men. I say, Mr. President, that they are entitled to the best that this country can produce for them.

Lastly, I should like to urge immediate attention to this pressing problem as a major step in the successful integration of the American and British war-production machines. It has been suggested in high quarters that the United States should concentrate on the production of bombers and the British on fighter planes. The benefits from this arrangement appear, to the layman, at least, to be many. They reputedly have the best fighters, we the best bombers. We could fly our bombers over, but we must crate and ship our fighters, losing ships and man-hours in the process. But bombers require much more aluminum per plane than do fighters, and therefore the adoption of this plan would require another big jump in aluminum production. This time, Mr. President, instead of listening while the monopolies explain why it cannot be done, let us listen to the men fighting and dying who would like to tell us it must be done and done now. And who knows best, those who can lose our war here or those who can win it for us over there?

EXHIBIT A

[From the New York Times of May 9, 1942]

PLANES AND SHIPS POURING INTO WAR—QUADRUPLING FLOW OF BOMBERS IN YEAR, MARTIN REGRETS LACK OF ALUMINUM SLOWING OUTPUT—TIME CUT BY BETHLEHEM—LIBERTY VESSELS TAKE WATER IN 90 DAYS, SOON IN 75, AS AGAINST SCHEDULE OF 105

(By Sidney M. Shalett)

BALTIMORE, May 8.—In a way, it was too bad that any wishful thinkers in the Axis camp, who would like to regard American manufacturers as complacent, could not have visited two war plants in the Baltimore area yesterday.

It would not have been good news for Hitler & Co., for they would have heard a pioneer aircraft maker complain because he was able only to quadruple his output this year and a big-scale shipbuilder promise to lop off more than 25 percent from the Maritime Commission's own time schedule for building "liberty ships."

The Martin bomber plants and the Bethlehem-Fairfield shipyard were visited by newspaper correspondents on the "production for victory" tour arranged by the National Association of Manufacturers.

At the bomber plant Glenn L. Martin, president and founder of the company, chose not to boast that 1941 production had been quadrupled. Instead, he charged—and in no uncertain terms—that the Government's early failure to give his company a sufficiently high priority rating, and the consequent flow of aluminum to his company on "a too little and too late" basis, had held down his potentional production by 20 percent.

At the 16-way Bethlehem-Fairfield Yard, which was not even organized prior to March 1941, officials told how 40 keels already had been laid; how the twenty-fifth "liberty ship" was to be launched the next day, and how 172 ships were scheduled to come off the ways before the end of 1943.

WAYS OF SPEEDING PRODUCTION

At both plants concrete instances of how new speed-up processes for manufacturing certain parts of ships and planes had cut precious hours—and even days—from production schedules were explained and demonstrated.

An official spokesman for the Maritime Commission sanctioned use of some specific figures pertaining to the 10,500-ton standardized cargo vessels known as liberty ships. Throughout the Nation two liberty ships are leaving the ways daily and a building schedule of 105 days has been fixed.

At Bethlehem, according to A. B. Homer, vice president, the schedule is nearing 90 days, and, according to J. M. Willis, general manager, a 75-day schedule is the goal.

Furthermore, Mr. Homer said, Bethlehem, which has 350 ships, naval and merchant, under construction at its various plants throughout the country, promises "to deliver merchant ships of approximately 1,000,000 tonnage" this year alone.

But the liberty shipyard, opposed as it is to the U-boat challenge, now holds the spotlight. The sprawling new yard employs 23,000 men, including 3,500 at a fabrication and preassembly plant.

The company was fortunate enough to find an old Pullman factory, virtually idle for 10 years, not far from the yard; the factory even was equipped with monster presses which, with a little adapting, could be turned to shipbuilding purposes.

The old plant is so big that complete plates for four ships can be fabricated and assembled there at one time. So now the steel plates pour in, are pressed into shape, riveted or welded together, roll out and are carried on flat cars to the yard, where the boys on a round-the-clock schedule bang them into ships.

A "BOSS PLATE" EVERY 2 MINUTES

T. S. McElroy, manager of the yard, said there were so many time-saving devices in the fabrication plant that they couldn't all be named. He explained one. There's a thing on a ship called a boss plate, two on the stern of each vessel.

When Bethlehem's men started building liberty ships they had to hammer out boss plates by hand over a forge. That took 2 days. So Bethlehem took an old Pullman press, rigged up a special die for it at a cost of $1,500, and now they stamp out boss plates automatically. It takes 2 minutes.

Bona fide assembly-line production is in progress at two of the Martin bomber plants in the Baltimore area.

It is not, of course, the moving assembly line of the pre-war auto plants, for planes aren't built that way. In one cavernous building, where the Navy's heavy patrol bombers, the PBM-3's, are built, the hulls are stacked in ways and specialized crews of workmen, each trained to a specific job, do the moving—not the planes.

In another vast building that was not even in existence a year ago, the B-26's, the Army's medium bombers, are turned out.

To the reporters was shown the 140,000-pound Mars, the largest flying boat in the world.

Mr. Martin expressed the opinion that with enough really huge transports and bombers like the Mars, the Panama Canal could be bombed out of existence, the battleship and a two-ocean navy could be scrapped, and still the country could get by.

[From the New York Times of May 9, 1942]

RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION ASKS $5,000,000,000 ADDITIONAL FUNDS FOR EXPANSION OF WAR INDUSTRIAL PLANTS

WASHINGTON, May 8.—Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, asked Congress today to grant $5,000,000,000 of additional borrowing authority to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation so that it might carry on a vast program of war plant expansion, purchase of vital materials, and the financing of many other war activities.

Testifying before a Senate banking subcommittee, Mr. Jones said that the new funds would be needed to finance an aluminum plant expansion program, which he said would result in an annual capacity of 2,100,000,000 pounds of the metal by early 1943.

"It looks like we are going to have ample aluminum," the lending chief asserted.

"Production," he said, "already has reached a rate of 1,000,000,000 pounds annually, compared with 300,000,000 pounds 2 years ago and 540,000,000 pounds last year."

Mr. Jones said that commitments by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its subsidiaries in the wartime lending and spending program now totaled $14,300,000,000, of which $576,000,000 had been canceled for various reasons and $565,000,000 repaid.

"The total," he said, "was divided between $1,500,000,000 in loans and the remainder in purchases or investments. About $11,000,000,000 of the total," he testified, "had not yet been disbursed, although outlays had now reached $10,000,000 or $12,000,000 a day. Under present law the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may borrow $9,130,000,000."

"We've done a lot of interesting things, all of which cost money," Jones remarked.

He said that commitments for aircraft-plant production totaled $1,912,000,000; magnesium plants, $360,000,000; synthetic-rubber plants, $700,000,000; steel plants, $734,000,000; ordnance manufacture, $468,000,000, and shipyards, $182,000,000, out of total defense plants corporation commitments of $6,391,000,000.

"Magnesium production," he said, "would reach 600,000,000 pounds annually under the program, compared with 33,000,000 pounds a year ago, while synthetic rubber production would be 800,000 tons per year, compared with 25,000 tons last year. The program includes an increase of 10,000,000 tons in the annual capacity of steel plants."

[From the New York Times of May 11, 1942]

GIANT PLANT POURS ALUMINUM SHEETS—IMMENSE WAR-BORN BUILDING OF ALCOA IN TENNESSEE IS LARGEST OF KIND IN UNITED STATES—MULTIPLIES PRODUCTION—IT AND OLD PLANT WILL GIVE 50 TIMES LATTER'S PRE-1939 RATE—BOTTLENECK SCOUTED

(By Sidney M. Shalett)

KNOXVILLE, TENN., May 10—The Aluminum Co. of America offered yesterday its rebuttal to the frequent accusation that aluminum is the bottleneck holding up the tools of war. It displayed its new war-born fabrication plant, a place so immense that the mind hardly can realize it actually exists and its production boss made the flat promise that by the end of the year it will be turning out 50 times more sheet aluminum—the stuff that goes into airplanes—than was produced prior to 1939.

The new plant is a giant among giants in the Nation's war industry—true, not yet a fully grown giant, but one that is going to perform awesome feats of strength once it reaches full growth.

One year ago, only a few steel girders marked the spot on the red clay hill in the Knoxville area where the country's biggest aluminum fabricating plant was to rise. Yesterday, newspaper correspondents on the "production for victory" tour of war plants, sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers, saw how fast and how well the planners had built. It was up, it was in action, and from its miraculous mills, the war metal is rolling forth in shiny sheets, longer than city blocks.

SKIN FOR FIGHTING PLANES

The United States alone, by the end of 1943, will be producing 2,100,000,000 pounds of aluminum a year—more than seven times the amount produced 5 years ago—and Canadian ore will add another 400,000,000 pounds to the pot.

But the Aluminum Co., through its $215,000,000 self-financed war-expansion program intends to do all it can to maintain its position as the top aluminum producer.

Aluminum ore—alumina, as it is called—is derived commercially from bauxite, a mineral coming chiefly from South America and Arkansas. The soft-spoken aluminum makers of the Tennessee foothills are fabricating pig aluminum into skin for fighting planes, sinews for battleships, and other tools of war, and of what they promise to do further to win the war.

At the outset of the tour of the plant, A. D. Huddleston, regional manager, and E. M. Chandler, superintendent of fabricating plants, were informed that Glenn Martin, builder of bombers, had told the group 2 days before that lack of a steady flow of aluminum to his plant in the Baltimore area was cutting bomber production one-fifth.

REPORTS ON TIME DELIVERIES

"We are not behind," Mr. Huddleston said, "we are ahead. We are producing our monthly quota of aluminum, and more. We have a stock pile of several million pounds of aluminum, boxed up and ready to go out."

Mr. Huddleston explained that the Aluminum Co. does not fill orders as it did in the pre-war days. It makes its aluminum at the direction of the Government, and sends it out when and where the aircraft scheduling unit of the War Production Board at Dayton, Ohio, tells it. So, if Glenn Martin isn't getting his aluminum, the fault lies somewhere else, Mr. Huddleston said.

"He's getting everything we're told to give him—and on time," he declared.

Viewed as a purely physical spectacle, the new North Plant was tremendously impressive. The plant is so vast that the tour had to be made in midget trucks, not much bigger than an Army jeep. Molten metal was poured into 3,300-ton ingots; ingots were converted into huge "sandwiches" (two layers of high purity aluminum with a chunk of tough alloy between) and the sandwich went into two break-down mills of 7,000,000 pounds' pressure.

The metal came out of the mill reduced from 8 inches to three-quarters of an inch. Then it went to the continuous mill, which mashed it, rolled it, bounced it, sprayed it, and turned it out a block-long sheet no more than an eighth of an inch thick. Coiling, more heating, rolling, shearing, and trimming, and the aluminum, now in polished rectangular sheets, was ready for the plane factories.

The Aluminum Co. has another fabricating plant—the West Plant, near Knoxville. This plant, 20 years old, used to be considered "Pretty hot stuff" an official said, but now, alongside the North Plant, it looks as antiquated as a 1918 airplane. Still it turns out the aluminum.

It was Mr. CHANDLER who announced the production possibilities for the expanded aluminum company plant near Knoxville.

"In 1938 we saw the war coming on and rushed our expansion plans," he said. "In 1939, when our guess proved right, we doubled our production. In 1940 we doubled it again.

"In 1941 utilizing the West Plant alone we made 4.2 times as much as we made in 1939. In 1942, with the North Plant partly in operation, we now are producing aluminum at 13½ times the 1939 rate. And our ultimate goal, which we will reach by the end of the year, is 25 times the 1939 figure, or 50 times the pre-1939 rate. We can do it too."

[From the New York Times of June 4, 1942]

THIRTY PERCENT CUT IS SEATED IN STEEL, EXPANSION—SHORTAGES WILL REDUCE PROJECTED 10,000,000 TON RISE IN CAPACITY, BATT WARNS—PLANTS TO "PATCH, PRAY"—CIVILIAN GOODS WILL BE HELD TO MINIMUM SUBSISTENCE LEVEL, WAR PRODUCTION BOARD OFFICIALS DECLARE

(By John McCormac)

WASHINGTON, June 3.—The American people were warned today that "our civilian economy is fast going on a minimum subsistence standard," that industry must now get ready to "patch and pray," and that even many war materials are now short. The warning was delivered at a press conference by William L. Batt, chairman of the Requirements Committee of the War Production Board, and A. I. Henderson, newly appointed Director of Materials.

As an indication of the seriousness of the situation, it was declared that the previously planned 10,000,000-ton steel expansion program would be cut by 30 to 35 percent because of shortages in materials.

To keep the military machine running full blast and to produce enough goods for essential civilian requirements, it would now be necessary, said Mr. Batt, to plan at long range concerning the material requirements, and to make schedules carefully to meet them; to revise specifications to reduce the amounts of scarce materials used; to make a widespread use of substitutes, such as concrete or creosoted wood for steel, molybdenum for tungsten, and secondary molybdenum for virgin aluminum; to obtain a vast increase of civilian cooperation with the salvage program to speed up the flow of scrap, particularly of metals and rubber.

WARNS WORK MAY BE DELAYED

"As the vast production machine which has been created over the last 2 years swings into action," said Mr. Batt, "the difficulty of providing materials to feed it will become more and more apparent. I see times ahead when a shipway may stand idle for lack of steel and an ammunition line may slow down for lack of copper and brass.

"The past months have been relatively easy. The military has taken from the civilian to meet its needs. From here on out it will be a continuous problem to provide materials to meet the needs of our fighting forces."

Mr. Batt announced that revision of the war plant expansion program had been made necessary by the shortage of materials, particularly in metals. Although the steel industry was now operating at more than 99 percent of capacity, there is a shortage of steel.

Steel capacity has been increased about 5,000,000 tons. Of the projected 10,000,000-ton increase, now being reviewed by Donald Nelson, head of the War Production Board, probably only 65 or 70 percent would be completed, said Mr. Batt. About 70 percent at least of the projected increase in pig-iron capacity will be completed. Even the curtailed expansion program will cost about $1,500,000,000, of which industry would provide $500,000,000. This year's steel output may total 85,000,000 tons.

CUBA A SOURCE OF NICKEL

Discussing other metals of which there is a shortage, Mr. Batt said the Government had allocated $20,000,000 for the production of nickel in Cuba from 1 percent ore, while development of low-grade domestic manganese ores would cost the Government $40,000,000 and private industry $6,000,000. This development, which would produce more than 600,000 tons a year, would suffice with imports from Latin America to cover American needs, it was stated.

On chrome development the Government is spending more than $10,000,000 and private industry about $1,500,000. Development of low-grade ores in Montana will produce more than 500,000 tons of 40-percent chromium concentrate a year, some chromium continues to come from abroad and there is a sizable stockpile. A broad program of domestic tungsten production is expected to triple this year our 1939 output of 4,000 tons.

As regards aluminum, expansion completed or in progress will give a total supply in 1943 of more than 2,500,000,000 pounds of aluminum. The Government is spending $568,000,000 on this expansion program and private industry $85,000,000. Actual production of aluminum this year should be 1,083,000,000 pounds. Production of magnesium this year should approximate 170,000,000 pounds. The Government is spending $319,000,000 to finance the expansion and private industry $20,000,000.

HEAVY RISE IN COPPER USE

The Government is spending $180,000,000 for copper development and private capital $40,000,000. As compared with a 1939 consumption of 800,000 tons for civilian uses, about 1,800,000 tons of copper will be obtained this year from domestic production and imports and none will be available for nonessential civilian users.

The Government has a sizable stock pile of tin, is getting about 18,000 tons a year from Bolivia, and small quantities here and there around the world. But this is only a fraction of normal consumption of 100,000 tons a year, and means that glass and fiber containers will replace tin for civilian use.

In the expansion of chemical plants the Government and private industry are spending more than $1,500,000,000. Shortages exist in ammonia, butadiene, styrene, and other chemicals for synthetic rubber; sodium nitrate for fertilizer; chlorine, phenol, toluene, aniline, benzol, coal-tar products, fats and oils, and glycerine.

It was pointed out by Messrs. Batt and Henderson that the raw materials situation was at its worst now because it was necessary to build up backlogs for the new fabricating plants.

Never before has the United States had a national income of $110,000,000,000, and never before has so large a proportion of it been expended for the production of heavy goods, which consume enormous quantities of materials.

[From the New York Times of June 5, 1942]

MANY SUBSTITUTES BEING USED IN MAKING OF TRAINER PLANES—WOOD, PLASTICS, FABRIC, AND STEEL ARE TAKING THE PLACE OF ALUMINUM—AMOUNT OF OTHER METALS IS REDUCED

WASHINGTON, June 4.—Wood, plywood, plastics, steel, and fabric are being used in increasing quantities in the manufacture of training planes to save aluminum and other

strategic materials for combat types, the War Department said today.

Conversion has gone so far that one trainer has wooden fuel tanks. Use of steel in another model has saved 1,246 pounds of aluminum for each plane.

Use of substitutes has tapped new fields of skilled labor and new plant facilities. Thus, the furniture industry is making many subcontracted parts.

To conserve aluminum it has been decided that most twin-engined trainers must be of wood. Three types are planned for production, the AT–10, AT–13, and AT–15, each about the size of a medium bomber.

The Beechcraft AT–10 advanced twin-engined trainer, which has the wooden fuel tanks, obtains about 85 percent of parts for the body from subcontractors without previous experience in aircraft construction.

Careful designing reduced the metal used in the basic structure of this plane to 97 pounds, or 1.6 percent of the weight. Only 13 percent of the total gross weight of the trainer, excluding engines and propellers, is of metal, which is used for brackets, tail wheel attachment structure, spar attachments, engine nacelle attachment fittings, aileron hinges, wing fittings and the like. The fuel tanks are lined with synthetic material which can readily be patched or replaced.

The Fairchild AT–13 twin-engined advance trainer incorporates a number of scientific methods in handling modern plastic-bonded plywoods. The wings are of wood, fabricated under a special process, and the fuselage of wood with plywood covering.

The AT–15 Boeing Stearman advanced trainer has fabric-covered wooden wings and a fuselage of tube steel construction.

The North American AT–6 single-engined advanced trainer, soon to go into production, represents a revolutionary development involving the replacement of aluminum with low-carbon steel sheet, which is expected to prove comparable to aluminum alloy in strength, weight and safety. Use of plywood and steel on these trainers will eliminate 75 percent by weight of aluminum alloy, or about 1,246 pounds per plane.

The saving on 1,000 such trainers would provide enough aluminum for 400 pursuit planes or 150 medium bombers.

Another version of this plane, the AT–6A, calls for fabrication of the outer wing panels, wing tips, ailerons, flaps, tabs, and the entire empennage and rear monocoque section of the fuselage in resin-bonded plywood.

Redesigning of the Vultee BT–15 single-engined basic trainer saved 565 pounds of aluminum and 6 pounds of magnesium per plane. The fuselage, formerly covered with aluminum sheet, is now fabric covered. Redesigning of the earlier model, BT–13, is also being studied.

[From the New York Times of June 9, 1942]

ALUMINUM STREAM FLOWS ENDLESSLY—NEXT YEAR EXPECTED TO SEE AN OUTPUT ON BASIS OF 2,100,000,000 POUNDS—ROLLING SPEEDED FIFTYFOLD — ITS SOURCE FORMS ONE-TWELFTH OF EARTH'S CRUST—BIG JOB IS REFINING

KNOXVILLE, TENN.—Endlessly the silvery river flows like a mountain torrent, sunlight from high factory windows flashing in weird patterns against its eternal undulations. It is America's river of victory.

The silvery river is the everlasting flow of sheet aluminum through the presses and over the production line of the Nation's largest single industrial plant, located in the Nashville area by the Aluminum Co. of America. Up to the outbreak of war the strong, light metal, which forms a twelfth of the crust of the earth, was finding its way into many industrial uses—especially household wares and railroad trains—but it still was far from having found its place in the sun.

Despite the abundance, it was difficult to extract and relatively expensive. Within the next 12 months, however, the United States will be producing the metal at a rate of 2,100,000,000 pounds a year, more than sevenfold the production of 5 years ago, and enough to replace every railroad passenger car in the country three times a year.

This has been largely a triumph of engineering and technology. In one vital process alone at this plant, company engineers explain, the rolling of aluminum has been speeded up fiftyfold. Otherwise the factory, which even now covers more ground than any other plant in the country, must have been increased in size 10 times to give the same output.

PRICE FALLING STEADILY

In the last 2 years, due to these developments and the mass production which they made possible, the price of the metal has been cut from 20 cents to 15 cents a pound, and the end still is far from sight.

Today the entire effort is directed to winning the war. But in the company's laboratories are new aluminum alloys with copper, manganese and magnesium which promise to be stronger, lighter, and cheaper for peacetime industrial uses. They are not being brought into production at present because they still require much experimentation and it is unwise to change horses in the middle of a stream.

But the Aluminum Age may well succeed the Iron Age, now in its twilight.

No other American industry is watched so zealously by the Army and Navy. Every pound of the light, silvery metal is precious to the war effort and the new technical methods for its extraction and fabrication are closely guarded.

The manufacture of 2,000,000,000 pounds of sheet aluminum a year will require more electric power than was consumed in 1940 in 27 of the 48 States. The amount of current required to make a pound would light the average American home for 10 days. For every pound, 9 pounds of other materials are required.

PROGRAM BEGUN IN 1938

The present program got under way late in 1938, after Munich. War still was far in the future, but the Aluminum Co. officials saw that the country was bound to arm itself, especially in the air. The expansion, primarily undertaken to supply the needs of the aircraft manufactufers, has been stepped up as other needs have arisen.

The second phase came in October 1941, when the Defense Plant Corporation let the first contracts in a program to add another 512,000,000 pounds to the country's productive capacity. The third phase, first announced in February, will add about 600,000,000 pounds more. This is far more of the metal than, it is believed, the Axis Powers will be able to produce.

The abundance of aluminum is deceptive. It is far more common, for example, than iron. Any clay bank contains plenty of it. It occurs, however, in a finely distributed form and the job is to extract it. Most clays are too poor, unless recently devised processes prove highly successful, to be worked profitably.

The richest source is a red, hard clay, bauxite. This is not abundant in the United States. There are considerable deposits in Arkansas and much richer ones in British and Dutch Guiana. Bauxite is subjected to a chemical process, out of which comes a white powder which looks like sugar.

This is alumina, a combination of aluminum and oxygen. Before it can be made into a metal the oxygen must be removed. This is done by electricity, the cost of which is one of the chief items in the cost of the metal. The result is an aluminum ingot, of no use until it is pressed down into a sheet less than a sixteenth of an inch thick.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Glass	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Green	Overton
Bailey	Guffey	Pepper
Bankhead	Gurney	Radcliffe
Barbour	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Herring	Rosier
Bone	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Schwartz
Bridges	Hughes	Shipstead
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Burton	La Follette	Spencer
Butler	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lee	Taft
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tobey
Connally	McNary	Truman
Davis	Maybank	Tunnell
Doxey	Mead	Tydings
Ellender	Millikin	Vandenberg
George	Murdock	Van Nuys
Gerry	Murray	Wheeler
Gillette	Norris	White

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

PRESERVATION OF FREEDOM AND LIBERTY UNDER THE AMERICAN FLAG

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, yesterday in celebrating Flag Day, we realized that our flag has recently taken on a new significance and has acquired added luster. A few years ago, in accordance with a resolution passed by the Congress of the United States, a committee, of which I was chairman, was appointed to arrange for the national celebration of the one hundred and twenty-fifth anniversary of the writing of the Star-Spangled Banner. That celebration, as Senators may remember, was held in September 1939, most appropriately, in Baltimore at Fort McHenry, where the Star-Spangled Banner was written, and it was largely attended. As we joined in that homage to our flag, none of us foresaw the events, momentous and tragic to this country and to the world, which have since happened. On that day in 1939, our flag was recognized as an outstanding symbol of liberty and democracy. Today most assuredly it is still so regarded, and with ever-increasing brilliance, glory, and promise.

Never before have the eyes of the world looked more intently and eagerly upon the flag as an outstanding symbol of justice and of humanity. Our flag bears witness today that the cause of liberty, though fiercely and cruelly flouted and assailed, is more firmly entrenched than at any time since the bloody war of aggression against Europe was begun by the Nazis, and since the slimy treachery of Pearl Harbor.

It may be said that Germany and Japan, after making enormous conquests of territory, have not been required to surrender their loot; that they have not

been stopped in their tracks; that they are still carrying on their nefarious schemes of conquest. True it is, but the world for them is changing fast. We hear of the capture by the Germans of a city in Africa and of most violent assaults by them on Sevastopol. We realize the gravity of a pincer movement by which the African and European armies of Germany seek to form a coalition in Asia Minor and Suez, with the hope that they may join the Japanese forces in forming a continuous line of conquest from the Atlantic to the Pacific. We face the still but partially controlled fury of the submarine and the resulting menace to our shipping, and, thereby, to the cause of ourselves and our Allies. These events and dangers do not frighten us; they do not dishearten us. We now know that the Nazi might is not invincible, and must soon reckon upon a second front, being obliged to do what Bismarck had dreaded, that is, to fight at one and the same time upon both eastern and western fronts.

We know that in a short time the Japanese will be faced with a force which they cannot withstand. The battle of Midway Island a few days ago may not have turned the tide of the war, but it shows that the sinister schemes of the Japanese to dominate the Pacific will come to naught; that the day of reckoning for them and their fellow conspirators, Germany and Italy, is inevitable. The Axis Powers can see no end of signs of eventual defeat. The convincing demonstration of the effectiveness of our fighting forces; the indomitable patriotism and persistence of Russia; of Great Britain and her Dominions; of China; the epoch-making treaty between England and Russia and the understanding between the United States and Russia, both of which were recently announced; the rapid growth of the war resources of the Allies, especially in the air—all these are gloomy portents of disaster to the Nazis and their fellow conspirators against the peace and security of the world.

The world was shocked a day or so ago by the hideous destruction of a town in Czechoslovakia, by the murder of all the male citizens in that town, and by the carrying away of all its women and children. It was a cruel illustration of the kind of savage butchery which has made Tamerlane and Attila, the Hun, infamous in the pages of history.

Certainly this bloody act was prompted by a premonition of defeat. It betrayed the foreboding and the desperation which is beginning to possess the minds of the Nazis, especially as the haunting thought seizes them that their bloodthirsty efforts to superimpose their will upon conquered Europe will eventually fail completely, and that the nations which are now under their heel will, at the first possible moment, arise and drive out the bloody invaders. All these are signs of the times and they bring ever-mounting despair to the Axis.

For long dreary months those who resisted the Nazis could reckon upon little except hope. Now they see, actually or potentially, within their hands the means of stopping full in their tracks the Axis marauders and of driving them back to their own countries, thereby relieving the world from the incubus and misery of subjugation. The way to that end may be long, arduous, and fraught with much suffering, but quite definitely that gleaming goal is visible. It can be reached provided the members of the Allied Nations will make that effort of which they are capable. No one, whether in the ranks of the Allied Powers or in the hosts of the Axis, now doubts for a moment that such effort will be made, and made successfully. But we, the people of the United States, those of Great Britain and her dominions, of Russia, China, heroic Greece, and all the other peoples of the world who have been tortured by the brute might of the Axis, must put forth the greatest possible effort. This they realize and this they are ready to do.

It is necessary that we win a just peace. It is even more essential that we preserve it, after it shall be won. Peace will not be durable unless it is just. We must not make the mistake of 20 years ago, thinking that a lasting peace could be secured in one stroke, and that then the job was done. We believed at the time the Versailles Treaty, whatever its merits, was made that the task was really completed. We should have known that the work of keeping peace had only begun. Had we really understood the problem, many mistakes in policy could have been avoided, and probably the Nazis would not have attempted to clutch at world domination.

Almost invariably a patient underestimates the time necessary for a full recovery from a serious operation, or from any form of grave illness. Nature requires a long time before there can be a complete physical readjustment. Meanwhile, a sensitiveness of mood persists, and an erratic instability of opinion is often quite noticeable.

This result is true also of nations, especially those which have been subjected to severe strains, as from a long war. The recovery period really is protracted far beyond what apparently is necessary. Public opinion is fitful. Internal unrest and disorders frequently arise. Often there is an illogical discontent with what has been and is, and continued attempts at experimentation, often ill-advised, are characteristic of a nation in process of recuperation. Under the most favorable circumstances this war-racked world cannot heal readily. Sufferings have been too acute to permit of an easy and quick recovery. So, at the best, the next 20 or more years will be a period of continued convalescence. For years we must reckon with acute cases of the irritation of convalescence, as an inevitable problem in the life of nations, as it is in that of individuals. During those years, those of us who are young today will have much of the responsibility for international health. Never in history has such an opportunity been given to work for the healing of nations and the welfare of humanity. But do not be surprised nor disheartened if we meet again and again with the often-seen irritation of a convalescent.

We hear much in these days of stockpiles and inventories, of the vast number of airplanes which we are constructing. In fact, the suggestion a year ago that we might build as many as 50,000 airplanes a year seemed merely a fantastic iridescent, and Utopian dream. Now it is, in essence, reality. Already our rate of airplane production is greater than that of any other nation in the world. The submarine remains a serious menace, but we are building ships faster and faster. We are launching two a day, and soon three a day, and even more will be our record.

Our armed forces are increasing rapidly. They are being outfitted with all necessary equipment. Many of our mistakes are being rectified, and solutions have been found for many of our harassing problems.

In spite of setbacks, some of which should have been avoided, we have made tremendous progress in carrying out our war program under the farsighted, resourceful, and vigorous leadership of President Roosevelt, assisted by his many competent aides, and in cooperation with the Congress of the United States—cooperation which has been very effective.

The Bible says, in substance, that a people without vision will perish. We know that we need vision, sound and constructive vision. We know also that it is essential that we now do many concrete things, more in both variety and number than ever before. We must spend money freely whenever necessary for our war purposes. But we must economize, saving every dollar and every penny the spending of which is not essential. We must be ready to make any changes in our policies that our war program demands. But let us continue to cherish the basic principles of our Government, and to hold fast to those economic, industrial, financial, and political policies which have been so helpful in the building up of our Nation. Let us preserve them except insofar as the temporary demands of our war program require otherwise, or whenever our judgment, after very mature consideration, approves permanent changes.

As I said a moment ago, we hear much of stockpiles and inventories of war materials that are essential to our war program. One of the stockpiles which we are accumulating is very real, indeed, although it is intangible and invisible. It is the spirit of our people and of the people of our allies. It is the conviction that we will find such a solution to our problems as will bring an end to the insolent attempt of the Axis to subjugate and to control the world. That is not overconfidence. That opinion rests upon a clear knowledge of many dominant facts. One is that we are not going to be disheartened by further conquests of the Axis, should they occur. Another is that in this war we can finish successfully what we have begun.

So, when we consider our ever-mounting stockpiles and inventories of war materials, we realize that one of our most valuable possessions is our firm and unshakable purpose to help preserve for

ourselves and the remainder of the world freedom and liberty. We shall rest from our labors only when that essential and indispensable result shall have been accomplished.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Glass	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Green	Overton
Bailey	Guffey	Pepper
Bankhead	Gurney	Radcliffe
Barbour	Hayden	Reed
Barkley	Herring	Rosier
Bone	Hill	Russell
Brewster	Holman	Schwartz
Bridges	Hughes	Shipstead
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Burton	La Follette	Spencer
Butler	Langer	Stewart
Capper	Lee	Taft
Caraway	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Idaho	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Tobey
Connally	McNary	Truman
Davis	Maybank	Tunnell
Doxey	Mead	Tydings
Ellender	Millikin	Vandenberg
George	Murdock	Van Nuys
Gerry	Murray	Wheeler
Gillette	Norris	White

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

THE HIGHWAY TO ALASKA—QUESTION OF PERSONAL PRIVILEGE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I rise to a point of personal privilege.

It concerns a false and malicious charge against a majority of the Members of this body and myself appearing in an editorial in the Bismarck Tribune, published at Bismarck, N. Dak., in the issue of May 28, 1942.

I quote the editorial:

PAYING ON A MORTGAGE

Many North Dakotans were surprised when Senator WILLIAM LANGER blared forth with his opposition to the prairie road to Alaska. Since he is a Prairie State Senator everyone supposed that he would favor the prairie route.

But no one need have been surprised at this. Neither need they be surprised at many things Senator LANGER doubtless will do from time to time in the future. He has political debts to pay—and they are not owed to the people of North Dakota, but to the Senators who voted to keep him in the Senate.

When the Senate voted to seat Senator LANGER, by a count of 52 to 30, it was immediately clear that the North Dakotan was under a very real obligation to those 52 Members of the Senate. Politics being what it is—and Senator LANGER being the kind of man he is—only those who believe in Santa Claus will contend that North Dakota's junior Member in the Senate had not made plenty of promises.

Some of the men who voted to seat him doubtless would scorn to make a certain kind of deal. They refrained from defending Mr. LANGER's record, but voted to seat him on the ground that North Dakota alone has the right to select its representatives. But others—of the "practical politician" type—would not hesitate to place a mortgage on a vote which they might need some day. It may be taken for granted that they did take such a mortgage on the Senator from North Dakota.

The best view of Senator LANGER's action is that he is paying on the mortgage held by one or more Senators from the West Coast States who wanted the Alaskan road to extend northward through the mountains.

They had only to notify Senator LANGER that an installment on the mortgage was due to force him into action. There is no other explanation, whereas this is an adequate explanation.

It is a shameful thing that this condition exists. It is a handicap to North Dakota that it should exist. But only those who insist on closing their eyes to facts will miss further evidences that it does exist. These developments are bound to occur from time to time as the various Senators who have claims on Senator LANGER exercise their rights of collection under their mortgage.

Mr. President, it is not an uncommon thing in this Nation to have critical items and editorials published about members of our Government. To this practice, I, of course, have not the slightest objection, for there is nothing more important in any democratic nation than preservation of the freedom of the press. It is one of the cornerstones upon which the foundation of democracies rests. It is one of the characteristics differentiating governments of free peoples from governments of tyrants with whom we are now engaged in mortal combat.

In passing, it might be observed that freedom of the press can be undermined and weakened to a point of destruction by forces other than autocratic governments. Indeed, the freedom of the press may be said to be held in trust by the publishers of the press in all parts of our country. But it can be undermined by those few editors and publishers possessing a part of this trust when wantonly or maliciously they publish charges of crime against members of our Government when no basis of fact exists and when the slightest investigation would demonstrate such charge to be false.

It is also important to maintain respect for our Government and all its branches. If the people lose respect and confidence in their Government, it cannot endure.

While we are engaged in the contest to preserve democracies and freedoms in all parts of the world, we should not overlook our obligation to preserve these institutions inviolate at home.

The aforementioned editorial charges that I mortgaged my vote to an unnamed number of unnamed Senators of the 52 who after some 3 weeks of debate upon the floor of the Senate voted that I should be seated as a United States Senator when my right to hold that office was challenged. This editorial charges that certain Members of the Senate of what are called practical politician type would not hesitate to place a mortgage on a vote which they might need some day.

Such a malicious and vicious charge might be passed over without notice, had the editorial ceased at this point, but it proceeds to state:

It may be taken for granted that they did take such a mortgage on the Senator from North Dakota.

The editorial proceeds:

They had only to notify Senator LANGER that an installment on the mortgage was due to force him into action.

The editor continues:

It is a shameful thing that this condition exists.

No sensible interpretation can be placed upon these remarks other than that I entered into a corrupt and criminal agreement with several Members of the Senate, agreeing to vote as they would direct or force me to vote in the event they cast their votes in favor of my being seated.

Mr. President, I submit that this is no charge of incompetence, general dereliction of duty, log rolling, or the like. It is a direct charge of a criminal conspiracy by myself and by Members of this body.

I denounce it as being utterly false. I state that I have had no agreement, directly or indirectly, expressly or by implication, with any Member of this body at any time to cast my vote in any manner, fashion, or form, or to do anything else for his vote or support.

If this editorial were truthful, the people of the country would have a just right to have disrespect and contempt for this body.

If it is permitted to go unchallenged, I greatly fear the editorial, now republished in other newspapers, will cause the people of the country to believe that it is truthful. It would, in my opinion, be a cowardly act on my part to permit it to go unchallenged.

Mr. President, throughout the long and trying experience wherein my right to sit in this Chamber was challenged, I suffered in silence to await judgment of my peers. I had been twice elected to the high office of attorney general of North Dakota, and twice elected to the highest office in the State—that of chief executive—by my own people.

Then in a free election of free people I was duly elected by the same free people to represent, in the United States Senate, the State in which I was born and where I have lived all my life.

It was not easy to sit silently by for day after day and week after week while these debates were proceeding, but I thought that to be the proper and dignified course.

The greatest satisfaction I experienced in the vote of the Senate on this issue was the feeling that each Senator in a free land, in this country, was free and remained free to vote as his conscience dictated. It was also of no small interest to me to note that such votes were cast by the Members of this body without regard to the sections of our country which they represented.

An examination of the roll-call vote will show that I was supported by old Democrats and young Democrats, by liberals and those of a more conservative leaning, by Members of long and continued service in the Senate and by Senators more recently chosen. This list included Members from the deep South and Members from the far Northwest, Maine Re-

publicans and Democrats from Texas, those who had most fervently supported the administration and those who had most vigorously opposed it; and those who opposed my seating were from the same groups. Indeed, any person of intelligence in scanning the roster of this roll call would find only humor, if the charge was not so vicious, in the assertion that this vote came about through any corrupt agreement. It would accredit to me a promise and an attempt to ride two fast moving horses traveling in opposite directions at the same time.

I had, previous to this vote, cast my own vote on important and vital matters for a year preceding in the United States Senate. The scanning of the record would furnish proof that I sought the support of no group at any time. Some of my votes were cast when the change of a single vote would alter the result. The record will show that I voted independently. I voted each time as my conscience directed, and notwithstanding an editorial to the contrary, I propose to continue to so do so long as I am honored with membership in this body which I cherish and honor so much.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD subsequently said: Mr. President, in view of the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] this afternoon, I desire to say that when the Langer case was before the Senate I had intended to discuss it but it had been discussed for 3 weeks, it was late in the afternoon, and I did not want to take the time of the Senate when a vote was about to be had. I had not intended to discuss it since, but, in view of the criticism of the Senate for that vote, and also because newspapers throughout my section of the country have criticized my vote, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD some correspondence I have had with an editor friend of mine, who violently disagreed with the vote of the Senate. I ask that it be printed following the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota this afternoon. It consists of two letters and some memoranda dealing with other cases involving the eligibility of a Senator's election, which have been considered and disposed of by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 23, 1942.*

Mr. WALTER K. MICKELSON,
Editor, The Journal, New Ulm, Minn.

MY DEAR WALTER: I have your editorial of April 2, 1942, before me, in which you disagree with my position in the Langer matter. Evidently, if present in the Senate, you would have voted to deny Senator LANGER his seat.

At the outset, I want to state that my vote was not cast for an individual but for the principle that the will of the people, fairly expressed, shall govern, provided constitutional qualifications are met. If we depart from that great principle, then we change our form of government.

In your editorial you state:

"After reading all the testimony and the speeches which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD we wonder why they ousted Lorimer, Newberry, and Smith and yet seated LANGER. At least the three first-named gentlemen used their own money to win their elections."

There can be no comparison of these cases with that of Senator LANGER. The record discloses that in the Lorimer, Newberry, and Smith cases, also in the Vare case, the petitions requesting that they be not seated were based entirely upon corruption of the elections in which they claimed to have been elected to the Senate. There was no such contention by petitioners in the Langer case. They did not attack the legality of the election.

You state the three men you mention spent their own money. The record is to the contrary. A summary of the nature and disposition of these cases, taken from the record, is set forth below.

Each of the cases you mention and the Vare case deal with corruption of elections and therefore, within constitutional provisions, the election certificates of the men were involved, with the exception of the Newberry case. Their election was held to have been obtained by corrupt means. As stated, that question did not arise here.

The House and Senate have always recognized their power to examine the legality of elections because the validity of the election certificate is involved.

In my opinion, the question in these cases involves the power of the Senate, under sections 3 and 5 of article I of the Constitution. Section 5, as you know, provides that "Each House shall be the judge of the elections, returns, and qualifications of its own Members, * * *." We are not left in doubt what is meant by the word "qualifications" in that sentence, for they are set forth in section 3, as follows: "No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained to the age of 30 years, and been 9 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen." As petitioners did not contend that LANGER did not meet these qualifications, and as there was no contention that LANGER had obtained his election by corrupt means, the question then was, Has the Senate the right to impose other qualifications on a Senator-elect who appears to take his seat?

In the Constitutional Convention other qualifications were proposed. For instance, it was proposed that certain property qualifications should be included. This was voted down. Provisions were also offered to the convention delegating to the Senate the power to impose such further qualifications as the Senate might see fit. This was debated and rejected, on the ground that power in the Senate to impose other qualifications would make it possible for the Senate to subvert constitutional government.

The sovereign people of the various States, by representatives in the Constitutional Convention, created the Federal Government and limited its power. They imposed such limitations upon the qualifications of a Senator as they deemed necessary. For the creature of the sovereign States to impose other limitations upon its creator, the States, who send duly elected representatives here with an undisputed certificate of election, would be to usurp power that is an attribute inherent in sovereignty. The creature would then arrogate to itself power retained by its creator. In other words, the creature would constitute itself the keeper of its creator's conscience.

In dealing with the qualifications of a Senator seeking membership it is plainly intended that the rights of the various States should be protected in sending to the Senate whom they choose, provided only that the candidate for admittance meets the constitutional qualifications.

Clearly the people never intended that the Senate should take upon itself the duty of making itself a grand or petit jury to inquire into the acts of a Senator committed prior to his election and which have nothing to do with the purity of elections. Nor was it intended that the Senate should impose other qualifications than those enumerated in the Constitution. Such matters are reserved to the States.

Of course, the Senate has jurisdiction over acts committed after membership in the Senate has been acquired and has the power to expel. Such question did not arise here.

Mention has been made in various sources that the British Parliament has complete power to impose any kind of qualification upon its membership. The Parliament of Great Britain does not act under a constitution limiting the power of its members. At one time they imposed a qualification making it necessary for a member to be a communicant of the State Church of England. Many other qualifications were imposed which, if permitted by the Senate of the United States, would undoubtedly lead to dangerous impositions in times of great national controversy.

We are a Nation of many religious and political faiths. Our citizenship is composed of many races. Among these are citizens of every State. History shows that religious, racial, and political passions at times rise beyond reason. The framers of the Constitution anticipated this and therefore reserved to the people of the States the right to elect a man to the Senate of their own choosing. Otherwise isn't it plain that they feared the Senate, under such conditions, might impose obnoxious qualifications of its own and thereby thwart a free choice of the people in selecting their representatives in the Senate? We must not forget this National Government was created by the States.

It cannot be denied that only to the extent that these limitations have served to restrain public officials, executives, legislators, and courts from usurping powers not granted have we been able to preserve a free government.

I find nowhere in the Constitution nor in the decision of any court any recognition of the power of the Senate to override the verdict of a sovereign State's electorate in the selection of a Senator, provided the machinery of election has not been corrupted and the qualifications laid down in the Constitution have been met.

It has been stated in various sources that because LANGER was a Republican, Republican politics entered into his seating. This is an unworthy assumption. There were more than twice as many Democrats voted to seat him as Republicans.

You will note that 16 Republicans and 36 Democrats—a total of 52—voted that, on the arguments and evidence presented, Senator LANGER should be seated. I think we have a right to assume that they concurred in these views. Twenty-two Democrats and 8 Republicans voted to the contrary. I think we have a right to assume that they dissented from these views.

With best wishes, I am,

Yours sincerely,

HENRIK SHIPSTEAD.

P. S. The official record in the cases you mention is herewith attached, with proper authoritative citations to substantiate my contention that the cases you mention have no basis for comparison or parallel, as you seem to believe.

Frank L. Smith of Illinois was denied his seat upon the basis of a report of a special committee showing that he had expended $458,782 in his election, and out of that sum $203,000 was contributed by officers of large utility corporations, including the Insull crowd, doing business in Illinois when Smith, at that time, was chairman of the Illinois Commerce Commission, with which these

utility companies had business before (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 69, pt. 2, p. 1718).

In addition, the Senate refused to seat William S. Vare of Pennsylvania. The reason for refusing a seat to him was because at the primary election at which Vare was alleged to have been nominated as a candidate for the Senate, there were numerous and various instances of fraud and corruption in his behalf. To insure his nomination there was expended a sum exceeding $785,000 (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 71, pt. 3, p. 3413).

William Lorimer was denied his seat because the Senate claimed corrupt methods and practices were employed in his election to the Senate. The Senate claimed that at least 10 votes of members of the Illinois Legislature were purchased. Anyhow, he was denied his seat, on the ground of corruption of the election machinery. I assume they had the proof. This, you will note, came in the days when legislatures elected the Senators (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 46, pt. 7, p. 6790).

Newberry was not denied a seat in the Senate. He was seated by a vote of 46 to 41 because it could not be shown that he had consented to or had knowledge of the expenditures of $195,000 in the primaries in which he claimed to have obtained the nomination (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 62, pt. 2, pp. 1108-1116).

However, Mr. Newberry resigned some months later and gave his reasons therefor.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *April 27, 1942.*

Mr. WALTER K. MICKELSON,
Editor, The Journal, New Ulm, Minn.

MY DEAR WALTER: I have just received your letter this morning with further reference to the Langer case, in which you state:

"In this as in most other cases, much depends on the good common sense of the Members of the Senate. As I see it, there can be abuses if the Senate sets up some standard of decency, just as I feel there is an abuse right now when a rather strained interpretation of the Senate power permits a man of the type of Senator LANGER to sit in the Senate and legislate for the whole country. Right now the United States Senate has the authority over the power to tax and to destroy the entire Nation. Somehow or other we have to depend on the good common sense of the majority not to abuse this power."

The trouble with that argument is that the framers of the Constitution did not leave this matter of imposing additional qualifications to the "good common sense of the Members of the Senate." It was retained to be decided by the common sense of the electorate at the ballot box. In my opinion, the common sense of the electorate is at least on a par with that of the Senate. They at times may err, but I do not believe oftener than the Senate. At any rate, the people have a better right to err than the Senate, because they are supreme.

Evidently the framers of the Constitution did not share your confidence in the "good common sense of the majority (of the Senate) not to abuse this power" to override the right of the electorate of the State to select whom they choose. Otherwise they would have given them this power. They preferred to have the people depend on their own intelligence and conscience to determine the moral character and intellectual fitness of their representatives in the Senate. In this they may have made a mistake, but I do not think so.

The ultimate end of such argument, if it should prevail, would be that the Senate itself should elect the Senators for the various States, in order that a Senator's qualifications shall meet with the approval of a majority of the Senate.

To me at least it is plain that for the Senate to assert such power, either with a majority or two-thirds vote, would, in my opinion, be an arrogation of the power of dictatorship over the will of the people of the States.

It would be just as sensible for Congress to arrogate to itself the power to change the Constitution without submitting any proposed change to the people of the States for their ratification. If such assumption of power should become the rule, it would then, in the course of events, be possible for the Senate to delegate such power to the President as other legislative powers have been delegated. This has been done on the assumption that the power to legislate includes the power to delegate. I do not agree with this assumption, but after the camel has his head under the tent he has progressively occupied more of the tent.

Such theory is plainly contrary to past interpretation of the Senate's power and would overthrow the fundamental theory that the people are the keepers of their own conscience and judgment when they, through the ballot box, express their own opinions as to a candidate's qualifications as a member of the United States Senate.

You will note that 16 Republicans and 36 Democrats—a total of 52 and a majority of 12—voted for the seating of LANGER. Whether they voted as they did for the same reason that I did is not for me to say. It is possible many of them may have accepted your views and voted on the basis of "their good common sense." In that case you have some champions of your views in the Senate.

I had intended to speak on this subject in the Senate, but it had been discussed for 3 weeks and the final session was late in the evening, and the Senate was very impatient for a vote. Because I thought the issues were so clear I doubted if I could add anything new, and so I refrained imposing upon the Senate by taking time to discuss this matter further before a Senate that was impatient to act.

Yours sincerely,

HENRIK SHIPSTEAD.

GREETINGS EXTENDED TO HEROES OF THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD brief greetings extended last Saturday in the reception room of the Senate on the occasion when the 14 outstanding young heroes of the United States and Great Britain appeared here in the Capitol. The greetings were extended by the President pro tempore, the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and by me.

There being no objection, the greetings were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator GLASS. Young gentlemen, due to your characteristic courage and extraordinary skill you have attained to the status of international heroism, and as President pro tempore of the United States Senate it gives me pleasure to greet you and to tell you that the Senate, as well as our Nation, are very proud of you and of your accomplishments.

Senator BARKLEY. Young men, it will no doubt be a long time before we have as many visitors in the Senate Chamber who are entitled, by virtue of their heroic conduct and success in war, to be called heroes. The American people so regard you, whether you are English or whether you are Americans. We are all in the same fight.

I reiterate our deep appreciation of the honor you do us by coming here and allowing us to be inspired by your presence and by the memory of your great deeds.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider measures on the calendar to which there is no objection, beginning at the end of the last call.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to call the measures on the calendar.

AMENDMENTS TO NATIONAL SERVICE LIFE INSURANCE ACT OF 1940

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2543) to amend subsection (3) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Finance with an amendment, on page 7, after line 14, to insert:

SEC. 7. Section 601 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, approved October 8, 1940, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(*f*) The terms 'parent', 'father', and 'mother' include a father, mother, father through adoption, mother through adoption, and persons who have stood in loco parentis to a member of the military or naval forces at any time prior to entry into active service for a period of not less than 1 year."

SEC. 8. Section 602 (g) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, approved October 8, 1940, is hereby amended by striking therefrom the following: "(including person in loco parentis if designated as beneficiary by the insured)."

SEC. 9. Section 602 (h) (3) (C) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, approved October 8, 1940, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(C) if no widow, widower, or child, to the parent or parents of the insured who last bore that relationship, if living, in equal shares;".

SEC. 10. Effective the first day of the month next following the enactment of this act, in no event shall monthly payments of yearly renewable term or automatic, or national service life insurance serve to reduce amounts of compensation or pension otherwise payable under existing compensation or pension laws. Section 5, act of July 19, 1939 (38 U. S. C. 472b), as amended by section 2, act of August 21, 1941 (Public Law No. 242, 77th Cong.), is modified accordingly.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (3) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended by section 10 of Public, No. 360, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 20, 1941, is hereby repealed and there is substituted in lieu thereof, effective as of December 20, 1941, the following to be known as subsection (3) of section 602 (d) of said act:

"(3) (A) Any person in the active service who on or after October 8, 1940, and prior to April 20, 1942, becomes totally disabled as a result of injury or disease incurred in line of duty and such disability continues without interruption for 6 months, without having in force at time of incurrence of such disability at least $5,000 insurance issued under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, or the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, or this act, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted, effective as of the commencement of such total disability, National Service Life Insurance in an amount which together with any such insurance then in force shall aggregate $5,000, and premiums on such insurance shall be waived until 6 months after the insured

ceases to be totally disabled or until April 20, 1943, whichever is the earlier date: *Provided*, That such protection shall cease and terminate unless within such period such disabled person shall make application in writing for continuance of all or any part of such insurance and shall submit evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of entitlement to waiver of premiums under section 602 (n) of this act or tender the premiums thereafter becoming due: *Provided further*, That waiver of premiums under section 602 (n) shall not be denied under this subsection on the ground that total disability commenced prior to the effective date of such insurance: *And provided further*, That anyone who applied for and was issued insurance after becoming totally disabled, and but for such application would be entitled to insurance hereunder, shall have the right, upon application within the time and in the manner as above limited, to elect to surrender insurance applied for and to be issued insurance hereunder, or if such insurance shall have lapsed without election, such person shall be considered subject in all respects to the provisions of this subsection, as hereby amended, but policies issued hereunder shall be effective from date of surrender or lapse of policy previously issued.

"(B) Any person in the active service who on or after December 7, 1941, and prior to April 20, 1942, has been or shall be captured, besieged, or otherwise isolated by the forces of an enemy of the United States for a period of at least 30 consecutive days and extending beyond April 19, 1942, and at the time of such capture, siege, or isolation by the enemy did not have in force insurance in the aggregate amount of at least $5,000 under the War Risk Insurance Act, as amended, the World War Veterans' Act, as amended, or this act, shall be deemed to have applied for and to have been granted, effective as of the date of such capture, siege, or isolation, National Service Life Insurance in an amount which together with any such insurance then in force shall aggregate $5,000 of insurance, and such insurance shall remain in force and premiums on such insurance shall be waived during the period while such person remains so captured, besieged, or isolated, and for 6 months thereafter: *Provided*, That such protection shall cease and terminate at the end of such period of 6 months unless within such period such person shall make application in writing for the continuance of all or any part of such insurance and shall submit evidence satisfactory to the Administrator of entitlement to waiver of premiums under section 602 (n) of this act, or tender the premiums thereafter becoming due."

SEC. 2. Section 602 (d) is hereby further amended by adding a new subsection (5) to read as follows:

"(5) If any person deemed to have been issued insurance under subsection (3) (A) or (B) hereof die without filing application and within the time limited therefor, death insurance benefits shall be payable in the manner and to the persons as stated in subsection (2): *Provided*, That no application for insurance payments under subsections (2) or (3) as hereby amended, shall be valid unless filed in the Veterans' Administration within 1 year after the date of death of the insured or 1 year after the date of this enactment, whichever is the later date, and relationship and dependency of the applicant, where required as a basis for such claim, shall be proved as of date of death of insured by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator: *And provided further*, That persons shown by evidence satisfactory to the Administrator to have been mentally or legally incompetent at the time the right to apply for continuation of insurance or for death benefits expires, may make such application at any time within 1 year after removal of such disability."

SEC. 3. Section 602 (d) is hereby further amended by adding a new subsection (6) to read as follows:

"(6) Policies issued hereunder upon application as provided in subsection (3) (A) or (B) shall be issued upon the same terms and conditions as are contained in the standard policies of National Service Life Insurance."

SEC. 4. The Administrator is authorized and directed to transfer from the National Service Life Insurance appropriation to the National Service Life Insurance fund such sums as may be necessary to cover all losses incurred and premiums waived under subsections (2), (3), and (4) of section 602 (d) as amended.

SEC. 5. Subsection 602 (n) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended, effective as of October 8, 1940, to read as follows:

"(n) Upon application by the insured and under such regulations as the Administrator may promulgate, payment of premiums on such insurance may be waived during the continuous total disability of the insured, which continues or has continued for 6 or more consecutive months, if such disability commenced (1) subsequent to the date of his application for insurance; (2) while the insurance was in force under premium-paying conditions, and (3) prior to the insured's sixtieth birthday: *Provided*, That the Administrator shall not grant waiver of any premium becoming due more than 1 year prior to the receipt in the Veterans' Administration of application for the same, except as hereinafter provided, and any premiums paid for months during which such waiver is effective shall be refunded. The Administrator shall provide by regulations for examination or reexamination of an insured claiming benefits under this subsection, and may deny benefits for failure to cooperate. In the event that it is found that an insured is no longer totally disabled, the waiver of premiums shall cease as of the date of such finding and the policy of insurance may be continued by payment of premiums as provided in said policy: *Provided further*, That in any case in which the Administrator finds that the insured's failure to make timely application for waiver of premiums or his failure to submit satisfactory evidence of the existence or continuance of total disability was due to circumstances beyond his control, the Administrator may grant waiver or continuance of waiver of premiums. Premium rates shall be calculated without charge for the cost of the waiver of premiums herein provided and no deduction from benefits otherwise payable shall be made on account thereof."

SEC. 6. Section 617 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 is hereby amended to read as follows:

"In the event of a disagreement as to a claim arising under this part, suit may be brought in the same manner and subject to the same conditions and limitations as are applicable to United States Government life (converted) insurance under the provisions of sections 19 and 500 of the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended: *Provided*, That in any such suit the decision of the Administrator as to waiver or nonwaiver of premiums under this act as now or hereafter amended shall be conclusive and binding on the court."

SEC. 7. Section 601 of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, approved October 8, 1940, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following subsection:

"(f) The terms 'parent,' 'father,' and 'mother' include a father, mother, father through adoption, mother through adoption, and persons who have stood in loco parentis to a member of the military or naval forces at any time prior to entry into active service for a period of not less than 1 year."

SEC. 8. Section 602 (g) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, approved October 8, 1940, is hereby amended by striking therefrom the following: "(including person in loco parentis if designated as beneficiary by the insured)."

SEC. 9. Section 602 (h) (3) (C) of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, approved October 8, 1940, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(C) if no widow, widower, or child, to the parent or parents of the insured who last bore that relationship, if living, in equal shares;".

SEC. 10. Effective the first day of the month next following the enactment of this act, in no event shall monthly payments of yearly renewable term or automatic, or national service life insurance serve to reduce amounts of compensation or pension otherwise payable under existing compensation or pension laws. Section 5, act of July 19, 1939 (38 U. S. C. 472b), as amended by section 2, act of August 21, 1941 (Public Law No. 242, 77th Cong.), is modified accordingly.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FLIGHT OFFICER IN THE ARMY AIR FORCES

The bill (S. 2553) to create the title of flight officer in the Army Air Forces, to amend the Army Aviation Cadet Act, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby created for the Army Air Forces the title of flight officer. A flight officer shall have the rank, pay, and allowances, provided for a warrant officer, junior grade, and shall take rank as of the date of appointment. Flight officers shall be entitled to the benefits of all existing laws or regulations covering retirement, pensions, and disability as are applicable to members of the Army of the United States when called or ordered into the active military service of the United States under existing statutory authorizations and shall be entitled to longevity pay as provided for warrant officers in section 1 of the act of August 21, 1941 (Public Law 230, 77th Cong.). Flight officers (warrant officers, junior grade) appointed under this authority shall not be limited by the restriction as to numbers established by section 3 of the act of August 21, 1941 (Public Law 230, 77th Cong.).

SEC. 2. The provisions of section 3 of the Army Aviation Cadet Act of June 3, 1941, are hereby suspended for the duration of the present war and for 6 months thereafter except as to any person who has enlisted or who has been appointed as an aviation cadet prior to the date of enactment of this act. During such period and under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, male citizens of the United States may enlist as aviation cadets and men having an enlisted status in the Army of the United States may be appointed by the Secretary of War as aviation cadets. All enlistments shall be for the period of the duration of the present war and for 6 months thereafter unless sooner terminated by the President. Upon successful completion of the prescribed course of training and instruction and under such regulations with respect to selection as the Secretary of War may prescribe, each such cadet shall be commissioned as a second lieutenant in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the act of September 22, 1941 (Public Law 252, 77th Cong.), or appointed as a flight officer in the Army of the United States. Under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, the status, pay,

and allowances of any aviation cadet who fails to complete successfully the prescribed course of training and instruction may be terminated and for the remainder of the war and 6 months thereafter he may be required to serve in any enlisted grade with the pay and allowances of such grade.

SEC. 3. During the continuance of the present war and for 6 months thereafter, the Secretary of War is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to make temporary appointments as flight officers in the Army of the United States from among men having an enlisted status in the Army of the United States who have received training as aviation students.

SEC. 4. Pursuant to such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, flight officers may be appointed, by selection, to the grade of second lieutenant and, upon such appointment, shall be commissioned in the Army of the United States under the provisions of the act of September 22, 1941 (Public Law 252, 77th Cong.).

SEC. 5. Any person who has completed the prescribed course of training and instruction as an aviation cadet or aviation student and has served in time of war as a commissioned officer or flight officer in the Army of the United States may, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, be appointed an officer in the Air Corps Reserve.

SEC. 6. Section 4 of the Army Aviation Cadet Act of June 3, 1941, is hereby amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and by substituting the following in lieu thereof: "Any person appointed as a flight officer in the Army of the United States shall be entitled at the time of such appointment to an allowance of $150 for uniforms."

SEC. 7. Section 5 of the Army Aviation Cadet Act of June 3, 1941, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. Aviation cadets who are undergoing courses of instruction which require them to participate regularly and frequently in aerial flights shall be issued insurance in the amount of $10,000 under the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 1008), as amended, except that the premiums shall be paid by the Government. Upon being commissioned as second lieutenants or appointed as flight officers and until permanently relieved from duty involving participation in regular and frequent aerial flights, the insurance provided for aviation cadets or aviation students under this or other existing law shall continue but the premiums shall be deducted from the pay of the individual concerned and paid, as the Secretary of War may direct, to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Upon being permanently relieved from duty involving participation in regular and frequent aerial flights, release from active duty, or discharge, the insurance of aviation cadets, flight officers, and officers may be continued at the option and at the expense of the individual concerned."

SEC. 8. This act may be cited as the "Flight Officer Act."

CERTIFICATES IN CONNECTION WITH PAY AND ALLOWANCE ACCOUNTS

The bill (S. 2555) to authorize the use of certificates by officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, in connection with pay and allowance accounts of military and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction of the War and Navy Departments was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That during the existence of the present war in which the United States is engaged, and during the 6 months immediately following the termination of such war, certificates of officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, executed on and after December 8, 1941, attesting to the existence of the stated facts, and which are filed with and relate to vouchers and papers involving pay and allowances of civilian and military personnel under the jurisdiction of the War or Navy Departments, shall be accepted as supporting such payments so far as said facts are concerned without the necessity of any other supporting evidence or certificates: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe the places where and the classes of pay and allowances accounts to which the above authority of law may be made applicable.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2503) to provide for the payment of retired pay to certain retired judges of the police and municipal courts of the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to have an explanation of the bill. If none is forthcoming, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

USE OF LETHAL GAS IN EXECUTIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 2505) to amend sections 23–701 and 23–702 of title 23, chapter 7, of the District of Columbia Code, 1940 edition, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted etc., That section 23–701 of title 23, chapter 7, of the District of Columbia Code, 1940 edition, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 23–701. Capital punishment—how inflicted: The mode of capital punishment shall be by the administration of lethal gas."

SEC. 2. That section 23–702 of title 23, chapter 7, of the District of Columbia Code, 1940 edition, be, and the same is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 23–702. Commissioners to provide death chamber, appoint executioner and assistants, and fix fees: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and required to provide a death chamber and necessary apparatus for inflicting the death penalty by the administration of lethal gas, to designate an executioner and necessary assistants, not exceeding three in number, and to fix the fees thereof for services."

DR. WESLEY K. HARRIS

The bill (H. R. 6297) to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Dr. Wesley K. Harris was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ASSIGNMENT OF CERTAIN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA POLICE OFFICERS TO DETECTIVE DUTY

The bill (H. R. 6782) to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to assign officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force to duty in the detective bureau of the Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGULATIONS OF AMBULANCES AND FUNERAL CARS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (H. R. 6804) to amend paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SUSPENSION OF ANTITRUST LAWS IN CERTAIN CASES

The bill (S. 2431) to suspend the operation of the antitrust laws and Federal Trade Commission Act in certain instances requisite to the promotion of the war was announced as next in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the two Houses have agreed on an amendment to the so-called little-business bill which was passed several days ago, substantially in the terms of Senate bill 2431, making it unnecessary to pass that bill. I therefore ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

EMPLOYMENT OF CERTAIN FORMER MEMBERS OF THE MILITARY FORCES BY DEFENSE CONTRACTORS

The bill (H. R. 6634) to facilitate the employment by defense contractors of certain former members of the land and naval forces, including the Coast Guard, of the United States was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL BANKRUPTCY ACT

The bill (H. R. 7066) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. PEPPER subsequently said: Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to revert temporarily to Calendar No. 1483, House bill 7066, with the privilege of giving a brief explanation of the bill, a municipal bankruptcy bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have objected to consideration of the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to make an explanation of the bill if I may do so. I think perhaps the best summary of the nature of the bill which can be found appears on page 3 of the report of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on Calendar No. 1483, House bill 7066, passed by the House of Representatives and favorably reported by the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. I read from the committee report, as follows:

REPORT OF THE SECTION OF MUNICIPAL LAW OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

(Indianapolis meeting of council, October 1941)

The section recommends the adoption of the following resolution:

"*Resolved*, That the municipal debt readjustment provisions of the Federal Bankruptcy Act should not be allowed to expire June 30, 1942, and that the municipal law section is authorized to represent the association at congressional hearings if legislation deferring that date of expiration is introduced in the Congress of the United States."

REPORT

The existing municipal debt readjustment provisions of the Federal Bankruptcy Act were originally adopted in 1937 and as since extended will expire June 30, 1942, by their own terms of limitation. Their constitutionality was sustained by the United States Supreme Court in the Bekins case in 1937. Debt adjustments under the act have been numerous, and have been confined largely to the Southern and Southwestern States.

Proceedings under the act have been comprehensively studied by a committee of the municipal law section under the title of Municipal debt readjustments under the Federal Bankruptcy Act, and have been fully discussed at meetings of the section. It is the conclusion of the section that the results of the proceedings have been advantageous to both bondholders and the municipalities.

It is reported to the section that there are numerous important situations in which proceedings will be necessary but cannot be instituted prior to the present expiration date.

The municipal law section favored the extension of 1939 and now urges the association to approve a further extension.

The report of the committee also contains the following resolution, adopted by the house of delegates of the American Bar Association at the 1941 Indianapolis meeting:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY HOUSE OF DELEGATES OF THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION AT 1941 INDIANAPOLIS MEETING

(P. 175, Printed Reports of American Bar Association, vol. 66)

Resolved, That the municipal debt readjustment provisions of the Federal Bankruptcy Act should not be allowed to expire June 30, 1942, and that the municipal law section is authorized to represent the association at congressional hearings if legislation deferring that date of expiration is introduced in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator will permit me to do so, I should like to say one further word, and then I shall yield.

Mr. President, the report also states the number of cases which are pending in various States and the number of municipalities which are affected by the legislation. The necessity for its extension arises out of the fact that the law would expire on June 30 of this year, and that even the cases which are now being considered by the courts could not be terminated in a proper way if the extension is not made possible.

My colleague in the Senate introduced a bill with our joint concurrence to extend the operation of the law for 2 years, but meanwhile the present bill came through the House of Representatives extending it 4 years. So the Senate Committee on the Judiciary simply substituted the House bill for the Senate bill, and it comes here with a favorable report from the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, which at three different times had the matter before it. The committee held hearings at an earlier session; it did not hold hearings at the latter sessions because it was already familiar with the subject. The committee held hearings and recommended that the bill pass. The bill proposes no change in the present law except an extension of the Municipal Compositions Act from June 30, 1942, to 4 years from that date.

Now I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I concur in everything the Senator has said with respect to the bill. In Colorado some irrigation and drainage districts, which are undergoing bankruptcy, very badly need the extension provided for in the measure. I hope the bill may be considered and enacted because the time is very limited.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], who has objected to present consideration of the bill, if the explanation is of any help to him.

Mr. McNARY. The explanation is satisfactory. The able Senator from Colorado also explained it to me. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of House bill 7066?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 7066) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ESTATE OF ORION KNOX

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4923) for the relief of the estate of Orion Knox, deceased, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$10,634.95" and insert "$5,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

MRS. JESSIE A. BEECHWOOD

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5317) for the relief of Mrs. Jessie A. Beechwood, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$2,500" and insert "$1,000", and in line 7, after "United States", to strike out "for compensation and for reimbursement for certain expenses incurred."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

MADELEINE HAMMETT AND OTHERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 5854) for the relief of Madeleine Hammett, Olive Hammett, Walter Young, the estate of Laura O'Malley Young, deceased, and the legal guardian of Laura Elizabeth Young, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with amendments, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$6,357.44" and insert "$5,000"; in line 7, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$500" and insert "$100"; at the beginning of line 9, to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$768.46"; in line 10, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$5,500" and insert "$5,000"; and on page 2, line 2, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$100."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ANDREW J. BISSINGER—ADJUSTED-SERVICE CERTIFICATE

The bill (H. R. 3337) to provide for the issuance of a duplicate adjusted-service certificate to Andrew J. Bissinger, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. GEORGE subsequently said: Mr. President, when Calendar No. 1488, House bill 3337, was called, there was no objection, and the bill was passed. I have examined the report of the Veterans' Administration on that bill, and I ask unanimous consent for the reconsideration of the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, may I ask for an explanation as to why the bill should be referred to the Committee on Finance? It is a Military Affairs Committee bill.

Mr. GEORGE. It was passed on by the Military Affairs Committee; but let me say to the distinguished Senator from Utah that it involves proposed legislation having to do with a veteran of the World War. The Finance Committee has exclusive jurisdiction of adjusted compensation, disability allowances, and all special relief bills having to do with veterans of the World War. For that reason I have asked that the votes be reconsidered and that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance. I did not do so until I read the report of General Hines.

The case is somewhat peculiar. There seems to be some merit in the bill. At the same time, the Veterans' Administrator has advised against the passage of the bill, for what seem to me to be very substantial reasons. I therefore ask that the bill be sent to the committee which has jurisdiction of the subject matter, so that legislation on this same question may be kept uniform and there may not be one ruling for one veteran and another ruling for another.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I shall not object to the request of the Senator from Georgia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the votes by which the bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed, are reconsidered, and the bill will be referred to the Committee on Finance.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE CROSS TO RAYMOND P. FINNEGAN

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 538) granting the Distinguished Service Cross to Raymond P. Finnegan, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an

amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

Notwithstanding the provisions of the act of Congress approved May 26, 1928, governing the time limitation for consideration of recommendations for the award of decorations to former Army personnel, that the War Department be, and is hereby, authorized and directed to confer the Distinguished Service Cross upon Raymond P. Finnegan and John P. Cullen, respectively, both formerly corporals of Company G, One Hundred and Sixth Infantry, Twenty-seventh Division, American Expeditionary Forces, for extraordinary heroism in action with the enemy east of Ronssoy, France, during the engagement of September 27, 1918, in the first attack on the outpost position of the Hindenburg line defenses, for which their commanding officers cited them for exceptional gallantry and conduct beyond the call of duty and recommended them for the award of the Distinguished Service Cross.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting the Distinguished Service Cross to Raymond P. Finnegan and John P. Cullen, respectively."

CONTROL OF EXPORTATION OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES

The bill (S. 2558) to further expedite the prosecution of the war by authorizing the control of the exportation of certain commodities was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to have a full explanation of the bill. It does not read in a way to challenge my support. However, my objection may be explained away.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, by the act of July 20, 1940, an embargo was laid on the exportation of certain materials useful for war purposes. Such exports may be made only under license. The act was limited to June 30, 1942. The reason for the act arose from some difficulties we had over rubber.

The bill would allow the embargo to remain until 6 months after the end of the war or until the act is repealed by concurrent resolution or until the President shall determine that there is no further need for the embargo. The bill would make it possible for the United States to control the exportation of materials which can be used and are used for war purposes. If the present law is not continued, such materials may be purchased by private individuals and find their way into the hands of our enemies.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the objection which occurs to me to the bill as it stands is that it absolutely delegates to the President, without any guide or principle whatever, complete power to prohibit the exportation of anything or everything which may be exported from this country. That power would extend for 6 months after the end of the war. It seems to me that, while it may be necessary to control exports, Congress should at least prescribe some kind of principles or some guidance which may be followed in prohibiting exports.

When the law was originally enacted it was confined to the principle of prohibiting the exportation of commodities which we might need in connection with the manufacture of munitions. The Board of Economic Warfare, entirely disregarding the limitations on that power, has gone ahead and tried to prohibit the exportation of everything. Its legal power to do so has been questioned, and very properly so. It seems to me that if we are to grant such tremendous power, absolutely to shut off all exports from this country, it ought to be based upon some legislative principle which should be followed by the Board of Economic Warfare in making such prohibitions. The policy seems to me to be of such importance that I object to the consideration of the bill at this time under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if the Senator objects, I think we ought to put the Senate on notice that the present law expires on June 30. As the Senator from Ohio says, the law operates through Executive orders by the President. Through such Executive orders the powers have actually been expanded, and the Board of Economic Warfare is actually doing things which it was not assumed would be done in peacetime when the law went into effect. However, we are now at war; and if the present law is permitted to expire on June 30, we may find ourselves in great difficulty with respect to the exportation of materials which should not be exported at the present time.

Mr. TAFT. I shall have no objection to consideration of the bill on Thursday, if the Senator wishes to take it up at that time; but I should like to have an opportunity to examine it a little more thoroughly before it is actually debated on the floor of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR CUSTODIAL EMPLOYEES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BOARD OF EDUCATION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6899) to exempt custodial employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education from the operation of the provisions of section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act approved May 10, 1916, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with amendments, on page 1, line 9, after the name "Columbia" to strike out the words "by reason of any provision, decision, or construction of said section, or acts amendatory thereto"; on page 2, line 9, after the word "schools", to strike out "and for nonrecreational purposes"; and in line 14, after the word "compensation", to insert "at a rate not in excess of the rate of pay received as an employee of the Board of Education."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2412) to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of civilians, and for the prevention and relief of civilian distress arising out of the present war, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. PEPPER. Let the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

LEANNA M. STRIGHT

The bill (H. R. 6598) for the relief of Leanna M. Stright, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALEX GAMBLE

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6410) for the relief of Alex Gamble, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$4,000", and insert "$2,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

PERCY RAY GREER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2363) for the relief of Percy Ray Greer, a minor, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,000", and insert "$500", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $500 to the lawful guardian of Percy Ray Greer, a minor, of Rayville, La., in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by the said Percy Ray Greer on July 19, 1941, as the result of an accident involving a United States Army command car in which he was riding as a passenger: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MINNIE C. SANDERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2461) for the relief of Minnie C. Sanders, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000", and insert "$1,500", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Minnie C. Sanders, of the township of Union, Union County, N. J., the sum of $1,500, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by her when she was struck by a Government motorcycle on the West Point Military

Reservation, West Point, N. Y., on June 3, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES E. SAVAGE

The bill (H. R. 5526) for the relief of James E. Savage, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JEFF ROBERTS

The bill (H. R. 6349) for the relief of Jeff Roberts, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDWARD P. REILLY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6077) for the relief of Edward P. Reilly, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$1,500", and insert "$1,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

ALICE W. MILLER

The bill (H. R. 3352) for the relief of Alice W. Miller was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

A. H. LARZELERE

The bill (H. R. 5938) for the relief of A. H. Larzelere was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VERNON VAN ZANDT

The bill (S. 2551) for the relief of Vernon Van Zandt was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the status of Vernon Van Zandt, doctor of medicine, 947 West Eighth Street, Los Angeles, Calif., as a United States medical officer, the payments made to him as fees for medical treatment furnished by him during the period from July 16, 1934, to May 1, 1937, inclusive, to employees of the Government entitled to medical care and treatment under the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, as amended, be, and the same are hereby, validated.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to Dr. Vernon Van Zandt, out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, a sum equal to the total amount refunded by him on account of the payments validated by section 1 hereof.

CHAN TSORK-YING

The bill (H. R. 2419) for the relief of Chan Tsork-ying was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANNIE BROWN

The bill (H. R. 1349) for the relief of Annie Brown was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

G. H. CONDON AND OTHERS

The bill (H. R. 5610) for the relief of G. H. Condon, M. E. Cannon, W. J. Esterle, C. C. Gasaway, James F. Retallack, and L. G. Yinger was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MR. AND MRS. E. P. BALL

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6184) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. E. P. Ball, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,590.59", and insert "$2,590.59."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CLAIM OF CHARLES E. SALMONS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2195) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Charles E. Salmons, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the figures "1941", to insert a colon and the words *"Provided*, That the judgment, if any, shall not exceed $5,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Charles E. Salmons, of Sedalia, Mo., against the United States for compensation for the death of his wife, Nadine Salmons, as a result of a collision between the automobile in which she was riding as a passenger and a United States Army Air Corps tractor on Highway No. 50, near Tipton, Mo., on August 10, 1941: *Provided*, That the judgment, if any, shall not exceed $5,000.

SEC. 2. In the determination of such claim, the United States shall be held liable for damages, and for any acts committed by any of its officers or employees, to the same extent as if the United States were a private person.

SEC. 3. Suit upon such claim may be instituted at any time within 1 year after the enactment of this act, notwithstanding the lapse of time or any statute of limitations. Proceedings for the determination of such claim, and appeals from and payment of any judgment thereon, shall be in the same manner as in the case of claims over which such court has jurisdiction under the provisions of paragraph "Twentieth" of section 23 of the Judicial Code, as amended.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STANDARD DESIGN FOR A SERVICE FLAG

The bill (S. 2442) to authorize the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, there are three bills relating to the same subject matter, Calendar Nos. 1513, 1514, and 1515. I should like to have the bills go over unless they are explained at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] reported Calendar No. 1513, Senate bill 2442.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, Calendar Nos. 1514 and 1515, Senate bill 481 and House Joint Resolution 303, provide merely for codification of the existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States. No penalty is provided in either measure. Calendar No. 1514, Senate bill 481, is sponsored by the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY]. That bill is identical with House Joint Resolution 303. I move that the Senate proceed to consider House Joint Resolution 303, and, if the joint resolution shall be passed, I shall then move that Senate bill 481 be indefinitely postponed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Calendar No. 1513 should be first disposed of.

Mr. McFARLAND. Calendar No. 1513 is not the same as Calendar Nos. 1514 and 1515.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In pursuance of the regular order, Calendar No. 1513 should be first disposed of.

Mr. McFARLAND. I beg the Chair's pardon; I thought we had reached Calendar No. 1514.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to speak on Calendar No. 1513, Senate bill 2442. The bill was introduced by me at the request of the American Legion. It is simply a bill to authorize the Secretary of War to adopt a standard service flag to be displayed, under regulations to be prescribed by him, by the immediate relatives of men in the service.

I shall state the purpose of the bill. There have been a number of different designs for a service flag by various service organizations, and also some private designs, some of which, I understand, have been patented, with the result that there is no standardization and no official emblem which the immediate relatives of men in the service are entitled to display. It is believed that it would be very desirable to permit the Secretary of War to adopt a standard, no matter what it may be, which will then become the recognized emblem for such service flag display, and which then may only be manufactured under license from the War Department, with the idea of eliminating the profit element. I believe that there can be no possible objection to it. The committee also adopted an amendment authorizing the Secretary of War to authorize and adopt a lapel button to be worn by immediate relatives of men in the service. I do not think there can be any possible objection to it, because it simply is in the interest of standardization and authorization.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2442) to authorize the Secretary of War to

approve a standard design for a service flag, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to approve a design for a service flag, which flag may be displayed in a window of the place of residence of persons who are members of the immediate family of a person serving in the armed forces of the United States during the current war.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is also authorized and directed to approve a design for a service lapel button, which button may be worn by members of the immediate family of a person serving in the armed forces of the United States during the current war.

SEC. 3. Upon the approval by the Secretary of War of the design for such service flag and service lapel button, he shall cause notice thereof, together with a description of the approved flag and button, to be published in the Federal Register. Thereafter any person may apply to the Secretary of War for a license to manufacture and sell the approved service flag, or the approved service lapel button, or both. Any person, firm, or corporation who manufactures any such service flag or service lapel button without having first obtained such a license, or otherwise violates this act, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of War is authorized to make such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and a service lapel button."

CODIFICATION OF RULES AND CUSTOMS PERTAINING TO DISPLAY OF THE AMERICAN FLAG

The bill (S. 481) to regulate and codify existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and usage of the flag of the United States of America, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr President, I ask unanimous consent that House joint resolution 303, Calendar No. 1515, be substituted for Senate bill 481, and be now considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 303) to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the House joint resolution does not provide any penalty for the misuse of the flag, but simply prescribes what shall be the proper use of the flag, and codifies the rules governing the usage of the flag as they have been established by the Navy and the Army and various organizations in the past.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on the Judiciary was, on page 1, after line 9, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2 (a) It is the universal custom to display the flag only from sunrise to sunset on buildings and on stationary flagstaffs in the open. However, the flag may be displayed at night upon special occasions when it is desired to produce a patriotic effect.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "SEC. 2. (a)" and insert "(b)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the beginning of line, 7 to strike out "b" and insert "c."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, at the beginning of page 9, to strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 19, after the date "December 25" to insert "such other days as may be proclaimed by the President of the United States."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, at the beginning of line 23, to strike "(d)" and insert "(e)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, at the beginning of line 1, to strike out "(e)" and insert "(f)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was on the same page, at the beginning of line 3, to strike out "(f)" and insert "(g)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 3, page 5, paragraph (k), in line 14, after the word "auditorium", to strike out "whether" and insert "if"; in the same line, after the word "in", to strike out "or outside"; and in line 15, after the word "on", to strike out "or in front of a" and insert "the."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section and paragraph, on page 5, at the beginning of line 19, to insert "so displayed in the chancel or on the platform."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in the same section and paragraph, on page 5, line 21, after the word "audience", to insert "But when the flag is displayed from a staff in a church or public auditorium elsewhere than in the chancel or on the platform it shall be placed in the position of honor at the right of the congregation or audience as they face the chancel or platform. Any other flag so displayed should be placed on the left of the congregation or audience as they face the chancel or platform."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 7, to strike out:

SEC. 5. That during the ceremony of hoisting or lowering the flag or when the flag is passing in a parade or in a review, all persons present should face the flag, stand at attention, and salute. The salute to the flag in the moving columns should be rendered at the moment the flag passes.

And insert:

SEC. 5. That during the ceremony of hoisting or lowering the flag or when the flag is passing in a parade or in a review, all persons present should face the flag, stand at attention, and salute. Those present in uniform should render the right-hand salute. When not in uniform, men should remove the headdress with the right hand holding it at the left shoulder, the hand being over the heart. Men without hats merely stand at attention. Women should salute by placing the right hand over the heart. The salute to the flag in the moving column should be rendered at the moment the flag passes.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 8, after line 23, to insert:

SEC. 6. That when the national anthem is played and the flag is not displayed, all present should stand and face toward the music. Those in uniform should salute at the first note of the anthem, retaining this position until the last note. All others should stand at attention, men removing the headdress. When the flag is displayed, the salute to the flag should be given.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 7. That the pledge of allegiance to the flag, "I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all," be rendered by standing with the right hand over the heart; extending the right hand, palm upward, toward the flag at the words "to the flag" and holding this position until the end, when the hand drops to the side. However, civilians will always show full respect to the flag when the pledge is given by merely standing at attention, men removing the headdress. Persons in uniform shall render the military salute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 16, to insert:

SEC. 8. Any rule or custom pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States of America, set forth herein, may be altered, modified, or repealed, or additional rules with respect thereto may be prescribed, by the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, whenever he deems it to be appropriate or desirable; and any such alteration or additional rule shall be set forth in a proclamation.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 481 will be indefinitely postponed.

HARVEY C. ARTIS

The bill (H. R. 780) for the relief of Harvey C. Artis was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CATHERINE R. JOHNSON

The bill (H. R. 3402) for the relief of Catherine R. Johnson was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

A. MACK DODD AND HENRY DODD

The bill (H. R. 6597) for the relief of A. Mack Dodd and Henry Dodd was con-

sidered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

F. A. HOLMES

The bill (H. R. 6676) for the relief of F. A. Holmes, former United States disbursing clerk for the State of Illinois, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. CHARLES O. DEFORD

The bill (H. R. 3173) to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to Mrs. Charles O. DeFord was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act for the relief of Mrs. Charles O. DeFord."

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 2585) to provide that loans on the 1942 crop of corn, wheat, rice, cotton, tobacco, and peanuts shall be made at a rate equal to the parity price was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2500) relating to the assessment of tangible personal property in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. I ask that the bill go over unless it is explained.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

PAYMENT TO JANITORS AND CUSTODIANS FOR SERVICES TO LOCAL SELECTIVE-SERVICE BOARDS

The bill (S. 1622) to authorize payment to janitors and custodians of the public schools of the District of Columbia for services rendered for local boards of the Selective Service System was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," approved May 10, 1916, as amended, or any other provision of law, janitors and custodians employed in the public schools of the District of Columbia shall be entitled to be paid additional compensation, computed at the regular rate of compensation received by them, for any services rendered, outside their usual hours of employment at either day or night sessions of such schools, during the period from October 16, 1940, to January 31, 1941, for local boards of the Selective Service System located in various public-school buildings; and the appropriation for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System, contained in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, approved October 8, 1940, is hereby made available for such purpose.

MEMORIAL TO GEORGE EARLE CHAMBERLAIN IN GALLINGER HOSPITAL

The bill (S. 2316) to provide for the placing in Gallinger Hospital of a memorial to George Earle Chamberlain was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to provide for the placing, with appropriate ceremonies, in Gallinger Hospital, Washington, D. C., of a bust of the late George Earle Chamberlain, formerly a Senator from the State of Oregon, or a suitable bronze plaque bearing his name and a proper inscription, as a memorial to his efforts and achievements on behalf of Gallinger Hospital.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

METROPOLITAN POLICE FORCE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 2502) relating to the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all persons appointed to the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia as privates after the effective date of this act shall serve a probationary period of 3 years: *Provided*, That the annual increases in salary provided for by the act entitled "An act to fix the salaries of officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force and the Fire Department of the District of Columbia," approved July 1, 1930, shall not be affected.

SEC. 2. There shall be a Board in the Metropolitan Police Department to be known as the Metropolitan Police Probationers Board, and it shall consist of three officers of the Metropolitan Police force of the rank of captain or higher, who shall be designated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia from time to time for service on said Board.

If any commanding officer has cause to believe that any probationer under his command is inefficient, or that he has been guilty of misconduct, or that his services are not satisfactory, such commanding officer shall forward a full written report respecting such inefficiency, misconduct, or unsatisfactory services to the major and superintendent of police. The major and superintendent of police shall thereupon forward said report to the Metropolitan Police Probationers Board, which shall consider the case carefully, then return the report, with its own report and recommendation, to the major and superintendent of police. The major and superintendent of police shall then forward all papers in the case, together with his recommendation, to the Commissioners for final action as to whether or not the probationer shall be dismissed. If the Commissioners shall be of opinion, in view of all the circumstances of the case, that the probationer should not be retained in the service, they shall forthwith order him dismissed from the force.

The Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall have power to adopt such regulations as they may deem advisable relating to the making and forwarding of reports concerning the inefficiency, misconduct, or unsatisfactory services of probationers and governing procedure before the Metropolitan Police Probationers Board.

SEC. 3. From and after the effective date of this act the privates of the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia shall be classified as follows: Privates, class 1, and privates, class 2. Class 1 shall comprise all privates who are serving or who shall hereafter be serving their probationary period. Class 2 shall comprise all privates who have served 3 years or more on the force. Upon the approval of this act all privates classified under existing law as privates, classes 2 and 3, shall be classified as privates, class 2: *Provided, however*, That those privates who are serving their probationary period on the date of the approval of this act shall continue to serve the probationary period prescribed by law when they were appointed to the force, and upon the completion of such period shall be placed in class 2: *Provided further*, That hereafter, in order that the full complement of the Metropolitan Police force may at all times be maintained, as authorized by law, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized, when vacancies occur in class 2 of said Metropolitan Police force which cannot be filled by promotion, to appoint privates in class 1 equal in number to the positions vacated in said class 2; and the respective salaries specifically provided for such vacant positions may be reduced to pay the salaries of the privates so appointed in class 1.

SEC. 4. There is hereby created in the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia the rank of corporal, at a salary of $2,600 per annum, to be filled by promotion from the rank of private, class 2, as provided for in section 3 hereof, in such numbers as the Commissioners may deem necessary within the appropriations made by Congress. Promotion to the rank of corporal, and from that rank to the rank of sergeant, shall be made in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States," approved January 16, 1883, as amended, and such regulations as to examination, qualifications, and length of service on the force as the United States Civil Service Commission may approve.

SEC. 5. All acts and parts of acts inconsistent with the provisions of this act are hereby repealed.

SEC. 6. This act shall become effective upon its approval by the President.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 6386) to provide for an adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, etc., was announced as next in order.

Mr. BURTON. I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

JOSEPH SHARFSIN

The bill (H. R. 6925) to provide additional compensation for Joseph Sharfsin, Esq., for professional services rendered the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AMENDMENT OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA INCOME TAX ACT

The bill (H. R. 6953) to amend the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, and for other purposes, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. BURTON subsequently said: Mr. President, a few moments ago the Senate passed House bill 6953 to amend the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, and for other purposes. It is a clarifying act, and I think it will be helpful if I may have unanimous consent to place in the RECORD immediately

following the passage of the bill a copy of the report of the Senate committee and also a copy of a letter from the Corporation Counsel addressed to me under date of June 11, 1942, explaining the reasons for the clarification.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report and letter are as follows:

(Report No 1480)

The Committee on the District of Columbia, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 6953) amending the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon, without amendment, and recommend that the bill do pass.

The District of Columbia Income Tax Act levies a tax upon the income from District of Columbia sources of domestic and foreign corporations and requires every corporation engaged in business or commercial activity in the District to obtain a license so to do. It is the purpose of this proposed amendment to exempt from the tax income from the sale of personal property where orders therefor require acceptance without the District before becoming binding on the purchaser and seller and title to such property passes from the seller to the purchaser without the District, and to exempt from the licensing provisions of the act corporations which merely obtain orders for the sale of personal property by telephone, mail, or personal solicitation by salesmen in the District where such orders require acceptance without the District and title passes without the District.

The bill also provides that income from the sale of personal property to the United States is not from District sources, unless the taxpayer is engaged in business in the District and such property is delivered for use within the District.

The passage of the bill is recommended by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

A letter explaining the provisions of this measure and purposes sought to be achieved thereby are contained in a letter signed by the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia, dated April 21, 1942, and submitted herewith for the information of the Senate.

APRIL 21, 1942.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Pursuant to your telephone request of this afternoon asking that I advise you as to the effect of the bill substituted for H. R. 6871 (H. R. 6953) please be advised as follows:

This measure, to the best of my information, will result in a loss of revenue to the District of Columbia of approximately $185,000 per annum, plus an unknown additional figure.

Under the terms of the bill, a foreign corporation which has a representative in the District of Columbia soliciting orders, the acceptance thereof being out of the District and title to such property passing from the purchaser to the seller without said District, would not be subject to the District of Columbia tax. Furthermore, the District would obtain no tax from the sale of personal property to the United States unless the seller is engaged in business in the District of Columbia and the property sold to the United States is delivered for use in said District.

The practical effect, so far as sales to the United States Government are concerned, is that foreign corporations not engaged in business in the District of Columbia would pay no tax, and even those engaged in business in the District of Columbia would only pay a tax upon the income from sales of such property for use in the District.

Foreign corporations which merely obtain orders for the sale of personal property from persons in the District by telephone, mail, or personal solicitation (which orders are accepted without the District) would not be subject to the tax unless delivery is made into the District in some manner whereby title to the goods passes in the District. Generally title would pass in the District in cases where delivery is made into the District in the delivery equipment of the seller, or c. o. d., or draft with bill of lading attached. In substantially all cases where sales are made by corporations not engaged in business in the District the parties can arrange for delivery in a manner whereby title will pass without the District, thus relieving the seller of the District income tax.

Very truly yours,

RICHMOND B. KEECH,
Corporation Counsel,
District of Columbia.

CORPORATION COUNSEL,
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, June 11, 1942.

Hon. HAROLD H. BURTON,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Reference is made to our telephone conversation of this date regarding the estimated loss in revenue which the District will suffer from enactment of the provisions of H. R. 6953, amending the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, and the purpose of section 5 thereof authorizing the Assessor to compromise inheritance taxes in double domicile cases.

Section 2 (b) of the District of Columbia Income Tax Act levies a tax upon the income from District of Columbia sources of every corporation. This office has construed the law to tax income of foreign corporations derived from the sale of tangible personal property to buyers in the District in cases where such sales were the result of personal solicitation in the District. Public Law No. 428 was approved on February 2, 1942. This act amended the District of Columbia Income Tax Act by adding thereto several new sections, one of which requires every corporation engaged in any business or receiving income from District sources to obtain a license so to do, and further provides for the revocation of such licenses for failure to pay an income tax to the District and for prosecution of persons engaged in business or commercial activity on behalf of corporations not having a license so to do.

After enactment of Public No. 428, numerous complaints were received by Members of Congress from representatives of corporations required to obtain licenses thereunder. Hearings were held by the House District Committee, and the first four sections of H. R. 6953 were prepared at the request of the committee.

For the tax year 1940, corporations having no District address paid income taxes in the approximate amount of $185,000. It is my understanding that substantially all of these receipts represented income from sales solicited in the District, in which cases the orders were accepted and title to the goods passed without the District. Thus, substantially all of such revenues will be lost under the provisions of H. R. 6953. In addition thereto, it appears that many corporations subject to the tax under the District's interpretation of the law have not filed returns nor paid any tax. We have no way of estimating the number of such corporations nor the amount of revenue lost as the result of their exemption from the provisions of the act. While the Commissioners are opposed to the exemption of foreign corporations from the tax and the consequent reduction in District revenues, it is thought that enactment of H. R. 6953 will accomplish the purposes desired by the interested parties with the least possible disruption of the other provisions of the District of Columbia Income Tax Act.

Section 5 of H. R. 6953 was added at the request of the Commissioners. In many cases where decedents have homes in two or more taxing jurisdictions it is difficult, if not impossible, to determine which of such homes was the principal domestic establishment or domicile of such decedent. In such cases each of the jurisdictions involved generally claims the right to assert inheritance and estate taxes upon the transfer of the entire estate on the grounds that the decedent was domiciled therein. In some cases, where several jurisdictions are involved, the taxes claimed exceed the value of the entire estate (see *Texas v. Florida, et al.*, 306 U. S. 398). Cases of conflicting domicile, where no compromise or settlement may be effected, generally result in lengthy and costly litigation, and it is not unusual that a decedent is held to be domiciled in two jurisdictions, in which event the estate is required to pay inheritance or estate taxes to each jurisdiction upon the transfer of the entire estate.

Proposals for solving the double domicile problem have been for some years the subject of study and controversy by the National Tax Association and various other groups of interested persons. The proposal that claims arising under cases of conflicting domicile be settled by compromise appears to be the most satisfactory one yet made and this solution already has been adopted by a number of the States and is receiving favorable consideration by others.

The Commissioners are authorized to compromise liability under the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, and it is their view that they also should be authorized to compromise inheritance and estate taxes in cases of conflicting claims of domicile.

Very truly yours,

RICHMOND B. KEECH,
Corporation Counsel, District of Columbia.

COTTON ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS

The bill (S. 2545) to promote the war effort by facilitating the planting of the full allotted acreage of cotton as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture as the Nation's war goal was announced as next in order.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think properly the purpose of the bill should be disclosed to the Senate.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill is to allow a cotton farmer to lend any part of his cotton allotment to some other farmer without prejudicing his allotment for the next year. Specifically, it would apply in the Southwest, for instance, where the green bugs ate up all the wheat crop, but there is still time, though not much left, for the farmers affected to plant some cotton, so that the year's crop will not be a total loss to them.

The purpose of the bill is simply to make it possible for the Agricultural Department to distribute the unused cotton allotment to other farmers. It would not increase the total cotton allotment but would simply allow the use by other farmers of the allotments which have not been used by the farmers to whom they have been given.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (h) of section 344 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is hereby amended as follows:

After the word "apportionment" in first proviso add the words "of either original allottee or transferee."

At the end of the first proviso of this subsection, after the word "years", strike out the semicolon, add a comma and the words "and parity and soil-conservation payments shall remain with the original allottee in the same manner as though no portion of allotment had been temporarily transferred." At the end of this subsection, as amended, strike out the period, add a colon and the words "*Provided further*, That this maximum of 40 percent of the acreage on such farms shall not apply to such acres as may be temporarily reallocated to such farm by the county committee, as provided in this subsection."

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION ACT

The bill (H. R. 5870) to amend section 21 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917, was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COOPERATION BETWEEN THE BUREAU OF RECLAMATION AND FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

The bill (S. 2322) to remove the time limit for cooperation between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Farm Security Administration in the development of farm units on public lands under Federal reclamation projects was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of August 7, 1939 (Public, No. 307, 76th Cong., 1st sess.), as amended by the act of June 17, 1940 (Public, No. 636, 76th Cong., 3d sess.), and as amended by the act of May 28, 1941 (Public, No. 77, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), is hereby further amended by striking out "during the fiscal year 1942."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. This completes the calendar.

PREVENTION OF PERNICIOUS POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether there is any probability that next Thursday we can take up for consideration Order of Business 1389, Senate bill 2471, providing for amendment of the Hatch Act. The bill has been reported from the Committee on Privileges and Elections. I understand it is contemplated that the Senate will take an adjournment until Thursday. This is a bill in which the teachers of the country, through the National Education Association and the American Association of University Professors, are very much interested. It has been on the calendar for some time. The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] has discussed it with me on two or three occasions. When the calendar has been called the bill has been passed over without action being taken, and I should like to have it taken up next Thursday, if it will not interfere with the legislative program.

Mr. BARKLEY. It had been expected that today the junior Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] would seek to obtain consideration of a bill on the calendar which was put over from last Monday until today, but, at the request of certain Senators who could not be present today, it was not taken up. It is my hope that we will take that bill up Thursday. I do not know how long will be required in its consideration, but so far as I am personally concerned, after the disposition of that bill I shall not object to the Senate considering the bill to which the Senator from Michigan refers.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Senator very much. I note that the junior Senator from Oregon has just entered the Chamber, and perhaps he has been informed that we are discussing Order of Business 1389, the proposed amendment to the Hatch Act.

Mr. HOLMAN. My attention was just called to the fact that the bill was under discussion.

Mr. BROWN. We hope to have it taken up Thursday, after the conclusion of the consideration of a bill which the junior Senator from Florida desires to have considered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEES TO REPORT, ETC.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the contemplated adjournment following today's session, committees be authorized to submit reports to the Senate on bills or resolutions ready for report, that the Vice President be authorized to sign bills or resolutions ready for signature, and that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, 13, 24, 32, 113, 114, and 115 to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. HOUSTON, Mr. STARNES, Mr. HENDRICKS, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, and 11 to the bill (H. R. 7182) making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes; that the House agreed to the amendments of the Senate No. 6 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House disagreed to the amendment of the Senate No. 7 to the bill.

The message further announced that the House further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 1 to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution; and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 2025. An act to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service;

S. 2285. An act to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank, of certain officers of the Navy;

S. 2427. An act to amend the Act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes;

S. 2496. An act to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7036. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the fifty-second annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Chattanooga, Tenn., June 23 to 26, inclusive, 1942; and

S. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution to extend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Commerce, submitted the following favorable reports of nominations:

Sundry officers for promotion in the Coast Guard; and

Several employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to be hydrographic and geodetic engineers with the rank of lieutenant commander in that Survey, from April 24, 1942.

THE COAST GUARD

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee on Commerce nominations of the cadets who will graduate next Friday morning at the United States Coast Guard Academy to be ensigns. In order that those who graduate may be commissioned ensigns Friday, it is necessary that their nominations be confirmed by the Senate. I understand the Senate is to adjourn until Thursday, and I ask unanimous consent that the norminations be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk proceeded to state sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be notified forthwith.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be immediately notified.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will proceed to state the nominations on the calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Reginald S. Kazanjian, of Rhode Island, to be consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles J. Pisar, of Wisconsin, to be consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the postmaster nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 17 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, June 18, 1942, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 15, 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Orray Taft, Jr., of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 8 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul of the United States of America.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

James Lawrence Fly, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1942 (reappointment).

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE A MAJOR GENERAL

Lt. Gen. Delos Carleton Emmons (colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Maj. Gen. Adna R. Chaffee, deceased.

TO BE A BRIGADIER GENERAL

Lt. Gen. Delos Carleton Emmons (colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States, vice Brig. Gen. William Bryden appointed major general, Regular Army.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE A LIEUTENANT GENERAL

Maj. Gen. Joseph Taggart McNarney (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Ralph Royce (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Willis Henry Hale (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Edwin Sanders Perrin (captain, Air Corps; temporary major, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Ennis Clement Whitehead (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Kenneth Newton Walker (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States—Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Carl William Connell (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Albert Lee Sneed, Air Corps.

Col. Nathan Farragut Twining (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Army of the United States—Air Corps), Army of the United States.

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

Capt. Daniel J. Callaghan to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 28th day of May 1942.

Commander Gail Morgan to be a captain in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

The following-named lieutenant commanders to be commanders in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Alvin I. Malstrom
Geoffrey E. Sage

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942:

Loring O. Shook	William E. Howard, Jr.
Elmer O. Davis	Raymond O. Burzynski
Howard W. Taylor	Ralph K. James
Thurston B. Clark	John Quinn
Charles R. Watts	Harry E. Sears
James B. Lee	Harlow J. Carpenter

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Norman D. Gage, December 24, 1941.
Byron H. Nowell, January 1, 1942.
Elbert M. Stever, January 1, 1942.
David H. McClintock, January 1, 1942.
Walter F. Henry, January 1, 1942.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) Grant O. Hansen, United States Naval Reserve, to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of July 1941.

Lt. (Jr. Gr.) William J. Bush to be a lieutenant (junior grade) in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of June 1942, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

The following-named assistant surgeons of the United States Naval Reserve, to be assistant surgeons in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

William A. Reishtein, March 20, 1941.
Hubert M. Poteat, Jr., July 7, 1941.

Asst. Surg. Richard C. Morrison to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 5th day of May 1942, to correct the date of rank as previously nominated and confirmed.

Acting Asst. Surg. Henry J. Caes to be an assistant surgeon in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant (junior grade), to rank from the 2d day of June 1942.

Assistant Paymaster Charles L. Harris, Jr., to be passed assistant paymaster in the Navy, with the rank of lieutenant, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

The following-named assistant paymasters of the United States Naval Reserve, to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, with the rank of ensign, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Harmon S. Tolbert, May 30, 1940.
Marion V. Fowler, November 18, 1941.
Stanford F. Zimet, November 18, 1941.
Daniel G. Cone, November 18, 1941.

Capt. Theodore S. Wilkinson to be a rear admiral in the Navy, to rank from the 21st day of April 1942.

Lt. Comdr. Milo R. Williams to be a commander in the Navy, to rank from the 1st day of January 1942.

The following-named lieutenants (junior grade) to be lieutenants in the Navy, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

James E. Johnson, July 1, 1941.
Kenneth West, December 1, 1941.
Hubert B. Harden, January 1, 1942.
Frank L. Barrows, January 1, 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 15, 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

Reginald S. Kazanjian to be a consul of the United States of America.

Charles J. Pisar to be a consul general of the United States of America.

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE ENSIGNS IN THE COAST GUARD TO RANK FROM THE 19TH DAY OF JUNE 1942

Arthur Arnold Atkinson, Jr.
Harvey Niell Joseph Moore Aviles
Roger Hicks Banner
George Thomason Beemer
George Franklin Breitwieser, Jr.
Fletcher Webster Brown, Jr.
Ernest Hill Burt, Jr.
Joseph Lawrence Butt
Peter Joseph Butvidas
Leroy Allen Cheney
James William Christman
Robert Johnson Clark
Robert Paul Cunningham
Ward Jackson Davies, Jr.
Opie Lloyd Dawson
John Everard Day
Charles Dorian
Robert Eugene Emerson
George Clayton Fleming
Hersey Cecil Forehand, Jr.
Sherman Kendall Frick
Richard Lindley Fuller
Frederick August Goettel
Harry Eugene Haff, Jr.
Eugene Lewis Hall
John Locke Haney
Roderick Lynn Harris
Albert Aal Heckman
Harold Thompson Hendrickson
Wells Frederick Impson
Gerhard Karl Kelz
George Hiram Lawrence

Urial Herbert Leach, Jr.
Bainbridge Bradley Leland
James David Luse
Hugh Ferrel Lusk
Donald Harry Luzius
Clinton Earl McAuliffe
Marcus Harper McGarity
James Walter McGary
James Walter Moreau
William Clement Morrill
Frederick Clarke Munchmeyer
Charles Edward Norton
Theodore Somerville Pattison, Jr.
Curtis Roderick Peck
Julian Robert Raper, Jr.
Jerry Koller Rea
Stanley Herbert Rice
Francis Xavier Riley
Billy Richard Ryan
Charles William Scharff
Edward Donald Scheiderer
Frank Close Schmitz
Charles Martin Shepard 3d
Stanton Duane Smith
John Wallace Sutherland
William Perley Thoman
Lewis Walter Tibbits, Jr.
Louis Aelred Volse
Douglas Davis Vosler
John Mayo Waters, Jr.
Kenneth Eugene Webb
Richard Herbert Welton
Kenneth Evans Wilson
David William Woods
Walter Alden Wright
George Jacob Yost
Richard William Young
Charles Zelinski

POSTMASTERS

CALIFORNIA

Joseph V. Gaffey, Burlingame.
Thomas G. Boothroyd, Central Valley.
Lillian L. Throne, Palos Verdes Estates.
William H. McCarthy, San Francisco.
Elmer R. Winchell, Susanville.

KANSAS

George O. Hunt, Belle Plaine.
William E. Gallanaugh, Gardner.
Samuel N. Nunemaker, Hesston.
George E. Smysor, Mulvane.
Amos A. Belsley, Wellington.

LOUISIANA

Ralph N. Menetre, Covington.
Ernest S. Jemison, Slidell.

MONTANA

Margaret M. Westlund, Frazer.
Hugh H. Waldron, Froid.

OHIO

Frank J. McCauley, Marietta.
John Maurer, New Philadelphia.

PENNSYLVANIA

Orabel Rarick, Barnesville.
Daniel Warne Rankin, Dunbar.
Harry L. Verner, East Brady.
Leonard E. Devilbiss, Fawn Grove.
Joseph J. Myers, Irvine.
William Killion, Irvona.
Thomas R. Lawler, Jessup.
Howard E. Bixler, Manchester.
Frank H. Zinke, Jr., Monaca.
Lottie Tueche, New Eagle.
Robert H. Barber, Rydal.
Harry O. Shirey, Sheffield.
James M. Gates, South Fork.
Nellie M. Graham, Torrance.
Cora H. Stephens, White Mills.
Sadie L. Brunner, Worcester.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

TO BE REAR ADMIRALS

Frederick C. Sherman
Walden L. Ainsworth
Norman Scott
Howard H. Good
Mahlon S. Tisdale

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 15, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord and Master of us all, our help in ages past, abide with us in that silence behind which there is a sure and steadfast anchorage of the soul. We praise Thee for that truth which no depths can drown and which lifts us above the tyranny of these tragic times. Grant that from the springs of night there may well a holy light that shall penetrate the veneer of barbarism, making us aware that, however dark the shadows, they but conceal a brighter dawn. We thank Thee that Thy light is world-wide and world-deep and is the germinating power of the soul of humanity.

O Saviour, the Light of the world that never dims and the Life that never dies, Thou hast set us in the bonds of time; even the angels in their mission through the skies are not stayed in their flight. As the flames of human life are quivering on yonder battlefields, forgive us if feet are loitering and wills are faltering; we pray Thee to inspire us with hard, hard toil that does not die with evening time. As a world bent and bleeding stands out on either side of us, oh, lead captivity captive and pluck out of its heart the great mystery of the tragedy of human suffering. Bless and guide our President, our Speaker, and the Congress that the matchless glory of our democracy may be revealed. Glory be to Thee, O Lord Most High. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 11, 1942, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill, joint resolution, and concurrent resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 5204. An act authorizing the charging of fees for brand inspection under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended;

H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 for the training and education of defense workers; and

H. Con. Res. 67. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill entitled "Revenue revision of 1942."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 6355. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1940.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2427. An act to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes;

S. 2496. An act to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution to extend and amend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6071) entitled "An act to grant a preference right to certain oil and gas lessees," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. HATCH, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 7041) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. GLASS, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 7182) entitled "An act making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the Naval Service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6430) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate, Nos. 30 and 34, to the foregoing bill; further insists upon its amendments, Nos. 9, 11, 13, 24, 32, 113, 114, and 115 to the said bill disagreed to by the House, and asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and appoints Mr. GLASS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. GREEN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. NYE, and Mr.

WHITE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6709) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 2, 17, 18, 31, and 36 to the foregoing bill; that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 40, 44, and 79 to said bill; that the Senate further insists on its amendments Nos. 19, 21, 38, 40 to 48, inclusive, 79, 81, 83, 85, 86, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, 97, 101, and 102 to said bill, and that it ask a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon; and that Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. MCNARY be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2025) entitled "An act to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service."

MEMBERS-ELECT

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communications from the Clerk of the House, which were read:

JUNE 12, 1942.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. ELMER J. HOLLAND as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-seventh Congress, from the Thirty-third Congressional District of Pennsylvania, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Hon. JOSEPH A. MCARDLE, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

JUNE 10, 1942.

The honorable the SPEAKER,
House of Representatives.

SIR: The certificate of election in due form of law of Hon. THOMAS B. MILLER as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-seventh Congress, from the Twelfth Congressional District of Pennsylvania, to fill the vacancy caused by the resignation of Hon. J. HAROLD FLANNERY, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,
SOUTH TRIMBLE,
Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS

Mr. HOLLAND and Mr. MILLER appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

APPROPRIATION FOR WAR HOUSING AND WAR PUBLIC WORKS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 308, making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia, with Senate amendments thereto, and further insist on the disagreement of the House to amendment No. 1 and to agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object because I feel the House has gone into this situation thoroughly. We have found that there was need for dormitories for people who are to work in the Government departments. We have found that there is no need for these houses that the Senate has put on and that there is no justification for them. That is the reason that this bill has not become law. I feel that the Senate ought to yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Will the gentleman point out that it was shown in the hearings that private capital had agreed to build 40,000 family dwelling units for the defense program and the conferees felt that at least this program ought to be developed and used before the Government itself went into the building of family dwelling units? We did agree and are willing and have always been willing to give them the barracks which they need.

Mr. TABER. And to go just as far as necessary.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. And attention also might be called to the disproportionate cost of construction.

Mr. TABER. It is a terrible cost to go and build substantial family houses such as the Senate wanted, and I do not believe that the War Production Board would give them a priority for it if the money were provided.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We ought to go to conference, though, and see if we cannot work it out.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection, and the Speaker appointed the following conferees on the part of the House: Messrs. CANNON of Missouri, WOODRUM, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, JOHNSON of West Virginia, RABAUT, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the executive office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, further insist upon the disagreement of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, 13, 24, 32, 113, 114, and 115, and agree to the further conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there is included in the amendments in dispute an amendment dealing with the Civil Service Commission and the so-called Board of Legal Examiners. I hope the gentleman from Virginia can give the House some assurance that the conferees will not yield on that amendment without it being brought back for a further vote in the House.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would not like to give assurances of that kind. If the conferees reach a point where they think they ought to agree I think we ought to have a free conference. The gentleman knows how we have all felt about it and I think he can rest assured we will do what ought to be done.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield ?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that if the conferees are going to make any such agreement as that, we would want a similar agreement on the Tennessee Valley Authority amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We would like to have a free conference, if we could, I may say to the gentleman. I am sure we shall have no trouble.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. WOODRUM of Virginia; FITZPATRICK, HOUSTON, STARNES of Alabama, HENDRICKS, WIGGLESWORTH, DIRKSEN, and CASE of South Dakota.

SEVENTH SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7182) making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there are 11 Senate amendments to this bill. They add $75,000 to the amount provided by the House but otherwise are largely a matter of adjustment of phraseology. I move, therefore, that the House concur in all of the Senate amendments except amendments numbered 6 and 7, as to which I shall offer a separate motion when this motion is disposed of.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report all the Senate amendments except Nos. 6 and 7.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, after line 6, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Miscellaneous expenses, Navy, 1942: For the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes, or the classification laws, or section 5 of the act of April 6, 1914 (38 Stat. 335), $75,000, of which amount $65,000 shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred since January 28, 1942."

Page 3, line 5, strike out "1942."

Page 3, line 6, after "$15,000,000" insert ", to remain available until expended."

Page 3, line 22, strike out "1942."

Page 3, line 23, strike out "1942."

Page 5, line 8, after "vessels", insert ", subject to authorization thereof by other law."

Page 5, line 8, strike out all after "vessels" down to and including "thereof" in line 14.

Page 5, line 20, after "$1,190,000", insert ": *Provided*, That existing limitations with respect to the detail of personnel to officers' quarters and messes ashore shall not apply to the Coast Guard Academy, the Coast Guard Yard, the New London Base, Coast Guard and merchant marine officers' training stations, and in addition, not to exceed 95 in number at such stations as shall be designated by the Commandant of the Coast Guard with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy."

Page 5, line 21, after "$4,110,000" insert ": *Provided*, That existing limitations with respect to the furnishing of equipment for officers' messes ashore shall not apply to the Coast Guard Academy, the Coast Guard Yard, Coast Guard bases, and Coast Guard and merchant marine officers' training stations."

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report Senate amendments Nos 6 and 7.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 7, strike out "500,000".

Page 5, lines 7 and 8, strike out "tons of."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House agree to Senate amendment numbered 6 with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out insert "not to exceed 1,000,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House disagree to Senate amendment numbered 7.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr Speaker, these two amendments, Nos. 6 and 7, relate to the construction of auxiliary naval tonnage. As the bill originally passed the House and was transmitted to the Senate, provision was made for the use of funds and legislative authority to construct 500,000 tons. The Senate amended that by providing for the construction of an unlimited tonnage, subject to authorization of other law. We propose here to provide for the construction of not to exceed 1,000,000 tons, as may be authorized by other law, instead of an unlimited amount as the Senate proposes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The bill as it passed the House provided for 500,000 tons of construction, and, as we understood it, that was the amount of the authorization. The Senate added an unlimited amount of tonnage and permitted anything to be started that might be authorized during 1943. We felt that it ought to be limited, and we have brought this amendment back, which would bring it to 1,000,000 tons, which is all these people ought to start right now.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let me see if I understand this. The 500,000 tons is authorized. This amendment provides for 1,000,000 tons, but the money is made available for only 500,000 tons. Before they can go up to 1,000,000 tons there must be a further authorization of 500,000 tons.

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But there need be no further appropriation, because the appropriation is now being set up for 1,000,000 tons, provided the Committee on Naval Affairs and the House recommend an additional 500,000 tons.

Mr. TABER. That is correct. There would be no further construction permitted until after further authorizing legislation went through.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there is a House bill pending in the Senate authorizing the construction of 500,000 tons. It is our understanding that the Senate proposes to increase this authorization to 750,000 or 1,000,000 tons. The Navy Department has requested authorization up to 1,000,000 tons. For that reason, my motion provides that we agree to not to exceed 1,000,000 tons, or such part as the bill now in the Senate may finally authorize.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It simply means that the House will hereafter authorize an additional 500,000 tons before the money will become available for that 500,000 tons.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Upon the enactment of that authorization, this fund will become available.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman know whether or not the steel mills will be able to furnish this tonnage, and how soon?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They have never yet failed to supply all that was needed for the American Navy.

Mr. RICH. I am told that many shipyards now are waiting for plates for ships, and are unable to get them because the steel mills are unable to produce them.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. May I say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that this type of construction will not interfere with furnishing plates for other types of construction. There is no conflict between this 500,000 tons plus the authorization for the money for 1,000,000 tons with any other shipbuilding program.

Mr. RICH. Has it not been the fact that some of the shipbuilders have been waiting on steel?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. On certain types of ships, particularly battleships, there has been a slowing down on account of the heavy armor.

Mr. RICH. I may say to the chairman that if under the lease-lend we would stop shipping steel to operate those gold mines over in Africe and permit such steel to be made for the construction of battleships, we would probably get the steel we need.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman that the first step is legislation authorizing this construction and the second is making appropriations for the construction, and that is what we are attending to now to be governed by the final terms of the authorizing bill.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein an address I made over the radio on last Saturday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, further insist upon the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendments still in disagreement, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, there are one or two members of the Appropriations Committee that I do not see on the floor who would want to object to this request until they had a chance to be here. I wonder if the gentleman from Georgia would not withdraw his request at this time.

Mr. TARVER. I may say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that it is not the purpose of the conferees to have another conference until Thursday, which gives ample time for the other member of the conference committee to return to Washington if he desires to do so and participate in the conference. On account of the fact that only 15 days intervene between this date and the end of the present fiscal year and on account of the further fact that there are many important amendments still in disagreement, it seems to be urgent that we should not delay the conference beyond Thursday of this week.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the gentleman is not going to have a meeting until Thursday, there will be nothing lost by not pressing the motion at this time, and therefore I feel that until I have a chance to consult certain Members I shall have to object.

Mr. TARVER. I understand, I will say to the gentleman, that some Members, or one Member on the gentleman's side is impressed with the feeling that there should not be a further conference unless that Member is accorded the privilege of voting by proxy. Since there appears to be no reason why the Member in question should not attend the conference if he desires, we on this side, since it is a very unusual request, will not be able to concur in it. If the gentleman from Massachusetts objects, then our only recourse will be to ask the Rules Committee this afternoon for a rule sending the bill to conference, as it is extremely urgent that it should go to conference as soon as possible.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not care what procedure the gentleman follows, because that is his own lookout; but if the gentleman is not going to have a meeting until Thursday, I do not see any reason why the gentleman cannot make the same request tomorrow, when other members of the committee will be here.

Mr. TARVER. No; the other member to whom the gentleman refers will not be here tomorrow, and that will only delay sending the bill to conference, because if the gentleman maintains his attitude, a rule will have to be requested eventually, so why not now? If the gentleman desires to object, that is his privilege.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I object, Mr. Speaker.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS OF ENLISTED MEN OF THE ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD

Mr. MAY submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 2467) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of an Associated Press dispatch relating to the story of the sinking of the carrier *Lexington*.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I present a conference report and statement upon the bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

FIFTH LEND-LEASE REPORT (H. DOC. NO. 799)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, delivered to the Clerk of the House on June 12, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

This is the fifth 90-day report to the Congress on operations under the Lend-Lease Act.

For the 3 months ending May 31, 1942, lend-lease aid amounted to more than $1,900,000,000. For the 15-month period from March 1941 through May 1942 aid totaled $4,497,000,000 in goods and services. We are now making aid available at a monthly rate equivalent to $8,000,000,000 per year.

Dollar figures do not portray all that is happening. The Congress has wisely set few limits to the types of aid which may be and are being provided. Food—over 5,000,000,000 pounds—and medicine have helped to sustain the British and Russian and Chinese peoples in their gallant will to fight. Metals, machine tools, and other essentials have aided them to maintain and step up their production of munitions. The bombardment planes and the tanks which were ordered for them last spring and summer are now putting their mark on the enemy. The British pilots trained in this country have begun their work at Cologne and Essen.

And lend-lease is no longer one way. Those who have been receiving lend-lease aid in their hour of greatest need have taken the initiative in reciprocating. To the full extent of their ability, they are supplying us, on the same lend-lease basis, with many things we need now. American troops on Australian and British soil are being fed and housed and equipped in part out of Australian and British supplies and weapons. Our Allies have sent us special machine tools and equipment for our munitions factories. British antiaircraft guns help us to defend our vital bases, and British-developed detection devices assist us to spot enemy aircraft. We are sharing the blueprints and battle experience of the United Nations.

These things, invaluable as they have proven, are not the major benefit we will receive for our lend-lease aid. That benefit will be the defeat of the Axis. But the assistance we have been given by our partners in the common struggle is heartening evidence of the way in which the other United Nations are pooling their resources with our own. Each United Nation is contributing to the ultimate victory not merely its dollars, pounds, or rubles, but the full measure of its men, its weapons, and its productive capacity.

Our reservoir of resources is now approaching flood stage. The next step is for our military, industrial, and shipping experts to direct its full force against the centers of enemy power. Great Britain and the United States have together set up expert combined bodies to do the job, in close cooperation with Russia, China, and the other United Nations. They are equipping the United Nations to fight this world-wide war on a world-wide basis. They are taking combined action to carry our men and weapons—on anything that will float or fly—to the places from which we can launch our offensives.

By combined action now, we can preserve freedom and restore peace to our peoples. By combined action later we can fulfill the victory we have joined to attain. The concept of the United Nations will not perish on the battlefields of this terrible war. It will live to lay the basis of the enduring world understanding on which mankind depends to preserve its peace and its freedom.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 11, 1942.*

THE STARS AND STRIPES

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Speaker, last week was set aside as Flag Week to celebrate the one hundred and sixty-fifth anniversary of the official acceptance of the Stars and Stripes by the Congress.

Born of blood and tears, symbol of tolerance, justice, mercy, and a profound belief in the Eternal God, it is well, indeed, for us to reconsecrate ourselves from time to time to those ideals it represents.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ATTEMPT TO "PURGE" CONGRESS

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KNUTSON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

HIS MAJESTY, KING GEORGE II OF GREECE

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is in the city a distinguished king of a great people, His Majesty George II of Greece. I think it fitting and proper that the Members should have the privilege of meeting our distinguished guest. Therefore I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time, such recess to be subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, in receiving as our guest today King George of Greece, we not only honor him, but through him we honor the heroic people of brave Greece.

Greece occupies a foremost page in the history of man. The people of that brave country have contributed greatly to the constructive progress of mankind.

This generation has enhanced the great part their forbears have played in the known history of man.

This generation of Greeks has undergone trials and tribulations unknown to past generations. They have been tested as no generation of Greeks have; and many generations of the past in Greece

have had severe and trying periods of pain and suffering.

This generation, in its bravery, in its adherence to faith—love of God and love of country—in its devotion to the ideals and aspirations of Greece of today, have made sacrifices that command the attention, respect, and sympathy of all decent mankind. When the history of this period is written in its true light the heroism and the sacrifices of the brave people of Greece will occupy prominent pages. Greece and its people will receive proper and fitting recognition for the part played in defeating the vicious forces of world destruction—and in preserving for the future a world in which righteousness and decency will prevail.

Greece may be overrun by the pagan forces of nazi-ism, but Greece is not conquered or defeated.

The spirit of Greece still exists, and still fights on. It is only a few days ago that our distinguished guest, the brave King George of Greece, stated:

> My people not only were still fighting, but would continue to fight on to victory until a new world is established.

In a recent press conference the Prime Minister of Greece, Emmanual Tsouderos, who is accompanying King George, was asked, "Are the Greeks able to resist now?" "They have never stopped resisting," was his reply.

King George, in a recent statement, said:

> I am in your Capital to renew to your great President and to the American Government and people Greece's pledge to continue the battle—as long as the road to victory may be—until a new world is established where the desire for peace will be synonymous with the will to achieve peace and the determination to preserve peace.

That is the statement of a brave warrior and a great, sincere statesman.

The people of Greece—small, but brave Greece—are fighting for the preservation of their homes, their freedom, their independence, and at the same time for a future decent world in which to live.

They have the will to win and the determination and the courage to win.

These brave people, according to reports, are undergoing great suffering and distress as a result of the inhuman practices of the Nazi hordes. Food, clothing, medicine, and other necessities of life are needed to relieve the distressing situation that exists.

Our country should, and we all know it will, do everything within its power to relieve the distress that exists.

In any event, when victory comes to our cause, courageous Greece will occupy its place among the nations of the world as a free and independent nation, commanding the respect, assistance, and support of the United States of America. Our admiration, our friendship, and the debt of gratitude owed to Greece will not be forgotten when victory comes to our cause.

We are honored in having as our guest today this great leader of a brave people who do not know the meaning of the word "defeat." He represents the sovereignty of his people, their righteous cause, their bravery, their sacrifices, their hopes and aspirations—the restoration in the future of their complete and untrammeled freedom and independence.

In receiving him as our guest we honor him as a man. We also honor him as the representative of a brave government and a courageous people.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. The House will now stand in recess, and the Chair appoints as a committee to escort our distinguished guest to the Chamber, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS].

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess.

The committee appointed by the Chair escorted King George to the Chamber, and he took his place on the rostrum at the side of the Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Members of the House of Representatives, we regret the circumstances that brought our distinguished guest to this country, and that he is not today in the great land of Greece, there administering to his flock. The head of a great nation and a proud people, it is my pleasure, it is my high privilege, it is my distinguished honor to present to you His Majesty, George II, King of Greece.

His Majesty King George addressed the House as follows:

Mr. Speaker and Members of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, I am proud to be in your midst and to bring you the greetings of fighting Greece.

By your side, by the side of Great Britain and of the other United Nations of free men, I continue and shall continue, no matter what the hardships, whatever the cost, the struggle for the liberation of Greece, a nation which over a span of 5,000 years survived vicissitudes and force, and which today is much less disposed than ever to surrender its great heritage of civilization and languish a prisoner to the powers of darkness and of evil.

When we took up arms first against the Italians and then against the Germans, we knew very well what misfortunes awaited our country and how difficult it was for our friends immediately to come to our assistance. France then lay prostrate and most of the smaller nations of Europe, one after the other, had bowed to the might of the invader, but no Greek doubted for an instant where his honor lay. With the help of God and knowing that every Greek was ready and willing to die in defense of his freedom and his honor, I assumed the responsibility to history and to the Greek people to lead them forward in the full performance of their duty. At one of the most critical crossroads of human history, when the fate of civilization hung in the balance, Greece proved by its stand that no price was too high to pay for human freedom and international decency.

Fortunately the sacrifices of my country were not in vain. Due to the resistance of the Greek people in continental Greece and in Crete, 7 precious months were gained at a most crucial stage of the war, and the plans of the invader went awry. The Greek victories in Albania shattered irretrievably Italy's prestige and our resistance to Germany saved precious time for other fronts.

In this struggle Greece is proud to find itself a second time within a quarter of a century by the side of the powerful and generous American democracy. In the United States my country always has found support and sympathetic understanding. The valuable aid which you have given us during this war will never be forgotten. The initiative which you took along with Great Britain, to bring relief to the starving people of Greece, is a tribute to your civilization, which is characterized by a Christian spirit of helpfulness. I thank you from the bottom of my heart.

I know that the people of the United States by long and arduous effort have earned the right to be and are a living example of the best in contemporary civilization and that they are inspired by those nobler feelings and ideals which distinguish civilized man from the barbarian. Your prosperous democracy by long and persistent application has utilized for the benefit of the working masses the numerous technological means which human intellect today contributes to civilization and has given us tangible proof of fairness and of justice.

You have not employed the power of your great country to attack weaker nations. You have given an example of self-restraint, shown how a most powerful country can impose justice upon itself first so that it may rightly exact it of others. The great ideals with which the United States today inspires the peoples of the world will contribute not only to the happier conclusion of the current war but will provide the foundations of the happier and more harmonious life after the war which humanity expects.

Decency and justice must govern relations between people in the post-war world which must not be left a prey to vandalism a further time. In order to achieve this result the machinery of international cooperation must be strengthened so as to utilize in order under law the tremendous resources of peace-loving peoples. The economic life of the nations must be reorganized in a manner which shall secure to all the well-being to which the plain men and women of the world are entitled. Above all else it is vital that those who have fought the battle of right be secured against invasion, and the wrongdoers—including those who either for ulterior motives or simply because of weakness permitted themselves to become tools of the Axis—be impressed that predatory policies do not pay. The preservation of freedom is not the obligation of any single people in any one part of the world; it is an obligation of all peace-loving peoples throughout the world. This simple truth is the base rock of international understanding and the cornerstone for cooperation between freemen in the world to come.

Greece with its limited resources is wholeheartedly at the service of these ideals. Today when more than ever victory is clearly discernible on the flaming horizon, she is determined to contribute whatever she can toward that victory. Knowing the boundless resources which the American people are placing in motion for the common effort, I feel duty bound to speak with great modesty of my country's contribution to the same cause. However small that contribution may appear to be in contrast with what you are doing, it is everything we have. With all our free fighting men who have survived, with all our ships which have not been sunk, we will fight on land, we will fight on sea, and we will fight in the air, to the very end, by your side and by the side of the other United Nations, until barbaric violence is put down and a new world is established—a world for freemen, not for slaves.

At the conclusion of the address King George was escorted to the Well of the House where he received the Members.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order at 1 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings during the recess of the House will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION OF WAR PROGRAM

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. THOMASON addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. MAHON, from the Committee on Appropriations, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the Government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for printing in the RECORD.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a very excellent address delivered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] in the rotunda of the Capitol on Flag Day.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PADDOCK] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BLACK-OUT CURTAINS FOR THE HOUSE OFFICE BUILDINGS

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, Defense Coordinator John Russell Young has announced that there will be an all-night black-out test on Wednesday next. The headlines of the paper say that willful violators of the black-out will face penalties. I think that is a fine idea and I am for it, but I call attention of the Members of the fact that despite previous black-out trials we have had no arrangements made as yet for providing black-out curtains for the House Office Buildings.

The Senate Office Building has had these black-out curtains for a considerable period of time, and it seems to me the time has arrived when Members of the House should not be kept out of their offices on nights when black-out tests are scheduled because of failure to provide proper black-out protection. Many of us work in our offices at night and arrangements should be made so that we might have black-out curtains.

Furthermore, we are not trying to teach Members where to hunt for the electric-light switches nor how to walk in the dark, but we are trying to provide for decent conditions during black-outs and for the protection of the Capital City.

I trust that between now and Wednesday night black-out curtains will be provided for the House Office Buildings. Private citizens and offices are being threatened with penalties for noncompliance and I think the Government, itself, should be among the first to cooperate rather than among the last to comply.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(By unanimous consent, Mr. GUYER was granted permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a Flag Day address which I delivered in Washington on yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter on the oil situation as printed in the Springfield (Mass.) Union.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short article entitled "A Tribute to Our Flag."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PARLIAMENTARY LEGISLATIVE BODIES

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, most worthwhile things in life, while being enjoyed and appreciated, generally, have been taken for granted. So it has been with democracy. The most of us, while enjoying and appreciating the benefits of democracy, have been taking them for granted.

We, as legislators, as parliamentarians in a democracy, have the responsibility for making democracy work and for making democracy secure.

During the past 20 years we have seen the slow, but steady fade-away of parliamentary bodies. Parliamentary or legislative bodies, as such, no longer exist in a large portion of the world—we are the largest and most important parliamentary legislative body still alive.

The main reason for the disappearance of parliamentary, legislative bodies has been their failure to solve the economic and social problems of their peoples.

Perhaps, if we, if Congress, if our parliamentary, legislative body does not use its powers to solve the social and economic problems of our people, this body, as parliamentary bodies elsewhere, also may disappear.

We still have an opportunity to prove ourselves worth while and it is imperative that we do so. Let us unite to bring H. R. 1036 on the floor for discussion to settle some of our current problems and to prepare for the peace to come.

I, therefore, want to urge you who have not yet signed discharge petition No. 7, to sign now, to bring H. R. 1036 on the floor for action on old-age pensions now.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a poem by T. J. Kilmuth.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter by the president of Loyola University of New Orleans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RIVERS AND HARBORS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rivers and Harbors may sit today during the session of the House and during the remainder of the week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

OLD-AGE PENSION ANNUITY AND INSURANCE SYSTEM

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SMITH of Washington addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an address I made in my home district.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to ex-

tend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD on two topics, in one to include a resolution of the Independent Petroleum Consumers Association supporting a bill I introduced, and in the other to include an address made by me before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit two requests: I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow afternoon after the disposition of the business on the Speaker's table and other special orders I may address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. GREEN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter written by myself.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two subjects and to include therein certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made by Hon. Joseph B. Eastman, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, on the 9th of this month at Cleveland, Ohio. With his usual clarity and ability Mr. Eastman discusses our important current transportation problems.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address made by Dean Acheson of the State Department.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE CONSENT CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is consent day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the calendar.

PUYALLUP TRIBE OF INDIANS, WASHINGTON; TO AUTHORIZE CORRECTIONS IN TRIBAL ROLL

The Clerk called the first bill on the Consent Calendar, H. R. 4578, to authorize certain corrections in the tribal membership roll of the Puyallup Tribe of Indians in the State of Washington, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BLAND). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill has been passed over on several occasions. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE], is on the floor. I believe it would be well for him to make a statement concerning this legislation.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this bill has been pending before the House for many months and was commented upon by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] to the effect that the Department of the Interior had written in its report to the House Committee on Indian Affairs certain seeming objections. I took this up with the Secretary of the Interior. After several conferences I succeeded in securing from the Department of the Interior a report which said it was now satisfied that the points to which they directed attention in their letter to the committee had been worked out satisfactorily.

The bill merely provides a means by which certain funds now in the possession of the Government and belonging to the Puyallup Tribe of Indians can be distributed. It merely sets up the manner in which funds shall be distributed.

The objections of the Department have been straightened out and I can conceive of no tenable reason for anyone requesting that the bill hereafter go over. It is desired that the bill be enacted and the money paid out as soon as possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill was passed over without prejudice at the request of our colleague from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT]. He is unavoidably absent today. Therefore, out of courtesy to him, I ask unanimous consent that it go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

FRED B. WOODARD

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3759, to limit the operation of sections 109 and 113 of the Criminal Code, and section 190 of the Revised Statutes of the United States with respect to certain counsel.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

PHILIPPINE ARMY PAY BILL

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2387, to equalize the rates of pay of all personnel in the United States Army, the Navy, the Philippine Scouts, and the Philippine Commonwealth Army, and for other purposes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, this bill carries an authorization for an appropriation of approximately $60,000,000. The committee studying these bills feels it is of such a nature that it should be considered by the House, although the bill itself is very meritorious; therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE]?

There was no objection.

CODIFICATION OF TITLE I OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 4280, to codify Title I of the United States Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, when this bill was called up at the call of the last Consent Calendar, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT] made inquiry if the measure in any way altered, modified, or changed existing law. In the absence of an explanation at that time it was passed over without prejudice. I see the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEOGH], is present, and I shall be glad to have him explain the bill. Before he does that may I express my own personal compliment to him and to his committee for undertaking this rather monumental work which when completed will serve as a permanent framework on which to construct future legislation.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, this bill, together with the other three that appear later on the calendar today is the first of a series of bills that have been or will be introduced and which will have as their ultimate object the enactment into positive law of the United States Code. The attainment of that objective will create a permanent framework of existing law of a general nature within and around which all future new and amendatory legislation may be drafted in code form, that is, in language of title and section.

We have a precedent for this in title XXVI, which is the title containing the Internal Revenue Code. Any of the Members who have had anything to do with legislation affecting title XXVI since the enactment of that code know how much better and how much easier it is not only to draft legislation but also to explain it.

One looking at such bill knows immediately what the objective is and how that objective is sought to be reached.

This bill, together with the other three presently pending on the calendar, makes absolutely no change in the substantive law but rather codifies existing law as it presently stands. For this reason we are hopeful that we may get some action on it looking toward the ultimate attainment of our objective. There is no agency of Government, no Member of the House nor anyone connected with the law generally to whom our objective has

been explained who has not wholeheartedly approved it.

Mr. COLE of New York. This bill codifies title I of the code and the other two bills codify titles IV, VI, and IX. What is happening to the other intermediate numbers?

Mr. KEOGH. We have taken each title of the code and propose to make a separate bill of it. There will, of course, be some titles that will perhaps require minor revision before they can be passed and we hesitate to put them on the Unanimous Consent Calendar.

This title, as well as some of the other titles, are the ones that can be enacted into law without any change at all. That is why we have taken I, IV, VI, and IX. They are the easiest, and we would rather begin with the easiest and work up to the hardest.

Mr. COLE of New York. After the gentleman has succeeded in completing codifying the whole existing law does he or his committee have any program or plan by which they may educate the membership of the House toward using the codification after it has been accomplished?

Mr. KEOGH. We are hoping that by the time our ultimate objective is attained there will perhaps be some modification of the method of legislative drafting. I may say to the gentleman that I have pending before the Committee on Accounts, and have had for some time, a bill (H. R. 4901) to create a permanent office of law revision counsel which might coordinate not only the work of our committee but also the work of legislative drafting.

Mr. COLE of New York. I think the gentleman's committee has undertaken a very worth-while project from the standpoint of systematic and logical changes or enactments of law.

Mr. KEOGH. I am very much obliged to the gentleman.

I should like to acknowledge our appreciation for the assistance that we have been given in connection with our program by the editorial staff of the West Publishing Co., of St. Paul, Minn., and the Edward Thompson Co., of Brooklyn, N. Y. These organization have been most cooperative in their attitude and have performed a great portion of this work without any compensation.

We are also indebted to Mr. Charles J. Zinn, of the District of Columbia and New York Bar, who has been working with the committee in connection with all of the matters which have come before it.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I rise to make an observation as ranking member of the committee. I want to compliment the gentleman upon the great industry he has shown in connection with this whole subject matter. He has demonstrated a devotion through modification of Federal statutes that is well worthy of the admiration we have for him.

Mr. KEOGH. I thank the gentleman and express to him and to the other members of the Committee on Revision of the Laws my sincere appreciation for their continuing and intelligent cooperation.

May I observe to the House that we have sought to adopt as the slogan for our work: "Making laws understandable is as important as making the laws."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 1 of the Code of Laws of the United States of America shall read as follows:

"TITLE 1—GENERAL PROVISIONS

"Chap. Sec.
"1. Rules of construction 1
"2. Acts and resolutions; formalities of enactment; repeals; sealing of instruments 101
"3. Code of Laws of United States and Supplements; District of Columbia Code and Supplements 201

"CHAPTER 1—RULES OF CONSTRUCTION

"Sec. 1. Words denoting number, gender, etc.
"Sec. 2. 'County' as including 'parish,' etc.
"Sec. 3. 'Vessel' as including all means of water transportation.
"Sec. 4. 'Vehicle' as including all means of land transportation.
"Sec. 5. 'Company' or 'association' as including successors and assigns.
"Sec. 6. Limitation of term 'products of American fisheries.'

"Words denoting number, gender, etc.

"SECTION 1. In determining the meaning of any act or resolution of Congress words importing the singular number may extend and be applied to several persons or things; words importing the plural number may include the singular; words importing the masculine gender may be applied to females; the words 'insane person' and 'lunatic' shall include every idiot, non compos, lunatic, and insane person; the word 'person' may extend and be applied to partnerships and corporations, and the reference to any officer shall include any person authorized by law to perform the duties of such office, unless the context shows that such words were intended to be used in a more limited sense; and a requirement of an 'oath' shall be deemed complied with by making affirmation in judicial form.

"'County' as including 'parish', etc.

"SEC. 2. The word 'county' includes a parish, or any other equivalent subdivision of a State or Territory of the United States.

"'Vessel' as including all means of water transportation

"SEC. 3. The word 'vessel" includes every description of watercraft or other artificial contrivance used, or capable of being used, as a means of transportation on water.

"'Vehicle' as including all means of land transportation

"SEC. 4. The word 'vehicle' includes every description of carriage or other artificial contrivance used, or capable of being used, as a means of transportation on land.

"'Company' or 'association' as including successors and assigns

"SEC. 5. The word 'company' or 'association,' when used in reference to a corporation, shall be deemed to embrace the words 'successors and assigns of such company or association,' in like manner as if these last-named words, or words of similar import, were expressed.

"Limitation of term 'products of American fisheries'

"SEC. 6. Wherever, in the statutes of the United States or in the rulings, regulations, or interpretations of various administrative bureaus and agencies of the United States there appears or may appear the term 'products of American fisheries,' said term shall not include fresh or frozen fish fillets, fresh or frozen fish steaks, or fresh or frozen slices of fish substantially free of bone (including any of the foregoing divided into sections), produced in a foreign country or its territorial waters, in whole or in part with the use of the labor of persons who are not residents of the United States.

"CHAPTER 2—ACTS AND RESOLUTIONS; FORMALITIES OF ENACTMENT; REPEALS; SEALING OF INSTRUMENTS

"Sec. 101. Enacting clause.
"Sec. 102. Resolving clause.
"Sec. 103. Enacting or resolving words after first section.
"Sec. 104. Numbering of sections; single proposition.
"Sec. 105. Title of appropriation acts.
"Sec. 106. Printing bills and joint resolutions.
"Sec. 107. Parchment or paper for printing enrolled bills or resolutions.
"Sec. 108. Repeal of repealing act.
"Sec. 109. Repeal of statutes as affecting existing liabilities.
"Sec. 110. Saving clause of Revised Statutes.
"Sec. 111. Repeals as evidence of prior effectiveness.
"Sec. 112. Statutes at Large; contents; admissibility in evidence.
"Sec. 113. 'Little and Brown's' edition of laws and treaties; admissibility in evidence.
"Sec. 114. Sealing of instruments.

"Enacting clause

"SEC. 101. The enacting clause of all acts of Congress shall be in the following form: 'Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.'

"Resolving clause

"SEC. 102. The resolving clause of all joint resolutions shall be in the following form: 'Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.'

"Enacting or resolving words after first section

"SEC. 103. No enacting or resolving words shall be used in any section of an act or resolution of Congress except in the first.

"Numbering of sections; single proposition

"SEC. 104. Each section shall be numbered, and shall contain, as nearly as may be, a single proposition of enactment.

"Title of appropriation acts

"SEC. 105. The style and title of all acts making appropriations for the support of Government shall be as follows: 'An act making appropriations (here insert the object) for the year ending June 30 (here insert the calendar year).'

"Printing bills and joint resolutions

"SEC. 106. Every bill or joint resolution in each House of Congress shall, when such bill or resolution passes either House, be printed, and such printed copy shall be called the engrossed bill or resolution, as the case may be. Said engrossed bill or resolution shall be signed by the Clerk of the House or the Secretary of the Senate, and shall be sent to the other House, and in that form shall be dealt with by that House and its officers, and, if passed, returned signed by said Clerk or Secretary. When such bill, or joint resolution shall have passed both Houses, it shall be printed and shall then be called the enrolled bill, or joint resolution, as the case may be, and shall be signed by the Presiding Officers

of both Houses and sent to the President of the United States. During the last 6 days of a session such engrossing and enrolling of bills and joint resolutions may be done otherwise than as above prescribed, upon the order of Congress by concurrent resolution.

"Parchment or paper for printing enrolled bills or resolutions

"SEC. 107. Enrolled bills and resolutions of either House of Congress shall be printed on parchment or paper of suitable quality, as shall be determined by the Joint Committee on Printing.

"Repeal of repealing act

"SEC. 108. Whenever an act is repealed, which repealed a former act, such former act shall not thereby be revived, unless it shall be expressly so provided.

"Repeal of statutes as affecting existing liabilities

"SEC. 109. The repeal of any statute shall not have the effect to release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred under such statute, unless the repealing act shall so expressly provide, and such statute shall be treated as still remaining in force for the purpose of sustaining any proper action or prosecution for the enforcement of such penalty, forfeiture, or liability.

"Saving clause of Revised Statutes

"SEC. 110. All acts of limitation, whether applicable to civil causes and proceedings, or to the prosecution of offenses, or for the recovery of penalties or forfeitures, embraced in the Revised Statutes and covered by the repeal contained therein, shall not be affected thereby, but all suits, proceedings, or prosecutions, whether civil or criminal, for causes arising, or acts done or committed prior to said repeal, may be commenced and prosecuted within the same time as if said repeal had not been made.

"Repeals as evidence of prior effectiveness

"SEC. 111. No inference shall be raised by the enactment of the act of March 3, 1933 (ch. 202, 47 Stat. 1431), that the sections of the Revised Statutes repealed by such act were in force or effect at the time of such enactment: *Provided, however,* That any rights or liabilities existing under such repealed sections shall not be affected by their repeal.

"Statutes at Large; contents; admissibility in evidence

"SEC. 112. The Secretary of State shall cause to be compiled, edited, indexed, and published, the United States Statutes at Large, which shall contain all the laws and concurrent resolutions enacted during each regular session of Congress; all treaties to which the United States is a party that have been proclaimed since the date of the adjournment of the regular session of Congress next preceding; all international agreements other than treaties to which the United States is a party that have been signed, proclaimed, or with reference to which any other final formality has been executed, since that date; all proclamations by the President in the numbered series issued since that date; and also any amendments to the Constitution of the United States proposed or ratified pursuant to article V thereof since that date, together with the certificate of the Secretary of State issued in compliance with the provision contained in section 160 of title 5. In the event of an extra session of Congress, the Secretary of State shall cause all the laws and concurrent resolutions enacted during said extra session to be consolidated with, and published as part of, the contents of the volume for the next regular session. The United States Statutes at Large shall be legal evidence of laws, concurrent resolutions, treaties, international agreements other than treaties, proclamations by the President, and proposed or ratified amendments to the Constitution of the United States therein contained, in all the courts of the United States, the several States, and the Territories and insular possessions of the United States.

"'Little and Brown's' edition of laws and treaties; admissibility in evidence

"SEC. 113. The edition of the laws and treaties of the United States, published by Little and Brown, shall be competent evidence of the several public and private acts of Congress, and of the several treaties therein contained, in all the courts of law and equity and of maritime jurisdiction, and in all the tribunals and public officers of the United States, and of the several States, without any further proof or authentication thereof.

"Sealing of instruments

"SEC. 114. In all cases where a seal is necessary by law to any commission, process, or other instrument provided for by the laws of Congress, it shall be lawful to affix the proper seal by making an impression therewith directly on the paper to which such seal is necessary; which shall be as valid as if made on wax or other adhesive substance.

"CHAPTER 3—CODE OF LAWS OF UNITED STATES AND SUPPLEMENTS; DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CODE AND SUPPLEMENTS

"Sec. 201. Publication and distribution of Code of Laws of United States and Supplements and District of Columbia Code and Supplements.

"(a) Publishing in slip or pamphlet form or in Statutes at Large.

"(b) Curtailing number of copies published.

"(c) Dispensing with publication of more than one Supplement for each Congress.

"Sec. 202. Preparation and publication of Codes and Supplements.

"(a) Cumulative Supplements to Code of Laws of United States for each session of Congress.

"(b) Cumulative Supplement to District of Columbia Code for each session of Congress.

"(c) New editions of Codes and Supplements.

"Sec. 203. District of Columbia Code; preparation and publication; cumulative supplements.

"Sec. 204. Codes and Supplements as establishing prima facie the Laws of United States and District of Columbia; citation of Codes and Supplements.

"(a) Code of Laws of United States; effect as prima facie the law.

"(b) District of Columbia Code; effect as prima facie the law.

"(c) District of Columbia Code; citation.

"(d) Supplements to Codes; citation.

"(e) New edition of Codes: citation.

"Sec. 205. Codes and Supplements; where printed; form and style; ancillaries.

"Sec. 206. Bills and resolutions of Committee on Revision of Laws of House of Representatives; form and style; ancillaries; curtailment of copies.

"Sec. 207. Copies of acts and resolutions in slip form; additional number printed for Committee on Revision of Laws of House of Representatives.

"Sec. 208. Delegation of function of Committee on Revision of the Laws to other agencies; printing, etc., under direction of Joint Committee on Printing.

"Sec. 209. Copies of Supplements to Code of Laws of United States and of District of Columbia Code and Supplements; conclusive evidence of original.

"Sec. 210. Distribution of Supplements to Code of Laws of United States and of District of Columbia Code and Supplements; slip and pamphlet copies.

"Sec. 211. Copies to Members of Congress.

"Sec. 212. Additional distribution at each new Congress.

"Sec. 213. Appropriation for preparing and editing supplements.

"Publication and distribution of code of laws of United States and Supplements and District of Columbia Code and Supplements

"SEC. 201. In order to avoid duplication and waste—

"(a) Publishing in slip or pamphlet form or in Statutes at Large.—Publication in slip or pamphlet form or in the Statutes at Large of any of the volumes or publications enumerated in sections 202, 203 of this title, shall in event of enactment, be dispensed with whenever the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives so directs the Secretary of State;

"(b) Curtailing number of copies published.—Curtailment of the number provided by law to be printed and distributed of the volumes or publications enumerated in sections 202, 203 of this title may be directed by such committee, except that the Public Printer shall print such numbers as are necessary for depository library distribution and for sale; and

"(c) Dispensing with publication of more than one Supplement for each Congress.—Such committee may direct that the printing and distribution of any supplement to the Code of Laws of the United States or to the Code of the District of Columbia be dispensed with entirely, except that there shall be printed and distributed for each Congress at least one supplement to each such code, containing the legislation of such Congress.

"Preparation and publication of codes and supplements

"SEC. 202. There shall be prepared and published under the supervision of the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives—

"(a) Cumulative Supplements to Code of Laws of United States for each session of Congress.—A supplement for each session of the Congress to the then current edition of the Code of Laws of the United States, cumulatively embracing the legislation of the then current supplement and correcting errors in such edition and supplement;

"(b) Cumulative Supplement to District of Columbia Code for each session of Congress.—A supplement for each session of the Congress to the then current edition of the Code of the District of Columbia, cumulatively embracing the legislation of the then current supplement, and correcting errors in such edition and supplement;

"(c) New editions of Codes and Supplements.—New editions of the Code of Laws of the United States and of the Code of the District of Columbia, correcting errors and incorporating the then current supplement. In the case of each code new editions shall not be published oftener than once in each 5 years. Copies of each such edition shall be distributed in the same manner as provided in the case of supplements to the code of which it is a new edition. Supplements published after any new edition shall not contain the legislation of supplements published before such new edition.

"District of Columbia Code; preparation and publication; cumulative supplements

"SEC. 203. The Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives is authorized to print bills to codify, revise, and reenact the general and permanent laws relating to the District of Columbia and cumulative supplements thereto, similar in style, respectively, to the Code of Laws of the United States, and supplements thereto, and to so continue until final enactment thereof in both Houses of the Congress of the United States.

"Codes and supplements as establishing prima facie the laws of United States and District of Columbia; citation of codes and supplements

"SEC. 204. In all courts, tribunals, and public offices of the United States, at home or abroad, of the District of Columbia, and of each State, Territory, or insular possession of the United States—

"(a) Code of Laws of United States; effect as prima facie the law.—The matter set forth in the edition of the Code of Laws of the United States current at any time shall, together with the then current supplement, if any, establish prima facie the laws of the United States, general and permanent in their nature, in force on the day preceding the commencement of the session following the last session the legislation of which is included

"(b) District of Columbia Code; effect as prima facie the law.—The matter set forth in the edition of the Code of the District of Columbia current at any time shall, together with the then current supplement, if any, establish prima facie the laws, general and permanent in their nature, relating to or in force in the District of Columbia on the day preceding the commencement of the session following the last session the legislation of which is included, except such laws as are of application in the District of Columbia by reason of being laws of the United States general and permanent in their nature.

"(c) District of Columbia Code; citation.—The Code of the District of Columbia may be cited as 'D. C. Code.'

"(d) Supplements to Codes; citation.—Supplements to the Code of Laws of the United States and to the Code of the District of Columbia may be cited, respectively, as 'U. S. C., Sup. ', and 'D. C. Code, Sup. ', the blank in each case being filled with Roman figures denoting the number of the supplement.

"(e) New edition of Codes; citation.—New editions of each of such codes may be cited, respectively, as 'U. S. C., ed.', and 'D. C. Code, ed.', the blank in each case being filled with figures denoting the last year the legislation of which is included in whole or in part.

"Codes and supplement; where printed; form and style; ancillaries

"SEC. 205. The publications provided for in sections 202, 203 of this title shall be printed at the Government Printing Office and shall be in such form and style and with such ancillaries as may be prescribed by the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives. The Librarian of Congress is directed to cooperate with such committee in the preparation of such ancillaries. Such publications shall be furnished with such thumb insets and other devices to distinguish parts, with such facilities for the insertion of additional matter, and with such explanatory and advertising slips, and shall be printed on such paper and bound in such material as may be prescribed by such committee

"Bills and resolutions of Committee on Revision of Laws of House of Representatives; form and style; ancillaries; curtailment of copies

"SEC. 206. All bills and resolutions referred to or reported by the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives shall be printed in such form and style, and with such ancillaries, as such committee may prescribe as being economical and suitable, to so continue until final enactment thereof in both Houses of Congress; and such committee may also curtail the number of copies of such bills to be printed in the various parliamentary stages in the House of Representatives.

"Copies of acts and resolutions in slip form; additional number printed for Committee on Revision of Laws of House of Representatives

"SEC. 207. The Public Printer is directed to print, in addition to the number provided by existing law, and, as soon as printed, to distribute in such manner as the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives shall determine, 20 copies in slip form of each public act and joint resolution.

"Delegation of function of Committee on Revision of the Laws to other agencies; printing, and so forth, under direction of Joint Committee on Printing

"SEC. 208. The functions vested by sections 201, 202, 204–207 of this title in the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives may from time to time be vested in such other agency as the Congress may by concurrent resolution provide: *Provided*, That the printing, binding, and distribution of the volumes and publications enumerated in sections 202, 203 of this title shall be done under the direction of the Joint Committee on Printing.

"Copies of Supplements to Code of Laws of United States and of District of Columbia Code and Supplements; conclusive evidence of original

"SEC. 209. Copies of the Code of Laws relating to the District of Columbia and copies of the supplements provided for by sections 202, 203 of this title printed at the Government Printing Office and bearing its imprint, shall be conclusive evidence of the original of such code and supplements in the custody of the Secretary of State.

"Distribution of supplements to Code of Laws of United States and of District of Columbia Code and supplements; slip and pamphlet copies

"SEC. 210. Copies of the Code of Laws relating to the District of Columbia, and of the supplements provided for by sections 202, 203 of this title shall be distributed by the Superintendent of Documents in the same manner as bound volumes of the Statutes at Large: *Provided*, That no slip or pamphlet copies of the Code of Laws relating to the District of Columbia, and of the supplements provided for by sections 202, 203 of this title need be printed or distributed.

"Copies to Members of Congress

"SEC. 211. In addition to quotas provided for by section 210 of this title there shall be printed, published, and distributed of the Code of Laws relating to the District of Columbia with tables, index, and other ancillaries, suitably bound and with thumb inserts and other convenient devices to distinguish the parts, and of the supplements to both codes as provided for by sections 202, 203 of this title, 10 copies of each for each Member of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress in which the original authorized publication is made, for his use and distribution, and in addition for the Committee on Revision of the Laws of the House of Representatives and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate a number of bound copies of each equal to 10 times the number of members of such committees, and 1 bound copy of each for the use of each committee of the Senate and House of Representatives.

"Additional distribution at each new Congress

"SEC. 212. In addition the Superintendent of Documents shall, at the beginning of the first session of each Congress, supply to each Senator and Representative in such Congress, who may in writing apply for the same, one copy each of the Code of Laws of the United States, the Code of Laws relating to the District of Columbia, and the latest supplement to each code: *Provided*, That such applicant shall certify in his written application for the same that the volume or volumes for which he applies is intended for his personal use exclusively: *And provided further*, That no Senator or Representative during his term of service shall receive under this section more than one copy each of the volumes enumerated herein.

"Appropriation for preparing and editing supplements

"SEC. 213. For preparation and editing an annual appropriation of $6,500 is authorized to carry out the purposes of sections 202 and 203 of this title."

SEC. 2. The sections or parts thereof of the Statutes at Large or the Revised Statutes covering provisions codified in this act are hereby repealed, insofar as such provisions appeared in title 1, United States Code, 1940 edition, as shown by the appended table: *Provided*, That any rights or liabilities now existing under such repealed sections or parts thereof shall not be affected by such repeal.

Statutes at Large or Revised Statutes

	Title 1, United States Code, 1940 ed., section
R. S., sec. 1	1
R. S., sec. 2	2
R. S., sec. 3	3
R. S., sec. 4	4
R. S., sec. 5	5
Act June 11, 1940, ch. 325, sec. 1, 54 Stat. 305	6
R. S., sec. 7	21
R. S., sec. 8	22
R. S., sec. 9	23
R. S., sec. 10	24
R. S., sec. 11	25
Resolution Nov. 1, 1893, 28 Stat., Appendix 5; act Mar. 2, 1895, ch. 177, sec. 1, 28 Stat. 769	26
Act Mar. 6, 1920, ch. 94, sec. 1, 41 Stat. 520	27
R. S., sec. 12	28
R. S., sec. 13	29
R. S., sec. 5599	29a
Act Mar 3, 1933, ch. 202, sec. 3, 47 Stat. 1431	29b
Act Jan. 12, 1895, ch. 23, sec. 73, 28 Stat. 615; June 20, 1936, ch. 630, sec. 9, 49 Stat. 1551; June 16, 1938, ch. 477, sec. 1, 52 Stat. 760	30
R. S., sec. 908	30a
R. S., sec. 6	31
Resolution Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 586, sec. 1, 45 Stat. 1540	51a
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 2, 45 Stat. 1007; resolution Mar 2, 1929, ch. 586, sec. 2, 45 Stat. 1541	52
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 3, 45 Stat. 1007	53
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 4, 45 Stat. 1007; resolution Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 586, sec. 3, 45 Stat. 1541	54
Resolution Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 586, sec. 4, 45 Stat. 1542; act Mar. 4, 1933, ch. 282, sec. 1, 47 Stat. 1603; June 13, 1934, ch. 483, secs. 1 2, 48 Stat. 948	54a
Resolution Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 586, sec. 5, 45 Stat. 1542; act Mar. 4, 1933, ch. 282, sec. 1, 47 Stat. 1603; June 13, 1934, ch. 483, secs. 1, 2, 48 Stat. 948	54b
Resolution Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 586, sec. 6, 45 Stat. 1542	54c
Resolution Mar. 2, 1929, ch. 586, sec. 7, 45 Stat. 1542	54d
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 5, 45 Stat. 1007	55
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 6, 45 Stat. 1007	56
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 7, 45 Stat. 1008	57
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 8, 45 Stat. 1008	58

	Title 1, United States Code, 1940 ed., section
Act May 29, 1928, ch. 910, sec. 10, 45 Stat. 1008	59
Act Mar. 3, 1933, ch. 202, sec. 2, 47 Stat. 1431	60

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERFORMANCE OF ANNUAL LABOR ON CERTAIN MINING CLAIMS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6295, to suspend the requirements for the performance of annual labor on certain mining claims.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN OF THE ARMED FORCES OF THE UNITED STATES TO ACCEPT DECORATIONS, ETC., TENDERED THEM BY GOVERNMENTS OF COBELLIGERENT NATIONS OR THE OTHER AMERICAN REPUBLICS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2404, to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered them by governments of cobelligerent nations or the other American republics.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

Mr. COLE of New York. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this bill not only authorizes members of our armed forces to accept foreign decorations but, in addition, establishes a new medal or award under four or five different categories or phases. Later in the call of the calendar there will be considered a bill from the Committee on Naval Affairs creating medals and awards for meritorious and distinctive national service.

I wonder if it may not be feasible for representatives of the two committees, both of which in their individual capacities have no doubt studied these bills, to confer to see if there may not be some uniformity in creating these awards, or at least to see that there is no divergence or inconsistencies between the two systems.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. Personally, I would have no objection to that. I may say, however, that this bill came to the House Committee on Military Affairs from the War Department with a request for early passage. The House Committee on Military Affairs unanimously reported the bill after a full and fair hearing. Only this morning two officers of the War Department, who were trying not only to pay proper tribute and honor to those who have done something outstanding but also to encourage friendly relations between us and all our Allies, told us that they think this would have a great moral and psychological value. Therefore, I hope the gentleman from New Jersey will not object to the consideration of the bill at this time. Then, if the bill for the Navy comes up later, perhaps we can pass it so that the two bills will at least be consistent with each other. This is meritorious legislation that deserves immediate and favorable action.

Mr. COLE of New York. The bill from the Committee on Naval Affairs is coming up today. There is no question but that this is an important matter, important to the successful prosecution of the war, but I do feel that we should proceed rather cautiously not only in creating these awards for valor but in making the awards themselves, so that the recipients of them will feel that they have been given some real recognition for their services and that after they receive it, it will not be cheapened by some careless distribution of it.

Mr. THOMASON. Certainly, it should not be cheapened by giving a medal to everyone who comes along and that is not going to happen. However, as I understood from the representatives of the War Department only this morning, there are some very outstanding cases in Bataan, Java, Panama, South America, and other places, in which the Army would like to confer this honor without long delay, not only so as to reward bravery but set an inspiring example to others.

Mr. COLE of New York. Would not the gentleman suggest to his chairman that he designate two or three members of his committee, and request the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs to do likewise, and then in the interval of the next 2 weeks they can sit down and go over this entire matter of making these awards?

Mr. THOMASON. I shall be very glad to do so. I am agreeing, however, for I know the gentleman from New Jersey is going to object, but I do insist upon early action.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request that the bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT OF A DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6702, to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern district of California in order to fill a vacancy in the office of an additional district judge heretofore authorized for such district.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill was passed over without prejudice 2 weeks ago at the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], who is unavoidably absent today, so I make the same request at this time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

VOLUNTARY ADJUSTMENT OF OBLIGATIONS OF RAILROADS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7121, to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN], the author of the bill, is on the floor. He is chairman of the Committee on Reorganization and Bankruptcy of the Judiciary Committee and reported the bill to the House. May I ask the gentleman to explain this bill briefly?

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the bill H. R. 7121, reenacts chapter 15 of the Bankruptcy Act, which permits the voluntary adjustment of railroad obligations. It comes to the House with the unanimous approval of the Committee on the Judiciary. Hearings were held and numerous witnesses appeared and testified, and other witnesses filed written statements and briefs. No one appeared in opposition to the measure. However, several amendments were suggested by those who testified and these amendments were carefully considered by the Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization and by the full Judiciary Committee.

This bill has to do with railroads which do not need the complete reorganization afforded by chapter 77 of the Bankruptcy Act. It was originally enacted in 1939 to enable railroads which were in need of minor adjustment of their financial structures to bring about such changes by voluntary agreement. It has worked excellently in the two outstanding cases in which resort has been had to it, namely, the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad case and the Lehigh Valley Railroad case. These reorganizations have been completed and everyone concerned is thoroughly satisfied with them.

Witnesses who have appeared at the hearings on this bill—H. R. 7121—have pointed out the beneficial results accomplished in those two cases and in other cases in which reorganizations were effected through chapter XV proceedings.

Since the philosophy of this legislation was approved by the House in the enactment of chapter XV of the Bankruptcy Act in 1939 it would appear that this brief, simple, and nontechnical statement should suffice at this time to meet the request of the gentleman from Tennessee. I shall, with the consent of the House, insert in the RECORD the report of the Committee on the Judiciary on the bill. There are a number of changes in the bill as compared with chapter XV as it originally existed. One of the outstanding changes is that H. R. 7121 would make chapter XV permanent legislation whereas the original chapter XV was

temporary, expiring 1 year after its effective date. H. R. 7121 would allow the Interstate Commerce Commission to propose a modified plan. This was not permitted under the original chapter XV. Another change would permit noncarrier corporations obligated on securities of carriers to file petitions and have the same benefits which carriers had under chapter XV. Noncarrier corporations which control two or more carriers have been brought within the jurisdiction of the Interstate Commerce Commission by act of Congress. It was felt by the committee that it is proper that this amendment should be made. Another amendment would allow a single judge of the three-judge court, with certain limitations, to conduct all hearings and enter all orders, subject to review on application of any party in interest or on the court's own motion. This amendment is in line with similar amendments, enacted in the present session of Congress, affecting three-judge-court procedure in other types of cases.

Another change allows reasonable expenses, including reasonable attorneys' fees, where modification of the proposal is adopted and found by the court to be beneficial to the petitioner or any class of creditors or to be in the public interest. The latter amendment resulted from a criticism made by one of the witnesses which appealed to the members of the committee who attended the hearings and to the full committee. In the Peoria & Eastern Railway case a number of modifications to the plan was suggested by persons appearing on behalf of holders of obligations of the petitioner. Some of these modifications were adopted, but the court in entering its final order observed that while the modifications were beneficial and while the proposers were to be complimented for the beneficial work they had done, nevertheless, because of the absence of a specific grant of power in chapter XV, the court was powerless to award any expenses, including reasonable attorneys' fees to those who had proposed the modifications. The committee felt that where proposals are made to the plans and such proposals are found to be beneficial and a finding is definitely made by the court to that effect, it is only fair and proper that reasonable expenses be allowed to those who proposed the changes and such expenses should include reasonable attorneys' fees. As I have stated, such reasonable expenses, including such reasonable attorneys' fees are only permitted under the bill (H. R. 7121) in the event the proposals are adopted and are found to be of benefit to the petitioner or any class of creditors or to be in the public interest.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I say that the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MCLAUGHLIN] has made a very laymanlike explanation of a very technical bill. I think we all generally appreciate what it is all about. It is technical, it is far reaching, and it did receive every consideration before the subcommittee and the committee, and I hope there will be no objection.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. I thank the gentleman from Michigan, a member of the subcommittee, who has always contributed very materially to the work of the subcommittee and who did so in this instance.

Mr. SPRINGER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I want to compliment the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska for the splendid statement made with respect to this bill. I may say for the benefit of the Members of the House that long hearings were had and this proposed legislation was given every consideration and was reported out of the Judiciary Committee unanimously for passage. I hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. MCLAUGHLIN. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for his observation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act of July 1, 1898, entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States", as amended, is hereby further amended by inserting after chapter XIV the following:

"CHAPTER XV—RAILROAD ADJUSTMENTS

"ARTICLE I—JURISDICTION

"SEC. 700. In addition to the jurisdiction otherwise exercised, courts of bankruptcy shall exercise original jurisdiction, as provided in this chapter, for postponements, or modifications of debt, interest, rent, and maturities or for modifications of the securities or capital structures of railroads.

"ARTICLE II—DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 705. The following terms, as used in this chapter, unless a different meaning is plainly required by the context, shall be construed as follows:

"(1) 'Petitioner' means any carrier as defined in section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act, excluding any corporation in equity receivership or in proceedings for reorganization under section 77 of this act, petitioning for a plan of adjustment, as hereinafter defined, or any corporation filing a petition under the provisions of section 711 of this chapter.

"(2) 'Claims' includes debts whether liquidated or unliquidated, certificates of deposits of securities (other than stock and option warrants to subscribe to stock), including demands and obligations of whatever character made, assumed, or guaranteed by the petitioner.

"(3) 'Debt' shall be considered to include all claims held or owned by 'creditors' as hereinafter defined.

"(4) 'Creditors' shall include all holders of claims, demands, and obligations of whatever character against the petitioner or its property, whether or not such claims would otherwise constitute provable claims in bankruptcy, including the holders of claims made, assumed, or guaranteed by the petitioner.

"(5) 'Securities' shall include those defined in section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, also securities in respect of which any carrier, as defined in section 20a, has assumed any obligation or liability as lessor, lessee, guarantor, endorser, surety, or otherwise, and also certificates of deposit and all other evidences of ownership of or interest in securities.

"(6) 'Commission' refers to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

"(7) 'Adjustment' shall include postponements or modifications of debt, interest, rent, and maturities and modifications of the securities or capital structures.

"SEC. 706. No creditor shall be deemed to be 'affected' by any plan unless such plan proposes a modification of the evidence of debt or other instrument defining the rights of such creditor, or a modification of the security, if any, for the claim of such creditor.

"ARTICLE III—PETITION AND POWERS OF COURT

"SEC. 710. Any railroad corporation not in equity receivership or in process of reorganization under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act at the time of filing its petition hereunder, and which has not been in equity receivership or in process of reorganization under said section 77 within 10 years prior to the filing of such petition, which shall have—

"(1) prepared a plan of adjustment and secured assurances satisfactory to the Commission of the acceptance of such plan from creditors holding at least 25 percent of the aggregate amount of all claims affected by said plan of adjustment (including all such affected claims against said corporation, its parents, and subsidiaries); and

"(2) thereafter obtained an order from the Commission (but not of a division thereof) under section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act authorizing the issuance or modification of securities (other than securities held by, or to be issued to, Reconstruction Finance Corporation) as proposed by such plan of adjustment as filed, or as modified by, or with the approval of, the Commission, such order of the Commission to include also specific findings—

"(a) that such corporation is not in need of financial reorganization of the character provided for under section 77 of this act;

"(b) that such corporation's inability to meet its debts matured or about to mature is reasonably expected to be temporary only; and

"(c) that such plan of adjustment, after due consideration of the probable prospective earnings of the property in the light of its earnings experience and of such changes as may reasonably be expected—

"(i) is in the public interest and in the best interests of each class of creditors and stockholders;

"(ii) is feasible, financially advisable, and not likely to be followed by the insolvency of said corporation, or by need of financial reorganization or adjustment;

"(iii) does not provide for fixed charges (of whatsoever nature, including fixed charges on debt, amortization of discount on debt, and rent for leased roads), in an amount in excess of what will be adequately covered by the probable earnings available for the payment thereof;

"(iv) leaves adequate means for such future financing as may be requisite;

"(v) is consistent with adequate maintenance of the property; and

"(vi) is consistent with the proper performance by such railroad corporation of service to the public as a common carrier, will not impair its ability to perform such service:

"Provided, That in making the foregoing specific findings the Commission shall scrutinize the facts independently of the extent of acceptances of such plan and of any lack of opposition thereto: *Provided further*, That an order of the Commission (or of a Division thereof) under section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act, made prior to the effective date of this chapter, authorizing the issuance or modification of securities as proposed by a plan of adjustment (other than securities held by, or to be issued to, Reconstruction Finance Corporation), shall be effective for the purpose of this subparagraph (2) of the first sentence of section 710, notwithstanding failure to include therein the foregoing specific findings, if such order did include the specific findings that such proposed issuance or modification of securities is compatible with the public interest, is consistent with the proper performance by the railroad

corporation of service to the public as a common carrier, and will not impair its ability to perform such service; and

"(3) secured assents to such plan of adjustment or such plan of adjustment as modified by, or with approval of, the Commission, by creditors holding more than two-thirds of the aggregate amount of the claims affected by said plan, which two-thirds shall include at least a majority of the aggregate amount of the claims of each affected class,

may file in the United States district court in whose territorial jurisdiction such railroad corporation has had its principal executive or principal operating office during the preceding 6 months or a greater period thereof, its petition averring that it is unable to meet its debts, matured or about to mature, and desires to carry out the plan of adjustment.

"A copy of the order obtained from the Commission, as above provided, shall be filed with the petition and made a part thereof.

"SEC. 711. Any corporation which has complied with subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of the first sentence of section 710, and in which corporation the majority of the capital stock having power to vote for the election of directors is owned directly, or indirectly through an intervening medium by any railroad corporation which has filed a petition hereunder, or any corporation which is a lessor of the petitioning corporation and which has complied with the aforesaid subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 710, or any corporation which is liable or obligated, contingently or otherwise, on securities issued by or on which the obligation or liability has been assumed by, the petitioning carrier corporation and which has complied with the aforesaid subparagraphs (1), (2), and (3) of section 710, may file its petition in the same court in which the petition first aforesaid shall have been filed, and such petitions shall be heard and disposed of in a single proceeding. Any corporation liable or obligated, contingently or otherwise, upon the securities of a carrier shall, with respect to such securities and any securities issued in lieu thereof and for the purposes of this chapter, be deemed a carrier within the intent and meaning of section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended, and if such corporation is a holding company, controlling two or more carriers, it shall, to the extent provided by the Commission in its order, be subject to such of the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act as, under the provisions of paragraph (3) of section 5 thereof, are applicable to a person, not a carrier, authorized by an order entered under paragraph (2) of that section to acquire control of any carrier or two or more carriers.

"SEC. 712. The petition shall be accompanied by payment to the clerk of a filing fee of $100, which shall be in addition to the fees required to be collected by the clerk under other sections of this act or any other act.

"SEC. 713. Immediately following the filing of the petition, there shall be convened a special court of three judges in the manner provided by section 266, as amended, of the Judicial Code, and thereafter all proceedings relative to such plan or any modification thereof shall be conducted before such court. Such three-judge court shall be vested with and shall exercise all the powers of a district court sitting in equity and all the powers as a court of bankruptcy necessary to carry out the intent and provisions of this chapter, including the classification of claims at such time and in such manner as the court may direct: *Provided, however,* That any one of the three judges constituting the special court who may be designated by the special court, may perform all functions, conduct all proceedings, and enter all orders, except that such single judge shall not hold a hearing for approval of a plan as provided in section 720 or for confirmation of a plan as provided in section 725 or enter the final decree. Any act of a single judge hereby permitted shall be subject to review by the special court on application by any party in interest filed within 30 days after said act or by order of such court on its own motion made within such period of 30 days.

"SEC. 714. The special court, after hearing, promptly shall enter an order approving the petition as properly filed under this chapter if satisfied that such petition complies with this chapter and has been filed in good faith, or dismissing such petition if not so satisfied.

"SEC. 715. If the petition is approved by the special court, the said court, during the pendency of the proceedings under this chapter, shall have exclusive jurisdiction of the petitioner and of its property wherever located to the extent which may be necessary to protect the same against any action which might be inconsistent with said plan of adjustment or might interfere with the effective execution of said plan if approved by the court, or otherwise inconsistent with or contrary to the purposes and provisions of this chapter: *Provided, however,* That nothing herein contained shall be construed to authorize the court to appoint any trustee or receiver for said properties or any part thereof, or otherwise take possession of such properties or control the operation or administration thereof.

"ARTICLE IV—HEARINGS

"SEC. 720. The special court shall fix a date for a hearing to be held promptly after the filing of the petition and notice of such hearing or hearings shall be given to all persons in interest in such reasonable manner as the court shall direct. In such proceeding the court may allow such interventions of persons in interest as it may deem just and proper, but any person in interest shall have the right to present evidence and be heard thereon, in person or by attorney, with or without intervention. Any person or persons in interest who shall be permitted to intervene or who shall present evidence and be heard thereon, in person or by attorney, with or without intervention, proposing any modification of the plan of adjustment, which modification shall be adopted and which shall be found by the court to be of benefit to the petitioner or to any class of creditors of petitioner or to be in the public interest, may be allowed actual and reasonable expenses (including reasonable attorneys' fees), which expenses may be entered as a part of the decree approving and confirming the plan and the adjustment provided thereby pursuant to the provisions of section 725 of this chapter.

"SEC. 721. After such hearing, the special court may approve the plan as filed or propose to modify such plan and as hereinafter provided approve the same as so modified. If the court shall propose to modify the plan, then: (a) if such modification substantially alters the basis for the specific findings included in the order made by the Commission under section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act, the plan as so proposed to be modified shall be resubmitted to the Commission and shall not be finally approved by the court until the Commission (but not a division thereof) has authorized the issuance or modification of securities as proposed by the plan as so modified (other than securities held by, or to be issued to, Reconstruction Finance Corporation) making the findings required by clause (c) of subparagraph (2) of the first sentence of section 710, even in a case where the original order of the Commission under said section 20a was made prior to the effective date of this chapter; and (b) if such modification substantially or adversely affects the interests of any class or classes of creditors, such plan shall be resubmitted, in such manner as the court may direct, to those creditors so affected by such modification and shall not be finally approved until after (1) a hearing on such modification, to be held within such reasonable time as the court may fix, at which hearing any person in interest may object to such modification, and (2) a reasonable opportunity (within a period to be fixed by the court), following such hearing, within which such affected creditors who have assented to the plan may withdraw or cancel their assents to the plan, and failure by any such creditor to withdraw or cancel an assent within such period shall constitute an acceptance by such assenting creditor of the plan as so modified. After such authorization and finding by the Commission, where required hereby, and after such hearing and opportunity to withdraw or cancel, where required hereby, the court may make the proposed modification, and as provided in section 725 finally approve and confirm the plan as so modified.

"SEC. 722. If the United States or any agency thereof, or any corporation (other than the Reconstruction Finance Corporation) the majority of the stock of which is owned by the United States, is a creditor or stockholder, the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized to act in respect of the interests or claims of the United States or of such agency or other corporation. If in any proceeding under this chapter the United States is a creditor on claims for taxes or customs duties (whether or not the United States has any other interest in or claim against the debtor as creditor or stockholder), no plan which does not provide for the payment thereof shall be approved or confirmed by the court except upon the acceptance of a lesser amount or of a postponement by the Secretary of the Treasury certified to the court: *Provided,* That if the Secretary of the Treasury shall fail to accept or reject such lesser amount or such postponement for more than 60 days after receipt of written notice so to do from the court, accompanied by a certified copy of the plan, the consent of the United States insofar as its claims for taxes or customs duties are concerned shall be conclusively presumed.

"ARTICLE V—PROCEEDINGS SUBSEQUENT TO APPROVAL OF PETITION

"SEC. 725. If the special court shall find—

"(1) that, at the time of the filing of said petition as provided in article III hereof, the proposed plan of adjustment had been assented to by not less than two-thirds of the aggregate amount of all claims of the petitioner affected by such plan, including at least a majority of the aggregate amount of claims of each such class;

"(2) that the plan of adjustment as submitted or as modified by the court has been accepted as submitted or, if modified, then as modified by or on behalf of creditors affected by such plan holding more than three-fourths of the aggregate amount of the claims affected by said plan, including at least three-fifths of the aggregate amount of the claims of each affected class;

"(3) that the plan meets the requirements of clause (c), and the petitioner meets the requirements of clauses (a) and (b) of subparagraph (2) of the first sentence of section 710, and that the plan is fair and equitable as an adjustment and as such will: (a) afford due recognition to the rights of each class of creditors and stockholders and fair consideration to each class adversely affected and (b) will conform to the law of the land regarding the participation of the various classes of creditors and stockholders: *Provided,* That in making the findings required by this clause (3), the court shall scrutinize the facts independently of the extent of acceptance of such plan, and of any lack of opposition thereto, and of the fact that the Commission, under section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act, has authorized the issuance

or modification of securities as proposed by such plan, and of the fact that the Commission has made such or similar findings;

"(4) that all corporate action required to authorize the issuance or modification of securities pursuant to such plan shall have been duly taken either before or since the enactment of this chapter;

"(5) that the petitioner has not, in connection with said plan or the effectuation thereof, done any act or failed to perform any duty which act or failure would be a bar to the discharge of a bankrupt, and that the plan and the acceptance thereof are in good faith and have not been made or procured by any means, promises, or acts forbidden by this act;

"(6) that, after hearings for the purpose, all amounts or considerations, directly or indirectly paid or to be paid by or for the petitioner for expenses, fees, reimbursement, or compensation of any character whatsoever incurred in connection with the proceeding and plan, or preliminary thereto or in aid thereof, together with all the facts and circumstances relating to the incurring thereof, have been fully disclosed to the court so far as such amounts or considerations can be ascertained at the time of such hearings, that all such amounts or considerations are fair and reasonable, and to the extent that any such amounts or considerations are not then ascertainable, the same are to be so disclosed to the court when ascertained, and are to be subject to approval by the special court as fair and reasonable, and except with such approval no amounts or considerations covered by this clause (6) shall be paid; and—

"(7) that the provisions of sections 722, 736, and 737 of this chapter have been complied with.

"Said court shall file an opinion setting forth its conclusions and the reasons therefor and shall enter a decree approving and confirming such plan and the adjustment provided thereby, which decree shall be binding upon the petitioner and upon all creditors and security holders of the petitioner; and thereafter the petitioner shall have full power and authority to and shall put into effect and carry out the plan and the orders of the special court relative thereto and issue the securities provided by the plan without further reference to or authority from the Commission or any other authority, State or Federal, except where required by any law relating to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and the rights of all creditors and security holders with respect to claims and securities affected by the plan shall be those provided by the plan as so approved and confirmed: *Provided, however,* That the title of any owner, whether as trustee or otherwise, to rolling-stock equipment leased or conditionally sold to the petitioner, and any right of such owner to take possession of such property in compliance with the provisions of any such lease or conditional sale contract, shall not be affected by the provisions of this chapter.

"No plan shall be approved under this chapter unless the special court finds that with respect to the continuation of, or any change in, the voting rights in the petitioner, control of the petitioner, and the identity of, and the power and manner of selection of the persons who are to be directors, officers, or voting trustees, if any, upon the consummation of the plan and their respective successors, the plan makes full disclosure, is adequate, equitable, in the best interests of creditors and stockholders of each class, and consistent with public policy.

"SEC. 726. After the special court shall have approved as properly filed a petition pursuant to article III hereof, the special court, from time to time during the pendency of the proceedings hereunder, may enjoin the institution of, or stay, for a reasonable time, any action or proceeding to enforce any right against the petitioner or its property based upon claims affected by the proposed plan of adjustment in any court, State or Federal, whether for the enforcement of any such claim or for the appointment of receivers in equity or of the institution or prosecution of a proceeding under section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act or otherwise: *Provided, however,* That no such stay shall affect any proceeding based on or to enforce any claim which would be required to be paid if the plan of adjustment proposed by the petitioner were then in effect.

"SEC. 727. Unless the plan of adjustment as submitted or as modified shall have been confirmed by the special court within 1 year from the date of filing the petition, the proceedings shall be dismissed unless, for good cause shown, on motion of any party in interest, the court, if satisfied that confirmation of a plan is in immediate prospect, shall determine otherwise.

"SEC. 728. Without prejudice to existing rights of all creditors, including those affected by the plan, and as a condition to the approval of any plan by the special court, the petitioner, from and after the filing of the petition with the court and until the making of a final order by the special court approving a plan or dismissing the petition, shall continue to make or tender payments to all creditors affected by the plan of sums currently payable to such creditors equal to the amounts proposed to be paid to such creditors under the plan: *Provided,* That the making of such payments shall not constitute a preference within the meaning of the Bankruptcy Act, nor shall acceptance of such payments constitute an acceptance of a plan. If from and after the filing of the petition with the special court, there shall be any failure to make or tender such payments, the special court, unless there is good cause shown for the failure, shall dismiss the proceedings. In finally approving any plan, the court may make or require to be made such adjustments with respect to said payments or any of them as may be necessary to make the same conform to the provisions of said plan as finally approved.

"SEC. 729. In providing for any such payments the petitioner may require any bond or other security, including interest coupons affected by such payments to be presented to or deposited with a paying agent or depositary named by the petitioner for appropriate stamping to show the amounts of such payment.

"ARTICLE VI—TAX PROVISIONS

"SEC. 735. The provisions of sections 1801, 1802, 3481, and 3482 of the Internal Revenue Code and any amendments thereto, unless specifically providing to the contrary, shall not apply to the issuance, transfer, or exchange of securities or the making or delivery of conveyances to make effective any plan of adjustment confirmed under the provisions of this chapter.

"SEC. 736. In addition to the notices elsewhere expressly provided, the clerk of the court in which any proceedings under this chapter are pending shall forthwith transmit to the Secretary of the Treasury copies of—

"(1) every petition filed under this chapter;

"(2) the orders approving or dismissing petitions;

"(3) the orders approving plans as filed or as modified, together with copies of such plans as approved;

"(4) the decrees approving and confirming plans and the adjustments provided thereby, together with copies of such plans as approved;

"(5) the injunctions or other orders made under section 726 of this chapter;

"(6) the orders dismissing proceedings under this chapter; and

"(7) such other papers filed in the proceedings as the Secretary of the Treasury may request or which the court may direct to be transmitted to him.

"SEC. 737. Any order fixing the time for confirming a plan which affects claims or stock of the United States shall include a notice of not less than 30 days to the Secretary of the Treasury.

"SEC. 738. The special court shall have power to determine the amount and legality of claims of the United States for taxes or customs duties, and to order payment thereof; and the order of the special court (provided for in sec. 714) approving the petition shall have the effect of an adjudication of bankruptcy of the petitioner for the purposes of section 274 of the Internal Revenue Code and the corresponding provisions of prior and subsequent revenue acts. The running of the htatute of limitations on the assessment or collection of any internal-revenue tax shall be suspended while a proceeding under this chapter is pending and until it is finally dismissed.

"ARTICLE VII—INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

"SEC. 740. If, in any application filed with the Commission, pursuant to section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act for authority to issue or modify securities, the applicant shall allege that the purpose in making such application is to enable it to file a petition under the provisions of this chapter, the Commission shall take final action on such application as promptly as possible, and in any event within 120 days after the filing of such application, unless the Commission finds that a longer time, not exceeding 60 days, is needed in the public interest.

"ARTICLE VIII—FINAL DECREE AND REVIEW

"SEC. 745. Any final order or decree of the special court may be reviewed by the Supreme Court of the United States upon application for certiorari made by any person affected by the plan who deems himself aggrieved within 60 days after the entry of such order or decree, pursuant to the applicable provisions of the Judicial Code.

"SEC. 746. In the decree approving and confirming the plan the court may require such reports of the action taken by the petitioner thereunder in the execution of the plan as may be necessary to a final disposition of the cause, and in its final decree disposing of the cause the court shall retain jurisdiction in the district court to the extent necessary to protect and enforce the rights of the parties under said plan and the orders of the court thereon.

"ARTICLE IX—FILING RECORD WITH COMMISSION

"SEC. 750. The clerk of the court in which any proceedings under this chapter are pending shall forthwith transmit to the Interstate Commerce Commission copies of all pleadings, petitions, motions, applications, orders, judgments, decrees, and other papers in such proceedings filed with the court or entered therein, including copies of any transcripts of testimony, hearings, or other proceedings that may be transcribed and filed in such proceedings together with copies of all exhibits, except to the extent that the court finds that compliance with this section would be impracticable.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point and to include therein the report of the Committee on the Judiciary on this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

The Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7121) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uni-

form system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto, after consideration, report the same favorably to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

This bill supersedes H. R. 6840 on which hearings were held, and embodies amendments adopted by the committee.

PURPOSE OF LEGISLATION

H. R. 7121 is substantially the same as the original chapter XV of the Bankruptcy Act which was enacted during the first session of the Seventy-sixth Congress and which expired July 31, 1940. Because of the time limitation of the original act very few railroads were able to take advantage of it. Experience has shown the relief afforded by the act to be most beneficial and it is now thought desirable to make the act a permanent part of the bankruptcy law in order that railroads now in need of such relief, as well as those which may need such relief in the future, may have the benefit of the act.

The purpose of the bill is to enable railroads which are not insolvent and which are fundamentally sound as transportation systems, but which are handicapped financially by maturing obligations or other temporary financial difficulties to enter into agreements with their creditors and security holders for the postponement or modification of obligations, and submit such agreements to the Interstate Commerce Commission and then to courts of bankruptcy for hearings and appropriate action by which such agreements are made effective without impairing the normal operations, employee relations, and the permanent stability of the railroads.

American railroads, generally speaking, may be divided into three groups:

1. Those clearly solvent and in a position to operate successfully.

2. Those clearly insolvent and needing complete reorganization as provided by section 77 of the bankruptcy act.

3. Those in temporary financial difficulties and requiring relief, but not the drastic overhauling of their capital structures provided for in section 77.

This bill, if enacted, will make available to railroads in the third group, their subsidiaries, and noncarrier corporations liable on the obligations of the debtor railroad the bankruptcy power contained in article I, chapter 8, clause 1 of the Constitution, which permits Congress to establish uniform laws on the subject of bankruptcies.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PRESENT BILL AND PRIOR ACT

The bill differs in few respects from the original chapter XV. H. R. 7121 provides, as its predecessor did not, that any corporation which is liable or obligated, contingently or otherwise, on securities issued by the petitioning carrier corporation may file a petition in the same court in which the petitioning carrier corporation filed its petition and be afforded the same relief with respect to the obligations of the petitioning railroad held by the noncarrier corporation as may be extended to the petitioning railroad corporation itself. In other words, H. R. 7121 extends the jurisdiction of the original chapter XV to a noncarrier corporation liable on securities of the petitioning carrier. The relief which thus may be afforded such noncarrier corporations would extend only to securities of the petitioning carrier corporation on which the noncarrier corporation is liable and would in no way affect other obligations of the noncarrier corporation. The hearings held on this bill demonstrated the desirability of such an extension of jurisdiction in order that the purpose of this proposed legislation might not be defeated in certain instances.

The courts have held that under the original act no allowances could be made by the court to intervenors for expenses incurred as a result of their intervention, regardless of the value of the services rendered by such intervenors. H. R. 7121 provides that the court may allow actual and reasonable expenses, including reasonable attorney's fees, to parties in interest proposing a modification to the plan in the event such modification shall be adopted and shall be found by the court to be beneficial to the petitioner or to any class of creditors or to be in the public interest. Your committee is of the opinion that the court should be authorized to grant reimbursement to such intervenors for reasonable expenses, including attorney's fees, incurred in the rendering of such services. The provision is drawn in such a manner, however, as to preclude frivolous intervention, allowances being permitted only in those cases where the proposed modification is adopted and found to be beneficial.

The original chapter XV contained a provision exempting from taxation the income deemed to have been realized by the petitioning railroad corporation by reason of the modification or cancelation of indebtedness in a proceeding. H. R. 7121 contains no such provision, it being eliminated for the reason that it is anticipated that a law will be enacted which will apply to this subject both as to proceedings under chapter XV and railroad reorganization proceedings under section 77. The Treasury Department has approved elimination of this provision.

EXPERIENCE UNDER PRIOR ACT AND DESIRABILITY OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The original chapter XV was in effect only 1 year. In that time only a very few railroads were able to take advantage of the act. The results achieved proved so favorable, as was shown by testimony given at the hearing, that your committee is of the opinion that the benefits of the act should be made available to other railroads in need of relief of the type provided by this measure. In addition it appears that no good purpose would be served in limiting the act as to time. H. R. 7121, therefore, proposes to make chapter XV a permanent part of the bankruptcy law. The original act was of tremendous benefit to the Baltimore & Ohio and Lehigh Valley Railroads and saved those roads from the costly and long-drawn-out procedure and expense involved in receivership or section 77 proceedings. This bill, it is thought, can render material aid to the national war program. The seriousness of the war in which our country is engaged and the vital role transportation is playing in the conduct of the war now makes it imperative that our transportation system be preserved and maintained in the most efficient state and that the carriers themselves be placed on a sound financial basis so as to enable them to meet the unusual demands which are being and will be imposed upon them. Receiverships usually involve a costly and long-drawn-out procedure. H. R. 7121, if enacted, will afford distressed railroads, not insolvent in the bankruptcy sense, an opportunity to make the necessary financial adjustments without being forced to go through receivership or section 77 proceedings.

EXPLANATION OF BILL AND GENERAL STATEMENT

The procedure provided by the bill is simple and direct. Stated briefly, any railroad desiring to effect an adjustment of certain of its obligations, as well as the modification or postponement of certain of its securities or its capital structure, prepares a proposal plan of adjustment and secures assurances of acceptance of the plan from creditors and security holders having at least 25 percent of the claims affected thereby. Whenever the minimum of 25 percent of the aggregate amount of the claims affected by the proposed plan of adjustment give such assurance, the railroad is authorized to submit the proposed plan to the Interstate Commerce Commission for examination in accordance with the requirements of section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act. Should all of the requirements of said section 20a be met, the Commission is authorized to issue an order approving the issuance or modification of the securities involved in the plan.

Among the salient provisions of section 20a on which the Interstate Commerce Commission is required to make findings prior to the issuance of the order referred to are:

"Such proposed issuance or modification of securities is in the public interest, is consistent with the continuance by the railroad corporation of service to the public as a common carrier, and will not impair its ability to perform such service."

Thereafter, the railroad desiring to effect such proposed plan shall obtain assents thereto by its creditors holding "more than two-thirds of the aggregate amount of the claims affected by said plan, which two-thirds shall include at least a majority of the aggregate amount of the claims of each affected class." When such assents are secured, the railroad may file a petition in the United States district court having jurisdiction as provided in the bill, and a special court of three judges is convened to conduct the proceedings relative to such plan, hold hearings, and exercise jurisdiction over the petitioning railroad and its property, although the court does not appoint a receiver or trustee to undertake to control the operation of the carrier.

If the three-judge court, after hearings, shall be satisfied that the proposed plan of adjustment has been assented to by the requisite percentages aforesaid, and "that the plan is fair and equitable, is in the public interest, affords due recognition to the rights of each class of creditors and stockholders, does not discriminate unfairly in favor of any class of creditors or stockholders, and will conform to the requirements of the law of the land regarding the participation of the various classes of creditors and stockholders," the court shall file an opinion setting forth its conclusions and the reasons therefor and shall enter a decree approving and confirming such plan, provided the plan as submitted to or as modified by the court, has been accepted by creditors holding not less than three-fourths of the aggregate amount of the claims affected by the plan, including at least 60 percent of the aggregate amount of the claims of each affected class.

Upon confirmation of the plan, the decree of the three-judge court is binding on the petitioner and on all the creditors and security holders of the railroad. While the effect of the decree of the court is to establish the plan of adjustment over the possible objection of a dissenting minority of less than 25 percent of all of the creditors and security holders affected thereby, care has been taken that the rights of minority interests shall be properly safeguarded and that due process of law shall be exercised.

In order that proceedings brought under the provisions of the chapter may be conducted with the utmost expedition, H. R. 7121 contains a provision whereby the special three-judge court may designate a single judge of the three-judge court to act in all matters except on the approval or confirmation of a plan or on a final decree. Any act of such single judge shall be subject to review by the special three-judge court on application by any party in interest or by order of such court or its own motion.

The Interstate Commerce Commission is required to act within 120 days on any application filed with the Commission pursuant to section 20a of the Interstate Commerce Act, for authority to issue or modify securities, where the applicant alleges that the purpose of making such application is to enable it to file a petition under the provisions of this

bill. The public interest in the proceeding is protected by the finding of the Commission, after hearing, that the issuance or modification of securities as proposed conforms to section 20a. The private rights of creditors and stockholders are protected in the proceeding conducted by the three-judge court, and by its findings as required by section 725 of the bill. Moreover, the plan of adjustment approved by the three-judge court may contain appropriate provisions for the safeguarding of the interests of creditors and others affected by the plan "in all matters of the petitioner's financial policy and operation."

The bill provides that the plan shall be confirmed by the court within 1 year from the date of filing the petition, unless for good cause shown, further delay is found to be justifiable. Parties in interest may intervene, and any holder of securities or stock of the railroad is given the right to present evidence and be heard. Allowance of reasonable expenses is authorized to be paid to intervenors whose proposed modifications are adopted and found to be beneficial to the petitioner or to any class of creditors or to be in the public interest. During the pendency of the proceeding, the petitioning railroad must continue to make payments to all creditors affected by the plan of obligations currently payable and equal to the amounts proposed to be paid under the plan, thereby preventing the discontinuance of interest payments, etc., as would be the case if the petition were filed in accordance with section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act, or in equity. Prompt review of the decision of the three-judge court is authorized by certiorari to the United States Supreme Court.

Equipment trust certificates, taxes, operating expenses, wages, employment contracts, unliquidated claims, and other similar obligations are not affected by the plan of adjustment.

The bill is not intended as an amendment of or a substitute for section 77 of the Bankruptcy Act. Section 77 is a comprehensive reorganization statute which codifies equity procedure in large measure, and avails itself of the bankruptcy power to the end that railroad reorganizations, as extensive as the necessities may require, can be effective. The pending bill makes no provision for trustees, counsel, or committees; contemplates that the debtor shall continue to operate its property; and enables the debtor and it creditors to agree upon a plan providing for adjustments of the maturities of interest and principal. No provision is made for involuntary proceedings or for the presentation of alternative plans by the respective stockholder or creditor interests as in section 77.

It is not contemplated that any plan of adjustment can be approved by the court for railroad companies where the continued participation of stockholders in the company can be maintained only at the sacrifice of substantive rights of creditors. The bill provides that the plan must conform to the requirements of the law of the land with reference to the participation of stockholders and creditors, and this provision has been interpreted to require that the plan must conform to the principles of *Northern Pacific Railway Co.* v. *Boyd* (228 U. S. 482). It was clearly shown at the hearing, however, that, regardless of this limitation, the original chapter XV had provided relief to an important group of railroad companies, which were not in need of radical reorganization, by enabling them to effect desirable adjustments with their creditors without going into bankruptcy or equity receivership. It was also shown that this bill, if passed by Congress, will provide similar relief to other important railroads confronted with a situation similar to that of the roads helped by the original chapter XV.

Where a railroad company is so burdened with a heavy capital structure that it is in need of thoroughgoing reorganization, it is not in the public interest, nor even, except temporarily, in the interest of the company itself, that such a reorganization be postponed. It is not the intention that this legislation afford a means of avoiding reorganizations in such cases. On the other hand, where a railroad company is not in need of complete reorganization, but is in need of temporary relief only, it is not good public policy to force such a company to enter an equity receivership or bankruptcy when such drastic action can be avoided by legislation that will afford appropriate relief. Experience has shown that when a railroad enters bankruptcy or an equity receivership, it generally suffers great damage through the break-down of the morale of its forces, the interference with or displacement of its management and its employees, the burden of unavoidable expenses of the reorganization litigation, and the blow to its credit. It is manifestly in the interest of all concerned to avoid these losses and experience under the original chapter XV has shown that these losses can be avoided.

The proposed legislation has the endorsement and approval of railroad owners, railroad employee organizations, railroad management, investors, newspapers, public officials and, it is believed, has the sanction of the public generally.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SERVICE OF CIRCUIT JUDGES WITH THE SUPREME COURT OF HAWAII

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 6618, providing for the temporary service of circuit judges with the Supreme Court of Hawaii in case of vacancies in such court.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 82 (relating to the appointment of justices of the Supreme Court of Hawaii, of the act entitled "An act to provide a government for the Supreme Court of Hawaii) of the act entitled is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That whenever a vacancy exists in the office of any of the justices of such court, the remaining justice or justices may from time to time, by written order, call in one or more circuit judges, as the case may be, to sit with the remaining justice or justices in the hearing and determination of such cause or causes or matters as said justice or justices may prescribe in said written order."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROHIBITING THE MAKING OF PHOTOGRAPHS, ETC.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1707) to prevent the making of photographs and sketches of military or naval reservations, naval vessels, and other naval and military properties, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. This bill makes it a criminal offense, subject to a fine of $1,000 and imprisonment of a year, for any person taking a photograph of any military establishment, either Army or Navy, or any military equipment. The result of it is that if any amateur photographer takes a picture of a parade going down Pennsylvania Avenue he might have to pay a fine of $1,000. This is a very drastic sort of measure, recommended by the War Department as essential for the purpose of preventing sabotage and espionage. Apparently it is necessary and is recommended by the Committee on Military Affairs, but as the bill has been reported by the committee, it makes this act permanent, perpetual legislation, which I feel is a great mistake. If no member of the Committee on Military Affairs is present, who has authority to accept an amendment limiting the operation of the act to the duration of the war, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RENTAL ALLOWANCES FOR OFFICERS WITHOUT DEPENDENTS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1587) to provide rental allowances for officers without dependents on sea duty when deprived of quarters on board ship.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That hereafter officers of the Navy and Marine Corps on sea duty, who are deprived of their quarters on board ship due to repairs or other conditions which render them uninhabitable, and in cases where the hire of quarters is not practicable, may be reimbursed for expenses incurred in an amount not exceeding their quarters allowance, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe.

SEC. 2. This act shall apply to officers of the Coast Guard, subject to the regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy when serving under the Navy, and to regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury when serving under the Treasury Department.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

INCLUSION OF SERVICE ON ACTIVE DUTY IN COMPUTATION OF PAY, ETC.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2286) to authorize the inclusion of service on active duty as service on the active list in computation of service of commissioned warrant officers in the Navy for pay purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows

Be it enacted, etc., That, effective from September 8, 1939, for the purpose of determining both active duty and retired pay of commissioned warrant officers of the Navy, including such officers advanced in rank pursuant to the provisions of the act approved June 21, 1930 (46 Stat. 793), the phrase "with creditable records on the active list" appearing in section 1 of the act approved June 10, 1922, as amended (45 Stat. 1187), shall be construed to include, as service on the active list, service on active duty heretofore or hereafter performed subsequent to retirement.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO SUBMARINES

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2455) to amend the act entitled "An act to pro-

vide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty," to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty," approved April 9, 1928 (45 Stat. 412), as amended (49 Stat. 1091; 34 U. S. C. 886), be, and the same is hereby, further amended by striking out, in line 20 thereof, the words "as now provided by law" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "as now or hereafter provided by law"; and by striking out the proviso therein and inserting in lieu thereof a proviso to read as follows: "*Provided*, That divers employed in actual salvage or repair operations in depths of over 90 feet, or in depths of less than 90 feet when the officer in charge of the salvage or repair operation shall find in accordance with instructions prescribed by the Secretary of the Navy that extraordinary hazardous conditions exist, shall, in addition to the foregoing, receive the sum of $5 per hour for each hour or fraction thereof so employed."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 3, strike out "divers employed" and insert "officers and enlisted men employed as divers."

The committee amendment was agreed to, and the bill as amended was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AWARD OF MEDALS, NAVY CROSSES, ETC.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 2456) to amend the act approved February 4, 1919 (40 Stat. 1056), entitled "An act to provide for the award of medals of honor, distinguished-service medals, and Navy crosses, and for other purposes," so as to change the conditions for the award of medals, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. In furtherance of the request previously made in connection with the Military Affairs Committee, I ask unanimous consent that this bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

VESSELS OF CANADIAN REGISTRY TO TRANSPORT IRON ORE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 7100) to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore on the Great Lakes during 1942," approved January 27, 1942 (Public Law 416, 77th Cong.), to continue it in force during the existing war.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore on the Great Lakes during 1942," approved January 27, 1942 (Public Law 416, 77th Cong.), is amended to read as follows:

"That by reason of emergency conditions in transportation on the Great Lakes, notwithstanding the provisions of section 27 of the act of Congress approved June 5, 1920 (41 Stat. 999), as amended by act of Congress approved April 11, 1935 (49 Stat. 154), and by act of Congress approved July 2, 1935 (49 Stat. 442), or the provisions of any other act of Congress or regulation, vessels of Canadian registry shall be permitted to transport iron ore between United States ports on the Great Lakes during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate."

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BRIDGEPORT IRRIGATION DISTRICT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6904) for the relief of the Bridgeport Irrigation District.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I have one or two questions I wanted to ask of the author of the bill. In his absence I ask unanimous consent that the bill go over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMERICAN WAR MOTHERS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 6401) for the incorporation of American War Mothers, as amended, and matters relating thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, to inquire of the author of the bill as to his interpretation of the expression that this bill makes eligible for membership in the American War Mothers organization mothers of sons serving in this war.

The period of inauguration of this war has been given as December 7, 1941, and the ending period has been described as "until the termination of said war." May I inquire of the gentleman, What is his interpretation of that expression? When does the war terminate?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, my interpretation of that is when war actually ends and when there are no further casualties, or at the time when the President or the Congress declares that the war has actually ended.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman does not intend that the termination takes place at the time of the signing of the peace treaty, then?

Mr. SPRINGER. I would think it is when fighting ceases.

Mr. COLE of New York. When the suspension of hostilities takes place, by mutual agreement between the opposing parties?

Mr. SPRINGER. Probably not by mutual agreement, but when they actually end.

Mr. COLE of New York. In the nature of an armistice at least?

Mr. SPRINGER. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 97, chapter 7, title 36, of the Code of Laws of the United States of America, 1934 edition, be amended and is amended as follows:

"That the membership of American War Mothers is limited to women, and no woman shall be and become a member of this corporation unless she is a citizen of the United States and unless her son or sons or daughter or daughters of her blood served in the Army or Navy of the United States, or in the military or naval service of its Allies, in the great World War of 1917–18, at some time during the period between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918, or in the present World War which commenced in the year 1941, and at some time on and after December 7, 1941, and until the termination of said war, having an honorable discharge from such service, or who is still in the service."

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, strike out lines 3 to 5, inclusive, and insert "That section 7 of the act entitled 'An act to incorporate the American War Mothers,' approved February 24, 1925 (43 Stat. 966; title 36, sec. 97, U. S. C., 1940 ed.), be amended to read as follows:"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend section 7 of the act entitled 'An act to incorporate the American War Mothers,' approved February 24, 1925 (43 Stat. 966; title 36, sec. 97, U. S. C., 1940 ed.)."

AMENDING NATIONALITY ACT OF 1940

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 5569, to amend the Nationality Act of 1940, to preserve the nationality of naturalized veterans of the Spanish-American War and of the World War, and of their wives, minor children, and dependent parents.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CLAIMS AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT OF MEXICO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7096, to provide for the settlement of claims of the Government of the United States on behalf of American nationals against the Government of Mexico comprehended within the terms of agreements concluded by the United States and Mexico.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Speaker, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE IN PETROLEUM AND ITS PRODUCTS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 2066, to make permanently effective the act regulating interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill makes permanent what has heretofore been temporary legislation. I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee if the bill was reported unanimously by his committee.

Mr. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it was reported unanimously by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 13 of the act entitled "An act to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products by prohibiting the shipment in such commerce of petroleum and its products produced in violation of State law, and for other purposes," approved February 22, 1935 (49 Stat. 30), as amended, is hereby repealed.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TITLE 9, UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7112, to codify and enact into absolute law title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the author please explain the bill?

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, the same observation I made with reference to H. R. 4280 will apply to this bill. We have taken title 9 of the United States Code as it stands now, making absolutely no substantive change in the law, and we are enacting that title into positive and absolute law. If in the future anyone should seek to add a new section or amend the existing section of title 9, it may be drawn in title and section language. We might possibly adopt the practice of italicizing the new and amendatory matter and bracketing the deleted portions, so that when one looks at a bill as introduced he knows what effect it will have on existing law and will not have to wait as we do now until we get the report.

Mr. O'HARA. This is purely a codification of previous acts of Congress?

Mr. KEOGH. Exactly, just as the law stands now, with no change at all.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration," is codified and enacted into absolute law, as follows:

"TITLE 9—ARBITRATION

"Sec. 1. Maritime transactions and commerce defined; exceptions to operation of title.

"Sec. 2. Validity, irrevocability, and enforcement of agreements to arbitrate.

"Sec. 3. Stay of proceedings where issue therein referable to arbitration.

"Sec. 4. Failure, and so forth, to arbitrate under agreement; petition to United States court having jurisdiction for order to compel arbitration; notice and service thereof; hearing and determination.

"Sec. 5. Appointment of arbitrators or umpire.

"Sec. 6. Application heard as motion.

"Sec. 7. Witnesses before arbitrators; fees; compelling attendance.

"Sec. 8. Proceedings begun by libel in admiralty and seizure of vessel or property.

"Sec. 9. Award of arbitrators; confirmation; jurisdiction; procedure.

"Sec. 10. Same; vacation; grounds; rehearing.

"Sec. 11. Same; modification or correction; grounds; order.

"Sec. 12. Notice of motions to vacate or modify; service; stay of proceedings.

"Sec. 13. Papers filed with order on motions; judgment; docketing; force and effect; enforcement.

"Sec. 14 Contracts not affected.

"'MARITIME TRANSACTIONS' AND 'COMMERCE' DEFINED; EXCEPTIONS TO OPERATION OF TITLE

"SECTION 1. 'Maritime transactions,' as herein defined, means charter parties, bills of lading of water carriers, agreements relating to wharfage, supplies furnished vessels or repairs to vessels, collisions, or any other matters in foreign commerce which, if the subject of controversy, would be embraced within admiralty jurisdiction; 'commerce', as herein defined, means commerce among the several States or with foreign nations, or in any Territory of the United States or in the District of Columbia, or between any such Territory and another, or between any such Territory and any State or foreign nation, or between the District of Columbia and any State or Territory or foreign nation, but nothing herein contained shall apply to contracts of employment of seamen, railroad employees, or any other class of workers engaged in foreign or interstate commerce.

"VALIDITY, IRREVOCABILITY, AND ENFORCEMENT OF AGREEMENTS TO ARBITRATE

"SEC. 2. A written provision in any maritime transaction or a contract evidencing a transaction involving commerce to settle by arbitration a controversy thereafter arising out of such contract or transaction, or the refusal to perform the whole or any part thereof, or an agreement in writing to submit to arbitration an existing controversy arising out of such a contract, transaction, or refusal, shall be valid, irrevocable, and enforceable, save upon such grounds as exist at law or in equity for the revocation of any contract.

"STAY OF PROCEEDINGS WHERE ISSUE THEREIN REFERABLE TO ARBITRATION

"SEC. 3. If any suit or proceeding be brought in any of the courts of the United States upon any issue referable to arbitration under an agreement in writing for such arbitration, the court in which such suit is pending, upon being satisfied that the issue involved in such suit or proceeding is referable to arbitration under such an agreement, shall on application of one of the parties stay the trial of the action until such arbitration has been had in accordance with the terms of the agreement, providing the applicant for the stay is not in default in proceeding with such arbitration.

"FAILURE, AND SO FORTH, TO ARBITRATE UNDER AGREEMENT; PETITION TO UNITED STATES COURT HAVING JURISDICTION FOR ORDER TO COMPEL ARBITRATION; NOTICE AND SERVICE THEREOF; HEARING AND DETERMINATION

"SEC. 4. A party aggrieved by the alleged failure, neglect, or refusal of another to arbitrate under a written agreement for arbitration may petition any court of the United States which, save for such agreement, would have jurisdiction under the judicial code at law, in equity, or in admiralty of the subject matter of a suit arising out of the controversy between the parties, for an order directing that such arbitration proceed in the manner provided for in such agreement. Five days' notice in writing of such application shall be served upon the party in default. Service thereof shall be made in the manner provided by law for the service of summons in the jurisdiction in which the proceeding is brought. The court shall hear the parties, and upon being satisfied that the making of the agreement for arbitration or the failure to comply therewith is not in issue, the court shall make an order directing the parties to proceed to arbitration in accordance with the terms of the agreement. The hearing and proceedings, under such agreement, shall be within the district in which the petition for an order directing such arbitration is filed. If the making of the arbitration agreement or the failure, neglect, or refusal to perform the same be in issue, the court shall proceed summarily to the trial thereof. If no jury trial be demanded by the party alleged to be in default, or if the matter in dispute is within admiralty jurisdiction, the court shall hear and determine such issue. Where such an issue is raised, the party alleged to be in default may, except in cases of admiralty, on or before the return day of the notice of application, demand a jury trial of such issue, and upon such demand the court shall make an order referring the issue or issues to a jury in the manner provided by law for referring to a jury issues in an equity action, or may specially call a jury for that purpose. If the jury find that no agreement in writing for arbitration was made or that there is no default in proceeding thereunder, the proceeding shall be dismissed. If the jury find that an agreement for arbitration was made in writing and that there is a default in proceeding thereunder, the court shall make an order summarily directing the parties to proceed with the arbitration in accordance with the terms thereof.

"APPOINTMENT OF ARBITRATORS OR UMPIRE

"SEC. 5. If in the agreement provision be made for a method of naming or appointing an arbitrator or arbitrators or an umpire, such method shall be followed; but if no method be provided therein, or if a method be provided and any party thereto shall fail to avail himself of such method, or if for any other reason there shall be a lapse in the naming of an arbitrator or arbitrators or umpire, or in filling a vacancy, then upon the application of either party to the controversy the court shall designate and appoint an arbitrator or arbitrators or umpire, as the case may require, who shall act under the said agreement with the same force and effect as if he or they had been specifically named therein; and unless otherwise provided in the agreement the arbitration shall be by a single arbitrator.

"APPLICATION HEARD AS MOTION

"SEC. 6. Any application to the court hereunder shall be made and heard in the manner provided by law for the making and hearing of motions, except as otherwise herein expressly provided.

"WITNESSES BEFORE ARBITRATORS; FEES; COMPELLING ATTENDANCE

"SEC. 7. The arbitrators selected, either as prescribed in this title or otherwise, or a majority of them, may summon in writing any person to attend before them or any of them as a witness and in a proper case to bring with him or them any book, record, document, or paper which may be deemed material as evidence in the case. The fees for such attendance shall be the same as the fees of witnesses before masters of the United States courts. Said summons shall issue in the name of the arbitrator or arbitrators, or a majority of them, and shall be signed by the arbitrators, or a majority of them, and shall be directed to the said person and shall be served in the same manner as subpenas to appear and testify before the court; if any person or persons so summoned to testify shall refuse or neglect to obey said summons, upon petition the United States court in and for the district in which such arbitrators, or a majority of them, are sitting may compel the attendance of such person or persons before said arbitrator or arbitrators, or punish said person or persons for contempt in the same manner provided on February 12, 1925, for securing the attendance of witnesses or their punishment for neglect or refusal to attend in the courts of the United States.

"PROCEEDINGS BEGUN BY LIBEL IN ADMIRALTY AND SEIZURE OF VESSEL OR PROPERTY

"SEC. 8. If the basis of jurisdiction be a cause of action otherwise justiciable in admiralty, then, notwithstanding anything herein to the contrary, the party claiming to be aggrieved may begin his proceeding hereunder by libel and seizure of the vessel or other property of the other party according to the usual course of admiralty proceedings, and the court shall then have jurisdiction to direct the parties to proceed with the arbitration and shall retain jurisdiction to enter its decree upon the award.

"AWARD OF ARBITRATORS; CONFIRMATION; JURISDICTION; PROCEDURE

"SEC. 9. If the parties in their agreement have agreed that a judgment of the court shall be entered upon the award made pursuant to the arbitration, and shall specify the court, then at any time within 1 year after the award is made any party to the arbitration may apply to the court so specified for an order confirming the award, and thereupon the court must grant such an order unless the award is vacated, modified, or corrected as prescribed in sections 10 and 11 of this title. If no court is specified in the agreement of the parties, then such application may be made to the United States court in and for the district within which such award was made. Notice of the application shall be served upon the adverse party, and thereupon the court shall have jurisdiction of such party as though he had appeared generally in the proceeding. If the adverse party is a resident of the district within which the award was made, such service shall be made upon the adverse party or his attorney as prescribed by law for service of notice of motion in an action in the same court. If the adverse party shall be a nonresident, then the notice of the application shall be served by the marshal of any district within which the adverse party may be found in like manner as other process of the court.

"SAME; VACATION; GROUNDS; REHEARING

"SEC. 10. In either of the following cases the United States court in and for the district wherein the award was made may make an order vacating the award upon the application of any party to the arbitration—

"(a) Where the award was procured by corruption, fraud, or undue means.

"(b) Where there was evident partiality or corruption in the arbitrators, or either of them.

"(c) Where the arbitrators were guilty of misconduct in refusing to postpone the hearing, upon sufficient cause shown, or in refusing to hear evidence pertinent and material to the controversy; or of any other misbehavior by which the rights of any party have been prejudiced.

"(d) Where the arbitrators exceeded their powers, or so imperfectly executed them that a mutual, final, and definite award upon the subject matter submitted was not made.

"(e) Where an award is vacated and the time within which the agreement required the award to be made has not expired the court may, in its discretion, direct a rehearing by the arbitrators.

"SAME; MODIFICATION OR CORRECTION; GROUNDS; ORDER

"SEC. 11. In either of the following cases the United States court in and for the district wherein the award was made may make an order modifying or correcting the award upon the application of any party to the arbitration—

"(a) Where there was an evident material miscalculation of figures or an evident material mistake in the description of any person, thing, or property referred to in the award.

"(b) Where the arbitrators have awarded upon a matter not submitted to them, unless it is a matter not affecting the merits of the decision upon the matter submitted.

"(c) Where the award is imperfect in matter of form not affecting the merits of the controversy.

"The order may modify and correct the award, so as to effect the intent thereof and promote justice between the parties.

"NOTICE OF MOTIONS TO VACATE OR MODIFY; SERVICE; STAY OF PROCEEDINGS

"SEC. 12. Notice of a motion to vacate, modify, or correct an award must be served upon the adverse party or his attorney within 3 months after the award is filed or delivered. If the adverse party is a resident of the district within which the award was made, such service shall be made upon the adverse party or his attorney as prescribed by law for service of notice of motion in an action in the same court. If the adverse party shall be a nonresident, then the notice of the application shall be served by the marshal of any district within which the adverse party may be found in like manner as other process of the court. For the purposes of the motion any judge who might make an order to stay the proceedings in an action brought in the same court may make an order, to be served with the notice of motion, staying the proceedings of the adverse party to enforce the award.

"PAPERS FILED WITH ORDER ON MOTIONS; JUDGMENT; DOCKETING; FORCE AND EFFECT; ENFORCEMENT

"SEC. 13. The party moving for an order confirming, modifying, or correcting an award shall, at the time such order is filed with the clerk for the entry of judgment thereon, also file the following papers with the clerk:

"(a) The agreement; the selection or appointment, if any, of an additional arbitrator or umpire; and each written extension of the time, if any, within which to make the award.

"(b) The award.

"(c) Each notice, affidavit, or other paper used upon an application to confirm, modify, or correct the award, and a copy of each order of the court upon such an application.

"The judgment shall be docketed as if it was rendered in an action.

"The judgment so entered shall have the same force and effect, in all respects, as, and be subject to all the provisions of law relating to, a judgment in an action; and it may be enforced as if it had been rendered in an action in the court in which it is entered.

"CONTRACTS NOT AFFECTED

"SEC. 14. This title shall not apply to contracts made prior to January 1, 1926."

SEC. 2. The sections or parts thereof of the Statutes at Large covering provisions codified in this act, insofar as such provisions appear in title 9, United States Code and supplements thereto, as shown by the appended table, are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That any rights or liabilities now existing under such repealed sections or parts thereof shall not be affected by such repeal.

STATUTES AT LARGE

	Title 9, United States Code, section
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 1, 43 Stat. 883	1
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 2, 43 Stat. 883	2
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 3, 43 Stat. 883	3
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 4, 43 Stat. 883	4
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 5, 43 Stat. 884	5
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 6, 43 Stat. 884	6
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 7, 43 Stat. 884	7
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 8, 43 Stat. 884	8
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 9, 43 Stat. 885	9
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 10, 43 Stat. 885	10
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 11, 43 Stat. 885	11
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 12, 43 Stat. 885	12
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 13, 43 Stat. 886	13
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 14, 43 Stat. 886	14
Feb. 12, 1925, ch. 213, sec. 15, 43 Stat. 886	15

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CODIFICATION OF TITLE 4 OF UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the next bill (H. R. 7113), to codify and enact into absolute law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and seal, seat of government, and the States."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, to propound, if I may, a unanimous consent request.

On page 14 of the bill in the listing of the statutes at large affected by this codification, the printer in printing the bill omitted to strike out "(1)" in the second line of the tabulation. On next to the last line he inserted "(a) 16" after "1126," instead of before it, although it is shown clearly in the report that that is the way it should be.

I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may make that correction in the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and seal, seat of government, and the States," is codified and enacted into absolute law, as follows:

"TITLE 4—FLAG AND SEAL, SEAT OF GOVERNMENT, AND THE STATES

"Sec. 1. Flag; stripes and stars on.

"Sec. 2. Same; additional stars.

"Sec. 3. Use of flag for advertising purposes; mutilation of flag.
"Sec. 4. Seal of United States.
"Sec. 5. Same; custody and use of.
"Sec. 6. Permanent seat of government.
"Sec. 7. Public offices; at seat of government.
"Sec. 8. Same; removal from seat of government.
"Sec. 9. Oath by members of legislatures and officers.
"Sec. 10. Same; by whom administered.
"Sec. 11. Assent to purchase of lands for forts.
"Sec. 12. Tax on motor fuel sold on military or other reservations; reports to State taxing authority.
"Sec. 13. State, etc., taxation affecting Federal areas; sales or use tax.
"Sec. 14. Same; income tax.
"Sec. 15. Same; exception of United States, its instrumentalities, and authorized purchasers therefrom.
"Sec. 16. Same; jurisdiction of United States over Federal areas unaffected.
"Sec. 17. Same; exception of Indians.
"Sec. 18. Same; definitions.

"FLAGS; STRIPES AND STARS ON

"SECTION 1. The flag of the United States shall be 13 horizontal stripes, alternate red and white; and the union of the flag shall be 48 stars, white in a blue field.

"SAME; ADDITIONAL STARS

"SEC. 2. On the admission of a new State into the Union one star shall be added to the union of the flag; and such addition shall take effect on the fourth day of July then next succeeding such admission.

"USE OF FLAG FOR ADVERTISING PURPOSES; MUTILATION OF FLAG

"SEC. 3. Any person who, within the District of Columbia, in any manner, for exhibition or display, shall place or cause to be placed any word, figure, mark, picture, design, drawing, or any advertisement of any nature upon any flag, standard, colors, or ensign of the United States of America; or shall expose or cause to be exposed to public view any such flag, standard, colors, or ensign upon which shall have been printed, painted, or otherwise placed, or to which shall be attached, appended, affixed, or annexed any word, figure, mark, picture, design, or drawing, or any advertisement of any nature; or who, within the District of Columbia, shall manufacture, sell, expose for sale, or to public view, or give away or have in possession for sale, or to be given away or for use for any purpose, any article or substance being an article of merchandise, or a receptacle for merchandise or article or thing for carrying or transporting merchandise, upon which shall have been printed, painted, attached, or otherwise placed a representation of any such flag, standard, colors, or ensign, to advertise, call attention to, decorate, mark, or distinguish the article or substance on which so placed; or who, within the District of Columbia, shall publicly mutilate, deface, defile, or defy, trample upon, or cast contempt, either by word or act, upon any such flag, standard, colors, or ensign, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $100 or by imprisonment for not more than 30 days, or both, in the discretion of the court. The words 'flag, standard, colors, or ensign', as used herein, shall include any flag, standard, colors, ensign, or any picture or representation of either, or of any part or parts of either, made of any substance or represented on any substance, of any size evidently purporting to be either of said flag, standard, colors, or ensign of the United States of America or a picture or a representation of either, upon which shall be shown the colors, the stars and the stripes, in any number of either thereof, or of any part or parts of either, by which the average person seeing the same without deliberation may believe the same to represent the flag, colors, standard, or ensign of the United States of America.

"SEAL OF THE UNITED STATES

"SEC. 4. The seal heretofore used by the United States in Congress assembled is declared to be the seal of the United States.

"SAME; CUSTODY AND USE OF

"SEC. 5. The Secretary of State shall have the custody and charge of such seal, and shall make out and record, and shall affix the same to, all civil commissions for officers of the United States, to be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, or by the President alone. But the seal shall not be affixed to any commission before the same has been signed by the President of the United States, nor to any other instrument, without the special warrant of the President therefor.

"PERMANENT SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

"SEC. 6. All that part of the territory of the United States included within the present limits of the District of Columbia shall be the permanent seat of government of the United States.

"PUBLIC OFFICES; AT SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

"SEC. 7. All offices attached to the seat of government shall be exercised in the District of Columbia, and not elsewhere, except as otherwise expressly provided by law.

"SAME; REMOVAL FROM SEAT OF GOVERNMENT

"SEC. 8. In case of the prevalence of a contagious or epidemic disease at the seat of government, the President may permit and direct the removal of any or all the public offices to such other place or places as he shall deem most safe and convenient for conducting the public business.

"OATH BY MEMBERS OF LEGISLATURES AND OFFICERS

"SEC. 9. Every member of a State legislature, and every executive and judicial officer of a State, shall, before he proceeds to execute the duties of his office, take an oath in the following form, to wit: 'I, A B, do solemnly swear that I will support the Constitution of the United States.'

"SAME; BY WHOM ADMINISTERED

"SEC. 10. Such oath may be administered by any person who, by the law of the State, is authorized to administer the oath of office; and the person so administering such oath shall cause a record or certificate thereof to be made in the same manner, as by the law of the State, he is directed to record or certify the oath of office.

"ASSENT TO PURCHASE OF LANDS FOR FORTS

"SEC. 11. The President of the United States is authorized to procure the assent of the legislature of any State, within which any purchase of land has been made for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dockyards, and other needful buildings, without such consent having been obtained.

"TAX ON MOTOR FUEL SOLD ON MILITARY OR OTHER RESERVATION REPORTS TO STATE TAXING AUTHORITY

"SEC. 12. (a) All taxes levied by any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia upon, with respect to, or measured by, sales, purchases, storage, or use of gasoline or other motor-vehicle fuels may be levied, in the same manner and to the same extent, with respect to such fuels when sold by or through post exchanges, ship stores, ship service stores, commissaries, filling stations, licensed traders, and other similar agencies, located on United States military or other reservations, when such fuels are not for the exclusive use of the United States. Such taxes, so levied, shall be paid to the proper taxing authorities of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, within whose borders the reservation affected may be located.

"(b) The officer in charge of such reservation shall, on or before the fifteenth day of each month, submit a written statement to the proper taxing authorities of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia within whose borders the reservation is located, showing the amount of such motor fuel with respect to which taxes are payable under subsection (a) for the preceding month.

"STATE, ETC., TAXATION AFFECTING FEDERAL AREAS; SALES OR USE TAX

"SEC. 13. (a) No person shall be relieved from liability for payment of, collection of, or accounting for any sales or use tax levied by any State, or by any duly constituted taxing authority therein, having jurisdiction to levy such a tax, on the ground that the sale or use, with respect to which such tax is levied, occurred in whole or in part within a Federal area; and such State or taxing authority shall have full jurisdiction and power to levy and collect any such tax in any Federal area within such State to the same extent and with the same effect as though such area was not a Federal area.

"(b)) The provisions of subsection (a) shall be applicable only with respect to sales or purchases made, receipts from sales received, or storage or use occurring, after December 31, 1940.

"SAME; INCOME TAX

"SEC. 14. (a) No person shall be relieved from liability for any income tax levied by any State, or by any duly constituted taxing authority therein, having jurisdiction to levy such a tax, by reason of his residing within a Federal area or receiving income from transactions occurring or services performed in such area; and such State or taxing authority shall have full jurisdiction and power to levy and collect such tax in any Federal area within such State to the same extent and with the same effect as though such area was not a Federal area.

"(b) The provisions of subsection (a) shall be applicable only with respect to income or receipts received after December 31, 1940.

"SAME; EXCEPTION OF UNITED STATES, ITS INSTRUMENTALITIES, AND AUTHORIZED PURCHASES THEREFROM

"SEC. 15. (a) The provisions of sections 13 and 14 of this title shall not be deemed to authorize the levy or collection of any tax on or from the United States or any instrumentality thereof, or the levy or collection of any tax with respect to sale, purchase, storage, or use of tangible personal property sold by the United States or any instrumentality thereof to any authorized purchaser.

"(b) A person shall be deemed to be an authorized purchaser under this section only with respect to purchases which he is permitted to make from commissaries, ship's stores, or voluntary unincorporated organizations of Army or Navy Personnel under regulations promulgated by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy.

"SAME; JURISDICTION OF UNITED STATES OVER FEDERAL AREAS UNAFFECTED

"SEC. 16. The provisions of sections 13 to 18 of this title shall not for the purposes of any other provision of law be deemed to deprive the United States of exclusive jurisdiction over any Federal area over which it would otherwise have exclusive jurisdiction or to limit the jurisdiction of the United States over any Federal area.

"SAME; EXCEPTION OF INDIANS

"SEC. 17. Nothing in sections 13 and 14 of this title shall be deemed to authorize the levy or collection of any tax on or from any Indian not otherwise taxed.

"SAME; DEFINITIONS

"SEC. 18. As used in sections 13–17 of this title—

"(a) The term 'person' shall have the meaning assigned to it in section 3797 of title 26.

"(b) The term 'sales or use tax' means any tax levied on, with respect to, or measured by, sales, receipts from sales, purchases, storage, or use of tangible personal property, except a tax with respect to which the provisions of section 12 of this title are applicable.

"(c) The term 'income tax' means any tax levied on, with respect to, or measured by, net income, gross income, or gross receipts.

"(d) The term 'State' includes any Territory or possession of the United States.

"(e) The term 'Federal area' means any lands or premises held or acquired by or for the use of the United States or any department, establishment, or agency of the United States; and any Federal area, or any part thereof, which is located within the exterior boundaries of any State, shall be deemed to be a Federal area located within such State."

SEC. 2. The sections or parts thereof of the Statutes at Large or the Revised Statutes covering provisions codified in this act are hereby repealed insofar as such provisions appear in title 4, United States Code, 1940 edition, and supplements thereto, as shown by the appended table: *Provided*, That any rights or liabilities now existing under such repealed sections or parts thereof shall not be affected by such repeal.

STATUTES AT LARGE OR REVISED STATUTES

	Title 4, United States Code, section
R. S., secs. 1791, 1792	1
R. S., sec. 1792	2
Feb. 8, 1917, ch. 34, 39 Stat. 900	3
R. S., sec. 1793	4
R. S., secs. 203, 1794	5
R. S. sec. 1795	6
R. S., sec. 1796	7
R. S., sec. 4798	8
R. S., sec. 1836	9
R. S., sec. 1837	10
R. S., sec. 1838	11
June 16, 1936, ch. 582, sec. 10, 49 Stat. 1521; Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 7, 54 Stat. 1060	12
Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 1, 54 Stat. 1059	13
Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 2, 54 Stat. 1060	14
Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 3, 54 Stat. 1060	15
Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 4, 54 Stat. 1060	16
Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 5, 54 Stat. 1060	17
Oct. 9, 1940, ch. 787, sec. 6, 54 Stat. 1060	18

With the following committee amendment:

Page 11, line 5, after "203", insert "first clause."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OFFICIAL AND PENAL BONDS—CODIFICATION OF TITLE VI OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 7120, to codify and enact into absolute law title VI of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds."

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and Penal Bonds," is codified and enacted into absolute law, as follows:

"TITLE 6—OFFICIAL AND PENAL BONDS

"Sec. 1. Custody.
"Sec. 2. Examination as to sufficiency of sureties.
"Sec. 3. Renewal; continuance of liability.
"Sec. 4. Notice of delinquency of principal.
"Sec. 5. Limitation of actions against sureties.
"Sec. 6. Surety companies as sureties.
"Sec. 7. Same; appointment of agents; service of process.
"Sec. 8. Same; deposit of copy of charter.
"Sec. 9. Same; quarterly statements.
"Sec. 10. Same; jurisdiction of suits on bonds.
"Sec. 11. Same; nonpayment of judgment.
"Sec. 12. Same; estoppel to deny corporate powers.
"Sec. 13. Same; failure to comply with the law.
"Sec. 14. Rate of premium on bond; premiums not to be paid by United States.
"Sec. 15. Bonds or notes of United States in lieu of recognizance, stipulation, bond, guaranty, or undertaking; place of deposit; return to depositor; contractors' bonds.

"CUSTODY

"SEC. 1. All bonds of the Treasurer of the United States, collectors of internal revenue, collectors, comptrollers of customs, surveyors, and other officers of the customs, either as such officers or as disbursing officers of the Treasury, bonds of the Secretary of the Senate, Clerk of the House of Representatives, and the Sergeant at Arms of the House of Representatives, shall be placed in the custody of the Secretary of the Treasury and filed as he may direct; and the duties required by law on March 2, 1895, of the Comptroller of the Treasury in regard to such bonds, as the successor of the Commissioner of Customs and First Comptroller of the Treasury, shall be performed by the Secretary of the Treasury.

"EXAMINATION AS TO SUFFICIENCY OF SURETIES

"SEC. 2. Every officer required by law to take and approve official bonds shall cause the same to be examined at least once every 2 years for the purpose of ascertaining the sufficiency of the sureties thereon; and every officer having power to fix the amount of an official bond shall examine it to ascertain the sufficiency of the amount thereof and approve or fix said amount at least once in 2 years and as much oftener as he may deem it necessary.

"RENEWAL; CONTINUANCE OF LIABILITY

"SEC. 3. Every officer whose duty it is to take and approve official bonds shall cause all such bonds to be renewed every 4 years after their dates, but he may require such bonds to be renewed or strengthened oftener if he deem such action necessary. In the discretion of such officer the requirement of a new bond may be waived for the period of service of a bonded officer after the expiration of a 4-year term of service pending the appointment and qualification of his successor. The nonperformance of any requirement of the provisions of section 1 to 3 of this title, or of that part of section 27 of title 19 relating to transmitting copies of oaths to the Secretary of the Treasury, on the part of any official of the Government shall not be held to affect in any respect the liability of principal or sureties on any bond made or to be made to the United States. The liability of the principal and sureties on all official bonds shall continue and cover the period of service ensuing until the appointment and qualification of the successor of the principal. Nothing in said sections shall be construed to repeal or modify section 38 of title 39: *Provided*, That the payment and acceptance of the annual premium on corporate surety bonds furnished by postal officers and employees shall be a compliance with the requirement for the renewal of such bonds within the meaning of sections 1 to 3 of this title.

"NOTICE OF DELINQUENCY OF PRINCIPAL

"SEC. 4. Whenever any deficiency shall be discovered in the accounts of any official of the United States, or of any officer disbursing or chargeable with public money, it shall be the duty of the accounting officers making such discovery to at once notify the head of the department having control over the affairs of said officer of the nature and amount of said deficiency, and it shall be the immediate duty of said head of department to at once notify all obligors upon the bond or bonds of such official of the nature of such deficiency and the amount thereof. Said notification shall be deemed sufficient if mailed at the post office in the city of Washington, D. C., addressed to said sureties, respectively, and directed to the respective post offices where said obligor may reside, if known; but a failure to give or mail such notice shall not discharge the surety or sureties upon such bond.

"LIMITATION OF ACTIONS AGAINST SURETIES

"SEC. 5. If, upon the statement of the account of any official of the United States, or of any officer disbursing or chargeable with public money, by the accounting officers, it shall thereby appear that he is indebted to the United States, and suit therefor shall not be instituted within 5 years after such statement of said account, the sureties on his bond shall not be liable for such indebtedness.

"SURETY COMPANIES AS SURETIES

"SEC. 6. Whenever any recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking conditioned for the faithful performance of any duty, or for doing or refraining from doing anything in such recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking specified, is by the laws of the United States required or permitted to be given with one surety or with two or more sureties, the execution of the same or the guaranteeing of the performance of the condition thereof shall be sufficient when executed or guaranteed solely by a corporation incorporated under the laws of the United States or of any State having power to guarantee the fidelity of persons holding positions of public or private trust, and to execute and guarantee bonds and undertakings in judicial proceedings. Such recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking shall be approved by the head of department, court, judge, officer, board, or body executive, legislative, or judicial required to approve or accept the same. No officer or person having the approval of any bond shall exact that it shall be furnished by a guaranty company or by any particular guaranty company.

"SAME; APPOINTMENT OF AGENTS; SERVICE OF PROCESS

"SEC. 7. No such company shall do business under the provisions of sections 6 to 13 of this title beyond the limits of the State or Territory under whose laws it was incorporated and in which its principal office is located, nor beyond the limits of the District of Columbia, when such company was incorporated under its laws or the laws of the United States and its principal office is located in said District, until it shall by a written power of attorney appoint some person residing within the jurisdiction of the court for the judicial district wherein such suretyship is to be undertaken, who shall be a citizen of the State, Territory, or District of Columbia, wherein such court is held, as its agent, upon whom may be served all lawful process against such company, and who shall be authorized to enter an appearance in its behalf. A copy of such power of attorney duly certified and authenticated, shall be filed with the clerk of the district court of the United States for such district at each place where a term of such court is or may be held, which copy, or a certified copy thereof, shall be legal evidence in all controversies arising under sections 6 to 13 of this title. If any such agent shall be removed, resign, or die, become insane, or otherwise incapable of acting, it shall be the duty of such company to appoint another agent in his place as hereinbefore prescribed, and until such appointment shall have been made, or during the absence of any agent of

such company from such district, service of process may be upon the clerk of the court wherein such suit is brought, with like effect as upon an agent appointed by the company. The officer executing such process upon such clerk shall immediately transmit a copy thereof by mail to the company, and state such fact in his return. A judgment, decree, or order of a court entered or made after service of process as aforesaid shall be as valid and binding on such company as if served with process in said district.

"SAME; DEPOSIT OF COPY OF CHARTER

"SEC. 8. Every company, before transacting any business under sections 6 to 13 of this title, shall deposit with the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States a copy of its charter or articles of incorporation, and a statement, signed and sworn to by its president and secretary, showing its assets and liabilities. If the said Secretary of the Treasury shall be satisfied that such company has authority under its charter to do the business provided for in sections 6 to 13 of this title, and that it has a paid-up capital of not less than $250,000, in cash or its equivalent, and is able to keep and perform its contracts, he shall grant authority in writing to such company to do business under sections 6 to 13 of this title.

"SAME; QUARTERLY STATEMENTS

"SEC. 9. Every such company shall, in the months of January, April, July, and October of each year, file with the said Secretary of the Treasury a statement, signed and sworn to by its president and secretary, showing its assets and liabilities, as is required by section 8 of this title. The said Secretary of the Treasury shall have the power, and it shall be his duty to revoke the authority of any such company to transact any new business under sections 6 to 13 of this title whenever in his judgment such company is not solvent or is conducting its business in violation of sections 6 to 13 of this title. He may institute inquiry at any time into the solvency of said company and may require that additional security be given at any time by any principal when he deems such company no longer sufficient security.

"SAME; JURISDICTION OF SUITS ON BONDS

"SEC. 10. Any surety company doing business under the provisions of sections 6 to 13 of this title may be sued in respect thereof in any court of the United States which has or may have jurisdiction of actions or suits upon such recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking, in the district in which such recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking was made or guaranteed, or in the district in which the principal office of such company is located. For the purposes of sections 6 to 13 of this title such recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking shall be treated as made or guaranteed in the district in which the office is located, to which it is returnable, or in which it is filed, or in the district in which the principal in such recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking resided when it was made or guaranteed.

"SAME; NONPAYMENT OF JUDGMENT

"SEC. 11. If any such company shall neglect or refuse to pay any final judgment or decree rendered against it upon any such recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking made or guaranteed by it under the provisions of sections 6 to 13 of this title, from which no appeal or supersedeas has been taken, for 30 days after the rendition of such judgment or decree, it shall forfeit all right to do business under sections 6 to 13 of this title.

"SAME; ESTOPPEL TO DENY CORPORATE POWERS

"SEC. 12. Any company which shall execute or guarantee any recognizance, stipulation, bond, or undertaking under the provisions of sections 6 to 13 of this title shall be estopped in any proceeding to enforce the liability which it shall have assumed to incur, to deny its corporate power to execute or guarantee such instrument or assume such liability.

"SAME; FAILURE TO COMPLY WITH LAW

"SEC. 13. Any company doing business under the provisions of sections 6 to 13 of this title which shall fail to comply with any of its provisions shall forfeit to the United States for every such failure not less than $500 nor more than $5,000, to be recovered by suit in the name of the United States in the same courts in which suit may be brought against such company under the provisions of sections 6 to 13 of this title, and such failure shall not affect the validity of any contract entered into by such company.

"RATE OF PREMIUM ON BOND; PREMIUMS NOT TO BE PAID BY UNITED STATES

"SEC. 14. Until otherwise provided by law no bond shall be accepted from any surety or bonding company for any officer or employee of the United States which shall cost more than 35 percent in excess of the rate of premium charged for a like bond during the calendar year 1908. The United States shall not pay any part of the premium or other cost of furnishing a bond required by law or otherwise of any officer or employee of the United States.

"BONDS OR NOTES OF UNITED STATES IN LIEU OF RECOGNIZANCE, STIPULATION, BOND, GUARANTY, OR UNDERTAKING; PLACE OF DEPOSIT; RETURN TO DEPOSITOR; CONTRACTORS' BONDS

"SEC. 15. Wherever by the laws of the United States or regulations made pursuant thereto, any person is required to furnish any recognizance, stipulation, bond, guaranty, or undertaking, hereinafter called 'penal bond', with surety or sureties, such person may, in lieu of such surety or sureties, deposit as security with the official having authority to approve such penal bond, United States Liberty bonds or other bonds or notes of the United States in a sum equal at their par value to the amount of such penal bond required to be furnished, together with an agreement authorizing such official to collect or sell such bonds or notes so deposited in case of any default in the performance of any of the conditions or stipulations of such penal bond. The acceptance of such United States bonds or notes in lieu of surety or sureties required by law shall have the same force and effect as individual or corporate sureties, or certified checks, bank drafts, post-office money orders, or cash, for the penalty or amount of such penal bond. The bonds or notes deposited hereunder, and such other United States bonds or notes as may be substituted therefor from time to time as such security, may be deposited with the Treasurer of the United States, a Federal Reserve bank, or other depositary duly designated for that purpose by the Secretary, which shall issue receipt therefor, describing such bonds or notes so deposited. As soon as security for the performance of such penal bond is no longer necessary, such bonds or notes so deposited shall be returned to the depositor. In case a person or persons supplying a contractor with labor or material as provided by section 270 of title 40 shall file with the obligee, at any time after a default in the performance of any contract subject to said section 270, the application and affidavit therein provided, the obligee shall not deliver to the obligor the deposited bonds or notes nor any surplus proceeds thereof until the expiration of the time limited by said section 270 for the institution of suit by such person or persons, and, in case suit shall be instituted within such time, shall hold said bonds or notes or proceeds subject to the order of the court having jurisdiction thereof. Nothing herein contained shall affect or impair the priority of the claim of the United States against the bonds or notes deposited or any right or remedy granted by said section 270 or by this section to the United States for default upon any obligation of said penal bond. All laws inconsistent with this section are hereby so modified as to conform to the provisions hereof. Nothing contained herein shall affect the authority of courts over the security, where such bonds are taken as security in judicial proceedings, or the authority of any administrative officer of the United States to receive United States bonds for security in cases authorized by existing laws. The Secretary may prescribe rules and regulations necessary and proper for carrying this section into effect. The term 'person' in this section means an individual, a trust or estate, a partnership, or a corporation; the term 'Secretary' means the Secretary of the Treasury. In order to avoid the frequent substitution of securities such rules and regulations may limit the effect of this section, in appropriate classes of cases, to bonds and notes of the United States maturing more than a year after the date of deposit of such bonds as security. The phrase 'bonds or notes of the United States' shall be deemed, for the purposes of this section, to mean any public-debt obligations of the United States and any bonds, notes, or other obligations which are unconditionally guaranteed as to both interest and principal by the United States."

SEC. 2. The sections or parts thereof of the Statutes at Large covering provisions codified in this act, insofar as such provisions appear in title 6, United States Code, 1940 edition, and supplements thereto, as shown by the appended table, are hereby repealed: *Provided*, That any rights or liabilities now existing under such repealed sections or parts thereof shall not be affected by such repeal.

STATUTES AT LARGE

	Title 6, United States Code, section
Mar. 2, 1895, ch. 177, sec. 5, 28 Stat. 807; June 17, 1930, ch. 497, secs. 523, 651 (a) (1), 46 Stat. 740, 762	1
Mar. 2, 1895, ch. 177, sec. 5, 28 Stat. 807	2
Mar. 2, 1895, ch. 177, sec. 5, 28 Stat. 807; Mar. 8, 1928, ch. 148, 45 Stat. 247	3
Aug. 8, 1888, ch. 787, sec. 1, 25 Stat. 387	4
Aug. 8, 1888, ch. 787, sec. 2, 25 Stat. 387; June 10, 1921, ch. 18, sec. 301, 42 Stat. 23	5
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 1, 28 Stat. 279	6
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 2, 28 Stat. 279	7
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 3, 28 Stat. 279; Mar. 23, 1910, ch. 109, 36 Stat. 241	8
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 4, 28 Stat. 279; Mar. 23, 1910, ch. 109, 36 Stat. 241	9
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 5, 28 Stat. 280	10
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 6, 28 Stat. 280; Jan. 31, 1928, ch. 14, sec. 1, 45 Stat. 54	11
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 7, 28 Stat. 280	12
Aug. 13, 1894, ch. 282, sec. 8, 28 Stat. 280	13
Aug. 5, 1909, ch. 7, 36 Stat. 125	14
Feb. 24, 1919, ch. 18, sec. 1320, 40 Stat. 1148; Nov. 23, 1921, ch. 136, sec. 1329, 42 Stat. 318; June 2, 1924, ch. 234, secs. 2, 1029, 43 Stat. 253; 349; Feb. 26, 1926, ch. 27, secs. 2, 1126, 1200, 44 Stat. 9, 122, 125; Feb. 4, 1935, ch. 5, sec. 7, 49 Stat. 22	15

With the following committee amendments:

The amendments are as follows:

Page 7, line 20, insert before period at end the words "of this title.";

Page 13, line 10:

(Line 1 of tabulation) after "sec. 5" insert "second paragraph"; and at end of line after "523" insert "first paragraph";

(Line 2 of tabulation) strike out "651 (a) (1)" and "762";

(Line 3 of tabulation) after "sec. 5" insert "third paragraph";

(Line 4 of tabulation) after "sec. 5" insert "fourth paragraph";

(Line 7 of tabulation) after semicolon insert "as modified by";

(Line 16 of tabulation) after semicolon insert "as modified by";

(Line 20 of tabulation) after "125" insert "first paragraph under 'Department of Commerce and Labor' ";

(Line 22 of tabulation) strike out all after semicolon;

(Line 23 of tabulation) strike out "349;", "1200", and "125"; and insert after "2"—"(a) (1), (6),".

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Calendar No. 552, the bill (S. 2368) to amend the joint resolution approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 858), as amended, and the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 (54 Stat. 885), as amended, so as to remove the requirement that medical statements shall be furnished to those persons performing military service thereunder, which has not been on the calendar the necessary length of time may, nevertheless, be considered at this time.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, we have had no copies of this bill and do not know what is in it. The unofficial objectors on this committee ordinarily object to the bringing up of bills we have not had time to study.

Is this bill of such extreme urgency that it cannot go over 2 weeks in order to allow us to study it?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I may say to the gentleman from New Jersey that the officials of the War Department and the Selective Service Board are very anxious to have this bill enacted into law. It is a Senate bill and has already passed that body.

The purpose of the bill is to eliminate from the provision of section 3 (a) of the Selective Service and Training Act the compulsory requirement of furnishing the soldier certain medical statements. The health and medical committee which has studied the matter has recommended that this compulsory requirement be taken out, and we are convinced by the hearings held before our committee that as a matter of fact this requirement should be taken out, that the officials ought not to be required to give the medical statements to the persons in question in cases, for instance, involving mental deficiencies, heart disease, cancer, and other malignant conditions. Under the law as it stands at the present time they are required to give these statements. We believe they ought not to be required but that it should be left within the discretion of the medical authorities.

Mr. KEAN. I do not believe there is any such urgency to this bill that it cannot go over for 2 weeks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

PREVENTING THE MAKING OF PHOTOGRAPHS AND SKETCHES OF MILITARY OR NAVAL RESERVATIONS, ETC.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, before we leave the Consent Calendar, I ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar No. 535, S. 1707, an act to prevent the making of photographs and sketches of military or naval reservations, naval vessels, and other naval and military properties, and for other purposes.

I objected to it when it was reached in its regular order because there was no member of the Committee on Military Affairs on the floor. Since then members of the Military Affairs Committee have come on the floor and have consented to an amendment limiting the effect of the act to the duration of the war. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it may be called up and that the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] may offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whoever, except in performance of duty or employment in connection with the national defense, shall knowingly and willfully make any sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, copy, or other representation of any navy yard, naval station, or of any military post, fort, camp, station, arsenal, airfield, or other military or naval reservation, or place used for national defense purposes by the War or Navy Departments, or of any vessel, aircraft, installation, equipment, or other property whatsoever, located within any such post, fort, camp, arsenal, airfield, yard, station, reservation or place, or in the waters adjacent thereto, or in any defensive sea area established in accordance with law; or whoever, except in performance of duty or employment in connection with the national defense, shall knowingly and willfully make any sketch, photograph, photographic negative, blueprint, plan, map, model, copy, or other representation of any vessel, aircraft, installation, equipment, or other property relating to the national defense being manufactured or under construction or repair for or awaiting delivery to the War or Navy Departments or the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States under any contract or agreement with the United States or such country or otherwise on behalf of the United States or such country, located at the factory, plant, yard, storehouse, or other place of business of any contractor, subcontractor, or other person, or in the waters adjacent to any such place, shall be punished as provided herein.

SEC. 2. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 1, the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy is authorized, under such regulations as he may prescribe, to permit photographs, sketches, or other representations to be made when, in his opinion, the interests of national defense will not be adversely affected thereby.

SEC. 3. Any person found guilty of a violation of this act shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment.

SEC. 4. The provisions of this act shall apply in the Philippine Islands as well as in all other places within the territory or jurisdiction of the United States.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 10, insert a new section to read as follows:

"This act shall be effective only for the duration of the present war as determined by proclamation of the President."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARKETING QUOTAS FOR PEANUTS

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7137) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to marketing quotas for peanuts, and for other purposes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, was this bill on the Consent Calendar?

Mr. FULMER. No; this bill was not on the Consent Calendar. I may state to the gentleman from Massachusetts that it was unanimously reported by the Committee on Agriculture, and that it is perfectly satisfactory to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and others to call it up at this time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have a rule that I am supposed to have some notice of the calling up of these bills so that I may have the minority member of the committee here. That notice not having been given, and the minority representative not being here, I cannot consent to its consideration at this time.

Mr. FULMER. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] went over to speak with the gentleman after speaking with the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], but the gentleman happens not to be on the floor at the moment. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] is deeply interested in this matter and he spoke with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], and also the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], and it was perfectly satisfactory to them.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture says is correct. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE] did come over here. I understood the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] had no objection, and that he would be on the floor if the bill was called up. I know nothing else about it. However, one Member has just suggested to me that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], who is not present, is very much opposed to the bill.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, may I say that I spoke to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] about an hour ago and told him that the Speaker had consented that the bill be called up at the completion of the Consent Calendar. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] stated he knew of no objection to the bill. I was not able to see the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have been on the floor every minute since 12 o'clock.

Mr. PACE. The gentleman was absent for a moment, and in his absence I spoke to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have not been absent a single moment. I may have been standing in the cloakroom, but I was not very far away.

Mr. PACE. He escaped my notice at the time. I did want the gentleman to know about it. I spoke to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. The bill is not an important piece of legislation. It simply changes some administrative features of the program, and its importance is that the peanut crop is now coming along.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What harm would there be if it went over until tomorrow?

Mr. PACE. If we can get permission of the Speaker to call it up tomorrow, no harm would be done.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I must insist that the ranking minority member of the committee be present. That is the only way we can have good government. We have to know what this legislation is about, and I think it would be advisable to have it go over.

Mr. PACE. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman's wishes.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] is now on the floor, and we would like to renew the request made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE]?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Speaker, due to the opposition of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD], I object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a speech delivered by the distinguished head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, J. Edgar Hoover, at St. Johns University Law School, Brooklyn, N. Y., on June 11, 1942.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address delivered by him.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend three separate radio speeches of mine in the RECORD, under dates of May 31, June 7, and June 12.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I ask unanimous consent that those who have special orders yield me 3 minutes in order to bring up a resolution that I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not hear the request.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentlemen who have special orders yield me 3 minutes in order to bring up a resolution that I have here?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Has the gentlewoman consulted with the Speaker in reference to this matter?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. No; I have not.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Then the gentlewoman from Massachusetts cannot be recognized at this time.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from the president of the Michigan College of Mining and Technology.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOOK]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CANFIELD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from a soldier to his father.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PRIEST]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced the following resolution:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America views with horror and abhorrence the vicious mass revenge murders now being inflicted upon the innocent peoples of conquered Europe by a barbarous and brutal enemy; and be it further

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress of the United States of America deplores the atrocities and persecutions inflicted upon the heroic people of the Kingdom of Greece and upon the peoples of other countries by the inhuman war lords of the Axis Powers; and the Congress of the United States of America extends to those unfortunate and long-suffering peoples its deep and profound sympathy and pledges its support to measures substantially to relieve and ameliorate their condition and to restore to them the freedom and independence they enjoyed before being ruthlessly wrested from them by conscienceless and soulless aggressors.

Mr. Speaker, we have just heard the splendid and inspiring address delivered by the able and gallant King of Greece, the King of the armies of Greece and the King of the country which is giving all it has in order that the peoples of the world may be free, may have an opportunity to worship God as they see fit, and may have freedom of action in their government and freedom in every way. I believe no Member of Congress or any other person here today listened to that address without great emotion. The Congress views with abhorrence the vicious mass revenge murders now being inflicted upon perfectly innocent peoples of conquered Europe and Asia by a brutal and barbarous enemy. I have visited Greece and as the great soldier King addressed the Congress the glories of that country and the courage and valor of her soldiers were vividly in my mind. Mr. Speaker, I had hoped that this resolution could be taken up today and acted upon. I am sorry the House is going to adjourn so soon. I believe that within a day or two this resolution will be passed. I believe this resolution of sympathy and assistance will give heart to the nations, particularly the smaller nations, who have been gallantly fighting, and will give them a hope and assistance that will enable them to win freedom for all time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7036. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the fifty-second annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans, to be held at Chattanooga, Tenn., June 23 to 26, inclusive, 1942.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 2285. An act to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank, of certain officers of the Navy;

S. 2025. An act to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service;

S. 2427. An act to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes;

S. 2496. An act to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 130. A joint resolution to extend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 16, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, June 16, 1942, for consideration of war housing, room 1324, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, June 16, 1942.

Business to be considered: H. R. 7002, to increase agricultural purchasing power and to meet the need of combating malnutrition among the people of low income by defining and making certain a reasonable definition and standard for nonfat dry milk solids.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Wednesday, June 17, 1942.

Business to be considered: Hearing on Federal Communications Commission.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Wednesday, June 17, 1942.

Business to be considered: Hearings on H. R. 7212, a bill to amend section 13 (d) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1750. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting four supplemental estimates of appropriations for the fiscal year 1943 for the Department of Commerce (Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics), amounting to $4,945,175 (H. Doc. No. 796); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1751. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation for the legislative establishment, United States Senate, for the fiscal year 1942, amounting to $50,000 (H. Doc. No. 797); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1752. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriations for the emergency fund for the President amounting to $100,000,000 (H. Doc. No. 798); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

1753. A letter from the Administrator, War Shipping Administration, transmitting a report of action taken under section 217 (b) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public, No. 498, 77th Cong.); to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1754. A letter from the Department of the Secretary of Hawaii, transmitting copy of the laws enacted by the Legislature of the Territory of Hawaii, special session of 1941; to the Committee on the Territories.

1755. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for reciprocal privileges with respect to the filing of applications for patents for inventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

1756. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting herewith, pursuant to the act of June 22, 1936 (49 Stat. 1803), a report dated November 30, 1939, of economic conditions affecting certain lands of the irrigation project under the jurisdiction of the Oroville-Tonasket irrigation district in the State of Washington; also a draft of bill to provide relief to the owners of former Indian-owned land within the Oroville-Tonasket irrigation district, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 7160. A bill to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy during the existing war, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2238). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. BURCH: Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads. S. 337. An act to provide for a permanent postage rate of 1½ cents per pound on books; with amendment (Rept. No. 2239). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 1957. An act to establish the naval procurement fund, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2240). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PATMAN:

H. R. 7230. A bill authorizing the issuance of certificates of indebtedness to the Federal reserve banks, for financing the national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COFFEE of Washington:

H. J. Res. 326. Joint resolution to create a commission on tax integration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts:

H. Con. Res. 70. Concurrent resolution condemning the atrocities inflicted by the Axis Powers upon the subjugated people of Europe and Asia and expressing the sympathy of the Congress to the victims of aggression and pledging the support of the Congress to measures substantially to relieve and redress their wrongs; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3063. By Mr. BLAND: Petition of 47 citizens of Newport News, Va., and adopted by the Orcutt Avenue Baptist Church, of Newport News, Va., urging passage of Senate bill 860, and House bills 4000 and 6785; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3064. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 120 residents of the city of Butler in the State of Pennsylvania, urging the passage of Senate bill 860, as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3065. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition of Mrs. E C. Jacobs and 38 other residents of Flora, Ill., urging the enactment of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3066. By Mr. LYNCH: Resolution of the Butchers' Union of Greater New York and vicinity, urging increases in pay for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3067. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 223 voters in Macomb and St. Clair Counties, Mich., expressing opposition to proposed legislation to restrict the sale of beer in the vicinity of military camps, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 16, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father, Author of the morning light and Guardian through the darkness, grant us Thy spirit as we go forward to our labors of this day. In that mysterious sense of companionship, which we cannot understand, do Thou stand by a true, wise friend to help us in that faith which alone leads to victory in Christ Jesus, in whom are embodied all the sanctities and sufferings of humanity.

Almighty God, we pray with high resolution that we may reverence the conscience as king; may strive in all righteous ways to redress human wrongs; speak no evil and honor our words; lead good lives and live in chastity; teach by wholesome example in our daily conduct; be courteous to all, loving the truth, despising the false, and discovering that the core of human life is good and under Divine guidance is destined to become better. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 780. An act for the relief of Harvey C. Artis;

H. R. 1349. An act for the relief of Annie Brown;

H. R. 2419. An act for the relief of Chan Tsork-ying;

H. R. 3352. An act for the relief of Alice W. Miller;

H. R. 3402. An act for the relief of Catherine R. Johnson;

H. R. 5526. An act for the relief of James E. Savage;

H. R. 5610. An act for the relief of G. H. Condon, M. E. Cannon, W. J. Esterle, C. C. Gasaway, James F. Retallack, and L. G. Yinger;

H. R. 5870. An act to amend section 24 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917;

H. R. 5938. An act for the relief of A. H. Larzelere;

H. R. 6297. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Dr. Wesley K. Harris;

H. R. 6349. An act for the relief of Jeff Roberts;

H. R. 6597. An act for the relief of A. Mack Dodd and Henry Dodd;

H. R. 6598. An act for the relief of Leanna M. Stright;

H. R. 6634. An act to facilitate the employment by defense contractors of certain former members of the land and naval forces, including the Coast Guard, of the United States;

H. R. 6676. An act for the relief of F. A. Holmes, former United States disbursing clerk for the State of Illinois;

H. R. 6782. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to assign officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force to duty in the detective bureau of the Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6804. An act to amend paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6925. An act to provide additional compensation for Joseph Sharfsin, Esq., for professional services rendered the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6953. An act to amend the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7066. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 3173. An act to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act of September 7, 1916, to Mrs. Charles O. DeFord;

H. R. 4923. An act for the relief of the estate of Orion Knox, deceased;

H. R. 5317. An act for the relief of Mrs. Jessie A. Beechwood;

H. R. 5854. An act for the relief of Madeleine Hammett, Olive Hammett, Walter Young, the estate of Laura O'Malley Young, deceased, and the legal guardian of Laura Elizabeth Young;

H. R. 6077. An act for the relief of Edward P. Reilly;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. E. P. Ball;

H. R. 6410. An act for the relief of Alex Gamble;

H. R. 6899. An act to exempt custodial employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education from the operation of the provisions of section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act, approved May 10, 1916; and

H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 536. An act granting the Distinguished Service Cross to Raymond P. Finnegan and John P. Cullen, respectively;

S. 1622. An act to authorize payment to janitors and custodians of the public schools of the District of Columbia for services rendered for local boards of the Selective Service System;

S. 2195. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Charles E. Salmons;

S. 2316. An act to provide for the placing in Gallinger Hospital of a memorial to George Earle Chamberlain;

S. 2322. An act to remove the time limit for cooperation between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Farm Security Administration in the development of farm units on public lands under Federal reclamation projects;

S. 2363. An act for the relief of Percy Ray Greer, a minor;

S. 2442. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and a service lapel button;

S. 2461. An act for the relief of Minnie C. Sanders;

S. 2502. An act relating to the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia;

S. 2505. An act to amend sections 23-701 and 23-702 of title 23, chapter 7, of the District of Columbia Code, 1940 edition;

S. 2543. An act to amend subsection (3) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

S. 2545. An act to promote the war effort by facilitating the planting of the full allotted acreage of cotton, as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture as the Nation's war goal;

S. 2551. An act for the relief of Vernon Van Zandt;

S. 2553. An act to create the title of flight officer in the Army Air Forces, to amend the Army Aviation Cadet Act, and for other purposes; and

S. 2555. An act to authorize the use of certificates by officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, in connection with pay and allowance accounts of military and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction of the War and Navy Departments.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2309. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2467) entitled "An act to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes."

HEROES OF THE UNITED NATIONS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday last the city of Washington entertained certain heroes of the United Nations. While the House was not in session, informal arrangements were made for the Members in Washington to meet these heroes. Practically all the membership of the House was present and we met these men in the Speaker's office and then, on account of the large number of Members present, we came in on the floor of the House and there the Members were introduced to these heroes.

The heroes were met by the Acting Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX], myself, and the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], as well as a great majority of the Members of this body. I am glad to report to the Speaker that it was a very splendid occasion and I carried out the instructions which the Speaker gave me. At this point in the RECORD I ask unanimous consent to insert brief remarks made on that occasion by myself, as well as a newspaper story in one of the Washington papers, giving the names and the exploits of the heroes whom we honored last Saturday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

In welcoming the heroes on their visit to the House of Representatives, Mr. MCCORMACK made the following statement:

Mr. MCCORMACK. Gentlemen, the Congress is happy to have you here. We are very proud of your accomplishments.

The House is not in session today, and for that reason the House cannot officially welcome you. This is a meeting of those Members who are present in Washington today, comprising most of the Members, to meet and honor you valiant men who typify the wonderful spirit of the forces fighting the aggressor. I shall not refer to nor ask you from what country you come, for in this conflict we are all fighting in one cause, to overthrow the forces of destruction and to make a decent future world in which to live. You have heard many speeches on your tour, so I will not weary you with a long speech, so I will conclude my remarks so that Members present can shake hands with each one of you.

Article from the Washington Post of Saturday, June 13, 1942, containing biographical sketches and citations of the feats of daring performed by the heroes honored by the House of Representatives at the reception in the Speaker's office and the House Chamber:

WASHINGTON WILL HONOR WAR HEROES TODAY WITH PARADE AND PAGEANTRY—RECEPTION AT WHITE HOUSE; WATER-GATE RALLY SCHEDULED

Fourteen American and British war heroes will put the battle front practically in the lap of Washington's home front today with a parade of such proportions that it is sure to arouse nostalgic memories of those "good old days."

Typical of more halcyon times when a parade down Pennsylvania Avenue warranted taking the day off, today's procession will be formed near the White House and will include the Army Air Force Band from Bolling Field, various motorized units and cars carrying flags of the United Nations.

The heroes will travel in open Army cars, with pendant signs identifying each one and the battle front where he served.

Today's stop is the fourth of a tour of 21 cities that began in New York Monday and proceeded to Boston, Philadelphia, and Baltimore.

A White House reception, an official greeting on Capitol Hill by special committees of the House and Senate, luncheon at the Treasury with Secretary Morgenthau as host, and a reception at the British Embassy round out their schedule for the day.

In the evening there will be a mass free-admission rally at the water gate opposite Lincoln Memorial, at which the heroes will be introduced and tell briefly of their exploits.

Also, there will be an informal pageant written by Maxwell Anderson, New York playwright, and conducted by Melvyn Douglas. Music will be by Bernie Cummins and his orchestra, with Jane Pickens, radio, stage, and

screen star, leading community singing. Girls from the Capital Theater's Rhythm Rockets and the Earle Theater's Roxyettes also will take part.

The quartet of American Army and Navy men among the heroes includes:

LT. ELLIOTT VANDEVANTER, JR.

Lieutenant Vandevanter, Jr., of Washington, was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for attacks against Japanese landing parties in the face of heavy antiaircraft fire on Luzon, and as a member of a flight that scored hits on a Japanese battleship and two destroyers in the southwest Pacific.

His wife, who resides here with her mother, Mrs. Patrick Lathrop, 2129 Florida Avenue NW., was much in the news several years back when, during a visit to Shanghai, she was kicked by a Japanese soldier. Earlier this year when she was interviewed by a Post reporter following announcement that her husband had been awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross, Mrs. Vandevanter said she thought it was rather silly to suggest that he was paying back the Japanese for their mistreatment of her, and said she'd exchange all of the lieutenant's medals for just one visit from him.

Lieutenant Vandevanter's citation read in part:

"Due to bad weather he could not find an opening for his bomb so he made run after run under enemy fire, until a hole in the clouds permitted an effective attack."

The Washington flier has seen almost continuous action since December 7.

ENSIGN FRANCIS PINTER, DISTINGUISHED FLYING CROSS, UNITED STATES NAVAL RESERVE

Ensign Pinter recently was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for his brave and daring removal of 16 men and a woman from a life raft that had been adrift for more than 60 hours. Despite the fact that his plane was heavily loaded with bombs and gas, Ensign Pinter effected an almost miraculous landing and take-off in heavy seas to effect the rescue.

A native of Bethlehem, Pa., Ensign Pinter attended Penn State College and Moravian College, where he excelled in boxing and football. Enlisting in the Naval Reserve as a seaman, second class, in December 1939, he was appointed an ensign in the air force in November 1940. Since his appointment he has been assigned to the air force, Atlantic Fleet.

ENSIGN DONALD F. MASON

Ensign Mason is a New York boy who recently headlined the newspapers of the Nation with the now famous wireless report, "Sighted sub, sank same."

Ensign Mason is 28 and his home is at 623 Fourth Street, Rochester, N. Y.

The story of his achievement brought a thrill to the entire Nation. While piloting his plane on patrol duty he observed the wake of a submarine proceeding submerged at periscope depth. He immediately turned, dived to a low altitude and dropped two depth bombs which straddled the periscope. The conning tower of the submarine rose slightly in the water for a short period and then sank again. A large patch of oil soon covered the area.

Ensign Mason received two decorations—the Distinguished Flying Cross and the Silver Star. His citation read in part:

"For distinguished coolness, alertness, initiative, and excellent flying ability."

Ensign Mason is married and his wife is at present in Alameda, Calif.

LT. WILLIAM C. CARRITHERS

Lieutenant Carrithers was cited for special skill as a bomber navigator. He participated on a long series of flights, during which B–17's were used to bomb Japanese troops and installations.

As a navigator, it was Lieutenant Carrithers' job to take his bomber from the home field to the target, which almost always involved distant water flights over many islands in the southwest Pacific. In addition to these duties, he acted as a gunner in fighting off Japanese attacking planes once they were over the target.

Lieutenant Carrithers was born in Chicago. He attended school at Albuquerque and Denver and was a graduate of the University of Colorado. His mother is Mrs. Gertrude Carrithers, of Manitou Springs, Colo.

The 10 British war heroes are:

SQUADRON LEADER NETTLETON, VICTORIA CROSS

Squadron Leader John Daring Nettleton was the leader of 1 of 2 formations of 6 Lancaster heavy bombers which flew 1,000 miles over hostile territory in order to deliver a low-level bombardment in full daylight on the Diesel engine factory at Augsburg, near Munich, in southern Germany (date of attack, April 17, 1942). Soon after crossing into enemy territory his formation was engaged by 25 to 35 fighters and one by one the aircraft of his formation were shot down until only his own and 1 other remained.

After a flight carried out mostly at an altitude of 50 feet above ground, he brought his two remaining aircraft to Augsburg and plunged directly through antiaircraft fire of great intensity. Though fired at from point-blank range, they held their course and dropped their bombs true on the target. The second aircraft, hit by flak, crashed in flames. Squadron Leader Nettleton's plane, though riddled, flew safely back to base, the only surviving plane in the original detachment.

Squadron Leader Nettleton, 24, is the grandson of Admiral Nettleton, Royal Navy. He was born in Nongoma, Zululand, and his home is at Rondebosch, Cape Town. He took his wings early in 1939, was promoted to flight officer in 1940, flight lieutenant in February 1941, and squadron leader in the following July. He has led daylight raids over Brest, St. Omer and Augsburg in addition to countless night operations which included two raids on Berlin.

FLIGHT LT. CARROLL WARREN M'COLPIN

Flight Lieutenant McColpin was born in Buffalo, N. Y., but lived in Los Angeles for a number of years before he joined the Royal Air Force.

Lieutenant McColpin is a member of the famour Third Eagle Squadron. He made his home in an airdrome whose famous pilots are credited with destroying nearly 900 enemy aircraft.

Red-haired Lieutenant McColpin fitted well into the fighting tradition of his station. On the ground he is quiet and unassuming; in the air his fellow Spitfire pilots say he can see Huns long before most fliers know they are about. On operations he has the dash of spirit inherited from his Irish mother, tempered by the caution instilled by his Scottish father.

He learned to fly in Los Angeles in 1938 and joined the Royal Air Force in October 1940. He was assigned to the Second Eagle Squadron; later was assigned to the First Squadron, and in July 1941 he got his first enemy plane.

CHIEF ENGINE ROOM ARTIFICER HARRY HOWARD, D. S. M. (R. N.)

Harry Howard will give the first-hand story of the St. Nazaire raids, for he took an active part in the blowing up of the dock gates and as a result won the Distinguished Service Medal.

He joined the Royal Navy in May 1919 and served in many parts of the world, including Hong Kong, Vladivostok, Italy, and Germany.

From 1938 to 1940 he served in the Mediterranean, being in action at Tobruk, Derna, Bardia, and Bengazi. He took part in the evacuation of headquarters troops from Bardia. At Tobruk he helped in clearing up underground shelters, which were heavily shelled and under fire constantly.

Harry Howard was signed to the *Campbeltown* in October 1941 and served in convoy and patrol work. He is 48 and was born at Sheffield, and was educated at Furse Hill School, Sheffield.

LT. J. MICHAEL HALL, LANCASHIRE FUSILIERS, ATTACHED NO. 3 COMMANDO

With an Irishman's love for action, Lieutenant Hall joined the commandos in May 1941, and took part in the combined operations attack at Vaagso on December 27, 1941. In this daring operation, Lieutenant Hall, with his section, was given the task of circling the town and attacking the main street from the landward side. After clearing the street the section was to join up with another party which was attacking from the shore. Before reaching the main street and while attempting to cross open ground, Lieutenant Hall was wounded. He finally made the ship, where an emergency operation was performed.

Lieutenant Hall, who is aged 21, was born at Bury, Lancashire. He was educated at St. Anne's-on-Sea School and at Bury Grammar School. His home is in Bury.

WING COMMANDER M. LOUDON, D. F. C.

Wing Commander Loudon is a distinguished fighter pilot who was awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for combat actions over Tobruk. From 1941 until recently he had been based in Libya, and in December of 1941, his wing, which he was leading, shot down eight Junker 87's, and probably destroyed half a dozen others. This action took place over El Gobi, south of Tobruk, where fighting is once again fierce. Earlier last year Commander Loudon was commanding officer of the city of Edinburgh Auxiliary Squadron, which played a large part in the defense of London during the all-out German bombing attacks.

He was born at Sao Paulo, Brazil, 26 years ago but was educated in England. He had taken a short-term commission in the Royal Air Force in 1935, so that upon the outbreak of war he was a trained fighter pilot. While engaged in convoy attack an unlucky hit put him out of action for a while, and during this period he served as staff pilot in a flying training command. He resumed operational flying in 1941.

He returned to Britain 2 months ago to lead operational fighter wing attacks, although he prefers desert warfare because, he says, "It's good to see your own tanks rumbling forward beneath you as you patrol in your hurricane."

LT. THOMAS WILSON BOYD, D. S. O. (R. N.), VOLUNTEER RESERVE

Lieutenant Boyd was awarded the Distinguished Service Order for his part in the combined operations attack on the naval base at St. Nazaire in March 1942. The decoration was given him for "great gallantry and skill in bombarding enemy positions on shore at point-blank range and in taking his own craft in the full light of searchlights and in the face of concentrated enemy fire from a range of less than 100 yards to the rescue of the crew of a burning motor launch."

Lieutenant Boyd has all the modesty of a true hero. He joined the Territorial Army (Tank Corps) in 1932. He took part in the evacuation of Army troops from Dunkerque. He obtained his commission in 1940 and served as first lieutenant in command of a motor torpedo boat. His latest assignment is in command of a motor gunboat.

SGT. R. GEORGE HERBERT, D. C. M., M. M.

Sergeant Herbert was awarded the Distinguished Conduct Medal for bravery in a commando attack on Vaagso, Norway, when, as a member of a section of commandos, his

duty was to capture gun emplacements and a German barracks. Having completed these tasks, in which 16 German soldiers and 1 officer were captured, his section was detailed to attack the main street on the shore end, and Sergeant Herbert distinguished himself in house-to-house fighting to establish contact with another British section.

Previous to the Vaagso attack and to an attack on the Lofoten Isles, Sergeant Herbert won the military medal for carrying a wounded officer and three wounded men back to his platoon during a last stand at Oudenarde. He fought during the retreat from Boulogne, dived from a boat sunk by enemy aircraft, and swam to another boat which was later sunk by aerial torpedoing. He arrived in England on H. M. S. *Crivey*.

Sergeant Herbert has served 7 years in the Army, mostly in China and India. He was recalled from the reserve at the beginning of the war and served in the East Lancashire Regiment. He is 28, was born at Blaina, Monmouthshire. His home is at Largs, Scotland.

PILOT OFFICER A. F. TAYLOR, D. F. C.

Pilot Officer A. F. Taylor, D. F. C., culminated 22 months of distinguished flying with the raiding parties that leveled Rostock and Luebeck. This is the story of the Rostock raid as Taylor tells it:

"We got to Rostock without any trouble," he said, "and we had a look around for about 5 minutes. There were lots of fires going already.

"I went in to bomb. We were carrying incendiaries.

"There was very little opposition over the target. Nothing happened to us and we set course for home.

"We crossed the Danish coast at 10,000 feet and started losing height again as we flew toward England. The trip seemed pretty well over.

"Over the sea I let the second pilot take over, and I went forward into the bomb aimer's position in the nose of the aircraft to see if I could see any shipping movement down below.

"I'd been lying down there about 4 or 5 minutes when there came a hell of a noise from the back. I got a sort of powerful kick in the pants as some bullets went through my leg and thigh.

"A German fighter came in dead astern this time. With our rear gunner dead from gunfire, we were defenseless against a stern attack except by maneuvering.

"I heard the German firing, so I shoved the stick over. Most of his tracer went whizzing by on the port side as we turned steeply away. I could see it from the cockpit, just a few feet away. I should say he was firing from almost point-blank range.

"He didn't make any further attacks. He probably thought we'd had it or he may have used up all his ammunition.

"Well, we just sort of flew on back. The wound was paining me now and the aircraft was difficult to fly. All the instruments, except the compass and the altimeter, had gone and the hydraulics had been shot away.

"The wireless operator started tapping away on the old set pretty heartily, which was a good show; the navigator kept his head and did some pretty astute navigating, so we managed to get back quite nicely and made a belly landing.

"I climbed out and was taken away in the ambulance."

Born in London, he went out to South Africa with his parents when he was only a few months old. There he was educated at Diocesan College, Capetown, and Capetown University. Coming to England, he went up to Cambridge, where he specialized in history.

SGT. D. N. HUNTLEY

Sergeant Huntley distinguished himself as a gunner on a Lancaster bomber in the epic Augsburg flight.

Engaged as a clerk in the Shell Oil Co.'s office in Salisbury, Southern Rhodesia, he was among the first 300 to enlist in the Royal Air Force in Southern Africa. Born in Salisbury in September 1921, he had not quite reached his eighteenth birthday when the war broke out. Sergeant Huntley comes from a fighting family. His father is still with the First Rhodesian Regiment, although his age barred him from going to Egypt with it. A brother is at present serving there with the King's Royal Rifles.

FLIGHT SGT. MAXWELL ALEXANDER DICK RIDDELL

Flight Sergeant Riddell hails from Hamilton, Lanarkshire, Scotland. At 21 he was a veteran pilot. His earliest ambition was to join the Royal Air Force, and by the time he was 16 he knew every British airplane on sight. When he was 17, at the time of the Munich crisis of 1938, he applied as a boy entrant to the Royal Air Force. He took part in the first leaflet raids which opened the Royal Air Force offensive against the Axis. Since the Royal Air Force began its big-scale attack on Germany's industrial targets young Sergeant Riddell has taken part in raids on all the principal targets in the Reich.

Once or twice, after attacks by night fighters and accurate gunfire from the ground defenses, this young Scot has wondered whether his aircraft would make base. But luck has been with him, and he has escaped the ordeal of bailing out over the sea or enemy-occupied country. More than once his bomber has had to force-land over England, but that has not prevented him from going off on another jaunt over Germany the following night.

When he was only 19 the King pinned the coveted Distinguished Flying Medal on his tunic for gallantry and devotion to duty in his execution of air operations. A few days before he came to the United States he was detailed for the great attack on Rostock. In 3 nights the Baltic port from which Germany sent supplies to the Russian front was battered into a smouldering heap of ashes. Sergeant Riddell took part in two of those raids.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 7232) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2241), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order against the bill.

DISPLAY AND USE OF THE UNITED STATES FLAG

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 303) to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America, with Senate amendments, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, after line 9, insert:

"SEC. 2. (a) It is the universal custom to display the flag only from sunrise to sunset on buildings and on stationary flagstaffs in the open. However, the flag may be displayed at night upon special occasions when it is desired to produce a patriotic effect."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "SEC. 2. (a)" and insert "(b)."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "(b)" and insert "(c)."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "(c)" and insert "(d)."

Page 2, line 13, after "25;" insert "such other days as may be proclaimed by the President of the United States;".

Page 2, line 16, strike out "(d)" and insert "(e)."

Page 2, line 19, strike out "(e)" and insert "(f)."

Page 2, line 21, strike out "(f)" and insert "(g)."

Page 5, line 6, strike out "whether" and insert "if."

Page 5, line 6, strike out "or outside."

Page 5, line 7, strike out "or in front of a" and insert "the."

Page 5, line 10, after "flag", insert "so displayed in the chancel or on the platform."

Page 5, line 12, after "audience." insert "But when the flag is displayed from a staff in a church or public auditorium elsewhere than in the chancel or on the platform it shall be placed in the position of honor at the right of the congregation or audience as they face the chancel or platform. Any other flag so displayed should be placed on the left of the congregation or audience as they face the chancel or platform."

Page 7, strike out lines 17 to 21, inclusive, and insert:

"SEC. 5. That during the ceremony of hoisting or lowering the flag or when the flag is passing in a parade or in a review, all persons present should face the flag, stand at attention, and salute. Those present in uniform should render the right-hand salute. When not in uniform, men should remove the headdress with the right hand, holding it at the left shoulder, the hand being over the heart. Men without hats merely stand at attention. Women should salute by placing the right hand over the heart. The salute to the flag in the moving column should be rendered at the moment the flag passes."

Page 7, after line 21, insert:

"SEC. 6. That when the national anthem is played and the flag is not displayed, all present should stand and face toward the music. Those in uniform should salute at the first note of the anthem, retaining this position until the last note. All others should stand at attention, men removing the headdress. When the flag is displayed, the salute to the flag should be given."

Page 7, after line 21, insert:

"SEC. 7. That the pledge of allegiance to the flag, 'I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one Nation indivisible, with liberty and justice for all', be rendered by standing with the right hand over the heart; extending the right hand, palm upward, toward the flag at the words 'to the flag' and holding this position until the end, when the hand drops to the side. However, civilians will always show full respect to the flag when the pledge is given by merely standing at attention, men removing the headdress. Persons in uniform shall render the military salute."

Page 7, after line 21, insert:

"SEC. 8. Any rule or custom pertaining to the display of the flag of the United States of America, set forth herein, may be altered, modified, or repealed, or additional rules with respect thereto may be prescribed, by the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, whenever he deems it to be appropriate or desirable; and any such alteration or additional rule shall be set forth in a proclamation."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Alabama explain the amendments to the House?

Mr. HOBBS. There are a number of amendments. The only amendments of any consequence are those giving the Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy the right to declare other days which should be observed by the display of the flag in accordance with the code, and to make such changes in the codification by proclamation as he may deem fit, from time to time.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is, the President of the United States?

Mr. HOBBS. That is right; yes, sir.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And it is a unanimous report on the part of the committee?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOBBS. I am happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. These amendments have the approval of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars and the other patriotic organizations that appeared before our committee in support of the bill?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I want to take this occasion to compliment the gentleman from Alabama for the splendid work he has done on this very fine piece of legislation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, can the gentleman tell me whether it is a proper use of the flag to display it in the way one of the papers did last Sunday, a full page ad with the flag and no commercial matter in the ad except down at the bottom of the page there was a statement, "call at our desk in this store," and so forth, for information with reference to the purchase of bonds and stamps?

Mr. HOBBS. I think that is perfectly permissible under this code, because this measure regulates only the use of the flag itself.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is there any legislation which prohibits the use of the flag in connection with commercial advertisement?

Mr. HOBBS. Yes, sir. There is a section in this bill which deals with that problem, and in every State of the Union and in the District of Columbia, there is a criminal law against desecration and improper use.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How do they use this flag in a full-page ad? Of course, they do not say anything about merchandise, but down at the bottom they ask the public to call at a certain booth in this particular store to buy stamps.

Mr. HOBBS. I do not know, sir; but this bill is advisory merely, it has no penal provisions.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7232, Rept. No. 2241) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes. Pending that, I desire to have an agreement with the gentleman from New York with respect to time for general debate. I believe that we can dispose of this matter in half an hour.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests for time. I suggest that we go into general debate with 20 minutes on a side.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, pending the motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate on the bill be confined to 40 minutes, one-half to be controlled by myself and one-half by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], debate to be confined to the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7232, with Mr. MILLS of Arkansas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent agreement, the gentleman from Missouri is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from New York to 20 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this is the second deficiency appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1942, and the last deficiency appropriation bill for this fiscal year. The estimates on which the bill is based, as received from the Bureau of the Budget aggregated $54,965,499.84. The committee reduced the estimate by $1,417,400, and submitted the bill to the House in the amount of $53,548,099.84. The largest item in the bill and practically the bulk of the bill is for the Post Office Department. There has been such an unprecedented and unpredictable increase in the volume of mail since the declaration of war that it has become necessary to provide additional funds for that Department. It is interesting to note in that connection that the increased cost of operating the Post Office Department has been accompanied by an increase in the estimated revenues. As a matter of fact, the increase in the revenues of the Department has exceeded the increased cost of operating the Department, resulting in a profit to the Government. The revenues for the fiscal year 1942 were originally estimated at $795,000,000, and the expenditures at $846,000,000, but due to the increase in the volume of business by the Department, the revenues are now estimated at $860,000,000, an increase of $65,000,000 over the original estimate, and the expenditures, which are now estimated at $878,000,000, show an increase of only $32,000,000.

Mr. BOEHNE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BOEHNE. Have the revenues from the second-class mail matter been reduced any?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The material difference is in the first-class mail. While, of course, there is some fluctuation in all classes of mail, the original estimates and the present requirements for other classes, including second-class, run approximately the same and there is not enough variation to show any marked effect.

The second largest item in the bill is made up of refunds and drawbacks from customs. They involve matters over which Congress has no control. When these claims are adjudicated and it is found that there has been an actual overpayment of customs duties, we have no choice but to refund the amounts of the overpayments. These items account for approximately $3,000,000 of the funds carried in this bill.

The fourth item is for the District of Columbia, and is for minor deficiencies, all of which are payable out of the revenues of the District of Columbia.

The last item is for various agencies of the Federal Government, covering a wide field, and in small amounts, but all are actual created deficiencies which were fully justified before the committee and in which approval is largely a matter of routine.

Unless there is some question, I will yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes. This bill carries a total of $53,548,099.84, all of it, with the exception of a very few small items, comparatively small, for incurred deficiencies and audited claims and judgments; $38,688,000 is for the Post Office Department, $3,000,000 is for refunds and drawbacks in customs. The two items that are involved here that are for new money are about $800,000 for the F. B. I. and about $8,000,000 for the guayule rubber plant in California. In connection with these estimates, the committee has been exceedingly careful in going over every item that has been presented to it. The committee has eliminated everything except those things that absolutely have to be done. This guayule project which I have referred to, I have grave doubts about. I doubt whether or not it will yield rubber enough to justify the expenditures that we are making upon it. On the other hand, our rubber situation is so critical that it is absolutely impossible for us at this time to turn down anything that might produce any substantial quantity of rubber, and for that reason we have included about $8,000,000

for that purpose. I do not see that there is any item here that could legitimately be criticized.

The items for the Post Office Department, $38,000,000, are entirely due to the situation that has been created by the increased volume of business and increased propaganda that has been going out.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wanted to ask the gentleman whether he could tell us what progress has been made on this guayule business, whether they have actually gotten any planting done, and what kind of situation the thing is in.

Mr. TABER. We gave them an item of money, perhaps $5,000,000, about 3 or 4 months ago. I cannot give the exact date. They have gone ahead and done what planting it was contemplated they could do in the period ending June 30. That money is practically all exhausted. There have been additional allotments from the President's fund—as I remember it, about $600,000. I am giving that from memory.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Can the gentleman tell us approximately how many acres have been planted?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Anderson has the detail of that, and I will yield to him.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Will the gentleman yield me some time later?

Mr. TABER. I will yield the gentleman from California some time as soon as I have finished so he can go into that question.

The items for the Post Office Department, as I said, are almost entirely due to the increased volume of business; not only the volume of business, but the burdens that are placed upon the Post Office Department as a result of a lot of these campaigns that are going on. While those campaigns do not yield any money, because the franking privilege is available, they are sending out a type of propaganda from the Treasury Department with reference to Government bonds that we all approve of and want to see go ahead.

There is no way out.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

There is an addition to the items carried in the bill, an item increasing the amount that may be spent under the limitation upon the public-debt service, about $1,000,000, for their activities.

I think we have to get back of this bill. I cannot see any way out.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, anyone who is interested in getting new rubber for their tires is undoubtedly interested in the guayule rubber project.

The President has asked for an all-out drive to reclaim scrap rubber throughout the entire country. In looking around my office this morning I think I struck on a plan where all of us might be able to contribute a little. Certainly Capitol Hill has a lot of available rubber lying around that could be added to this drive. If each of you will look around your office you will notice that under each "gaboon" there is an 18-inch flat piece of rubber. There must be a couple of thousand of them around Capitol Hill. I suggest that we turn those over to President Roosevelt's rubber drive. If Members cannot learn to expectorate straight enough without a rubber mat under the "gaboon," then we ought to get a bigger bucket for them. Besides, linoleum will make a good mat if one is necessary.

In connection with the guayule rubber project, I knew that this bill was coming in, and about 10 days ago sent a request out to Maj. E. W. Kelly, who is managing the project in Salinas, requesting an up-to-date report on the work that has been done there. Yesterday I received the letter which I requested and I shall ask permission to include it with my remarks.

I think the Department of Agriculture and the Forest Service, to which Service was assigned the emergency guayule rubber project, are to be complimented for their work up to date. They worked under extremely difficult handicaps. The legislation was not signed by the President until the 5th of March and they could not actually start to work until that time. All of the available seed, approximately 23,000 pounds, that was on hand when this project was approved, is in the ground and growing. All of the seedlings that were in the company's nursery last year have been transplanted to the field, and they are also growing. A great many wells have been dug. I do not remember how many miles of duckboards have been laid down in the various seedbeds, but so far as I can ascertain, approximately 530 acres of seedbeds have been prepared and planted with the 23,000 pounds of seed that was available when the project got under way.

Some 70 monitor plots or test beds of an acre each have been planted throughout Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, and California in an attempt to ascertain where guayule will produce the best results outside of its present location in the Salinas Valley.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes, I will be glad to yield.

Mr. RICH. Have you any reason to believe that there is not enough land on which to plant this guayule, or has the Department of Agriculture said they are fearful that they will not have sufficient lands for that purpose?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. No; I do not believe anyone is concerned about lack of land; our most serious lack at the present time is lack of seed.

Mr. RICH. The reason I bring that up is because we are considering the Interior Department appropriation bill now, and every irrigation project in that bill the Department wants to build now for this particular purpose. One further question, if the gentleman will permit: What climate does this plant need for growth?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. In the southwestern part of the United States is the best climate. The southern half of California, most of New Mexico, Arizona, and certain portions of Texas have the ideal climate where there is a sufficient supply of winter rain and long dry spells in the summer.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Is it not equally true that summer rains and long dry winters will produce the same results?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. It should do equally well under that condition. It must have the long dry spells to store up the supply of rubber in the plant.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. That is true; and during that long dry period is when the plant actually produces its rubber content.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The gentleman is exactly right.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the gentleman state whether there is any substantial planting outside of the State of California?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I refer the gentleman to the letter I will insert in the RECORD, written to me by the Forest Service. To the best of my information the only substantial planting outside of the State of California has been in these monitor or test plots that have been scattered throughout the entire southwestern area.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 additional minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Does the gentleman know whether any substantial sum out of this $8,000,000 is to be paid to the General Tire & Rubber Co. for its planting?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The General Tire & Rubber Co. has nothing to do with this outside of taking an interest in it.

The Intercontinental Rubber Co. from which the Government purchased processes, patents, and rights has already been taken care of in a previous appropriation.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. No part of this money goes to either of the rubber companies?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I prefer that the gentleman ask that question of the chairman of the committee. I do not believe any of this appropriation goes for that purpose.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. As the gentleman knows, I am very much interested in the guayule experiment.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I think we are all interested in anything that will produce rubber or a rubber substitute, because we are going to need rubber sorely in a very short time.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. It is my information that in southern Texas,

New Mexico, and Arizona the total acreage in guayule does not exceed that of 30 monitor plots.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. As I said before, our most serious difficulty now is a shortage of seed. I am of the opinion, however, that with modern methods of cultivation, modern methods of seed collection, and modern methods of extracting rubber from the plant this will produce a rich source of rubber supply within the next few years.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman spoke of the need of a long dry spell to make this plant yield the rubber. Can this plant be grown in winter in any Northern State?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. No; it does not grow well in temperatures that run below freezing in winter.

Mr. RICH. It must be grown where there is no frost.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. It must be grown in such ideal climate as we have in California.

Mr. RICH. California, here we come!

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. I share the views and the fear expressed by my neighbor and colleague from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. The people in New Mexico and in extreme west Texas, especially in the Big Bend of Texas, are manifesting unusual interest in this very worthy undertaking the gentleman from California has been working for and sponsoring, but at the same time there seems to be a shortage of seed, or a shortage of money, or something that is necessary to get this project under way. I agree with the gentleman that there are marvelous possibilities for the development and production of rubber from the guayule plant all through the arid southwestern country.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Our most serious shortage now is seed.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Under what circumstances are these plantings being made? Are they made on private land, on Government-owned land, or on land to which the Government intends to take title?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The plantings in the nurseries are done on land the Government owns or leases. The planting in the fields of plants transplanted from the nurseries are made on leased land.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. On leased land?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Leased or rented land; yes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I mean the production will be under the control of the Department of Agriculture; is that correct?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The product will belong to the Department of Agriculture?

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Yes; the product will belong to the Government.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. For the Forest Service.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. The Department of Agriculture turned the project over to the Forest Service, which is one of the most efficient Bureaus we have in the Government.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. It is being very well handled.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I include as part of my remarks the letter previously referred to from the Department of Agriculture, as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Salinas, Calif., June 11, 1942.

Hon. J. Z. ANDERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: Reference is made to your letter of June 2 and your wire of June 10 to Major Kelley. He will be in Missoula, Mont., for about 2 weeks, and has asked me to prepare a report in response to your letter.

The immediate task facing the emergency rubber project this spring was the establishment of nurseries to accommodate the sowing of about 22,800 pounds of seed acquired from the Intercontinental Rubber Co., and the transplanting of the seedlings produced in the 20 acres of nursery sown by the Intercontinental Rubber Co. in 1941 into field plantations and test plots.

Time was very short in which to accomplish the above work. According to information obtained by the company, the nursery sowing should be completed by May 15, and the transplanting by April 15. Funds were made available for initiation of the work from the President's lend-lease funds. A large amount of equipment and materials had to be procured by purchase or transfer from other work, offices established, personnel obtained, and construction work accomplished before the actual program could get under way in full swing.

Major Kelley arrived at Salinas on February 11, and a small group of key personnel arrived between February 14 and 21. The first group of personnel came from region 1 of the Forest Service and the shelterbelt project. A purchasing unit was detailed as a block from Missoula, Mont.

The Government obtained possession of the property of the Intercontinental Rubber Co. on March 5. Between February 11 and March 5 estimates were prepared covering materials needed for construction work and for the purchase of equipment. Requisitions were prepared for transfer of equipment from Forest Service regions, the Civilian Conservation Corps, and other agencies. Purchases and actual transfers were initiated. Preliminary surveys of lands of suitable soil characteristics for leasing for nurseries and field transplanting of seedlings were made.

ESTABLISHMENT OF NURSERIES

Time was a critical factor in the establishment of nurseries and the sowing of the 22,800 pounds of guayule seed. The project had to start practically from scratch as the expansion from a 20-acre nursery operated by the company to 530 net acres in seed beds involved a large amount of detailed planning, procurement of essential equipment and materials, construction work, and land preparation. Except for about 60 acres of land acquired from the company, it was necessary to lease land of suitable characteristics.

The most difficult job was the planning, procurement of materials and equipment, and installation of a complete overhead sprinkling system for each of three separate nurseries, comprising a total of about 750 acres of land. This involved the drilling of 4 wells, the deepest being 652 feet and the shallowest 386 feet, the laying of over 17 miles of underground water main, and the installation of 94 miles of 1-inch overhead pipe. This was laid on about 33,000 posts 6 feet above ground. The drilling of wells and installation of the watering system were done by contract. Purchases of materials were made by the Government. Great commendation is due the contractors. No group of men ever worked more diligently or cooperated more wholeheartedly in the accomplishment of a difficult task.

The installation of the watering system had to be dovetailed with the sowing of the seed. The seed is pregerminated and in delicate condition when sown. It should have a first watering within one-quarter to one-half hour after sowing. Contract for the laying of the underground system was let on March 11 and the job was completed April 29. Contract for the overhead was let March 13 and it was completed May 11.

One of the first things needed was a seed-treatment building and the installation of equipment to provide for sufficiently rapid treatment of seed to permit sowing within the time limits. Plans were drawn for a building with over-all dimensions of 80 by 108 feet. Contract for construction was let March 2 and the building was completed March 19.

The company had one new model seeding machine. Five additional machines were required. Contract for the construction of these machines was let February 21. Two were delivered March 13 and deliveries were completed March 19.

Each nursery bed (4 by 400 feet) is bordered on both sides by 8-inch wooden tracks composed of 1 by 8 cleated boards. These duckboards are necessary for the satisfactory operation of the nursery machinery, such as the seeding machines, weeding carts, and mowing machines, on these beds. The complete installation in all nurseries required 3,571,008 board feet or 5,356,512 linear feet of 1 by 8 boards. If all of the tracks were placed end to end they would stretch for 1,014 miles. The contract for the cleated boards, we are told, constituted the largest single contract for lumber ever let in this community.

Each nursery block is protected from too rapid drying from high surface winds by the erection of lines of snow fence every 49 feet. For this purpose 111 miles of snow fence was obtained—33 miles were purchased and the balance was obtained by transfer from other Forest Service regions and from other Federal agencies.

Sowing was started April 27 and 11,458 beds were completed by May 19. Some odd lots of seed were left over and additional construction of watering system was necessary before these could be sown. This was completed June 5. A total of 11,786 beds were sown on 530 net acres of seed beds. A seed bed is 4 by 400 feet. Several days were lost, 21 in fact, because of rain and wet land.

Present indications are that unless some unforeseen catastrophe occurs these seed beds will yield this fall sufficient seedlings for transplanting to the field plantations of around 45,000 to 50,000 acres—around 400,000,000 seedlings.

FIELD PLANTING

Leasing of land for field planting was carried on concurrently with leasing for nurseries. The company had five planting machines which were sufficient to accomplish the transplanting job. These had to be reconditioned for use, however, as some of them had not been used for several years. Plowing, disking, harrowing, and other land preparation work for both the field planting and the nurseries was begun in February and carried on as needed until both jobs were accomplished.

Field transplanting of seedlings obtained from the 20 acres of nursery planted by the company in 1941 began on March 5, the day the guayule bill was signed by the President, and except for about 100 acres of experimental plantings was completed on April 11. These experimental plantings were completed on April 26. In addition to the field plantations the Bureau of Plant Industry set out about 70 acres of indicator plots of about 1 acre each in various locations in California, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas. These plots are for the purpose of determining the suitability of the various localities for future guayule plantations. A total of about 9,935,000 seedlings were planted on 871 acres of plantations and in the indicator plots.

EQUIPMENT

It was necessary to purchase and obtain by transfer from other governmental sources a considerable amount of motorized equipment and farm implements, both for the immediate job this spring and for the planting of around 50,000 acres this fall, winter, and next spring. It is planned to arrange with farmers for as much of the land preparation work as possible, but a large amount of this work will need to be done by the Government. Altogether some 400 pieces of motorized equipment (tractors, trucks, and a few passenger cars) have been obtained, and about 200 farm implements varying from standard types of plows, discs, and harrows to specialized pieces used in the guayule nurseries.

LABOR AND PERSONNEL

It was early apparent that local labor sources would be entirely inadequate to meet the needs of both the guayule project and local agriculture. A site for a 1,000-man camp was selected on lands obtained from the company about 8 miles east of Salinas. Contract for construction of the camp was let March 12. The first 200-man unit was completed and occupied March 30, and the whole camp was completed April 22. There are a total of 37 buildings in the camp. Two wells were drilled to provide a water supply for the camp.

Labor has been imported mostly from the Los Angeles area. Turn-over is high. We had on June 1, 887 laborers in camp, and were employing a total of 2,042 laborers of which 634 were women. Over 2,000 people were employed on weeding in the nurseries. Hand weeding has developed into a bigger job than anticipated, due primarily to the fact that most of the nursery acreage is on land not heretofore used for the purpose. This is a critical job at this time, and will continue so until July 1 to 15 when it is expected that labor requirements for this work will decrease materially. The response of the women and girls of Salinas and surrounding towns to a very critical weed situation in the nurseries which seriously jeopardized the work done so far, was indeed inspiring.

Wage rates were arrived at in cooperation with local agricultural agencies. This has worked out very satisfactorily so far.

Technical and administrative personnel have been recruited from all parts of the country, including Alaska.

SEED HARVESTING

There are about 545 acres of company plantings, 7 to 13 years old, and 100 acres of 1941 plantings which will provide the major source of seed for resowing of nurseries next spring. Some seed may be available this fall from this spring's field transplanting and from the nurseries. It is still too early to predict whether sufficient seed will be obtainable to resow all the nursery acreage sown this year. However, indications are now that we will have a good seed crop.

Seed collection is a problem. It is done with a vacuum picker. Improved machinery is now being developed with which we hope to recover a greater percentage of available seed than has heretofore been possible.

LAND ACQUISITION

Advance surveys are now under way to locate general areas with suitable soil and climatic conditions for the growing of guayule. Detailed surveys and preliminary negotiations for leases are under way in the Sacramento Valley. To date, contacts have been made with 192 farmers, soil tests have been made on a total of 38,320 acres, and preliminary agreements for leasing on about 7,000 acres.

MISCELLANEOUS

Work is being initiated now looking toward the improvement of the rubber extraction from the shrub. It is known from records kept by the company that considerable losses of rubber occurred as between the percentage obtained by the present pilot mill and the large mill. It seems probable now that more efficient extraction is obtainable. The Bureau of Agricultural Engineering and Chemistry is cooperating in this work.

Other studies are being made of methods of growing and planting guayule looking toward obtaining the maximum percentage of rubber in the shortest possible time. The Bureau of Plant Industry is cooperating with the Forest Service in this work.

Some of the equipment may also be susceptible to improvement, partly from the standpoint of making it lighter and more economical to transport and use and partly to increase its efficiency in other ways. This situation is being studied now, and machinery companies are cooperating with the Forest Service in studying present equipment and advising in regard to changes.

Mr. Anderson, because of the pressure of the work here, it has been necessary to prepare this information rather hurriedly. I hope it will meet what you had in mind. Please do not hesitate to call on us if you desire further information.

Very truly yours,

EVAN W. KELLEY, *Director*,
By PAUL H. ROBERTS, *Acting*.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I call attention to the fact that this appropriation bill, which authorizes $38,688,000 for the Post Office Department, ought to be studied a little bit by the membership of the House. We have been told that we will have increased revenues as well as increased expenses. We talk about the various departments of the Government having a balanced budget. Where are they? You have not had a balanced budget for 12 years. May I say here that the revenues of the Post Office Department have recently been estimated as being $860,000,000, while the expenses for the year were $878,000,000, a deficit of $18,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, around 1934 we passed a tax bill, and in that tax bill we provided a postage of 3 cents for first-class mail. Prior to that time we had 2 cents postage. It was stated at that time that that was an emergency measure in order to raise revenue to help defray the expenses of government. We were told that it was expected to get $100,000,000 out of the 3-cent postage in order to pay the debt that we were creating in other branches of our Government. You know, we have had a deficit for the last 10 years that has been a stunning blow to the American people and our form of government, and pretty nearly fatal to the American Treasury.

The majority of the Members of Congress are responsible for passing laws and for the Post Office Department using up this $100,000,000. Today we find that we are still off balance. We are $18,000,000 in the red so far as the Post Office Department is concerned, whereas if we had not used up the $100,000,000 from the 3-cent postage we would have a credit of some $82,000,000. As the circumstances are today we pass these laws and find that we are now $18,000,000 in the red.

Members of Congress should realize that when bills are brought in here providing for increases in expenses that in order to pay our indebtedness the money has to be found somewhere. The people have to pay. I doubt very much if we are ever going to get rid of the 3 cents postage. As a matter of fact, it ought to be 4 cents postage on first-class mail to get revenue for expenses; also, other classes of mail should be increased. That would be a good way to raise revenue. But the people are going to kick at that kind of a tax, and just let me tell you when you get this new tax bill you are going to see some of the greatest kicking that has ever taken place in America. By the way, that tax bill was going to come in last November, but we are going to let it go by until after November this year, when the elections are over. After that it is going to be pretty tough picking for the people back home, because they have to make up these deficits, and under no circumstances are you going to stop creating additional deficits until the Congress stops passing laws and spending these fabulous sums of money. That is the only way you will stop additional deficits.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to offer an amendment to this bill in a few minutes. We have had the first reading of the bill and we have let that go by, but I have an amendment here that I want to submit to the House. It only involves $87,600, but it can be disposed of very quickly. When I offer the amendment I want to see how many Members of this House are going to vote for it. We are going to see whether you want to be conservative or not; we are going to see whether the Members of Congress are really going to try to stop spending. I am going to give you the chance to vote on my amendment. It is not a very popular one for me to present, I must admit.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW], chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the bill carrying the annual appropriation for the Post Office Department.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I think it will be interesting to the House and the country to know that the items in

this bill which relate to the postal establishment, comprising a substantial part of the total, are a reflection of the greatest volume of postal business in the history of America.

With the end of the fiscal year 1942 only 2 weeks distant it is possible to present some very impressive facts and figures showing the spectacular rise in postal volume.

The Postal System of the United States is the largest business organization in the world. It employed 277,388 persons on November 30 last and that number has since been increased by several thousands. Under the management of Postmaster General Frank C. Walker the Postal Service is being administered on a basis of economy and efficiency that might well be emulated by every other governmental department and establishment.

NEEDS WERE UNDERESTIMATED

When the Post Office Department officials came before our subcommittee to submit their requirements for the fiscal year 1942 they estimated that the postal revenues for this fiscal year, 1942, would be $795,000,000 and the postal expenditures for the year would be $846,000,000. They made these estimates in the full knowledge of a rising tide of postal volume but they fell short in their calculation of how fast and how high the tide would rise.

In 1941 the postal revenues amounted to $812,827,735.71, which was then an all-time high in postal history.

For the period July 1, 1941 to April 30, 1942, postal revenues totaled $725,366,587.09, an increase of $44,294,522.56, or 6.5 percent over the same period during the fiscal year 1941.

It is now estimated that the total postal revenues for the fiscal year 1942 will amount to $855,000,000, an increase over the fiscal year 1941 of $42,172,265, or 5.19 percent.

Accrued expenditures for the fiscal year 1941 amounted to $839,791,417.36.

For the first 10 months of the current fiscal year, accrued expenditures totaled $734,672,244.18, an increase of $33,450,868, or 4.77 percent over the same period for the fiscal year 1941.

It is now estimated that the accrued expenditures for the fiscal year 1942 will total $878,000,000, an increase of $38,208,583, or 4.55 percent over the fiscal year 1941.

In other words, it now appears that the postal receipts for the fiscal year 1942 will exceed the original estimate by $60,000,000, and the postal expenditures for the year will exceed the original estimate by $32,000,000.

MAILS MUST BE MOVED

"The mails have to be moved," is one of the ancient maxims of the Postal Service and long ago in the relations between our Appropriations Committee and the officials of the Department we established a gentlemen's agreement which is resilient enough to meet every emergency created by unanticipated expansion of volume. Under that agreement we fix the regular appropriations annually for the personnel groups and for space to haul the mails at what appear to be reasonable amounts, but always with the reservation that if the directing heads find it necessary to take on additional personnel and railroad space to keep the mails moving they may do so and come back to "the hill" with requests for deficiency appropriations to meet the added requirements imposed by the growing needs of the Service.

That is exactly what has happened in the current fiscal year and it is the explanation of the major deficiency postal items carried in this bill, such as $14,750,000 for clerks at first- and second-class post offices, $8,000,000 for city delivery carriers, $7,000,000 additional for transportation of the mails by railroad routes, and $2,190,000 for salaries in the Railway Mail Service.

The number of clerks at first- and second-class postoffices on July 1, 1941, was 80,613. During the present fiscal year up until April 30, 1942, it had been necessary to appoint 3,682 additional clerks to handle the mails. For the same reason it had been necessary to appoint 2,090 additional city letter carriers, bringing up the total from 61,085 on July 1, 1941, to 63,175 on April 30, 1942.

RAILROAD TRANSPORTATION

The situation in respect to railroad transportation of mails is similar to the spectacular growth in personnel.

For the fiscal year 1940 the annual rate of Railroad Transportation including cost of Emergency Service, totaled $102,640,328, an increase of $1,767,904 over the fiscal year 1939.

In 1941 the total was $110,970,217, an increase over 1940 of $8,329,889, of which $2,352,442 was due to the elimination of land-grant rates and $5,977,447 due to increase in the volume of mail.

The annual rate of regular railroad authorizations on April 30, 1942, was $100,813,527, an increase over April 30, 1941 of $2,152,661, of which $468,761 was due to the elimination of land-grant rates and $1,683,900 due to increase in the volume of mail.

The cost of Emergency Service for the first 10 months of the current fiscal year amount to $10,568,544, an increase of $235,875 over the same period of the fiscal year 1941. This is due to increase in the volume of the mail. The total increase for the first 10 months of 1942, due to increase in the volume of the mails, amounts to $1,919,775.

It may be of interest to know that on July 1, 555 fourth-class post offices will be advanced to the presidential grade because United States postal business in the smaller communities throughout the country has increased perceptibly during the past year. This means that, instead of being paid on the cancellation basis, each of these postmasters thus advanced will begin with a salary of $1,100 per annum. To cover this increased cost the bill before you carries $1,600,000.

The gross postal deficit in 1942, from present indications, will be around $23,000,000 as compared with a gross postal deficit of $26,963,681 for the fiscal year 1941. No longer ago than the fiscal year 1932 the gross postal deficit was $205,550,611.09. Deducting the nonpostal items of expenditure the Postal Service is now a self-sustaining institution and is "in the red" to the extent of about $40,000,000 to $44,000,000 a year. The nonpostal items in 1941 totaled $67,092,124, the largest of which was the penalty mail, which was responsible for $49,020,190 of the nonpostal total.

ENORMOUS GROWTH OF PENALTY MAIL

The penalty mail, which is the free mail sent out by the departments and bureaus of Government is still growing by leaps and bounds. The number of pieces of penalty mailings increased from 742,487,204 in the fiscal year 1937 to 1,123,563,721 in the fiscal year 1941 and the 1942 figures will show a very considerable increase over 1941. If the Post Office Department had been permitted to charge regular postage rates on the 1,123,563,721 pieces of penalty mail sent out by the departments, bureaus and agencies in the fiscal year 1941 it would have collected $49,020,190 of revenue from that source alone and the postal deficit of $26,963,681 would have been changed to a surplus of $22,056,499.

If the Post Office Department could get rid of its barnacles and dead-weight loads, its financial picture would be better and its revenues not only would pay all costs of operation, but would return substantial amounts to the Treasury. There has grown up a custom of "letting George do it," the "George" in this case being the Post Office Department. It is the Government's premier selling agency. It functions in registering aliens, in selling automobile use stamps and migratory bird stamps and Defense bonds and I should be surprised to learn that in any of its nonpostal functions it is ever adequately reimbursed. Certain payments are made to the Post Office Department, as in the case of the handling of Defense bonds, with the understanding that the Department is to "absorb" the remainder and faith in the Department's absorption capacity is shown by the fact that it is given a generous part to absorb.

WAR MAKES HEAVY DEMANDS

Our entrance into the war has added heavily to the burdens of the Postal Service. The total number of military postal units established is 738 of which 243 have been provided since mobilization. The number of employes assigned to military units is 1,310. It is not an easy matter to deliver mail to soldiers, especially those in mobile units, and there have been and still are numerous criticisms which the Department is seeking to reduce to the minimum. In order that the fathers and mothers, brothers and sisters, wives, and sweethearts of the boys in the service may have some idea of how this difficult problem is being met I asked the Department to prepare a statement for me, which is as follows:

ARRANGEMENTS FOR HANDLING MAIL FOR THE ARMED FORCES

On March 19, 1940, after lengthy study by officials of the Post Office and War Departments, an agreement was entered into by the Postmaster General and the Secretary of War, providing for an Army Postal Service to operate both during periods of peacetime field

training and during wartime emergencies. This agreement clearly defined the duties and responsibilities of the two Departments, and a field manual for the guidance of Army personnel engaged in handling mail was prepared, published, and distributed to all Army commands.

The principal matters covered by the agreement are: The furnishing by the Army of mail transportation between the points where mail is assembled and made ready for delivery to the Army (postal concentration center) and the points where such mail is actually turned over to the Army (base post office); the maintenance by the Army of a card index for supplying the complete current addresses of military personnel; the formation of a postal corps manned by officers drawn from experienced postal employees; the erection by the Army at camps and posts of buildings for postal purposes in accordance with Post Office Department specifications; and the establishment in the War Department of an Army Postal Service through which all postal matters are handled by liaison with the Post Office Department.

This agreement received its first test at posts and camps during the Army augmentation program following enactment of the Selective Service Act, and in the field during maneuvers held in 1940 and 1941. It received its first test in overseas theaters when troops were sent to occupy the leased bases.

Under War Department regulations, the Army Postal Service is an activity of The Adjutant General's Department, and that Department has established in Washington, D. C., facilities to supervise the operation of the Army Postal Service and to maintain a continuing liaison with the Post Office Department. At each corps area and department headquarters outside of Washington, The Adjutant General's section thereof maintains liaison with local postal authorities on Army Postal Service. Nine post-office inspectors in charge have been designated as liaison with the nine corps area commanders.

Mail for our armed forces is brought together by the Post Office Department at designated post offices, there the mail for a given military force is made up to the regiments or other separate military units (sometimes as small as a company). The Post Office Department then delivers the mail to the authorized representatives of the Army. Thereafter the Army Postal Service distributes the mail to smaller military units and then causes it to be delivered to the addressee.

Mail received at Army post offices for delivery to the Army is of two classes, (1) sufficiently addressed mail, and (2) mail requiring directory service. Sufficiently addressed mail, after it has been made up by the post office to regiments or other separate military units, is called for at the Army post office by a mail orderly, who takes the mail to his headquarters and separates it to smaller military units.

Mail for troops who have departed for overseas destinations is distributed by the United States Postal Service to regiments and like organizations and delivered promptly thereafter to the military authorities at the port of embarkation. From that point on, its handling and transportation to the overseas port is directed and controlled by the Army and Navy.

Mail service for Navy personnel presents different postal operating problems, as many of the units are highly mobile.

The Secretary of the Navy has established in the Office of Naval Operations a postal liaison officer. It is through this facility and the naval post offices that the mail-handling operations for Navy personnel are coordinated, directed, and supervised. This facility also has on its staff former post-office inspectors.

Mail service for Navy personnel on United States ships and at foreign shore stations is provided through Navy post offices, which are manned by Navy mail clerks.

At domestic shore stations mail is delivered either through the United States Postal Service, a Navy post office, or by Navy mail orderlies. Where Navy mail clerks are assigned, the mail is separated by the Postal Service to Navy units and given to Navy mail clerks for delivery. Where Navy mail clerks are not assigned, the delivery is made by Navy mail orderlies.

Mail for the personnel of United States ships and for the Fleet Marine Force is addressed in care of the postmaster at New York, N. Y., or the postmaster at San Francisco, Calif., where there are postal concentration centers for Navy mail. At these centers the mail for ships and naval units is distributed, sacked, and labeled. The mail is then delivered by Navy authorities to the respective ships and units.

Due to the war, it has become necessary to expand mail service for Navy personnel and to inaugurate methods of mail handling which will maintain the secrecy of movement and of the location of seagoing units and forces. Continuing liaison between the Navy and Post Office Departments is maintained for the purpose of revising new methods of mail handling and improving old ones in the light of changng conditions.

ISAAC GREGG, THE HERO ON THE ECONOMY FRONT

Believing that honor should be bestowed where honor is due, I cannot close my reference to the postal items in this bill without showering a heartfelt meed of praise on one economy I have found in the well-ordered and well-conducted Post Office Department—an economy that stands out like a brilliant lighthouse in the Washington fog of bureaucracy. While the Post Office Department is handling a perfect gorge of penalty mail, the outpourings of a great number of high-powered and multi-manned press bureaus created to puff the work and toot the personalities of bureau chiefs, its own press bureau is a one-man affair. It is as easy for one familiar with Washington to think of a one-man army as a one-man press bureau but it seems to work in the Post Office Department. Like the Marines, Isaac Gregg, veteran Washington correspondent, who runs the Post Office Department's one-man press bureau, seems always to have the situation well in hand. If all of the other departments, bureaus, and activities where press bureaus flower and bloom would adopt the one-man idea so gloriously demonstrated by Ike Gregg, the Government's personnel would drop like a lead plummet, the United States Treasury would postpone its last gasp, and the housing situation in Washington would be greatly relieved.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Can the gentleman give us the amount of revenue lost by reason of the use of the franking privilege by Congress, as distinguished from the amount lost by reason of the use of penalty mail by the administrative branch of the Government?

Mr. LUDLOW. I can. I have that figure before me now. I may say for the information of the Members that the loss of receipts because of the use of the franking privilege has very considerably diminished instead of being an increasing item.

For the fiscal year 1940 the number of pieces of franked mail sent out was 45,136,539, and the estimated loss of revenue at the regular postal rates for congressional mail was $1,217,561. For the fiscal year 1941 the number of pieces of franked mail was 30,920,380, and the estimated loss of revenue at the regular postal rates was $926,843. You will note that this is a very marked decrease, in marked contrast with the up-surge of the volume of the departmental, or penalty, mail.

In the fiscal year 1940 the penalty mail, other than Post Office Department, consisted of 999,138,119 pieces, the estimated loss of revenue at the regular postage rates being $39,905,033. In the fiscal year 1941 the use of penalty mail increased to 1,123,563,721 pieces, the estimated loss of revenue at the regular postage rates being $49,020,190.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, in connection with the explanation we have had here today as to guayule rubber, I think it worth while for the Members of the House to recognize that it will take several years to develop this project, and that if all the guayule is grown in one particular plot we shall not test this proposition out as thoroughly as we should. The areas of west Texas, Arizona, New Mexico, Southern California, and the Republic of Mexico are the natural habitat of this plant. We should make sure that the guayule experiment as carried along proves conclusively how much can be grown, and we should carry the program along until the cost of rubber from that source comes down to a figure comparable with that of rubber received from other parts of the world.

Guayule rubber, if the program is properly carried through, can be produced in this country at a cost of from 17 to 19 cents a pound, and it will insure that this country will be permanently safe in having its own natural rubber source.

I think very fine work has been done. I congratulate the gentleman from California. I am glad to see this much money in the bill for the guayule rubber program, but I hope it is so expended that the appropriation is spread over the States which are the natural habitat of this plant and that we do not spend it where the plant does not normally have a chance to grow.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

For payment to the widow of Patrick J. Boland, late a Representative from the State of Pennsylvania, $10,000, to be disbursed by the Sergeant at Arms of the House.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

YOUNGEST GENERAL IN THE ARMY

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to call to the attention of the House a historic little item that happened yesterday when the President sent to the Senate the nomination of six Air Corps colonels to be made brigadier generals, and first on the list was 36-year-old Edwin S. Perrin, of Custer, S. Dak., present deputy chief of staff to Gen. George H. Brett, commander of our air forces in Australia.

The Associated Press dispatch thereon points out that Colonel Perrin, at 36, will become the youngest general in the United States Army in World War No. 2. Up to the time of his nomination that honor was accorded to Brig. Gen. Lawrence S. Kuter, who was made a brigadier general February 2, 1942, and who was 37 last month. General Perrin, nominated yesterday, will not be 37 until next October.

In this connection the War Department advises me that the youngest general in United States history was the Marquis de Lafayette, who was commissioned at the age of 20 in 1777. That was a signal recognition of his service in the American Revolution. In World War No. 2 John N. Hodges was made a brigadier general at the age of 34 years. Thus it will be seen that General Kuter and General Perrin have been accorded a rare honor.

Mr. Chairman, I call attention to this incident because Eddie Perrin, as we called him in Custer, is a boy who comes from a typical American family. His father is the cashier of a little country bank in the town of Custer, which is my home town—a town of less than 2,000 people. His mother is active in community affairs. I believe she was an officer and possibly the president of the Women's Civic Club in 1927, at the time the Coolidges' spent the summer in the Black Hills and Mrs. Coolidge dedicated the big log community building that had been erected by the civic club. Mrs. Perrin has played the organ at the community church every Sunday for many years. Mr. Perrin has often been a member of the church board, as indeed he has been a member of many a committee that has worked for the welfare of the community. His life has been spent as the cashier of the Custer County Bank, which is right next door to the little business establishment I have in Custer, so I know him very well.

The people of Custer, knowing the integrity of the Perrin family, and having watched with interest the appointment of Eddie to West Point some years ago by a distinguished predecessor of mine, the Honorable William Williamson, will take great pride in the fact that this boy, who comes from a small town, because of devotion to his duty, becomes at 36 the youngest general in the United States Army. Incidentally, a second son of Mr. and Mrs. Perrin is in Washington doing a very important job with the United States Public Health Service.

It just happened that this morning in the subcommittee on Appropriations for the War Department we had before us General Arnold, Chief of the Army Air Forces. Prior to his testimony to the committee I had an opportunity to visit with him for a few minutes, and remarked that we appreciated the distinction and the honor that was being accorded one of our home-town boys. General Arnold said to me, "He is doing a grand job." As I have said, Colonel Perrin, to be General Perrin as soon as his nomination is confirmed, is Deputy Chief of Staff for the Army Air Forces in the southwest Pacific.

It is these boys from the little towns of America, from average American families, who are doing a grand job, that insure victory for the forces of the United States in the war.

The Clerk read as follows:

Stationery: For an additional allowance for stationery for Representatives, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, for the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, $87,600.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: On page 2, line 19, strike out "Stationery: For an additional allowance for stationery for Representatives, Delegates, and the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico, for the second session of the Seventy-seventh Congress, $87,600."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I am offering an amendment here to strike out this $200 additional for each Member of the Congress for stationery.

I recall that a year ago we were requested to add one additional clerk to our office force at a compensation of $1,500 a year. I did not feel that the extra clerk was necessary at that time, and I do not feel this provision is necessary now. Certainly, it is not necessary for my office because I do not need it. I am not reaching down into my pocket for additional stationery money at the present time for the conduct of my office. I think it behooves every Member of Congress to economize in every way he can. Stationery is hard to get, paper is scarce, and the more paper we go out and purchase or the more we circularize our districts, the more it is going to cost the Government, and I do not think the taxpayers should have to pay for political circularization of any kind for any Member of Congress from any party. If there is any reason for some Members having additional stationery for the conduct of their offices, that is all right with me. I would not object to paying for them, but I do not like to see this provision go into the bill now as a general proposition because I believe we can get along without it. Let each Member submit a bill at the end of the session for his requirements up to $200. We are told to economize and if we expect the people back home to follow us we ought to economize here in the House of Representatives. I am offering this amendment and I hope it will pass, because I do not believe we should spend the money.

I now want to call your attention to the Treasury statement. You are responsible in great measure for this Treasury statement. On June 10 I find that you are in the red $18,782,127,540.19.

The taxpayers of this country some day have got to make this up. The taxpayers have got to pay the bill or else we go into bankruptcy. There is no Member of the House who would get up here and say that we ought to go into bankruptcy. Certainly I would not say that. I would say that we should buckle our belts tighter and tighter every day as we go along here, and we should try to cut out the nonessentials in Government. We ought not to figure that we can spend one penny that is not necessary. I do not mean $100 or $1,000,000 or $1,000,000,000. I think we ought to save every penny. The pennies make the dollars.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, will mize with the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but as far as I am concerned, my stationery account has been out for some time and because of the heavy mail we receive we have had to work Saturday afternoon and we work Sunday morning up to half past 1, trying to catch up with the mail and get it out. I am at a loss to understand how the gentleman figures that Members of the House and Senate are going to be able to answer these people who continually write and want so many questions answered because of the emergency in which we find ourselves. It is possible we could get along with less than the $200, but there is not any doubt in my mind that there should be an additional appropriation because, as far as I am concerned, it is all gone now and has been for about 2 or 3 weeks.

Mr. RICH. I do not say this would apply to the gentleman's district, but I wonder if there is not an undue amount of circularizing going on this year because it is an election year.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think I understand the point of view of the gentleman about this, but I would like to say to the gentleman that I believe one of our primary duties is to keep in just as close touch with the people as we can, particularly the people we are supposed to represent. After all, they have great difficulty at present in getting from any other person in the Government a sympathetic hearing with regard to their problems, and we have a peculiar duty to them for that reason. I believe we have another duty, which is to try to keep them accurately informed about what is really happening when there are so many false rumors floating around all the time.

Mr. RICH. I agree with the gentleman about that, but does not the gentleman think we should assume our responsibility here in the House and not put all power in the White House and let him form these executive branches of Government by Executive order? That is your function, and that is my function, and if we did that, we would not have

so many conflicting statements by Government organizations set up by Executive order.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VOORHIS of California: Page 2, line 22, insert:

"For the purpose of enabling the Appropriations Committee to employ the services of not to exceed 50 highly qualified persons to maintain a constant check upon the progress of contracts let by the United States, or any department thereof, and to report upon any avoidable waste, unnecessary additions to cost, negligence, or other matters increasing the cost of such contracts to the United States, $500,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order against the amendment that it proposes legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman kindly withhold his point of order for about 3 minutes?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I much regret that I have agreed to get the bill through promptly as other important legislation is waiting which must be disposed of this afternoon. If the gentleman's amendment were in order, I would be glad to have it debated. But in view of the fact that it is not admissible, I am constrained to insist on the point of order.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Then, Mr. Chairman, I would like to be heard briefly on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is glad to hear the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, of course, I do not want to match myself as a parliamentarian against the gentleman from Missouri. But it seems to me if there is any place where one can offer an amendment to enable the Appropriations Committee to hire personnel, it ought to be in this bill, which is a deficiency bill, and also at this point, where we are considering matters having to do with the House of Representatives. This is a matter about which I have spoken before in the House, and concerning which I feel rather deeply, because I think it is one of the major responsibilities of the Congress, and especially of the House, to see that the people of this country in the midst of this war receive a dollar of value for every dollar they spend. I want the Congress armed to do that job. I want us to do it now; not after the war, when the waste will be irretrievable. To have a staff now that could follow these contracts through would, I am convinced, be a most salutary thing. Its very existence would be a sobering influence, would make for more care, more efficiency. Here is a chance to save very large sums of money, perhaps. These are expenditures thousands of times as great as those over which we frequently sweat and strain here. I believe the situation today is better than it was. But there are still too many reports coming in complaining about unnecessary waste on some of these jobs for me to be complacent about it. I believe Congress should act, and that my proposal is a very important one.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from California state to the Chair whether he knows of any legislation authorizing the appropriations proposed in his amendment?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. No; I do not know of any legislation authorizing such expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. Unless there is legislation authorizing the appropriation, the Chair is constrained to sustain the point of order made by the gentleman from Missouri.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For an additional amount for administrative expenses of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation, fiscal year 1942, including the objects specified under this head in the Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1942, $150,000, payable from the funds of such Corporation.

FEES OF COMMISSIONERS, UNITED STATES COURTS

Fees of commissioners: For an additional amount for fees of United States commissioners and other committing magistrates acting under section 1014, Revised Statutes, fiscal year 1939, $52.21.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this time principally to call attention to the fact that while this bill calls for an appropriation for guayule, there are two other plants concerning which we have had testimony, that produce more latex than the guayule plant does, and do not take as long in point of time to mature. I am favorable to this appropriation to try out guayule. I think it is a good thing. I should like to see additional appropriations to try out these other two plants, because all of us know what a desperate situation has developed in regard to crude rubber. Poor management, selfishness, and lack of foresight has put our country in need of a most critical material, which has been cut off by the emergency of war. Our need is due to the fact that we had to depend upon someone else. If we had developed the possibilities of the three plants to which I am referring we could now be relying upon ourselves and would need help from no one.

Not only would we now be raising our own rubber plants, but we would be utilizing millions of acres of land, which have been and are now curtailing production.

What a boon to agriculture, if instead of paying benefits for not raising anything, we had devoted our efforts to producing the crops from which rubber could be made. We had testimony before the Committee on Agriculture some time ago that in Russia is a type of dandelion, known as the koksagez plant, which can be raised and grown in 46 of our 48 States. The Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, has written to Russia to get some of the seed of the koksagez plant. This plant will produce latex, from which rubber is made, the first year, while it takes the guayule plant 4 years. Also, we had testimony before the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures that there is another plant now being produced in Matamoros Province in Mexico known as the Chrysta Stegea. This plant will grow in 90 days. It will grow in Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona, and, no doubt, in parts of California. It will grow in Mexico, and will produce more latex than either of the other two. Personally, I think it would be a good thing if this House initiated a movement, and possibly we will get some legislation out of the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to try some experimental work on these two plants, and supplement what is being done in respect to the guayule plant, and we may find that before we get through with these experiments, this country can become self-sufficient so far as rubber is concerned.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Yes; I will gladly yield.

Mr. GILLIE. The gentleman spoke about the seed that had been sent for to Russia.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Yes.

Mr. GILLIE. The seed has already been sent for, considerable of it, and I was informed the other day that Purdue University has received some and has planted it, and that the plant is already up.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I am very glad to have the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Yes; I will yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. We have other plants in the Southwest, like our common milkweed, and also there is the lechuguilla, both of which develop the same quantity.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. We have had testimony in regard to that, and I think it would be of great benefit to our country and our people if we should work out a program whereby we could derive our own rubber from our own plants. It would also aid the agricultural program, and let me say before I leave the floor, that Russia is producing 50,000 tons a year from this koksagez plant. If it is a sound experiment, and has proven practical in Russia, there is no reason it cannot be done here in this country. Surely our people are as intelligent, resourceful, and energetic as the people of any other country, not only in developing the plant, but also in developing the machinery for producing the rubber from its elements.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. I yield.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman have any information as to what types of machinery and plant are required to process the stuff and as to how involved it is?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. No; I have not; but there was an engineer who has appeared before the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures who has devoted 27 years to the machinery industry in the manufacture of rubber, and he says that the machinery would be even more simple than it is in our present plants, and would cost less money.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. The gentleman would agree that the Mexican plant would permit the use of simple machinery, at least, and would offer a possibility of providing an early rubber source in line with the gentleman's very sensible suggestion?

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Yes; I agree with the gentleman from New Mexico.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

Operating supplies for public buildings: For an additional amount for operating supplies for public buildings, fiscal year 1942, including the objects specified under this head in the Post Office Department Appropriation Act, 1942, $215,000.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise at this time to discuss one or two aspects of the Post Office Department in its issuing of stamps.

It is well to note that in certain European countries a large part of the revenue used by those countries to maintain the operations of their governments is derived from the sale of stamps issued through their post-office departments. Some effort has been made by stamp collectors in the United States to interest our Post Office Department in issuing bicolored or multicolored stamps. Recently the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, dealing with the Post Office Department, saw fit to strike out the provision whereby bicolored stamps were issued by our Post Office Department. It will be recalled that airmail stamps were formerly issued in two or more colors. Today they are issued only in one color. It may seem trifling to point out to the Committee of the Whole of the House of Representatives that that resulted in a loss in its appeal to philatelists, the scientific name for stamp collectors in the United States. The British colonies derive no small amount of revenue, by which they maintain their colonial governments, throughout their vastly scattered Empire, through the sale of handsome postage stamps, issued by famous lithographers in London, Waterlow & Sons, principally.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the United States Government is saved a cool $100,000 by the change of design?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Yes. On the other hand it is pointed out by philatelists that the issuance of varied and lithographically inviting stamps could make a distinct appeal to the stamp collectors of the United States, who number about eight and a half million, in providing irresistible incentives to them to buy these stamps, 90 percent of which would be profit to the Government, because they would be put into stamp collections and never used.

In that connection I would point out that if we would issue stamps incorporating a semipostal feature, such as Switzerland does, we would derive extra revenue for the Post Office Department. In such countries as Switzerland, Portugal, Spain, Holland, France, Belgium, San Marino, and many other countries, they issue what are known as semipostal stamps. In other words, they have a stamp such as three plus one, or three plus two. Those stamps would be for use on carrying first-class mail from one city to another, carrying the regular 3-cent charge, but would cost 4 or 5 cents to the general public. The extra amount would be earmarked for Red Cross or some other special use, such as the U. S. O., Navy and Army Relief, and so forth.

I simply point out to the committee as worthy of study the example set by other stamp-issuing countries of the world, as to the revenue which they derive from issuing semipostal stamps. Those stamps in Switzerland maintain all of the hospital and all of the Red Cross services of that entire country from the revenue derived over and above the amount earmarked for postage.

These could be issued, such as 3 cents plus 1 cent, or 3 cents plus 2 cents, and leave it to the public as to whether or not they wanted to buy those stamps, such as the Red Cross issue or the U. S. O. issue, or anything else, and the extra amount over 3 cents to be set aside for that purpose.

Millions of dollars were derived by the little countries of Switzerland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia before the Second World War began, from this plan. The Philatelic Agency maintained by the Post Office Department of the United States Government brings into the Treasury a large sum every year, derived solely from the sale of postage stamps, principally the commemorative issues, to stamp collectors. There being approximately eight and one-half million stamp collectors in the United States, that is a group well worthy of being importuned to purchase more stamps. President Roosevelt is a stamp collector, and so is Secretary of the Interior Ickes. They have done a great deal to add to the prestige and numbers of the stamp collectors of the country and thereby have augmented the sources of revenue for our Post Office Department, through the pulling power of their personalities.

Recently we have seen fit to authorize issuance of three commemorative stamps, namely, the 3-cent Kentucky, the 5-cent stamp honoring China, to be placed on sale on July 7, and the new 3-cent stamp which will be issued on July 4, called Win the War Stamp. From those issues alone millions of dollars will be derived by our Post Office Department through the purchase of stamps placed in stamp collectors' albums and never employed for postage. That is a method of raising funds which the European countries cater to extensively. Central and South American countries derive a tremendous share of the revenue needed for the operation of their governments solely from the sale of their stamps, beautiful scenic specimens which they issue very frequently, and in great variety, sold to the stamp collectors throughout the world.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. I know the gentleman has a good deal more knowledge of stamp collecting than I, but is it the gentleman's opinion that the mere fact a stamp is printed in two colors will greatly enhance its sale to stamp collectors?

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. The British Government has found that issuing stamps in more than one color has direct appeal to stamp collectors, particularly those below the age of 20. Great Britain has gone to great lengths to make the appearance of its stamps attractive, and the lithographers of England have developed this to an astonishing degree. In particular, the stamps issued by the British colonies are among the most attractive stamps issued in the world.

Mr. LUDLOW. It is my opinion that it is not the color that attracts the buyers, so much as it is the denomination and the design.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. The variation of colors, sizes, shapes, of the stamps produces a measurably added attraction tempting to the stamp collectors, I may say to the gentleman from Indiana.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS of Arkansas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill H. R. 7232, the second deficiency appropriation bill, reported the same back to the House without amendment with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending

June 30, 1943, insist upon the disagreement of the House to the Senate amendments still in disagreement, and agree to the conference requested by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand it is not the purpose of the gentleman from Georgia to have the conference before Monday.

Mr. TARVER. That is the understanding at the present time.

Mr. TABER. With that statement, Mr. Speaker, I shall not object to the gentleman's request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. TARVER, CANNON of Missouri, LEAVY, TERRY, COLLINS, LAMBERTSON, DIRKSEN, and PLUMLEY.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief press release on the opening of the Grand Coulee Dam gates.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. HENDRICKS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I received from a former distinguished Member of this body, now a county court judge, John J. Fitzgerald, of Brooklyn.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole on the second deficiency bill and to include therein a letter I received from the Forest Service.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein excerpts of letters from my constituents on the benefits they have received from the Farm Security Administration.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article appearing in the Illustrated Gazette.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein excerpts from speeches delivered by former Ambassador James W. Gerard and by Sir Norman Angell at a convention on the 12th of this month.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SERVICE MEN'S DEPENDENTS' ALLOWANCES

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 2467) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2467) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the House amendment insert the following:

"That this Act may be cited as the Servicemen's Dependents Allowance Act of 1942.

"Title I

"SEC. 101. The dependent or dependents of any enlisted man of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grades in the Army of the United States, the United States Navy, the Marine Corps, or the Coast Guard, including any and all retired and reserve components of such services, shall be entitled to receive a monthly family allowance for any period during which such enlisted man is in the active military or naval service of the United States on or after June 1, 1942 during the existence of any war declared by Congress and the six months immediately following the termination of any such war.

"SEC. 102. The monthly family allowance payable under this title to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall consist of the Government's contribution to such allowance and the reduction in or charge to the pay of such enlisted man.

"SEC. 103. The dependents of any such enlisted man to whom a family allowance is payable under the provisions of this title shall be divided into two classes to be known as "Class A" and as "Class B" dependents. The Class A dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the wife, the child, or the former wife divorced of any such enlisted man. The Class B dependents of any such enlisted man shall include any person who is the parent, grandchild, brother, or sister of such enlisted man and who is found by the Secretary of the department concerned to be dependent upon such enlisted man for a substantial portion of his support.

"SEC. 104. A monthly family allowance shall be granted and paid by the United States to the Class A dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man upon written application to the department concerned made by such enlisted man or made by or on behalf of such dependent or dependents. A monthly family allowance shall be granted and paid by the United States to the Class B dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man upon written application to the department concerned made by such enlisted man, or upon written application to the department concerned made by or on behalf of such dependent or dependents in any case in which the Secretary of the department concerned finds that it is impracticable for such enlisted man to request the payment of such allowance. The payment of a monthly family allowance to any Class B dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall be terminated upon the receipt by the department concerned of a written request by such enlisted man that such allowance be terminated.

"SEC. 105. (a) The amount of the Government's contribution to the family allowance payable to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall be the aggregate of the amount of the Government's contribution to the Class A dependent or dependents of such enlisted man and the amount of the Government's contribution to the Class B dependent or dependents of such enlisted man.

"(b) The amount of the Government's contribution to the Class A dependent or dependents of such enlisted man shall be at a monthly rate of—

"(1) $28, if such enlisted man has a wife but no child;

"(2) $40, if such enlisted man has a wife and one child, and an additional $10 for each additional child;

"(3) $20, if such enlisted man has no wife but has one child;

"(4) $30, if such enlisted man has no wife but has two children, and an additional $10 for each additional child; and

"(5) $20, in addition to the amounts, if any, payable under clauses (1), (2), (3), or (4) of this subsection, if such enlisted man has a former wife divorced.

"(c) The amount of the Government's contribution to the Class B dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man shall be at a monthly rate of—

"(1) $15, if such enlisted man has only one parent who is a Class B dependent, and an additional $5 for each grandchild, brother, or sister which such enlisted man has who is a Class B dependent, but not more than $50 in the aggregate;

"(2) $25, if such enlisted man has two parents who are Class B dependents, and an additional $5 for each grandchild, brother, or sister which such enlisted man has who is a Class B dependent, but not more than $50 in the aggregate; and

"(3) $5, if such enlisted man has no parent who is a Class B dependent, for each grandchild, brother, or sister which such enlisted man has who is a Class B dependent, but not more than $50 in the aggregate.

"In any case in which the amount of the Government's contribution to the Class B dependents of any enlisted man would be greater than $50, if there were no limitation upon the aggregate amount of the Government's contribution to such dependents, the amount contributed by the Government to each such dependent shall be reduced in the

same proportion as the aggregate amount of the Government's contribution to all such dependents is reduced.

"SEC. 106. (a) For any month for which a monthly family allowance is paid under this title to the dependent or dependents of any such enlisted man the monthly pay of such enlisted man shall be reduced by, or charged with, the amount of $22, and shall be reduced by, or charged with, an additional amount of $5 if the dependents to whom such allowance is payable include both Class A and Class B dependents. The amount by which the pay of any such enlisted man is so reduced or with which it is so charged shall constitute part of the monthly family allowance payable to his dependent or dependents.

"(b) In any case in which the family allowance is payable to more than one dependent of any such enlisted man, the amount by which the pay of such enlisted man is reduced or with which it is charged shall be apportioned among and paid for the benefit of such dependents in the following proportions:

"(1) If such dependents are all Class A dependents or are all Class B dependents, such amount shall be apportioned among such dependents in the same ratio in which they share the total Government contribution payable to them under section 105.

"(2) If one or more of such dependents are Class A dependents and one or more of such dependents are Class B dependents, $22 of such amount shall be apportioned among such Class A dependents in the same ratio in which they share the total Government contribution payable to such Class A dependents under section 105 and $5 of such amount shall be apportioned among such Class B dependents in the same ratio in which they share the total Government contribution payable to such Class B dependents under section 105.

"(c) Notwithstanding any other provision of this title, in any case in which a family allowance is granted under this title to a wife or a child living separate and apart from the enlisted man under a court order or a written agreement, or to a former wife divorced, the amount of the family allowance payable to such wife, child, or former wife divorced shall not exceed the amount fixed in the court order or decree or in the written agreement as the amount to be paid to such wife, child, or former wife divorced. In any case in which the application of the provisions of the preceding sentence results in a reduction in a family allowance which would otherwise be payable under this title, the amount by which the pay of the enlisted man is reduced or with which it is charged and the amount of the Government contribution to such family allowance may each be reduced in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the department concerned.

"SEC. 107. Any monthly family allowance provided for by this title shall be paid for the period beginning with the day on which application therefor is filed or the day on which the dependent or dependents first become entitled thereto under section 101, whichever is later, and ending with the day on which the disbursing officer paying the allowance receives notice of a change in status of the enlisted man concerned which terminated the right of his dependent or dependents to receive such allowance or notice of the discharge from or death in the service of such enlisted man: *Provided*, That in the case of any dependent of an enlisted man in active service on the date of enactment of this Act, if application is filed for a monthly family allowance within six months after such date of enactment or within such longer period as may be prescribed in special cases by the Secretary of the department concerned, the period for which such family allowance shall be paid shall begin with the date on which such dependent first becomes entitled thereto under section 101: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy may, by regulations prescribed by them jointly, fix the dates of commencement and termination of any such family allowance on any dates not more than one month before or one month after the dates above prescribed. Such regulations shall in no event provide for the payment of such allowances for any period prior to the first day of the first calendar month following the date of enactment of this Act or for any period when the United States is not engaged in a war declared by Congress and which is more than six months later than the date of termination of any such war. Any allowances which accrue under this title for the period preceding November 1, 1942, shall not be actually paid until after November 1, 1942.

"SEC. 108. In any case in which any allotment from the pay of an enlisted man is already in effect at the time a monthly family allowance becomes payable under this title to a dependent or dependents of such enlisted man, such allotment may be continued, modified, or discontinued in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the head of the department concerned.

"SEC. 109. Any family allowance to which any dependent or dependents of any enlisted man is entitled under the provisions of this title shall be paid on behalf of such dependent or dependents to any person who may be designated by such enlisted man unless the Secretary of the department concerned determines that the person so designated is not an appropriate payee. In any case in which the Secretary of the department concerned determines that the person so designated is not an appropriate payee or in any case in which the enlisted man has not designated a payee, such allowance shall be paid on behalf of such dependent or dependents to such person as may be designated in regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the department concerned.

"SEC. 110. (a) Any family allowance granted under the provisions of this title to the dependent or dependents of any enlisted man shall continue to be paid irrespective of the pay accruing to such enlisted man.

"(b) In case of the desertion or imprisonment of any enlisted man to the dependent or dependents of whom a family allowance has been granted under the provisions of this title, the family allowance thereafter payable to such dependent or dependents and the reduction of or charge to pay of such enlisted man shall be determined in accordance with such regulations as may be prescribed by the Secretary of the department concerned.

"(c) In any case in which an enlisted man is entitled to receive or to have credited to his account pay and allowances for any period under the Act of March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, Seventy-seventh Congress), such enlisted man shall be deemed to be an enlisted man during such period for the purposes of this title.

"(d) Nothing contained in this Act shall be construed to modify the Act approved March 7, 1942 (Public Law 490, Seventy-seventh Congress).

"SEC. 111. This title shall be administered by the Secretary of War in its application to enlisted men of the Army of the United States and the dependents of such enlisted men and shall be administered by the Secretary of the Navy in its application to enlisted men of the United States Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard, and the dependents of such enlisted men. Said Secretaries are authorized to prescribe jointly or severally such regulations as they may deem necessary to enable them to carry out the provisions of this title and to delegate to such officers or employees of their respective departments as they may designate any of their functions under this title.

"SEC. 112. The determination of all facts, including the fact of dependency, which it shall be necessary to determine in the administration of this title shall be made by the Secretary of the department concerned and such determination shall be final and conclusive for all purposes and shall not be subject to review in any court or by any accounting officer of the Government. The Secretary of the department concerned may at any time on the basis of new evidence or for other good cause reconsider or modify any such determination, and may waive the recovery of any money erroneously paid under this title whenever he finds that such recovery would be against equity and good conscience. The General Accounting Office shall not refuse to allow credit in the accounts of any disbursing officer for any erroneous payment or overpayment made by him in carrying out the provisions of this title unless such erroneous payment or overpayment was made by him as the result of his gross negligence or with the intent to defraud the United States. No recovery shall be made from any officer authorizing any erroneous payment or overpayment under this title unless such payment was authorized by him as the result of his gross negligence or with the intent to defraud the United States.

"SEC. 113. Any appropriations heretofore or hereafter made to the department concerned for the pay of enlisted men shall be available for the payment of the family allowances payable under the provisions of this title.

"SEC. 114. The Director of the Selective Service System is authorized and directed to cooperate with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy by providing them with such information in the possession of, or available to, the Selective Service System as may be necessary to enable them to efficiently administer the provisions of this title.

"SEC. 115. The monthly family allowances payable under the provisions of this title shall not be assignable; shall not be subject to the claims of creditors of any person to whom or on behalf of whom they are paid; and shall not be liable to attachment, levy, or seizure by or under any legal or equitable process whatever.

"SEC. 116. Whoever shall obtain or receive any money, check, or family allowance under this title, without being entitled thereto and with intent to defraud, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

"SEC. 117. Whoever in any claim for family allowance or in any document required by this title or by regulation made under this title makes any statement of a material fact knowing it to be false, shall be guilty of perjury and shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment for not more than two years, or both.

"SEC. 118. Any person who has been entitled to payment of a family allowance under this title and whose entitlement to payment of such allowance has ceased shall, if he thereafter accepts payment of such allowance with the intent to defraud, be punished by a fine of not more than $2,000, or by imprisonment for not more than one year, or both.

"SEC. 119. No part of any amount paid pursuant to the provisions of this title shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with any family allowance payable under this title, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating this section shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not less than $100 nor more than $1,000.

"SEC. 120. As used in this title—

"(a) The term 'wife' means a lawful wife.

"(b) The term 'former wife divorced' means a former wife divorced who has not remarried and to whom alimony has been decreed and is still payable.

"(c) The term 'child' includes—

"(1) a legitimate child;

"(2) a child legally adopted;

"(3) a stepchild, if a member of the man's household, including a stepchild who continues as a member of the man's household after death of the mother or termination of the marriage; and

"(4) an illegitimate child, but only if the man has been judicially ordered or decreed to contribute to such child's support; has been judicially decreed to be the putative father of such child; or, has acknowledged under oath in writing, that he is the father of such child.

"(d) The term 'grandchild' means a child as above defined of a child as above defined, and is limited to persons to whom the enlisted man has stood in loco parentis for a period of not less than one year prior to his enlistment or induction.

"(e) The term 'parent' includes father and mother, grandfather and grandmother, stepfather and stepmother, father and mother through adoption, either of the person in the service, or of the spouse, and persons who, for a period of not less than one year prior to the man's enlistment or induction, stood in loco parentis to the man concerned: *Provided*, That not more than two within those named therein may be designated to receive an allowance, and in the absence of a designation by the enlisted man preference shall be given to the parent, or parents not exceeding two, who actually exercised parental relationship at the time of or most nearly prior to the date of the enlisted man's entrance into active service: *Provided further*, That if such parent or parents be not dependent or waive an allowance, preference may be extended to others within the class who at a more remote time actually supported the enlisted man prior to entrance into service.

"(f) The terms 'brother' and 'sister' include brothers and sisters of the half blood as well as those of the whole blood, stepbrothers and stepsisters, and brothers and sisters through adoption.

"(g) The terms 'child', 'grandchild', 'brother', and 'sister' are limited to unmarried persons either (1) under eighteen years of age, or (2) of any age, if incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect.

"(h) The terms 'pay' and 'base pay' mean base pay and longevity pay only.

"(i) The terms 'man' and 'enlisted man' mean any enlisted individual of the fourth, fifth, sixth, or seventh grade in any of the services mentioned in section 101 of this Act, but does not include any member of the Limited Service Marine Corps Reserve, the Philippine Army, the Philippine Scouts, the insular force of the Navy, the Samoan native guard or band of the Navy, or the Samoan reserve force of the Marine Corps.

"(j) The term 'department concerned' means the War Department or the Navy Department, whichever may be the appropriate one in the particular case.

"Title II

"SEC. 201. (a) Paragraph (1) of section 5 (e) of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"'(1) The President is authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this Act in the land and naval forces of the United States of any or all categories of those men whose employment in industry, agriculture, or other occupations or employment, or whose activity in other endeavors, is found in accordance with section 10(a)(2) to be necessary to the maintenance of the national health, safety, or interest. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this Act in the land and naval forces of the United States (1) of any or all categories of those men in a status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support which renders their deferment advisable, and (2) of any or all categories of those men found to be physically, mentally, or morally deficient or defective. For the purpose of determining whether or not the deferment of men is advisable because of their status with respect to persons dependent upon them for support, any payments of allowances which are payable by the United States to the dependents of persons serving in the land or naval forces of the United States shall be taken into consideration but the fact that such payments of allowances are payable shall not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon financial considerations and shall not be deemed to remove the grounds for deferment when the dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents. The President is also authorized, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, to provide for the deferment from training and service under this Act in the land and naval forces of the United States of any or all categories of those men who have wives or children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. No deferment from such training and service shall be made in the case of any individual except upon the basis of the status of such individual, and no such deferment shall be made of individuals by occupational groups or of groups of individuals in any plant or institution. Rules and regulations issued pursuant to this subsection shall include provisions requiring that there be posted in a conspicuous place at the office of each local board a list setting forth the names and classifications of those men who have been classified by such local board.'

"(b) Section 15 of such Act, as amended, is amended by striking out subsection (c) thereof."

And the House agree to the same.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the part of the House.

ELBERT D. THOMAS,
JOSH LEE,
LISTER HILL,
WARREN R. AUSTIN,
CHAN GURNEY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2467) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

This bill was passed by the Senate and sent to the House after a similar House bill (H. R. 7119) had already been reported to the House by the Committee on Military Affairs. Consequently, the Senate bill was not referred to the House committee and, when the House passed the Senate bill, the House struck out all of the text of the Senate bill after the enacting clause and inserted in lieu thereof the text of the House bill, as it had been amended by the House. While it happened in this fashion that the House amendment was a complete substitute for the Senate bill and there were many differences in form between the two, there were relatively few important differences of substance between the Senate bill and the House amendment.

The more important differences between the Senate bill and the House amendment, and the provisions of the conference agreement with respect thereto, are as follows:

1. The Senate bill provided that allowances should be payable for the period beginning with the first day of the first month following the enactment of the act, but that allowances accruing for the period preceding the first day of the fourth calendar month following such enactment should not actually be paid until after the first day of such fourth calendar month. The House amendment provided that allowances should be payable for the period beginning with the first day of the second month following the enactment of the act. The conference agreement provides that allowances shall be payable for the period beginning with June 1, 1942, but that allowances accruing for the period preceding November 1, 1942, shall not actually be paid until after November 1, 1942.

2. The Senate bill provided that class B dependents should include any person who is the parent, grandchild, brother, or sister of the enlisted man and who is dependent upon the enlisted man for a substantial portion of his support. The House amendment required that a class B dependent be dependent on the enlisted man for his chief support. Both the Senate bill and the House amendment defined parents so as to include parents, parents-in-law, and grandparents. However, under the House amendment not more than two parents (as so defined) could be regarded as dependents of an enlisted man, while under the Senate bill there was an additional allowance of $5 for each parent in excess of two. The Senate bill permitted grandchildren and brothers and sisters of the enlisted man to be included among class B dependents if they were either (1) under 18 years of age, or (2) of any age, if incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect. The House amendment did not permit grandchildren to be included as dependents in any case and permitted brothers and sisters (including those less than 18 years of age) to be included as dependents only if they were disabled. The conference agreement provides that persons having the required relationship may be included as class B dependents if they are dependent upon the enlisted man for a substantial portion of their support. The conference agreement follows the House amendment with respect to the limitation upon the number of parents who may receive allowances. The agreement provides that grandchildren, brothers, and sisters may be included among class B dependents only if they are (1) under 18 years of age, or (2) incapable of self-support by reason of mental or physical defect. There is an additional limitation in the case of grandchildren which permits them to be included only if the enlisted man stood in loco parentis to them for a period of at least 1 year prior to his entry into the service.

3. The Senate bill provided that the payment of an allowance to any class B dependent should be terminated upon the request of the enlisted man. The House amendment contained no such provision. This provision is retained by the conference agreement.

4. Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provided that the Government's contributions to the class B dependents of an enlisted man should not exceed $50 a month in the aggregate. Under the Senate

bill, in cases where the aggregate of such contributions to class B dependents would otherwise exceed $50, there would be a proportionate reduction in the amount of such contribution payable to each such dependent. Under the House amendment, in such cases, the $50 would be apportioned among the class B dependents as may be prescribed by regulations. The conference agreement provides for a proportionate reduction in such cases.

5. The House amendment contained a provision, which was not in the Senate bill, under which the enlisted man himself could determine the manner in which the amount taken from his pay should be divided among his dependents. The Senate bill provided that the amount taken from the pay of the enlisted man should be divided among his dependents in the same ratio in which the contribution from the Government was divided. The conference agreement follows the Senate bill in this respect.

6. Both the Senate bill and the House amendment provided that, subject to the general limitations upon the period for which allowances were payable, the allowance in any case should be paid for the period beginning with the date of filing application therefor. However, the Senate bill contained a provision, which was not in the House amendment, providing that in cases where the enlisted man is already in active service on the date of enactment of the act, if application is filed within 6 months after the date of enactment of the act or within such longer time as may be prescribed in special cases by the Secretary of the department concerned, the allowance should be paid for the period beginning with the date on which the dependent would have first become entitled thereto if an application had been filed at any earlier time. The conference agreement retains this provision of the Senate bill, which is particularly necessary in view of the fact that allowances are to begin to accrue as of June 1, 1942, and, of course, applications could not be filed by that date.

7. The Senate bill contained a provision, which was not in the House amendment, providing that the Secretary of the department concerned might at any time for good cause reconsider or modify any determination previously made by him in the administration of the act, and that he might waive the recovery of money erroneously paid under the act whenever he found that such recovery would be against equity and good conscience. The latter part of this provision is similar to provisions of existing law relating to payments made by the Veterans' Administration (U. S. C., title 38, sec. 507a). The Senate bill also contained a provision relieving authorizing officers from liability for erroneous payments or overpayments made under the act, unless they authorized such payments as the result of gross negligence or with the intent to defraud. The conference agreement retains these provisions.

8. Title II of the Senate bill contained amendments to the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 which were not contained in the House amendment. The conference agreement retains these provisions with clarifying changes. The purpose of these amendments to the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 is largely to clarify the questions which will arise in the administration of that act by reason of the fact that the dependents of registrants would be entitled to allowances under this Act if such registrants were inducted for active service.

These amendments provide, first, that for the purpose of determining whether or not men shall be deferred because of their dependents, any payments of allowances which would be payable by the United States to such dependents should be taken into consideration but should not be deemed conclusively to remove the grounds for deferment when dependency is based upon financial considerations and should not be deemed to remove the grounds for deferment when dependency is based upon other than financial considerations and cannot be eliminated by financial assistance to the dependents, and, second, that the President may provide for the deferment of any or all categories of those men who have wives or children, or wives and children, with whom they maintain a bona fide family relationship in their homes. The definition of the term "dependent" contained in the existing law is also repealed.

The effect of these amendments is to make it clear that under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 it will be possible to carry out the policy expressed in the report of the House committee on H. R. 7119, to the effect that established families should be preserved insofar as is practicable and should not be indiscriminately uprooted. To this end, these amendments authorize the deferment of men with wives and children until after the available single men have been inducted. It will of course be necessary to induct married men when the supply of available single men is exhausted. At that time it may be deemed advisable to distinguish between married men without children and married men with children. Such a distinction would be authorized by these amendments.

ANDREW J. MAY,
R. E. THOMASON,
DOW W. HARTER,
W. G. ANDREWS,
LESLIE C. ARENDS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, this report covers the bill S. 2467, commonly known and referred to as the pay-allotment bill. It so happens that the House passed such a bill, or such a bill was reported to the House of Representatives, and thereafter the Senate passed the Senate bill, which came to the House. After consideration of the House bill, the provisions contained in the Senate bill following the enacting clause was stricken and the provisions of the House bill substituted for the Senate provision. In that way it constituted only one amendment to the Senate bill.

The major difference between the two bills was the fact that the House has provided for payment of these allotments beginning on the 1st day of the month following the enactment and the effective date of the legislation. The Senate bill contained a different provision.

It was agreed in conference that the bill should be retroactive to the 1st day of the present month of June as the beginning date of payments, and the House receded from its position as to the amount allotted and the amount provided to be paid by the Government to the dependents of the enlisted men, and accepted the Senate provisions. May I say that in each instance the Senate provision was higher than the House provision.

The matter has been discussed from time to time; I know of no controversy on the report; and if there is no one who desires to discuss the matter or to ask a question, I shall move the previous question.

Mrs. BOLTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. Is it very clear that the Nurses Corps of both the Army and Navy are included in the bill?

Mr. MAY. May I say to the gentlewoman that the Nurses Corps in both the Army and Navy are included, for the reason that all nurses are in the Army of the United States and its regular nursing corps, and the same thing is true in the Navy.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I desire to congratulate the conferees on this legislation.

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman for a question.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. In this connection may I say to the gentleman from Kentucky that I received a letter yesterday from a lady in my district who said she had seven sons in the service and that up to now she had not been allowed any allotment at all.

I submit that under these conditions, when our people are sending boys into the service, or they being taken from their homes, all over the country, it is only right and just that we not only pay those boys adequately but that we provide adequate allotments for their dependents.

Mr. MAY. I am sure the lady will be taken care of. She ought to be taken care of, and I hope she remembers the gentleman's active service in her behalf.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. They always do.

I want her and all other similar dependents provided for. It will add greatly to the morale of the men in the service to know that their dependents are not suffering.

Mr. PACE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. Inasmuch as this bill and the conference report contain title II of the Senate bill, which has not been considered or debated in the House, does not the gentleman think that we should have a rather clear explanation of the purpose and intention of title II as covered in the conference report?

Mr. MAY. I think the gentleman is entirely right, and I will be happy to make the explanation as clear as I can.

Title II was inserted in the Senate bill but was not in the House bill. It is true that there were no hearings on title II, except informal hearings before the House Military Affairs Committee in the form of conferences, at which Major Keesling, expert of the Selective Service Bureau, appeared and made a complete explanation to the House committee. That was after the House bill, or the version that the House reported, had been reported and placed on the calendar.

The Senate then inserted the provision now known as title II in the bill. That is intended to take care of the question of reclassification and deferment of married men and what we understand is to be the procedure is already being carried out. The Director of the Selective

Service System is now preparing direction to the several State directors and through them to the local draft boards directing the reclassification of all married men and single men with dependents in order that they may be classified about as follows: According to the way we understand it, the first to be inducted will be single men who have been classified as III-A because of a dependent mother or dependent sister, for instance. The next thing that will happen will be the reclassification of married men so as to classify them, first, a man who has a wife but no children; second, a man who has a wife and no children, but the wife is self-supporting; third, a man who has a wife and children. Then there will probably be other classifications that I have not mentioned here. But the intention is to carry out the policy stated by the House committee in its report in the very last section which declares that it is the policy of the Congress not to break up or to disintegrate the institution of the home in this country. We put that in there for the sole and express purposes of giving notice to the authorities in the Selective Service Board here in Washington and to the draft boards throughout the country that it is not the intention of the Congress to take married men until we have exhausted our other sources of manpower.

Mr. ANDREWS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ANDREWS. I may say to the gentleman that I think there has been a good deal of misunderstanding about the proposed amendment not only on the part of the Members of the House but the press generally throughout the country. What this amendment actually does is as follows: It reclassifies everyone who is now classified III-A whether he be single or married. The Selective Service Board is very anxious to have this amendment because with the amendment they will be able to issue the necessary instructions and arrange classification in the categories of all persons classified III-A whether they be single or married. There is no thought at the moment of any inductions within that group except in the reclassification where they will discover persons who were not in the situation of having actual dependents; for example, a married man who has a wife who has a fortune or enough money to get along on, he may be classified I-A. Now, it will take months in order to carry this out, but the Members of the House fully understand that at the top of the III-A classification will be single men with no dependents, a single man with two dependents, a single man with three dependents, a single man with four dependents, and a married man with one dependent, his wife, and possibly his father and mother, and you may expect to find a man with a dependent wife and three or four children and a dependent father or mother.

It arranges scientifically and soundly, as I see it, the entire picture of the III-A registrants in the country, and gets them out of the situation obtaining today where a draft board might have 500 III-A registrants last November and then have another 500 III-A registrants in March and under the present situation they would be obliged to take everybody out of the November category before they took anyone out of the March category, even though persons in the November category might have a very heavy dependency and some in the March category might have a very light dependency. I think the statement in the conference report is perfectly clear.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PACE. It may be that the scientific requirements are such that this should be enacted, and I shall not dispute that, but does not the gentleman think he should inform the House that upon the adoption of this section the Congress surrenders entirely and completely any control whatever or any voice whatever as to who shall serve in the military and naval forces and who shall not?

Mr. ANDREWS. We have already surrendered that. This does not have the least effect upon it.

Mr. PACE. I do not believe there is in the present law such language as is found in this amendment, which states that deferments may be made in any occupation, in any employment, whenever it is considered that the national interest may require.

Mr. ANDREWS. The President has that authority today under a previous act.

Mr. PACE. Or that any person with any type of dependency may be deferred wherever that deferment is advisable, which, to my mind, takes completely out of the law and places in the Director of the Selective Service System or the President absolute direction as to who shall and who shall not serve.

Mr. ANDREWS. The whole theory of this act is based upon one idea, that of preserving the home, most of all. Beyond that, it would be of more advantage to the draft boards, because no two draft board chairmen are alike. It would standardize their interpretation and judgment.

Mr. MAY. The whole purpose of this is to stop what is actually going on in the country now, the practice of married men with dependents being drafted by local boards because of the exhaustion of their quotas otherwise. The whole intent of this from the viewpoint of the testimony the committee heard and from the standpoint of the Selective Service System and the local boards is to reclassify and to conduct an intelligent and systematic induction of these groups of men rather than let it go along as it is now going.

Mr. PACE. Of course, this amendment includes many more than married men. It also covers all occupations and all employments.

Mr. MAY. No; it does not.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that, as far as occupations are concerned, this language is no change from that which is already in the law?

Mr. MAY. None whatever.

Mr. SPARKMAN. And that the changes that are really worked out here are those relating to dependency, and that even there automatic deferment is not provided for, but it simply gives discretion to defer such persons as ought to be deferred by groups and by classifications?

Mr. MAY. And under regulations to be prescribed by the Selective Service System. That is exactly what it does.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I agree very largely with the gentleman from Georgia with reference to part of his statements, yet, as I stated in the committee, I think it is to be deplored that this legislation comes before us in the manner in which it does. It was not presented to the House Committee on Military Affairs and it was not presented to the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, I mean, in the hearings. There are no printed hearings. All of the evidence and all of the statements we have on this are based upon informal hearings and discussions that have been held. I deplore the fact that a record has not been built up in order to back up this legislation, and I say that even though I believe the legislation itself is helpful and is needed.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I should like to respond to my colleague from Alabama by saying that we did have numerous conferences with representatives of the Selective Service System. They and the Army officers appeared at the meetings of the conferees and testified at length there. I agree with the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] that it is not the best of practice. I did not want to put it into the pay bill without hearings, but rather would have chosen, if it had been left to me, to amend the Selective Training and Service Act and have an actual hearing on that bill. However, not having done so, this legislation is so urgent that I shall be constrained to move the previous question on the conference report unless further information is desired.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. BULWINKLE. In a county in my district 25 married men were inducted this week.

Mr. MAY. I stated a moment ago that the purpose of this amendment—and that is one of the urgent reasons for enacting this bill quickly—is to stop that practice, which is now going on. It is happening in the same way in my own home county. I was down there and found out about it the other day.

Mr. BULWINKLE. What will happen to those married men who have recently gone into the service?

Mr. MAY. I do not know what will happen to them.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. REECE of Tennessee) there were—ayes 84, noes 0.

So the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OMNIBUS PRIVATE CLAIMS BILL

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first omnibus bill on the Private Calendar.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title I—(H. R. 3831. For the relief of George S. Wolbert, receiver of the Neafie & Levy Ship & Engine Building Co.) By Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania.

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George S. Wolbert, receiver of the Neafie & Levy Ship & Engine Building Co., the sum of $103,821.56, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the difference between the actual cost of the construction of three torpedo-boat destroyers and the amount paid by the United States under the contract entered into for the building of said boats, as found by the Court of Claims on January 8, 1940, and reported in Senate Document No. 161, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of line 9, on page 2, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HANCOCK: Page 1, strike out all of title I.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, this bill is a hang-over from the Spanish-American War. In 1898 the Navy Department entered into a contract for the construction of three destroyers. This was a new type of vessel, new for the Navy and new for the contractor. It was provided in the contract that if there were changes in the specifications, the contract price would be adjusted accordingly. That is, if there were additional costs due to changes in the specifications, the contractor should receive additional compensation, and if the changes reduced the cost, the contract price should be adjusted downward. There were a number of changes in the plans, and the cost of the vessels was increased over the original estimates, but those additional costs were fully compensated for.

In 1903 the account of the contractor was finally settled and the contractor signed a release in full.

Perhaps you gentlemen do not remember the cumbersome language of a general release. Here is the wording of the release signed by the contractor when his account was paid:

The Neafie & Levy Ship & Engine Building Co. * * * does hereby, for itself, its successors and assigns, and its legal representatives, remise, release, and forever discharge the United States of and from all and all manner of debts, dues, sum and sums of money, accounts, reckonings, claims, and demands whatsoever in law and in equity, for or by reason of, or on account of, the construction of said vessel under the contract aforesaid.

Similar releases were executed for all three vessels.

Now, in 1904, the Neafie & Levy Co., the claimant in this case, went into bankruptcy and a receiver was appointed. The company is still in bankruptcy, and the claimant here is the receiver. If the bill is passed he and his attorneys will be the chief beneficiaries. Certainly, no creditor regards his claim against this company as a live asset.

In 1910 the receiver came to the Congress and asked for compensation for the losses sustained on the construction of the three vessels. The Senate referred the matter to the Court of Claims for findings of facts and findings of law. This was in 1910. It was not until 1940 that the Court of Claims rendered its decision. Obviously, there was laches of the grossest sort on the part of the plaintiff, sufficient to bar the claim, I think, without any additional evidence whatever.

For 30 years the matter was pending in the Court of Claims, and when the Court of Claims made its findings, they were in favor of the Government and adverse to the claimant.

The opinion in the case was written by our former colleague, Judge Williams, and his concluding paragraph is as follows:

While the builders of the *Bainbridge*, *Barry*, and *Chauncey* sustained a loss of $103,821.56, plaintiff's claim for reimbursement in that amount is neither a legal nor equitable one in a juridical sense.

Now we are asked to reverse the Court of Claims, to act as a court of appeals and to decide the case on a few affidavits that are presented here, all of which, of course, are self-serving.

If you have time to read the opinion of the Court of Claims which really went into the case and studied the evidence carefully, I think you will agree that the decision of the Court is correct.

It is true that the Neafie & Levy Co. suffered a loss, but it is also true that the Court of Claims has found there is no legal or equitable claim against the Government of the United States on account of that loss. Contractors have to take their chances. Sometimes they make a lot of money, sometimes they lose money. I do not believe there is any obligation on the part of the Federal Government to guarantee to a contractor that he is going to make a profit every time he is given a Federal contract.

It will be argued that there are precedents for paying claims of this sort, identical claims, but those are bad precedents, and I believe we should follow the decision of the Court of Claims and vote down this bill.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from New York. This claim was referred to me as a subcommittee of the Committee on Claims, for which reason I rise now to oppose the motion to strike out the title. It is with great reluctance, of course, that I inform the House that I believe my distinguished friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] has rather innocently misstated some of the very pertinent facts in connection with this claim. He mentioned that the claimant is guilty of laches. That, of course, is not borne out by the record. This contract is one of three similar contracts entered into between the Navy Department and three shipbuilding companies in 1898. They were admittedly experimental contracts. Therefore, the provision for the adjustment of any excess cost was made. The ships contracted to be built were of new design, never having been manufactured by any company in this country. The Navy Department knew that and recognized it, and after considerable delay in obtaining the required materials, and after considerable delay due to change in plans by the Navy Department, the ships were finally completed, and thereafter negotiations between the company and the Department were entered into looking to an adjustment of these excess costs.

It was found, however, that it was not possible under the law to make adjustments, even though the Department approved that it should be done. There was no recourse, therefore, except to come to Congress. The other body adopted a rather seldom used procedure and referred the cause to the Court of Claims, not to determine the matter but rather to report to Congress. The Court of Claims had no right and had no power under the resolution of reference to find judgment for this claimant. The Court of Claims could only do what it had done—namely, report the finding of fact and conclusions of law back to the Congress.

That cause was in the Court of Claims from 1910 to 1940. It was through no fault of this claimant or its representative. Upon the coming in of the report, in 1940, this bill was introduced in behalf of the claimant and has been diligently prosecuted since that time. As I say, the contract entered into was admittedly an experimental contract. The gentleman from New York says there is no legal or moral claim. I disagree with the gentleman. The Navy Department admits there is no legal claim, and no one contends there is, but it was the intention of the parties to the contract that there should be an adjustment for excess costs, thus creating the moral claim.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEOGH. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. I read from the finding of facts:

Most of the changes were not and could not be foreseen, but were found necessary as the work developed. All of them were paid for in accordance with the method provided for in the contracts.

Mr. KEOGH. Exactly; except that the final adjustment was not made, and it is admitted by the Department that these additional excess costs were all thoroughly audited in the hearings before the Court of Claims, before which the Department was ably represented, and these are the findings of fact of the Court of Claims. Furthermore, the gentleman says there is no moral claim. It was written into the original contract that there should and might be an adjustment for excess costs. The gentleman mentioned also about the release that was signed. That release was merely the ordinary form of release required in order that the contractor receive final payment. The claimant had no other choice but to sign that release, and I point out particularly that the other two contractors who entered into precisely similar contracts have been beneficiaries of private bills that have now been enacted into law, the payments for which have been made, and to which reference is made in this report. There were three contractors all in precisely the same position. Two of them have been fully compensated and indemnified for excess costs, and we are now appealing for justice to this House, to insure that the third sole remaining contractor who, up to the present time, has not received the relief that was intended to be granted him under the contract, should be compensated. That is all they are asking you to do. We are not creating any claims, we are not giving away any money, we are simply asking this House to do in a legal, orderly procedure that which was intended to be done under the original contract. I trust the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] will be defeated.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] to strike out title I.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. Hancock) there were—ayes 35, noes 31.

Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LANHAM). The Chair will count. [After counting.] Obviously there is no quorum present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant-at-Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 176, nays 124, not voting 132, as follows:

[Roll No. 75]

YEAS—176

Allen, Ill.	Burdick	Cooper
Anderson, N. Mex.	Burgin	Costello
Angell	Butler	Courtney
Arends	Camp	Cunningham
Barnes	Canfield	Curtis
Beckworth	Cannon, Fla.	Davis, Ohio
Bender	Cannon, Mo.	Davis, Tenn.
Bennett	Carlson	Day
Boggs	Carter	Dewey
Bolton	Cartwright	Ditter
Bonner	Chiperfield	Dondero
Boren	Claypool	Drewry
Brooks	Clevenger	Durham
Brown, Ga.	Cole, N. Y.	Dworshak
Brown, Ohio	Collins	Elston
Buck	Colmer	Engel
	Cooley	Fenton
Folger	Kinzer	Rogers, Mass.
Ford, Miss.	Kunkel	Rolph
Ford, Thomas F.	Landis	Romjue
Fulmer	Lanham	Russell
Gale	Leavy	Satterfield
Gamble	LeCompte	Short
Gearhart	Lewis	Sikes
Gerlach	Ludlow	Simpson
Gibson	McGregor	Smith, Maine
Gillette	McIntyre	Smith, Ohio
Gillie	McLean	Smith, Wis.
Graham	Mahon	South
Granger	Martin, Iowa	Sparkman
Guyer	Martin, Mass.	Spence
Gwynne	Mason	Springer
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Merritt	Stearns, N. H.
	Michener	Stefan
Hancock	Miller	Stevenson
Harris, Va.	Mills, Ark.	Sumner, Ill.
Harter	Monroney	Taber
Hébert	Moser	Tarver
Heidinger	Mundt	Thill
Hess	Murray	Thom
Hill, Colo.	Nelson	Thomas, Tex.
Hobbs	Norrell	Thomason
Hoffman	O'Brien, N. Y.	Tibbott
Holbrock	O'Neal	Treadway
Hope	Pace	Van Zandt
Houston	Patman	Vorys, Ohio
Hull	Peterson, Ga.	Welch
Jenkins, Ohio	Pierce	West
Jennings	Poage	Wheat
Jensen	Rankin, Miss.	White
Johnson, Calif.	Rankin, Mont.	Whitten
Johnson, Ill.	Reed, Ill.	Whittington
Johnson, Luther A.	Reed, N. Y.	Wigglesworth
	Rees, Kans.	Williams
Johnson, Okla.	Rich	Wolverton, N. J.
Jones	Rizley	Woodruff, Mich.
Jonkman	Robertson, Va.	Woodrum, Va.
Kean	Robinson, Utah	Young
Keefe	Rockwell	Zimmerman
Kilday	Rodgers, Pa.	

NAYS—124

Allen, La.	Haines	Myers, Pa.
Anderson, Calif.	Harris, Ark.	Nichols
Arnold	Hart	O'Brien, Mich.
Bates, Ky.	Healey	O'Connor
Beam	Hill, Wash.	O'Hara
Bell	Holland	Patton
Bland	Hook	Pheiffer, William T.
Bloom	Hunter	
Bradley, Mich.	Imhoff	Pittenger
Bryson	Jackson	Priest
Byron	Jacobsen	Rabaut
Capozzoli	Jarman	Ramsay
Celler	Johnson, W. Va.	Ramspeck
Chapman	Kee	Randolph
Chenoweth	Kefauver	Reece, Tenn.
Clason	Kelley, Pa.	Richards
Coffee, Wash.	Kelly, Ill.	Rivers
Cox	Kennedy, Martin J.	Rogers, Okla.
Cravens		Sanders
Crosser	Keogh	Sasscer
D'Alesandro	Kerr	Sauthoff
Dickstein	Kirwan	Scrugham
Dingell	Knutson	Shanley
Domengeaux	Kopplemann	Sheppard
Doughton	Kramer	Sheridan
Downs	Lane	Smith, Wash.
Duncan	Lea	Sullivan
Eberharter	Lesinski	Sutphin
Edmiston	Lynch	Talle
Elliott, Calif.	McCormack	Tenerowicz
Englebright	McGehee	Thomas, N. J.
Faddis	McKeough	Tolan
Fitzgerald	McLaughlin	Traynor
Fitzpatrick	McMillan	Vincent, Ky.
Flannagan	Maciejewski	Vinson, Ga.
Fogarty	Maciora	Voorhis, Calif.
Forand	Manasco	Ward
Gehrmann	Mansfield	Weaver
Gossett	May	Weiss
Grant, Ala.	Meyer, Md.	Wickersham
Green	Mills, La.	Winter
Gregory	Murdock	Wright

NOT VOTING—132

Andersen, H. Carl	Buckley, N. Y.	Delaney
	Bulwinkle	Dies
Andresen, August H.	Burch	Dirksen
	Byrne	Disney
Andrews	Case, S. Dak.	Douglas
Baldwin	Casey, Mass.	Eaton
Barden	Clark	Eliot, Mass.
Barry	Cluett	Ellis
Bates, Mass.	Cochran	Fellows
Baumhart	Coffee, Nebr.	Fish
Beiter	Cole, Md.	Flaherty
Bishop	Copeland	Ford, Leland M.
Blackney	Crawford	Gathings
Boehne	Creal	Gavagan
Boykin	Crowther	Gifford
Bradley, Pa.	Culkin	Gilchrist
Buckler, Minn.	Cullen	Gore
Grant, Ind.	Magnuson	Scott
Hall, Leonard W.	Marcantonio	Secrest
	Mitchell	Shafer, Mich.
Halleck	Mott	Shannon
Hare	Norton	Smith, Pa.
Harness	O'Day	Smith, Va.
Harrington	O'Leary	Smith, W. Va.
Hartley	Oliver	Snyder
Heffernan	Osmers	Somers, N. Y.
Hendricks	O'Toole	Starnes, Ala.
Hinshaw	Paddock	Steagall
Holmes	Patrick	Stratton
Howell	Pearson	Sumners, Tex.
Izac	Peterson, Fla.	Sweeney
Jarrett	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Talbot
Jenks, N. H.		Terry
Johns	Plauché	Tinkham
Johnson, Ind.	Ploeser	Vreeland
Johnson, Lyndon B.	Plumley	Wadsworth
	Powers	Walter
Kennedy, Michael J.	Robertson, N. Dak.	Wasielewski
		Wene
Kilburn	Robsion, Ky.	Whelchel
Kleberg	Rockefeller	Wilson
Klein	Sabath	Wolcott
Kocialkowski	Sacks	Wolfenden, Pa.
Lambertson	Scanlon	Worley
Larrabee	Schaefer, Ill.	Youngdahl
McGranery	Schuetz	
Maas	Schulte	

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Barden with Mr. Grant of Indiana.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Wolfenden.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Shafer of Michigan.
Mr. Patrick with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Hare with Mr. Fellows.
Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
Mr. Plauché with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Dirksen.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Mott.
Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Hartley.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Schulte with Mr. Copeland.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Ploeser.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Andrews.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Creal with Mr. Talbot.
Mr. Whelchel with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.
Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Maas.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Rockefeller.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Tinkham.
Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Eliot of Massachusetts with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. McGranery with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Izac with Mr. August H. Andresen.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Case of South Dakota.
Mr. Terry with Mr. Oliver.
Mr. Coffee of Nebraska with Mr. Youngdahl.
Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Paddock.
Mr. Pearson with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Sacks with Mr. Gilchrist.
Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Hinshaw.
Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Jenks.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. Disney with Mr. Holmes.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Jarrett.
Mr. Flaherty with Mr. Harness.

Mr. O'Day with Mr. Johns.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Howell.
Mr. Snyder with Mr. Baumhart.
Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Beiter with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.
Mr. Scanlon with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Bishop.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Schuetz.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Lyndon B. Johnson.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Worley.
Mr. Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. Kocialkowski.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. Mitchell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title II—(H. R. 1551. For the relief of W. E. Floding Co.) By Mr. RAMSPECK.

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, and in full settlement against the Government of the United States, the sum of $1,504.73 to the W. E. Floding Co., of Atlanta, Ga., for furnishing heat, light, and elevator service to the United States Naval Reserve in Atlanta during the years 1930 through 1934.

With the following committee amendments:

Line 23, insert "of all claims."

Line 24, strike out "$1,504.73" and insert "$1,250."

Page 3, line 2, after the figures, insert ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include some remarks by David E. Lilienthal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

OMNIBUS PRIVATE CLAIMS

The Clerk read as follows:

Title III—(H. R. 3356. For the relief of the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey.) By Mr. SOMERS of New York.

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Standard Oil Co., a corporation of the State of New Jersey, sole beneficial owner of the tank vessels *Zoppot*, *Gedania*, and *Baltic*, the sum of $60,283, such sum representing losses sustained by Standard Oil Co. by payment of discriminatory excess tonnage taxes and light moneys into the Treasury under protest upon the several entries of said tank vessels in ports of the United States prior to the President's proclamation of May 6, 1921, suspending and discontinuing foreign discriminatory duties of tonnage and imposts within the United States so far as respects the vessels of the Free City of Danzig. The acceptance of said sum by Standard Oil Co., sole beneficial owner of the tank vessels, *Zoppot*, *Gedania*, and *Baltic*, shall be in full satisfaction of all claims in respect to such losses: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: On page 3, beginning in line 11, strike out all of title III.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this amendment is to strike out title III. That title of the bill would pay to the Standard Oil Co. of New Jersey the sum of $60,283, which the Standard Oil Co. is seeking to recover, and which was paid to the Government as excess tonnage tax and light taxes upon three vessels which the Standard Oil Co. had leased and was operating as oil tankers. The three vessels were owned by a subsidiary corporation which was incorporated under the laws of the Free City of Danzig. Under existing laws at that time these light taxes were properly assessed against these vessels. However, it was shown to the President, and on May 6, 1921, he issued a proclamation whereby those taxes were no longer to be levied against any ships belonging to the Free City of Danzig.

Under existing law, at any time it was definitely shown to the President that a foreign country was not levying any discriminatory taxes against American vessels, then he had the authority to relieve those vessels from taxation.

The committee makes a point of the fact that in the case of Germany, where we entered into a treaty with Germany whereby taxes that had been levied against American vessels at German ports were to be eliminated and abolished, the President, in issuing his proclamation, made his proclamation retroactive to the date of the treaty, which was perfectly natural. But the committee contends that in this case, since the City of Danzig did not levy any taxes at any time against American vessels, the President's proclamation should have been made retroactive. The President, had he wished, could have made the proclamation retroactive, but he did not. It was a matter within his jurisdiction and his authority. In exercising his authority he relieved from taxation only as of May 6, 1921. As long as the law existed, the boats belonging to foreign countries were subject to these taxes unless the President relieved them by official proclamation. So that the Standard Oil Co. has no right to claim that these taxes were levied against them unjustly. They were properly levied and properly collected, and as a result they really have no claim to have these taxes remitted.

As a matter of fact, the American Minister in Warsaw, Poland, was notified officially that the city of Danzig did not levy any taxes against American vessels, and within 13 days of that notification the President issued his proclamation. There was no delay from the time at which the President was notified. He carried out the full requirements of the law. He did not make the proclamation effective as of any prior date.

The effect of the passage of this legislation would be to try to make the President do something which he did not see fit to do. He had the authority, had he wished to do so, to make his proclamation retroactive and as a result refund to the Standard Oil Co. the $60,000. He did not do so, and there is no justification why this Congress, 21 years later, should write into that proclamation the retroactive feature.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. Before the gentleman takes his seat I wish he would explain that this case has been fairly tried in the Court of Claims, and the Court of Claims has found that the taxes were legally assessed and collected.

Mr. COSTELLO. I am glad the gentleman brought up that point, because the Standard Oil Co. was given authority to go to the Court of Claims. They took the matter before the Court of Claims. They were denied relief, and they filed an appeal to take it to the Supreme Court. Their appeal was denied in 1933.

For these reasons I believe that this bill should be defeated, because the taxes were properly levied at the time. They were collected in accordance with the law, and the Standard Oil Co. has no right to complain that the President, in issuing his proclamation, did not give them some special benefits.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COSTELLO. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK. I believe the gentleman and I are in thorough agreement with the opinion of the Attorney General. His concluding words are these:

In view of the fact that the claimant has had his day in court which decided the issues on the merits and held that the taxes had been validly imposed, no reason appears why a refund should be allowed by legislative action.

I do not, therefore, favor the enactment of this bill. I believe the gentleman and I are in accord with the Attorney General.

Mr. COSTELLO. I am quite sure of that and I hope the House will adopt the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California to strike out the title.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title IV—(H. R. 2187. For the relief of Nannie May Blythe and Claudia Blythe). By Mr. MCGEHEE.

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Nannie May Blythe and Claudia Blythe, jointly, both of Natchez, Miss., the sum of $5,000 in full satisfaction of

all claims against the United States on account of the death of their 17-year-old brother, Earl Alexander Blythe, who was killed on October 23, 1913, while on duty as a special-delivery messenger for the post office in Natchez, Miss.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HANCOCK: On page 4 strike out all of title IV.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this item principally because of its antiquity.

In 1913 a young man, 17 years of age, was acting as a special-delivery messenger in the post office at Natchez, Miss. One day he attempted to deliver a special-delivery letter some time after dark. The man to whom the letter was addressed had retired, and when the messenger knocked at the front door there was no response. The messenger then knocked on a side window. Again there was no response. He returned to the front door. The householder, fearing it was an intruder and, having a gun, fired through the door and killed the messenger boy. Now, in 1942, 29 years later, the sisters of this boy are asking for an award of $5,000 on the theory, I suppose, that had the young man lived he might conceivably have contributed to their support.

There was no Employee's Compensation Act in 1913. The United States Employee's Compensation Act was not passed until 1916. I have consistently objected to bills awarding compensation for injuries or death suffered prior to 1916. It has been my contention that people who sustained injuries before that year should receive only such benefits as the law of that time afforded. The Employees Compensation Act was not made retroactive.

I have a great deal of sympathy with these two old ladies who lost their brother so many years ago, but I do not feel we should go that far back to pay claims. The claim originated in 1913, it was presented for the first time a year or two ago. The Post Office Department has no record of the young man's employment or of his death. I think it my duty to try to discourage the presentation of claims of this sort and of such antiquity.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is for the relief of the Blythe sisters. Their brother was a special-delivery messenger at the Natchez, Miss., post office. In 1914, when this young man was about 17 years of age, in the performance of his duty, he was given a letter to deliver to a man by the name of Reed. He tried to deliver the letter. The boy had an infirmity in that he could not hear well. When he knocked on the door of the Reed home he did not get any response. He then went to a window and knocked on that, but again could get no response. He returned to the door and Mr. Reed said:

If you do not tell me who you are I will shoot.

It seems there had been some trouble around Mr. Reed's home a few nights before, probably a robbery, or something. Not getting a response from the young man Mr. Reed shot through the door and the young man was killed.

This young man was 17 years of age; his mother was a widow; he had two sisters. He was their main support. The mother died shortly after on account of shock from the death of her son.

These two sisters are elderly ladies today, one of them infirm and unable to work, and the other working at a very meager salary. I know them personally and have been knowing them for years. I agree with the gentleman from New York that the claim is rather antiquated, but there was no law on the statute books at that time under which they could be given any relief; in fact they did not know they could receive relief until 4 or 5 years ago when in talking to them I suggested that I could probably secure the passage of an act by Congress which would give them some relief and aid them on account of the loss of their brother who was contributing to their support and who, if living, today would be contributing to them. Hence I introduced a bill. Two years ago it passed the House and went to the Senate, but Congress adjourned without the Senate taking final action. I have again introduced the bill and it is before you for consideration.

I think these good women are entitled to some compensation even at this late date, for they are now in their latter years and need it most. Were the brother living today he would be of some aid and help in supporting them. I think they are entitled to be compensated and I do hope the Congress will approve of this legislation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York to strike out the title.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HANCOCK) there were—ayes 35, noes 81.

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title V—(H. R. 2782. For the relief of Charles H. Dougherty, Sr.) By Mr. KEOGH.

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $135.62 to Charles H. Dougherty, Sr., of Ozone Park, Queens County, N. Y., being in full settlement of all claims against the United States by reason of extra labor above the legal day of 8 hours performed by Charles H. Dougherty, Sr., between the 8th day of March 1878 and the 20th day of September 1878, together with interest thereon, the receipt of same to be taken and accepted as a full and final release and discharge of his claim.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 5, line 18, after "1878" strike out the remainder of the line, down to and including the word "claim" in line 20 and insert the following: "while employed at the Brooklyn Navy Yard: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HANCOCK: Page 5, strike out all of title V.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Obviously a quorum is not present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 76]

Andersen, H. Carl	Gavagan	Oliver
Andresen, August H.	Gifford	Osmers
Angell	Gilchrist	Paddock
Baldwin	Gillette	Peterson, Ga.
Barden	Gore	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Barry	Grant, Ind.	Plauché
Bates, Mass.	Hall, Leonard W.	Ploeser
Baumhart	Halleck	Plumley
Beiter	Hare	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bishop	Harness	Robsion, Ky.
Blackney	Harrington	Rockefeller
Boykin	Hart	Sacks
Bradley, Pa.	Healey	Scanlon
Buckler, Minn.	Hébert	Schaefer, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.	Heffernan	Schuetz
Burdick	Hinshaw	Schulte
Byrne	Holmes	Scott
Byron	Howell	Secrest
Casey, Mass.	Izac	Shafer, Mich.
Celler	Jarman	Shannon
Clark	Jarrett	Simpson
Cluett	Jenks, N. H.	Smith, Pa.
Cochran	Johns	Smith, Va.
Coffee, Nebr.	Johnson, Ind.	Smith, Wash.
Cole, Md.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Smith, W. Va.
Copeland	Kennedy, Michael J.	Somers, N. Y.
Crawford	Kilburn	Stratton
Creal	Kleberg	Talbot
Crowther	Klein	Terry
Culkin	Kocialkowski	Tinkham
Cullen	Kopplemann	Vreeland
Delaney	Lambertson	Wadsworth
Dies	Larrabee	Walter
Dirksen	Lea	Wasielewski
Disney	McGranery	Weaver
Dondero	McLean	Wene
Douglas	Maas	Whelchel
Eaton	Marcantonio	White
Eliot, Mass.	Merritt	Wilson
Ellis	Mitchell	Wolcott
Fellows	Murdock	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fish	Norton	Worley
Flaherty	O'Day	Youngdahl
Ford, Leland M.	O'Leary	
Gathings		

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two hundred and ninety-five Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. McCORMACK, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his amendment.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Speaker, the amount involved in this title is not large,

but the bill is rather important in principle. I thought title IV was too old to be revived; it was 29 years old, but this is 64 years old, and it is certainly old enough to be allowed to rest in peace. My friend here on my right suggests it has whiskers down to its knees.

Briefly, the claim is this: An old gentleman named Dougherty asserts that he worked for the navy yard in Brooklyn in 1878, from March to September, about 6 months, although the commandant of the navy yard reports there is no record of such a man being employed there at that time. But, assume he was employed there in 1878. He says that he worked overtime beyond the standard 8-hour day. We all know there was no such thing as a standard 8-hour day in 1878. We can remember in our own youth that people worked in factories and everywhere else 10 and 12 hours a day. The 8-hour day is a comparatively new institution. This man evidently worked 10 hours a day because he claims 310 hours overtime, which is about 2 hours a day over 8 for every working day he was employed, assuming he worked for 6 months. He claims 2 hours a day overtime at 43¾ cents per hour, which he figures amounts to the total sum of $135.62½ cents. This niggardly Claims Committee has thrown out the extra one-half cent and only allows $135.62.

As I say, it is a small amount which is involved, but if we are going to take up claims that are 64 years old, it will cost the Government hundreds of millions of dollars. We all have nice old men in our districts who at one time or other worked for the Government. I know several in my district who worked on the Panama Canal. I am sure that they worked 10 or 12 hours a day. If this bill goes through, those men are entitled to extra compensation for all the hours they worked in excess of 40 hours a week, not at 43¾ cents an hour but at modern wages with time and a half for overtime. If you are going to make our present laws regarding hours of work retroactive, you should do the same thing in respect to wages, and if you do it for one man, you should do it for all men.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How about giving the waiters downstairs who went on strike something, too?

Mr. HANCOCK. If the gentleman will introduce a bill for that purpose, I will be sympathetic.

Mr. HOFFMAN. We will all have indigestion if we do not do something here quick.

Mr. HANCOCK. I advise the gentleman to try the cafeteria over in the New House Office Building.

Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt that Mr. Dougherty is a worthy old gentleman and a good, patriotic American. I do not doubt that he worked overtime if 8 hours be considered a workday in 1878, but I disclaim that it is proper for us to revive claims as old as this one, and we have no right now to establish an 8-hour standard workday for 1878 or any other year antedating our present laws.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable reluctance that I take up the time of the House on this matter, but I hope that you will for a few minutes forget that I am standing here and let me put in the Well of this House, not an old man but rather a distinguished, honorable, honest man, a man who many years ago served his Government. The only fact of any moment that has been raised against this claim is that the Navy Department has no record of his employment. I venture to say that that is perhaps the most novel defense that has ever been made. The defendant says, "I know nothing about it," therefore, you are urged to turn down this claim. This, notwithstanding the fact, and I hope you will bear this in mind, that in the Seventy-fourth Congress, 1935, hundreds of individuals in precisely the same position as this man were beneficiaries of legislation at your hands totaling not $135.62 but hundreds of thousands of dollars.

If I may be permitted I should like to call to the attention of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] the fact that his then distinguished colleague, the minority leader of this House, introduced that bill which became law and under which most, if not all, of those beneficiaries have been paid.

The claimant, Mr. Dougherty, worked in the Brooklyn Navy Yard. Like many others, he placed his claim in the hands of several lawyers who represented most of these claimants, one of whom has gained rather an international reputation for himself by his constant advertising in the public-notice columns of the metropolitan dailies. Mr. Dougherty's case was in their hands. It was not until after the enactment of that law, Private, 349, Seventy-fourth Congress, that it came to his attention that his claim was not among those included.

If he had been included, as he should have been, I would not be presuming upon your time this afternoon and Mr. Dougherty's faith in his Government, which, I venture to say, is the only thing that has kept him alive, would be vindicated. He is now in his 89th year. He is, I am informed, the last living man who worked in one of those navy yards during that time.

I know that it is trivial, I know that it is small compared with the problems with which we are faced, but to him it is the most important thing that has happened. I know that if he were here he would say to you, as I am saying for him now, "Do not treat this lightly, do not consider it humorously, or flippantly, but just do the same degree of justice to me as has been done to hundreds and hundreds of others in a similar situation." I am sure he would say that and, having said it, I am sure he would be perfectly willing to rest his case in your hands and be guided by your judgment. I trust the motion will be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK] to strike out title V.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HANCOCK) there were—ayes 59, noes 89.

So the amendment was rejected.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter and a short magazine article.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read.

OMNIBUS PRIVATE CLAIMS

The Clerk read as follows:

Title VI—(H. R. 3432. For the relief of Maurice Victor.) By Mr. MCCORMACK.

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Maurice Victor, Boston, Mass., the sum of $1,594.63. Such sum represents reimbursement for the loss sustained by the said Maurice Victor on account of the payment of a judgment rendered against him on July 24, 1928, in a suit brought by the United States in the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts on a bail bond executed by the said Maurice Victor and conditioned upon the delivery in court of one George Beatty. The said George Beatty defaulted on October 25, 1927, but subsequently he was arraigned, sentenced, and, his sentence being suspended, placed on probation for 2 years.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 6, line 11, strike out "represents" and insert in lieu thereof "shall be accepted in full settlement of all claims against the United States for."

In line 18, after "Beatty" insert the following ": *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000."

On page 7, line 1, beginning with "The" strike out the remainder of line 1 and all of lines 2, 3, and 4.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title VII—(S. 416. For the relief of E. A. Wailes, receiver of Delta Oil Co.) By Mr. HARRISON.

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to E. A. Wailes, receiver of Delta Oil Co., of Mississippi, the sum of $13,539.60, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for the balance due on cotton linters in accordance with the findings of fact made by the Court of Claims under date of June 3, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same

shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Title VIII—(S. 819. For the relief of the widow and children of Dr. Jo M. Ferguson.) By Mr. BARKLEY.

That the Veterans' Administration is hereby authorized and directed to cancel an alleged overpayment in the sum of $7,051.94 charged against Dr. Jo M. Ferguson for disabled emergency officers' retirement payments received by him, and to pay to the widow and children of Dr. Ferguson the sum of $7,666.21, representing the net balance payable of the proceeds of insurance policy K-18334 issued to Dr. Ferguson, and the civil-service retirement fund credited to Dr. Ferguson, at the time of his death on September 21, 1938: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COSTELLO: On page 8, line 1, strike out all of title VIII.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this title is to pay to the heirs of Dr. Ferguson the sum of $7,666.21, which would cancel the overpayment of $7,051.94 paid Dr. Ferguson as retirement benefits paid a disabled emergency officer, and it would add thereto the $614.27 which is the balance due on his insurance policy.

The disabled emergency officer's pay which was received by Dr. Ferguson was forfeited under a decision of the Veterans' Administration because he was charged with having violated section 504 of the 1924 law. It was contended that while the language of the Veterans' Administration decision, which is applied in this case, does not require that a forfeiture of the right to compensation must of necessity cancel the retirement pay, which supplanted his previous compensation payments, nevertheless the fact is that the Administration did determine that the retirement pay should be canceled and should be forfeited. It was the ruling of the Administration that he should lose both the compensation which he had received and the retirement pay which, during a period of 5 years, was substituted for the compensation.

The disability compensation was paid to him in approximately the sum of $3,000, a little less than that, from the date of his discharge, July 11, 1919, until May 30, 1928, at which time he was awarded emergency officer's retirement pay, until it was discontinued in 1933.

It appears that in the course of the proceedings in which Dr. Ferguson endeavored to obtain service connection for his disability, he filed various affidavits, including affidavits from two or three other doctors. The affidavit of one doctor was an entire forgery in the handwriting of Dr. Ferguson. Another had inserted into the affidavit the date on which the doctor presumably had first examined Dr. Ferguson. That date was inserted into that affidavit by Dr. Ferguson. The same was true of another affidavit which was submitted in 1924.

On the strength of Dr. Ferguson's affidavit and that of two or three other doctors in 1920, he was denied service connection. In 1924 he filed a new affidavit, along with some new affidavits from others doctors, and on the strength of these new affidavits, in which false dates were inserted, he was granted his service connection, and as a consequence was given compensation dating from the date of his discharge.

It is because of that fraud which was perpetrated on the Veterans' Administration, which definitely was done by Dr. Ferguson himself with the idea of trying to defraud the Government, that he was denied his compensation benefits and likewise his retirement-pay benefits. There is no reason why, having lost his compensation benefits because of those deeds, he should still be given his retirement pay, which was based on the same set of facts.

The purpose of this legislation would be to give back his retirement pay. If he is not to receive the one, he should not receive the other. The only money that he would get would be this retirement pay, if you pass this bill. Actually he had received from the Government in excess of $10,000 to which he was not entitled, but because of the balance remaining on his insurance policy at the time of his death, and other items, there were some offsets, and it left a balance of $614 in the policy due the widow.

The doctor is not entitled to this. It is another one of those cases of a doctor trying to get some benefits from the Government, and all he needed to do was to prove his service connection. He finally succeeded by using these various affidavits, which he himself had falsified.

It is alleged that a mistake was made and that Dr. Ferguson had drawn up the false affidavit in order that another doctor might use it as a guide in filling out the genuine affidavit, and that Dr. Foley signed the one which he himself made out, but Dr. Ferguson, in sending the affidavit down to be notarized, sent the false one down, on which Dr. Ferguson had forged the signature of Dr. Foley. It appears to me that it was no mistake. I do not think Dr. Ferguson could honestly claim it was an error, especially in view of the fact that he had inserted erroneous dates in two or three other affidavits trying to prove that various doctors who had examined him had examined him possibly a year or so earlier in order to show that he was examined right after he left the service and had these various ailments and, therefore, his ailments were service-connected. He committed a fraud, and I therefore think he is not entitled to the relief. I think the Members of this body should strike this title from the bill.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, it is too bad that the House does not have the time to give more consideration to bills of this character. My good friend the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] says that Dr. Ferguson is trying to get this through. The doctor has been dead 5 years and this is a claim of his widow and children for his war-risk insurance that had been in existence for over 19 years. Dr. Ferguson had paid premiums of $326 per year on this war-risk insurance since 1919. This just goes to show how little the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] or the committee of official objectors know about this bill.

Dr. Ferguson was a busy physician, he was an honored physician, he was loved by his people, for as their physician, he had served them a long time. On September 29, 1919, he took out this war-risk insurance and paid premiums on it until his death in 1938. Each month the Veterans' Administration wrote him and called on him for these premiums—$326 per annum—and after he became so disabled he could not attend to his business his wife would scrape around and get up the money to send in for this insurance, many times having to borrow money from neighbors and friends. Never once until his death did the Veterans' Administration or anybody else contend that Dr. Ferguson owed the Government anything or that there was anything shady or wrong or anything questionable, about the affidavit executed in 1920.

In 1920 the affidavit was made, that is in question here, and it was admitted by the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] that the affidavit did not get anywhere. The fact is the Bureau turned down the claim and held proof insufficient. He filed it in 1920. He got no benefit from it. It was turned down and I want to read a few lines from this affidavit:

That the said claimant incurred rheumatism at or near Plattsburg Barracks, N. Y., on or about April 1919, under the following circumstances: Began with neuralgia in teeth, followed by rheumatism in shoulders.

That said claimant also incurred bad teeth at or near Plattsburg Barracks, N. Y., on or about March 1919, under the following circumstances: Neglect of teeth causing three to be extracted.

The affidavit goes on with some other things, but that is the extent of the disability he claimed. Of course, the Veterans' Administration turned it down. I submit that if Ferguson had intended to defraud the Government he would have written a stronger affidavit.

Now, after 20 years and after premium payments had been made on this war-risk insurance, in order to keep from paying the widow and children, the Veterans' Administration hatched up some flimsy excuses and said they were not going to pay it. Dr. Ferguson did not forge the affidavit.

I call on this House now to see that this war-risk insurance policy is kept inviolate and that the Veterans' Administration not be permitted to hatch up some little excuse after accepting premium payments month after month and year after year, until the death of Dr. Ferguson.

If he had gone out and bought insurance from a private company, of course, his widow and children would have received full payment on his death, notwithstanding anything that he had done. But here they reach out and say, "No; we are going to grab that and hold it and keep it." I am surprised that any objection was made to the payment of this war-risk insurance to his widow and children.

Dr. Ferguson was an employee of the Veterans' Administration, and here is what they say about him:

Insofar as Dr. Ferguson's employment with the Veterans' Administration is concerned, his personal folder shows that throughout his service he maintained a satisfactory record as an administrative officer and performed his duties efficiently until toward the last of his service, when illness took him away.

Here from their own mouth comes a tribute to the man that they would by adroit suggestions and unfounded half truths destroy and deprive his widow and children of his insurance benefits. They denied it on a technicality and they have harangued his widow and children since his death.

They simply said, "Your husband was given something back in 1924 that he was not entitled to, and now we are going to take your insurance." That is not right; that is not right; that is not justice, and this Congress will not approve this action.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman's amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. I yield.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. If it were a private insurance contract, it would only be questionable for fraud if death occurred within 2 years after it was taken out. This was 10 years or more.

Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky. Of course, and before you can perpetrate a fraud you must take something or commit some fraud. Dr. Ferguson was not guilty of any fraud or any wrongdoing. He did not sign Dr. Foley's name to that affidavit, and I challenge any man here to go to the Veterans' Administration and look at the affidavits. Look at the record. The record is clear if you will check it. I had the record sent up this morning and I looked at the two affidavits and no one has ever said that these signatures were signed by any other person except a man in the Veterans' Administration here who claims that the signatures were forged.

Dr. Ferguson was an honorable man, and I hope this Congress will erase these unfair charges from his good name by your vote in approving this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO] to strike out the title.

The question was taken; and on motion of Mr. COSTELLO the House divided, and there were—ayes 36, noes 72.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-nine Members present, not a quorum. This is an automatic call. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from California to strike out the title. The Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 74, nays 203, not voting 155, as follows:

[Roll No. 77]

YEAS—74

Arends	Graham	O'Brien, N. Y.
Bennett	Grant, Ala.	O'Hara
Bonner	Guyer	Pheiffer, William T.
Bradley, Mich.	Gwynne	Pierce
Buck	Hancock	Ramsay
Camp	Harter	Rich
Canfield	Hill, Colo.	Rizley
Chiperfield	Hoffman	Rockwell
Clason	Hook	Rodgers, Pa.
Cooley	Hope	Sheppard
Costello	Houston	Smith, Maine
Crowther	Jennings	Smith, Ohio
Dewey	Johnson, Calif.	Springer
Doughton	Johnson, Ill.	Sumner, Ill.
Durham	Jonkman	Taber
Elston	Kean	Tarver
Engel	Kinzer	Tenerowicz
Faddis	Kunkel	Thom
Fitzgerald	LeCompte	Thomas, N. J.
Folger	Mahon	Tibbott
Gale	Martin, Mass.	Treadway
Gamble	Michener	Vorys, Ohio
Gibson	Miller	Wigglesworth
Gillette	Moser	Wolverton, N. J.
Gillie	Mundt	

NAYS—203

Allen, La.	Dworshak	Leavy
Anderson, Calif.	Eberharter	Lesinski
Anderson, N. Mex.	Edmiston	Lewis
	Elliott, Calif.	Ludlow
Angell	Fenton	Lynch
Barnes	Fitzpatrick	McCormack
Bates, Ky.	Flannagan	McGehee
Beam	Fogarty	McGranery
Beckworth	Forand	McGregor
Bell	Ford, Miss.	McIntyre
Bender	Ford, Thomas F.	McKeough
Bland	Gearhart	McLaughlin
Bloom	Gehrmann	McLean
Boehne	Gerlach	McMillan
Boggs	Gossett	Maciora
Bolton	Granger	Manasco
Brooks	Green	Martin, Iowa
Brown, Ga.	Gregory	Mason
Brown, Ohio	Haines	May
Bryson	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Meyer, Md.
Burch	Harris, Ark.	Mills, Ark.
Butler	Harris, Va.	Mills, La.
Cannon, Fla.	Hartley	Monroney
Cannon, Mo.	Heidinger	Mott
Capozzoli	Hendricks	Murdock
Carlson	Hess	Murray
Carter	Hill, Wash.	Nelson
Cartwright	Holbrock	Nichols
Chapman	Holland	Norrell
Chenoweth	Hull	O'Brien, Mich.
Claypool	Hunter	O'Connor
Clevenger	Imhoff	O'Neal
Coffee, Wash.	Jackson	Patrick
Cole, N. Y.	Jacobsen	Patton
Collins	Jarman	Peterson, Ga.
Colmer	Jenkins, Ohio	Pittenger
Cooper	Jensen	Poage
Courtney	Johnson,	Priest
Cox	Luther A.	Rabaut
Crosser	Johnson, Okla.	Ramspeck
Cunningham	Johnson, W. Va.	Randolph
Curtis	Jones	Rankin, Miss.
D'Alesandro	Kee	Rankin, Mont.
Davis, Ohio	Keefe	Reece, Tenn.
Davis, Tenn.	Kefauver	Reed, Ill.
Day	Kelley, Pa.	Reed, N. Y.
Dickstein	Kelly, Ill.	Rees, Kans.
Dingell	Keogh	Rivers
Domengeaux	Kerr	Robertson, Va.
Dondero	Kilday	Robinson, Utah
Douglas	Knutson	Rogers, Mass.
Downs	Lane	Rolph
Drewry	Lanham	Romjue
Duncan	Larkin	Russell
Sabath	Steagall	Ward
Sanders	Stefan	Weaver
Satterfield	Stevenson	Weiss
Sauthoff	Sullivan	Welch
Scrugham	Sutphin	West
Shanley	Sweeney	Wheat
Sheridan	Talle	Whitten
Short	Thill	Whittington
Sikes	Thomas, Tex.	Wickersham
Smith, Va.	Thomason	Williams
Smith, Wash.	Traynor	Woodrum, Va.
Smith, Wis.	Van Zandt	Wright
South	Vincent, Ky.	Young
Sparkman	Vinson, Ga.	Zimmerman
Spence	Voorhis, Calif.	

NOT VOTING—155

Allen, Ill.	Gifford	Paddock
Andersen, H. Carl	Gilchrist	Patman
	Gore	Pearson
Andresen, August H.	Grant, Ind.	Peterson, Fla.
	Hall, Leonard W.	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Andrews	Halleck	Plauché
Arnold	Hare	Ploeser
Baldwin	Harness	Plumley
Barden	Harrington	Powers
Barry	Hart	Richards
Bates, Mass.	Healey	Robertson, N. Dak.
Baumhart	Hébert	
Beiter	Heffernan	Robsion, Ky.
Bishop	Hinshaw	Rockefeller
Blackney	Hobbs	Rogers, Okla.
Boren	Holmes	Sacks
Boykin	Howell	Sasscer
Bradley, Pa.	Izac	Scanlon
Buckler, Minn.	Jarrett	Schaefer, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.	Jenks, N. H.	Schuetz
Bulwinkle	Johns	Schulte
Burdick	Johnson, Ind.	Scott
Burgin	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Secrest
Byrne		Shafer, Mich.
Byron	Kennedy, Martin J.	Shannon
Case, S. Dak.		Simpson
Casey, Mass.	Kennedy, Michael J.	Smith, Pa.
Celler		Smith, W. Va.
Clark	Kilburn	Snyder
Cluett	Kirwan	Somers, N. Y.
Cochran	Kleberg	Starnes, Ala.
Coffee, Nebr.	Klein	Stearns, N. H.
Cole, Md.	Kocialkowski	Stratton
Copeland	Kopplemann	Sumners, Tex.
Cravens	Kramer	Talbot
Crawford	Lambertson	Terry
Creal	Landis	Tinkham
Culkin	Larrabee	Tolan
Cullen	Lea	Vreeland
Delaney	Maas	Wadsworth
Dies	Maciejewski	Walter
Dirksen	Magnuson	Wasielewski
Disney	Mansfield	Wene
Ditter	Marcantonio	Whelchel
Eaton	Merritt	White
Eliot, Mass.	Mitchell	Wilson
Ellis	Myers, Pa.	Winter
Englebright	Norton	Wolcott
Fellows	O'Day	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fish	O'Leary	Woodruff, Mich.
Flaherty	Oliver	Worley
Ford, Leland M.	Osmers	Youngdahl
Fulmer	O'Toole	
Gathings	Pace	
Gavagan		

So the motion to strike out the title was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. Burgin with Mr. Simpson.

Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Englebright.

Mr. Lea with Mr. Ditter.

Mr. Patman with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.

Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Allen of Illinois.

Mr. Cochran with Mr. Landis.

Mr. Pace with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Richards with Mr. Winter.

Mr. Arnold with Mr. Celler.

Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Kirwan.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Boren with Mr. Kopplemann.

Mr. Hébert with Mr. Maciejewski.

Mr. Cravens with Mr. Kramer.

Mr. Weiss with Mrs. Byron.

Mr. Merritt with Mr. Healey.

Mr. Sasscer with Mr. White.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title IX—(S. 885. For the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934.) By Mr. TRUMAN.

That the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri having made a finding by authority of the provisions of Private Law No. 256 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, approved August 11, 1939, that certain dikes constructed in the Missouri River by the War Department (which dikes were thereafter removed) caused the flooding of certain farm lands at or near Bean Lake, in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, in the month of March 1934, with resultant damage to certain claimants' property, and the court having further found and determined the amount of loss suffered by each of said claimants, the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the following-named persons or their heirs, representatives, administrators, executors, successors, or assigns, the following amounts: Julius P. Kuhnert, $1,538.75; G. M. McCrary, $240; Paul N. Shouse, $2,775; Mrs. C. E. Johnson, $4,235.46; Mrs. A. H. Wilbert, $797.90; G. E. Hutson, $2,127; James D. Kelly, $8,806; W. H. Myers, $693.22; Frank Dougherty, $956.75; H. A. Whitnah, $858.20; N. D. Gasaway, $134.75; Paul Johnson, $206.08; John H. Chapin, $250; L. K. Poos, $692.77; H. F. Chapin, $785.50; Goldie Noland, who is the same person as Goldie P. Noland, $783.17; B. F. Kabel, $497; S. O. Daniels, $2,395; W. D. Shreve, $667.50; Elmer Willis, $1,011.90; Ethel McDuff, $1,426; and Emma Schults, $981.55.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COSTELLO moves to strike out, on page 9, line 1, all of title IX.

Mr. COSTELLO. Mr. Speaker, my purpose in offering this amendment to strike out title IX is because of the fact that when this bill was on the Private Calendar I objected to it. The facts out of which this bill arises are that the Army engineers went to the Missouri River and in an attempt to prevent floods evolved a program whereby they decided to change the channel of the river. They built numerous dikes, and tried to straighten out the river. There had not been any floods in that particular area of any consequence. The banks on both sides of the river were quite high. As a result of the dikes which were constructed, the following year ice backed up behind these new dikes, and the river, not being allowed to follow its normal course, backed up behind and a serious flood ensued and various claimants suffered damages. The following year the Army engineers decided that the program they had evolved was not satisfactory. Therefore, they returned and removed the original dikes which they had put in and changed the course of the river back to the original bed through which it had flown. This matter was referred to the district court out in the State of Missouri. That court went through extensive findings in rendering its decision. It listed the amount of damages which each claimant suffered as the result of the flood.

It went into quite some discussion as to what the Congress had meant when it authorized the court "to hear the case and to render a judgment without interest but in accordance with the same provisions of law as if the United States were a private party."

The reasons for my objection are not based on whether the Government should be considered a private party but simply that I thought it is a question that this body should determine. It is a question as to whether or not the Government should be responsible for the torts of its agents as long as those agents are performing their governmental duties. The Army engineers believed they had a workable plan for preventing floods in the Missouri River. The following year, when the flood came, it developed that their plan was not workable but was an obstruction which caused floods. They therefore changed their plans. The only question that really comes before this Congress, the court having determined the amount of damages actually sustained by these various people, is whether we shall approve of the Government paying for that damage when the Government is exercising a purely and proper governmental authority in building dikes, or in trying to bring about flood control or any other exercise of governmental power, which the Government has a right and an obligation to perform. It is simply a question which this Congress must determine for itself.

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from California. The gentleman from California has discussed the bill very clearly and fairly. The facts are that in 1933 the Government spent a great deal of money on the upper Missouri, largely for the purpose of making it navigable. Dikes were constructed south of St. Joseph, in Platte County, extending from the Kansas side to the Missouri side. The channel of the river was approximately 1,200 feet wide. This dike was built from the Kansas side approximately 900 feet across the river toward the Missouri side and a high bank on the Missouri side. Never in the memory of anyone living in that part of the country had there been a flood in this particular area. In the spring of 1934, sometime after this dike had been placed there, the river above the dike was confined to approximately one-fourth the normal width of its channel.

A rise came in the river with the breaking up of the ice in March. The ice piled up above the dike and extended for a distance of 2 or 3 miles up the river. The water came out over 3,500 acres of as fine farm land as there is in the United States, highly developed farm land.

There are 22 claimants here, all of them farmers. The smallest claim is $134, and the largest is $8,800. Many fine fat cattle and many fine hogs and all kinds of livestock were drowned. The water came over so suddenly after the ice had piled up that there was no chance to get any of the property out. Many of the persons themselves had to run for their lives.

As soon as the flood was over the ice jam was blasted out and within a reasonable time the dike was removed because it was found that it was absolutely improper and that it would probably continue to cause floods. As a matter of fact, the channel of the river came down and hit the dike instead of going where the Army engineers had expected it to go; it went back into the original channel below the dike.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNCAN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. There is no question whatever that the damage done to the landowners, the farmers in that area, was caused by the construction of these dikes?

Mr. DUNCAN. The district court at St. Joseph which heard the case used this language:

The dikes constructed and placed in the manner mentioned and under the circumstances then existing were the direct and proximate cause of the resultant flood.

The trial judge, before whom the case was tried, used this language:

I shall be happy if the Congress shall discover in the findings of fact that I make a basis for some relief to the plaintiff and his assignors.

The case was decided very largely on a technical question; a provision that was written into the bill which authorized the district court to try and to determine the case as if the Government were an individual. The court discussed at considerable length the question of whether or not the Congress had the constitutional right to direct the court how it should try the case. After making its findings of fact and conclusions of law the court stated that he hoped under his findings of fact the Congress could find some way to compensate these people. The court found the amount of damage that each of these claimants had sustained. He found that the placing of the dike in the river was the proximate cause of the flood. He found that there was about a 9-foot normal rise in the river which was not flood stage. He found that by reason of the clogging of the ice against the dike the river rose from 7 to 9 feet higher than the flood stage of 8 or 9 feet.

Mr. SHORT. The fact that the Army engineers tore out the dike that they had constructed is further proof that the finding of the court was correct?

Mr. DUNCAN. I think it is conclusive proof that the Army engineers had made a mistake in judgment that caused the owners of these 3,500 acres of farm land to sustain great damage. The water was approximately 4 feet deep on land that had never before within the memory of man been overflowed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUNCAN. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The amount asked by each claimant is the exact amount which the court found he was entitled to?

Mr. DUNCAN. Yes. There is no dispute on the part of the Army engineers, because they went in there immediately after the flood and made a list of the amount of damage. They took an inventory of it and the court found the amount of damage each claimant had sustained.

This is a very just and meritorious bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. COSTELLO].

The amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEMUEL T. ROOT, JR.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Claims be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 925), for the relief of Lemuel T. Root, Jr., and that the same be rereferred to the Committee on Public Lands.

I have consulted with the chairman of the Committee on Claims, and there is no question about it.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the gentleman is granted.

There was no objection.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES FOR DEPENDENTS OF ENLISTED MEN OF THE ARMY, NAVY, MARINE CORPS, AND COAST GUARD

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 71.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed, in enrolling the bill (S. 2467) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes, to make the following necessary change in the language of the bill:

In section 107, strike out the words "the first day of the first calendar month following the date of enactment of this act" and in lieu thereof insert "June 1, 1942."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, it is just a change of date?

Mr. MAY. That is all; it is necessary to make this section conform to other sections of the bill in order to provide the retroactive payment to the men.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There was no objection.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Arthur Krock which appeared in the New York Times on June 16.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein six cards with some very effective ideas that were brought to my attention relative to present conditions.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a short article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter I received from 39 war mothers.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the text of a short resolution.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Thursday next, after the conclusion of the legislative business of the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday of this week may be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

MEDICAL COLLEGES AND THE PRESENT NEED FOR DOCTORS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a letter from the College of Physicians and Surgeons at Columbia University and my answer thereto of June 12.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Columbia University wrote me a letter. I assume other Members of Congress received a similar letter, but in case some of you have not received it, I am inserting the letter addressed to me and my answer thereto:

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY,
COLLEGE OF PHYSICIANS AND SURGEONS,
New York, N. Y., June 9, 1942.

Hon. SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE DICKSTEIN: The medical schools of the country have been cooperating with the Army and Navy in an effort to increase the number of medical graduates each year through the acceleration of the medical-school programs by the elimination of all long vacations. The Army in particular is very short of medical officers.

As a part of the accelerated program of the medical schools, President Roosevelt, the Bureau of the Budget, the Federal Department of Education, and the Social Security Agency under Mr. McNutt had requested the Congress for loans for students in the accelerated program in medicine, engineering, dentistry, physics, chemistry, and other critical occupations, such loans to offset the earnings of the partially self-supporting students during the summer vacations and to provide for those of limited financial means the added tuition because of the acceleration of instruction.

We have just been informed that the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives has not included provision for such loans to students in its recommendation for funds for the Social Security Agency, as requested. Unless these students can have financial assistance in the form of loans which they are prepared to repay, except in the case of disability or death, it will not be possible to continue the accelerated program of most of the medical schools.

The medical schools and the students are prepared to do everything possible in the all-out war effort. The small financial aid recommended for students in the accelerated program will permit an important contribution to the national effort. We earnestly request that an appropriation be made for loans to students in the several critical occupations which have such important aspects in the war program.

Trusting that we may have your favorable support, I am

Cordially yours,

WILLARD C. RAPPLEYE, M. D., *Dean.*

JUNE 12, 1942.

DR. WILLARD C. RAPPLEYE,
Dean, Columbia University,
College of Physicians and Surgeons,
New York City.

DEAR DEAN RAPPLEYE: I have your letter of June 9, in which you urge my cooperation in having Congress pass a law, allowing financial assistance to medical students during the present emergency, to enable such students to continue their professional studies in connection with the accelerated program now in vogue in most medical schools.

You complain that the Appropriations Committee did not see fit to include provision for such loans to students.

I believe, along with many other Members of Congress, that the reason for this action by the Appropriations Committee is due solely to the policy pursued by your school, as well as other medical schools in the country, in adhering to a policy which is discriminatory and absolutely unfair to many young men who desire to embrace a medical career. It has been the policy of your school, as well as other medical schools similarly circum-

stanced, to deny admission to many highly qualified young men who suffer from the disgrace of not being socially acceptable to you.

Many young men, in whom I am interested, have taken all the necessary steps to prepare for admission to medical schools, have maintained high degrees of scholarship, and who have maintained excellent character records, only to find their applications for admission to your school, as well as other medical schools, have been rejected for no ostensible reason, and purely as an act of discrimination.

As long as this policy continues, it is preposterous to have Members of Congress, who are interested in the well-being of their constituents, and their country, support a policy of financial assistance to a select few, whom the various medical schools see fit to continue on their rolls, as against the qualified many who not only meet all the standards of scholarship, but who are able to maintain their financial obligations without the necessity of loans from the Government for that purpose.

It is my well-considered opinion, which is concurred with by many of my colleagues, that if this discrimination by medical schools should ripen into a well-fixed policy, as it now shows every indication of becoming one, it will be necessary for the Government itself to establish medical schools to fill its need for physicians, in the same manner in which it fills its needs for officers, by maintaining schools, similar in design to West Point and Annapolis.

Sincerely yours,

SAMUEL DICKSTEIN,
Member of Congress.

The Appropriations Committee refused to grant this request and I personally commend them for refusing the appropriation. The College of Physicians and Surgeons wanted Congress to grant this money as a sort of loan giving the medical colleges the right to help certain students complete their medical courses.

In the first place I charge there are no schools to put these medical students into; and, secondly, I charge that the medical schools of today are nothing but closed corporations. I do not believe there is one of us who has been able to get a student in a medical school in many years. I know there are a number of medical schools that have been discriminating against people of certain races. I know that it takes a blue blood of the third generation to get his boy into medical school.

The medical profession now say they want to cooperate with the Army and the Navy. More power to them; but had the many schools and colleges not discriminated against but admitted the many brilliant young men and women who had completed their premedical courses and passed their examination with a mark of 100 percent, we should have had more physicians today. We are now faced with a peak demand and find ourselves stranded for physicians. The Army needs 800 a month; they need at least 40,000 physicians this year. We have not got them.

The public press, as well as other organs of public opinion, have repeatedly called attention to the great shortage of doctors which now exists in our armed forces.

According to the statement of one reputable source, it would require some 800 doctors every month for our rapidly expanding Army and Navy, and our existing institutions are incapable of turning out a number sufficient to take care of the present needs.

Furthermore, our existing medical colleges are not equipped to impart sufficient instruction or give sufficient clinical facilities to medical students for whom there is now such a crying need.

I know that the situation is particularly acute in my own city, as well as all along the eastern seaboard of the United States, since none of the medical schools in this area have been able to supply the number of doctors required there by our Army.

The need for medical instruction is growing day by day, and a good many schools had to resort to accelerated programs in order to accomplish the desired results. But with the accelerated program, and in spite of all their efforts, our medical schools have simply broken down.

I do not wish to refer, at this time, to the reason for this situation. The fault is perhaps not entirely with us, but may be in part at least due to the peculiar policy adopted by a large number of institutions, where competent students have been denied admission, because of prejudice and because of the backgrounds which cause discrimination among some of the authorities of some of the medical schools, but whatever the cause may have been, we are confronted with a situation that must be remedied. It is no longer a question as to what could have been done or might have been done in the past, just as we cannot discuss now what this country might have done if there had not been a Pearl Harbor.

Our duty, as Members of Congress, is to bring about material legislation if a condition can be remedied by legislation. For it is this very situation which calls for legislative action which induced me to introduce a bill for the erection of a number of medical military schools, throughout the United States. To make this program more effective, I provide in my bill for the creation of military medical schools in every one of the corps areas, into which this country is divided. In this way every section of the country will be represented, and there will be no discrimination as to any one region or one section of the United States being preferred over any other.

Furthermore to make it still more acceptable, this bill provides that every Member of this body, as well as every Senator, designate candidates and alternates on the same plans by which our military and naval officers are chosen into West Point and Annapolis, giving every section of the country, and every congressional district, proper recognition. This provision makes for a uniformity which eliminates any possible discrimination.

The bill also provides that the graduates of these schools give at least 10 years of service to this country, just as the graduates of West Point and Annapolis are obliged to give this time to the service in our military or naval forces. By the graduation of a sufficient number of candidates, we shall satisfy the crying need for physicians and we shall also provide one other thing, and that is competent doctors, trained by our own Army to take care of the many soldiers who may come back to us at the end of the war, wounded or in need of medical care.

It will not be necessary for the Army then to call upon private physicians to give up their practices and give the Army their services, but on the contrary we shall have our own medical service ready to tackle the problem in its own way. Furthermore, we shall not be limited by the many requirements of the various States as to the number of years a student must spend in any given subject, but the bill provides instruction in branches of medical science which are most necessary for an Army doctor, and would compel a student to spend as much time as the authorities deem necessary in preparation for their work. We shall stress military medicine and the part a physician would play in saving the life of a soldier rather than the peacetime activities of a doctor, which our medical schools train doctors for. It will be necessary to teach our medical students more about surgery and less about obstetrics.

I am sure that the doctors trained by our new academies will make great contributions to the science of medicine. They will be in a position to observe the operation of the latest medical improvements and advances of science under conditions of modern battles. American ingenuity is always up to the occasion, and I am sure that the science of healing as practiced by our many physicians will further the cause of medical science throughout the world and bring some very beneficial results to mankind at large.

Ours will be the most modern and up-to-date medical schools the world has ever seen, and will be forever to the credit of this Congress in launching this undertaking and bringing lasting benefits to mankind as a whole.

In the last 10 years, Mr. Speaker, I have known of young American boys and girls, brilliant in their mind and education, who had completed their premedical course, who were ready to enter medical school but were refused admission by the medical colleges in the United States. Four hundred or more of these Americans had to go to Scotland to study medicine. Over several hundred more Americans had to go to other parts of the world to study medicine. There was not enough room in the colleges here, and if there was room in the medical colleges they could not get in because they did not come from that stratum of society that was permitted to enter those colleges. That is a rather strong statement to make, but I can back it up by facts and evidence in my possession.

My purpose in rising at this time is to end all discrimination against prospective medical students, engineers, and chemists, whoever they may be once and for all. Let us, Congress, create a medical academy similar to the academies at

West Point or Annapolis. Let us create a medical academy in which all students who are capable and intelligent may have the opportunity to study medicine, if that is what they want to do. Let us stop discrimination in medical colleges and break up this closed corporation that we have in medical schools in this country. I want to bring about a better understanding, a better feeling amongst the American people and amongst the families of the country by creating this academy of medicine, to be financed and supported by the Government of the United States of America.

I am recommending 9 areas in which these schools will be located, and the Members will have an opportunity to appoint 5 principals and 10 alternates irrespective of their race, creed, color, or financial and social standing of their families. We will need doctors and we will need them very badly. We need them now, and we will need them after the war is over. When these students graduate, I am putting them on the same basis as the West Pointer; they must serve their country for at least 10 years, or be placed on the reserve or excused or discharged when and if the Government does not need them.

We are building up an army and navy from West Point, from Annapolis, from the Marine Corps, and so forth, but we have been neglectful in building up a medical corps strong and sufficient in mind and body to be able to cope with all the problems that are confronting this country now and which will confront the country after the war at which time there will be a great need for them in hospitals and nurseries in every part of our country.

Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced a bill, which is known as H. R. 7231, creating this academy of medicine, to be divided into nine zones. It will give every boy and girl who desires to study medicine the opportunity to study medicine and to become a great physician under the guidance of the administration, the Congress, and the Government of the United States. Mr. Speaker, if there ever was a time, this is the time now to create such an academy where race or creed will not count; where prejudices will be done away with; where everyone will have the opportunity of being educated for a vocation which he is deprived of being prepared now. As I have pointed out, there is not a chance today for any young, intelligent boy or girl to enter a medical college unless he or she comes from a certain class or social group acceptable to the people in charge of medical schools. It is about time that we give these boys and girls, and there are thousands of them, the opportunity they are entitled to. These boys and girls are now wasting their talents. They have the qualifications to enter medical schools, but instead are working as dishwashers in some restaurant, because they cannot find a place to go to college. I know of cases in which mothers and fathers have struggled for years to give their boy an education and prepare him for medical school, but could not find a place for him. No college would accept him, because, as I pointed out, it is a closed corporation.

In view of this war, in view of what we expect to happen—and I hope it does not happen—we will need every man who is capable of taking care of and giving attention to our wounded veterans, and this will result in a better understanding amongst the American people. I am going to ask the Committee on Military Affairs for an early hearing. I propose to submit proof and evidence of what I have charged here today, and I defy any school, big or small, to deny these charges that very few can enter the schools because of the conditions that I have outlined this afternoon. I am not attacking the medical profession. I am attacking the undemocratic practice of discrimination which prevails in many medical schools.

Mr. Speaker, we are fighting this war to preserve the principles of democracy. We are sending our boys abroad to fight the forces that are threatening to destroy our democratic way of life. Let us be worthy of our fighting forces. Let us keep faith with them and preserve and protect for them the principles of democracy at the home front. They are fighting against intolerance and bigotry. Let us make sure that they will not have to fight the same evil forces at home when they return.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, owing to the lateness of the hour, I am not going to take much time of the House, but I would like to call the attention of the Members to a statement which I made on the floor of the House yesterday, the main substance of which appears on page A2273 of the Appendix of the RECORD. It is a brief discussion of the pipe line and barge canal to connect up the intercoastal waterway systems of the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Ocean.

This is a subject of tremendous importance to all of the country at this time. It is of more importance to the East and North parts of our country that is experiencing gasoline rationing than it is to any other part of the country. I hope the membership of the House will become practical and representative when they cast their votes on this bill tomorrow.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Who is going to pay for the building of this pipe line?

Mr. GREEN. The bill provides that the Army engineers shall carry out construction. In that event, and if necessary to obtain the pipe line, the War Department, of course, will construct it. However, I may say that the bill will not bar construction of the pipe line by private concerns should that be deemed advisable.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Who would eventually own the property, both the pipe line and the rights-of-way?

Mr. GREEN. They will be owned by the Federal Government, if constructed by the Federal Government.

There is now an existing right-of-way for the barge canal that can be utilized, should that route be selected by the Army engineers. There are also land owners in Florida who are ready to make great concessions in order to provide a right-of-way for the pipe line in such places as it may depart from the existing barge canal right-of-way.

The thing that is of peculiar and particular interest now is the oil famine which is facing our country. We have today gasoline rationing in some 17 States in the Union. There are large investments in the oil industry, in filling stations, for instance. Suppose a neighbor of yours has a filling station corner valued at $50,000, and that is not at all unusual in a large-sized community. Before gasoline rationing, that filling station was well worth the investment, and employed, say, three shifts, with three or four men to a shift. Those men earned and were paid salaries and/or commissions. With gasoline rationing, that investment has depreciated at least for the time being to about 10 percent of its value, and in many instances the 15 men who operated that filling station in support of their families have been reduced in number to 1 or 2 men, just part time, to sell 10 percent or 5 percent of the gasoline they sold a few months ago.

I hope the Members of the House, particularly from the East and the North, will bear in mind that these filling-station operators and their families, and the investors in the stations, are looking to the Congress to pass this bill as the one medium through which the wise men in the war effort, and I am referring to the officials, believe they can get it.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. How long will it take to build this pipe line?

Mr. GREEN. It is my calculation that a barge channel across Florida will be constructed in 9 months after work begins. The Army engineers said it would take from 1 to 3 years. That was the testimony before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors. The pipe line in from 4 to 6 months. Both are approved by the War Department officials and by the House Rivers and Harbors Committee—not a vote against the bill in the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The fact is, however, that this is a war and this is an unusual situation. There was no trouble of the kind the gentleman has described in normal times. We have plenty of oil and plenty of gasoline. The trouble is the transportation.

Mr. GREEN. That bottleneck must be relieved.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. It is only a temporary situation. Are the oil companies who are benefiting by all of this delivery through the pipe lines going to pay rent

to the Government for using the pipe lines for the distribution of their oil?

Mr. GREEN. I am not advised concerning the details to be worked out. However, the Army engineers, the Oil Coordinator's office, and the War Production Board, I am sure, will protect the interests of the Government.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman sees my point?

Mr. GREEN. I do. I am sure that that will be protected. Also in few weeks of operation, barge canal will save from submarine destruction enough war materials to pay all costs of construction. You can send fuel oil, gasoline, or crude oil through a pipe line. The proposal in this bill is to build a pipe line across Florida, connecting up for immediate or a little sooner usage the existing waterways of the east and west coasts of Florida. That pipe line can be constructed in from 4 to 6 months. However, it will carry only 10 or 12 percent of the oil that is needed on the east coast now. It will help, it is true, but it will not answer the situation nor give adequate nor safe, nor permanent relief.

There has been some objection advanced to the construction of this canal. Some have even said it is the beginning of a ship canal. I assure the House that that is not the case. It has no kinship whatever to the ship canal.

I believe the Army engineers in their plans of construction will decide to use locks in the construction of the canal. I anticipate that you may soon be so informed. I am not informing you today to that effect, but it is my belief the canal will have locks in it, probably wooden locks, in order to eliminate the necessity for critical materials.

Knowing the condition of the soil and the subsoil to be dredged, information concerning which was presented in the hearings before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, I am willing to stake any reasonable wager that construction can be accomplished in 8 months. That is across the main ridge of the State of Florida, which is only 29 miles, and the main construction part is about half of 29 miles.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. What is the cost of this operation?

Mr. GREEN. The Army engineers estimate that the installation of the locks will save $11,000,000. The cost has been estimated by the Army engineers at different times as being from nineteen-million to thirty-million-odd dollars.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. What communities will it help, from Florida to where?

Mr. GREEN. Frankly, I do not see much benefit to my State. It will get the critical and necessary war materials from Texas, Mexico, Louisiana, and the Mississippi Valley to the war industrial plants of the Eastern States and Northern States, particularly such States as Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New York, Ohio, West Virginia, and all New England States.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I hope the gentleman does not think this war is going to last that long.

Mr. GREEN. The evidence produced before our committee indicated that this may be a long war, far longer than 9 months, in which this channel and pipe lines will be constructed.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am inclined to agree with the gentleman.

Mr. GREEN. You can force oil through a pipe line, but you cannot force sulfur, salt, lead, cotton, timber, and other materials necessary for the manufacture of our war machinery.

Do you realize it takes sulfuric acid to process practically every war metal that goes into our war machines? Likewise, salt and lead? Our Nation's source of these materials is Arizona, Texas, Mississippi, and Louisiana. The railroads are doing all they can to haul this material from Texas, Louisiana, and various western centers to the East, but they cannot furnish the required amount of transportation and that is our bottleneck today.

In less than 12 months I predict you are going to have a dire and serious shortage not only of oil in the East, not only of fuel oil and gasoline, homes without furnaces running because they cannot get oil or coal to run them, filling stations practically closed, war production factories, large and small, but you are also going to be without sulfur and salt and lead and cotton and wool and lumber in the eastern war factories because you do not have the means of transportation to get these materials there. The railroads are carrying all they can, but they cannot carry these materials in sufficient quantities. The American Association of Railroads, I am advised, a few days ago asked Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman, War Production Board, for a priority for 1,275 new locomotives for replacements. They were not to take on new business, but to replace old, worn-out locomotives. The best they could be allowed was 350 locomotives. This means that your railroad transportation will be less in the next 12 months than in the last 12 months, and it means that your demand for that same kind of transportation will increase more than 300 percent.

How about your rubber shortage? Can you depend upon the trucks and busses to bring this material? They are on the downgrade, so far as their transportation ability is concerned.

RUBBER AND GASOLINE SHORTAGE

The demand in the factories is also increasing. You have now, in your war factories, some 8,000,000 men employed. It is expected you will soon have 10,000,000 additional employees in same. How are these men going to turn out your war machinery unless they can get the raw material to the processing plants to turn it out? So it is a matter of common sense. Practically all Members of the House since Pearl Harbor have voted for the war effort and the things that have been called for by the war administration. This measure is approved and urged by the Chief of Army Engineers, the Army Engineer Corps, the War Department, the Oil Coordinator's Office, and they appeared personally before the committee and pleaded for it. It is also approved by Donald Nelson, of the War Production Board. Would you give them their airplane money, their tank money, their battleship money, and their ammunition money, and then refuse to give them facilities to transport the material in order that our people may have the war effort fully carried forward?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. In just a moment.

The situation is getting very serious. I will not enumerate here various other war reasons and refer to the many millions of dollars worth of cargoes that have been lost along the east coast and the Gulf coast of the United States. Several hundred men have lost their lives through destruction by these submarines. If you could have had this intercoastal canal across Florida connecting up the East Coast Waterway with the west or Gulf Coast Waterway, 95 percent of those cargoes and 95 percent of those lives would not have been lost, because your cargoes of critical materials, primarily oil at that time, would have gone through this barge line into a protected route where the submarines could not have hit them. Remember that the men who lost their lives on those oil vessels and other cargo-carrying ships were American citizens coming from every congressional district in the United States. I owe something to them and their families. I owe something to the families of the men and women in this country who are sending their boys on these tankers and on our other war vessels. I place their lives and their blood above petty wrangling as to whether or not some minor investment or major investment may or may not be affected by war-effort legislation.

FLORIDA FAVORS BILL

Practically all Florida citizens strongly favor immediate enactment of this bill because they have had opportunity to witness the tragedies over the past several months of submarine destruction and murder off our Florida coast. Millions of dollars worth of war cargoes and hundreds of American lives have been lost very near our Florida coast line through the savage and murderous attacks of enemy submarines. Some of these occurrences have been within naked eye view of Florida coastal towns. The destroyed cargoes drift upon our beaches. The scorched, oily, and bullet and torpedo riddled bodies of the victims are brought into our Florida coastal towns. Florida people know that this barge canal will, after its construction, save practically all future similar losses.

I have received scores of telegrams the last few days from Florida people urging and pleading for passage of this barge item. Such outstanding units as the Board of County Commissioners of Pinellas County (Clearwater-St. Petersburg), mayors, businessmen, professional men, laboring men, anxious parents, and many organizations. Here is one which I want to read:

CEDAR KEY, FLA., *June 16, 1942.*

Hon. R. A. GREEN,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.:

We do not know how to express ourselves when we know of so many good Americans being in and dying in the hospitals that gave their all on oil tankers and merchant ships for the people of Florida and then see

others in our State give in to sectional jealousy and fight the thing that would have made it possible to have saved so many of these good men. The canal would have been built long since except for this selfish and jealous spirit. We depend on you to keep the canal in the Mansfield bill.

D. A. ANDREWS, *Mayor.*

I do not see how you, as Members of Congress and responsible to your own constituents who are directly interested in the protection, relief, and security that this bill will give, can afford to vote against it. The learned and able chairman of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, the gentleman from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD, in a speech before the Congress recently, said:

It is but idle talk for anyone to say that the proposed pipe line across Florida will solve the gasoline problem. If the East had to depend upon pipe lines alone, then twenty-six or twenty-seven 10-inch pipe lines would be required. In the absence of the ocean tankers and barge channel across Florida, then a combination of all other methods of transportation that have been proposed will be insufficient to supply the normal needs of the East.

The rail lines have exceeded all expectations, but they have nearly reached their limit. Mr. Eastman tells us that 870 locomotives are now engaged in this service. Tank cars are limited in number, and steel for additions or replacements is not available. One 8-inch pipe across Florida has been suggested. "Every little bit helps," said the old woman when she spit in the sea.

The war may last for many years. All indications seem to point to that end. As long as the war lasts, the enemy submarines will be hovering around our coasts to destroy the ships engaged in the transportation of oil, our most essential war material.

Our Navy is engaged in the distant war zones. We cannot afford to bring it home to convoy tank ships engaged in the domestic trade. Neither can we reasonably spare the tankers for this service, as every tanker is needed to supply the Army and Navy overseas. Congress should be able to provide the means of internal transportation for our war needs without weakening our forces at the front.

This serious problem should be dealt with strictly from a national viewpoint. The plan proposed in this bill gives reasonable assurance of transporting large quantities of oil and gasoline within a few months. That would give partial relief to a serious condition in the East. When completed the barge channel connecting the Atlantic and Gulf intracoastal waterways will be ample to supply all the oil and gasoline needs of the East. So far as I am informed, there is no other plan available that gives hope of such accomplishment.

After spending approximately $200,000,000 on the inland system, it occurs to me that the connecting link across Florida should be supplied. The disconnected sections can now supply important local needs, but, if connected, the system would become of great national importance.

The barge channel would serve a great national purpose for many of our war needs other than oil and gasoline.

A few days ago when this bill was under consideration by the House for passage under suspension of rules, the question of possible adverse effect on the ground water and plant life of Florida was mentioned. In the anticipation that on tomorrow when this bill is considered on the floor this question should again come up, I believe you, my colleagues, are entitled to know the origin of the alleged damage bugaboo. And bear in mind, please, that this so-called damage fright was brought forth when in 1937 and 1939 the House Rivers and Harbors Committee was considering a sea-level ship canal of thirty-odd feet depth. This accusation is not now in any way attempted to be applied to a high lock 12-foot barge canal but for fear that some of you have been misled concerning this matter I take the liberty to now present to you a statement appearing in the hearings before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in February and March 1939. It follows:

General Markham and Colonel Somervell, who have given thorough examination and study, you will recall stated emphatically that the project was feasible and should be promptly prosecuted to completion. (Note: General Markham was the then Chief of the United States Army Engineers and Colonel Somervell is now Lieutenant General Somervell and is commanding general, Services of Supply, War Department, Gen. Charles P. Summerall, former Chief of Staff, United States Army, also testified at these hearings and with the other two high Army men mentioned strongly emphasized the war necessity of and war justification of construction of canal across north Florida.)

I would call to the attention of the committee now that even the opposition so-called water experts say that the ground-water supply of south Florida will not be affected. They now contend that the adverse effect will be for probably 50 or 75 miles on the south side of the canal. You will note also that they deny the former desert possibility which 2 years ago was so vigorously portrayed before this committee.

One thing which impresses me above many other things is that the Army engineers (General Markham and Colonel Somervell and others) and geologists Purney and Paige are unanimous in their conclusions that Florida's ground-water supply will not be adversely affected by the digging of this canal. They admit that the water in the wells on either side of the canal may possibly be lowered some 30 to 50 feet. In summarizing the number and value of these wells, it has been conclusively brought out and proven that not more than $40,000 to $60,000 could possibly be the damage to these wells. In other words, all of the wells could be adequately deepened for $50,000 to $60,000 in the event the water table in the wells should drop. This is the only damage which could possibly be done by constructing the canal. All agree, even the opposition so-called geologists and engineers, that the surface vegetation, even on the bank of the canal, will not be adversely affected. The ground-water scare falls. It was of course brought out by skillful planning of the railroad opposition to the canal.

Along this line, of peculiar interest, is a communication recently sent by the Honorable E. E. Callaway of Lakeland, Fla., to United States Senator ROBERT TAFT. I have obtained permission to use this letter. It will be of interest to the committee because it tells the origin of the ground-water scare and of course rightfully places this responsibility and trick on the railroads and their tricksters. The letter follows:

LAKELAND, FLA., *February 27, 1939.*

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: Some of these days you are no doubt going to be called upon to express yourself relative to the Florida ship canal and my study of this matter may be of some assistance to you.

I live and have my entire property holdings and financial interests in and around Lakeland, which is the very heart of the citrus fruit and vegetable belt. The nearest point at which the proposed route of the canal touches us is about 75 miles.

While Pat Hurley was Secretary of War a determined organization began to shape itself for the surveying of the canal, and to build it if found feasible. At that time I began to make an earnest study of the matter, with but one thought in mind, and that was the merits or demerits of the project. The engineers and geologists made a number of surveys of various proposed routes, from Georgia south, and I spent many days and weeks with them on various trips, watching their borings, tests, etc., and studying the probable effect the same would have on the water supply of our citrus and vegetable belt of central and south Florida. After months and years of study of the matter, I reached the conclusion that the canal would not have any serious damage or injury to our water supply. I am absolutely certain of this, regardless of what anyone may say to the contrary.

For several years I have been chairman of the lecture staff of the Florida State Bureau of Publicity, a nonprofit service organization, and while engaged in lecturing throughout the North, trying to intelligently present Florida, I called upon various interests and organizations for statistics and information from time to time, and on one occasion when discussing the proposed canal with one of our leading railroad lawyers, he stated to me that if the canal should ever take on serious form, as though it might be built, that he would "turn the dogs loose against it," and when I asked him what he meant by that he said, "If the farmers of the citrus and vegetable belt should feel that it will ruin their water supply they will never permit the canal to be built."

There is not any doubt whatever in my mind that all the talk and criticism about the canal hurting our water supply was inspired by that railroad lawyer.

When my campaign for Governor was over in 1936 a man from Bradenton who claims to be at the head of some "water conservation league," and who is opposing the canal on the theory that it will hurt the water supply, came into my office, lifted up his foot, and exhibited to me that he had worn the sole of his shoe through, and was in desperate need of money, sought to solicit my active support in behalf of his organization for the purpose of raising money from the farmers and the public, under the pretext that the canal would ruin the water, and he tried to impress upon me that in view of the temper of the people "we can raise thousands of dollars." I told him that my talents and reputation were not for sale in that way, and he left.

So much for the water aspects. What about its commercial and military aspects?

Since you and I were both born and reared in the Mississippi or Ohio Valley country, I believe that we can approach some phases of this matter with understanding viewpoints. One of the most important trade routes in the world is that between the mouth of the Mississippi River at New Orleans and the Atlantic seaboard. As our population increases and our country needs more and more the resources and the products of the Mississippi Valley and the South this trade route will grow in importance. My father, who was an old-school philosopher, Baptist preacher, and a Republican, and a great friend and admirer of your father, often said, "Keep the snakes out of the trail between the garden and the kitchen." The garden is the Mississippi Valley and the kitchen is the Atlantic seaboard.

Now, Senator, why should the people of this country be penalized by rail and steamship rates resulting from a thousand-mile haul around the Florida Peninsula, when Nature had done a great deal toward providing a passage from the Gulf into the Atlantic up at the instep of this peninsula?

The entire route of the proposed canal, selected by the engineers, was at one time and for long geological periods a salt-water strait, such as now separates Florida from Cuba, and the section down here where I live, and where we grow fruit and vegetables, was a large island such as Cuba now is, of some 6,000 square miles, standing up above the seas, with many thousands of fresh-water lakes, as it still has, which fed many creeks and rivers, which flowed, and still flow north, east, south, and west. These are facts that no informed man will deny.

Fresh water rises in our city wells here in Lakeland 180 feet above sea level, whereas at the highest point it rises along the route of the canal is not over 40 feet. This within itself is complete answer to the water scare.

Some of the steamship lines say they will not use the canal if built. This is all bunk. They will use it, or others will, but they do not want it built because they wish to preserve the present exorbitant mail and freight rates for the long haul around. The people are penalized as a result.

In case of a war with one or more major powers, this canal will then be worth many times its cost, for we can mine the straight from Key West to Yucatan, and with one navy protect our Atlantic and Gulf ports, and keep the Gulf and Mississippi Valley areas free.

Many people of south Florida are sincerely opposed to the canal because they have been made believe that it will hurt the water. Certain of our citrus fruit and vegetable people are opposed to it because they are jealous of Texas and say that it will better enable Texas to get into our eastern market.

Miami and that section are opposed to it because they are fearful that if it is built, the pleasure craft which now spend the winter in Miami will enter the State at Jacksonville, anchor in that chain of big lakes in central Florida, the very heart of the fruit belt, or go on into the Gulf and winter in the warm waters around St. Petersburg and Sarasota. This is the real motive of the opposition of Miami and the lower east coast.

With all of our several hundred miles of Florida seacoast, we actually have less than 40 miles of deep-water terminals in the State. The Tampa Harbor is a shallow body of water, and it has a very hard rock bottom, and it is expensive to dredge it, so it can never be a great harbor or a great industrial district because of this fact.

With our developing responsibility and opportunity in Latin America, we must begin to look ahead for the development and handling of that relationship, providing opportunities for our own people, and if this canal is dug, it will make available ample deep-water terminal and industrial sites in one of the finest living, working, and recreational sections of the earth.

My interest in this matter is that of a citizen of Florida and this country. I do not own a dollar's worth of any kind of property within 75 miles of it, and have no intention of owning any. If I felt there was any question about it hurting our water supply I would oppose it with all my power. I am for its construction, because I have studied it with an open mind for many years, and I believe that it is a great national challenge and opportunity. I have favored and still favor the St. Lawrence waterway for the same reason, and I am in favor of the canal from the Ohio into Lake Erie, and the one from the Tennessee River into the Tombigbee for the same reasons.

I know that it takes money and lots of it to build such projects, and we must begin to think of economy, but it seems that we must continue to provide some form of relief for our underprivileged, and money spent in the development of such sound and permanent projects as these will be a million times of more value than boondoggling it away as we have been.

I think that we should begin seriously to consider the building of the Nicaraguan canal. Japan has started out to conquer China, and to convert her half a billion people into economic slaves, producing and distributing goods in competition with the rest of the world, and while I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet, I can see and realize that we must get ready to meet that challenge if we would preserve our democracy and our civilization.

This letter is long, but I felt that such a message from one friend to another would be appreciated, and I hope that it will assist you in understanding some of the issues that may come up.

Sincerely yours,

E. E. CALLAWAY.

[Here the gavel fell.]

(Mr. GREEN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks in the RECORD and to include certain excerpts.)

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting in the Appendix a short article written by Prof. Richard H. Heindel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY] is recognized for 10 minutes.

INDEMNIFYING VOLUNTEER CIVILIAN DEFENSE WORKERS

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of my remarks there may be inserted a copy of a bill which I have introduced—House bill 7236.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, on January 7, 1942, I introduced H. R. 6316, which had for its object the payment of compensation for injuries or death sustained by volunteer civilian defense workers in line of their patriotic duty. Since January 7th other Representatives and Senators have introduced bills which had the same or similar objectives.

However, I regret to report that, up to this time, nothing has been done by Congress to provide any form of indemnity or medical benefits for the many thousands of patriotic citizens who are serving as air-raid wardens and in other voluntary capacities connected with our program of national defense.

On March 27, 1942, President Roosevelt approved Public Law 506, which permits the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to issue policies of insurance through the War Damage Corporation, to owners of real and personal property. This insurance covers damage to real and personal property which may result from "enemy attack, including any action taken by the military, naval, or air forces of the United States in resisting enemy attack."

Under this law it is now possible for a home owner to purchase insurance on his house and the contents of his house at a small cost; for instance—the cost of insurance for a 1-year period, on such property is only $1 per thousand. Thus a home valued at $5,000 could be fully protected for 1 year on the payment of only $5.

In my opinion, which I believe is shared by the majority of the Members of Congress, this law authorizing such insurance by the War Damage Corporation goes far toward meeting a popular demand for protection against the extraordinar ydangers that may result from invasion by land, sea, or air. However, the existing law, beneficial as it is, does not provide protection against an even more important danger, the injury or loss of life resulting from volunteer civilian defense service.

Because of our failure, up to this time, to recognize the danger involved in civilian defense activities and our lack of provision to indemnify our self sacrificing and devoted citizens, injured or killed in the performance of their official duties as air raid wardens or in any other capacity as volunteer civilian defense workers I have today introduced H. R. 7236.

This bill, H. R. 7236, extends the authority of the War Damage Corporation to the issuing of policies of insurance on the lives of such volunteer workers, granting them benefits in the event of personal injury or death, incurred while engaged in the work of civilian defense.

The War Damage Corporation will, as they did in the case of insurance on real and personal property, establish premium rates and a schedule of benefits. Since this insurance is limited to war activities and will be issued through an agency of the Federal Government, the cost to the individual should be extremely low.

My idea of suitable cost of this proposed insurance, based upon the rates recently fixed by the War Damage Corporation on real and personal property insurance, is as follows:

Five thousand dollars death benefit policy for an annual premium of $5.

(a) Not more than $10,000 to be issued on any one life.

(b) Disability benefits not to exceed $100 a month and total payments limited to face value of the policy.

I had hoped that provision would have been made to indemnify our citizens for their losses without making it necessary for them to buy insurance fror the Government. Since nothing has been done along these lines, and since there is no indication of an intention to provide free coverage, other than the creation of the War Damage Corporation, which requires payment of premiums for coverage, I believe that we are in duty bound to make available to these loyal workers, upon whom we must rely in emergencies, the type of insurance provided for in my bill.

I would like every Member of the House to make a special study of this problem and join with me in my efforts to obtain

relief for, and recognition of, this vast civilian army.

H. R. 7236

A bill to amend section 5 g (a) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act providing for the financing of the War Damage Corporation

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 g (a) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act (15 U. S. Code sec. 606 b–2) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5g. (a) The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby directed to continue to supply funds to the War Damage Corporation, a corporation created pursuant to section 5d of this act; and the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this subsection. Such funds shall be supplied only upon the request of the Secretary of Commerce, with the approval of the President, and the aggregate amount of the funds so supplied shall not exceed $1,000,000,000. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to and shall empower the War Damage Corporation to use its funds to provide through insurance, reinsurance, or otherwise reasonable protection *against personal injury or loss of life of any air-raid warden or other civilian defense worker while engaged in the work of civilian defense and* against loss of or damage to property, real and personal, which may result from enemy attack (including any action taken by the military, naval, or air forces of the United States in resisting enemy attack), with such general exceptions as the War Damage Corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, may deem advisable: *Provided, That no air-raid warden or volunteer worker engaged in civilian defense shall be entitled to the benefits provided for in this act who has not previously taken an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States.* Such protection shall be made available through the War Damage Corporation on and after a date to be determined and published by the Secretary of Commerce, which shall not be later than July 1, 1942, upon the payment of such premium or other charge, and subject to such terms and conditions, as the War Damage Corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, may establish, but, in view of the national interest involved, the War Damage Corporation shall from time to time establish uniform rates for each type of property with respect to which such protection is made available, and, in order to establish a basis for such rates, such Corporation shall estimate the average risk of loss on all property of such type in the United States. Such protection shall be applicable only (1) to such property situated in the United States (including the several States and the District of Columbia), the Philippine Islands, the Canal Zone, the Territories and possessions of the United States, and in such other places as may be determined by the President to be under the dominion and control of the United States, (2) to such property in transit between any points located in any of the foregoing, and (3) to all bridges between the United States and Canada and between the United States and Mexico: *Provided*, That such protection shall not be applicable after the date determined by the Secretary of Commerce under this subsection to property in transit upon which the United States Maritime Commission is authorized to provide marine war-risk insurance. The War Damage Corporation, with the approval of the Secretary of Commerce, may suspend, restrict, or otherwise limit such protection in any area to the extent that it may determine to be necessary or advisable in consideration of the loss of control over such area by the United States making it impossible or impracticable to provide such protection in such area."

(NOTE.—New matter in italics.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. GATHINGS, for 1 week, on account of death in family.

To Mr. DOUGLAS, for the remainder of the week, on account of important Government business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 538. An act granting the Distinguished Service Cross to Raymond P. Finnegan and John P. Cullen, respectively; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1622. An act to authorize payment to janitors and custodians of the public schools of the District of Columbia for services rendered for local boards of the Selective Service System; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2195. An act conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Western District of Missouri to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Charles E. Salmons; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2316. An act to provide for the placing in Gallinger Hospital of a memorial to George Earle Chamberlain; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2322. An act to remove the time limit for cooperation between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Farm Security Administration in the development of farm units on public lands under Federal reclamation projects; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2363. An act for the relief of Percy Ray Greer, a minor; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2442. An act to authorize the Secretary of War to approve a standard design for a service flag and a service lapel button; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2461. An act for the relief of Minnie C. Sanders; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2502. An act relating to the Metropolitan Police force of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2505. An act to amend sections 23–701 and 23–702 of title 23, chapter 7, of the District of Columbia Code, 1940 edition; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 2543. An act to amend subsection (3) of section 602 (d) of the National Service Life Insurance Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

S. 2551. An act for the relief of Vernon Van Zandt; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2553. An act to create the title of flight officer in the Army Air Forces, to amend the Army Aviation Cadet Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 2555. An act to authorize the use of certificates by officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, in connection with pay and allowance accounts of military and civilian personnel under the jurisdiction of the War and Navy Departments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ENROLLED BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 780. An act for the relief of Harvey C. Artis;

H. R. 1349. An act for the relief of Annie Brown;

H. R. 2419. An act for the relief of Chan Tsork-ying;

H. R. 3352. An act for the relief of Alice W. Miller;

H. R. 3402. An act for the relief of Catherine R. Johnson;

H. R. 5204. An act authorizing the charging of fees for brand inspection under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended;

H. R. 5526. An act for the relief of James E. Savage;

H. R. 5610. An act for the relief of G. H. Condon, M. E. Cannon, W. J. Esterle, C. C. Gasaway, James F. Retallack, and L. G. Yinger;

H. R. 5870. An act to amend section 24 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917;

H. R. 5938. An act for the relief of A. H. Larzelere;

H. R. 6297. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Dr. Wesley K. Harris;

H. R. 6349. An act for the relief of Jeff Roberts;

H. R. 6597. An act for the relief of A. Mack Dodd and Henry Dodd;

H. R. 6598. An act for the relief of Leanna M. Stright;

H. R. 6676. An act for the relief of F. A. Holmes, former United States disbursing clerk for the State of Illinois;

H. R. 6782. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to assign officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force to duty in the detective bureau of the Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6804. An act to amend paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the Government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6925. An act to provide additional compensation for Joseph Sharfsin, Esq., for professional services rendered the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6953. An act to amend the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7066. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and

H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 for the training and education of defense workers.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7036. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the fifty-second reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Chattanooga, Tenn., June 23 to 26, inclusive, 1942.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.)

the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 17, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m. on Wednesday, June 17, 1942, for consideration of war housing, room 1324, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Wednesday, June 17, 1942.

Business to be considered: Hearing on Federal Communications Commission.

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Wednesday, June 17, 1942.

Business to be considered: Hearings on H. R. 7212, a bill to amend section 13 (d) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1757. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 11, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Skagway Harbor, Alaska, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on May 20, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1758. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 11, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and an illustration, on a review of reports on the Shipyard River, S. C., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on June 20, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1759. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 16, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Appomattox River, Va., with a view to determining the advisability of modifying the existing project at and in the vicinity of Petersburg, Va., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on December 16, 1940; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1760. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 16, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and two illustrations, on a review of reports on the Black Rock Channel and Tonawanda Harbor, N. Y., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 11, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1761. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for promotion in the Medical Department of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1762. A letter from the comptroller, Near East Relief, transmitting his report for the year ending December 31, 1941; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1763. A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, Chairman, Foreign Trade Zones Board, transmitting the annual report of the Foreign Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941, and the annual report of the city of New York covering operations of the foreign-trade zone at Stapleton, Staten Island, N. Y., during the calendar year 1940; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1764. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, for the War Department, for military activities, in the amount of $114,481,725 (H. Doc. No. 800); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1765. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for speedy and summary notice in proceedings to condemn land for war purposes, and to accelerate the distribution of deposits and awards to the persons entitled thereto in such cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1766. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1767. A letter from The Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1768. A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide for reciprocal privileges with respect to the filing of applications for patents for inventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

1769. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a report dated November 30, 1939, of economic conditions affecting certain lands of the irrigation project under the jurisdiction of the Oroville-Tonasket irrigation district in the State of Washington; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 7232. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2241). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CELLER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2221. An act to provide for the adjustment of certain tort claims against the United States and to confer jurisdiction in respect thereto on the district courts of the United States, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. 2245). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. Interim report filed by Special Committee No. 3 on Matériel, Procurement, and Personnel pursuant to House Resolution 162, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs to study the progress of the national defense program; with amendment (Rept. No. 2246). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 6601. A bill to reorganize the system of land offices and land districts in Alaska; without amendment (Rept. No. 2247). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SECREST: Committee on the Library. H. R. 6378. A bill to provide for the giving of flags to widows and children of deceased Members; without amendment (Rept. No. 2248). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SECREST: Committee on the Library. H. R. 7114. A bill to amend the Library of Congress Trust Fund Board Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2249). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SECREST: Committee on the Library. H. R. 5266. A bill to amend section 1 of the act of March 4, 1921, relating to the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 2250). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SECREST: Committee on the Library. House Joint Resolution 285. Joint resolution providing for the filling of a vacancy in the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution of the class other than Members of Congress; without amendment (Rept. No. 2251). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2914. A bill for the relief of Marie Engert; with amendment (Rept. No. 2242). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 6370. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Ching Shee (Ching Toy Wun); without amendment (Rept. No. 2243). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TALLE: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. S. 708. An act for the relief of Joseph Arreas; with amendment (Rept. No. 2244). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DICKSTEIN:

H. R. 7231. A bill for the creation of medical academies; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANNON of Missouri:

H. R. 7232. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 7233. A bill to provide for payments to holders of grazing permits or licenses for loss due to use of public domain or other property of the United States for war purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. DOUGHTON:

H. R. 7234. A bill to exempt from duty personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 7235. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY:

H. R. 7236. A bill to amend section 5g (a) of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, providing for the financing of the War Damage Corporation; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. R. 7237. A bill to provide for the payment of attorney's fees from Osage tribal funds; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MURDOCK:

H. R. 7238. A bill to provide for payments to holders of grazing permits or licenses for loss due to use of public domain or other property of United States for war purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MOSER:

H. R. 7239. A bill to authorize the Director of the Census to issue certifications of birth records; to the Committee on the Census.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 504. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 7160, a bill to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy during the existing war, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to consider their Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 9, relative to rationing of gasoline in the State of Louisiana; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. SABATH introduced a bill (H. R. 7240) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claim of Alex Ranieri against the United States for the amount of such actual losses, damages, or compensation as shall appear to be due him, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3068. By Mr. FISH: Petition of Rev. Adrian J. Hamm of the Read Mills Baptist Church of Mahopac, N. Y., urging the passage of Senate bill 860, a bill to prohibit the sale of all alcoholic liquors in or near military camps or naval bases in the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3069. By Mr. THOMAS F. FORD: Resolution of the California Housing and Planning Association, urging immediate restoration of certain congressional appropriations for Central Valley project development, so that irrigation and power resources be jointly developed according to a long-term program of maximum benefit to the State; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3070. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 29 citizens of Beaver County, Pa., urging the early passage of Senate bill 860, a bill to provide for common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3071. By Mr. MICHENER: Petition transmitted by Eugene J. McCann, executive secretary of the Michigan State Council of Brewery Workers, Detroit, Mich., and signed by 352 residents of the Second Congressional District of Michigan, opposing the enactment of any legislation which has for its purpose the restriction of the sale of beer in the vicinity of military camps, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3072. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of the faculty of Kemper Hall, Kenosha, Wis., requesting that the enacting clause of the National Constitution be amended by inserting after the words, "We the people of the United States," this clause, "devoutly recognizing the authority and law of Jesus Christ, the Saviour and King of nations"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3073. Also, petition of members of the Methodist Church of Edgerton, Wis., favoring the passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3074. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Federation of Businessmen's Associations, Inc., Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to a general Federal sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3075. Also, petition of Mrs. William Joseph La Mout, of West Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of her resolution with reference to labor legislation; to the Committee on Labor.

3076. Also, petition of the Great Lakes Harbors Association of Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the St. Lawrence water systems; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

3077. Also, petition of John S. Tomlinson, of Upland, Pa., and others, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3078. Also, petition of the University of Maryland of College Park, Md., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the National Youth Administration relative to vocational education national defense; to the Committee on Appropriations.

3079. Also, petition of Lynn C. Bisbee, of the Builders and Conservationists of America, Fremont, Ind., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the liquor traffic; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3080. Also, petition of the United States Department of Commerce Local No. 23, United Federal Workers of America, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the seven-point program as outlined by the President of the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3081. Also, petition of the National Conference of State Liquor Administrators, in convention June 4, 1942, at Milwaukee, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3082. Also, petition of the Congress of Industrial Organizations, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, O Lord for Thy merciful presence which has comforted us when we were sad, nerved our souls anew when discouraged and quieted the feverish strain of unrest. We thank Thee that through the years, with their joys and sorrows, hopes, and fears, have fallen upon us Thy hallowed benediction. With grateful hearts may we be responsive to Thy goodness as the sun and the flowers which brighten our way, giving unto us that spiritual vision by which we behold the beauty and glory of things divine. Dear Lord, for new cares and duties, for new privileges, and responsibilities we pray that we may stand related to the very best gifts of life.

Mercifully consider the toilsome worker and the patient sufferer; wilt Thou comfort them with the gospel of hope and inspiration, blessing them with the solace which comes from a trusting heart. We pray that they may accept the ache and even the urge of sacrificial passion which voices the very genius of heaven and earth. As we look upon the clouds which shadow this world, enable us to grasp dauntlessly the higher, the larger, and the more-completing realities of the Christ revealed in His earthly mission—

"Whenever man oppresses man beneath
the liberal sun,
O Lord be there; Thine arm make bare;
Thy righteous will be done."

In Thy holy name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SESSION OF THE COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds may be permitted to sit during the session of the House.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement regarding Dr. Smith.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of service to Jews, and include a list of names.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein several editorials relating to the visit of His Majesty King George II, of Greece.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I have just received an estimate from the Government Printing Office that the address of His Excellency the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Luxembourg, Joseph Bech, together with a letter and a short biographical sketch of Mr. Bech, will make approximately two and one-half pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of

$112.50. I therefore renew my unanimous-consent request at this time that this be included in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in three particulars: First, strikes during the war; second, should the draft age be lowered to 18?; third, on the subject of why not more foreign trade zones? and to include with reference to the latter, two statements by Dr. Thomas Lyons, secretary of the Foreign Trade Zone, which, according to the estimate by the Public Printer, would cost $120.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the requests are granted.

There was no objection.

PRESERVE AMERICA

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include two brief quotations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LANDIS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEHRMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein some excerpts and a few letters from my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RECLAMATION

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. DWORSHAK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

RETIRING $2,000,000,000 OF SILVER CERTIFICATES

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, the fight to repeal the silver purchase act and retire $2,000,000,000 dollars of the money of this country, the only redeemable money we have that circulates more rapidly than any other kind, composed largely of $1 silver certificates, is going on steadily. When I think of the effect of this plan on the national economy, I am tempted to say it is going on viciously, as indicated in the columns of the press and in communications being put out from influential sources.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, in answer to a letter from the secretary of the Economists' National Committee for Monetary Policy, I have prepared a letter. I ask permission to extend my remarks and include therein a letter from the secretary, Professor Spahr, of the New York University, and my reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix by publishing certain statements made by the Department of Agriculture to officials of that Department with reference to what is known as the Andrews amendment to the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, and what would have been its effect on the soil-conservation program had it been enacted.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Labor Record of New Orleans.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my own remarks and to insert therein a letter from a West Point cadet.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and to include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. PIERCE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks and include therein a copy of a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. SABATH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein statements made by our former colleague, Mr. Samuel Pettengill, of Indiana.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

THE WAR LABOR BOARD AND STRIKES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I was glad to see that Mr. William H. Davis, Chairman of the War Labor Board, yesterday ordered 125 employees of the Arkwright Corporation, in Fall River, Mass., a textile concern which is manufacturing merchandise for the progress of the war, to end an unauthorized strike or forfeit their jobs.

Davis said the Nation-wide industry-labor no-strike agreement cannot be flouted by a small group of selfish and willful workers.

If Mr. Davis and the War Labor Board are so much interested in this small labor group, why do they not take similar action in the case of strikes in the ranks of members belonging to the following unions, C. I. O. and A. F. of L., which I insert in the Appendix?

In my State the Lukenweld Co., of Coatesville, appealed directly to the War Labor Board yesterday to end a 3-day strike which has held up vital welding work for the Navy.

What we need is a uniform policy for the settlement of all strikes, whether it is C. I. O., A. F. of L. or an independent union; a law for one should be good for all.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago the gentleman from Mississippi, my good friend, Mr. RANKIN, told us that today is the anniversary of the Battle of Bunker Hill where the first blood was shed for American independence. I thought Lexington and Concord came before Bunker Hill.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Over in Boston Harbor a group of our forefathers went out on that British ship and dumped the tea into the harbor, because they did not like the tax.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. That was tea. That was not blood.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They did not like the tax on that tea. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] spoke about the heroism of those men and how they fought for our independence at that time. But how come we have not the courage to prevent these unions from taxing men who want to work? You answer me that someday.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I can answer that right now.

Mr. HOFFMAN. You get an answer to that from your side. Millions upon millions of dollars have been charged American men who want to work. Tribute by the million collected by force and coercion from Americans who are denied the right to work for the defeat of our enemies. They soak it to them and you fellows on the majority side let them get away with it. Then you let Leon Henderson come along and put it over on you. Now you are going to give him some 60,000 employees at an expense of some $161,000,000. Why not restore the freedom which our forefathers won in the Revolutionary War and which we have let be taken from us?

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include resolutions adopted by the thirty-sixth annual convention of the Rivers and Harbors Congress held at Chicago, Ill., on May 29 and 30, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. ANGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the Bonneville project, and to include a statement of M. H. Hedges, director of research, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce or a subcommittee thereof may sit during the sessions of the House today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CHAPMAN]?

There was no objection.

PIPE LINE AND NAVIGABLE BARGE CHANNEL ACROSS FLORIDA

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 490, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6999) to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipe line and a navigable barge channel across Florida, the construction of an inland route from the western terminus of this channel to the present eastern terminus of the Intracoastal Waterway, and by deepening and enlarging the Intracoastal Waterway from its present eastern terminus to the vicinity of the Mexican border. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]; and, pending that, I yield 5 minutes to myself.

Mr. Speaker, this is an open rule for the consideration of H. R. 6999, the same bill that was brought up under suspension of the rules, with the exception that I understand there are certain modifications to be proposed by the chairman of the committee. This is a very important piece of legislation, and a piece of legislation that should receive the careful consideration of this House. As is generally known, we have a situation with reference to shipping that is very, very acute. We are attempting to wage a war from five to ten thousand miles from the shores of continental United States. Shipping today constitutes the bottleneck of that war effort.

We must have the necessary tankers in order to get the fuel oil to our combat forces fighting in the far-flung seas of the world. We have, in addition to that, a very acute fuel-oil and gasoline shortage on the Atlantic coast of the United States. Most of that oil from the oil fields of the West heretofore has been transported in tankers by sea. A very small portion of the oil consumed in this eastern area has been transported by railway tank cars and in some instances by pipe lines. These tankers that have been bringing this fuel oil here to be consumed upon the east coast and to be transported to our fighting forces are now needed exclusively in the war effort.

I have not the time to go into the details of the bill, but it is proposed under it to alleviate this situation by relieving these tankers, many of which have already been sunk in that effort, entirely for the war effort, and to transport this needed fuel oil by barge and pipe line.

Mr. BEITER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I am sorry. My time is rather limited.

Mr. BEITER. For a brief question?

Mr. COLMER. For a brief question.

Mr. BEITER. Does the gentleman know that the Secretary of the Interior this morning authorized the construction of an 8-inch pipe line across the State of Florida?

Mr. COLMER. I understand that the President of the United States already has the authority to do that if he sees fit to do so.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. Let me answer the question first, then I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I just want to say to the gentleman from New York that an 8-inch pipe line would not carry over 25,000 or 30,000 barrels of oil a day, and that is infinitesimal, compared with the demand.

Mr. COLMER. That is what I wanted to say to the gentleman from New York. I understand that this pipe line would be inadequate. All I know is that those who have studied the matter tell us that something like this is necessary. They have gone into it thoroughly. I, like you, am just an ordinary layman. I am not advised about what is necessary and what is not necessary. But I do know this. I do not believe that this Congress is going to stand in the way of an all-out war effort.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

I know that this Congress consists of patriotic American citizens. There may be differences of opinion among us. With those who differ with my opinion I have no fault to find. Personally, I have always been opposed to the so-called Florida ship canal. I do not know whether or not this barge canal is necessary, but I am told that it is necessary in order to get up here the fuel oil and the gasoline necessary for the eastern consumption and for our war effort.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. What length of time does the gentleman estimate it will take to construct a barge canal across Florida?

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman is on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, where this bill was considered. I will let him answer his own question.

Mr. CARTER. The office of the Chief of Engineers stated this morning that it would take 3 years to build the barge canal. I thought that information might have some effect on the gentleman's attitude.

Mr. COLMER. I am not in position to argue that question with the distinguished gentleman from California.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Let me answer the gentleman from California. That statement ought not to go into the RECORD without some explanation. The barge line the gentleman from California has in mind would extend all the way from St. Joe to Jacksonville. However, in the letter which Judge Mansfield has, it is shown that it is necessary to build this line only from Jacksonville across to Port Inglis, and that can be done within something like 15 months.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I happened to have been present in the Committee on Rivers and Harbors this morning when General Reybold was called to answer the very question raised by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]. He said it would take from 2½ to 3 years to build that canal across Florida.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. You had in mind at that time the canal all the way around from St. Joseph, but if you build this line from Jacksonville across to Port Inglis it will be sufficient, and it can be done in about 15 months, according to his own testimony before the committee.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, there is considerable and, I am sure, honest division of opinion over that portion of the legislation authorizing the dredging of the barge canal. Although I understand amendments to which I referred a moment ago will be offered by the committee decreasing substantially the cost of the construction of the canal, I can sympathetically understand the attitude of that portion of the membership which is reflected in their apprehension that the expenditure of so many millions of dollars is a serious thing where there is any question of its contribution to the

Nation's one immediate purpose of winning the war. But that some relief is necessary is unquestioned. I hope that those who are opposed to that feature of the proposed legislation will not vote against the rule but that the House will adopt the rule and thereby afford ample opportunity for free debate upon these controversial issues.

In this connection I should like to briefly refer to the fact that in this era of shortages one of the most essential items that must be conserved is steel. For upon this material depends our ability to construct our ships, our guns, and practically every weapon of warfare. Today thousands of barges are under construction in the shipyards of the country, and many barges will be required to transport this gas and fuel oil along the intercoastal canal to the East from the oil fields of Texas and Oklahoma whether the Florida canal is authorized or not. Fuel oil can be transported in wooden barges as easily as in steel barges. Additional thousands of these barges will be required for this purpose. The supply of timber in this country is abundant, if not inexhaustible, and there is no reason or practical sense utilized when these barges for the transportation of fuel oil are not constructed out of this abundant supply of timber. Those gentlemen in control of the various departments of the Government requiring these barges should insist that this precious steel be conserved for the uses for which there are no substitutes and that these barges should be constructed of wood. There are hundreds of small shipyards in the country that can turn out these wooden barges within a few days from the time that they receive the orders, and it is to be hoped that that will be the policy adopted by those in authority in the future.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, the matter before us today is nothing new. The same bill was before the House a few days ago and was considered under suspension of the rules, requiring a two-thirds vote to pass the bill. There was only 20 minutes of debate on a side, 40 minutes of debate in all. The result was that there was much confusion, as I see it, about this whole thing.

The bill is before us today under a rule which will permit 2 hours of general debate, and then all the time that is necessary for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

As far as the merits of the legislation are concerned, I think there are some propositions on which we are all agreed. First, if this legislation is necessary for the winning of the war, then I take it we are all for it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I would rather not, but I will.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I was going to say to the gentleman that we provided $8,000,000 or $10,000,000 to build a lock at Sault Ste. Marie or the Soo. It does not carry an ounce of oil, and this development is necessary for the transportation of oil to the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not want to confuse the issue. I think we have an important matter here. Why inject a Michigan project which is entirely unrelated?

Going back to where I was interrupted, if this legislation is a necessary adjunct to the national defense, then I take it we should at least all be for it. It is just a question, Is it necessary? I do not know. The Rivers and Harbors Committee should give us this information if the bill is considered.

My thought is that this is what will happen. This bill will be subject to amendment. An amendment will be offered to strike out the Florida barge canal, going across Florida. In my opinion, that will possibly carry. If it does carry, then the bill will mean this, that the inland waterway barge canal beginning over at Texas will be authorized along the Gulf up to Florida, then a pipe line will be authorized across Florida, and then on the Atlantic side of the pipe line an intracoastal barge line will be authorized from that point in Florida to New England.

The purpose is to bring oil and fuel to Norfolk for the Navy and to these other eastern seaports for the Navy, and to bring oil and fuel to New England and to the eastern coast to be used by the citizens in keeping warm and carrying on the war industries, which are so numerous and so essential to the national defense.

The preceding speaker suggested that this morning an order had been made by Mr. Ickes, Oil Coordinator, for the construction of an 8-inch pipe line across Florida. My information is that that is correct. I feel just as keenly that one 8-inch pipe will not do the job. I base that opinion on the information given to the Rules Committee when the hearing was held on this rule. I understand that it is the purpose to place two or three 8-inch or larger pipes in the same trench across Florida.

Of course, it is impossible at the moment to get any new iron pipe. It is not being manufactured at present and it is not available, but we were told that there are sufficient quantities of iron pipe in the ground in Texas that is not being used, and the intent is to remove that pipe in Texas and place it in this trench across Florida. We were told that if two or three of these pipes were laid, as suggested, that those two or three pipes would carry all the oil brought by the barges to the Florida west coast and deliver it on the east coast of Florida with the same rapidity as if the barge went through the canal; that no time would be lost, and that no quantity of oil would be lost. That is as I understand it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I hope the gentleman will excuse me.

I presume there are some local interests along the Mississippi, and elsewhere, that are primarily interested in having this pipe line follow some other route. I suppose we are all more or less controlled at times by our local interests. At least I am. I am always primarily controlled by my local interests, but those interests must always be subservient to the common good. The question we must decide today is whether we are going to be controlled by that group or bloc that is primarily interested in a Mississippi canal or are we going to follow those primarily interested in the Florida Canal or whether we are interested in the great problem before our people today as to whether or not we are to get oil where it is needed in this war effort. So far as I am concerned, that is all there is to this proposition.

If we can get but one pipe line or one string of pipes across Florida, I do not believe that is sufficient. So far as authority to lay the pipe line is concerned, the President, by law passed by this Congress within the last few months, granted adequate power to lay pipe lines for national defense, if, where, and when he thinks advisable. So if Mr. Ickes did issue that order this morning, he has authority to issue it. If he confined it to one pipe line, then I should say it looks to me as if he wanted to indicate today that we would have only one pipe line, knowing that one pipe line could not do the job and that that might have some influence on putting another canal across Florida. For my part, I am going to listen to this whole thing. I am opposed to the Florida ship canal. A great many people here are opposed to it. I am not going to vote for any Florida ship canal. There is a difference between a ship canal and a barge canal. I am not going to vote for anything that I believe leads to a Florida ship canal unless it is absolutely necessary in national defense. Then if it is, I am for this barge canal which could not be made into a regular ocean-going ship canal unless additional legislation were enacted by the Congress.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. If the gentleman has a contribution to make, yes.

Mr. WHITE. As a matter of fact, the gentleman appreciates the fact that the little country of Holland, with no resources in the way of timber or anything of that sort, by utilizing its water and by building canals, has become one of the great financial countries of the world. It is one of the richest countries in the world and this is due to the utilization of its canal system.

Mr. MICHENER. What is the gentleman getting at?

Mr. WHITE. I mean the gold reserves and everything of that sort are higher in Holland than anywhere else, and they have been the money lenders of the world.

Mr. MICHENER. Let us leave Holland, let us leave the gold reserve, and let us leave the philosophy of the silver experts out of the argument in this matter.

Mr. WHITE. We are talking about transportation now.

Mr. MICHENER. The only thing before us now is whether we want to consider this whole bill. I think we do. I do not think there is a man here who will vote against this rule to bring this measure before the House. If there is, I want him to stand up and say so. I do not think that we can justify any ac-

tion we take on this rule by anything that happened in Holland in the years that are gone.

Mr. WHITE. Does the gentleman think——

Mr. MICHENER. Occasionally.

Mr. WHITE. Holland was made one of the greatest countries in the world by the construction of these barge canals?

Mr. MICHENER. Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, we all appreciate that patience is a virtue.

Mr. WHITE. I think the gentleman exercises patience in listening to some of the arguments on that side.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] says that he does not want to vote for the Florida ship canal. Well, this is the Florida ship canal that we have before us now. This Florida ship canal has more lives than the proverbial cat. It has been before us time and again, and every time it comes before us, either in committee or on the floor of the House, it is killed. I think today we ought to kill it dead. As a matter of fact, if we vote this money today, you can depend upon it that they will be back here asking for more money, possibly not tomorrow, but surely the day after tomorrow, and next year and the year after. This is the Florida ship canal in disguise. It is nothing more nor less.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that this is the Florida ship canal dressed up in the cloak of national defense?

Mr. BENDER. That is correct. Before we came to the floor of the House we had a meeting of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and Major General Reybold was asked how long it would take to build this barge canal, or this lock project—this enterprise that seems to be least offensive that is before the committee today, and he indicated to the secretary of the committee, and that was communicated to Judge MANSFIELD, our chairman, that this least offensive of all the Florida ship-canal projects would require from 2½ to 3 years to construct. If we fail to solve this problem of the submarines and their activities in the Atlantic and the Pacific before 2½ or 3 years, I am sure that we will be in a bad way. I am sure that this submarine menace will have been solved long before 2½ years will have passed.

When this matter was under consideration before, under a rule to suspend, with 20 minutes of debate on all sides a few days ago, it was represented on the floor that President Roosevelt was for this project. All of you will remember President Roosevelt having indicated in his press conference on that day or the following day after we considered this matter, that this is not his baby, and that he is not urging its passage, and if representations were made that Donald Nelson is for this project, I say there is no word of Donald Nelson before this House or before the Rivers and Harbors Committee to indicate that he is for this project.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Mr. NELSON. Reference having been made to Mr. Donald Nelson, I got him by phone, and he told me he is in favor of the pipe line, and, as has been suggested by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] that there is ample used material that can be taken out of the ground in Texas and used for this pipe line.

Mr. BENDER. I thank the gentleman. There is a difference between the pipe line and the Florida ship canal. All of the authority necessary for the construction of a pipe line is already available, and as a matter of fact I have been told on good authority that project is already in the process of construction.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. I do not know of a single Member who is opposed to building a pipe line, because that is the only immediate solution for the oil and fuel emergency that confronts the country.

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RICH. And if they build a canal only 12 feet deep for barges, that would not call for a width of 125 feet. When they get that width, they will then proceed to get authority to dig it deep enough for ocean-going vessels, and then we will have the Florida ship canal.

Mr. BENDER. We cannot justify an expenditure of $144,000,000 for this nondefense project at this time, when we need every dime that we can possibly find for our war effort.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Does not the gentleman think this bill might be more properly entitled "A bill to delay the construction of a needed pipe line by tying it up with the Florida ship canal"?

Mr. BENDER. There is no question about that.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. COX].

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Ohio has just said that we cannot afford to appropriate $140,000,000 for this project. I would answer him by saying we can afford to appropriate any amount that substantially contributes to the war effort.

We will commit serious error if we permit party politics to be made out of this legislation. There is no politics in it. None should be injected into it. If there is a Member on this floor who, since the war, has endeavored to drive all politics out of his heart, and who has in my judgment completely succeeded, it is the distinguished gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. I commend the record that he has made to the membership of this House. He is an inspiration to me, and I am sure if you learn to know him as I do, you will hold him in the same high regard. His position is not an easy one, yet I give you the assurance that if those advocating this Florida barge canal make out a good case, he will support it. That is the attitude that I think should be taken by all Members, irrespective of whether they sit to the right or to the left of the center aisle.

I trust that gentlemen on my side who are enthusiastic in their support of the barge canal proposition will not provoke opposition by needlessly prodding the gentlemen on the other side who hold contrary views, and who are equally sincere.

I live somewhat in the neighborhood of where this canal is to be constructed. My district borders on the Florida line. I am acquainted with the issue that has existed for some time and I know that politics has been made of the proposition of building a ship canal. There were many people who honestly believed that it would drain the area, to the detriment of the people who till the soil for a living. However, that objection has been entirely eliminated and cannot now be urged against the new proposal. In order that the canals that have already been constructed may be fully utilized they must be connected up and made a continuous canal from Mexico to New Jersey. By constructing a canal across Florida the objection to the argument originally made against the proposed ship canal is completely disposed of.

I have nothing to gain out of this proposition. I do not think there is anything in it of a selfish nature to anybody. The Florida delegation is divided. They are sincere men, and I respect the views of each and every one of them; but I have the feeling, and it is my belief, that the proposal has merit and that the improvements should be made. I believe it will substantially contribute to the war effort, in that it will take a tremendous part of the heavy load of traffic that is necessary to pass between the East and the West.

Mr. Speaker, I trust that the membership will give close attention to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, our affectionate and devoted friend, Judge MANSFIELD. I believe if given a fair opportunity he will make out a case which you can well afford to support.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I listened very carefully to the statement of my colleague from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER]. This matter of a Florida ship canal has been before us several times. The House has voted on it after debate. I still do not know from what he said today whether the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] intends to vote for the bill or against it. I will be glad to have him tell me, because I often seek his advice before casting my vote. I have found by experience that I could get much information from him. I understood him to say he was going to listen to the debate and make up his mind afterward. That is a fine way to do.

No one other than the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] is more fully aware of the fact that every time someone opposes some bill on this floor he is accused of doing it because of political motives. And if it is called a war measure, if one opposes it, he is called disloyal, even though the label be false. I say no one knows that better than the gentleman from Georgia, because he has been falsely accused of that very thing many times.

Now, how are we to know whether this is a war measure? As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] said, we are all in favor of anything that will help defeat our enemies. There is no question about that. It does not need repetition every 15 minutes. But it is also true that some of us are growing a little bit weary of swallowing everything that comes up here in a bottle labeled "national defense."

It is not all good, by any means, nor is it all national defense or a war measure. Some of it makes us very ill after it is down. Now, you take this price-control business. The other day we got rid of the Civilian Conservation Corps, $80,000,000. Along comes Leon Henderson with a request for $161,000,000, 66,000 more employees. A war measure is it? I would like to know. When we need every dollar for war it is folly to permit the bureaucrats to build up a political machine, spend millions to hire thousands of additional political employees as snoopers. If I read the papers right, the thing that the people are finding fault with Congress about is because we do not look into these things ourselves but accept the statement of somebody down below.

One thing that makes me wary is letters such as I received this morning, which is typical of the whole situation. It is from a man who operates a little store in a resort district. He gets milk in the morning at 7 o'clock. The resorters come in—and there are still a few of them—in the forenoon, place their orders, and he makes a delivery of groceries in the afternoon. Along comes Leon Henderson and says: "One delivery a day!" Not by automobile, not by rubber-tired vehicle, but one delivery a day even if he hooks up the old horse or drives an ox cart—one delivery a day. Where is there any sense in that? It is things like that, I tell you, that make us wary and make us wonder whether something like the ship canal which carries millions of dollars is all right or whether it is not all right.

Another man writes me that he has received an order from Henderson to make a price book before a certain date listing every item in his store. He is an agricultural implement dealer. He says he cannot do that in the time limit. He said: "You go down there and get an order from Leon to let me have more time." How can I do it? You know I can no more get an order from Henderson for him than I could for the other fellow to make two deliveries a day so he can deliver those groceries in the afternoon when he must deliver the milk in the morning.

The folks are getting fed up with that kind of foolishness. So, like my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] I would like to know whether we need the ship canal now or whether we do not. I do not propose to vote for something just because somebody at the other end of the Avenue asks for it, for in my experience in the past on the matters about which I know they have been wrong about 95 percent of the time. So I intend to use my own judgment in determining how I vote. With the war to be won I cannot vote to waste our money on projects which are unnecessary. Let us support the war effort now. Let the social gains, the commercial projects wait until we have defeated our enemies.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, my distinguished friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] asked me how I intended to vote. My vote will be controlled by the facts developed in the debate. My decision will not be controlled by what somebody in the Government has done that may have been wrong in the past. I want to base my vote on facts and not on likes or dislikes. I am opposed to the Florida ship canal. I favor necessary national defense. If this project comes in this class, then I shall vote for it, otherwise not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know how I am going to vote.

Mr. MICHENER. I am going to vote to eliminate the canal across Florida unless the information which the Rivers and Harbors Committee obtained this morning changes the situation. Apparently my distinguished colleague from Michigan is not interested in the evidence; his mind is made up. Far be it from me to even inquire concerning any decision my friend might make about any matter.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. I take it, then, the gentleman is in favor of the adoption of this rule so that the House may hear what the distinguished gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, has to say about this further study he has made of the matter.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; I think it is the function of the House to hear evidence adduced by the committees. I do not want to arrive at any arbitrary conclusion just because I do not like something somebody has done in the past.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I do not believe there is a Member in this House who would not be disposed to listen to the arguments pro and con on this bill, but I know just how the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] feels, for we find every time they bring one of these things in they label it a war measure. We have had that experience so often in the Interior bill, where so many projects were put through on the plea that they were war measures. We are supposed to follow that argument without dissent, but there are some of us who want to know whether this is a project that is absolutely essential to the winning of the war; if it is not, we want to save every dollar we can that it may go toward the prosecution of the war. We do not want to be forced to swallow sugar-coated pills, no matter whether they come from the White House or the leadership in the House of Representatives, or somebody who wants to improve his standing in his own district; whether it be something for the State of Florida or the St. Lawrence waterway. We are not interested in those things because we do not believe they will win the war.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman's statement is both sound and reasonable. I think we see alike on this legislation. We are willing to be shown, willing to listen to the evidence, then make up our minds to do that which we believe to be for the best interest of the country.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I am sorry, but my time has expired.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH], chairman of the Rules Committee.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Michigan, as usual, criticizes and finds fault with everything that the President or the administration has done or recommended.

Mr. MASON. Which gentleman from Michigan? There were two gentlemen from Michigan who spoke?

Mr. SABATH. I refer to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. Personally I think if anybody has been wrong 95 percent of the time it was the gentleman from Michigan, but that is not here nor there.

As to the rule, may I say that when the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee presented his case before the Rules Committee the committee also gave real consideration to the statement of the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANNON], in whom I have the utmost confidence, and whose article months ago I read with a great deal of interest. I believe that that proposal of his with reference to the building of an intercoastal canal with some modification of course and changes would be helpful; but I feel that we ought to have the facts and the House should have the facts and the evidence from the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, who I am satisfied will be able to enlighten the House as to the report of the engineers with respect to the actual need and time required for this project.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] states that this barge canal will come close to his district and will be beneficial to that section of his State. Unfortunately, I cannot say that, it is not close to my district or even close to my State. It will not be beneficial to my section of the country, but I do believe it will be helpful in relieving the fuel shortage in the East. Consequently, I feel that favorable action should be taken, especially in view of the assurances that have been given as to the modification of the original plan as beyond question, we, at this time, regardless of any benefits to our districts, should act favorably if it will help to supply the

needed fuel and power to expedite production of war materials.

In connection with this legislation, I feel I should again call attention to the fact that when we in the Middle West help other sections of our country, as in this case it will help Texas, Louisiana, Alabama, Florida, and southern sections and the East, unfortunately, many of the Representatives from these sections oppose any legislation which may be beneficial to the Midwest. For years the President and many Members from our section have urged the building of the St. Lawrence waterway project, but because it does not directly benefit the States of the gentlemen that will be helped by the legislation now before us they have opposed legislation for the construction of this great project. This is not the first time that I have voted for legislation and appropriations that have been helpful to the South and to the East. Perhaps the most beneficial legislation that comes to my mind for which I voted that proved a boon and of great value to the East was that which brought about the construction of the Panama Canal. I voted for it because I believed it would be for the best interests of our Nation. I still believe that the St. Lawrence project will be of just as great benefit to our country as the Panama Canal has proven to be. Therefore, in all justice and in the spirit of fair play, I urge and appeal to the Members representing those sections to withdraw their opposition to the St. Lawrence waterway project and join with us and prove that they can be just as liberal and fair, at least in this respect, as we have been at all times. Of course, I also reserve the right to decide my vote as to those two canal propositions, because I am anxiously awaiting the report of the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee.

Personally, I feel the House is entitled to pass judgment upon this important matter, and that is the reason the rule has been granted. I regret that the original rule was not called up when the matter was considered formerly. If the bill had been considered under the rule at that time, the statute would now be on the books. In view of the conditions I have stated, I think the rule should be adopted and the membership given the chance and opportunity to vote as their conscience and good judgment dictates, taking into consideration, of course, what is the very best thing not for their district but for our Nation and our country as a whole.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, it is probably just as sensible and just as timely that I wave the flag a bit and exploit and exhibit my patriotism as it is for other Members of this House. I think it more obligatory on my part, possibly, to be a little more fair with the Members of this House and with the American public.

May I say to you that it is my duty also to deal dispassionately, if possible, with a subject of as much import as this one? The Florida ship canal is 30 years old, at least in thought. Let me say to you that it is quite unique, indeed, if not singular, that the proposed canal now, inch for inch, is the old Florida ship-canal route in its entirety. It is, inch for inch, the proposed route.

If, indeed, it is true that we do not need additional legislation for a pipe line across Florida or any other State, then why is it true that the pipe line should be brought in here in the form of proposed legislation? If we can build it without legislation, why do we not do so?

May I inform the Members of the House now that a pipe line is going to be laid across the State of Florida, and there is no need for legislation for it. Let me also inform the House that I, too, am very definitely for a pipe line, and to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] may I say that I am also for his idea of divorcing the proposed nefarious cross-State canal from the pipe-line issue, and I, too, will vote for a pipe line.

I am opposed to the Florida ship canal and always have been. Let me say once more that if we need a barge line across Florida, for heaven's sake let us use the one that we have now dug, and deepen it as the Army engineers have agreed to do, perhaps by proper mandate. They have agreed to deepen it 2 feet. It has the width now. If we need a canal, let us use the one we have. Let us not, therefore, gamble with the very salient fact that possibly we will destroy the water table and injure the indispensable reservoirs for water feeding south Florida. That is the consensus of opinion of every one of us who live there; it is the consensus of opinion of the Army engineers and many geological engineers and experts of all kinds and types who have been queried in the matter have said that possibly it will injure our water supply.

Every time a bill for national defense has been brought to this floor I voted for it, and any time in the future that a bill for national defense is brought in I shall support it. But let us not bless one that is not a national defense bill and call it such, then go back home and tell our people that indeed we are patriots. Let us be sane men as well as patriots.

I am for the pipe line, and that is about to be built now. Why do we not divorce these matters and let us shoot at them foursquare.

Mr. BROOKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. Does not the gentleman feel that the House should have the opportunity to hear the debate, as my friend the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] has suggested, then pass judgment on the matter?

Mr. CANNON of Florida. The committee having this matter in charge owed the House the same duty to divorce these matters as it did to bring them here together. Whether I am for the rule or not is to be determined, but I am against the bill, and if I could conceive that my vote against the rule would defeat the bill, I would be against the rule, too.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I think the House should have an opportunity to hear the bill discussed and have the real facts in the case available. On page 5269 of the RECORD of yesterday you will find that I made a little talk on this project and endeavored to show you why it is in no way akin to the ship canal across Florida. This is only a subterfuge used by those who serve vested interests to make this barge canal appear as a part of it. Be not misled. Army engineers have recommended a lock barge canal. These locks kill any hopes now of any deeper canal.

The Chief of the Army engineers appeared before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors and plead in person, seriously and pleadingly, for the passage of this bill, and for the beginning immediately of construction of the pipe line and the barge canal. He said it was in the war effort and was so needed. He told me within the last 10 minutes that he could build the canal within 2 years, a barge lock canal. Other engineers say they can do it in 10 months. Will you believe them or will you believe those who have at all times fought all waterway developments? Will you give an opportunity to discuss this in the interest of the lives and the war effort, or will you defeat even consideration of the bill because of petty politics and the partisan views of those who oppose waterway development as a policy?

The people of my State are naturally interested in this, but they will receive very little direct benefit from it. This is not a Florida measure. It is true the channel will cross my State. My State has offered the right-of-way for this barge canal. It is patriotic of the people of the State to do that. The people of the East, the war industries, the American people, are the ones who are asking you to pass this bill, so you are going along with the war effort.

Did you vote for a 5-year battleship program and a 2- or 3-year airplane program? If you voted for a war program reaching over several years, and when you know this bottleneck exists in your transportation, do you not think the people of the east coast from Maine to Florida are entitled to have taken off of them this gasoline rationing? They need passage of this bill.

In our Committee on Rivers and Harbors it was brought out clearly that this is a war measure and that the only way to relieve gasoline rationing is to pass this bill as is, with the addition of the locks which are recommended by the Army Engineers.

Are you taking the advice of the Army engineers, the Oil Coordinator, and the War Production Board chief, or are you listening to propagandists who as a general policy in the face of the bloodshed of the American people still fight all waterway developments?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD].

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make one observation, to begin with. If the Florida ship canal, that is, the canal across Florida—I am not talking about this barge canal—had been built, we would have probably saved 25 or 30 tankers and a number of human lives as well. We did not build that ship canal—then let us do the next best thing, build the Florida barge canal and do it now.

In the next place, it used to cost about 50 cents a barrel to bring oil in by tankers. That is out. It now costs about $1.65 to bring it in by rail. That is a fact. Before our Committee on Banking and Currency tomorrow there will be a bill authorizing the payment of a bonus to the oil men in order that they may pay the railroads that exorbitant rate for bringing oil up here. With 591,000 barrels of oil needed here every day, the cost of the bonus will be more than the cost of the canal. If you want to save money, build this barge canal across Florida and protect the people of the east coast against a fuel and gasoline famine for the coming winter. This barge canal is as vital to national defense and the peace and security of this Nation as the bombers it will help build by providing ample fuel for commercial, industrial, and domestic use.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6999) to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipe line and a navigable barge channel across Florida, the construction of an inland route from the western terminus of this channel to the present eastern terminus of the Intracoastal Waterway, and by deepening and enlarging the Intracoastal Waterway from its present eastern terminus to the vicinity of the Mexican border.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 6999, with Mr. COSTELLO in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, you have just heard announced the substance of the bill now before us. I introduced this bill. I did not have any malice aforethought toward anyone in doing so. I was trying to do something that I thought would be for the benefit of a great many people in the United States. I put it up to Congress. Congress can do as it pleases with it. It does not concern me any more than it does any other Member of the House.

There are several amendments to be suggested. I thought I should make an announcement of these amendments.

On yesterday evening the Chief of Engineers wrote me a letter announcing what the Board had done last week on a resolution by the Senate Committee on Commerce adopted 2 years ago last February. They decided in favor of a lock barge canal across Florida instead of a sea-level canal. The cost would be $14,000,000 less than the cost of a sea-level canal. At the highest point it would be 52 feet above sea level. This would eliminate the question of the contamination of ground waters in Florida by reason of having the canal filled with salt water from the ocean.

The estimated cost of the lock-barge canal is $44,000,000. The Chief of Engineers also suggested that we eliminate for the present the construction of the channel from the west end of the proposed lock canal to the vicinity of Apalachee Bay where it will connect with the existing intracoastal canal from Corpus Christi, Tex., up to that point. The reason for this is that the Gulf, at that point, is too shallow for submarines or any other ocean craft to come in there. The shallows extend out for a distance of from 18 to 25 miles from the coast, and barges can navigate that 125 miles, or whatever the distance is, with safety so far as enemy submarines or other craft are concerned. In fact, barges are navigating it now to the same point where the channel would be constructed across Florida under the bill.

There are also amendments which the committee has agreed to, and the bill provides for a pipe line across Florida. At the proper time I want to offer an amendment to provide for one or more pipe lines across Florida. We have hopes of getting three lines from Texas. The chairman of the State railway commission there who has jurisdiction over them informs me that he thinks he can get two 10-inch pipe lines and one 8-inch pipe line taken up and moved over to Florida, which under medium pressure would transport about 180,000 barrels of oil a day across that State.

A pipe line was authorized there this morning, as I understand, by the Coordinator, Mr. Ickes. This pipe line also comes from Texas and has been purchased down there, as I understand, at a cost of about $3,000,000. It is only an 8-inch line.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time and yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have heard all the testimony before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors on this measure. I have no interest in it except that I think it is necessary to supply oil and gasoline to the Atlantic seaboard and for our war efforts on the Atlantic Ocean.

We are now short about 600,000 or 700,000 barrels a day on the Atlantic seaboard. Our tankers are being sunk daily. An 8-inch pipe line would carry only about 30,000 barrels a day. You would have to have at least 20 of these 8-inch pipe lines to meet the demand, and I doubt if you could get the material to build them. This barge canal is already completed, you might say, from the borders of Mexico clear around to Port Inglis, at the western terminus of the proposed Florida Canal. It is true that from St. Joseph down to Port Inglis there is a short distance of open Gulf. The water is deep enough for a canal, but it is too shallow for submarines. Therefore, it would be amply protected and could be used all except about 15 days a year on an average, when the weather is rough on the Gulf of Mexico.

You also have a barge canal from the shore of New Jersey down to the eastern terminus of this proposed canal at Jacksonville, Fla., but for the want of about 75 or 80 miles of barge canal across the isthmus of Florida, you absolutely have the greatest and most necessary military supply in the world bottled up, and I doubt if you could build enough pipe lines to supply it within a reasonable time.

Now, this barge canal will not carry ocean-going vessels, it is true, but it will carry all the gasoline and all the oil that is necessary, and it will also carry other materials that are absolutely necessary for our war efforts and that are absolutely essential for the use of the people along the Atlantic seaboard.

They talk about building a 24-inch pipe line from Texas clear around to Philadelphia. There is not a 24-inch pipe line in America—now remember that—and to build it would take a solid year. You would have to run through the Allegheny Mountains where the weather gets terrifically cold and where the oil in it would be slowed down during the winter months.

The only way, as I see it, to get this supply now, or at any time within a reasonable period of time, would be to complete this barge canal across the isthmus of Florida, and in the meantime build these pipe lines across that isthmus sufficiently large to relieve, to some extent, the scarcity of oil on the Atlantic seaboard.

This proposition is 300 miles from where I live. I have no interest in it except the interest of my country. I have gone and stayed day after day and cross-examined all the witnesses appearing before the committee, and I am prepared to say that this is the only solution that has been offered that will give us an ample supply of oil on the Atlantic seaboard within a reasonable time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. How long will it take to complete the barge canal across that peninsula?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. They told us before the committee that the barge canal from Jacksonville across to Port Inglis, on the Gulf of Mexico, would take about 15 months.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the distance?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Around 80 miles.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. How does that cost per mile compare with the cost of a project all along the Gulf coast?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I do not know that now. The canal along the Gulf coast is already there.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am talking about the original cost.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I do not know. A great deal of it was through the sound, protected by a string of islands. Most of the oil of America is produced right in here in Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Arkansas, and Oklahoma. There are 650,000 barrels a day produced in California. That will supply the Pacific coast, but in Michigan they have only about 47,000 barrels a day, and about the same amount in Pennsylvania. All the oil that is necessary is produced right in here in this area, and if we will provide facilities for transporting it we can relieve shortage on the Atlantic seaboard and deliver to our vessels on the Atlantic Ocean.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS].

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, some weeks ago I had the pleasure of attending a meeting here of representatives of all the engineering societies of the United States. At that meeting General Somervell, Chief of Services of Supply, United States Army, was the principal speaker. He had this to say, among other things—and I quote:

> I respectfully commend to the attention of those of you in transportation the unhappy fact that transport, afloat and ashore, is our greatest bottleneck today. Our tank factories and our plane factories are turning out machines in numbers that would astound and dismay the dictator. Our task is to get them where they are needed by the shortest route in the shortest possible time. If one of you transportation engineers can figure out some way of increasing transportation efficiency and put that scheme to work, you would be as great a national hero as the general who wins the battles on the field.

Two weeks thereafter, speaking at the Thirty-sixth National Conference of the Rivers and Harbors Congress, General Reybold, Chief of the United States Army Engineers, outlined transportation difficulties facing this Nation in 1917. He pointed out that the one great resource at that time was the railroads, and he pointed out that in many ways, although they did a magnificent job, they failed to perform the task.

He further showed that America was not completely tested in 1917 as she is being tested today. He said the only hope of America in meeting the transport crisis today lies in our inland-waterway system. I quote one paragraph of his address:

> An outstanding example of the service being performed is offered by the traffic moving on the intracoastal canals. In those intracoastal waterways America has this one resounding answer to the submarines lurking off the coastal tanker routes.

General Reybold then urged the Congress to press for essential and vital inland-waterway developments.

Mr. Chairman, I have cited these two great authorities in the American Army, Generals Somervell and Reybold, to bring to the attention of the Congress that what we are debating here today is something larger, something more important even, than the question of supplying oil and petroleum to the east coast. It is a problem that is connected intimately with all other transportation difficulties, and I say to you that our entire transport system may very well be compromised by the rubber situation. Were we to vote against this canal development today, and were the alarmists about the rubber situation proved to be true—that is, that our rubber supply for civilian use and even for essential use is to be exhausted in from 1 to 2 years—then our country would again be in the situation faced in 1917, when we were totally and completely dependent upon the railroads for commerce. I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that we have here by the completion, as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has pointed out, of this barge canal, at least a partial answer to the transport problem of our Nation. All of us agree that the pipe line should be built. But all of us realize that that can be only a partial solution of the problem, although all of us know that the pipe line cannot supply 1,300,000 barrels of fuel a day as is required in the eastern section of the country. Let me also remind the Congress that a pipe line is limited to fuel and gasoline or whatever you put in that line.

This barge canal will carry sulfur, will carry salt, will carry chemicals, will carry petroleum derivatives, will carry lumber, will carry cotton, and numerous and various raw materials that we must have in the industrial East if we are to prosecute this war to a successful conclusion. No pipe line can carry those commodities.

I say we are challenging fate itself when we deny this potential, vast, protected inland waterway system for the transporting of essential commerce. I understand the intimate and important connection of oil, but this is a much larger problem than oil and petroleum. It touches at the very roots of the entire transportation system of our Nation.

I have heard it said here today that we should not even discuss the merits of this project because it may not be completed within a year or 3 years, I say "So what?" Do any of my colleagues claim to have intuition, as Mr. Hitler claims to have? Do you claim to have the intuition to know when this war is going to end? Are you going to gamble on the transportation system of this country because some of you might think the war might end in a year or 2 years or 3 years from now? If that is so, then all of you who have voted for appropriations within the past several weeks and months, which call for projects by the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, some of which will not even be started until 1945 or even 1946, cannot justify your votes. You have approved those measures because you think they are needed and that they are necessary. I say to you that 2 years from now—God hope that I am wrong—this canal may be more important than ever, because our rubber resources may run out. Our only system of commerce and travel in the Nation may be the inland waterway system and the railroads. I venture to say that no Member of this Congress who comes from the valleys of the Mississippi or the Ohio or the Missouri or the Red or the Arkansas, or who is familiar with the operations of the great New York Barge Canal or who is familiar with the inland traffic on the Great Lakes, will deny the vital, the most important role that the inland waterways are playing in the winning of this war today.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOGGS. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. I would like to ask the gentleman a direct question and if answered directly it would be a considerable factor in my determination as to the way to vote on this barge canal, and I think it would be a determining factor in the decision of many other Members. As the gentleman knows, we have a War Planning Board, which not only undertakes to plan the war, but to advise the Congress what is necessary in the way of legislation to furnish the facilities necessary for the conduct of the war, as far as legislation is concerned. I would like to ask the gentleman if the War Planning Board, which consults with the Director of Transportation, with the Chairman of the Maritime Commission and other such similar agencies in arriving at their decisions on matters of this kind, has recommended to the Congress that this barge canal be built?

Mr. BOGGS. I regret that I am unable to answer the gentleman's question. I presume the distinguished chairman of the committee can do so. But the only agency of this Government that passes upon the feasibility of projects of this type is the Corps of Engineers. The Corps of Engineers has definitely and most emphatically not on one occasion but on a half dozen occasions approved the necessity for this project.

So important do I consider the recent remarks of General Reybold that I quote at length from his timely address:

> Let us look back to the crisis of World War No. 1. Fortunately—as things turned out—America never was tested to the ultimate in that other war. But, had we been so tested, how would we have stood the test?
>
> Let us recall that transportation is as much a factor in the war potential of a nation as are the nation's natural resources, its manufacturing capacities, and the spiritual strength of its people. In this light, let us contrast the "transport potential" of America in 1917 with that of our country today.
>
> In 1917, practically all of the Nation's transportation eggs were in one basket, that of the railways. At that time, large-scale truck transportation was in its infancy. And the Nation's system of inland waterways, potentially the finest in the world, was still unimproved and was still not in general use.
>
> Such was the situation as of World War No. 1, 25 years ago. Adequate as the railways may then have been for peacetime needs,

they creaked and groaned under the expanded load of war. Needless to say, the crisis would have been even greater had World War No. 1 developed into an all-out effort like the war facing us today.

What then is the transportation situation today? To begin with, our needs are infinitely greater than they were 25 years ago. The present war is an all-out one in every respect. Furthermore, it is a mechanized war. It demands material in unprecedented quantities.

To meet this situation, we have our fine system of railways, just as we had them in 1917. In addition, we have our great system of highways and our great trucking industry. But, unfortunately, the trucking industry is compromised by the shortage of rubber. Thus, the transportation situation today would not be substantially better than it was in 1917, except for one factor. That factor is our present system of improved inland waterways.

While much has been said here today about the necessity of supplying the east coast with petroleum in all of its forms in order to keep war production throughout the industrial East at its peak, too little emphasis has been laid upon the intimate connection between this proposal and our entire transportation problem. I have attempted to read and study the literature which is available with reference to the tragic rubber situation confronting America. While there appears to be a wealth of confusion surrounding this problem, it has been generally estimated and stated that millions of units now engaged in highway transportation in one form or another, will eventually have to be removed from commerce, unless an immediate answer to the rubber shortage is found. With this critical situation facing our country, will any Member of Congress take the responsibility—the solemn responsibility—of denying to the Nation, at this time, the greatest potential transportation system that can be developed? It does not require a great amount of imagination to visualize the potentiality of the inland intracoastal routes when those routes form one continuous protected waterway from the Mexican border to the heart of the industrial East. Granted that the East is crying for fuel oil, gasoline, and petroleum in all of its forms, and granted that several pipe lines constructed across Florida can supply some portion of the estimated daily demand of 1,300,000 barrels, but even more important is the fact that the completion of a very small link in the intracoastal canal will make possible the safe transportation not only of petroleum, but of salt, sulfur, chemicals, cotton, wool, lumber, and all types of essential raw materials. Again I say, with so much uncertainty about the rubber situation, will this Congress today deny to the Nation a plan which at least offers a partial solution to what General Somervell and General Reybold and Admiral Land and Donald Nelson have described as America's No. 1 problem—the bottleneck of transportation.

Does any Member of this Congress living near the great Mississippi Valley, or living near the valleys of the Ohio, the Missouri, the Illinois, the Arkansas, or the Red Rivers, deny the incalculable value of the inland waterway system? Cannot all Members envisage the insuperable difficulties which would face our transport system if the inland waterways were not now available almost throughout the entire Nation? If all of you could visit the great ports of the Gulf and of the Atlantic seaboard; if you could see the congestion existing in those ports; if you could travel along our coast lines and see floating over the waters tons and tons of black crude oil; if you could go into the small hospitals located in the towns along the Gulf and the Atlantic seaboards, and see the mangled and burned sailors who man our great merchant marine; if you had been at Virginia Beach yesterday and had witnessed from that great playground the sinking of two of our merchant vessels within easy gunshot of the coast line, none of you could possibly doubt the vital need for the authorization of this project today.

I have heard the objection raised that it may take a year or more to complete this link in the intracoastal system. Is that a valid objection? Is it a reflection of some type of higher knowledge or of intuition as to when this cruel struggle will end? Do those who make this objection equally object to the contracts which have been granted by the Army, Navy, and Maritime Commission, some of which call for the beginning of work in 1944 and as late as 1946? All of us pray God that this war will be over in a year or in 18 months, but none of us can afford to gamble with the security of our country, because we have some notion or idea as to how long this war will last. Those in command have stated that transport is as vital as the building of tanks, guns, and planes, as vital as the fortification of islands and bases and would anyone here today vote against the appropriations for the building of guns, and tanks, and planes if those implements of warfare were deemed necessary by those in command?

It has been shown that we must limit all of the activities of our country today to those projects deemed vital to the winning of the war. On that theory we have ceased the construction of homes, of private buildings, we have ceased the manufacture of automobiles, of radios, of refrigerators, and countless other items which are deemed nonessential at this time. In contrast we are spending billions of dollars upon implements of war which after the conflict is over may never be utilized again. In the project before the House today, however, we are in the happy situation of having before us for consideration a plan not only vital and necessary in winning the war, but which will be of lasting and permanent value generations after this war is over. By all standards, it is a good investment.

During the past several years the traffic on the Gulf section of the Canal has trebled in volume. Imagine the value of this route when it is safe and clear from Corpus Christi, Tex., to Maine, and when it connects with the great inland water routes in the Mississippi Valley, in the Great Lakes, in the valleys of the Missouri, the Ohio, the Arkansas, and the Red.

I have carefully read the hearings conducted before the distinguished Committee on Rivers and Harbors. I have found that more than 50 people testified before the committee. I have found that all of those appearing before that Committee having an intimate knowledge of transport, of petroleum, of salt, of sulphur, of chemicals, have advocated the immediate adoption of the plan. All of them have said that the pipe line should be built, but likewise all of them have pointed out that the pipe line is merely a temporary expedient and not the answer to the over-all problem—the problem of providing a safe means of transport for petroleum, for sulfur, for chemicals, for raw materials, for cotton, and so forth. They have said that the real answer is to be found in the construction of the canal across Florida.

It is impossible to dissociate transport from the war itself. No Member of this House would today desire to bear the responsibility of voting against an essential war measure. A vote against the canal project by every reasonable deduction must be construed as a vote against the war and a vote which may delay victory and jeopardize the security of our country during the period of its greatest crisis.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I do not think it is necessary to discuss the question or the motive of every Member of the House to do his utmost to advance the war effort of the Nation. We stand united in our desire to aid our country in every possible way, but in our eagerness to advance our war effort let us be sure that we do not do the wrong thing or make a mistake.

We are asked to commit the Government to a program calling for the expenditure of $144,000,000 to build a barge canal across Florida, and some pipe lines. We are asked to do that as a war measure. The only problem confronting the House this afternoon in this bill is a fuel emergency which has been caused, due to the fortunes of war. If you who live along the Atlantic seaboard or in New England believe you are going to bring aid and relief to the people of your section by voting for a barge line, you are badly mistaken, because General Reybold, the Chief of Engineers, came before our Committee on Rivers and Harbors and stated that, in spite of what the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has told you about 10 or 15 months to build this barge line across the State of Florida, it would take 3 years to build it. By that time the people along the Atlantic seaboard and in New England would be cold more than once, and for two or three winters.

As a war measure there is no excuse for bringing this bill before the House to build a barge line. I am opposed to it.

I am in favor of building the pipe lines. If one pipe line across the State of Florida is not enough, then put two or three along the same right-of-way in order to relieve the emergency and provide the fuel that is necessary not only for the comfort of the people in the eastern part of our country but also for the advancement of our war effort and the supply-

ing of fuel to the ships of the Navy and our merchant marine. At the proper time, therefore, I shall offer an amendment to strike out the barge canal provision in this bill. I approve and will support the pipe-line provisions of the bill. I am ready to vote for it with that change even though, in my judgment, it is not necessary to pass additional legislation to build pipe lines in the United States. The President has that authority today. In order, however, that there can be no question about it let us go on record affirmatively rather than negatively and let us vote to build the pipe lines so that the question will be foreclosed forever.

Something has been said about a statement appearing in the public press immediately after the House rejected this proposal some 2 weeks ago to the effect that the President said he had never asked for the Florida barge line. Undoubtedly this statement is absolutely true; he never has asked for it. He is the Commander in Chief of the armed forces of our country. The Navy has not asked for it; the War Department has not asked for it. Who has asked for it, then? In my opinion it is necessary that we should not commit the Government to that vast expenditure under the guise of a war effort and do the wrong thing. My amendment, if adopted, would reduce the bill from $144,000,000 to $10,000,000, which is the amount the Chief of Engineers has said was necessary to build a pipe line across Florida. I want to quote the testimony of the Chief of Engineers for it furnishes a conclusive answer as to the length of time it would take to build this barge canal. I am quoting from page 19 of the hearings on this bill. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] asked:

> About how long would it be reasonable to anticipate would be required to put the canal across there from Port Inglis to the St. Johns River?

The very point the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] pointed out.

General Reybold made the following reply:

> That is a difficult question to answer under the present conditions of priorities and available equipment for the excavations that have to be made across there. But if we were to complete that canal in 3 years, I would think we had done a good job.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. In connection with the cost of the pipe line which the gentleman has just quoted, I notice in a copy of a letter which has been handed me from General Reybold to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors that the cost is given as $44,000,000 for the construction of this barge canal. The pending bill calls for the expenditure of $144,000,000. Can the gentleman explain the difference?

Mr. DONDERO. The difference in the figures comes about because of the fact that the last proposal which came before our committee about 11 o'clock today contemplated the changing of the project from a sea-level canal to a lock canal. This, of course, would make it unnecessary to dig a canal across Florida of great depth. Undoubtedly that is the reason for the reduction in the amount of the estimated cost.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. A few weeks ago in conference with the Chief of the Corps of Engineers of the War Department I was told that under no circumstances, even though they had all the equipment, all the necessary labor, and worked 24 hours a day, that under no circumstances could this canal be completed in less than a minimum of 3 years.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. What is the name of the man to whom the gentleman talked?

Mr. PLOESER. It was General Reybold. Let me say further that he did not believe a 3-year project made any contribution to the war effort.

Mr. DONDERO. Unless we have relief from the emergency that now confronts the Nation in less time than 3 years we might be in great difficulty by the end of that time.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Most certainly the gentleman will acknowledge that relief from the present submarine situation can be obtained only by the destruction of the submarine. The answer to the submarine menace is men-of-war. The problem, as I see it, is the one of finding money and materials to build more men-of-war.

Mr. DONDERO. Undoubtedly the gentleman is correct.

I wish to make one further reference to General Reybold's testimony, and that relates to the building of pipe lines. Again the colloquy was between Mr. GREEN and General Reybold. The question was:

> How long would it take to build the pipe line? We all want to know that.

General Reybold replied:

> That is another question of priorities. We think that with prompt deliveries of material on that pipe line we could complete the job in 6 months.

That is the statement of the Chief of Engineers.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. Will not the gentleman admit two points, since he brought that up: That he received information not in writing that this was an administration measure and desired by the President? Will the gentleman admit that?

Mr. DONDERO. That is, the bill before us today?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Oh, no; I do not admit that.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman admit that he has received official information from General Reybold that it could be constructed in 15 months?

Mr. DONDERO. I have not received that information.

Mr. GREEN. The gentleman did not get that information?

Mr. DONDERO. In fact, we received information from the Chief of Engineers this morning that this lock and dam canal would take 2½ to 3 years to build.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. During the course of the gentleman's excellent statement he asked the question, Who is demanding this canal? He told who was not demanding the canal, but did not answer the question, Who is demanding the canal?

Mr. DONDERO. I do not think I can answer that.

Mr. COLE of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. The gentleman has stated that the President has not asked for it, and that several others have not asked for it. I am curious to know what officer or agency of the Government has asked for it.

Mr. DONDERO. There is very meager information on that.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. I would like to call the gentleman's attention to a letter that is being circulated in the House from Gen. Eugene Reybold, Chief of Engineers, under date of June 15, the last paragraph of which reads as follows:

> Since time has not permitted me to ascertain whether the information presented in this letter is in accord with the program of the President, such information should be considered as factual and involving no commitment as to that program.

I wonder what that means?

Mr. DONDERO. The Chief of Engineers made the same guarded statement when he came before our committee in relation to this bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON].

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I want to call your attention first to and emphasize the statement brought out by the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs when the gentleman from Michigan was addressing the House a few minutes ago, in the concluding paragraph of the Chief of Engineers' letter sent yesterday to the Rivers and Harbors Committee, as follows:

> Since time has not permitted me to ascertain whether the information presented in this letter is in accord with the program of the President, such information should be considered as factual and involving no commitment as to that program.

I call attention to the fact that this bill does not come before the House in the ordinary, orderly way that rivers and

harbors projects come before the House. Normally there is a survey. This is acted upon by the district engineers, then the division engineers, then by the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, after which the chief submits a report to the Congress, and that comes in documentary form. That is the normal way that rivers and harbors projects are handled.

There is no report of the Board of Engineers recommending this particular project. The nearest to that is the letter which you have had submitted here today. I am pleased, however, with some of the statements made therein because they vindicate the position which I have taken for practically 10 years. I have insisted, and it was not entirely my thought—it was based upon the testimony and studies of experts—that the cutting of the canal route 13B would gravely endanger the water supply of south Florida. That view was agreed to by the Board of Engineers, and if I have time I will quote it to you, in which they point out that the potential damage to the water supply of the State of Florida would be greater than the financial resources of any taxing district of the State.

Yesterday there came the statement that it should be a lock canal in order to remove that threat to the water supply of the State of Florida. But I would like to call your attention to the further fact that in the bill which we are considering today the width is indicated as 125 feet. The Chief of Engineers yesterday in his letter said the minimum width should be 150 feet and when the Board of Engineers was considering the old cross-State canal they pointed out clearly that if it were built, the great portion of the commerce would be oil and that 250 feet was insufficient. They also pointed out in the statement the dangers and hazards that would be caused by either collision or fire.

I bring to you hurriedly this statement of the Board of Engineers created by the Congress, virtually an agent of this Congress, as follows:

> The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, after due consideration of the facts presented, finds that the construction of a sea-level canal would certainly draw down the ground water in the Ocala limestone adjacent to the canal line. * * * The draw-down of the level of the ground water in the Ocala limestone in the vicinity of the canal may reduce the artesian head in wells in the adjoining territory, and the rise in the salt water may impair the water supply from deep wells in the vicinity of the canal.

The Board also made this statement, referring to that portion in which I made reference to oil and hazards:

> In order to pass in this narrow rock channel, it will be necessary for the larger vessels to check down to a very slow speed. While this maneuver cannot be classed as highly hazardous and while it is tolerated by shipping in harbors where the occasion for passing is relatively infrequent all experience shows that occasional lapses of judgment or failure of ships to respond properly to the helm, would result in collisions or groundings, and that in the course of a year a considerable number of accidents, each more or less serious, would occur if the attempt were made to handle so large a volume of traffic through such a restricted waterway. A serious accident would block the canal for a considerable period of time. A serious collision with a loaded tanker would release large quantities of oil in the confined waters and would expose other vessels to a major hazard of fire. An accident to a vessel loaded with gasoline might have even more serious consequences.

I will not go into the whole story, but he points out clearly that if any canal is built it would have to be sufficiently wide. The barges that go one way have to come back. When you go into a lock canal only a certain number can be handled through the locks.

As I pointed out, subsequent events have proven that to be true. This House passed a law authorizing the construction of pipe lines, not one pipe line but more than one pipe line. A distinguished member of the committee has this morning called the attention of the House to the fact that today the Oil Petroleum Coordinator has authorized construction of a pipe line across Florida.

There are other ways in which there can be transportation of oil in the State of Florida. The haul will be a little longer, but there is already an intercoastal waterway partially built, and there is provision in the pending omnibus rivers and harbors bill for finishing that from the Anclote River, which is just about here on the map, down to Caloosahatchee, at a cost of only $3,200,000, and it is recommended by the Chief of Engineers and the Board in the orderly way.

The deepening of the Okeechobee-Caloosahatchee, which is in connection with the flood-control district, across here, could be done at a cost of only $208,000. Less than $4,000,000 would give you a waterway down the west coast and across the State of Florida.

Mr. KEEFE. What about on the way up from there?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. On the way up from there, that connects with the intercoastal waterway at Stuart. From there to Jacksonville you have 8 feet, and from there on you have a greater depth. So within a short time, with very little dredging, that could be put in use.

I hesitate to talk too much about that because that is in my district, but it was recognized, and there is a statement in the report on the pending rivers and harbors bill to the effect that the Navy said it would be beneficial. In the report in regard to deepening the cross-State waterway and recommending its modification to 8 feet appears this statement:

> The Navy Department states that this project is of considerable interest to national defense for the reason that it would permit the use of this waterway by naval small patrol craft.

In a very little time that could be done. But aside from that, right here is the port of Tampa, with oil terminals and facilities. It is only 86 miles to the deep water in the St. Johns at Sanford, which would be part of the water that this so-called cross-State canal would go in. Another pipe line of 86 miles would get you there. You would save all that cut through the rock; you would save that additional many millions of expense.

These matters are being studied by the Oil Coordinator. The map shows that a pipe line from Tampa over to Cocoa would be only 91 miles long. One hundred and seventy-seven miles of pipe would build two more pipe lines across the State of Florida.

I am not an expert on pipe lines, but a series of studies is being made for the purpose of getting petroleum from the ports into the East. Many of them involve far more practical and more rapid ways of getting the oil here than this project.

I am not on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, I am on the Merchant Marine Committee. I have analyzed and I have urged the use of inland waterways wherever possible. I have advocated the use of barges, wooden barges, and wooden vessels. I have studied and listened day in and day out to the problem. This canal is not the answer to the problem of getting petroleum into the East. The situation will be explained to you by other members of the committee.

There is another problem purely from a local viewpoint, but you can see the fairness of this. In south Florida there are many, many military establishments. Many of you know that in that area is the southeastern air base, and I could name others but will not, because many of them have probably been established since censorship. However, there is a great number of military establishments there.

Further, this canal will have to be bridged. A large portion of our revenue in Florida comes from the gasoline tax. Our road and bridge funds come from the gasoline tax. Today we are not getting much money from that tax. No provision is made here for building bridges over that canal. That is another item of expense that will come into the situation. With the State not able to pay for them, the Federal Government must needs do it, yet in the law as written here there is no provision for that.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is all included in the $44,000,000.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. There is nothing in this bill or the report to cover that situation.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may say that we have no report on it yet. The report is not printed. The Board acted on it just last Monday, and the Chief acted on it just yesterday evening late.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. So I have the gentleman's assurance as chairman of the committee that it is the intention of this Congress that the Federal Government will build the bridges over the canal?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is law now. The Hobbs bill provides for that.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. The Hobbs bill may not provide for it entirely.

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is all included in the $44,000,000, bridges and all.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I thank the chairman for this definite assurance.

Mr. Chairman, I hope you will vote down the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS].

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Florida [Mr. CANNON] addressed the House a few minutes ago on the rule. I asked him to yield and he declined, but he later yielded to the gentleman from Louisiana. I am sorry that my colleague declined to yield to me because I do not recall that I have ever declined to yield to a member of the Florida delegation, and do not expect to in the future, if I have the time to yield.

The reason I wanted my colleague from Miami to yield to me was because he said the Florida canal was 30 years old. He is just a little short on that. The Florida canal, from the beginning, is over 100 years old.

Andrew Jackson made the first survey on the Florida canal, and, in addition to that, I think he assumed that, perhaps, because it was 30 years old it ought to be dead. Let me say to you that in connection with the hearings on this canal before, I went to the Library of Congress and went to the trouble to study the history of many canals throughout the world; the Suez, the Manchester in England, the Kiel Canal, and the Panama Canal. In almost every instance the history of those canals shows that it took about 100 years for those who could look into the future to convince those who could not that those canals ought to be constructed. Yes; it took young De Lesseps many years, and he never did convince the King of France, Louis XVI, that the Suez Canal should be built. It was after about 100 years that he came into the picture and then, finally, convinced England that it should be built. You see what that canal means today. It took about the same length of time to convince the English people that the Manchester Canal ought to be built. While we are talking about ruining the water supply of the State of Florida, let me say that in almost every instance they have some bugaboo of that sort. The fact of the matter is that King Louis XVI told young De Lesseps that the difference in the water level between, I believe, the Mediterranean and the Red Sea, or whatever sea the Suez Canal flows into, was so great that if they dug that canal they would flood all the coasts on the other sea. When they brought in the Manchester Canal, the engineers told them it would ruin the estuaries of the Thames River and ruin Liverpool, but it has made Liverpool.

Now, we hear a lot about this water, and I heard my colleague from Miami and my friend from Tampa [Mr. PETERSON] tell you that eminent engineers and geologists have said that this is going to damage the water supply of Florida. I wanted them to yield to me because I knew my friend the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] would admit that he was quoting from a statement made about a ship canal and not a barge canal with locks in it.

We have always had that sort of thing in considering this matter, and I can point out to you in the record, the same as these gentlemen did, statements by one of the greatest engineers who ever served in the corps, General Markham, and by one of the outstanding geologists of this country, Mr. Pernie, of New York, after having made a survey of this canal, stated that it would absolutely not damage the water supply of the State of Florida. However, I will forego any further statements about that, because we are not talking about a ship canal, because we are not talking about following route 13B. The canal we are talking about today is a barge canal with locks. I think we have confused the subject somewhat because we have put too much emphasis on a pipe line. Let me say to you that I am for a pipe line. While I am talking about a pipe line, let me state that my colleague from Florida was discussing a proposed pipe line from Tampa to Cocoa, or Tampa to Sanford, Fla., and I was for that, too. But we could not do anything with it because the Oil Coordinator said we could not get the oil into the port of Tampa, and therefore the pipe lines were not possible, and turned them down. That is the reason we have not followed that. If we are talking about the building of a pipe line to carry all the oil we will need, let me say to you that we will need 1,300,000 barrels of oil this coming year. The railroads have been allocated 700,000 barrels, and three 10-inch pipe lines will carry only one-third of the oil necessary. In other words, it would take 10 of them to carry the necessary oil, while a barge canal would carry all that oil. In addition to this, we must not only think of the oil necessary to be carried to the East. We must think of the many other items of commerce that must go to the East and we must realize that Mr. Eastman has said that the railroads are already overburdened and that there would be a strain on the rolling stock and rails of the railroads. We must think of the many boats already lost, the ships and tankers, and so forth, because we did not build this canal. We must think of the lives lost. Let me say that I am in favor of putting locks in the canal, but I hope this Congress will think not only of the oil, but of all the other necessities of commerce that should go through this canal. I must oppose any effort to strike the barge canal from the bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG].

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, the discussion this afternoon has gone far afield, in my opinion, from the things that we should really consider here. Seated here in the front row, for instance, I hear gentlemen, through misapprehension, misunderstanding, or prejudice, for instance, attempt to show that the bill before us has to do with many matters wholly unrelated to it. There has been a terrible confusion created which is uncalled for.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEBERG. I cannot yield. There is an interesting thing connected with it.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. KLEBERG. I cannot yield at the moment, but I shall in a few moments, if I can. I have no desire to do anything except to present this thing as it is. The situation before us at the present moment is one which has to do with whether or not this great deliberative body, which has provided the agencies of the Government heretofore created, still has within its membership sufficient power to make a recommendation which will stick, still has within itself sufficient brains to meet an immediate emergency. Of course, no greater comfort could be given to Hitler and his satellites than for the people of the United States to remain idle in their accomplishments toward successfully reaching conclusions, which will first keep them fleeing and "keeping the U. S. A. flying" and "keeping the U. S. A. rolling." Engineers are not necessary to tell you that if the intracoastal-canal system already developed to a point up to where we could join the Atlantic and Gulf coast sections in the service of this Nation for barges, if barges are available, that they can deliver oil, and everybody knows that it depends upon barges. You are willing to accept a pipe line, yes; and you are willing to forget for the moment that along the Atlantic seaboard there are a number of great refineries that are starving to death for crude oil out of which to make those essential products that have to do with keeping the wheels of industry turning in the East. I am amazed at the picture presented here today. Time does not permit me to go into the matter very fully insofar as statistics are concerned.

Have you any realization of the great commerce on the intracoastal canals of this country? I shall read to you something from a paper discussed here this afternoon:

Recommendations made by Army engineers for enlargement to 12-foot depth from Corpus Christi to Mobile were based upon the remarkable increase in tonnage during the past few years. Commerce in 1940 was 50 percent greater than in 1939 and for the calendar year 1941 showed an increase of 50 percent over the previous year. Total commerce doubled in the 2-year period. During the calendar year 1941, tonnage handled by the intracoastal waterway from the Mississippi River east to Apalachee Bay, amounted to 4,204,000 tons. Tonnage, Mississippi River to Sabine River on Texas lines, 1941, 13,806,225 tons. From Sabine River to Brazos River in Texas, 1941, 11,523,538 tons. (Canal from Brazos River to Corpus Christi, distance approximately 120 miles, was not open to commerce until April of this year.) Total commerce for entire Gulf intracoastal waterway for calendar year 1941, 29,532,793 tons.

Mr. Chairman, there is much more than oil involved in this question. Along the Atlantic coast and along the Gulf there are located defense projects which require many supplies. Anything which

would relieve the present situation referred to by my colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] would not give much comfort to Hitler and his satellites. A great deal of our country is going to be cold this year, a great many people are going to be unable to get about, and unable to assemble supplies. Are we not in this House of Representatives competent to at least try to meet this issue? Does this House realize that wars have not been won by arms alone, but by the brains and guts of those who bear those arms? Does not this Congress have sufficient courage to make a recommendation that will stick, which comes from one of its great committees, presided over by the man who in my humble opinion probably knows more about waterways and their worth than any man in the United States?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, the problem of getting across the ridge of Florida, 29 miles, is the heart of this bill. In other words, to build this portion of the canal here without the channel across Florida, is to increase your transportation bottle, but to leave the neck as it is. Pipe lines, whether they be 8-inch or even 12-inch, having both, also can give to the east coast in your war plants and in your home furnaces and filling stations oil to the extent of 15 percent. The pipe line with the boats, after canal is completed, will give 100 percent of the sulfur and 100 percent of the oil, and all other war essential materials.

You cannot put sulphur, salt, lead, cotton, and other war solid materials through a pipe line. I will tell you why you have not got a whole lot of Federal men here to tell you about it. They went before the Rivers and Harbors Committee and gave their statements because they did not have time to go through the red tape of official reports. That is why statements in writing from them are not here. Can we not trust the membership of this House to have a little ability and courage of their own rather than to have somebody tell them what to do? If you want to have those reports we will get them from Mr. Nelson, Chairman, War Production Board; we will get them from the Secretary of War; we will get them from the Army engineers and the Navy. You know why the President did not send something up here. You gentlemen who are fighting this from a partisan viewpoint would have said he was trying to be a dictator. Since when have you Republicans solicited leadership of President Roosevelt. No, no, my friends.

Now, who is opposed to it? You have all asked, Who is for it? I will tell you that of some 50 witnesses who appeared before our committee, only 1 was against it. He made a perfunctory statement for the railroads. They are the only ones who have ever opposed the ship canal. Now, my friends, the locks are put in, and I understood the railroads would not oppose it if the locks are put in. Now, what stands as the opposition? Nothing. Do you want this oil to get to your people in the East? You are probably going to have general gasoline rationing throughout the United States. Do you think you will win this war in 15 or 18 months? Regardless of what you have been told, the Chief of Army engineers told me that he would build it in 15 months. He will build it in 10 or 12 months. He said to me not more than 30 minutes ago over the telephone that he would build it in 2 years. Will the war be over in 2 years? You do not know. If so, stop the battleship construction that is going on which will take more than 2 years. Stop all of your war production that is going to take more than 2 years.

You probably will be in the very near future called upon to vote billions, probably thirty additional billions, primarily for construction of airplanes; these airplanes to be constructed 2 years and later from today. Do you think you will vote for that airplane construction 2 to 4 years in advance? I believe you will vote for it, and if you do not, I am satisfied that many of you will have constituents who feel you are not supporting the war effort. Is it not prudent to vote for the relief of the transportation bottleneck 12 months from today, because you know that then it will be more acute? If it should take 2 years to construct the barge channel and locks across north Florida, then it will be constructed probably before the first airplane is constructed under the appropriation which you may vote for in the very near future.

You are going to need on the east coast factories of our country sulfur, lead, petroleum products, salt, cotton, and other materials to make these very airplanes. These materials are practically all produced in Mexico, Texas, Louisiana, and Mississippi. Now, my friends, I hope you will drive partisan feeling away from your hearts and think in the terms of war necessity and vote for this barge channel item in order that our eastern war factories may be assured 12 months or 2 years from today that they can have delivered to them these essential materials. You fully realize that you now have in your war processing plants some 8,000,000 workers and that in the very near future it is planned and hoped that 10,000,000 additional workers may be added to the force of these war plants. Are you going by your vote today to deny these additional workers materials to process for war machines? If you vote against the relief of this transportation bottleneck, you are voting directly against giving these factories 1½ or 2 years from today these essential war materials.

My friends, bear in mind that this bill is not destined to relieve the oil famine only because I fear that not many months from now, our war-material famine in the East may be more acute than oil famine is today. It positively will, unless the transportation bottle-neck is opened up. This barge item across north Florida is the only thing offered to you as a Congressman to vote for to relieve it. I cannot understand why many of you, particularly on the minority side, are squawking about the lack of written statements from War Department chiefs for the measure. It seems to me that it is time that Members of Congress and the Congress as such may well think for themselves and exercise their prerogatives as representatives of the American people, and exert themselves and vote for measures that will help the American people without having to be lassoed and corralled in by some bureaucrat. I am sure you can trust the membership of your House Rivers and Harbors Committee. I was present when the bill was reported by the committee. I did not hear a single dissenting vote against report of this bill. On the contrary, almost every Member present voted to report it favorably. I admit that some members of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee do not approve of this bill. I doubt that they approved it then, but they did not vote against its favorable report in the committee. Some of the gentlemen who are on the floor today fighting this bill did not attend 5 percent of the hearing time in the committee. Had they attended the hearings on this bill, I doubt that they would now be opposing it so vigorously.

My colleagues, this is not a sectional matter. It is not a Florida matter. It happens that the main barge channel crosses the State of Florida. That is incidental. The purpose of the bill is to connect your existing intracoastal waterway of the Gulf of Mexico with your existing intracoastal waterway of the Atlantic Ocean. You have some 29 miles across the upper part of the peninsula of Florida as a final and missing link of this system. The system is approximately 2,400 miles long. Twenty-nine additional miles in the middle of the system, the final line, in all justice to the war effort, should be agreed to without a single dissenting vote. Your Nation has spent hundreds of millions of dollars on this coastal system. It is my opinion that the local barge canal across the 29-mile stretch in Florida will be constructed for less than $20,000,000. I base this opinion upon competent engineering evidence produced before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee in open hearings. The purpose of the bill is to get our war essential materials from their origin, in raw state, from the western portions of our country to the eastern portion. Our factories are in the East; our resources in the West. The 29-mile stretch of the Florida peninsula now stands as a definite barrier between the meeting of these two. Then how can you call it a Florida project or a sectional project, and, my friends, party should not be here today considered. You should not make party capital out of this matter and look at it from a partisan view. All parties—Democrats, Republicans, and all—are interested in the success of this war. Republican boys and Democratic boys are in our armed forces. Parties should be forgotten. This is a war measure and is, according to the War Department officials, in the interest of prosecution of the war and should be immediately approved and constructed. General Reybold, Chief of Army Engineers, in testimony before the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, recently said that he recommended passage of the bill and immediate beginning

of construction on the pipe line and on the barge canal. Do you need any higher technical, administrative, or war authority than this spokesman from your own Army?

I may say to the gentleman from Florida if you want any information concerning the ground water and its origin, read page 5269 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of yesterday. You will see the railroads started that bugaboo. I put that in the RECORD in a speech yesterday. It is contained in a letter to Senator BOB TAFT, from a prominent Florida Republican, a dear friend of his. So do not make a partisan issue out of this bill today. This legislation is the only thing that will give adequate and permanent relief. The war may not be ended in 2 years. Let us hope so, but who knows. The war officials are building, training, and planning as though it may last many years. We should give them all they request. They have requested and endorsed this bill. This channel across Florida is the heart of this bill. You have no bill without it. They are building the pipe lines today. What is the use developing further the Texas and Louisiana portion of the canal and not connect across Florida? You would make the bottleneck that much smaller? If you knock out the barge canal across Florida, then kill the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG], in the course of his remarks a few minutes ago, suggested that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] wanted the canal built lower down across his district. I may say to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] there is a canal down there now. There is a barge canal down there now across the State of Florida. What the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] was suggesting was that that barge canal be widened and deepened and used, instead of spending a much larger sum for the canal under discussion.

Although the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KLEBERG] did not extend me the courtesy of yielding, I yield to him, and before I do that I want to say, because the gentleman may have something to say in regard to this statement that I desire to make, that I resent the insinuation that he made against the gentleman from Florida when he said he might want it down there because of its proximity to his district.

Mr. KLEBERG. I recall this fact to the gentleman: That neither my distinguished friend nor the gentleman from Florida could make that canal usable today, based on a certain situation which we know to exist. What we are trying to do is to connect the entire intracoastal waterway so that it will be useful to the whole Nation rather than to one section.

Mr. CARTER. I am not aware of any situation that would make that canal unusable. In fact, if the gentleman from Texas will look at the report of the Chief of Engineers, he will see that the Chief of Engineers recommended the very canal that the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] had in mind, which is called the Okeechobee-Caloosahatchee Canal. They recommend that as a very important part of the intracoastal waterway connecting the Gulf coast and the Atlantic coast. That is what I am contending for here now.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I regret that I do not have time to yield further.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT].

GASOLINE RATIONING PROGRAM IS UNDERMINING PUBLIC FAITH THROUGH ITS GROSS DISCRIMINATION

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, while we are discussing the construction of pipe lines and barge canals as necessary for relieving the shortage of fuel oil, it is proper to give serious reflection to the fact that thousands of gasoline dealers are facing certain bankruptcy should the present inequitable gasoline rationing program be continued.

In my congressional district in Pennsylvania we have counties that are under the rationing program while in adjoining counties the system is not in effect. As a result, many dealers are not able in the rationed areas to dispose of their gasoline because of the regulations governing its sale; yet they are forced to watch their customers cross a line 2 or 3 miles away and purchase an unlimited supply. There has been a marked decrease in business to these dealers, many of whom are faced with financial ruin through such rank discrimination.

The situation is made more ridiculous by the fact that the gasoline sold in the unrationed area is hauled from the county already under the rationing program.

The dealers and likewise the citizens in the rationed sections of the country are just as anxious as any other citizen that the war be prosecuted to a speedy and victorious conclusion. Yet they are mindful of the fact that when Nationwide rationing was proposed as being equitable and fair a cry of protest brought about an immediate order that the plan be delayed until a scrap rubber collection campaign could be conducted to ascertain the actual need for such restrictions.

In all fairness, citizens in the rationed areas ask why such consideration was not shown to them before the present rationing program was launched.

There is no need of "beating around the bush"—the gasoline rationing program is a farce and has been the means of producing a bumper crop of chiselers—and a war was never won where chiselers were permitted to destroy the common effort.

The average American citizen worthy of the name is eager to share any burden necessary to win this war. The word sacrifice is inscribed on the true American's heart in letters of blood and tears. However, sacrifice in the American language as practiced by the founders of this Nation means—common sacrifice. The chiseler is scorned and despised as bitterly as though he were an active member of the fighting forces of the enemy. In truth, he is an active participant by his despicable conduct. The regrettable fact is that the Government through the administration of the present gasoline rationing program is making chiselers out of honest citizens.

The destruction of the property rights of gasoline dealers in the rationed areas, and the undermining of the morals of citizens by such discriminatory regulations effective in one section of the Nation only, are false to the American spirit of sacrifice.

If this is everybody's war—then in common justice let everyone share the sacrifice together. Any other system that shows preference to one section of the country is repugnant to American ideals, and this is exactly what has happened as a result of the inequitable rationing of gasoline.

There is a marked conflict of opinion as to the actual necessity for the rationing of gasoline.

The view against rationing is not confined to the man in the street but is likewise shared by many well-informed persons in the business and industrial life of the Nation. That there is a basis for such an opinion is evidenced by the fact that no one in authority seems to be able to give any convincing information on the supply of gasoline and rubber.

For the past 6 weeks I have literally camped on the doorstep of Hon. Harold Ickes, Secretary of the Interior, and Hon. Leon Henderson, Price Administrator. I have received courteous and sympathetic treatment from these agencies, but no assurance that any remedy can be found for the present distressing conditions brought about by the intolerable gasoline-rationing program.

If we desire to foster national unity, the first requisite is to place every American citizen on the same level. This demands that if the Government insists on a gasoline-rationing program that a system be devised that will treat every citizen alike.

To achieve such an aim, if we are to have rationing, let it be controlled at the source of supply in the same manner as the local draft board passes on the eligibility of Selective Service registrants. The draft law proceeds on the theory that the sacrifice incident to being called for service should be uniform and equally shared, and, as a result, the registrant's neighbors are considered to be proper judges of all pertinent facts.

By applying a similar principle to the rationing of gasoline, the dealer should be given a reasonable percentage of his regular supply and he in turn can ration the amount of each sale from his knowledge of the customer's needs.

The corner garage man is well equipped to determine the carefree individual from the one who has a definite need for gasoline and who will only ask for it in reasonable quantities. Through such a system the common cheat and the chiseler will be known in his own neighborhood, where the condemnation of his neighbors is a penalty that can be enforced with worth-while results.

As long as the Government permits the present system of ruthless competition and the destruction of property rights, loss of life earnings, and bankruptcy to stalk every honest gasoline dealer and

American citizen in the rationed areas you will continue to hear the rising chorus of protest against such an un-American and inequitable system that is causing good American citizens to echo the question, What are we fighting for?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER].

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Chairman, the Florida ship-canal project again claims the attention of Congress, although it is presented here in a new form. This bill is but a cloak for the discredited ship-canal proposal.

When the Senate in March 1936 refused to appropriate $12,000,000 for the completion of the Florida canal project it was thought that the last had been heard of this enterprise. But here it is again.

Since the project was first proposed it has been a subject of sharp controversy. The canal herein proposed will require years to build and appears to be economically unjustified. It would impose on the State of Florida burdensome expenses of construction and maintenance of bridges and other adjuncts to the waterway and would require materials and manpower urgently needed for war purposes. Geologists have reported that such a canal would menace the underground water supply of Florida. And officials of water transportation have declared that they would not use it. The Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors previously reported that present and prospective benefits from a canal across Florida do not establish the economic justification for the large expenditures necessary for its construction. See page 29, House Document No. 194, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session. All these arguments against the canal may be waived, and there yet remains one fact that should condemn the project at this time: it is in no way a necessity. We would do better to utilize those waterways already in operation.

Why divert $144,000,000 and labor urgently needed for the war effort to the construction of a project which will not be available until 1945? The United States needs every dollar and every worker to produce the ships, the airplanes, the tanks, the guns, and the food required for the successful prosecution of the war.

If the canal is built, its cost will be borne by men and women who already carry all the taxes they can stand.

There was brought to the attention of the Rivers and Harbors Committee this morning a statement from the Board of Army Engineers to the effect that it would take at least two and a half to 3 years under favorable conditions to build this canal. If any Members here have had occasion to contact the War Production Board recently in an effort to get priorities for materials necessary for the war effort they know that this canal will never be completed before that time.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is it not true that even if the building of the barge canal were authorized, materials are not available?

Mr. BEITER. That is true, and the War Production Board would place this way down the list, giving priority on steel for battleships and planes, where it is vitally needed now.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BEITER. I yield.

Mr. KEFAUVER. What is the distance between the end of the waterway in Boston and its southern terminus?

Mr. BEITER. I should judge about 2,000 miles.

Mr. KEFAUVER. What is it from the west coast of Florida?

Mr. BEITER. The chairman of the committee advises me that it is about 1,200 miles.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Exactly, about 2,000 miles, and only 29 miles needed to connect it up and make it usable. Is not that true?

Mr. BEITER. If the canal were completed it would be 2,400 miles long.

Mr. KEFAUVER. With only 30 miles needed to make it usable throughout its entire length.

Mr. BEITER. No; I believe it is about 191 miles.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, an effort has been made to inject partisanship into this issue. In a strictly partisan fight there is no question as to where I stand. I admire any Member of this House for standing by his party whenever a strictly party issue is raised. To attempt, however, to drag this red herring across the floor of the House this afternoon is to me nothing short of contemptible. No one has injected any partisan issue except people who feel the weakness of their cause and are attempting to line up a majority of the majority party on that basis. The last two or three speakers who addressed this House against this project were members of the majority party, and, as a matter of fact, in Florida itself the Democrats are divided. There is a division of newspaper opinion on this monstrosity within the State. Communities immediately contiguous to the project are for it, and Florida communities away from the project are against it.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. I believe my colleague has in mind the speaker preceding him who referred to the ship canal. There is no serious opposition in Florida, not even from the railroads, to the barge-lock canal. We had an election in Florida not long ago and they were kind enough to give me—I hate to refer to it—a substantial majority in 57 of the 67 counties in my district. I believe the gentleman will find that 95 percent of the people of the State are in favor of a lock-barge canal for war emergency, which the gentleman knows this is.

Mr. BENDER. I am glad the gentleman raised that question, for I hold in my hand an editorial from the Miami Herald of June 16, 1942. It reads as follows:

The advocates in Congress of the cross-State ship canal show a persistence that would be commendable if they would turn their efforts from political boondoggling to winning the war.

Chairman MANSFIELD, of Texas, of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee, says he will bring the $144,000,000 barge canal-pipe line measure up in the regular order of business tomorrow. MANSFIELD'S committee recommended the barge canal along the route of the $300,000,000 cross-State ship canal. It was a thinly veiled cloak for putting over the big ditch on the American taxpayer.

Before the bill was ordered up, its backers circulated maps showing the proposed canal. They omitted the most navigable section of the Intracoastal Waterway (the East Coast Canal) from Jacksonville to Key West. They failed to note Lake Okeechobee, the second largest body of fresh water within the United States; they failed to mark any existing or potential water route in south Florida. These maps were part of the whole pattern of duplicity which has characterized the revival of the big ditch under the guise of barge canal.

Its advocates whispered on Capitol Hill that the measure had administration blessing, although the President denied it both before the bill was debated and after it was defeated. They tried to claim it was a solution of the petroleum shortages in the East and a war measure, when the fact that the canal would take nearly 3 years to complete was evidence that it had no bearing on the fuel emergency or value in prosecuting the war; would, in fact, by employing needed men and materials, impede the war effort.

This is a Florida newspaper of general circulation—the Miami Herald.

And further quoting:

An informed Congress defeated the proposal decisively.

South Florida does not enjoy the constant battling to safeguard this most populous and progressive section of the State against this menace to its entire economic structure.

That does not come from a Republican. It comes from an organ in the State of Florida that has supported consistently Democrats for elective offices in the State.

Mr. BEITER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BEITER. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN] referred a moment ago to the 57 counties that he carried. That probably was prior to the time—or may account, rather—for an Associated Press dispatch of November 11, 1941, in which Mr. GREEN, of Florida, stated that he sees a need for delay of the ship canal and favors further study of claims that the proposed cross-State canal would damage south Florida.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I refuse to yield at this time.

Mr. Chairman, everyone on the floor is conversant with the fact that there are 269 Democrats on this floor and 166 Republicans. Even if all the Republicans would vote on one side of this issue, they certainly could not defeat it, but I say to you there is a difference of opinion even on our side on this issue, as there is on the majority side. This issue was defeated when it came up under a rule

providing for 20 minutes' debate by the majority party of the House, because the majority leader, the President of the United States, made no effort to line up votes for this project. I say that what has been represented here is absolutely correct; Mr. Nelson and none of the people charged with the war effort are in anywise urging the adoption of this proposition.

Mr. Chairman, this is the entering wedge for the Florida ship canal, and if this bill is agreed to you will be asked to appropriate additional money up to $300,000,000 to complete the project. This is a part of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence project. I have a telegram here from those who are proposing the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence waterway project in favor of this canal.

Long before the war started an effort was made to put this ship canal over. Now, under the guise of the war effort, and shame on those who are attempting to label this canal as a war measure, because it would require 2½ to 3 years to build, this Florida canal is again being brought forward. If we cannot lick the submarine menace before 2½ or 3 years I say we are lost. It is essential that we lick them quickly and speedily in order to get the ships over where they will do the most good in the war effort and get the supplies where they belong, on fronts. Any effort to label this as a war measure, let me repeat again, is an attempt to becloud the issue.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the hard-working gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman will recall that in the opening of this debate the gentleman from Oregon asked who had endorsed this proposal among governmental officials or bodies. Up to the present time that question has not been answered, showing that not a single individual or body has placed its endorsement on this matter. The War Production Board has not endorsed it, the Army and Navy Munitions Board has not endorsed it, the Chief of Engineers, who appeared before our committee, said he was not appearing as the representative of the President. If it has been endorsed, as claimed by many, I will yield time to that person to get up here and tell me that the War Production Board has endorsed this project, that the Navy has endorsed it, that the Army has endorsed it, and explain those endorsements.

Mr. BENDER. I know the energetic and distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] is absolutely correct.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today contains two separate proposals: One is the barge line across the State of Florida intended to help facilitate the transfer of oil to the east coast, and the other for a regular pipe line to be used for the same purpose. The pipe line, we are informed, would cost approximately $10,000,000 and would be completed in 6 months. The barge line, if materials and labor are available, would be completed, according to the testimony, in about 2½ or 3 years. That is just too long. It would cost at least $135,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, no one denies the shortage of transportation facilities for oil that has come about because of the destruction of coastwise shipping.

Mr. Chairman, this legislation ought to be examined in a practical way. Those who propose it say that it is necessary for the promotion of the war effort. If I thought this were correct, I would not hesitate to support it. As a matter of fact, if the membership of this House could be convinced that the barge proposal really would help the war effort, there would be little opposition on either side of the House. It happens that there is a big controversy over this measure right in the State of Florida itself, as well as on both sides of the aisle of this House.

Mr. Chairman, the barge proposal does not come at the request of the War Department or the Navy Department or even the War Production Board. It happens that most of those who are in support of the barge proposal are, generally speaking, the advocates of the old Florida ship canal, which would, if completed, cost something like $250,000,000.

It is well known on the floor of the House that the Florida ship canal is a part of an old "pork-barrel" proposal that has been haunting the halls of this Congress for many years.

Mr. Chairman, it is my candid opinion that the building of the barge canal is impractical. It would not be completed in time to take care of a situation that is imminent. It would require materials, labor, and money that should go to the building of more ships to take care of the shortage in that respect. This proposal is, in my judgment, what might be known as a camel getting its nose under a tent. It is just getting ready for a project at a later date to complete a ship canal.

Mr. Chairman, I submit that it would be much more practical and less expensive to put two or three 8- or 10-inch pipe lines in the same channel and carry the oil in that way much quicker, and much less expensively. We could get the whole job done in about 6 months. We could save the additional money, manpower, and materials for other important war production.

The barge proposal should be defeated. The pipe-line proposal of sufficient size to carry a sufficient supply can, and should be completed within minimum time. It can be done with less money and material, and get the required supply of oil to the east coast where it is needed before the end of the year.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman yield some more time?

Mr. CARTER. Has the gentleman exhausted his speakers?

Mr. MANSFIELD. All but myself.

Mr. CARTER. I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if this Florida canal bill is a war measure, why is there a partisan division? If this is a war measure, why is the Florida delegation divided? It never divides on war issues. If this is a war measure, Andrew Jackson was much more forensic than I dreamed he was. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. HENDRICKS] said that Andrew Jackson started this canal. What on earth did Andrew Jackson know about this war now? If this is a war measure, indeed I am confused. There has been no distinct division of this House recently on any war measure that I can recall.

If this question of a Florida canal is age old, surely those who sought its passage and its completion and its effectiveness then could not have known what you and I would be fighting about today.

This indeed is not a war measure. If it were, the President would be for it. General Reybold had this to say in his letter to the eminent chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of this House:

> Since time has not permitted me to ascertain whether the information presented in this letter is in accord with the program of the President, such information should be considered as factual and involving no commitment as to that program.

Why would not the War Department be for it? Why would not the Navy Department be for it? The Navy Department is for the Caloosahatchee Canal now existing and in being in Florida. The Navy has blessed that project as a war measure. The Navy has not blessed this one. No agency of this Government has blessed this measure that I know anything about. I now yield to anyone who will tell me what agency has blessed it, and by virtue of what medium. Mr. GREEN? Mr. HENDRICKS? Any one of you now? No; the cross State canal is not a war measure.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. According to the accepted formula of marriage ceremonies, they must speak now or forever after hold their peace?

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GREEN. One of the friends of transportation, particularly the railroads, Mr. Eastman, has sent a direct and urgent communication to the Senate Committee on Commerce urging that this bill be passed. The Chief of Army Engineers spoke for the War Department and said it should be approved, that construction of the pipe line and the barge canal should be begun immediately.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I am through yielding now.

Mr. GREEN. And if you were to ask Mr. Nelson, Mr. Nelson would tell you that he wants it.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Since when does the gentleman from Florida have a private pipe line of information that no other Member of this House can get?

Mr. GREEN. This is just a matter of detail. The only ones that are opposing it are the railroads. All those departments would approve it.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. By what secretive method does the gentleman from Florida learn all this information? I say to you it is not available for this House.

Mr. GREEN. During the discussion under the 5-minute rule I will read them to the House.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. The proposed canal to which this bill addresses itself is 192 miles long. The canal now existing is but 90 miles long. Therefore, why build a canal across and up Florida when you already have one across Florida, particularly one that has at least received the blessing of the Navy?

Mr. GREEN. And the Navy withdrew that blessing.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I do not yield any further.

It has been said also by some of the illustrious spokesmen who preceded me that they were for intercoastal waterways. Who is not? The only question that we of the opposition in Florida raise is the utility of the waterways now constructed. If, indeed, danger is imminent, if this is a war measure, let us so consider it. Why bicker about building something about which there is diversity of opinion as to the time required for its construction? The least possible time I have been able to discover is 15 months. The prevailing opinion, the consensus of opinion, however, definitely is about 3 years.

If the gentlemen farther up the east coast are concerned vitally with oil for fuel and with oil for the ordinary intercourse of the citizenry, then, of course, another winter will pass before 15 months roll around. But this project does not go off on that phase. It is a continuation of the nefarious and vicious and often defeated cross-State canal of the great State of Florida.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Apparently the major argument in support of this canal is the transportation of oil from the West to the Atlantic seaboard. The gentleman's colleague [Mr. HENDRICKS] said that the daily consumption of oil on the Atlantic seaboard is 1,300,000 barrels. The report is that the railroads transport 700,000 barrels, the existing pipe lines and barge canals transport 200,000, which is 900,000, and the pipe line now under consideration from Texas to Philadelphia will bring in 300,000 barrels. That brings it up to 1,200,000 barrels. The proposed pipe line across Florida will bring in 300,000 barrels, according to the report. This apparently will furnish all the oil the Atlantic seaboard needs.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I thank my friend for his contribution.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I want to make a correction of a statement.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I will yield in just a minute.

I would like someone to tell me also what relationship the pipe line bears to the cross-State canal.

Further, it has also been said that the water question, or rather the fear concerning the water supply of south Florida, was raised by the railroads. I would like to inform whoever made that statement—I think it was the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN]—that the water question was raised originally and has been fought constantly and with great religion by the citrus growers and the farmers of south Florida. They are the ones who raised the question.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I do not yield at this time.

Mr. GREEN. Read the record.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I would also like to invite the membership of this committee to read the letter sent to the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee under date of June 15 by General Reybold.

I will now yield to the chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

Mr. MANSFIELD. I wanted to make a correction in the statement of the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE], who just took his seat. The gentleman stated that the pipe line which was authorized goes to Philadelphia. That pipe line goes to Salem, Ill., 900 miles away from Philadelphia.

Mr. COLE of New York. But it will bring to the east coast 300,000 barrels of oil.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not a gallon that I can figure out anywhere.

Mr. COLE of New York. The report of the gentleman's committee refers to the proposed pipe line from Texas, which will add 300,000 barrels. I assumed that was the pipe line.

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; that pipe line was not granted. The original request was for Philadelphia, but Donald Nelson turned it down and only granted it to Salem, Ill.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. And to you of the gentry of Texas, who are vitally concerned in this measure, I would like to remind you that you will still have your improvements regardless of what channel or conduit is used through Florida. We have a canal now constructed in Florida and there is no use building a new one.

We of the opposition in Florida merely suggest that you utilize the channel we now have across that State. So we are now fighting your case. And to you among the patriots who believe it is your responsibility to save the country, let me remind you that I too am willing to give my little assistance to save this country. To those of you who believe it to be your burning desire and, indeed, your sacred trust, to serve your congressional district, I, too, am serving mine.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SIKES.]

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that this fight should degenerate into a cross-State ship canal or anti-cross-State ship canal issue and I am afraid that is the issue which has been fought on this floor this afternoon.

We are not interested in the Florida cross-State ship canal at this time. We are interested in shipping. There is no more serious problem before the people of this Nation today than shipping. The one real bottleneck in our war effort today is shipping. Obviously, there is need to take whatever steps are at our disposal to relieve that situation. Every day has brought ship sinking after ship sinking. Vital war materials are being lost. Some of them cannot be replaced. Ships are going down. American lives are being lost. Skilled seamen, valued workmen are being lost to this country. A thousand men are dead who might be alive today if this problem had been solved. So we offer today a bill which, in part, will help to solve the problem of shipping. It is a bill for the construction of a pipe line and a barge canal across Florida and for the continued development of the intercoastal waterway westward to Texas. Obviously, the pipe line part of the bill has already been solved. Orders have gone out for its construction.

I think, Mr. Chairman, it would have been well if we had passed this bill months ago while it was still important to the construction of a pipe line, because for months negotiations have been carried on by departments of our Government for the construction of that pipe line. This bill could have helped greatly to get the pipe line built and to save valuable time and material if we had passed it when it was first proposed. But principally we are concerned with a barge canal across Florida. We are concerned because of the time issue involved, because of the distance which can be saved in our shipping. No one denies the fact that a barge canal can be constructed speedily across Florida.

Do not forget that to go southward and utilize the Caloosahatchee Canal it is necessary to travel an additional 500 miles. It takes a long time for ships to go 500 miles. Do not forget that for shipping to go southward around the tip of Florida it is necessary to travel an additional 700 miles, much of which is in open, unprotected water. So from the standpoint of time saved in getting vital material to our eastern seaboard, it is a very important thing that we build the barge canal. As to cost, the cost is much less than that of many other items which we have considered essential to national defense, much less than many items which will not bring the saving of life and of vital material that this bill can bring to us. Forty millions of dollars will build the canal. Cargoes and ships worth many times that amount have been lost in shipping sunk off the Gulf and Atlantic coasts. Let me point out to you that in actual dredging there are only 29 miles of dry land between the rivers which will be joined in the construction of this canal. Let me point out to you the very little critical material actually required in this type of construction. There is much labor now available for this type of work and no shortage of material or labor is contemplated. Let me point out to you

that this barge canal can do things that one pipe line or any number of pipe lines cannot do. You cannot send a bale of cotton through a pipe line. You cannot ship foodstuffs or manufactured articles through a pipe line. You cannot ship a boat load of lumber through a pipe line.

There is one item of vital material on top of another that is being shipped eastward along our Intracoastal Waterway which must go out into the open Gulf or out into the open Atlantic because this vital link in our transportation system is not now available. Let us help where we can to solve the major problem now before us. Let us save the lives of American seamen. Let us protect our ships and insure the delivery of the materials with which we can win the war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Rhode Island [Mr. FORAND].

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of this bill, and I sincerely hope that it will pass.

Its passage would be the first step in a project that would help to relieve the distress that I envision for my home State of Rhode Island, and for the eastern seaboard next winter unless the oil-shortage situation is remedied at an early date.

I am confident that no Member of the House would oppose this legislation if he could visualize the terrible plight in which our people in the northeastern section of the country will be next winter, when the cold weather sets in, unless we can find a way to provide heating oil for them. Think of the aged and the little children, the inmates of institutions, the patients in the hospitals. Would you want to be responsible for denying them heat next winter?

Is there any Representative here, while professing his patriotism and his great desire to help the war effort, who can justify his position in opposing efforts being made to bring oil to the numerous war industries of New England?

These facts, my friends, are worthy of serious consideration.

Now as to gasoline: You know, as well as I do, the great opposition that has arisen to Nation-wide gasoline rationing. To you who are a part of that opposition, I ask: Are you not willing to do your share to see that our people in the East are provided at least a reasonable amount of gasoline so that they may use their automobiles to get to and from work and occasionally take their families to the seashore? You want your people to have all the gasoline they want. Will you not help us get at least a part of the amount we need?

Bear in mind also that along the eastern seaboard there has, over the years, developed a huge business at the seashores and at the roadsides. Most of the operators of these businesses are so-called little-business men, many of them having tied up their life's savings in the enterprise. They will be wiped out unless the motorists have gasoline to travel.

Then there is the small distributor of petroleum products. Here is a group of men whose volume of sales is reduced because of the oil shortage and yet whose expenses have increased because of wage raises, Government orders to limit amounts of oil delivered—necessitating two or three trips to deliver what used to be delivered in one trip—and the compiling and filing of reports required by the Government.

I ask you, my colleagues, to consider all these facts, and, if you will, I am confident you will feel as I do and vote for the passage of this bill.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY].

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, in line with the remarks which the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] made this afternoon, I have tried to approach this legislation entirely with an open mind. The American people expect that of us today. Certainly if this could be properly labeled as a war measure, I would support it. But I am convinced that I cannot support it. In the first place, the American people expect us to look at these matters calmly and very carefully these days. I call attention to the fact that just a few days ago this matter was before us in a bill requesting an appropriation of $144,000,000. In fact, this bill as now written is for that same amount. But we find now that it has dropped to about $80,000,000. In other words, we have the word of the Chief of Engineers in his letter circulated on the floor today that the new high-level canal they now want to construct, to get away from the salt-water soil contamination menace in Florida, will cost $44,000,000. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] told us that the pipe line will cost about $10,000,000, and then there is $26,000,000 additional which is set aside to deepen the present existing barge canal and build the Texas and New Jersey extensions.

The gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BOGGS] earlier this afternoon painted a rosy picture, stressing the fact that in addition to gasoline that they were going to haul cotton and all sorts of other commodities on this canal system. I have talked with the Maritime Commission about that and asked what their thoughts are. They pointed out to me if we are to transport daily some 600,000 barrels of oil in wood or concrete barges—steel barges are out of the question—we will have to, some place, somewhere, build approximately 500 of these barges, which of necessity are shallow draft and, because of channel limitations, reasonably small in size. Those barges will require for motive power the construction of 250 tugs, and that those tugs will require about 500 horsepower each of Diesel engines, and where are we going to get them? I happen to be a member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee. On Monday we had before us representatives of the Army and the Navy and the Coast Guard and the fishing industry, all crying for more motive power to put into small boats needed to combat the submarine menace and needed for small tugs for harbor work on the coast and in the Gulf, and needed for more power units to replace the fishing vessels that have been taken out of the fishing trade and transferred to war work. These fishing vessels must be replaced as soon as possible on the east and west coasts and Gulf lest our war workers, in and out of the active armed forces, suffer a severe loss in fish-food products. And these must be replaced as soon as possible lest fish products, such as various fish meals, fish oils, and so forth, vitally needed in the war effort be sought for in vain.

That motive power is not available, and the Maritime Commission will tell you now that they have not the faintest idea where they could get this motive power to take care of these tugs to haul the barges. In addition to that, I remind you that these tugs will operate on a 24-hour basis, which will require at least 6 men on each watch on each one of these tugs, or an average of 20 men per tug, or an additional number of 5,000 trained seamen, to move this oil, let alone cotton and the other commodities that we have been told about.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. BOGGS. Does not the gentleman admit that should the rubber situation prove to be as serious as it is pretty generally said to be, we are going to have to utilize some means of transportation to take up the slack caused by the loss of truck transportation. Does not the gentleman further know——

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Oh, I refuse to yield further. The gentleman had his time this afternoon.

Mr. BOGGS. We are either going to have to build these barges or tank cars and railroad locomotives.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I refuse to yield any further. Let me just state the problem before the Maritime Commission at the present time. Their operating schedule calls for the completion of 23,000,000 tons of shipping by the end of next year. That will require 7,000,000 tons of steel, and Admiral Vickery just got through telling me that that is not now available. They have not the shipyards or the ways available to build concrete or wooden barges, and even so, barges are not worth a hoot until you provide them with motive power. Further, where are you going to get these trained men?

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Oh, the gentleman had his time this afternoon. I say this to the gentleman, that if we have not cleaned up this submarine menace within the next 3 years that it will take to build this canal, and we will not be able to settle the submarine menace without this motive power needed to patrol the coast and the Gulf, then in such case I say to you that we better spend our money that will go into the proposed construction of this ship canal, the demand for which the Florida people

are not even able to agree on, and put this money into the construction of patrol craft on the Atlantic Ocean. Furthermore, if we in this country have not solved our rubber situation through the creation and use of substitutes by the time it will take to build this canal, then we in all probability will be in such an unfavorable war position as well as internal economic crisis as to not make this canal of much national service.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

I wish to say the House expressed itself on this bill the other day. During the course of the debate when the bill was brought in under suspension of the rules, the statement of a distinguished Senator from Florida was referred to. The distinguished Senator from Florida was making some remarks about the construction of pipe lines and waterways across northern Florida. He said durthe course of those remarks in referring to the barge canal:

> That barge canal, I think, will be found to be the first aid in the construction of the Florida ship canal. I know that time after time it has been said and thought on the floor of the Senate and elsewhere that the proposal for the Florida ship canal was some sort of a boondoggling scheme whereby Florida was attempting to get some money out of the Public Treasury.

That is the statement of a distinguished Senator from Florida. He contends that it is the first stage of the Florida ship canal. That at least is one man's idea, a very prominent citizen of Florida. I have heard similar expressions from others, but at least that is what he thinks this proposal starts. It starts the Florida ship canal.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. HENDRICKS. Unfortunately that statement was made in regard to another canal, and, in addition to that, the gentleman must realize with me that if we ever go any further with this canal it must be authorized by Congress, no matter what he says.

Mr. CARTER. I do not yield further. I disagree with the gentleman as to it being made with reference to another canal. The gentleman's remarks are admitted to be for the construction of a pipe line and waterway across northern Florida.

Mr. HENDRICKS. It was another bill.

Mr. CARTER. I have no further requests for time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in regard to the proposed ship channel across Florida, there is no man in this House any more opposed to that than I am. A year ago last February when the measure was before our committee it was adopted by a majority of 11 to 8 of the members of the committee present at that time. I hold in my hand a minority report which I dictated and which I signed, strenuously opposing a ship channel across Florida. That was signed by eight other members of the committee with me, including all of the gentlemen on the committee who spoke here today against this measure. My good friend, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], was one of them.

This proposition has no more to do with a ship channel across Florida than it has with running a ship channel up the Mississippi River to Chicago; not a particle on earth more.

A great deal has been said about this not having been recommended by some of the Government bureaus. Every gentleman who has raised that point has heretofore strenuously objected to Congress appealing to bureaus in Washington as to what they should do or how they should vote upon measures coming before Congress. I have been a Member for 26 years and I have never yet submitted a bill or a project which came before my committee to anybody but the Board of Engineers or the Chief of Engineers of the War Department, to get scientific information, and nothing else.

I want to know if my good friends are sincere in that objection.

Mr. CARTER. If the gentleman will yield, I am one of those who objected. I would like to suggest to the distinguished chairman that we are working under wartime regime now. If I want to put a furnace in my home in California I would have to get permission from somebody downtown to do it.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I only yielded for a question. The gentleman is taking up my time.

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman has yielded to me and I shall cease speaking when he wishes me to cease. We are operating under war regulations now.

Mr. MANSFIELD. But under the same law. There is no difference in law.

I want to show you how sincere these gentlemen are. When the St. Lawrence waterway was before us it was recommended by the President of the United States, by the Secretary of War, by the Secretary of the Navy, by every agency of this Government that had any connection whatever with war preparations or with national defense. Who was guided by it? Every gentleman who spoke here today is of the same opinion about the St. Lawrence as he was before. So what is the use going to all that trouble to get different persons to endorse a proposition? What is Congress here for? The gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] said the other day that we had not submitted it to the Budget.

I have never submitted a river and harbor legislative proposition to the Budget in my life, nor has anyone else. The gentleman has served on the Appropriations Committee so long, where that rule prevails, that he gets it confused with legislation. The Budget is to control appropriations. Of course, if legislation is on the books and an appropriation comes up, then they are guided by the Budget to a great extent. But the Budget has no business saying to you or to me how we shall vote on a proposition up here for legislation. It is ridiculous on its face.

If Congress proposes to set aside every right and province that it holds to some Government bureau, then why not say so and quit and say we are not capable of legislating?

Mr. Chairman, you have heard talk about a canal across the southern part of Florida, 300 miles down the Florida Peninsula. I know four times as much about that as any Member who has spoken on the subject today, for I was on the committee when the project was first put into legislation. It was done to keep the waters from Lake Okeechobee from flooding the lands to the west of the lake and from going down over the Everglades and swamping out the land. It was a reclamation project, and we combined it with a project for commerce by digging a ditch across there 6 feet deep to get the dirt to make the levee to hold the water from flooding these lands and going down through the Everglades. We called it a navigation channel. What would it be worth in conveying oil and gasoline to the East? How would you get to it from the Gulf? There is no way on earth of getting to it except to dredge a harbor there 30 feet deep or more to provide a port to bring the oil over there. Then by making a 12-foot channel out of the 6-foot channel across to the Atlantic side and converting the 8-foot channel farther up to a 12-foot channel as far as Jacksonville you would have a navigable channel, but it would be worth nothing in transporting oil and gasoline to the east coast in an effort to avoid submarines, for the Gulf would be just as full of submarines as the Atlantic if you get to hauling oil across it. We do not have a tanker that can be devoted to this use right now, not one. I have some knowledge of this subject; I have been working on it for a year or two. Every tanker we possess is needed now to carry oil and gasoline thousands of miles across the oceans to the Army and Navy. If we had a thousand tankers we could not devote any appreciable number of them to domestic use.

Let us now turn to the channel along the western and northern Gulf coast. Before I proceed further I may say that some of this has been recommended by war agencies. The channel just east of New Orleans, south of Lake Ponchartrain, has been recommended by the Navy and the Maritime Commission; not only that, but the Maritime Commission itself has spent five or six million dollars there dredging a part of that channel without waiting for Congress to act. We have a bill which provides for extending it on out and completing the work and connecting it up with the other channels.

Oil is not the only commodity to be thought of in the use of these canals. Between two and a half and three million tons of sulfur go annually to the East coast, 87 percent of it being used in the war industry today. It used to go to its destination for $2.20 a ton. Now it costs $11 a ton to get it there. What route does it now follow? It is taken by intracoastal canal to New Orleans, then up the Mississippi and Illinois Rivers to Chicago, where it is transferred to lake steamers. It goes 800 miles to Buffalo and is there transferred to rail carriers or to barges on the Erie Canal and taken

to the point of use by the war industries. I do not know what present conditions are, but just before the war broke out our industries consumed 9,000,000 tons of sulfuric acid made from this sulfur—9,000,000 tons in 1 year; 87 percent of it now goes into war industries, but it costs the Government $11 a ton today, or $8 a ton more than it should simply because we cannot ship it by barge through this intracoastal waterway. It formerly went on ocean ships around the coast. We had 100,000,000 tons of freight going around there. That is all out of the picture. Two hundred and eighty-seven ships have already been destroyed, and I am told that a thousand men have lost their lives to the submarines. Admiral Land told me that a tanker will cost between two and a half and three million dollars. Count up the cost of 287; not only that, but count the cost of the cargoes. Complaints are coming to me from the Jersey coast far above Atlantic City to the effect that oil has come on the beaches there so much from these sunken tankers that the people cannot enjoy their surf-side pleasures. It is serious.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RICH. If so many of our ships have been sunk, does not the gentleman believe we ought to spend a little of the money we now have to protect our shores against German submarines? If we are unable to defend our own coast, how are we going to get our men and materials to foreign countries, or to win the war?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We cannot afford to bring our Army and Navy back here to protect our domestic commerce.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. The gentleman is right.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If Congress is not capable of doing it itself, for goodness sake, let us resign and quit, and let a Congress come here that can.

My good friend from Florida [Mr. PETERSON] spoke about bridges. The bridges over the proposed channel are embraced in the $44,000,000 recommendation. Under the Hobbs bill, passed a few years ago, the Government has to pay the cost of those bridges. In some instances that burden was formerly placed upon the railroads, the counties, and municipalities that had them, but all that is embraced in the $44,000,000.

At the proper time I shall offer certain amendments to this bill in order to simplify it, and if those amendments are agreed to, and I believe they will be—I do not think anybody will object to them, in fact—the cost of the whole proposition will be reduced from $144,000,000 to $80,000,000, including the pipe lines and all.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Why does the gentleman believe that cost is an element if this is a national defense measure?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Oh, every man to his own opinion. I have not said anything about national defense. I want to get oil and gasoline to the East.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I am trying to get information which will enable me to vote properly on this bill. In view of the fact that there is an intracoastal waterway along the Atlantic coast to the north, can the gentleman tell me why it is not possible right now to transfer some of this oil from the tankers which are being sunk farther north to small vessels and permit it to go through the intercoastal system of the Atlantic now?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The tankers cannot run at all.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. I mean from north Florida.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The purpose is to get it over there, so it can go up that way.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. What the gentleman is trying to find out is how it will prevent the sinking of these ships that have messed up that beach there even after you get this canal across Florida. That is what I think he is driving at. I will ask the gentleman a question. The distinguished gentleman from Texas mentioned that there is oil coming to the shore from sunken ships. The question is, How would those ships avoid being sunk merely by digging this canal across Florida?

Mr. MANSFIELD. By keeping them away from there, letting them take the inland channel.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is an important thing.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield? This barge line would be intracoastal.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Wait a minute. I have the floor. If you can get this canal across there, then the ships that will be carrying this oil will not have to go out to sea?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The oil will go up to Bordentown, N. J., then it will go by pipe line or by short rail haul across to New York Harbor. However, a great quantity of it will be used on the Delaware River.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is more industrial than New York.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Anyway, getting the canal across there keeps these ships that bear the oil from going out to sea, is that right?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is right, and they will be in protected water all the way along.

Mr. CLASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. As I understand it, you are trying to put this canal across for the purpose of relieving the oil situation of the East?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. CLASON. How far along the Gulf of Mexico do you have to carry this intracoastal waterway in order to reach the oil fields?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The intracoastal waterway is completed already from Carabelle, Fla., to Corpus Christi, Tex.

Mr. CLASON. The oil fields are where?

Mr. MANSFIELD. They are all along here, in Texas and Louisiana.

Mr. CLASON. Would it be necessary to extend this waterway beyond Corpus Christi, beyond the Texas border, in order to bring oil to the East?

Mr. MANSFIELD. One of the largest refineries we have is already down there.

Mr. CLASON. The purpose in bringing the intercoastal waterway to the Mexican border is in order to develop oil transportation, and not for any other purpose?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Also for the purpose of bringing ore up from Mexico. Our tin smelter, located at Texas City, has just commenced operations, or did in April. They were getting their ore from Java and from Bolivia in South America. Java is now in the hands of the Japanese. Ships cannot bring it in from Bolivia. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has financed that plant at great cost—I do not know how much, but several million dollars.

The only ore they can get is in Mexico, something like 400 miles down beyond this point. The ore and pig lead is stacked up there now at Brownsville in big lots with a high wire fence around it and with soldiers guarding it.

Mr. CLASON. Will the gentleman explain one more proposition. How would he answer the question which has been raised as to the possibility of securing the barges and tugs necessary to move the barges through the waterway?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We have enough steel barges now for gasoline.

Mr. CLASON. For how much gasoline? How much would they move?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It will move all the gasoline we need on the east coast, but for crude oil and for types of oil other than gasoline the wooden barges are just as suitable as the steel. You use the steel barges for the gasoline and the wood barges for the crude and fuel oils.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Is it not a fact that the mayor of the city of New York has promised 50 high-powered tugs to be used on that route?

Mr. MANSFIELD. He has offered 50 high-powered tugs. Furthermore, Captain Rude, of the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, says there are hundreds of little boats available under his observation, and he has used some of them himself in his operations—boats that can tow these barges up there by the hundreds. He says that if one little boat was not of sufficient strength to do it, he has hitched two of them onto a fleet of barges and pulled them up the waterway.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment, there is hereby authorized to be constructed under the direction of the

Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers a barge canal 12 feet deep and 125 feet wide from the existing channel of similar dimensions in the St. Johns River of Florida across Florida to the vicinity of the Gulf of Mexico, and from the western terminus of this canal across Florida, a canal of similar dimensions within the coast line of Florida to the present eastern terminus of the Intracoastal Waterway in the vicinity of Apalachee Bay; and that there is also authorized the enlargement of the present Intracoastal Waterway from the vicinity of Apalachee Bay to Corpus Christi, Tex., and its extension to the vicinity of the Mexican border so as to provide throughout the entire length of the canal a channel 12 feet deep and 125 feet wide: *Provided*, That the Chief of Engineers is authorized within reasonable limits to vary, in his discretion, the above-prescribed dimensions wherever advisable: *And provided further*, That pending the completion of the aforesaid navigable channels there is authorized to be constructed under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers a pipe line, together with all necessary terminal facilities, for the transportation of petroleum from the vicinity of Apalachicola Bay to the vicinity of Jacksonville, Fla. For the above purposes there is hereby authorized $144,000,000.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, in line 23, strike out "Apalachicola Bay" and insert "Port St. Joe."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer a committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD: On page 2, in line 15, after "*Provided*", insert "That between Mobile, Ala., and New Orleans, La., the project shall be modified in accordance with the recommendations of the Chief of Engineers in his report dated April 27, 1942: *Provided further*."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was agreed upon by the committee in response to the unanimous report of the Board and the Chief of Engineers made after this bill was originally reported. It includes the channel in the neighborhood of Lake Pontchartrain. It takes the channel out of Lake Pontchartrain, where it is a little hazardous in bad weather, and utilizes the 6- or 7-mile channel already dredged by the Maritime Commission, and continues that course until it reconnects with the old line east of Pontchartrain.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. The Committee on Rivers and Harbors went over this amendment, and I think we were in unanimous agreement on it, because it relines the intracoastal canal there at a certain point. As far as the members of the committee who were present are concerned, I believe that everyone present was in agreement on it, and I think there is no objection to the amendment.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes; it was unanimous with the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the commitee amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to adopt the lock canal across Florida in accordance with the letter you have seen here today from the Chief of Engineers.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD: On page 2, strike out lines 3 to 9, inclusive, and the word "Bay" in line 10, and insert "high-level lock barge canal from the St. Johns River across Florida to the Gulf of Mexico in accordance with the plans set forth in the letter of the Chief of Engineers dated June 15, 1942."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I presume you are all familiar with what that is. The bill as originally reported, while it did not specifically so state, was based on the engineers' estimates for a sea-level canal 12 feet deep. This would reduce it to a high-level lock canal with 5 locks upon it, 3 at one end and 2 at the other. The highest part would be 52 feet above sea level, with no salt water in it whatever, and with no possibility, as the Chief of Engineers tells us, of contaminating the ground waters of Florida, which so many people seem to fear from the old ship-canal proposal.

I may state for the benefit of all that the amendment I am offering here now in no sense of the word prejudices an amendment which will be offered directly to cut out the channel across Florida. I want to perfect the bill first and then let the other propositions come up later.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Does this proposed channel cost $44,000,000?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Is that the same channel that General Reybold told us this morning would still take 3 years to construct?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I understand he said 2½ to 3.

Mr. DONDERO. We will not quarrel about 6 months.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. The original program called for an expenditure of $197,921,000, according to the report on the rivers and harbors bill.

Mr. MANSFIELD. That thing has been dead 10 years.

Mr. CLASON. It is a report of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session.

Mr. MANSFIELD. We do not have that before us at all.

Mr. CLASON. Will this take the place of that?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No; it has not connection with it; none whatever.

Mr. DONDERO. If the gentleman will yield, may I ask this further question:

Do I correctly understand the gentleman to say that the adoption of this amendment will not prejudice the amendment I have on the desk to strike out the barge canal entirely and adopt the pipe line?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I am perfectly willing for it to be acted upon with the distinct understanding that I want to perfect the bill first so that if it should be adopted it will be ready, but it will in no sense of the word prejudice the gentleman's proposal to knock out the channel entirely.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I desire to inquire whether or not it would be proper at this time for me to offer my substitute for the committee amendment to the committee amendment now proposed.

The CHAIRMAN. It would not be necessary for the gentleman from Michigan to offer his amendment at this time as a substitute. The gentleman can offer it later as a separate amendment and he will not be prejudiced by any action on the amendment now being offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DONDERO. May I make the further inquiry whether or not it will be possible under the rules of the House to offer the amendment as a substitute after the amendment of the Chairman has been voted upon one way or the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is quite correct. It will be possible to offer his amendment later in view of the fact that the amendment that the gentleman proposes to offer strikes out language different from the language that the gentleman from Texas is amending.

Mr. DONDERO. If I may make a further inquiry, will it be proper to offer my substitute at this time?

The CHAIRMAN. It would not be proper at the present time because the language of the gentleman from Michigan refers to the regular language contained in the bill and is different from that offered by the gentleman from Texas.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, do I understand that the course of the lock canal is the same as shown on the map we have before us here?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Substantially.

Mrs. BOLTON. And that is the general course of the old ship canal?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mrs. BOLTON. Is it the same course?

Mr. MANSFIELD. It is the same course, but it cannot be converted into a ship canal because they would have to relocate it or else put this out of commission for 5 years while building a ship canal.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the matter just voted on eliminates that portion of the channel inland from the west end of the channel across Florida to the

east end of the existing Intracoastal Waterway near Carrabelle, a distance of about 120 miles, all of which would have to be through rock; and this eliminates $50,000,000 and cuts down the total cost; then by adopting a lock canal across Florida we make a further saving of $14,000,000, making the total savings $64,000,000.

Mr. Chairman, I now offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD: On page 2, line 21, after the word "Engineers", strike out "a pipe line" and insert "one or more pipe lines, as the President may deem to be necessary."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the original bill read "pipe line." Some construed that to mean more than one pipe laid in the same trench. In fact, we have one pipe line in Texas within my knowledge where we have several pipes in it for a certain distance, but they just call it a pipe line. To eliminate any misunderstanding as to whether or not it would prohibit more than one pipe, this amendment is offered. One pipe is of very little use within itself. The pipe line that was authorized this morning by Mr. Ickes is only an 8-inch pipe running along the line indicated here. We want, if possible, to get two or three 10-inch pipes to go with it. We have no positive assurance we can get them, but the chairman of the State Railway Commission of Texas tells me that he is satisfied in his own mind he can do it. He has jurisdiction over them and would have to enter an order for them to be vacated from their present location in Texas so they could be moved over here.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Would it not be wiser if you want to construct a line sufficient to take care of the business which I understand is necessary, instead of constructing three 8-inch lines to construct one 12-inch or 14-inch line, we will say, which would do a great deal more work than three of them?

Mr. MANSFIELD. You cannot get the pipe. We know they have 10-inch pipes which we think we can get. If we can get larger pipe we will be glad to use it, but I do not know of any pipe that large in the oil industry at present.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman said a moment ago he could not get the pipe. If that is so, where are you going to get the material to build the bridges and the steel necessary for the locks?

Mr. MANSFIELD. We will not have any steel locks.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. You will have to use steel to reinforce the concrete.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Not at all. We will have wood. I have seen wood locks all over the gentleman's State—before he was born.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman refers to the old Pennsylvania Canal, no longer in existence and which by all means would be obsolete alongside of the present-day canal built entirely with steel and concrete.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. And if this 8-inch pipe line can be authorized without the need of special legislation, what occasion is there for further legislation by the House now?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Because we need more of them. We should have two or three. If we can get two 10-inch pipe lines in addition to the 8-inch line, we can carry nearly 200,000 barrels of oil and gasoline a day to the East. One 8-inch pipe line will afford capacity for only about 30,000 barrels, and while 30,000 barrels will help a little, yet we need very much more than that.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And in that connection I should like to ask the gentleman what statement he cares to make in response to a suggestion that by increasing the barge-line service up the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers and by the installation of additional pipe lines between Pittsburgh and the East, that sufficient oil for the requirements of the Atlantic seaboard could be provided more quickly than by the construction of this canal.

Mr. MANSFIELD. In the first place, you cannot get the pipe. I tried for 6 months to bring about that service which the gentleman has suggested. They have now only two small pipe lines which were put there for the purpose of taking gasoline to the West. They can reverse the flow on those, but with that very proposal you will still be short approximately 400,000 barrels of oil a day to the East, unless you can get the tankers restored to the sea.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And even with the barge-line service up the Mississippi and up the Ohio, as I have suggested, with the increase in capacity there, still there would be need for this canal?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I do not feel that I got an answer from the distinguished chairman of the committee to the question that I asked a moment ago.

Mr. MANSFIELD. What is the gentleman's question?

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. My question was this: If the Office of Petroleum Coordinator can issue orders for the construction of an 8-inch pipe line without necessity for legislation by this House, what necessity is there for legislation for any pipe line? I grant that an 8-inch pipe line is inadequate, but why have additional legislation?

Mr. MANSFIELD. And I counter by asking the gentleman a question. Has he done it, or is he going to do it or is there any way to force him to do it without legislation?

Mr. CLASON. Under the gentleman's amendment as I understand it it would be for the President in his opinion, if he thought it advisable, but under the law which we passed last year the President can construct as many pipe lines as he wants to anywhere.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Every man to his own opinion. I am not trying to change any man's opinion.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD: Page 20, line 23, after the word "petroleum", insert "and its products."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the bill simply read "for the transportation of petroleum." This adds the words "and its products," which would include gasoline. I do not know whether that would be included under "petroleum" or not. Some contend that it will. Some might disagree, but this makes it absolutely definite.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, the bill would authorize $144,000,000 as originally reported. As we have amended it, it would require not to exceed $80,000,000. I offer an amendment to strike out "$144,000,000" and insert "$80,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MANSFIELD: On page 2, line 25, strike out "$144,000,000" and insert "$80,000,000."

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I want to most heartily endorse this amendment. Since this bill was before the House under suspension of the rules, we have saved the country $64,000,000, simply by putting it over this long. I want to congratulate the House on that saving.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. And I want to congratulate the gentleman from California for helping us to do it.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman. I am always glad to have a part in saving money.

My only regret with reference to this matter is that we have not waited a little longer, because if in that interval we could save $64,000,000, I think if we waited a little longer we might save the main portion of this $80,000,000 that is remaining. A motion will be made here for that very purpose this afternoon. As soon as the distinguished chairman has completed his amendments a motion will be renewed to strike out this Florida barge canal, and I hope that the action of the House this afternoon with reference to that will be the same as it was when the matter was considered before, and that I will in a short time be able to get up here and congratulate the membership of the House again upon saving some more money.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. If the policy of the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] is carried out it will be a repetition of that old policy of "too little and too late." If this House had passed the measure to construct this canal when it came here the first time, the Florida Canal could have been completed and these tankers that are now going down and losing the oil that is needed for national defense, and sending our sailors to death in flaming seas of oil, would probably not be sinking today.

I certainly hope that the Congress will not dilly-dally and delay any longer. This is nothing to me more than to any other patriotic American. It does not affect my territory any more than it affects that of the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] or the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. But I sincerely trust that we will not adopt the doctrine laid down by the gentleman from California of delaying while this destruction is going on. This canal is necessary if we are to get a sufficient amount of oil to the Atlantic seaboard.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I want to suggest that that issue is in no sense of the word involved in the amendment that is now offered.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. No! No! I am for the gentleman's amendment, but I was simply answering the argument of the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

I, too, want to congratulate the gentleman for cutting this bill down from $144,000,000 to $80,000,000. As the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] says, it may be dilly-dallying, but it is a good thing if we did.

Just let me report to the House the amount of appropriations from January 3 of this year. In the 22 bills which you have passed you have already appropriated the enormous sum of $93,340,710,280.02. That does not include all the bills because many of them are still in conference, and the amounts will be increased. It will probably take 7 or 8 years' revenue to equal the amount that has been appropriated. If you are going to win the war, there is one thing sure, and that is we should not spend one penny that is not essential or not necessary. If we just dilly-dally a little longer and cut this down from $144,000,000 to $80,000,000, and then cut out the $80,000,000, we will be doing a grand job this afternoon.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, I do not interpret the amendment we have just adopted as being any saving which would not have been had otherwise, for the Army engineers would not have spent a dollar more than was necessary, and they will not under this $80,000,000 to be left in the bill. So, after all, the money appropriated by this bill for this war emergency cannot be used for anything except this war project, and there will be a saving.

Mr. Chairman, I called Mr. Nelson, of the War Production Board, and I am authorized to say that the Chairman of the War Production Board strongly endorses and desires that this bill be passed. Do you want to go with him or not? Let me tell you something else.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. In just a moment. The gentleman did not yield to me, but I will yield to him if time permits.

Mr. Eastman, the Coordinator of Transportation of this country, has asked that this bill be passed. Do you want any further assurances? The Chief of the Corps of Army Engineers, General Reybold, has appeared before the committee both in person and by letter and asks that this bill be passed and this construction authorized immediately. He told me an hour ago that he could construct this canal in 2 years; I think it will be constructed in 1 year. A distance of 29 miles across Florida is all that remains to be constructed. Do you mean to say that with a war emergency facing us and all these requests facing us you will hold up the use of a canal 2,400 miles long—Intracoastal Waterway—by refusing to permit them to build this 29-mile link? It will be constructed, Mr. Chairman, in 12 months.

I shall vigorously oppose the amendment to be proposed by the minority party to knock the waterway portion of this bill. I ask my colleagues to support the committee and vote down this amendment when it is offered.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendments were withdrawn.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, can the gentleman from Texas tell us whether any of this $80,000,000 will be spent north of Jacksonville along the Atlantic coast?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I may state to the gentleman that there is nothing like that proposed in the bill.

Mr. CLASON. These boats, or barges, would proceed from Jacksonville northward how far?

Mr. MANSFIELD. To Trenton, N. J.

Mr. CLASON. What is the plan for distribution of the oil after it reaches Trenton?

Mr. MANSFIELD. There are some pipe lines there now.

Mr. CLASON. It will be distributed by pipe line or rail?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes. And there would be far less than a hundred-mile haul by rail.

Mr. CLASON. To what point?

Mr. MANSFIELD. To any point around the New York Harbor area.

Mr. CLASON. The gentleman means to the refineries in New Jersey and the vicinity?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. CLASON. Then is it a fact that no further construction is necessary along the Atlantic seaboard?

Mr. MANSFIELD. The channel is in good condition, all 12 feet deep and some of it 35 feet deep in the Delaware River and the Chesapeake Bay, for instance.

Mr. CLASON. I understood, though, from reading the hearings that there was some question about the width of the channel, that it was quite narrow in places; is that so?

Mr. MANSFIELD. That is not correct.

By unanimous consent, the pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact the other amendments have been adopted it now becomes necessary to amend the title and I wish to offer an amendment to accomplish that purpose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair advises the gentleman from Texas that an amendment to the title of the bill should be offered after the bill has been passed in the House.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DONDERO: On page 2, after the word "a" at the end of line 2, strike out lines 3 down to the words "pipe line" in line 21, inclusive, and in line 25, page 2, strike out the figures "$144,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof, "$10,000,000."

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, this is the amendment I mentioned when I had the floor earlier in the day.

The only question before the Committee this afternoon is to find a solution for a fuel or oil emergency. The barge canal does not solve this problem; if it did and came in here as an indispensable solution, I would vote for it, but it does not do that. Every word of testimony we had before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors indicated that it would take 3 years before the barge canal could be completed. People along the Atlantic seaboard and in New England would freeze to death long before any oil could pass through this proposed canal. It would therefore be far too late and too little if we depended upon building a barge canal across Florida to solve what is an immediate war problem. What will solve it? Those who came before our committee said that the pipe-line method was the only method and the only solution for it. I am going to quote what I consider to be the best statement made before the Rivers and Harbors Committee, a portion of the testimony of a representative of the Office of the Oil Coordinator, Major Parten. Major Parten testified that the solution rested in the pipe-line method.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. On page 233 of the hearings is the question and the answer:

Mr. DONDERO. I think if I understood your statement correctly, the substance of it is this, that in your opinion the quickest way to solve our problem is by the pipe-line method.

And Major Parten answered:

That is true, but if we had tankers it would be that much better. But without

tankers it is the pipe-line problem that is the major key. We must use all of the facilities we have, but we must have that pipe line to do the job. That is the opinion of all the authorities in the oil industry today.

So the whole matter centers around the question of whether or not you want to adopt the barge line as a war measure, then wait 3 years for a solution of your problem, or adopt this amendment, confine our effort to building pipe lines and getting oil across Florida to the Atlantic seaboard within 6 months, besides reducing the amount from $144,000,000 to $10,000,000. If it is necessary to have more money to build more than one 10-inch line I am willing that the amendment be amended to provide whatever is necessary to put in more than one 10-inch line. A 10-inch line will carry 60,000 barrels a day to the Atlantic seaboard. Two or three of those lines would raise it to nearly 200,000 barrels per day, which would go a long way toward the solution of our problem.

I hope the committee will adopt the amendment, not in the interest of economy alone, but in the interest of promoting our national defense, because we cannot wait 3 years and hope to solve the problem that is before us. I ask, therefore, that the amendment be adopted. As a matter of fact, I do not think it is necessary to have this legislation. We already have legislation on the books, and it has been there for nearly 11 months, authorizing the Chief Executive to proceed with the building of pipe lines anywhere in the United States if he finds that it is necessary in connection with our defense effort, but waiving that question and desiring that the House go on record affirmatively rather than negatively I am willing that we adopt that portion of the bill before us which provides for the building of these pipe lines in order to give the aid that is necessary along the Atlantic seaboard.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO] would win the war with a medicine dropper. Of all the proposals of which I ever heard of "too little and too late," his suggestion here is certainly the ne plus ultra. It was testified before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors time and time again that a 10-inch pipe line would only deliver 50,000 barrels of oil a day, whereas on the Atlantic seaboard we are now short 600,000 barrels a day. The place to get it is from the oil fields of Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Arkansas.

Mr. Chairman, I heard that witness testify before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, but he was advocating a pipe line 24 inches in diameter from the oil fields in northern Texas all the way to Philadelphia, Pa. There is not a 24-inch oil pipe line in America today, and that fact was called to his attention. It would take a year to build that line, and then it would only furnish 280,000 barrels a day, and probably less because of the cold weather when it had to go through the Allegheny Mountains.

If you are going to carry the amount of oil necessary in 10-inch pipes, even across the Florida peninsula, it will take at least 12 of them, and I doubt if you could get the material. They tell you this would take 2 years to construct, but I seriously doubt that.

In addition there are other essential materials that are absolutely essential to the war effort and of which there is a shortage all along the Atlantic seaboard. This canal is necessary in order to complete that barge line from the borders of Mexico around to the coast of New Jersey. When this line is finished it will take all the oil that the country will need. They say it will take years to complete it. The testimony showed that they could build that 12-foot barge line in 15 months. The distance it would have to be dug is rather short.

For one to stand here and say that although we are in a war that may last 10 years, and because the gentleman from Michigan cannot see this thing finished next week or next month and he is willing to knock it out and build a 10-inch pipe line, which is paramount to trying to win the war with a medicine dropper. And I am not so sure he would be for it if it could be finished in 30 days.

We are in an emergency. This oil cannot go around the Florida Peninsula. Those vessels are being sunk today by enemy submarines. The oil is filling the Atlantic seaboard. It might take 15 months, it could take 2 years, but having heard all the testimony before the committee, I think we will never be able to supply the amount of oil necessary to carry this war on the Atlantic Ocean and of supplying the oil needs of the Atlantic seaboard until this barge line across the Florida peninsula is completed.

I therefore trust that the gentleman's amendment will be voted down and that the bill as reported and amended by the committee will be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment, in my judgment, would very seriously cripple this bill. My reasons for stating that are first, the reason just given by the gentleman from Mississippi, namely, that by all the testimony given, the amount of oil that can be delivered by pipe line is only a very small fraction of the amount really needed to take care of the east coast problem. Furthermore, nothing but oil could be handled through the pipe line, and it therefore would be of no benefit with regard to certain other products which are also very important. Unless the barge canal is constructed the whole project is very seriously crippled, and, as some gentlemen stated this afternoon, although the intercoastal canals on both the Atlantic and Gulf coasts would be able to accommodate a very large volume of traffic after the improvements have been made it could not get across the State of Florida.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. The channel along the Gulf is now carrying all the freight it can possibly handle.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is the point I attempted to make, I may say to the gentleman.

Mr. MANSFIELD. If a pipe line across Florida amounts to anything in the conveyance of oil, it will be useless unless you can get the existing channel enlarged so that the traffic can get through.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Exactly. The next thing I want to say is the reason the Members should defeat this amendment and the reason they should vote for the bill is primarily this:

We have already seen as our country has gone through the period of this war we have been through that we needed a safe method of water-borne transportation, we needed as long an intercoastal waterway as we could possibly have, particularly one from the producing areas of the Gulf to the consuming areas of the Atlantic coast.

To me, it is not so much a question of getting gasoline for people to ride around in automobiles, it is a question of fuel oil, it is a question of sulfur, it is a question of many other products that have to be moved.

Gentlemen assert that it is going to take a long time to build the barge canal. It takes a long time to build some of our Navy but it is a lucky thing we started building naval vessels when we did, even though we were told the two-ocean Navy could not be completed until 1946. Anybody who has seen what has happened to the shipping of America in the last few months can understand how much better it would have been had we had the foresight to improve an intercoastal waterway years ago. This bill provides not only for this canal across Florida but for the improvement and enlargement of the Intracoastal Waterway along the Gulf Coast.

The Florida canal, in my judgment, is a kind of a bogey man that is raised up here. Certain gentlemen have made flamboyant speeches in the past against that project and they are unable to shake off their old thoughts in order to consider the question we have before us today upon its real merits, its real importance to the safety of America and the safe transportation and delivery of essential products.

One gentleman argued today that the only question here was the transportation of oil. I disagree with that. I think the problem of the congestion of rail transportation may be very serious before we get through with this war. Therefore, I believe the improvement of this whole intracoastal waterway system is a matter of tremendous national importance not only with regard to oil but with regard to our whole transportation problem.

I am further of the opinion, and I say this from considerable observation, that the Corps of Army Engineers is not only an extremely competent organization but

one which prides itself upon never exceeding its estimate of the time in which it can do something. In other words, you may depend upon it that if the Corps of Engineers tells the committee it can complete a job within a certain length of time, it will be completed at least within that length of time and in all probability very much sooner than that.

Unless I miss my guess, the time will come when this House will be asked to appropriate money for the purpose of paying bonuses to the oil companies, for the reason that at the same time there is a price ceiling on oil there is an increased cost of transportation, because less of the oil can be shipped by water. We will be told we must pay the oil companies a bonus in order to keep the price level where it is fixed and enable them to meet the increased transportation costs. Under these circumstances, if you can improve this intercoastal waterway you may avoid the expenditure of some money that way, and certainly it would be better to spend the money on a waterway that will be useful in the future rather than on bonuses from which we shall have nothing whatever to show for the expenditures.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 10 words.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few observations on this bill and on the pending amendment. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MANSFIELD] has offered amendments, which have been adopted, and which it seems to me have met many of the sound objections that have been advanced against the bill as originally reported out of the committee.

The other day, when the bill came up under suspension, many of the Members voted against the suspension of the rules upon the theory that the bill should come up under the rule which had been reported out. I think there was logic to that position. One could not honestly disagree with any Member who took that position.

That situation has changed. We are now considering this bill under a rule, and the bill is now subject to amendment.

One thing is certain, that if we had this barge canal now it would be of inestimable value to our country. The argument that it may take so long to build the barge canal seems to me to be illogical. The fact remains that we would be thankful now in the conduct of the war, in view of the many sinkings and the loss of American lives which have taken place, if we had this 12-foot barge canal at the present time. I think one has courage to predict that the war will be over within a year or a year and a half, much as we all hope and pray that it will.

This canal is important from the angle not only of wartime activity but peacetime activity. It is the building of one of the missing links of the intercoastal waterway from Texas to the Atlantic seaboard. There is one other missing link that sometime in the near future should also be constructed, and that is the building of a canal across New Jersey, completing the entire intercoastal waterway.

In connection with that, only a few minutes ago I received a telegram from Governor Edison, of New Jersey, in favor of the bill as reported out of the committee, and certainly as amended, and urging that the missing link of the canal across New Jersey be completed in the near future.

Such an intercoastal waterway would be of inestimable value to our country. Certainly if we had the barge canal now across Florida as well as the completed missing link across New Jersey it would be of great value to our country. This means a lot to the eastern seaboard. It means a lot to the future of New England and all the States along the eastern seaboard. It is a national problem.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Is it not true that this barge canal will be of great importance not only in time of war but in time of peace, in that this canal will complete a waterway that will go from Brownsville, Tex., clear to New England?

Mr. McCORMACK. There is absolutely no question about that.

I rest the case today mainly on the ground that those who oppose the construction of this barge canal on the ground that it would take an appreciable period of time to build it overlook the fact that the building of this canal and of the canal across New Jersey should some day be done for the best interests of our country, and that now is the time to do it. If we had this missing link across Florida today it would go a long way toward meeting the serious problem that confronts the eastern seaboard in these trying days.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment offered by my friend on the other side will be defeated and that the bill as amended will pass.

The telegram from Governor Edison, of New Jersey, is as follows:

WEST ORANGE, N. J.,
June 17, 1942.

Hon. JOHN W. McCORMACK,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building:

I understand Mansfield bill is likely to come up in the House today. Hope that you will do all you can to insure that the barge canal across Florida stays in the bill. I have long advocated a complete and adequate inland waterway along the Atlantic coast as a vital part of our system of national defense in war and economic developments in peace. I believe the completion of the missing link across Florida and a short stretch in New Jersey will vastly increase the usefulness of the entire system in the same way that important terminals vastly increase the usefulness of railroads. Small boats such as the Navy's PT types will play an increasing role in naval warfare. Rapid transfer of such craft in protected waters from the Gulf to the Atlantic and all along the seaboard is highly desirable. Movement of vital materials like oil and sugar can be accomplished in small barges without the risks of ocean travel, and the need to divert Navy equipment and personnel to protect it. There are many other advantages that will readily occur to you if a truly adequate inland waterway existed from the Gulf of Mexico to New York, New England, and the Great Lakes. The stretch across Florida and New Jersey remain the bottlenecks and I sincerely hope that Florida block can be eliminated within the next 15 months.

CHARLES EDISON,
Governor of New Jersey.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out a sufficient number of words to get the floor.

Mr. Chairman, it is regretted by me that this bill or this proposed legislation has taken such a turn. We have spent hours this afternoon to get the proponents of this legislation to show us the relationship between the barge canal and the pipe line. That showing has not been made.

I regret that the gentleman who preceded me saw fit to advise this House on two occasions where this amendment came from, which side it came from. I am here now occupying the same niche in this House, I hope, as the general membership of this House. I am interested in and have done just as much, I believe and hope, to foster the national defense of this country as most of the membership of this House. I, too, am interested in the stopping of bloodshed and the loss of tankers.

If, indeed, a canal is indispensable, I invite this Congress now to see to it that the canal already built is used. It needs deepening 2 feet. The Army engineers have provided for that. This canal is 90 miles long, yet the canal that certain people are trying to sell this Congress today is 192 miles long, across and up Florida and not across Florida.

Now, Mr. Chairman, this amendment just offered addresses itself to the divorcement, if you please, of the barge canal which has no relationship to the pipe line. Yet this bill seeks to link the two. I, too, am for the pipe line, and so are we all. This amendment, if it is passed, therefore, will give us a clear shot and a clear thought at this proposition. Never before has the proposed across-State canal of Florida had the blessing of a national defense pipe line, and it does not deserve it now.

Therefore, staking everything which I have, every record I have ever dreamed of making, I advise this House that this so-called barge canal has not made a proper showing in this House and the relationship of it to the pipe line has not been shown. I therefore insist, as a Member of this House, that this amendment is proper, and I urge your support of it at this time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last 15 words.

Mr. Chairman, about every argument has been made, but I feel it my duty to say a few words in opposition to this amendment. I want to say seriously, I am here and on the floor at the moment, in an effort to do my part as a legislator for a complete winning of the war. That may sound superfluous, but it bears notice that the proponents of this amendment, with rare exceptions, have voted against practically every measure brought into

this House for the Nation's adequate preparation and protection. Their records are quite black.

The objection to the barge canal comes from the same voices which objected to the many other war measures which fortunately were adopted in spite of them.

Recently I was in my home city. The Colt's Patent Fire Arms factory is located there. I believe it is the largest machine-gun factory in the world. One morning there came into my office a delegation of Colt's war workers to tell me that there was something wrong in the country, because they had been sent home because the raw materials they needed to work with in order to make the machine guns for the airplanes, for the tanks and for our ships and for our soldiers, were not at hand. And so they had to suspend work until the material arrived.

This barge canal is not only for oil and gasoline, we need it to carry the materials that the workers in my district and throughout the land must have to produce the armament with which to make that final effort, whenever it may come, which will mean victory. And those who stand in the way will have much to answer for, not only to their districts, but to the Nation and to the free peoples of the world. The people may forgive them for what they did in the past. I doubt they will overlook their standing in the way of measures which mean so much in these critical times. How paltry are the arguments that the barge canal should be turned down because of its cost. We cannot measure the winning of the war in dollars. Actually the opponents of this canal are the wasters, for they are willing to waste the important strategic materials in the Nation rather than approve new methods of transportation to bring them to the factories. There is not a department in Washington that is not striving to save every dollar it can under every war measure we adopt here. This is being done anyway, and when it comes to a question of paying for the needs of today or the needs of 2 years from now, no Member in this House can acclaim himself as being for the war effort or for the winning of the war and at the same time oppose a proposition as worthy as this is, not only for war purposes, but for normal peacetime purposes as well.

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment. I am not going to make any statement that you can find answered in the hearings or in the reports. I am going to indulge in a little horseback logic that I believe ought to get by. The gentleman from Michigan called attention to a lot of figures in reports. Those reports contained statements with reference to freight hauled on the Gulf Coast Intercoastal Canal, a little in excess of 29,500,000 tons in 1941. I submit this proposition to you: If this barge canal is cut across Florida in accordance with the bill as now perfected——

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for an interruption there?

Mr. KLEBERG. Yes.

Mr. MANSFIELD. To state to the gentleman that the tonnage handled there last year on a channel 9 feet deep and 100 feet wide has never been equaled in the history of the world in this country or any other country.

Mr. KLEBERG. I thank the gentleman for his contribution, and I submit this proposition: If there happens to be a gap cut there that we are talking about today, what is there to prevent the 29,500,000 tons of merchandise and more to reach the destination along the eastern Atlantic seaboard? I ask the question humbly. A statement was made here today that nothing has been said to connect the pipe line with the barge canal. My heavens, we want to start somewhere, sometime, even with an eye dropper, to get what we can across over there, where it can get some place.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEBERG. Yes.

Mr. WRIGHT. Of course, it is possible that this canal will not be finished in time to aid our war effort, but does the gentleman think that the war will not last that long? This canal might be the necessary link and might even mean the difference between victory and defeat.

Mr. KLEBERG. Of course, the gentleman is quite correct. All you have to do is to look back in history a way and remember the 40-year war to draw your sights on how long this war may last.

Never before in the history of warfare connected with mankind have forces equal to those alined against each other today been so engaged, and no man has a right to assume that this war will come to an end in 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 years. This war is going to end only when we reach Berlin, Tokyo, and whatever hide-out Mussolini tries to use at the end of that time. When that time comes, probably this war will come to an end.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEBERG. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. With the rubber situation being what it is today and the danger there is that we may have to take off the highways thousands and thousands of trucks, is it not doubly dangerous with this situation today, to deny ourselves this great system of intracoastal canals?

Mr. KLEBERG. I might accept the gentleman's statement except that I am for putting more trucks on the highways, and, I believe, if we have the rubber, that we can do it, and, I believe, that we will get the rubber.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KLEBERG. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. Merely to make this observation. If in another year we do not have this barge canal in operation, then we will have not only oil rationing, in the East, but rationing of food and other materials. The railroads were able to get only 350 locomotives for replacements although they asked for 725, and that is why Mr. Eastman, realizing the necessity for transportation, asks for the passage of this bill.

Mr. KLEBERG. The gentleman is correct. The point I make is this. We can move whatever we need to move along inland waterways from the producing areas in my State or in Oklahoma or in California, yes, in Michigan, in many instances, finished goods and chemicals, if we connect up these two great systems of waterways, and that today, I believe, is the answer to the situation which confronts the eastern seaboard.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I have been listening to this debate. I do not have the slightest interest that any patriotic citizen does not have. I do not believe I can be mistaken about this proposition. Eighty million dollars is involved in an attempt to cover in behind protection the coast-borne traffic of the United States and shorten the line of transportation, bring all of the commodities that come down the rivers and contact the intracoastal canal—make it possible for that traffic to move in full protection, and shorten the line for ordinary transportation. That is the proposition. There is no human being on the face of this earth who can see through this curtain of battle smoke that shrouds the world. Nobody can know but that 10 years from now we may be fighting for our lives with our backs to the wall. Nobody can know that thing. It is absolutely essential, if we are isolated, that we be as nearly self-sufficient as possible. We know the difficulty of transporting commodities from the East and North, and the interchange of commodities necessary to develop the highest maximum of strength required to fight alone if necessary. I do not see how we can afford not to do this. I am not willing to take a chance. Eighty million involved in the question of putting behind walls transportation within the United States. I am just not willing to take that chance.

I have no interest in this legislation other than the interest that everybody has. I can appreciate how gentlemen might vote on this if we were certain how long this war would be fighting. But when we have got the proposition that for $80,000,000 we can put behind protection from the submarine much of the necessary interchange of commodities between the North and the South, the East and the West, I do not see how we can afford to take the chance. Eighty million dollars, when you are fighting a war for existence, is nothing. However, this canal is necessary to shorten the line and complete the unfinished link in the Intercoastal Canal.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. GREEN. In the very near future we will be called upon to appropriate thirty or more billion dollars for airplanes. How can they operate those airplanes without gasoline?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not yield on that at all. I am presenting in

this 5 minutes the one proposition which I have mentioned and which to me seems determinative.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANNON] spoke a while ago of a canal across Florida away down on the peninsula. It was testified before the committee by Army engineers that that was a shallow canal, only about 6 feet, and that to get to it it would be impossible for these barges to navigate the Gulf of Mexico. So this is the only chance of getting a barge canal through there.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Well, the only point I want to make—and it addresses itself to my common sense—is that here with $80,000,000 we can put behind the protection of shallow water the commodities that move from the North and East and South and West. It will shorten the line and would be equally useful in peacetime. I do not think we can afford not to spend the money. This is true: However long it may take, we know that the quicker we begin the shorter time it will take to finish it.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield.

Mr. JONKMAN. If this is a war measure, why does not the War Production Board, the Army, and the Navy recommend it? Is it because of the general policy adopted a few months ago of discontinuing long-time construction?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do not know what their policy is, but I know what the policy of common sense is in this situation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DONDERO) there were ayes 113 and noes 125.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. DONDERO and Mr. GREEN to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were—ayes 124, noes 142.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RIVERS: Page 2, line 24, after the word "Florida", insert the following: *"Provided*, That in addition to the sum herein authorized, there is hereby authorized the sum not to exceed $13,000,000 for the purpose of constructing a crude oil pipe line from either Charleston, S. C., or Savannah, Ga., whichever of the said cities, or both, on the inland waterway meets with the approval of the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of War, to the Tinsley oil field located in the vicinity of Yazoo, Miss. The construction of the said line to be under the supervision of the Army engineers."

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, this is not an amendment gotten up without consideration, for even before last November I appeared before committees studying the question of the construction of crude-oil pipe lines to the east coast. A refined pipe line is of no assistance in this emergency; you have got to get the crude oil to the East and get the petroleum products from the crude oil. Last February I appeared before the Committee on Interstate Commerce in favor of a pipe line to relieve the shortage back to the coast. Everybody knows that those in charge of gasoline rationing and the pipe-line priorities are making one devil of a mess of the defense of this country; they are destroying the faith of the American people in Congress, these bureaucrats down here; they are doing nothing to relieve—and I say this advisedly—they are doing nothing to relieve the shortage on the east coast. We hear rumors, but we do not see any results. It was testified before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors on this bill that this pipe line would take in the neighborhood of 49,000 tons of steel and it has been testified that it could be built in 3 months' time. It has been testified that it is about 500 miles from an oil-producing area to Savannah, Ga., or Charleston, wherever the Army and the Navy decide the terminus would be better placed on the inland waterway, and I think it is germane to this bill. It is an aid to the inland waterway program.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. This is an additional pipe line to that provided in the bill.

Mr. RIVERS. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. And what size will it be?

Mr. RIVERS. Twelve and three-quarter inches.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. And it is to cost how much?

Mr. RIVERS. It will cost in the neighborhood of $13,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. As I understand it this line will not have to cross any mountains. Is that correct?

Mr. RIVERS. It crosses no mountains. I appreciate the gentleman's calling this to my attention. It will be constructed in an area of this country where there is not one mountain to cross. The pipe line that goes from Long View, Tex., up to Salem, Ill., would take about three times as much steel and cost a great deal more to build because it crosses mountains. This goes from the oil-producing areas to the seaboard without a single mountain to be crossed. It hooks up with the inland waterway and it can serve the navy yards at Boston, Philadelphia, Portland, and Norfolk, and at Charleston. In my opinion this additional pipe line is necessary. It can be built in 3 months and completed before cold weather grips New England and the North. I believe that if the committee today will approve this amendment we shall have gone a long way toward serving the east coast. Seventy thousand barrels of crude oil a day is a great deal, if you please.

Mr. MICHENER. Has the gentleman any assurance from the War Production Board that they will release the necessary steel?

Mr. RIVERS. No; I do not have any assurance on anything from the War Production Board. The only thing I am sure of the War Production Board is that it is delaying the war effort, and unless the Congress of this country tells them to do a thing they will not do it. The Cole bill authorized the construction of a pipe line, gave them authority to do it, yet nothing has been done on it yet. They will do nothing unless Congress asserts its own authority. We are being consumed by the bureaucrats.

I hope the committee will accept this amendment.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RIVERS. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has made reference to the bureaucrats. Does the gentleman believe it is the duty of Congress to take over the conduct of the war as distinguished from the so-called bureaucrats whose job it is to carry on and prosecute the war?

Mr. RIVERS. I feel that the Congress has given a lot of its powers to people who are not entitled to them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws his point of order.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CARTER. I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane to the bill. While it is true that the bill does refer to one pipe line, the gentleman's amendment refers to an altogether different pipe line in a different place, to be constructed for a different sum of money. While it is true they refer to similar subjects, I contend that the gentleman's proposal is not germane to this particular paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from South Carolina desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Chairman, the same question was brought up in the committee and it was agreed that insofar as it was of assistance to the inland waterways it would be germane. I think it is as germane to this proposition as any pipe line would be.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COSTELLO). The Chair is ready to rule.

The gentleman from South Carolina has offered an amendment which would provide for the building of an additional pipe line, either in South Carolina or Georgia. The bill originally provided for the building of a pipe line and has been amended now to provide for the building of one or more pipe lines which should be built in the interest of national defense to provide for the transportation of materials and supplies for that purpose. The amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina applies likewise to the transportation of crude oil and such

supplies for the carrying out of national defense.

It has been previously held in the House in connection with a bill providing for an interoceanic route that an amendment providing for another route was proper and germane.

It appears to the Chair that the amendment which the gentleman from South Carolina offers, since it provides for additional pipe lines, is germane to the bill, and the Chair overrules the point of order made by the gentleman from California.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. Chairman, I hope no effort will be made to kill the bill indirectly, because any proposition of this kind to load it up would have the effect of killing it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does not the gentleman think it is highly important from a national defense standpoint and from a Navy standpoint to have as many pipe lines as feasible to bring either crude petroleum or gasoline to the Atlantic seaboard so that the ships can be served? That is all the gentleman's amendment proposes to do. It proposes to build a pipe line from St. Jo over to Brunswick, Savannah, Charleston, or any other place on the Atlantic seaboard in the interest of national defense so that Navy ships may be taken care of.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Has the gentleman any assurance where he can get the pipe for the pipe line?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Probably the same assurance that Secretary Ickes gave when he ordered a pipe line built from St. Jo to Jacksonville. Of course, if you cannot get the pipe, and if priorities are not granted, it cannot be built. There will be no harm in Congress saying that this pipe line should be constructed, if it is feasible to get the pipe. May I say to the gentleman from Texas and to the House that this identical question has been taken up with Secretary Ickes and with Secretary Knox, and I can assure the House that the Navy Department is vitally interested in seeing all possible methods established to get petroleum, either raw petroleum or the finished product, to the eastern seaboard. Of course, the priority committee may say, "We cannot grant a priority for it," and it could not be built; but there is no harm in the Congress saying that it should be done if it is possible to do so.

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yielded to the gentleman for a question. Is he through?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; I am through.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Of course, here you are called upon to adopt a proposal to build a pipe line across the country costing many millions of dollars. You know absolutely nothing about it. You are simply loading it on to another bill where it should not be. I hope that the amendment will be voted down by the Committee.

Mr. RIVERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANSFIELD. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. RIVERS. I have been working on this thing myself for 7 months.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Yes.

Mr. BOGGS. Have you had any committee hearings?

Mr. RIVERS. No; but I have been before the bureaucrats down here in Washington on it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an effort on the part of the gentleman from South Carolina or myself to load down this bill with unnecessary amendments. I am for the bill, since the committee has gone on record with reference to keeping the barge line in the measure.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Has not the gentleman voted against this bill all along the line and at every opportunity?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I have voted against the construction of a barge line because, in my judgment, there is no military value at this time in the construction of a barge line, but I am for a pipe line, and for months I have been working with the gentleman from South Carolina in trying to get a pipe line constructed to bring petroleum, both crude and finished, to the eastern seaboard for the purpose of aiding the Navy and thereby keeping the Navy from being subjected to the hazards of the submarine menace in the Gulf of Mexico and the Atlantic Ocean.

No effort is being made by this amendment to load the bill down. If the House wants pipe lines, now is the opportunity for the Members to so indicate. If they want a barge line, then vote this amendment down and we will then see that the main objective of the bill is not the construction of a pipe line but the construction of a barge canal.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. If it is essential to the war effort to get oil from one section of the country to the East, why is it not just as essential to have this pipe line?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Why, of course it is. An effort is being made to bring petroleum over to the eastern seaboard. There is Charleston, there is Norfolk, and there are other places. The line that Mr. Ickes approved today will only provide 35,000 barrels. Now, what is 35,000 barrels to accommodate the Navy and to accommodate the eastern seaboard?

I hope the amendment will be agreed to because it will be indicated then that the committee is interested in pipe lines and not interested altogether in a barge line that has no naval or military value.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARTER. Can the gentleman give any assurance to the House that there may be some hope of cutting this barge line out on a motion to recommit?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Not at all. I want to be fair and candid with the gentleman. I am not going to vote to recommit this bill. I am going to vote for this bill since the pipe lines are in the bill. I think it ought to be just a pipe-line proposition, but since the House has put the barge canal in it, I am going to take the bill as the committee wrote it. But I do think that no monopoly should be given to one concern. Anybody should have the right to build pipe lines.

Mr. CARTER. The gentleman is familiar with naval construction. What does he think about the possibility of getting steel for this line?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The only trouble that has confronted Mr. Ickes up to date in building his big line out in the Chicago area has been steel. It has been hoped that they could bring the petroleum in in a smaller pipe. The proposal of the Department originally was a 24-inch pipe. This proposal will probably permit a 12-inch pipe. We have evidence that that will not be in conflict with the use of steel for other things at this time. Therefore, I earnestly urge this House, in the interest of national defense and in the interest of getting petroleum on the eastern seaboard, to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, as a member of the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors, I feel that the record should be kept straight regarding this amendment which has been proposed by the gentleman from South Carolina. The statement has been made here that there was nothing before the committee, that there has been no consideration of this proposed pipe line. As a matter of fact, however, this matter was brought before the House Committee on Rivers and Harbors and it was discussed at length. It was shown there without contradiction that the shortest possible distance from the Atlantic seaboard to the oil fields of this country was a pipe line running from Savannah, Ga., to the oil fields of Mississippi. So if we are really honestly concerned about getting the petroleum products from the oil fields to the Atlantic seaboard, the quickest, the most direct, and the most economical way of doing it is by starting at a point on the Atlantic seaboard nearest the oil fields and going west until you tap the first oil fields. By doing that you will initiate this project which runs from Savannah west to the Mississippi fields. Then if you want more oil, you can extend the pipe line on across the Mississippi River into Louisiana and Texas and the western oil fields.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. JENNINGS. What is the output in the oil fields in Mississippi that this pipe line will tap?

Mr. PETERSON of Georgia. One hundred thousand barrels a day. Not only that, but this pipe line can be extended only a few miles farther west and have an unlimited supply of oil.

This proposal does not in any way contradict the proposed Florida barge canal or the Florida pipe line, or the pipe line that has already been authorized which is several hundred miles longer an will cost millions and millions of dollars more, and will take months and months longer to construct. You already have a barge line, the inland waterway, 12 feet deep from Savannah, Ga., all the way up to the New England coast. You already have the oil fields of Mississippi. You have no mountains, you have no great barriers to cross. You have those who are ready and stand willing and anxious to build this pipe line. You have every needed facility offered. If you are really honestly concerned, as a war measure, in getting petroleum products to the Atlantic seaboard, you should by all means adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina, which would authorize a pipe line from the oil fields to the closest point on the Atlantic seaboard.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, no man on this floor is more interested than I in seeing that the eastern seaboard and the northeastern part of this country receive gas and oil in quantity sufficient to carry on our national commerce. They are not receiving it today. Apparently, from the legislation being considered by the Congress and the reports we get from the various governmental departments, this winter there will be an acute shortage of oil not only for the homes but for motor transport and every other activity in which oil is used.

In my district in Mississippi the Tinsley field is today producing under proration about 100,000 barrels of oil a day. As the gentleman from Georgia stated a moment ago, the nearest oil field to the eastern seaboard is the Tinsley field, and the shortest distance from this field to the Atlantic seaboard would be a direct line from Tinsley field to Savannah or some other point in Georgia. A pipe line can be constructed there for about $12,000,000 or $13,000,000, a nominal sum to carry on properly our commercial and defense activities in our country's hour of stress.

Even if we construct the barge line and the pipe line through Florida we would not have over 30 to 35 percent of the fuel necessary to carry on properly, flowing to the eastern coastline.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McGEHEE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. This proposed pipe line should be constructed. It would not interfere in the least with this program, because if we construct this pipe line and also the pipe line mentioned in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO], both of them together would not carry 100,000 barrels of oil a day and therefore would not interfere with the barge line at all. Besides, this is the most feasible line that has been proposed. It follows the shortest course from any oil field to the Atlantic seaboard, crosses no mountains, and would not be hampered by extreme cold. Besides, it would not have to cross the Mississippi River.

Mr. McGEHEE. The construction of both of them would not furnish over 60,000 or 70,000 barrels of oil a day and other avenues must be found by which this Congress can see to it that a sufficient amount of oil is sent to the Atlantic coast line.

There is enough second-hand pipe in Texas that could be utilized to construct this line. I was in conference on this proposition with some of the officials of the War Department a few days ago and they have already found several hundred miles of second-hand pipe that could be used now, and they discussed with me the feasibility of establishing a pipe line from the Tinsley field in my district to certain northern points. I think the most advantageous point is the one suggested in the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS], with whom I have been working with this in view, and to help alleviate the oil shortage conditions in the eastern part of the country. I think this is absolutely necessary under present conditions and it is not going to affect this bill in any way whatever. This will simply mean taking advantage of an opportunity to secure the facilities we must have in order to carry on the commerce of this country. I do hope the committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I repeat the Florida ship canal dressed up as a "barge line" is nonessential to the war effort. The barge line could not be constructed in less than two and a half or three years, while this pipe line could be constructed within a very short space of time, and therefore I am supporting the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS]. At the same time let me point out, as I did earlier in the day, that no more legislation is required to construct pipe lines. The President was granted this authority 10 months ago.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal of merit in this pipe line as proposed in the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina. We must adopt every method within our power to get petroleum products to the eastern seaboard. We need them for the war effort; we need them for heating purposes; we need them for purposes of locomotion.

I represent a district in Illinois in the center of oil production known as the Great Illinois Basin, in which is located Salem, and where it is intended that the pipe line from Texas shall terminate. If it were germane, it would be my purpose to introduce an amendment to this bill which would provide for the lifting of Regulation M–68, issued by the Oil Petroleum Coordinator, which has stifled and stopped the development of oil in Illinois. When that order was issued on December 23, 1941, Illinois was producing 397,000 barrels of oil a day. Under that restriction the production of oil has dropped 113,000 barrels a day, or almost one-third of its production. We have at least 200 oil-drilling rigs stacked in southern Illinois, not operating. The crews have disintegrated, and we are dropping off in our production of petroleum daily. The plan I would offer, were it germane, would permit development to increase production of oil 200,000 barrels a day in the southern Illinois fields—oil that can be transported overnight to the eastern seaboard. This will be done gladly by independent and major oil companies with pipe they have on hand and without the cost of one penny to the Government. Why, in the month of April, at Effingham, Ill., where the Illinois Central has a junction with the Pennsylvania Railroad, 11,000 loaded oil cars were transferred from the Illinois Central to the Pennsylvania coming from the South and from Texas for transshipment east. This was in addition to the oil that came from the West to Effingham via the Pennsylvania. You will be surprised to know that 60 percent of the freight business of the Pennsylvania Railroad through that junction point is oil. We can originate that oil in Illinois and get it to the East two and a half times as fast as it can come from the West and Southwest, and I maintain that in order to avoid an oil famine this fall, before these pipe lines and barge lines can be put into operation, M–68, restricting the drilling for oil in Illinois, must be lifted by the Office of Petroleum Coordinator. This should be done, and an amendment will be offered in the Senate to require that it be done.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I am going to vote for this amendment. I have been opposed to the barge-canal features of this bill, but I am decidedly in favor of the pipe-line feature. I do not see why we should provide for one section in that vicinity of the country and not provide for the other. I hope that a motion to recommit this bill when we get into the House to strike out the barge canal will prevail. I have always been in favor of the extension of the intracoastal canal system, and I might say that in the development of waterways, as a member of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, I have always voted for the improvement of our intracoastal seaway.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. I think it was shown before our committee that this proposed pipe line is the shortest line from the oil fields of this country to the Atlantic seaboard, and that it would cost less

than any other way of getting oil that is so vitally needed in our defense effort. I hope the amendment will be approved.

Mr. CARTER. That is my recollection of the testimony before the committee. As I say, I hope in the House that we will be able to divest the bill of the feature of the barge canal, and if that is stricken out I feel that this bill will be passed almost unanimously for these two pipe lines and for the improvement of the other waterway provided for in the bill.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. BRADLEY of Michigan. I am in favor of the amendment, because it will lessen the shortage in the haulage equipment necessary to get the petroleum products through the shorter distance from Savannah up through the present Intracoastal Waterway and make much easier the necessary turn-around of tugs and barges.

Mr. CARTER. I thank the gentleman, and I reiterate that I would like to see this amendment placed in the bill.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

When we began the consideration of this bill earlier in the day, it was upon the theory that there was a great shortage of gasoline on the eastern coast and that that shortage was interfering materially with our defense program, including domestic activities, such shortage being due to loss and lack of transportation facilities. It was suggested that in order to meet the defense demands, we should devise ways and means by which we could obtain oil in the territory so badly needed. It was suggested further that we construct a pipe line through the Gulf of Mexico from Texas across Florida and up the Atlantic coast. It is agreed by all that if it is necessary this should be done, but it occurs to me now, as it occurred to me 10 days ago when we rejected this bill under the motion to suspend the rules, that we should obtain the oil where it is and bring it to the place where it is needed by the cheapest and the shortest route. That appeals to me as the common-sense way to approach the problem. It appears now from the evidence that we cannot only obtain the oil east of the Mississippi River, but we can get it to where it is needed more cheaply by providing a pipe line from the oil fields of Mississippi or Louisiana directly across the country, and avoid the danger that may follow if we carry it along the coast of the Gulf and then along the Atlantic coast of Florida and Georgia up to the inland waterway route at Charleston, S. C., or Savannah, Ga., and then use the inland waterway for carrying it farther north.

I am not a navigator nor an oil refiner, but it occurs to me that if I were an oil refiner in Texas, Louisiana, or Mississippi, and should be called upon to transport 300,000 barrels of oil per day to the Atlantic seaboard for defense industries and be certain to get it there, I would want to go through a territory where I was sure I would not be attacked or molested by the enemy, and where the hazard would be much less than by the water route. I can easily visualize how a torpedo boat or a submarine might get into this inland water route and there attack ships and barges as well as in the ocean, but if you have a pipe line running from the oil fields of Mississippi, Louisiana, or Texas to the seaboard where oil is so badly needed in the defense program, there would be no danger from the enemy, and to my way of thinking it is a consideration that we should take into account in an effort to solve this problem. I am sure everyone here is interested in trying to solve it as efficiently and as cheaply as possible. It is true we will use the inland waterway to some extent but we can eliminate several hundred miles of it by the adoption of this amendment.

This proposal of my colleague will in no way interfere with the pipe line included in the bill; it will not only supplement it but it will guarantee an increased supply of oil to the Atlantic seaboard in case the enemy should disrupt or destroy the line across Florida. The outstanding virtue, however, is that it will meet the emergency now because it has been stated that this pipe line can be constructed within 3 months and time is of the essence if the emergency is as great as has been represented here today. Like the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], I am opposed to the barge-line proposal as a defense measure, because it will take too long to construct it. If the defense industries in the East and Northeast are in need of gasoline, we cannot afford to wait 3 years to get it. I think the barge would assist in coastwise shipping in peacetime, but not now. But if the suggestion of the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] to recommit the bill by striking out the item providing for a barge line in case this amendment prevails may mean the committee will not bring the bill back to the House and our defense program will then suffer for lack of materials and in order to meet the demands for industry the people in turn in their normal and necessary business activities will be subjected to increased suffering and losses in their business operations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I just want to announce that I have no objection to the amendment that has been offered. In order to close debate on it, I suggest that the amendment be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PETERSON of Florida: At the end of the bill add the following:

"There is also hereby authorized to be constructed, under the direction of the Secretary of War and the supervision of the Chief of Engineers, the waterway from the Anclote River to the Caloosahatchee River, in accordance with House Document No. 371, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session; and from Punta Rasa to the Intracoastal Waterway near Stuart, in accordance with House Document No. 696, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session; and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such sum of money as may be necessary for such construction."

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi reserves a point of order, and the gentleman from Florida is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, this is to place in the bill the improvements which have already been recognized and recommended by the Chief of Engineers and the Secretary of War to the Rivers and Harbors Committee, after orderly and normal procedure, approved by the district engineer, the division engineer, and the Board of Engineers.

It is the improvement to which I have referred today. It gives a sheltered inland waterway from where the proposed cross-State canal would go down to the Okeechobee-Caloosahatchee Canal, and the deepening of that canal. Most of the work has been done. There are some places here and there where they would have to do dredging.

The reports are public documents. Those improvements are in the regular river and harbor bill. This has always been referred to as a connecting link. This will serve south Florida. It will serve the two largest cities on the west coast. It connects with the east coast Intercoastal Waterway into Jacksonville and clear on up to Boston. It is part of the link and has always been recognized as such. The report shows it is being used today, but deepened by 2 feet the waterway from Fort Myers to Stuart will greatly increase the tonnage that can be moved across there and will carry oil across to Stuart, and then you will have it on the east coast and can serve the Naval Establishment at Key West.

As stated in my previous statement today, the Navy also specifically refers to it and says that the Navy Department considers the project is of considerable importance to national defense.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. I did not hear the amendment read. Is this for the improvement of the Okeechobee Canal?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes; from Caloosahatchee to the Okeechobee. They are the two that have been approved and are already in the pending river and harbor bill.

Mr. CARTER. It is the improvement of the intercoastal canal leading down to the Okeechobee Canal?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Yes, sir.

Mr. CARTER. And then for the improvement of the Okeechobee Canal across Florida?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. That is right.

Mr. CARTER. I will say to the gentleman that during the course of my remarks this afternoon I committed myself to a policy of that kind rather than the building of this other canal.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I think it is a very wise policy. I hope you will vote for this amendment.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. What is the estimated cost of this?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Two hundred and eight thousand dollars. The other is $3,200,000.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And the total cost is?

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. A little less than three and a half million dollars. It will serve that vast area—another connecting link, and will serve the Navy and other Establishments at Key West and Jacksonville.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the amendment is not germane and therefore it is not in order.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. I wish to support the point of order that has been made by the gentleman from Mississippi. I do it for the purpose of calling attention to the fact that there is only one waterway that is already in the bill, or at least one waterway system. The point of order was overruled as to the pipe line because they would have brought in additional pipe lines. I understood that the bill could not be opened for other waterways. Now, if there is a system in there and it should be held that the point of order is not good because it is a part of that system that is mentioned in the bill, I desire still to press the point of order at this time, because if other waterways than the system are permitted, we are likely to have the St. Lawrence waterway and every other waterway in that bill.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, the observations with reference to the point of order by the gentleman from Virginia would be correct if it were not that this is a part of the Intracoastal Waterway from Corpus Christi, Tex., to Boston, Mass., and has been so recognized by the Rivers and Harbors Committee and the Army engineers themselves in the report which placed it in the other bill which refers specifically to this and contains the following language:

> As shown in the foregoing paragraph, the proposed waterway between the Caloosahatchie and the Anclote Rivers, which serve as a link in the Intracoastal Waterway extending from Boston to Corpus Christi will connect three harbors for ocean-going vessels, Tampa, St. Petersburg, and South Boca Grande——

In other words, it is part of the intracoastal waterway from Corpus Christi to Boston, Mass., of which we have authorized today the part from Texas on and connects those three. It is recognized by the Congress as such.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be heard on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman briefly.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Chairman, in overruling the point of order I made to the rivers amendment, the Chair cited a precedent to the effect that an amendment authorizing the construction of a second canal was held to be germane to a bill authorizing the construction of a canal. I respectfully refer the Chairman to the same precedent that the Chair used against me a few minutes ago.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COSTELLO). The Chair is ready to rule.

Replying to the statement of the gentleman from California regarding the Rivers amendment and the precedent there cited, the Chair wishes to point out that the citation the Chair referred to provided for locating a canal in an area different from the one proposed in the bill. In the present instance the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida provides for the location of an additional canal.

Mr. CARTER. If the Chair will permit, these canals are not in the same place.

The CHAIRMAN. They are not in exactly the same area. The citation the Chair referred to was the case of an amendment that changed the location provided in the bill. In this instance the amendment provides an additional location for an additional canal. It is, however, part of the same waterway, as the gentleman from Florida has so well pointed out, part of the Intracoastal Waterway. The amendment simply provides for a second connecting link in the waterways. The Chair is therefore constrained, particularly in view of its previous ruling, to overrule the point of order.

The point of order is overruled and the amendment is held to be germane.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the pending amendment be limited to 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to be heard on the amendment?

Mr. MANSFIELD. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. PETERSON of Florida) there were—ayes 92, noes 121.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. COSTELLO, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 6999) to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipe line and a navigable barge channel across Florida, the construction of an inland route from the western terminus of this channel to the present eastern terminus of the Intracoastal Waterway, and by deepening and enlarging the Intracoastal Waterway from its present eastern terminus to the vicinity of the Mexican border, pursuant to House Joint Resolution 490 he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment?

If not, the Chair will put them en gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CANNON of Florida. I am.

The SPEAKER. Does any member of the committee on either side desire to offer a motion to recommit? [After a pause.] The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Florida.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Mr. CANNON of Florida moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors with the following amendment:
>
> On page 2, line 2, after the word "engineers", strike out the following: "a high level lock barge canal from the St. Johns River across Florida to the Gulf of Mexico, in accordance with plans set forth in letter of the Chief of Engineers dated June 15, 1942, and that there is also authorized."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, on the motion to recommit I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit the bill offered by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 134, nays 205, not voting 93, as follows:

[Roll No. 78]

YEAS—134

Allen, Ill.	Dirksen	Hill, Colo.
Arends	Ditter	Hinshaw
Bates, Ky.	Dondero	Hoffman
Beiter	Drewry	Holbrock
Bender	Dworshak	Hope
Bennett	Eaton	Howell
Bishop	Edmiston	Hull
Boehne	Elston	Imhoff
Bolton	Engel	Jacobsen
Boren	Faddis	Jenkins, Ohio
Bradley, Mich.	Fenton	Jennings
Brown, Ohio	Gale	Jensen
Butler	Gearhart	Johnson, Calif.
Cannon, Fla.	Gillette	Johnson, Ill.
Carlson	Gillie	Jones
Carter	Graham	Jonkman
Chapman	Granger	Keefe
Chenoweth	Gregory	Kinzer
Chiperfield	Guyer	Knutson
Claypool	Gwynne	Landis
Clevenger	Hall, Edwin Arthur	LeCompte
Cole, N. Y.	Hall, Leonard W.	Ludlow
Creal	Hancock	McGregor
Crowther	Harter	McIntyre
Cunningham	Heidinger	McLean
Curtis	Hess	Martin, Iowa
Davis, Ohio		Mason
Day		May

Michener	Robinson, Utah	Sweeney
Miller	Rockefeller	Taber
Moser	Rockwell	Talle
Mundt	Rodgers, Pa.	Thill
Murray	Rogers, Okla.	Thom
Nelson	Rolph	Thomas, N. J.
O'Brien, N. Y.	Sauthoff	Tibbott
O'Hara	Scott	Van Zandt
O'Neal	Secrest	Vincent, Ky.
Peterson, Fla.	Short	Vorys, Ohio
Ploeser	Simpson	Wheat
Rankin, Mont.	Smith, Ohio	Williams
Reece, Tenn.	Smith, Va.	Winter
Reed, Ill.	Smith, Wis.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Reed, N. Y.	Spence	Wolverton, N. J.
Rees, Kans.	Springer	Woodruff, Mich.
Rich	Stefan	
Robertson, Va.	Sumner, Ill.	

NAYS—205

Allen, La.	Gossett	O'Toole
Anderson, Calif.	Grant, Ala.	Pace
Anderson, N. Mex.	Green	Patman
Andrews	Haines	Patrick
Angell	Hare	Patton
Arnold	Harris, Ark.	Pearson
Barnes	Harris, Va.	Peterson, Ga.
Barry	Hart	Pheiffer, William T.
Bates, Mass.	Hartley	Pierce
Beam	Healey	Pittenger
Beckworth	Hébert	Poage
Bell	Heffernan	Powers
Bland	Hendricks	Priest
Bloom	Hill, Wash.	Rabaut
Boggs	Holland	Ramsay
Bonner	Hook	Randolph
Bradley, Pa.	Houston	Rankin, Miss.
Brooks	Hunter	Richards
Brown, Ga.	Jackson	Rivers
Bryson	Jarman	Rizley
Buckley, N. Y.	Jenks, N. H.	Rogers, Mass.
Bulwinkle	Johnson, Luther A.	Russell
Burgin	Johnson, Okla.	Sabath
Byrne	Johnson, W. Va.	Sacks
Byron	Kean	Sanders
Camp	Kefauver	Sasscer
Canfield	Kelley, Pa.	Scanlon
Cannon, Mo.	Kelly, Ill.	Scrugham
Capozzoli	Kennedy, Martin J.	Shanley
Cartwright	Keogh	Sheridan
Case, S. Dak.	Kerr	Sikes
Celler	Kilday	Smith, Maine
Clason	Kirwan	Smith, Pa.
Coffee, Wash.	Kleberg	Smith, Wash.
Collins	Klein	Snyder
Colmer	Kopplemann	Somers, N. Y.
Cooley	Kramer	South
Cooper	Kunkel	Starnes, Ala.
Costello	Lane	Steagall
Courtney	Lanham	Stearns, N. H.
Cox	Lea	Stevenson
Cravens	Leavy	Sullivan
Crosser	Lesinski	Sumners, Tex.
D'Alesandro	Lewis	Sutphin
Davis, Tenn.	Lynch	Talbot
Dickstein	McCormack	Tarver
Dingell	McGehee	Tenerowicz
Disney	McKeough	Thomas, Tex.
Domengeaux	McLaughlin	Thomason
Doughton	McMillan	Traynor
Downs	Maciora	Treadway
Duncan	Magnuson	Vinson, Ga.
Durham	Mahon	Voorhis, Calif.
Eberharter	Manasco	Wadsworth
Elliott, Calif.	Mansfield	Ward
Englebright	Martin, Mass.	Weaver
Fellows	Merritt	Welch
Fitzpatrick	Meyer, Md.	Wene
Flannagan	Mills, Ark.	West
Fogarty	Mills, La.	Whelchel
Folger	Monroney	White
Forand	Mott	Whitten
Ford, Thomas F.	Murdock	Whittington
Fulmer	Nichols	Wickersham
Gamble	Norrell	Wigglesworth
Gavagan	O'Brien, Mich.	Wright
Gehrmann	O'Connor	Young
Gerlach	O'Leary	Zimmerman
Gibson		

NOT VOTING—93

Andersen, H. Carl	Casey, Mass.	Douglas
Andresen, August H.	Clark	Eliot, Mass.
Baldwin	Cluett	Ellis
Barden	Cochran	Fish
Baumhart	Coffee, Nebr.	Fitzgerald
Blackney	Cole, Md.	Flaherty
Boykin	Copeland	Ford, Leland M.
Buck	Crawford	Ford, Miss.
Buckler, Minn.	Culkin	Gathings
Burch	Cullen	Gifford
Burdick	Delaney	Gilchrist
Butler	Dewey	Gore
Carter	Dies	Grant, Ind.
Case, S. C.	Disney	Gross
Chapman	Dondero	Hall
Chiperfield	Douglas	Halleck
Church	Eliot, Mass.	Harness
Clason	Ellis	Harrington
Clevenger	Fish	Hobbs
Cochran	Fitzgerald	Holmes
Coffee, Nebr.	Flaherty	Izac
Cole, Md.	Ford, Leland M.	Jarrett
Copeland	Ford, Miss.	Johns
Crawford	Gathings	Johnson, Ind.
Culkin	Gifford	Johnson, Lyndon B.
Cullen	Gilchrist	Kee
Delaney	Gore	Kennedy, Michael J.
Dewey	Grant, Ind.	Kilburn
Dies	Gross	Kocialkowski
Disney	Hall	Lambertson
Dondero	Halleck	Larrabee
Douglas	Harness	McGranery
Eliot, Mass.	Harrington	Maas
Ellis	Hobbs	Maciejewski
Fish	Holmes	Marcantonio
Fitzgerald	Izac	Mitchell
Flaherty	Jarrett	Myers, Pa.
Ford, Leland M.	Johns	Norton
Ford, Miss.	Johnson, Ind.	O'Day
Gathings	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Oliver
Gifford	Kee	Osmers
Gilchrist	Kennedy, Michael J.	Paddock
Gore	Kilburn	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Grant, Ind.	Kocialkowski	Plauché
Gross	Lambertson	Plumley
Hall	Larrabee	Ramspeck
	McGranery	Robertson, N. Dak.
	Maas	Robsion, Ky.
	Maciejewski	Romjue
	Marcantonio	Satterfield
	Mitchell	Schaefer, Ill.
	Myers, Pa.	Schuetz
	Norton	Schulte
	O'Day	Shafer, Mich.
	Oliver	Shannon
	Osmers	Sheppard
	Paddock	Smith, W. Va.
	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Sparkman
	Plauché	Stratton
	Plumley	Terry
	Ramspeck	Tinkham
	Robertson, N. Dak.	Tolan
	Robsion, Ky.	Vreeland
	Romjue	Walter
	Satterfield	Wasielewski
	Schaefer, Ill.	Weiss
	Schuetz	Wilson
	Schulte	Wolcott
	Shafer, Mich.	Woodrum, Va.
	Shannon	Worley
	Sheppard	Youngdahl
	Smith, W. Va.	
	Sparkman	
	Stratton	
	Terry	
	Tinkham	
	Tolan	
	Vreeland	
	Walter	
	Wasielewski	
	Weiss	
	Wilson	
	Wolcott	
	Woodrum, Va.	
	Worley	
	Youngdahl	

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Baumhart for, with Mr. Hobbs against.
Mr. Stratton for, with Mrs. Norton against.
Mr. Blackney for, with Mr. Weiss against.

General pairs:

Mr. Barden with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Dewey.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. Shafer of Michigan.
Mr. Cochran with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Fitzgerald with Mr. Gilchrist.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Elict of Massachusetts with Mr. Oliver.
Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
Mr. Coffee of Nebraska with Mr. Grant of Indiana.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Holmes.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Youngdahl.
Mr. Plauché with Mr. Harness.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. August H. Andresen.
Mr. Sparkman with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.
Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Tinkham.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Jarrett.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Paddock.
Mr. Terry with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Johns.
Mr. Worley with Mr. Osmers.
Mrs. D'Day with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Maciejewski with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. McGranery with Mr Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Copeland.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Casey of Massachusetts.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Cole of Maryland.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Dies.
Mr. Flaherty with Mr. Schulte.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. Mitchell.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Kocialkowski.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipe line and a navigable barge channel across Florida, and by deepening and enlarging the Intracoastal Waterway from its present eastern terminus to the vicinity of the Mexican border."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. BLAND, for the 18th and 19th of June, on account of official business.

PROGRAM FOR THIS WEEK AND NEXT

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire what we may expect as the program for the rest of the week and next week, if the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] can give it to us.

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be glad to answer the inquiry. On tomorrow a bill from the Committee on Military Affairs relating to those in the service will be considered. It is a technical bill that has been referred to a number of times by the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]. He calls it a technical bill. I understand there is no opposition, but there will be some debate.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is amendments to the Soldiers and Sailors' Relief Act?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. I will not state the order in which these things will be taken up, because I do not want to be committed to an order. There is a conference report on the Justice Department appropriation bill which will be called up tomorrow. House Resolution 433, authorizing the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of the House to make a study of the alien situation in the United States, will be brought up for consideration. I understand that bill has been reported unanimously by the Rules Committee.

On Friday of this week, there is a bill involving $8,000,000,000 plus for the Navy coming up and I think it is quite important that we pass that bill as quickly as possible.

Monday will be District Day and I have been informed by the chairman of the District Committee that there may be several bills which have passed the Senate brought up, all of a noncontroversial nature. I have been assured that nothing controversial will be brought up.

There may be some other matters I have no knowledge of now brought up, but whatever they are they will be noncontroversial.

On Tuesday an appropriation bill for war purposes, covering $40,000,000,000 plus, recommended by the committee, will come up for consideration.

Other than that, I am not prepared now to make any further statement as to what will come up next week.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKEOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address delivered over station WWDC on Wednesday, June 10, 1942, by Mr. Leo E. George, president of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks, on Carl Berger's Your Government and Mine program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a patriotic speech made at Las Vegas, Nev., by Frank Fenton, assistant to President William Green, of the A. F. of L.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of the legislative program of the day and following any special orders antedating mine, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD and include therein a telegram from 23,000 workers at the Fore River shipyard asking that a carrier be named for the carrier *Lexington*, to replace the one that was sunk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, last evening the Secretary of the Navy announced that the request of the navy yard workers, and that of hundreds of others and mine would be granted and that a carrier, C. L. 16, would be called the *Lexington*.

The name "Lexington" has played too great a part in our history and in the history of the world for our Government not to have a ship constantly afloat named the *Lexington*. Truly the name "Lexington" shall not die. It will live always in the minds of all liberty-loving persons. Today, more than ever before, when many of the peoples of the world are fighting to preserve freedom of speech, freedom of action, freedom of government, freedom to worship God as they see fit, fighting to preserve their very existence, has it been so important to remember Lexington, where was fired the shot for freedom that was heard around the world.

The following is the splendid and inspiring telegram from the 23,000 workers at Fore River:

QUINCY, MASS., *June 16, 1942.*

HON. EDITH N. ROGERS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

The following telegram was sent to Secretary of the Navy Knox this morning:

"Twenty-three thousand workers at Bethlehem's Fore River yard, where the *Lexington* was built, respectfully urge you to give the name 'Lexington' to our carrier CV-16. We glory in the achievement of that fine ship, the sacrifice of which to many of us is a personal loss. We pledge our utmost efforts to build ships with all the speed and all the skill that is in our power. We beg the privilege to produce another *Lexington*."

Anything you can do toward having this request granted will be greatly appreciated.

W. H. NORTON,
President, Independent Union of Fore River Workers.
W. G. MCDERMOTT,
Chairman of Employee Members.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a newspaper article by Jim Blissell.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday, June 22, at the conclusion of the legislative program of the day and following any other special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SOMERS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech by Rabbi Rabinowitz, of Brooklyn, on the question, "Why a Jewish Army?"

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

(Mr. DITTER, Mr. BUCKLEY of New York, Mr. SANDERS, and Mr. WICKERSHAM asked and were given permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Rhode Island?

There was no objection.

Mr. FOGARTY. Mr. Speaker, Republican Members of this House took the floor today in opposition to the measure authorizing construction of the Florida pipe line and channel, and those Members adopted any subterfuge which presented itself to the mind, in order to destroy this program which, alone of all those which have been considered, offers any immediate hope of relief from the oil drought which exists in the eastern seaboard area right now.

Some Members said the idea does not have the endorsement of, or is not urged by, any responsible agency of the Federal Government, yet they knew the recommendation came from the Chief of the United States Army Engineers. Mr. Eastman, Director of Defense Transportation, has appealed for help to relieve the dangerous situation which we all know exists, and the War Production Board is unable to obtain more than 25 percent of the locomotives the railroads need desperately for replacements. The Petroleum Coordinator announces to New England that it may be without heat this winter, and plead for the conversion of oil-burning furnaces to coal, not only in homes, but in shops and factories engaged in war work, and that very coal is to be carried over transportation systems already fast approaching the saturation point.

We all know the job the railroads are doing. We all know that during the depression years they were not able to replace rolling stock to a sufficient extent to take care of the great demands being made on them at the present time. We all know that the railroads cannot do the job with this oil that must be done, yet here, when an opportunity presented itself to Congress to take definite action to relieve the situation, we saw organized Republican opposition quibbling and urging delay—urging delay in the construction of a project which will prove of inestimable value, not only now, in time of war, but, to an even greater degree, in time of peace.

Some of these Members appealed for help from the Navy in combating the submarine menace along our Atlantic coast. Such an appeal is penny-wise and pound-foolish. This appeal is made in spite of the news we are receiving daily about the job our Navy is doing all over the world. We have had enough buck passing—we have had enough of depending on others to get the job done. This is a job for Congress—let the Navy do its job—we shall do ours.

All the tankers we can possibly build will be needed by our Navy and our Army, regardless of whether there is 1 submarine or 100 submarines off our Atlantic coast. This war is for far greater stakes than ridding our shores of that danger. It is for us to adopt other measures to relieve the situation, and this House has done so today, despite the opposition of 90 percent of the Republican representation in the House. This House has had an opportunity today to fulfill its obligation to the people who sent us here, and to prove to them that the House of Representatives is equal to the occasion.

That the pipe line is necessary there has been no shadow of doubt. The only

argument raised here was in connection with the barge channel across Florida, which had the recommendation of General Reybold, Chief of Engineers, of the United States Army. We all know that this Engineers Corps is famous for the fact that it never underestimates a project. We can all feel secure in the knowledge that it will take little more than a year, if indeed it takes that long, to build this channel, and, in conjunction with the pipe line, that will soon be in operation across Florida, boost the flow of oil to the East to a point where it will take care of the actual needs of the area. The Intracoastal Waterway is actually in existence from Texas to New Jersey, with the exception of this one small strip of less than 200 miles, yet Members on the other side would deprive the Nation of the benefit of this continuous safe waterway for transportation of badly needed materials. Members there have said the war will be over before it is finished. Who can say—who can be so bold as to predict the date of the termination of this holocaust. Though all of us pray daily that the end shall come soon, and the terrible loss of life be brought to a speedy end, we all have every reason to believe that the end is still off in the distant future, and it behooves every one of us to do everything humanly possible to speed up the work of producing to win the war, and to do everything humanly possible to ease some of the hardships for those who must remain at home and do the producing.

This channel which was under consideration is not meant to serve solely for the transportation of gasoline. It is to serve for the transportation of oil, of sulfur, and many other critical materials that must be brought to the factories of the industrial East, and which, by means of this channel, can be brought to the East over a protected waterway, with a minimum of risk.

Gentlemen, the country watched our actions here today. Our interest in party politics was of no importance and should have been given no place here. For those who plead economy, whether it affects the war effort or not, there was satisfaction in knowing that this measure had been reduced in dollars from 144,000,000 to 80,000,000. Such evidence through a guarantee of the honesty and sincerity of those who urged the adoption of the program, fell short of convincing those who consider party first, and the welfare of the Nation second.

Gentlemen, I am glad I have supported this measure, you who made its passage possible have reason to be proud of your action. The people of New England asked you for consideration and you listened to them. The whole industrial East begged you to come to its assistance and you were not found wanting. The defense of the Nation demanded that you vote for the passage of this measure, and you heeded the call of duty.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution of the House of Representatives of Louisiana in reference to the need for calcium arsenate in the farms of the South.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I received from Leon Henderson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

PERMANENT POSTAGE RATE OF 1½ CENTS PER POUND ON BOOKS

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 337) to provide for a permanent postage rate of 1½ cents per pound on books. This bill has been reported with an amendment by the House Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is recognizing the gentleman on the theory that this bill will not take any considerable time, and that it has a unanimous report.

Mr. BURCH. Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the postage rate on books consisting wholly of reading matter and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books, when mailed under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, shall be 1½ cents per pound or fraction thereof, irrespective of the postal zone of destination thereof.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

"That for the purpose of fixing postage rates on religious and educational books consisting wholly of reading matter and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of other books there shall be established the following classifications:

"(a) Religious books which shall consist of the Bible and any other book or books used by any group, sect, system, or faith of worship manifesting a belief in the Supreme Being; love and obedience toward God, and/or conformity to Biblical precepts.

"(b) Educational books (including books with work sheets) which shall consist of any book or books used in the training, guiding, disciplining, developing, strengthening, or improving the moral or mental character of students.

"SEC. 2. The postage rate on religious and educational books, when mailed under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, shall be 3 cents per pound or fraction thereof, irrespective of the postal zone of destination thereof, except that the rates now or hereafter prescribed for third- or fourth-class matter shall apply in every case where such rate is lower than the rate prescribed herein for books under this classification.

"SEC. 3. To be entitled to the preferential rates provided for religious and educational books, the publisher of any such book shall furnish to the Postmaster General, at such times and under such conditions as the Postmaster General may prescribe, satisfactory evidence under oath or affirmation from the governing body of the religious or educational institution using such book or the public officer or body charged with the duty of approving books for use in the State in which such institution is located, that the book or books concerned are approved for use for religious or educational purposes.

"SEC. 4. This act shall take effect July 1, 1942.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. BURCH. It is a unanimous report; yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Virginia yield to me?

Mr. BURCH. I yield.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD regarding my views on this report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARTLEY. Mr. Speaker, while from the first part of the bill it might be assumed that the low rate contemplated would be accorded to all religious and educational books, it is apparent from a closer study that only educational books which are used as college or school textbooks are to be entitled to the 3-cent postal rate.

I believe that the bill as drawn discriminates against a large class of people who have not had the advantage of a high-school or college education and who, in order to overcome their handicap, rely upon the various facilities for self-education afforded by private publishers.

It is possible that the President may have had this need in mind when he stated, in connection with the Presidential promulgation of October 31, 1938:

The purpose of the new rate is to facilitate the distribution of books to our people in order to promote their cultural growth and educational development.

The Bureau of the Census reports for 1940 reflect the following educational characteristics of adults 25 years of age and over:

	8th year grade school and less		Beyond 8th year grade school		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Farm	11,225,958	75.89	3,566,878	24.11	14,792,836	100.00
Urban	34,333,688	57.24	25,649,312	42.76	59,983,000	100.00
Total	45,559,656	60.93	29,216,190	39.07	74,775,836	100.00

Thus it appears that approximately 45,000,000 people—over 60 percent of our adult population—have not had the opportunity to acquire any more than, if as much as, a grammar-school education. Of these 45,000,000 nearly 3,000,000 never attended school for any length of time, nearly 8,000,000 left during the first 4 years of grade school, and another 9,000,000 left school during the fifth and sixth grades.

There is included in the foregoing total some 450,000 men physically fit for military duty under the Selective Service Act who have been found to be illiterate to the extent that they are not therefore elegible for military service. Nor do these figures include some 16,000,000 youths between the ages of 15 and 24 who have quit school before the high-school level, many of whom never attended school for any length of time.

It seems to follow that 60,000,000 people having left school in the lower grades do not necessarily cease their efforts to acquire a better education, and that in the main their educational needs are supplied direct from the output of private publishers.

The latest figures available from the Department of Commerce indicate that during 1939 the following books were published in the United States:

	Volumes	Percentage to total
General literature	104,233,269	57.17
Fiction	14,811,181	8.12
Subtotal	119,044,450	65.29
School textbooks	63,274,758	34.71
Total	182,319,108	100.00

While much has been said about fiction in the various hearings before the Post Office and Post Roads Committee, it appears that it represents but 8.12 percent of the total volume. It is estimated that less than one-half of these books of fiction are shipped under the book-rate classification at the present time. It is my considered opinion that the 104,000,000 volumes of general literature constitute, for the most part, the source of self-education for the 60,000,000 grown-ups who in their youth never got beyond the grammar-school level of education.

According to the minutes of previous hearings on the subject of book postage, Mr. Roy M. North, Deputy Third Assistant Postmaster General, stated before our committee that the actual out-of-pocket disparity created by the advent of the 1½-cent rate for books was more nearly one and one-half million dollars—this as compared to the bookkeeping deficit of seven and one-half million dollars, six millions of which, in the form of fixed charges, and so forth, would have to be absorbed by other services if the 1½-cent rate for books were not in existence. Consideration of the one and one-half million dollar cash deficit as a Federal contribution toward the education of the 60,000,000 underprivileged people would mean a per capita expenditure of 2½ cents per annum for books.

Compare, then, this 2½ cents per annum expenditure with the actual public expenditure of $100 per annum for some 30,000,000 classroom students, of which the Federal Government's share is $153,000,000, or over $5 per capita per annum.

It seems to us that books designed for self-education are just as important from the standpoint of public welfare as school books and should at least receive the same treatment insofar as postal shipping rates are concerned. Surely it is not public policy to attach a higher rate to the educational facilities of the members of the community who have had to discontinue their Government-sponsored education while giving the lower rate to those members of the community who could afford to stay in school at public expense. Nor does it seem possible that this Congress would advocate the continuation of what appears to be the discrimination against books in favor of magazines and newspapers, particularly when such a great percentage of books have for their subject matter subjects such as religion, sociology, economics, science, medicine, agriculture, gardening, history, geography, biography, encyclopedias, and so on.

I have asked for and received from a representative group of book publishers the following data on the increase in volume and corresponding reduction of the retail prices of books over the period of the last 4 years—since the advent of the 1½-cent rate for books:

1938:	
Pounds	18,469,000
Average retail price per pound	$1.16
1941:	
Pounds	35,040,000
Average retail price per pound	$0.86

Three factors stand out:

First. There has been an increase in volume of nearly 100 percent.

Second. There has been a reduction of 30 cents a pound in the average retail prices of these books.

Third. These savings have been passed on to consumers despite an increase in manufacturing cost of from 6 percent to 20 percent for labor and materials.

The group so represented includes 10 of the 20 leading publishers in the industry, publishers of all kinds of books—general, mail order, fiction, subscription sets, juvenile, encyclopedias, and the operations of two major book clubs.

Thus it appears that the publishers have not only passed on the entire postage savings to the consumer, but have effectuated an additional consumer savings because of increased volume and lowered transportation charges, of 25 cents a pound, or nearly five times the reduction in postage rates.

I have been advised that the incidental first-class mail occasioned by the publishers sending statements and receiving corresponding remittances from the purchasers of self-educational books brings about a net profit to the Post Office Department of 1 cent per transaction, and that there are an average of some 10 to 12 exchanges of first-class mail resulting from each shipment of books.

From the Census of Manufactures for the year 1939 we learn that the book industry is essentially that of the small businessman; some 700 firms do an average business of $200,000 per annum. On the other hand, more than half of these firms are located within the three States of New York, Massachusetts, and Pennsylvania.

A 3-cent rated for educational and religious books, with a return to the parcel-post rates for all other books, would seem to result in a further concentration of the book-publishing industry in three large cities—New York, Boston, and Philadelphia—because in that way a publisher could reach directly some 30 percent of the population under circumstances whereby the parcel-post rate would be actually lower than the proposed 3-cent rate.

Consideration should be given to the fact that the average weight per parcel of books shipped under the 1½-cent rate has been over 5 pounds. A good example might be cited in the fact that no publisher intending to engage in the publication of books of national interest would ever think of starting a business in States such as Arizona, California, Oregon, and so forth, for what must appear to be the obvious reason that in order to reach the great mass of the population he would have to ship his books to the sixth, seventh, and eighth zones—zones wherein the bulk of our population resides. The average parcel-post charge for the shipment of a 20-pound set of books to the first, second, and third zones would be 35 cents, compared to 60 cents under a flat 3-cent rate and 40 cents under a flat 2-cent rate. On the other hand, the same set of books shipped from California to Massachusetts would cost the recipient $2.24 in parcel-post charges.

In connection with the foregoing, it is well to remember that fourth-class matter—parcel post—for the local, first, second, and third zones operated under a deficit during 1941 of some $19,000,000. It is my opinion that an act which would force publishers to concentrate their sales efforts and shipments in these three zones would simply transfer the deficit from the book-rate section of the fourth-class matter to the zone section, and further restrict the efforts of the typical small business man when every effort is being made to help him to survive the effects of our necessary war economy. After all, the gross sales of the entire book-publishing industry have been, on the average, less than the net annual profit of any one of a hundred of our large industrial organizations.

It is my opinion that bill H. R. 5820 as now constituted cannot be efficiently administered. It would seem to place a terrific burden of censorship on the officials of the Post Office Department. The bill would seem to provide for situations where certain books might be approved by the public officer or body charged with such duty in one State and disapproved in another. It would appear necessary that the Post Office be required to keep individual State records of books shipped to and from each and every State in the Union in order to properly administer such a law.

Any effort on the part of the Post Office Department to define a religious body

with a belief in a Supreme Being would, apart from violating the Constitution, set up an impossible administrative problem.

In view of the fact that the actual cash disparity has been reported at one and a half million dollars and that the annual volume of books shipped under the preferential rate appears to be 150,000,000 pounds, or a deficiency of 1 cent a pound, I would prefer that the rate be set at 2½ cents per pound, instead of 3 cents, as provided in the House bill. This increase in rate over the rate previously established by Presidential order is apparently the first step to eliminate deficits in certain branches of the postal rate structure.

I can see no reason why publishers of books should be discriminated against and believe that the entire second-, third-, and fourth-class postal rates should be thoroughly investigated, so as to eliminate the $80,000,000 deficit there sustained.

I have today introduced a resolution calling for the appointment of a special subcommittee to investigate our postal rate structure, with a view toward the ending of this subsidy.

I call upon those newspapers, magazines, and so forth, who have been so critical of the Congress and its alleged benefits, such as the late lamented congressional retirement plan, to support my resolution to end their subsidy.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "An act providing preferential rates of postage for certain religious and educational books."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made in committee this afternoon and include a telegram that I received from Gov. Charles Edison, of New Jersey.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including therein a splendid radio lecture made several weeks ago entitled "Dedication to Courage," by Rev. Robert J. Slavin, O. P.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG] is recognized for 10 minutes.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Price Administration in Ohio has a great many high-salaried officials and employees. For example, Birkett L. Williams, regional administrator, sought and secured his appointment at a salary fixed at $6,500 per annum. Within a very few weeks—almost before he had warmed his desk chair—his salary was increased to $8,000. Mr. Clinton Fiske sought employment and was appointed assistant regional administrator and then his salary was increased from $4,600 per annum to $6,500 during the same short period of time. Other salary increases amounting in some instances to 20 percent were made under authority of the regional administrator. It is unfortunate that this has been permitted to occur.

In view of the fact that so many fine school teachers and other patriotic public-spirited citizens, not only in Ohio, but throughout the country, volunteered their services and without thought of compensation did hard work in connection with sugar rationing throughout the country and gasoline rationing in the East and are ready to do this in the future, it is rather remarkable that such a scale of fancy salaries should have been established and that such marked salary increases should have been made in such a short period of time. Men and women who are making truly great financial sacrifices to buy War bonds and stamps have a right to feel that public money needed for our all-out war effort will not be wasted.

Unfortunately for my constituents, who in many instances have been inconvenienced and compelled to waste valuable time, very little consideration seems to be paid by the regional administrator and his staff to proper and prompt procedure in issuing sugar-rationing cars. Complaint has come to me from constituents throughout Ohio that they were compelled to wait sometimes hours in order to procure sugar-rationing cards. As an example, in Morrow County, the Office of Price Administration only issues sugar-rationing cards on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Fridays, and on those days will only receive applications from 9 to 11 in the morning and 1 to 3 in the afternoon. Do these bureaucrats resort to this sort of procedure to exasperate people? To cause them to question the wisdom of sugar rationing? To subject them to expense, inconvenience, and hardship? My constituents from miles around drive to the designated headquarters and then find that only a limited number of cards are prepared and issued during the few hours which these bureaucrats have allotted for public service. It apparently does not matter to the high-salaried administrator and his staff who are enjoying fancy salaries that thousands of families need sugar now to can fruit which is ripened.

A constituent of mine living in Sparta, Ohio, drove 20 miles on a Friday, waited in line, and then could not secure her rationing card on that day and was compelled to make the trip on another day. Her strawberries were spoiling, and she had to use her tires making this unnecessary trip. Citizens who failed to hoard sugar before rationing are being handicapped and inconvenienced. They are being compelled by the Morrow County bureaucrats and by the Price Administration officials in other sections of Ohio to make needless trips, stand around, and suffer delay at a time of the year when every minute is precious to the farmer and to the farm women, at a period when time is precious to everyone.

Sugar stock piles in the United States have become so large they are embarrassing Government officials responsible for the drastic rationing of the housewives' sugar bowls according to the Chicago Sun. A confidential Government survey of the supply situation given the Chicago Sun shows that sugar on hand, available from domestic cane and beet crops, Cuba and other nearby sources, is more than a million tons above the normal consumption of 6,800,000 tons a year. This is after taking into account the sugar needs of Great Britain, Canada, and Russia under lend-lease and otherwise. Already overtures have been made to the War Production Board by eastern sugar interests seeking construction of warehouses to store the unexpected surplus sugar. So many boats have been hauling sugar from the West Indies recently that a number are slated to be diverted to import bananas from Latin-American countries. Shipments of sugar from Hawaii also have been larger than expected. Ships taking supplies into the Pacific war ports have been dropping by Hawaii to pick up pay loads of sugar on their return trips. Another factor is the recent conversion of distilleries to the production of industrial alcohol out of wheat and other grain for the manufacture of munitions, particularly smokeless powder. This has reduced to about half the amount of sugar originally estimated by experts to be needed for the manufacture of industrial alcohol. The situation now confronting the rationing advocates is one of face saving. They plan to relax rationing quotas in August.

The Chicago Sun reports the above facts. My view is that sugar rationing was proper. I am an admirer of Administrator Leon Henderson and at the time he directed a Nation-wide sugar rationing policy, I believe he had ample justification. Probably the situation is now materially changed. My hope is that officials in Washington will immediately cancel the sugar-rationing program if rationing is no longer essential.

In any event Administrator Leon Henderson should crack down on some of his subordinates. This public-be-damned policy pursued in my State must cease. A public-be-pleased policy should be adopted. Farmers and farmers' wives are just about the busiest people on earth and they should not be compelled to undergo inconvenience and delay.

In connection with any rationing program which may be necessary in the future let us hope that public officials will make every effort to serve the public, to cooperate with our citizens, and to make it easy and convenient for them to secure rationing cards.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. SCOTT for 2 weeks.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1587. An act to provide rental allowances for officers without dependents on sea duty when deprived of quarters on board ship;

S. 2066. An act to make permanently effective the act regulating interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products;

S. 2286. An act to authorize inclusion of service on active duty as service on the active list in computation of service of commissioned warrant officers in the Navy for pay purposes; and

S. 2309. An act for the relief of the First National Bank, of Huntsville, Tex., and the Canton Exchange Bank, of Canton, Miss., and the First National Bank, of Canton, Miss.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 780. An act for the relief of Harvey C. Artis;

H. R. 1349. An act for the relief of Annie Brown;

H. R. 2419. An act for the relief of Chan Tsork-ying;

H. R. 3352. An act for the relief of Alice W. Miller;

H. R. 3402. An act for the relief of Catherine R. Johnson;

H. R. 5204. An act authorizing the charging of fees for brand inspection under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended;

H. R. 5526. An act for the relief of James E. Savage;

H. R. 5610. An act for the relief of G. H. Condon, M. E. Cannon, W. J. Esterle, C. C. Gasaway, James F. Retallack, and L. G. Yinger;

H. R. 5870. An act to amend section 24 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917;

H. R. 5938. An act for the relief of A. H. Larzelere;

H. R. 6297. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Dr. Wesley K. Harris;

H. R. 6349. An act for the relief of Jeff Roberts;

H. R. 6597. An act for the relief of A. Mack Dodd and Henry Dodd;

H. R. 6598. An act for the relief of Leanna M. Stright;

H. R. 6634. An act to facilitate the employment by defense contractors of certain former members of the land and naval forces, including the Coast Guard of the United States;

H. R. 6676. An act for the relief of F. A. Holmes, former United States disbursing clerk for the State of Illinois;

H. R. 6782. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to assign officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force to duty in the detective bureau of the Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6804. An act to amend paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6925. An act to provide additional compensation for Joseph Sharfsin, Esq., for professional services rendered the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6953. An act to amend the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7066. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and

H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 for the training and education of defense workers.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 18, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Thursday, June 18, 1942, for consideration of war housing, room 1324, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, June 18, 1942.

Business to be considered: Hearing on Federal Communications Commission.

There will be a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 2 p. m., Wednesday, June 24, 1942.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 6832, a bill to repeal section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third-time zone.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1770. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 16, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Harbor of Refuge at Sandy Bay, Cape Ann, Mass., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on July 28, 1941; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

1771. A letter from the Attorney General transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by making it a criminal offense to possess unlawfully or to reproduce various certificates issued pursuant thereto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1772. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department, Office of the Secretary, in the amount of $150,000,000 for the payment of capital stock of the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and an amendment to the estimate of the War Production Board (H. Doc. No. 776) pending before Congress (H. Doc. No. 801); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. H. R. 7184. A bill to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2252). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MOSER: Committee on the Census. H. R. 7239. A bill to authorize the Director of the Census to issue certifications of birth records; without amendment (Rept. No. 2253). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 5839. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended; with amendment (Rept. No. 2254). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 7241. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to consolidate certain exceptions to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes and to improve the United States Code; to the Committee on Revision of the Laws.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 7242. A bill to authorize temporary appointments in the Army of the United States of officers on duty with the Medical Administrative Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 7243. A bill to authorize the rank of rear admiral in the Dental Corps of the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TALBOT:

H. R. 7244. A bill to suspend the effectiveness during the existing national emergency of the tariff duty on coconuts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. Res. 505. Resolution to provide for the consideration of H. R. 7184, a bill to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. Res. 506. Resolution to investigate second-, third-, and fourth-class postage rates; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLEVENGER:

H. R. 7245. A bill for the relief of Claude M. Nichols; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. CREAL:

H. R. 7246. A bill for the relief of Richard L. Frymire; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

H. R. 7247. A bill for the relief of Silas Frankel and Louis M. Koren; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 7248. A bill to reinstate E. Lewis Field, a captain, United States Army, retired, to the active list of the Regular Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCANLON:

H. R. 7249. A bill for the relief of John T. Shirley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Ohio:

H. R. 7250. A bill granting a pension to Geneva Blazer Fowler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 7251. A bill granting a pension to Grace Alberta Schrock; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. THILL:

H. R. 7252. A bill for the relief of Oswald Jaeger Baking Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3083. By Mr. BUTLER: Petition of the members of South Park Methodist Church, Buffalo, N. Y., urging the early passage of Senate bill 860 and to provide all protection possible for the men called to the colors against all kinds of vice and intoxicating liquors, including beer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3084. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 51 members of the Providence Baptist Church, Ellwood City, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917, and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3085. By Mr. JONES: Petition of Mrs. Harold Hays and 68 citizens of Mercer County, Ohio, supporting Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3086. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Los Angeles Newspaper Guild, relative to the proposed general sales tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3087. Also, resolutions of the California Federation of Women's Clubs, relative to suitable legislation to promote morale, research on sexual psychopaths, all-out efforts for winning the war, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3088. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of Daisy Miller and other citizens of Hillsboro, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860, a bill providing for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3089. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of 18 members of the Michigan State Farm Bureau, Arcadia community group, expressing their interest in the Hobbs bill (H. R. 6672); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 1942

The Reverend Luther Jenkins Holcomb, D. D., pastor, Temple Baptist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God and most merciful Father, we thank Thee for Thy guidance in the affairs of our national life throughout the years of our existence as an American people. We realize our need for Thee now as never before. Bless our Commander in Chief; hold in Thy holy care his life. We pray for each Member of Congress and all engaged in the sacred task of defending our country. Grant us grace to please Thee in all that we think and plan and do. Bless the work of this day. We ask it in the name of Jesus. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, June 15, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolution:

On June 12, 1942:

S. 2318. An act for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo.

On June 16, 1942:

S. 2025. An act to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service;

S. 2285. An act to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank, of certain officers of the Navy;

S. 2427. An act to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes;

S. 2496. An act to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution to extend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE RECEIVED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 15th instant,

The following message from the House of Representatives was received by the Secretary of the Senate during the adjournment:

That the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1587. An act to provide rental allowances for officers without dependents on sea duty when deprived of quarters on board ship;

S. 2066. An act to make permanently effective the act regulating interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products; and

S. 2286. An act to authorize inclusion of service on active duty as service on the active list in computation of service of commissioned warrant officers in the Navy for pay purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 15th instant,

The VICE PRESIDENT signed the following enrolled bills and joint resolution during the adjournment of the Senate, which had been signed previously by the Speaker of the House of Representatives:

S. 1587. An act to provide rental allowances for officers without dependents on sea duty when deprived of quarters on board ship;

S. 2066. An act to make permanently effective the act regulating interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products;

S. 2286. An act to authorize inclusion of service on active duty as service on the active list in computation of service of commissioned warrant officers in the Navy for pay purposes;

S. 2309. An act for the relief of the First National Bank, of Huntsville, Tex., and the Canton Exchange Bank, of Canton, Miss., and the First National Bank, of Canton, Miss.;

H. R. 780. An act for the relief of Harvey C. Artis;

H. R. 1349. An act for the relief of Annie Brown;

H. R. 2419. An act for the relief of Chan Tsork-ying;

H. R. 3352. An act for the relief of Alice W. Miller;

H. R. 3402. An act for the relief of Catherine R. Johnson;

H. R. 5204. An act authorizing the charging of fees for brand inspection under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended;

H. R. 5526. An act for the relief of James E. Savage;

H. R. 5610. An act for the relief of G. H. Condon, M. E. Cannon, W. J. Esterle, C. C. Gasaway, James F. Retallack, and L. G. Yinger;

H. R. 5870. An act to amend section 24 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917;

H. R. 5938. An act for the relief of A. H. Larzelere;

H. R. 6297. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Dr. Wesley K. Harris;

H. R. 6349. An act for the relief of Jeff Roberts;

H. R. 6597. An act for the relief of A. Mack Dodd and Henry Dodd;

H. R. 6598. An act for the relief of Leanna M. Stright;

H. R. 6678. An act for the relief of F. A. Holmes, former United States disbursing clerk for the State of Illinois;

H. R. 6782. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to assign officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force to duty in the detective bureau of the Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6804. An act to amend paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended;

H. R. 6925. An act to provide additional compensation for Joseph Sharfsin, Esq., for professional services rendered the District of Columbia, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6953. An act to amend the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7066. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and

H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 for the training and education of defense workers.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Capper	Guffey
Andrews	Caraway	Gurney
Bailey	Chandler	Hayden
Ball	Clark, Idaho	Hill
Barbour	Clark, Mo.	Holman
Bilbo	Connally	Hughes
Bone	Davis	Johnson, Calif.
Brewster	Downey	Johnson, Colo.
Bridges	Doxey	Kilgore
Brooks	Ellender	Langer
Brown	George	Lee
Bulow	Gerry	Lucas
Burton	Gillette	McCarran
Butler	Glass	McFarland
Byrd	Green	McKellar

McNary	Radcliffe	Thomas, Okla.
Maybank	Rosier	Thomas, Utah
Mead	Russell	Truman
Millikin	Schwartz	Tunnell
Murdock	Shipstead	Tydings
Murray	Smathers	Vandenberg
Norris	Smith	Van Nuys
Nye	Spencer	Wheeler
O'Mahoney	Stewart	White
Overton	Taft	
Pepper	Thomas, Idaho	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] is absent from the Senate because of illness in his family.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is absent on important public business.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

AMENDMENT TO THE BUDGET—SOCIAL SECURITY BOARD (S. DOC. NO 215)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an amendment to the Budget for 1943 involving an increase of $19,500,000—revised estimate of appropriation for the Social Security Board, Federal Security Agency, fiscal year 1943 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

OROVILLE-TONASKET IRRIGATION DISTRICT, WASHINGTON

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide relief to the owners of former Indian-owned land within the Oroville-Tonasket irrigation district, Washington, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORTS OF FOREIGN-TRADE ZONES BOARD, ETC.

A letter from the Secretary of Commerce, Chairman, Foreign-Trade Zones Board, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Foreign-Trade Zones Board for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1941, and the annual report of the city of New York covering operations of the foreign-trade zone at Stapleton, Staten Island, N. Y., during the calendar year 1940 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Finance.

RECIPROCAL PRIVILEGES WITH RESPECT TO FILING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PATENTS

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Commerce, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for reciprocal privileges with respect to the filing of applications for patents for inventions, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Patents.

REPORT OF THE NEAR EAST RELIEF

A letter from the Comptroller of the Near East Relief, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of the Near East Relief for the year ended December 31, 1941 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Printing.

COORDINATION OF FORWARDING AND SIMILAR SERVICING OF WATER-BORNE EXPORT AND IMPORT FOREIGN COMMERCE

A letter from the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of action taken under section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (Public Law 498, 77th Cong.) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Commerce.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Two letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Navy, Interior (2), and Agriculture (12), the War Production Board, the National Archives, Federal Security Agency, Federal Communications Commission, and the United States attorney for the district of Massachusetts, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of New Hampshire, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Atwood, Fort Scott, Ransom, and Towanda, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTION OF THE KANSAS STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE—GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to a resolution adopted last Friday, June 12, by the general assembly of the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce, at its annual meeting in Topeka, Kans. I consider it an eminently fair and moderate statement of the sentiment of the people of Kansas in regard to proposed Nation-wide rationing of gasoline to conserve rubber supplies.

Winning the war, it is stated, is the first interest of the people of Kansas.

To this end—

The resolution states—

they are ready and willing to accept the guidance of those authorities who have the responsibility for the accomplishment of this purpose, and will willingly make any sacrifices entailed.

But with the surplus of gasoline presenting an acute storage problem, the rationing of gasoline, the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce notes, "is not readily understood."

If this is the only method of rubber conservation which ingenuity can devise * * * Kansas will accept it cheerfully.

The resolution states—

We ask that full facts respecting the rubber crisis be determined and that an adequate statement of facts be made to the public before any conservation or rationing program is instituted in this State.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks, and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the members of the Kansas State Chamber of Commerce, and representatives of local chambers of commerce, meeting in Topeka, Friday, June 12, 1942, respectfully submit to all individuals and agencies of Government which have authority or responsibility in respect to the rubber shortage in the United States the following observations:

The people of Kansas have one first interest today. That is winning the war with the least possible loss of lives. To this end they are ready and willing to accept the guidance of those authorities who have the responsibility for the accomplishment of this purpose, and will willingly make any sacrifices entailed.

Kansans do not like the accomplishment of a purpose through indirection. With the surplus of gasoline in the State presenting an acute storage problem, the rationing of gasoline is not readily understood. If this is the only method of rubber conservation which ingenuity can devise and which is adequate to the needs of the armed forces of the United States, then Kansans will accept it and cheerfully abide by whatever regulation is required. However, cheerful compliance must be based on knowledge and understanding.

Accordingly we heartily commend the stand taken by Gov. Payne H. Ratner and the Kansas Members of Congress in their request that a thorough, complete, and exhaustive examination be made of all of the many factors involved in the circumstances. We ask that gasoline rationing be not imposed except as a last resort. We ask that the full facts respecting the rubber crisis be determined and that an adequate statement of the facts be made to the public before any conservation or rationing program is instituted in this State.

TOPEKA, *June 12, 1942.*

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS, ETC.

Mr. O'MAHONEY presented a telegram embodying a resolution adopted by members of the Wyoming State Conference of the Methodist Church, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW CASTLE, WYO., *June 18, 1942.*

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Resolved, That we, the members of the Wyoming State Conference of the Methodist Church, assembled in Wheatland, Wyo., urge

the passage of Senate bill 860, and request that this communication be read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

D. M. KITCH,
Conference Secretary,
Worland, Wyo.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a resolution transmitted to me in a letter from Mrs. Faith M. Settle, student secretary, W. S. C. S., Methodist Church, Cottonwood Falls, Kans. The program proposed by this group has my wholehearted support.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In the meeting of our Women's Society of Christian Service of the Methodist Church of Cottonwood Falls, Kans., on June 12, 1942, it was unanimously voted that our society go on record as favoring all legislation aimed at the suppression of vice and liquor sales in and around our military camps here and elsewhere.

Above resolution attested to by:

MRS. GEORGE GUTSCH,
President.
MRS. BLANCHE WADSWORTH,
Recording Secretary.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, during the past several weeks I have received hundreds of letters from citizens of Georgia urging the immediate enactment of Senate bill 860. In addition, there have been forwarded from Georgia petitions signed by more than 15,000 people urging immediate and favorable action on this proposed legislation.

This bill has already been favorably reported and is on the Senate Calendar. For this reason I shall not file the petitions for reference to a committee, but I ask that the verbiage of the petition, hundreds of copies of which have come in from every section of Georgia, be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PETITION FOR S. 860

To the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

Whereas in the last World War the Congress of the United States included in the War Act legislation forbidding the exploitation of the men in the Army and Navy by liquor and commercialized vice, and the Federal Government was responsible for its enforcement; and

Whereas in the Selective Service Act of 1940, Congress made no provision for the defense of the young men of today from the traffic in alcoholic beverages and commercialized prostitution in camp areas; and

Whereas, the United States Surgeon General charges that in an army starting free from disease, the dread social diseases have arisen alarmingly, threatening, as Secretary of War Stimson says, "Serious danger to our war effort," and according to authentic investigators, rendering the conditions around the camps "intolerable," menacing the health, morals, and efficiency of the men, so, therefore.

We, the undersigned citizens, do beseech you to use all possible influence to bring bill S. 860 to a successful vote in both Houses of Congress, thus giving our young defenders the same protection their fathers had in 1917.

Mr. RUSSELL. People everywhere are very greatly concerned about the welfare of the young manhood of this Nation who have been called away from their homes and loved ones into the armed services. I am sure that an overwhelming majority of the people in Georgia favor the enactment of S. 860, and I hope it may be possible to bring this bill before the Senate at the earliest possible date. Two attempts have already been made to bring the measure before the Senate. Whether Senators favor the legislation or not, the interest in this measure is so widespread that it is certainly entitled to have its day in the Senate and a record vote on its passage after full discussion.

Mr. MURRAY presented a letter addressed to him by Maude C. Behner, of Billings, Mont., of the Montana Council of Churches (affiliated with the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America), which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONTANA COUNCIL OF CHURCHES,
Billings, June 13, 1942.

Hon. JAMES E. MURRAY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MURRAY: Enclosed is a petition which I am asked to send you with the request that you insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

History will show that parents have protested to their Congressmen regarding defense for our defenders from alcoholic beverages. Your reply to my former letter has been favorable but I urge the Senate to pass S. 860 now and put it up to the Secretaries of War and Navy to abolish liquor.

In my own thinking I believe we should abolish it in the Nation (as we did in 1917) "for the duration."

Our leaders are calling for the elimination of expenditures to the point of sacrifice and yet the most wasteful and destructive expenditure in the country is allowed grain, sugar, rubber, and other transportation and allowed to promote itself by advertising.

Sincerely,

MAUDE C. BEHNER.

Mr. MURRAY also presented a petition (accompanying the foregoing letter), numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Billings, Mont., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. President, I have been requested by Mr. Franklin W. Harper, Route 1, Hookstown, Pa., to have entered in the RECORD a petition praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments, known as the Sheppard bill. I ask unanimous consent that the petition be printed in full, together with the 30 signatures attached, and properly referred.

There being no objection, the petition, with the signatures attached, was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Congress of the United States:

We, citizens of Beaver County, Pa., respectfully petition your honorable body to take up and pass at an early date, Senate bill 860, "To provide for common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps and naval establishments," known as the Sheppard bill.

We ask for the enactment of this legislation for the following reasons:

1. To help win the war. History abundantly proves that liquor and prostitution are hindrances to the successful prosecution of war.

2. To give us a more efficient Army and Navy and to protect our young men in the national service from being exploited by the liquor traffic and by commercialized vice. Congress enacted similar legislation in the first World War. If a dry Army and Navy was good military strategy in World War No. 1, it is good military strategy in World War No. 2.

3. The persistence of the liquor traffic in pushing its products upon our soldier boys. Speaking of what has been done to make beer available at Army camps as "one of the finest things that could happen to the brewing industry," the Brewer's Digest of May 1941, "Here is a chance to cultivate a taste for beer in millions of young men who will eventually constitute the largest beer-consuming section of our population."

4. To make possible the effective enforcement of the May law, which Congress has already enacted to protect our armed forces against vice. Liquor and prostitution are twin evils. With no law against liquor, the difficulties of enforcing the law against vice are greatly increased.

Franklin Harper, Route 1, Hookstown, Pa.; Lewis Devitt, Weirton, W. Va.; Alex Cross, Weirton, W. Va.; Thomas Conley, New Cumberland, W. Va.; F. D. Savage, Clinton, Pa.; H. H. Leeper, Burgettstown, Pa.; Jas. L. Cross, Georgetown, Pa.; Lizzie J. Frazer, Burgettstown, Pa.; Mary L. Ervin, Georgetown, Pa.; Mrs. Lewis Devitt, Weirton, W. Va.; William C. Simpson and daughter, Hookstown, Pa.; Mrs. Josephine Tarr, Burgettstown, Pa.; Imogene Reed, Hookstown, Pa.; Mrs. Nancy Andrews, Burgettstown, Pa; Elsie V. Andrews, Burgettstown, Pa.; Mrs. Elsie M. Alloway, Georgetown, Pa.; Mrs. W. Lyons, Burgettstown, Pa.; Mrs. Mary D. Campbell, Hookstown, Pa.; M. Grace Cross, Weirton, W. Va.; Mrs. Mary Gilliland, Burgettstown, Pa.; Wayne Mercer, Burgettstown, Pa.; Mrs. Mary Tarr, Burgettstown, Pa.; J. F. Frazer, Burgettstown, Pa.; Jennie V. Savage, Clinton, Pa.; H. C. Campbell, Hookstown, Pa.; Mrs. Eula Arnold, Weirton, W. Va.; Mrs. Meryl McCracken, Burgettstown, Pa.; Ruth Arnold, Weirton, W. Va.; Lois Savage, Clinton, Pa.; Mrs. Lena Savage, Clinton, Pa.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE LOUISIANA LEGISLATURE—RATIONING OF GASOLINE AND AMENDMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I present to the Senate two concurrent resolutions adopted by the Louisiana Legislature, one dealing with gasoline rationing and the other with amendment of

the Social Security Act. I ask that they be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, and properly referred.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolutions presented by the Senator from Louisiana will be printed in the RECORD, under the rule, and appropriately referred.

To the Committee on Banking and Currency:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 9

Whereas there are rumors, emanating from reliable governmental sources in Washington, that gasoline rationing is contemplated throughout the entire Nation; and

Whereas if the purpose of this proposed rationing is to conserve rubber and stop unnecessary luxury driving in the State of Louisiana; and

Whereas the State of Louisiana has taken regulatory steps in conserving rubber by placing a 40-mile-per-hour speed limit on the State highways; and

Whereas the service stations in the State of Louisiana have caused to be introduced in this legislature a bill to restrict Sunday luxury and nonessential driving by closing filling stations on Sundays except for emergencies and necessary driving; and

Whereas the above completely fulfills the part of the citizens of the State of Louisiana to conserve rubber for the war effort; and

Whereas the official records of the Conservation Department of the State of Louisiana, for the past quarter, show that production in the State of Louisiana, from the numerous oil fields located in the State of Louisiana, was 144,200,000 gallons per day; and

Whereas the official records of the State of Louisiana show that there are 16 large refineries operating in this State with a total capable capacity of an output of 6,300,000 gallons of gasoline per day; and

Whereas the official records of the State of Louisiana show that the total consumption of gasoline during the year 1941 was 666,667 gallons of gasoline per day and, as a result of abandonment of unnecessary luxury driving, this figure has been reduced approximately 30 percent; and

Whereas a clear view of the complete picture clearly shows that there cannot be and there is not a shortage of gasoline in this State either from the production or refining divisions of the industry; and

Whereas total rationing will not help the United States but will endanger the war effort by forcing the closing of many of the refineries in this State that are now refining 100-octane aviation gasoline and essential heavier fuel oil; and

Whereas the necessity of the refining of crude petroleum into 100-octane aviation gasoline and heavier fuel oil for our armed forces would necessitate either the use or destruction of the byproduct, motor gasoline, which must be manufactured and cannot be stored due to the lack of storage facilities and the nonavailability of steel for additional storage tanks; and

Whereas in the oil-producing and refining States there exists a surplus of gasoline and to restrict its consumption would not only necessitate the closing up of oil refineries and oil wells, due to lack of storage facilities, but would curtail business by necessarily placing thousands of small business men out of their businesses; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of Louisiana (the House of Representatives concurring), That we do respectfully urge Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board; Joseph B. Eastman, Transportation Coordinator; Harold L. Ickes, Petroleum Coordinator; and Leon Henderson, Director of the Office of Price Administration, that no rationing of gasoline be attempted in the State of Louisiana as the facts and figures show that there is an existing surplus and that rationing will tend to harmfully effect the war effort in this State: Be it further

Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to the Senators and Congressmen representing the State of Louisiana and to Governors, Senators and Representatives of the oil-producing and refining States in the United States.

MARC M. MOUTON,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

B. NORMAN BAUER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

To the Committee on Finance:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 11

Whereas, upon making application for old-age assistance in Louisiana, it is required that an old person execute an affidavit as to his or her financial status, same being known as the pauper's oath; and

Whereas, the old people in this State who are certified for old-age assistance are visited every 90 days by a field worker sent out from the welfare department, whose duty it is to check on the change in financial status of these old people thereby subjecting them to untold embarrassment and humiliation; and

Whereas, it is the sense of this body that the execution of such affidavit, commonly referred to as the pauper's oath, is unnecessary, inasmuch as the grant of old-age assistance should be determined upon income, and not solely upon property possessed by applicant; and

Whereas, the elimination of visits to these old people every 90 days would result in considerable savings which could be paid out for old-age assistance, and

Whereas, it is the further sense of this body that an annual visit to clients of the welfare department drawing old-age assistance is adequate, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Senate of the State of Louisiana, and the House of Representatives concurring that the Congress of the United States of America, and the Governor of the State of Louisiana, be and they are hereby memorialized to amend the Social Security Act, and all rules and regulations set up thereunder, in order that the so-called pauper's oath required of the old people making application for old-age assistance be eliminated; and be it

Further resolved, etc., that the Congress of the United States of America, and the Governor of Louisiana, be further memorialized to amend the Social Security Act, and all rules and regulations set up thereunder to eliminate the visits every 90 days to old-age assistance clients, and to provide for an annual visit only; and be it further

Resolved, etc., that copies of this resolution be furnished the Congress of the United States; the Governor of Louisiana, and the press of this State.

MARC M. MOUTON,
Lieutenant Governor and President of the Senate.

R. NORMAN BAUER,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

COMMITTEE REPORTS FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 15th instant, the following reports of committees were submitted during the adjournment:

On June 16, 1942:

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. 2598. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes—an original bill reported in lieu of the bill (S. 2445) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations or mergers of telegraph operations, and for other purposes, heretofore referred to the Committee on Commerce (Rept. No. 1490).

On June 17, 1942:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

H. R. 6908. A bill to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1491).

By Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2581. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to convey to the people of Puerto Rico certain real estate now under the jurisdiction of the United States; without amendment (Rept. No. 1492).

By Mr. CHANDLER, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2591. A bill to authorize the exchange of lands between the War Department and the Department of the Interior; without amendment (Rept. No. 1493); and

H. R. 6081. A bill to amend an act entitled "An act to promote on the retired list officers who were decorated and recommended for promotion for distinguished service during the World War and who have not attained the rank to which recommended," so as to confer on officers above the rank of brigadier general the same retirement privileges now enjoyed by other officers; without amendment (Rept. No. 1494).

ADDITIONAL DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Order of Business 1340, Senate bill 2319, introduced by the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], providing for the appointment of a district judge for the northern district of California.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HILL. As I understand, this is a bill creating an additional district judgeship in the State of California. I am informed the bill has the recommendation of the Judicial Conference, and that it also has the unanimous recommendation of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCARRAN. If I may make the matter just a little clearer, this is not a bill creating an additional judgeship. When the judgeship for the northern district of California was created some years ago, the law contained a proviso that no appointment should be made to fill the vacancy when a vacancy occurred. Since that time, however, the work in the northern district of California has become so voluminous that it has been deemed necessary by the Judicial Conference and by the Department of Justice that the vacancy should be filled. The vacancy occurred by reason of the death of Judge Louderback some months ago. The Judicial Conference recommends that the vacancy be filled, the Department of Justice recommends that the vacancy be filled, and the Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate, having made a study of the subject, so recommends, and has reported the bill favorably. I ask that it be now considered and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2319) to provide for the appointment of

a district judge for the northern district of California in order to fill a vacancy in the office of an additional district judge heretofore authorized for such district was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, a district judge for the District Court of the United States for the Northern District of California in order to fill the vacancy in the office of the district judge appointed for such district under authority of the act of March 3, 1927, and, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to fill any subsequent vacancy in such office.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BROWN:

From the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 4242. A bill for the relief of the Corbitt Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1495).

From the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 4314. A bill authorizing the States of Minnesota and Wisconsin, jointly or separately, to acquire bridges now existing or to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the St. Croix River, also known as Lake St. Croix, at or near Hudson, Wis.; without amendment (Rept. No. 1500); and

H. J. Res. 294. Joint resolution instructing the Secretary of War to henceforth designate the new lock in the St. Marys River at Sault Sainte Marie, Mich., as the "General MacArthur lock"; with amendments (Rept. No. 1501).

By Mr. STEWART, from the Committee on Immigration:

S. 2293. A bill to provide for taking into custody certain persons who are citizens or subjects of, or owe allegiance to, any nation or country with which the United States is at war; with amendments (Rept. No. 1496).

By Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 2989. A bill to authorize the use of a tract of land in California known as the Millerton Rancheria in connection with the Central Valley project, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1497).

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2586. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue it in force during the existing war; with amendments (Rept. No. 1499).

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I wish to make a short interim report on the conversion situation from the special committee of which I am chairman. It will take but a few moments.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, but has the routine morning business been concluded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are in order, and the Chair assumes the Senator from Missouri is about to make a report from the committee of which he is chairman. The Senator from Missouri has no right to debate the report except by unanimous consent.

Mr. McNARY. I have insisted that the rule be enforced, that the routine morning business be concluded without interruption.

Mr. TRUMAN. I do not wish to make the report out of order.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Missouri is in order in submitting the report, but the Senator could submit the report as well after we conclude the routine morning business.

MONOGRAPH DESIGNED TO FURNISH A BASIS FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION WITH REFERENCE TO THE FUTURE OF THE CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS (S. DOC. NO. 216)

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Printing, reported a resolution, Senate Resolution 265, which was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the letter from the Director of the Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress, transmitting to the Honorable ELBERT D. THOMAS, of Utah, chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, a monograph designed to furnish to the Congress a basis for legislative action with reference to the future of the Civilian Conservation Corps, be printed as a Senate document.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills and joint resolution:

On June 16, 1942:

S. 2025. An act to readjust the pay and allowances of personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and Public Health Service;

S. 2285. An act to provide for the retirement, with advanced rank, of certain officers of the Navy;

S. 2427. An act to amend the act relating to preventing the publication of inventions in the national interest, and for other purposes;

S. 2496. An act to authorize the construction or acquisition of additional naval aircraft, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 130. Joint resolution to extend certain emergency laws relating to the merchant marine, and for other purposes.

On June 17, 1942:

S. 1587. An act to provide rental allowances for officers without dependents on sea duty when deprived of quarters on board ship;

S. 2066. An act to make permanently effective the act regulating interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products;

S. 2286. An act to authorize inclusion of service on active duty as service on the active list in computation of service of commissioned warrant officers in the Navy for pay purposes; and

S. 2309. An act for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex., and the Canton Exchange Bank of Canton, Miss., and the First National Bank of Canton, Miss.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself, Mr. HATCH, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. SCHWARTZ, Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. CLARK of Idaho, Mr. McCARRAN, and Mr. HOLMAN):

S. 2599. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to compensate holders of grazing permits and licenses for losses sustained by reason of use of the public lands for war purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, by direction of a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I introduce a bill for appropriate reference, with the co-sponsorship and by direction of the membership of the committee.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

By Mr. GILLETTE (for himself, Mr. WHEELER, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. McNARY, and Mr. NORRIS):

S. 2600. A bill to expedite the prosecution of the war by making provision for an increased supply of rubber manufactured from alcohol produced from agricultural or forest products; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma introduced Senate bill 2601, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri:

S. 2602. A bill to amend the Canal Zone Code; to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 2603. A bill to provide for payment by the United States of certain delinquent lease rentals upon lands in the Standing Rock Indian Reservation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. NORRIS:

S. 2604. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Republican River; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2605. A bill to authorize temporary appointments in the Army of the United States of officers on duty with the Medical Administrative Corps; and

S. 2606. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by making it a criminal offense to possess unlawfully or to reproduce various certificates issued pursuant thereto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. STEWART introduced Senate bill 2607, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BROWN:

S. 2608. A bill for the relief of Dennis Hall; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

S. 2609. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Steve York; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2610. A bill for the relief of Richard Barker; to the Committee on Claims.

PROHIBITION OF DISTRIBUTION OF CERTAIN INFORMATION WITH RESPECT TO AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for appropriate reference. I ask that the bill be printed in the RECORD, and that immediately following it there be printed as a part of my remarks a statement and two telegrams explanatory of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (S. 2601) prohibiting the distribution of certain information with respect to agricultural commodities, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry,

and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress hereby finds and declares that undue and excessive fluctuations in the prices of agricultural commodities tend to hinder and impede the effective prosecution of the war.

SEC. 2. During the present wars in which the United States is engaged, it shall be hereafter unlawful for any private individual, corporation, organization, or association to distribute to the public, or to a selected group or groups of persons, through the mails, or by telephone, telegraph, radio or other means of communication, any information with respect to the price or the price trend of any agricultural commodity with the intent that such information shall be acted upon for the purpose of maintaining or altering the price or the price trend, upward or downward, of any such commodity, or with the intent that the market or the market trend for such commodity shall be affected.

SEC. 3. Whoever knowingly violates any provision of this act shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $, or imprisoned not more than years, or both. If the violation is by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or director thereof who knowingly participates in such violation shall be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

The statement and telegrams presented by Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma in connection with the bill are as follows:

Our people are in an all-out war in practically every part of the world. To win the war we must have all-out production of food, fiber, special war equipment, and trained men to use such supplies for war.

Secretary Wickard says, "Food will win the war and write the peace." Again the Secretary says, "Double your production. Stock your silos with corn. Grow us food—to eat, to store, to send abroad."

To secure the necessary food and clothing farmers must produce to the limits of capacity; however, because of a shortage of farm labor and increased costs of farm supplies, many farmers are complaining that they are being discriminated against in that the prices of their products are being kept below parity with wages and the products of industry.

To date, the prices of but few farm products have reached parity and the farmers are alleging that there is a well-organized effort to depress and keep their prices down—in some instances far below parity.

For 10 years it has been the policy of the Government to increase farm prices to full parity with wages and industry. As a war measure the Congress enacted legislation providing for the fixing of ceilings on all commodities and products but exempted salaries and wages.

Now complaints are general that this price-control law is being disregarded, if not violated. One complaint is as follows:

Congress by law has forbidden the Price Administrator to place a ceiling on the price of raw cotton below 21.47 for middling seven-eighths-inch staple at the farm, yet for months the Price Administrator has had a ceiling on the products of raw cotton (cotton yarn and cotton goods) tied to the price of raw cotton far below the limitation fixed by the Congress. From the time this ceiling was placed on the products of raw cotton, the ceiling of such products could not be raised until raw cotton itself had advanced 45 points or multiples thereof. The Price Administrator has now gone even further for he has now untied the ceiling on the products of raw cotton from raw cotton itself by fixing a ceiling on the products based on raw cotton at 20.37 for middling fifteen-sixteenths inch at the 10 designated markets, and which is the equivalent of not more than 19 cents for middling seven-eighths inch at the farm, or some $12.50 per bale below the limit fixed by Congress.

Another charge is that the Price Administration has ordered the abrogation of bona fide contracts consummated between the United States Government itself and the processors of raw cotton before the fixing of the present ceiling if the basis of the processor's price was above the equivalent of 20.37 for middling fifteen-sixteenths inch at the 10 designated markets, or approximately 19 cents for middling seven-eighths inch at the farm.

With respect to cotton the public is advised that present prices are abnormally high. Cotton futures are selling below 18 cents per pound and on the farm the price is not nearly that figure. The Bureau of Agricultural Economics has released figures to show that when cotton sells for 18 cents per pound, the farmer-producer receives approximately that amount per hour for his work of production. At 18 cents per hour the cotton worker makes some $1.80 for 10 hours hard work in the outdoor heat of summer.

The President has designated the cotton South as "The Nation's No. 1 Economic Problem" and the direct cause of such problem is the low price of cotton.

Another complaint filed with the committee is the charge that there is a well-financed organization created for the special purpose of working cooperatively to influence farm market prices. This complaint is lodged against the International Market Forecast Bureau, with advertised telegraphic offices at 15 Moore Street, New York, and with a mail office at Post Office Box 182, Wall Street Station, New York. On May 27, 1942, this bureau sent out notices as follows:

"OCTOBER COTTON WILL SELL BELOW 18 CENTS—ADVICE TO COTTON MILLS

"We advise you to sell October cotton futures at the market and on all small rallies, keeping all short positions intact until October cotton sells below 18 cents. Then get in touch with us for additional advice."

At the time the notice and advice was sent out October futures were selling around 19.50 and immediately a short-selling wave started and did not end until the advertised objective had been reached. This organized bear raid upon cotton farm prices caused a decline of some $10 per bale and a loss on the 10,000,000 bales in storage of some $100,000,000. The estimated loss on the Government stocks of cotton alone amounted to almost one-half that amount.

At a time when we have a great and necessary public-spending program for war equipment; when the profits of industry are so great that they are under constant investigation; when the wage scale is the highest in history and with farmers being appealed to for production and for more production, and with their expenses mounting, they feel that they should be accorded at least the full protection of the law respecting prices. All they ask is that their prices be placed on a basis of parity with industry and they will not be satisfied with less.

They know that both industry and labor are represented in high and in key positions in the Government and having no such representation themselves, they are depending upon their Representatives in the Congress to protect their interests.

Another general complaint has come to the committee with respect to the purchase by the United States of some 200,000 bales of Peruvian cotton. At a time when farmers are being urged to reduce their cotton acreage and, in sections where grain crops have been destroyed and farmers have appealed for permission to plant cotton and have been denied, they fail to understand why it is in the public interest to be purchasing foreign cotton.

The information and data being assembled will be used as a basis for the submission of additional corrective and protective legislation.

MEMPHIS, TENN., *June 17, 1942.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Regarding recent cotton price decline one of our members from Missouri telephoned us June 4 they had been advised by W. E. Richmond & Co., future brokers, of Memphis, that market would decline to 17.75, and market went there on the 6th. Personal regards.

CHARLES G. HENRY, *Manager,*
Midsouth Cotton Growers Association.

NEW YORK, N. Y., *June 16, 1942.*

Senator ELMER THOMAS of Oklahoma:

I have just read your statement pertaining to a New York forecast company causing a raid on the cotton market. In the first place, I have not one subscriber in New York City. This information was first sent only to southern mills buyers and merchants and planters. The decision to take a bearish stand on cotton was prompted solely by the fact that of the Henderson and Mr. Roosevelt's anti-inflation program placing a ceiling on various types of cotton goods. I have no connection directly, indirectly, and/or otherwise with any professional cotton traders or cotton brokers, and as my sole small income I derive out of this business comes chiefly from the southern farmers and southern merchants and mills, this information was first sent to them by air mail and telegrams before it was sent by plain mail to others in the South. The cotton market has at all times a major trend, and my forecasting would have very little effect on prices one way or the other. In fact, the $500,000,000 Hoover revolving fund in 1930 did not prevent cotton prices from going to their lowest point in history. If you desire any further information, I will be only too glad to serve you.

E. L. MCGUIGAN,
International Market Forecast Bureau.

MILITARY AND NAVAL AVIATION ACADEMIES

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I introduce a bill for the creation of a Military Aviation Academy and a Naval Aviation Academy, one to be under the direction and supervision of the Secretary of War and the other under the supervision of the Secretary of the Navy.

The Military Aviation Academy would be divided into four different schools under one head, one to be located in the Southwest, one in that part of the Middle West between the Mississippi River and the Rocky Mountains, one in the Central South, and one in the eastern part of the United States.

The Naval Aviation Academy would likewise be divided into four separate schools under one head—one to be located in the Middle West, somewhere in the Great Lakes area; another on the Pacific coast; one in the area of the Gulf of Mexico; and one on the Atlantic seaboard.

I believe that the creation of such schools, which would have for their purpose the training of aviation cadets, who, upon graduation, would become commissioned officers, would render to the Army and Navy a great service. In recent months it has become increasingly apparent that this war and perhaps future wars must be fought principally in the air. The increasing power of bombers

and airplanes has, indeed, forced new ideas into the minds of many of our Army and Navy leaders, as well as the country at large. Recently a naval engagement was fought near Midway Island in the Pacific, and yet the warships were almost 100 miles from one another. It was fought by airplanes dropping bombs upon enemy vessels. It seems to be a settled fact now that the strength of a navy is not measured by its warships, its destroyers, its dreadnaughts, or other men-of-war, but by the added number of its airplanes, carriers, and bombers.

It seems also a fact that air bombers can sink any vessel that floats. For a long time this was thought to be impossible, but recent months have shown the fallacy of the belief that the so-called superbattleship is practically impregnable. When the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor they destroyed several large and powerful battleships because those battleships were not protected by fighter planes to drive away the enemy aircraft. About the same time they sank two of the largest and most powerful battleships that Great Britain had ever built. One was the *Prince of Wales*, which had been sent into the waters of the Far East some time before for the purpose of impressing certain jealous and envious nations and giving a tremendous show of power and naval strength. If newspaper reports are correct, the *Prince of Wales* rested upon the floor of the Pacific Ocean within 40 minutes after it was attacked by Japanese bombing planes. It had no aircraft protection.

It is quite probable that hereafter most of the nations having no appreciable sea power will give less attention to superbattleships and more attention to flexible and mobile ships, each of which may carry a few fighting planes. In fact, it has been suggested that all ships plying the ocean should carry some aircraft as a means of defense, if nothing else.

The use of airplanes and bombers on land is equally important, and the effects of their use very impressive. Newspapers recently told the story of the destruction of an entire town in Germany as the effect of 1 night's raid by British bombers.

The necessity, therefore, for a stepped-up air program is easily seen, and I think air academies should be established and operated and conducted separately and apart from West Point and Annapolis. There is probably need for a general streamlining and modernizing of both of our service academies even now, but that is another subject. The immediate object now is to train cadets for air service, to train them rapidly, and to train many of them; and I think that schools for this purpose, scattered about over the United States, and erected as quickly as possible, is the answer to this question.

I know, of course, that we now have many so-called air schools over the country where fliers are being trained, but I feel that the building of such schools to which cadets are appointed and special thought and attention given to air combat in all its phases would add an emphasis to and increase the effort for the development of a powerful Air Corps.

I have repeatedly stated that I think America needs to have the most powerful air force on earth, and we cannot have it unless we give special attention to the idea and go at it on a larger and more determined basis than we have in the past. Airplanes are here to stay. Their power has been proven. A reasonably strong air force could wipe out the strongest navy on earth if it were not protected by an air force of its own. These are facts that we know and must face, and I believe the building of these air schools, located, as they would be, in different parts of the country where weather conditions and flying conditions are different, would have a tendency to fully develop a great and powerful naval and land fighting force for America. I request that the bill be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The bill (S. 2607) to provide for the establishment and operation of a Military Aviation Academy and a Naval Aviation Academy for training persons for service as commissioned officers in the military and naval forces was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

WHAT'S WRONG WITH CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY

[Mr. O'MAHONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by him on June 17, 1942, on the subject What's Wrong With Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

ATTACKS ON CONGRESS—RADIO BROADCAST BY FULTON LEWIS, JR.

[Mr. O'MAHONEY (for Mr. BARKLEY) asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio broadcast by Fulton Lewis, Jr., over the Mutual Broadcasting System, June 16, 1942, on the subject of attacks on Congress, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RECORD OF CONGRESS ON NATIONAL DEFENSE

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Gould Lincoln entitled "Congress' Record for National Defense Gives the Lie to Its Many Critics," published in the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of June 18, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ROOSEVELT AS WAR PRESIDENT

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Clarke Beach on Roosevelt as War President, published in the Washington (D. C.) Star of June 7, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RUBBER SHORTAGE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TRUMAN

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the rubber question delivered by him on June 15, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION — ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the graduating exercises of Pueblo Junior College on the subject International Cooperation, which appears in the Appendix.]

BIRTHDAY CELEBRATION OF THE ANNUITY LEAGUE—ADDRESS BY SENATOR JOHNSON OF COLORADO

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him on June 11, 1942, at the annual celebration of the Annuity League, in the Rainbow Ballroom, Denver, Colo., which appears in the Appendix.]

SPEECH BY SENATOR LEE ON COLLECTION OF SCRAP RUBBER

[Mr. LEE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a speech delivered by him on the subject of the scrap rubber collection campaign, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY HON. SUMNER WELLES AT UNITED NATIONS RALLY, BALTIMORE, MD.

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State, at the United Nations rally in Baltimore, Md., June 17, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

UNITED WE STAND—ADDRESS BY PAUL V. McNUTT

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "United We Stand," delivered by Hon. Paul V. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator, at the United Flag Day celebration under the auspices of the District of Columbia Department of the American Legion, at Meridian Park, Washington, D. C., June 14, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM—ADDRESS BY JOSEPH B. EASTMAN

[Mr. TRUMAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the transportation situation delivered by Hon. Joseph B. Eastman, Director of the Office of Defense Transportation, before the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Cleveland, on June 9, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

REVIEW OF THE BOOK—VICTORY THROUGH AIR POWER—BY MAJ. A. P. DESEVERSKY

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a review by Maj. Gen. William C. Rivers, United States Army, retired, of the book, Victory Through Air Power, written by Maj. Alexander P. De-Seversky, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE SALES TAX OBSESSION—EDITORIAL FROM THE ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of June 15, 1942, entitled "The Sales Tax Obsession," which appears in the Appendix.]

DR. CARVER OF TUSKEGEE—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of June 16, 1942, entitled "Dr. Carver of Tuskegee," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE RIO GRANDE SOUTHERN

[Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Denver Post entitled "Rio Grande Southern Performs Miracles on Mountain Line," which appears in the Appendix.]

THE FLORIDA SHIP CANAL

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the Florida ship canal, published in the Nashua, N. H., Telegraph of June 13, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

INCREASE IN STRIKES—ARTICLE BY DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. BRIDGES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by David Lawrence on the subject of the Increase in Strikes, published in the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of June 12, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

MR. JUSTICE MURPHY AND THE ARMY

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of June 18, 1942, relating to the entry into the Army of Mr. Justice Frank Murphy, of the Supreme Court of the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

POWERS OF SENATE SPECIAL SILVER COMMITTEE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 261) to confer additional authority on the Senate Special Silver Committee, created pursuant to Senate Resolution 187, Seventy-fourth Congress.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that the resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be passed over.

The routine morning business is concluded.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 416. An act for the relief of E. A. Walles, receiver of Delta Oil Co.;

S. 819. An act for the relief of the widow and children of Dr. Jo M. Ferguson; and

S. 885. An act for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake, in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 337) to provide for a permanent postage rate of 1½ cents per pound on books, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 1707. An act to prevent the making of photographs and sketches of military or naval reservations, naval vessels, and other naval and military properties, and for other purposes; and

S. 2455. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty", to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2467) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the amendments of the Senate numbered 40, 44, and 79 to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; that the House further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 19, 21, 38, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 81, 83, 85, 86, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, 97, 101, and 102 to the bill; agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TARVER, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. LEAVY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. PLUMLEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 303) to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 1551. An act for the relief of W. E. Floding Co.;

H. R. 2187. An act for the relief of Nannie May Blythe and Claudia Blythe;

H. R. 2782. An act for the relief of Charles H. Dougherty, Sr.;

H. R. 3432. An act for the relief of Maurice Victor;

H. R. 4280. An act to codify title 1 of the United States Code;

H. R. 6401. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American War Mothers", approved February 24, 1925 (43 Stat. 966; title 36, sec. 97, U. S. C., 1940 edition);

H. R. 6618. An act providing for the temporary service of circuit judges with the Supreme Court of Hawaii in case of vacancies in such court;

H. R. 6999. An act to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipe line and a navigable barge channel across Florida, and by deepening and enlarging the Intracoastal Waterway from its present eastern terminus to the vicinity of the Mexican border;

H. R. 7100. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore on the Great Lakes during 1942", approved January 27, 1942 (Public Law 416, 77th Cong.), to continue it in force during the existing war;

H. R. 7112. An act to codify and enact into absolute law title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration";

H. R. 7113. An act to codify and enact into absolute law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and seal, seat of government, and the States";

H. R. 7120. An act to codify and enact into absolute law title 6 of the United States Code entitled "Official and penal bonds";

H. R. 7121. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and

H. R. 7232. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) authorizing the Secretary of the Senate in the enrollment of the bill (S. 2467) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes, to make a necessary change, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 1551. An act for the relief of W. E. Floding Co.;

H. R. 2187. An act for the relief of Nannie May Blythe and Claudia Blythe;

H. R. 2782. An act for the relief of Charles H. Dougherty, Sr.; and

H. R. 3432. An act for the relief of Maurice Victor; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 6999. An act to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipe line and a navigable barge channel across Florida, and by deepening and enlarging the Intracoastal Waterway from its present eastern terminus to the vicinity of the Mexican border; and

H. R. 7100. An act to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing vessels of Canadian registry to transport iron ore on the Great Lakes during 1942," approved January 27, 1942 (Public Law 416, 77th Cong.), to continue it in force during the existing war; to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 4280. An act to codify title 1 of the United States Code;

H. R. 6401. An act to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American War Mothers," approved February 24, 1925 (43 Stat. 966; title 36, sec. 97, U. S. C., 1940 ed.);

H. R. 6618. An act providing for the temporary service of circuit judges with the Supreme Court of Hawaii in case of vacancies in such court;

H. R. 7112. An act to codify and enact into absolute law, title 9 of the United States Code, entitled "Arbitration";

H. R. 7113. An act to codify and enact into absolute law title 4 of the United States Code, entitled "Flag and seal, seat of Government, and the States";

H. R. 7120. An act to codify and enact into absolute law title 6 of the United States Code, entitled "Official and penal bonds"; and

H. R. 7121. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7232. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. VAN NUYS subsequently said: Mr. President, earlier in the day House bill 7121, to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States, was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary for consideration. I have since learned that the Committee on Interstate Commerce has had before it a bill similar in nature, that a subcommittee has held public hearings on the bill and is in a position to dispose of House bill 7121 more expeditiously than could the Committee on the Judiciary. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from the further consideration

of the bill and that it be referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

EXTENSION OF REDUCED INTEREST RATES ON FEDERAL LAND-BANK AND LAND BANK COMMISSIONER LOANS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CLARK of Idaho submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6315) to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land-bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans, having met after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate; and agree to the same.

J. H. BANKHEAD,
CLYDE HERRING,
D. WORTH CLARK,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

H. P. FULMER,
JOHN W. FLANNAGAN, Jr.,
WALTER M. PIERCE,
CLIFFORD R. HOPE,
J. ROLAND KINZER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

CIVILIAN WAR BENEFITS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1492, Senate bill 2412, a bill to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of civilians, and for the prevention and relief of civilian distress arising out of the present war, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I assume the motion is debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A motion to proceed to the consideration of a measure during the morning hour is not debatable.

Mr. TAFT. I understood it was open to debate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. After the bill has been taken up it will be open to debate.

Mr. TAFT. Surely we can debate the question whether a bill should be taken up or not taken up.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Not during the morning hour.

Mr. TAFT. I understood the Chair to state the morning hour had been concluded.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business has been concluded, but the morning hour has not yet been concluded. The morning hour will continue until 2 o'clock.

The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Florida.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2412) to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of civilians, and for the prevention and relief of civilian distress arising out of the present war, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Education and Labor with an amendment.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES FOR THE DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN ENLISTED PERSONNEL—CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 71, which was read, as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate is authorized and directed, in enrolling the bill (S. 2467) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes, to make the following necessary change in the language of the bill:

In section 107, strike out the words "the first day of the first calendar month following the date of enactment of this act" and in lieu thereof insert "June 1, 1942."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 71.

The purpose of this concurrent resolution is to authorize the Secretary of the Senate to make a clerical correction in enrolling the bill (S. 2467) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes.

The conference agreement provides that the period for which allowances are payable should begin with June 1, 1942. It is necessary to change one of the dates mentioned in section 107 of the conference report to June 1, 1942, in order that this section may be consistent with the other provisions of the bill on this point.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I desire to discuss the concurrent resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. HILL. A parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. As I understand, the bill of the Senator from Florida was made the pending order of business. Is that not correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That is correct. The Chair then laid before the Senate a privileged matter from the House of Representatives.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. As I understand, Senate bill 2412, Calendar No. 1492, is the pending business. The motion that the Senate proceed to its consideration was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The consideration of the bill is suspended for the moment for the consideration of a privileged matter.

Mr. PEPPER. That is what I understood. I merely desired to ask Senators if they would be good enough, when these other matters shall have been disposed of, to let me make a statement about the bill, then that any amendments Senators desire to offer may be offered, or the bill considered in detail. I make this statement because I agreed that I would yield to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], who desired to make a report to the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Ohio has the floor.

ADDITIONAL NAVAL APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I understand there is on the President's desk a message from the House of Representatives relating to House bill 7182. I ask the Chair to lay the message before the Senate so that I may make a motion in regard to it.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7182, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 15, 1942.

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10, and 11 to the bill (H. R. 7182) making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes; and

That the House agree to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 to said bill with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert "not to exceed 1,000,000"; and

That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate No. 7 to said bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the House has agreed to all the amendments of the Senate except amendments numbered 6 and 7. In the bill there was authorization for the building of 500,000 tons of auxiliary shipping. The House changed that to 1,000,000 tons. The bill makes supplemental appropriation for the Navy. The only difference between the action of the Senate and the action of the House is the difference between the authorization of 500,000 tons of auxiliary shipping and 1,000,000 tons of auxiliary shipping.

Mr. President, I now move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 7, and that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

POSTAGE RATE ON BOOKS

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield so that I may ask to have conferees appointed on the part of the Senate with respect to Senate bill 337?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House with respect to that bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 337) to provide for a permanent postage rate of 1½ cents per pound on books.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, we are operating in a very disorderly fashion. One Senator obtains the floor and then proceeds to farm it out to various Senators. The Senator from Ohio yields in order that action may be taken on conference reports and then loses the floor. If he yields for any further business to be transacted, I shall make the point that he thereby loses the floor. He should proceed to make the statement he was about to make. Conference reports should come up in order, so that we may have some form or some attempt to follow a plan which is logical with respect to our legislation.

Mr. McKELLAR. If the Senator from Ohio will further yield to me, I wish to say to the Senator from Oregon that it is very necessary that the bill be passed and cut of the way before the 1st of July, because the law with which it deals expires the 1st of July.

Mr. McNARY. I understand that. Everything is necessary. Everything has priority. Everyone is anxious to have legislation completed by the 1st of July. But this matter is not so important that it cannot wait 15 or 20 minutes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. McNARY subsequently said: Mr. President, in the absence of the able Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendments to Senate bill 337, ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. REED conferees on the part of the Senate.

FAMILY ALLOWANCES FOR THE DEPENDENTS OF CERTAIN ENLISTED PERSONNEL—CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the concurrent resolution before the Senate is to complete legislation on the bill with reference to the making of allowances for the dependents of enlisted men, and I desire to make a statement with respect to that bill.

In March of this year I introduced the first bill to provide allowances for dependents of enlisted men. This bill was not intended, as some of the newspaper editors seemed to think, to make it possible to draft men with dependents, but to relieve hardship in hundreds of cases where for one reason or another men with dependents had already been drafted. Later, when it became apparent that the administration intended to draft men with dependents, I introduced a bill to provide definite classifications among men having dependents. I realized that there was some objection to permanent legislative classifications, and I therefore supported the bill which gave authority to make these classifications to the President. I wish to urge that the President and the Selective Service Director proceed immediately to break up class III–A into four or five different groups in order that hardship may be avoided, and a reasonable stability brought about in the manpower available for our Army and Navy.

Ten thousand men a day are now being inducted into service; 300,000 men a month will be inducted during the months of June, July, and August. It is essential that whatever system is adopted be adopted immediately.

We have registered today more than 26,000,000 men. If we add to this number those who become 20 in 1942 and 1943 we will have available before the end of 1943 approximately 28,400,000 men. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at the end of my remarks, as exhibit A, a table showing the estimate of total manpower available. The table also shows the number available if boys of 19 should be drafted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. (See exhibit A.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it is likely that in order to carry to its conclusion an all-out war against Germany and Japan it will be necessary to have 10,000,000 men in the armed forces, including the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and the Air Forces. Already the Army has set a goal of 4,500,000 men for this year, and there will be approximately 1,000,000 men in the Navy. If we take another 2,500,000 in 1943 and 2,000,000 in 1944 it will make a total of 10,000,000.

On the other hand, this is only about one-third of the registration by the end of 1943. The other two-thirds will be available for essential duty at home, and it will not be long before all civilian activity will be essential activity. An analysis of the classifications shows that simple financial dependency in and of itself cannot much longer be a cause for deferment. If the entire 17,000,000 men who have deferments in this registration group are thrown in at the same time, however, and drafted strictly by law according to their order numbers, there will not only be great hardship to many men and many families, but the Army will get many more older men included in the registration up to 45 years of age, and will not get nearly the proportion of younger men which they consider necessary and desirable.

In common with other Senators I have received many complaints of unjust discrimination inherent in the present system. As long as dependency is the sole test there is a wide difference among different boards as to what constitutes dependency. Some boards hold that no wife is dependent if she is physically able to work. Other boards hold that all wives are dependent. Other boards base the classification on the question whether the wife is actually working or has worked before marriage. Wives who have not been dependent become dependent through the arrival of children. It seems far better to base the classification on the age and family status of each man than on the elusive quality of dependency, subject always to the board's authority to deal with special hardship cases of dependency.

I have serious complaint today of the fact that many older family men are being drafted. I received a letter recently from a man 33 years of age, with a wife and three children, drafted this month because he has been reasonably successful and has acquired enough property to give him an income of $100 a month outside of his salary. I do not think such a man should be drafted as against another man who has spent everything he has made during the first 10 years of his married life, or as against a boy of 21 who assists the support of a father, and I doubt if he ought to be drafted before a boy of 19 is drafted. The carrying on of essential civilian activity is of the greatest importance. Men over 30 have usually risen in their industry or profession to a position where they are more important than the younger men. At the same time they are less able to endure the hardships of active service. It seems far better to recognize that their best service to their country and to their family is at home in their established occupation.

At the same time we will have to consider shortly the question of drafting boys 19 years old and 18 years old. Many boys of this age have already volunteered. We should decide, and decide deliberately and intelligently, whether boys of 19 should be taken before men more than 30 years of age with families. We should also decide whether volunteering should longer be allowed. It was not allowed near the end of the World War and it is contrary to the basic theory of the Selective Service Act. If a young man can serve his country best in an industrial position, he ought to be required to stay where he is of most value.

In order to make such a decision it is essential that we have estimates of the number of men available in different dependency groups and age groups. I have worked with the officials of the Selective Service System, and intend to present for the RECORD a little later—they are too complicated to read—some very rough estimates upon which an intelligent conclusion can be based.

As a result of this investigation I wish to make a definite suggestion, and express the hope that the Selective Service Director will see fit to adopt it. This is my proposal:

First. Reclassify all those married before the draft law who are now living with wife or children into class III.

Second. Divide class III into the following subclasses and provide that no subclass shall be drafted until substantially all of the previous class have been exhausted:

(A) Those without wife and children but with class B dependents (parents, minor sisters and brothers, and so forth) who registered prior to 1942 and are, therefore, under approximately 37 years of age, except cases of exceptional dependency requirements.

(B) Those living with wife but without children who registered prior to 1942 and are, therefore, under approximately 37 years of age, except cases of exceptional dependency requirements.

(C) Those living with wife and children, or children only, under 30 years of age on July 1, 1942, except cases of exceptional dependency requirements.

(D) All other class III registrants, including (1) those with wife and children, or children only, over 30 years of age on July 1, 1942, (2) those with class B dependents not included in subclass (A), (3) those with wife only, not included in subclass (B), and (4) all cases of exceptional dependency.

In order to show the total number of men who fall into each class, including the subclasses which I have proposed, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD, at the close of my remarks, exhibit B.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

Mr. TAFT. These figures are the roughest estimates, and I do not guarantee them in any way. They are calculated from the limited statistical material which seems to be available. The figures include those who have already registered and those who become 20 during the year 1942 and are therefore available before the end of this year. The table shows that of a total of 27,220,000 registrants, 4,795,000 will be classified as I–A and found to be physically qualified for service; 1,673,000 will be classified as I–B and therefore available for limited service; 1,213,000 will be deferred as essential in industry, commerce, and agriculture; 17,088,000 will be found to have dependents; and 2,450,000 will fall into class IV, unavailable for physical and other reasons. It is at once apparent that we shall have to call on some of those who fall into class III in order to provide necessary manpower.

The figures show further that 1,205,000 men under 37 years of age are unmarried but have dependent parents, sisters, brothers, or others. It seemed wise to the Military Affairs Committee and it seems wise to me, now that dependency allowances have been provided, that this group be called on before calling on married men, permitting deferment, however, in cases in which the Government allowance is seriously inadequate and other arrangements for the care of dependents cannot be made. Assuming about 20 percent of such cases as a guess, there remain 965,000 men who can be drafted. My estimate is that of this number of men perhaps 550,000 would be found physically qualified for active service and not deferable by reason of essential industrial activities.

Next comes the class of married men with wives but no children. The table shows that there are approximately 2,760,000 of such men. I have assumed that perhaps 10 percent would still have to be deferred for dependency because no other sufficient means can be provided to support a wife. Of the 2,700,000 men who remain, I estimate that 1,300,000 could be finally classified as I–A.

In class III–C, married men under 30 years of age on January 1, 1942, with dependent children, I estimate that there are 2,054,000, of whom 400,000 would be cases of exceptional dependency. This leaves 1,654,000, of whom perhaps 800,000 could ultimately be classified as I–A.

After setting aside these three groups, there would remain in class III–D a grand total of 11,479,000 men. It is unlikely that any of these men will ever be called, and if this is the fact, it is wise to tell them now that their proper work is at home, and that they should devote themselves wholeheartedly to the support of the war through civilian activities.

Finally, I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at the end of my remarks exhibit C, showing the men available for military service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit C.)

Mr. TAFT. In this table I have given the figures if boys of 19 are called at some time in the year 1943, and again in 1944. The table shows that if this procedure is followed, and if the classes which I have designated as III-A, III-B, and III–C are also called, 10,489,000 men will be available at the end of 1944.

In order to provide 5,500,000 men in 1942, it will certainly be necessary to call Class III-A, namely, men with dependents other than wives and children. I believe that Congress will have to decide shortly, certainly by 1943, whether boys of 19 should be called before married men without children, or whether married men without children should be called first. I, myself, have formed no definite conclusion as to which group should be called first, but I do feel definitely that boys of 19 should be called before calling family men of more than 30 years of age. If this conclusion is correct, it will be necessary to call boys of 19 not later than the summer of 1943.

In any event, it seems to me essential to prevent injustice and a poor selection for military purposes, that the Director of Selective Service proceed immediately to make a definite division into classes of those now deferred for dependency. Every day men are being drafted who should not be drafted, either for the good of the Army or for the morale and welfare of the population at home. Men are being inducted at a rate in excess of 300,000 a month. There should be no delay in acting immediately on the mandate given by Congress.

EXHIBIT A

Estimate of total manpower available

(A) Those who were 21 to 35, inclusive, on Oct. 16, 1940, plus those who became 21 before July 1, 1941, but excluding those who registered voluntarily while under 21 years of age	17, 220, 000
(B) Those who became 20 in 1941, and those who became 21 during the last 6 months of 1941 and who registered on Feb. 16, 1942	1, 800, 000
(C) Those who were 36 or more on Oct. 16, 1940, but less than 45 on Feb. 16, 1942. Because of the lapse of time, this represents about seven and one-quarter age groups	7, 000, 000
(D) Those who became 20 in 1942	1, 200, 000
(E) Those who became 20 in 1943	1, 200, 000
(F) Those who became 19 in 1943	1, 200, 000
Total	29, 620, 000

According to the Census figures, the total number of males between the ages of 20 and 44, inclusive, is only 25,173,960. If we add to this number 3,600,000 who become 19 and 20 in 1942, we only get 28,773,960. Other comparisons of registration figures with Census figures seem to leave the Census about a million men short in every case.

EXHIBIT B

	Men who registered prior to 1942, 21–35 years of age[1]	Men of 20 and 21 who registered Feb. 16, 1942	Men 37–44 who registered Feb. 16, 1942	Men reaching 20 in the year 1942	Total
	[1] 17, 220, 000	[2] 1, 800, 000	7, 000, 000	1, 200, 000	[3] 27, 220, 000
Class I-A and I-C	[4] 2, 755, 000	[4] 972, 000	[6] 420, 000	648, 000	4, 795, 000
Class I-B	1, 033, 000	216, 000	280, 000	144, 000	1, 673, 000
Class II	688, 000	189, 000	210, 000	126, 000	1, 213, 000
Class III	11, 193, 000	261, 000	5, 460, 000	174, 000	17, 088, 000
Class III-A	[7] 965, 000	144, 000		96, 000	1, 205, 000
Class III-B	[8] 2, 700, 000	36, 000		24, 000	2, 760, 000
Class III-C	[9] 1, 600, 000	32, 000		22, 000	1, 654, 000
Class III-D	5, 940, 000	48, 000	5, 459, 000	32, 000	11, 479, 000
Class IV	1, 550, 000	162, 000	630, 000	108, 000	2, 450, 000

[1] The total of the first 2 registrations from the United States and its Territories was 17,753,000 from which I have deducted 3 percent for 18- and 19-year olds who registered voluntarily.

[2] Includes those who became 20 in 1941, and who became 21 from July 1 to Dec. 31, 1941.

[3] About 1,000,000 more than census figure, although it does not include an estimated 800,000 men in the armed forces at the date of the first registration.

[4] The arbitrary percentages used to determine the number of men in different classes were adopted from the rather incomplete figures of the Selective Service Statistical Division. For the first 2 registrations, the percentages used are 16, 6, 4, 65, and 9 percent respectively.

[5] The arbitrary percentages here used are merely estimates. It is estimated that 54 percent will be class I–A, 12 percent class I–B, 10½ percent class II, 14½ percent class III, 9 percent class IV. The same percentages are used for men becoming 20 in 1942 and men becoming 19 and 20 thereafter.

[6] The arbitrary percentages used for the older men are also merely estimates. They are 6 percent for class I–A, 4 percent for class I–B, 3 percent for class II, 78 percent for class III, and 9 percent for class IV. The census figures seem to show that 75 percent of this age group have a wife or children, and I have estimated 3 percent for class B dependents. The percentages for classes I and II are so small because of the very high percentage in class III.

[7] It is estimated that there are 1,205,000 from the first registration falling in class III–A, but that 240,000 are such serious cases as to throw them into class III–D. It is estimated that there are 168,000 with B dependents in the 37–44 age group, who also fall into class D.

[8] It is estimated that there are 3,000,000 from the first 2 registrations in class III–B, wives but no children, of whom 300,000 fall into class III–D by reason of hardship dependency. It is estimated that there are 995,000 men with wives but no children in the 37–44 age group, who also fall into class D.

[9] It is estimated that there are 2,000,000 men from the first two registrations in class III–C, married men with children under 30, of whom 400,000 fall into class D by reason of hardship dependency.

EXHIBIT C

Estimate of number of men from different classes available and physically qualified for military service

(1) Men in the Regular Army, National Guard, Navy, and other forces on Oct. 16, 1940, not required to register	800,000
(2) Men to be classified in I-A before Dec. 31, 1942	4,795,000
(3) Men classified as I-B, but available for limited service, estimated at 20 percent of those so qualified	300,000
(4) Men under 37 with dependents other than wife or children, proposed class III-A	550,000
(5) Men under 37 with wife but no children, proposed class III-B	1,300,000
Total available in 1942 under present law	7,745,000
(6) Men who become 20 in 1943	648,000
(7) Men who become 19 in 1943	648,000
(8) Men with wives and children under 30, proposed class III-C	800,000
Total available by Dec. 31, 1943, if 19-year-olds are subject to induction	9,841,000
(9) Men becoming 19 in 1944	648,000
Total available without calling on class III-D	10,489,000

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. Has the Senator any figures from General Hershey or the Selective Service Board as to the number of illiterates?

Mr. TAFT. I have such figures; but I could not give them without delaying the Senate for some time. There is a fair number of illiterates, but I cannot give the Senator the exact figures. They are included in Class 4, and at the present moment are entirely excluded from the calculations I have given. If many of such illiterates can be taught to read and write and can be enlisted, there will be a substantial addition to the total manpower available.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, that is a serious problem in South Carolina, where large numbers of single men who have not a fourth-grade education are denied the right to enter the armed services or to be selected. Large numbers have been rejected by the Army for lack of education. Therefore they are deferred. That is particularly true of the Negroes. They desire to serve. If the Senator will be kind enough to permit me to make a suggestion, I suggest that General Hershey make a most thorough study of the question, looking to the possibility, within a year, of giving sufficient education to the large number of single men who have been deferred because of lack of education.

Mr. TAFT. I think the suggestion of the Senator is very wise. I understand that a study of the subject is being made.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. As I understand, that is being done by regulation, and not by law.

Mr. TAFT. It is being done by regulation, and not by law. It is also being done by the States. Perhaps the State of South Carolina has been taking some such action.

Mr. MAYBANK. We have been taking such action for 2 years.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is not being done pursuant to an act of Congress.

Mr. MAYBANK. No; but the question of sufficient funds arises in communities which are too poor to carry on the work. We have been working on the problem for at least a year and a half. Large numbers of men are rejected by the boards, or after they are sent to camp, because they lack what is termed a fourth-grade education. Many of them are desirous of serving, and so many of them are desirous of being educated that in some sections of the Southern States a problem has arised by reason of the lack of sufficient per capita income or wealth in certain communities to accomplish anything worth while.

Mr. TAFT. I feel confident that General Hershey will take the greatest interest in doing something.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If in the interest of equity a reclassification is made along the lines indicated by the Senator, the question immediately arises—and, indeed, has already arisen in considerable correspondence—as to whether or not the new equities should be made retroactive. Will the Senator comment on that question?

Mr. TAFT. I think it would be extremely difficult to lay down any rule that they must be made retroactive, because the men are scattered all over the world. There might be some ruling that in special cases, with the approval of the commanding officer, men who would not be drafted under the new arrangement might perhaps be released from the Army. However, I do not think a flat rule could be adopted.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator's conclusions are correct. The fact remains that a new friction is injected into the Army morale in respect to men who find their counterparts in society relieved of the burden they have assumed.

Mr. TAFT. Most of such men are already somewhat indignant, and a slight difference in indignation probably would not make a great difference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to House Concurrent Resolution 71.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF LIFE OF FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I report favorably, with an amendment, House Joint Resolution 311, continuing the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation as an agency of the United States, and I submit a report—No. 1498—thereon.

The Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation expires on June 30. Yesterday the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry acted upon House Joint Resolution 311. The Department is very anxious to have it passed. I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 311) continuing the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation as an agency of the United States.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from South Carolina?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, with an amendment, on page 1, line 5, after "June 30," to strike out "1947" and insert in lieu thereof "1945."

Mr. SMITH. The amendment, Mr. President, would simply continue the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation until 1945 instead of 1947. The matter is very urgent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment of the amendment and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 311) was read the third time and passed.

ADDITIONAL REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE INVESTIGATING THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, from the Special Committee Investigating the National Defense Program, I submit parts 8 and 9 of Report No. 480, and ask that they be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The reports will be received and printed.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, on March 16 Mr. Donald Nelson, of the War Production Board, sent a special message to the Senate while it was in session. The message was read by me into the RECORD, covering the controversy which was then going on between himself and Mr. Guthrie. I read that letter into the RECORD, and made the statement that the committee was not in the habit of going into personal controversies, but that at the request of the Chairman of the War Production Board we would take up the matter.

The next day a subcommittee of the House subpenaed Mr. Guthrie to appear before the House committee. He appeared there, and the hearings before the House committee continued for some time.

Since the House committee had submitted no report, we were again urged by the chairman of the War Production Board, Mr. Nelson, to take up the matter,

and on April 14, 15, 16, and 21 we held hearings on the controversy. We heard Mr. Guthrie, Mr. Reed, and several other men who are in charge of the particular bureau in the War Production Board which had to do with conversions. We drew up a report, based on the hearings, and reached certain conclusions which I think should be read to the Senate. It will take only a few minutes to read them, because they cover only a page or two. The conclusions are as follows:

CONCLUSION

This investigation was undertaken solely at the request of the Chairman of the War Production Board, Mr. Donald Nelson. The request compelled the committee, contrary to its usual practice and to the personal choice of its members, to pass upon questions of personal qualifications and responsibility. In deference to that request, it has been necessary to state conclusions frankly, however unsatisfactory they may be to those upon whom the criticism falls.

We have been particularly careful in this instance to arrive at a conclusion which meets the almost unanimous consent of the committee. I say "almost," because it is not to the entire satisfaction of one member of the committee, but he is going along with the committee on the report. We had to be very careful in our conclusions, because just day before yesterday the House made a diametrically opposite report and conclusion.

I continue to read the conclusion:

After an examination of the subject of conversion and the findings in connection with the charges of Robert R. Guthrie, the committee is of the opinion that Philip D. Reed, the Chief of the Bureau of Industry Branches, did not take the necessary action to obtain the maximum conversion of private industry to war production in the shortest possible time. The committee has not been impressed with Mr. Reed's ability or accomplishments, either in the field of conversion or in the field of copper, lead, and zinc, where the committee, in its report of January 15, 1942, had occasion to criticize his failure, when he was Deputy Director of the Materials Division of the Office of Production Management, to recognize that a shortage of these metals was imminent or to take proper action with respect thereto. Insofar as Mr. Guthrie is critical of Mr. Reed and certain other dollar-a-year men, and of the slowness with which curtailment orders were issued by the Bureau of Industry Branches, the committee believes that Mr. Guthrie was correct.

In view of the paramount importance of war production and the vital necessity in that connection for conserving critical materials, the committee believes that the delay of this Bureau in issuing orders curtailing civilian production is most unfortunate. The record does show that James S. Knowlson, Director of the Division of Industry Operations, took effective action on March 17, following Mr. Guthrie's resignation, to assure that civilian production would be curtailed and conversion of industries accomplished. The committee, however, believes that an investigation should have been instigated by Mr. Knowlson for the purpose of establishing exactly which individuals were responsible for the delays and causing them to sever their connections with the War Production Board.

In his testimony before the committee, Mr. Knowlson expressed the opinion that the employment of dollar-a-year men was a matter of the personal integrity of the individual. The committee does not wholly concur in this conclusion. It believes that the Guthrie case points to the conclusion that certain dollar-a-year men within the Bureau of Industry Branches are unable to divorce themselves from their subconscious gravitation to their own industries. The committee feels that the evidence introduced in this case confirms its conclusion in its report of January 15, 1942:

"* * * The committee believes that most dollar-a-year and without-compensation men are honest and conscientious, and that they would not intentionally favor big business. However, it is not their intentional acts that the committee fears but their subconscious tendency, without which they would hardly be human, to judge all matters before them in the light of their past experiences and convictions."

In this connection it should be noted that War Production Board administrative order No. 4, section 2, provides:

"No person so engaged (on dollar-a-year basis) shall make determination directly affecting the affairs of the firm or company in which he is employed."

The committee believes that in view of the foregoing facts, this provision should be amended by striking out the words "firm" and "company" and substituting the word "industry."

That is, no dollar-a-year man should be allowed to have control over the industry with which he is connected and from which he is receiving a salary.

By adopting such an amendment dollar-a-year men would be prohibited from making decisions of policy on matters affecting their own industries. The proposed amendment is not intended as a reflection on the integrity of any dollar-a-year men. As a matter of fact, the committee highly commends many of the leaders of industry who have made their experience and judgment available for public purposes, especially those who have been able to sever their personal connections with private industry and forego their salaries as officials in private industry.

As stated in Division Administrative Order No. 2 by Mr. Knowlson, the Bureau of Industry Branches has responsibility for bringing about maximum use of industrial equipment. The Labor Division and the Division of Civilian Supply are consulted by the Bureau, but their effectiveness in the conversion program is limited in that their powers are merely advisory. The investigation of the Guthrie charges discloses the paradoxical situation of the Division of Civilian Supply, which speaks for the consumer, and which would therefore be expected to argue for a larger supply of civilian commodities, but instead is advocating an all-out effort. The Labor Division, which again might be expected to protest drastic curtailment in view of great dislocations in employment, has also been a consistent advocate of an accelerated all-out conversion. On the other hand, the Bureau of Industry Branches prior to Mr. Guthrie's resignation and the concerted efforts of Robert R. Nathan and Mr. Knowlson consistently advocated a policy of temporizing, moderation, and delay.

It should be observed that the Labor Division is largely staffed by persons from the labor movement, who are on regular governmental salaries—the Civilian Supply Division largely by paid personnel, a majority being recruited from old-line Government agencies—as contrasted with the Division of Industry Operations and its Bureau of Industry Branches, which are largely staffed by dollar-a-year men drawn from industry.

Most of them now draw salaries from their private companies.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield on that point?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LUCAS. What is the implication of the last statement? Why draw comparisons among the three?

Mr. TRUMAN. I am drawing that comparison simply to show that the people who have no financial interest in industry are anxious to see the war effort go forward a little more rapidly than are those who are still connected with industry.

Mr. LUCAS. From that statement, am I to understand that the committee of which the distinguished Senator is chairman would advocate the elimination of all dollar-a-year men?

Mr. TRUMAN. We made a very strong statement on that subject on January 15, and Mr. Nelson came to the committee and discussed the matter with us, and told us that he thought he could not possibly organize the Office of Production Management into the War Production Board unless he could make use of the dollar-a-year men. We told him we would go along with him to the best of our ability, but we still held to the conclusion that a man's heart is where his pocketbook is.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator will further yield, let me say that I notice that on page 2 of the report the committee say, in paragraph 2:

Heading this Bureau is Philip D. Reed, serving with the War Production Board on a dollar-a-year basis, on leave from his position as chairman of the board of the General Electric Co., from which company he is presently receiving a salary and bonus totaling $120,000 per year.

I simply wondered why that statement was published in the report.

Mr. TRUMAN. I think the Senator has a confidential committee print which was not supposed to be distributed.

Mr. LUCAS. I am sorry.

Mr. TRUMAN. In the final conclusion and final report that statement does not appear.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very sorry if I have made available anything which is confidential. I merely sent to the committee room for the report, and when I received it I assumed it was public property.

Mr. TRUMAN. The revised report will not contain that statement.

Mr. LUCAS. If there is anything in the portion read which is detrimental to the defense program, of course, I withdraw it.

Mr. TRUMAN. The final draft of the report was sent to the printer last night, and I will have it here as soon as possible.

Mr. LUCAS. I regret very much that I divulged the information.

Mr. TRUMAN. I regret it, too.

Mr. LUCAS. Because I did not realize that it was a confidential committee print.

Mr. TRUMAN. Of course, I know the Senator did not realize it was a confidential committee print.

Mr. LUCAS. I supposed that every Member of the Senate had it.

Mr. TRUMAN. No. I hoped that the final print would be available immediately, but it has not yet come to the Capitol.

Mr. LUCAS. I had some other questions in connection with the report which I was about to ask the able Senator, but perhaps I had better refrain.

Mr. TRUMAN. I shall be glad to answer any questions the Senator desires to ask, but the statement the Senator read appears in a confidential report, which is revised somewhat in the final draft.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. On the question of dollar-a-year men, as I understand the Senator, no criticism whatever is being made by the committee of the integrity of the men who have been serving at a dollar a year.

Mr. TRUMAN. No; not at all.

Mr. BURTON. But, on the other hand, it is recognized that there is a great need for their valuable experience and their judgment. It is the opinion of the committee that in securing the services of these men for the Government, if they are unable to sever their private connections, their services should be rendered to the Government either in an advisory capacity or in a capacity in which they will be administering someone else's orders. They should not be in positions where they would make the final decisions on questions of policy, and they should not make decisions for the Government in connection with their own industries.

Mr. TRUMAN. That has always been my theory.

Mr. BURTON. And to the extent they are able to sever their connections with their own private industries it is to the benefit of the Government that they do so, as exemplified in the case of Mr. Knowlson, who testified he had been able to do so, and Mr. Nelson, who had been able to do so.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Missouri yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not disagree with that theory at all. I am very happy to go along with it. I was merely attempting to obtain some information in regard to the Guthrie matter. I rather think, perhaps, there has been a little too much said about Mr. Guthrie. I think he has been given a little more prominence in the war-production effort than he deserves.

Mr. TRUMAN. I agree with the Senator absolutely on that subject, but the situation developed in such a manner that the committee had to go forward with the investigation at the request of Mr. Nelson, and we had to make a report on the findings of the committee following the hearings.

Mr. LUCAS. If I understand the Senator from Missouri correctly, in the beginning Mr. Nelson requested that an investigation be made of charges laid to his doorstep by Mr. Guthrie.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Later on the House committee undertook a similar investigation.

Mr. TRUMAN. We never duplicate what another committee does. We stayed away from it for 5 weeks, hoping that the House would wind it up and make a report, but within 10 days Mr. Nelson made a further request that we go ahead and hold the hearings.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand, a committee of the House and a committee of the Senate investigated the charges made by Mr. Guthrie.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. While we charge there is much duplication and confusion in the War Production Board and Army and Navy, we find a little of it among our own group in the Congress. We find a duplication of effort in this investigation. I have before me the report of the House committee, and I desire to read the findings of that committee into the RECORD at the proper time.

Mr. TRUMAN. I have read it, but I have no objection.

Mr. LUCAS. It is possible that Members of the Senate have not seen what the House committee said with respect to Mr. Guthrie.

Mr. TRUMAN. The House committee had a right to draw whatever conclusions they saw fit, and I am not criticizing anyone, but the situation developed through the action of the House committee in calling witnesses after I had made the announcement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that we would comply with Mr. Nelson's request. The House committee did not arrive at any conclusion or make a report until the report was ready to be submitted by the Senate committee.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. There is another committee which has been appointed by the Senate to consider, among other things, the rubber situation. This committee is under the chairmanship of the distinguished Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE]. The purpose of that committee was to ascertain whether or not rubber could be made efficiently from grain alcohol. The investigation to date discloses that the entire matter of the production, or attempted production, of synthetic rubber is under the supervision of Rubber Reserve. The committee tried to ascertain the names of the officials of the Government who are handling this particular matter, and had difficulty in finding out who the particular dollar-a-year men were, but the attorney for the committee ascertained their names, or purported names. The list shows that the representatives of the big four rubber companies, such as Goodrich, Firestone, United States Rubber, and Goodyear, constitute the particular board that is in charge of the program for the production of synthetic rubber.

The evidence further discloses that efforts have been made by independent companies to make rubber out of grain alcohol and petroleum products; but it seems impossible to get any proposal approved by the R. F. C. and the War Production Board. So it has occured to some members of the committee that these representatives of the so-called big four rubber companies that are in control are blocking any and all efforts to produce rubber except through the companies they themselves have dominated. That is also the case as to the making of rubber from petroleum products. It is true that provision has been made for some 200,000 tons of rubber to be produced from alcohol derived from present distilleries but when the war is over the distilleries will want to resume making their regular product, distilled spirits, so at that time the big companies or their subsidiaries, will be left in control of the synthetic plants under their management and control, and probably these plants will be acquired at a price of their own fixing and thus they will obtain control of the production of all synthetic rubber after the war is over. I make this statement for the RECORD, as I understand the report of the committee now before the Senate in effect condemns that sort of practice. Am I correct?

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator's statement is as correct as it can be. I appreciate his suggestion.

At this point I desire to read from the last paragraph of the report, and, then, after a short statement, I shall be through.

> In looking back on the curtailment program, it seems clear to the committee that there was a failure to recognize the imminency of shortages in important materials and that there was more delay in taking adequate action in the public interest than was desirable or should have been permitted. In particular there was damaging delay in the conversion to war purposes in the Durable Goods Branch. The mass of curtailment orders in this field did not begin to issue until the latter part of March, almost 4 months after Pearl Harbor. While there is evidence that steps were being planned along appropriate lines prior to the resignation of Mr. Guthrie, it is noticeable that the action did not take place until after his resignation. His protests during the preceding days may well have contributed something toward increasing the speed of action or at least toward centering attention upon the need for action. The vital need for the conservation of critical materials for war uses and the urgency of increased war production have made every delay at the source of production costly beyond all possibility of measurement.

It was anticipated that Mr. Nelson would appear before the full special committee this morning and discuss, among other things, the reorganization of the War Production Board along the lines suggested in the report of this committee of January 15. Mr. Nelson learned at the last moment that the British War Production Manager was in the city and wanted a conference with him, and we had to postpone the hearing. We had had some discussion with the War Production Board with regard to a reorganization, and it was proposed as a supplemental part of this report to include a statement from the committee on that subject. That statement along with the preliminary draft of this report, had already been made public. I therefore want to make the statement with regard to the hearing of Mr. Nelson, which did not take place this morning, a part of the RECORD at this point. I may add that

Mr. Nelson at a later date will discuss the matters in this statement when he appears before the committee.

Mr. BURTON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TRUMAN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. In listening to the statement of the Senator with regard to the report, I gathered that it is not the intent of the Senator to point out that at the present time there is a failure on the part of the War Production Board, or those in charge of it, to proceed rapidly with the conversion program and make a creditable record as they are now proceeding, but it is directed primarily to the fact that the steps toward conversion were slow in coming, and that the Government did suffer from the slowness of the conversion of various lines of industry to war needs.

Mr. TRUMAN. That is correct. We simply point out a few mistakes in the hope that they will not be made again.

Mr. BURTON. We join in commending Mr. Nelson for his leadership in bringing about increased war production. It is increasing day by day but we feel that a statement of the facts, based upon past history, will benefit the war effort by bringing forth circumstances which should be avoided in the future.

Mr. TRUMAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I wish to make just a brief statement in connection with the report. I have very great respect for the distinguished junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] and all the members of his committee. I think they have done an unusually constructive piece of work in connection with the various types of investigation they have made from time to time since the committee was appointed by the Senate. I merely wish to discuss the committee report briefly, because, in my humble opinion, the importance which has been attached to Mr. Guthrie's conclusions is all out of proportion to his work.

Mr. President, obviously there are many problems involved in the war program. Necessarily our hindsight is a little better than our foresight. It is not very unusual for a Senator to look back some 3 or 4 months or 6 months and say, "Had I known then what I know now, in view of subsequent events, my decision might have been different. I might have acted with a little more speed. There might have been a little more harmony, or a little more of this or that in connection with an all-out war effort."

In my humble opinion, the men connected with the War Production Board have done a magnificient job. I do not doubt that mistakes have been made. I do not doubt mistakes will continue to be made as we move along in the greatest effort in the history of our country to convert a complete peace economy to meet the needs of an all-out war program. It is not possible overnight to turn our economic system into a war machine without making a number of mistakes.

I notice that the committee says on page 21 of the report that—

Mr. Knowlson consistently advocated a policy of temporizing, moderation, and delay.

Many a United States Senator has interviewed the War Production Board and discussed with them the possibility of saving some small business from complete demolition as a result of the war effort. I have talked with Mr. Knowlson many times myself, and I agree with the committee that he has temporized on some important matters in which small business was involved. I know he gave careful consideration to cases wherein it seemed inevitable that employees, anywhere from 20 to 500, were about to be thrown out of employment because the war effort demanded the strategic and critical materials their companies had been using in peacetime.

Mr. Knowlson, through temporizing, through some delay was attempting to save a small business in many instances. He may have temporized on some of the larger questions of conversion. However, I am willing to give him the benefit of the doubt, in view of the almost impossible task we have thrust upon him and his associates.

In this report it is said there are three different types of philosophy involved in this controversy, and that "the philosophy of ruthless curtailment of nonessential civilian production was supported by the Labor Division and the Division of Civilian Supply of the War Production Board."

Yes, there has been ruthless curtailment of nonessentials. It was absolutely necessary that that be done. We have to curtail nonessentials which are not vital to the defense of the country.

Mr. President, I submit that the men in the War Production Board, and the men in the Army and the Navy are carrying the most difficult burden ever placed upon the backs of human beings. They have had absolutely more responsibility than any other group of men in the history of this Nation or any other nation, in the attempt to give to this Nation of free people, in the shortest possible time, what the President of the United States requested. The Senator from Illinois is not defending anyone if criticism is constructive, but I doubt that this report can be of any material aid to the war effort.

That is especially true where we discover a very strong corollary to this report. We find a committee of the House of Representatives also investigating this man Guthrie, who is a small business man from Paducah, Ky. According to this report Guthrie did not get along with the big fellows, and they did not get along with him in the War Production Board. I wish to refer to what was said by the committee of the House which investigated the same matter the Truman committee has been investigating. It is well to observe in passing that frequently we are much concerned about confusion, duplication, and division of authority among the men we have to contact in the executive branch of the Government. I think we should also be concerned about two committees in the legislative branch of the Government investigating the same subject matter.

On page 2 of the report of the House committee, filed on June 16, 1942, we find this statement:

In the second interim report submitted by Special Committee No. 3 on February 11, 1942, to the House of Representatives, it was stated among other things that:

"While it is true that the dollar-a-year man may retain his interest in certain firms and corporations, the committee believes that in by far the greater majority of cases his loyalty to Government interests has remained unaffected, and that the services rendered to date by the dollar-a-year men have been extremely useful and in many cases indispensable to the conduct of the war program."

They further state:

It is the feeling of the committee that there has been no evidence submitted during the course of the hearings on the charges made by Guthrie which would cause it to recede from its findings regarding the conduct of dollar-a-year men in general as indicated from the language above.

I am quoting from the report made by the special committee of the House of Representatives investigating the same subject matter covered by the Truman committee.

On page 9 of the report, where they discuss the question of wool, which is one of the textile branches of the War Production Board, I find the following in the last paragraph:

Mr. Phillip Reed—

He is the individual who is criticized by the Truman committee—

Mr. Phillip Reed, Guthrie's superior and Chief of the Bureau of Industry Operations, testified in connection with this subject that due to certain outstanding characteristics of Guthrie which began gradually to reveal themselves, the morale of Guthrie's branch disintegrated, culminating in a threatened mass resignation that reached the ear of Mr. J. A. Rice and subsequently came to his (Reed's) attention.

The committee concludes by setting forth its findings, and I wish to read them into the RECORD. They are found on page 11 of the report:

1. That there was a sharp and divided conflict of opinion between Guthrie and the dollar-a-year men named by him, but there is lack of proof that this was significant of anything other than strong convictions on the part of those whose duty it was to offer technical advice, together with a lack of proof that they intended to serve any interest other than that of the Government.

2. That it is not possible to depend solely upon Government career men and college professors without practical experience in industry at so serious a time as this, without the assistance of those experienced in the world of business, and without the specialized knowledge of executives and technicians of a high caliber.

3. The committee feels that in most instances men drawn from industry, whether as dollar-a-year men or compensated for their services, have rendered valuable, sincere, and conscientious service to the war effort. They have brought to the production program a wealth of knowledge and experience the necessity of which should be obvious. It cannot be expected that such men should sever all connections with the business world, nor should they be subjected to criticism or suspicion solely because of existing or former industry connections.

If I may diverge for a moment at that point, I should like to have it distinctly understood that I hold no brief for any dollar-a-year man or any individual who is connected with the War Production Board as a dollar-a-year man, who

might be using his position for selfish and personal advantage. Anyone who takes advantage of the war effort to further his own industry or his own bankroll, the Senator from Illinois cannot condemn too severely. We all know, however, that we must procure the services of the key men in the great industries if we are to obtain the maximum production of which American industry is capable.

Mr. President, I do not doubt the sincerity of this man Guthrie, but from the limited investigation I have been able to make, I do seriously doubt that he knew a great deal about the particular department in which he served. As the committee states, the real source of the difficulty in the War Production Board was the clash of personalities over technical matters.

Mr. President, I now read point No. 4, which appears at the top of page 12, as follows:

4. That the committee was impressed with the sincerity of Guthrie and his aides, and that there was no question but that they favored the immediate curtailment of civilian production and conversion of industrial production to the war effort, regardless of collateral effect.

That collateral effect is the one thing which, in my opinion, Guthrie did not understand.

5. That while the committee, as shown by its long campaign to impress the public with the necessity for the conservation and stock piling of strategic and critical materials, is sympathetic with the views advocated by Guthrie in that regard, it nevertheless feels that the question of collateral consequences surrounding conservation and converson were for the most part disregarded by Guthrie.

6. That there was abundant evidence of confusion, red tape, and the lack of a clearly defined authority who could make and enforce decisions in the textile and related branches.

7. That the committee appreciates the fact that Mr. Donald M. Nelson holds a high and responsible office and in the interest of good administration necessarily must rely on the judgment of his departmental chiefs, and it deplores the publicity attendant upon Guthrie's resignation and charges which have attracted far greater attention than they justify.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SCHWARTZ in the chair). Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I do not know whether it has been made clear in the Senator's statement, but it is a rather interesting coincidence that this rather detailed report, which has been pending for several months after the hearings, should have appeared while the publication of the Truman committee report was being delayed at the request of those downtown. Whether it is anything more than merely an interesting coincidence will have to remain to be determined, but I will say that in the light of the circumstances it is possibly unfortunate, and I am sure we all appreciate the importance which the Senator from Illinois attaches to the report of a committee of the other body of Congress.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from Maine in his usual effective way may be criticizing the Senator from Illinois for attaching such a tremendous amount of importance to a report from a committee of the other body of Congress. It is perfectly all right for him to do so if he wishes. I merely lay the House committee report before the Senate, and I cannot help doing so when a committee of one branch of the Congress comes in with a report which is diametrically opposed to the report submitted by a committee of the other branch. I think the country is entitled to know all the facts. It can judge who is right.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I shall yield in a moment. I am convinced that there has been far too much importance laid upon this matter. Here we have conflicting reports from the two distinguished bodies of the legislative branch of the Government. I served in the House, and so did my friend the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER]. He and I have much respect for its Members, as we also have for the Members of the Senate. I am not condemning the Truman committee for its report. I think, in fairness to all, however, we have a right to discuss it. What occurred in the House may be something more than a mere coincidence, as suggested by the Senator from Maine. I do not know anything about that, obviously, and I shall not condemn through speculation or implication. There is too much of that throughout the country. All I know is what the facts show, and I thought it was to the interest of Donald Nelson and the War Production Board that these facts be brought out in connection with the Truman committee report. I have defended Donald Nelson in connection with the heroic effort he is putting forward as head of the War Production Board. I know that men under him will make mistakes, as I said a moment ago, but I submit there is no greater patriot, no man with greater industry and zeal, there is no individual in America who is more interested in winning the war than Mr. Nelson. He, better than anyone else, has a complete conception of his responsibilities to America and the United Nations as we battle for our very existence. I doubt that a man could be found in America who could have surpassed the job Mr. Nelson has done up to now in the administration of his duties and authority as head of the War Production Board. In organizing and administering a national program touching practically every phase of our economic life, it is inevitable that he must come in contact with the Guthries and the Reeds and others there who, because of some whim, are hampering the war effort. There are always some men in any crisis who cannot see the trees for the forest.

I now yield to the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Illinois does not have to defend Donald Nelson to the Senate or to the committee. What the committee has been endeavoring to do is to protect Donald Nelson from some of the people who may cause him a great deal of embarrassment a little later in the year if he does not immediately take the matter in hand and clean up the situation there. That is the reason for the report. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that when the Senate committee submitted a report on the aluminum situation the committee in the House dealing with the same situation made a report diametrically opposite to the Senate committee report, and history has shown which one was correct.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very glad the Senator from Illinois addressed the Senate and called attention to some of the matters contained in the report. I happen to be a member of the Truman committee, but I wish to confess that I have not been as diligent in attendance on the committee meetings and as industrious in reading the hearings and reports as have some of the other members of the committee. That is not because of any lack of appreciation of the importance of the work of the committee, but because of the pressure of duties in other jurisdictions. But I was present a portion of the time when the hearings relating to Mr. Guthrie and Mr. Reed were held. I do not know Mr. Reed; I would not know him if I saw him; I have no interest in Mr. Reed; but I am extremely interested in the very outstanding service which I think Mr. Donald Nelson, as head of the War Production Board, is rendering the Government. I am anxious that neither the Senate nor the Truman committee shall do anything to interfere with or to impede Mr. Nelson in his efforts, or embarrass him in the handling of his organization.

Mr. President, I wish to say a word about dollar-a-year men. My own view is that it would be better if we did not have any dollar-a-year men; that it would be better if they were all placed on Government salaries, and cut off from their private connections. But we have dollar-a-year men. By the way, Mr. Guthrie, the man whom the committee seems to applaud and cheer, was a dollar-a-year man, as I understand.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, he severed all his business connections and was working for the Government for nothing, on a dollar-a-year basis.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; on a dollar-a-year basis.

Mr. TRUMAN. He was not receiving a salary from any other source.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes. He was not a nickel-a-year man; he was a dollar-a-year man. He was working for the Government for nothing. I am not criticizing Mr. Guthrie. I do not know anything about Mr. Guthrie.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. The Senator would feel that there was a difference between a dollar-a-year man who was not being paid by private industry and a dollar-a-year man who was being paid $125,000 a year by private industry, would he not?

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; unless the former were getting a good deal of compensation in the way of gratification of his vanity and satisfaction of personal hunger for vindication at the hands of the committee.

Mr. President, as I said, I should like to see these men all sever their private connections and be on the Government pay roll, and on no one else's pay roll, but that is not the system, that is not the policy under which we have been working. I should prefer that all of them have no master except the Government of the United States.

When the Government uses the services of a man from industry it tries to find one who knows something about the subject with which he is to deal. If it employed an expert to regulate the watch business, it would get someone who knows something about watches and the watch business. We are following the practice of bringing into the Federal service men who know the subject with which they are to deal.

Mr. President, I voted against making the report in question. I wish to confess that my motive was largely, if not entirely, an interest in Mr. Nelson. Mr. Nelson regards the report as reflecting on his policy, while Mr. Reed, the man directly criticized, is a subordinate of his. Mr. Nelson feels, since Mr. Reed is still in the service and since Mr. Guthrie has resigned, that he, Nelson, is responsible for the orders with respect to conversion. In a letter which Mr. Nelson wrote he said he thought the conversion had been worked out as near to the right time and as effectively as it could be worked out. The committee criticized that statement. I quote as follows from the committee report:

> Commenting on the conversion program and the time when it was put into effect, he (Mr. Nelson) stated:
>
> "As I said to the newspapermen, only time will tell and only history can record whether we have been too slow or too rapid. In my opinion, it is about the right time. We had to do it at this time to conserve materials, to make provision for manpower, and to bring about facilities. We have moved as rapidly and as effectively as we could at the time that we thought it was advisable to make these curtailments. They have been made. Most of them have now been made, and the dates have been set. At the end of May practically all of the consumers' durable industries will have shut down. Many of them will have been converted into war work at that time."

It is the attitude of Mr. Nelson, under his responsibility as head of this Board, that he effectuated the conversion from private industry to war-production industry in the best way that it could be done, and at about the right time.

I shall now read what the committee said, and I think Mr. Nelson is justified in concluding that this is an assault on his policy. I am not hostile to the committee. I am simply expressing my own views. The committee said:

> The theory has been advanced that history alone will be able to decide whether the conversion program was initiated in due course or the delay in getting it under way at the proper time has caused irreparable injury to our war effort. Recent events have shown this conclusion to be untenable.

In other words, the committee takes direct issue with Mr. Nelson.

> As a graphic illustration the committee points to the conversion of the automobile industry, which has exploded the fallacy that automobile machine tools were not adaptable to war production—

And so forth. It is not unreasonable to assume that Mr. Nelson regards that as an attack on his theory and policy.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In justice to Mr. Nelson, I think it should be made clear that he was not in charge throughout the past year, when the automobile industry was running at a record rate. Within 2 weeks after he took over the responsibility in January the automobile conversion order was issued. I think that the celerity with which Mr. Nelson carried out that program reflects great credit upon him.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Maine for that observation. I think it is sound. However, one reading the report might conclude that the committee was assailing Mr. Nelson for not having done so earlier. He was in the organization in some capacity during all this time; but, as I recall, he was not the head of it until January of this year.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think there is no reflection on him. The Knudsen-Hillman combination was functioning throughout that entire year. I think the program is very creditable to Mr. Nelson.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. I do not want the implication to be left that Mr. Knudsen had not considered and made plans for conversion of the automobile industry. I myself happen to know that in a conference between my colleague, Mr. Knudsen, and Mr. Kanzler, who is now Mr. Nelson's representative in the Detroit area, plans were fully made for the conversion of the automobile industry. The process had already been started before this order was issued.

However, everyone must remember that the attack on Pearl Harbor occurred just a few weeks before the order was made, and that attack greatly changed the general situation. I think the implied criticism of the administration of Mr. Knudsen is not justified.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me say to the Senator from Michigan that the Senator from Texas is not criticizing Mr. Knudsen. The assault on Mr. Knudsen came from Maine, not from Texas. We in Texas use too many of his products on credit to be at all offensive to Mr. Knudsen. [Laughter.]

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I certainly did not mean to bring into issue the action of Mr. Knudsen and Mr. Hillman. I thought we were confining ourselves to the question of whether Mr. Nelson was being challenged.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. I think it is perfectly clear that the question under discussion involves no criticism of Mr. Knudsen.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, in speaking of the conversion of a great industry such as the automobile industry and other industries, Senators speak of it as though it were a matter like calling a page or punching a button. It is a tremendous thing to touch a great industry in the United States with force and arms and say, "You must convert." It is a matter which requires caution and patience in its decision. We all want it; but I do not regard the efforts of the men who went about it in a studied, systematic way as being evidence of their lack of appreciation of the importance of the step, or the wisdom of the manner in which it was performed.

As soon as the news of Pearl Harbor broke, everybody was angry because we had not built a great Navy 15 years ago. Yet 15 years ago Senators were voting "no" on the question of increasing the size of our Navy. When the attack on Pearl Harbor occurred, we were all sorry that we did not have great fleets of airplanes; yet 3 years ago when we were voting on the question in the Senate, Senators were voting "no." When we woke up and found that the Dutch had lost the Dutch East Indies, we all began to clamor about rubber, and to ask why somebody had not done something about rubber 3 or 4 years ago. Was any Senator worried about rubber back in those days? Nobody then was talking about rubber. We did not anticipate what has since happened. The loss of the Dutch East Indies was another Pearl Harbor. It broke on us with all the tragedy and suddenness of a dramatic incident for which we had not been looking.

I do not blame the men who were trying to do their duty in the War Production Board. Our hindsight is undoubtedly better than our foresight. Six months after it is all over we sit down in a committee room with a couple of prima donnas, Mr. Reed and Mr. Guthrie, each one wanting a blessing from Congress, and try to tell them what they should have done 6 months ago. That time is past. It is all over. What good does it do now for a committee of the Senate to kick somebody around the lot?

If Mr. Reed is not the right man, put him out; but this is not the way to do it. The way to do it is not to assault Mr. Nelson. The word assault may be too strong. I want to be fair. However, the committee report is an attack on him. It may be a sort of feather-duster attack, but it is an attack. A man may be annoyed with a feather duster until he feels that he would rather be hit, because then he can hit back. So long as he is only being annoyed by a feather duster, he brushes it aside as he would a fly.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. In the report which was made on January 15, we discussed every phase of this question. Mr. Reed showed his inefficiency then, and we had hoped that he would not be in the new set-up. Mr. Nelson told us that he was going to have a reorganization of the set-up; but he did not get rid of Mr.

Reed. Now Mr. Reed has him in another controversy, and we are still trying to save Mr. Nelson from Mr. Reed.

Mr. CONNALLY. That is not the way to get rid of Mr. Reed. Go and tell the President that he ought to be fired. The President is the man who is the head of all this business.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. I take very serious exception to that statement. Donald Nelson was put in charge of this work, and we understood that his coattails were not to be pulled by any one, not even by the President. The Senator intimates that we are interfering in executive administration. That may be warranted. What else could we do, when Mr. Nelson himself invited us to investigate? We did not intrude in this matter. We were invited in.

Mr. CONNALLY. Evidently the Senator's position is that nobody can touch Mr. Nelson except the committee. Leave the President out. I do not want to drag him into it. Let us assume that Mr. Nelson has authority to dismiss Mr. Reed. Let him dismiss him if he wants to do so; but so long as Mr. Nelson thinks Mr. Reed is doing a good job and fitting in with Mr. Nelson's program, I do not believe it is any of our business to try to reorganize this particular agency by picking out one man and saying, "This man must go." I do not know Mr. Reed. I hold no brief for him. It seems to me that the committee has fallen into the error of taking sides in a personal controversy between Mr. Reed and Mr. Guthrie.

When we boil this thing down and all the volatile matter disappears, we find a little personal squabble between Mr. Guthrie and Mr. Reed, two clashing personalities. It is said that Mr. Reed has an unfavorable personality. I understand that he did not impress the committee. Some of the committee members say that he intimated that members of the committee do not know as much as he does. Of course, we have asses everywhere. I do not know Mr. Reed, and I do not know what size ass he is; but evidently he has some personal qualities which do not "gee." Probably Mr. Guthrie also had some of such qualities. Each is trying to be the "big shot" in the War Production Board. They get into a squabble, and Mr. Guthrie becomes angry and resigns, and runs up to Capitol Hill.

Let me show why I think the committee has made a personal issue of the question.

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CONNALLY. I yield.

Mr. TRUMAN. Let me correct a statement which the Senator has just made. It was Mr. Nelson, and not Mr. Guthrie, who came to Capitol Hill. Mr. Nelson made the request for the investigation.

Mr. CONNALLY. Yes; he wanted an investigation to disprove Mr. Guthrie's statement.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. He did not get what he ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. He did not get what he ordered. He did not know what the result would be.

I am not trying to shield Mr. Nelson. He is a human being. He is subject to many of the weaknesses to which others are subject. That is why I am trying to keep the committee from condemning him. I think Mr. Nelson is doing a stupendous job, and doing it well. As I understand, he is not a dollar-a-year man. He gave up a tremendous salary to accept a position with the Government. He is doing a great work, and I will not vote for any resolution or anything else which would impede or hinder him. I have not yet been convinced that he is wrong.

Bouquets for Mr. Guthrie are scattered throughout the report. I wonder if Mr. Guthrie is in the gallery. I do not know. He ought to be, to hear these tributes. This is what the report says on page 21:

> On the other hand, the Bureau of Industry branches prior to Mr. Guthrie's resignation and the concerted efforts of Robert R. Nathan and Mr. Knowlson consistently advocated a policy of temporizing, moderation, and delay.

In other words, everybody except Mr. Guthrie wanted to delay, temporize and moderate. I do not think that can be true. I do not think Mr. Nelson is trying to do those things. Mr. Nelson is not mentioned by name, but the responsible heads of the division are mentioned.

Another tribute to Mr. Guthrie is found on page 19 of the report.

> Insofar as Mr. Guthrie is critical of Mr. Reed and certain other dollar-a-year men, and of the slowness with which curtailment orders were issued by the Bureau of Industry branches, the committee believes that Mr. Guthrie was correct.

Why does not the committee state its own conclusions? Why does it give blanket endorsement to everything Mr. Guthrie said about Mr. Reed? I venture the assertion that the committee does not know all the things Mr. Guthrie said about Mr. Reed behind his back. I do not think the committee ought to do such things as that. It ought not to take one man's side and say," Mr. Smith is right, and Mr. Brown is wrong."

On page 21 there is another tribute to Mr. Guthrie.

> While there is evidence that steps were being planned along appropriate lines prior to the resignation of Mr. Guthrie—

The committee says that plans were being made along appropriate lines. That is why Mr. Nelson was there.

> it is noticeable that the action did not take place until after his resignation.

In other words, Mr. Guthrie forced this thing by his resignation, although it was taking place before he resigned. What kind of a conclusion is that?

> His protests during the preceding days may well have contributed something toward increasing the speed of action or at least toward centering attention upon the need for action. The vital need for the conservation of critical materials for war uses and the urgency of increased war production have made every delay at the source of production costly beyond all possibility of measurement.

I do not care to quarrel with that general statement.

In conclusion I have no quarrel with the committee. I was voted down, practically with one voice. Mine was the only vote against the report of the committee. That is not unusual. I have been in the minority many times, and I am not complaining at that; but I believe that the committee, at least by indirection, is criticizing the efforts which Mr. Nelson is making. By singling out one man, the committee put Mr. Nelson "on the spot." Mr. Nelson may feel that he must keep this man instead of kicking him out because some reflection is cast upon him. I do not know what his policy is. Sometimes men feel that way. Mr. Nelson may feel like saying, "I will not throw my friend to the wolves." Most of them are thrown to the wolves; but sometimes a man rises up and says, "No; I will not throw my friend to the wolves."

It seems to me that this problem could have been solved in some other way.

In closing let me say that Mr. Nelson is not from my State. I never saw him in my life until he came before the Truman committee several months ago while he occupied a subordinate position in his organization. After I heard his testimony and his views with regard to war production, I personally considered that he was the strongest man in all the organization, and that he should be put at the head of it, to be the one man at the head of our war production. While I do not claim that what I thought had anything on earth to do with his appointment or anything to do with shaping opinion, I was gratified to learn months later that the President had come to the conclusion that Mr. Nelson was the man to head the War Production Board, and so he was put in power. He has been working night and day under tremendous pressure. I think he has a broad vision and a broad concept of the tremendous responsibilities of the War Production Board. I think he is doing a great job. He gave up a tremendous salary and is taking the pay of a Government official; and I will not vote for anything which would impede or hinder Mr. Nelson or reflect upon his conduct of the important office he holds.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I rise briefly to point out to the Senate that the report submitted by the Truman committee is no more a personal attack upon Mr. Nelson than the statement just made by my distinguished colleague from Texas is a personal attack upon the chairman of our committee. I do not believe that the element of personal attack enters into the matter at all. The report is submitted to the Senate of an investigation requested by Mr. Nelson on the part of a regularly constituted committee of the Senate, which reviewed the facts. The committee sat in one session after another, many of which I attended, and all of which were attended by the chairman of the committee.

After the facts were reviewed and after the evidence was submitted, the committee, the agent of the Senate, had nothing else to do in keeping with its integrity, but to make its report to the body which created it.

Mr. President, judging from a review of the work of the Truman committee, and from a review of the criticism of its work in the press, on the radio, and in other agencies of communication, I be-

lieve it is rendering great service to the Senate and to the war effort. If we are not entitled to review the facts and to make an impartial and impassionate report, we had better abandon the committee, abdicate our rights as Senators, and leave the appraisal of the war effort entirely to others.

As one who has attended the meetings of the committee, and who has great faith in the chairman of the committee and in his leadership and direction, I desire to say that the report, in keeping with every other report of the Truman committee, is a report for greater war production, and not a personal attack upon any man. I commend the chairman of the committee for his able leadership of the committee, and I hope he will continue to carry on.

PROHIBITION OF PHOTOGRAPHS AND SKETCHES OF MILITARY OR NAVAL RESERVATIONS, VESSELS, AND PROPERTIES

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1707) to prevent the making of photographs and sketches of military or naval reservations, naval vessels, and other naval and military properties, and for other purposes, which was, on page 3, after line 9, to insert:

SEC. 5. This act shall be effective only for the duration of the present war as determined by proclamation of the President.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

USE OF CIVILIAN PILOTS AND SMALL AIRPLANES FOR ANTISUBMARINE PATROL

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, during the day the Senate was asked to approve the action of the House increasing the appropriation for the production of new shipping so as to provide for 1,000,000 tons instead of 500,000 tons. I was glad to vote for the measure, and there was no objection on the part of the other Members of the Senate. However, while we are voting further money to produce a million tons of new shipping, we might consider the extent to which we have provided protection for the shipping we already have along our own coasts.

On April 30 last I presented to the Senate a detailed suggestion that we establish an air umbrella over our entire Atlantic coastal waters extending from Maine to Florida and 50 miles to sea, to combat the deadly submarine attacks upon our ships. I suggested that we do this by utilizing the small, slow, privately owned airplanes which are already in existence but are idle at almost every airport throughout our vast country.

I suggested that these planes should be flown by sportsmen pilots whose flying skill and knowledge of light airplanes, as well as the airplanes themselves, today are lying idle and wasted. Most of these men would not be called to strenuous active duty in combat, ferry, or instruction services, but they could relieve the younger men for those more strenuous duties.

On April 30 I stated that the United States reported on April 16, 1942, the sinking of 131 vessels within close reach of our American shores. Since that date, in the span of 60 days, 120 more ships have gone down, increasing the number to approximately 250 ships sunk by Axis submarines in our waters, climaxed with the spectacle of two large American cargo ships being torpedoed, one of them sunk, by enemy submarines within view of thousands of persons at a Virginia beach resort on June 15.

I fully realize that we are contemplating the manufacture of many lighter-than-air craft, or "blimps," to meet this problem. I fully realize that in the future we shall manufacture specially designed air, surface, and under-the-surface craft to banish submarines. But our ships are being sunk daily within sight of our shores, while thousands of small aircraft and the services of patriotic citizens are not now being utilized to meet this tragic situation.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. I wonder if the Senator has any definite figures as to what aircraft may be available which are not being used?

Mr. BROOKS. If the Senator will permit me to finish my statement. I think his question will be answered.

Mr. HILL. Very well.

Mr. BROOKS. Over 2,000 of these small craft, I am informed, already are equipped with 2-way radios, and the steel that would be necessary for the building of bomb and depth charge racks to equip several thousand of these planes would not equal the steel sent to the bottom of the sea with the sinking of a single cargo ship.

It took a long time to convince many heads of the services that airplanes would be the most effective weapons and gun platforms of this war, but, finally, everyone recognizes it, and we will, in the future, build aircraft carriers and planes rather than cumbersome battleships.

How long will it take to convince these same heads that in this world-encircling war we must use every available air and surface craft to stop enemy submarines from invading and working at will in our American waters?

How many more ships must be sunk? How many more lives must be lost before these thousands of available small aircraft and experienced civilian pilots will be mobilized and pressed into service to form this air umbrella over our American coastal waters to preserve these precious cargo ships so vital to our supply, our safety, and our ultimate victory?

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say I believe that every available plane should be used. I happen to know of a privately owned plane in my State of Alabama which is being used for this very purpose today. I was interested in knowing what was the source of the Senator's information as to the fact that there are 2,000 of these planes which are available and could be used but are not now being used.

Mr. BROOKS. The source of my information is the report that there are that many planes registered with the Civilian Aeronautics Authority which are not now used in the military service.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator know that they are not being used at all for the purpose of endeavoring to locate and observe submarines?

Mr. BROOKS. I said they are not being used now in this service.

Mr. HILL. In this service?

Mr. BROOKS. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. I happen to know of one case, as I say, of a plane owned in Birmingham, Ala., which is now being used along the Atlantic coast for the very purpose of endeavoring to spot submarines in order that the submarines, if possible, may be destroyed. The Senator speaks of 2,000 planes now licensed with the C. A. A. which are not now being used for this purpose.

Mr. BROOKS. They are not being used for this purpose; that is correct.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to comment along the line the Senator from Alabama has suggested, that excellent service is being rendered to the Army and Navy by a volunteer civilian patrol which has been in operation along the Atlantic coast of Florida. I think it should be made a matter of public record that some submarines have already been sunk as a result of the operations of this volunteer civilian patrol service.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the Senator, and I am sure the record is correct that these small planes can, if fully utilized, furnish an air umbrella over all our coast line.

The stories of courage, daring, and skill of the air arm of our Navy, the Navy itself, and the Marines in the Coral Sea, and, in addition, our Army and Marines defending Midway, have thrilled all America.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I live within 2 miles of the Atlantic Ocean, and I am glad to say, for the information of the Senator, I know that everything possible is being done; that several bases for such aircraft have been located; that they are doing very good work; and have been doing so for, perhaps, 3 months.

Mr. BROOKS. I thank the Senator. I am sure again it is true that wherever they have been utilized they are effective. My concern is that they are not being utilized along the entire coast. The full facilities are not being utilized to defend our shipping today.

The dynamic and dramatic eyewitness stories of Stanley Johnston of the victory of our Navy in the Pacific has given every citizen of our country renewed faith and confidence in the fighting ability and efficiency of our American Navy. The fact that our Navy has so successfully transported hundreds of thousands of American soldiers to foreign lands thousands of miles from America is proof of its efficiency, but the sinking of more than 250 cargo ships and tankers in our

coastal waters is ample and eloquent proof that we have failed miserably to meet this challenge of the submarines here at home. The answer is that we have not used the full facilities at our command.

Where the limited civilian air patrol has been tried, it has proven successful, as admitted by officials, and as testified to here today by Senators. It should be extended along our entire coast, and at once.

Our American production of arms, munitions, guns, and planes has amazed the world, but our failure to meet this submarine menace along our coast comes close to being gross negligence.

We have vast numbers of American soldiers in Iceland, Ireland, Australia, and countless other points thousands of miles from home. Can we keep open the constant line of supplies to them? Can we reach them constantly with sufficient materials and munitions? Can we reach them when they call for help? Can we reach them when they are wounded? Can we open a new front to meet the demand of Russia? Can we launch an attack on Japan to bolster up the courageous and battered Chinese?

The President has recently reported to the Congress that the battle of production is on the way to being won, but that another—that of distributing war weapons to the distant battle fronts in sufficient number, and on time—is now in the crucial stage.

To meet this problem of distribution we must have ships, ships, and more ships. And yet 250 ships have been sunk close to our very coast while our small planes are grounded and our experienced civilian pilots have not been pressed into service.

Prime Minister Curtin of far-off Australia, speaking the other day of the submarine successes against the United Nations, said our shipping losses are greater than our capacity to replace them, and almost at the very hour he was speaking, two more ships were torpedoed, one of them sunk within sight of our Virginia resort, and this, I repeat, while thousands of our small planes are not employed to meet this menace.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have my detailed suggestion made on April 30 printed as a part of my remarks at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROSIER in the chair). Without objection it is so ordered.

The statement referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WAYLAND BROOKS, OF ILLINOIS, ON THE FLOOR OF THE SENATE, THURSDAY, APRIL 30, 1942, URGING THE USE OF CIVILIAN PILOTS AND SMALL AIRPLANES FOR PATROLING THE COASTLINES OF THE UNITED STATES AND FIGHTING ENEMY SUBMARINES ATTACKING UNITED STATES SHIPPING IN COASTAL WATERS.

The Axis Powers have cut our line of supply of tin and rubber. They haven't cut our production of gasoline, but they have sunk tankers and merchant marine supply ships right within sight of our shore. We are on the verge of denying our people the supply of, or right to use, gasoline largely because we haven't been able to stop their attack on our shipping in our own waters.

Every lesson of the war points to the power of aircraft. It was from the air that we suffered our greatest naval defeat and humiliation at Pearl Harbor. It was from the air that we lost our planes and airfields in the Philippines. It was from the air that our great battleships were sunk near Java. It was from the air attacks that the French found that the Maginot Line was inadequate in modern war. It was from the air that the British found a force against which the *Prince of Wales* and the *Repulse* could not successfully defend themselves. And yet our tankers and merchant ships go down day after day, with little or no air protection above them.

We have thousands of small airplanes already manufactured and frozen idle on the ground. We have thousands of patriotic, courageous and competent civilian pilots grounded in our own country. These planes and pilots, unfitted for foreign military service, are capable and competent to provide a constant umbrella over these slow moving tankers and merchant ships.

By April 16, 1942, the United States had announced the sinking of 131 vessels within close reach of our shore. A total of 857 crew members of these vessels were reported killed, many of them having died in burning oil. The reports announced 1,084 missing, and 3,593 rescued. The monetary losses of these ships and their cargoes was certainly well over $100,000,000.

Ships are the most critical materials of the war, not only from the American standpoint, but for the United Nations. Food and military munitions are piling up awaiting available ships. These losses average over one a day since the war began. They have offset any ship building—actual building of ships—since Pearl Harbor. Announced rates of building are at 1¼ ships a day at this time. In other words the production of ships is only keeping pace with sinkings and the country has not made any gains in production of the 8,000,000 tons of ships ordered for this year. We are straining the sinews of the steel and ship building industries to produce the vessels and neglecting to apply a remedy that is so readily available.

The great majority of the sinkings are within a stone's throw of the shores. Some have been so close to shore that spectators on the beaches and shore highways were in grandstand seats for these battles. Recently, survivors were rescued by rowboats.

Every one of these ships sunk means a loss of almost a full day's production for the entire steel and ship-building facilities of the Nation. Tankers on which the enemy is concentrating are the most vital type of ship required. Rationing of fuels on both coasts is based on these losses.

We all assume that the Army and Navy have been doing the best they can with the forces available for coastal patrol to halt the sinkings. The results—continuing daily—show that additional help and lots of it, is badly needed.

The help is available—men, equipment, aircraft and pilots, and the necessary skill in administration. It is not now being used. Utilization of these resources need not disturb the main war effort in any way.

We should take into military service under Army or Navy direction and supervision, enough of the country's light aircraft and men who have been sportsmen pilots to operate a 24-hour a day continuous air umbrella along the entire Atlantic coastline.

This "umbrella" should be flown in small, slow airplanes—the only kind of planes that should be used for submarine hunting. They should be armed with one or two depth charges and a two-way radio. They should be flown by sportsmen pilots whose flying skill and knowledge of the capabilities of light airplanes are today lying idle and wasted.

The men are ready to go at once. Details of the projected air anti-submarine patrol in light ships have been worked out. The aircraft are available in almost countless numbers. I understand new planes are now frozen by Government order at a dozen different aircraft factories. The pilots are doing a little flying but chiefly they are wondering why we are continually losing ships at sea when they know that, if used, they could virtually bring sinkings to a halt in a belt extending from Maine to Florida and 50 miles to sea. Creation of a safety zone of these proportions would protect the coastal traffic that we now are losing.

One thousand pilots could do the job. Actually, the country has 100,000 licensed pilots of which probably two-thirds would have the experience in the air that would qualify them to perform this kind of patrol work. Obviously, the field from which to draw pilots is large. Most of these men are individuals who would not be called to combat, ferry, or instruction duties in the ordinary course of affairs. Used on the patrol, they would release to other duties the highly trained and skilled personnel now attempting in inadequate numbers and with improper types of craft, to maintain an air patrol. These men are needed on our fighting fronts—in the Pacific and other theaters of war.

Ground personnel for the light-plane patrol should be mostly unskilled. One or two trained mechanics at each base—not more than 150 all told—could supervise the maintenance, service, and inspection of the patrol airplanes.

It should be a volunteer service. The men should be made Army or naval special reservists and placed on temporary active duty, or some other method used to place them under Army or naval supervision. A great knowledge of types of boats, naval procedures, and so forth, is not required. Once the patrol is set up this kind of training could be given.

But primarily the men should be given to understand that any submarine they see will be an enemy sub and should be both reported by radio and attacked. If American submarines must operate along the coasts they can stay out of the patrolled zone or notify the particular units watching the areas where they will maneuver.

The kind of airplanes that could do this job better than any others are types such as the Piper Cub Cruiser, the Rearwin Cloudster, the Stinson Voyager and 105, the Luscombe, Aeronca, and Taylorcraft types. Their speeds are ample—since all will cruise at 80 miles an hour or better. Their range is ample, since most of those mentioned have up to 4 hours of flying—while 2 hours at a time would be the recommended duration for any single patrol flight. Their load-carrying capacities are such that in addition to one pilot they could carry two-way radio, ample fuel and lubricants easily, and up to 350 pounds of depth charges or bombs. Their slow speed is their big advantage. All these airplanes can fly at 60 miles an hour in complete safety. They are easy to fly; land at less than 40 miles an hour; they can be operated from improvised airports with safety by day or night. They all are equally adaptable for either pontoons or wheels. Their initial costs range from $3,000 down to $1,500.

Hundreds of these types of airplanes are now available—ready to fly at once. At one factory (Piper) I understand more than 750 airplanes are staked out, frozen by orders from the Government that prevent their sales to others than those engaged in war work. This factory's capacity is 300 a month alone, and there are at least 6 other plants where suitable types are made. The Civil

Aeronautics Authority has closed up to 60 percent of all the Nation's airports—due to demands for an elaborate guard and dispatching system—and more than enough airplanes for the patrol could be commandeered from the closed airports in a few Central States. Illinois, among others, could supply the entire requirement of planes for the patrol.

Let us take one of these planes (Piper Cub Cruiser) for an example. Here are the performances, weight, range, and other characteristics:

This plane is a standard type found throughout the United States. It weighs 760 pounds empty; will carry a 700-pound load. It will fly as fast as 95 miles an hour and as slow as 45 to 50. It has a 75-horsepower engine that consumes only 5 gallons of fuel an hour. In addition to a pilot and 25 gallons of fuel, plus adequate lubricants, it will carry a pay load (in this case a military load) of 380 pounds.

This 380 pounds can be divided into 300 pounds of depth charges and 80 pounds of radio and a rubber boat.

Engines for these little airplanes are among the most reliable in aviation. They are made in large numbers by a wide variety of companies. They are available and they can easily be maintained. They give assurance of running for long periods of time, an assurance that is required for pilot morale in overwater operations. Cost of operating the engines is less than $3 per hour, compared with $3 a minute for high-powered military engines in service types now being used for this work.

A minimum of instruments is necessary. These little planes can fly slowly enough so that great skill in blind flying and blind navigation is definitely not required by their operators. No planes can operate in fog, nor can submarines attack boats in dense fog because of lack of visibility. If caught at sea by fogs that form, the little planes can be flown down close to the water until they reach shore. Safe landings can be made on beaches or into shallow water, if necessary.

I am informed racks to carry depth charges already have been designed and built for these little planes. Such racks can be installed in 4 hours per ship. Obviously, the Navy would supply the bombs and depth charges, and the Army or Navy should supply personnel to service the charges at each base and to man ground radio stations for the patrol.

Definite choosing of patrol fields along the eastern coast should take into account the local terrain, existence or absence of airports, weather factors, and other items. Survey work to pick these locations and get them into shape for patrol flying would require only a short time.

Where necessary, pontons could be fitted and natural harbors, sheltered bays, and so forth, could be utilized as bases.

Highways and trucking would make supply problems easy in solution.

In considering the patrols and special techniques for their flying could easily be worked out. The point is that the little planes, used in recommended numbers would cover the patrol zone so frequently that no given spots would escape the eyes of observers, except in extraordinary weather conditions, for periods of longer than a few minutes. In other words, an airplane would be over any given spot in any point on the zone at frequent intervals. The present patrols cannot approach this record for frequency and speeds of patrol planes are so great that observation is cursory at best. There are vast stretches of coastline that cannot conceivably be covered with the present limited equipment and men.

If there is any refueling of enemy submarines from coastal points or from coastal boats, it certainly would be halted under this system. No point, however, remote, would be left unguarded either by day or night. Activities necessary for refueling submarines would certainly be spotted.

On such a patrol there would undoubtedly be losses of planes and men. There would be losses forced by weather, by accidents, by limitations in experience and skill. The patrol would of necessity be a volunteer service. Inquiry among the pilots in Illinois shows that sufficient men to provide for the operation of the entire patrol could be recruited in a few days by asking for volunteers in this State alone. I understand that some 500 pilots in my State have shown their willingness to serve their country in any capacity and specifically in this one.

There would constantly be observers in the air who would cover the entire zone, 50 miles to sea, at frequent intervals. It would be an armed patrol, able to strike at enemy subs. It would be able also to call up the Navy's regular forces, by air or sea, to assist. There could be no extended attacks on surface vessels without having three or four patrol planes quickly arriving on the scene with their depth bombs, and radios calling up heavier attack units.

A submerged submarine is defenseless against an aircraft, and this point is the crux in the tactics that would be used.

Suppose a patrol plane sighted a sub. If the sub is on the surface, the patrol ship would circle and immediately call for heavy Army or Navy units. If the sub crash-dives upon sighting the patrol ship, the patrol pilot can dive on the submarine, fly down to within 10 feet of the water above the diving sub and drop its depth charges. No practice or great accuracy would be required to put charges within killing distance of the sub under these conditions. Under the recommended patrolling system several of the patrolling aircraft could be called to the scene where any one of them had sighted a sub within a few minutes after the first alarm sounded.

There could be no repetition of the bold, daylight attacks, prolonged over a period of 20 minutes to 3 hours that have already occurred.

For night operations slightly different techniques can be used. Every vessel leaves a visible wake in traveling over the surface of the sea. Wakes are visible for miles to air patrols. Submarines on the surface or surfaced enough to have periscopes out leave wakes. These could be seen at night from the air.

Probably the best system would be to constantly cover each vessel proceeding through each zone during the night. Vessels operating north or south (along the Atlantic coast, for example) would be known. They would be picked up at dusk and planes would fly a constant patrol over them throughout the hours of darkness. Additional methods and alternative methods and devices could be adopted or developed to fit any special conditions or situations, as experience teaches.

The British operated just such a patrol as is suggested here around the coasts of England in the World War of 1914–18. It was flown in ships with performance almost exactly comparable to that of the types suggested here. This patrol broke up the submarine menace around the British coasts. Pilots who flew this patrol objected to it after the first few weeks because submarines disappeared and submarine activity ceased, and the patrol was a monotonous one.

At this time the Army and Navy are conducting patrols with a wide variety of planes. A few Civil Air Patrol ships have been used in a cautious patrol that went only 15 miles to sea and carried only radio. A large number of the Army planes now used have been armed only with machine guns, which are almost completely impotent against submarines. Also both the Army and Navy planes that have been used have been high-speed planes that limit their observation, and only a very limited number of bases from which they could be operated.

This submarine warfare off our coasts has become a critical affair. It is as much a crisis as was Dunkirk when British yachtsmen, tugboatmen, and others took their boats, pleasure launches, antique ferryboats, and everything else that would float to carry back to England a few soldiers. No one asked the skippers if they were civilians or navy.

The sportsmen pilots of our entire country are as ready and willing to risk their own lives as were the British. And they can do as effective a job. We believe they should have some sort of regular service supervision over them.

From the Minute Men of Lexington through Indian wars to Dunkirk, to the guerrilla fighting in Serbia, Russia, and elsewhere in conquered nations, there are numberless precedents for using men from civil life as direct auxiliaries to military forces.

We talk of civilian defense and plan blackouts and appoint block captains to tell and teach us how to hide from the flying sons of our enemies when and if they fly thousands of miles to destroy our cities and plants and war producing facilities, but we ground our own civilian pilots and planes while our enemies sink our ships within sight of our shores.

Why freeze our civilian planes and pilots to the ground while our ships and our tankers go down and our American sailors burn in oil within sight of our shores?

On March 31, 1942, I introduced Senate Resolution 233, asking for the appointment of a special Senate committee to investigate and encourage the advanced training of the preliminary essentials of future airmen into our high schools and other educational institutions throughout our entire land. Promptly the United States Commissioner of Education answered that the Government would institute this in a vastly increased manner. I commend that action, and I urge again the appointment of this special committee to determine to what extent this work is being and will be increased.

I urge further that we investigate and encourage the establishment of a vastly enlarged specialist civilian corps of already trained pilots with already available planes to search out and destroy enemy submarines and provide a constant umbrella of air protection to our men and materials within sight of our American shores.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, no Nation in the history of the world ever undertook so gigantic a war enterprise as we have assumed; to meet so many formidable enemies so many thousands of miles from our shores. To conquer them will mean the tremendous sacrifice of human life; it will mean tremendous human suffering; it will mean the loss of materials and supplies that will burden this Nation for generations to come.

The American people are willing to make any sacrifices necessary abroad or at home, but everyone knows that to win this war means ships and more ships, and certainly we should utilize every available instrument at our command to save these ships within sight of our American shores.

I sincerely urge those Members of this body who have influence with the administration to use their every influence to see that all these planes, if necessary, and pilots, and all other available resources are used, and, at once, to save these ships.

It will mean not only saving the ships themselves, but it will mean supplies for our country. It means supplies for our soldiers. It means support for our Allies. It may mean winning the war.

EXPORT CONTROL OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I desire to present a matter which will take but a moment or two. On the last calendar day the Senate considered Calendar No. 1490, Senate bill 2558, which proposes to continue in effect the embargo provision of the act of July 2, 1940. That provision of the act would come to an end by law on June 30 this year; so prompt action is now necessary.

Objection was made to the consideration of the bill by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. He had no objection to the theory of the bill, but he did object to the wording. I am ready to offer two amendments which are acceptable to him. The first is an amendment to the committee amendment on page 2, line 21, so that it will read:

The authority granted by this section shall terminate on June 30, 1944, or upon any prior date which the Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President, may designate—

And so forth.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the bill by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2558) to further expedite the prosecution of the war by authorizing the control of the exportation of certain commodities.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah for the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment on page 2, after line 10, to strike out:

"(d) The authority granted in this section shall terminate upon the date of a proclamation by the President, declaring that the continuance of the authority granted hereunder is not necessary in the interest of the national defense and security; except that as to offenses committed, or rights or liabilities incurred prior to such date, the provisions of this section and such rules, regulations, and proclamations shall be treated as remaining in effect for the purpose of sustaining any suit, action, or prosecution with respect to such right, liability, or offense."

And insert:

"(d) The authority granted by this section shall terminate upon the expiration of 6 months following the termination of the war or upon any prior date which the Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President, may designate; except that as to offenses committed, or rights or liabilities incurred prior to such date, the provisions of this section and such rules, regulations, and proclamations shall be treated as remaining in effect for the purpose of sustaining any suit, action, or prosecution with respect to such right, liability, or offense."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment of the Senator from Utah to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the amendment of the committee on page 2, line 21, after the word "terminate", it is proposed to strike out "upon the expiration of six months following the termination of the war," and to insert "on June 30, 1944."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment to the amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I now offer an amendment which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 1, it is proposed to strike out the comma after the word "Warfare" and insert a period, and to strike out "in conformity with the President's Executive order of September 15, 1941 (Numbered 8900, 6 F. R. 4795–6), as amended by Executive order of December 17, 1941 (Numbered 8982, 6 F. R. 6530)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANTIRACKET LEGISLATION

Mr. HOLMAN. Mr. President, on March 9 last I introduced Senate bill 2347, intended to strengthen the Antiracketeering Act of 1934. My bill is being considered by a subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. Since I may soon depart for the West with a subcommittee of the Senate Committees on Public Lands and Military Affairs, I may not be present, should the committee report my bill, I therefore now ask unanimous consent to have printed as a part of my remarks, the text of an article published last Saturday in the Packer, a newspaper, as a result of an interview which I gave on the subject treated by my bill.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REVIVED INTEREST IN ANTIRACKET BILL IN SENATE—FAVORABLE HOUSE COMMITTEE REPORT ON NEW HOBBS BILL APPEARS TO HAVE RENEWED SENATE INTEREST IN HOLMAN BILL

WASHINGTON, D. C., June 12.—A favorable House committee report upon the new Hobbs antiracketeering labor bill appears to have forced a revival of Senate interest in the Holman bill (S. 2347). This bill proposes to strengthen the Anti-Racketeering Act of 1934 as it applies to interference with trade or commerce by violence, threats, coercion, or intimidation. The bill, according to its author, would remove the clause in the Act of 1934 upon which a portion of the majority report of the Supreme Court in the case of Local 807, New York City, was based.

Introduced in early March the Holman bill was brought to initial hearings before a Senate subcommittee on the judiciary on March 25. Hearings were not resumed, however, until June 5, when representatives of the National League of Wholesale Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Distributors, Farm Bureau, National Grange and other organizations asked that, to avoid laborious repetition, the testimony before the House subcommittee on the Hobbs bill be accepted by the Senate group. The request was granted with the proviso that revised or new testimony might be added by request to that presented before the House subcommittee.

Senator HOLMAN, of Oregon, author of the Senate bill, is making a determined effort to bring forth a favorable report on his bill by the Senate subcommittee. The Senator has been a consistent supporter of antiracketeering legislation despite the opposition of the administration to labor legislation at this time.

Lashing out at the administration's attitude toward labor racketeering, Senator HOLMAN this week said:

"The President and his apologists have stated that strikes have not been a serious factor in retarding production—that only a negligible percentage of the industries of the Nation have been involved in strikes. Bear in mind that the mainspring of my watch is but a trifling percentage of the cost or bulk of the watch, yet without the mainspring the watch would be worthless as a timepiece. So it is with the manufacture of airplanes and all other pieces of complicated mechanisms. This is a machine war. The lack of a part destroys the utility of the whole.

"I have opposed the President's policy of fostering strike-masters and the racketeers of honest labor and I have introduced bills intended to terminate the present intolerable conditions which are retarding, possibly disastrously, the war efforts of our Nation. However my bills are reposing in committee, undoubtedly in compliance with the President's ideas. Again let us examine the record:

"March 2, 1942.—Decision of Justice Byrnes registering the majority opinion of the Supreme Court (Chief Justice Stone dissenting) held in effect that the use of force and violence was not incompatible to the lawful settlement of disputes between employers and employees and suggesting legislation.

"March 9, 1942.—I introduced S. 2347, intended to cure the outrageous situation confirmed by the above Supreme Court opinion.

"March 25, 1942.—Hearing of the Senate Judiciary Committee on bill No. S. 2347.

"June 5, 1942.—Hearing of the Senate Judiciary Committee on bill No. S. 2347.

"June 9, 1942.—There the matter rests, 3 months after filing the Supreme Court's devastating opinion.

"During the last 9 years there has been fostered and there has developed a regulating force in our country which in some respects has superseded the constituted authorities, both local and Federal.

"It seems to me if constituted government countenances the exercise of civic authorities by those other than the officers of the law, and the use of force and violence by some persons—both aliens and citizens—to enforce their wills upon other persons, government, to be consistent and fair, must permit all persons—not only the racketeers of honest labor—to resort to force and violence to enforce their wills on all other persons; then we shall have anarchy and chaos or serfdom of the submissive weak under the tyranny of the ruthless strong.

"Do you realize that it has come to pass during the Roosevelt administration whereby I can prevent the delivery of your mail, providing I represent myself as being a member or agent of a group operating under the administration's approved policies of enforcing its decrees? Do you realize that I can prevent your use of the public highways or of the public sidewalks, and I can prevent you from entering places of business, providing I represent myself as being a member or the agent of a group operating under the administration's approved policies of enforcing its decrees? Do you realize that I can force you to pay tribute to me to obtain employment in industry, commerce, or trade providing I represent myself as being a member or the agent of a group operating under the administration's approved policies of enforcing its decrees?

"In my opinion those public officials who fail to enforce the laws which they have

taken an oath to maintain should be separated from the public service forthwith either by discharge, recall, or impeachment as the available means for such purpose may require; but not being a lawyer I have only the general idea that the law is a method, of means, whereby under our government all persons shall compose their differences peaceably and that any method which contemplates the use of force and violence by some privileged persons to enforce their wills upon other persons is not law."

Endorsing the general aims of men and women who labor, regardless of their affiliations, Senator HOLMAN said: "At the same time, I resent the exploitation of the workers and the lawless methods employed by those who exploit the honest and patriotic workers of our country."

THE 100-PERCENT SUPERTAX

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, through the newspapers I am informed that the Treasury's proposal that a 100-percent tax be levied on all net incomes above $25,000, after deducting tax liability and other items, has been eliminated. The newspapers did not say just why. This proposal should be adopted, in my opinion.

It has been commonly asserted, and so far as I know, has never been denied, that 72,000 millionaires were created by the last war; roughly, a new millionaire for every two soldiers killed. So far as I am concerned, that is not going to be repeated in this war.

Actually a person would have to earn between $70,000 and $80,000 a year before being subject to the 100-percent supertax. Possibly, according to an expert, 11,000 persons in the United States might be affected. But the probabilities are that under the deduction system not more than 5,000 would have to pay the supertax, and the expert states:

> The truth is that existing tax rates already have prevented about 99 percent or more of the taxpayers from retaining anything like $25,000 a year.

Mr. President, that is exactly the point, that between 1 and 2 percent of the people have been and are controlling by far the largest percentage of the wealth of the country, and I believe we should compel them to pay their just share of taxes.

The money to carry on the war and support the Government must come from somewhere. We have been hearing much about new sales taxes and taxing the lower income groups. I believe that before either of these alternatives is adopted the Treasury's proposal toward drastic taxation should be adopted. One hundred and eighty-four million dollars would be collected from the supertax. It would come from the 11,000 persons with incomes above $50,000 a year, who have a total income of about $2,600,000,000, on which the Government collects between 50 and 70 percent.

It is my judgment that the people of this country are determined that in this war the rich shall pay their just share. So far as I am concerned, I propose that the Senate shall see that that is done.

I ask unanimous consent that as a part of my remarks an article written by David Lawrence and published in the Washington Evening Star of June 17 be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPERTAX PLAN SEEN AS GESTURE — MIGHT AFFECT ABOUT 10,000 IN UPPER GROUP

(By David Lawrence)

The Treasury's proposal that a 100 percent tax be levied on all net incomes above $25,000 after deducting tax liability and other items is much more of a gesture toward heavy taxation than a reality.

Actually, a person would have to earn somewhere between $70,000 and $80,000 a year before being subject to the 100 percent super tax. Possibly 11,000 persons in the United States might be affected, but the probabilities are that under the deduction system not more than 5,000 would have to pay the super tax.

What is not generally realized by those who cry out for drastic taxation and who resort to the arts of demagogy to prove they are soaking the rich is that the soaking already has been accomplished. The time is not far off when the demagogs will have to tell the people the sad truth, namely, that sources of taxation in the higher brackets are drying up and that taxes will have to be extracted in larger and larger amounts from the low-income groups which have hitherto been favored with a partial immunity.

FEW RETAIN $25,000

President Roosevelt, in one of his recent addresses, used the figure of $25,000 as a probable maximum that a taxpayer would be able to retain—as if this were some real hardship that was about to be imposed on a large number of the American people. The truth is that existing tax rates already have prevented about 99 percent or more of the taxpayers from retaining anything like $25,000 a year.

There are plenty of persons who would be happy if the Government made it possible for them to retain as much as $25,000 after taxes. Indeed, anybody who earns $30,000 or $40,000 or even $50,000 a year cannot retain $25,000 after paying Federal taxes. If State taxes were included in the reckoning, it is conceivable that under certain circumstances the taxpayer might be earning as much as $60,000, or possibly more, before he or she could count on a net residue of as much as $25,000.

The tax rates being proposed by the House Ways and Means Committee permits a man who earns $3,000 a year to retain $2,694, and by the time the $20,000-a-year income is reached in the tables it will be found that the taxpayer can retain only $13,736. So there has to be a large paper earning of somewhere near $70,000 before the citizen can ever become one of the small class of persons who could be remotely affected by the $25,000 maximum or the payment of a 100-percent super tax.

WOULD BRING $184,000,000

The Treasury's proposal looks more like a fulfillment of the gesture toward drastic taxation that has been bandied about in recent months as proof that the taxation is really drastic for the public generally. It is drastic for an infinitely small few. This is revealed by the fact that only $184,000,000 will be collected from the super tax. This group of 11,000 persons with incomes above $50,000 a year have a total income of about $2,600,000,000, of which the Government collects somewhere between 50 and 70 percent.

Yet there are 15,940,000 persons with incomes from $2,000 to $10,000 a year whose income is about $54,000,000,000. A relatively small part of this has been tapped for tax purposes. Some day, when a real tax program is proposed that is designed to collect revenue, it can be expected that the tax rates will be made heavier between $2,000 and $20,000 and that there will be further taxes on the low-income groups. But that day cannot be expected to materialize so close to a congressional election, where the quantity of votes counts rather than the size of the individual income.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. PEPPER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Nye
Andrews	Gillette	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Glass	Overton
Ball	Green	Pepper
Barbour	Guffey	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Gurney	Rosier
Bone	Hayden	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Schwartz
Bridges	Holman	Shipstead
Brooks	Hughes	Smathers
Brown	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Spencer
Burton	Kilgore	Stewart
Butler	Langer	Taft
Byrd	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McFarland	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Tydings
Connally	Maybank	Vandenberg
Davis	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	Wheeler
Doxey	Murdock	White
Ellender	Murray	
George	Norris	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

CEILING PRICE OF PEANUTS—EDITORIAL FROM THE ATLANTA CONSTITUTION

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the Atlanta Constitution of June 14 carried an editorial which clearly points out a very great injustice done the farmers of my State. Some of us have been trying to have this injustice remedied.

Farm meetings were held all over Georgia, at which it was represented to the farmers that it was their patriotic duty to produce peanuts in enormous quantities in order that we might not suffer from a serious shortage of vegetable oils. Thousands of farmers responded to this call, and the acreage devoted to peanuts has been greatly increased. As pointed out in the editorial, peanuts seriously deplete the soil and are a very expensive crop to produce.

Now that the farmers in the name of patriotism have planted and are trying to produce these peanuts, they find that a ceiling price has been fixed so low that in many cases the farmers will suffer an actual financial loss in producing peanuts. I do not know of any industry which has been called upon to produce for the war effort which has not been allowed a fair profit, and in many cases the profits have been staggering and excessive. There can certainly be no justification for requiring the farmers of the Southeast to produce, at a loss to themselves, those things that are necessary for the war effort.

There are no more patriotic people in the world than these farmers. Their sons are in the armed forces, and they

are struggling to win the battle of production with less labor and less fertilizer, and priorities prevent their obtaining adequate farm machinery. Common justice demands the elimination or raising of this ceiling price on peanut oil in order that these farmers, who are already struggling with debts and difficulties, may avoid being put out of business and allowed a profit.

The chances are that this war will last another year, and it would be a short-sighted policy to take advantage of the farmers in production this year and place them where they cannot produce adequate supplies of farm products such as peanut oil next year when the need may be very much greater.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Constitution to which I have referred be printed in full in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEANUTS—SAD STORY

In time of war, when a nation must come from a position of almost complete unpreparedness to one of great preparedness within a short period of time, some errors and blunders are to be expected.

The story of peanuts and the war effort, however, is one of the mistakes which seems to have no real reason for being.

Georgia, along with other peanut-producing States, was asked to aid the war effort by putting 1,300,000 acres in peanuts. The total southern acreage requested was 5,000,000 acres.

Peanuts are needed for the production of oil.

Georgia farmers have put thousands and thousands of acres into peanuts. It is possible that acreage close to the 1,300,000 requested by the Government has been given over to the not-so-lowly goober.

Farmers did this because of the pledge of a floor price of $82 per ton. Peanuts cost that much to produce.

It now develops there is a ceiling price of $88 per ton.

This means the farmers cannot make any money on peanuts. The cost per ton is about $82. It had been anticipated the ceiling price would be about $100.

The result will be unfortunate in more ways than one.

Many farmers, not familiar with peanut farming, planted many acres in peanuts. Peanuts require as much attention as cotton. There are thousands of acres of peanuts in Georgia which already are lost. The grass has got the fields. There are thousands more acres from which the peanuts will never be harvested if the price is not above $88. The hogs will be turned into the fields to do the harvesting.

Peanuts, incidentally, are perhaps the most serious soil-depleting crop one may grow. Soil used for peanuts will hardly produce anything else the next year without heavy use of fertilizer.

There has been some bad advice or some bad decisions in Washington. If it was dictated by the producers of soybean oil, it was wrong. There is no comparison in the cost of production between soybeans and peanuts.

Whatever it was, it is wrong and there is time to correct it.

There is no use running hundreds of farmers and so embittering others that next year, when the need will be for 10,000,000 acres if the war still is on, it will be impossible to persuade the farmers to court disaster with another—and larger—crop of peanuts.

Mr. Leon Henderson would do well to take the advice of some of those farmers who know peanuts.

The present situation is wrong. And needless.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 10, 20, and 36 to the bill, and concurred thereon; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 55 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 21 and 23 to said bill.

CIVILIAN WAR BENEFITS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2412) to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of civilians, and for the prevention and relief of civilian distress arising out of the present war, and for other purposes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the pending bill is designed to provide compensation to civilians who may sustain injury from enemy attack. Of course, the attack is primarily regarded as a possible bombing attack upon the civilian population of the United States and certain defined off-shore areas which I shall mention more specifically a little later, and upon certain seamen who might be engaged in their duties upon ships registered in the United States service.

The bill, I will say at the outset, although introduced by the junior Senator from Florida, was introduced, first, at the instance of those who were handling legislation for the War Department, and, secondly, at the instance of the Bureau of the Budget, so that the virtue and the completeness of the bill are attributable to the splendid work which has been done upon it by the various agencies of the Government directly concerned with this problem—to wit, the Bureau of the Budget, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Federal Security Agency, the Employees' Compensation Commission, the Office of Education, and the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. So in no appreciable sense it is the work of the junior Senator from Florida.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Michigan?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I ask the Senator in that connection whether the Treasury Department has surveyed the general physical purview that is in contemplation?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I cannot say to the able Senator from Michigan that the Treasury Department has done so, but I can say that it was approved and specifically supported and sustained before the committee by the Bureau of the Budget, and that Bureau, in the report it filed with the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, advised that the bill was in accord with the program of the President. I am sure, therefore, that all pertinent agencies were contacted in the preliminary preparation of the bill. The bill, of course, has the approval of the Committee on Education and Labor of the Senate. Rather extensive hearings were had, and, as I have said, the administrative agencies enumerated worked together most cooperatively in formulating a bill that would meet, as nearly as could be, unexpected situations which might arise when civilians sustain injury from various forms of enemy attack.

I may say that the Federal Security Agency, through representatives it sent to England, has made a careful investigation of the British law, and the actual conditions of this character which have been met by the British Government.

The committee and the administrative agencies have had the benefit of the whole gamut of the British experience. So far as information has been available they have also taken advantage of the experience gained by the Germans.

Mr. President, the bill falls into five titles, which I shall enumerate only briefly. The first title provides the scale of benefits to be paid with respect to death, disability, or detention on the part of civilians as the result of a war hazard, as defined in the act.

Generally speaking, the hazards referred to are the kind which might be the result of bombing attacks, or which might result from efforts to repel bombing attacks, either actual or imaginary. If a city were to be bombed and a civilian were to be hurt by bombs, he would be covered by the scale of benefits provided in the bill. If a civilian were injured by shrapnel which might be fired from the guns of our defending forces, he would also be protected. If, in addition, the enemy were hurling shells upon our shores and a civilian sustained an injury, such injury would be covered by the bill. If an ammunition truck were moving about the streets or highways in the ordinary operation of some war agency, and it should explode or for any reason cause injury to a civilian, that type of injury also would be covered.

In no case would any civilian be compensated for any injury less than one-third total and permanent disability. We have eliminated the minor injuries which might be the subject of abuse in some cases. In no case is compensation provided until the injured civilian shall have sustained an injury which is found by the Federal Security Administrator or his designated agent to be at least one-third total and permanent disability.

In addition to the classes of cases to which I have referred, the bill would also cover—for the first time, I believe—seamen who might be injured in the performance of their duties. We all know that there has been no more heroic and gallant class of citizenry than the men who have gone to sea in ships during this great crisis and have experienced the ordeal which so many of those men have experienced. The committee ascertained that under existing law the dependents of such men may recover up to $5,000 in the ordinary case, because of an insurance policy which covers them; but the committee did not discover any benefits which would be payable to the injured seaman himself. We have therefore endeavored to make the benefits of this bill available to a seaman who might sustain injuries in the performance of his duties upon a ship in the registry and service of the United States.

Title I of the bill covers the cases of disability to which I have referred. In addition, it covers the case of detention by the enemy of a United States civilian, which might occur in the United States; also the detention outside the United States of a person who either is a citizen of the United States or owes allegiance to the United States, or who might be a resident of the United States abroad when taken into custody of and detained by the enemy.

The bill provides that no benefits shall be payable to anybody outside the United States; that is, no one may receive funds outside the territory of the United States, as defined in the bill, except by affirmative order of the President. Principles of classification in respect to such cases would be laid down by the President.

The United States, as defined in the bill, includes continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands. In the Virgin Islands and in Puerto Rico the scale of benefits prescribed in the bill may be modified by the Federal Security Administrator if he finds conditions and circumstances which justify some difference in the scale of benefits to be paid.

That, Mr. President, is substantially the provision and import of title I. However, it covers an important class of cases which I did not mention specifically, namely, the civilian defense workers. The able Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] has been very helpful to the committee in the improvement of the bill in this respect. The bill covers injuries which might be sustained by civilian defense workers, not only during the course of an air raid alarm, but while an enemy assault might be in progress, or at any time while the civilian defense worker might be engaged in the performance of his or her duty.

The Senate will be interested to know that protection has been given to the Government with respect to this matter by so defining "civilian defense worker" as to refer to a person who is duly registered in the Office of Civilian Defense, whose duties are specifically covered by regulation, and who is a clearly ascertainable and definable person, and not merely any civilian who might on occasion volunteer to do something which might be of private or public benefit.

The scale of benefits provided is between $30 a month and $85 a month. If, for example, a civilian were to suffer the loss of his arm while engaged in the performance of his duties in a factory, and if the injury thus sustained were covered by the workmen's compensation laws of the State in which the injured person was residing, the case would be covered by such laws. That is to say, the person would file an application, be observed, and receive payment exactly as though the injury had occurred in the ordinary course of performance of his or her duty. However, under the terms of the bill the United States Government would reimburse the insurer who paid the benefits in the amount it disbursed.

We admit that the benefits are not identical in amount in all cases; but in handling the bill the committee had to make a choice whether to attain complete perfection and set up an army of Federal employees to administer the law, or to take approximate perfection and not face the necessity of creating a great horde of additional personnel. The committee chose the latter course, and has availed itself to every possible degree of personnel already in the employ of the Federal Government, the States, the local governments, and in some instances in the employ of private persons, firms, or corporations. So in the illustration I have cited, if the injury should occur during working hours, the person injured would receive the same benefit which he would receive if the injury were sustained in time of peace, provided, of course, that the injury were of a type covered by workmen's compensation laws. So far as I know, all injuries sustained in the performance of one's duty are compensable where workmen's compensation laws are in existence.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Has the Senator any information indicating how the scale of benefits provided in the bill compares on the average with State compensation benefits?

Mr. PEPPER. Generally speaking, I will say to the able Senator from Michigan, the scale of benefits provided in the bill is less than the benefits available in most States under State workmen's compensation laws. We have met that matter in this way: If the amount of the benefits payable under workmen's compensation laws in a State is less than the benefits payable under the proposed law, the injured person would receive the difference, after having received the benefits payable under the local law. So in no case would an injured citizen receive less than is provided under the workmen's compensation law of the State of his residence.

In addition, the scale of benefit payments is, generally speaking, related, as best the administrative agencies and the committee could relate it, to other existing benefits which civilians might derive. For example, in fixing the scale of benefits, the administrative agencies and the committee had to take into consideration the benefits payable to the dependents of a veteran, or of a soldier, sailor, or airman actually in the military service, and to keep them properly related to that scale of benefits. We also had to take into consideration the social security benefits which are payable to civilians. Likewise, we had to consider the benefits which a veteran himself would receive in case he should sustain a personal injury in the performance of his duties. We also had the example of the Senate's recent action in providing for a scale of allowances to the dependents of men in the military and naval services.

The scale of benefits runs between a minimum of $30 a month and a maximum of $85 a month. Let me make that a little clearer, perhaps, by two or three illustrations. If a civilian should be injured to a greater degree than one-third total and permanent disability, and were totally unemployed and earning nothing whatsoever, for that injury he would receive $30 a month. Let me say at the outset that under the bill no benefits would extend beyond 5 years after the termination of the war.

The committee had facing it the question of whether to make all the benefits payable in a lump sum so that when the lump sum was exhausted the benefits would stop, or whether to make them continue so long as the disability continued, which, by hypothesis, since only permanent disabilities were to be compensated for, would mean so long as the individual lived, or whether we should properly terminate the benefits, let the matter come back to Congress, let Congress receive the report of the Federal Security Administrator which is provided for, and let the Congress decide what it should do in respect to the matter.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the junior Senator from Florida yield to his colleague?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. ANDREWS. I wonder whether the proposed law would take care of the situation which arose at Wake Island? About a thousand laborers who were on the island were captured and carried away to Japan. Would the proposed law take care of their families?

Mr. PEPPER. It would, let me say to the Senator, under title III. One of the pressing needs which occasioned the drawing up of the bill was the situation to which my colleague refers.

Mr. ANDREWS. Would it take care of similar situations elsewhere?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. I appreciate my colleague's making the inquiry.

The benefits for personally sustained disability would run up to a maximum of $85 a month or to two-thirds of the monthly earnings of the person injured, whichever would be the lesser sum. Of course, provision is made that dependents who actually derived their principal sustenance from the injured civilian would receive sustenance benefits in case

of the death of such person if he were the victim of an attack; but as to all the beneficiaries, however numerous they may be, and whether they are parents or collateral relatives or dependents—children or widow or widower—in no case would the total amount to be paid out by the Federal Government for any one person exceed the sum of $85 a month.

Let me add, Mr. President, that in addition to such pecuniary payments the bill also provides that the Federal Security Administrator, who is charged with the duty and the privilege of the administration of the proposed law, may extend its benefits to the granting of funeral benefits or hospital-care and medical-care services to a person injured. That is to say, the sentiment back of the bill is that the person injured should be made whole at the expense of the Federal Government, to the extent that that is physically possible. The bill contemplates that the person injured may receive hospitalization either in a Federal hospital, when such facilities are available, or from a private physician, a private nurse, in a private hospital, or from other private sources, if there be any; and such sources then are entitled to reimbursement from the funds provided by the act.

Mr. President, title II of the bill has for its purpose the provision of relief in cases in which a community or a large number of persons might be the victims of what we might call a blitzkrieg from the enemy. In England it was found that this kind of authority on the part of the Government officials was not only absolutely essential to the rehabilitation of the people, and in order to make provision for their temporary comfort, but it was also very valuable in keeping up the morale of the persons who might be the victims of such terrible attacks. So the committee would like the Senate to know that the Federal Security Administrator would actually have the power to dispense cash to civilians who might be the victims of such enemy assaults.

If, for example, a certain town were raided or bombed, the Federal Security Administrator, through the agencies which I shall subsequently describe a little more particularly, would have the authority, in the first place, to provide medical care for the persons who received injury—hospitalization, and all other kinds of medical attention which might be proper. His authority would include, by the way, the power to supply such persons with artificial limbs, if subsequently it should be found necessary to do so.

In the second place, the Administrator would have the right and the duty to make temporary repairs to the dwellings or even the places of business of civilians whose dwellings or places of business migh be rendered uninhabitable or untenable by the attack of the enemy, but the committee has carefully limited the provision in such cases to only temporary reconditioning, and in no case would all of a man's house or any appreciable part of his house be rebuilt. The expression which was used, I think, was to "make it fit against wind and weather," or, in other words, to make it windproof and weatherproof.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. How does that provision correlate itself with the insurance law recently passed to cover property damage?

Mr. PEPPER. There is a technical possibility of a conflict, but no actual prospect of it, because we made the purpose very clear. The able senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] has been very helpful on that matter, since he sat on the committee which devised the property insurance bill which the Congress has already passed. We very carefully tried to avoid any duplication, and made it very clear that the property-insurance bill relates to reimbursement to a person who might sustain injury to his property, whereas the provision of which I have been speaking is designed merely to give the Federal agency authority to put in window panes or to put patches in the roof so that the house would be habitable by a family; or if, for example, a workman were to lose his tools in the attack, and did not have other tools, the Administrator, by the power we would impose, would have the right to buy him tools so that he could continue in his employment.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May we say that the pending bill would provide first aid, as opposed to rehabilitation; is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. That is exactly correct. In title II of the bill, section 201 (c), on page 43, provision is made that—

(c) Assistance and services under this title shall be designed to restore normal civilian activities as rapidly as possible, but not to provide any permanent rebuilding or rehabilitation. In no case shall such assistance with respect to damaged living quarters or other real property exceed the cost of making such property temporarily serviceable.

Let me say that in the bill we proposed one thing in which the Senate may be interested. By reference, we proposed to legalize the Office of Civilian Defense, or perhaps I should say that we proposed that the Congress take legislative notice of its existence. That, too, was the helpful suggestion made in committee by the able senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who collaborated in the drawing of this section. In the bill the existence of the Office of Civilian Defense is not in any way completely provided for, and its scope is not at all adequately defined, but legislative reference is made to it.

The Federal Security Administration, which has been very helpful in drafting the bill, has had the aid of the able senior Senator from Ohio and other members of the committee in framing language reposing first in the Federal Security Administrator general responsibility for the administration of the bill; but by the terms of the bill it is made the duty of the Federal Security Administrator to provide that the existing agencies shall perform all the essential functions which are contemplated under the bill, except providing the money itself, for which he is the conduit, to the several agencies. It is only fair to say that I think the Federal Security Agency has worked out a very sensible coordination with the Office of Civilian Defense, whose representative, together with the other political and private agencies designed to meet such situations, will have primary responsibility in case of a blitzkrieg or community assault. Here again the committee has scrupulously attempted to avoid the creation of any unnecessary additional employee of the Government.

So in case a community were to be attacked, the agency which would have authority to meet the needs of the situation would be the local defense council. That council is itself under the Office of Civilian Defense; but, if I understand the matter correctly, it is usually appointed by the mayor or the governor of the community or of the area affected.

So in formulating the bill we have carefully tried to avoid any duplication of effort on the part of any public functionaries or, I may add, private agencies.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may ask a further question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator constantly refers to the fact that the bill relates to protection against the hazards of attack. Is the bill confined entirely to providing such protection? If an ammunition dump exploded as a result of spontaneous combustion or something of that kind, would the resultant damage be covered by the terms of the bill?

Mr. PEPPER. Such damage would be covered, except with respect to employees of the particular plant. That is assumed to be taken care of by either the employer or private insurance, and is not covered by the bill; but under the terms of the bill persons not employed, protected, or covered by the company whose plant was damaged would be protected.

I am glad the Senator asked that question because it brings to mind another point to which I think attention should be called. The term "war hazard," as described in title I of the bill, includes a practice black-out. That is to say, a civilian who sustains more than a one-third permanent disability as the result of injuries resulting directly, even from a practice black-out, would be eligible to the benefits which are provided in the bill. The matter was discussed in the committee, and an amendment to that effect will be offered by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] who voted with the minority of the committee. The majority of the committee felt that the bill was intended to shift from the individual to the public the burden of injury and loss as the result of hazards directly attributable to the war. I distinctly remember that in February I was about to leave the city of Los Angeles, that jewel city in the great State of the distinguished senior Senator from California, when an alert was being sounded to indicate an enemy attack or an imagined enemy attack. At least, the signal for the alert came from the duly constituted military or naval authorities. I read in the newspapers, as I am sure other Senators read, that three persons, as I recall,

lost their lives that evening as a result of collisions between automobiles on the streets of the city. I understand that one or two persons died as the result of shock and fright; they sustained a heart attack that caused death, in a manner directly attributable to the experience which they had undergone.

That, together with certain additional information of a similar character, led the committee to infer that similar cases might occur all over this country. Our people have never heretofore experienced anything like black-outs and certainly anything like an enemy attack, and naturally there will be cases of persons who, through no fault of their own, will sustain injury in excess of a third disability. If it is a scratch on the chin, a bruise on the head or a hanging nail on the finger, such an injury is not covered by the bill. No injury is compensable unless it exceeds one-third disability in the first place, and unless it is permanent, in the second place. But the committee felt that in the way that will be ascertained by the Federal Security Administrator if it can be proved by the claimant that he or she sustained this kind of injury, and that it was directly attributable to a black-out, such person should not be denied the benefit of payment provided by the pending bill.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think perhaps the Senator has covered the question I was about to ask him. In using his recent example as typical of the general situation. I was about to inquire if a serious automobile accident occurs during a black-out is it assumed that the accident is the result of the black-out?

Mr. PEPPER. No; I will say to the able Senator, every claim must be established to the satisfaction of the Federal Security Administrator by the claimant; the claimant will have to establish his or her right to the benefits claimed.

Of course, it is a question of fact, except that by the terms of the bill itself anyone who sustains an injury as the result of willful conduct or intoxication is excluded from the receipt of benefits. It will, however, be a matter for the person to prove to the satisfaction of the Federal Security Administrator that the injury sustained was the proximate result of the war hazard defined.

Mr. VANDENBERG. And did not involve contributory negligence.

Mr. PEPPER. And did not involve culpable conduct. As a lawyer, I should have to say that contributory negligence may be something less than intoxication or willful conduct; a person might, according to the technical scales of the law, in a damage suit be responsible for contributory negligence; but, in order to get the benefits provided by the pending bill such person will have to satisfy the Administrator that he was acting with due care and in good faith under the circumstances and, notwithstanding, sustained the injury.

I believe I have referred to titles I and II. Title III is designed, primarily, to affect civilians who are in off-shore areas—that is to say, outside the United States—as defined in the bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. In title III, I am very much interested, for the reason that a number of persons from the west coast and the Northwestern States have been taken prisoner at Wake Island, and at Midway, while others were injured at Pearl Harbor, and I assume now when the reports shall be received we will find that there are some such cases in Alaska. So there are different kinds and types of cases for which provision should be made.

I am hopeful that the Senator will go into detail as to the handling of the prisoners who were under the employ of contractors in the different areas. Certainly since these incidents have happened the dependents of a number of the persons thus affected are now on relief and in real destitution. A society in Idaho is being formed, to which thousands of dollars have already been subscribed, for the purpose of taking care of the situation. As I understand, the pending bill proposes to take care of it, and I am very anxious to see it passed. I hope the Senator will go into detail and give an explanation of how the bill will work.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for the inquiry. In the first place, I desire to assure the Senator that the War Department and the Navy Department have been vitally concerned about effectively and adequately meeting the situation the Senator has in mind. They are completely satisfied that that situation will be effectively met by the passage of the pending bill.

As the law now exists, there are two types of benefits available to the dependents of civilians who might sustain death or to civilians who might sustain injury or to the dependents of civilians who might be detained by the enemy. The first of those is Public Law No. 490, of March 7, 1942, Seventy-seventh Congress, which protects employees of the United States Government, not those working for a contractor, but those working for the United States Government in its sovereign capacity. That, of course, limits the application of the law to a rather narrow group of United States Government employees only. The type of case the able Senator from Idaho has in mind is the case of a workman who is employed by a contractor, not by the Government, outside the United States, who sustains death or disability or who is detained by the enemy.

The only law on the statute books at the present time affecting that kind of case is the law of August 16, 1941, which extended the Longshoremen's Act to such persons. It protects them, however, only in case the injuries occurred during the time they were actually employed in the performance of their duty, and they would not be protected if detention by the enemy or if the injury or the loss of life occurred at night, for example, or at a time when they were not engaged in the performance of their regular duties.

The bill now pending extends the benefits of the Longshoremen's Act to such persons, no matter what time of day they sustain the disability, death, or detention by the enemy, whether it be at night, while they are off duty or while they are in the performance of their duties. They will be covered by adequate law, if this bill shall be passed by the Congress and approved by the President.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. In the event they are taken as prisoners——

Mr. PEPPER. Let me add a further observation, then I will yield to the Senator. Heretofore the benefits of the Longshoremen's Act have been available only to those who were working upon military or naval bases, and not on some other public work, which was provided or was in the course of construction at the instance of the United States Government. Under this bill any kind of a public work is included. So that, if a citizen of the United States or a person owing allegiance to the United States or a resident of the United States abroad should sustain injury in any one of these types or degrees, then the benefits of this proposed law would be available to such persons.

The agency that will administer this law, under the pending bill, will be the Employees' Compensation Commission, an established agency, of course, with long experience and consisting of an able and adequate personnel, and the membership of the commission is confirmed by the Senate. As I have said, it is that agency that will administer the Longshoremen's Act under this bill, because it is already administering the provisions of the existing Longshoremen's Act under present law.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. What would be the status, then, of one who was taken prisoner?

Mr. PEPPER. The dependents of a prisoner would receive under this proposed act not to exceed $85 a month in the case of a family, with intermediate amounts depending upon the number and classes of dependents.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. I was under the impression that it was two-thirds of the wage received, but not to exceed $116 a month.

Mr. PEPPER. I am in error about that. These benefit schedules vary a little. Under title III, according to the scale of benefits, the dependent of a person detained by the enemy, would receive 66⅔ percent of the monthly compensation which was being received by the detained person at the time of his detention.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. That is the point I wanted to develop for the RECORD.

Mr. PEPPER. Not exceeding a gross amount of $108 a month. That is the maximum the bill allows.

Title IV merely contains some miscellaneous provisions, which are not of general interest, provisions relative to the receipt of funds by fraud, payment for legal services, and the like.

Title V, I have already covered by stating that it extends the benefits of the existing Longshoremen's Act to (1) employees of a contractor or a subcontractor with the United States who is engaged in any employment—

(1) at any military, air, or naval base acquired after January 1, 1940, by the United States from any foreign government; or

(2) upon any lands occupied or used by the United States for military or naval purposes in any Territory or possession outside the continental United States (including Alaska; the Philippine Islands; the United States Naval Operating Base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba; and the Canal Zone); or

(3) upon any public work in any Territory or possession outside the continental United States (including Alaska; the Philippine Islands; the United States Naval Operating Base, Guantanamo Bay, Cuba; and the Canal Zone), if such employee is engaged in employment at such place under the contract of a contractor (or any subcontractor or subordinate subcontractor with respect to the contract of such contractor) with the United States; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to apply to any employee of such a contractor or subcontractor who is engaged exclusively in furnishing materials or supplies under his contract.

The Canal Zone is not covered by any existing law. We extend the benefits of the law to employees engaged upon public works or military or naval work in the Canal Zone.

I think it is necessary to add only two statements. In the first place, considerable discretion has been vested in the Federal Security Administrator. That was done consciously by the administrative agencies and by the committee, because we were, by hypothesis, dealing with a situation which we cannot accurately anticipate. We do not know what needs will arise. We have availed ourselves of the experience of Britain, and have put many helpful restraints in the law as the result of that knowledge. But we have had to vest him with quite a responsibility, including the large power under title II to which I referred. But in order that the Congress might have knowledge of the manner in which he administers the authority, we have made it obligatory upon the Administrator to file a report with the Congress quarterly, so that in a general way, the Congress may be able to scrutinize the methods by which he disburses Federal funds.

The last point is that the bill authorizes the appropriation of such funds as are necessary to meet the prescribed purposes of the bill. No one can say what funds will be necessary, no one can anticipate how great the need may be. We have therefore had to leave the provision of the authority for the appropriation very general in character, the appropriation to be large enough to met whatever need may arise.

We all recall the recent statement of the Secretary of War that it is almost inevitable, if not really inevitable, that our citizens will sustain injury from direct enemy attacks. The committee has, therefore, with the cooperation of the administrative authorities, prepared the pending bill, to meet, so far as the medical services and the funds may provide, any distress or need which might arise out of such an unhappy circumstance as I have been discussing.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I wish to offer an amendment to the amendment of the committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 39, after line 20, it is proposed to strike out:

(2) in the case of a civilian defense worker, it also includes a personal injury sustained by such worker after December 6, 1941, while in the performance of his duty as such worker, or disease incurred by him which was proximately caused by his performance of such duty after such date; and

And on page 40, after line 16, it is proposed to strike out:

(c) The term "civilian defense worker" means any civilian (except a person who is paid by the United States, or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof, for services as a civilian defense worker) who is engaged in the Aircraft Warning Service, or is a member of the Civil Air Patrol, or is a member of the United States Citizens Defense Corps in the protective services engaged in civilian defense, as such protective services are established from time to time by regulation or order of the Director of the Office of Civilian Defense, or is registered for a course of training prescribed and approved by said Director for such protective services.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment I offer is designed to eliminate any liability on the part of the Government for compensation to members of the Civilian Defense Corps except as they are civilians who may be injured in an air raid, in which case they would receive compensation as anyone else would.

The bill which is before the Senate deals with three or four entirely distinct subjects. The only thing which ties them together is their relation to enemy action, and the fact that they all provide for the dispensation of Government money to different classes of citizens in the United States.

Title III and title V cover the question of employees of the Government, of employees of contractors with the Government who are injured or detained by the enemy. In other words, those titles deal with the kinds of cases occurring at Wake Island, where men were captured by the Japanese. Their wives would be supported. It seems to me that is a proper obligation of the Government, and I believe those titles should be enacted.

Title II deals with the question of an air raid in some volume, creating what might be called a disaster condition in some American city. Probably we could deal with such a situation without legislation, or we could enact legislation at the time, as we have in the case of flood disasters and other disasters; but I believe it is desirable to deal with that question in advance, and title II, as it is now written, provides purely for temporary assistance. Wide discretion is given, as it should be, to restore the normal life of the community as rapidly as possible. I see no reason why that should not be done, and I think it should be done.

The section has been amended. As originally drafted, it seemed to me to give the Social Security Administrator power, and to suggest, even, that he step in and take full charge of such conditions, but I understand that is not the plan. In fact, I believe Congress has been delinquent in not legislating to deal with this kind of situation, as to who has actual authority in the case of an air raid. It is not clear today whether the local authorities, the Office of Civilian Defense, or the Administrator of Social Security has authority. There may well be serious conflict. I think this section could be improved, but it at least provides that the Federal Security Administration and the Director of the Office of Civilian Defense shall prepare a plan or plans to meet the emergency. They have made a series of agreements which can easily be embodied into such a plan, saying what each one shall do, what the local defense council shall do, what the American Red Cross shall do.

As I understand the plan, authority in the case of an air raid will be in the hands of the local council of defense, which in effect is made up of the authorities of the city or State which may be involved. The local authorities will be in charge. The Federal Security Administrator will provide some money, the American Red Cross will provide soup kitchens and the like. They have divided up the functions, and, as I understand, when the Army perhaps might step in, where military law might be declared, the situation would be in charge of the local commander of the civilian defense council of the particular locality, and the pending bill is not intended to change that condition. I think it would be better if it made the division of authority somewhat clearer.

My objection is to certain features of title I, and besides the pending amendment, I propose to offer two or three other amendments to cut down the scope of the compensation provided by title I.

Of course, the proposal to compensate civilians in time of war is a new one. I do not believe we ever have heretofore made such provision in this country. The Senate took some such action in the case of property destroyed by enemy bombing, but before the bill was finally adopted it was put on an insurance basis. No one is to be compensated for property destruction unless he has insured his property and paid a premium. In the case before us we go a step beyond that and undertake to provide compensation for civilians injured in the course of war.

Certainly we should approach the establishment of such a principle with great care. I do not know how far we should go to compensate individuals because of damage which results to them from war. There are thousands of small business men who are being put out of business, and they are not to be compensated. So far as I can see, I think it would be very impractical to compensate them. They are being put out of business by the regulations issued by the Office of Price Administration, they are being put out of business by the priority orders; yet we do not undertake to compensate them, and I do not believe we should do so.

The French have a saying, "C'est la guerre," meaning that some condition is the result of war. The burden of war falls largely on those whom it touches. But we have gone somewhat beyond that, and I personally feel that it is all right to do so, if we can make the obligation definite, if it is a fairly rare obligation, so that a man can say that it was extremely bad luck on his part, and the rest of the population should help him out. If it is a perfectly clear case, if it is a case which can be clearly defined, I do not greatly object to establishing the principle and proceeding on the principle which has been established in England.

Only the other day the Senate took the position that it did not propose to subsidize industry. Senators voted down a bill which undertook to subsidize industries which were unable longer to operate because of the regulations of the Office of Price Control, as a result of conditions brought about by the war. There is certainly widespread doubt as to whether we should compensate everyone for every kind of injury which may result from the war.

It seems to me that we should not go beyond compensating for the injury or death of civilians resulting from direct enemy action. If the bill is confined to that, I think it can be defended. If a few people are bonded in token raids, such as may very well occur in this country, I see no reason why they should not receive some compensation, just as a soldier would receive compensation; but when we say that every member of the Citizens Defense Corps, from now until the war is over, who may be injured in the course of his duty, shall be compensated by the Federal Government, I believe we are going into a tremendous field, far beyond anything that is necessary, far beyond anything that is wise, and I venture to say that the claims filed by such persons for injury will be 100 times as many as the claims filed for injury resulting directly from enemy action.

Of course, persons who are injured in the course of their duties can present cases of hardship; but we do not undertake to compensate anyone who is injured in an automobile accident. We do not even today by law provide for the compensation of a man run down by a Government truck. He has to come to the Congress and file a claim to be considered and dealt with by special act. Very likely he ought to be compensated. Certainly a man run down by a Government truck is far more entitled to be compensated by the Government than some member of the civilian-defense corps who happens to be injured while performing service in a black-out, carrying a flashlight, and who perhaps is run into by an automobile. The Government certainly does not have as much direct responsibility for such an injury as it does in a tort case. So far as I know, no member of the Red Cross is entitled to compensation by the Government for injury. I may be mistaken, but I do not think any such legislation has been enacted, and there are certainly thousands of employees in the American Red Cross who have at least as good a claim on the Government as have the members of the citizens defense corps.

Mr. President, there are four respects in which I believe the scope of the bill should be limited. The first is that with which I have just dealt. I asked a witness who appeared before the committee:

How many members of the citizens defense corps are likely to qualify under this bill as being entitled to compensation?

His answer was three, or four, or five, or perhaps six million before we finish with the war.

That is a tremendous proportion of the population of the United States. That is six times as many persons as were in the Army of the United States who are now entitled to veterans' compensation of one kind or another. The scale of benefits is not unlike that of veterans' compensation. I can think of many kinds of cases that seem to me to present a great doubt as to whether members of the citizens defense corps should be compensated. It is a very large group. The book issued on the citizens defense corps shows that it shall include staff corps, air-raid wardens, auxiliary policemen, auxiliary firemen, fire watchers, demolition and clearance crews, raid-repair squads, rescue squads, decontamination squads, medical corps, nurses' aid corps, drivers' corps, messengers' corps, emergency food and housing corporation. Those are listed as essential and necessary components of a proper civilian defense unit; so Senators can see the tremendous scope of the bill when we undertake to provide compensation for these volunteer workers. Of course, if they are not volunteers they are covered as Federal employees. But these people are all volunteers. They are not paid. The exact scope of their duties is uncertain. It will not be easy to determine when they are engaged in the scope of their duties and when they are not engaged in the scope of their duties.

It seems to me fairly clear under the bill, for instance, that if, while an air-raid warden is taking a bath, the siren blows in a practice black-out, and he leaps from the bathtub and breaks his leg, he is entitled to compensation from the Government; that if an air-raid warden goes out on a rainy night and catches pneumonia and dies, he is entitled to compensation from the Government; or that if an air-raid warden goes around the city to inspect premises and advise people as to where their air-raid shelters are, and he falls down the cellar steps, he is entitled to compensation from the Government. One can think of a thousand cases that seem to me to go far beyond anything for which the Government should compensate, and one can see that it is going to be very difficult to determine the exact scope of the proposed liability.

Compensation is limited to 5 years, but if the compensation is continued for 5 years, Senators know how almost impossible it will be to discontinue it. A new class of pensioners having been created, Senators know how impossible it will be to prevent the continuation for a lifetime of pensions which have been received for a period of 5 years.

Furthermore, it is very easy to increase pensions. Two years ago we increased the old-age pension from $30 to $40. Once we recognize a liability, once we say that persons are entitled to compensation from the United States Government, it is very difficult to prevent continuation of such compensation in order to meet the demands of those receiving compensation as they grow older.

Of course, even if the language in question were stricken out, the air-raid wardens would be covered. They are covered if they are injured by any bomb, by any direct enemy action. They would receive compensation like any other civilian. I believe if we confine this provision to air raids the number of claims would be very small. Very few persons will actually come under it, and it would be fairly easy to determine who are really injured by enemy action.

There are three other respects in which I think compensation is too broad. The bill provides for compensation for the dependents of those detained by the enemy. Of course, we have already taken care of the contractors' employees who were sent by the United States Government to Wake Island or to other islands. The United States Government there assumed an obligation. But let us assume that an ordinary civilian traveling in Malaya, had stopped in Singapore, and was detained by the Japanese. I do not quite see why the United States Government should compensate his dependents in the United States. I happen to know a lady who owned a small rubber plantation in Malaya, which of course has been cut off, and which was an essential source of her income. She would get no compensation, although that income was cut off. She was taking a chance when she invested money in Malaya. A man who traveled to Malaya or in any other threatened country when war was more or less imminent was taking a chance. I do not see why the United States Government should compensate the dependents of civilians who had no connection with the Government whatever, and who happened to be caught by the war in some foreign land.

In the third place, the bill provides for compensation even to ordinary civilians resulting from practice black-outs. Ordinarily the damage to ordinary civilians who are not members of the Citizens Defense Corps is confined to enemy action, but by special provision one of the war risk hazards is stated to be black-outs, including practice black-outs. Last night I thought my house was properly dimmed out; as a matter of fact it was properly dimmed out; but two air-raid wardens came to the door and claimed that the house should be completely blacked out, although it was then only 10 minutes after 10, and the siren had not yet blown. All the lights were put out, and I stumbled downstairs in a perfectly dark night to open the front door. If I had fallen and broken my leg I should have been entitled to compensation from the United States Government. Frankly I do not think I would be entitled to it. I think

those are things which fall in the category of ordinary accidents, such as if in ordinary peacetime I were run over by an automobile, or suffered some other accident. I think I ought to be responsible for what happens to me under those circumstances. So I think that provision should be stricken out, and the provision for damage to civilians confined to those who are actually injured or damaged by enemy attack.

The fourth respect in which I think the bill is somewhat broad is more complicated, and I think more open to question, I question whether we should undertake to compensate anyone for enemy action if it includes enemy invasion. In other words, I do not believe that even the President ought to be able to extend this liability to civilians who suffer damage from the Japanese while the Japanese are in occupation of the Philippines. I believe we ought to wait until after any invasion is over, and then survey the situation, and decide then what we shall do; but not to try to say in advance that every man injured from enemy action, even though it is in territory occupied by the enemy, shall receive compensation from the United States Government. One of the amendments I propose excludes injury resulting in territory directly occupied by the enemy at the time and for 10 days or 2 weeks thereafter.

Mr. President, it seems to me that in this bill we are creating a new type of pension. One of the curses of our past history has been the constant addition to the number of pensions, until in the end it has looked as if less than 50 percent of the people of the country would have to try to support the other 50 percent. I see no reason why we should undertake at the present time to add to that number a group of from five to six million men and women who are perfectly willing to serve, who are perfectly willing to give their services, and who, in my opinion, are subjected to no more extraordinary danger of accident than if they were engaged in their ordinary everyday pursuits of life.

Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on the amendment which I have offered.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I am happy to be able to support the pending bill. I am proud that it came from the Committee on Education and Labor. I congratulate the committee which has reported the bill for the serious way in which it has undertaken its work.

The bill is new in theory, but that should not make it an objectionable measure. The bill may provide for more claims than anyone can anticipate if the war becomes as terrible and serious as many persons have thought it may. On the other hand, if we are successful in the war effort there will not be many claims. I think that this much should be said: When once total war, spherical war, global war, or whatever one may choose to call it, is undertaken, the sooner we bring home to our people the fact that all are responsible for the war, all might suffer by the war, and therefore all should sustain the losses, the better off we will be in a social and governmental way.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO THE STATES FOR PUBLIC EDUCATION

It is in relation to this kind of legislation that I wish to take the time of the Senate for a moment or two to call attention to another subject. Today the Committee on Education and Labor voted to report the Federal aid-to-education bill. The bill has been on the Senate Calendar for three Congresses in the past, but has never become law.

Mr. President, on May 29 of this year our newspapers carried a report that the President of the United States, after conference with the United States Commissioner of Education and the Director of Selective Service, proposed to project a program of adult education to alleviate a situation revealed by the fact that 433,000 men of draft age have been found to be without sufficient education—fourth grade—to serve in the Army, about 250,000 of whom—enough for 15 divisions in the Army—are physically fit. A few nights later, the following came from the Berlin radio:

> A total of 430,000 men have had to be rejected up to now by the American recruiting authorities, Washington military circles report. Of this enormous quantity of men, 250,000 had been physically fit for defense. For this reason, President Roosevelt will ask for a fund of $15,000,000 from Congress so that in special schools these men can be prepared for military service. America tries to tell the world that it is the seat of culture and education.

Unfortunately, the facts are such as to give just such aid and comfort to the enemy. Becoming angry or swearing at Hitler and Goebbels will not eradicate or liquidate our oversupply of illiteracy. It is true, as H. G. Wells has said that—

> Ignorance is an intolerable nuisance, for mental slums are more dangerous to mankind than material ones.

Something needs to be done now to eradicate functional illiteracy and to prevent its recurrence in the future.

Apparently the American people learned but little from their experience in the last war with respect to the equalization of educational opportunity. The American Academy of Science reported in 1919 that an examination of 1,500,000 men in the draft of the first World War revealed that 25.3 percent could not read a newspaper or write a letter home. That report should have aroused the Nation. It should have prompted Congress to undertake a vigorous program of Federal aid to education in the States in order to equalize educational opportunity and thus help to prevent a new generation of illiterates.

More than 20 years ago a commission of the National Education Association, moved by the disclosures of illiteracy among our draftees, prepared for Congress a bill to provide Federal participation in the support of education in the several States. In one form or another, a similar proposal has been before Congress for the past 6 years.

The prevalence of illiteracy among our young adults who had been unable because of previous lack of educational opportunity to acquire the rudiments of schooling should have resulted 20 years ago in a vigorous program of adult education. Relatively little was done until 1933. Since then the public schools, using W. P. A. teachers, have taught an estimated 2,000,000 adults to read and write. About one-third of those adults were Negroes who had been denied previous educational opportunities; a substantial portion of them were foreign-born; the majority of them were beyond 40 years of age.

According to the information available, it appears that about 20 percent of our men of military age, excluding the mentally deficient, are functionally illiterate. In the last war, as has already been stated, the percentage was 25. At this rate functional illiteracy among the mentally competent of our population will be eradicated scarcely before the end of the next 100 years.

Data from the 1940 census show that 10,104,612 persons 25 years of age and older have completed not more than 4 years of schooling. That number is 13.57 percent of the population of that age group. Official reports do not reveal the States from which the functionally illiterate draftees come, but it seems a safe assumption that they come from the States in about the same proportion as the persons reported by the Bureau of the Census. The census data show that every State has a sizable share of persons of low educational status. The Southern States—including Texas, Oklahoma, and Kentucky—have 4,486,760 of them; the Northern States—east of the Mississippi, including West Virginia and Maryland—have 4,336,800; and the Western States have 1,281,052. The percentages run from 4.1 percent in Iowa to 35.7 percent in Louisiana. When it is recalled that our population is highly mobile, nearly 25 percent of the native-born now living in States other than those of their birth, it can be safely concluded that the States which have the most widely available educational opportunities import a share of their illiterates and near-illiterates from the States where educational opportunities are not as widely available as they should be. Some 4 or 5 years ago, a group of farm leaders in a great Midwest agricultural State complained that their State was importing illiteracy from the States with the most inadequate schools. Hardly any State is able to escape the consequences of poor educational opportunities in other States.

Certainly the last war and this one should have taught us that the availability and quality of educational opportunity in every nook and corner of the Union is a matter of concern to the Nation. In this time of total war, we need every available and potential economic and human resource. The 15 armed divisions are not merely a loss to our military power; they are also a loss to our productive power. They will produce no aircraft or other complicated machines for modern warfare; and without the rudiments of modern schooling, there is no way to enable them to do so. It is probably true that 15 additional divisions of armed and equipped soldiers would have turned the tide of

any decisive battle in history, from Marathon to Argonne.

It is by no means sufficient, important as it is, that we merely try to provide schools for these neglected people now that the crisis is upon us. Illiteracy, the product of educational neglect, must be stopped at its source; and that can be done only by giving educational opportunity to the children—all the children of all the people of America.

A few days ago Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O., issued a statement that should impress every leader—political, industrial, or military—with the necessity of action now to strengthen our educational system:

> Labor has always believed in wholehearted support of public education. Especially now when we are at war against fascism, public education symbolizes the kind of thing we are fighting for.
>
> It is our profound conviction that the war must not be used to weaken or destroy our system of public education. To the contrary, it must be a part of the war effort to strengthen our educational system.
>
> It is, therefore, of the greatest importance that there should be maintained in every State and community a well-supported system of public education. This means especially the provision of well-paid teachers who are given the protection they need so that they may impartially teach the truth and honestly prepare youth for the changing conditions in the world. The workers engaged in the vital tasks of war production are determined that this war shall be won in order that our children may have the opportunity for a better life.
>
> We must stand firmly against any attempt to lower school standards during this period, against any attempt to impair our war effort and the post-war world by depriving our children of their right to an education.
>
> Adequate public education is a national need. Those States and communities that are financially unable to maintain good schools should be assisted by Federal funds. We stand firmly in support of the proposition that all the children of the Nation should have a fair and equal opportunity for education because upon them depends the future well-being of our Nation.

On May 8, 1942, the Vice President of the United States delivered a great address, one widely quoted throughout the world, in which he said some impressive things about the place of reading and writing in the people's march to freedom and democracy.

> The prophets of the Old Testament were the first to preach social justice. But that which was sensed by the prophets many centuries before Christ was not given complete and powerful political expression until our Nation was formed as a Federal Union a century and a half ago. Even then the march of the common people had just begun. Most of them did not yet know how to read and write. There were no public schools to which all children could go. Men and women cannot be really free until they have plenty to eat, and time and ability to read and think and talk things over. Down the years the people of the United States have moved steadily forward in the practice of democracy. Through universal education they now can read and write and form opinions of their own. They have learned, and are still learning, the art of production * * * that is, how to make a living. They have learned, and are still learning, the art of self-government.

But the march of the 10,000,000 who have not had a fourth-grade education has hardly begun. So long as nearly 1 out of 7 of our adults 25 years of age and older is denied the rudiments of education democracy has not come to full fruition. This condition is the result of past neglect and the failure of the National Government to consider one of the fundamentals of the bulwark of freedom and democracy, the ability of all the citizens to read and write.

In 1937 Senator Harrison, of Mississippi, jointly with the then chairman of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, Senator Black, of Alabama, introduced a bill to provide financial assistance to the States for public education. That bill was favorably reported after extensive hearings by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. While the bill was before the House Committee on Education, and hearings were being held, the President requested the Advisory Committee on Education, previously appointed by him to study Federal aid for vocational education, to give more extended consideration to the whole subject of Federal relationship to State and local conduct of education, and to prepare a report. Thereafter, the Congress took no further action in the matter pending the report of the President's Advisory Committee on Education.

On February 8, 1938, the President's committee transmitted its report to the President. The report was published by the committee, and also as House Document No. 529, Seventy-fifth Congress, third session. The committee found by unanimous agreement that—

> The educational services now provided for a considerable percentage of the Nation's children are below any level that should be tolerated in a civilized country.

And that—

> unless the Federal Government participates in the financing of schools and related services, several millions of children in the United States will continue to be largely denied the educational opportunities that should be regarded as their birthright.

The Senator from Mississippi and I introduced a bill drawn in keeping with the recommendations of the President's advisory committee. After extensive hearings before a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor in the Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, the bill, S. 1305, was reported to the Senate with the recommendation that it pass. Because of several circumstances which it is not necessary to relate here, the bill died on the calendar of the Seventy-sixth Congress.

In 1941 Senator Harrison and I introduced another bill, Senate bill 1313, to provide Federal assistance to the States for education. Extensive hearings were held on the bill. One important aspect of that bill was the proposal to grant financial assistance to the States in providing for school facilities in defense areas. Since that time grants have been made available through Public Law 137, known as the Lanham Act, and sometimes referred to as the Community Facilities Act. Under these new conditions it appears that the greatest need for Federal assistance in education is for funds for the equalization of elementary and secondary educational opportunities among and within the States. Accordingly, on February 11, 1942, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] and I submitted to the Committee on Education and Labor the committee print of a bill to provide such funds. On June 12, 1942, we submitted another committee print, carrying minor changes in the first committee print. We now propose to report a corresponding bill from the committee, and to call on the Senate for action. I shall summarize briefly the reasons for this proposal.

There are wide differences in the extent and quality of public school programs in the various States. These differences are of long and continuous standing, and account chiefly for the appalling extent of illiteracy and near illiteracy already referred to.

These inequalities of educational opportunity are the reflection of the inequalities in the ability of the States to support public schools and of the inequalities of the burdens the States have to bear. They are not due to the lack of effort on the part of the States with the least financial ability.

Some persons seem to think that every State could support an adequate school program without unreasonably great effort. They are mistaken. If Mississippi were to maintain as high an educational standard as that maintained by Delaware, it would have to make more than 12 times as much effort as that made by Delaware. Such States as Mississippi, Alabama, South Carolina, Arkansas, and Georgia cannot possibly, from their own resources, maintain educational programs for their children comparable to the educational programs maintained in such States as New Jersey, California, New York, and Delaware. Obviously without financial assistance many States cannot provide suitable educational opportunities for every child.

But mere measures of per capita financial ability do not measure the great differences in the ability of the States to support schools. The States with the lowest financial resources have far greater numbers of children in proportion to the number of adults than do the States with the highest financial resources.

One often hears the statement that inequalities of educational opportunity among the States are chiefly due to the failure of certain States to make as great a financial effort to support schools as do other States. That statement is not true. Of the 12 States which make the greatest effort, not 1 is among the 12 highest with respect to expenditures per pupil. Of the 12 States making the least effort, 6 are among the 12 spending the most per pupil.

Such States as Alabama, Arkansas, South Carolina, and Mississippi are able to spend only about one-fifth as much per pupil for education as do New York, New Jersey, and California. Can a State hire teachers at an average salary of $559 a year and expect them to be as competent as the teachers employed by another State for $2,604 a year? If children in different sections of the Nation are to have similar opportunities for learning, they must have teachers of

approximately the same qualifications. Such a condition can hardly exist when salary levels differ as widely as they do now.

In addition to the general need for partial equalization of school opportunities among the States, there has long been a need for more funds for Negro schools. This need has recently been brought into sharp focus by the decisions of Federal courts that under the Constitution no discrimination on the basis of race or color may be made in the payment of teachers' salaries. To provide equal salaries for all teachers having the same qualifications and responsibilities, it will be necessary in many of the States to lower the salaries of white teachers, or to curtail the present school program, or to obtain adequate Federal aid. Obviously, the third possibility is the only socially constructive one.

Federal aid for education is directly related to the war effort. Certainly in the current effort to win the war we must look to the future. Every year a new crop of young people come through our schools. It is not inconceivable that boys now in the elementary grades may become old enough to bear arms before the war is won. What the Nation does now about their education will determine to no small degree what they are able to do for the Nation tomorrow. It is these same children now of school age who will bear the brunt of the post-war reconstruction. It is inconceivable that the Nation should fail at this time to make available everywhere the schooling so necessary to a full realization of winning the peace as well as the war.

Practically every economist knows, and many of them have said, that Federal aid for education is a necessary part of the post-war program of the National Government. The question is whether we shall wait until calamities more dire than those following the first World War shall be permitted to strike our public schools before any constructive effort in their behalf is undertaken.

There is already a rapidly developing shortage of teachers, especially in our rural schools. It is perfectly obvious that in many cases the revenues of State governments will, within another year, suffer sharp declines. The necessary program for winning the war and its economic effects will inevitably result in curtailment of State funds. In the very States with the least economic resources there is generally the greatest dependence upon State funds for public school support. Thus, in the very areas where school facilities are most meager, the financial calamity will hit hardest and quickest.

In general, the cost of living has advanced 15 percent or more within the last year. Teachers' salaries, in general, especially in our rural schools, remain static. Nearly everywhere, rural teachers can double and triple their salaries by going into defense industry. We now face the test as to whether our Natonal Government believes that educational opportunity, free and open to all, is really a cornerstone of freedom and democracy.

The bill for Federal aid for education, proposed by the Senator from Alabama and myself, is a simple and direct measure, based upon sound principles. Its chief characteristics are these:

First. It provides specifically that "the control and supervision of public schools shall remain solely a State function, or a local function under State law." It specifically states that no Federal "department, agency, or officer * * * shall exercise any supervision or control over any school with respect to which any funds are expended pursuant to this act."

Second. The funds will be appropriated to the States according to need as determined by a formula based on the number of persons 5 to 17 years old and the personal net income in the respective States.

Third. Each State will provide through its legislature for a plan whereby the funds received will be apportioned to its respective local school jurisdictions in some manner that will fit the situation in that State so as effectively to lessen inequalities of educational opportunities.

Fourth. Full recognition is given to the right of the States to maintain separate schools for children of the minority races, while at the same time ample provision is made for increasing the financial support of the separate schools. In States which maintain separate schools for separate races, the minority races will be allotted their pro rata share of the Federal funds in proportion to population without reduction of the proportion of State and local monies expended during the fiscal year ended in 1941 for public schools for minority races.

Mr. President, this is a matter of gravest importance. What the Congress does about it will determine the future of millions of our children. By the enactment of this legislation we can demonstrate that we mean to make democracy work.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT].

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Norris
Andrews	Gerry	Nye
Bailey	Green	Overton
Ball	Gurney	Pepper
Barbour	Hill	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Holman	Rosier
Brewster	Johnson, Calif.	Russell
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Schwartz
Brown	Kilgore	Shipstead
Bulow	Langer	Smith
Burton	Lee	Spencer
Butler	Lucas	Stewart
Byrd	McCarran	Taft
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Idaho
Chandler	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Truman
Connally	Maybank	Tunnell
Davis	Mead	Van Nuys
Doxey	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Murdock	White

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. PEPPER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. The yeas and nays having been ordered, the question is on the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to strike out the civilian defense worker provision.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, ETC., APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit a conference report, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 35.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 18, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 33, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, and 53; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$228,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$15,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$85,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,685,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "the" insert the following words: "surplus fund of the"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "the" where it appears the first time insert the words "surplus fund of the"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$440,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$417,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,242,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$18,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$60,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$760,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "and" where it appears the second time, and insert in lieu thereof the word "or" and in line 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "the" where it appears the first time insert "surplus fund of the"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "the" where it appears the first time, insert the words "surplus fund of the"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 10, 20, 21, 23, 36, and 55.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN H. KERR,
BUTLER B. HARE,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
HARRY P. BEAM,
ALBERT E. CARTER,
KARL STEFAN,
ROBERT F. JONES,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report? The Chair hears none, and the question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives as to the action of the House on certain Senate amendments to House bill 6599, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 18, 1942.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 10, 20, and 36 to the bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"SEC. 505. Hereafter, no part of the funds appropriated for salaries of judges, the Attorney General, Assistant Attorneys General, Solicitor General, district attorneys, marshals, and clerks of court shall be used for any other purpose whatsoever, but such salaries shall be allotted out of appropriations made for such salaries and retained by the Department or the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and paid to such officials severally, as and when such salaries fall due and without delay."; and

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 21 and 23 to said bill.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I move to concur in the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 55.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments numbered 21 and 23, ask for a further conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. WHITE conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

CIVILIAN WAR BENEFITS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2412) to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of civilians, and for the prevention and relief of civilian distress arising out of the present war, and for other purposes.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the amendment now pending is an amendment to strike out language so that the liability of the Government will not extend to civilian defense workers unless they are actually injured as a result of enemy action. I ask that before the vote is taken the clerk read the language proposed to be eliminated by the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 39 it is proposed to strike out lines 21 to 24, inclusive, and on page 40 lines 1 and 2, inclusive, as follows:

(2) In the case of a civilian defense worker, it also includes a personal injury sustained by such worker after December 6, 1941, while in the performance of his duty as such worker, or disease incurred by him which was proximately caused by his performance of such duty after such date.

And on page 40, to strike out lines 17 to 25, inclusive, and on page 41 lines 1 to 3, inclusive, as follows:

(c) The term "civilian defense worker" means any civilian (except a person who is paid by the United States, or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof, for services as a civilian defense worker) who is engaged in the Aircraft Warning Service, or is a member of the Civil Air Patrol, or is a member of the United States Citizens Defense Corps in the protective services engaged in civilian defense, as such protective services are established from time to time by regulation or order of the Director of the Office of Civilian Defense, or is registered for a course of training prescribed and approved by said Director for such protective services.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the committee amendment. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SPENCER (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. I understand that if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote, and, therefore, I am at liberty to vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is necessarily absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY].

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is necessarily absent, has a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is necessarily absent. He has a general pair with the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER].

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on public business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] is necessarily absent.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] is absent from the Senate because of illness in his family.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is absent on important public business.

The Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] is detained in a meeting of the Committee on Patents.

The Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY], the Senators from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ and Mr. HATCH], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from

Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], are detained in committee meetings.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] are detained in a meeting of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], and will vote. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 26, nays 34, as follows:

YEAS—26

Aiken	Connally	McKellar
Bailey	Davis	Murdock
Barbour	George	Radcliffe
Brewster	Gerry	Smith
Brown	Gurney	Spencer
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Taft
Butler	Langer	Wheeler
Byrd	Lucas	White
Chandler	McFarland	

NAYS—34

Andrews	Johnson, Calif.	Rosier
Ball	Kilgore	Russell
Bilbo	Lee	Schwartz
Brooks	McCarran	Shipstead
Bulow	McNary	Stewart
Capper	Maybank	Thomas, Idaho
Clark, Idaho	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Doxey	Millikin	Truman
Ellender	Norris	Tunnell
Green	Nye	Van Nuys
Hill	Overton	
Holman	Pepper	

NOT VOTING—36

Austin	Glass	Reed
Bankhead	Guffey	Reynolds
Barkley	Hatch	Smathers
Bone	Hayden	Thomas, Okla.
Bridges	Herring	Tobey
Bunker	Hughes	Tydings
Caraway	La Follette	Vandenberg
Chavez	Lodge	Wagner
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Wallgren
Danaher	Murray	Walsh
Downey	O'Daniel	Wiley
Gillette	O'Mahoney	Willis

So Mr. TAFT's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. In the committee amendment, on page 62, in line 19, it is proposed to strike out "including practice black-outs."

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, by reason of the rejection of the amendment I just offered, any member of the Citizens Defense Corps who is injured in the course of his duties would receive compensation, and of course, would receive compensation whether the injury was sustained in a black-out or not in a black-out. If the words "including practice black-outs" remain in the bill, however, the ordinary citizen to whom the Government has assumed no obligation whatever, will receive compensation, if he happens to be injured in a black-out, including a practice black-out. It seems to me fairly obvious that an ordinary civilian who is injured when there is no enemy raid of any kind whatsoever, but merely a practice black-out, has no claim of any kind on the Government. If he falls down in the dark that certainly is a risk which he assumes, and it is something which, it seems to me, obviously should be eliminated as a cause for compensation. The only issue, therefore, is whether we wish to eliminate from the bill compensation to an ordinary civilian who is not a member of the Citizens Defense Corps, or of any other Government-connected organization, who happens to suffer an injury in a black-out, including a practice black-out.

It seems to me obvious that that clause should be eliminated. I may say that it was not in the original draft of the bill, and that the committee inserted it with great doubt. I believe the committee itself was very much divided on that question.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. GEORGE. I should like to have the Senator from Florida give heed to the Senator's answer. If during a practice black-out I should go out on the street and be run over by an automobile and permanently injured, would I have a valid claim against the Government?

Mr. TAFT. The Senator would have a claim against the Government because that action is defined as a war risk hazard for which compensation is given if one is disabled.

Mr. GEORGE. In other words, the Congress by this measure would adopt the theory that the Government should assume liability for the citizen when the citizen is perfectly free to do as he pleases, to act as he pleases, to conduct himself as he pleases, simply because a war is in progress.

Mr. TAFT. Simply because there is a black-out resulting from the war.

Mr. GEORGE. Simply by reason of a black-out, because war is being carried on.

Mr. TAFT. Yes.

Mr. GEORGE. That theory seems to run through the whole bill, as I analyze it.

Mr. TAFT. I may say that, of course, in many of the towns on both coasts of the United States, there are today more or less constant dim-outs, so that practically any accident that happens may be attributed to the black-out or the dim-out or the practice black-out.

Mr. GEORGE. Such black-outs or dim-outs occur every night in the coastal cities.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I should like to answer that point.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield so that I may ask a question?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to ask both the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], What will be the cost of the bill? Has there been any estimate made as to what its cost will be?

Mr. TAFT. There has been no estimate made as to the cost of the bill. The compensation, I suppose, is more or less equivalent to the compensation received by veterans of the World War. Perhaps it will be somewhat less, but not much less. There are about 6,000,000 persons, according to the testimony, who may be covered in the Citizens Defense Corps alone. It is impossible to estimate how long the war will last. I do not see how any estimate of cost could be made.

Mr. McKELLAR. May I ask the Senator from Florida whether any estimate of cost has been made?

Mr. PEPPER. No; there has been none made for the reason that it is not possible to anticipate what might be the scope or the extent of the injury that enemy attack might cause to the civilians of this country.

In the explanation I made earlier today in the first presentation of the bill, I named the Federal agencies which have supported this bill. It was prepared by the Bureau of the Budget, which advised the Congress that it was in accord with the program of the President, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Office of Civilian Defense, the Federal Security Administrator, and the Employees' Compensation Commission. Those were the Federal agencies which have had experience with this kind of thing, or whose duties would cover this kind of thing in case an enemy raid occurred in such way as to injure civilians of the country.

Mr. McKELLAR. If I may ask the Senator another question, is there any precedent for the bill in our country or in any other country?

Mr. PEPPER. The bill very closely tracks the British law. It follows the same principle. We have the advantage of the information received by those who went over there and studied the operations of the British law. The measure rather closely follows that law.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was any estimate made as to what it had cost the British Government?

Mr. PEPPER. The British have had to deal with the matter in the same way we have. The British have made appropriations from time to time covering the expenditures as they might be necessary. We know, of course, about how many persons have been killed in England due to air raids, and how many have been injured. I can state the number to the Senator, but I do not think that is information which I should make public at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall not ask the Senator to do that. It would appear that a tremendous amount of money will have to be paid out by the British Government.

Mr. PEPPER. Only in the cases of the great many persons who sustain injuries. The purpose of this bill is to enable the Federal Government to provide compensation to civilians who sus-

tain injuries from enemy attack, or from war hazards, of a peculiar character associated with enemy attack or preparation therefor. But the compensation would be very much less in this country than it would be in England, we all anticipate, unless much greater injury shall be done than we can imagine possible.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. If the committee provision should be adopted any civilian injured as the result of a black-out caused by an air raid would be compensated?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. I will say, Mr. President, in response to the statement made by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] that the reason the committee put the words "practice black-out" in the bill was that an injury had to be permanent in character and greater than one-third in degree to entitle a person to receive benefits under the measure. The Senate will bear in mind that no one would receive any benefit under this bill unless the injury sustained were more than one-third disability and permanent in its nature.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, because I think this amendment involves a different principle in allowing compensation to civilians in connection with black-outs, and when there is no enemy attack, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, before the calling of the roll is proceeded with, I wish to make a remark on this subject.

Mr. President, I voted against the other amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio, although I wanted to be recorded in favor of the amendment. I was busily engaged in writing at my desk, and when the vote was recapitulated by the clerk it was apparent to me that the amendment had been lost, or I should have asked the right to change my vote before the announcement of the result.

I shall vote in favor of the pending amendment, although I am frank to say that if I felt that the Government were able, without danger of financial disaster, to carry out the principle involved in the bill, as I understand it from the little study I have been able to make of it I should vote against this amendment.

The thing which staggers me, Mr. President, is the enormous expense which it seems to me the Government would incur if we should enact this kind of legislation. I know that our sympathies lean toward the principle of the bill. I should like to vote to compensate all the classes of persons mentioned in the bill; but I feel that we are treading on extremely dangerous ground when we go as far as is proposed. The financial resources of our Government are not unlimited; and the imagination is staggered by the colossal debt which we are piling up. We must all undergo sacrifices in this war; and they will not fall equally upon all of us. I do not believe there is any way to equalize them. The burden of one citizen will be greater than that of another, not because of any fault of any citizen, but because of the very nature of the circumstances.

I do not believe it is possible to make compensation in money for services of the nature described in the bill. There is no one who would not gladly pay for such services if he felt that we were able to do so. However, as I see it, in a great war such as this the Government of the United States cannot pay in money for all the sacrifices which it calls upon its citizens to make. It seems to me that the burdens—which as I see it will be increased—are sufficient to make it dangerous to enact this kind of legislation. I may be entirely mistaken. My sympathy is entirely the other way. I can see the possibility of hundreds of millions of dollars of damages and liabilities accruing. I should like to be able to pay for them. I should like to see my Government pay for them; but I do not believe it can do so. I think that with the tremendous debt we are piling up from day to day we must curtail our activities in that direction or financial disaster will certainly follow.

Therefore I shall vote for the pending amendment. I am not sure that I ought not to vote against the enactment of the bill itself. I confess that I have not been able to examine it in all its details. I am in entire sympathy with what the authors of the legislation wish to bring about. It would be a noble thing to do; but I fear that we are attempting to do the impossible.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I entirely sympathize with the fear and misgiving indicated by the able Senator from Nebraska. In dealing with this problem and presenting it to the committee the Government agencies were naturally asked how much the proposed law would cost. To be truthful, all they could say to the committee was that they did not know what it would cost, because no living person can tell what may be the extent of civilian injury in this country from enemy attack. We do know what the experience of the British has been. None of us anticipates that in this country there will be anything like the widespread injury from enemy attacks which the British have already experienced.

I suppose it is permissible to say that so far the British civilian casualties from enemy attack have been something like 100,000, roughly, equally divided between the wounded and the killed. Britain has been subjected to intensive enemy attack for more than a year. It is proximate to the enemy. That is the experience which the British have had. Yet imagine what would have been the suffering of those 100,000 people if they had had to bear the penalty and cost of such injury, without any governmental assistance whatever, without any medical care, without any hospitalization, without any temporary relief to make their homes habitable, perhaps without money for food for a few days until they could reorient themselves while their communities were being partially rebuilt, and having to sustain permanent injury without any compensation whatever from the Government.

Therefore, the Government agencies recommended this legislation. I do not anticipate that the amount of injury in this country in terms of dollars will be very great. The casualties in Britain have been only about 100,000, and we should not anticipate that many casualties in this country. However, if we should have a "blitz" in some American community, I feel that Members of Congress would want to see provision made for those who suffer injury instead of having the loss fall upon them individually, when only a few would be able to bear it, or fall upon the local communities, which might not be able to bear it. Instead of whatever sacrifice they may make falling upon their counties or their States, which may not be able adequately to meet the problem, and instead of the people depending upon private charity, I am confident that even if the cost is large—which I do not anticipate—Members of Congress feel that the burden should be borne as a part of the war expenditure by the United States Government.

The local defense agencies, the States, and the local governments, will have their part; but they will not be expected to furnish the money to provide compensation to civilians who may sustain injury.

The Senate will recall that we put in the bill a very definite safeguard against fictitious or petty claims. No person would receive a penny under the terms of the bill unless he should sustain an injury amounting to at least one-third total and permanent disability.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator has stated the exact truth about the matter. Although the bill provides that petty claims may not be paid, the limitation is arbitrary. When thousands of people come just below the scales fixed by law, how long would it be before we should be asked to change the law? How long would it be before there would be a clamor, which would be irresistible, to lower the limitation? Would not anybody have an argument in his favor, on principle, for lowering the limitation? Is there any reason why we should pay a claim for one-third total and permanent disability, and not pay a claim for disability just below one-third? Where are we to stop unless we pay all such claims?

Mr. PEPPER. Of course, we all know that when we act through human agencies there is frailty and error. The Federal Security Administrator would be the one primarily charged with the administration of the law. The Senate will remember that he is supposed to make a report to the Congress every 3 months.

The bill would not appropriate any money. It would merely authorize the appropriations necessary to carry out the purposes of the bill. So the Appropriations Committees of the House and the Senate would be able to scrutinize the administration of the law. They would not have to recommend the appropriation of more money than they might think appropriate under the circumstances.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. As I understand, the provision which the Senator from Ohio seeks to have stricken from the bill applies only to civilians?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. STEWART. And only during practice black-outs.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. STEWART. I supported the Senator in his contention with respect to the other amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio because, as I understood, it applied to those who actually participate in practice black-outs, that is, civilian defense workers who might be injured while engaged in a practice black-out. However, I do not know whether I can go along with the Senator on this amendment.

I heard the Senator speak of the number of injuries which had occurred in England; but I understood him to say that they occurred during actual raids, and not during practice black-outs.

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. STEWART. There is no way to state from experience the number of injuries which occurred in Great Britain or anywhere else from practice black-outs.

Mr. PEPPER. The committee had that in mind. Certainly no great number of persons would come within this category. The question is submitted to the Senate for its consideration. It was felt by the committee that in almost every practice black-out a few persons, without fault on their own part, and without themselves being responsible in any culpable sense for their own injury, would sustain more than one-third total and permanent disability.

All of us realize that we have to think of the community as well as the individual. Let us suppose that during a practice black-out the head of a family collides with some obstacle or is run over; suppose he is not at fault; suppose he is not covered by insurance, and suppose he is killed, and leaves a widow and children. He has lost his life in connection with a matter which is related in a rather intimate way to the war effort. It is up to us to determine whether we prefer to have the dependents of such persons suffer without relief, have them rely upon charity for assistance, have them obtain assistance from local authorities and agencies, or have them assisted by the Federal Government which, after all, is responsible for the war effort.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. It appears to me that civilians would have an opportunity to file a claim against a Government agency which might injure them, just as they now have an opportunity to file a claim if, for instance, a C. C. C. truck should injure them; and the Senate Committee on Claims could pass upon such claims. Certainly we cannot insure civilians against injuries received during black-out practices or other practices.

Mr. PEPPER. Of course, anyone always has the right to file his claim with the Senate Committee on Claims. Although it might be that the Congress, by hypothesis, would be attentive to cases of that kind by separate legislation, we should recall that the President has been urging that, instead of cluttering up its own calendar with private claims, Congress establish some tribunal to pass upon all small claims. All the claims affected by the pending bill would be small claims, with benefit payments of from $30 to a maximum of $85 a month; and the law would not extend beyond 5 years after the termination of war; so the pending bill is not indefinite either in term or in amount.

Mr. MAYBANK. Such injured civilians would still have a chance to bring their claims before the Senate Committee on Claims, would they not?

Mr. PEPPER. Except for the regulations or restraints which the Congress or the President might have imposed upon them with respect to such cases, they would of course have the right to present their claims to the Senate Committee on Claims for such relief as that procedure might offer.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. I understand the statement by the able junior Senator from Florida to be that the law would apply to cases in which an injury was suffered during a practice black-out—for instance, the case of a person who, while driving an automobile during a black-out ran over another person. In cases of that character, in which the person injured was free from negligence, and the person who caused the injury was negligent, the person who suffered the injury would have a right of action against the person causing the injury, would he not?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct. Let me say that the Senator has not had a chance to examine all the details of the bill. The bill provides subrogation of the Federal Government in such a case. In other words, if the injury to the civilian occurred as the result of the negligence of another person, and if the Federal Government compensated the injured person, the Federal Government would be subrogated to the right of the injured person in respect to his claim against the one negligently causing the injury. In that way the Government's compensation payments would be covered.

Mr. OVERTON. I do not understand why the bill should apply to injuries received during practice black-outs.

Mr. PEPPER. That is purely a matter of determining how wide the law should spread.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I was interested in what was said about the possibility of taking the injury claims to the Senate Committee on Claims. The difficulty is that in the ordinary case the Committee on Claims does not have the necessary machinery properly to pass on such claims, and the committee is not equipped to make the investigation which properly should be made. Necessarily the Committee on Claims quite generally acts upon ex parte reports and statements made by claimants and their counsel.

Mr. PEPPER. I think that is a very pertinent observation. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I very heartily approve the statements which were made a few minutes ago by the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] on the amendment. I happen to be the chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee's subcommittee which handles the defense supplemental appropriation bills. About a month ago I asked the clerk of the Appropriations Committee to figure up how much we had spent for war purposes in the 5 months since the 5th of last January, now not quite 6 months. His report to me was that in those 5 months we had appropriated $86,000,000,000 for war purposes. That was the amount of money which had been provided for war purposes since the 5th of last January, up to approximately the 25th of May. That amount does not include the number of billions of dollars of expenditures which will be considered before our committee this week and next week, and by the 1st of July we shall have appropriated well over $100,000,000,000.

Mr. President, as I read the pending bill there is no telling how much money will be required to pay the claims which will be presented under it to our Government. The amount of such claims would be almost unlimited. The bill provides, in reality, virtually a blank check on the Government for all who may suffer any kind of injury under the circumstances mentioned in the bill. As the Senator from Nebraska has so well asked, Where shall we get the money with which to pay such claims? It is generally estimated that the entire wealth of the United States is approximately $300,000,000,000. If we appropriate $100,000,000,000 during the first 6 months of this year, and if thereafter claims should be filed, under the terms of the pending bill, aggregating, it may be, a million or hundreds of millions or, it may be billions of dollars, I am not only very doubtful as to whether we should pass the bill, but I am inclined to believe that we should not pass it. Up to date we have not suffered any losses from invasion, or any appreciable losses from raids. Why should we invite claims of the sort mentioned in the bill?

I think we should postpone the bill. It may be a very proper bill. Under other circumstances it may be necessary for us to pass a bill similar to the one now pending; but certainly at the present time there is no need to pass this bill. Certainly it should not be passed in the condition in which we find ourselves, in the greatest war in which we have ever been engaged, a war which we must win. We must win this war; but let me say to the Members of the Senate that if we are going to dissipate and waste our revenues, if we are going to pay all sorts of claims which would be made under this bill, we shall not have the funds with which to obtain the implements of war we shall need in order to win.

I confess that, with the duties which have devolved upon me in the last few weeks, I have not had an opportunity to examine the bill as carefully as I should

like to do. I make that confession, and admit that I may not be as familiar with the terms of the bill as I should be. However, as I read the bill, it seems to me that it provides for one of the greatest extravagances in which our country may ever indulge.

I think that all of us should bear the burden of this war. I think that all of us should take some of the chances the war involves. All of us should make sacrifices. In a great war of this kind I do not think that we should make good the losses of everyone or that the Government should undertake to compensate for any injury which any person may receive or any loss which he may sustain. We cannot do it. As the distinguished Senator from Nebraska has said, we cannot get the money with which to do it. We shall not have the money with which to pay such claims. We shall not have the money with which to conduct the war if we continue to make forays on the Treasury of the United States in the way which is proposed in the bill. My sympathy goes out to anyone who is hurt. The sympathy of every man goes out to anyone who is hurt; but because a person is hurt is no reason for saddling the damages on the Government, especially at a time such as this.

I plead with the Senator to postpone his bill until a time when we can understand it better. We do not know what has happened in Great Britain concerning such matters. We do not know what claims are paid there. They cannot be paying very much, because a few days ago they advertised that they had appropriated $6,000,000,000 for some purpose. Why, we appropriate $6,000,000,000 and never think about it, and probably many of us do not even look at the bill. We have already appropriated upward of $86,000,000,000 in the last 6 months; and we must add very greatly to that sum. I plead with the Members of the Senate, I plead with my friend the Senator from Florida, to let us win the war first, and settle claims afterward.

I am willing to be generous, but I do not wish to see the revenues of the Government wasted. We have not the revenues to waste. Under the present circumstances we should not obligate ourselves for the payment of such expenses as would result from the enactment of such legislation as that proposed. I do not believe the country will sustain us if we do.

I hope Senators will take the advise of the distinguished Senator from Nebraska and adopt the amendment of the Senator from Ohio, or vote the bill down. I wish to be perfectly frank; I cannot vote for the bill. I expect to vote against it, because I do not think it is proper for us to pass such a measure.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator from Florida a question or two with respect to a proper interpretation of the bill. I invite the Senator's attention to section 102, which provides that "benefits under this title shall be provided with respect to civilians who sustain a war injury (as defined in section 106)."

Turning to section 106 I find this provision:

As used in this title—

(a) The term "war injury" means—

(1) a personal injury sustained after December 6, 1941, proximately resulting from a war-risk hazard (as defined in title IV), and includes any disease proximately resulting from such personal injury;

(2) in the case of a civilian defense worker—

What is a civilian defense worker under the terms of the bill?

Mr. PEPPER. A civilian defense worker is defined on page 40, from line 17 to the bottom of the page and in the first three lines on page 41. In substance, a defense worker is one of the regularly appointed and acting civilian defense workers under the rules and regulations prescribed by the Office of Civilian Defense.

Mr. LUCAS. I was thinking, for instance, of a man in a factory doing war work. Would the bill apply to him in the event, we will say, there were an explosion, and 40 or 50 men were killed?

Mr. PEPPER. Not in the case of an ordinary explosion, but such a man would be covered if a bomb were dropped on the factory and he were injured.

Mr. LUCAS. What would be the difference whether he were killed by a bomb or by an explosion in the factory? They would both be accidents resulting from war work.

Mr. PEPPER. Yes; but the administrative agencies and the committee which recommended the bill left out that kind of a case, due to the assumption that, in the first place, there are workmen's compensation laws in the several States which confer benefits on workers injured in the performance of their duties; and, in the second place, it was assumed that in operations particularly hazardous some separate insurance provision would be made by the employer.

Mr. LUCAS. Would not the workmen's compensation acts and other benefit provisions in the various States apply to a case where bombs were dropped on a factory?

Mr. PEPPER. Generally speaking, they would, but the difference is that in such a case the worker would get the benefit provided by the Workmen's Compensation Act, but the Federal Government would reimburse the insurer for the amount disbursed, in cases where the insurer had not charged any premium to either the employer or the employee. So this really gives a coverage which would not exist. The ordinary case would be covered by the workmen's compensation laws, and the insurer would charge a higher premium due to the hazardous nature of the work, but in the case of an injury from a bombing the insurers would not charge a premium, because if they charged enough to meet the contingencies of a raid, the rate would be too high, and if they did not charge enough and a raid should come, they would not have the money with which to pay off.

Mr. LUCAS. Under the proposed law, would the individual working in the factory, who was injured as the result of the dropping of a bomb, draw double compensation?

Mr. PEPPER. No.

Mr. LUCAS. That is, compensation from his State under the Workmen's Compensation Act, and compensation from the Government under the proposed law?

Mr. PEPPER. No; in that case he would draw the benefits which would be provided by the workmen's compensation law of his State, but if those benefits were less in amount than the benefits proposed to be provided by the pending measure, he would get the difference from the Federal Treasury.

Mr. LUCAS. It would be necessary for him to file a claim for the difference?

Mr. PEPPER. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I desire to have the attention of the acting leader, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], in charge of the pending bill. May we not have an understanding that the bill will go over until Monday? A number of Senators have indicated to me that they would like to have further opportunity to study the bill and to read the discussion in the RECORD. This is an important measure, of course. I am not making the request on my own account, but it occurs to me that it might be well, that it would make for better legislation, if we did not try to dispose of the bill today or tomorrow, but let the matter rest in status quo until Monday. I submit the inquiry to the Senator from Alabama and the Senator from Florida in the best of faith.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I have not had opportunity to consult with the able Senator from Alabama, who is now the acting leader, and, of course, I have had no opportunity to consult with the members of the Committee on Education and Labor, but, so far as I may presume to speak for them without their acquiescense, personally I have no objection to what the Senator suggests, and would welcome the Senate having ample opportunity to study the bill.

Mr. HILL. It seems evident that we cannot finish the consideration of the bill tonight, and if the Senator from Oregon will yield the floor I will now move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business, with the thought in mind that when executive business is concluded the Senate will then recess until Monday.

Mr. PEPPER. With the understanding that the pending bill will be the unfinished business on Monday?

Mr. HILL. The pending bill will, of course, be the unfinished business on Monday in case we take a recess today.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, at the proper time I shall ask that the pending bill go to the Finance Committee for some study of the financial aspects involved. The bill deals with three or four administrative agencies, the principal one of which comes directly under the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee, and the matter is too important, it seems to me, to be passed upon without a thorough consideration by the committee

which is responsible for the raising of taxes. I desire to give notice that at the proper time I shall move that the bill be referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PEPPER. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. PEPPER. Is the Senator from Georgia making the motion today, or giving notice that he will make it Monday?

Mr. GEORGE. I am giving notice that I shall make the motion at the proper time. I am not making it today.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, am I to understand that the acting majority leader does not desire to have the Senate meet tomorrow?

Mr. HILL. The desire is that the Senate go over until Monday. I understand that the Senator from Michigan has a bridge bill he wishes to have considered, in which the Senator from Minnesota is very much interested. I take it there will be no opposition to the bill, and I know of no reason why the Senator should not obtain consent at this time to have the bill considered.

Mr. BROWN. I have been ready to report the bill, but I had thought that under the rule it would have to lie over 1 day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It would have to.

Mr. BROWN. I do not think the bill should be taken up in the absence of the two Senators from Wisconsin. I think it should go over until Monday, but I will file the report today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

ALVIRA MANFREDI—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BROWN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5845) for the relief of Alvira Manfredi, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "$1,000" insert "$2,893"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
JAMES H. HUGHES,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
EUGENE J. KEOGH,
W. A. PITTENGER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

DECLINE IN THE COST OF LIVING

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a short statement showing that for the first time in 19 months, according to the figures of the Bureau of Labor Statistics, there has been a decline in the cost of living, which I think is directly attributable to the operations of general order No. 1 of the Price Control Act. I ask that the statement be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Office of Price Administration, Consumer Division]

EFFECT OF GENERAL MAXIMUM PRICE REGULATION ON THE COST-OF-LIVING INDEX

Reflecting the impact of the general maximum price regulation, the cost of living in large cities dropped 0.1 percent between May 15 and June 2, 1942, according to figures released by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The decline follows 19 consecutive monthly increases beginning with November 1940.

The largest decline occurred in rent which dropped 1.2 percent as the result of rent control in several cities, which counterbalanced rent increases elsewhere. Clothing prices dropped 0.5 percent and those of house furnishings, 0.3 percent. Two groups of items increased. Food prices increased by 0.3 and fuel, electricity, and ice prices by 0.1 percent. Most of these increases, however, occurred with respect to items exempted by the Price Control Act or otherwise from the general maximum price regulation. The decline of 0.1 percent in the cost-of-living index from May 15 to June 2, compares with a rise of 0.8 percent between April 15 and May 15, and 0.7 percent between March 15 and April 15.

These figures mean that for the first time in more than a year and a half, the housewife's dollar will buy as much during the current month as during the preceding month. In the light of the abrupt reversal of the trend of the cost-of-living index, this is clearly an accomplishment of the general maximum price regulation which became effective May 18. It is an accomplishment of real importance to the national economy and to the morale of the home front.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROSIER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

By Mr. MCCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Leslie S. Kofoed, of Nevada, to be United States marshal for the district of Nevada, vice Frank L. Middleton, term expired.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Walter W. Orebaugh, of Kansas, now a Foreign Service officer of class 7 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul; and

Orray Taft, Jr., of California, now a Foreign Service officer of class 8 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul.

By Mr. GILLETTE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Frank T. Leighton to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 22d day of November 1941;

Capt. Daniel J. Callaghan to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 28th day of May 1942;

Sundry officers for promotion in the Navy; and

Col. Allen H. Turnage to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps for temporary service from the 29th day of March 1942.

LYNN R. EDMINSTER

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I report favorably from the Committee on Finance the nomination of Lynn R. Edminster, of Illinois, to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 16, 1943, vice Raymond B. Stevens, deceased.

In this connection I may say that I have advised with the majority and the minority leaders, and have conferred with the two Senators from Illinois, and the nomination is agreeable to all these Senators. There is a reason why the nomination should be confirmed today and the President notified, and I ask that the nomination be considered at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and the nomination will be stated.

The Chief Clerk stated the nomination of Lynn R. Edminster to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed, and the President will be notified forthwith.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, the nomination of Leslie S. Kofoed, of Nevada, to be United States marshal for the district of Nevada, has been previously reported, and I now ask for immediate consideration of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Leslie S. Kofoed, of Nevada, to be United States marshal for the district of Nevada.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of this nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

THE ARMY

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] I report favorably, from the Committee on Military Affairs, certain nominations in the Army, and ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Kentucky? The Chair hears none,

and, without objection, the nominations are confirmed.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of the nominations in the Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS

Mr. HILL. From the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments I report favorably two nominations of State directors in the Office of Government Reports. I ask for immediate consideration of the nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nominations? The Chair hears none. The nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles W. Hardesty to be State director in the Office of Government Reports for Delaware.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William Freiday to be State director in the Office of Government Reports for New Jersey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of the confirmation of these nominations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard of the United States.

Mr. HILL. I ask that these routine Coast Guard nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] wishes to address the Senate for a few minutes, but without the transaction of any business. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of legislative business.

AUTHORIZATION FOR SIGNING OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that during the forthcoming recess of the Senate the Presiding Officer be authorized to sign bills and resolutions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 6634. An act to facilitate the employment by defense contractors of certain former members of the land and naval forces, including the Coast Guard, of the United States; and

H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America.

ANNIVERSARY OF BIRTH OF JON SIGURDSSON

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, June 17 was the anniversary of the birth of the great Icelandic statesman and scholar, Jon Sigurdsson. It was he who did more than any other man to give Iceland its complete independence.

Today, too, is almost another anniversary, for it was just about a year ago that President Roosevelt and the Icelandic Government agreed on the dispatching of American soldiers to Icelandic territory.

As the Icelandic Minister to the United States, the Honorable Thor Thors, said recently, that agreement was one of the United States' first victories in the war.

Strategically placed between two continents, Iceland is one of the most important bases in the great battle of the Atlantic. We can attribute much of the success of the United Nations, in transporting troops and supplies across the Atlantic to Britain and Russia, to our bases in Iceland.

But that agreement a year ago represents much more than a military victory. It represents a growing friendship and understanding between our Republic and the one which Jon Sigurdsson helped to build.

It was the two countries' common love of freedom, and respect for democratic, decent government which was the basis of their agreement. The Icelandic Government and the peoples of Iceland know that today the United States and all its Allies are fighting for the same kind of world for which Sigurdsson fought.

What he worked for in Iceland the United Nations are working for and fighting for in the whole world today.

Sigurdsson made Reykjavik not only the political but the spiritual capital of Iceland.

Today his country is aiding the United Nations in becoming not just a political force but a world-encompassing spiritual force fighting against oppression and ruthlessness.

Iceland, despite its previous geographical isolation, has watched closely as Hitler gobbled up one after the other of Europe's small, free countries. With particular sorrow, the Icelanders watched the Nazi hordes march into Norway and Denmark, killing, looting, destroying.

Iceland did not make the fateful mistake of imagining that it could isolate itself from a world in which all the forces of evil had alined themselves against all the forces of good.

Like Jon Sigurdsson, the present Icelandic statesmen knew there could be no compromise between the two. That is why today thousands of young Americans, at the invitation of the Icelandic Government, are stationed in that northern Republic, guarding the Western Hemisphere, and aiding the free passage of American men and supplies to our Russian and British Allies.

We know today that if it were not for their presence, Hitler, without any agreement with the Icelandic Government, would have landed his Nazi soldiers there, and as he has done to every land he has touched, liberty would be wiped out, Nazi tyranny would be imposed on another free people, and Iceland brought to starvation.

Iceland, in fact, was one of the first countries to resist the Nazis. In 1938 when Hitler asked for air bases in Iceland, Iceland said no. Hitler claimed he wanted the bases for scientific and commercial purposes. Iceland knew better.

Today the people of Iceland and the people of the United States can be glad that their leaders foresaw the Nazi menace to Iceland, and eliminated it. Everything which Jon Sigurdsson built will never fall into the blood-stained hands of Hitler.

As Icelanders celebrate Jon Sigurdsson's birthday, I know that the people of the United States join them in honoring his memory.

May his work be a continued guidance to them and to us in working toward a world of decency and security after this war against evil has ended.

AXIS ATROCITIES IN SERBIA

Mr. President, after the pleasant theme on which I have spoken, I wish now sadly to submit the report of a great tragedy which is today gripping and tearing the heart of the earth.

A few days ago, the Yugoslav minister to the United States, Mr. Constantin Fotitch, filed with the State Department a memorandum which charged the Axis with horrible atrocities perpetrated in Serbia.

This memorandum, as well as another recent memorandum of the Yugoslav Government in exile, listed the following executions of Serbs:

More than 100,000 by Hungarian soldiers in northern Yugoslavia.

More than 365,000 Serbs massacred by Germans, Italians, and pro-Axis Ustashi troops throughout Yugoslavia.

Mr. President, "man's inhumanity to man" never was better exemplified than by these harrowing stories of atrocities

trickling out of Nazi-infested Yugoslavia.

The Yugoslav memoranda list the most sadistic crimes in the world's history and constitute the blackest indictment of the Axis Powers.

According to these documents, almost the entire Serbian populations in the areas of Banat and Kacksa were either massacred or thrown into concentration camps.

Entire populations of towns were exterminated. The good people of Horgos, Subotica, Sombor, Backa-Topola, and Novi Sad exist no more.

In Subotica 100 children and their teachers were shot outside the grammar school.

The women and children of the town were taken to the shores of lake Palic, where they were shot and their bodies thrown into the lake.

Scores of thousands of Yugoslavs are living in concentration camps. Thirteen thousand were reported to be crowded in the camp of Novi Sad, with hardly more than space to sit down.

Some time ago, Yugoslavia's Premier-in-exile, Dr. Jovanovitch, in a broadcast from London, said:

> In our fatherland there reigns a regime of terror, massacre, and extermination. Our brethren, the Slovenes, are being chased from their homes without pity into the freezing cold. The Serbian people are exposed to torments and slaughter unheard of in the world's history.

The so-called German punitive expeditions, said the Yugoslav Premier, destroyed entire Serbian provinces "with sword and flame."

In Kragujevatch, said Dr. Jovanovitch, the Germans "shot all the pupils of the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades of the city's high school, as well as all the professors and the director."

The children died singing, he added. "While like sheafs the children collapsed under the fire, cries were heard: 'Long live the King, long live Serbia! Shoot! we are children of Serbia!' "

The Germans, said Premier Jovanovitch, had to drug their soldiers to carry out the execution of the children. The horror was too much even for them.

Mr. President, I wish to register here the most categorical condemnation of these inhuman barbarities. The Hungarian, Nazi, and Italian authorities and Ustashi criminals responsible for these criminal acts stand condemned in the eyes and hearts of free men everywhere; and a condign punishment should be reserved for them when the day of reckoning comes.

Woe to the brutal Axis savages when their victims rise and throw off the abominable yoke of their conquerors with the help of the United Nations.

Mr. President, one would have to go a long way to find a people with greater spirit and endurance than the Yugoslav people.

In spite of the sufferings of the people of the heroic Balkan country, resistance there to the Axis oppressors is boiling ever more fiercely. One hundred thousand to one hundred and fifty thousand Yugoslav patriots are fighting the Nazis, Italians, and Hungarians.

These Yugoslav heroes are led by a great soldier, General Draja Mikhailovitch. Basing his men in the rugged mountains of Serbia and Bosnia, Mikhailovitch has managed to conduct a fairly large offensive against the German, Italian, Hungarian, and Bulgarian troops of occupation in Yugoslavia. The Yugoslav patriots have been making forays against Axis garrisons and cutting vital Axis communication lines.

Thus the Yugoslavs have been immobilizing at least 23 Axis divisions in the unconquerable Balkan country. With General Mikhailovitch and his army on the loose, the Axis dare not withdraw large forces from Yugoslavia to fight on the more crucial Russian front.

Fighting desperately in the east and watching fearfully in the west, the Nazis simply cannot spare the men nor the equipment to stamp out this growing resistance of the Balkans. Therefore, they resort to cruel and cowardly reprisals against innocent victims.

General Mikhailovitch's wife, daughter, and two sons long ago were taken as "hostages" by the Germans and a price was placed on the general's head. Probably the Nazis will make good their threats to kill the Yugoslav hero's family in revenge, but they can break the spirit neither of this man nor his kin.

Hitler and his satellites are learning that the light of liberty is hard to extinguish. It may be temporarily suppressed, but it will blaze forth to consume those who would destroy it.

Let this message from the halls of the American Senate reach the heroic people of Yugoslavia. This is the message:

Stand fast, people of Yugoslavia. Keep the fire of liberty burning. The ever-growing might of the United Nations will soon be felt in every front of this global war. God willing, the dark forces of tyranny will be crushed, and happiness and liberty restored to you.

Stand fast, heroes of Yugoslavia.

OUR LIVESTOCK AND MEAT INDUSTRY

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, it is the declared policy of the Congress to be fair with agriculture. This body has had under consideration during this session many measures designed to be helpful to all of our citizens. We have earnestly sought to safeguard their interests during a great national crisis, but I fear we have overlooked the livestock industry. This country not only has the best livestock industry the world has ever known, but normally the best markets to be found anywhere. We pride ourselves that over the years we have also built up the most efficient meat processing, inspection, grading, marketing, and distribution systems yet developed. For our own welfare and the well-being of populations everywhere, we must permit nothing that we or others may do unnecessarily to impair or weaken the foundation of our great livestock and meat industry.

Let me remind my colleagues that no single industry is more important to the welfare of our people than the livestock industry. It touches more people by far than any other industry in America. About one-third of our entire population is concerned with it in some way. Normally the income from livestock represents approximately 70 percent of our total national farm income. It is evident that anything which depresses prices or reduces livestock values touches almost every farm home in America and many urban homes as well. We must give appropriate support to this industry and the sturdy stockmen of this country, who ask nothing more than a fair chance. Let us make sure that none there are who would make their task a more difficult and arduous one.

STOCKMEN START MOVEMENT TO PROTECT OWN INDUSTRY

My attention has been called to a meeting of cattlemen at Omaha, Nebr., on May 16, which was attended by producers, feeders, and other representatives of the industry from most of the great cattle-producing States.

Reports from this meeting and reports from my own State, which is a great cattle-producing State as well as a grain and feed-producing region, indicate that stockmen and farmers are deeply concerned because of recent events in Washington which they fear will have a detrimental effect on producers generally. The group of cattlemen at the Omaha meeting were seeking no selfish advantage for themselves. They were inspired by an earnest desire to guard against any possible shortage of meats and at the same time preserve the industry which they represent.

During World War No. 1 there were threats and much talk of meatless meals and meatless days. Our producers now hear talk of meat rationing and the consequences which it may bring upon us. All of this talk is not because of insufficient production but apparently to carry out some theory of our planned economy.

There is not the slightest need for concern about meatless days, much less of rationing of meats or of livestock. Any such need is very remote, indeed, unless, by some action of those charged with the responsibility of Price Administration, they become confused in the multiplicity of policies laid down for both producers and consumers. Recent proposals further to reduce tariff duties on livestock, meat, and certain other farm commodities of which we have great surpluses, in order to carry out more of our economic theories of tariff reform, are disturbing to our stockmen and farmers.

Mr. President, the so-called surpluses which we talk about may soon disappear unless producers are assured fair prices for their products. We have never quibbled about the cost of planes, tanks, ships, or any other war materials. Food is essential war material. We want to obtain it just as economically as our producers can supply it. But just as in the production of munitions of war, we must not destroy the source of our production by forcing prices below the cost of production and thereby putting our plants out of operation. Just so with our farmers and stockmen. Livestock and farm leaders impress upon us the fact that unless farmers can get enough from the sale of their products to pay the increased costs of labor, equipment, and supplies, they will be unable to supply our needs.

WE MUST PROTECT OUR DOMESTIC MARKETS

Mr. President, in my remarks, and also those of my colleagues, mention has been made of recent proposals to reduce tariff duties on live cattle, livestock, and other food products from Mexico. Included were such items also as protein supplements, flaxseed, soybean, and cottonseed cake and meal.

I put into the RECORD the other day a statement submitted by Fred Brenckman, Washington representative of the National Grange, America's oldest farm organization. The American Farm Bureau Federation and several other farm organizations and commodity groups oppose further tariff reductions at this time, as do some Members of Congress.

Mr. President, if we needed all the products mentioned in the list to win the war our farmers and stockmen would be the last to oppose bringing them in. It is known that we have abundant supplies of most of them, and of some we have surpluses which are actually depressing prices to our producers.

It is also known that the cost of production in Mexico is much lower than in this country because of the lower wages, lower living costs, and other economic conditions. Our producers are willing to meet any fair competition on an equitable basis. But the threat of cheap products from neighboring countries has a depressing effect upon the products with which they compete that may be supplied by our producers, and at a time when we should be concerned about doing everything possible to make sure of increased production of the most urgently needed commodities.

We have great resources of meats in this country. We have the largest number of cattle in history. For the first time cattle estimates approach the 75,000,000 mark. With other meat animals the numbers are proportionately large.

Reference to our great meat animal resources were ably discussed by my distinguished colleague from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] in his remarks on May 20. He also inserted in the RECORD a statement made by Dr. E. W. Sheets before the Committee for Reciprocity Information. Dr. Sheets is an international authorit, on livestock and farm problems, who for many years was Chief of Animal Husbandry in the Department of Agriculture. At the present time Dr. Sheets is Secretary of the United States Live Stock Association. His efforts and accomplishments in behalf of the livestock and meat industry are well known.

POST-WAR LIVESTOCK PROBLEMS

In an address before livestock and farm leaders at Concord, N. H., Dr. Sheets gave us a good analysis of post-war livestock and farm conditions. My distinguished colleague from that State [Mr. TOBEY] put this statement into the RECORD on February 9.

Cancelation of huge war contracts in our plants and factories, with a big unemployment problem, is not improbable. It is, of course, well known that agriculture has always been the great reservoir for unemployment.

Mr. President, the end of the war will mean that the flow of livestock products, lard, meats, dairy, and poultry products now going abroad will stop, with a turning of European countries to cheaper sources of production, notably South American countries.

While our factories will endeavor to get back to supplying our civilian needs of all kinds as quickly as possible to restore our post-war economy, monetary inflation to help liquidate our huge war debt will be a constant threat to stockmen and farmers.

Our producers, with large supplies of meat animals, would be in a more serious plight at this time except for the demand for pork and lard. The total disappearance of lard in the months from October 1941 through April 1942 was approximately 1,151,226,000 pounds, compared to a little more than 862,410,000 pounds last year. This was about 200,000,000 pounds above the 1936–41 average disappearance.

The disappearance of other pork products has also been very large, resulting in a contraseasonal decline in stocks at a time when normally they were being accumulated.

Recent attempts to depress cattle prices, in the face of this situation, is very disheartening to our producers. We have heard the suggestion put forth that if farmers and stockmen are unable to meet the increased costs of production they will be given a subsidy.

FARMERS DO NOT WANT SUBSIDIES

As I gather the sentiment among farmers and stockmen, Mr. President, they do not ask for nor do they want subsidy payments. They do not want to burden the Federal Treasury at a time when we must conserve our financial resources. They do not want to burden the taxpayers of the Nation. They want fair prices for their products on the market. They believe that the nonfarm consumers of the country, receiving an income about four times that of the farmer, are able to pay fair prices for food and clothing.

There has been much discussion in this body about parity payments. The distinguished Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] led a gallant fight for a new concept of parity that would be fair to stockmen. Stockmen are fully aware that parity, as now determined, does not represent equitable relationships as between livestock and other farm commodities. Many of the same farmers who produce livestock also grow wheat, corn, and other farm crops as a part of their diversified farm program. The conversion of these basic crops into essential food for our armed forces and civil population determines whether or not they receive a return above the cost of production.

It is not surprising, therefore, that stockmen from about 20 States were represented at the meeting at Omaha and formed an emergency organization, known as the National Livestock Advisory Committee. The purpose is to gather factual information among producers, and work with farm and other groups and agencies to protect and safeguard our great livestock industry during this critical period.

Represented in the movement, as I understand, were producers and feeders of cattle from the following States: Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Wisconsin, Wyoming, and possibly others.

Mr. President, what producers and feeders in all of these and the other States desire is to hold production costs to the lowest possible level; finish their animals so as to supply the kind of products which consumers want with a minimum of waste; and to reduce their cattle inventories by putting on the market in an orderly manner increasingly larger numbers of mature animals, cows and heifer stock. What is more important, they desire to work out an understanding with Federal agencies and Congress so that prices and values of their herds and flocks will not be depressed and thus bring ruination to the livestock and meat industry.

Let me remind my colleagues again that we not only have nearly 75,000,000 cattle, but we shall probably close the war with approximately 75,000,000 head of hogs, whereas a normal inventory would be something less than 60,000,000 head. Yet the only assurances from the Government which the livestock producers and feeders have are promises, not backed up by any law, that prices for some products will be supported at 85 percent of parity. Livestock producers know that parity as now determined means the ruination of their business.

STOCKMEN NOT RECEIVING EQUITABLE TREATMENT

Business concerns have binding contracts at cost plus a profit; producers of corn, wheat, cotton, and a few other farm crops have loans at specified price levels. But the livestock producers and feeders have no assurances of any kind that they will get even the cost of production. They must rely upon their own organizations, and their own willingness to reduce wartime stocks now on hand as a market factor while they produce to feed our own and the hungry people in other countries, until adjustments in their production plants shall have been made in accordance with post-war domestic demands.

Mr. President, this may not be a rosy picture which confronts our stockmen, but we must face the facts. We must not permit their livestock, accumulated at great sacrifice and expense, to be unnecessarily depreciated in value. Our stockmen expect no special consideration on the part of Congress. What they do expect, as I understand, is that the Congress permit no agency of the Government or any other agency to depress livestock prices, or the prices of livestock products, at this critical time.

I think it will be appreciated that this country needs now and will urgently need later on, large numbers of livestock to

help rebuild a war-torn and hungry world. Our producers will not only be called upon to supply the food needed now, but later to supply the breeding stock with which to help heal the wounds of war in most of the countries of the Old World.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, June 22, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 18, 1942:

FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

The following-named persons for promotion in the Foreign Service of the United States, effective as of June 1, 1942, as follows:

From Foreign Service officer of class 3 to Foreign Service officer of class 2:
Raymond H. Geist, of Ohio.
Loy W. Henderson, of Colorado.

From Foreign Service officer of class 4 to Foreign Service officer of class 3:
Selden Chapin, of Pennsylvania.
George F. Kennan, of Wisconsin.
Samuel Reber, of New York.
Robert Lacy Smyth, of California.
Angus I. Ward, of Michigan.

From Foreign Service officer of class 5 to Foreign Service officer of class 4:
Maurice W. Altaffer, of Ohio.
William W. Butterworth, Jr., of Louisiana.
Paul C. Daniels, of New York.
Cecil Wayne Gray, of Tennessee.
A. Dana Hodgdon, of Maryland.
George H. Winters, of Kansas.

From Foreign Service officer of class 6 to Foreign Service officer of class 5:
LaVerne Baldwin, of New York.
Warren M. Chase, of Indiana.
Oliver Edmund Clubb, of Minnesota.
Raymond A. Hare, of Iowa.
Bertel E. Kuniholm, of Massachusetts.
Rufus H. Lane, Jr., of Virginia.
James S. Moose, Jr., of Arkansas.
William T. Turner, of Georgia.

From Foreign Service officer of class 7 to Foreign Service officer of class 6:
George V. Allen, of North Carolina.
Robert Y. Brown, of Alabama.
Albert E. Clattenburg, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Robert D. Coe, of Wyoming.
John B. Faust, of South Carolina.
Claude H. Hall, Jr., of Maryland.
R. Borden Reams, of Pennsylvania.
Charles S. Reed, 2d, of Ohio.
Arthur R. Ringwalt, of Nebraska.

From Foreign Service officer of class 8 to Foreign Service officer of class 7:
Robert A. Acly, of Massachusetts.
Fritz A. M. Alfsen, of New York.
Edward Anderson, of Florida.
Hiram Bingham, Jr., of Connecticut.
Ralph J. Blake, of Oregon.
Carl H. Boehringer, of Michigan.
Hedley V. Cooke, Jr., of New Jersey.
Sherburne Dillingham, of New Jersey.
Douglas Flood, of Illinois.
Miss Constance R. Harvey, of New York.
Reginald S. Kazanjian, of Rhode Island.
Edward P. Maffitt, of Missouri.
Ernest de W. Mayer, of New York.
George E. Miller, of New Jersey.
Reginald P. Mitchell, of Florida.
William D. Moreland, Jr., of Oregon.
Shiras Morris, Jr., of Connecticut.
Paul H. Pearson, of Iowa.
Archibald R. Randolph, of Virginia.
Frank A. Schuler, Jr., of Michigan.
Elvin Seibert, of New York.
Jay Walker, of the District of Columbia.
Joe D. Walstrom, of Missouri.
Rolland Welch, of Texas.
H. Bartlett Wells, of New Jersey.

From Foreign Service officer, unclassified, to Foreign Service officer of class 8:
Maurice M. Bernbaum, of Illinois.
Stephen C. Brown, of Virginia.
Leslie W. Johnson, of Minnesota.
Fred K. Salter, of Georgia.
Milton Patterson Thompson, of Tennessee.

UNDER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Abe Fortas, of Tennessee, to be Under Secretary of the Interior, vice John J. Dempsey, resigned.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to be hydrographic and geodetic engineers, with rank of lieutenant in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from the 30th day of June 1942:
Charles A. Schoene
William R. Tucker
Philip A. Weber

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT, MEDICAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

First Lt. Andrew Carroll Offutt, Medical Corps Reserve.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANT, DENTAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

First Lt. Joseph Robert Gibson, Dental Corps Reserve.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

Maj. David Ray Nimocks, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1940.

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Robert Van Roo, Field Artillery (temporary captain), with rank from June 12, 1938.

TO AIR CORPS

Second Lt. Ralph Earl Freese, Quartermaster Corps, with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt. Frank Jacob Schaefer, Jr., Cavalry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1941.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonels with rank from June 1, 1942

Lt. Col. Edward Chamberlin Rose, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Albert Eger Brown, Infantry (temporary major general).

Lt. Col. William Nalle, Cavalry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Ralph Cadot Holliday, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Charles Chisholm Drake, Quartermaster Corps (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. William Joseph Morrissey, Infantry (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Henry Charles McLean, Infantry (temporary colonel).

To be lieutenant colonels with rank from July 4, 1942

Maj. Clarence Lionel Adcock, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. John Leon McElroy, Infantry (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Henry Morehead Underwood, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. James Bryan Newman, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. James Creel Marshall, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Walter Ernest Lorence, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Lucius DuBignon Clay, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).

Maj. Lloyd Ernst Mielenz, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Pierre Alexander Agnew, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Alexander Murray Neilson, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Hoel Smith Bishop, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Maj. Robert Habersham Elliott, Corps of Engineers (temporary lieutenant colonel).

Maj. Samuel Davis Sturgis, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from July 14, 1942

Maj. Thomas Hay Nixon, Ordnance Department (temporary colonel).

To be lieutenant colonel with rank from July 31, 1942

Maj. Anderson Thomas William Moore Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

To be first lieutenants with rank from July 1, 1942

Second Lt. Elbridge Reed Fendall, Infantry (temporary major).

Second Lt. Robert Irven Beaver, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Jack Alloyse Requarth, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Walden Francis Woodward, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. George Carpenter Dewey, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Albert William Frink, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Lawrence Merril Hoover, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Albert Joseph Genetti, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Harold Edward Hassenfelt, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Bernard Richard Luczak, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Byron Benjamin Webb, Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. William Robert Donaldson, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Raymond Harley Lumry, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. John William Gorn, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Lewis Dowe Vieman, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Donald Francis Slaughter, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Kurt Gustav Radtke, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Charles Pettingell Samson, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. William John Alphonse Hussey, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Robert Murphy Williams, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Kenneth Gool Pavey, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Mylo LeRoy Heen, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. James Richard Myers, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. John Enos Wood, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Robert Richard Christofk, Signal Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Gene Sawyer Edwards, Field Artillery (temporary captain).

Second Lt. John Irving Pray, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Joe Ahee, Cavalry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Joseph Bayne Sallee, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Gerald Hamilton Ragsdale, Infantry (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Harry Balish, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. Oliver Kenneth Marshall, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Edwin Bruce Miller, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).

Second Lt. Murray Dean Dougan, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant).

Second Lt. James Newton Shigley, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Charles William Reeves, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Kenneth Earl Lay, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Carl Thomas Schooley, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Roger Martin Bachman, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Homer Edward Miller, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Dale Donald Brannon, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Robert Allen Sharrer, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Julius Porter Faris, Jr., Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. James Franklin Bishop, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Leslie Hector Cross, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Richard Farris Ludeman, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Gordon David Bilat, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Glenn Taylor Beelman, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Leonard George Jewett, Field Artillery (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Frank Albert Swatta, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Tom English Matlack, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Glen S. Waterman, Signal Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Calvin Oliver Smith, Coast Artillery Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Claude Jones Merrill, Chemical Warfare Service (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Fred Thomas Crimmins, Jr., Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Eugene Batchelder Fletcher, Air Corps (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Jesse Price Moorefield, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Kenneth Willard Kirtley, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Leo Gunnard Carlson, Cavalry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. Dean Carrol Hoevet, Air Corps (temporary first lieutenant).
Second Lt. Marvin Leonard McNickle, Air Corps (temporary captain).

To be first lieutenants, with rank from July 21, 1942

Second Lt. Dwight True Hunkins, Infantry (temporary captain).
Second Lt. William John Penly, Corps of Engineers (temporary captain).

MEDICAL CORPS

To be lieutenant colonel

Maj. Hubert Maurice Nicholson, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 10, 1942.

To be majors

Capt. Richard Love Daniel, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Otis Otto Benson, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Ernest Holden Parsons, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Kenneth Arthur Brewer, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Norman Wilhalm Anderson, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Paul Strimple Fancher, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Vinnie Hale Jeffress, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Kenneth Frederick Ernst, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Theodore Longworth Finley, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Kermit Hoyt Gates, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Charles Lee Kirkpatrick, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Loyd Eugene Griffis, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Joseph Hamilton McNinch, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. William Jeffers Kennard, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Edward Miller Sager, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Allan Brodie Ramsay, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Achilles Lacy Tynes, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Robert Barrett Skinner, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Dwight Lawson, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. James Little Murchison, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Norman Webb White, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. William Clarence Knott, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Paul Edmund Keller, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Albert Henry Robinson, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. John Frederick Blatt, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. John Randolph Copenhaver, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Cyril Edward McEnany, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Frank Yearsley Leaver, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.
Capt. Leonard Neil Swanson, Medical Corps (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from July 1, 1942.

To be captains

First Lt. Donald Eugene Reiner, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1942.
First Lt. Howard Eugene Sellards, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.
First Lt. Alva Edward Miller, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.
First Lt. George Gilmore McShatko, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.
First Lt. Byron Atlee Nichol, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.
First Lt. Norman Elwood King, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1942.
First Lt. Austin W. Bennett, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.
First Lt. John Mayo Talbot, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.
First Lt. Rolland Bernard Sigafoos, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.
First Lt. Robert Leonce Hullinghorst, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1942.
First Lt. Carl Neil Ekman, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.
First Lt. Laurence Addison Potter, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 1, 1942.
First Lt. Carl Winn Hall, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 5, 1942.
First Lt. John Marshall Salyer, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 5, 1942.
First Lt. George Savage Boyer, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 11, 1942.
First Lt. James Francis Reilly, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 15, 1942.
First Lt. Tillman Davis Johnson, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 29, 1942.
First Lt. Michael Deane Buscemi, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 29, 1942.
First Lt. Raymond Cunningham Stiles, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 29, 1942.
First Lt. James Samuel Pisackerly, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 29, 1942.
First Lt. Henry Curtis Harrell, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 29, 1942.
First Lt. Hensley Starling Johnson, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 29, 1942.
First Lt. Frederick Clinton Hopp, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 29, 1942.
First Lt. Harvey Clark Boyd, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 29, 1942.
First Lt. Carroll Steiner Svare, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 29, 1942.
First Lt. Edward John Doyle, Medical Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 29, 1942.

DENTAL CORPS

To be captains

First Lt. Jesse Moyer Swink, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 29, 1942.
First Lt. Jack Benjamin Caldwell, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 29, 1942.
First Lt. Raymond George Waldmann, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 29, 1942.
First Lt. Carroll Godfrey Hawkinson, Dental Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 29, 1942.
First Lt. George Herbert Moulton, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 29, 1942.
First Lt. George Broughton Foote, Dental Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 29, 1942.

VETERINARY CORPS

To be colonels

Lt. Col. Mott Ramsey, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 11, 1942.
Lt. Col. Gerald Woodward FitzGerald, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from July 19, 1942.

To be major

Capt. Austin Taylor Getz, Veterinary Corps (temporary major), with rank from July 22, 1942.

MEDICAL ADMINISTRATIVE CORPS

To be first lieutenant

Second Lt. Leonard Paul Zagelow, Medical Administrative Corps (temporary captain), with rank from July 15, 1942.

CHAPLAINS

To be colonel

Chaplain (Lt. Col.) Edmond Joseph Griffin, United States Army (temporary colonel), with rank from July 3, 1942.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

To be captain, Judge Advocate General's Department, with rank from date of appointment

Maj. Robert McDonald Gray, Judge Advocate General's Department Reserve.

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Infantry

Harold Reid Armstrong, Jr.
Will Gillespie Atwood, Jr.
James Herbert Brown.
William Edward Byerts, Jr.
George Franklin Charlton.
Connie Craig Cotton.
William Ellis Cox.
Roger Jerald Culhane.
Dale Taylor Elliott.
William Paul Fife.
Thomas William Fishburn.
Irving Heymont.
Richard Eugene Hotchkiss.
George Lamar Jones.
William Freese Kernan.
William Lindsay Koob, Jr.
Oliver Morton Legg.
Clyde Okey McPeek.
Martin Cadenhead McWilliams.
James Harry Mobley.
Warren Edgar Nossaman.
James Martin Pratt.
David Leroy Ramsey.
John Edward Reid.
Donald Joseph Richardson.
George Frederick Sawyer.
Waldo Ernest Schmitt.
Ralph Bayard Sessoms, Jr.
Milton Jerome Sheldon.
Thomas Colyer Shields.
Joseph Alvin Shirley.
James Max Snyder.
Rosario Sorbello
Richard Joseph Stillman.
Walter Blakely Todd.
Richard Hull Verheul.
Leroy Buckman Wilson.
James McIndoe Winterbottom.
Paul Marshall Woods.

Cavalry

Jack Boswell.
William Prager Cassedy.
Carter Greer Dudley.
Lowell Reginald Eklund.
Jack Philip Geise.
Gaynor William Hathaway.
Chester Thomas Harvie.
Charles Edward Jenkins.
Richard Clement Moran.

Field Artillery

Ralph Harry Bowen.
James Richard Burkhart.
John Sydney Cook, Jr.
John Weamer Elder.
Benjamin Apthorp Gould Fuller 2d.
Howard Overton Golladay.
Moyer Delos Harris.
Richard Brittain Kreutzer.
Richard George Labovitz.
Norman Murchison Grusky Locksley.
MacDonald Oliver, Jr.
John William Salyards.
Carl William Schaad.
Albert Dulaney Schutz.
Robert Earl Simons.
Bradford Lee Smith.
Darrel Leon Syron.
Jerry Marion Wimberley.

Coast Artillery Corps

Lewis Jones Adams.
George Wilbur Best, Jr.
Charles Stuart Cumings.
Elmer Pershing Curtis.
John Edward Fritz.
Andrew Robert Grant.
Richard Irvin, Jr.
James Curtis Jeffries, Jr.
Walter Killilae.
Leroy Cosby Land.
Reuben Wallis Mundy.
Raymond Tardin Napier.
Everett Vinson Peterson.
Edward Stephen Rice.
William McKinley Shepard.
James Luke Smith, Jr.
Alva William Swartz.
James Bernard Via.
Michael Edward Wardell.
Robert James Welsh.
Charles Crisp Wilder, Jr.
Verne Rumbaugh Wilson.

Corps of Engineers

Clayton Arthur Bird.
Charles William Flynn, Jr.
Walter Philip Leber.
Arthur Wilson Starkey.
Samuel Frederick Stebelton.
Parker Osborne Stuart.
John Rhodes Thompson.
David Hall Woods.

Signal Corps

William Brooks Carroll.
William Arthur Grimshaw.
Russell Park Jones.
James Beecher McKenzie.
Latimer Whittle MacMillan, Jr.

Quartermaster Corps

Myron Richard Bittikofer.
William Joseph Daly.
Walter Alfred Higgins.
Raymond LaVerne Hoff.
Donald Charles Hughes.
Orville Kenneth Knight.
Lloyd Edward Rabjohn.
William Evans Rust, Jr.
Gordon Francis Tyrrell, Jr.

Finance Department

Lawrence Longshore Parsons.

Ordnance Department

Jesse Charles Crumbley, Jr.
Emil William Delu.
William John Durrenberger.
Walter Parrish Glover, Jr.
Robert Neil Grove.
James Maurice Hamblin.
Gerald Johnson, Jr.
Harold Vernon Mackey.
John Raymond Penington.
Francis Fred Poppenburg.
Roy Edgar Rayle, Jr.
John Pershing Taylor.
Karl Heinrich Zornig.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

Capt. Timothy J. Keleher to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 11th day of June 1942, and to continue during his assignment as a member of the Army and Navy Munitions Board.

Capt. Arthur G. Robinson to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 16th day of June 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 18, 1942:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION

Lynn R. Edminster to be a member of the United States Tariff Commission for the remainder of the term expiring June 16, 1943.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Leslie S. Kofoed to be United States marshal for the district of Nevada.

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS

STATE DIRECTORS

Charles W. Hardesty to be State director for Delaware.

William Freiday to be State director for New Jersey.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE MAJOR GENERAL

Delos Carleton Emmons

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERAL

Delos Carleton Emmons

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE LIEUTENANT GENERAL

Joseph Taggart McNarney

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Ralph Royce
Willis Henry Hale

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Edwin Sanders Perrin
Ennis Clement Whitehead
Kenneth Newton Walker
Carl William Connell
Albert Lee Sneed
Nathan Farragut Twining

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEERS

Frank G. Johnson
William F. Mainate
Roger C. Rowse

COAST GUARD OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE CAPTAINS

William K. Scammell
Russel L. Lucas

TO BE COMMANDERS

Robert C. Sarratt
Raymond V. Marron
Carl H. Hilton
Joseph H. Rosenthal
Frank M. Meals

TO BE LIEUTENANT COMMANDERS

John P. Crowley
Arthur G. Morrill
Philip A. Short
George N. Bernier
Dwight H. Dexter
Edward W. Holtz
Herbert F. Walsh
Edwin J. Roland
Peter V. Colmar
George H. Bowerman

TO BE LIEUTENANTS

Harold L. Wood
Arthur W. Johnsen
Douglas B. Henderson
Robert Wilcox
Chester R. Bender
Richard R. Smith
Samuel G. Guill
Paul E. Trimble
Russell R. Waesche, Jr.
Joseph P. Martin
George W. Playdon
Thomas F. Epley
Julius E. Richey
Benjamin B. Sherry
Frederick J. Statts
James S. Muzzy
Raymond W. Blouin
Fred F. Nichols
Theodore F. Knoll
Nelson C. McCormick
Frank M. McCabe

TO BE LIEUTENANTS (JUNIOR GRADE)

Robert D. Brodie 4th
Robert W. Goehring
Harry L. Morgan
John D. McCubbin
Ross P. Bullard
Orvan R. Smeder
Victor Pfeiffer
William L. Morrison
David W. Sinclair
Robert R. Russell
Charles E. Masters, Jr.
Robert H. Prause, Jr.
James N. Schrader
Harry F. Frazer
Julian J. Shingler
Warner K. Thompson, Jr.
William R. Riedel
Lewis B. Kendall
Ralph N. West
Charles E. Sharp
Charles W. Schuh
Lynn Parker
Claude G. Winstead
Thomas G. Byrne

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 18, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Charles D. Beatty, lieutenant junior grade, chaplain at the Marine Barracks, Quantico, Va., offered the following prayer:

O God, who art the help of all the ends of the earth; we come before Thee to offer our praise and thanksgiving for Thy love and goodness to us and to all men.

We bring to Thee our prayers for our country, earnestly beseeching Thee to grant Thy blessing upon the President of the United States, upon our people, and upon their Senators and Representatives in Congress assembled; that Thou wouldest be pleased to direct and prosper all their consultations, to the advancement of Thy glory, the good of Thy church, the safety, honor, and welfare of Thy people.

More especially, we pray for the men of our land's armed forces, that they may be under Thy Divine Providence, and held in the hollow of Thy hand.

"O Trinity of love and power
Our brethren shield in danger's hour.
Mid rock and tempest, fire and foe,
Protect them wheresoe'er they go.
And may there ever rise to Thee
Glad hymns of praise on land and sea."

These things we pray, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SUSPENDING ANNUAL LABOR ON CERTAIN MINING CLAIMS

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 6295), to suspend the requirement for the performance of annual labor on certain mining claims, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provision of section 2324 of the Revised Statutes of the United States which requires that on each mining claim located after May 10, 1872, and until a patent has been issued therefor, not less than $100 worth of labor shall be performed or improvements made during each year, shall be suspended as to all valid mining claims in the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, which are situated within the exterior limits of any area withdrawn by Executive order for purposes of national defense, and such suspension shall remain in force and effect until the end of the assessment year during which the order of withdrawal is vacated by the President or by act of Congress. Where it is found necessary to utilize the surface of valid mining claims for purposes of national defense, the record holders thereof are authorized to enter into agreements providing for such use with any executive department or Federal agency exercising control or jurisdiction over the land.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. What is the bill?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, about 4,000 square miles in the State of Nevada have been withdrawn for a gunnery school, for aviation practice. There are several hundred mining claims in this area, and men cannot go on them to do the annual work, on account of the firing. This bill is to suspend the requirements for work on these claims.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. They are obliged to do a certain amount of work every year to hold the claim?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes; $100 worth of work every year.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has this been before the regular committee?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes. It is favorably reported by the committee and has the recommendation of all of the departments concerned.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And it is a unanimous report from the committee?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING AGRICULTURAL ACT OF 1938

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 7137) to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to marketing quotas for peanuts, and for other purposes, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, is amended as follows:

(1) Section 358 (d) is amended by striking out the last sentence thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following: "The amount of the marketing quota for each farm shall be a number of pounds of peanuts equal to the normal production or the actual production, whichever is the greater, of the farm peanut acreage allotment and no peanuts shall be marketed under the quota for any farm other than peanuts actually produced on the farm."

(2) Section 359 (b) is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Beginning with the 1941 crop of peanuts, payment of the penalty of 3 cents per pound upon the marketing of peanuts as provided in subsection (a) above will not be required if such excess peanuts are delivered to or marketed through an agency or agencies designated each year by the Secretary or if the producer pays to the United States, with respect to excess peanuts which, when marketed, were identified in the manner prescribed in the regulations of the Secretary as quota peanuts, an amount determined under regulations of the Secretary to represent the amount received for the peanuts in excess of the amount which would have been received had such peanuts been delivered to a designated agency as excess peanuts. Any peanuts received under this subsection by such agency shall be sold by such agency (i) for crushing for oil under a sales agreement approved by the Secretary; (ii) for cleaning and shelling at prices not less than those established for quota peanuts under any peanut diversion, peanut loan, or peanut purchase program; or (iii) for seed at prices established by the Secretary. For all peanuts so delivered to a designated agency under this subsection producers shall be paid for the portion of the lot constituting excess peanuts, the market value, as of the date of delivery, of the products thereof when crushed for oil, less the estimated costs of storing, handling, selling, and processing such peanuts, but not less than prices established by the Secretary pursuant to authority contained in existing law. Any person who, pursuant to the provisions of this subsection, acquires peanuts for crushing for oil and who uses or disposes of such peanuts for any purpose other than that for which acquired shall pay a penalty of 3 cents per pound upon the peanuts so used or disposed of and shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both, for each and every offense. Operations under this subsection shall be carried on under regulations prescribed by the Secretary, and the operations of any agency designated to receive and market peanuts may be separate from or combined with operations of other agencies."

(3) Section 359 (d) is amended to read as follows: "The word 'peanuts' for the purposes of this act shall mean all peanuts produced, excluding any peanuts which it is established by the producer or otherwise, in accordance with regulations of the Secretary, were not picked or threshed either before or after marketing from the farm."

(4) Section 301 (b) (13) (B) is amended by inserting, after the word "cotton" wherever it appears therein, the words "or peanuts" and by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence: "For 1942, the normal yield for any county, in the case of peanuts, shall be the average yield per acre for peanuts for the county, adjusted for abnormal conditions, during the years 1936–40, inclusive, except that for any county in which the years 1935–39, inclusive, are equally as representative, such period may be used in determining the normal yields for counties in the State."

(5) Section 301 (b) (13 (E) is amended by deleting the word "or" after the word "wheat" and before the word "cotton" wherever it appears therein and by inserting, after the word "cotton" wherever it appears therein, the words "or peanuts" and by adding after the first sentence thereof the following new sentence: "For 1942 the normal yield for any farm, in the case of peanuts, shall be the average yield per acre of peanuts for the farm, adjusted for abnormal conditions, during the years 1936–40, inclusive, except that for any county in which the years 1935–39, inclusive, are equally as representative, such period may be used in determining normal yields for farms in the county."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman from Georgia please explain the bill?

Mr. PACE. The changes in the bill relate to the administration of the peanut program. It redefines the term "peanut" to include hand-picked peanuts as well as machine-picked peanuts and it redefines "marketing quota" so as to make the marketing quota the actual or the normal yield, whichever is greater, and it defines the normal yield for the farm and the normal yield for the county. It is purely administrative, is unanimously recommended by the committee, and is desired by the Department for this year's program.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PACE. Yes.

Mr. RIZLEY. My colleague the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY], of the Committee on Agriculture, heretofore objected to the consideration of this bill by unanimous consent. I understand that he is out of town today. Has the gentleman consulted with him?

Mr. PACE. I consulted with him yesterday afternoon, and also about the attitude of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think that all of the objections hitherto advanced, have been overcome.

Mr. PACE. Yes, so far as I know.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossing and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and the motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on June 9 I asked permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an article entitled "The Protection of Federal Records Against Hazards of World War No. 1." The article runs two and a half pages, and I have an estimate from the Public Printer. I ask unanimous consent that it may be extended in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LATE EDWARD W. GRAY

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday there died in Newark, in his seventy-first year, Edward W. Gray, who represented the old Eighth District of New Jersey during the last World War as a Member of the Sixty-fourth and Sixty-fifth Congresses.

Mr. Gray was born in Jersey City, and before coming to Congress had been actively connected with the newspaper business.

He served 6 years as secretary of the Republican State committee, 8 as a member of the State board of tenement-house supervision, and 3 as secretary to Gov. Edward C. Stokes.

A man of strong personal views, he always voted his convictions, regardless of party position.

In late years he is best remembered for the strong fight he made for repeal of the prohibition amendment; and, for this reason, though a Republican, he supported Governor Smith in 1928.

The courageous stand which he always took for what he believed to be right, as well as his other fine personal qualities, will cause him to be greatly missed by his many friends.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes today after any other special orders heretofore made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a recent news letter of mine to my constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, on June 3, 1942, the first aerial bombardment of North America was accomplished. Japanese planes dropped bombs over Dutch Harbor, Alaska. This actual air invasion of our continent should at once remove the last vestige of complacency as to how close our west coast is to actual war.

On Tuesday, June 9, 1942, the people in my home city of San Francisco voted 5 to 1 in favor of bond issues for protection against air raids. Provision is made for an auxiliary water-pumping plant, as well as additional fire-fighting equipment and pumper units. Applications for the necessary priorities are being completed and will be forwarded to the War Production Board.

Mr. Speaker, San Francisco is thoroughly organized. We have the air-raid wardens, auxiliary policemen and firemen, and a completely coordinated corps of civilian workers covering every block of our city.

Similar organizations are no doubt prepared to operate in every city and hamlet in the country.

The faithful patriotic loyal citizens who are serving so conscientiously should be assured of medical care, hospitalization, and compensation, if injured in the performance of their duties.

This proposition was advocated by me when we were considering Senate bill 2208, the so-called second war-powers bill. I am today introducing a new bill to handle the matter specifically, and I hope the Judiciary Committee will act on the bill and report it out favorably. The matter is urgent.

INCREASED PAY FOR SOLDIERS, SAILORS, AND MARINES

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and insert a short editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

GERMAN PERSECUTION OF CONQUERED NATIONS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

[Mr. DICKSTEIN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing an article by Arthur Sears Henning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ELMER DAVIS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Newton (Iowa) News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CAL TINNEY

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, last night, over the National Broadcasting chain, Cal Tinney, who sells the cigars for a tobacco company—the Bayuk cigars—up in Philadelphia, the Phillies cigar, I think it is, advocated the reelection of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT], and the defeat of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT], the gentleman from California [Mr. LELAND M. FORD], and the Member from the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan.

Now, I wonder whether that tobacco company is employing Mr. Tinney to sell tobacco or whether he is broadcasting for the Communists, because, as I recall, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT] has been one of the few opponents of the Dies committee, while the other three named Members, whose defeat this gentleman advocated, have supported the Dies committee.

Can it be that all those who smoke the Phillies cigar or use any of the products of this company are expected to follow the recommendations of this broadcaster and vote for Congressmen who support the Communists, who advocate the abolition of the Dies committee? Some of those who smoke the Phillies cigars will begin to wonder whether the company which employs this radio representative will not have all it can do to put out a cheaper and a better cigar or is it possible that they are now making so much money that they have taken on the sideline of supporting politically the Communist Party and the candidates it supports.

If that be true, then the House Ways and Means Committee should find in its revenues another ample reservoir which might be tapped for additional taxes.

I do not know, but I am going to write the tobacco company and find out whether they really are more interested in selling cigars than they are in establishing the Communists in power here. What sort of market are Communists going to give them? Are they better customers than loyal Americans who believe in constitutional government?

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I saw a statement to the effect that the Ways and Means Committee were now much alarmed for fear they were going to bring out a tax bill that would provide only six and one-half billions of new revenue. The President recommended that they raise $9,000,000,000 of new revenue.

The reason they decided to cut down on the amount is because of the fact that the President and the Ways and Means Committee could not agree.

Let me show you why you need more revenue: Since January 3, and up to June 15, we passed bills in the House of Representatives spending $93,340,710,280.02. If you do not get revenue from the people of the country you are going to sink this Nation, and I warn you that the Ways and Means Committee, and the President of the United States, and the Congress has got to tax the people of this country until it hurts; either that, or you have got to stop spending; it is one of the two; which shall it be?

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JARMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Anniston Star of Anniston, Ala., in defense of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND THE FEDERAL JUDICIARY APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 1943

The SPEAKER. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6599), making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6599) "making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 35.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, 13, 18, 22, 24, 26, 28, 30, 33, 34, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, and 53; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$228,600"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 11: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 11, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$15,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$85,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 15: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 15, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,685,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "the" insert the following words "surplus fund of the"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment, after the word "the" where it appears the first time insert the words "surplus fund of the"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$440,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$417,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,242,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$18,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$700,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$60,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$760,000"; and the Senate agree to same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "and" where it appears the second time, and insert in lieu thereof the word "or" and in line 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "the" where it appears the first time insert "surplus fund of the"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 54: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 54, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment after the word "the" where it appears the first time, insert the words "surplus fund of the"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 10, 20, 21, 23, 36, and 55.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN H. KERR,
BUTLER B. HARE,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
HARRY P. BEAM,
ALBERT E. CARTER,
KARL STEFAN,
ROBERT F. JONES,
Managers on the part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
JOHN H. BANKHEAD,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report, as to each of such amendments, namely:

Totals, allocations, corrections of text, etc.

The following amendments are in corrections of totals, allocations, and of text, etc.: 1, 7, 14, 40, 47, 48, 50, and 51.

Title I—Department of State

Office of the Secretary of State

Amendment No. 2, printing and binding: The House appropriated $254,000; the Senate, $152,400. The conferees have agreed on $228,600.

Foreign Intercourse

Amendments Nos. 3, 4, 5, and 6, diplomatic representatives to Bolivia, Ecuador, and Paraguay: The House provided Envoys Extraordinary and Ministers Plenipotentiary; the Senate, Ambassadors Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary. The House recedes.

International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico

Amendment No. 8, salaries and expenses: The Senate effected a reduction of $400 under the House figure on account of printing and binding, to which the House agrees.

Amendment No. 9, Lower Rio Grande flood-control project: The Senate effected a reduction of $540 under the House figure on account of printing and binding, to which the House agrees.

Amendment No. 11, fence construction on the international boundary: The Senate inserted new language appropriating $50,000 for this project. The conferees have agreed on $15,000.

International Fisheries Commission

Amendment No. 12, salaries and expenses: The Senate effected a decrease of $320 under the House figure, on account of printing and binding, to which the House agrees.

International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission

Amendment No. 13, salaries and expenses: The Senate effected a reduction of $40 under the House figure, on account of printing and binding, to which the House agrees.

Cooperation With the American Republics

Amendment No. 15, salaries and expenses: The House appropriated $1,700,000, including an allotment of $100,000 for printing and binding; the Senate effected a reduction of $35,360 under the House figure, on account of printing and binding. The conferees have agreed on an appropriation of $1,685,000, or a cut of $15,000 under the House figure, on account of printing and binding.

Travel Expenses

Amendment No. 16: The Senate inserted a new paragraph, as follows:

"Of the total amount available under this title for traveling expenses, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed, on or before August 1, 1942, to cover into the Treasury the sum of $123,734, which shall be in addition to reductions in amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in the appropriations made by this title below the Budget estimates."

The House recedes with an amendment in correction of the text, adding the words shown in italics in the following excerpt: "to cover into the *surplus fund of the* Treasury".

Title II—Department of Justice

Office of the Attorney General

Amendments Nos. 17 and 18, Administrative Division and Personnel Division: The Senate has merged these two divisions into the single division "Administrative Division" and has merged the appropriations made by the House for the two separate divisions into a single appropriation comprising the total of the two House figures, namely, $916,000. The House agrees to the merger, with an appropriation of $900,000.

Amendment No. 19, printing and binding: The House appropriated $567,500; the Senate, $340,500. The House recedes with an amendment, making the amount appropriated, $500,000.

Amendment No. 22, salaries and expenses, special war effort unit: The House authorized expenditures for press clippings, which the Senate eliminated. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 24, salaries and expenses of marshals, and so forth: The House authorized 3 cents per mile for the use of privately owned automobiles for transportation when traveling on official business within the limits of the official stations of marshals and their deputies; the Senate authorized 4 cents per mile. The House recedes.

Travel Expenses

Amendment No. 25: The Senate inserted a new paragraph, as follows:

"Of the total amount available under this title for traveling expenses, with the exception of the amount for traveling expenses of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Attorney General is authorized and directed on or before August 1, 1942, to cover into the Treasury the sum of $253,350, which shall be in addition to reductions in amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in the appropriations made by this title below the Budget estimates."

The House recedes with an amendment in correction of the text, adding the words shown in italics in the following excerpt: "to cover into the *surplus fund of the* Treasury".

Title III—Department of Commerce

Contingent Expenses, Department of Commerce

Amendment No. 26, printing and binding: The Senate excluded printing of Sixteenth Census material from the items to be paid for out of this appropriation, to which the House agrees.

Amendment No. 27, printing and binding: The House appropriated $550,000; the Senate, $330,000. The House recedes with an amendment fixing the amount at $440,000.

Amendment No. 28, salaries and expenses, National Inventors Council Service Staff: The Senate effected a decrease of $800 under the House figure, on account of printing and binding, to which the House agrees.

Bureau of the Census

Amendment No. 29: The House appropriated $3,200,000; the Senate, $3,163,992, being a reduction of $36,008 on account of printing and binding. The House recedes with an amendment fixing the amount at $3,175,000.

Amendment No. 30, salaries and expenses, age and citizenship certification: The Senate effected a decrease of $2,000 under the House figure, on account of printing and binding, to which the House agrees.

Amendment No. 31, customs statistics: The Senate effected a reduction of $4,482 under the House figure, on account of printing and binding. The House recedes with an amendment fixing the amount of the reduction at $2,500.

Amendment No. 32, compiling census reports, and so forth: The House appropriated $1,257,000; the Senate, $1,067,000. The House recedes with an amendment fixing the amount at $1,242,000.

Office of Administrator of Civil Aeronautics

Amendment No. 33, establishment of air-navigation facilities: The House appropriated $5,640,000; the Senate appropriated $9,315,000, making $2,875,000 immediately available, and added the following proviso:

"*Provided*, That this appropriation and the unexpended balances of all appropriations heretofore made under this head for the fiscal year 1942 are hereby consolidated and shall be disbursed and accounted for as one fund and remain available until June 30, 1943: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $800,000 of this amount shall be available for the establishment of landing areas."

The House recedes.

Amendment No. 34, technical development: The House appropriated $380,000; the Senate, $899,600, making $519,600 immediately available. The increase of $519,600 over the House figure is for certain airport paving development projects in compliance with a special request of the Secretary of War. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 35, civilian pilot training: The Senate inserted a proviso, as follows:

"*Provided further*, That $2,000,000 of this appropriation may be restored to the emergency fund for the President, created by the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942, in reimbursement of a like amount advanced therefrom."

The Senate recedes.

Civil Aeronautics Board

Amendment No. 37, printing and binding: The House appropriated $24,000; the Senate, $14,400. The House recedes with an amendment fixing the amount at $18,000.

Coast and Geodetic Survey

Amendment No. 38, geodetic control surveys: The House appropriated $80,000; the Senate, $449,400, restoring the Budget estimate except a reduction of $600 on account of printing and binding. The House recedes.

Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce

Amendment No. 39, departmental salaries and expenses: The House appropriated $1,140,000; the Senate, $1,423,000. The House recedes.

Amendment No. 41, field office service: The House appropriated $345,000; the Senate, $430,000. The House recedes.

Patent Office

Amendment No. 42, salaries: The Senate makes the appropriation available for salaries outside the District of Columbia, to which the House agrees.

Amendments Nos. 43, 44, and 45, printing and binding: The House appropriated $791,000 for printing the weekly issue of patents, the Official Gazette, etc., $69,000 for miscellaneous printing, in all, $860,000; the Senate appropriated $632,800 for the weekly issue of patents, the Official Gazette, etc., $55,200 for miscellaneous printing, in all, $688,000. The House recedes with an amendment appropriating $700,000 for the weekly issue of patents, the Official Gazette, etc., $60,000 for miscellaneous printing, in all, $760,000.

National Bureau of Standards

Amendment No. 46, operation and administration: The House appropriated $377,000; the Senate, $406,700. The House recedes.

Weather Bureau

Amendment No. 49, observations, warnings, and general weather service: The House appropriated $7,982,100; the Senate, $8,761,135. The House recedes.

Travel Expenses

Amendment No. 52: The Senate inserted the following provision:

"Of the total amount available under this title for traveling expenses, with the exception of the amount for traveling expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed, on and before August 1, 1942, to cover into the Treasury the sum of $64,804, which shall be in addition to reductions in amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in the appropriations made by this title below the Budget estimates."

The House recedes with an amendment perfecting the text, as follows:

"Of the total amount available under this title for traveling expenses, with the exception of the amount for traveling expenses of the Civil Aeronautics Administration, the Secretary of Commerce is authorized and directed, on or before August 1, 1942, to cover into the surplus fund of the Treasury the sum of $64,804, which shall be in addition to reductions in amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in the appropriations made by this title below the Budget estimates."

Title IV—The Judiciary

Court of Claims

Amendment No. 53, repairs and improvements: The Senate inserted a new paragraph appropriating $4,550 for repairs and improvements to the Court of Claims buildings, to which the House agrees.

Travel Expenses

Amendment No. 54: The Senate inserted a new paragraph, as follows:

"Of the total amount available under this title for traveling expenses, the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts is authorized and directed, on or before August 1, 1942, to cover into the Treasury the sum of $30,387, which shall be in addition to reductions in amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in the appropriations made by this title below the Budget estimates."

The House recedes with an amendment in correction of the text, adding the words shown in italics in the following excerpt: "to cover into the *surplus fund of the* Treasury".

Amendments in disagreement

International Boundary Commission, United States and Mexico.

Amendment No. 10, Douglas-Agua Prieta sanitation project: The Senate inserted new language providing an appropriation of $90,000 for the construction of the United States portion of this project. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Immigration and Naturalization Service

Amendment No. 20, salaries and expenses: The Senate inserted a new proviso, as follows:

"*Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for alterations, improvements, and repairs to premises occupied for detention purposes without regard to section 322 of the Act of June 30, 1932 (40 U. S. C. 278a), when authorized or approved by the Attorney General, and for all necessary expenses incident to the maintenance, care, detention, surveillance, parole, and transportation of alien enemies, including transportation and other expenses in the return of such aliens to place of bona fide residence or to such other place as may be authorized by the Attorney General:"

The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Miscellaneous appropriations

Amendment No. 21, enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws: The Senate inserted a new proviso, as follows:

"*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the payment of any person hereafter appointed at a salary of $5,000 or more for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws unless such person is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Amendment No. 23, salaries and expenses of special attorneys, and so forth: The Senate inserted a new proviso as follows:

"*Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the payment of any person hereafter appointed at a salary of $5,000 or more and paid from this appropriation unless such person is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Civil Aeronautics Authority

Amendment No. 36, development of landing areas. The Senate inserted a new paragraph, appropriating $199,740,000 for this purpose. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur.

Appropriations for salaries of certain officers in the Department of Justice and the Judiciary to be allotted and disbursed as provided in the appropriation and without delay

Amendment No. 55. The Senate inserted a new section at the end of the bill as follows:

"SEC. 505. No part of the funds appropriated by titles II and IV for salaries of judges, the Attorney General, Assistant Attorneys General, Solicitor General, district attorneys, marshals, and clerks of court shall be used for any other purpose whatsoever, but such salaries shall be allotted out of appropriations herein made for such salaries and retained by the Department or the Administrative Office of the United States Courts and paid to such officials severally, as and when such salaries fall due and without delay."

The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment making the provision permanent.

LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN H. KERR,
BUTLER B. HARE,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
HARRY P. BEAM,
ALBERT E. CARTER,
KARL STEFAN,
ROBERT F. JONES,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 10: Page 25, line 9, after the word "division" insert the following: "Douglas-Agua Prieta sanitation project: For the construction of the United States portion of the Douglas-Agua Prieta sanitation project at Douglas, Ariz., as authorized by section 2 of the act approved August 19, 1935 (49 Stat. 660), in accordance with an agreement with Mexico effected by an exchange of notes pursuant to a joint report of the International Boundary Commission, $90,000, to be immediately available and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That no part of this appropriation shall be expended for construction until the governing body of the city of Douglas, Ariz., has given assurances satisfactory to the Secretary of State that it will (a) cause to be furnished, without cost to the United States, evidence satisfactory to the Commissioner of the United States section of said Commission that title to all lands or easements in land which may be designated by said Commissioner as necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the United States portion of said project is vested in the city of Douglas, Ariz.; (b) upon notification by the said Commissioner that the United States portion of said project has been completed, take over and operate and maintain the said project; (c) hold the United States harmless on account of damage or claim of damage arising out of or connected with the construction or operation and maintenance of or failure to operate and maintain said project or any part thereof."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 10 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 20: Page 41, line 19, after the word "laws", insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That this appropriation shall be available for alterations, improvements, and repairs to premises occupied for detention purposes without regard to section 322 of the act of June 30, 1932 (40 U. S. C., 278a), when authorized or approved by the Attorney General, and for all necessary expenses incident to the maintenance, care, detention, surveillance, parole, and transportation of alien enemies, including transportation and other expenses in the return of such aliens to place of bona fide residence or to such other place as may be authorized by the Attorney General."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 20 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 21: Page 44, line 1, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the payment of any person hereafter appointed at a salary of $5,000 or more for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws unless such person is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment put on the Senate which changes the existing law in the matter of Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation of officials receiving beyond a certain salary. Existing law sets the figure at $7,500; the Senate amendment reduces the figure to $5,000.

This amendment provides that where the salary is $5,000 or more the nomination has to be made by the President and confirmed by the Senate. This seems to be the practical difficulty with regard to that proposition: It is necessary, we are advised, and it seems to me that the advice is sound, that it is frequently necessary to employ attorneys in this department and in order to get attorneys who can take care of the public interest properly it is necessary to pay more than $5,000. Sometimes Congress is not in session. There is another reason for this. The President has not the time, speaking practically, to examine into the qualifications of all the shifting personnel in this department, especially during these times, and I doubt if the Senate has time to properly examine into the matter. Under existing law the responsibility can be centered in the head of the department.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. This particular amendment has especially to do with the enforcement of the anti-trust law of which Thurman Arnold is the head. I think he has done a magnificent job. I understand if this amendment is adopted, it will very much cripple the enforcement of the anti-trust laws for the reason already stated by the gentleman from Texas that sometimes it is necessary to employ a specialist for a short time. You have to do it quickly. You cannot go through the formula of sending the nomination to the Senate. That would take quite a long while. And in these war days with conditions as they are, things have to be done, and this motion should not prevail. We have gotten along very well with the $7,500 provision, and I can see no reason

why that figure should be lowered to $5,000. I hope the position of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], will be sustained by the House.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I very much hope that the chairman of the subcommittee may see his way clear to agree with the position of the House as it was expressed in this bill when it left the House.

Mr. RABAUT. I may say to the gentleman that of course I went over there as a servant of the House, as a conferee on this matter. My position is well known to the House, and, of course, the will of the House will have the attention of the committee.

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. I quite agree with the distinguished gentleman from Texas that this Antitrust Division of the Government has made one of the outstanding records of any department we have downtown. It has been fearless and effective in the prosecution of the war effort and in breaking up not only industrial trusts but in moving against labor unions that are violating the spirit of the Antitrust Act in restraint of trade. It would be very disastrous to our war effort to throw a monkey wrench into the system that is providing efficient and effective manpower. Many of these men are specialists and they are hard to find. The young men are being taken away or are volunteering in the Army to become officers. I think it is highly essential that this situation not be disturbed at the present time and that this effective work not be disturbed. May I ask the gentleman if he intends to move to further insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I do. If the motion offered by the chairman of the subcommittee does not prevail, then I shall move that we further insist on the position of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Has Mr. Arnold expressed himself on this proposition?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. He is in favor of leaving it as it is?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes. He is opposed to this arrangement.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I hope the motion to recede and concur will not be agreed to. It seems to me that this is a matter in which every Member of the House, without regard to what side of the aisle he or she sits on, is concerned. There is a constant encroachment upon the liberty of ourselves, if I may use that expression in a descriptive sense. It seems to me that this question from a broad angle concerns each and every one of us.

There is a secondary but also important question involved and that is the fact that we are at war. I have talked with Mr. Arnold and he told me yesterday that within the last 2 months 55 lawyers have left his division or bureau to enter the armed forces of our country. He stated further that if this provision goes through it will have a crippling effect upon the activities of his office and the performance of the duties of himself and his associates, which duties are so vital and important at all times, but particularly in these days.

I am sure that if the House insists upon its position the chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations and the other members of the conference committee will not feel disturbed or distressed in any way. I hope the motion will not be agreed to and that the matter will go back for further conference, and the conferees of both Houses will remove this and the other amendment which are distasteful to the Members of the House.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. RIVERS].

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I would be very disloyal to the Department of Justice if I did not get up on the floor and tell you something about the Department of Justice as I know it first hand. For 4 years I worked down there. I worked with Thurman Arnold; I worked in the Criminal Division and in other divisions of the Department of Justice. I know about this organization, and I respectfully, and with every talent at my command, ask you to sustain the position of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], who is himself a great lawyer and who knows about these people. If this $5,000 limitation is sustained, if the Senate has to confirm these men, it will have a seriously crippling effect upon that organization. We cannot afford now to cripple them. I tell you I know about them. I have worked with them. They cannot operate if we put this on. Goodness knows we need an organization now to take care of the unworthy elements of people who have wormed their way into the inner sanctums of our Government. We should be thankful for the Department of Justice. We must sustain this Department. We cannot afford to shackle it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 21.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: On page 48, line 8, after "duties", insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the payment of any person hereafter appointed at a salary of $5,000 or more and paid from this appropriation unless such person is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is similar to the one just considered. I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment, and I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS].

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I call the attention of the House to the fact that this is the same proposition upon which you just voted. Our position is in opposition to the motion just made by the chairman of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 23.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 36: On page 67, after line 6, insert the following:

"Development of landing areas: For continuation of the program for the construction, improvement, and repair of not to exceed 668 public airports and other public landing areas in the United States and its Territories and possessions, selected by the Administrator, and approved by a Board composed of the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of Commerce, as necessary for national defense, including areas essential for safe approaches and including the acquisition of land, $199,740,000, to be immediately available, of which not to exceed $14,716,500 shall be available for administrative expenses, including personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this appropriation shall not be construed as precluding the use of other appropriations available for any of the purposes for which this appropriation is made: *Provided further*, That any or all of the foregoing appropriation of $199,740,000, as well as any unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made under this head for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942 are hereby consolidated and shall be disbursed and accounted for as one fund under the appropriation under this head in the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, to remain available until June 30, 1943, and may be transferred to any other Federal agency organized to undertake the work herein provided for either by contract or by force account, and such agency is authorized to proceed with such work."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment. On that motion I desire recognition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, this amendment carries $199,740,000 for continuation of the program for the construction, improvement, and repair of public airports, and other public landing areas in the United States and its Territories and possessions necessary for national defense.

This appropriation is covered by a supplemental Budget estimate which was transmitted to the Congress subsequently to the passage of the bill by the House.

When the program for which this appropriation is made is completed there will be in the continental United States a total of 2,784 airports and landing fields of all classes, including those now in existence. Of these, 395 will accommodate every type and size of military and civil aircraft; 395 others will accommodate all types of civil aircraft and all types of mil-

itary aircraft, except medium and heavy bombers; and the remainder will accommodate smaller military and civil craft.

The location of the fields of the several classes will be subject to the approval of a Board composed of the Secretary of War, Secretary of the Navy, and Secretary of Commerce, and the controlling factor governing location will be the military requirements of the Army and Navy, with the secondary consideration of their future value to civil aviation.

In the interest of national defense I most respectfully urge the House to agree to the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 55: On page 102, after line 14, insert the following:

"SEC. 505. No part of the funds appropriated by titles II and IV for salaries of judges, the Attorney General, Assistant Attorneys General, Solicitor General, district attorneys, marshals, and clerks of court shall be used for any other purpose whatsoever, but such salaries shall be allotted out of appropriations herein made for such salaries and retained by the Department or the administrative office of the United States courts and paid to such officials severally, as and when such salaries fall due and without delay."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 55 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 505. Hereafter no part of the funds appropriated for salaries of judges, the Attorney General, Assistant Attorneys General, Solicitor General, district attorneys, marshals, and clerks of court shall be used for any other purpose whatsoever, but such salaries shall be allotted out of appropriations made for such salaries and retained by the Department or the administrative office of the United States courts and paid to such officials severally, as and when such salaries fall due and without delay."

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which action was taken on the several motions was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF SOLDIERS' AND SAILORS' CIVIL RELIEF ACT OF 1940

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7164) to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the relief and benefits provided therein to certain persons, to include certain additional proceedings and transactions therein, to provide further relief for persons in military service, to change certain insurance provisions thereof, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by myself and the ranking member on the minority side of the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7164, with Mr. PATMAN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the original Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act was passed on the 17th day of October 1940. It was prepared and reported by your House Military Affairs Committee. It was substantially the same kind of an act as was passed during the first World War. The present law which this bill proposes to amend was enacted before we became involved in actual war.

My only purpose in consuming these few minutes is to state briefly the facts with respect to the care, caution, and deliberation observed by the House Committee on Military Affairs in connection with the preparation of the legislation. In addition to the very careful consideration and extensive hearings on the original bill when it was enacted, this proposal to amend the original act was referred to the House Committee on Military Affairs. I thereupon referred it to a special committee made up of three members of that committee whom I regarded then and still regard as very fine lawyers, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS].

After that committee was appointed they held considerable hearings. They contacted all the groups and interests concerned, including several departments of the Government, particularly the Army, the Navy, and the Veterans' Administration, and the American Bankers Association and the business interests of the country, and heard them. After they did that, out of considerations of extra caution and care they reported the bill to the whole committee, whereupon further hearings were had, and as a result of those hearings the bill you have before you now was reported by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], as the chairman of the special committee to which it was referred.

I do not care to take the time of the House to undertake to make a detailed explanation of the various amendments. As a matter of fact, I did not have an opportunity to attend all the various hearings and am not as familiar with the various amendments as are other gentlemen. For that reason, I propose to yield the time to the gentlemen who do know about it, in order that they may debate it.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN].

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, as the chairman of our committee has so well stated to you, this matter came before the committee as a result of a great many bills that had been introduced in both Houses of the Congress, seeking to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940. It was decided it would be best to work out one composite bill, or rather one bill trying to do a complete job rather than to take up each of these bills individually and present them to the House. The special committee that was appointed worked rather long and faithfully on this matter. We took every bill that had been introduced. We studied the reports on those bills. Some of them had already passed the Senate, some had been reported out by the Senate Military Affairs Committee, others were pending before the Senate Military Affairs Committee and still others before the House Military Affairs Committee. The Judge Advocate General's Department of the Army assigned to us Maj. William D. Partlow, Jr., who proved very helpful and very faithful. I believe I can say that probably no man in our Government now knows more about the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act and the various decisions bearing upon it than does Major Partlow, who worked with us so long and made such a fine contribution.

When the original act was brought before our committee Major Bendetson, now Colonel Bendetson, served in the same capacity.

In addition to the services of Major Partlow we had the services of Major Longfellow, and to a limited extent, those of Colonel O'Brien, of the Special Services. The Assistant Administrator in charge of insurance for the Veterans' Administration, met with us on several occasions, discussed fully and fairly the insurance provisions, and the American Bankers Association had its representative to confer with us and testify before the committee. The same thing was true of the American Bar Association, the Legal Aid Bureau, and various other interested associations and persons.

We had some very fine suggestions from different lawyers and different persons connected directly and indirectly with this subject throughout the whole United States. As a result of these suggestions and conferences and hearings, we have worked out this bill which we are presenting to you today.

I should like to suggest that each Member get a copy of the report which is now available on the floor. It is Report No. 2198 on H. R. 7164. There is a statement of a little more than six pages, which gives rather completely but briefly the substance of these amendments. Then following that, in accordance with the Ramseyer rule, is set out the Soldiers and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as affected by these proposed amendments. That original act became law on October 17, 1940. Conditions have greatly changed since that original act was passed. At that time we were considering calling in an army of 900,000 men for the purpose of giving them 1 year's training.

The maximum time that we thought they would be away from home at that time was 1 year. Today we are counting the Army in the millions. We are at war. We are not calling these men simply for the purpose of training, but we are calling them for the duration of the emergency and no one knows how long that may be.

Under the act of October 17, 1940, the protection that was given to these men who were called into service and training was frozen as of that date. Since that time, of course, we know that hundreds of thousands, and even millions, have been called. In addition to that, different age groups have been called. Furthermore, there have been pointed out to us various loopholes and deficiencies in the original act. We have seen the need for further relief, and under this bill proposing general amendments to the act of October 17, 1940, we are trying to plug those loopholes and to give that additional relief.

In considering this measure I would like to suggest to you that you keep uppermost in your mind at all times the fact that the primary purpose of this legislation is to give relief to the boy that is called into service. How it affects others, while, of course, entitled to great consideration, is secondary to the primary purpose, that of lifting as much as we can from the shoulders of the service man the undue burden that might be placed upon him if required to take care of these obligations immediately or without some stay or other adjustment. Its constitutionality is based upon the provision in the Constitution giving the Congress the right to raise and maintain an army, it being considered that the maintenance of morale of that army is just as essential as the providing of supplies and munitions. As a matter of fact, this principle has been upheld by the United States Supreme Court on different occasions.

Under these amendments we go a little further in several respects than did the original act. We tried to give him a reasonable time after he leaves the service in which to make adjustments of obligations that have piled up, or that have been postponed during the time that he was in service. We have tried to give him relief from some things we felt would be too great a burden upon him, if he were required to remain under those particular obligations. For instance, we have made provision that a person who had a lease on property to be used for business, residential, professional, or agricultural purposes, might, within the discretion of the court and under certain conditions, be relieved from the obligation of paying the rental charges after he is called into service. We furthermore provide that the rate of interest on obligations that are stayed during the time that he is in service may not be charged at a rate greater than 6 percent.

We raise the amount of insurance that the Government will guarantee for him from $5,000 to $10,000. I am sure that no one will confuse this insurance with the insurance that is carried under the National Life Insurance Act. This insurance that we are speaking of in this particular bill is insurance with private companies, which the soldier held prior to his going into the service. Under the original act we gave him a right to have the Government guarantee the payment of premiums on those insurance policies, to the extent of $5,000. We raised that amount in this bill to $10,000, full well realizing that under the present practice of calling men into service, an older group is going in, a group that has a larger insurance estate built up. I might add in this connection that the experience of the Government during the World War with reference to insuring the payment of insurance premiums was very good.

Mr. BEAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. In just a moment. Let me finish this statement. As a matter of fact the amount of money lost to the Government as a result of insuring these premiums during the World War was less than $20,000. I now yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BEAM. Does the gentleman mean that that pertains only to Government insurance, or does it pertain to insurance premiums of private institutions?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It pertains to insurance carried in private companies up to $10,000.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. PACE. In the operation of that, suppose that a soldier has a policy that has a large cash value that is more than ample to carry the policy. Does the Government step in and relieve any charge against the policy during his service, or does the Government step in after the policy has absorbed its cash value?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Government steps in immediately upon the application of the soldier and guarantees the payment of the premiums. Remember, the Government does not actually pay the premiums. The Government simply says to the insurance company, "We will guarantee that these premiums will be paid." Now, having once taken that position, the Government continues to guarantee the payment of those premiums. If the cash reserve value of the policy is used up, the Government still guarantees the payment of the premiums, and in such a case when the soldier comes out of the service, there will be an excess indebtedness on the policy, and the soldier then has the right within 12 months' time to arrange with the insurance company to pay one-third of that excess indebtedness during that 12 months' period, and to adjust the balance over a period of 3 years.

Mr. PACE. But if there is a cash value there, it would be absorbed before the Government makes any payment.

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the policy should lapse, the cash reserve would be applied to the payment of the premiums, of course.

Mr. BARNES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. Yes.

Mr. BARNES. Is that in addition to the $10,000 insurance that a man can take under the Government policy?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It has no connection with the Government insurance whatever. It would allow him to have the Government carry a $10,000 policy, or at least to protect the payment of these premiums with the Government guarantee during the period he is in the service.

Mr. THOM. If there is a cash reserve, why is a guarantee necessary on the part of the Government to continue the policy in force?

Mr. SPARKMAN. It makes it easier for the soldier to carry his insurance.

Of course, different policies have different provisions with reference to the cash reserves. I suppose if you get right down to the technicality of the thing, it is not necessary unless that soldier is in there beyond a period of time for which that cash reserve can carry his policy. Then it would become quite essential.

Mr. KILDAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. Of course, it also gives him the benefit of maintaining his insurance estate in the condition in which he had it when he went into the service, and keep it that way as long as he is there. Then when he comes out it will be adjusted on whatever basis he sees fit to adjust it. In other words, he could permit it to be taken out of his reserve, thereby reducing his insurance estate to that extent, or he could take advantage of the provision here to pay it in installments over a period of time equal to the time of his service.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is correct. It protects him against that time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Then it insures him against that time when the cash reserve might be fully used up.

Mr. BEAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BEAM. That pertains solely to enlisted men? It has no relevancy to officers?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The term "persons in the military service" is described in the original act. It includes all persons in the armed forces.

Mr. BEAM. Does that mean it would pay the premiums of all men from generals on down, or admirals on down?

Mr. SPARKMAN. We do not pay the premiums at all.

Mr. BEAM. Do we guarantee them? The only thing I am interested in is protecting the enlisted man. I think we are paying the officers now, in view of our increased allotment, sufficient to enable them to pay their premiums like everybody else. I am primarily interested in seeing that the enlisted man is protected, as the gentleman has said. I am interested in finding out if that pertains to all persons in the armed service.

Mr. SPARKMAN. It pertains to all persons in the armed forces.

Mr. KILDAY. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. But his ability to perform his contract must be lessened by reason of his military service.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is true.

Mr. KILDAY. In other words, if a man is serving in the armed forces for more money than he got in civil life, he is not entitled to any of the benefits of the provisions of this bill.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is right.

Mr. KILDAY. This is to take care of the men who are handicapped because of their military service.

Mr. SPARKMAN. That is right.

Mr. BEAM. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. BEAM. That would be a good provision, because many of the officers are getting more in the Army than they were getting in civilian life.

Mr. KILDAY. That is true. All of this is based on his ability to pay.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Just so that I may understand this statement correctly, if a man goes into the military service and he has a private contract of insurance in force, upon which there may be a cash-surrender value, he is required, under the terms of that contract, to pay premium installments in order to keep his contract in force. If he has not the necessary income, the Government, under this act, as I understand it, steps in and guarantees the payment of that premium so as to keep his contract of insurance in force. Then when he comes out of the service he owes an accumulation of back premiums, which the Government has guaranteed in order to keep his contract in force, and then he may either apply, as I understand you, the cash-surrender value of the policy in liquidation of those past-due premiums that the Government has guaranteed or he may enter into a contract and pay those premiums out of other funds over a period of 3 years. In no event do I understand that the Government itself actually pays the money to the insurance company, but the basis of guaranteeing these premiums is so as to keep his policy in force and effect, so that he will have it when he comes out of the service. Is that correct?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentleman has correctly stated the situation.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I notice in the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act on page 11, in section 301, paragraph 4, there is provision for allotments for rent out of the soldiers' and sailors' pay, to take care of the rent of their wives and children. I notice that is not repealed. Is that in addition to the allowances that were provided for in the legislation that was passed by the House the other day, or how does that work into the situation?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The gentlewoman was not reading from the present bill, was she?

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I was reading from the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act, on page 11, which is amended by the legislation under consideration. That provision to which I referred is not repealed by this legislation by its terms. I would like to know the effect of the present allotment act on those provisions.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Let me try to answer the lady's question.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. If the gentleman would rather answer it privately, that is all right with me.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Perhaps I had much rather. I do not quite get the statement that the gentlewoman makes, because this bill makes no allotment at all. This bill simply gives relief. By the way, at this particular time I would just like to make this short statement:

With reference to all these matters we have tried to make the law flexible by lodging discretion within the courts to do or not to do as justice and equity may require. The same may be said also with regard to the rental payments and the cancelation of rental contracts.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Not by the terms of the bill; there is no provision for the courts to change it.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. KILDAY. As I understand the question it is whether this allotment comes out of the allotments and allowances in the other bill; that is whether this gives the Secretary power to take from a man in the Army an allotment of a portion of his pay for the rent of his family. That, of course, would be deducted from his pay.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Is that in addition to the allotments we set forth the other day?

Mr. KILDAY. Yes; I understand it would be.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. HAINES. The gentleman has in large part answered what I had in mind. I was going to inquire whether there had to be a cash surrender value to these policies.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Not necessarily. That is one amendment we made to the original act. The law on the statute books requires that there be a cash-surrender value and not more than 50 percent of that cash-surrender value be pledged. We take that out and make it on insurance policies that have been taken out in good faith at least 30 days prior to the soldier's going in and on which one full premium has been paid. Such a person under the amendment suggested would be entitled to the protection of that insurance that he may not be able to get at any other time in his life.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. PACE. Could the gentleman tell me what would be the situation where a policy has been assigned, we will say to the bank, to secure a loan that approximates its cash-surrender value? Would the Government come in and guarantee the premium whereby the assignee would probably reap the benefits of the guaranty?

Mr. SPARKMAN. The Government would not if the benefits had been fully assigned, but it would do this: There is a provision here that gives protection to the insurers as against that assignee unless the policy has been irrevocably transferred and all benefits to the soldier lost under it. There is a special provision that takes care of that.

Mr. PACE. You could not irrevocably transfer it unless the transferee had an insurable interest in the insured, could you?

Mr. SPARKMAN. If the interest had been used up completely and the title transferred the insured, of course, has lost all interest in it.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPARKMAN. I yield.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I have one or two very brief questions? Could he take term insurance under this new provision? The term insurance, of course, would have no cash-surrender value.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe the original act made provision for term insurance.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The original act excluded term insurance, and the original act also provided that it had to be in force for at least 30 days prior to the time of his actual induction. What is the period of time the policy has to be in force now? Is he required to have paid one full premium?

Mr. SPARKMAN. My recollection is that he must have paid one full premium. I believe this is taken up in article 4, which starts on page 13.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. In term insurance, as in other insurance, the premium may be paid quarterly or in other installments.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I believe it means one full annual premium.

Mr. KILDAY. It is written on the basis of a yearly premium. They can pay the premium in quarterly, semiannual, or monthly installments, but the premium is based on the yearly premium.

Mr. SPARKMAN. May I say that these insurance features have been very carefully passed upon. The Veterans' Administration prepared and submitted to the Senate a favorable report which did make some changes, but the officials of the Veterans' Administration sat in conference with us when the changes were made. They did not agree fully with all the provisions.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky has consumed all his time, 30 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, as has been stated before, this bill represents amendments to the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act of past years. It was made necessary because of the state of

war and the extension of the service of those in it and the great number of men who are still to go in the service.

The chairman of the committee very wisely, I believe, delegated the preparation and development of this bill to a subcommittee of three of the Committee on Military Affairs. This subcommittee consisted of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HARNESS]. The gentleman from Indiana is unavoidably absent today on account of official business. As I say, this subcommittee has done one of the finest jobs ever done by the Committee on Military Affairs. This subcommittee, to my certain knowledge, worked tirelessly for several months in exhaustive hearings and studies. The Members will appreciate the character of the work done on this bill when I remind them that the bill has been so well prepared to the knowledge of the Senate Military Affairs Committee that thus far no bill has been proposed in the Senate. It may be that some revision of the bill will be necessary and these changes will probably be taken care of in the Senate bill.

I, for one, as a member of the Committee on Military Affairs, would hesitate to support any amendment today that is not approved by the members of the special subcommittee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], who are present today. May I say that, in my opinion, it would be advisable, once this bill is passed by the House, for the Members to send copies of the bill to those in their districts who by virtue of their position might be interested in the processes of the bill, and receive such comment as they may wish to make, credit associations, bankers, insurance companies, banks, and organizations of that type.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to yield the control of the balance of the time to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ELSTON], but I know it is not his intention to make any extended speech before we hear from the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY], a member of the special committee.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON].

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, may I say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS], speaking for myself and, I am sure, for every member of the Committee on Military Affairs, that I wholeheartedly endorse what he has said about the hard work that has been done by this subcommittee. It has already been disclosed that this is a highly technical and a highly legal subject.

The chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs in his wisdom several months ago assigned the duty of working out the details of this bill to the three gentlemen whose names have been mentioned, and I join with the gentleman from New York in saying that I do not know of any bill that has had the hard work and attention that this bill has had. I am sure the Members of the House will conclude when the debate is over and you have read and studied the bill and report, that this committee is entitled not only to the thanks of the Committee on Military Affairs, which it already has, but also the membership of the House at large. All of us want to be sure that every man in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps is afforded every reasonable and just protection that we can give him. Our committee has given this bill the most careful study and consideration. I feel sure it will pass without opposition.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Just to clear up one question which has arisen on the subject of insurance, may I ask, this act is not intended to attempt to change, validate or in any way interfere with the war risk provisions that are to be found on most policies of insurance which are being written today, and I assume all of them? It merely keeps in force the provisions of existing policies, whatever they may be?

Mr. KILDAY. That is true. Under the original act there was a requirement that the policy should have been in effect for a period of 30 days before entrance into the military service. It is true that in some instances policies were written because the agent knew a man was going into the service and in that way the Government guaranteed it, but that was before the declaration of war. Immediately after the declaration of war all of the companies invoked the war clause, so that we are now safe in adopting a statute in this shape, without a requirement having to do with a minimum period of time. It is impossible now for a man to get a policy in contemplation of service which would give him complete protection during his period of service.

Mr. Chairman, the number of questions that have been asked here evidences the fact that this bill is very inclusive and presents many difficult and technical problems. It would be impossible in the time allotted for debate to discuss each provision separately and to have a complete understanding of them.

May I say that the original Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 was adopted under the powers we had under the Constitution to raise and maintain armies. Of course, an army without morale would be no army at all. The right to adopt statutes of this kind under that power has been sustained on a number of occasions. Now we are operating under a much broader power than we had at the time we wrote the original Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, because we have the advantage of the war powers that come to the Federal Government.

We have attempted, in these amendments, to affect property rights and contract rights just as little as possible and still give the benefits that we are trying to give to the men in the service. In other words, except in a very few isolated cases, we have not affected the substance of the contract but only its enforcement. We have attempted not to affect the subjective law but only the adjective law in each particular case. They are outstanding cases in which we had to go into the substantive part of the contract, because otherwise the relief would have been of no value at all. That is true in connection with leases, for instance, where we give the right of cancelation, but also give the court the power to adjust the equities on a fair basis. That is also true of the provision in reference to interest. We say that, no matter what may have been the provision in the original contract, while a man is in service the interest on his contract shall not exceed 6 percent per annum. Of course, that does affect the substance of the contract, but it is necessary, especially where we have industrial loans, and so forth. I may say that the representative of the National Association of Morris Plan Bankers appeared before the committee and did not object to that provision.

We were particularly gratified to find complete cooperation from business in this regard. The American Bankers Association worked with us, as did the associations of finance companies, the Morris Plan banks, the retail creditmen, and others affected. We found them to be very reasonable in the demands which they made. As a matter of fact, they made no demands. They asked if they could be helpful.

We must always be careful in this type of legislation not to give the service man so much protection that we actually operate to his detriment. In other words, if we should write this bill in the form that every contract, even those hereafter executed, might be frozen without any means by which the businessman could still operate, we would actually be doing everybody within draft age—and that is practically everybody in the country, a very serious injustice. His credit would be frozen completely. He could neither do business nor buy the necessities of life.

While the bill provides that every maker of a contract hereafter entered into shall have the right, as would comakers and copurchasers, to resort to the benefits of this act and freeze the payment so long as the man was in the service, the proviso permits comakers to waive the benefits of the act.

In other words, if a young man is within the draft ages and he and his wife want to buy some item they need in their home, if some older person, some relative, say, will sign with them and waive the provisions of this act, then a merchant or banker can deal in complete confidence with the party within the draft ages. In that way we have not frozen the credit and rights of the men who are within the draft ages. That was all the installment people and banks asked. They were perfectly satisfied with that, and I think it is very reasonable from every side of the case.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. This situation appeals to me as one that might be very important. A married man may have had

a Federal Housing Administration loan. I am taking that merely as an example of the situation to which I refer. He is drafted and goes into the service. He has a wife and maybe he has children. What is the effect of this law in the event of his failure to make those payments?

Mr. KILDAY. May I say to the gentleman that he was protected in the original act, except that the original act by its terms applied only to those contracts entered into prior to the effective date of the act, which was October 17, 1940. That leaves us with a hiatus in the act. One of the main purposes of this amendment is to fill in the space of time between October 17, 1940, and this date. When this amendment is adopted, a man owning a home, no matter when the contract was executed, will be able when he goes into the service to have the payments on that home frozen during the time he is absent.

Of course, that can be a very great hardship to the person who is loaning the money, especially if it should be an individual. There has been an injustice in the operation of the act heretofore, because where a person has a house rented out and the tenant goes into the service there is provision in the original law by which eviction cannot be had for 90 days, and then there is a further provision that the court may make such other order as may be required in equity.

We have in this act taken care of the man who may own that house and have a mortgage on it. The court may extend to him exactly the same privileges that it extends to his tenant, so that when it freezes the tenant's rent it also takes care of the landlord who has only an equity and is paying it out.

There is this that we want to remember about the relief provided under this law. It is resorted to in very rare instances. When the different associations came before us and outlined the objections that they might have to it and to various provisions in the existing act, we asked them, "How many times have you had difficulty from October 17, 1940, to the present, with that provision?" They have all had to answer, "None."

The point is this. If the man was a good credit risk in the first place and he went into the Army, his morals have not changed a particle. In the great majority of cases he will go to the man to whom he owes money before he is inducted or during his 2 weeks' furlough to straighten out his business, and they will come to some agreement, some understanding between themselves. This has worked out to be satisfactory to both sides; so that the number of times that this act has been invoked are very few, considering the period of time it has been in effect and the millions of men to whom it has applied.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. In the case of taxes or assessments which are past due and where there is an attempt to foreclose the lien, what provision is made to take care of that situation?

Mr. KILDAY. He is protected against taxes, assessments, and things of that kind to the same extent as in the case of any other debt. That was true in the original act. We have done a little something more for him here. You take the period of redemption that exists in most cases for the property owner after tax foreclosure, for instance. We provide in this amendment that the period he is in the Army shall not count within the period of redemption, so that we place him whole while he is in the Army. Say he has a 2-year period of redemption and he is gone a year and a half of that time. That year and a half does not count in his 2-year period of redemption.

Mr. SPRINGER. In other words, as I understand, the tax or the assessment which would be collectible otherwise is simply frozen, and the matter is held in abeyance until his return from the service?

Mr. KILDAY. The gentleman is correct. The burden, I may say, is cast upon the tax collector to show that he is not in the service. In other words, he cannot go in and take a default judgment against him.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. In my judgment, and the judgment of those who have examined the act as amended, this goes further than that and covers cases where a State, a county, or a municipality may have a claim outside of taxes or a tax lien which may be enforceable during the absence of the soldier. This act will cover it and protect the soldier during his absence.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. There are two questions in mind. One is where the foreclosure has been had before this act went into effect; I presume this bill does not toll the period of redemption in that case?

Mr. KILDAY. That is about the most difficult and interesting question we have found in the whole bill. We have no right to divest property interests. If there has been a complete foreclosure and a complete vesting of title in the person who has bought in under the foreclosure, we cannot divest that title. That is the reason there is necessity for speed with respect to these amendments. In those cases where there is a complete foreclosure or complete divestiture of title from the man in the service, it appears that under the Constitution we could not now divest that title from the person in whom vested and revest it in the person who had lost the title. This makes it essential that we proceed rapidly to get this act into effect.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. O'HARA. My other question is this: I presume with respect to the tolling of the statute on these matters of foreclosure, whether tax title or mortgage foreclosure, the interest rate provided by law of that State or the interest rate provided in the mortgage continues at the same rate.

Mr. KILDAY. Provided it does not exceed 6 percent. We put an over-all ceiling of 6 percent on the obligations of any man in the service.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the chairman of our committee.

Mr. MAY. I would like for the gentleman to point out, if he will, and discuss it, if he desires to do so, the fact that in conferring upon the courts the right to pass upon the provisions of this act we also included the right to review the findings and regulations of any department of the Government that may have issued any.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, the act is so big and there are so many things in it it is not possible to call the various matters to mind and discuss them. I do want to say, however, that the entire matter has been approached in a very conservative and reasonable manner, in my opinion. There has been the intention to provide thoroughly for the man who goes into the service and at the same time not to militate against all of the interests of the man who happens to hold his obligations. I sincerely trust there will never be an effort either here or in the other body to go any further than that. The protection given here is thoroughly adequate and, when taken in connection with the increased pay and the allowances added under our other acts, I believe the interests of the men in the service are protected. I think the three bills we have put through here in the last few weeks—the pay bill, the allotment bill, and these amendments to the Soldiers' and Sailors' Relief Act—will grant complete protection to the man who goes into the service.

I want to say this for fear there is going to be some question about it when it gets back here from conference. We have raised the limit on the insurance that will be protected from $5,000 to $10,000. I find that almost everyone gets a wrong impression about that insurance. It has no connection with and no relationship to the national service life insurance.

There may be some effort to reduce the maximum protected from $10,000 to $5,000. That should not be done. Older men are now being inducted. Unless we protect their insurance for them they will find themselves without adequate protection after the war. When they come out they may not be insurable. If they are, because of their age, the premiums will be prohibitive.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. I have an inquiry from a bank, asking me this question:

Under this law what happens to the endorser on a service man's note in a case of this sort? For instance, the service man owes the bank $5,000 and there is an endorser. The service man is excused from payment during his service, and what effect does that have on the endorser?

Mr. KILDAY. The original act applied to the principal and persons secondarily liable, but there have been constructions to the effect that the joint maker or comaker would not be a person secondarily liable under the definition we included in the act. But the man who is definitely an endorser or a man who is actually secondarily liable has always had full protection, and the bank must have its loan frozen so long as the principal is in the service. The provision contained in this bill to permit a waiver of the rights of the relief act will permit the bank when closing a loan hereafter to protect its right to proceed against everyone on the note except the man in the service and his dependents.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio [Mrs. BOLTON].

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, I think we all have been very much impressed by the meticulous manner in which the committee has studied this particular bill. We have done as much as we can as a Congress to show ourselves aware of the human problems that are involved in the raising of this enormous Army and Navy. The fact that all sides of this particular problem have been so carefully studied, should bring to the people of the country a reassurance of the attitude of the Congress in their behalf. I want to note that in caring for the men we use that term as inclusive of the women who are also in the service of both the Army and the Navy, the corps of nurses who are serving in the armed forces of the country. I feel sure that a great deal of relief is going to be experienced by everyone involved when this bill becomes law.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, as the subject of a soldiers' and sailors' civil-relief law is most complicated, I feel that the Military Affairs Committee acted very wisely in appointing a very competent subcommittee to revise proposed legislation, consisting of Congressmen SPARKMAN, KILDAY, and HARNESS, after extensive hearings had been held before the full committee. When the testimony was given I suggested certain changes in the bill under consideration which are contained in the legislation under discussion today. This bill, in my opinion, affords greater and better relief for our soldiers and sailors and their dependents than was provided during any previous war, insofar as their civil troubles are concerned. The subcommittee has performed its duties well. As during the last war, we must expect seeming inequities and injustices to flow from legislation of this kind, but it is necessary to protect the rights of those in our armed forces who are not in a position to act in their own behalf. Even the broad provisions of this bill will not cover all possible situations which may arise. It will prove of great value in maintaining the morale of our soldiers and sailors while away from their homes and their businesses.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes. A few moments ago the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee asked the gentleman from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] to explain that change which has been suggested in the law so as to protect men in the service against orders, rules, and regulations of Government bureaus and departments. I will seek to answer the question now, inasmuch as the gentleman from Texas did not have the time to do so.

The original act approved October 17, 1940, in section 205, provided:

> The period of military service shall not be included in computing any period now or hereafter to be limited by any law for the bringing of any action by or against any person in military service, or by or against his heirs, executors, administrators, or assigns, whether such cause of action shall have accrued prior to or during the period of such service.

It was called to the attention of the committee that in these days, particularly, we live under rules, regulations, and orders of a great many different Government bureaus and departments, and that we are not governed entirely by statutory law. Under the circumstances it was deemed advisable that the committee amend section 205. Accordingly that has been done, as a result of which section 205 now provides as follows:

> The period of military service shall not be included in computing any period now or hereafter to be limited by any law, regulation, or order for the bringing of any action or proceeding in any court, board, bureau, commission, department, or other agency of Government.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I shall be glad to yield to the chairman of our committee.

Mr. MAY. Merely to observe here that the gentleman from Ohio was responsible for the suggestion of this amendment.

Mr. ELSTON. I thank the gentleman for his statement. I believe the entire Military Affairs Committee was impressed with the necessity of protecting the men in service against such Government bureau and department orders, rules and regulations as may affect them. It is just as essential to protect the service men against the operation of these departmental orders and regulations as it is to protect them against the operation of the laws on our statute books.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. ELSTON. Yes.

Mr. MAY. To call attention to the fact that for several years there has been pending in Congress bills which proposed to set up a court to construe and correlate these regulations of department rules of action. One of them was introduced by Senator Logan of Kentucky. That bill has been pending for several months.

Mr. ELSTON. Such bills, of course, would be beneficial to any person whose interests might be affected by any bureau. Section 205, as amended, is necessary in order that we may take care of the men in the service.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELSTON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Is there any provision in this bill which will maintain alimony payments where a man is found able to pay. Will he still have to pay alimony, or will that be suspended also?

Mr. ELSTON. Under the Service Men's Allotment Act, which we recently passed, any man against whom a court order for the payment of alimony has been made is required to allot $22 from his pay to his divorced wife. It is mandatory that he make such allotment. Under that act, the Government will add $28, making $50 in all, but in no event can the total be greater than the amount fixed by the court order.

I hope, Mr. Chairman, that section 205 will be retained and that this entire bill will be adopted. We owe to the men in the service and their families the protection which this measure will guarantee.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time, 2½ minutes, to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS].

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to join in what has already been said with reference to the diligent, conscientious, and effective work of the subcommittee which has drafted this bill. It was composed of Representatives JOHN SPARKMAN, of Alabama; PAUL KILDAY, of Texas; and FORREST HARNESS, of Indiana. These gentlemen worked long hours with zeal and determination to give the full Committee of the Military Affairs a good bill to present to you today. I do not believe that any committee or group of men can at any one time write a perfect bill upon such a subject as this. It is too broad and too comprehensive, and covers too many phases of society and of life itself. I believe, however, that the bill presented is a good bill and contains as much remedial legislation as any one committee can hope to place before the Congress at one time on such a subject.

This bill springs from the desire of the people of the United States to make sure as far as possible that men in service are not placed at a civil disadvantage during their absence. It springs from the inability of the men who are in service to properly manage their normal business affairs while away. It likewise arises from the differences in pay which a soldier receives and what the same man normally earns in civil life.

The people back home feel, and this Congress feels, that the Nation's de-

fenders should not be compelled to fight a battle on two fronts at once—one back home and the other on the firing line facing the enemies of democracy. We feel that the normal obligations of the man contracted prior to service induction should be suspended as far as practicable during this tour of duty, and that the soldier should be protected from default in his obligations due to his inability to pay caused by reduction in income due to service.

In the original act there were numerous loopholes. I regret very much to have to say that in some few instances these loopholes were made the basis of imposition upon the absent soldier and sailor. While the committee was considering this bill I received a number of letters from our people back home calling my attention to inequitable situations arising out of the loopholes in this act. I especially received critical letters from those who referred to foreclosures made outside of court. The original act did not cover the case where under the laws of some States a foreclosure of property for past-due obligations may be made without the aid of a court. I received critical letters of cases where unfortunately individuals and corporations threatened to take away the property of a soldier who at that moment was serving in the combat forces of the Nation in a foreign land.

It was at that time that I received a letter from the wife of an Army sergeant who is serving in Australia. She referred to their child born since the sergeant had been sent by the Air Force to Australia and of the fact that some company was trying to take furniture which the family was using during the absence of the soldier. This case came within the loophole regarding action outside of court and was aided by the fact that there was no punishment for the person who attempted to violate the law but did not succeed. The present bill covers these two cases.

It covers the case of the soldier who has entered into an obligation to pay interest, which in some States runs as high as 3½ percent per month, and which interest during his absence will accumulate far beyond the value of the property by which it is secured. This bill provides no interest charge during service shall exceed 6 percent per annum and thereby gives full protection to the soldier.

Mr. Chairman, I have made an investigation to find out just how the original bill was administered by the courts of this land. This investigation has taken my inquiries into many States and to many people. I am glad to be able to state here that our courts are really doing their full part. They are anxious to see that our soldiers and sailors are freed as far as possible from the worries of civil life as they fight our battles in defense of the Nation. I am told that within the terms of the statute they make every effort to protect these men and, accordingly, give the act a most liberal interpretation.

Mr. Chairman, with the enactment of this bill your Committee on Military Affairs will have gone a long way to provide for and protect our service men. We have just enacted the Army pay bill, giving our men the minimum amount of $50 per month pay as a private soldier. We followed this with the passage through the House and Senate of the allotment bill, under the terms of which we have tried to take care of the dependent wife, father, and mother, children, and other relatives of the soldier and the sailor. We now submit this bill to you for your consideration—a bill to protect these service men from civil process in courts and from the operation of obligations previously incurred, the enforcement of which will prove onerous to the individual because of his service to the Nation.

This is a good bill, Mr. Chairman. It should pass and should pass without a dissenting vote. This is a good program and is one which should bring to us a feeling of pride and satisfaction in having done our part in drafting it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I understand there is only one amendment to be offered and it has the support of the subcommittee. I therefore ask unanimous consent that the reading of the bill be dispensed with and that amendments be in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act Amendments of 1942.

SEC. 2. (a) Section 103 (1) of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 is amended by striking out the words "and others" and inserting in lieu thereof "accommodation makers, and others, whether primarily or secondarily."

(b) Section 103 (2) of such act is amended by striking out the words "or other person" and inserting in lieu thereof "accommodation maker, or other person, whether primarily or secondarily."

SEC. 3. Section 103 of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"(3) Whenever, by reason of the military service of a principal upon a criminal bail bond the sureties upon such bond are prevented from enforcing the attendance of their principal and performing their obligation, the court shall discharge such sureties and exonerate the bail.

"(4) Nothing contained in this act shall prevent a waiver in writing of the benefits afforded by subsections (1) and (2) of this section by any surety, guarantor, endorser, accommodation maker, or other person, whether primarily or secondarily liable upon the obligation or liability, except that after the date of enactment of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act Amendments of 1942 no such waiver shall be valid unless it is executed as an instrument separate from the obligation or liability in respect of which it applies, and no such waiver shall be valid after the beginning of the period of military service if executed by an individual who subsequent to the execution of such waiver becomes a person in military service, or if executed by a dependent of such individual, unless executed by such individual or dependent during the period specified in section 106."

SEC. 4. Article I of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 104. Persons who serve with the forces of any nation with which the United States may be allied in the prosecution of any war in which the United States engages while this act remains in force and who immediately prior to such service were citizens of the United States shall, except in those cases provided for in section 512, be entitled to the relief and benefits afforded by this act if such service is similar to military service as defined in this act, unless they are dishonorably discharged therefrom, or it appears that they do not intend to resume United States citizenship.

"SEC. 105. The Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy shall make provision, in such manner as each may deem appropriate for his respective Department, to insure the giving of notice of the benefits accorded by this act to persons in and to persons entering military service. The Director of Selective Service shall cooperate with the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy in carrying out the provisions of this section.

"SEC. 106. Any person who has been ordered to report for induction under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, shall be entitled to the relief and benefits accorded persons in military service under articles I, II, and III of this act during the period beginning on the date of receipt of such order and ending on the date upon which such person reports for induction; and any member of the Enlisted Reserve Corps who is ordered to report for military service shall be entitled to such relief and benefits during the period beginning on the date of receipt of such order and ending on the date upon which he reports for such service.

"SEC. 107. Nothing contained in this act shall prevent—

"(a) the modification, termination, or cancelation of any contract, lease, or bailment, or any obligation secured by mortgage, trust deed, lien, or other security in the nature of a mortgage, or

"(b) the repossession, retention, foreclosure, sale, forfeiture, or taking possession of property which is security for any obligation or which has been purchased or received under a contract, lease, or bailment,

pursuant to a written agreement of the parties thereto (including the person in military service concerned, or the person to whom section 106 is applicable, whether or not such person is a party to the obligation), or their assignees, executed during or after the period of military service of the person concerned or during the period specified in section 106."

SEC. 5. Section 205 of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 205. The period of military service shall not be included in computing any period now or hereafter to be limited by any law, regulation, or order for the bringing of any action or proceeding in any court, board, bureau, commission, department, or other agency of government by or against any person in military service or by or against his heirs, executors, administrators, or assigns, whether such cause of action or the right or privilege to institute such action or proceeding shall have accrued prior to or during the period of such service, nor shall any part of such period which occurs after the date of enactment of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act Amendments of 1942 be included in computing any period now or hereafter provided by any law for the redemption of real property sold or forfeited to enforce any obligation, tax, or assessment."

SEC. 6. Article II of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 206. No obligation or liability bearing interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent per annum incurred by a person in military service prior to his entry into such service shall, during any part of the period of military service which occurs after the date of enactment of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil

Relief Act Amendments of 1942, bear interest at a rate in excess of 6 percent per annum unless, in the opinion of the court, upon application thereto by the obligee, the ability of such person in military service to pay interest upon such obligation or liability at a rate in excess of 6 percent per annum is not materially affected by reason of such service, in which case the court may make such order as in its opinion may be just. As used in this section the term 'interest' includes service charges, renewal charges, fees, or any other charges (except bona fide insurance) in respect of such obligation or liability."

SEC. 7. The title to article III of such act is amended to read as follows: "Rent, installment contracts, mortgages, liens, assignments, leases."

SEC. 8. (a) Section 300 (2) of such act is amended by adding the following sentence: "Where such stay is granted or other order is made by the court, the owner of the premises shall be entitled, upon application therefor, to relief in respect of such premises similar to that granted persons in military service in sections 301, 302, and 500 of this act to such extent and for such period as may appear to the court to be just."

(b) Section 300 (3) of such act is amended by inserting after the word "hereof" a comma and "or attempts so to do,".

SEC. 9. (a) Section 301 (1) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 301. (1) No person who has received, or whose assignor has received, under a contract for the purchase of real or personal property, or of lease or bailment with a view to purchase of such property, a deposit or installment of the purchase price, or a deposit or installment under the contract, lease, or bailment, from a person or from the assignor of a person who, after the date of payment of such deposit or installment, has entered military service, shall exercise any right or option under such contract to rescind or terminate the contract or resume possession of the property for nonpayment of any installment thereunder due or for any other breach of the terms thereof occurring prior to or during the period of such military service, except by action in a court of competent jurisdiction."

(b) Section 302 (1) of such act is amended by striking out the words "originating prior to the date of approval of this act and," and by inserting after the word "him" the words "which obligations originated prior to such person's period of military service."

(c) Sections 301 (3) and 302 (2) of such act are each amended by striking out the words "except as provided in section 303,".

(d) Section 301 (2) of such act is amended by striking out the word "hereof" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "of this section or in section 107, or attempts so to do,".

SEC. 10. Section 302 (3) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"(3) No sale, foreclosure, or seizure of property for nonpayment of any sum due under any such obligation, or for any other breach of the terms thereof, whether under a power of sale, under a judgment entered upon warrant of attorney to confess judgment contained therein, or otherwise, shall be valid if made after the date of enactment of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act Amendments of 1942 and during the period of military service or within three months thereafter, except pursuant to an agreement as provided in section 107, unless upon an order previously granted by the court and a return thereto made and approved by the court.

"(4) Any person who shall knowingly cause to be made any sale, foreclosure, or seizure of property, defined as invalid by subsection (3) hereof, or attempts so to do, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by imprisonment not to exceed 1 year or by fine not to exceed $1,000, or both."

SEC. 11. Section 303 of such act is repealed.

SEC. 12. Article III of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 303. Where a proceeding to foreclose a mortgage upon or to resume possession of personal property, or to rescind or terminate a contract for the purchase thereof, has been stayed as provided in this act, the court may, unless, in its opinion, an undue hardship would result to the dependents of the person in military service, appoint three disinterested parties to appraise the property and, based upon the report of the appraisers, order such sum, if any, as may be just, paid to the person in military service or his dependent, as the case may be, as a condition of foreclosing the mortgage, resuming possession of the property, or rescinding or terminating the contract.

"SEC. 304. (1) The provisions of this section shall apply to any lease covering premises occupied for dwelling, professional, business, agricultural, or similar purposes in any case in which (a) such lease was executed by or on the behalf of a person who, after the execution of such lease, entered military service, and (b) the premises so leased have been occupied for such purposes, or for a combination of such purposes, by such person or by him and his dependents.

"(2) Any such lease may be terminated by notice in writing delivered to the lessor (or his grantee) or to the lessor's (or his grantee's) agent by the lessee at any time following the date of the beginning of his period of military service. Delivery of such notice may be accomplished by placing it in an envelope properly stamped and duly addressed to the lessor (or his grantee) or to the lessor's (or his grantee's) agent and depositing the notice in the United States mails. Termination of any such lease providing for monthly payment of rent shall not be effective until 30 days after the first date on which the next rental payment is due and payable subsequent to the date when such notice is delivered or mailed. In the case of all other leases, termination shall be effected on the last day of the month following the month in which such notice is delivered or mailed and in such case any unpaid rental for a period preceding termination shall be proratably computed and any rental paid in advance for a period succeeding termination shall be refunded by the lessor (or his assignee). Upon application by the lessor to the appropriate court prior to the termination period provided for in the notice, any relief granted in this subsection shall be subject to such modifications or restrictions as, in the opinion of the court, justice and equity may in the circumstances require.

"(3) Any person who shall knowingly seize, hold, or detain the personal effects, clothing, furniture, or other property of any person who has lawfully terminated a lease covered by this section, or in any manner interfere with the removal of such property from the premises covered by such lease, for the purpose of subjecting or attempting to subject any of such property to a claim for rent accruing subsequent to the date of termination of such lease, or attempts so to do, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by imprisonment not to exceed 1 year or by fine not to exceed $1,000, or both.

"SEC. 305. (1) Where any life insurance policy on the life of a person in military service has been assigned prior to such person's period of military service to secure the payment of any obligation of such person, no assignee of such policy shall, during the period of military service of the insured or within 1 year thereafter, except upon the consent in writing of the insured made during such period or when the premiums thereon are due and unpaid or upon the death of the insured, exercise any right or option by virtue of such assignment unless upon leave of court granted upon an application made therefor by such assignee. The court may thereupon refuse to grant such leave unless in the opinion of the court the ability of the obligor to comply with the terms of the obligation is not materially affected by reason of his military service. For the purpose of this subsection premiums which are guaranteed under the provisions of article IV of this act shall not be deemed to be due and unpaid.

"(2) No person shall exercise any right to foreclose or enforce any lien for storage of household goods, furniture, or personal effects of a person in military service during such person's period of military service and for 3 months thereafter except upon an order previously granted by a court upon application therefor and a return thereto made and approved by the court. In such proceeding the court may, after hearing, in its discretion, on its own motion, and shall, on application to it by such person in military service or some person on his behalf, unless in the opinion of the court the ability of the defendant to pay the storage charges due is not materially affected by reason of his military service—

"(a) stay the proceedings as provided in this act; or

"(b) make such other disposition of the case as may be equitable to conserve the interest of all parties.

The enactment of the provisions of this subsection shall not be construed in any way as affecting or as limiting the scope of section 302 of this act.

"(3) Any person who shall knowingly take any action contrary to the provisions of this section, or attempts so to do, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and shall be punished by imprisonment not to exceed 1 year or by fine not to exceed $1,000, or both.

"SEC. 306. Dependents of a person in military service shall be entitled to the benefits accorded to persons in military service under the provisions of this article upon application to a court therefor, unless in the opinion of the court the ability of such dependents to comply with the terms of the obligation, contract, lease, or bailment has not been materially impaired by reason of the military service of the person upon whom the applicants are dependent."

SEC. 13. Article IV of such act is amended to read as follows:

"ARTICLE IV—INSURANCE

"SEC. 400. In this article the term 'policy' shall include any contract of life insurance on the level premium, endowment, or legal reserve plan. It shall also include any benefit in the nature of life insurance arising out of membership in any fraternal or beneficial association; the term 'premium' shall include membership dues or assessments in such association, and the date of issuance of policy as herein limited shall refer to the date of admission to membership in such association; the term 'insured' shall include any person who is the holder of a policy as defined in this article; the term 'insurer' shall include any corporation, partnership, or other form of association which secures or provides insurance under any policy as defined in this article; the term 'cash surrender value' shall include dividend accumulations, the value of any paid-up additions, and other amounts that are available to the insured upon complete surrender of all rights under the policy, less any indebtedness on the policy; the term 'holder of a policy of life insurance' shall include insured persons who have assigned such a policy as security for the payment of indebtedness, except when such assignment completely and permanently divests the insured of all interest in the policy.

"SEC. 401. (1) The benefits of this article shall apply to any person in military service who is the holder of a policy of life insur-

ance, when such holder, or a person designated by him, or, in case the holder is outside the continental United States (excluding Alaska and the Panama Canal Zone), a beneficiary or dependent, shall apply for such benefits on a form prepared in accordance with regulations which shall be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs. Such form shall set forth particularly that the application therein made is a consent to such modification of the terms of the original contract of insurance as are made necessary by the provisions of this article and by receiving and filing the same the insurer shall be deemed to have assented thereto, to the extent, if any, to which the policy on which the application is made is within the provisions of this article. The original of such application shall be sent by the insured to the insurer, and a copy thereof to the Veterans' Administration.

"(2) The Veterans' Administration shall issue through suitable military and naval channels a notice for distribution by appropriate military and naval authorities to persons in the military service explaining the provisions of this article and shall furnish forms to be distributed to those desiring to make application for its benefits.

"SEC. 402. The benefits of this article shall be available to any person in military service in respect of contracts of insurance in force under their terms up to but not exceeding a face value of $10,000, irrespective of the number of policies held by such person whether in one or more companies when such contracts were made and a premium was paid thereon before the date of approval of this act or not less than 30 days before entry into the military service. In no event shall the provisions of this article apply to any policy on which premiums are due and unpaid for a period of more than 1 year at the time when application for the benefits of this article is made.

"SEC. 403. The Veterans' Administration shall, subject to regulations, which shall be prescribed by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, compile and maintain a list of such persons in military service as have made application for the benefits of this article, and shall (1) find whether the policy is entitled to protection under this article; (2) reject any application for such benefits made by persons who are not persons in military service; (3) reject any applications for such benefits in excess of the amount permitted by section 402; and (4) reject any applications in respect of contracts of insurance otherwise not entitled to the benefits of this article. Said Administration shall immediately notify the insurer and the insured in writing of every rejection or approval.

"SEC. 404. When one or more applications are made under this article by any one person in military service in respect of insurance exceeding a total face value of $10,000, whether on one or more policies or in one or more companies, and the insured shall not in his application indicate an order of preference, the Veterans' Administration shall reject such policies as have the inferior cash surrender value, so as to reduce the total benefits conferred within the face value of $10,000, and where necessary for this purpose shall direct the insurer to divide any policy into two separate policies. The said Administration shall immediately notify the insurer and the insured in writing of such selection.

"SEC. 405. In the event of maturity of a policy as a death claim or otherwise before the expiration of the period of protection under the provisions of this article, the insurer in making settlement will deduct from the amount of insurance the premiums guaranteed under this article, together with interest thereon at the rate fixed in the policy for policy loans. If no rate of interest is specifically fixed in the policy, the rate shall be the rate fixed for policy loans in other policies issued by the insurer at the time the policy brought under this article was issued. The amount deducted by reason of the protection afforded by this article shall be reported by the insurer to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

"SEC. 406. No policy found by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to be entitled to protection under this article shall, subsequent to date of application and during the period of military service of the insured or during one year after the expiration of such service, lapse or otherwise terminate or be forfeited for the nonpayment of a premium becoming due and payable, or the nonpayment of any indebtedness or interest.

"SEC. 407. Payment of premiums and interest thereon at the rate specified in section 405 hereof due or becoming due on a policy while protected under the provisions of this article is guaranteed by the United States, and if the amount so guaranteed is not paid prior to the expiration of the period of insurance protection under this article, the amount then due shall be treated by the insurer as a policy loan on such policy; but if at the expiration of the period of insurance protection the cash surrender value is less than the amount then due and the insured has not applied for the benefits of section 408, the policy shall then cease and terminate and the United States shall pay the insurer the difference between such amount and the cash surrender value.

"SEC. 408. Before the expiration of the period of 1 year from the date of the termination of the period of military service of the insured and upon application by the insured and payment by the insured to the insurer of at least one-third of the indebtedness in excess of the cash surrender value of the policy, the remaining amount of such excess indebtedness established against the policy under authority of this article will be placed as an interest-bearing indebtedness against the amount of insurance, to be deducted in any settlement thereunder unless sooner paid. The insured shall be required to pay the premiums on the policy as they become due and to pay such excess indebtedness with interest at a rate not to exceed 4 percent per annum within a period of 3 years from the date of termination of his period of military service. If any premium be not paid when due or within the grace period allowed by the policy, or if the indebtedness with interest be not paid in full by the insured within 3 years after the date of termination of his period of military service, then the policy shall cease and become void, and the Government shall pay to the insurer the difference between the remaining unpaid indebtedness and the cash value of the policy as of the due date of the unpaid premium.

"SEC. 409. No dividend or other monetary benefit under a policy shall be paid to an insured or used to purchase dividend additions while a policy is protected by the provisions of this article, except with the consent and approval of the Veterans' Administration. If such consent is not procured, such dividends or benefits shall be added to the value of the policy to be used as a credit when final settlement is made with the insurer. No cash value, loan value, or withdrawal of dividend accumulation, or unearned premium, or other value of similar character shall be available to the insured while the policy is protected under this article, except upon approval by the Veterans' Administration. The insured's right to change a beneficiary designation or select an optional settlement for a beneficiary shall not be affected by the provisions of this article, but such policy may not be assigned while under the protection of this article.

"SEC. 410. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized and directed to provide by regulations for such rules of procedure and forms as he may deem advisable in carrying out the provisions of this article. The findings of fact and conclusions of law made by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs in administering the provisions of this article shall be final, and shall not be subject to review by any other official or agency of the Government. The Administrator of Veterans' Affairs shall report annually to the Congress on the administration of this article.

"SEC. 411. This article shall not apply to any policy which is void or which may at the option of the insurer be voidable, if the insured is in military service, either in this country or abroad, nor to any policy which as a result of being in military service, either in this country or abroad, provides for the payment of any sum less than the face thereof or for the payment of an additional amount as premium unless such policy is revised so as to exclude such provisions and is in force under its terms as revised at the time the holder thereof applies for the benefits of this article.

"SEC. 412. This article shall apply only to insurance companies or associations which are required by the law under which they are organized or doing business to maintain a reserve, or, which if not so required, have made or shall make provision for the collection from all those insured in such insurer of a premium to cover the special war risk of those insured persons who are in military service.

"SEC. 413. (1) The provisions of this article in force immediately prior to the enactment of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act Amendments of 1942 (hereinafter in this section called 'such provisions') shall remain in full force and effect with respect to all valid applications for protection executed prior to the date of enactment of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act Amendments of 1942 and all policies to which such applications pertain shall continue to be entitled to the protection granted thereby.

"(2) Any insurer under a policy accepted under such provisions shall, subject to the approval of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and upon complete surrender by it to the United States, within 90 days after the date of enactment of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act amendments of 1942, of all certificates issued in accordance with such provisions together with all right to payment thereunder, be entitled to the guarantee of unpaid premiums and interest thereon and the mode of settlement for such policies as provided by this article, as amended. The privileges and benefits granted by the foregoing sentence shall be in lieu of the method of settlement, and the requirement for accounts and reports prescribed by such provisions. In the event any such insurer fails to surrender within the said 90 days all such certificates and rights to payment, the accounts, reports, and settlements required to be made by such insurer under such provisions shall continue to be made as required and shall be governed by such provisions."

SEC. 14. (a) Section 500 (1) and (2) are amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 500. (1) The provisions of this section shall apply when any taxes or assessments, whether general or special (other than taxes on income), whether falling due prior to or during the period of military service, in respect of personal property, money, or credits, or real property owned and occupied for dwelling, professional, business, or agricultural purposes by a person in military service or his dependents at the commencement of his period of military service and still so occupied by his dependents or employees are not paid.

"(2) No sale of such property shall be made to enforce the collection of such tax or assessment, or any proceeding or action for such purpose commenced, except upon leave of court granted upon application made

therefor by the collector of taxes or other officer whose duty it is to enforce the collection of taxes or assessments. The court thereupon, unless in its opinion the ability of the person in military service to pay such taxes or assessments is not materially affected by reason of such service, may stay such proceedings or such sale, as provided in this act, for a period extending not more than six months after the termination of the period of military service of such person."

(b) Section 500 (5) of such act is repealed.

SEC. 15. Section 509 of such act is amended by striking out "section 500" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 500, 513, and 514" and by striking out the word "section" at the end thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the word "sections."

SEC. 16. Section 512 of such act is amended by striking out the words "this article" and inserting in lieu thereof "sections 501 to 511, inclusive."

SEC. 17. Article V of such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"SEC. 514. For the purposes of taxation in respect of any person, or of his property, income, or gross income, by any State, Territory, possession, or political subdivision of any of the foregoing, or by the District of Columbia, such person shall not be deemed to have lost a residence or domicile in any State, Territory, possession, or political subdivision of any of the foregoing, or in the District of Columbia, solely by reason of being absent therefrom in compliance with military or naval orders, or to have acquired a residence or domicile in, or to have become resident in or a resident of, any other State, Territory, possession, or political subdivision of any of the foregoing, or the District of Columbia, while, and solely by reason of being, so absent. For the purposes of taxation in respect of the income or gross income of any such person by any State, Territory, possession, or political subdivision of any of the foregoing, or the District of Columbia, of which such person is not a resident or in which he is not domiciled, compensation for military or naval service shall not be deemed income for services performed within, or from sources within, such State, Territory, possession, political subdivision, or District. This section shall be effective as of September 8, 1939, except that it shall not require the crediting or refunding of any tax paid prior to the date of the enactment of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act amendments of 1942."

SEC. 18. Such act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"ARTICLE VII—FURTHER RELIEF

"SEC. 700. (1) A person may, at any time during his period of military service or within 6 months thereafter, apply to a court for relief in respect of any obligation or liability incurred by such person prior to his period of military service or in respect of any tax or assessment, whether falling due prior to or during his period of military service. The court, after appropriate notice and hearing, unless in its opinion the ability of the applicant to comply with the terms of such obligation or liability or to pay such tax or assessment has not been materially affected by reason of his military service, may grant the following relief:

"(a) In the case of an obligation payable under its terms in installments under a contract for the purchase of real estate, or secured by a mortgage or other instrument in the nature of a mortgage upon real estate, a stay of the enforcement of such obligation during the applicant's period of military service and, from the date of termination of such period of military service or from the date of application if made after such service, for a period equal to the period of the remaining life of the installment contract or other instrument plus a period of time equal to the period of military service of the applicant, or any part of such combined period, subject to payment of the balance of principal and accumulated interest due and unpaid at the date of termination of the period of military service or from the date of application, as the case may be, in equal installments during such combined period at such rate of interest on the unpaid balance as is prescribed in such contract, or other instrument evidencing the obligation, for installments paid when due, and subject to such other terms as may be just.

"(b) In the case of any other obligation, liability, tax, or assessment, a stay of the enforcement thereof during the applicant's period of military service and, from the date of termination of such period of military service or from the date of application if made after such service, for a period of time equal to the period of military service of the applicant or any part of such period, subject to payment of the balance of principal and accumulated interest due and unpaid at the date of termination of such period of military service or the date of application, as the case may be, in equal periodic installments during such extended period at such rate of interest as may be prescribed for such obligation, liability, tax, or assessment, if paid when due, and subject to such other terms as may be just.

"(2) When any court has granted a stay as provided in this section no fine or penalty shall accrue during the period the terms and conditions of such stay are complied with by reason of failure to comply with the terms or conditions of the obligation, liability, tax, or assessment in respect of which such stay was granted."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment on page 2, line 12.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAY: Page 2, line 12, after the word "shall" insert "not enforce the provisions of such bond during the military service of the principal thereon, and may in accordance with the principles of equity and justice either during or after such service."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPARKMAN: Page 17, line 8, strike out all after the word "at" down to the period in line 12 and insert in lieu thereof the words "4 per centum per annum."

And on page 18, line 6, after the word "policy" insert the words "at 4 per centum per annum."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to attempt to amend this much needed bill at this time but I wish to call the attention of the Committee on Military Affairs to a couple of matters which require attention and which I understand from the War Department are being brought to their attention.

There is no provision now under the one hundred and fourteenth article of war for the execution, by men in the field, of instruments such as deeds, chattel mortgages, and other instruments requiring an oath or acknowledgment, before their officers in the place of notaries. Such a change in the law should be made, because many different transactions, many deeds and forms of tax returns, chattel mortgages, real estate mortgages, and other documents are being delayed, because no notaries under the laws of the various States are in the field, and there is no provision for the officers to act as notaries.

I had intended to attempt to prepare an amendment to that effect and to offer it to the committee or possibly on the floor, but I have been informed by the War Department that such an amendment is being prepared as a separate act and is being sent up here.

Another matter that should receive the early attention of the Military Affairs Committee is to make it possible to send photographic copies of legal documents back to the States. I understand there is under consideration a provision for microfilming letters and other documents of soldiers and sailors in the field, to be flown back to the States and then sent out to the addressees. What should be done is to make provision for the proper authentication of a microfilm of any soldier's legal documents which are required to be sent back, and then for the proper distribution of those documents by the Signal Corps who would handle the film, so that a man in the field will not undergo the additional hardship of having his personal or legal affairs tied up because of the fact that, first, he cannot get to a notary, and, second, that the document may be lost or delayed unduly in transit.

While I have no desire to delay the enactment of this bill, I hope we shall realize that full relief in these legal matters has not yet been done to these men, and I hope our Military Affairs Committee will bear in mind these further ways in which the hardships of service and the delays and annoyances may be avoided.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. PATMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7164) to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the relief and benefits provided therein to certain persons, to include certain additional proceedings and transactions therein, to provide further relief for persons in military service, to change certain insurance provisions thereof, and for other purposes, directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole today and to include therein a list of lawyers representing the American Bar Association in the various States who gave aid on this measure.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

TO ESTABLISH THE COMPOSITION OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY AND AUTHORIZE THE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, presented the following report on the bill (H. R. 7184) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2256), which was read, referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 7184, a bill to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

ADMINISTRATION OF OFFICER PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY DURING THE EXISTING WAR

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report on the bill (H. R. 7160), to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy during the existing war, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2257) which was read, referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of H. R. 7160, a bill to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy during the existing war, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

TO AUTHORIZE ACCEPTANCE BY OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN OF THE UNITED STATES ARMED FORCES OF DECORATIONS, ETC., TENDERED BY CERTAIN FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS, AND TO CREATE THE DECORATIONS "LEGION OF MERIT," AND "MEDAL FOR MERIT"

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged report on the bill (S. 2404), to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered by governments of cobelligerent nations or the other American republics and to create the decorations to be known as the Legion of Merit, and the Medal for Merit (Rept. No. 2258), which was read, referred to the House Calendar, and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of S. 2404, a bill to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, medals, and emblems tendered by governments of cobelligerent nations or the other American republics and to create the decorations to be known as the Legion of Merit, and the Medal for Merit. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 1 hour to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Military Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO ALIENS IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 433.

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas due to the present world crisis a number of heretofore unknown major problems dealing with the alien situation in the United States has arisen which require the attention of the Congress; and

Whereas so that the Congress, in whom is vested responsibility for enacting legislation governing the problem, may be better informed as to how to approach that important duty: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization be, and it is hereby, authorized to hold hearings for the purpose of making a careful survey and study of the various problems relating to the alien situation in the United States, such as, (1) the question of the proper handling of the thousands of cases of aliens who are temporarily in the United States but who cannot depart because of world conditions; (2) the question of the disposition of aliens, principally criminals, insane, and other highly undesirable types, under order of deportation but who cannot at present be deported; (3) the extremely serious alien enemy situation; (4) the possible necessity of amending the naturalization laws to meet the emergency situation; (5) other studies of the general situation not only as it applies to the present but also with a view to looking forward to a post-war policy; and (6) all other questions in relation thereto which would assist Congress in the enactment of necessary remedial legislation.

The House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to request and secure, for the purposes of this resolution, the cooperation of, the production of records and rules and regulations of, and the assistance of such personnel under the Attorney General, and the services, bureaus, or offices under his jurisdiction, as may be deemed necessary by the committee.

For the purposes of this resolution, the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to sit and act at such time and places within the United States, whether the House is sitting or recessed or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, to take such testimony or records, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Speaker of the House at the request of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by the Sergeant at Arms of the House or by such person or persons as may be designated by him. The chairman of the committee or any member of the committee may administer oaths to witnesses. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of such committee or any subcommittee thereof, or having been required to produce necessary books or papers or documents or vouchers by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the study and investigation heretofore authorized, or who fails to produce such books or papers or documents or vouchers as required by subpenas, shall be held to the penalties provided in section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 192), as amended.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

A resolution as far reaching and dangerous as this one ought to be discussed before the full membership of the House.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will not the gentleman withhold the point of order?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I think the Congress ought to know everything that goes on about this. I insist on my point of order.

Mr. SABATH. Will not the gentleman withhold it for a minute?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I want the House to hear the whole of the proceedings.

Mr. SABATH. I hope the gentleman will not press his point of order at this time. We have two other very important bills we would like to pass.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. If there is going to be discussion on this bill the Congress is going to hear it.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman does not know much about it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Oh, yes; I do; I know a great deal about it.

Mr. SABATH. It comes with a unanimous report from the Immigration Committee.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I cannot help that.

Mr. SABATH. And the work is needed.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. It is far-reaching. The Committee on Immigration and Naturalization can hold its meetings here. All they have to do is pass on legislation. We have the Dies committee to do this other work. I make the point of order a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold that at the request of the Chair?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I will withhold it for a moment, if it is withdrawn.

The SPEAKER. The Chair can make no promise as to what the gentleman from Illinois may do.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am not going to let this go through unless the entire membership is present.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the other two bills are of such great importance that they should be passed without any delay and I withdraw my request for the immediate consideration of House Resolution 433, not because it is not needed and necessary, but for the purpose of enabling the House to pass upon the other two extremely important bills.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMPOSITION OF UNITED STATES NAVY AND AUTHORIZATION OF CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 7184, to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee by unanimous vote has reported a rule on two naval bills. The committee, after hearing the gentleman from Georgia, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, and also the minority leader, came to the conclusion that the bills were of such importance that a special rule should be reported providing for 1 hour's general debate on each. I have no objection to the bill being taken up by unanimous consent, in order to save time, realizing Members want to get away this afternoon, and I do not wish to delay the consideration of the legislation.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and, of course, I am not going to object, will the gentleman from Georgia also incorporate a request that there be 1 hour's debate, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half to be controlled by this side?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, if my first request is granted, I ask unanimous consent that the debate be limited to 1 hour, one-half to be controlled by myself and one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT], ranking minority member of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman state whether or not there will be a roll call on this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There will be a roll call. I wish to announce that if unanimous consent is granted, at the end of the consideration of the bill I will ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] that debate be limited to 1 hour, one-half to be controlled by himself and one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees may have until midnight to file a conference report and statement on the independent offices appropriation bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

ESTABLISHMENT OF COMPOSITION OF UNITED STATES NAVY AND AUTHORIZATION OF CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is the largest single authorization bill for the construction of combatant ships that has ever been considered by the Naval Affairs Committee and reported to the House. It authorizes an increase in the combatant tonnage of aircraft carriers by 500,000 tons, of cruisers by 500,000 tons, and destroyers and destroyer escort vessels by 900,000 tons. It will be noted that this authorization does not provide for increasing the tonnage of capital ships. This omission is occasioned by two facts, first, that existing authorizations for capital ships will, when completed, provide an adequate number of battleships and, second, it is anticipated and is borne out by the war so far that the loss in aircraft carriers, cruisers, and destroyers will be, relatively, much greater than in battleships, and, consequently, provision must be made for a large additional number of these types of ships.

In addition to the emphasis placed upon the construction of aircraft carriers, as is done in this bill, I am pleased to report that the Navy Department is fully alive to the major, if not decisive, role that aircraft carriers and the planes based thereon have been playing in the present war. This does not mean that other types of combatant ships have lost their long-range value, but the policy of the Navy Department in concentrating, for the present, on the construction of aircraft carriers is, in my opinion, entirely sound. This will necessitate deferring the construction of certain other types of ships, the immediate need for which is not so urgent. In other words, I understand that the Navy Department in projecting its immediate ship construction program from time to time will be guided by the most recent war experience in determining the types of combatant ships which require the highest priority.

I am aware that at some future date a readjustment will impend, requiring the conversion of some of our combatant shipbuilding facilities to peacetime production. However, I am further of the opinion that we should utilize to the maximum, for the time being, our entire combatant ship productivity. Every combatant ship that can possibly be constructed is urgently needed in order to bring the present war to an early and successful conclusion. In order to utilize the trained skill of the available shipbuilding industry to the maximum, it is necessary to make plans in such a way that there will be no hiatus in the productive rate.

The program which is contemplated by the bill H. R. 7184 is designed to utilize the country's shipbuilding capacity to the fullest extent which does not cramp or hinder other war programs during the ensuing years. I am advised that the Navy Department estimates that the last keel authorized by this act will be laid by December 31, 1944, and the last ship will be in service before the end of the calendar year 1946.

The enactment of this combatant ship authorization program will merge into the previous authorization acts and not cause any disruption of existing programs. As an illustration, the peak load of construction under the proposed program will be reached in 1945 when the present authorized programs will be fast approaching exhaustion. If this bill is enacted, the Navy Department contemplates getting under way almost immediately, in connection with the aircraft carrier part thereof, while the cruiser and destroyer program will be started early in 1943.

Previous authorizations for the construction of combatant ships have totaled 3,749,480. The vital necessity for additional authorizations at this time is seen in the fact that of the above total authorization, 1,009,245 tons are in service; 2,646,606 tons are under construction, and there remains a balance of only 93,629 tons available.

Let the House bear in mind that of all the enormous shipbuilding program that has heretofore been authorized all of it is under way except 93,629 tons, and

it is necessary that the Navy Department continue to have that flexibility to take care of replacements that may occur as the war progresses.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Do I correctly understand the gentleman to say that of all the authorizations the Congress has ever made, there remain only 93,000 tons on which actual construction has not begun?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. The gentleman does not refer to contracts let, but he means actual construction of the ships?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Previous authorizations for the construction of combatant ships have totaled 3,749,480 tons. The vital necessity for additional authorizations at this time is seen in the fact that, of the above total authorization, 1,009,245 tons are in service and 2,646,606 tons are under construction, leaving a balance of 93,629 tons for which no contracts have been made.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. May I ask the gentleman if in the deliberations of the committee consideration was given to the submarine menace? Does this bill provide for any construction in connection with that?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am coming to that.

In addition to the combatant ships provided for in this bill, provision is made for the construction of 800 small vessels suitable for use as patrol vessels, mine vessels, and the like. The urgent need today for vessels of the small boat type is in the patrol craft category. If the present indications in this connection are borne out by subsequent events, the entire 800-ship authorization for construction of small vessels contained in this bill will be used to provide submarine chasers and torpedo boats. It is contemplated that this authorization will be utilized for the construction of ships of the following types and numbers:

Steel subchasers	400
Wooden subchasers	200
Modern torpedo boats	200

The other ship authorization contained in the bill would authorize the Secretary of the Navy to acquire and convert not exceeding 200 small vessels for coastal defense, patrol, mine sweeping, and similar purposes as he may consider necessary for the successful prosecution of the war. In view of the serious aspects of the submarine warfare along the Atlantic Coast, I need not emphasize the urgent necessity for this authorization.

An important item in the bill, aside from authorization for ship construction, is the provision which permits replacement of combatant ships without regard to the type of ship being replaced. While I am of the opinion that the policy adopted by the Naval Affairs Committee in 1934, that Congress should control the tonnage authorized for the various categories of combatant ships, is sound during peacetime, still, it is apparent that absolute control during wartime is not practical.

I am convinced that the greatest amount of flexibility is necessary to meet the changing requirements of modern warfare, and I have complete confidence, in this connection, that the discretion proposed to be vested in the Navy Department relative to this matter will be wisely administered.

I have attempted in this statement to outline the main features of this extremely important bill now under consideration. I also commend to your careful consideration the detailed report of the Naval Affairs Committee with respect to the bill H. R. 7184. On behalf of the Naval Affairs Committee I recommend early enactment of this extremely important measure.

Under previous laws, Congress, by direction of the Committee on Naval Affairs, has required replacements to be in the category of the ships that have been destroyed. For instance, in the destruction of the *Houston*, that went down in the Coral Sea fight, under the law a cruiser would have to be built back. In the proposed bill, however, we give the Navy the flexibility to authorize the construction of whatever type is necessary to replace any ship, irrespective of the category the ship belongs to that is destroyed.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. In connection with the ship the gentleman has just mentioned that went down in the battle of the Coral Sea, under the legislation here could they convert that, if it was appropriate to do so, into an airplane carrier?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Absolutely. I may say that the Committee on Naval Affairs in peacetime will insist on certain ships of a particular category being replaced. We have to keep the Navy on an even keel and not have it overbalanced in one category and underconstructed in another category.

Take for instance the *Houston*. Under the language of this bill, the Navy Department can determine to lay down the replacement of that vessel in submarines, in cruisers, or in airplane carriers. They can lay it down in any category they see fit to, except in the category of battleships.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Is not the flexibility of which the gentleman speaks necessary today because of the change in the method of warfare due to development of aircraft?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Absolutely. In that connection may I say this? The Navy has considered the battleship as the backbone of its fleet, and the fleet has been built in accordance with that idea. The modern development of aircraft has demonstrated conclusively that the backbone of the Navy today is what is known as the airplane carrier. The airplane carrier, with destroyers, cruisers, and submarines grouped around it, is the spearhead of all modern naval task forces. Therefore, in this bill and in the program of the Navy Department, they are concentrating on airplane carriers.

At the same time let no Member think for one moment that battleships under certain conditions would not play a very dominant role. It may so happen that the enemy's aircraft carriers may be stricken from the sea. It may so happen that ours will be stricken from the sea. We all know that in the Coral Sea fight and in the Midway fight a determined effort was made by both sides to drive out and destroy the airplane carriers. If that happens, and neither side has airplane carriers to any great extent, then battleships will come back into the role they were designed to play before aviation reached this high point of development.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. Aside from the question of flexibility, of allowing the Navy the right to replace vessels as they see fit, would it be in order to say how many airplane carriers, cruisers, and destroyers are contemplated by this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It would not be in order for the committee to disclose the break-down of the combatant ships. I stated this morning in executive session to the Committee on Rules, by permission of the Navy Department, a complete break-down of how many ships this tonnage will turn out according to their program. I cannot disclose publicly how many airplane carriers will be built out of this 500,000 tons, nor can I disclose how many airplane carriers we are converting from other types of ships, or give any detailed information.

Mr. THOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. THOM. What is the comparative cost of construction of a battleship and an aircraft carrier?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That depends on the tonnage. A modern battleship of 35,000 tons will cost in the neighborhood of $75,000,000 to $85,000,000. If it is over that it will run in the neighborhood of $100,000,000. The airplane carrier will cost a great deal less than that amount of money.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. How long does it take to construct them?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. You can construct a modern airplane carrier within a limit of approximately 2 years. It takes approximately 4 years to construct a battleship.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. With respect to the statement that the construction of an airplane carrier requires 2 years, is it not true that the type of ship now being built on the west coast and elsewhere of about 10,000 tons capacity is being built in 46 days? Has the Navy made any use of that type of ship?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Let me say to the gentleman that great ships of the type the gentleman has referred to, known as merchant ships, are being converted into airplane carriers. Of course, they do not have the striking force of the regularly constructed airplane carrier, but they do have a great military value and we are converting a large number. Many of our airplane carriers were originally designed as merchant ships.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. I was just wondering, however, if it would not be possible, and has not Mr. Keyser tried to do the same thing for the airplane carriers as he has done for the merchant ships?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I can only state that the Navy Department is converting maritime ships as fast as it is humanly possible to convert them where they think they can meet the requirements of the type of ship which has a limited and particular duty to perform. The type of ship to which the gentleman from New Mexico is referring, in all probability, would never be brought into direct contact with a modern airplane carrier, but it does have a great military advantage and we are using them in certain restricted areas and converting a great number of them.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. A moment ago the gentleman mentioned the value of the capital ships. Is it not true should the airplane carrier be disposed of in battle, it will be necessary to have at hand the gun power of capital ships to meet the gun power of the enemy's capital ships?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Absolutely, and may I say that the program of the Navy Department is that we are building a certain number of battleships. Not a single one of those ships for which the keel has actually been laid will be converted into an airplane carrier, because they do not have the movability, they do not have the speed essential for an airplane carrier, but all of those capital ships that are in the blueprint stage, and for which contracts have not been made, and for which keels have not been laid, will be deferred for the time being so the ways can be used to lay down the airplane carriers called for in this bill.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. I have noticed certain statements in the press attributed to the gentleman and other members of his committee relative to the submarine menace in the Gulf and on the Atlantic seaboard. I further notice that we are authorizing aircraft carriers, cruisers, and destroyers. What vessels are being constructed by the Navy to meet the submarine menace?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We have a construction program that involves some 1,300 vessels and they are all to be used as much as possible in combating the submarine menace. This program here provides for a thousand more, plus those already under way. All of them will be used to combat the submarine menace. The House must bear in mind, of course, that we are all concerned about the submarine menace. However, this is a world war and it must be visualized by the naval authorities from a world standpoint. It may be necessary to have certain equipment at one place and that, in turn, lessens a proper defense at another place. It is a most difficult job on a coast line as large as the coast line of the United States to have adequate protection just at this time successfully to destroy the submarine menace. But I can assure the House that everything humanly possible is being done, both in furnishing aircraft and in furnishing equipment to combat the submarine menace. When you realize that the British Isles could be put in the Gulf of Mexico, you can readily see how large a task it is to handle the submarine menace on the Atlantic, the Gulf, and the Pacific.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. I presume steps are being taken to construct an additional number of high-speed tankers to accompany the fleet. Can the gentleman tell us about that?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is an auxiliary and that is not in this program. That is already under way.

Mr. HINSHAW. Are we going to have a sufficient number of them?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It all depends on how many survive attacks or how many are destroyed. But, of course, you could not run your fleet without tankers. May I say that with a task force it is necessary for the tankers to accompany the fleet, because the task force will probably have to fuel out on the seas. So, you could not have the fleet afloat unless you have an ample number of tankers, and that is just as important as having the men to operate the ships.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the language broad enough to permit the construction of what is known as mosquito boats?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It is broad enough to permit the construction of mosquito boats, and submarine boats and patrol craft, any craft the Navy thinks necessary to combat the submarine menace, and may I say the Navy Department advised the committee that these ships, these small craft, will be built all over the United States. They will be built in the Mississippi Valley, they will be built in the Gulf area, and in the Great Lakes area, wherever there is available facilities these ships will be built, and if any Member knows of any shipbuilding company that has not enough work to keep it busy, if he will notify the Bureau of Yards and Docks, they will be glad to see to it that that shipbuilding company has facilities for the construction of these ships.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS. Is is not a fact, as I have gathered from various statements in the press, that relatively few ships under convoy of the Navy have been lost from submarine attacks?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Up to yesterday, under the convoy system, not a single ship has been lost. As to what happened down at Virginia Beach, coming into Chesapeake Bay, that was part of a convoy that probably reached that point, and there were two sinkings yesterday, but under the convoy system up to date what happened yesterday was the only loss.

Mr. SANDERS. And that would lead to the conclusion that the Navy has the means available in the convoy system to combat submarines. Perhaps the gentleman cannot divulge the details, but would the gentleman say from his knowledge of the situation that further steps are in process of being developed, satisfactory to the gentleman, to meet the submarine menace?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The Naval Affairs Committee has been deeply concerned about the submarine menace as well as about a great many other things. We had the ranking admiral dealing with that before the committee and we went into it in executive session, and today there is a member of our committee belonging to the minority side, because we have no politics in our committee, who is making a most careful investigation with the various admirals from one end of the country to the other to see how the program is getting on and what is being done and if everything is being done to combat the submarine menace. We are all conscious of the seriousness of it. It must be combatted, but at the same time we have to hold Pearl Harbor, and we have to hold the lines going to Australia, and we have to hold the lines going to Iceland and to Ireland, and we have to maintain the convoys throughout the length and breadth of the seas. It is a big problem to deal with.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. I believe the gentleman states it would take about 2 years to construct an airplane carrier.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. How long will it take to convert another ship to one?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I would rather not go into that now. We are converting certain combatant ships that were laid down for different types into airplane carriers, and we are making

wonderful progress. If the gentleman knew the number of airplane carriers that we are building, the number that is being converted, the number called for in this program, plus the number of merchant ships being converted, he would readily conclude that the Navy Department is conscious of the great importance of aircraft carriers, and leaving nothing undone to bring about complete domination in the Atlantic, with sufficient carriers to dominate the situation.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. We appreciate that everything the gentleman says is true, and we appreciate the great work that he and his committee have done. If certain information cannot be disclosed, no one will complain. The gentleman stated that it would cost about $75,000,000 to construct a battleship.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. And very much less to construct an airplane carrier.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is correct.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN. Would it be in order for the gentleman to state how much?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It all depends upon the tonnage. One type of airplane carrier will cost a great deal more than another, and we will have different tonnages of airplane carriers, because it must be borne in mind that an aviator has to have a stable, steady base on which to alight. Just visualize what these great boys are doing—a ship speeding along at 30 knots an hour—flying probably 180 or 200 miles from that ship and combating an enemy. He comes back with 50 or 100 wounds in his airplane. The speed of that airplane carrier is still 25 or 30 knots. He must land upon that or else go down to a watery grave. Therefore, you must build carriers of certain tonnage that will afford him a stable place upon which to land. The larger they are the more money they will cost.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. MAY. I think the House and the public generally would be interested in knowing that there is complete coordination of effort between both the Army and the Navy on every battle front, in every section of the far-flung world.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct. As you have read in the newspapers, the recent fight in the Coral Sea shows the complete coordination of the land-based planes and the surface planes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if there are no further questions, I wish to make this statement: I am going to ask for a roll call on this bill. I want the country to know that, whatever our views may have been prior to December 7, this Congress, irrespective of those views, has given its unanimous support to every preparedness program that has been brought before the House.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I would like to ask the number of submarines that will be provided for?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I cannot tell the gentleman the number. I disclosed it this morning, but suffice it to say that the bill that was passed a few days ago provided for 100 more submarines than had heretofore been authorized.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I understand, and there will be additional submarines provided for in this bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Oh, yes; a great many.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Taking into consideration the ships we have, what we are building, and what has been authorized and will be authorized by the passage of this bill, would one be correct in assuming in the near future the United States will have the greatest Navy in the world, both from the standpoint of ships and tonnage?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I may say that when this program is completed, probably it will be larger than that of the combined navies of the world.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, after the illuminating and detailed statement by the distinguished chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee I am sure there is little left to be said upon the bill before us, H. R. 7184, to establish the composition of the Navy. And yet, as the acting ranking minority member of that great committee, I feel I should supplement his remarks by at least a brief statement on this historic step toward naval supremacy.

As the chairman has stated, this bill came from the Naval Affairs Committee with a unanimous favorable report, and I have no doubt that on the roll call which will follow this debate there will not be a single adverse vote in the House. That is the way most of the major naval bills have come from the committee, and that is the way the House has reacted to most of them.

The chairman of the committee has told you that this was the largest naval authorization bill that had ever been reported to the House by the Naval Affairs Committee. I venture to say further that it authorizes the largest naval building program that has ever been undertaken at one time by any nation in the entire history of the world. It authorizes the construction of 500,000 tons of aircraft carriers, 500,000 tons of cruisers, and 900,000 tons of destroyers and destroyer escort vessels; and, in addition to that, undertakes the construction of 800 small vessels suitable for use as patrol vessels, mine vessels, and other similar small surface craft which have so effectively proved their worth and necessity in the present war.

Some years ago when the present broad program was started by the Naval Affairs Committee of the House—and this bill is only the latest phase of that program—someone asked me how large a navy, in my opinion, we should have. This, as I say, was years before we entered this war. I replied that we ought to have a navy as large as any combination of navies which could conceivably be brought against us by any combination of enemies. That has been the goal of the Naval Affairs Committee, and when the program called for in this bill is completed, that is exactly what we will have. It will be larger than all the rest of the navies of the world combined. If from now on until the end of the war our Navy continues to have as great success as it has had to date, and we believe it will have that success, there can be no possible doubt of that statement, because it is the aim of our Navy to sink Axis warships faster than the Axis Powers can build them.

Some of you may know that in regard to aircraft carriers the Japanese losses so far in this war have been six to our one.

They have sunk one of our aircraft carriers and we have sunk six of theirs, reducing their total airplane carrier strength to less than half what it was at the beginning of the war. The Japs, of course, are building more aircraft carriers, too, and that is one of the principal reasons for this bill.

You will recall the statement of Admiral Nimitz yesterday that the Japanese losses at Coral Sea and at Midway had been 10 to 1 against the Japanese both in planes and personnel. This bill will help the Navy to continue that ratio, and we hope even to better it.

The chairman said a few moments ago something that he said in committee when we were considering this bill. He said that it might be possible that the warring nations would destroy each other's airplane carriers so fast that after a while neither of them would have any, and that then the battleships would come in. I think then, on the record of past performances, that it will be a long time before the battleships come in, for this bill is calculated to prevent any such thing as an elimination of our aircraft carrier force by the enemy. It will give us a continuing supply of carriers to meet any contingency.

Now, I am going to make a statement, and I want you to know that I am making it sincerely and that I thoroughly believe it. I have been convinced of it ever since I have been a member of the committee. When you listened to the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee a few minutes ago you listened to the man who, in my opinion, is the outstanding authority in the United States on naval policy. You will note that I said policy—not strategy or tactics, for that is the field of the professional naval expert. This program of building the greatest navy in the world began years ago in the Naval Affairs Committee, just as soon as the expiration of the arms limitation treaty would let us begin. From that time until the present the naval policy of the United States has

been made by the Naval Affairs Committee of the House under the leadership of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]. He has been years ahead of the country and of the Navy itself in many of the most important features of our great Naval Establishment which have proven most effective and the most useful in this war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 additional minutes.

My colleagues on the committee, including myself, all think so much of this great chairman that sometime during this session, if time permits, I am going to try to make a compilation of the outstanding developments in naval policy that have been brought about in the last few years under his leadership. When the full story is told I have no doubt that you will agree with what I have said as to the supremacy of our distinguished chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], in this field.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. Gladly.

Mr. HARE. I am wondering whether or not the gentleman has heard the report that many of the naval air pilots at Midway were equipped with only discarded planes?

Mr. MOTT. No; I have not heard that report, and if that had been the case, I may say to the gentleman from South Carolina, we would have heard it in committee before this time, because the ranking naval officers, those in responsible charge of the conduct of this war for the Navy, have been most cooperative in giving to the Naval Affairs Committee all the information they could possibly give. In answer to our direct questions they never evade; they realize that in order for the committee to work intelligently it is necessary for them to have the information. If any such thing has occurred as the gentleman has referred to, I am sure we would have known of it.

Mr. HARE. I am very glad to have this information, because the report is current that we probably would not have lost so many pilots at Midway had they been equipped with the more modern type of fighting planes that we have on hand.

Mr. MOTT. I am glad to assure the gentleman that our naval pilots are equipped with modern fighting planes, and that one of the objectives of the Navy has always been quality in planes as well as in ships. The Navy has never sacrificed quality for quantity, and I am certain it never will.

I have just one more observation to make: I wish here to emphasize the point that we all should maintain, as I believe all of us do, the greatest confidence in the Navy of the United States and in the officer and enlisted personnel which is manning this Navy. In my opinion we never have had a better Navy in point of quality at any time in our history. Before this war is over our Navy will have made a record such as has never been surpassed by any Navy in all the history of the world. We should have supreme confidence as long as this war lasts in the naval leaders, in the Army leaders, and in the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, for it is only through that confidence and complete support that we do our full part in bringing the war to a speedy and a completely successful conclusion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the balance of my time to the distinguished gentleman from the State of Washington, Mr. MAGNUSON, a member of the committee, a lieutenant commander in the Navy, who has just returned from service with the Pacific Fleet.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to yield to the gentleman from Washington 10 minutes of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 11 minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to speak on this bill, but I realize the membership of this House want to find out as many facts as they can of the war.

There is very little we can say—those who are on the committee and those who may go out and look at some of these things—because of censorship. However, I was fortunate enough to spend some time in the Pacific area and during that time I not only learned some lessons, which I have tried to impart to my committee colleagues but I have reached some conclusions. If any Member of this House were to ask me the main conclusion arrived at regarding the composition of our Navy my answer would be this bill.

It places emphasis upon aircraft carriers and cruisers. The chairman could not tell you how many will be built, but the emphasis is there; and, thank God, we have deferred action on battleships for the time being.

I bring no note of pessimism regarding the Pacific war. If one could be pessimistic, it would be only because of geography and geography alone. We have little conception of the tremendous distances involved. This is why ships of the carrier type must be built—carriers, cruisers, and destroyers in great quantities. It is hard to reach any place in Japanese territory or Japanese held territory from our bases without traveling thousands of miles. The longer the cruising range, the more carriers and cruisers we have with the speed and that range, just so much shorter will be the Japanese war.

I have been asked many times, "What is your impression of the Japanese?" Well, my personal feeling toward them, of course, could not be expressed here on the floor. This is more or less universal. I have lived among them out on the Pacific coast. They are pretty tough. And one should remember in connection with this, that they have been 20 long years figuring this thing out. They will lay out a plan. It will be a good one, and they will go to their death to carry it out. But here is what is going to whip them. If something goes wrong along the way, if something unorthodox takes place, or if something happens that is not in the book, they do not know what to do. They require another huddle before they can go ahead with another plan. Coral Sea and Midway demonstrated that. What is going to whip the Japs in the long run is good old Yankee, old-fashioned ingenuity to cope with these things as we have demonstrated in all Pacific battles.

Mr. Speaker, I was glad to see on return in this House that Members were not standing up every time some ship was sunk by a submarine off their State or near their district and shouting for protection and to have the Navy to go down there to protect that particular area. This House has been patriotic and sensible about that because the Navy is fighting a war all over the world. We have forces in Europe, Australia, Alaska, and other places. We just cannot divert these forces. And we will combat this submarine menace. As a matter of fact, this bill combats the menace because it provides for hundreds of these small patrol boats to work in cooperation with the air force. It is a job in which they all have to work together. An airplane spots a submarine, keeps it down, and the patrol boat goes out and gets it. Do not let any one, for one minute convince you that we should take the Navy away from convoy lines by which we are supplying these great world fronts.

Sometimes the public has been excited about this, but you have not done so and you have not sold the United States Navy short. They know what they are doing. If the Japanese are tough, let me tell you something about the boys out with the fleets. They are getting pretty darned tough themselves.

It is not a very easy job out there. The boys for instance who are working off Pearl Harbor, when they do get shore leave have little to do. Hawaii is an armed camp. Many of them even stay aboard ship, because the restrictions are not as bad. It is pretty tough going. The submarine crews that go out on patrols sometimes are out there as long as 74 days. They never see the light of day for 74 days. They are in close quarters. Down in the daytime and up at night. When they do get into Pearl Harbor, as I say, there is little for them to do.

If some think our boys are not taking it, they are mistaken. I know this House does not think that. You have given them everything within your power.

I have been amused too at another thing, and I want to make this statement for the benefit of my colleagues. No one out in the Pacific Fleet is critical of Congress. They think Congress is doing a pretty good job.

There are a lot of things needed out there, but there is no "beefing" or "crabbing" about it, because they know, as the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs pointed out, that this is a world

war. They are getting along with what they have and they are doing pretty well with it. They know there is more coming.

I can bring back to my colleagues the feeling that they feel everybody at home is doing a good job.

A good example of your sound policy here was when the Japanese attacked Dutch Harbor. The Navy expected an attack on Dutch Harbor about 30 days before it happened. Some will ask, Why did not you send something up there to defend Dutch Harbor? You did not get excited about it either; the Japanese wanted us to. But they did not fool our old friend Admiral Nimitz, and as a result the Japanese suffered the worst defeat they ever suffered in the history of their nation. I say that when these things happen, when a submarine moves around close to your district and mine, let us continue that policy. Those fellows out there know what they are doing, and let us not have too many Monday morning quarterbacks at home.

The United States Navy is no mean organization. They know pretty well what they can and cannot do. This bill provides what they now need. This bill answers the lessons—as bitter and as hard as they are—of the new type of naval warfare. This bill is one answer to all destroyers of freedom. This bill will make in time the real guardian of that freedom—the United States Navy—the greatest force in the world.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. JENKS].

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I want to make just a small contribution in favor of this bill before us today. I had the privilege and the honor of being selected as one of a committee of four 2 years ago to visit Pearl Harbor. We were taken out there from Long Beach on a heavy cruiser. We were 7 days on board one of those heavy cruisers and if ever there was confidence in the hearts of a thousand boys who were on that ship, it was those boys that I had the opportunity of seeing performing for 7 days going out and 7 days coming back.

I came home and went into an election right after that, 2 years ago. I told my people in New Hampshire that the Japanese Fleet would never get beyond Pearl Harbor. I am of the same opinion now, because a year before that I went from the home of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], in Seattle, all the way down the Pacific coast, and I saw all the fortifications, I saw all of the flying fields, I saw all of the preparations that were being made for just the occasion that we are in now.

But I want to say one thing, that I believe the American people have underestimated the Japanese and have perhaps overestimated ourselves in this Pacific war. I do not mean by that that we are not going to win the war, because we know we are.

When I went down to the Navy Department, which was almost the first thing I did when I came into Congress, I talked with Admiral Leahy there, and he talked very discouragingly to me about submarines. I talked with him about submarines, because we have the Portsmouth Navy Yard, at Portsmouth, N. H., and it builds nothing but submarines. Admiral Leahy said to me at that time:

> The Department begins to think that submarines are beginning to be a little obsolete and that battleships are the things we must have.

At that time we had three building ways at the Portsmouth Navy Yard building submarines, and I was trying to increase the business there naturally. Today we have seven building ways and we are launching a submarine every 30 days.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES].

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in the limited time we have to discuss this bill, I wish to call the attention of the Members of the House to the program from 1934 up to date as set forth in the report of the Committee on Naval Affairs. That gives you, in a concise statement, the authorizations that have been recommended by the committee down through that period.

While it is true that we have emphasized the construction of the heavier type ships such as the battleship, this is simply because were were warned in 1938 by Admiral Leahy, then Chief of Naval Operations, that unless we started to do something toward building up the fleet of the United States we would soon find ourselves in a dangerous condition because of the tremendous program then under way by the Japanese and the other naval powers of the world.

It is well for us to recall that in 1922, as a result of the Naval Disarmament Conference, we actually scrapped 29 battleships in order to show the nations of the world that we were vitally interested in peace. Of these battleships, 18 were actually in service and the other 11 were in various stages of construction. Some of these were 70 percent complete.

In 1938, Admiral Leahy emphasized the urgency of getting under way, saying that we had done no heavy construction work since 1922, a period of 16 years, and that in view of the tremendous program they were aware Japan and other naval powers were carrying out, it was important for us to build up the heavier type of ships that were so necessary to combat the possible danger of a heavier and stronger enemy fleet.

He made it known to us then, that with the mere 20-percent increase requested, he would be unable to carry on a successful campaign in the Japanese home waters. He further said that if he received three times the increase for which he then asked, in 1938, he would be unable to cope successfully with the Japanese in their home waters. I make this statement because we were aware of the expansion of the naval program that the Japanese were carrying out. Acting on the advice of Admiral Leahy and the Navy Department the Congress soon passed the act of May 17, 1938, authorizing an increase in construction of 295,412 tons of combatant ships. This was followed by the Expansion Act of June 14, 1940, providing for a further increase of 11 percent or 167,000 tons, and by the act of July 19, 1940, of an increase of 70 percent, or 1,325,000 tons. During this period—1938–40—Congress also authorized a tremendous expansion in naval public works, auxiliary ships, and aircraft, all of which is set forth in the tables I am including herewith.

This bill now before the House with a unanimous vote of approval by the Naval Affairs Committee incorporates the largest single authorization for expansion of the Navy ever presented to the House. The necessity for authorizing such an expansion at the present time should be made clear. Of all the tonnage authorized in previous acts, from the Vinson-Trammell Act of 1934 through and including authorization for an additional 200,000 tons of submarines passed by this House on May 13, 1942, less than 100,000 tons remain not already under construction. The country's shipbuilding capacity for combatant ships is limited and, therefore, must be utilized to the fullest extent which does not hinder war programs for other ships and material.

The shipyard capacity is further limited by the size of ways that are available, there being only a limited number available for ships of larger tonnages. This situation requires very long-range planning. Another factor that enters into the problem of expanding the Navy is the type of shipyard. Ways alone do not indicate the ability of a shipyard to construct certain types of vessels. The nature of the upland facilities, that is, the type of machinery contained in the shops and yards adjacent to the shipways determine, in a large measure, what type of ship can be constructed in a given yard. In other words, only certain yards can build battleships, the larger cruisers, and the large type of aircraft carrier. Submarine construction is peculiar and can only be conducted in certain yards. Some large ways can be adapted for use in the construction of two small ships instead of one large ship, while a medium-size way can only be used for the construction of either one medium-size ship or one small ship. From this, the necessity of long-range planning of combatant ship construction can be readily seen.

Another element pointing to the necessity authorizing the expansion called for by the present bill is the unexpected speed-up in the supplying of material and the construction of war vessels. In laying out any program it is necessary to estimate the length of time the ship will occupy the ways, that is, the interval between laying the keel and the launching. Such marvelous strides have been taken in shortening these periods of late that periods on the ways, based on past experience, are apt to be misleading.

It has been found that if materials can be made available, ships can be fabricated on the ways in times which 2 years ago would have been unbelievable. If these periods are reduced very much further, we will find empty ways waiting for work much earlier than had been expected. As a result, instead of having a program which would occupy our facilities through 1944, we now find shipbuilding unemployment rapidly approaching.

The enactment of the proposed authorization program will fit into the planning under the previous authorization acts without any disruption of those programs. If this bill is enacted, the Navy Department plans to get under way almost immediately on the aircraft carrier allocation thereunder, while the cruiser and destroyer program will be started in the early months of next year. The data presented to the committee showed that the productive capacity of the yards building combatant ships will be available and can only be fully utilized by enactment of the additional authorization called for in the present bill. All the shipbuilding ways of the country must be kept active and the only way to insure this activity is to provide authorization for such types of ships as can be constructed on all the types of ways in order to maintain the balanced fleet that is necessary for the successful prosecution of any war.

The conception of a balanced fleet has been somewhat changed by results of naval engagements of the present war. In this respect, the requirement of a greater number of aircraft carriers and supporting cruisers and destroyers has been met in the proposed legislation. However, recognition of the part of the submarine in the war has been provided for in the revision clause incorporated in the committee amendment to section 1 of the bill, which authorizes varying the tonnages of any class by 30 percent, permitting some of this tonnage to be used for the construction of submarines.

A question that has naturally arisen in the minds of a large number of people is, "Why the sudden expansion of carrier construction now?" It will be recalled that the Limitation of Armament Conferences resulted in a specific tonnage restriction for carriers for the nations concerned; it is a well-known fact that this country built up to that tonnage, the U. S. S. *Wasp* representing the last increment within the carrier category. Due to the tonnage restriction imposed, it was necessary to accept in the carriers we built a number of design limitations. Assuming that a reasonable number of landing platforms were required, it was impossible to put in these vessels protection, in particular, which would have been desirable due to the fact that such additional protection resulted in considerable increase in tonnage for each unit.

With regard to the development of radical departures from previously conceived principles of naval warfare, nothing has occurred to date to indicate that any carrier in sea operations has accomplished more than had been expected. The current problem is rather one of building, by every means practicable, an increased number of carriers in order to overcome the handicaps imposed by previous international conferences.

It is common knowledge that the war in the Pacific has developed into a war of naval task forces. It is also generally known, and consistent with previous conceptions, that any force of major proportions must be supported by air power brought to bear either from carriers with the force concerned or from adjacent shore positions. Due to the vast area involved in the Pacific in particular, the task forces required in that area are correspondingly large in number; this in turn requires a considerable increase in carrier strength.

It is by no means considered that the day of the battleship is over. It has always been believed that battleships would require air as well as cruiser, destroyer, and other support; the battleships sunk to date by aircraft have been destroyed, principally, due to the lack of such proper support as is within the province of carriers to supply.

Japan has a number of strong battleships, and it will undoubtedly develop that while isolated cases of destruction of these craft by aircraft will occur, it is not believed that the destruction of this force of heavy ships can be depended upon without the existence of a correspondingly large force of similar craft available to us.

By amending the previous authorization acts so as to permit constructing replacement vessels for those lost in any of the combatant-ship categories, additional precaution is provided for maintaining a balanced fleet, including battleships.

The committee feels that the present success of the Navy Department in carrying out its shipbuilding program beyond all reasonable expectations should be recognized and stimulated by the enactment of authorization for additional expansion at the present time. It is vital to the national security that we expedite action on this bill so that the construction program can get under way with the least possible delay.

Ship construction authorizations since 1938

Authorizing act	Combatant		Auxiliaries		Patrol, mine, and miscellaneous		Estimated cost		
	Number of vessels	Tonnage	Number of vessels	Tonnage	Number of vessels	Tonnage	Construction and machinery	Armor, armament, and ammunition	Total
Naval Expansion Act, Public Law 528, 75th Cong., May 17, 1938	47	308,350					$674,094,000	$285,630,000	$959,724,000
			22				205,096,162	36,450,000	241,546,162
					43		26,186,978	2,022,000	28,208,978
Two Motor Vessel Act, Public Law 212, 76th Cong., July 25, 1939			2				2,715,110		2,715,110
11 Percent Expansion Act, Public Law 629, 76th Cong., June 14, 1940	22	166,725					397,549,000	124,225,000	521,774,000
			22				207,318,000	24,725,000	232,043,000
					7		23,267,000	2,100,000	25,367,000
First Supplemental Appropriation Act, Public Law 667, 76th Cong., June 26, 1940			7				29,135,097	4,300,000	33,435,097
					289		113,969,475	25,125,000	139,094,475
70 Percent Expansion Act, Public Law 757, 76th Cong., July 19, 1940	247						3,533,504,000	1,317,950,000	4,851,454,000
			23				227,250,000	43,525,000	270,775,000
					72		60,588,500	15,600,000	76,188,500
Second Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1941, Public Law 781, 76th Cong., Sept. 9, 1940			22				108,463,363	15,650,000	124,113,363
					2		2,348,000	450,000	2,798,000
Small Vessels Act, Public Law 4, 77th Cong., Jan. 31, 1941						400	400,000,000	93,000,000	493,000,000
Fifth Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1941, Public Law 29, 77th Cong., Apr. 5, 1941			12				54,000,000	8,570,000	65,570,000
1941 Auxiliary Vessel Act, Public Law 72, May 24, 1941			91				509,223,000	90,000,000	640,000,000
					57		40,777,000		
400 Vessels for Local Defense, Public Law 323, Nov. 21, 1941					400		300,000,000	110,000,000	410,000,000
Third Supplemental, Public, 353, 77th Cong., approved Dec. 17, 1941			[1] 102	404,923			485,907,600	314,525,000	944,746,600
					[1] 174	120,262	144,314,000		
					400		337,000,000	110,000,000	447,000,000
150,000 tons combatant vessels, Public Law 369, 77th Cong., Dec. 23, 1941	46						487,643,000	145,900,000	633,543,000
200,000 tons combatant vessels, Public Law 551, 77th Cong., May 13, 1942		200,000					750,000,000	137,500,000	887,500,000
Total							9,120,349,285	2,907,247,000	12,027,596,285

[1] 274,815 tons unassigned; total estimated cost, $369,778,400.

Public Works authorization acts, from June 25, 1938, to date (May 11, 1942)

Authorization act	Date		Total amount authorized
75th Cong., Public, 737	June 25, 1938	Yard, base, and radio-finder facilities (purchase of land, construction of buildings, and furnishing of accessories at navy yards, bases, and radio stations).	$3, 879, 057
76th Cong., Public, 43	Apr. 25, 1939	Hepburn board air bases (purchase of land, construction of buildings, and furnishing of accessories at naval air stations and laboratory buildings at naval aircraft factory).	66, 800, 000
76th Cong., Public, 106	June 2, 1939	Expansion of facilities (construction of drydocks, shop buildings, and furnishing accessories for same).	53, 854, 500
76th Cong., Public, 635	June 15, 1940	Air base bill (10,000 planes) (purchase of land, construction of buildings, and furnishing of accessories at air stations to provide facilities for 10,000-plane program).	177, 994, 362
76th Cong., Public, 786	Sept. 18, 1940	Drydock construction and improvements (purchase and construction of drydocks)	23, 680, 000
77th Cong., Public, 21	Mar. 23, 1941	Naval ammunition depots and naval air station facilities (buildings and accessories at ammunition depots and naval air stations).	100, 502, 883
77th Cong., Public, 22	do	Shore facilities (general construction at shore establishments of the Navy)	245, 228, 500
77th Cong., Public 129	June 24, 1941	Section bases for small craft (construction of buildings, facilities, etc., to establish auxiliary bases for small patrol craft).	50, 000, 000
77th Cong., Public 174	July 14, 1941	Expansion of facilities (construction work ashore, such as buildings, roads, services, etc., and the furnishing of equipment and accessories for shore establishments).	31, 115, 000
77th Cong., Public 210	Aug. 16, 1941	Air facilities (construction of facilities for lighter-than-air craft)	22, 600, 000
77th Cong., Public 241	Aug. 21, 1941	Shore facilities (construction work ashore, such as buildings, roads, services, etc., and the furnishing of equipment and accessories for shore establishments).	244, 929, 800
77th Cong., Public 378	Dec. 26, 1941	Public works (construction work ashore, such as buildings, roads, services, etc., and the furnishing of equipment and accessories for shore establishments).	310, 000, 000
77th Cong., Public 438	Feb. 6, 1942	do	450, 000, 000
77th Cong., Public 531	Apr. 28, 1942	do	800, 000, 000
Total			2, 580, 584, 102

Aircraft

Authorizing acts	Airplanes	Lighter-than-air craft
20-percent act, May 17, 1938, Public, 528, 75th Cong	3, 000	1 training; rigid, 3,000,000 cubic feet.
11-percent act, June 14, 1940, Public, 629, 76th Cong	4, 500	Not to exceed 18 nonrigids.
Airbase bill, June 15, 1940, Public, 635, 76th Cong	[1]10, 000	Not to exceed 48 nonrigids.
70-percent act, July 19, 1940, Public, 757, 76th Cong	15, 000+	
Current Navy program to reach and maintain	27, 000	
S. 2496, 77th Cong., signed by the President June 17, 1942		Provide and maintain lighter-than-air craft at a total of 200.

[1] 16,000 pilots.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

A TURNING POINT IN NAVAL POLICY

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am sure it is a pleasure for any Member of the House to join in the tribute the gentleman from Oregon paid to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] on the leadership he has given in the development of the American Navy. We who have seen him work know that he has had to lead, sometimes against the opposition of entrenched opinion downtown, giving evidence, if evidence is needed, that Congress does perform a valuable function in a people's government. And recently, we have seen that not only has the gentleman from Georgia advocated spending money for a navy, he has tried to have it spent honestly and efficiently. The Committee on Naval Affairs has done an excellent job in exposing excessive costs and inefficiency.

Now then, I feel equally sure that the Members of the House will join in a tribute to the ranking minority member of the committee the gentleman from Minnesota [MEL MAAS], now a colonel in the Marines, and to the gentleman from Oregon himself [Mr. MOTT] for the leadership they have given and for what they have done in the development of the American Navy, and particularly what the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] has done in the development of bases in the Pacific area. He fought 5 years on this floor, in committee room, downtown, and in the forum of public opinion, for the establishment of an air base at Tongue Point. He fought again, almost single-handed at first, for the naval shore station at Tillamook. But he won those fights, and in so doing he established for the Navy and for the United States a policy of developing shore stations. The gentleman from Oregon began that fight before land-based aircraft stopped the threat of a German invasion for England. He began that fight before land-based flying fortresses and carrier-borne bombers went out from Midway and smashed the Japs, smashed them before they got within firing range of our battleships. And so I pay tribute, too, to the gentleman from Oregon for what he has done as a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs. I am not sure that he is entirely satisfied with what was achieved in the past, but he certainly pointed the way and is entitled to some of the credit for the new policy that is being written into law today. As the bases that have been developed along the Pacific coast and in Hawaii and in Alaska get into action and as we hear the results of what is being done from them the country will realize that we owe a debt of gratitude to the members of the Naval Affairs Committee who have fought for them.

I enjoyed as every Member did this afternoon the report the gentleman from Washington brought back from the battle of the Pacific. He said, "Do not sell the Navy short." I want to add to that, "Do not sell the marines short." When the full story of the battle of Midway is released, you will find that there are new laurels resting upon the Marine Corps, which is a part of the Naval Establishment.

Mr. Speaker, the bill before us this afternoon, marks a definite turning point in the naval policy of the United States. It recognizes, as nothing before has recognized, the change that the airplane has wrought in naval warfare. Possibly it took the loss of those British ships, the H. M. S. *Hood* and *Repulse*, to jolt our collective thinking. Possibly it took the successes in the Coral Sea and at Midway, even and including the loss of the *Lexington*, a carrier, to bring this about, this recognition of air power in naval mastery. Whatever it has been, thank God for the day that we have called a halt to the slow, costly construction of huge battleships and turned to the production of aircraft carriers and smaller, faster surface ships.

I speak on this point with some feeling because my own position with respect to our naval program of the past few years is being misinterpreted by people who looked at a vote and never looked further to determine the reasons. I refer to a misinterpretation placed upon a vote where I voted against the passage of a naval appropriation bill. I voted "no" on that occasion in protest against the pursuance of a construction policy that was putting battleships ahead of air power. And that my position may be made clear, with permission of the House, I refer at this time to a colloquy which

took place between myself and the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] on the floor of the House March 25, 1938. I quote:

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. It was repeatedly brought out in the debate on the new Navy bill that the $70,000,000 battleships would cost from eighty to one hundred millions by the time they are commissioned. I merely want to add in comment that I think it is the belief of most of the people that I know that they have more confidence in the defensive ability of either the Air Corps in the Army or the air forces of the Navy than they have in the addition of one battleship; and, as far as I am concerned, and as most of the people in my part of the country are concerned, they would rather see the air forces extended than to see a supercruiser built.

I am struck also by the concluding sentence in the committee report relating to the Air Corps, which reads as follows:

"There is evidence in the possession of the committee that we greatly excel any power in the world in naval aviation, and that, from the standpoint of project airplanes on hand, on order, and remaining to be ordered under funds heretofore made available, both Army and Navy, we are only excelled by the British Empire."

Mr. TERRY. I understand that that is correct. At the present time, of course, our Army Air Force contemplates a program of 2,320 project planes to be completed by June 1940, but, of course, in the meantime the situation of the other nations may have changed.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I wonder if the gentleman could tell me what these new planes cost, such as were recently used in the trip to Argentina, those flying fortresses?

Mr. TERRY. I understand that Army planes of the type of the flying fortresses under the command of Col. Robert Olds, that went to South America and made the wonderful trip back here in about 11 hours, cost about $250,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars per plane?

Mr. TERRY. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Speaking for one, I feel if the Army will build a few more of those planes, we will not need to build so many $70,000,000 battleships. Which means more defense—1 of those ships or 280 flying fortresses? I endorse the suggestion of the gentleman for some sort of a committee that will give us a picture of our combined strength in planes—Marine Corps, Army, and Navy—and hope the information will be made available to the country and to the Congress. I think it would be very valuable.

Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to say "I told you so," I am merely trying to point out that some of us who voted in protest against expenditure of funds for what we believed to be a mode of naval warfare that was outdated, yes, outdated before war broke out in Europe in September 1939. The exchange of remarks I have cited was in March 1938, and, as will be noted, began with a reference to the Navy battleship bill.

Now the bill before us today not merely proposes to build aircraft carriers instead of battleships, but it proposes to build some small, speedy patrol boats. I quote from the committee's report:

The vital need today for vessels of the small-boat type is in the patrol-craft category. * * * It is believed that when the official program is determined, it will consist of ships of the following types and numbers:

Steel subchasers	400
Wooden subchasers	200
Motor torpedo boats	200

And again, I speak with personal conviction. Some Members will remember the day when it was proposed to give away our entire fleet of motor torpedo boats, the mosquito boat incident. And some will remember that I called attention to a law on the statute books which made that gift illegal.

In spite of the fact that the transfer would have left us without any of the motor torpedo boats until more could be built, in spite of the fact that the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs unanimously adopted a resolution of protest and demanded an explanation, and in spite of the fact that this incident took place months before the overage destroyer trade for some bases, and in spite of the fact that I had urged acquisition of outlying bases, and had introduced bills asking for that action, some people with short memories have confused the mosquito-boat incident with the destroyer trade.

Some Members of Congress will recall that considerable recognition was given to the saving of the mosquito boats at the time—the saving of them until we could build others that we might spare—ample recognition. The distinguished chairman of Naval Affairs in the Senate spoke to that body for a couple of hours on the subject; a Member of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] placed in the RECORD, an editorial from the Saturday Evening Post reciting the facts in the matter. I refer to it today only because some people who want to win an election carelessly confuse the mosquito-boat give-away which I helped to prevent, with the destroyer-trade, which I applauded.

So, Mr. Speaker, as one who 2 years ago believed in the motor torpedo boats when we had only 21, I hail this bill with a glad heart because it proposes to build 200 of them! The bill before us this afternoon, a bill authorizing eight-billion-dollars-plus of aircraft carriers and fast ships, will pass overwhelmingly and will serve notice again to the world that no matter what the cost and no matter how long it may take, Uncle Sam is in this war to win!

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GREEN. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me because I wanted to make an announcement. I was interested in the statement of the Chairman a few moments ago concerning the Navy's desiring to know of the availability of building facilities. I make this announcement with the hope that it may come to the knowledge of the Navy that at Pensacola, Fla., they have a splendid navy yard which is very anxious to participate in Navy contract work.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a certain colloquy I had with the gentleman from Arkansas on the subject of battleships during the consideration of the War Department bill in 1938.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the authorized composition of the United States Navy in underage vessels, as established by the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503), as amended by the acts of May 17, 1938 (52 Stat. 401), June 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 394), July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 779), December 23, 1941 (Public, No. 369, 77th Cong., 1st sess.), and May 13, 1942 (Public, No. 551, 77th Cong., 2d sess.), is hereby further increased by 1,900,000 tons of combatant ships, as follows:

(a) Aircraft carriers, 500,000 tons;

(b) Cruisers, 500,000 tons; and

(c) Destroyers and destroyer escort vessels, 900,000 tons: *Provided*, That the foregoing increases in tonnages for each of the three classes of aircraft carriers, cruisers, and destroyers and destroyer escort vessels may be varied upward or downward in the amount of 30 percent of the total increased tonnage authorized herein so long as the sum of the total increases in tonnages of these classes as authorized herein is not exceeded.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 9, after the word "varied", strike out the remainder of the section and insert "downward in the amount of 30 percent of the total increased tonnage authorized herein, and if so varied downward, the tonnage so decreased may be used to increase the tonnage of any other class of vessel authorized above, or to increase the tonnage of submarines heretofore authorized, so long as the sum of the total increases in tonnages of these classes, including submarines as authorized herein, is not exceeded: *Provided further*, That the total authorized tonnage by classes of vessels authorized by the acts of May 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503), May 17, 1938 (52 Stat. 401), and June 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 394), may be varied upward or downward in the amount of 30 percent so long as the sum of the total increases in tonnage of these classes so authorized is not exceeded."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. The President of the United States is hereby authorized to construct such vessels, including replacements thereof as authorized by the act of March 27, 1934 (48 Stat. 503), as may be necessary to provide the total underage composition authorized in section 1 of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 2, page 3, after the word "vessels" strike out the words "including replacements" in line 2, and all of line 3 and down to the figures and parentheses in line 4, and after the word "act" in line 5, insert "and to maintain such total increased authorized composition by constructing replacement vessels for such vessels as may be overage as defined in section 7 of the act approved June 14, 1940 (54 Stat. 395), or as may have been or may be lost: *Provided*, That notwithstanding the provisions of any other law, parts of

laws, or other provisions of this act, the replacement vessels herein authorized are not required to be of the same class as the vessels which have become overage or been lost, so long as they are either battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers or destroyer escort vessels, or submarines, and so long as the total authorized composition of the United States Navy in underage vessels, as herein or hereafter increased, is not exceeded."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. The Secretary of the Navy, with the approval of the President, is hereby authorized to undertake the construction of not to exceed 800 small vessels suitable for use as patrol vessels, mine vessels and the like, as he may consider best suited for the successful prosecution of the war, such vessels to be in addition to those heretofore authorized.

With the following committee amendment:

At the end of section 3 insert a new section as follows:

"SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to acquire and convert not to exceed 200 small vessels for coastal defense, patrol, mine sweeping, and similar purposes as he may consider necessary for the successful prosecution of the war, such vessels to be in addition to those heretofore authorized.

"SEC. 5. (a) Section 5 (a) of the act approved July 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 780), is hereby amended by striking out the words 'at a total cost not to exceed $50,000,000,' and inserting in lieu thereof the words 'to a total number not to exceed 72.'

"(b) Section 2 of the act approved January 31, 1941 (55 Stat. 5), is hereby amended by striking out the words 'to a total amount not exceeding $400,000,000.'"

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 4. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 15, change "Sec. 4" to "Sec. 6."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia]. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on the passage of the bill I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 319, nays 0, not voting 113, as follows:

[Roll No. 79]

YEAS—319

Allen, La.	Bates, Mass.	Boren
Anderson, Calif.	Beam	Bradley, Mich.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Beckworth	Bradley, Pa.
	Bell	Brooks
Andrews	Bender	Brown, Ga.
Angell	Bennett	Brown, Ohio
Arends	Bishop	Bryson
Arnold	Bloom	Buck
Barnes	Boehne	Bulwinkle
Barry	Boggs	Burch
Bates, Ky.	Bolton	Burgin
Byron	Holbrock	Pittenger
Camp	Holland	Ploeser
Canfield	Holmes	Poage
Cannon, Fla.	Hook	Powers
Cannon, Mo.	Hope	Priest
Capozzoli	Houston	Rabaut
Carlson	Howell	Ramsay
Carter	Hull	Randolph
Cartwright	Hunter	Rankin, Miss.
Case, S. Dak.	Imhoff	Rankin, Mont.
Celler	Jackson	Reece, Tenn.
Chapman	Jacobsen	Reed, Ill.
Chenoweth	Jarman	Reed, N. Y.
Chiperfield	Jenkins, Ohio	Rees, Kans.
Clason	Jenks, N. H.	Rich
Claypool	Jennings	Rivers
Clevenger	Jensen	Rizley
Cochran	Johns	Robertson, Va.
Coffee, Wash.	Johnson, Calif.	Robinson, Utah
Collins	Johnson, Ill.	Rockwell
Colmer	Johnson, Luther A.	Rodgers, Pa.
Cooley		Rogers, Mass.
Cooper	Johnson, Okla.	Rogers, Okla.
Costello	Johnson, W. Va.	Rolph
Cox	Jones	Russell
Cravens	Jonkman	Sabath
Crosser	Kean	Sacks
Crowther	Kee	Sanders
Cunningham	Keefe	Sasscer
Curtis	Kefauver	Sauthoff
D'Alesandro	Kelley, Pa.	Scanlon
Davis, Ohio	Kelly, Ill.	Scott
Davis, Tenn.	Kerr	Scrugham
Day	Kilday	Secrest
Dewey	Kinzer	Shanley
Dickstein	Kirwan	Sheppard
Dingell	Klein	Short
Dirksen	Knutson	Smith, Maine
Disney	Kopplemann	Smith, Ohio
Ditter	Kunkel	Smith, Pa.
Dondero	Landis	Smith, Va.
Doughton	Lane	Smith, Wash.
Downs	Lanham	Smith, Wis.
Drewry	Lea	Snyder
Duncan	Leavy	Somers, N. Y.
Durham	LeCompte	South
Dworshak	Lesinski	Sparkman
Eaton	Lewis	Spence
Eberharter	Ludlow	Springer
Edmiston	Lynch	Starnes, Ala.
Elliott, Calif.	McCormack	Steagall
Elston	McGehee	Stearns, N. H.
Engel	McGranery	Stefan
Englebright	McIntyre	Stevenson
Faddis	McKeough	Sullivan
Fellows	McLaughlin	Sumner, Ill.
Fenton	McLean	Sumners, Tex.
Fitzgerald	McMillan	Sutphin
Fitzpatrick	Maas	Taber
Flannagan	Maciora	Talbot
Fogarty	Magnuson	Talle
Folger	Mahon	Tarver
Ford, Thomas F.	Manasco	Tenerowicz
Fulmer	Mansfield	Thill
Gale	Martin, Iowa	Thom
Gamble	Martin, Mass.	Thomas, N. J.
Gehrmann	Mason	Thomas, Tex.
Gibson	May	Thomason
Gillie	Meyer, Md.	Tibbott
Gossett	Michener	Tolan
Graham	Mills, Ark.	Treadway
Granger	Mills, La.	Van Zandt
Grant, Ala.	Monroney	Vincent, Ky.
Green	Moser	Vinson, Ga.
Gregory	Mott	Voorhis, Calif.
Guyer	Mundt	Vorys, Ohio
Gwynne	Murdock	Wadsworth
Haines	Murray	Ward
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Myers, Pa.	Weaver
	Nelson	Welch
Hall, Leonard W.	Norrell	Wene
	O'Brien, Mich.	West
Hancock	O'Brien, N. Y.	Wheat
Hare	O'Hara	Whelchel
Harris, Ark.	O'Leary	Whitten
Hart	O'Neal	Whittington
Harter	O'Toole	Wickersham
Hartley	Pace	Wigglesworth
Healey	Patman	Williams
Hébert	Patrick	Winter
Heidinger	Patton	Wolfenden, Pa.
Hendricks	Pearson	Wolverton, N. J.
Hess	Peterson, Fla.	Woodruff, Mich.
Hill, Colo.	Peterson, Ga.	Woodrum, Va.
Hill, Wash.	Pheiffer, William T.	Wright
Hinshaw		Young
Hoffman	Pierce	Zimmerman

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—113

Allen, Ill.	Andresen, August H.	Barden
Andersen, H. Carl	Baldwin	Baumhart
		Beiter
Blackney	Gilchrist	Osmers
Bland	Gillette	Paddock
Bonner	Gore	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Boykin	Grant, Ind.	
Buckler, Minn.	Halleck	Plauché
Buckley, N. Y.	Harness	Plumley
Burdick	Harrington	Ramspeck
Butler	Harris, Va.	Richards
Byrne	Heffernan	Robertson, N. Dak.
Casey, Mass.	Hobbs	
Clark	Izac	Robsion, Ky.
Cluett	Jarrett	Rockefeller
Coffee, Nebr.	Johnson, Ind.	Romjue
Cole, Md.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Satterfield
Cole, N. Y.		Schaefer, Ill.
Copeland	Kennedy, Martin J.	Schuetz
Courtney		Schulte
Crawford	Kennedy, Michael J.	Shafer, Mich.
Creal		Shannon
Culkin	Keogh	Sheridan
Cullen	Kilburn	Sikes
Delaney	Kleberg	Simpson
Dies	Kocialkowski	Smith, W. Va.
Domengeaux	Kramer	Stratton
Douglas	Lambertson	Sweeney
Eliot, Mass.	Larrabee	Terry
Ellis	McGregor	Tinkham
Fish	Maciejewski	Traynor
Flaherty	Marcantonio	Vreeland
Forand	Merritt	Walter
Ford, Leland M.	Miller	Wasielewski
Ford, Miss.	Mitchell	Weiss
Gathings	Nichols	White
Gavagan	Norton	Wilson
Gearhart	O'Connor	Wolcott
Gerlach	O'Day	Worley
Gifford	Oliver	Youngdahl

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Beiter with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Buckley of New York with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Youngdahl.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Jarrett.
Mr. Kramer with Mr. Grant of Indiana.
Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Gilchrist.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Copeland.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Johnson of Illinois.
Mr. Terry with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Plauché with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Coffee of Nebraska with Mr. Gearhart.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Miller.
Mr. Eliot of Massachusetts with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Maciejewski with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Traynor with Mr. Wasielewski.
Mr. Weiss with Mr. Casey of Massachusetts.
Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Harrington.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Smith of West Virginia.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. White.
Mr. Walter with Miss O'Day.
Mr. Forand with Mr. Flaherty.
Mr. Barden with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Harris of Viginia with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Rockefeller.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Harness.
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Bland with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Butler.
Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Gerlach.
Mr. Creal with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Simpson.
Mr. Richards with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.
Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Paddock.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Baumhart.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Oliver.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.
Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Shafer of Michigan.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Tinkham.
Mr. Courtney with Mr. Hallock.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Douglas.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. August H. Andresen.
Mr. Worley with Mr. Kocialkowski.
Mr. Schulte with Mr. Mitchell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, House Resolution 505 will be laid on the table.

There was no objection.

ALIEN SITUATION IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 433, which I send to the desk and ask to have read:

The Clerk read as follows:

Whereas due to the present world crisis a number of heretofore unknown major problems dealing with the alien situation in the United States has arisen which require the attention of the Congress; and

Whereas so that the Congress, in whom is vested responsibility for enacting legislation governing the problem, may be better informed as to how to approach that important duty: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization be, and it is hereby, authorized to hold hearings for the purpose of making a careful survey and study of the various problems relating to the alien situation in the United States, such as, (1) the question of the proper handling of the thousands of cases of aliens who are temporarily in the United States but who cannot depart because of world conditions; (2) the question of the disposition of aliens, principally criminals, insane, and other highly undesirable types, under order of deportation but who cannot at present be deported; (3) the extremely serious alien enemy situation; (4) the possible necessity of amending the naturalization laws to meet the emergency situation; (5) other studies of the general situation not only as it applies to the present but also with a view to looking forward to a post-war policy; and (6) all other questions in relation thereto which would assist Congress in the enactment of necessary remedial legislation.

The House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to request and secure, for the purposes of this resolution, the cooperation of, the production of records and rules and regulations of, and the assistance of such personnel under the Attorney General, and the services, bureaus, or offices under his jurisdiction, as may be deemed necessary by the committee.

For the purposes of this resolution, the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, or any subcommittee thereof, is hereby authorized to sit and act at such time and places within the United States, whether the House is sitting or recessed or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, to require the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books or papers or documents or vouchers by subpena or otherwise, to take such testimony or records, as it deems necessary. Subpenas shall be issued under the signature of the Speaker of the House at the request of the chairman of the committee and shall be served by the Sergeant at Arms of the House or by such person or persons as may be designated by him. The chairman of the committee or any member of the committee may administer oaths to witnesses. Every person who, having been summoned as a witness by authority of such committee or any subcommittee thereof, or having been required to produce necessary books or papers or documents or vouchers by authority of said committee or any subcommittee thereof, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the study and investigation heretofore authorized, or who fails to produce such books or papers or documents or vouchers as required by subpenas, shall be held to the penalties provided in section 102 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (U. S. C., title 2, sec. 192), as amended.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Mississippi for a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Are we considering the rule now or the resolution?

Mr. SABATH. Just the resolution. There is no rule.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. How does the resolution get the floor?

Mr. SABATH. It is a privileged resolution, approved by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this is a privileged resolution?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. And the only way it can be amended is for the gentleman to yield for an amendment?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield for an amendment or two?

Mr. SABATH. I will see how we will get along and answer that question later.

Mr. COCHRAN. And if the gentleman will not yield for an amendment, the only way that we can amend the resolution is to vote down the previous question.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. How about a division of the time?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois, under the rules of the House, is entitled to 1 hour.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. What about the opposition to the resolution?

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I will yield 30 minutes to those opposed to the resolution, as is the usual order.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The minority is usually entitled to 30 minutes.

Mr. SABATH. Yes. I do not desire to take advantage of anyone, and, as I just stated, I shall yield time to any Member desiring to be heard in opposition to the resolution. Mr. Speaker, I am satisfied that if the membership of this House had heard the request made by members of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, which committee reported this resolution, their testimony giving the need for the passage of the resolution, there would be no opposition to it. The resolution came to the Committee on Rules by the unanimous vote of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

The Rules Committee believe that the Immigration Committee is justified in urging this resolution and the power that will be given to that committee. Understand, this is not a special committee that is being provided for, but it merely gives additional power to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, so that it may be able to penetrate many of the intricate questions that have arisen due to the war. It is well known that there are many provisions in our immigration and naturalization laws which should be amended. We have many people in this country who are alien enemies, but under our law as I view it, and as it is reported, we cannot do anything with them. All the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization desires is the right to investigate and compile and try to bring about amendments to our laws so that a proper bill may be brought in that will give the Department and the Bureau of Immigration and Naturalization certain additional powers which they should have.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. As a matter of fact, all that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization has to do now is to introduce a bill covering this matter and hold hearings. There is no necessity for giving them additional powers.

Mr. SABATH. It is very easy for the gentleman to say all they have to do is to bring in a bill, but what kind of a bill?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi rose.

Mr. SABATH. I do not yield any further. This means nothing to me, but I feel that we need a revision of these laws. Many men have obtained their naturalization by fraud, and I feel that something should be done about it; that some law should be passed to bring about cancelations of those naturalization papers. There are many other things also. This committee which has held hearings is familiar with the questions involved and the committee needs additional power and additional help. They cannot do it themselves. What they need, as I understand it, is a few men who would compile and revise the immigration and naturalization laws, so as to aid these various bureaus in order that they may bring about a proper and just enforcement of the law.

Now, members of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization are here and they can more fully explain to you the need of this important work that is to be done by them. The chairman of the committee and the Members who appeared before the Rules Committee have explained that the most the study and survey would cost would be below $10,000. I think it is needed; but every time a bill comes here from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, it matters not how important it may be to the country, there are a few gentlemen who are fearful that it may do great harm to the Nation, when in fact this study would be to the interest of our country. It will be helpful and beneficial, and I have the utmost confidence in the membership of the Immigration Committee and know that they would not ask for this power and privilege to work on our immigration and naturalization problems if they did not think it was for the best interest of the country. They are here, and as I also wish to yield to some of those who desire to speak against the resolution I am going to conclude.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Does the gentleman think it would be proper for this House to delegate to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization a study of the post-war policy of this country with respect to the general situation—a study of the post-war policy of this country?

Mr. SABATH. Well, I believe this is an important committee and the question deserves a great deal of study. As I started to say, at least 10 countries have been absorbed by the Nazis. The question of whether this country or that country or its people are entitled to any quotas or not under the law is a question that must be determined.

Mr. EBERHARTER. But it says here "other studies of the general situation looking forward to a post-war policy." Does the gentleman think it would be right for the Congress to delegate that to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization?

Mr. SABATH. It does not mean that they must bring in a bill on it. They want to study it and examine it and look into it and see what should be done that will preserve and safeguard the interests of our country. I am not interested personally at all. It does not mean anything to me personally, but I do feel that this committee should have this power, and that the few thousand dollars required will be well spent.

Mr. COCHRAN. How much?

Mr. SABATH. Not more than $10,000.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is the ceiling?

Mr. SABATH. That is the ceiling, as I have been given to understand and as has been testified to.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. COCHRAN. I wish the gentleman would look on page 2, lines 13 to 20, wherein you give this committee power to go into the Department of Justice, to take every record that they have there, and bring it before them; and, furthermore, you give them the power, if they ask for it, to have the entire Department of Justice assigned to the committee.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman has been here too long, and he knows that any legislative committee has the right to ask a department for records if any legislation is pending whereby such record will help the committee in deciding whether they should vote out a certain bill or not.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SABATH. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. On page 2, line 4, as a part of the authority or power granted to the committee, it says, "under order of deportation but who cannot at present be deported." Can the gentleman give the House assurance that if this committee is authorized and functions, alien Harry Bridges will actually be deported and sent back to Australia?

Mr. SABATH. Oh, some people are so obsessed with Bridges, when we have so many more important things, where the rights and liberties of millions of people are involved. Personally, I am of the opinion that this is put in because we have so many of these men. They may not be as bad as Bridges in your eyes, but they should be deported, but under the present law the administration can do nothing. They do not know where to deport them. They do not know what to do with them. Under the bill that I believe they will agree upon we might be able to do something to relieve the unbearable situation.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SABATH. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. In answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] it was the Committee on Immigration that voted the bill to deport Bridges. We are ready to deport any Communist or any person who is not fit for this country.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I think I have explained to the satisfaction of all fair-minded men that this legislation is required. I conclude and I reserve the balance of the time.

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I shall not comment at all upon this resolution. Neither shall I yield. I do want to state, however, that I am sure the Rules Committee did not intend that a rule should be reported out with the stump-speech "whereases" contained in this rule. Those "whereases" have no place in legislation of this kind.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. I will not. Had the attention of the committee been called to this before the resolution was reported out I am sure the "whereases" would have been stricken out.

Mr. SABATH. That is the intention.

Mr. MICHENER. The second point I want to make is that this is a privileged resolution. The difference is that where a legislative committee reports a bill and it is on the calendar, that committee then asks the Rules Committee for a rule to permit that particular piece of legislation to come before the House for consideration. That is the case in which a rule is granted. When the rule has passed, consideration of the bill goes back into the hands of the legislative committee. The pending resolution authorizes an investigation. All investigation resolutions must come before the Rules Committee, and that is why the Rules Committee is here with this resolution. I cannot see that there is anything requiring this resolution to permit the Immigration Committee to function. I may say that the only thing given to the Immigration Committee in this resolution is the power to subpena witneses, to go where they want to hold their hearings, and to secure such money as is necessary from the very liberal committee of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]. There will be no investigation until the Committee on Accounts authorizes the money, provided this resolution passes.

I have been asked if this rule can be amended. Under the rules of the House the time is entirely in the hands and control of the chairman of the Committee on Rules. If the chairman of the Committee on Rules yields for an amendment he then loses the floor. I do not imagine he will yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. MICHENER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the House should vote down the previous question, the resolution could be amended.

Mr. MICHENER. Yes; the gentleman is quite correct; if the previous question is voted down the chairman of the committee loses the floor and the gentleman from Missouri possibly would gain the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], the ranking member on the Immigration Committee.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, with apologies to Shakespeare: "I come to bury Caesar, not to praise him." I come not here to bury this resolution but to praise it.

If House Resolution 433 is adopted it will authorize the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization of this House to study and survey the problems that confront the Nation today concerning the aliens within our gates; that is all. There are different classes of aliens within our gates, the friendly alien and the enemy alien. The friendly aliens here can be divided into two groups: The one that is here on a temporary visa whose time has expired but who cannot be sent back to his home because of the war. Something should be done about this class of alien, and there are hundreds of this kind. The second group of friendly aliens are here illegally; they are people who slipped across the border, who jumped ship, or who in some other way got in without a regular visa. There are thousands of them, I am told; and something must be done about these two groups of friendly aliens, those who are here properly with a temporary visa and those who are here improperly, illegally, whom we cannot deport because there is no place to deport them. This presents two very serious problems.

The second group of aliens who create problems and whose problems will be made the subject of study by this resolution are the enemy aliens. These can be divided into three main groups: The Japanese, the Italians, and the Germans. These three groups can, in turn, be divided into three classes: Some who are here on a temporary visa, some who are here illegally—as in the case of the two groups of friendly aliens—and some who are here permanently under regular visa, but who are dangerous, but who under our present laws we cannot touch. So I say there is a real problem to be studied and surveyed. It is a great task you will place upon the Immigration and Naturalization Committee when you vote for this resolution; it is a serious job which you are placing upon their shoulders.

I have heard whispers to the effect that this is a duplication of the work of the Dies committee, that it overlaps what the Dies committee is doing. As a member of the Dies committee I see not one thing in this resolution that would make

it either a duplication of or an interference with the work of the Dies committee. The Dies committee was set up to study subversive activities—not aliens of various classes, but subversive activities of all classes. This resolution does not set up this committee to study subversive activities but just to study the problems in connection with the aliens within our gates of the various categories I have already listed.

What powers does this resolution give the Immigration and Naturalization Committee that it does not have now? As has already been explained, it would give the power to the chairman to subpena through the office of the Sergeant at Arms or the Speaker witnesses, and to require the production of books and records.

That power is given to the chairman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES], a member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I regret very much there has been a certain amount of feeling engendered here this afternoon, not by reason of the legislation before us but because of personalities involved. I would like to have you vote on this measure on its merits. If you will do that, I believe you will support it. If you do not think we need this legislation, all right, vote it down, but you ought to give it the consideration to which it is entitled. It is entitled to be considered on its merits. If you do not think this problem of immigration and naturalization should be pretty carefully studied right now, then pass it up.

Mr. Speaker, if I thought this legislation would provide in any way for a duplication of the work of the Dies committee, or any other committee, I would not support it; neither would I support a resolution for any kind of a snooping committee. I have a prejudice against snooping committees as such.

As a minority member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, and during the past 5 years having had various groups offering all kinds of suggestions on the question of naturalization and immigration, due to problems that have arisen in recent years, I have come to the conclusion that some committee representing this Congress ought to have a little more authority and a little more leeway than our committee has at this time to go into this very important problem a little more thoroughly. Let me say, too, Mr. Speaker, that I am not in favor of spending money on "junketing" trips at the expense of the taxpayers of this country. We do not need to do that. There are, however, individuals and groups of people who should be required to appear before a committee of this kind so we may have the facts that would, in my judgment, be helpful in the improvement of our policy dealing with this question.

It ought to be understood, too, that this committee would only make recommendations to the Congress. Very little money would need to be expended. I certainly would not favor spending a lot of money on it.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution No. 433 authorizes the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization to hold hearings for the purpose of making a survey and study of the policy of the United States concerning the alien problem as it relates to the question of naturalization, as well as that of immigration. This study would be made with a view of providing legislation that would be helpful to the people of this country in dealing with this very important problem.

Under this resolution the committee, among other things, would give careful study to the question of our method of naturalization of foreigners in an effort to determine whether it would be practical to make any changes with respect to the requirements of aliens who have entered the United States legally and who want to become citizens.

The committee would also give particular study to the question of the proper handling of the cases of many thousand aliens who have been permitted to enter this country temporarily and who now, in most instances, want to remain here permanently. Of course, for the present, it is practically impossible for them to return to their native lands. Many of them should be required to return when the time comes to do so.

We have, in this country, a great number of undesirable individuals who should never have been permitted to enter this country and should be deported. They include criminals, insane people, and aliens who have entered illegally.

We have a further group of people from foreign lands who do not see fit to conform to the American way of life and who are not imbued with the prinples of American democracy. Those people should be separated from this country just as soon as it can properly be done.

Mr. Speaker, the question of handling these various groups of people during the present emergency ought to have the pretty careful study of this Congress. If legislation is to be submitted it should be done so after the whole matter has been carefully examined.

Mr. Speaker, the war situation has caused the question of naturalization and immigration to become more complex and more important to the people of this country. The attitude and policy of the United States toward the nations and races of the world as regards immigration and naturalization is becoming more important every day.

The paramount and most important thing is the winning of the war. We all understand that. Other conditions must be secondary. We do, however, find ourselves in an unusual and peculiar situation. People of different races, creeds, and color are on both sides in this world catastrophy. Our men are fighting side by side in the cause of liberty with people from various parts of the world.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the economic agreements, commitments, and understandings that are being worked out among the allied countries and considering the proposals that have been submitted with regard to the war plans, the question of dealing with peoples, foreign to our own, on immigration matters will be extremely intricate and highly important.

When this war is finally concluded, and we pray that will be very soon, our country is going to be faced with many new and difficult situations. The question of dealing with poverty-stricken people of the devastated countries of Europe and Asia will be extremely significant. A most important problem will be that of determining who shall, or who shall not, be permitted to cross our threshold and enjoy the blessings of American liberty we so highly cherish.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution, in my judgment, points in the right direction. A great deal of good can be accomplished on behalf of this Congress as well as on behalf of this country if the terms of the resolution are carried out in the proper spirit.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from New York, a valuable member of our committee.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. In line with the gentleman's statement, according to the testimony before our committee, approximately 400,000 new immigration or naturalization cases have been filed in the last 2 years. We have to cope with that situation and devise ways and means of taking care of the new problems that are constantly being raised.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I appreciate the gentleman's contribution.

Mr. MUNDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. The gentleman from Kansas and the gentleman from Illinois have made some very compelling and convincing arguments and have about persuaded me as to the necessity for this legislation, but I would like to call attention to certain language in the bill and have some further explanation on it. It says:

> For the purpose of making a careful survey and study of the various problems relating to the alien situation in the United States, such as—

And then there are one, two, three, four subdivisions, and then—

> (5) other studies of the general situation not only as it applies to the present but also with a view to looking forward to a post-war policy.

I wonder why the words "to a post-war alien and immigration policy" were not included?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think they have been included. This study and examination would not include any other subject matter.

Mr. MUNDT. It could, according to this language.

Mr. REES of Kansas. There is no intention whatever to do that, and I do not think the wording of the resolution could be so interpreted.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman think we are going altogether too fast? This war has not been won. That is our first job. Then when we win this war we may go into this Union Now, if some folks have their way, where all citizens of this country and all the peoples of the world will become citizens of a World United States. There will be no aliens. We will all be under one flag. But not if I can prevent it.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman answers his own question, in accordance with his own interpretation of it.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. For a question; yes.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman talks about undesirable aliens.

Mr. REES of Kansas. May I have your question, please?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I will ask the gentleman from Kansas this question: Is it not a fact that the man you propose to put in as chairman of this committee has opposed the deportation of Bridges whom the Attorney General of the United States says is a Communist and belongs to an organization dedicated to the overthrow of this Government? Answer that question.

Mr. REES of Kansas. The gentleman to whom you refer, I presume will have the floor and can speak for himself. I would like to tell the gentleman very definitely a fact that he well knows; that I, as a member of the minority party and a minority member of the committee, have nothing to say about the chairmanship of any committee of this House. The chairman of the Committee on Naturalization and Immigration is a member of the same party as the distinguished Member from Mississippi. He knows that his party has control of the appointment of the chairmen of all committees and that we, on this side of the aisle, have nothing to say as to whom shall be the chairman of any committee. Let me further say to the distinguished Member from Mississippi, that the resolution for the deportation of Harry Bridges was reported by our committee by a decided majority.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. How do you expect to get anything out of this committee under those conditions that will contribute to the best interests of the American people?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I will have to answer the gentleman from Mississippi in this way: It is my hope and my judgment that the considered opinion of the majority of the committee will control the situation. If this is a personal matter with the gentleman from Mississippi, as regards the chairman of the committee, he can discuss it in due time when he has the floor. It is the resolution I am discussing, not personalities. Let me say again in closing, I am just as zealous as any Member on this floor in guarding the rights of the American people. Goodness knows, they need plenty of guarding, right now.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to explain the parliamentary situation at the outset. This resolution comes in here under a rule, but when you vote on the rule you automatically vote on the resolution. You do not get a separate vote on the resolution. You vote on them both at one time. The chairman of the committee controls the time. Unless he yields for an amendment, no one can offer an amendment.

I am one Member who comes from a large city, who has never at any time since I have been here desired to make our immigration laws so liberal that anybody who wants to can come to this country. You talk about the people that are in this country that are here by fraud. The gentleman from Illinois talks about the people that have secured their naturalization papers by fraud. We have laws on the statute books today to punish those people. We can take care of every one of them. We do not need additional legislation other than agreements with other countries to send them back.

The best you are going to get out of this resolution, if it passes, if you get anything out of it, is legislation liberalizing the immigration laws. I do not have time to go into the resolution as a whole, but take from line 13 to line 20, inclusive, on page 2. This House is telling this committee that it can go to the Department of Justice and say to the Department of Justice, "Give us your confidential files; give us every employee you have that we want." Read it. You cannot construe it in any other way.

The President of the United States, through the Director of the Budget, sent me a letter and sent the Committee on Appropriations a letter complaining about the select committees of the House and Senate taking employees from the executive branch of the Government, and pointing out that at the time the letter was written employees of the executive branch of the Government detailed to the House and the Senate included personnel that were drawing salaries amounting to $375,000 a year. One of the committees of this House at one time had 75 employees of the executive branch of the Government detailed to it.

A resolution along this line has been pending for years. This is not the first Congress in which this has been introduced. I have fought it in every Congress. This committee has exactly the same power as it wants here, except for the power of subpena and the power to go to the departments to get help. It can do what the Committee on Agriculture can do—investigate the agricultural situation. It can do what the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce can do—investigate interstate and foreign commerce from every angle. The only good part about this resolution is the fact that the Committee on Immigration is going to do the job, but it does not need this power to do this job, if it wants to get down to work and hold hearings and bring in proper legislation, if it is needed.

The Department of Justice is handling this situation as it should be handled. It has the Japs in camps and it knows where every alien in this country is. It has their fingerprints and registration. If the Department of Justice comes to the conclusion it needs additional laws, surely it can follow usual procedure and make a recommendation through the Speaker. I see no reason for passing this legislation. The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization will, I am sure, meet with the committee at any time it desires and go into any phase of immigration and naturalization which he feels should be corrected.

Because some people came here in violation of our laws is no reason we should now legalize their entry. This committee has brought in bills legalizing the entry of various aliens, and I have voted against all such bills. There are many still on the calendar.

I cannot bring myself to the point where I am willing to condone the offense of those who came to our country in violation of our laws.

I hope the resolution is defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN].

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I want to assure the House that it has never been my intention to run the show. I have always confided in the full committee and discussed all matters pertaining to this problem with it. There are certain very important facts concerning the Japanese problem in this country which I have not the time to discuss fully at this time but which we all know have created a rather serious situation. There are thousands of enemy aliens walking around. We have nothing to determine just what we are going to do about them. We have thousands of them now in our camps, and we are feeding them with wheat, while our boys in the hands of the Japanese are getting rice once or twice a day, and they are lucky to get it.

We have a serious alien problem, which should be solved for the protection and the best interests of this country. Whether it is the gentleman from Mississippi or any other gentleman here—and I stand on my rights as an American citizen, and I feel I am as good an American as the gentleman although my forefathers did not come here 300 years ago—I believe that anyone here who thinks he has a solution to any of the many problems confronting us should be given a fair chance.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I will not yield to the gentleman.

It is not the intention of this committee to engage investigators. It is not the intention of this committee to start a series of sightseeing trips around the country. This is a war problem that must be solved as soon as possible.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. For a very brief question.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman answer the question submitted by the gentleman from Missouri as to why the gentleman's committee does not have in

its possession at the present time all the powers here sought?

Mr. DICKSTEIN. He has been wrong today as he has been wrong before, with all due respect to my colleague. We have no right to go outside the District of Columbia. We have no right to subpena. We have no authority to insist that certain people appear before the committee to testify. We can have witnesses only if they themselves offer to appear before the committee. I do not have to tell you that very few enemy aliens—especially the people who have something to hide—will come before the committee voluntarily to testify.

I deny that we have the power now. I deny the charge of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] that we can do all these things under our present set-up.

Mr. Speaker, I do not crave for more work than I have now. My office, as I am sure are the offices of all other Members, is flooded with work. But I felt it was my duty to take on this added responsibility. You did not believe me nor help me in 1934 and 1938 when I asked for your support to combat un-American activities but you have praised the Dies committee and have given them half a million dollars. I am now giving you some constructive suggestions. For your own country's sake, give the committee the authority necessary to solve this problem, and an opportunity to come back to you and make recommendations that will be for the benefit of the country. There is no intention to engage counsel. Every member of the committee is a hard-working gentleman and is willing to do his job. I do not propose to run the show. I have been outvoted before in the committee and I am going to submit every question to the full committee before any action is taken. We are not going to take people away from the Department of Justice. They are going to try to give us every possible help they can along these lines and I submit to you and I appeal to you, in the name of your country, give the Immigration Committee the authority to study these serious problems.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi 3 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this resolution. In the first place it is absolutely unnecessary. The gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN], chairman of the committee that is to conduct these proceedings, pounded the table and told what a good American he is. But he had the opportunity to deny here, and he did not deny, that he did not vote to deport Harry Bridges, a Communist, whom the Attorney General of the United States said was a Communist, belonging to a party dedicated to the overthrow and destruction of this Government.

So, if it is alien enemies you are after, I submit that I would much prefer to risk the F. B. I. The F. B. I. has all the power to investigate the very things he proposes to investigate. I prefer to leave it with the Dies committee which, he says, he helped to create. At that time, if I remember correctly, he thought he was going to be the chairman of that committee and the rest of us were assured he was not before we ever voted for it.

Besides, we have the Army and the Navy Intelligence Services. The Army and Navy Intelligence divisions are staffed with men who are dedicated to the preservation of this Republic and sworn to uphold the Constitution of the United States. They are searching all the time for these subversive elements and turning them in.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOOK. If that is true, then why all the excitement over the Dies committee?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Oh, well, the gentleman from Michigan and I do not agree on the Dies committee. I was for it. I think it has done a wonderful job. The American people think so and the Congress thinks so. The gentlemen from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] does not seem to think so. He thinks about as much of Mr. DIES as Mr. DIES does of him.

Mr. HOOK. There must be duplication if the gentleman is right.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a short observation?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. No; I will not because the gentleman would not yield to me.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield for the purpose of a correction?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. No; but if the gentleman wants to ask me a question. I will yield.

Mr. MASON. I want to ask the gentleman this question: Does the gentleman know that the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization voted out the bill to deport Bridges unanimously?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. The gentleman from Illinois knows that the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] did not vote to deport Harry Bridges.

Mr. MASON. I know; but he was not present at the time we voted that out.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. All right. Remember that we also have the Department of Justice that is busy seeking out enemy aliens.

They talk about the Japanese. The alien Japanese in this country are all now in concentration camps, and the rest of them have all been moved out of the danger zone; yet under this bill this committee could go to the Pacific coast and duplicate the very work that the Tolan committee has been doing all these months. Someone showed me, a moment ago, two volumes of the report of the Tolan committee, showing that it has been doing the very work this committee proposes to do.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I will yield for a question.

Mr. SABATH. The gentleman stated the committee could deport or do something with the Japanese immigrants that have come into this country. You know this committee would not have any such power under this resolution.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. This committee has all the power it needs under the Constitution. If it wants to make somebody testify or summon some witness, they can come here and get the authority, and we would give it to them.

This resolution gives them authority to globe-trot all over the United States. We have the Tolan committee, we have the Dies committee, and we also have the F. B. I., the most efficient organization of its kind on earth, perhaps. We have the intelligence service of the Army and the intelligence service of the Navy, and all the patriotic organizations and the officials of every State on the look-out, and yet they come here, the very ones who have opposed restricting immigration, if you please, or some of them have, and want this resolution adopted here giving this committee power to duplicate all that work. If any of you will read all its purposes, you will see that as Shakespeare says, it is as broad as the casing air. They can do almost anything, gallivant all around over the United States, if necessary, make all kinds of studies about post-war conditions. I wonder if the chairman would write us a report on post-war conditions along the lines of his ideas in the Bridges case and on immigration generally. Again, it gives them the power to summon witnesses and to require the production of books and papers and to delve into the private affairs of everybody.

The American people are patriotic. They do not have to be talked downhill to by a few people who arrogate to themselves a patriotism that they claim nobody else has. The American people are capable of looking after these things, and they are doing it. Why create this committee to go with its clerk and the chairman, perhaps, everywhere from Maine to New Mexico or to Arizona and call in witnesses and take up time and spend money? You talk about $10,000. Why, they would not get out of the District of Columbia on $10,000. We know how such things go. I think I am one of the few if not the only chairman of a committee who has ever turned back any money for investigations here. That was when we visited the various veterans' hospitals over the country.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will have to say to the gentleman that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BLAND] on several occasions has returned money for investigations.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I will accept that amendment to my statement.

Mr. COCHRAN. There are others that have, too.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. They are few and far between. I am glad to have them mentioned—and their names put in the RECORD.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I was interested in what the gentleman said with reference to the Jap question, which this committee would be authorized to look into. The gentleman made some reference to the work of the Tolan committee. I presume he knows the Tolan committee did spend some 3 weeks on the Pacific coast looking into that question, made a rather complete report, and the recommendations generally have been followed by the authorities in handling that problem. It has been handled in a highly satisfactory manner.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Absolutely.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this resolution will be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER].

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, after serving 18 months as a member of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, I hope the Members of the House will not consider it presumptuous of me in saying that some of the arguments that have been made this afternoon against this resolution would probably not have been made and that the criticism of the resolution would perhaps have been more temperate had the House fully realized the really great problems which are confronting this important committee of the House in these days of crises and world upheaval. This is an emergency measure to cope with an emergency which is broad and drastic now, and which may become increasingly so with the passing of time. If there is any set of laws in this country that is not remaining static at this time, it is the laws with reference to immigration and naturalization. The Nationalty Act of 1940, which is the bible of our committee, has been amended in several very important particulars since the outbreak of the war. It is reasonable to assume that new conditions will arise from time to time that will require intensive investigation. The committee is not asking for a great sum of money to travel around the country. I venture the opinion that most of the hearings will be held right in No. 445 of the House Office Building, which is our committee room. The modest appropriation involved here is simply incidental to the main purpose of the resolution, which is to vest our committee with the additional power and authority to properly conduct these hearings and to arrive at the facts. That is the meat of the measure.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman give the House an idea of how much money the committee is going to ask for?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. It is my understanding that we are asking for only $10,000.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is that the committee as a whole, or is it just the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I am not speaking for the committee. I heard that on the floor this afternoon. The gentleman is probably better advised about that than I am. I wish to add that it is my personal understanding that the Department of Justice is mindful of the importance of the questions we are considering this afternoon and, to the best of my knowledge, the Department is not opposed to the enactment of this legislation.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. I am sorry that I cannot yield further to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman has made a statement that should not go unchallenged.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry but I cannot yield further to the gentleman because my time has virtually expired. The statement I make is that the Department of Justice at least knows about this resolution, and is fully informed of the facts and circumstances which so clearly indicate the need for broadening the scope of our investigation of the various aspects of the alien problem, not only with respect to the two classes of aliens mentioned this afternoon by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], but also with respect to that great body of aliens who fall in the twilight zone who must be properly classified and fairly dealt with during these grim days of war and also during the days of adjustment and reconstruction in the post-war period.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I have no word of criticism to make of the Immigration Committee or any other committee of the House. However, one of the things that this resolution refers to in section 3 is "the extremely serious enemy-alien situation." Our good friend, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], pointed out that the Tolan committee has already covered that subject very fully. They held hearings for over 3 weeks on the west coast. The recommendations made by the Tolan committee have been sent to the departments, and the final report has been made and is available to the entire membership of the House.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER] said that the Department of Justice blessed this resolution. Just a few moments ago an official of the Department said he had not seen the resolution and that the Department was not in favor of the resolution. This statement was made over the telephone in the last 10 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. To give some advice to the gentleman from Ohio. Mr. TOLAN's committee did not touch on the question dealing with immigration. That committee made a recommendation so far as evacuating the Japanese from certain areas is concerned, and that was followed through by the Department of Justice, with the help of the War Department.

Mr. BENDER. I did not say anything about immigration. I spoke about handling the alien situation regarding the Japanese, the Italian, and the German aliens in the country.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There are thousands of dangerous Japanese fifth-column people in this country, still aliens, and the Tolan committee did not handle that question at all. It was just to evacuate certain Japanese from California into certain concentration camps, where we are feeding them a la carte.

Mr. BENDER. I am sure the gentleman has not read the report of the Tolan Committee. If he had he would not make that statement.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Is it not true that the Department of Justice from the very beginning set up a committee to consider these dangerous enemy aliens, and where they were dangerous put them in a concentration camp immediately?

Mr. BENDER. The gentleman is exactly right. I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, there is a very serious question here. I do not know whether it is the province of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization or some other committee of this House to discuss and find out about it. That is the subject of dual citizenship. I think we can pretty well control aliens, because, after all, they do not have the rights that citizens have; but when it comes to the question of dual citizenship we are in a very dangerous state. Curiously enough, it is the enemy countries from which these dual citizens come to this country and whose children and grandchildren may hold dual citizenship. It is Germany, Italy, and Japan that provide us with the dual citizens. These people have citizenship in both countries. Among the Japanese there is a certain class called the Kibei. They are American-born Japanese, holding Japanese citizenship as well, and who have returned to Japan for a year or 2 years of study, generally in a military branch of the government. Those are the really dangerous people of Japanese descent in this country, because they are purely Japanese by training and indoctrination. They are absolutely opposed to everything that you and I believe in. They have been trained in the Shinto religion, in Bushido—the code of the warrior—and so on and so forth. If this committee could tell me they would take up this subject and find what can and should be done to eradicate dual citizenship in this country, either by declaring through law that those American citizens who also hold allegiance to some foreign potentate or government will be denied their American citizenship, or some other method,

then I will be glad to go along with the purposes of this resolution, because I have waited a long time for such legislation out of that committee.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. MASON. I am glad to inform the gentleman that the subject of dual citizenship has been taken up by our committee; that it was partially solved in the 1940 act, and that it would be a part of this further study.

Mr. HINSHAW. Can anybody tell me how you can take an American citizen who may be claimed as a citizen by Japan, Germany, or Italy, and first determine who he is and then deny him the rights of American citizenship?

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. I spent 16 days in Hawaii on the Joint Committee on Territories investigating that proposition. The question of whether or not these Japanese claim dual citizenship is not left with us. It is left with their own country.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand that.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. This committee would not touch that side of it at all.

Mr. HINSHAW. I want this committee or some other committee of this House—I do not happen to be a member of a committee that can take this subject up, but I want somebody to get busy and eradicate dual citizenship in the United States.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I wonder how the gentleman thinks that can be done when the Constitution provides that a person born in this country is a citizen, and the Kibeis you have been talking about are born in this country.

Mr. HINSHAW. I suggest that there be a constitutional amendment and I suggest that the gentleman from Alabama draw one, as he has made such a detailed study of the subject.

I might add that I have introduced two bills, H. R. 6820 and H. R. 6821, designed to eliminate the so-called foreign language school, wherein children are indoctrinated with the ideals and culture of the country of their parents and taught to worship or revere the rulers of those countries. Those schools are among the best fifth column factories that have been allowed to flourish here. I hope that the Committee on Education will give those bills early consideration. Then with the solution of the dual citizenship problem we may be well on the way to some real Americanism.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SMITH].

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that this innocent little resolution has aroused a great deal of heat unnecessarily. I know the House wants to be fair about this matter as it wants to be fair about all matters. In the opinion of the Rules Committee, there is nothing harmful in this resolution, and it has the capacity for doing a great deal of good in ascertaining for the House information that it ought to have.

Ever since I have been here I have been what is known as a restrictionist. I have had to fight the Immigration Committee on many occasions, much more often than I have been with them. If I thought this was a resolution that was going to help get any more aliens in this country who did not belong here, or to keep a single alien here, I would have opposed the resolution coming out of the Rules Committee, and so would the majority of that committee.

Now, that same thing is true of the Immigration Committee. The Immigration Committee, as you all know, is divided on that subject, and when the Immigration Committee comes to you and says that "we unanimously, both sides of this question, after investigation, think that our committee ought to go forward in our investigation and have authority to summon witnesses and see if we can find out the facts"—when both the restrictionists and the other people on that committee agree, why in the world ought there be all of this heat on this subject? The worst that can be said about it is that it certainly cannot do anybody any harm. Somebody said, "You will bring in some legislation that will let all of these aliens into the country." Well, they have brought in a lot of legislation and every time they have, we have defeated it. If they bring in some legislation that is not right, we will defeat it again.

I recognize that the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is opposed to this. I know why he is opposed to it, and I respect him for it. He is the watch dog of the Treasury. He would not let us have any money for any investigation.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am opposed to the resolution for several reasons. I want no liberal legislation now and I am sure the gentleman does not.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Ah, but the gentleman is talking about legislation; I am not talking about legislation. That is where we are mistaken; this is not legislation.

Mr. COCHRAN. But I fear all you will get out of it is liberal legislation.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I do not yield further. It does not necessarily lead to any legislation. All this does is to give that committee a power it does not have now; namely, to summons witnesses and investigate, and it is not going to cost the committee headed by the gentleman from Missouri very much money.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SABATH) there were—ayes 53, noes 101.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 96, nays 200, answered "present" 1, not voting 135, as follows:

[Roll No. 80]

YEAS—96

Andrews	Holland	Pheiffer, William T.
Angell	Hunter	Pittenger
Bates, Mass.	Imhoff	Poage
Beam	Jackson	Powers
Bloom	Jenks, N. H.	Ramsay
Bolton	Kean	Reed, N. Y.
Bradley, Pa.	Kee	Rees, Kans.
Bryson	Kelly, Ill.	Robinson, Utah
Bulwinkle	Kerr	Rogers, Mass.
Burgin	Kirwan	Sabath
Byron	Knutson	Sacks
Canfield	Kopplemann	Sasscer
Cannon, Fla.	Kramer	Scanlon
Capozzoli	Kunkel	Scrugham
Chenoweth	Lane	Secrest
Clason	Lea	Shanley
Claypool	Leavy	Smith, Ohio
Coffee, Wash.	Lesinski	Smith, Pa.
D'Alesandro	Lynch	Smith, Va.
Dewey	McCormack	Smith, Wash.
Dickstein	McKeough	Snyder
Dingell	McMillan	Somers, N. Y.
Downs	Maciora	Spence
Elston	Magnuson	Steagall
Fitzgerald	Martin, Mass.	Sutphin
Fitzpatrick	Mason	Talbot
Fogarty	Meyer, Md.	Talle
Ford, Thomas F.	Mundt	Wadsworth
Guyer	Murdock	Wright
Hart	Myers, Pa.	Young
Healey	O'Brien, N. Y.	
Hill, Wash.	O'Leary	
Hinshaw	O'Toole	

NAYS—200

Allen, La.	Folger	McGehee
Anderson, Calif.	Fulmer	McGranery
Arends	Gale	McIntyre
Arnold	Gamble	McLaughlin
Barnes	Gearhart	McLean
Bates, Ky.	Gerhmann	Mahon
Beckworth	Gibson	Manasco
Bell	Gillie	Mansfield
Bender	Gossett	Martin, Iowa
Bennett	Graham	May
Bishop	Granger	Michener
Boehne	Grant, Ala.	Mills, Ark.
Boggs	Green	Mills, La.
Boren	Gregory	Monroney
Bradley, Mich.	Gwynne	Moser
Brooks	Haines	Mott
Brown, Ga.	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murray
Brown, Ohio	Hall, Leonard W.	Nelson
Burch	Hancock	Norrell
Butler	Hare	O'Brien, Mich.
Camp	Harris, Ark.	O'Hara
Cannon, Mo.	Harris, Va.	Pace
Carlson	Hartley	Patman
Cartwright	Hébert	Patton
Chapman	Heidinger	Pearson
Chiperfield	Hess	Peterson, Ga.
Clevenger	Hill, Colo.	Pierce
Cochran	Hoffman	Ploeser
Collins	Holbrock	Priest
Colmer	Holmes	Rabaut
Cooley	Hope	Randolph
Cooper	Houston	Rankin, Miss.
Costello	Howell	Rankin, Mont.
Cox	Hull	Reece, Tenn.
Cravens	Jacobsen	Reed, Ill.
Cunningham	Jarman	Rivers
Curtis	Jenkins, Ohio	Rizley
Davis, Ohio	Jennings	Robertson, Va.
Davis, Tenn.	Jensen	Robsion, Ky.
Day	Johns	Rockwell
Dirksen	Johnson, Calif.	Rodgers, Pa.
Disney	Johnson, Ill.	Rogers, Okla.
Ditter	Johnson, Luther A.	Rolph
Dondero	Johnson, Okla.	Russell
Doughton	Johnson, W. Va.	Sanders
Drewry	Jones	Sauthoff
Duncan	Jonkman	Sheppard
Durham	Keefe	Short
Dworshak	Kilday	Smith, Maine
Eberharter	Kinzer	Smith, Wis.
Edmiston	Landis	South
Elliott, Calif.	Lanham	Sparkman
Engel	LeCompte	Springer
Englebright	Lewis	Starnes, Ala.
Faddis	Ludlow	Stefan
Fellows		Stevenson
Fenton		Sullivan
Flannagan		Sumner, Ill.

Taber	Van Zandt	Whitten
Tarver	Vinson, Ga.	Whittington
Tenerowicz	Vorys, Ohio	Wickersham
Thill	Ward	Wigglesworth
Thom	Weaver	Williams
Thomas, N. J.	Welch	Wolfenden, Pa.
Thomas, Tex.	Wene	Wolverton, N. J.
Thomason	West	Woodruff, Mich.
Tibbott	Wheat	Zimmerman
Treadway	Whelchel	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hook

NOT VOTING—135

Allen, Ill.	Ford, Leland M.	Osmers
Andersen, H. Carl	Ford, Miss.	Paddock
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gathings	Patrick
Andresen, August H.	Gavagan	Peterson, Fla.
Baldwin	Gerlach	Pfeifer Joseph L.
Barden	Gifford	Plauché
Barry	Gilchrist	Plumley
Baumhart	Gillette	Ramspeck
Beiter	Gore	Rich
Blackney	Grant, Ind.	Richards
Bland	Halleck	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bonner	Harness	Rockefeller
Boykin	Harrington	Romjue
Buck	Harter	Satterfield
Buckler, Minn.	Hendricks	Schaefer, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.	Hobbs	Schuetz
Burdick	Izac	Schulte
Byrne	Jarrett	Scott
Carter	Johnson, Ind.	Shafer, Mich.
Case, S. Dak.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Shannon
Casey, Mass.	Kefauver	Sheridan
Celler	Kelley, Pa.	Sikes
Clark	Kennedy, Martin J.	Simpson
Cluett	Kennedy, Michael J.	Smith, W. Va.
Coffee, Nebr.	Keogh	Stearns, N. H.
Cole, Md.	Kilburn	Stratton
Cole, N. Y.	Kleberg	Sumners, Tex.
Copeland	Klein	Sweeney
Courtney	Kocialkowski	Terry
Crawford	Lambertson	Tinkham
Creal	Larrabee	Tolan
Crosser	McGregor	Traynor
Crowther	Maas	Vincent, Ky.
Culkin	Maciejewski	Voorhis, Calif.
Cullen	Marcantonio	Vreeland
Delaney	Merritt	Walter
Dies	Miller	Wasielewski
Domengeaux	Mitchell	Weiss
Douglas	Nichols	White
Eaton	Norton	Wilson
Elliot, Mass.	O'Connor	Winter
Ellis	O'Day	Wolcott
Fish	Oliver	Woodrum, Va.
Flaherty	O'Neal	Worley
Forand		Youngdahl

So the resolution was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Beiter (for) with Mr. Burdick (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Barden with Mr. McGregor.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Kilburn.
Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Rockefeller.
Mr. Domengeaux with Mr. Harness.
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Allen of Illinois.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Hobbs with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Ramspeck with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Bonner with Mr. Gerlach.
Mr. Creal with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Simpson.
Mr. Richards with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.
Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Cole of New York.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Paddock.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Baumhart.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Oliver.
Mr. Clark with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.
Mr. Ford of Mississippi with Mr. Shafer of Michigan.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Tinkham.
Mr. Courtney with Mr. Halleck.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Douglas.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. August H. Andresen.
Mr. Heffernan with Mr. Culkin.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Stratton.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Youngdahl.
Mr. Sheridan with Mr. Jarrett.
Mr. Coffee of Nebraska with Mr. Grant of Indiana.
Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Gilchrist.
Mr. Nichols with Mr. Copeland.
Mr. Merritt with Mr. Wolcott.
Mr. O'Connor with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Terry with Mr. Crawford.
Mr. Plauché with Mr. Buckler.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Miller.
Mr. Eliot of Massachusetts with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Maciejewski with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Eaton.
Mr. Traynor with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Wasielewski with Mr. Plumley.
Mr. Weiss with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.
Mr. Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Rich.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Carter.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. White.
Mr. Walter with Mrs. O'Day.
Mr. Forand with Mr. Flaherty.
Mr. Worley with Mr. Crosser.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. Mitchell.
Mr. Anderson of New Mexico with Mr. Barry.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Celler.
Mr. Harter with Mr. Hendricks.
Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Klein with Mr. Mahon.
Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Patrick.
Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Schulte.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Tolan.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was rejected and lay that motion on the table.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. MacDaniel, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 71. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Secretary of the Senate in the enrollment of the bill (S. 2467) to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes, to make a necessary change.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1707. An act to prevent the making of photographs and sketches of military or naval reservations, naval vessels, and other naval and military properties, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 6 to the bill (H. R. 7182) entitled "An act making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes"; and that the Senate recedes from its amendment No. 7 to said bill.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following department and agencies:

1. Department of the Interior.
2. Federal Communications Commission.
3. Federal Security Agency.
4. United States attorney for the District of Massachusetts.

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 337) entitled "An act to provide for a permanent postage rate of 1½ cents per pound on books," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. REED to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Interior.
3. Department of the Navy.
4. The National Archives.
5. War Production Board.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6315), entitled "An act to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans."

POSTAGE RATES ON BOOKS

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 337, to provide for a permanent postage rate of 1½ cents per pound on on books, with a House amendment thereto, insist on the House amendment, agree to the conference asked by the Senate and appoint conferees.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. BURCH, HAINES, PRIEST, HARTLEY, and PLOESER.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article entitled "Lidice" which appeared in the Washington Post of June 15, 1942. It is by Barnet Nover, one of the best special writers on the staff of the Post. Mr. Nover's article should be read, if for

no other reason than to remind ourselves that we are fighting for the preservation of every basic principle of human decency, and that the fantastic barbarity of the Nazis "is a reflection of the doubts that have begun to beset them."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next after the disposition of the legislative business of the day and other special orders I may address the House for 45 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes today at the conclusion of any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the case of the Ruck-A-Chucky gold miners.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT]?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT OVER AND PROGRAM FOR NEXT WEEK

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—and I am not going to object—there have been three or four rumors to the effect that the big appropriation bill may be called up on either Tuesday, Thursday, or Friday. Can the gentleman tell us definitely when it will be brought up?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am unable to state definitely, but it will not be Friday. It will be either Tuesday or Thursday. I have heard those rumors myself, and as a result I have made some inquiry. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER] is hopeful it will come up on Tuesday. Of course, it cannot come up on Wednesday, because on that day we will hold services in memory of our departed colleagues. I am unable to state definitely now when it will come up, but it will be either Tuesday or Thursday. If it is not ready for consideration Tuesday, it will come up on Thursday, but not Friday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are there any additions to the program for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes. As I stated, on Wednesday we will hold services in memory of our departed colleagues.

On Monday we will consider business of the District of Columbia Committee, which, I understand, will be noncontroversial. A conference report on the inddependent offices appropriation bill will be filed, on which there is agreeement. I do not think there will be any controversy, although there may be some speeches. I do not think a roll call will be required; however, that will come up on Monday.

If the appropriation bill is not ready Tuesday, it will come up on Thursday.

There may be some legislation that will come up on Tuesday, but I am confident it will be of a noncontroversial nature, although I do not know now what it will be.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including therein a release recently made by the Office of Price Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE] is recognized for 30 minutes.

A COLUMBIA RIVER AUTHORITY

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, a bill—S. 2430—to amend the Bonneville Act has been introduced into the Senate by Senator BONE, with a companion bill—H. R. 6890—in the House by the gentleman from Washington, Representative MARTIN SMITH. Hearings, in which I have been intensely interested, are now being held before a joint subcommittee. All the Pacific Northwest is watching this matter with interest and concern which is being expressed by resolutions and by messages and statements to the subcommittee. Just this morning I received an endorsing resolution, unanimously adopted by the Oregon State Grange, in annual session June 15. A similar message has been received from the Oregon State Federation of Labor. It is the consensus of opinion in our section that these vast power properties at Coulee and Bonneville should be administered by an Authority, and that the Congress should create a Columbia River Authority, giving and granting to it full power to do everything necessary to develop and distribute the electric energy of the Columbia River most widely and most beneficially.

I favor a Columbia River Authority and the purchase by it of the private utility systems. As this bill will probably be before the House it appears to me well to direct attention to it now. Some legislation is imperative, as these great projects are now being operated under provisional legislation and Executive order.

WHY AN AUTHORITY IS NEEDED

The Federal Government has so much at stake and so much electric current to sell, it is apparent that there must be a single Authority to market the power and to formulate the policies. At present, the great Coulee property is under the Bureau of Reclamation; the power is generated at Bonneville by the War Department; it is marketed by the Bonneville Administration. The inclusion of Coulee power with Bonneville was brought about by Executive order, and it is a temporary arrangement. Therefore, we must now provide a permanent Authority.

IMPORTANCE OF THE MEASURE

The members of that subcommittee have before them one of the greatest opportunities of their lives to do something really worth while for mankind, reaching far into the future. I am gratified over the representation from the Pacific Northwest on that subcommittee—Oregon and Washington each having one Senator and one Representative as members.

The words they put into the fundamental law will be construed and quoted through many years to come. The legislation will require the greatest care and the greatest patience in the formulation of policies and practices. To my mind, the work may be almost as basic and far reaching in the power world as were the effects on governmental institutions of those who wrote the Constitution of the United States. The bill not only provides for the distribution of power from the greatest power reservoir in the world but it sets up a new type of public administrative body to handle public power and, above all, to encourage local governmental units to purchase and distribute power for the benefit of their communities. This is a new type of Federal governmental activity. It is not comparable to T. V. A. because it is solely a hydroelectric project. It is exhausting no coal mines and no other natural resources. Its resources are inexhaustible. It is unlike T. V. A. in that it includes no type of activity except the transmission and sale of electric current. The very permanence of this great power supply and the fact that its beneficial use reaches so far into the future indicates the need for constructive legislation, guided by vision and foresight. Our Government and our national administration are subject to constant change. The vast property, the great opportunity, and the undoubted development of large-scale electric industry on the Columbia River point the necessity for some permanent and unchanging administrative authority. As the projects are now being administered, the policies may change with every national political shift.

THE MIRACLE OF BONNEVILLE AND COULEE

We all know it was a miracle that this great power was brought into production at a time of world crisis, when it has become a most potent factor in saving civilization. The question is sometimes asked, What will be done with this vast accumulation of power when the war is over

and the war industries are no longer needed? Undoubtedly there is before the Northwest an era of great industrial development, but I desire to point out that if the States of Oregon and Washington used low-cost power as freely as it is used in Winnipeg and Fort William, Canada, it would require the entire output of the Columbia River power, developed at Coulee and Bonneville, to supply the public and domestic needs and industries of the two States, in addition to the other power now being developed. At the present time through each meter is going about an average of 1,000 kilowatt-hours per year. Winnipeg and other places in Canada are using five times that number of kilowatt-hours. Why? Because the current is cheap. The Government is furnishing the power at Bonneville at $17.50 per kilowatt-year wholesale, or less than 2 mills per kilowatt-hour. Allowing reasonable margin to pay debts and operating costs the present rate can be cut half in two in years to come. You who are accustomed to high-cost electricity must change your point of view in thinking of the Pacific Northwest. The use of electricity is regulated by the price. Make it cheap and all will use it freely. Even the greatest enthusiasts can scarcely realize our future use of electric current, because it will be so cheap.

The Columbia River is the most valuable power stream on the globe. On that river and its tributaries there can be constructed hydroelectric power plants which will develop half as much hydroelectric power as is now being developed by oil, gas, coal, and hydro in the whole United States. The total power development, hydro and coal, at the present time in the United States is a little more than 40,000,000 kilowatts. Engineers have announced, after careful survey, that on the Columbia River and its tributaries there can be developed more than 20,000,000 kilowatts. We have enough potential hydroelectric power in the Columbia River Basin to light and heat the homes of millions and to turn the wheels of extensive industries.

The dams at Bonneville and Coulee will last for centuries and will be the wonder of ages yet to come—as long as water runs to the seas. The only other comparable works of man are the Pyramids of Egypt, and what a contrast! The ancient wonders were built to satisfy man's vanity. These constructions were made for man's welfare—for the more abundant life and for the benefit of living mankind.

In this hour of our grave national danger these dams have proven of greatest significance. Their particular relation to our war industry is in the manufacture of aluminum and magnesium, the most strategic light metals, absolutely essential for the construction of airplanes. Many of the industries of the present and future, which depend upon great blocks of electric power, can be located most advantageously in this region. The marketing of the power contemplates the development of industry on a great scale, as well as the development of publicly owned power-distribution systems by such governmental units as cities, P. U. D.'s, and R. E. A.'s. No one can at this time form a reasonable estimate of the value of the property which will be affected by the legislation. It is safe to say that it will be more valuable than all the anthracite beds of Pennsylvania or the rich iron-ore acres of the Mesabi Range.

The most lasting, foresighted, and far-reaching internal improvement inaugurated by this administration has been the construction of the dams on the Columbia River. Think what this has meant to the war program alone! In September 1932 Franklin D. Roosevelt came to Oregon. I had the pleasure of introducing him to his audience, where he spoke, near the banks of the great river, and made his declaration that the next development of public power in the United States must be on the Columbia River.

PIONEERING IN PUBLIC POWER

This bill very fittingly bears the names of Senator BONE and Representative MARTIN SMITH. There is no one more highly regarded by the proponents of public power than Senator BONE. His outstanding ability and his sustained enthusiasm made Tacoma the most successful public-power city of the Nation. Representative MARTIN SMITH has been a tower of strength in helping toward the development of the great Bonneville system and public distribution of power. I know that pride of authorship will not hinder these earnest public-power advocates from consideration of every plan or idea which may be offered to strengthen their proposed legislation. Those who formulated the Federal Constitution agreed that it was a series of compromises.

We all like to recall our personal connections with a great cause. When I left the old Illinois home of my youth, my father said, "Walter, you are seeking a new location in the far West. Find some place where the water runs swiftly, where power can be developed. Industry will come to such a location, and it will be a prosperous community." He spoke from his knowledge of the power of the Merrimac, which at one time turned more spindles than any other stream in the world. That was long before the day of hydroelectric power generation. For 59 years I have viewed the tumbling waters of the Columbia and its rapidly flowing tributaries. Over a quarter of a century ago I was instrumental in organizing what we called the Public Power League of Oregon, which came into being for the purpose of harnessing and developing the Columbia River so that it might be operated for the use and benefit of mankind. For years I have watched with jealous eye the encroachments of absentee financiers, representatives of the eastern money group, as they have gathered in the franchises and absorbed the power sites of our favored region. I have seen numerous corporations organized to corner that wealth. They have been capitalized for many times the actual money invested, in the hope that the inflated watered values would ultimately be made up by the natural values created by the people. As Governor of Oregon, I did everything I could to promote public development of electric energy. For the past 10 years in Congress, I have spoken, written, and planned for the fullest and freest use of Columbia River power. Naturally, I am intensely interested in all legislation affecting its control and use.

ONE ADMINISTRATOR OR A BOARD?

Fundamental and enduring legislation must be built on principles rather than on personalities and emergencies. It is our duty to throw around such legislation every possible protective clause. This is fundamental, and in proposing such clauses I mean no reflection upon those who will be the administrators of the project, in the immediate future or in years to come.

I do not regard it as fundamentally important whether the Congress commits the administration of the act to a board of three or to a single administrator. If I were to decide the matter, I would provide for a board of three members—a businessman, a lawyer, and an engineer of training and experience. The engineer and lawyer should perform their duties as members of the Board and also each should head the engineering and legal departments of the Board or Authority. I would require that such a Board should be appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, the appointment to include the name of a chairman. The Board would have authority to appoint an administrator. An advisory board without real authority is futile and useless. I believe the Board would be more pleasing to the people of the Northwest than a single administrator.

In my remarks, I shall refer to the chosen administration as the Authority, meaning always the individual or group operating the power projects at Bonneville and Coulee. I realize that if an ideal man can always be found, the single administrator might prove more effective in a crisis. I believe, however, that the Board will bring more talent to the project and make it stronger. T. V. A. seems to have done quite well with a Board. Most big business in the United States is conducted by a board of directors, with a president executing orders. It is right and proper that, whether it be a single administrator or a commission, or board, the appointment should be made by our Chief Executive, for a definite term, and with confirmation by the Senate.

As I read the bill I find there are no checks or reviews of the acts of the administrator except by the Secretary of the Interior. I also note that, though the President is made responsible for the choice of administrator, the Secretary is to appoint the general counsel, the chief engineer, and the assistant administrator, and that these men are not confirmed by the Senate. I do not believe such a set-up is fair to any administrator, nor that it can be successful. It is my opinion that those serving the project must be appointed by and responsible to the Board or Administrator.

THE IMPORTANCE OF HOLDING PRESENT WHOLESALE RATES

The State of Oregon is living under a long-range economy of exhaustion. Its principal industries are built around its enormous stands of timber. Under present destructive practices, this resource

will, in time, be exhausted. Oregon exports its bulk resources in the form of raw materials, and imports the finished products it uses. This means that its cost of living includes a two-way transportation charge. For Oregon to hold a favorable economic place in the federation of States this trend must be reversed. Bonneville is the means to this end.

Decisions of men in emergency agencies, unacquainted with the region, its natural resources, and local economic aspects, have resulted in unbalanced war industries being placed where they will add little to the future prosperity of Oregon. Unfortunately, after the emergency, Oregon must look for further and different industrial development. This will depend entirely upon cheap power. Nothing must be done which will increase Bonneville's wholesale rate as fixed by its first Administrator, Mr. J. D. Ross, who was a competent engineer, capable of making that important and far-reaching decision. These rates were, according to law, approved by the Federal Power Commission.

Money will not be put into new industry unless there is assurance that the wholesale rate will not be raised after the investment is made. I long ago covered this phase with industrialists who cited to me what happened at Niagara. There, a large increase was made in wholesale electric rates after the initial industrial Bonneville's wholesale rate as fixed by its and creating monopoly. This led to the monopolization of the power of that great natural resource by Alcoa.

Future possibilities in steam development, as well as the use of package Diesel and aircraft power units, will force industry into other regions, closer to an assured market, unless the Bonneville wholesale rate be protected to the point where the power-cost differential will offset added transportation costs. This is one of the most important of the problems before the committee. Bonneville is Oregon's future industrial hope. Opportunity must be preserved by throwing safeguards around the rate structure, providing for wholesale rates for energy.

RATES

It is fundamental that rates charged should be sufficient to liquidate the cost, with interest, within the time limit as fixed by law, after extended discussion. Rates for electric energy marketed by the Authority must continue to be approved by the Federal Power Commission, and must not be raised except by consent of the Congress. It is my contention that there should be no broad grant of authority which should in any way sidestep the Congress and its prerogatives. Such would be contrary to the long-established precedent on which this Government is founded. Certain responsibilities must rest with the duly elected representatives of the people. Every bill should be carefully checked to make certain that it is consistent with this conception.

When the cost of the power project as allocated by the Federal Power Commission has been returned to the United States Treasury, then the citizens of the Northwest should have the full advantage of their natural resources and surroundings. Then the rates charged for electric energy should be reduced to the lowest possible point which will pay the operation and upkeep and extend improvements of the property. No one will question that, when the debt to the Government has been fully repaid, this great project should not be merely a Bureau in Washington. Then the regional interest may transcend the Government's interest. We should start right, with a responsible, representative authority. This fundamental legislation must look to the future.

POWER AND RECLAMATION

Definitely and most emphatically the Bonneville and Coulee rate payers must not be required to take up losses which may come in the laudable and important effort of the Reclamation Service to irrigate lands under the Columbia Basin Irrigation Project. Under many irrigation projects in the West, the farmers are finding it almost impossible to milk off the debt created when water was put on the land, even where gravity water was available. The Columbia Basin Irrigation Project is dependent on pumping, generally far more costly than gravity water. If there should be any loss on the irrigation project, the electric rate payers should not bear it. I am assuming that the Columbia Basin Irrigation Project will remain part of the Reclamation Bureau and will never be linked to the power project under the Columbia River Authority. I consider it important that there be included in the bill and proposed to the Congress a section clearly declaring such policy. I hope the bill will be carefully studied for that particular purpose. As a Representative in Congress from Oregon, I am in duty bound to see that this proposed legislation leaves no loopholes through which such charges could be made a burden or a responsibility for the users of Bonneville power.

WAS GRAND COULEE INTENDED FOR POWER OR RECLAMATION?

On August 19, 1935, in the Seventy-fourth Session of the Congress, when the House had under consideration the bill authorizing the construction of Grand Coulee Dam, Representative Samuel B. Hill, coming from Spokane, Wash., representing the congressional district in which the dam is situated, used the following words, found on page 13725 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 73, part 13; Hill said, "This is not a reclamation project. This is a power dam, and there is no reclamation in the program for its construction at this time." He made it very clear that the project was started as an electric-power project. Reclamation was afterward added when the high dam was decided upon by the President.

COULEE COST ALLOCATION

I regard it as of fundamental importance that the bill provide clearly and explicitly that the Federal Power Commission be the governmental agency given the authority to allocate to each of the several interests involved the proportion of the cost that should be paid by each. Bonneville costs have been allocated by the Commission between navigation and power. Coulee costs have not yet been allocated between reclamation, power, and flood control. Certainly such allocation should be provided for, and speedily made, so that the Columbia River Authority may know at the start how much it is supposed to reimburse the Government for the investment made at Grand Coulee. In the light of present-day events, the Government interest rate charged to Bonneville is certainly too high, but the President, when he fixed the rate of 3½ percent based it upon very different money-market conditions which then prevailed. Interest has constantly been lowering in our country for almost a century. We must have the very lowest possible figure for the interest rates on Grand Coulee investment for power, as found justified by the Federal Power Commission.

NO INTERFERENCE WITH IRRIGATION RIGHTS

It is my firm conviction that the pending bill does not in any way interfere with nor affect irrigation rights. Nevertheless, as the Oregon Reclamation Congress has gone on record in opposition to the bill in its present form, I recommend that a section be added disclaiming any intention to curtail in any way or to interfere with or to limit irrigation projects in any manner.

THE ACQUISITION PROGRAM

The heart of the pending bill is the private utility acquisition feature which gives and grants to the Authority the right and privilege to purchase existing private utilities in Oregon and Washington. It is expressly provided that this purchase shall be financed by the sale of revenue bonds.

Revenue bonds have demonstrated their adequacy when applied to agencies which are subdivisions of the State, but so far as I know, it is a new Federal procedure. I am strongly in favor of such financing, provided that in so doing Congress can retain the functions delegated to it by our Constitution.

The buyers of revenue bonds must be assured that they will be liquidated and that interest charges will be met. Rates are the security upon which such bonds rest. Naturally, the first concern of the lenders will be the rate base. In marketing some municipal issues of revenue bonds, it has been argued that they were more secure for the holders than general obligation bonds because they usually carry a provision that if the income is not sufficient, rates may be raised. This may be done by agreement or by court order. It is quicker and more easily accomplished than a general property levy to meet any deficiency.

Power history shows the imperative necessity of protecting the established Bonneville wholesale rate, as well as the Federal investment in the power project. The Congress cannot get away from the fact that the inclusion of rate provisions is standard procedure in indentures covering the issuance of revenue bonds. We must legislate to protect the public interest.

HANDLING THE FUNDS

Section 11a of the bill covers the creation of a separate fund in the Treas-

ury to be known as the Columbia Power Administration fund. Experience to date indicates strongly that there must be a separation of funds, according to the derived sources, rather than lumping these funds together. It would seem that public interest, as well as sound financing, requires an accounting separation of funds so that the status of the project can be determined from time to time by the appropriate congressional committees. Without such separation, the Budget and the appropriation committees of the Congress have no gage to measure the use of appropriations. Section 11c covers the permanent appropriation of unsegregated funds. The effect of such handling of funds, as is included in this bill, is to subordinate the Federal equity to that of the holders of the revenue bonds.

It must be borne in mind, in this connection, that the existing Bonneville Act requires that returns, with interest, be made to the Treasury on that part of the Federal investment allocated to power. The appropriations to date have been made on this basis and it would appear that the same provision should be included in the proposed bill, inasmuch as funds were definitely voted on the theory that a full return would be made to the Treasury. Congress may assume that after the Coulee allocation is made the same obligations will exist there.

PLEDGES AND OBLIGATIONS

The first large appropriation for Bonneville and Coulee was allotted by the Public Works Administration in 1933. Since that time the wise and far-seeing appropriations committees of the House and Senate have poured millions more into these dams, electric equipment and transmission lines. In all this expenditure, in hearings, when seeking appropriations, and in statements on the floor of the House, the people of the United States have been given our sacred pledge that the money invested in the power project should be put back into the Treasury of the United States, with interest. That pledge must be kept in its fullest detail. In order to keep that pledge and promise, and also to conduct the business in an orderly manner, we must have a definite outline of procedure for the whole river. Bonneville is operating under statutes carefully worked out; Coulee power project is connected with it by executive order. The period of 40 years for amortization was declared a reasonable period by the President, who also set the interest rate at 3½ percent.

Under this bill, the entire power income of Coulee and Bonneville generating plants is pledged to pay the interest and amortization on the revenue bonds sold to acquire the private utilities. These charges may come in ahead of the original costs of Bonneville and Coulee. It was never intended that anything should interfere with the aforesaid repayment. The primary collections from wholesale power rates at these dams, less actual operating expenses, are in honor bound to be taken to pay interest and amortize the Federal debt.

SAFEGUARDS

We who are now making the laws for managing the Columbia River power plants may all be out of office before any private utility can be purchased and turned over to the Authority under the terms of this bill. Recalling some of the experiences of the past and looking to the far future, we must make this bill proof against any possible action leading to scandals or questionable transactions, or monopolization which might take place because of errors in human judgment or evil intentions on the part of any person or persons in authority. Certain safeguards will protect all concerned, including the Administrator or Board or Authority, and will, above all, strengthen and protect the public power program.

The sponsors of this bill must clearly remember the scandalous difficulties which grew out of the sale of the Seattle Street Railways to the city of Seattle. The reverberations reached Oregon when I lived in its capital city. Let us have a clear-cut amendment that the revenue bonds sold have no lien except on the revenue from the properties purchased with moneys so obtained.

THE CERTIFICATE OF VALUE

In the bill, acquisition of property is to be determined upon by the Administrator, alone. This should, in my opinion, be surrounded by safeguards so the decision may be subject to review. We must do what is necessary to assure the sale of the distribution systems to public bodies on terms which they will willingly accept and find advantageous. It should not be intended to set up a public successor to the private power holding companies, on the same model.

There is a section in the bill—section 2g—providing that the Administrator or the Authority shall make a certificate to the Secretary of the Interior on the feasibility and on the justification of the price, stating that the properties will pay out and are a good purchase. Let the bill provide that the certificate be a document of real consequence and significance. Let the certificate show what has been the assessed tax value of the properties about to be purchased. Let the certificate show the values placed on the properties, by the private electric companies, for rate-making purposes. Let the certificate carry a survey and an estimate of value by some well-known firm of engineers to be selected by the Secretary of the Interior. Let the certificate state the annual revenue and the operating expenses over a 3-year period. Let the certificate show the number of customers, the number of meters, and the mortgage on each meter. Provide in the bill the proper detailed form of that certificate and require that it all be published for 3 consecutive weeks in at least 2 weekly papers in the district affected, before any purchase is consummated. Let the full calcium light of publicity shine, with all its searching glare, on each point in the transaction. We cannot afford to pass a bill that will affect so many thousands of people and cover so many millions of dollars of transactions, without safeguarding every step and providing against bargains made behind closed doors.

In the matter of determining the values of any public utility under purchase consideration by the Authority, no value should be given the property for a going business. No financial value should be set on a franchise which was a free gift from the people to the private utility, and one which they have a right to reclaim. No value should be placed on old and useless machines. It is a difficult problem which must be faced in these acquisitions.

The suggestions I have made should not interfere with marketing revenue bonds. This is, however, a point that should be fully developed by the committee for the information of Congress because a new type of financing is being applied to a Federal undertaking. Protection of public interest requires that the revenue bondholders shall not write the ticket. We must protect the Government investment and the rates of the ultimate purchaser. We must avoid repetition of the holding-company experience.

COMPETING LINES

I believe we should add a section to the bill giving the Authority the right and power to build a competing line when it is found impossible to purchase private utility properties for a reasonable price. Nothing will squeeze the water out of an over-capitalized property quicker than competition.

THE VALUE OF THE PRIVATE PROPERTIES

The committee has heard testimony that the private utilities in Oregon and Washington have a book value of $300,000,000. The Chairman of the Federal Power Commission, after a careful survey and study, has stated that the private utilities of the Nation have a capitalization of $13,000,000,000, with an actual valuation of less than $6,500,000,000. In other words, one-half of the stocks and bonds upon which the private utilities are earning dividends is water. It is a fact that, in the growing Northwest, electric properties were capitalized more highly than anywhere else in the United States. It is safe to say, that the private utilities there, with a book value of $300,000,000, claimed in public testimony, are not worth today more than somewhere between $100,000,000 and $150,000,000.

The price will be the only issue in many cases. Some of the companies will sell their properties. *The most important protective provision on the purchase price requires amendment of the bill to give the ultimate purchaser a chance to sit in at the bargaining table.* The cities, the P. U. D.'s, and other public bodies must tell the Authority what they can afford to pay. Sound operation requires recognition of the fundamentals of home rule which have so long been accepted in Oregon. The properties bought from the Authority by the governmental units must be so priced that they will be on a sound basis and that local interests will not be jeopardized. I believe the bill needs amendment in this particular.

A REASON FOR SAFEGUARDS

The Authority will be obliged to deal with a certain private utility in the city of Portland which is now having a repeated experience in the bankruptcy courts. It is in the hands of receivers and cases and lawsuits are pending involving millions with some of the great banks of the country. Its history may be followed in the reports of the receivers and in governmental records. I quote from a speech that I made in the Congress on July 1, 1935:

The floating of Central Public Service stock under gilded promises and the victimizing of 11,675 persons in Oregon is one of the greatest financial scandals in our State history. Worse still, Pepco, under orders from Central Public Service, bought 29,994 shares of Seattle Gas, worth $15 a share, and paid for it $225 a share, or 15 times its market value. Central Public Service at the time being the owner of Seattle Gas, as well as Pepco, paid itself through this deal 15 times the market price for Seattle Gas. The celebrated holding company sat on both sides of the table giving the operating company no choice and swindling it out of $6,753,748. Reporting the deal to its stockholders, Pepco, the Portland operating company, described it as $6,753,748 "added to plant and equipment." By that and other like deals, Central Public Service, a holding company, as owner of Portland Pepco, increased the indebtedness of that corporation from $45,000,000 to $71,000,000—an increase of $26,000,000 in only 1 year and 4 months—without any increase in tangible assets.

Is it not apparent that very careful safeguards must be thrown around the purchase of such a property? Should such a private utility be able to manipulate affairs so as to buy the power of the Columbia River at $17.50 per kilowatt-year for a long enough period, the growth of population and business will make such an increase in the values of their properties that they can be secure in the dividends on their watered stock.

Recent private utility financial reports show that, as their rates have been forced down by Bonneville, use has increased and profits have mounted. Conditions are changing so rapidly that if Bonneville Administration is not ready to buy nor the private utilities to sell, only short-term contracts should be entered into.

ENACTMENT DESIRED BY PUBLIC POWER ORGANIZATIONS

When the recent Federal order came, forcing interconnection between publicly and privately owned utilities, I said, "Goodby to public power in the Pacific Northwest." I do greatly fear the result of that order. I fear that it is the nose of the camel under the tent. Enactment of this legislation and the purchase of the private utility properties will safeguard us against this threat coming to us through enforced interconnection.

Enactment of this bill into law will make it possible for our public utility districts to get into actual operation. I hope the bill will be protected by amendments before it comes up for final consideration, so that the Congress may act with confidence and promptness. Cities and public utility districts which are ready to distribute Bonneville power locally are anxious to proceed on the basis provided in the proposed bill.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous special order of the House, the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

AN ACT TO END THE RUBBER CONFUSION IN AMERICA

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, due to the lateness of the hour, I will not consume the full 15 minutes allotted to me, but I do want to take a few minutes to call attention to the fact that I have introduced a bill known as H. R. 7253, which today was referred to the Banking and Currency Committee of the House, which has for its purpose the establishment of a Rubber Administrator for the United States.

It seems to me that the time has come to put an end to the carnival of confusion which has developed in this country with regard to the true situation confronting us from the standpoint of rubber.

For weeks and weeks Congress and the country have been treated to the sorry spectacle of high administration officials engaging in interdepartmental feuding which would do credit to the legend of the Martins and McCoys. There has been a plethora of name-calling but a deplorable paucity of rubber production. We have heard charges and countercharges and have read about fisticuffs, but still the delay continues in the imperative matter of putting American resources to work in the production of synthetic rubber. We have had threats of Nation-wide rationing of gasoline and even of the requisitioning of the tires of private car operators, but from equally high-ranking officials we have had emphatic denials of these programs. The time has definitely come to substitute action for acrimony in relieving the rubber shortage in America.

H. R. 7253 WOULD DO THE JOB

In the various hearings taking place before congressional committees we have heard experts on synthetic rubber and synthetic experts on everything testify to a variety of conclusions which are as lacking in uniformity and agreement as the reports coming from Japanese admirals trying to explain away their naval defeats in the Pacific.

Out of it all, however, certain deductions seem inevitable: First, somebody in the administration has bungled badly in failing to provide in advance a rubber stock pile adequate to meet American demands; after all, it is elemental logic to realize that an adequate stock pile of raw materials is a prerequisite in the functioning of an arsenal of democracy. Second, synthetic rubber can now be produced from both petroleum and agricultural products; the country is more interested in getting production started from both sources than it is in the efforts of certain southern petroleum interests to prevent or minimize production of synthetic rubber from farm products. Third, a single Rubber Administrator is needed to put a definite end to buck passing, to fix full responsibility for rubber development and distribution, and to get action now in producing the needed rubber essential for American military and civilian needs.

The bill I have prepared and introduced provides for a Rubber Administrator to be appointed by the President and to be charged with complete authority to get action in carrying out a program, first, for the purpose of utilizing rubber to the best advantage, and second, for the conservation of existing supplies of raw and reclaimed rubber and the collection of used rubber and its utilization, and third, for the production of synthetic rubber.

RUBBER CONTROL IS A FULL-TIME JOB

Keeping the economy of America on wheels and supplying rubber enough to fully equip our armed forces is a full-time job for somebody today. We have had enough of part-time tampering and temporizing with this important problem; we have had enough casual investigations and contradictory findings by diverse groups; we have had enough dodging and ducking and dallying. The President, Leon Henderson, Jesse Jones, Donald Nelson, and Harold Ickes have other important work to do. Let us now set up a central authority to get action so that our drive for victory will not be jeopardized on either the battle front or the home front by a complete break-down of our rubber supply.

I hope that Members of Congress will take the time to study the legislation which I propose and which is now before the House Committee on Banking and Currency. And I hope you will also join me in urging this committee to take action without delay and to bring in this bill or some similar legislation to end the confusion existing in the rubber situation and to start a program of producing synthetic rubber which may forever make America safe from another collapse of our supply of rubber materials such as is now apparently threatening this country.

Mr. Speaker, the time for action in the correction of the rubber problem confronting America is now!

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

THE AIRCRAFT CARRIER "LEXINGTON"

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein what I think is the most thrilling story I have ever read of any battle on land or sea, written by brave Stanley Johnston, of the Chicago Tribune, who was an eye-witness of the sinking of the U. S. S. *Lexington*. This story will probably run beyond the usual limit, but I believe it should be spread upon the permanent RECORD for all time.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may state to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that inasmuch as she does not know for certain that this article will cover more than two pages of the RECORD, the Chair will put the request, and if it is more than two pages, the Government Printing Office will send back an estimate.

Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply pleased to learn that the Secretary of the Navy agreed to grant the request of 23,000 workers at Fore River, namely, that the great ship they are now working on receive the courageous name of "Lexington" and that

they might be allowed to speed up its production in every possible way, in order that the great new *Lexington* might soon sail out to sea to carry on in the place of the courageous old *Lexington*, the carrier that so bravely battled the enemy to a defeat before internal explosions forced her own destroyers to help her to the end in the Coral Sea. The Secretary of the Navy in his telegram of reply to the workers on the new *Lexington* spoke of the inspiration of their request and their promise to speed up the work of its production.

The old battle-scarred *Lexington* was built at Fore River. The new *Lexington* is being produced by some of the men whose loyalty and energy and sweat produced the old. Many of us joined in making the request that this new carrier be named the *Lexington*. The people of the town of Lexington, old historic Lexington that I have the honor to represent, were so interested in having the brave name of Lexington carried forward and always kept afloat that they have already started to collect money, beginning at home and going all over the country, in order that another carrier might be built and named the *Lexington*.

To every American in the land, the name of Lexington represents bravery, courage, sacrifice and determination to fight to the bitter end for freedom and to maintain freedom. The courageous *Lexington* added glory and luster to the name. The ship, her planes, her equipment, her men of valor fought to the end. And when the end came, the flag was high, the exhausted men and injured ship held their heads high in the pride of duty done and victory gained.

The name Lexington has become especially significant, Mr. Speaker, to all the nations of the world who are fighting with us for real freedom. The name Lexington is an inspiring banner that every one of the nations must carry high today. I am more than glad and pleased, I am deeply moved in appreciation to know that again the *Lexington* will be afloat in August. Let the enemy beware, for it will be a fighting ship, in the loyalty and honor of her name and country.

I would like to speak of Mr. Johnston's description of the courage of the men on the gallant old ship, particularly of the new naval men, the enlisted men, the men who had been in the Navy only a few months and their behavior in their first real battle. The naval experts on the ship said they behaved like courageous old Navy men. We have every reason to be proud of them and proud to be Americans today.

In describing the end of the gallant *Lexington*, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Johnston writes:

The *Lexington* slowly filled with water and gradually, still upright, slid with a prolonged hiss beneath the water.

It seemed to me, Mr. Speaker, that that was a hiss of derision at the Axis; it was the old ship's applause for the defeat of the selfish, ambitious nations and tormentors for all the cruel persecution that has been carried on by them.

As the glow of her flames died away, one of her officers exclaimed, "She was a lady to the end."

"LEXINGTON'S" "DEATH" MARKED BY VALOR OF HER FIGHTING MEN—BLASTS ON STRICKEN "LEXINGTON" BLEW MEN AROUND "LIKE CORKS"—UNPARALLELED ACTS OF HEROISM MARKED FIGHT TO SAVE CARRIER—EXPLOSIONS INSIDE VESSEL COMPLETED WORK OF BOMBS—"ABANDON SHIP" ORDERS FOUND CREW HOLDING BATTLE STATIONS

(By Stanley Johnston)

This is the story of the *Lexington's* last hours.

It is a tale of gallantry above and beyond the valor of men in the heat of battle.

It is the story of a crew, smashed and blitzed from the air by an overwhelming enemy force, that rose to a second desperate fight when attacked from within by natural enemies that fed upon the fuels and stores within the great, valiant aircraft carrier.

It is an account of the dogged determination and unshakable courage with which the humblest and highest members of the ship's company strove together in a long, torturing, and deadly hazardous effort.

Its heartbreaking finish, in which the doomed *Lexington* slid flaming beneath the calm waters of the Coral Sea, was one they had battled against for hours.

Many of the men who distinguished themselves so greatly during these final 9 hours of the *Lexington's* existence as a ship had been Navy men for only a few months. Many of them had joined after the Japanese assaults on Pearl Harbor. Many were on their first cruise.

When it was over the oldest, tried seadogs in the crew declared that these as yet unsalted tars had behaved like "old men o' warsmen" the Navy's highest tribute to Navy men.

No one man could have seen all there was to see aboard the *Lexington* during these final hours. I saw what I could, and made straggling notes that later merely served to jog my memory. Much of what I am about to tell I learned from the lips of the ship's officers and men while we were on a long voyage back to the California port where we disembarked 25 days after these stirring happenings.

FIGHT TO SAVE "LEXINGTON" BEGAN AFTER ATTACK

The fight to save the *Lexington* began as soon as the attack upon her had ceased that morning of last May 8. The attack was the Japanese counterpart of a blow that the *Lexington's* own force of dive bombers, torpedo bombers, and fighters had launched over the 180 miles that separated our forces from the Japs. What our own airmen did to the Japanese in this, the third and final engagement in the battle of the Coral Sea, is material for our next installment.

Today we are concerned with the *Lexington*. The great old ship—one of the twin carriers around which almost all modern carrier fighting technique was developed—was hard hit in the attack which began at 11:16 a. m. and continued for 17 minutes.

Five torpedoes had torn huge holes—20 to 30 feet in diameter—in her port (left) side along the waterline and below it. One heavy bomb, probably a Japanese 1,000-pounder, had hit the ship's rail on the forward flight deck and on the port forward 5-inch-gun position. Another lighter bomb had ripped holes in her smokestack and killed with its splinters several men of an antiaircraft machine gun crew stationed there.

In addition to these direct hits by torpedoes and bombs, the *Lexington* also had been damaged to some extent by scores of near misses by Japanese dive bombers. The heavy bombs, exploding in the water at distances of 100 feet to 10 feet from the carrier's sides, had rocked her, and possibly had sprung certain side plates.

SIX-DEGREE LIST DEVELOPS AS WATER POURS INTO SHIP

She had taken, in the swift air battle, a 6° list to the port side as water poured through the torpedo holes.

Finally the heavy bomb which struck the rail of the forward flight deck had penetrated into the living quarters below. There a quantity of 5-inch shells, which were stacked so as to be close at hand for rapid firing, had been set off. The combination of explosions had started a fire and had been responsible for heavy casualties among the marines who formed the gun crews.

These quarters also happened to be those of Rear Admiral Aubrey Fitch, whose guest I was officially. My room, my clothing, notes, and typewriter, not to mention my safe in which I had $100 in currency and a wrist watch, suffered severely. Admiral Fitch's papers and belongings also were shattered and strewn about.

The fire that followed the explosions burned fiercely until damage crews extinguished it with chemicals, leaving the wreckage and tattered bits of furnishings covered with a chemical foam.

The torpedoes and bombs had damaged three fire rooms of the *Lexington's* engine system. This damage, however, was not sufficient to stop her.

Indeed, her speed never dropped below 25 knots until hours after the attack. She stayed with the other carrier—her name is withheld for reasons of national security—and with the cruisers and destroyers. We were all bound for the Japanese, the intention of Admiral Fitch and Rear Admiral Frank Fletcher being to close in and finish them off.

Almost before the last Japanese dive bomber had flown away Commander H. R. "Pop" Healy had telephoned to the bridge to tell Capt. Fred Sherman, the *Lexington's* skipper (and since promoted to rear admiral): "We've got the torpedo damage temporarily shored up, the fires out, and soon will have the ship back on an even keel. But I would suggest, sir, that if you have to take any more torpedoes you take 'em on the starboard (right) side."

CREWMEN REMAINED AT BATTLE STATIONS

The crew was still at battle stations. Below the wounded were being collected in various sick bays and having their injuries dressed.

I had made an arrangement with Commander Mort Seligman, the *Lexington's* executive officer, to make a series of disk recordings of the air action against the ship. Through the firing, the bomb bursts and all, I had talked into a microphone getting the exact times for various incidents, describing the Japanese, even getting on the disks the sounds of Japanese dive-bomber engines, our antiaircraft guns firing, bomb explosions, and the sound of the battle.

Naturally, my first thought was for these records. I ran below to Commander Seligman's cabin where the recording machine was situated. The marine orderly who had operated the machine throughout the fight played back our records. The two discs were perfect, recording, I believe for the first time in history, the sounds of battle. But alas, I was never to take them from the room. They were destroyed by fire before I ever got them off the *Lexington*.

Aboard the *Lexington* the routine of a carrier in dangerous waters was going on. Commander Healy was overseeing the pumping of fuel oil from port storage tanks into empty tanks on the starboard, and the list was taken off the ship and its flight deck. As soon as this was done our fighting planes, which had been in the air for periods ranging from 1 to 3 hours each, began coming back on board.

PLANE SQUASHES ON DECK, PLUNGES INTO OCEAN

The first one in was a scout bomber that had been on antitorpedo plane patrol. The machine had been damaged in battle and was flying erratically. When it circled, turned "into the slot" for its final approach it was high and flying too fast, but Lieut. Aquilla Dibrell, the landing officer, waved it in anyway.

The plane squashed onto the deck with its left wing low. The wing tip hit the deck, the plane bounced, struck again, and spun over the side into the water. The *Lexington's* navigation officer who saw the accident signaled a destroyer that was trailing us by a mile or more to the rescue.

Both members of the crew of that plane were picked up, unharmed by the accident. The pilot, Lieutenant McDonald, had been wounded in combat, his right arm having been broken by a Japanese bullet. This accounted for his poor approach and landing technique. It was notable that during the many weeks I was aboard the *Lexington* and the thousands of landings I saw, that McDonald's was the only one in which a plane was lost.

Now, many planes of all types began returning from the attack on the Jap fleet. So normal was the *Lexington's* appearance that many of them did not know she had been in a fight until they were on the deck and saw the bomb-splinter scratches. The damage to the flight deck was confined to the railing.

WRITER BEMOANS LOSS OF PHOTO MANUSCRIPT

"Oh, John, you should see my room," called Lt. Comdr. Jimmy Brett, leader of the *Lexington's* torpedo-plane squadron, after landing and going below. On the night before he had shown me a manuscript of a book he had been writing on color photography and he referred to it again.

"That damned bomb destroyed all my papers, 18 months' work," he cried. "I've got to write it all over again."

Because we were still in fighting trim no lunch was served. Instead sandwiches, apples, and coffee were handed around by the mess stewards. The crew stopped to munch a bit before continuing with the work of repairing damage. Morale among the crew and the airmen was high. They knew their ship had been hard hit, but she appeared able to take it.

The torpedo holes had been forgotten by the expedient of closing off the required number of watertight compartments in the hull. This had not noticeably affected the vessel's buoyancy. But this rosy picture was not to endure much longer.

At 12:45 p. m. there was a heavy, dull explosion inside the hull. I was standing on the flight deck, and my knees buckled as the ship shook. Going below with damage parties, I found that the blast had come from deep within, and had twisted heavy, steel, watertight doors from their hinges.

BLAST CAUSED WHEN AVIATION FUEL IGNITED

We discovered that the explosion had been caused by the igniting of volatile vapor from aviation gasoline that had seeped through fractured bulkheads from the huge storage tanks where fuel for the *Lexington's* air fleet was stored. Presumably these bulkheads were damaged by the torpedo and bomb explosions, allowing the escape of the 100-octane fuel.

Fires at a number of points in the opened holds were burning fiercely.

These were being fed fresh air through bent and twisted scuttles that had given way along with the watertight compartment doors. A scuttle is a thick steel hatch which closes off entrances between decks. Ordinarily it serves to make watertight the openings between decks in exactly the same way that watertight doors seal compartments in the same deck.

Because the hold was opened the fires could not be isolated and smothered. All the ship's chemical equipment was rushed into the job, but it was not enough. Water was impossible to get, because the blast had smashed water mains, the auxiliary pumps, and had cut off light and power to the hold. Consequently the flames spread swiftly.

DESTROYER TRIES TO AID, BUT EFFORT IS FUTILE

Hoses from other parts of the ship where auxiliary pumps were situated were linked up. A destroyer was called alongside and its hose lines were run aboard. But there were far too few auxiliary hose lines on the *Lexington* and the destroyer didn't help because its pumps could not lift water high and far enough.

About 1 p. m. we found that the first blast had killed Pop Healy, who had been working below. It also had thrown Comdr. Arthur J. White, the ship's surgeon, through one of his hospital doors, breaking his collarbone and one ankle.

Despite these injuries he dragged himself around for 5 hours tending other casualties—of the Japanese attack and of the explosions which followed. He quit only after the order to abandon ship had been given and he had seen the last wounded man evacuated from the hospital and laid out on the flight deck.

The second explosion came about 25 minutes after the first. It was the beginning of a series that ultimately came at intervals of a few seconds. That, however, was hours later. Each explosion damaged the fuel and aviation gasoline storage tanks further and the escape of these combustible fluids grew more rapidly as the day faded.

ELECTRICAL DIFFICULTY CRIPPLES STEERING

After the third and fourth explosions the navigator reported that the steering apparatus for the *Lexington*, which had functioned perfectly in the battle and up to that time, had failed. This failure was due to the loss of electric power for the bridge control. Men were stationed at the "trick wheel"—an auxiliary wheel situated deep inside the ship where it was operated by hand, but the greatest difficulty for the navigators was the loss of electrical communications systems to pass their orders to the wheelsmen.

When the fires destroyed these systems a line of men was formed along the deck, down from the bridge, and thence down into the ship's bowels where the "trick wheel" was being operated. Orders were transmitted by word of mouth from man to man down this line and rudder directions were entirely dependent upon this relay system, which was slow.

With the failure of the electrical power system came an interruption of the great blowers—the ship's ventilating system. Heat quickly rose in the engine and firerooms to between 145 and 162° F. Nevertheless, the engineer's gang stayed at their posts and kept their equipment going to give the 25-knot speed demanded.

"We felt most of the explosions a lot more strongly toward the rear than you did at the front," one of the fire tenders told me afterward. "The heat and blasts affected us to the point where we had difficulty in keeping our minds clear. We were dizzy and had violent headaches from the heat."

During this time the damage-control gangs and fire fighters were engaged in a desperate fight to save the ship. This fight was becoming hopeless. The flames rapidly increased their grip and extended their area. More than 25 percent of the below decks section was now a blazing inferno.

Bulkheads adjoining the burning sections turned red with heat and thick layers of paint curled off and began burning—to transfer the fire into new areas.

The steel decks above the fires grew unbearably hot and flames angrily licked their way up through the twisted open scuttles.

Then the fire engulfed the machine shop. Twenty bombs—each weighing 1,000 pounds of which three-quarters was TNT—were stored there, for loading into our heavy dive bombers. Further aft in the fire area was a stock of 48 torpedo warheads—about 550 pounds each, or a total of 26,400 pounds of the best explosive the Navy knows how to make.

Commander Seligman personally was leading his fire-fighting squad. Smoke below became so dense that beams from electric flashlights would not penetrate it. Only the familiarity of the men with the internal plan of the ship enabled them to move around at all.

BLASTS TOOK COSTLY TOLL OF FIRE FIGHTERS

Some of these fire fighters were killed or burned by almost every explosion. Many of the injuries came as the blasts bounced men off the steel walls. Bones were fractured, heads broken, and with it all there were critical burns.

As injured or smoke-blinded men from these gangs were brought to the flight deck for treatment, other men stepped forward, donned the smoke helmets taken from the casualties, and went below in their places.

Several times Commander Seligman was blown through open doors and out of scuttle holes. One of his men told me later: "The 'exec' was continually being blown through doors and out of holes like a cork out of a bottle."

It is not possible to estimate the total number of men lost fighting the fire, but medical records for the *Lexington* show that at least half the casualties were those caused by explosions and burns.

One of the most violent explosions of all came at 2:45 p. m. It happened just forward of the bridge and caused much damage. It was apparent to all that the end was near and I found later I had written in my notes the time of the explosion and the one word: "End." But I was wrong. The crew and officers did not even give up then.

The *Lexington* was still making headway strongly, though her steering was becoming awkward. This was due solely to the loss of time in transmitting orders. It was impossible to keep the helm steady. This time Admiral Fletcher signaled the other ships to disregard the movements of the *Lexington*.

BRIDGE ASKS DISTANCE TO NEAREST LAND

Next the gyro compass failed because of a final loss of electric power. The bridge asked the chart room: "Distance to nearest land?" Then the captain asked: "Distance to nearest point of Australia?" Finally came the order to plot the course to a designated point in Australia. It was evident that the captain was considering a departure from the rest of the fleet.

At 4 p. m. Captain Sherman ordered the engines stopped and fire rooms abandoned. Lt. Comdr. Mike Coffin, who received the order, stayed at his post passing on the word and assuring himself that every man got out. The *Lexington's* speed fell off rapidly until she was drifting helplessly sideways with smoke pouring from the main deck to starboard blanketing everything on that side.

The fight against the fire continued for another hour, at which time it was evident to all aboard her that the carrier could not be saved.

To remain aboard the ship any longer was courting disaster. An officer braved the heat and flames below to test the temperatures of the bombs and warheads. When he put his hand on their cases his palm was scorched. This meant, of course, that the temperatures of the explosives inside were beyond the heat level at which scientists decreed they would detonate.

COMMANDER REPORTS EXPLOSION DANGER

Singed, his clothing half burned off, Commander Seligman reported to Captain Sherman the existing condition below decks and the imminence of a devastating explosion of the ship's munitions. This explosion was delayed for 2 more hours. When that blast

came Captain Sherman slid down a rope to a rescue boat, the last man to leave his ship.

But I am getting ahead of my story. The time had arrived to make the momentous decision of abandoning the famous old ship, a powerful weapon of war which represented an enormous investment in cash and security for the Nation. It always is hard for a captain to leave his ship, especially so in wartime when she is needed. But before Captain Sherman spoke Admiral Fitch suggested that abandonment begin.

I heard the exchange of words, which was far from the usual conception of such a dramatic moment.

Admiral Fitch leaned over the high railing around his little bridge on "the island" and spoke to Captain Sherman, who was pacing the navigating bridge 10 feet below him. The admiral pitched his voice in a conversational tone, saying:

"Well, Fred, I guess it's time to get the men off."

It was 5:15 p. m., the end of the battle for the *Lexington*.

Her battered, exhausted, scorched, and singed crew gathered on the after end of the flight deck. Forward all was ablaze and the flight deck was too hot to put foot upon it.

Admiral Fletcher sent several destroyers alongside and we transferred our wounded, 160 men, to the vessel. Hundreds of the other crew members also stepped aboard the destroyers.

Still other hundreds let long hemp ropes down the sides of the *Lexington*, slid down them and into the limpid waters of the Coral Sea. Many life rafts soon were floating around the *Lexington's* stern. Big Navy whaleboats from cruisers and destroyers were plying back and forth. A few men struck out to swim the quarter-mile to the nearest cruisers.

Several members of flight crews removed the little yellow life rafts from fighter planes on the flight deck, planes that never would fly again. These men used the rafts to ferry themselves across to the warships standing by. It should be mentioned that 25 percent of the *Lexington's* fighting planes—those especially picked for lack of damage—were flown off her burning deck long before the fire was beyond all control and landed on her companion carrier. the number of planes thus saved was limited by the capacity of the other carrier's hangars.

I joined a group of pilots who remembered that the ship's store of ice cream would melt soon with the refrigerator's electric current cut off. Rather than lose it they got several 2-gallon cans and we sat around under the wings of planes parked on the deck and ate the ice cream from paper drinking cups.

CARRIER ABANDONED UNDER FULL DISCIPLINE

This was typical of the leisurely way in which the ship was abandoned. There was no hurry, no scrambling. This discipline was part of the reason roll calls later revealed that 92 percent of her personnel were safely transferred from her. Only 8 percent of the original complement were missing. Most of these were victims of the air fighting, the bombing, or torpedoing of the *Lexington*, or finally of the fire fighting and internal explosions.

I did a last turn on the deck with Lt. Comdr. Edward H. Eldredge, an air officer, after most of the crew had left. We decided to take the next favorable chance ourselves. My preparations consisted of transferring all notes to a breast pocket of my shirt, where I hoped they would stay dry. Then I picked a rope with a big knot at its end, where I might sit until picked up, and cautiously slid down. Eldredge was a bit careless in securing his grip and he did the trip to the water in one scorching flash that left him with blistered palms and a friction burn on one leg.

In 2 minutes I was picked up in a whaleboat with other men. We towed several life rafts as well, and got a number of men to a cruiser. I stayed aboard the cutter with the coxswain and we commenced to gather in men who were swimming and showing signs of exhaustion.

Hauling exhausted men from the water over a 3-foot-high gunwale while a small craft is rolling is no simple task. After pulling in about 30, one's arms weaken. In all, we got 60 aboard. They filled the boat because so many lay on the bottom trying to cough the sea water out of their lungs. Undoubtedly, the foresight of the coxswain in electing to pick up swimming men saved several lives.

While we were thus engaged there came a heavy explosion aboard the *Lexington* that sent the amidship portion of the flight deck hurtling into the air. Flames burst through. Immediately afterward came a blinding flash, a tremendous shock, and a billowing cloud of black smoke soaring skyward as the 1,000-pound bombs exploded. Bits of steel deck and side plates showered the sea for hundreds of yards around, endangering all in the water and in the boats.

I later learned that Commander Seligman had just slid down a rope into the sea and Captain Sherman was still on a rope when this explosion came. They had stayed to the last to see that every man got away.

Only a few minutes later the after tip of the flight deck was blasted away. Planes were tossed into the water when the torpedo warheads let go. Captain Sherman and Commander Seligman were swimming to a cutter when this happened. Luckily they were not harmed by the debris that fell all around them and they were rescued.

It was almost dark when our boat reached the mother ship and unloaded. The whole length of the *Lexington* was ablaze as I climbed aboard the rescue cruiser. It was a fierce, white fire, evidently consuming the 80,000 gallons of aviation fuel and million gallons of fuel oil from tanks now wide open.

RESCUE SHIPS ORDERED AWAY FROM BLAZE

Blast after blast rent the ship, but she floated high and upright. A few small vessels poking among the debris around her for possible swimmers were ordered to leave her side.

A destroyer stood by to administer the finishing coup. This consisted of a salvo of four heavy torpedoes delivered at close range. After their blasts had opened new holes the *Lexington* slowly filled with water and gradually, still upright, slid with a prolonged hiss beneath the water.

"She was a lady to the end," one of her officers exclaimed as the glow of her flames died away.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6634. An act to facilitate the employment by defense contractors of certain former members of the land and naval forces, including the Coast Guard, of the United States; and

H. J. Res. 303. Joint Resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet, in accordance with its previous order, on Monday, June 22, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Friday, June 19, 1942.

Business to be considered: Hearing on Federal Communications Commission.

There will be a meeting of a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 2 p. m., Wednesday, June 24, 1942.

Business to be considered: Public hearing on H. R. 6832, a bill to repeal section 3 of the Standard Time Act of March 19, 1918, as amended, relating to the placing of a certain portion of the State of Idaho in the third-time zone.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1773. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated April 13, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a review of reports on the Cambridge Harbor, Md., requested by a resolution of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, adopted on February 28, 1939 (H. Doc. No. 802), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2119. A bill to admit Mrs. George Joseph Poulin permanently to the United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2255). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 505. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 7184, a bill to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2256). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 504. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 7160, a bill to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy during the existing war, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2257). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 507. Resolution for the consideration of S. 2404, a bill to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept decorations, orders, medals, and emblems tendered by governments of cobelligerent nations or the other American republics and to create the decorations to be known as the Legion of Merit and the Medal for Merit; without amendment (Rept. No. 2258). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MUNDT:

H. R. 7253. A bill creating the office of Administrator of Rubber and Rubber Products and defining his duties; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois:

H. R. 7254. A bill to expedite the prosecution of the war by making provision for an increased supply of rubber manufactured from alcohol produced from agricultural or forest products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARLSON:

H. R. 7255. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Republican River; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

By Mr. DWORSHAK:

H. R. 7256. A bill to provide compensation for the injury, death, and detention of certain employees of contractors with the United States resulting from war hazards, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FULMER:

H. R. 7257. A bill to expedite the prosecution of the war by making provision for an increased supply of rubber manufactured from alcohol produced from agricultural or forest products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. PIERCE:

H. R. 7258. A bill to authorize payment of local improvement assessments upon land owned by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. ROLPH:

H. R. 7259. A bill to provide compensation for personnel sustaining disease or injury while performing civilian defense duty, and to provide indemnities to the beneficiaries of such personnel in certain cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STEFAN:

H. R. 7260. A bill to expedite the prosecution of the war by making provision for an increased supply of rubber manufactured from alcohol produced from agricultural or forest products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 7261. A bill to amend Public Law 506, Seventy-seventh Congress, so as to extend war-damage insurance protection to the Philippine Islands after July 1, 1942, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CASE of South Dakota:

H. R. 7262. A bill for the relief of Vida B. Rogers; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NORRELL:

H. R. 7263. A bill for the relief of Mrs. J. R. Bennett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLAUCHÉ:

H. R. 7264. A bill for the relief of Andrew Williams; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SCOTT:

H. R. 7265. A bill for the relief of Frank Borah; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 7266. A bill for the relief of Earl Thomas Dodd; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

H. R. 7267. A bill for the relief of Don Hicks; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3090. By Mr. FISH: Petition of 35 residents of my district, protesting against the enactment of Senate bill 983 and House bill 3852, measures to regulate the opening and closing of barber shops in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

3091. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 78 members of the First Methodist Church of Ellwood City, Pa., urging legislation which will provide the largest possible protection for our men in the Army and Navy, discontinuing the sale of beer in Government commissaries, establishing a dry zone in the immediate vicinity of military camps, and the strict enforcement of the law against prostitution; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3092. Also, petition of 15 members of the Lawrence County (Pa.) Christian Endeavor Union, urging the passage of Senate bill 860 and House bill 4000, to suppress vice and liquor in or near our camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3093. Also, petition of 54 members of the Free Methodist Church of Ellwood City, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 860, as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3094. Also, petition of 60 citizens of Franklin Township, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3095. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Associated District Newspapers, relative to a newspaper advertising campaign by the United States Treasury designed to sell its securities, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3096. By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa: Petition of the board of directors of the Lee-Henry National Farm Loan Association, representing 290 farmers and farm families in Henry, Lee, and Des Moines Counties, Iowa, urging that the interest rate of 3½ percent be continued upon Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3097. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by F. E. Van Tassel and 15 other citizens of Albany, Oreg., supporting Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3098. Also, petition signed by Helen Lee Thompson and 16 other citizens of Albany, Oreg., supporting Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3099. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the California State Council of Defense, at San Francisco, Calif., relative to compensation insurance for volunteers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3100. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Samuel D. Chabet, of Flint, Mich., petitioning consideration of his petition with reference to a grievance relative to employment; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

3101. Also, petition of Redmond & Redmond, of Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their claims with reference to the death of Francis James Oliver; to the Committee on Claims.

3102. Also, petition of August Wessig, of Chicago, Ill., concerning three memoranda pamphlets entitled "Motorist-Pedestrian-States Cooperation for Greater Safety"; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 22, 1942

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 18, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

The Reverend J. Lowry Fendrich, D. D., pastor of the Metropolitan Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Father, we invoke Thy blessing upon this assembly. As we come to the high tasks with which we are charged and upon which the destinies of so many millions depend, we place ourselves eagerly in Thy will. May we be so aware of our oneness with Thee that in the deliberations of this hour we may feel ourselves the perfect instruments through which Thine own eternal wisdon may be expressed. We pray that Thou wilt so move by Thy Spirit in the midst of this Nation that in the shaping of her policies and the execution of her tasks there may flow through her a blessing to all the earth. Support and illumine the President and those working with him to the fulfillment of our Nation's security. Abide in the hearts and homes of the men on the far-flung battle fronts of the world, and, out of this world confusion, may we, one by one, have a part in speeding the establishment of a new world brotherhood and peace.

Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, June 18, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on June 19, 1942, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 1587. An act to provide rental allowances for officers without dependents on sea duty when deprived of quarters on board ship; and

S. 2286. An act to authorize inclusion of service on active duty as service on the active list in computation of service of commissioned warrant officers in the Navy for pay purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 337) to provide for a permanent postage rate of 1½ cents per pound on books, disagreed to by the Senate; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and

that Mr. BURCH, Mr. HAINES, Mr. PRIEST, Mr. HARTLEY, and Mr. PLOESER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 6295. An act to suspend the requirement for the performance of annual labor on certain mining claims;

H. R. 7137. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to marketing quotas for peanuts, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7164. An act to amend the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the relief and benefits provided therein to certain persons, to include certain additional proceedings and transactions therein, to provide further relief for persons in military service, to change certain insurance provisions thereof, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7184. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 416. An act for the relief of E. A. Wailes, receiver of Delta Oil Co.;

S. 819. An act for the relief of the widow and children of Dr. Jo M. Ferguson;

S. 885. An act for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934;

S. 1707. An act to prevent the making of photographs and sketches of military or naval reservations, naval vessels, and other naval and military properties, and for other purposes;

S. 2467. An act to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6315. An act to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans; and

H. R. 7182. An act making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes.

THANKSGIVING FOR AMERICAN VICTORIES—PROCLAMATION BY MAYOR JOSEPH J. KELLY, OF BUFFALO, N. Y.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, on Monday, June 15, 1942, the people of Buffalo, after proclamation by Mayor Joseph J. Kelly, ceased all their normal activities for 2 minutes between noon and 12:02 p. m. to thank God for the victories of the American forces in the battle of the Coral Sea and Midway and to pray for the gallant young Americans who lost their lives in these battles.

This observance received Nation-wide attention and publicity, and, in the hope that it might be repeated elsewhere, this account of it is inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mayor Kelly and numerous Buffalonians have asked me to thank Secretary of the Navy Frank Knox and Capt. R. D. Workman, Chief of the Chaplain's Corps, United States Navy, for their message of appreciation for the Buffalo observance. Captain Workman's message reads as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy and those who serve under him as officers and enlisted personnel of the United States Navy, Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard deeply appreciate the religious spirit and sympathetic thoughtfulness of the people of the city of Buffalo which has prompted them to set apart Monday, June 15, as a day of prayer in behalf of those who serve in the naval branches of our armed forces. When the people of a great city thus unite in thinking of us, particularly to pray for us and our loved ones, we are deeply touched. Such an act of remembrance will strengthen our morale and our will to win. God grant that the combined efforts of those who serve at home and those who face our Nation's enemy will be used to hasten the day of peace when the spirit of the Prince of Peace may be the guiding force in all human hearts.

This not only indicates the fine cooperative spirit of the chief executive of my home city of Buffalo, but it establishes a precedent and sets an example which it would be well for all other communities of the country to follow.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Glass	Pepper
Bailey	Green	Radcliffe
Ball	Guffey	Reed
Bankhead	Gurney	Rosier
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Schwartz
Brewster	Hughes	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bulow	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	Langer	Taft
Butler	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McFarland	Tobey
Chavez	McKellar	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Connally	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Downey	Millikin	Wheeler
Doxey	Murdock	White
Ellender	Norris	Willis
George	Nye	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is absent from the Senate on important public business.

The Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA (S. DOC. NO. 217)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the District of Columbia, fiscal year 1942, in the amount of $1,250 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIM FOR DAMAGES BY COLLISION INCIDENT TO THE OPERATION OF NAVAL VESSELS (S. DOC. NO. 218)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Navy Department to pay a claim for damages by collision incident to the operation of vessels of the Navy, amounting to $170.57 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES TO PRIVATELY OWNED PROPERTY (S. DOC. NO. 219)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the several executive departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages to privately owned property, amounting to $17,691.93 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENTS RENDERED BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 220)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which have been submitted by the Treasury Department, amounting to $78,840.46 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

JUDGMENT RENDERED AGAINST THE GOVERNMENT BY A DISTRICT COURT (S. DOC. NO. 221)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a record of judgment rendered against the Government by a district court, amounting to $870 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. DOC. NO. 222)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to $2,418.56 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

CLAIM ALLOWED BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. DOC. NO. 223)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the payment of a certain claim allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to $232.31 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SCHEDULE OF CLAIMS ALLOWED BY THE GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE (S. DOC. NO. 224)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a schedule of claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to $51,426.07 (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A petition of sundry citizens of Woodsboro, Md., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. MAYBANK:

Petitions signed by Charles Holliday, of the Columbia Bible College, South Carolina, and sundry other citizens of the State of South Carolina and of other States, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; and also praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic liquors over the radio; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

Petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Anthony, Bethel, and Pittsburg, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

RESOLUTIONS OF KANSAS OIL MEN'S ASSOCIATION AND THE SYRACUSE (KANS.) INDUSTRIAL CLUB—GASOLINE RATIONING

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD resolutions recently adopted by the board of directors of the Kansas Oil Men's Association, also resolutions adopted by the Syracuse, Kans., Industrial Club condemning the proposed rationing of motor fuel in Kansas and the Midwest as unjustified and imposing unnecessary restrictions on the general public. I am heartily in accord with the stand taken by the Kansas Oil Men's Association and the Syracuse Industrial Club. I have received an overwhelming protest from the people of Kansas against any program which would prevent the free use of gasoline of which we have an overproduction in our section of the country. I ask that the resolutions be referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it resolved by the board of directors of the Kansas Oil Men's Association, That the possibility of gasoline rationing being extended into Kansas and the Midwest constitutes a useless, ridiculous, and unjustified threat to the war effort and business life of the State of Kansas, a State which knows no shortage of motor fuel and which has great potential reserves.

That such a proposed rationing cannot be justified upon any practical or economic grounds whatsoever. Rationing of gasoline would result in the shutting down of refineries and this would mean a decrease in the production of oil. Storage facilities for crude oil are not sufficient to permit the continued operation of wells which are unable to dispose of their oil.

That oil is one of the most necessary products for the successful prosecution of the war. Unless great care is exercised in the regulation of all matters affecting its production, the United States may find itself confronted with an oil shortage at the most critical time in the further progress of the war. That we endorse the statement issued by Frank Phillips, general chairman of the Petroleum Industry for District No. 2, appointed by the Petroleum Coordinator for war, Harold L. Ickes, which was issued from Chicago on May 24, 1942, and which discusses this matter.

Therefore the board of directors of the Kansas Oil Men's Association hereby resolves that the proposed rationing of motor fuel in Kansas and the Midwest be condemned in all principles as unjustifiable and advocating unnecessary restrictions on the general public, who are ready and willing to make any necessary sacrifices, but they want to be shown that there is necessity for the steps taken.

Be it resolved by the Syracuse Industrial Club, of Syracuse, Kans., That the club is unalterably opposed to the rationing of gasoline in Kansas, and especially the western portion thereof for the following reasons:

"1. That there is and should be no shortage of gasoline if the proration be lifted to permit the production of unrefined petroleum.

"2. That this part of Kansas is entirely agricultural, farms are widely scattered, and people must come long distances for supplies and to market their products.

"3. That agriculture is almost wholly dependent on gasoline for motive power, scarcely 1 percent are able to use horse-drawn machinery; farmers have no horses, harness, nor other equipment, and power machinery cannot be operated by horses.

"4. That an unusual wheat harvest is at hand and to ration or even limit gasoline at the present time would paralyze the whole country and cause untold loss to farmers and all others in the country.

"5. That there is a dire shortage of farm labor at present and it would require five times the labor to farm and market the crops with horse power, even if horses were available, than with gasoline power.

"6. That there is a concerted effort on the part of people here to limit travel to absolute necessity and to reduce speed on the highways from 25 to 40 percent."

Be it further resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be sent to our Senators and Congressman, and we respectfully urge them to do all in their power to prevent any action toward rationing of gasoline in this section of the country.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference a group of 20 petitions, sent to me from 26 communities in 14 counties in the State of Ohio, bearing approximately 1,475 signatures, urging the enactment of Senate bill 860.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petitions presented by the Senator from Ohio, will be received and lie on the table.

PETITION OF MEMBERS OF THE BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL DEPARTMENT OF THE Y. W. C. A., WILMINGTON, DEL.—SUGAR RATIONING: ALCOHOL

Mr. TUNNELL presented a petition of members of the business and professional department of the Young Women's Christian Association, of Wilmington, Del., which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached, as follows:

We, the undersigned members of the business and professional department of the Young Women's Christian Association in Wilmington Del., are willing to help our country by making any sacrifices which are necessary to bring this war to a speedy close, so we accepted willingly the recent sugar rationing. However, when we hear that the amount of sugar allotted to breweries has not been reduced, and the alcohol being made by the breweries has not been taken by defense industries, but is being sold without restriction to our armed forces and civilians to weaken their physical stamina and morale, we certainly feel that, if sugar rationing for civilians is necessary, the rationing of sugar for breweries, and of alcohol in general, is more essential.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. TUNNELL presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance Unions of Wilmington and Marshallton, and sundry citizens, all in the State of Delaware, which were ordered to lie on the table, and one of the petitions was ordered to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached, as follows:

Be it resolved, That we petition Congress to pass Senate bill 860, designed to protect the armed forces, to keep away all distracting influences, to preserve law and order at all times, to the end that their important work can be adequately performed.

And whereas the Secretary of Agriculture and other public officials have made impassioned pleas against the wastage of goods and other materials essential to winning the war, we protest against the wastage of sugar and grains in the manufacture of beer, wines, and distilled liquors.

Not only does the manufacture of alcoholic liquors waste valuable foods and other materials, but the use of these beverages jeopardizes the efficiency, morale, and safety of all our people.

Inasmuch as limitations are being put on automobiles, tires, refrigerators, articles of clothing, and even certain kinds of foods: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress be petitioned to prohibit the manufacture and sale of all alcoholic liquors, at least for the duration of the war.

Mr. TUNNELL also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Brack-Ex, Roselle, and Elsmore, and vicinity, all in the State of Delaware, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached, as follows:

BRACK-EX, DEL., *June 12, 1942.*

HON. JAMES M. TUNNELL,
Washington, D. C.:

We most respectfully appeal to you to support legislation which will provide the largest possible protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the insidious influ-

ence of vice and liquors. We ask you to use your influence in securing the passage of the Sheppard bill (S. 860) at an early date.

Mr. TUNNELL also presented the petition of members and friends of Asbury Methodist Church, of Wilmington, Del., which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached, as follows:

WILMINGTON, DEL.,
June 12, 1942.

Hon. JAMES M. TUNNELL,
Senator from Delaware,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the members and friends of the Asbury Methodist Church, of Wilmington, Del., most respectfully appeal to you to support legislation which will provide the largest possible protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and liquors. We ask you to use your influence in securing the passage of the Sheppard bill (S. 860) at an early date.

Mr. TUNNELL also presented the petition of Mrs. Margaret Foulk, of Wilmington, Del., which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILMINGTON, DEL.,
June 16, 1942.

The Honorable JAMES TUNNELL,
Senator from Delaware.

DEAR SIR: I most respectfully appeal to you to support legislation which will provide the largest possible protection to the men in our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and liquors.

I ask you to use your influence in securing passage of the Sheppard bill (S. 860) at an early date.

Yours respectfully,
MARGARET FOULK.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. CLARK of Missouri, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 5695. A bill to amend the Civilian Pilot Training Act of 1939 so as to provide for the training of civilian aviation technicians and mechanics; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1502).

By Mr. MURDOCK, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 2599. A bill authorizing the Secretary of War to compensate holders of grazing permits and licenses for losses sustained by reason of use of the public lands for war purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1503).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 2568. A bill to establish additional commissioned warrant and warrant grades in the United States Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1504);

S. 2570. A bill to provide for the sale by the Superintendent of Documents of copies of certain historical and naval documents printed by the Government Printing Office; without amendment (Rept. No. 1505); and

S. 2593. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the fire whch destroyed the Administration Building, Naval Operating Base, Norfolk, Va., on January 26, 1942; with amendments (Rept. No. 1506).

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BONE:

S. 2611. A bill for the relief of Grover C. Wedgwood; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLENDER:

S. 2612. A bill for the relief of Jean M. King; and

S. 2613. A bill for the relief of C. T. MacNeille, Andrew L. Yerger, Edna M. Yerger, William Yerger, Edward M. Yerger, Maxwell Plantations, Inc., and Moberly & Son; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 2614. A bill for the relief of Jack Stanley Long; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 2615. A bill relating to legislative and budgetary control of expenditures for publicity activities of the executive branch of the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HILL:

S. 2616. A bill to provide relief for members of the American Volunteer Group in China and for their dependents; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2617. A bill for the relief of Thomas J. O'Connor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2618. A bill for the relief of Beatriz Milan Vda. de Vazquez; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 2619. A bill to amend Article of War 114 so as to broaden the power to administer oaths and take acknowledgments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

(Mr. PEPPER introduced Senate bill 2620, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN (for himself and Mr. GERRY):

S. J. Res. 153. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to an agreement between the State of New York and the State of Rhode Island and Providence Plantations concerning the settlement of the boundary line between said States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 6295. An act to suspend the requirement for the performance of annual labor on certain mining claims; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

H. R. 7137. An act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to marketing quotas for peanuts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 7164. An act to amend the Soldiers and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, to extend the relief and benefits provided therein to certain persons, to include certain additional proceedings and transactions therein, to provide further relief for persons in military service, to change certain insurance provisions thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 7184. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

ASSISTANCE TO AND EXPENDITURES OF THE COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

Mr. BONE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 266) which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Patents is authorized to employ such experts, and such clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable, in the conducting of hearings during the Seventy-seventh Congress. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $7,500, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman. The heads of the executive departments and other executive agencies are hereby instructed to detail personnel temporarily to assist the committee in the preparation of its hearings on patent legislation on request of the chairman thereof.

STUDY OF UNITED STATES HISTORY IN SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the New York Times yesterday performed a most valuable service by publishing in the Sunday edition a summary of a survey it has conducted on the study of United States history in the colleges of the United States. It seems to me to be perfectly shocking that, as this survey shows, only 49 percent of the teachers' colleges in the United States require for admission the study of United States history. With respect to all teachers, professional and technical schools, colleges, and universities, public,,private, and denominational altogether, the great majority apparently do not require that a student seeking admission shall have passed an examination in United States history.

Of 606 schools covered by the survey, only 171 require United States history for admission. In other words, if I understand the survey, only 28 percent of these schools and colleges think it important that students who present themselves for admiss.on have a knowledge of the history of their country. I believe that the survey is of such a character that it ought to be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor. I ask unanimous consent that an editorial from the New York Times commenting upon this survey, and a chart showing the results of the survey, may be printed in the RECORD at this point, and that the survey itself be referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

There being no objection, the survey was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and the editorial and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY IN THE COLLEGES

It is rather disconcerting to read in this morning's Times that the colleges and universities of our country are slighting the study of United States history. When only 18 percent of the institutions of higher learning deem American history essential to undergraduate students and when only 28 percent require it of applicants for admission a problem arises that demands the careful attention of all serious-minded citizens and educators. This condition would be undesirable at any time; today, when our democratic heritage is threatened, the need for a clearer understanding of the American way of life becomes even more acute.

Particularly distressing is the fact that a majority of students go through 4 years of college, enter a professional or graduate

school, leave with one or more degrees—presumably as educated members of the community—without having taken even one course in American history. It is difficult to visualize a truly educated person who is unaware of the background of the United States.

That less than 10 percent of the total undergraduate body and only 8 percent of the freshmen are taking an interest in American history is not a comforting disclosure. Courses in the history of the United States should be required of all students in our colleges and universities, regardless of their academic program. It is just as important that a teacher, doctor, lawyer, or accountant know the history of this country as it is for the statesman, journalist, or economist. This is an obligation that cannot be shrugged aside by our educational institutions.

To make American history a required course for mature students of college age does not appear to be an undue imposition. As we look ahead to post-war problems, it is essential that we develop men and women with love and devotion for our democratic ideals. Obviously, you cannot teach patriotism by edict, nor develop a genuine love of nation by legislative act. It would be unrealistic to believe that a course in American history can work miracles. Yet we may be optimistic enough to feel that a more thorough understanding of the American way of life, a deeper appreciation of its magnificent past and promising future, would leave their mark upon young minds.

Our colleges and university leaders are aware of this need, more than two-thirds holding that American history should be made a required subject. They stress its importance in developing citizenship, in creating love of country, in building civic responsibility. In that way the democratic ideals and traditions upon which this country was founded can be made more secure and lasting. As Charles Warren, president of the Harvard Alumni Association, said recently: "American history must be so taught as to lay more emphasis on its principles of liberty, its democratic traditions, and on the flaming words and heroic efforts of its leaders." American history can become a refreshing, exciting experience for young and old alike.

Charted results of survey on college study of United States history

[The following chart shows the extent of the study of American history in the Nation's colleges and universities. Three categories are listed: Teachers colleges, professional and technological schools, and colleges and universities. Each group is divided into classifications based on control—public, private, denominational]

Question	Teachers colleges				Professional and technical schools				Colleges and universities				All			
	Public	Private	Denominational	Total	Public	Private	Denominational	Total	Public	Private	Denominational	Total	Public	Private	Denominational	Total
Undergraduates	66,161	4,215	431	70,807	11,509	22,891	1,963	36,363	234,431	131,008	114,945	480,384	312,101	158,114	117,339	587,554
Undergraduates in all history	26,808	1,342	226	28,376	2,669	2,968	804	6,441	51,336	40,322	40,368	132,026	80,813	44,634	41,398	166,845
Undergraduates in United States history	11,559	579	124	12,262	643	1,360	200	2,203	16,343	12,009	12,575	40,927	28,545	13,948	12,333	54,826
Size of freshman class	22,211	778	102	23,091	3,845	5,384	548	9,777	70,039	43,590	33,678	147,207	96,095	49,752	34,328	180,175
Freshmen in United States history courses	3,792	345	67	4,204	453	645	23	1,121	4,310	2,174	3,252	9,736	8,555	3,164	3,342	15,061
Freshmen in other history courses	7,719	301	20	8,040	1,245	892	198	2,335	18,429	13,183	13,517	45,129	27,393	14,376	13,735	55,504
Is United States history required for admission to college?																
Yes	46	5	1	52	6	10	9	25	26	19	49	94	78	34	59	171
No	49	4	1	54	7	21	14	42	57	102	180	339	113	127	195	435
Percentage "yes"				48				37	31	15	21	22	41	21	23	28
Is United States history required for undergraduate degree?																
Yes	45	6	1	52	3	9	6	18	12	11	34	57	60	26	41	127
No	49	4	1	54	16	61	37	114	73	112	201	386	138	177	239	554
Percentage "yes"				48				13	14	9	14	13	30	13	15	18
Is United States history required for students majoring in—																
Government:																
Yes	56	3	2	61	1	2	3	6	32	40	120	201	89	54	125	64%-268
No	16	0	0	16	0	3	1	4	42	40	49	131	58	43	50	151
Economics:																
Yes	46	3	1	50	2	4	3	9	23	36	74	133	71	43	78	44%-192
No	24	0	0	24	1	1	1	3	30	65	105	221	75	66	106	247
Sociology:																
Yes	41	2	2	45	2	2	3	7	17	25	60	102	60	29	65	36%-154
No	22	0	0	22	1	0	1	2	57	71	117	245	80	71	118	269
Should United States history be made compulsory?																
Yes	81	6	1	88	0	23	18	51	54	50	110	214	144	81	129	354
No	11	2	0	13	3	11	1	15	23	52	59	135	37	65	60	162
Percentage "yes"				87				77	71	49	65	61	80	55	68	69
Total number of colleges responding	95	10	2	107	19	65	51	135	85	127	236	448	198	200	292	690

INDUSTRIAL USES FOR FARM PRODUCTS—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CAPPER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject Industrial Uses for Farm Products, delivered by him on June 20, 1942, before the National Grange, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MALONEY TO THE GRADUATING CLASS OF THE MERIDEN, CONN., RED CROSS VOLUNTEER NURSES' AIDE CORPS

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at the graduation exercises of the first Meriden, Conn., class of the Red Cross Volunteer Nurses' Aide Corps on Sunday, June 14, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILLIS AT INDIANA REPUBLICAN STATE CONVENTION

[Mr. MCNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the keynote speech delivered by Senator WILLIS at the Indiana Republican State Convention in Indianapolis, Ind., on June 18, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY THE SECRETARY OF COMMERCE AT DEDICATION OF TECHNOLOGICAL INSTITUTE, NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY

[Mr. LUCAS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Hon. Jesse H. Jones, Secretary of Commerce, at the dedication of the Technological Institute of Northwestern University, Chicago, Ill., June 6, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY ARCHIBALD MACLEISH TO THE NATIONAL RETAIL DRYGOODS ASSOCIATION

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Archibald MacLeish before the National Retail Drygoods Association, Chicago, June 17, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

CHANGE OF POLITICAL AFFILIATION BY FORMER GOVERNOR MURPHY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the statement issued by former Gov. Francis P. Murphy, of New Hampshire, setting forth his reasons for changing his affiliation from the Republican Party to the Democratic Party, which appears in the Appendix.]

JAMES OGLETHORPE, FOUNDER OF GEORGIA

[Mr. GEORGE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article on James Oglethorpe, by Eric Underwood, from the Washington Post of June 6, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR AND PUBLIC POWER—ARTICLE BY RICHARD L. NEUBERGER

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "War and Public Power," written by Richard L. Neuberger, and published in the magazine Nation, which appears in the Appendix.]

FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION APPROPRIATIONS AND SALE OF GOVERNMENT-OWNED GRAIN

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement signed by leaders of farm, labor, and religious organizations relative to adequate appropriations for the Federal Security Administration and the sale of grain for livestock feed, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PEOPLE'S MOOD—ARTICLE BY MARK SULLIVAN

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Mark Sullivan entitled "The People's Mood," which appears in the Appendix.]

LEON HENDERSON TODAY—EDITORIAL IN WASHINGTON DAILY NEWS

[Mr. BROWN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Leon Henderson Today," published in the Washington (D. C.) Daily News of June 22, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

CIVILIAN WAR BENEFITS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2412) to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of civilians, and for the prevention and relief of civilian distress arising out of the present war, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to the committee amendment, proposing to strike out on page 62, line 19, the words "including practice black-outs." On the amendment the yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Trans-Radio Press is carrying an announcement from the Army at San Francisco of the shelling of the northern coast of Oregon last night at about 11:30 o'clock by an unidentified submarine. Between six and nine shells were hurled toward the shore near Seaside, Oreg. The Army announcement stated that no casualties or property damage resulted.

Senators will recall that this is the second time since December 7 the enemy has hurled missiles actually upon the coast of continental United States, the first time occurring last February when a submarine fired shots against the continental United States in the neighborhood of Santa Barbara, Calif. This time, farther north did the enemy strike.

Mr. President, it might have been a sad sequel of these attacks that a number of American citizens lost their lives, as directly the victims of the enemy as any soldier who might fall at the front. Those shells might have mangled the body of a man, woman, or child, and the victim would have been a direct casualty of the war.

Mr. President, it was in anticipation of such a situation that on the 6th of February of this year the President of the United States wrote the following letter, which is the genesis of the bill now pending before the Senate, and to which I respectfully call the attention of Senators:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 6, 1942.

Hon. PAUL V. MCNUTT,
Administrator, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. MCNUTT: In order to permit sufficient time for the study and development of adequate legislation required because of enemy action which has necessitated aid to the civilian population, it is necessary that provision be made for temporary immediate aid. Pending the development of such legislation, I am asking you, as Federal Security Administrator, to assume responsibility for providing temporary aid necessitated by enemy action to civilians, other than enemy aliens, residing in the United States: (1) who are disabled, or (2) who are dependents of civilians who are killed, disabled, interned, or reported as missing; or (3) who are otherwise in need of assistance or services. This aid may take the form of cash allowances or temporary provision for hospitalization, medical care, food, shelter, clothing, and transportation. It is not intended that such aid should cover civil or other personnel of the Federal Government, for whom other provisions are contemplated.

I have directed the Secretary of the Treasury to make available to you the sum of $5,000,000 from the appropriation "Emergency fund for the President" contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942, approved April 5, 1941. This sum is intended to provide for the contingencies arising out of enemy action as defined in my letter to the Secretary of the Treasury, copy of which I enclose.

Numerous proposals covering various parts of this problem have already been made and others are being developed. I have asked the Bureau of the Budget to give particular attention to the coordination and recommendation of legislation required because of enemy action which necessitates aid to the civilian population. I should therefore like you to continue to keep in close touch with the Bureau of the Budget so that all proposals can be considered in the submission of over-all legislation.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Referred to in the letter from the President to the Administrator is the following letter from the President to the Secretary of the Treasury, dated February 6, 1942:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, February 6, 1942.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: By virtue of the authority vested in me by the provisions of the appropriation entitled "Emergency fund for the President," contained in the Independent Offices Appropriations Act, 1942, approved April 5, 1941, I hereby make the following allocation:

To the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency ..... *Amount* $5,000,000

to be expended by the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency, or through such Federal or other agencies as he may designate, for providing temporary aid necessitated by enemy action to civilians, other than enemy aliens, residing in the United States: (1) Who are disabled; or (2) who are dependents of civilians who are killed, disabled, interned, or reported as missing; or (3) who are otherwise in need of assistance or services. This allocation is not intended to cover civil or other personnel of the Federal Government for whom other provisions are contemplated.

The funds hereby allocated shall be available for all necessary expenses in carrying out the above-described activities, including the procurement of supplies, services, and materials without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; the advance of funds without regard to section 3648 of the Revised Statutes; and the employment of such personnel without regard to the civil-service or classification laws as may be necessary or expedient for the accomplishment of these purposes.

Please arrange for the necessary transfer of funds and advise the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

Under the authority of those two directions of the President the sum of $5,000,000 was set aside to the Administrator of Federal Security, Mr. Paul V. McNutt. Mr. McNutt, in turn, allocated $750,000 to the Social Security Board through its Chairman, Mr. Altmeyer, and another $500,000 to the Public Health Service, through Surgeon General Parran. A considerable part of the special emergency fund provided by the President has already been expended in taking care of the dependents of civilians employed on off-shore bases, and in foreign work for the United States, who have been killed, or who have been captured and interned by the enemy.

Pursuant to the direction of the President the Bureau of the Budget assumed the responsibility of framing the right kind of legislation to deal with this subject, with provision for the dependents of civilians who lose their lives, and for the dependents of those who are captured by the enemy, as well as compensation to those injured by certain war hazards.

The Bureau of the Budget undertook that responsibility and collated the activities and cooperation of the War Department, the Navy Department, the Employees' Compensation Commission, the Federal Security Agency, and the Office of Civilian Defense. Every one of those agencies has had a very material part in the drafting of a measure to carry out the President's plan and proposal.

When the Bureau of the Budget had completed the preparation of the bill one of its representatives brought it here and, because I had introduced a similar bill, he offered it to me to introduce. I did introduce it, it was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, and representatives of all these agencies came before that committee; extensive hearings were held, and finally, after having considered the matter for some weeks, and having as active participants in the recommendation of the bill by two members of the Finance Committee, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the committee approved the bill that what is now the pending business. That is how that bill came to be here.

I have before me the original letter of the Director of the Bureau of the Budget to the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, which reads:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., May 1, 1942.

Hon. ELBERT D. THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: In response to your letter of April 28, regarding S. 2412, a bill "To provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of civilians, and for the prevention and relief of civilian distress arising out of the present war, and for other purposes," I am writing to advise you that this proposed legislation is in accord with the program of the President.

You may be interested to know that several differing proposals for dealing with the problems encompassed by this legislation were submitted to the Bureau of the Budget,

and that the Bureau, while cognizant of the fact that the legislation dealt with serious problems of public policy about which there might be genuine differences of opinion, nevertheless, took an active part in bringing the several departments together in order to secure a substantial agreement on the bill as it appears in the committee print of April 23.

I am advised in this connection that the Office of Civilian Defense will wish to make certain suggestions in order to clarify the application of the bill to civilian defense workers, and that other departments will also have some suggestions proposing minor changes in the bill.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD D. SMITH, *Director*.

Mr. President, I will say that the representatives of those various agencies came before the committee; they very helpfully participated in the drafting of the bill; the committee profited very greatly by their assistance, and, almost without exception, the suggestions which they made were incorporated in the bill in the form in which it finally came to the Senate floor.

I have before me the Washington Post of this morning, which contains a statement made by Harold Beresford Butler, the new British Minister to the United States. The article in question appears on page 5 of that newspaper, from which I quote, as follows:

Butler, who will head the British information services in the United States, succeeding Sir Gerald Campbell, said in reply to a question that 58,000 British service men were killed or missing since the war started and 44,000 civilians killed in air raids.

Think of that, Mr. President. Only 58,000 British soldiers have been killed, whereas 44,000 British civilians have been killed so far during the war. That means, therefore, that we are here today dealing with a bill to protect people who are at the front in modern war. If persons had been killed last night in Oregon, they would have been direct casualties of the enemy's attack and would have been the victims of a war hazard as defined in the bill. If persons had been killed in the State of the great senior and junior Senators from California [Mr. JOHNSON and Mr. DOWNEY], when a submarine shelled the California coast near Santa Barbara last February, of course, they would have been direct casualties of the war, the victims of direct enemy attack and assault.

Although we do not anticipate that there will be losses in this country at all comparable to those the British have sustained, yet the Secretary of War has told our people that it is inevitable that we shall experience bombing attacks from the enemy somewhere in this country.

Mr. President, we do not know where the first blitzkrieg blow will fall. God help us that it may be nowhere in this country, but, as sensible people, we know that we must provide for it, and that it might occur anywhere.

Senators have raised the question as to what the bill will cost. I said frankly to the Senate last Thursday that the committee could not tell the Senate what the bill will cost because we cannot tell the Senate how many persons are going to be killed or wounded. We do know what the British experience in that respect has been. The British have sustained a total of about 100,000 casualties; that is, killed and wounded. The scale of British benefits is about the same as the scale of benefits provided in this measure. So far as I know, this is the best evidence which can be given to the Senate as affording some indication of what the bill will cost. If we were to sustain losses comparable to those which have so far been sustained in Britain, which certainly should seem to be an outside figure for this country, it is estimated that the cost would be only about $36,000,000 a year, according to the scale of benefits now provided in the bill. It is proposed that the provisions of the bill be effective only for 5 years after the expiration of the war, so five times $36,000,000, or less than $200,000,000, would be the maximum total cost to the United States Government under the bill if we should sustain during this war the same number of casualties the British have already sustained.

I can give to the Senate a little additional data as to the property damage the British have sustained. It is estimated that so far—although naturally it is a figure they do not like to emphasize—the property damage sustained in Britain has been about $600,000,000. That includes damage in a city such as Coventry, where, I am told, every other house was destroyed. So if we were to calculate the civilian injuries and losses of life in terms of British experience, the figures I have given seem to indicate that the maximum which under the bill this country would be called upon to expend for a 5-year period after the war, would be not in excess of say $175,000,000, if we were to sustain the same number of injuries and deaths the British have already sustained during this war.

So, the bill is not an extravagant measure. It does not involve any waste of money. It will not result in profligacy on the part of the Government. It provides, I submit, in common decency for the payment of a common obligation which we owe to the civilians of the country who any day may be stricken down by enemy attack.

Mr. President, some question was raised in the Senate Thursday as to whether the war hazard covered by the bill was too large. I was somewhat responsible for including in the bill, in the committee, the practice black-out as a war hazard. The committee took that action because of what has happened during black-outs. The Evening Star of last Saturday showed that here in Washington last week one person was run over and killed as the result of the practice black-out. The same news item stated that in the previous black-out a person also lost his life. It has been the experience of the country that in nearly every one of these practice black-outs one or more citizens have lost their lives, and it seems to me it is only fair to include such casualties. From the indication of the opinion of the Senate last Thursday, however, I think perhaps the Senate is not willing to include that as a war risk hazard, and therefore, after having consulted with the chairman of the committee, and as the Senator temporarily handling the bill on the floor of the Senate, I am glad to accede to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] with respect to the words "practice black-out," and to agree that the bill may be modified to that extent, so that if there is no objection to that course, the practice black-out, as one of the hazards, would be eliminated from the bill.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Do I understand that the Senator from Florida is accepting the pending amendment?

Mr. PEPPER. I accept the pending amendment with respect to the practice black-out.

Mr. TAFT. That will mean setting aside the order for the yeas and nays?

Mr. PEPPER. I do not think it will be necessary to have the yeas and nays on that amendment.

Mr. TAFT. The yeas and nays were ordered on that amendment, but I assume they will not be necessary under the circumstances. If the Senator from Florida accepts the amendment, I shall ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, that that order for the yeas and nays be vacated, and that the amendment be agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the Senator from Ohio requests that the order for the yeas and nays on his amendment be vacated. Is there objection?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I will say that I gave notice that I should move that the bill be sent to the Finance Committee for study of certain of its features, and I believe I shall object to anything being done until I can urge the motion to refer the bill to the Finance Committee, because it seems to me to be a bill which ought to go to that committee for study of the financial responsibility which will be thrown on the Government if it shall pass in its present form.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to make a suggestion at this point?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes, indeed.

Mr. PEPPER. In view of the statement made by the able Senator from Georgia, I wonder if he would allow me to make a few concluding remarks, and then I shall yield the floor to the Senator to make his motion, after which, naturally, I should like the privilege of rebuttal, if there is anything I can properly say in rebuttal. Is that satisfactory to the Senator?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. I thought the Senator from Florida had concluded his remarks.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator for his kindness.

Mr. President, I wish to call the attention of the Senate to two or three things in regard to the able Senator's proposed motion. In the first place, the bill has been on the Senate floor for nearly 2

weeks, having been reported at that time by the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. In the second place, two members of the Finance Committee participated in the deliberations of the Committee on Education and Labor, which favorably reported the bill. One of those Senators is the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who was present during the entire deliberation upon this matter, and who took an active part in it, and who has not suggested to the Senate that the bill wholly should go back for reexamination.

The Senator from Ohio had only four amendments, I believe, limiting certain aspects of the bill, which he desired the Senate to pass upon, which the Senate, of course, is now doing.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is the other member of the Senate Finance Committee who participated in the deliberations in the Committee on Education and Labor, and when he learned of the proposed motion to be made by the able Senator from Georgia he sent me the following telegram which I think I may read to the Senate. The telegram is sent from Madison, Wis.

Hon. CLAUDE PEPPER,
United States Senate:

Please pair me against any motion to refer bill to Finance Committee and against any crippling amendments and in favor of its passage. I believe bill as well worked out as possible under circumstances. Precedent has been established to insure property against war damage at very nominal rates. It would be gross injustice to treat loss of life and limb or other consequences of enemy action less generously. No estimates of cost of property insurance were given prior to enactment of that bill because no one could foretell the extent of same. Similar situation prevails with regard to estimates of cost for compensation where persons are concerned. I hope majority of Senate will not establish a double standard for property and human beings to the disadvantage of the rank and file of the people.

That telegram is signed, "ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR."

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I understand that one of the chief reasons advanced for recommitting this bill is because of the large sums of money that will be necessary to carry out its purposes. Would it not be an extraordinary procedure for the Senate to refer this bill to the Finance Committee at this time? Can the Senator point out one bill previously sent to the Finance Committee in connection with which billions of dollars were appropriated? We shall be called upon in a few days to pass upon a naval appropriation bill providing for $8,500,000,000. Are we going to send that bill to the Finance Committee so as to determine whether or not the Finance Committee can provide the funds?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I cannot escape agreement with the suggestion of the able Senator from Louisiana. Because the Finance Committee devises tax legislation for the Senate, it does not seem to me to follow that that committee should have jurisdiction over every expenditure proposed in this body. Senators will note that this is only an authorization bill. It does not appropriate any money. The Appropriations Committee of the Senate will pass upon any proposed appropriation.

Moreover, the bill requires the Federal Security Administrator to make a report every 3 months to the Congress as to his activities under the terms of the proposed law. So before the Appropriations Committees appropriate much money they will have before them a detailed report of the Federal Security Administrator, who will be charged with the administration of the law.

Mr. President, of necessity the Senate Finance Committee is a busy committee. It is engaged in very difficult duties for the Senate and for the country, in devising tax legislation. I do not think it would want to assume any unnecessary burdens dealing with a matter which is not particularly within the scope of its obligations. If the bill is referred to the Senate Finance Committee a subcommittee will be appointed by the able chairman. It will have to start all over again with hearings if it is to obtain any real benefit from the proposed reference of the bill, and if the Senate is to experience any appreciable advantage from referring the bill to that committee.

In the first place, such a course would mean delay. We do not know what day will bring the sad and tragic news of an attack by bombing or other assault upon the civilians of the country. We do not want to find that we have made no provision for such a contingency.

In the second place, the Finance Committee would have to go over the same ground which I submit has already been fairly covered by the Committee on Education and Labor, the membership of which includes two very responsible members of the Senate Finance Committee, neither of whom happens to be a member of the majority party in this body.

I think the Senate knows enough about the ability and industry of the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] to realize that if he sat through every day at the council table during the hearings he went to the bottom of this measure; and yet he did not ask to have it referred to the Finance Committee. He was present and acquiesced in the report on the bill when it was reported out of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. He did state to his fellow committee members that he had certain amendments which he would like to have the Senate consider when the bill came before the Senate. We have done everything we could to collaborate with the Senator in the consideration of his amendments on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. It is quite true that I participated in the consideration of the bill. It is not true that I joined in the report on the bill; and it is not true that I will vote for the bill so long as there is included in its provisions compensation for some 5,000,000 to 6,000,000 air-raid wardens and other members of the Civilian Defense Corps, whose claims, I think, would amount to 10 times the amount of claims that would ever be filed by those injured by enemy bombs. I am willing to go along with compensation for civilians who are bombed by the enemy, and I so stated; but since my amendment was voted down by the Senate, and since compensation is now provided in the bill for anywhere from 3,000,000 to 6,000,000 members of the Civilian Defense Corps for injuries which may occur, which may be in no way connected with bombing or with the war but may be sustained in the course of their duties—while I am in favor of some provisions of the bill—I think that feature is of sufficient importance that I should be obliged to vote against the bill. I am in entire accord with title II and title III. I am quite willing to go along with compensation for civilians injured by enemy attack; but in view of the fact that on last Thursday the Senate voted down the amendment which I offered, I am afraid that the number of claims filed by members of the Civilian Defense Corps would involve an expense 10 times that which might result from claims of civilians injured by the enemy.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the able Senator for his very fair statement. I did not say that the Senator voted to report the bill. I said he was present when the bill was ordered to be reported from the committee. I believe the Senator will agree that that is a fact.

The Senator has disclosed that he is not complaining particularly about the action of the committee. He complains about the action of the Senate in including civilian defense workers. There was fair discussion of the issue on the floor of the Senate on last Thursday. The Senate voted fairly upon the matter, by a record vote, and the amendment of the Senator from Ohio did not prevail.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I shall be glad to yield in just a moment.

If the Senator from Ohio wishes reconsideration of that particular matter it can be had by a simple motion, to which I shall not object if he wishes to have the Senate vote on it again. However, that does not mean that on that question the bill ought to go to the Senate Finance Committee, when we can decide the question on the floor of the Senate without any difficulty and without consuming any appreciable time.

I now yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator referred to the extensive hearings. Were the 2 days of hearings which were held before the subcommittee the only hearings which were held?

Mr. PEPPER. Yes. Those were the actual hearings, Mr. President. I should have distinguished between the time spent in consultation with representatives

of various departments and the time spent in conducting the recorded hearings. Many days were spent by the committee in consultation with representatives of various departments in ironing out the provisions of the bill, which was a rather technical matter. Those conferences were not recorded and reported to the Senate.

Mr. BYRD. I note that at the hearing on March 31 two Senators were present, the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN]. On April 2 the subcommittee met, and the chairman of the subcommittee, the Senator from Florida, was the only Senator present. Only one Senator was present on the second day of the hearing.

Mr. PEPPER. That was the hearing before the subcommittee.

Mr. BYRD. Only two Senators were present on the first day of the hearing, and only one Senator was present on the second day of the hearing.

Mr. PEPPER. The subcommittee consisted of only three members. There was always a quorum present, either actually or by proxy.

Mr. BYRD. The record shows that on Thursday, April 2, the chairman of the subcommittee was the only Senator present.

Mr. PEPPER. That was during the compilation of the written testimony. However, subsequent to that time a quorum of the full committee met, the chairman being present, as well as several other Senators. The committee went over the ground deliberately, and called into consultation representatives of various departments. Finally, functioning as a full committee, the committee formulated the bill itself.

Mr. BYRD. So far as the printed hearings show, only two Senators were present on the first day of the hearings, and the Senator from Florida was the only Senator present on the second day.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I wonder if the Senator from Virginia imagines that something new is happening in the Senate when only two Senators are present at a hearing where testimony is being taken. The testimony is printed, and the full testimony is available to all Senators.

When the bill was discussed in the Senate Committee on Education and Labor a great many Senators were present. They met not merely one day, but several days; and, as always happens when any bill is honestly discussed and considered, there was considerable discussion back and forth. Surely the Senator from Virginia does not wish to imply that because the printed hearings before a subcommittee show only two Senators present, the action of the full committee in reporting the bill to the Senate is not a reflection of the work of the entire committee.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia regards this bill as one of the most important measures which has been presented to the Senate. The printed hearings show that only two hearings were held on this vitally important measure, involving in the future the expenditure of perhaps hundreds of millions of dollars. The proposed law would set the standard of compensation for a long time to come. The record—and that is the only thing by which the Senate can be guided—shows that only two Senators were present at the first meeting, and that the Senator from Florida, the chairman of the subcommittee, was the only Senator present at the second meeting.

I believe that some legislation of this kind is necessary; but I do not think adequate consideration has been given to the proposed legislation. Other Members of the Senate have the right to be informed by the hearings before the committee. The hearings occupied only two days, and were not extensive. I have read the printed hearings very carefully. There is no great amount of information contained in the printed record on this vital matter. I think it is important that the proposed legislation be given further consideration by the Finance Committee, which is the proper committee to give it consideration in the first instance.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida further yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad the Senator from Virginia is beginning to be a little studious about the action of the various committees of the Senate. I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Virginia to the fact——

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I do not claim to be more studious than other Senators; but I think I perform my duty with respect to studying the details of proposed legislation which comes before the Senate.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think that when the Senator takes himself so seriously as to rise in his place and call attention to a printed record of hearings held before a subcommittee, and pass judgment upon the action of the full committee, the chairman of the committee which has reported the bill has a right to say something about what the committee has done. I do not want to say it in any way that is unfair, because unfairness is not a part of my nature. However, the type of criticism which is advanced is not fair at all. The Senator has the bill before him. He notes that the bill has had several changes. There have been two or three committee prints of the bill, and the committee has considered each of those prints. This bill has not been hastily considered. Senators who are deemed to be on the opposition side have taken part in the hearings and have discussed almost every paragraph of the bill. The present speaker before the Senate in going over the bill, not in the final session of the Senate Committee on Education and Labor but in the session held 2 or 3 days before the final one, started reading the committee print from the beginning, and proceeded word for word. If the Senator thinks that there has not been consideration, his opinion must come merely from an assumption, which is scarcely a fair basis for a conclusion. If the argument is made that the bill should be sent to the Committee on Finance because only one Senator or two Senators were present at a certain hearing, of course such an argument has no validity at all and is an argument which means nothing. The Senate Committee on Education and Labor did not report the bill because two hearings had been held before a subcommittee, but reported it after study.

I think Mr. President, that we should be a little fair in criticizing committees, and should not jump at conclusions. The Senate Committee on Education and Labor has put forth as serious an effort, after study, as any other committee of the Senate has done with respect to bills reported to the Senate. Certainly the chairman of the Committee on Finance cannot stand on this floor and say, "Send the bill to my committee because it has not had adequate consideration." That would not be a valid argument, and no Senator will make an argument of that kind against a fellow Senator's committee. That there may be questions involved in the bill which the Finance Committee should consider is one thing, but we want to hear those questions. We do not want to send the bill to the Committee on Finance because of a statement that, of a subcommittee composed of three members, which held a hearing for the purpose of obtaining information to report to the general committee, information which was incorporated in a printed report, only one member happened to be present to conduct that hearing. I am not a lawyer, but I have heard of depositions. I do not think there is a court in the land that refuses to receive for what it is worth a deposition taken by only one man. Certainly when we are obtaining information at a hearing we do not have to have a great number of Senators present. If we did, the Senate would not be doing very much else but conduct committee hearings.

Mr. President, when the chairman of the Senate Committee on Finance tells us why the bill should be referred to the Committee on Finance we shall answer such arguments. However, the argument made by the Senator from Virginia is certainly not at all a valid argument, in the light of what the Senate has always done.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Utah seems to have overlooked the fact that Members of the Senate who are not members of the committee considering some particular legislation can obtain information only by reading the hearings

which were held by the committee considering the bill. I asked the Senator from Florida if any other hearings were held on the bill. He said that no others were held. The first hearing was held on March 31. It began at 10:30 a. m. and ended at 12:25 p. m., a period of less than 2 hours. The second hearing, with only 1 member of the subcommittee present, began at 10:30 a. m. and ended at 2:15 p. m., somewhat less than 4 hours. So on this vital bill, insofar as it enlightens the other 76 Members of the Senate who are not members of the Committee on Education and Labor, the only information they can secure as to the hearings must come from the printed record of the hearings, which were held during the course of 6 hours by the subcommittee, with 2 members present in one hearing and 1 member present in the other.

Mr. President, I have no desire to criticize the Committee on Education and Labor, under the distinguished leadership of the Senator from Utah. I recall, however, that the Committee on Education and Labor has suppressed important legislation which should have been presented to the Senate for consideration. I recall that last December the distinguished chairman of the committee, the Senator from Utah, gave positive assurance and made a positive agreement with the Senator from Virginia that certain proposed legislation relating to the labor situation would be considered by the Committee on Education and Labor and reported to the Senate. That proposed legislation, I may say, was not reported to the Senate by the Committee on Education and Labor. These two vitally important House bills were passed by the House by large majorities and were referred to the committee headed by the Senator from Utah. I make that statement not especially in criticism, but I want to say now that no committee of the Senate has the right to suppress important legislation which is passed by the House of Representatives and is sent to this body for consideration.

Mr. President, I say again that the bill pending should be referred to the Committee on Finance. It should have gone to the Committee on Finance in the first instance because it includes legislation relating to pensions, and pension legislation of this character has heretofore gone to the Committee on Finance. Social-security legislation has always gone to the Committee on Finance, and the pending bill includes legislation of that character. As the Senator from Texas points out, the provisions of the bill would entail great expense, and the necessary funds would have to be raised by additional taxation on the people. Nothing can be lost by referring the bill to the Committee on Finance. The testimony taken at all the hearings which have been held on the bill would be available to the Committee on Finance. In the first instance, the bill should have gone to the Committee on Finance, and in my judgment it should now be referred to that committee by the Senate.

Mr. MALONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. MALONEY. I cannot resist pointing out that the distinguished, able, and conscientious Senator from Virginia is chairman of the Committee on Rules, and he has a greater opportunity than have other Senators to overcome the unfortunate and haphazard practice of having bills improperly referred. I am hopeful that the present provoking situation—and I am in accord with the feeling of the Senator from Virginia in the matter—will result in accelerating some activity on the part of the Committee on Rules to see if we cannot at long last overcome this unfortunate practice.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I see on the floor today the able Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]. His name does not appear in the hearings as having been present; and yet I think he will attest that on several occasions the chairman of the committee and the junior Senator from Florida discussed the subject with him. He is the ranking Democratic member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Senator is correct. I am personally and vitally interested in two items in the bill, title III and title V. A bill dealing separately with that subject is pending before the Committee on Naval Affairs. That subject is the question of compensation to civilians who have been employed by contractors, and who have been taken prisoner in the Orient. I have frequently conferred with, and have made suggestions to the Senator from Florida and the chairman of the committee with reference to those provisions. Of course, I do not know whether all my suggestions have been accepted.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank the able senior Senator from Massachusetts for his statement.

Mr. President, from whom came the accusation that a fair hearing had not been given to the bill? Did it come from the able senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who participated in the hearings, and who personally knew what had been done? On the contrary, I have read a telegram sent by the able senior Senator from Wisconsin, from which I quote as follows:

> Please pair me against any motion to refer bill to Finance Committee and against any crippling amendments and in favor of its passage. I believe bill as well worked out as possible under circumstances.

He was present at the hearings. He knows about the deliberations of the committee. He gives his testimony to the Senate that there have been fair hearings and fair consideration of the measure.

Has anyone heard the able Senator from Ohio attack his fellow committee members for not giving adequate consideration to the measure? No. He is on the floor. He was present at those deliberations. He has not been the one to hurl that charge. No, Mr. President; it is Senators who were not present, Senators who do not have personal knowledge of the matter, Senators who have to draw upon their imagination or inclination, who are the ones who are hurling the attack against the committee.

The printed hearings with regard to the property damage bill before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency consist of only a little over 100 pages. The hearings held before the Committee on Education and Labor relative to the bill now under discussion number a little over 92 pages; so there is no discrepancy between the length of the hearings held on the bill relating to damage to property and those held on the bill relating to damage suffered personally by civilians. Moreover, the Committee on Education and Labor has submitted to the Senate a 36-page report carefully prepared by the legislative counsel of the Senate, Mr. Rice, who sits within my hearing. That report goes very much more in detail than does the report of the Committee on Banking and Currency with respect to the property damage bill which the Senate passed.

So, Mr. President, I cannot escape the conclusion—I hope it is not an unfair one—that the Senators who are primarily endeavoring to have the bill referred to the Senate Committee on Finance are Senators who do not feel so generously toward this type of legislation as perhaps some other Senators do, as evidenced by the fact that 11 out of a total membership of 21 on the Senate Committee on Finance on last Thursday voted in favor of the amendment of the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. At least we know that they would eliminate the civilian defense worker from the coverage of this bill, because they so voted on this floor on Thursday of last week.

Mr. President, I regard this as an emergency measure. If this bill had originated with the Senator from Florida, or even if it had originated in the Senate Committee on Education and Labor, then there would be, perhaps, good reason to say, "Well, perhaps some other committee should consider it"; but this bill emanated from the President of the United States; it was prepared by the Bureau of the Budget. The President made that Bureau his agent to supervise the preparation of this proposed legislation. I challenge any Senator to cite any bill which has had more careful scrutiny by the administrative agencies of the Government than this bill has had. As I have said, the Bureau of the Budget, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Employees' Compensation Commission, the Office of Civilian Defense, the Federal Security Agency directly throughout its consideration deliberated in the formulation of this bill. So, administratively and legislatively, it has had fair consideration.

As to the details of the bill, it is here before the Senators, it is on their desks, it is in print. We have already passed upon one item in the form of an amendment offered by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. We can pass upon any other item which any Senator may care

to question on this floor. That should be done, Mr. President, of course; but it is not fair to the committee, it is not fair to the Senate, it is not fair to the President of the United States, who has already made temporary provision of this character outlining the scope of the bill in an Executive order, it is not fair to the people of this country, who today or tonight may be stricken down by enemy attacks, for the Senate to delay further the consideration of this measure in view of the fair and generous consideration which has been given to it already.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, if the motion is in order—I should rather put it in the form of a request but since apparently that would not be granted——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is in order.

Mr. GEORGE. I move that the pending bill be referred to the Finance Committee. In making the motion, I am not raising any question of the good faith of the Committee on Education and Labor or of the fairness with which the committee has dealt with the bill. I am not questioning the conscientious consideration the bill has had at the hands of the committee. That is not my purpose at all; in fact, I am loathe to make the motion because of the respect I have for the chairman and all the members of the Committee on Education and Labor and because I feel certain that that committee has given full consideration to the bill. But when I looked through the report on this bill, Mr. President, and found that there was not a single estimate of cost, although the cost of some of its items might have been estimated, and indeed, the cost of some of them might have been ascertained, I felt impelled to make the motion which I have just made.

I wish to say again that I make it because it seems to me that the Finance Committee of the Senate has jurisdiction of the major features of this measure. I would not, of course, say that, perhaps, the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate, or the Civil Service Committee of the Senate, or it may be some other committee might not have jurisdiction of certain features of the bill. It is not practicable, of course, to incorporate various legislative proposals in a bill and send it to a particular committee without, perhaps, entrenching, to some extent, in a jurisdictional way upon the prerogatives of another committee.

This is not a motion that is made captiously; it is not made with any intent of reflecting on any member of the committee. The matter of holding hearings or what the hearings developed is not at all in my mind. I had hoped that by making the motion I might be able to obtain consent to have the bill go to the Finance Committee for the study of certain features of it, and that that committee might report promptly. I spoke to the majority leader on Saturday, and he was somewhat of the view that such an agreement might be made, but he subsequently stated to me that the proponents of the measure were not willing to have it take that course.

Mr. President, what is this bill? It is, primarily, a pension bill, having to do with the casualties of the present war. The Finance Committee, because in the past there has been no separate committee created by the Senate to consider such questions, has had jurisdiction of all matters of compensation, of all matters of allowance for disability for soldiers of World War No. 1 and their dependents; it has had jurisdiction of all insurance matters incident to World War No. 1 so far as the soldiers were concerned. The Finance Committee has reported to this body amendments to the National Life Insurance Act, and has brought within the terms of our present insurance provisions soldiers engaged in the present war. The soldiers engaged in this war are now entitled to the same compensation as were the soldiers in World War No. 1. We have tried to give them the same treatment with respect to compensation, with respect to protection, with respect to insurance, and all our men in the armed forces are now being treated comparably to those who served in or survived World War No. 1.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Am I correct in my expression that the Military Affairs Committee handled the recent Allotment Act and that the Senate Banking and Currency Committee handled the property damage legislation?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes; and I will be glad to discuss that circumstance in a moment. The Allotment Act is altogether a different act.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. I wish to ask the Senator if he would be willing to couple with his motion a reasonable limitation on the time, say, 30 days or such matter, within which the Finance Committee would be directed to report the bill back to the Senate?

Mr. GEORGE. Yes; I am quite willing to do so, I will say to the Senator, because it is not my purpose to defeat the pending bill.

Mr. NORRIS. It seems to me, if the Senator will yield further, that this bill ought to have gone to the Finance Committee, to begin with; it was a mistake, I think, to refer it to the Committee on Education and Labor; but it was referred to that committee without objection; the committee held hearings on it, and I think very conscientiously performed their duty. I do not agree with them; I shall oppose the bill, and, while I should dislike now, under all the circumstances, to vote to take the bill away from that committee and send it to the Committee on Finance, I feel, if the Committee on Finance were required to report within some reasonable time, that the motion of the Senator from Georgia should be agreed to.

Mr. GEORGE. I should be pleased to incorporate the Senator's suggestion in my motion.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. With respect to the motion of the Senator from Georgia, the Senator from Nebraska has raised an important question. That in title III provision is made to take care of prisoners who were captured at Wake Island. I think there is no objection to that provision. If a vote to refer the bill to the Finance Committee means its indefinite postponement, of course, I shall not vote to refer it, but, if we could have an agreement that the committee would report the bill back within a reasonable time, the situation would be different.

I realize that we are approaching a recess period; that the Committee on Finance will soon have before it a tax bill, and that it will be very busy. I am at a loss to know why it should want to take much time on the bill, and I should not want it referred to the Finance Committee, if, as I have said, it would mean its indefinite postponement or if it would mean waiting until next fall, for persons captured at Wake Island, and their dependents, are really in distress, and it seems to me the Senate is ready to make provision to take care of them. The matter has already been delayed 3 months. I hope there will not be further delay. I desired to bring out the point I have made, and to express the hope that, if the bill shall be referred to the Committe on Finance, the committee will report it back to the Senate as promptly as possible.

Mr. GEORGE. I fully appreciate that. Let me make one further statement as to why the bill should have been referred to the Committee on Finance. The Finance Committee has had jurisdiction from the beginning of social-security legislation. The burden of administering the proposed law would be on the Administrator, Mr. McNutt, and there are serious questions which should be considered in connection with the provisions of the bill which greatly enlarge his power and his authority.

As to title III, about which the Senator from Idaho has spoken, I understand there is now pending before some one of the committees of the Senate a separate bill dealing with the subject covered by that title. However, title III is not objectionable to me, and if that were all there were in the bill which is offered by the proponents of this measure I should have no objection to its passage with title III included. From the best study I have been able to make of title III of the bill I think it is a very proper matter for consideration and should be considered and passed upon by the Congress. I do not mean to say there are not other matters in the bill which should be enacted. I can assure the Senator that if it goes to the Committee on Finance it will be my purpose to report it back before we take up the tax bill, and I should hope to

do that within the next 10 or 15 days, because the tax bill will reach us in the Senate about the 20th of July, so there are less than 30 days between now and the time that bill will come over.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, it would seem to me that a matter of 10 days would be ample time. This bill has already been studied by the Department.

Mr. GEORGE. I understand that, but I do not wish to commit myself on accepting all that the departments want. I can very well understand why some of the departments want this bill.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. We are not asking that the bill be accepted in its present form.

Mr. GEORGE. I would not be for what they desired on that account. I can very well understand how, under the provisions of this bill, they could greatly enlarge all their bureaus. There would be the most magnificent expansion of the Social Security set-up this country has ever seen if the bill in its present form should be enacted into law.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield for a question. I wish to continue with my statement, however.

Mr. PEPPER. I should like to ask the Senator if the last statement he made was based upon any factual knowledge of any provision in the bill. I respectfully wish to advise the Senator, and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and other Senators who are present will bear me out, that the committee, in the drafting of the bill, has provided and safeguarded against that kind of thing. We practically made it the duty of the Administrator to act through other agents, and the Senator is honestly mistaken in his statement, if he will permit me to say so.

Mr. GEORGE. No; the Senator is not mistaken in his statement. I am basing the statement on all the experience I have had with public boards or public bureaus. I have never seen one shrink up. I have seen them expand and expand and expand, and if this bill shall be enacted we will be adding immeasurably to the bureaucracy of this Government. These various agencies will come before the Appropriations Committees and ask for appropriations, and it matters not how the Appropriations Committees may feel about it, they will be met with the statement that the Congress has passed the law, and that they have to expand in order to administer the law.

I say to the Senator right now that if this bill shall pass with certain of its provisions retained, the Social Security Administration and other agencies of the Government will have to be expanded twice over in order to administer the law.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. I quite agree with many of the statements the Senator is making about the bill. I am quite in accord with his criticism of the expanding of these agencies and these bureaus. Certainly there is much in the bill which I do not at all like, but I am anxious to have the Government take care of cases where the parties were taken prisoners, or injured, such as Pearl Harbor and Wake Island.

Mr. GEORGE. I agree with the Senator in that, and that feature would be administered through the United States Employment Service, as I understand. I do not think there is the slightest objections to that. I should be willing to have that part pass now if the other features of the bill were eliminated. But I think it would be fair to send the bill to the Committee on Finance, for a study of at least 3 or 4 or 5 days.

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. That would be very fine. I quite agree.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to make another statement. I think the Finance Committee should have the privilege and the opportunity of considering the whole social security set-up, to see how it would be affected by the enactment of the pending bill, to see how greatly it would be expanded under the proposal.

There is another thing which strikes me, and I state it with all due respect to the Committee on Education and Labor. As I have said, I have not a word of criticism to offer of that committee so far as its consideration of the bill is concerned, nor of the manner in which the committee considered it. This bill, of such supreme importance at this time, the chief features of which fell within the clear jurisdiction of the Committee on Finance, should have been referred to that committee for the further reason that the Committee on Finance should have some opportunity at least of passing on a proposal which would call for vastly increased taxes.

I was very much impressed by what the distinguished Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] said on the floor of the Senate last Thursday, when he reminded us that, after all, the Government of the United States is not a government of unlimited resources, that there is some limitation to its resources. We must realize that there is some limitation if we are to be perfectly frank with each other, and if we expect to pay back the money we are now obligating ourselves to pay back in the same sized dollar we have used out of the pockets of the citizen at the time we have been making the obligations.

Let me call attention to just a few facts. On April 24 of the present year the Director of the Bureau of the Budget issued a statement which is most impressive, in which he estimated that during the current fiscal year, ending June 30 next, within a few days, total receipts will meet 36 percent of total expenditures. During the next fiscal year, which will end on June 30, 1943, total receipts will meet only 31 percent of expenditures, assuming enactment by the Congress of the $7,000,000,000 of new taxes requested by the President in his Budget of last January.

I have here his estimates. I do not care to go into all of them, but I wish to call attention to a few facts. Mr. Smith said:

> Huge financing operations will be necessary next year to meet the tremendous deficit of $49,000,000,000. This estimated deficit assumes that the Congress will enact seven billions of new taxes. Even with that new tax legislation total estimated receipts will meet less than one-third of all Federal expenditures.

Attached to his statement is a compilation which shows that on July 1, 1943, 1 year hence, the total national debt will be $125,443,000,000.

Since this estimate was made a bill has been introduced and is now under consideration in the House of Representatives, I believe, for the maintenance of the War Department, with all that implies in wartime, carrying appropriations of thirty-nine and a half billion dollars. A bill is already on its way to the Senate, indeed, I believe it has arrived, providing additional appropriations for the naval service of eight and a half billion dollars. Forty-eight billion dollars are to be added, to say nothing of various other additions, to this revised estimate made by the Bureau of the Budget as of April 24, 1942.

All the money which will be appropriated may not be expended during the next fiscal year, I grant, but there will be the obligation, and let me say with all earnestness, it will be a disastrous day, if ever it should occur, if the American people should be forced to realize that we were not to pay this enormous debt with dollars of the same size and value the dollars have now, when we are incurring the obligations.

The Senator from Idaho has called attention to the third title of the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. In the interest of some accord with respect to this matter, in the first place, would the distinguished Senator be agreeable to the Senate continuing the consideration of all the remaining parts of the bill in subtitle I, which is the title to which he has addressed himself principally, then allowing title I to go to the Senate Committee on Finance, with an agreement relative to its expeditious return to the Senate? Would the Senator be agreeable to that suggestion? If so, I should consent to it. The bill is separable. Title I is the title which relates to benefits to civilians injured in the United States, or the dependents of those who suffer death or disability, or who might be interned or captured by the enemy in the United States.

Title II relates to the power of the Federal Government, through the Federal Security Administrator primarily, and then through the other private and public local agencies which attend to these matters, to meet emergency situations. They are authorized to give only temporary relief. If, for example, a city

were stricken by bombing raids, then under the set-up the Federal Government could disburse the money necessary to meet that temporary emergency, but only that.

Title III relates entirely to victims who sustain their disability or internment or death outside the United States, either at military, naval, or air bases, or upon some public works, and that is administered by the Employees' Compensation Commission.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that if he wants to expedite the matter, if he will strike from the bill titles I and II, and leave title III in the bill, I shall have no objection to it and will not insist on my motion. There may be other Senators who have views on other questions involved in the bill.

I wish to say to the Senator from Florida that when we consider the broad definition in the bill of civilian defense workers, when we consider that it is obvious that almost everyone in the United States can be brought within its provisions——

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will allow me to differ with him about that——

Mr. GEORGE. I will read the Senator's own definition, as contained in the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senator from Georgia will read it a little more closely, I think he will find that those persons are within definitely definable categories. They are not simply volunteer workers who might come in to help out. They actually must have been designated and appointed by the Civilian Defense Administration pursuant to generally prescribed regulations.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me proceed. I read from the bill:

(c) The term "civilian defense worker" means any civilian (except a person who is paid by the United States, or any department, agency, or instrumentality thereof, for services as a civilian defense worker) who is engaged in the Aircraft Warning Service, or is a member of the Civil Air Patrol, or is a member of the United States Citizens Defense Corps in the protective services engaged in civilian defense—

Senators, note this language—

as such protective services are established from time to time by regulation or order of the Director of the Office of Civilian Defense, or is registered for a course of training prescribed and approved by said Director for such protective services.

Mr. PEPPER. That is not an illimitable definition, I will say to the Senator from Georgia. It deals with certain prescribed rules.

Mr. GEORGE. No; but it is as broad as Mr. Landis, of the Office of Civilian Defense, wants to make it. It includes anyone who tomorrow he will say is designated to perform certain defense duties in the United States. If the Senator from Florida will pardon me, there would be 10,000,000 men and women who would fall within the exact terms of the bill. Why not handle the situation as we did in the first World War? Why not say to the people who are bona fide civilian defense workers: "You may have insurance at a nominal sum, as we give it to the men in the armed services; you may have your protection through the insurance features"? Why not send it down to the Veterans' Administration to be handled?

Do not put the enormous burden on Mr. McNutt's agency and on Mr. Landis' agency, because between them in the course of a night they can create an organization which would be fairly startling to the people of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, in the first place I do not have the distrust in the administrative agencies which has just been indicated by the able Senator from Georgia. He has a perfect right to believe that they would try to take advantage of their power, and stultify their duties and oaths of office, and use their power for sinister purposes. If the able Senator from Georgia believes that, he has a right to believe it. I do not believe it. But in the second place——

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am not yielding for an argument.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I——

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield for any question, but I do not yield for an argument. I wish to answer a part of the Senator's argument. I am not so distrustful of them. I know what they will do. There is not any doubt about it. I know what bureaus have always done. If we give them blanket authority they will do precisely what I have said, because they want to build up their organizations. Under this kind of legislation, if the Congress shall pass it, they would be justified in doing it. I am not critical of them for doing it, but I am critical of myself if I am willing to vote that kind of authority.

Mr. President, we have given much blanket authority already, but the American people do not expect us to make it possible for millions of people in the United States who are doing something for the Government in wartime, without direct compensation, to become pensioners of the Government.

My friend the Senator from Florida says the proposed legislation will continue for only 5 years. My friend is most optimistic. Let me say he is somewhat credulous. Let us assume someone who is drawing $85 a month under the provisions of the bill, and who may be getting $50 for dependents. At the end of 5 years let Senators visualize, if they can, the Congress of the United States cutting such a person off the rolls and saying to him, "The law under which you are drawing your $85 a month is going to be repealed." Senators, we cannot do that. It might be unconscionable to do it. If we build up a large number of pensioners—let us not call them pensioners—if we build up a large roll of persons who are drawing compensation from the Government for 5 years, Senators would be talking against the wind to come in here and say, "Well, you have had this compensation now for 5 years; you are crippled, you are maimed, and you are entitled to that compensation, but now we are going to cut it off."

No, Mr. President, we would not do that. We would not even think of doing that. When we adopt the proposed legislation it is here to stay.

I am perfectly willing for the civilian-defense workers to have the benefit of cheap insurance. Let it go to the Veterans' Bureau and be administered there. We have a bureau which deals with the matter of Government insurance. That bureau is already organized. It is able to function, and the matter can be handled by that bureau, without the necessity for creating a vast bureaucracy here to handle it.

Mr. President, I wish to say a word on the merits of the proposal. I had not intended to discuss it, but shall do so. Is not everyone trying to win this war? Is not every American farmer, whose labor supply has been cut, whose materials have been denied him, whose machinery cannot be supplied—is not he trying to win this war? Is not every professional man in America trying to win the war? What obligation has the Government to give special benefits? Must not the Government depend upon the people? Do Senators propose to put everyone on the pay roll? What difference is there between the status of those proposed to be covered by the bill and the man who has sent his boys to the war, who has gone back into the field, or into the little factory, or into the little dry goods or grocery store, to work to try to make a living for himself and the remaining members of the family? Do we owe him a less obligation than we owe some man or woman who runs up and down the streets at night telephoning to persons, "Your light is burning in your room"?

Mr. President, I do not wish to differentiate between our fellow citizens. I think every honest American is trying to win the war, and he is making a sacrifice of one kind or another to win the war. He may be making just as great a sacrifice as some civilian defense worker who is doing work in a defense organization for which he is not compensated. But if Senators feel that such persons are entitled to special consideration, let them have insurance, let them have it at a nominal sum, and let it be administered by the Bureau, which is already functioning. That is a matter which comes within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee. Do not have action taken on such a bill as this, Senators, without some opportunity being given to see if the bill cannot be bettered by the committee which has to deal with these very problems, the committee on whose shoulders the war effort is placing an enormous burden. The burden rests equally on every Member of the Senate and on every Member of the House. But already taxes on the American people will produce during a full year of operations $18,000,000,000. The House has now before it a bill which will add to that burden seven and a half to eight billion dollars. Let us say that the total burden is twenty-five or twenty-six billion dollars. Add, if you please, the ten to twelve billion dollars that the same taxpayers must pay

to their States and their counties and their cities, and we already have the staggering total tax on the people's shoulders, counting the tax bill to be reported by the House, of thirty-eight to forty billion dollars.

I will tell the Senate to whom we owe the obligation. We owe it to the men in the armed forces. We owe it to the men who sail the seas. We owe it to the men in the air, who are gambling every minute with their lives. We owe it to the men in the Army, the Navy, the Coast Guard, and the Marine Corps, and to their dependents. If we pass bills such as this without consideration the time may come when we shall not be able to care for those men as we ought to care for them. I am interested in them. I do not care more for the 5,000,000 or 6,000,000 civilian defense workers who are doing no more than every other American is doing. Because they are able to get out and move around they are willing to do a little guard duty or a little inspection duty. They are willing to sit up a little at night. It is proposed that we pension them. It is proposed that we leave it up to Mr. McNutt or Mr. Landis to say how many more may be brought in to become pensioners of the Government. I have no lack of respect for either of those gentlemen.

Are we not going to pause? Are we not going to stop and think? Are we not going to say that since this is an enormous undertaking the committee of the Congress which has the greater part of the jurisdiction—not all, but the greater part of the burden which the bill would place upon the agencies of the Government and upon the Congress and upon the people—should have some opportunity to examine it and look into it?

I have every sympathy with the desire to take care of civilian employees at Wake Island, or in any comparable position, who may have been killed or injured when they were not on duty, but when they were at their posts and ready to assume their duties. I have not a word of protest against any provision in title III of the bill for giving them full compensation, and giving them all the benefits provided for in the bill. I have not a word of protest against any other part of the bill which relates to the particular subject matter covered by title III.

If the Senator who proposes the bill were willing to eliminate the other titles and pass title III, that would be well and good. I can assure him that if the bill goes to the Finance Committee the Finance Committee will not encroach upon that subject. It will not be concerned about it. It is concerned only about those matters which rest directly upon our shoulders as responsible members of the committee. I am not assuming that the Finance Committee will give any better or more conscientious consideration to the bill than have the members of the committee presided over by the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] who has had it in charge; but I say that the matter is of such grave importance that it ought to go to the Finance Committee unless it is desired to pass title III of the bill, with all the related provisions, and introduce a new bill and give us an opportunity to study that bill and see what we can do with it.

Mr. McNARY obtained the floor.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. McNARY. I was about to comment on the parliamentary situation; but if the Senator wishes to work it out I shall be glad to cooperate with him. I make that statement because I presume the Senator desires to speak on the merits of the question.

Mr. PEPPER. I merely wish to make a brief statement, and then I shall be prepared to come to an agreement.

Does the Senator from Georgia care to give any indication as to the time which might be consumed by the examination of the bill by the Finance Committee? I think the Senate is entitled to some suggestion from the able chairman of the committee as to when he thinks his committee might be able to complete the task of examination if the bill should be referred to his committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am perfectly willing to modify my motion by providing that the bill be referred to the Finance Committee, to be reported by the 15th of July.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I rose to say a word on that subject. As I understand, the able Senator from Georgia approves title III of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct. I have no objection to it.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator's interest is confined to a study by the Finance Committee of the other parts of the bill.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, there are two ways of dealing with the situation. A portion of the bill could not be referred to the Finance Committee. If the bill should be referred to the Finance Committee, the whole bill would be referred. It would be practicable, if the able Senator from Florida were satisfied with that course, to strike out all the other titles of the bill and pass title III today.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I think it is well to make as much progress as can be made in this matter. If it could be agreed that we should delete titles I and II and pass the remainder of the bill, which is not controversial, with the understanding that a report would be forthcoming from the Committee on Finance by the 15th of July, as has been indicated by the Senator from Georgia, that would be the proper thing to do. I should very much like to see that course taken, if we are to defer passage of the entire bill.

Mr. McNARY. I think we could well strike out all the provisions of the bill save title III and pass it today. That would be a complete job. I should not say that the remainder of the bill should be referred to the Finance Committee. I think the proper procedure would be to introduce a new bill containing the other provisions and have it referred to the Finance Committee.

Mr. PEPPER. That would be all right.

Mr. McNARY. If the bill is to be referred to the Finance Committee, the whole of the bill must be referred. We cannot pick out a portion of the bill and pass it and refer the remainder of the bill to the committee.

I was about to suggest that at this time we strike out all the bill save title III, and that a new bill be then introduced, containing the other provisions, and referred to the Finance Committee. Then we can have an agreement as to when it should be reported by that committee. I think that is the orderly way to proceed, and that the quickest results can be obtained by that method.

Mr. PEPPER. I thank the Senator. He is very helpful and correct. However, I am afraid the Senator is not aware how titles IV and V tie in with title III. I do not think the Senator from Georgia would object to titles IV and V, because they relate to the same subject.

Mr. McNARY. I do not have the familiarity with the bill which I should have and probably will have before it comes to a vote. I am referring only to that part of the bill which is objectionable and which should be referred.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator that so far as I know titles III and IV are wholly unobjectionable, as is title IV insofar as the definitions apply to either title III or title V. Such definitions should, of course, be retained in the bill. However, there may be some definitions in title IV which would be meaningless without titles I and II.

Mr. PEPPER. We could authorize the correction of those definitions by the clerks.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, if that course is to be followed, I suggest that we take up some other matter, if there is some other matter to be taken up, while we amend title IV to fit titles III and V. That is what must be done. Title IV contains all the definitions for titles I, II, III, and V. It will have to be rather carefully amended. I think it can be done in half an hour or so, if the Senate is to be in session that long. I think that course is to be preferred to leaving it to the clerks.

Mr. PEPPER. I understand that other Senators have measures which they wish to bring up for consideration at this time.

I ask unanimous consent that the pending bill be temporarily laid aside.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Florida? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AMENDMENT OF THE ACT TO PREVENT PERNICIOUS POLITICAL ACTIVITIES

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 1389, Senate bill 2471. I do so by direction of the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2471) to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities", approved August 2, 1939, as amended, with respect to its application to officers and employees of educational, religious, eleemosynary, philanthropic, and cultural institutions, establishments, and

agencies, commonly known as the Hatch Act.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I think if I may be permitted to proceed for a very few minutes, I can briefly explain what the bill would accomplish.

Expressed simply, the bill will exempt all teachers, officers, and employees of educational or research institutions, supported by any State or subdivision thereof, or by the District of Columbia or any Territory of the United States, or by any recognized religious, philanthropic, or cultural organization. The main purpose is to exempt the teachers in the public schools, colleges, and universities from the provisions of the Hatch Act.

It is almost identical in form with my amendment to the Hatch bill, which was adopted by the Senate at the time the bill was passed. I refer, of course, to that portion of the bill which related to certain restrictions upon the activities of State employees. As the bill passed the Senate approximately 15 months ago, it did not apply to public-school teachers or university professors. My amendment was stricken out in conference. The reason given was that it was not considered necessary. I think there was never any intention on the part of the Senate that it should; but, because of rulings of the attorneys general of two States, the States of Ohio and Minnesota, and because of certain rulings of the Civil Service Commission, it is now generally considered by lawyers, particularly those representing the States, that the act does apply to public-school teachers and to teachers in educational institutions whose activities are in part provided for financially by the Federal Government.

I first had my attention called to the situation by the President or a trustee of Ohio State University, I do not recall which. The attention of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], who is not present today, was also called to it by the same officer. The Senator from New Mexico knew of my interest in the subject, and he suggested that I offer an amendment substantially like this amendment. I did so during the time when the Senator from New Mexico was injured and was in the hospital in New Mexico. He wrote to me saying that he hoped the amendment would be agreed to. It was then presented to the Committee on Privileges and Elections. A hearing was held, at which many representatives of the teaching profession were heard, as is shown by the hearings. In addition, I have received letters from a very large number of educational associations, some of which I shall mention: The National Education Association, the American Association of University Professors, the Michigan Education Association, the Massachusetts State Teachers Federation, the Chicago Teachers Union, and the American Federation of Teachers. I have also received letters from a great many representatives of various public schools, and from teachers in the following colleges and universities, among others: Amherst, Ohio State, University of Wyoming, University of Minnesota, Montana State University, Wayne University, Massachusetts State College, and the University of Michigan.

Briefly, first, the bill would eliminate the feeling on the part of educators everywhere that the Federal Government is exerting and extending its influence and control over education. In this country it has always been felt that education should be controlled very largely by the local school authorities, and they have always jealously guarded against any encroachment by the Federal Government. Second, it has been felt that by the prohibitions contained in the act the members of one of the finest elements in our public life—the teachers in the colleges, universities, and public schools—have had their political activity largely proscribed. I myself think that is most unfortunate. I think there should be the fullest participation in our public life by the well-informed and high-minded men and women who teach in our public schools, colleges, and universities. I think it would be most unfortunate if the teachers of the city of Ann Arbor, Mich., which is the seat of the great State University of my State, should be denied the right to serve as members of the city council or as chief executive of the city of Ann Arbor. A very prominent citizen of the city in Massachusetts in which Amherst College is located wrote me a letter in which he pointed out that the town council there consists of five persons, and that usually two or three of them have been members of the faculty of Amherst College. By reason of the act, great doubt is cast upon the right of those fine citizens to participate in the government of that city.

Believing, as I do, that we need in public life men and women of this type, it seems to me most unfortunate that the Hatch Act should be so construed as to keep them out of public and political activity. I well remember that when Marion Leroy Burton was president of the University of Michigan he delivered an address as temporary chairman of the Republican National Convention in Cleveland, I believe, which nominated Calvin Coolidge as President of the United States. Had the act then been in effect and applicable to our university, that service could not have been performed by President Burton. If the University of Utah had been a school which obtained funds under the Morrill Land Grant Act, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, could never have become a Member of the Senate. Doubtless many other instances of the unfortunate effect of the act could be given.

Third, the act operates in a most discriminatory manner. Very few teachers in the University of Michigan are affected by the provisions of the Hatch Act, but some are. The line of demarcation between those who can and those who cannot participate in public life is a very difficult one to determine and define. However, referring to an example in my own State, where I am most familiar with the situation, in the city of East Lansing, which is a suburb of our State capital, a town with a population of ten or fifteen thousand persons, practically every teacher in the Michigan State College, which is located there, is denied the right to participate in the politics of the town, while at Ann Arbor the great majority of the teachers may so participate. I think that situation will be found to prevail generally in the various States of the Union which have a State university as distinguished from a State land-grant college, such as our Michigan State College.

So far as I can learn from my mail, there is no substantial opposition to the bill.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. I concur in the statement made by the able Senator. So far as I can judge from my mail, there appears to be almost a unanimity of sentiment in favor of the proposed legislation. Was any opposition expressed in the committee?

Mr. BROWN. Yes; opposition was expressed by General Fries, a retired Army officer, who is quite a well-known character in the Capital. He is opposed to the bill.

Mr. Elmer E. Rogers, of Washington, also expressed some opposition to the bill in a statement submitted after the hearing. Mr. Rogers was present at the hearing, but it was closed before he could be heard. Mr. Rogers very frankly stated that he was amazed, however, at the narrow construction placed upon section 12 by the Civil Service Commission and was evidently not so certain of his opposition before he knew of this construction. Mr. Rogers was a very fair-minded witness.

Mr. WALSH. Was the committee unanimous in its report?

Mr. BROWN. I believe it was. The Senator from Rhode Island informs me that it was. I was not present when the committee voted.

Mr. WALSH. I hope the bill will pass. I suggest that the Senator ask to have incorporated in the RECORD in connection with his remarks the excellent report of the committee.

Mr. BROWN. I thank the Senator for the suggestion, and I shall so do.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The bill is before the Senate and is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading and was read the third time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill having been read the third time, the question is, Shall it pass?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my very able colleague the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] offered an amendment to the bill. He advised me before his departure from the city on public matters that he did not care to press it. That is why it was not presented today. I am sure he is satisfied with the form of the bill as it is about to pass.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Shall the bill pass?

The bill S. 2471 was passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 22. Nothing in sections 2, 9, or 12 of this act shall be deemed to prohibit or to make unlawful the doing of any act by any officer or employee of any educational or research institution, establishment, agency, or system which is supported in whole or in part by any State or political subdivision thereof, or by the District of Columbia or by any Territory or Territorial possession of the United States; or by any recognized religious, philanthropic, or cultural organization."

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, in accordance with the suggestion of the Senator from Massachusetts, I ask unanimous consent that the committee report on the bill be printed in the RECORD at this point, and also that a statement issued by a committee of the National Eucation Association under the leadership of Dr. Donald Du Shane, chairman of the committee in charge, be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report (No. 1348) and the statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Privileges and Elections, to whom was referred the bill (S. 2471) to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, with respect to its application to officers and employees of educational, religious, eleemosynary, philanthropic, and cultural institutions, establishments, and agencies, and commonly known as the Hatch Act, having considered the same, report favorably thereon and recommend that the bill do pass.

STATEMENT

This bill (S. 2471) was introduced by Senator BROWN, of Michigan, on April 20, 1942, and was referred to this committee. It is substantially the same as a bill (S. 1025) also introduced by Senator BROWN on March 3, 1941, which had also been referred to this committee.

On May 5, 1942, a hearing was held before the Committee on Privileges and Elections and Senator BROWN together with six additional witnesses were heard. Senator BROWN stated that the amendment is substantially the same as the former one introduced and advocated by him during the consideration of the second Hatch Act of March 1940, and that it was eliminated principally because of the expressed opinion of Senator HATCH, and others, that the provisions of the Hatch Act did not apply to teachers. After the enactment of the act the attorneys general of Ohio and Minnesota ruled that teachers in land-grant colleges and in schools being assisted under the Smith-Lever Act and Bankhead-Jones Act were subject to the act.

Other witnesses favoring the legislation and who made statements at the hearing were Prof. Donald Du Shane, National Education Association, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., secretary of the Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education; Miss Mabel Studebaker, member of the board of directors, classroom teacher's department, National Education Association, Erie, Pa., Dr. James K. Pollock, professor of political science, University of Michigan; Dr. Thomas F. Green, Jr., American Association of University Professors, 1155 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.; and Dr. Alonzo Myers, New York University, chairman of the Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education.

Witnesses opposing the legislation were Gen. Amos A. Fries, U. S. Army, retired, representing Friends of the Public Schools of America, with headquarters in Chicago, Ill.; and Mr. Elmer E. Rogers, 1735 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., who later submitted a paper which was included in the transcript of the hearings.

The principal arguments in favor of the bill are set forth in the following excerpts from the statements of witnesses:

Senator BROWN, of Michigan:

"I state two reasons for my advocacy of this bill. First, I think it is wrong to take out of political life one of the most beneficial elements in it, the teaching profession. They are high-minded people; they are students of the science of politics and government, and the people of any State and all other States are entitled to the benefit of their opinions and their active participation in politics.

"Second, the law is most discriminatory in that it applies to a considerable class of teachers and does not apply to another considerable class of teachers because there can be no constitutional justification for reaching that class of teachers whose salary or compensation is not in any way contributed to by the Federal Government.

* * * * *

"I do believe that we should pass this amendment which will remove this cloud from the teaching profession and give the general public the benefit of participation by teachers in political activity.

"I conclude with pointing out the principal things that teachers of the class I have mentioned (in schools and institutions receiving Federal aid) are unable to do:

"They may not be candidates for any public office, with the exception of local or municipal offices in a few localities.

"A teacher may not be a delegate to a political convention.

"A teacher may not serve on a political committee.

"A teacher may not make a political speech.

"A teacher may not serve as an election official.

"A teacher may not be connected, editorially or financially, with any political newspaper, whatever that may be, nor may he write for publication or publish any letter or article in favor of or against any political candidate, party, or faction.

"A teacher may not be a candidate for nomination or election to any National, State, county, or munipical office.

"A teacher may attend a caucus and cast his or her vote, but may not tell why.

"A teacher may not be a member of any political club whatsoever.

"Those are the particular items I have picked out as being unduly oppressive on the profession" (transcript of hearings, pp. 5–8).

Prof. Donald Du Shane:

"Why teachers should be excluded:

"1. Teachers belong to a profession which disapproves of, and does not engage in, pernicious political practices and they should continue to be good citizens without the Hatch Act.

"2. This act is discriminatory in that it applies to some teachers and not to others.

"3. The Hatch Act interferes with the freedom of teachers to discuss political issues freely and without Federal political control or censorship. In order to train our youth for understanding and participation in American political life it is of vital importance that the teachers' freedom to teach the truth shall not be interfered with.

"4. If teachers are to train effectively our youth for citizenship they must have full rights of citizenship themselves.

"5. American public schools are dependent upon the understanding and loyalty of our citizens for their financial support and their development and improvement. Very often questions involving the welfare of the schools are issues in political elections. Frequently candidates who are enemies of education run for political office. The integrity, and often the very existence of schools, depends upon the political activity of members of the teaching profession. It is part of their professional obligation to keep the needs and problems of the schools before the voters of their communities and States.

"6. Under the Federal Constitution the management and control of education is a State function. A comparison between American schools and those of totalitarian countries would seem to indicate the wisdom of local and State control of education. The partial disfranchisement and the muzzling of local and State teachers by the Federal Government is as unnecessary and unjustifiable as it is dangerous and alarming.

* * * * *

THE EFFECTS, AS TO TEACHERS, OF THE PASSAGE OF S. 2471

"S. 2471 does not exempt teachers from the following provisions of the Hatch Act:

"Section 1: It would continue to be illegal for teachers to interfere with another person's right to vote as he may choose.

"Section 3: It would still be illegal for teachers to promise any employment in federally aided schools as a reward for political activity.

"Section 4: It would still be illegal to deprive anyone of employment made possible by relief appropriations of Congress, because of race, creed, or political activity.

"Section 5: It would still be illegal for teachers to solicit or receive political contributions to beneficiaries of Federal relief funds.

"Section 6: It would be illegal for teachers to furnish or receive lists of Federal relief recipients for political purposes.

"Section 7: It would be illegal for teachers to use any Federal relief funds or authority for interfering with any individual's right to vote.

"Section 8: Any teacher who violates sections 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7 is subject to fine and imprisonment.

"Section 9: It would be illegal for any Federal teacher to belong to any revolutionary political party.

"Section 13: It would be illegal for any teacher or teacher organization to contribute over $5,000 to any campaign or election, or to purchase anything which will benefit any candidate for a Federal office.

"Section 20: It would be illegal for teachers to violate any law in force at the time of the passage of the Hatch Act.

"S. 2471 grants to teachers the following rights:

"Section 2: A teacher would have the right to use his official authority or influence to effect the nomination or election of any candidate for Federal office.

"Section 9: Federal teachers would have the right to use their authority and influence in affecting the result of an election and would be permitted to take part in political management or campaigns.

"Section 12: All teachers would have the right to use their authority or influence to affect the result of a nomination or election; to seek contributions from fellow employees for political purposes; and to take active part in political campaigns.

"Section 15: State and local teachers would be freed from civil-service regulations as to political activities of the classified civil service in effect prior to July 10, 1940.

"NOTE.—Section 18 does not permit teacher participation in school, bond, tax, and other nonparty elections, except as provided in sentence 2 of section 12 (a). (Transcript of hearings, pp. 25–28.)

THE HATCH ACT AND THE SCHOOLS

The Hatch Act must be amended to safeguard freedom of learning and teaching. The original act, passed in 1939, was an outgrowth of alleged abuses of Federal relief funds in the various States. After a brief experience it was claimed that some of the abuses were caused by State employees receiving part pay from Federal sources, so the act was amended in 1940 by extending it to certain State officers and employees.

Although teachers belong to a profession that does not condone or indulge in corrupt political practices, and although the record of debate in Congress does not indicate that there was any belief that teachers needed to be restrained from improper political procedure, yet the Hatch Act, as finally enacted and interpreted, interferes with the long-recognized political rights of many thousands of American teachers.

Some of the provisions of the Hatch Act seek to prevent political corruption and are in no sense injurious to the teaching profession, and in fact, in some cases provide necessary protection. There are other sections, however, which are definitely objectionable to teachers, which will limit their effectiveness, and which will interfere with the full functioning of teachers as protectors and citizenship instructors of millions of students.

Teachers have been slow to realize the full significance and the wide applications of the Hatch Act. It was at first believed that it covered only teachers in land-grant colleges and vocational teachers in Federally aided systems. As questions have arisen concerning the extent of this law the United States Civil Service Commission has made rulings and it now appears that in view of recent interpretations the Hatch Act can be, and probably will be, construed to apply to a majority of American teachers.

One of the basic purposes of the defense commission is to protect teachers from conditions which interfere with their full functioning. The commission believes that certain sections of the Hatch Act interfere with the protection of public schools, interfere with the freedom of teaching, and will be used as a means of threatening, intimidating, and coercing leaders, administrators, and other members of the teaching profession. The defense commission will make every effort to bring about such amendments of the Hatch Act as will restore and protect teachers' necessary rights and freedoms.

THREE SECTIONS SHOULD BE AMENDED

A careful study of the Hatch Act reveals three sections which, from the standpoint of the teaching profession, are objectionable and should be amended:

Section 2 of the act, although not yet adjudicated by the courts, will probably prevent numerous members of the teaching profession from discussing Federal policies involved in any election, or the qualifications of candidates for Federal office in their classrooms or teachers' meetings.

Likewise, section 9 (a) may be so interpreted as to discourage all teachers employed by the Federal Government or the District of Columbia from discussing Federal issues involved in an election or the merits of the candidates for Federal office in their classrooms or teachers' meetings. These teachers are specifically prohibited from taking any part in political management or in political campaigns.

Section 12 prohibits any State or local teacher or school official, any part of whose compensation is derived from Federal loans or grants, from doing or saying anything, as teachers, which will influence any nomination or election. This section also prevents any participation by such teachers in political management or political campaigns. Teachers affected by this act cannot become candidates for any political office.

TO WHOM DOES THE HATCH ACT APPLY?

The law authorizes the United States Civil Service Commission to interpret and enforce various provisions of the act. Based on actions by the United States Civil Service Commission up to the present time, it may be said authoritatively that:

1. All employees of land-grant colleges and universities, except possibly those engaged in building construction, are included in the provosions of the Hatch Act.

2. All vocational teachers and employees, any part of whose compensation comes from Federal aid, are likewise included.

3. All teachers whose compensation is in any part derived from the income of Federal grazing and forest lands are subject to the Hatch Act.

4. In view of prior decisions it is probable that all teachers whose school systems receive any Federal vocational funds will be subject to the Hatch Act, unless such funds are accounted for separately from other school funds.

5. In the light of prior decisions it is probable that teachers, any part of whose income comes from land grants from the Federal Government to State school systems, will be included under the Hatch Act. Such an interpretation would include under the provisions of the Hatch Act a majority of teachers in the United States.

WHY TEACHERS SHOULD BE EXCLUDED

Following is a brief statement of reasons why teachers should be excluded from sections 2, 9 (a), and 12 of the Hatch Act.

1. Teachers belong to a profession which disapproves of, and does not engage in pernicious political practices, and they would continue to be good citizens without the Hatch Act.

2. This act is discriminatory in that it applied to some teachers and not to others.

3. The Hatch Act interferes with the freedom of teachers to discuss political issues freely and without Federal political control or censorship. In order to train our youth for understanding and participation in American political life it is of vital importance that the teachers' freedom to teach the truth shall not be interfered with.

4. If teachers are to train effectively our youth for citizenship they must have full rights of citizenship themselves.

5. American public schools are dependent upon the understanding and loyalty of our citizens for their financial support and their development and improvement. Very often questions involving the welfare of the schools are issues in political elections. Frequently candidates who are enemies of education run for political office. The integrity and often the very existence of schools depends upon the political activity of members of the teaching profession. It is part of their professional obligation to keep the needs and problems of the schools before the voters of their communities and States.

6. Under the Federal Constitution the management and control of education is a State function. A comparison between American schools and those of totalitarian countries would seem to indicate the wisdom of local and State control of education. The partial disfranchisement and the muzzling of local and State teachers by the Federal Government is as unnecessary and unjustifiable as it is dangerous and alarming.

WHAT TO DO ABOUT IT

The defense commission believes that sections 2, 9 (a), and 12 of the Hatch Act should not apply to members of the teaching profession and will make every effort to have this law amended. However, it must be understood that no committee in Washington can secure such an amendment by itself. An amendment can be secured only if enough teachers in the various States and congressional districts talk to, write, and telegraph their representatives in Congress, indicating definitely their objections to the Hatch Act and urging a careful investigation of the merits and need of the proposed changes. Every teacher who wishes to help in the securing of needed amendments should notify the N. E. A. Commission for the Defense of Democracy Through Education, 1201 Sixteenth Street NW., Washington, D. C.

Mr. LUCAS subsequently said: Mr. President, I desire to submit a brief observation in respect to Senate bill 2471, which was passed without a record vote by the Senate earlier today. The bill, which was introduced by the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], proposes to amend the Hatch Act. I desire to take this opportunity to commend the able Senator from Michigan for introducing and having passed by the Senate such an amendment to the Hatch Act.

For a long time many of the ablest educators in my State have been writing me with respect to the cloud under which they were placed as the result of the passage of the original Hatch Act. In my opinion, the amendment which was unanimously passed by the Senate today will remove the unduly oppressive restriction which has been imposed on members of the teaching profession all this time because it was held that they came under the Hatch Act, and, therefore, could not participate in political activities. As time goes on, Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the Senate of the United States will take as to every other category of individuals the same position it has taken today with respect to the teachers throughout the country. The Senate has said by its vote that the teachers who are now being paid partially in this country by Federal funds are not subject to the Hatch Act, and, therefore, are able to participate, as they rightfully should, in political campaigns and elections. They are given the opportunity to hold political offices, if they so desire, and are free to make political speeches, if they so desire, which is the fundamental theory of government in this country.

ADDITIONAL PAY FOR CERTAIN DIVERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2455) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty," to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes, which was on page 2, line 4, to strike out "divers employed", and insert "officers and enlisted men employed as divers."

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

CONSOLIDATIONS AND MERGERS OF DOMESTIC TELEGRAPH CARRIERS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 2598.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (S. 2598) to amend the Communications Act of 1934,

as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not rise to object to the motion made by the able Senator from Arizona. The Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] is very much interested in the proposed legislation. I rose to suggest the absence of a quorum, so that he might be called to the Chamber. I assume the distinguished Senator from Arizona has no objection to the roll being called for a quorum.

Mr. McFARLAND. No.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Glass	Pepper
Bailey	Green	Radcliffe
Ball	Guffey	Reed
Bankhead	Gurney	Rosier
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Schwartz
Brewster	Hughes	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bulow	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	Langer	Taft
Butler	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McFarland	Tobey
Chavez	McKellar	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Connally	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Downey	Millikin	Wheeler
Doxey	Murdock	White
Ellender	Norris	Willis
George	Nye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2598.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2598) to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is amended by adding at the end of title II the following new section:

"CONSOLIDATIONS AND MERGERS OF TELEGRAPH OPERATIONS

"SEC. 222. (a) It shall be lawful, upon application to and approval by the Commission, as hereinafter provided, for domestic telegraph carriers to consolidate or merge their properties, or any part thereof, and for any domestic telegraph carrier, as part of the consolidation or merger or thereafter, to consolidate or merge with all or any part of the domestic telegraph operations of any carrier which is not primarily a telegraph carrier: *Provided*, That no domestic telegraph carrier shall consolidate or merge with any international telegraph carrier, and no international telegraph carrier shall consolidate or merge with any domestic telegraph carrier.

"(b) Whenever a consolidation or merger is proposed under subsection (a) of this section, the telegraph carrier or telegraph carriers seeking authority therefor shall submit an application to the Commission which shall include the provisions of the proposed plan for consolidation or merger, and thereupon the Commission shall order a public hearing to be held with respect to such application and shall give reasonable notice thereof, in writing, and an opportunity to be heard, to the Governor of each of the States in which any of the physical property involved in such proposed consolidation or merger is situated, to the Attorney General of the United States, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of State, representatives of employees where represented by bargaining representatives, and all other representatives known to the Commission, and to such other persons as the Commission may deem advisable. If, after such public hearing, the Commission finds that the proposed consolidation or merger, or an amended proposal for consolidation or merger, (1) is authorized by subsection (a) of this section, (2) conforms to all other applicable provisions of this section, (3) is in the public interest, the Commission shall enter an order approving and authorizing such consolidation or merger, and thereupon any law or laws making consolidations and mergers unlawful shall not apply to the proposed consolidation or merger. In finding whether any proposed consolidation or merger is in the public interest, the Commission shall give due consideration, among other things, to the financial soundness of the carrier resulting from such consolidation or merger.

"(c) (1) As a part of any consolidation or merger, or thereafter, any domestic telegraph carrier may, after hearing, and with the approval of the Commission, consolidate or merge with all or any part of the domestic telegraph facilities, operations, or service of any carrier.

"(2) Any proposed consolidation or merger of domestic telegraph carriers shall provide for the divestment of the international telegraph operations theretofore carried on by any party to the consolidation or merger, within a reasonable time to be fixed by the Commission, after the consideration for the property to be divested is found by the Commission to be commensurate with its value, and as soon as the legal obligations, if any, of the carrier to be so divested will permit. The Commission shall require at the time of the approval of such consolidation or merger that any such party exercise due diligence in bringing about such divestment as promptly as it reasonably can.

"(d) No proposed consolidation or merger shall be approved by the Commission if, as a result of such consolidation or merger, more than one-fifth of the capital stock of any carrier which is subject to the jurisdiction of the Commission will be owned or controlled, or voted, directly or indirectly, (1) by any alien or the representative of any alien, (2) by any foreign government or the representative thereof, (3) by any corporation organized under the laws of any foreign government, or (4) by any corporation of which any officer or director is an alien, or of which more than one-fifth of the capital stock is owned or controlled, or voted directly or indirectly, by any alien or the representative of any alien, by any foreign government or the representative thereof, or by any corporation organized under the laws of a foreign government.

"(e) (1) In the event of a consolidation or merger of domestic telegraph carriers pursuant to this act, the domestic telegraph carrier resulting from such consolidation or merger shall, except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection, distribute among the international telegraph carriers, telegraph traffic by wire or radio destined to points without the continental United States, and divide the charges for such traffic, in accordance with such just, reasonable, and equitable formula in the public interest as the interested carriers shall agree upon and the Commission shall approve: *Provided, however*, That in the event that the interested carriers should fail to agree upon a formula before the hearing on the application for consolidation or merger, the Commission, after due notice and hearing, shall prescribe a formula which it finds will be just, reasonable, equitable, and in the public interest, will be in accordance with the existing contractual rights of the carriers, and will effectuate the purposes of this subsection.

"(2) In the event of a consolidation or merger of domestic telegraph carriers which, immediately prior to such consolidation or merger, interchanged traffic with telegraph carriers in a contiguous foreign country (including Newfoundland), the domestic carrier resulting from such consolidation or merger shall distribute among such foreign telegraph carriers, telegraph traffic by wire or radio destined to points in such contiguous foreign countries (including Newfoundland) and shall divide the charges therefor, in accordance with such just, reasonable, and equitable formula in the public interest as the interested carriers shall agree upon and the Commission shall approve: *Provided, however*, That in the event the interested carriers should fail to agree upon a formula before the hearing on the application for consolidation or merger, the Commission, after due notice and hearing, shall prescribe a formula which it finds will be just, reasonable, equitable, and in the public interest, will be in accordance with the existing contractual rights of the carriers, and will effectuate the purposes of this subsection.

"(3) For the purposes of this subsection, the international telegraph operations of any domestic telegraph carrier shall be considered to be the operations of an independent international telegraph carrier, and the domestic telegraph operations of any international telegraph carrier shall be considered to be the operations of an independent domestic telegraph carrier.

"(4) Whenever, after a full hearing upon a complaint or upon its own initiative, the Commission finds that any such distribution of telegraph traffic among telegraph carriers, or any such division of charges for such traffic, which is being made or which is proposed to be made, is or will be unjust, unreasonable, or inequitable, or not in the public interest, the Commission shall by order prescribe the distribution of such telegraph traffic which is just, reasonable, equitable, and in the public interest.

"(f) (1) Each employee of any carrier which is a party to a consolidation or merger pursuant to this act who was employed by such carrier immediately preceding the approval of such consolidation or merger, and whose period of employment began on or before March 1, 1941, shall be employed by the carrier resulting from such consolidation or merger for a period of not less than 5 years from the date of the approval of such consolidation or merger at a rate of compensation and at a net weekly compensation not less than that received by such employee at the time of such approval, and, except with his consent, no such employee shall be assigned to work which is inconsistent with his past training and experience in the telegraph industry.

"(2) If any employee of any carrier which is a party to any such consolidation or merger, who was employed by such carrier immediately preceding the approval of such consolidation or merger, and whose period of employment began after March 1, 1941, is discharged at any time as a consequence of such consolidation or merger by the carrier resulting therefrom, such carrier shall pay such employee at the time he is discharged severance pay in cash equal to the amount

of salary or compensation he would have received during the full 4-week period immediately preceding such discharge at the rate of compensation or salary payable to him during such period, multiplied by the number of years he has been continuously employed immediately preceding such discharge by one or another of such carriers who were parties to such consolidation or merger, but in no case shall any such employee receive less severance pay than the amount of salary or compensation he would have received at such rate if he were employed during such full 4-week period.

"(3) For a period of 5 years after the date of approval of any such consolidation or merger, any employee of any carrier which is a party to such consolidation or merger, and who was such an employee on the date of approval of the plan for such consolidation or merger, shall have a preferential hiring and employment status for any position for which he is qualified by training and experience over any person who has not theretofore been an employee of any such carrier.

"(4) If any employee is transferred from one community to another, as a result of any such consolidation or merger, the carrier resulting therefrom shall pay the actual traveling expenses of such employee and his family, and, in addition to such traveling expenses and his regular pay as an employee of such carrier; such employee shall be paid by such carrier a sum equal to 2 months' pay at the same rate of pay as that received by him at the time of such transfer.

"(5) No such consolidation or merger, or the acceptance of any severance pay provided for by this subsection, shall result in the impairment of any pension right, or health, disability, or death insurance, or any other similar benefit, to which any individual may be entitled by reason of being an employee or former employee or a representative or beneficiary of an employee or former employee of any carrier which is a party to such consolidation or merger. The application for the consolidation or merger of any carriers under this act shall also contain a guaranty by the proposed consolidated or merged carrier that there will be no such impairment.

"(6) Any employee who, since August 27, 1940, has left a position, other than a temporary position, in the employ of any of the carriers which is a party to any such consolidation or merger, for the purpose of entering the military or naval forces of the United States, shall be considered to have been in the employ of such carrier during the time he is a member of such forces, and, upon making an application for employment with the consolidated or merged carrier within 40 days from the time he is relieved from service in any of such forces under honorable conditions, such former employee shall be employed by the consolidated or merged carrier and entitled to the benefits to which he would have been entitled if he had been employed by one of such carriers during all of such period of service with such forces. If any such former employee is disabled and because of such disability is no longer qualified to perform the duties of his former position but otherwise meets the requirements for employment, he shall be given such available employment at an appropriate rate of pay as he is able to perform and to which his service credit shall entitle him.

"(7) No employee of any carrier which is a party to any such consolidation or merger shall, without his consent, have his rate of compensation reduced, or be discharged or furloughed, as a direct result of such consolidation or merger, during the 5-year period after the date of the approval of such consolidation or merger, or, in contemplation of such consolidation and merger, during the 6-month period immediately preceding such approval.

"(8) Nothing contained in this subsection shall be construed to prevent the discharge of any employee for insubordination, incompetency, or any other similar cause.

"(9) All employees of any carrier resulting from any such consolidation or merger, with respect to their hours of employment, shall retain the rights provided by any collective bargaining agreement in force and effect upon the date of approval of such consolidation or merger until such agreement is terminated, executed, or superseded. Notwithstanding any other provision of this act, any agreement not prohibited by law pertaining to the protection of employees may hereafter be entered into by such consolidated or merged carrier and the duly authorized representative or representatives of its employees selected according to existing law. The employees of any such consolidated or merged carrier shall be entitled to the same remedies as are provided by the National Labor Relations Act for employees covered by such act; and the National Labor Relations Board shall have jurisdiction to enforce the provisions of this subsection to the same extent as such Board has jurisdiction to enforce the provisions of the National Labor Relations Act.

"(10) Nothing contained in this subsection shall apply to any employee of any carrier which is a party to any such consolidation or merger whose compensation is at the rate of more than $5,000 per annum.

"(g) As used in this section—

"(1) The term 'consolidation or merger' includes the legal consolidation or merger of two or more corporations, and the acquisition by a corporation through purchase, lease, or in any other manner, of the whole or any part of the property, securities, facilities, services, or business of any other corporation or corporations, or of the control thereof, in exchange for its own securities, or otherwise.

"(2) The term 'domestic telegraph carrier' means any common carrier by wire or radio, the major portion of whose traffic and revenues from record communications is derived from the acceptance, transmission, reception, and delivery of such communications both originating and terminating within the continental United States, including a corporation owning or controlling any such common carrier.

"(3) The term 'international telegraph carrier' means any common carrier by wire or radio, the major portion of whose traffic and revenues from record communications is derived from the acceptance, transmission, reception, and delivery of such communications either originating or terminating at points beyond the continental United States (other than points in Canada, Mexico, or Newfoundland) and which terminate or originate at points within the continental United States, including a corporation owning or controlling any such common carrier.

"(4) The term 'consolidated or merged carrier' means any carrier by wire or radio, which acquires or operates the properties and facilities unified and integrated by consolidation or merger.

"(5) The term 'domestic telegraph operations' includes acceptance, transmission, reception, and delivery of record communications by wire or radio which both originate and terminate at points within the continental United States or from or to points in Canada, Mexico, or Newfoundland, and includes acceptance, transmission, reception, or delivery performed within the continental United States between points of origin and points of exit from, and between points of entry into and points of destination within, the continental United States with respect to record communications by wire or radio which either originate or terminate beyond the continental United States, and also includes the transmission within the continental United States of messages which both originate and terminate outside but transit through the continental United States: *Provided*, That nothing in this section shall prevent international telegraph carriers from accepting and delivering international telegraph messages in the cities which constitute gateways approved by the Commission as points of entrance into or exit from the continental United States and the incidental transmission or reception of the same over its own or leased lines or circuits within the continental United States.

"(6) The term 'international telegraph operations' includes acceptance, transmission, reception, and delivery of record communications by wire or radio which either originate or terminate at points (other than points in Canada, Mexico, or Newfoundland) outside the continental United States, but does not include acceptance, transmission, reception, and delivery performed within the continental United States between points of origin within and points of exit from, and between points of entry into, and points of destination within, the continental United States with respect to such communications, or the transmission within the continental United States of messages which both originate and terminate outside but transit through the continental United States.

"(7) The term 'employee' shall include an individual who is absent from active service because of furlough, illness, or leave of absence: *Provided*, That there shall be no obligation upon the consolidated or merged carrier to reemploy any employee who is absent because of furlough, except in accordance with the terms of his furlough.

"(8) The term 'employees of any carrier which is a party to a consolidation or merger' shall not include employees who are employed in any business which any such carrier continues to operate independently of the consolidation or merger.

"(9) The term 'representative' includes any individual or labor organization."

SEC. 2. Section 214 (a) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 214. (a) No carrier shall undertake the construction of a new line or of an extension of any line, or shall acquire or operate any line, or extension thereof, or shall engage in transmission over or by means of such additional or extended line, unless and until there shall first have been obtained from the Commission a certificate that the present or future public convenience and necessity require or will require the construction, or operation, or construction and operation, of such additional or extended line: *Provided*, That no such certificate shall be required under this section for the construction, acquisition, operation, or extension of (1) a line within a single State unless such line constitutes part of an interstate line, (2) local, branch, or terminal lines not exceeding 10 miles in length, or (3) any line acquired under sections 221 and 222 of this act: *Provided further*, That the Commission may, upon appropriate request being made, authorize temporary or emergency service, or the supplementing of existing facilities, without regard to the provisions of this section. No carrier shall abandon a line, plant, office, or other physical facility, unless and until there shall first have been obtained from the Commission a certificate that the present or future public convenience and necessity require or will require such abandonment."

SEC. 3. Section 214 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(b) Upon receipt of an application for any such certificate, the Commission shall

cause notice thereof to be given to, and shall cause a copy of such application to be filed with, the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Governor of each State in which such additional or extended line is proposed to be constructed, operated, or abandoned, with the right to those notified to be heard; and the Commission may require such published notice as it shall determine."

SEC. 4. Section 214 (c) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(c) The Commission shall have power to issue such certificate as prayed for, or to refuse to issue it, or to issue it for a portion or portions of a line, or extension thereof, described in the application, or for the partial exercise only of such right or privilege, and may attach to the issuance of the certificate such terms and conditions as in its judgment the public convenience and necessity may require. After issuance of such certificate, and not before, the carrier may, without securing approval other than such certificate, comply with the terms and conditions contained in or attached to the issuance of such certificate and proceed with the construction, acquisition, operation, extension, or abandonment covered thereby. Any construction, acquisition, operation, extension, or abandonment contrary to the provisions of this section may be enjoined by any court of competent jurisdiction at the suit of the United States, the Commission, the State commission, any State affected, or any party in interest."

SEC. 5. Section 214 (d) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"(d) The Commission may, after full opportunity for hearing, in a proceeding upon complaint or upon its own initiative without complaint, authorize or require by order any carrier, party to such proceeding, to provide itself with adequate facilities for the expeditious and efficient performance of its service as a common carrier and to extend its line or to establish a public office; but no such authorization or order shall be made unless the Commission finds, as to such provision of facilities, as to such establishment of public offices, or as to such extension, that it is reasonably required in the interest of public convenience and necessity, or as to such extension or facilities that the expense involved therein will not impair the ability of the carrier to perform its duty to the public. Any carrier which refuses or neglects to comply with any order of the Commission made in pursuance of this paragraph shall forfeit to the United States $100 for each day during which such refusal or neglect continues."

SEC. 6. Section 5266 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 47, sec. 3), is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5266. Telegrams between the several departments of the Government and their officers and agents, relating exclusively to the public business, in their transmission over the lines of any telegraph company to which has been given the right-of-way, timber, or station lands from the public domain shall have priority over all other business. No part of any appropriation for the several departments of the Government shall be paid to any company which neglects or refuses to transmit such telegrams in accordance with the provisions of this section. No telegraph company shall, by reason of any benefit received under any provision of the Post Roads Act of July 24, 1866, as amended, be required to transmit such telegrams at rates less than those applicable to other telegrams in the same classes."

SEC. 7. If any provision of this act or the application thereof to any person or circumstance is held invalid, the remainder of the act, and the application of such provision to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected thereby.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce, to whom was referred the bill S. 2445, which was introduced by the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and myself, and which proposed to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of telegraph operations, and for other purposes, considered the bill and reported in lieu thereof Senate bill 2598, to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes, with the recommendation that it do pass without amendment.

The bill S. 2598, in the opinion of the committee, represents a sound, realistic, and carefully considered approach to the solution of a grave problem in the communications industry of this Nation which confronts the people and the Congress of the United States. This problem has been magnified and aggravated by the fact that the Nation is now at war; adequate communications facilities and the maintenance of a strong, cohesive, and far-flung communications system are as vital to the successful prosecution of the war as is the production of guns, airplanes, tanks, and ships.

When we introduced Senate bill 2445 I pointed out to the Senate that the proposed legislation was the outgrowth of a study of the subject made by the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate under Senate Resolution 95 of the Seventy-sixth Congress, which provided for "a thorough and complete study of the telegraph industry, including the economic conditions of the telegraph carriers, their relations to corporations engaged in other forms of communications, and the tendencies toward consolidation and a monopoly of such industry."

As a result of that study, the committee made certain recommendations. I shall not reread the recommendations into the RECORD at this time. Senate bill 2445 was an attempt upon the part of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] and myself to follow the recommendations.

These recommendations were based upon the findings of the committee, one of the most urgent of which was the finding that the Postal Telegraph Co.—third largest carrier—was in imminent financial danger. It was found that by September 1, 1941, less than $750,000 remained of a $5,000,000 working-capital loan made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Since that time the Postal Telegraph Co. has borrowed an additional one and a half million dollars from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which sum, we are informed, is largely used up at the present time. While the Western Union Telegraph Co., the largest land-line carrier, is presently operating at a profit, it has experienced great losses in recent years. Like the Postal, it has lost a large portion of its revenue to the Government-subsidized air mail, to the telegraph facilities of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and the radio point-to-point communication facilities. It also has a substantial debt structure, which may prove dangerous to it in the event another major business depression occurs.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, the bill under discussion is a very important measure, and, since we will have to vote on it, I think we should have order in the Chamber so that we can hear what the Senator from Arizona is saying.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senate will be in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, in pointing out the necessity for the enactment of this measure I should like to call attention briefly to a portion of the testimony of Commissioner Durr, of the Federal Communications Commission. Mr. Durr, in commenting upon the necessity for such legislation, stated:

It is, I think, generally recognized that, without the loan which Reconstruction Finance Corporation made to Postal, the company could not continue its operation. As of yesterday, April 22, 1942, Postal owed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation $6,000,000 and had commitments from Reconstruction Finance Corporation for an additional amount of $500,000. This loan is not presently due. The first installment does not mature until April 24, 1943, and payments are made monthly thereafter.

The prospect that the company will have to default on this loan is only too clear. For, even on a straight operations basis, which does not include provision for repayment of the loan, Postal shows a loss. As time goes on, if the present trend in the direction of greater and greater losses is not arrested, the position will be worse and not better.

Thus, the $6,000,000 of new money which has been pumped into the Postal picture has not saved it. It has served only to postpone the day when the problem of how the company can continue to run a telegraph business must be met and solved.

The obvious consequences of not solving that problem explains the deep apprehension which is reflected in the letters of the Defense Communications Board in connection with merger legislation. For unless something is done to check the downward spiral in Postal's affairs, it may not be possible to keep it together as a going telegraph business. This would be an undesirable prospect at any time from the viewpoint of the public interest in an adequate communications system. In wartime, it is, of course, especially undesirable.

No discussion of the impact of the war on the problem of telegraph merger would be realistic or complete if it did not examine merger in terms of critical war materials. This the Defense Communications Board recognized when it wrote:

"Merger in the domestic telegraph industry will result in substantial savings of critical war materials, now wasted through needless duplication of certain facilities, and will safeguard and promote the adequacy and flexibility of the country's wire telegraph communications, so vital in wartime."

In this connection, the study which the Commission has made available to the Communications Branch of the War Production Board reveals some very pertinent facts.

It appears that Western Union and Postal has each stretched 13,000 miles of pole lines, making a total of 26,000 miles, along the same railroad rights-of-way, separated from each other by less than the width of the right-of-way. These lines do not constitute alternate routes. They are identical ones.

If we translate Postal's 13,000 miles of pole lines into wire-miles, we get 86,000 miles of wire, representing approximately 9,700 tons of wire running from the same places to the same places, and so situated that the same flood or other natural calamity affects them both. By the same token, they are in a large measure equally vulnerable to the same enemy attack.

Nor is this the sole duplication, though it is the most complete one. Both companies more or less parallel each other in varying degrees of proximity for an additional distance of about 15,000 miles of pole line. In the case of Postal, this 15,000 miles of pole line carries 191,000 miles, or 19,000 tons of wire. In this connection, I want to make it perfectly clear that though we have a very substantial amount of duplication here, we do not have, as in the first category which I mentioned, complete duplication of lines.

Critical war materials are, of course, used in other parts of the telegraph operation. Printers are made of metal, and Western Union has 13,431 such machines in service to Postal's 6,550. It is safe to say that the morning after merger is accomplished, a total of 6,200 printers can be released. It is estimated that this would relieve any material shortage in connection with printer requirements for the next several years.

I wish also to call the attention of the Senate to the testimony of Brig. Gen. Frank E. Stoner, in charge of Army Communications Branch, Signal Corps, United States Army. Brigadier General Stoner, in testifying, used the following language:

The War Departmen' favors consolidation of the telegraph companies in the interest of economy in the use of critical equipment, materials, and personnel, all of which are necessary now for the use of important defense communication projects.

An illustration of the saving in important critical equipment and matériel may be had by referring to a recent report published by the Defense Communications Board prepared for publication by the Federal Communications Commission, in which it was stated that there are approximately 13,431 teletype printers in use in business offices. The Postal has approximately 6,550 of these printers. It is assumed that approximately 50 percent of those installations are caused by reason of competitive conditions. It is, therefore, safe to assume that approximately 5,000 of those printers might be diverted to national defense communication purposes in event of consolidation.

The Postal also has 747 branch offices. Assuming that 500 of those branch offices could be abandoned, it would mean an additional 1,200 printers would be released for such other use as might be made of them.

The War Department at the present time is not able to fill all requirements for teleprinters.

Consolidation would also further react on other critical materials, such as pole line hardware, typewriters, and equipment used in the fabrication of major items of equipment.

I might also refer to the item of secondary copper. The Postal and Western Union Telegraph Cos. at the present time have parallel circuits along railroad rights-of-way and along highways, running side by side, where the full capacity of both services is not needed and where recovery might be made by doing away with one of the companies' leads, and in so doing there also would be recovery of secondary copper, which is a critical material at the present time.

The War Department is well pleased with the cooperation they are now receiving from both telegraph companies. We are interested in the facilities of telegraph service as they affect our national defense set-up. We are not interested in the mechanics of any consolidation. But, certainly, we are interested in the use of the facilities; and we are interested in the conserving of materials for installation and maintenance. We are also interested in being able to obtain an additional supply of highly trained technical personnel which may be released in event consolidation is permitted.

Mr. President, I call the Senate's attention briefly to the testimony of Mr. Jesse Jones, Secretary of Commerce, who, in speaking of the proposed legislation, stated:

I think consolidation of these two companies on some basis fair to employees and to stockholders alike is highly desirable.

The telegraph business is as much a natural monopoly as is the telephone business or, you might say, the Post Office. Rates are fixed and governed by governmental authority, so that there can be no question of profiteering by reason of there being no actual competition in telegraph service.

There is ample competition in communications as we all know from the telephone and the radio. So there appears no reasonable objection from that standpoint. That is from the standpoint of monopoly.

Obviously the Postal Co. cannot survive without Government subsidy, and the fewer businesses the Government is called upon to subsidize the better off we will all be, I think.

I have discussed this matter with the President. I asked him if I might quote him as being in favor of the principles involved in this bill; at least, the principles I have discussed here, and he said that I was so authorized.

Furthermore, he made this suggestion to me, which he wanted me to bring to the subcommittee's attention as I understood him; that the legislation when enacted should make provision authorizing post offices to rent space where available space existed for telegraph offices; that there were hundreds, if not thousands, of places in the United States where it would be an economy to the Government and to the patron of the service, as well as a convenience to the public, to have telegraph offices installed in post offices.

Naturally, the President would want proper protection provided in the bill for any displaced labor; and that I am sure you gentlemen would insist upon, and that everybody wishes to have done.

Mr. President, when I was called upon to prepare this measure I asked the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], who has made a study of the communication problems of the Nation, to join with me in its preparation. We called in the representatives of the various companies interested, and we called in the representatives of the employees, to determine just what was thought should go into the proposed legislation in carrying out the recommendation of the Interstate Commerce Comittee. As the result of that study we introduced Senate bill 2445. When the proposed legislation was introduced it was naturally referred to the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I wish to ask the Senator a question. In places where these two telegraph companies now have duplication of lines and facilities, is it not the idea that the elimination of one would result in its facilities being absorbed by the new company?

Mr. McFARLAND. That is the idea. It would save much critical material, and save expense of maintenance of the duplicate lines. As I pointed out a moment ago, in many places the office of one company is located on one side of the railroad, and the office of the other company is located on the other side of the railroad. Material saved by doing away with useless duplication could be used in the war effort.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What proportion of the loss resulting to the communications line is going to be absorbed by the R. F. C.? It seems to me the R. F. C. is the one which will hold the sack.

Mr. McFARLAND. None of that is to be absorbed. The loan is secured, and it would mean that no longer would it be necessary to subsidize one of our communications systems.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. If the bill becomes law, will the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate pass some of our telegrams which we cannot get passed now? That committee turned down some official telegrams I sent on some very important matters, because they were longer than the committee thought they should be. Government departments cannot only send unlimited numbers of telegrams, but can call up over the long distance and talk $25 worth without batting an eye; yet Senators are greatly limited in the length of telegrams they send. I wonder if the passage of the proposed legislation will give us some relief?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I shall have to refer that question to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate. I do not believe I am able to answer the question, but I will say to the Senator from Texas that the enactment of the proposed legislation should provide, and I believe it will provide, a more efficient communications system throughout the United States. By eliminating duplications of effort the communications system should be improved and we should have better telegraph service.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator that it seems to me there is unnecessary duplication. Of course, I do not know the details of the bill. I do not know how much of the duplication will be paid for by the Government. It is a desirable objective if it can be worked out in fairness to the Government and to the constituent companies.

Mr. McFARLAND. That is exactly what we are trying to accomplish. I thank the Senator for his comments.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. The Senator has spoken about saving material. Will the Senator tell me what arrangements have

been made for the employees of the companies, some of whom have been with one or the other of the companies for long periods of time?

Mr. McFARLAND. I expect to cover that matter in a few moments, if the Senator will permit me to do so then.

Mr. MAYBANK. I shall thank the Senator for doing so. But they are protected, are they not?

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes. I will say now to the Senator from South Carolina that if this measure is adopted, it will be the most favorable measure toward labor that has ever been enacted by the Congress.

Mr. President, I was about to point out that the chairman of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce [Mr. WHEELER], appointed the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and me to consider the proposed legislation, and we again gave all the representatives of the employees and of the companies an opportunity to come before our subcommittee to suggest changes and to make recommendations in regard to the proposed legislation. I wish to compliment the members of the subcommittee for the manner in which they approached the problem and the careful study they gave to the subject.

We also had the assistance of the majority leader, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] in the consideration of the proposed legislation before the full committee. After careful consideration, Senate bill 2598, the bill now before the Senate, was recommended for enactment. That measure is different from Senate bill 2445 in that it eliminates the international merger from this field. This was done largely because of the opposition to that phase of the proposed legislation by the Navy Department.

Mr. President, in that connection I wish to have incorporated in the RECORD at this point a letter to the chairman of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee from Secretary of the Navy Knox.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 10, 1942.

MY DEAR SENATOR WHEELER: During the hearings before the subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate Commerce of the Senate on S. 2445, completed on May 13, 1942, testimony was presented by representatives of the War and Navy Departments. This testimony may have justified interpretation that the War and Navy Departments differ as to the possible effect upon the adequacy, security, and efficiency of military and naval communications of legislation which would authorize consolidation or merger of commercial communication facilities in the international field.

The vital interest of the War and Navy Departments in our commercial communication systems has, of course, long been recognized. This interest has been manifested in joint assumption by the military departments of the Government of a leading position in the development of these systems of communication along lines which would best prepare them readily to serve military and naval demands during war.

The availability of adequate and secure commercial communications in relation to our military and naval requirements has been a matter of deep concern and study by the military services for more than a quarter of a century. Specifically with reference to the pending legislation, the subject of consolidation or merger of our commercial communication facilities was considered by the Army and Navy Joint Board in 1934. At that time, among other conclusions, the Joint Board declared that, in case of proposed merger, the Army and the Navy should reserve judgment subject to a study as to the effect of any such proposed merger upon national defense.

With reference to the proposed consolidation or merger of communication facilities in the domestic field, the War and Navy Departments are in accord that present conditions demand congressional authorization to that end.

However, it is believed that a consolidation or merger of commercial communication facilities in the international field at this time would disturb world-wide communications and would consequently be detrimental to the war effort.

The Navy Department, therefore, recommends that those provisions of S. 2445 which would authorize consolidation or merger of commercial communication facilities in the international field be eliminated from the bill.

Sincerely yours,

_____.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, the remainder of the bill is largely the same as Senate bill 2445, with some improvements which were suggested by members of the committee and by those appearing before the committee.

Senate bill 2598, as reported by the committee, would permit the voluntary merger or consolidation of only domestic telegraph carriers into a single domestic telegraph carrier. It would not permit the consolidation or merger of international telegraph carriers.

Section 1 of the bill provides for the amendment of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, by the addition of a new section, section 222. Subsection (a) thereof makes lawful, after application to and approval by the Federal Communications Commission, the consolidation or merger of domestic telegraph carriers.

Subsection (b) requires the parties to a proposed merger or consolidation to submit application and the Commission to hold public hearings thereon, giving notice of hearing and opportunity to be heard to the Governors of each State in which property to be merged is situated, to the Attorney General, the Secretaries of War, Navy, and State Departments, and representatives of employees, and permits the Commission to enter an order approving merger if certain conditions are met.

Subsection (c) permits the merged or consolidated telegraph carrier to take over the domestic telegraph facilities of any carrier. Paragraph (2) provides for the divestment by the merged or consolidated domestic telegraph carrier of any international telegraph business it may carry on.

Subsection (d) prohibits approval of any consolidation or merger which would have more than one-fifth capital stock ownership by aliens, or representatives of aliens, or by foreign governments, or representatives of such governments.

Subsection (e) provides that the merged or consolidated telegraph carrier shall work out a formula for exchange of traffic with international telegraph carriers under certain equitable standards, and permits the Commission to prescribe such a formula only after the telegraph carriers fail to agree. Paragraph (2) provides an identical formula for the exchange of traffic with telegraph carriers in contiguous foreign countries—Canada, Newfoundland, and Mexico—whose telegraph traffic is regarded as domestic, rather than international telegraph traffic. Paragraph (3) provides that for the purpose of this subsection, domestic telegraph operations of an international telegraph carrier shall be considered a domestic carrier, and similarly, international telegraph operations of a domestic carrier shall be considered an international telegraph carrier. Paragraph (4) permits the Commission, upon complaint or on its own motion, to prescribe a telegraphic traffic interchange formula if, at any time, it finds that the formula followed is not equitable or in the public interest.

Subsection (f)—that is the subsection about which the Senator from South Carolina just asked me—provides that all employees of any carrier which becomes a party to consolidation or merger, who were employed on March 1, 1941, shall have full job protection at the compensation and rate of pay they received on the date of the approval of the consolidation or merger, with the added proviso that no employee may be assigned to work inconsistent with his training and experience. We anticipated that that would take care of all the employees except the additional employees who were required because of the increased business occasioned by the war effort.

Paragraph (2) provides that if any employee who is not covered by paragraph (1) is discharged as a result of consolidation or merger, he shall receive severance pay equal to 4 weeks' pay multiplied by the number of years he was employed by any carrier which was a party to consolidation or merger; and no employee, regardless of the tenure of his employment, is to receive less than 4 weeks' pay as a severance allowance. Paragraph (3) requires that for 5 years following merger or consolidation, employees of any carrier which was a party to merger or consolidation shall have a preferential hiring status with the merged telegraph carrier for such positions as he is qualified to fill. Paragraph (4) provides for payment of traveling expenses, continuance of salary, and a bonus equal to 2 months' pay for any employee transferred from one community to another as a result of consolidation or merger. Paragraph (5) provides against impairment of any pension right or any other health, insurance, or death benefit as a result of merger or consolidation. Paragraph (6) protects the jobs of those employees who have entered or shall enter the military service since August 27, 1940. Paragraph (7) protects

employees against discharge, or reduction in earnings, or furlough for 5 years after the consolidation or merger, or for 6 months before in anticipation of consolidation or merger. Paragraph (8) is the usual provision permitting discharge for incompetency or similar cause. Paragraph (9) protects employees' rights now guaranteed by any collective-bargaining agreements until such agreements are terminated, and extends to employees the remedies provided by the National Labor Relations Act. Paragraph (10) exempts employees who are paid more than $5,000 per annum from the provisions of the subsections.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I do not quite understand the Senator's formula for severance pay. Is there any distinction between voluntary severance and involuntary severance?

Mr. McFARLAND. The committee felt that if a man did not want to work he would not be entitled to severance pay; but if he was in the employ of the company on March 1, 1941, his job would be protected. A man in the military service, and out of employment for that reason, would have his job protected at the same salary he received before the merger. If he did not want to work, that would be his fault.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That would be voluntary severance.

Mr. McFARLAND. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. In that case would he receive pay for 4 weeks?

Mr. McFARLAND. If he were offered a job elsewhere, or if he wanted to quit of his own accord, I do not see why he should have any severance pay at all. Many employees might not want to continue to work. They might want to quit. To pay them all severance pay would require a great amount of money.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Does not the bill provide severance pay?

Mr. McFARLAND. The bill provides severance pay for those in the employ of the company on March 1, 1941, if they are not kept on the pay roll.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McFARLAND. Subsection (g) defines the terms used in the bill.

Section 2 provides for the amendment of section 214 (a) of the Communications Act, making certain technical clarifying changes in the present act to conform with the new bill. Section 3, section 4, and section 5 make similar technical changes in sections 214 (b), 214 (c), and 214 (d), respectively, of the present act.

Section 6 provides for amendment of section 5266 of the Revised Statutes to give priority of transit for Government telegrams and permits the elimination of the present preferential rate granted for carriage of Government messages.

Section 7 is the usual separability clause.

Mr. President, we feel that we have presented constructive legislation, made necessary by the rapid communications provided by the airplane, subsidized air mail, the telephone, and other communications systems.

At this time I wish to offer a clarifying amendment to subparagraph 7, on page 10, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 10, after line 5, it is proposed to strike out subparagraph 7 and insert in lieu thereof the following:

(7) No employee of any carrier which is a party to any such consolidation or merger shall, without his consent, have his rate of compensation reduced, or (except as provided in paragraph (2) of this subsection) be discharged or furloughed, as a direct result of such consolidation or merger, during the 5-year period after the date of the approval of such consolidation or merger, and no such employee shall, without his consent, have his compensation reduced, or be discharged or furloughed in contemplation of such consolidation and merger, during the 6-month period immediately preceding such approval.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Louisiana.

Mr. ELLENDER. For what period of time is the plan to be in effect? Is it only for 6 months after the consolidation is consummated? I understand that the reason the consolidation is being proposed is the enormous losses incurred by the Postal Telegraph Co. Am I correct?

Mr. McFARLAND. Not wholly, but largely.

Mr. ELLENDER. Is not that the main reason?

Mr. McFARLAND. I should say that that is one of the main reasons.

Mr. ELLENDER. If the services of these employees are retained, either with the Western Union or the Postal after it is taken over by the Western Union, how is it proposed to save the enormous costs?

Mr. McFARLAND. I will answer the Senator from Louisiana by stating that at this time the turn-over in employees is great. The turn-over makes this legislation workable under war conditions when it would not otherwise be practicable. I might call attention in this connection to the report of the Committee on Interstate Commerce on Senate Resolution 95, in which it is stated:

Western Union's own estimates, for example, as incorporated in charts L–A and LA–1, show that the company expects that between June 1941 and June 1944 nearly 5,000 employees, exclusive of messengers, will be separated from the pay roll by all causes. Although Postal's turn-over rate is higher, if calculated at the Western Union rate, about 1,600 of its employees, exclusive of messengers, may be expected to leave the company's service during the same 3-year period.

It is doubtful that any investigation, even one made at prohibitive cost, could accurately foretell the exact number of employees which would be required to operate an efficient consolidated company. Only actual experience in such operation would answer. There is a marked difference of opinion between many labor representatives and company officials on this question. Labor spokesmen believe that the consolidated company should absorb the present 60,000 employees in the industry. Some company representatives contend that the existing total of Western Union employees could handle all the domestic business. It is plain, however, that normal attrition and turn-over rates will remove nearly 7,000 employees from the industry within a 3-year period, the equivalent of more than two-thirds of Postal's present working force, exclusive of messengers.

Mr. ELLENDER. So long as the employees were retained on the pay roll of the Western Union, should it take over the Postal Telegraph Co., that cost would still remain, and necessarily the losses would be as great as they now are.

Mr. McFARLAND. If all of them should remain on the pay roll, that would be true, but according to statistics, the turn-over is rapid. The report to which I have referred was made last year, before the war. The present turn-over is even more rapid. The evidence showed that all the employees will not remain on the pay roll. The purpose of the labor provisions is to protect those who have been in the service 15 or 20 years. One man testified that he had worked for the Postal Telegraph Co. for 41 years.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am not questioning that. As I understand, the reason this consolidation is being advocated is that the Postal Telegraph System is losing a great amount of money. It cannot go along, and something must be done in order to relieve it. The bill provides that the entire force shall be retained on the pay roll. I do not see how expenses can be curtailed if that is done. The same expenses will continue. I cannot understand why the consolidation is advocated if expenses are not to be curtailed.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. I wish to make a suggestion in reply to the question of the Senator from Louisiana. Of course, it is true that if every employee of the Postal Co. should be continued in the employ of the consolidated company, there would be no saving in labor costs. However, it is anticipated that many of the employees will leave of their own free will and accord. They will not come under the 5-year guaranty of employment. Even if they should all remain on the pay roll, there would be economies outside labor costs. There would be the elimination of duplicate rentals and facilities of all sorts. So, even admitting—which I think would not be the case—that all the employees would continue on the pay roll, there would still be other opportunities for economies to be put into effect.

Mr. ELLENDER. Irrespective of that, is it not the purpose of the amendment which we are now being asked to pass upon to retain all employees of the Postal Telegraph Co. by the Western Union when the consolidation is made?

Mr. McFARLAND. No. This amendment is merely clarifying in its nature, and which does not change the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND].

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment.

If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill (S. 2598) was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

VALUE OF INDEPENDENT SENATE AND HOUSE COMMITTEE INVESTIGATIONS

Mr. TRUMAN. Mr. President, I am calling the attention of the Senate to comment in the press in appraisal of the recent report which was made to the Senate by the Special Committee to Investigate the War Program. I am not quarreling with the press over the conclusions at which it arrives on the report. A free press has a right to state its views and conclusions on any subject just as freely as we state ours here. We may not agree with the press, but it has a right to a free expression. That is one thing we are fighting for. Naturally I think the committee's conclusions are correct.

I am, however, in strong disagreement when the press states that the House of Representatives and the Senate are wasting time when each of them investigates the same subject. I disagree with the able and distinguished senior Senator from Illinois when he says that committees of the House and Senate should not make duplicate investigations.

The truth and the facts are most difficult to find, and, too much search cannot be made in order to find them and reach a sound conclusion.

I have been lucky enough to have been a member of three very excellent and efficient committees of the Senate when they were engaged in a sincere effort to get at the facts. Two of those committees were subcommittees of the Committee on Interstate Commerce and the other one is the special committee now working. One of those interstate subcommittees investigated public utility holding companies, and the other one the railroad financial and bankruptcy conditions. Both of those investigations resulted in bills which very materially altered the laws governing interstate commerce and transportation. Numerous investigations of the railroads had been made by committees of both the House and the Senate, but no one has ever intimated that because there was a duplication and a repetition of the facts the time and effort were wasted.

I believe that the founding fathers knew exactly what they were doing when they made the House and the Senate independent legislative bodies, responsible to the people, each on a different basis.

It will not hurt the bureaucrats and the Army and Navy brass hats to answer questions before these two legislative bodies. We represent the people directly, and we raise the money and authorize its expenditure so the appointees of the executive can act. We have a right to know how efficiently that money is used. One way to find out is to create special committees with power to force attendance and answers to questions under oath. During this emergency the executive branch of the Government has so expanded that one man or one committee cannot possibly know all that goes on.

Committees are composed of human beings, and none of us is perfect. Some of us like to work and dig and find out things for ourselves; some of us like to have someone else do the work and perhaps have some bright fellow from the other end of the Avenue tell us what he wants us to hear. One committee may have views exactly opposite from those of another as to what the evidence shows.

That has happened a number of times between the House Military Affairs Committee and the Senate special committee. But I cannot see any harm in it or any reason why the practice should be stopped. If one committee feels like whitewashing the Aluminum Co., and if the Senate's special committee does not then one or the other has interpreted the facts and the evidence correctly, and the people have had a chance to hear both sides of the question. This is true of camp construction, curtailment, conversion, and a number of other subjects.

The House Naval Affairs Committee has done a most constructive piece of work in showing up the bungling and inefficiency of the Procurement and Contract Section of the Navy Department, and the Senate special committee has made some similar investigations. Both have resulted in stopping waste of untold millions of dollars of the taxpayers' money. The expenses of the committees have been infinitesimal in comparison with the savings to the people.

The House and the Senate rarely agree on any piece of major legislation, and that is exactly what the Constitution intended. The more thoroughly and deliberately a question is considered the better the legislation. The committee of which I am the chairman has worked better with 10 Senators than it did with 7. The combined judgment and opinions of 10 Senators are just 10 times as sound as the judgment of one would be. That is true of the combined judgment and conclusions of committees of the two Houses. I have never worked with nine more earnest, hard-working, straight-thinking men. We have our differences of opinion and our arguments, but we have only one object in view, and we are unanimously agreed on that. That objective is to make a contribution toward winning the war, and winning it as quickly as possible. Some of the things we have had to do as a committee have been most disagreeable and distasteful to us, but no one expects to do what he likes to do in a total war. For my part I should much rather be running a field artillery outfit on the front or in a training center than presiding over an investigating committee. But circumstance has given me a distasteful job to do, and I am trying to do it with all I have, to help finish as quickly as possible the job the Nation has to do.

Our whole committee feels that way. We are after the facts and we shall report them to the Senate as we find them, and shall suggest the remedy. When the Senate feels that we are not doing a constructive job, all it has to do is to repeal the resolution under which we act, or withhold the necessary funds for our expenses.

What I want to impress upon the Senate is the fact that a number of investigating committees authorized by both the House and the Senate have done some good for the country. Perhaps there have been mistakes and conclusions from insufficient evidence, but on the whole the taxpayer and the ordinary citizen have benefited. The committee of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY] and the committees of the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] and the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] have done the Senate very great service. Some of the things those committees have investigated have also been looked into by the special committee of which I am the chairman, but the public interest has been well served by all of them; and I, for one, shall not vote to abolish any of them or to prevent them from looking into subjects for which they were authorized, even if they duplicate some of the work that the committee of which I am chairman is doing.

ACTIVITIES OF NATIONAL WAR LABOR BOARD

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, since the meeting of the President's Industrial Labor Conference I have tried to keep abreast of the activities of the War Labor Board. At the end of April I prepared an address to be delivered on the floor of the Senate. Since the address contains historical material, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The maintenance of continued all-out production is a matter of vital—even of life and death—importance to the country. On that we are all agreed. That obstacles to such all-out production, whether they consist of inefficiencies in productive methods, ineptness of management, or in stoppages due to labor disputes, should be reduced as rapidly as possible we are likewise agreed. Except for the actual prosecution of hostilities against the enemy, this is the major task now confronting the people of the United States and their representatives in Washington.

In considering legislation on the subject of labor disputes we should recognize that there is no disagreement among us concerning this objective; insofar as we differ, it is only over the most practical and intelligent methods of reaching that objective, over the most effective way of insuring that disagreements between management and labor will not obstruct full war production.

Much of the argument to date on this question has concerned the type of new machinery for the handling of labor disputes which we should, by statute, create. I suggest that before we pursue that argument further we should answer the more basic question of whether it is necessary to set up

new machinery at all. I submit to you that machinery is in existence for the prevention of strikes and the settlement of labor disputes, and that the record of its operation to date excludes the thought that it should be supplanted or disturbed at this time.

Let us examine that machinery and its record. At the heart of the machinery is the National War Labor Board, established by Executive order of the President on January 12, 1942. It is a board of 12 members, 4 of whom represent the public, 4 are representative of employees, and 4 are representative of employers. That Board has general authority under the Executive order finally to determine labor disputes which might interrupt work which contributes to the effective prosecution of the war. For this purpose, it may use the techniques of mediation, voluntary arbitration, or arbitration under the rules established by the Board.

In carrying out this work the Board is assisted by a large number of men representing the public, employers, and employees respectively, who have been appointed by the President as associate members of the Board, and who have authority to act as mediators or as arbitrators under the Board's direction.

The typical procedure for the settlement of a labor dispute which comes to the Board is the reference of this dispute to a panel of three associate members, on which representatives of the public, industry, and labor endeavor to bring about an agreement by the processes of mediation. If some issues cannot be settled, an effort is made to persuade the parties voluntarily to agree that they shall be determined by an arbitrator chosen by agreement of both sides. If this is not possible and some issues still remain in dispute, it then becomes the responsibility of the panel itself to investigate the matter and to make recommendations to the full War Labor Board as to how they should be settled. The Board itself then takes the case, and on the basis of the record and the recommendations of the panel issues an order for the final settlement of all issues in dispute. I will want to comment further upon the Board and its procedure, for I believe that it is developing techniques for the democratic adjustment of labor disputes which will prove of permanent value to the country. But I want first to describe the rest of the machinery, of which this Board is but a part.

For when I say that the Board is the heart of this country's present machinery for the settlement of labor disputes, I mean precisely that, but no more than that.

No single board or governmental agency could settle all the labor disputes or disagreements which arise in the thousands of plants throughout the country which are engaged in war production. When we speak of war production, we are speaking of by far the greater part of present-day American industry involving millions upon millions of employees. No single agency, whether created by statute or Executive order, and regardless of the size of its staff or the powers with which it is vested, could satisfactorily handle the grievances and disputes, the irritations and maladjustments which will arise from day to day and from week to week throughout our industries.

The bulk of these disputes must be handled now as they have been handled in the past—in the plants and factories themselves. They must be handled by wise management, by effective grievance machinery and by the orderly processes of collective bargaining. They call for industrial statesmanship upon the part of the representatives of industry and labor alike, exercised day by day and in each plant and department. We cannot consider the problem intelligently unless we consider the effect of the measures we are contemplating—not only upon the War Labor Board, but upon this vast pattern of established and organized procedures and relationships, the grievance machineries, the collective bargaining contracts, the no-strike agreements, and the established understandings between labor and management by which the bulk of the country's labor disputes are now settled.

This far-flung pattern of procedures and understandings constitutes the body of the machinery for handling labor disputes, of which the National War Labor Board is the guiding and influencing heart. In a real sense, it is new machinery which has already been revised and modified to meet the war emergency. The basis for the wartime settlement of industrial disputes throughout the Nation was laid on December 23, 1941, when the representatives of labor and industry, assembled in conference in Washington at the call of the President, entered into the following agreement:

"(1) There shall be no strikes or lock-outs; (2) all disputes shall be settled by peaceful means; (3) the President shall set up a proper War Labor Board to handle these disputes." This agreement has changed the face of labor relations in this country for the duration of the war. It is the basis for the entire system of adjusting labor disputes in the war-production industries. It is short and very simple, but its very shortness and simplicity reveal its all-inclusiveness. By fostering an agreement between the responsible leaders of management and labor, a result has been achieved which goes much further than the Government itself had ever seriously considered attempting to go by compulsion. This agreement does not provide merely for "cooling-off periods" or some other such arrangement which by prohibiting a strike before a certain date implicitly legalizes and invites a strike when that date has expired. It does not single out certain issues and by preventing strikes in regard to them implicitly open the way for strikes in regard to others. It simply says that "there shall be no strikes or lock-outs at all, and that all disputes shall be settled by peaceful means." I think that as Americans we should take pride in this agreement. The efforts by democratic countries to prohibit strikes by statute, all students of the subject agree, have proven a dismal failure, but by reason and persuasion we have achieved in this country what others, by compusion, have failed to do.

I believe that this achievement is more important because it seems to me to be the only really effective way of handling the problem of the grass roots—in the mines, mills, and factories where production is actually going on. Industrial relations in these plants are in the hands of literally millions of shop stewards and foremen, employee representatives and department heads, committees, and superintendents, union representatives and managers. Day by day, week by week, these men must meet the host of problems that arise; as industries are converted to war production, as men are laid off, transferred, or rehired to new jobs, as wage rates in competing plants and industries change, as prices rise and real wages fall, as production schedules increase, and men grow tired, nervous, and irritable. The situations which confront these men will usually be difficult to handle; they may be explosive. But I say that it is upon these men that the country must depend if these problems are to be met and the disputes are to be adjusted while the wheels of production are kept turning at full speed. These men—union leaders and plant managers alike—are the country's real first line of defense on the industrial front.

These men are Americans—no better than most Americans, and no worse. Like most Americans, they may be hot-headed and unreasonable at times, but I suggest that like most Americans they like to stand on their own feet and are willing to do by agreement what they are loath to do by compulsion. And that, I say to you, is the strength of the industry-labor agreement of December 23, 1941. Rather than threatening these men, rather than imposing penalties upon them, the country has called upon them to take the responsibility themselves for the maintenance of production, and I believe the record shows how well they are fulfilling that responsibility.

An interdepartmental committee representing 6 Federal agencies interested in war-labor matters—the War Department, Navy Department, Maritime Commission, Labor Department, War Production Board, and the National War Labor Board—have recently compiled figures of strikes appearing to affect the war effort during the first quarter of 1942 and have compared them with the figures for the first quarter of 1941. These figures show that employment on war materials has increased since the first quarter of 1941 by 3⅔ times—that is, from 156,000,000 man-days in the first quarter of 1941 to about 552,000,000 for the first quarter in 1942. Despite this increase, the man-days of idleness lost due to strikes affecting the war effort declined from 1,384,000 man-days idleness in the first quarter of 1941 to 332,000 man-days idle in the first quarter of 1942. Expressed as a percentage of war employment idleness in strikes relating to war production was approximately nine one-hundredths of 1 percent in the first quarter of 1941 and only six one-hundredths of 1 percent for the first quarter of 1942. Half of the total idleness in war strikes during the first quarter of 1942, moreover, is accounted for by 7 strikes. This is not, of course, a perfect record, but I submit that it is, nevertheless, a splendid record.

The industry-labor agreement not to strike is barely 4 months old. One would think that it would take considerable time for its impact to reach the thousands of men responsible for union-management relations throughout industry, and the temptation to use the habitual methods of a strike and lock-out would be strong for many of them.

The War Labor Board, moreover, has only been established and really functioning for something over 3 months, and its procedures for settlement of strikes are still new and not understood by many. Yet, out of each 10,000 workers engaged in war production in any one day during the first 3 months of this year, only 6 were on strike. I believe this record is a tribute to the wisdom of the Government in proceeding by the methods of agreement rather than the methods of compulsion. It is a tribute to the patriotism of the leaders of American labor and American industry; and though we can and must do better, I believe the record should give us confidence in the basic procedures we have so far established and cause us to think long before we tell these men that we cannot trust them and must impose upon them statutes and rules, threats, and penalties.

I have so far emphasized the first two provisions of the industry-labor agreement, that is, that there shall be no strikes and lock-outs, and that all disputes shall be peaceably settled.

Let us turn to the third and equally important part of the agreement, a clause which says, "The President shall set up a proper War Labor Board to handle these disputes." As I have already indicated, the President, in his Executive order of January 12, 1942, carried out this agreement. But in that order he did more than create the War Labor Board; he laid down the wartime pattern for the handling of all labor disputes affecting war production, not only before the War Labor Board in Washington, but in the field. This pattern is as follows: (1) The parties to a labor dispute must first resort to direct collective-

bargaining negotiations; (2) if a collective-bargaining agreement is in force between them which provides procedures for the settlement of all or any of their disputes, these procedures must be followed through and exhausted before any further steps are taken; (3) if direct collective bargaining or the procedures set up by contract do not settle the issues, the parties shall notify the commissioners of conciliation, Department of Labor, who shall endeavor to assist the parties to reach an agreement; (4) if the dispute is not promptly settled by the Commissioners of conciliation, the Secretary of Labor shall certify the dispute to the War Labor Board, which shall finally determine.

The order thus places first reliance upon the leaders of labor and industry in the field to work out their disputes among themselves. If they fail, it provides for the assistance of a Government conciliator. In the ordinary case the Board will only take jurisdiction of a dispute if the efforts of the commissioners of conciliation prove fruitless.

As a safeguard, however, and to insure that no disputes shall continue to the point at which it threatens war production, the order gives the Board authority to assume jurisdiction of any dispute at any stage, on its own motion, after consultation with the Secretary of Labor.

One other principle is established in the order which it is important for us to note. Section 2 of the order states that it shall not apply to labor disputes for which procedures for adjustment or settlement are otherwise provided until those procedures have been exhausted. And section 7 makes it clear that nothing in the order is intended to affect the provisions of the Railway Labor Act, the National Labor Relations Act, or certain other statutes which affect the settlement or adjustment of labor disputes. An obligation has thus been placed upon management and labor alike to pursue their legal remedies under existing statutes to a conclusion before attempting to bring their disputes before the War Labor Board.

Two things about the procedures just described should be noticed: First, that the entire order and the procedures themselves grow out of, and are based upon, the industry-labor agreement; and that the no-strike, no-lock-out pledge applies during all stages of the procedure and whether or not at any stage of the procedure from the start of bargaining in a plant to the final decision of the War Labor Board the parties fail to reach an agreement. These procedures, in other words, supplement the no-strike, no-lock-out pledge and offer an alternative means of disposing of the disputed issues. But the pledge itself stands on its own feet and is binding upon the parties, regardless of the success or failure of the mediation and arbitration procedures provided.

Second, this procedural pattern places its emphasis in the proper place—that is, not in Washington before a board where decisions will be imposed but in the plant where union and management representatives close to the problem are bargaining face to face, just as does the no-strike, no-lock-out pledge. The procedures place primary responsibility in these matters where it ought to lie—upon the shoulders of the employers and the employees themselves.

However strong we make these foundation stones, however, the keystone of the arch is and will remain the War Labor Board. I would like to return finally to a consideration of that Board and its record to date. I have described the Board, its tripartite composition with representatives of industry, labor, and the public, its panels of associate members, and its typical procedure in which efforts are first made to secure a voluntary agreement through mediation or arbitration and in which a final decision of the Board is handed down only if agreement fails.

I want now to emphasize certain aspects of this organization and procedure which I believe are worthy of careful consideration. First, I wish to discuss the tripartite principle upon which both the Board and its panels are organized. I believe that a study of the work of the Board and of the National Defense Mediation Board, which was similarly organized, will show that the tripartite principle has vindicated itself as a mediation device and should be preserved. The presence on a mediation panel of representatives of labor and industry inspire in the parties a confidence in the panel which could be obtained in no other way. An experienced industrialist familiar with managerial problems can understand the point of view of a company in a way that a public representative, whatever his theoretical experience, can rarely do. Union representatives will accept the wise and mature counsel of an experienced labor leader on a panel with a confidence which they likewise could rarely extend to a man who had never seen their problems from the inside. Settlements have been achieved and are being daily achieved through this tripartite mediation which have defied the efforts of experienced mediators acting alone as Government representatives. I submit, moreover, that the recommendations for settlement by such tripartite panels will frequently show a realism and understanding of practical problems faced by both parties which few lone Government officials could achieve.

I believe, moreover, that the tripartite principle is equally valuable upon the final Board itself. It is a courageous experiment, for we have not always had such confidence in the objectiveness and statesmanship of the two great parties in interest as to invite their representatives to sit on the tribunal which is deciding upon their disputes. And I freely admit that, given this opportunity, small men might well bring their partisanship into the deliberations of the tribunal and cause delays, bargaining, and compromise in an agency in which speed and fairness of decision should be the only objectives. But I believe that the record of the War Labor Board indicates that it is not composed of small men. I believe that the members of that Board have shown and are showing a deep consciousness of the great responsibilities which have been placed upon them, and a determination to fulfill those responsibilities with courage and with integrity.

It would be surprising, indeed, if differences in policy did not arise among them. In view of the difficulties of the issues which face them, indeed, I would be suspicious of their individual sincerity or integrity if I found them in continuous agreement. Dissenting opinions have been known to be issued even by members of the highest Court in the land. If differences on grave matters of policy between powerful interests in this country do exist, is it not better that those differences should be threshed out inside the determining agency which has the responsibility for determining them, by the leaders of both sides, than by a group of men representing merely the Government itself, operating in a comfortable vacuum, and have only the paper records and brief arguments by the contending parties to acquaint them with what is at stake? Is not this procedure again a further example of the American and democratic way of determining these issues by reason and agreement rather than by rigid compulsion from outside?

A second principle established by the Board is that of the effectiveness in a war of emergency of combining in one agency the powers of mediation and of final arbitral determination. It has been plausibly asserted that it is unsound to combine these functions in one agency; that a mediator who arbitrates must eventually, by his decisions, destroy the confidence in him of one party or the other, and thereby lose his effectiveness as a mediator, and that an arbitrator who mediates comes so close to the issues and hears so much that is confidential and off the record that he cannot thereafter make a fair decision upon the evidence before him.

In ordinary times much could be said in support of this criticism. I believe, however, that the record of the War Labor Board and the National Defense Mediation Board which preceded it shows this criticism to be unfounded in fact and overridden by other considerations of more importance to us in this emergency. For the power of a mediator to achieve a settlement depends not only upon his persuasiveness, insight, and patience but upon the presence on one side or on both of the economic strength to induce the other to agree. During the mediation of every labor dispute in peacetimes the course of negotiations is influenced, and to an extent at least, determined by the power of the union, if necessary, to strike, and the power of the company, if necessary, to resist that strike. Mediators and conciliators may help immeasureably in the last analysis in bargaining between management and labor, as in all commercial negotiations agreements are reached when both sides determine that it is to their economic interest to agree.

The war and the industry-labor agreement has changed all that. Strikes and lockouts are no longer available bargaining weapons. There is thus no longer any reason why, on important issues at least, one side should make concessions to the other, for they have little to lose by holding out. In that situation the place in the negotiations which has heretofore been played by the strike is now played by the fact that if agreement is finally not possible the War Labor Board will itself determine the issues.

The experience of the War Labor Board, the National Defense Mediation Board, and the Conciliation Service, since the beginning of the emergency, has proven conclusively that when the parties are deadlocked over important issues, they are seldom apt to listen attentively to the advice and counsel of a mediator who does not have the power ultimately to determine the dispute. One side or the other will always feel that he has more to gain by bringing his dispute to the final determining agency than by accepting the mediator's advice. Whereas, if the mediator has the power himself to determine the controversy or to make recommendations for its settlement, his suggestions for settlement are apt to be received with respect and carefully considered before they are turned down.

It is by no means true that the decisions of an arbitrator are fairer if they are handed down upon the basis of a formal record, than if that record has been supplemented by confidential and frank discussions with the parties. In the hands of a man who cannot be objective or who is himself biased, such procedure might, I agree, be dangerous; but in the hands of a man of fairness and integrity it can contribute only to the understanding and realism with which he will arrive at his decision; and in the last analysis one can guard against bias and unfairness not in determining procedures, but in the selection of men.

I have emphasized this point because it bears directly upon suggestions which have been made for the alteration of the War Labor Board. I believe that it is vital for us during this emergency to protect and foster the processes of collective bargaining rather than to rely for the determination of all disputes upon arbitration and imposed decisions. If we are to protect collective bargaining we must protect the mediation procedures of the War Labor Board and not render them useless and innocuous by creating a separate agency for the decision of cases where these mediation processes fail.

The record of the Board shows that under its present procedure the democratic processes

of settlement by bargaining and agreement are being preserved. Let us examine that record. Between January 12, 1942, the date of its creation, and April 21, 1942, 140 labor disputes were referred to the Board. These cases had been through the entire procedure set forth in the Executive order of the President, which I have described above. Direct collective bargaining on the issues had failed. The procedures for settlement set up by various contracts had been exhausted without result; the efforts of Government conciliators had been of no avail. For a month after January 13, 1942, the Board itself was necessarily occupied largely with establishing its procedures, its rules, its organization, and its staff. Thirty-eight of these cases have, nevertheless, been finally disposed of, and of this 38, 23 were disposed of by agreement of the parties without the necessity of any Board decision. In 9 other cases the parties had agreed on a procedure for voluntary arbitration and the Board is only waiting to close the cases until the award of the arbitrator is handed down.

I submit to you that these figures testify more convincingly to the effectiveness of the Board's present organization and procedures than any arguments I could advance. No one on the Board, of course, believes that it has achieved perfection. Greater speed in its decisions of cases may certainly be expected as the difficult policy problems which face it are met and determined. But I believe that the record shows that by the procedures for collective bargaining set up by the Executive order and in the industry-labor agreement, we have found the way—the American and democratic way—the most practical and effective way—of settling labor disputes and insuring continued all-out production. I believe that on the record of the Board and on the clear facts regarding the decline in strikes in the war production industries the burden of proof is on those who say that this established and operating system should now be disturbed or supplanted.

CIVILIAN WAR BENEFITS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2412) to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of civilians, and for the prevention and relief of civilian distress arising out of the present war, and for other purposes.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I move to strike out all that part of the bill from the beginning through line 14 on page 49.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair informs the Senator from Florida that there is pending before the Senate the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] to refer the bill to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am pleased to withdraw the motion, because the Senator is now about to offer the bill in amended form eliminating the features which I think should be looked into by the Committee on Finance. I have no objection to the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before we vote on the matter, I should like to know if an agreement has been made. Suppose in conference it were thought well to put back the items now agreed to be eliminated. Then the bill would go to conference without an additional hearing by the Committee on Finance.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the Senator will recall, upon reflection, that the stricken part cannot be put back in conference unless the House puts it in, because the bill is a Senate bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand the matter, the Senator is willing to strike out all the bill except title III; is that correct?

Mr. PEPPER. All except titles III, IV, and V, with the understanding that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and the Legislative Counsel and the junior Senator from Florida have worked over the matter so as to make only clerical and textual changes in titles IV and V, and limiting them only to their applicability to title III. In other words, titles I and II are, by the motion I now propose to make, to be completely deleted from the provisions of the bill.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I move——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will suspend for a moment. At a previous session of the Senate the yeas and nays were ordered on the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT]. That order would have to be rescinded, and the amendment withdrawn, before the amendment of the Senator from Florida would be in order.

Mr. TAFT. I have submitted a unanimous-consent request. I now withdraw that request, and ask unanimous consent that the order for the yeas and nays on the amendment be vacated, so that I may withdraw the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the order for the yeas and nays is vacated.

Mr. TAFT. I now withdraw the amendment offered by me.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. PEPPER. Now, Mr. President, I move to strike out all of Senate bill 2412 through line 14, on page 49, and to make the technical changes in the remainder of the bill indicated on the text which is now in the hands of the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 26, beginning in line 7, it is proposed to strike out all down to and including line 14 on page 49.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment offered by the Senator from Florida will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 49, line 15, it is proposed to strike out "Title III" and insert "Title I."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if it is not out of order, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate vote at one time on all technical amendments as they appear in the text of the copy of the bill in the hands of the clerk, unless there is objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the technical amendments are agreed to.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, there is a proposed amendment to the title.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That cannot be acted upon until all other amendments shall be disposed of and the bill shall have been passed.

Mr. PEPPER. I have another amendment to offer, which I ask to have reported by the clerk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 52, line 12, it is proposed to insert the following new sentence:

In any case in which benefits are not payable under this subsection by reason of the detention of a person because such person had no dependents eligible therefor, the same benefits as are provided for total disability shall be paid to or for the account of such person until he dies, until he is returned to his home or place of employment, or until he is able to be returned to the jurisdiction of the United States, whichever first occurs.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I will say, by way of explanation, that that amendment has been drafted by the Assistant Legislative Counsel, Mr. Rice; the content of it has been observed by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] and by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and, I believe, they have no objection. What it does is simply this: In case a worker who is employed on some offshore base or upon some public work outside the United States has no dependents as defined in the bill and such person is detained by the enemy, then, for the purposes of this bill, he would be considered as totally disabled for the period of his detention unless his death or return to the United States sooner terminated the benefits. In other words, the person himself who was a victim of detention would be entitled to the benefits which would be paid, if he had dependents, to his dependents.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I merely rise to say that I think this amendment is a most meritorious and proper one, because, as is well known, the Government in seeking men to go to some of our insular possessions for the purpose of improving them endeavored to secure young men without dependents, and the purpose of this amendment is in case of their capture by the enemy to permit the accumulation of the benefits which the dependents would otherwise be entitled to receive. I think it is altogether a proper amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. I move the adoption of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. PEPPER. I now move that the title of the bill be amended in accordance with the text at the desk.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide benefits for the injury,

disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes."

Mr. PEPPER. Now, out of order, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill, to be referred to the Committee on Finance. It is composed of the deleted sections of the bill which has just been under consideration by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The bill (S. 2620) to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of civilians, and for the prevention and relief of civilian distress arising out of the present war, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Finance.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent Executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 21 and 23 to the bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 34, 35, 36, 41, 71, and 78 to the bill and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 90 and 91 to the bill.

CUSTODY OF JAPANESE RESIDING IN THE UNITED STATES

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration and passage of Senate bill 2293, Calendar No. 1541. The bill was reported last week by me from the Committee on Immigration, and has been on the calendar, I think, since last Thursday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2293) to provide for taking into custody certain persons who are citizens or subjects of, or owe allegiance to, any nation or country with which the United States is at war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I do not desire to object. The able Senator from Tennessee very courteously spoke to me about the bill earlier today. As I understand, he is asking unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STEWART. Yes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the request of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McNARY. I assume that the bill is intended to strengthen the Executive order heretofore issued by the President with regard to Japanese in this country?

Mr. STEWART. The Executive order of the President, I will say to the Senator from Oregon, provides, as I understand, that all persons living in certain strategic areas may be removed from such areas. The Executive order would reach the same objective this bill reaches, but this bill goes beyond the order. The bill directs and authorizes the Secretary of War, during the war period, while the United States is at war with Japan, to take into custody and detain all Japanese in America and in the island possessions of America, regardless of whether or not they were American born, to retain them in custody for such period of time as the Secretary of War believes they should be retained, and to release them when he believes that their release will not be inimical to the interest of the national defense of the United States.

Mr. McNARY. Is this proposed legislation broader than the Executive order?

Mr. STEWART. I think it is somewhat broader; I think it goes further; it is not confined simply to the strategic areas, but, under this bill, Japanese might be detained at any point in the United States or in the island possessions of the United States, if, in the opinion of the Secretary of War, it was to the interest of the national defense to do so.

Mr. McNARY. Has this bill been given consideration by the Attorney General?

Mr. STEWART. Yes, sir; the Attorney General, in a letter which was addressed, as I recall, to the chairman of the Committee on Immigration but which was turned over to the subcommittee and placed in the hearings, stated that he thought the objectives of the bill were practically all reached by the Executive order of the President. I say I do not think so; I do not think the Executive order reaches quite so far as the bill does. Nevertheless, it was the opinion of the Attorney General that the bill perhaps presented some constitutional questions and, at the same time, that the objectives of the bill were practically reached by the Executive order of the President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, in reading the report of the committee I derive the impression that the author of the bill was seeking to raise——

Mr. STEWART. A constitutional question.

Mr. BALL. Yes, a constitutional question, and the reversal of a decision of the Supreme Court of the United States which held that Japanese born in the United States are citizens.

Mr. STEWART. It is stated in the report, and was stated by the author of the bill, that it was hoped that such an objective would be attained. I do not know that it will be. I think the bill, as a war measure, is strictly constitutional, and that, as a war measure alone, that question would not be raised, unless some Japanese who was detained by the Secretary of War might raise the question, perhaps, in the courts by a writ of habeas corpus. That was stated to be primarily the hope or one of the hopes of the authors of the bill. It is true it may be a little too ambitious a hope, and I do not know whether we can attain it.

Mr. BALL. Did the Secretary of War express any opinion on the bill, as to whether it is necessary?

Mr. STEWART. No, sir; I did not have any opinion from the Secretary of War. We had a letter from the Attorney General expressing the opinion I have just stated. Then, there was a witness from the State Department, Mr. Flournoy, who testified that, in his opinion, as a war measure, the bill was constitutional. Then, we have the opinion of a number of other men of some prominence, the attorneys general of three or four Western States, the Governors of several Western States, the legal departments of the State governments of three Western States, I believe, on the question of constitutionality, as well as the opinion of the attorney from the State Department that as a war measure the bill is constitutional.

Mr. BALL. It actually goes to a fundamental question in our immigration laws, does it not?

Mr. STEWART. If it is confined to a war measure it probably does not, because, as the Senator of course knows, in wartimes even the writ of habeas corpus can be suspended under certain circumstances.

Mr. BALL. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. As a war measure, this provision would not permit the raising of that question. I have said I hoped it would not be raised, because the decision of which we are speaking is one which was rendered 50 years ago in what is known as the Wong Kim Ark case, and I think the decision is based upon principles not fundamental. Nevertheless, that is only my personal view.

Mr. BALL. I think I must object to the unanimous-consent request, because it seems to me the bill goes to a question which is quite fundamental in our whole immigration policy.

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that under the Japanese law a Japanese may have a dual state, to wit, even though he is a citizen of the United States, he may

also be a citizen of Japan? Is not that true?

Mr. STEWART. That is absolutely correct.

Mr. HILL. The fact that a Japanese calls himself a citizen of the United States does not at all mean that his first allegiance, or his first loyalty, is to the United States, and the Secretary should be enabled to deal with the Japanese, whatever they may say their status is. Is that not true?

Mr. STEWART. We had at the hearings a copy of the Japanese law on that subject. The Japanese law, in effect, says that the son of every Japanese father is a Japanese, and apparently that is presumed to be interminable. It does not make any difference how many generations of them might be born in the United States or in the possessions belonging to the United States.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I wish to make an additional statement, and then I shall yield. The Japanese law also provides that every male citizen, regardless of where born or when he departed from Japan, is a Japanese citizen, and is subject to the Emperor of Japan until he has served his time in the Japanese Army or Navy. I now yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. TAFT. The principle which the Senator has laid down is undoubtedly the position taken by the Japanese; it is also the position taken by the Germans, and it is also the position which was taken by the English in the War of 1812.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator means with respect to dual citizenship.

Mr. TAFT. Yes. It is a principle which the United States never recognized. We absolutely deny that the Japanese have any right to say that a man who is a citizen of the United States is a citizen of their country. However, it seems to me that in the preamble to the bill we are, in effect, recognizing for the first time that such a rule could be laid down which would in any way be binding upon their nationals.

So far as the object of the proposed legislation is concerned, I realize the necessity for such a law, and I am in sympathy with it, but I do not like to see embodied in legislation anything that even looks like an admission that Japan has any right to say that a Japanese born in the United States, a citizen of the United States by our law, owes any loyalty to Japan. I think it would be rather unfortunate should we enact legislation indicating acquiescence in that contention.

Mr. McKELLAR. Under those circumstances, should not the statement be stricken out of the preamble?

Mr. TAFT. Yes. My objection is only to the preamble.

Mr. McKELLAR. A preamble is not, strictly speaking, a part of a law anyway. Could not the preamble be stricken out?

Mr. STEWART. It could be very easily stricken out without affecting the bill at all.

Mr. McKELLAR. I think it should be stricken out. In my opinion the Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is correct about that, and we should not give assent to any such principle. I think the Senator from Minnesota should withdraw his objection and let the bill pass, because it is a question which should be determined, and this is the best place in the world to determine it.

Mr. BALL. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. BALL. As the Senator states in the report, and as he stated on the floor, the Attorney General does not believe the bill to be necessary, but thinks we are accomplishing the same objective without it. My reason for objecting is that just the other evening, during a discussion of the whole far eastern picture with a man who has been in the Far East for 8 years, and is a student of conditions there, it was stated by him that when the United States adopted the exclusion policy against orientals, particularly the Japanese, it laid the foundation for the attack on Pearl Harbor. This bill is obviously aimed at strengthening that exclusion policy, and I do not believe we want to do that without more consideration being given to the subject than we shall be able to give it today.

Mr. STEWART. I think, as a matter of fact, that this is a subject which has been discussed and given serious consideration for 25 years. A commission was appointed during the term of President Harding, which was sent to the Hawaiian Islands to study certain labor questions. The Senator knows about that; it was aired in the hearings. That commission brought back a report which was made public by the subcommittee considering the pending bill. The report of the commission stated that the question of national defense in the Hawaiian Islands overwhelmingly overshadowed everything else they saw or heard of while there, and they asked the Congress to give immediate attention to the question, stating that if the Hawaiian Islands were ever to be under American control, the Congress would have to adopt legislation of some kind or character on the subject. The report was a rather voluminous one. It went into many different angles of the situation and it is referred to in the report on the pending bill.

The substance of it was that the Japanese, being a race of people utterly unassimilable, utterly different in every respect from Americans, of different ideas of religion and government, and different in every other way, there would never be a time when the two races could get along together in any area. The report refers to the fact that the Japanese are insolent and impudent, that they spied upon housewives when they were acting as servants in the homes, and that the people in the Islands had no peace of mind, and were constantly in fear.

Mr. TOBEY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. TOBEY. Are not the Senator's remarks motivated by these lines from Kipling:

Oh, east is east and west is west, and never the twain shall meet,
Till earth and sky stand presently at God's great judgment seat.

Mr. STEWART. I think the Senator's observation is quite appropriate, and his reference to those immortal lines of Kipling is an excellent contribution. One of the races is East and one is West, and certainly they cannot meet. There is not any possible ground upon which to meet.

However, we are wasting time in debating the question. As I understand, the Senator from Minnesota is objecting to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. BALL. That is correct.

Mr. STEWART. Then I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2293.

Mr. BALL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Glass	Pepper
Bailey	Green	Radcliffe
Ball	Guffey	Reed
Bankhead	Gurney	Rosier
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Schwartz
Brewster	Hughes	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bulow	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	Langer	Taft
Butler	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McFarland	Tobey
Chavez	McKellar	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Connally	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Downey	Millikin	Wheeler
Doxey	Murdock	White
Ellender	Norris	Willis
George	Nye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-four Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 2293.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I wish to take only a moment to discuss the matter. I oppose the consideration at this time of Senate bill 2293, which authorizes and directs the Secretary of War to take into custody, as he deems necessary, all persons of the Japanese race in America, whether they are citizens or not. A reading of the report on the bill makes it very apparent that its author is seeking to raise a fundamental question with respect to our whole immigration policy, and to upset, if possible, the Supreme Court decision which originally held that persons of the Japanese race born in America were American citizens, even though their parents could not become naturalized citizens.

In the first place, Mr. President, there is no showing in the committee report that any department of Government believes that this extreme legislation giving the Secretary of War authority to seize any American citizen who happens to be of the Japanese race wherever he finds him, is needed. In fact, the Attorney General said specifically to the committee that he does not believe it to be necessary. There is no testimony at all from the Secretary of War that he

believes it to be necessary. Certainly if we are going to do this to persons of the Japanese race who are American-born citizens, we should consider seriously whether we want to do the same thing to American citizens of German descent. As a matter of fact, the latter are in a position to do much greater harm to our war effort by sabotage than are American citizens of Japanese descent, because they stand out in any group of Americans by reason of their race. We know that prior to the war the Nazis were paying the expenses of anywhere from 1,000 to 1,500 citizens of German descent in my State of Minnesota, and the neighboring State of Wisconsin, to visit the homeland, where they tried to inculcate in them the Nazi doctrines.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. Does the Senator know of any request whatever coming from the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, or from the Attorney General, that legislation of this type be passed by the Congress?

Mr. BALL. No, there is no such request made. The committee report on the whole shows that there is no such request and that, in fact, the Attorney General is opposed to the passage of the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. If the Senator will yield further, I should like to observe that all the information I have been able to obtain with respect to the relocation of persons of Japanese descent is that it is proceeding very satisfactorily, and that the American citizens of Japanese descent are acquiescing in the program, and going into the camps wherever they are established, without any objection, without any protest, and without any adverse exhibition of any kind. If the program under the Executive order of the President is moving ahead satisfactorily, if by the Executive order and by the program now being followed we have solved what could have been, in my opinion, a very serious question, why should we invite trouble by the passage of a bill of this kind, when there is no request made for it by those whose responsibility it is to administer the program already started?

If we can wink at the Constitution in the case of the citizen of Japanese descent, then the next step, of course, is to move out and begin putting in concentration camps citizens of German descent, and every other citizen of foreign descent in the United States who may have come or whose parents or ancestors may have come from some nation with which we are today at war.

Mr. President, I think we are treading on very dangerous ground when we pass a bill of this kind, when, in my opinion, there is no necessity for it, and when no request has been made for it by responsible executive heads.

Mr. BALL. I thank the Senator from Utah. My information about the situation as it now stands is the same as that of the Senator from Utah. There is no request for this drastic authority.

I should like to make one additional point.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. The Senator from Minnesota says the authority proposed to be given under the bill is drastic. The Senator made the remark a few minutes ago that the same thing is being done now under the Executive order of the President.

Mr. BALL. The President has designated strategic areas from which the Secretary of War is authorized to remove any resident civilian, which is a different thing from the proposal of this bill, which would give him the authority to put into concentration camps 100,000 American citizens without giving them any trial.

The additional point which I desire to make is that it is very clear from the report that the author of the bill would like to raise a fundamental question and reverse the Supreme Court decision which holds that Japanese born in America are American citizens. It seems to me that when the war is over we shall face the problem of working out harmonious relations with the Orient. There is no question that the exclusion act has been a sore spot for many decades, and I do not believe we ought to "monkey" with it at this time, when it is not necessary to win the war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2293.

Mr. BALL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the folowing Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Glass	Pepper
Bailey	Green	Radcliffe
Ball	Guffey	Reed
Bankhead	Gurney	Rosier
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Schwartz
Brewster	Hughes	Shipstead
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Smathers
Brown	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Bulow	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	Langer	Taft
Butler	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McFarland	Tobey
Chavez	McKellar	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Connally	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Downey	Millikin	Wheeler
Doxey	Murdock	White
Ellender	Norris	Willis
George	Nye	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-four Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I am not at all prepared today to discuss as intelligently as I should like this important question.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I wonder if we could not appeal to the Senator from Tennessee to postpone his motion. The bill seems to me to involve very important constitutional questions. I do not think the Senator from Utah or any of us ought to be put to the task of trying to argue a constitutional question without any preparation. I wonder if the Senator from Tennessee would not be willing to postpone his motion?

Mr. MURDOCK. I do not know how strong an appeal I can make to the Senator from Tennessee, but I appeal to him at this time to withdraw his motion and give us a few days to look into the question. Then I am sure we can vote more intelligently on it. I appeal to him to let the bill go over for 2 or 3 days so that we may have an opportunity to look into the question and find out how serious it is.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I join with the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Ohio in their request. I have just seen the bill. In my State and, I am certain, in the State of the Senator from Utah and in most of the other Western and Mountain States, we are confronted with a very difficult situation. In the beet fields our farmers are extremely short of labor. Many of the Japanese race have come there and are helping to solve an extremely critical problem. I myself should like to get in touch with the Governor of my own State and ascertain what the conditions are and whether at this time the passage of such drastic legislation would make those Japanese so angry that they would stop work. They have been cooperating splendidly in the camps there. I should like to join the Senator from Utah and the Senator from Ohio in asking the Senator from Tennessee if he will not voluntarily give us at least a day or two in which to ascertain the implications and ramifications of the bill.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. Of course, I am perfectly willing to agree that the Senator from Utah or the Senator from Idaho, or any other Senator, shall have a day or two in order to consider any matter. Even if I were to oppose such a request, they probably would be given such opportunity. Of course, I desire to have the Senator from Idaho confer with the Governor and others in his State if he so wishes. I would suggest, however, that the bill go over until Thursday and be made the unfinished business on that day. I should like to have it disposed of.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HILL. On Thursday we shall have at least one appropriation bill to consider, and we may take up one or two other appropriation bills. I am sure the

Senator realizes that next Tuesday will be the 30th of June, and all appropriation bills must be passed by that time. If the Senate should recess today without making any disposition of the pending bill, of course, it would become the pending business when we meet on Thursday; but it might be that some appropriation bills would have to be considered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. As chairman of a subcommittee, I hope to obtain the floor by next Thursday in order to ask for the consideration on that date of the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill. That bill involves a number of items which may be the subject of considerable controversy.

Mr. HILL. I am sure that the Senator from Nevada feels that the bill should come up next Thursday.

Mr. McCARRAN. It must be taken up next Thursday, Mr. President, in order that it may be passed and a conference may be had on it before the fiscal year expires.

Mr. HILL. Is there any reason why the pending bill should not go over until Thursday?

Mr. STEWART. There is no reason except one personal to me. I have to be away, and I should like to have a vote on the bill. Of course, if other business is more important, I cannot inject my personal reason into the equation; but there are other Members of the Senate who are as much interested in the passage of the bill as I am, and I should like to have an expression from them. The senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], and other Senators are on the subcommittee. We agreed to undertake to bring up the bill as soon as possible, with the hope of having it passed. It seems that several Members of the Senate wish to have more time to think about it and consider it, particularly the Senator from Utah, who desires to prepare a big speech against it.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, I have no idea of making a big speech against anything the Senator from Tennessee introduces. I am rather reluctant to oppose anything he asks for. However, the bill presents a question which in my opinion is too important to be disposed of hurriedly. If the bill goes over for a few days, and if we have further opportunity to look into it, we can dispose of it promptly. At least we shall be able to dispose of it more intelligently.

Mr. STEWART. I am quite agreeable to that, if some arrangement can be worked out, because I am sure that after further study the Members of the Senate will approve the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I was about to suggest that the bill might be made the subject of a special order of business for a week from today. Of course, if there were any unfinished business preceding it, consideration of the bill would have to be postponed until we disposed of the unfinished business. As a special order the bill would have its status fixed, and it would be taken up Monday, unless it were crowded out by some other business. I am merely offering a suggestion to the able Senator from Tennessee as a means of meeting the situation.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let me ask the Senator from Tennessee whether it is his intention at this time to withdraw his motion for present consideration of the bill?

Mr. STEWART. I was attempting to work out an agreement or reach an understanding relative to the matter.

Mr. MURDOCK. I shall be glad to yield in order that any solution which is fair may be worked out.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me so that I may make a suggestion?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the Senator from California.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Inasmuch as the Senator from Tennessee is anxious to leave at the earliest possible moment, I was about to suggest that we agree that some reasonable time be given the Senator from Utah to look into the bill, but that we agree, as well, to vote on the bill on a day certain. Could such an agreement be made?

Mr. MURDOCK. That would be perfectly agreeable to me.

Mr. STEWART. In view of the prospective legislative situation for Thursday, suppose I request that I be permitted to withdraw my motion. I assume I can renew it at any time.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Yes.

Mr. STEWART. I do not want to make an agreement to take up the bill on Thursday if that day will be spent in the consideration of appropriation bills, and I certainly do not want the bill to go over until next Monday if it is possible to reach consideration of it at an earlier date, because I am compelled to leave the city very soon.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Would it not be agreeable to the Senator from Tennessee to obtain consent to withdraw his motion to take up the bill at this time?

Mr. STEWART. I am just about to do so.

Mr. HILL. Then when we meet on Thursday we will have to take up the appropriation bill, and it will have to be disposed of.

Mr. STEWART. Very well. If the Senator from Utah will yield to me, I make the request that I be allowed to withdraw my motion, which I shall expect to renew on Thursday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none, and the motion is withdrawn.

REQUISITIONING OF ARTICLES AND MATERIALS FOR GOVERNMENT USE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2586, calendar number 1542. Consideration of the bill will take only a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 2586) to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue it in force during the existing war.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2586) to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue it in force during the existing war, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That the first sentence of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That whenever the President determines that it is necessary in the interest of national defense or prosecution of war to requisition and take over for the use or operation by the United States or in its interest any military or naval equipment or munitions, or component parts thereof, or machinery, tools, or materials, or supplies necessary for the manufacture, servicing, or operation thereof, ordered, manufactured, procured, or possessed for export purposes, the exportation of which has been prohibited or curtailed in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the act approved July 2, 1940 (Public, No. 703, 76th Cong., 54 Stat. 714), as heretofore or hereafter amended, or any other law, he is hereby authorized and empowered to requisition and take over for the said use or operation by the United States, or in its interest, any of the foregoing articles or materials, and to sell or otherwise dispose of any such articles or materials, or any portion thereof, to a person or a corporation of the United States whenever he shall determine such action to be in the public interest."

SEC. 2. That section 3 of said act of October 10, 1940, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The authority granted in this act shall remain in force during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of the bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to give an explanation. I make this rather unusual request because the present law with regard to the requisition of war materials will come to an end on the 30th of this month. This requisition bill is necessary in order to continue the practice in which the Government has engaged during the last 2 years. The embargo bill went into effect on July 2, 1940. At that time hundreds of various

articles needed by foreign countries to be used by them in the war effort had been ordered. The exportation of those materials was stopped. Authority then was given to the President to requisition the materials for the use of our Government. It is to continue that authority that I ask for consideration of the bill at this time.

I should say that approximately 8,000 carloads of materials which belong to some foreign country are occupying the trackage of our country and causing congestion. Those materials are not being bought, but the Government needs authority to requisition them and use them, because all of them are materials which we need.

Mr. President, in agreeing to the amendment the other day which continued the embargo, at the request of the Senator from Ohio we changed the wording of the continuing clause. I shall move that we make section 3 of the pending bill consistent with the action taken the other day. Therefore I offer the amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, in line 7, after the word "force", it is proposed to insert the words "until June 30, 1944", and to strike out down to the word "or", in line 8, so as to make the section read:

SEC. 3. The authority granted in this act shall remain in force until June 30, 1944, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. I find that a number of the bills before the Committee on Naval Affairs and before other committees provide for termination of the powers granted at the end of the present war. In view of the amendment offered, I judge that the Senate Committee on Military Affairs has experienced the uncertainty of that language, and therefore has devised the language which the Senator proposes, which fixes a definite date for the termination of the powers conferred by the bill, and provides that if the war be then in existence the powers shall be extended. Is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is partially true. The provision which was worked out, carrying the continuation until 6 months after peace, came into existence in dealing with persons. Then it was also commonly used in dealing with things, and it has been written into much of our legislation having to do with the special powers granted the President during wartimes. It is all right, except for the single objection which was made by the Senator from Ohio, that it did leave a certain armistice period for an extension of the powers if Congress did not act or if the President did not act. Therefore the amendment is offered, so far as the pending bill is concerned and so far as the one which we passed the other day is concerned, and it is an amendment which is entirely in order and proper. I think such an amendment should be resisted if it had to do with persons who were held in some foreign land and if 6 months were needed in order to get them back.

Mr. WALSH. I approve of the change and of the amendment. Only this morning in the Committee on Naval Affairs there was a bill presented which provided that it should terminate "at the end the present war." The members of the committee raised questions as to what that meant, and suggested that it was uncertain. Suppose there should be peace made between certain countries and the war should continue on the part of other countries there would be uncertainty as to just what the phrase "at the end of the present war" meant. Apparently the Senator from Utah and his associates on the committee have devised this language for future legislation to prevent the use of the phrase which has heretofore been employed "at the end of the present war."

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the Senator.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad tc yield.

Mr. GERRY. I inquire what was the reason for inserting "June 30, 1944," in the amendment?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The committee extended the operation of the act 2 more years.

Mr. GERRY. Was there any special reason for that?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That was the date we determined on when we extended the Embargo Act; therefore, in order to make the Requisition Act consistent with the other act, we chose that arbitrary date.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. TAFT. I am partially responsible for that date. It may become very important to put a definite date on all emergency legislation because of the recent development of the idea of a long trial period. The Under Secretary of State made a speech indicating his view that there should be a trial period which might be as long as 5 years. It seems to me that emergency legislation might or might not be operative during such transition period. In my judgment, the Congress ought to be called upon from time to time to determine which of the emergency legislation should be continued, and which should not be continued. We can continue any act, but we ought to enact only short-time legislation, say for 2 years, with a provision, of course, that Congress may terminate it sooner in case the war should come to an end. In any event, we ought to pass within a period not longer than 2 years on the question of policy as to whether emergency legislation shall continue or shall not continue.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. As the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] stated a few moments ago, we had some discussion before the Naval Affairs Committee this morning along the same line as that which evidently took place in the Military Affairs Committee. The Senator from Ohio makes the suggestion that it is better to have a definite date. The phrase "the termination of the war" is certainly very indefinite. War might persist with one or more nations when peace had been made with others; in which event, unless there were adopted an amendment such as suggested for this bill, all these powers would continue in force.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] to the committee amendment.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

The amendment, as amended, was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend sections 1 and 3 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the President to requisition articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes', approved October 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue the act in effect during the existing war, and for other purposes."

ACCESS ROADS

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6908.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6908) to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6908) to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with an amendment.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator explain the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will be very happy to do so.

This bill, which has been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, has for its purpose increasing the authorization for access roads to plants and camps from $150,000,000 to $250,000,000. An increase of $100,000,000 was requested, and the committee has allowed the additional sum of $100,000,000.

It is necessary to have the access roads to the war plants of the country. The testimony was full and complete before the committee, and the committee has unanimously reported the bill. I hope it may be passed.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. President, I inquire when the testimony was taken.

Mr. McKELLAR. It was taken within the last week or 10 days before the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Did it embrace the question of gasoline?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it did not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The amendment of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads was to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That (a) section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, approved November 19, 1941 (Public Law No. 295, 77th Cong.), is hereby amended by striking out the figure "$150,000,000" and inserting in lieu thereof "$260,000,000, of which $10,000,000 shall be available for access roads to sources of raw materials."

(b) The first sentence of section 6 of such act is hereby amended by inserting, after the word "construction," a comma and the word "maintenance."

(c) The first sentence of section 6 of such act is hereby further amended by inserting before the period, at the end thereof, a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That such certification for access roads to sources of raw materials and industrial sites may be made by the Chairman of the War Production Board."

(d) Section 6 of such act is hereby further amended by inserting before the period, at the end thereof, a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That during the continuance of such emergency the Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to enter into contracts in amounts not exceeding the total of such authorization."

SEC. 2. The term "strategic network of highways," as defined in the first section of such act, shall include the principal highway traffic routes of military importance in Puerto Rico, approved by the War Department on December 8, 1941, and the principal highway traffic routes of military importance in the Territory of Hawaii, approved by the War Department on December 20, 1941.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I present the conference report on the independent offices appropriation bill and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration. I am moved to take this action at the request of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], who happens to be absent at the moment.

Mr. McNARY. May I make an inquiry of the Senator?

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly.

Mr. McNARY. Is this a complete report?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is a complete report, and its adoption means the passage of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the report, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 32, 113, and 114.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, 24, and 115; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That not to exceed $80,000 of the appropriations in this Act for the Civil Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and expenses (including printing and binding) of the Board of Legal Examiners created in the Civil Service Commission by Executive Order Numbered 8743 of April 23, 1941"; and the Senate agree to the same.

CARTER GLASS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HARRY S. TRUMAN,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
GERALD P. NYE,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

C. A. WOODRUM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
JOE STARNES,
(except as to Senate amendment 24),
JOE HENDRICKS,
FRANCIS CASE,
(with certain reservations),
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the report was considered and agreed to.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. O'MAHONEY submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 42, 76, 86, and 87.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 88, and 89; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$78,715"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$475,358"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$221,545"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$905,047"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$11,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "and the amount made available by this paragraph shall include the distribution of surplus commodities and relief milk and the certification of persons eligible for work relief and surplus commodities, including personal services without regard to such 12 per centum limitation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$208,460"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 20, 34, 35, 36, 41, 71, 78, 90, and 91.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
CARTER GLASS,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
ELMER THOMAS,
PAT MCCARRAN,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
HARRY P. BEAM,
ALBERT THOMAS,
KARL STEFAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7041, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 22, 1942.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 34, 35, 36, 41, 71, and 78 to the bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and concur therein;

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$7,609,840"; and

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 90 and 91 to said bill.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move that the Senate concur in the House amendment to Senate amendment numbered 20.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I move also that the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 90 and 91.

The motion was agreed to.

ANNIVERSARY TRIBUTE TO THE RUSSIANS

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I shall not detain the Senate long, but I believe we would be remiss if we allowed this day to pass without the RECORD showing that we paused to pay tribute to the gallant way in which, for a year, the Government and the people of Russia have stood like a stone wall against the invading hordes of nazi-ism.

A year ago, when Hitler loosed his attack against the Russians, there was uncertainty in the minds of many people as to how long the Russian Government might be able to resist the colossal host which was hurled so ruthlessly against them. There were some who thought that the Russian spirit was not capable of resisting so mighty an attack; yet those who entertained doubt, certainly those who had fear in their hearts, did not know the character and spirit of the Russians. They did not know the peculiar fidelity of the Russian people. They did not know the wisdom and the strength, and the foresight and the determination of Russia's gallant government and people.

It has now been made apparent to all the world that Russia has exhibited to our generation one of the most glorious defenses which has even been recorded upon the brilliant pages of history. Not only that, but they have done it uncomplainingly, they have done it manfully, they have done it nobly, so as to deserve the admiration and the gratitude of free men and women everywhere in the world. It is also appropriate to say that the attitude of cooperation with other powers and peoples of the earth which has been exhibited by the Russian Government and people augurs well for future freedom and free men.

We remember the remarkable address made in 1938 at the League of Nations Assembly by the then foreign minister of Russia, the present Ambassador to the United States, His Excellency Maxim Litvinov. At that time Russia, through his eloquent words, appealed to the other nations of the world to support the principle of collective security. It was not the Russians who first forsook that principle. It was not the Russians who first forsook the League of Nations.

Notwithstanding the severity of the pressure against them, they have entered into agreements with their allies which indicate that the Russians are not only thinking about cooperation in winning the war, but they are ready to join hands with other good peoples and good governments everywhere in the winning and the preservation of the peace.

We all know that without the help of Russia there can be no stability on earth, and what with Russia standing side by side with Britain and China and the United States, and other free peoples and governments who shall survive the onslaughts of the worst the Nazis can command, there is hope of a better world than man has ever dreamed of coming to pass.

So today we pour gratitude from our hearts to the heroic people of Russia who have saved freedom not only for themselves but for mankind.

Who can measure the debt they are due from us all whose battles they have fought? The spirit of heroism is indestructible. Russia will never fall, nor will the citadel of human freedom, the ark of human goodness.

Russia and liberty forever.

CELEBRATION OF ONE THOUSAND AND TWELFTH ANNIVERSARY OF ICELAND AS A DEMOCRACY

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, in yesterday's Washington Star there appeared a very interesting article by Frederic J. Haskin dealing with the little country and Government of Iceland. One thousand and twelve years ago a small group of people emigrated from Norway and sailed for Iceland. They took with them the system of government they had in the country from which they came, and they established it in the new country to which they migrated. This year they are celebrating the one thousand and twelfth anniversary of a continuous parliamentary democratic form of government, the purest democracy of its kind in the world, and the oldest democratic form of government in the world, so far as continuous existence is concerned. I ask that Mr. Haskin's article be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THOUSAND-YEAR-OLD DEMOCRACY

(By Frederic J. Haskin)

In a period of world upheaval, political, social, and economic, when governments are crumbling and the very pillars of democracy the world over are threatened, it is refreshing to think that this summer one nation—Iceland—will celebrate its one thousand and twelfth anniversary as a democratic state.

Iceland, as an attraction to newcomers, could well hang out a sign bearing these words: "No army, no navy, no jails, and no major crimes." If the would-be settler is interested in this small country's fiscal relations, Iceland keeps her budget balanced. These things augur well that Iceland has a workable democracy—a democracy that has stood for more than a thousand years and is stronger than ever.

It was in the summer of 930 A. D. that the oldest parliament still in existence opened for the transaction of business. And "opened" is right, for there were no man-made walls to surround it. The first meeting took place on a great cleft in a lava field, and its members were adventurous Norsemen who held no fear of the inclemencies of weather or the wrath of their fellow men. These pioneers in that memorable outdoor meeting laid the foundation for the Althing, a name which has persisted through the centuries to designate Iceland's highest lawmaking body. "Thing" is the old Norse verb "to talk," and "al" means "all." Thus, these early comers to Iceland set up a parliament in which could be discussed all things pertaining to the country's interest. Again that is democracy placed on a high and workable basis.

Iceland's Government, which was set up 600 years before Columbus discovered America, has undergone a few minor changes but remains today in principle of administration virtually the same as it was when first adopted in the open spaces. The Althing has 42 members, 14 of which constitute the upper house or senate and the remainder the lower house. The form of election varies somewhat from that of the United States in that some of the members of the senate are elected by the people and the remainder chosen by a joint vote of both the upper and lower assemblies. The process, however, constantly adds new leadership.

But while Iceland's democratic form of government and historic national assembly have survived more than 1,000 years, the country at one time lost its independence. That was in 1262 when the King of Norway, who had made previous attempts to do so, persuaded the Icelandic people to swear allegiance to him. In essence this removed from the Althing most of its governing power, but it remained in modified form chiefly as a court of law with judges who were chosen by the royal officials. In addition, it still retained some legislative power, exercised partly in conjunction with the King and partly by itself. This arrangement continued unaltered in its main features when Iceland, together with Norway, came under the Danish King in 1380.

By the Peace of Keil in 1814, when the King of Denmark had to yield Norway, no change was made in the relationship of Iceland with Denmark. When the consultative chambers were established in Denmark in 1834, the Icelanders claimed equal rights for themselves and this was granted. Though the King of Denmark resigned absolute power in 1849, he still held rulership over Iceland because the constitutional law under which he relinquished full power did not apply there. The Icelanders renewing their struggle for independence became an independent state of Denmark in 1918, both countries having the same King. When the Germans occupied Denmark on April 9, 1940, Iceland's Althing immediately declared for complete independence and on May 16, 1941, union with Denmark was terminated officially.

Thus, through the centuries the people of Iceland have retained a spirit of independence based upon the ideals of the intrepid pioneers who exposed themselves in a bleak field in the summer of 930 to lay the foundation for a people and a government that still remain. If there is a lesson in this chain of events it is the fact that a democracy is never threatened because it is a democracy, but because of the greed and selfishness of those who would become masters over the masses.

Centuries old, Iceland in recent times has had a new meaning for the people of the Western Hemisphere. Fearing that it might fall into the hands of the Germans as a naval and air base, British forces landed there on May 10, 1940, in order to insure adequate defense of this important outpost. Then came July 7, 1941, when it was announced by President Roosevelt that, as Commander in Chief, he had issued orders to the Navy that all necessary steps be taken to insure the safety of communications in the approaches between Iceland and the United States, as well as on seas between the United States and all other strategic outposts. By mutual agreement with Iceland, which included the promise not to interfere with Iceland's Government and to remove armed forces when the emergency is over, United States military forces landed there to supplement British forces, and also to enable transfer of some British troops.

Iceland is approximately the size of Ohio and has a population of more than 120,000 people. Lying just below the Arctic Circle, the island is not so icy as its name suggests, for temperatures in winter are higher than those in many areas in the temperate zones. The Gulf Stream, which normally flows around the island, has a great effect on the climate, but currents from the Arctic Ocean sometimes come down to the north coast and fill the firths and bays with ice. There are

no great extremes of cold or heat; and the mean temperature of Reykjavik, the capital, is 39.4 degrees.

Rich in literature and culture, possessing the oldest living language in Europe, claiming literacy for all normal adults, largely self-supporting, and with crime reduced to a minimum, Iceland after more than 10 centuries of democracy stands as a heartening beacon to those whose freedom is threatened.

PROPOSED WITHHOLDING OF NITROGEN

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, on the principle that it is generally considered more effective to lock the barn door before the horse is stolen rather than afterward, and perhaps more efficacious to comment on prospective Executive orders before they are issued rather than wait until they are put into effect, I desire briefly to call the attention of the Senate to a situation which is of very great importance and interest to the farmers of my own State and to the farmers of other States who are in a similar position.

This is a situation which was called to my attention by a letter written on June 19 by Mr. F. V. Heinkel, president of the Missouri Farmers' Association, the largest farm organization in the State of Missouri, and one of the largest in the United States, as well as one of the largest business enterprises in our State. I shall read the letter into the RECORD, but before doing so let me say that I think it is a matter of universal recognition that one of the greatest difficulties in our domestic situation at the present time is the inclination on the part of bureaucrats and other Government officials to issue orders ostensibly for one purpose, but really to accomplish an entirely different purpose, indicating a lack of frankness with the American people, which has caused a great deal of confusion and much dissatisfaction.

There are instances of this on every side. We all know that we have a sugar-rationing system, which has caused hardship upon millions of individuals and families, particularly upon the producers and canners of fruits and berries and vegetables, and which is due to a fictitious shortage and the insistence on the part of Government officials on using sugar to make alcohol for munition purposes, rather than availing themselves of tremendous surpluses of wheat and corn and other grains which are on hand, and which could have been equally well used for the manufacture of alcohol for munition purposes.

We all know that there is a very large group of extremely influential governmental officials who are agitating constantly for a national system for rationing gasoline, even in sections of the country where there is no shortage of gasoline, and where there is not likely to be a shortage. Their insistence on rationing gasoline is for the purpose of achieving an entirely different objective, namely, the conservation of rubber.

We all know that it has been advocated that the Secretary of Agriculture and the Commodity Credit Corporation be authorized and permitted to dump huge surpluses of grain on the market, ostensibly for the purpose of providing feed, but in reality for the purpose of breaking the prices of agricultural commodities. So I say that when we see in the offing another prospective order, ostensibly designed to accomplish one objective, but really aiming at another, it behooves Congress to take notice of it before the order really goes into effect.

Mr. President, as I said, the Missouri Farmers Association is the largest agricultural association in the State of Missouri, larger, I think, than all others combined. It is one of the principal business enterprises in the whole State.

Mr. Heinkel, president of that association, says in his letter under date of June 19, 1942:

DEAR SENATOR CLARK: Ostensibly because of transportation difficulties, I understand there is to be a general reduction of 40 percent made in the use of nitrogen in mixed fertilizers. If this is necessary in order to prosecute the war, the reduction should by all means be made.

However, we have information that someone in the Department of Agriculture contemplates recommending to the War Production Board that all nitrogen be withheld until next spring, and upon receipt of such recommendation, I understand the War Production Board will issue the order.

I cannot see any justification for holding our available supplies of nitrogen in storage until next spring when it had better be applied to the soil as soon as possible so that the growth of crops can be stimulated—such as in the case of small grains for fall and winter pasture—so that we will be in a better position to win the war.

It looks to me as if someone has ideas about using the war as an excuse to restrict the use of fertilizer this fall in order to curtail wheat acreage so as to help save the Agricultural Adjustment Administration programs. This will be my deduction until further evidence is forthcoming.

If this ruling is made by the War Production Board at the instance of the United States Department of Agriculture, Missouri is going to be severely discriminated against in favor of other States, particularly the Southern States, where fertilizer is extensively used on cotton during the spring months and those sections where vegetable crops are important.

Seventy-five percent of the fertilizer sold in Missouri is used in the fall and 25 percent in the spring. Missouri farmers drill fertilizers not alone with wheat in the fall, but with winter barley and rye for pasture and feed. Legume crops such as lespedeza, which is used widely for hay and pasture the following summer, are, of course, benefited. Fertilizer is used here in the spring chiefly for oats and corn, with perhaps some for orchards. Very little is used by general farmers for vegetable crops—most of them use manure on vegetable gardens.

During 1940, for example, Missouri used 1,025 tons of nitrogen in pure form in commercial fertilizers. A 40-percent general reduction would leave around 600 tons for our State. Since about 400 tons of this would be used in the fall and 200 tons in the spring, this would mean, if all nitrogen were held for spring use, that Missouri farmers would be short on the deal by 400 tons, or 80 percent instead of 40 percent.

As to the much-publicized wheat surpluses, Missouri has been contributing very little to them. Most of the surplus has been produced in the western and spring-wheat areas where very little fertilizer is sown with wheat.

The 10-year average wheat yield for Missouri is 28,000,000 bushels. The 1941 wheat crop yielded only 18,000,000 bushels, 37 percent less than the 10-year average. The 1942 crop is now estimated at 10,000,000 bushels, 62 percent less than the 10-year average and the smallest crop since 1875.

About 50 percent of all fertilizer used in Missouri is of mixed content, which includes nitrogen, and about 75 percent of it, as mentioned, is used in the fall, but not all of it is drilled with wheat. Probably much more of it is used on other small grains for fall and winter pasture, for grass silage, and for hay purposes the following spring. And growth of these crops should be stimulated with fertilizer this fall in order to furnish feed for the greatest number of livestock in our history.

As stated at the outset, if it is actually imperative that all nitrogen be held over until spring, no patriotic citizen has a right to complain. But if the war is to be used as a mere pretext to curtail wheat acreage, and which by so doing would certainly curtail the yield of forage and grains needed to feed our huge livestock numbers at a time like this, then I believe the matter needs careful investigation.

Yours very sincerely,

F. V. HEINKEL, *President*.

Mr. President, I concur in the conclusion that this matter should be carefully investigated, and I commend it to the consideration of the appropriate committee of the Senate.

GASOLINE RATIONING PROGRAM ON THE ATLANTIC SEABOARD

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, the six New England States and a great many other sections of the eastern seaboard of the United States which have been subjected to the gasoline rationing program, are facing an acute problem which is causing hardships to the recreational industry, which is a substantial industry in New England and the East. Having that in mind, and realizing what gasoline rationing means to tens of thousands of individuals who are engaged in the recreational industry, and at the same time not wanting to interfere with the successful prosecution of the war, recently, the Members of the United States Senate and the Members of the House from the three northern New England States, namely, Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont, addressed a communication to Leon Henderson, the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration, setting forth their views, and making a formal request of Mr. Henderson for consideration at this time of the needs of that industry. The communication clearly outlines the objective sought.

Mr. President, I ask that as a part of my remarks there be placed in the body of the RECORD this communication from the congressional delegations of Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 20, 1942.

LEON HENDERSON, *Administrator,*
Office of Price Administration,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HENDERSON: We are addressing you with reference to the gasoline-rationing program now in effect along the Atlantic seaboard, which includes New England. As you know, this program is creating a great hardship on the recreational industry so important to the economic stability of our area.

In New England one of our leading industries is this trade. The towns and the States are dependent upon it for a large percentage

of their revenue. It is the sole means of livelihood for thousands of our people.

In this crisis, as they have in every other, the people of New England are carrying their share of the burden gladly. The recreation industry so adversely affected by gasoline rationing is made up of loyal and patriotic citizens of modest means who are giving their sons, husbands, and brothers to the battle fronts of the world and their savings for the financing of our war effort. Their concern and ours over the effects of gasoline rationing is for the protection of an important source of revenue for the State and Federal Governments and for the protection of their own means of livelihood. They appeal to you for an adjustment that will be equitable and not damaging to our sole aim in this period, which is the winning of the war in the shortest possible time.

Many people own farms and summer homes in New England. Because in many instances gasoline rationing has made their property inaccessible, there appears to be in the offing an unloading of such holdings. What the effect of this would be upon the towns and States concerned is obvious.

In New England there are numerous summer camps the benefits of which to the health and welfare of boys and girls have long since been acknowledged. These camps are filled each summer with children of people of modest means and the children of the unfortunate of New England and the metropolitan centers of the Eastern States. It appears that gasoline rationing will force the curtailment of these camps, and it is certain that it will prohibit in a majority of the cases visits of the parents of the children to the camp sites.

Vacationists make reservations early at camp grounds and for cabin and hotel accommodations. Many of the hotels, and cabin courts in New England have for a long time been booked for the entire summer. Consequently, expenditures were made for services to be rendered. Gasoline rationing is resulting in the cancellation of reservations daily. Therefore, in addition to the loss of the season's business there is the loss of investments made upon the basis of reservations.

With the thought that for the good of all concerned the conditions we have enumerated should be alleviated if at all possible, we are making the following request of the administrators of the gasoline rationing program: We request that there be made available to persons making bona fide reservations for vacation periods in the rationed areas a supplemental gasoline rationing book the units of which would be adequate only for travel from the home of the vacationist to the place where his reservation has been made and return. For the time spent at the place of a person's vacation he would be dependent for gasoline solely upon his regular rationing book. We make the same request with reference to those having farms and summer cottages in the rationed area, whether their regular places of residence are in that rationed area or outside of it, and with reference to those carrying children to summer camps.

We should like to repeat that this plea is offered as a means of protection of an industry all-important to New England both as a means of livelihood for many of the people and as a source of badly needed revenue for the towns and States.

Rail and bus facilities in the rationed area are already greatly overcrowded and strained to the utmost of their capacities for the carrying of strategic war materials and people whose travel is essential to our war effort.

More and more in recent years people of every economic status have gone from congested areas and their places of employment to the quiet and relaxation of the country. We would say that it is generally acknowledged that such a change is beneficial to the people individually and for the Nation. Especially do we think that in such a period as this people who are devoting their time and energy to the successful prosecution of the war should be permitted, if it can be made practicable, to go to places from which they can return better fitted to carry their share of the load.

We should very much appreciate your action on this request.

Sincerely yours,

New Hampshire: Styles Bridges, United States Senate; Chas. W. Tobey, United States Senate; Arthur B. Jenks, Member of Congress; Foster Stearns, Member of Congress. Maine: Wallace H. White, Jr., United States Senate; Ralph O. Brewster, United States Senate; Margaret Smith, Member of Congress; Frank Fellows, Member of Congress. James C. Oliver, Member of Congress. Vermont: Warren H. Austin, United States Senate; George Aiken, United States Senate; Charles H. Plumley, Member of Congress.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE REPORTS, SIGNING OF BILLS, ETC.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment or recess of the Senate following today's session, authority be given, first, to the Vice President to sign duly enrolled bills; and second, to the Committee on Appropriations and the Committee on Interstate Commerce to submit reports, including notices of motions to suspend the rule; and third, to the Secretary to receive messages from the House.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate I ask unanimous consent that the committee be permitted to make reports between the adjournment or recess today and 12 o'clock Thursday, when the Senate is next to meet, according to my information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the recess of the Senate following today's session the Committee on Naval Affairs may be permitted to file reports on bills pending before it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

DESIGNATION OF CERTAIN LOCKS AT ST. MARYS FALLS CANAL, SAULT STE. MARIE, MICH.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, is it anticipated that the next call of the Calendar will be next Monday?

Mr. HILL. So far as I know it will be.

Mr. BROWN. It happens that I shall not be here on that day. House Joint Resolution 294, Calendar No. 1544, is the last measure on the calendar, to which I am sure there is no objection, but if I am not present when the calendar is called, it is possible some question might arise concerning the measure. It was unanimously reported from the Committee on Commerce. It is a House joint resolution which merely provides for the naming of the two unnamed locks at Sault Ste. Marie. One is proposed to be named for ex-Governor Chase S. Osborn, who was a resident of the city of Sault Ste. Marie, and a very distinguished Governor of our State; the other for Gen. Douglas MacArthur. As the joint resolution passed the House it related solely to the lock to be named for Gen. Douglas MacArthur. I had had in mind for some time the honoring of ex-Governor Osborn by naming the new locks for him. I had proposed that in a bill which I introduced. I found that one lock in the Sault was designated as the "fourth lock." I thought we might compromise by naming the fourth lock for General MacArthur, and the new lock for ex-Governor Osborn.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A joint resolution (H. J. Res. 294) instructing the Secretary of War to henceforth designate the new lock in the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the "General Douglas MacArthur Lock."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert the following:

That the Secretary of War is authorized and directed to take such steps as may be necessary to provide for the immediate designation of the lock now known as the "Fourth Lock" at St. Marys Falls Canal, Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the "General Douglas MacArthur Lock", and to provide for the immediate designation of the new lock at such canal, authorized by section 17 of Public Law 490, Seventy-seventh Congress, as the "Governor Chase S. Osborn Lock."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "Joint resolution instructing the Secretary of War to henceforth designate and name the fourth and new locks in the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. McFARLAND in the chair) laid before the

Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. O'MAHONEY, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

Abe Fortas, of Tennessee, to be Under Secretary of the Interior vice John J. Dempsey, resigned; and

Loraine Rollins, of Wyoming, to be register of the land office at Evanston, Wyo. (reappointment).

By Mr. VAN NUYS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Alexander Murchie, of New Hampshire, to be United States attorney for the district of New Hampshire;

Neale D. Murphy, of Rhode Island, to be United States marshal for the district of Rhode Island; and

Donald A. Draughon, of Puerto Rico, to be United States marshal for the district of Puerto Rico.

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

M. Frank Hammond, of Texas, to be United States marshal for the southern district of Texas.

From the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Sundry persons for promotion in the Foreign Service.

UNDER SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I understand that the nomination of Mr. Abe Fortas to be Under Secretary of the Interior has been favorably reported from the Senate Committee on Public Lands. On behalf of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], acting chairman of the committee, who made the report, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Abe Fortas to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present conideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Walter W. Orebaugh to be a consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Orray Taft, Jr., to be a consul.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Allen H. Turnage to be brigadier general for temporary service.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

RECESS TO THURSDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Thursday, June 25, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 22 (legislative day of June 18), 1942:

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Capt. Robert Haney Brooks, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Francis Winters Anderson, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Morris Eldred Brackett, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Robert Joseph Brennan, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Donald Larue Brubaker, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. John Charles Cressler, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Ralph Nelson Greene, Jr., Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Francis William Lanard, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Philip Jordan Noel, Jr., Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Samuel Hope Sandifer, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Edward Patrick Shannon, Jr., Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Mack Simmons, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Charles Mac Stanfill, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Lowell Richard Steele, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Gilbert Alfred Twichell, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. William Sherwin Wolf, Medical Corps Reserve.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

First Lt. Austin Andrew Miller, Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from June 13, 1936.

PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE COLONEL WITH RANK FROM JUNE 11, 1942

Lt. Col. Frank Victor Schneider, Infantry (temporary colonel).

IN THE NAVY

Admiral Thomas C. Hart, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of admiral pursuant to an act of Congress approved June 16, 1942 (S. 2285).

Rear Admiral Charles S. Freeman to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 17th day of June 1942, and to continue during his assignment as commander of the northwestern sea frontier.

Capt. Carleton H. Wright to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of May 1942.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

The following-named majors (temporary) to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of April 1942:

Frank H. Schwable

Peter A. McDonald

Fred D. Beans

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 20th day of April 1942:

Gerard T. Armitage, a citizen of Massachusetts.

Charles D. Barrett, Jr., a citizen of Virginia.

Thomas H. Barry, a citizen of Wisconsin.

Frank J. Clarke, a citizen of New York.

Hugh Corrigan, a citizen of New York.

Edward C. Cushman, Jr., a citizen of South Carolina.

Joseph P. Daly, a citizen of Massachusetts.

Donald K. Dayton, a citizen of Pennsylvania.

Jay C. Griffith, Jr., a citizen of Massachusetts.

James A. Harris, a citizen of Ohio.

Arthur W. Larson, a citizen of New York.

Preston St. C. Malone, a citizen of South Carolina.

Nathaniel S. Mewhinney, a citizen of Alabama.

William A. Murphy, a citizen of Georgia.

Harry B. Smith, a citizen of South Carolina.

George Swinston, Jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania.

John S. Todd, a citizen of Illinois.

Paul T. Torian, a citizen of Indiana.

POSTMASTERS

The following-named persons to be postmasters:

ALABAMA

Effie Mann, Nauvoo, Ala., in place of Effie Mann. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

Roy G. Underwood, Summerdale, Ala., in place of W. H. Hoffman, removed.

Maida C. Mosley, Thomaston, Ala., in place of G. W. Buck, retired.

ARKANSAS

George M. Doyle, Osceola, Ark., in place of C. C. Bowen. Incumbent's commission expired June 26, 1939.

CALIFORNIA

Raleigh Vinson Lambe, Brawley, Calif., in place of I. C. Adams, deceased.

Frank Emerson, Corona, Calif., in place of Frank Emerson. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1942.

Alden Levern Swanson, Crows Landing, Calif., in place of A. L. Swanson. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

Edmund V. Murphy, Madera, Calif., in place of E. V. Murphy. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

James R. Wilson, Sacramento, Calif., in place of J. R. Wilson. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1942.

COLORADO

Ershil A. Stansbury, La Veta, Colo., in place of G. M. Crouse. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

Rice A. Palmer, Redcliff, Colo., in place of R. A. Palmer. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1942.

William B. Giacomini, Sterling, Colo., in place of W. B. Giacomini. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Ben B. Beshoar, Trinidad, Colo., in place of B. B. Beshoar. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

CONNECTICUT

John L. Fields, Fitchville, Conn., in place of J. F. Fields, deceased.

Albert H. Nichols, Newtown, Conn., in place of P. H. McCarthy, deceased.

FLORIDA

William S. Griffiths, Opa Locka, Fla., in place of B. S. Strickland, declined.

GEORGIA

L'Bertie Rushing, Glennville, Ga., in place of L'Bertie Rushing. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1942.

Jesse W. Mundy, Jonesboro, Ga., in place of J. W. Mundy. Incumbent's commission expired March 13, 1941.

ILLINOIS

Clyde P. Stone, Carmi, Ill., in place of C. P. Stone. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1942.

Harry O. Given, Crossville, Ill., in place of H. O. Given. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1942.

Harlow B. Brown, Princeton, Ill., in place of H. B. Brown. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1942.

INDIANA

George W. Purcell, Bloomington, Ind., in place of G. W. Purcell. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1942.

Cassius W. Cottingham, Sharpsville, Ind., in place of C. W. Cottingham. Incumbent's commission expired March 11, 1940.

IOWA

Marguerite Biller, Dunkerton, Iowa, in place of C. G. Herman, resigned.

Gordon H. Carl, Paton, Iowa, in place of John Miller. Incumbent's commission expired March 30, 1942.

Maurice J. Harrington, Rockwell City, Iowa, in place of George Ritz, resigned.

Murray W. Gibson, West Branch, Iowa, in place of L. R. Kinsey, transferred.

KANSAS

Clyde S. Drake, Attica, Kans., in place of A. E. Biberstein, deceased.

Berton J. Haworth, Plainville, Kans., in place of C. W. Gilbert, deceased.

LOUISIANA

Eubert M. Creel, Franklinton, La., in place of Mrs. H. M. Brock. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1941.

MAINE

Garfield J. Jones, Millinocket, Maine, in place of G. J. Jones. Incumbent's commission expired December 1, 1941.

MARYLAND

John Earl Morris, Princess Anne, Md., in place of J. E. Morris. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1942.

MASSACHUSETTS

Charles H. McDonald, Westboro, Mass., in place of T. H. Hackett, deceased.

MICHIGAN

Otto E. Farwell, Barryton, Mich., in place of R. E. Bradin, transferred.

Rhea Henderson, Kingston, Mich., in place of L. G. Burns, removed.

Earl G. Abbott, Sterling, Mich., in place of B. M. Pomeroy, resigned.

MINNESOTA

John M. Donlin, Arlington, Minn., in place of R. J. Dolan, removed.

Teresa L. Wolf, Staples, Minn., in place of T. L. Wolf. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1942.

Leonard L. Krouss, Stewart, Minn., in place of L. A. Hakes, resigned.

Lura V. Frahm, Triumph, Minn., in place of L. V. Frahm. Incumbent's commission expired December 8, 1941.

MISSOURI

William P. Clarkson, Callao, Mo., in place of W. P. Clarkson. Incumbent's commission expired May 12, 1942.

Elizabeth A. Farnan, Clyde, Mo., in place of Elizabeth Farnan. Incumbent's commission expired April 16, 1942.

William G. Inlow, Curryville, Mo., in place of H. H. Cash, transferred.

Joseph F. Hargis, Downing, Mo., in place of J. F. Hargis. Incumbent's commission expired April 16, 1942.

Albert Linxwiler, Jefferson City, Mo., in place of Albert Linxwiler. Incumbent's commission expired May 3, 1942.

Louis N. Bowman, King City, Mo., in place of L. N. Bowman. Incumbent's commission expired April 27, 1942.

MONTANA

Godfrey Johnson, Ronan, Mont., in place of Godfrey Johnson. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1942.

NEW JERSEY

Joseph F. Kour, Little Ferry, N. J., in place of J. F. Kour. Incumbent's commission expired June 16, 1940.

Helen F. Jacobus, Milburn, N. J., in place of W. D. Hayes, removed.

NEW MEXICO

James H. Bell, Mesilla Park, N. Mex., in place of J. H. Bell. Incumbent's commission expired December 23, 1941.

NEW YORK

William S. Brown, Antwerp, N. Y., in place of W. S. Brown. Incumbent's commission expired May 14, 1942.

Bartholomew Francis Mannion, Dobbs Ferry, N. Y., in place of P. J. Carpenter, deceased.

Fred S. Tripp, Guilford, N. Y., in place of F. S. Tripp. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1942.

Henry J. Myer, Haines Falls, N. Y., in place of H. J. Myer. Incumbent's commission expired November 30, 1941.

George C. Kent, Hurley, N. Y. Office became Presidential July 1, 1941.

Edward G. Watts, Silver Bay, N. Y., in place of E. G. Watts. Incumbent's commission expired February 5, 1942.

NORTH CAROLINA

Wythe M. Peyton, Asheville, N. C., in place of W. M. Peyton. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1942.

Berder B. Long, Cullowhee, N. C., in place of B. B. Long. Incumbent's commission expired April 7, 1942.

James J. Parker, Murfreesboro, N. C., in place of J. J. Parker. Incumbent's commission expired May 22, 1942.

Wilbur R. Dosher, Wilmington, N. C., in place of W. R. Dosher. Incumbent's commission expired April 7, 1942.

NORTH DAKOTA

Orpheus H. Halverson, Northwood, N. Dak., in place of O. H. Halverson. Incumbent's commission expired May 31, 1942.

OHIO

Frank G. Schalmo, Canal Fulton, Ohio, in place of F. G. Schalmo. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1942.

Michael F. O'Donnell, Cleveland, Ohio, in place of M. F. O'Donnell. Incumbent's commission expired March 25, 1942.

Owen W. Gray, Convoy, Ohio, in place of O. W. Gray. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

Lloyd D. Poorman, Dalton, Ohio, in place of L. D. Poorman. Incumbent's commission expired May 6, 1942.

Ralph C. Benedum, East Liverpool, Ohio, in place of R. C. Benedum. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

Emma L. Merritt, Flushing, Ohio, in place of M. D. Morris, deceased.

Clara M. Burkhart, Leavittsburg, Ohio, in place of I. A. Francescon, resigned.

OKLAHOMA

Georgie M. Jeffers, Inola, Okla., in place of G. M. Jeffers. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1942.

Susan B. Smith, Roosevelt, Okla., in place of J. G. Ford, transferred.

James A. Barnett, Snyder, Okla., in place of I. E. Wallace. Incumbent's commission expired July 28, 1941.

PENNSYLVANIA

Marion S. Macomber, Delta, Pa., in place of M. S. Macomber. Incumbent's commission expired April 15, 1942.

PUERTO RICO

Sergio A. Valentine, Catano, P. R., in place of S. A. Valentine. Incumbent's commission expired December 1, 1941.

TENNESSEE

Joseph M. Dedman, Columbia, Tenn., in place of J. M. Dedman. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1942.

Donald B. Todd, Etowah, Tenn., in place of D. B. Todd. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1942.

Allen B. Shaddy, Petersburg, Tenn., in place of I. S. Davidson. Incumbent's commission expired January 16, 1939.

TEXAS

Opal Farris, Daisetta, Tex., in place of Opal Farris. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1942.

Rose Alice Brown, Deweyville, Tex., in place of R. M. Smith, transferred.

VERMONT

Clayton H. Bailey, Island Pond, Vt., in place of G. H. St. Pierre, deceased.

VIRGINIA

Thomas W. Cooke, Gloucester, Va., in place of T. W. Cooke. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1942.

Marcellus B. Garnett, Mathews, Va., in place of M. B. Garnett. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1942.

Eddie L. Southard, Stanardsville, Va., in place of E. L. Southard. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

WASHINGTON

Winifred L. Killion, Bryn Mawr, Wash., in place of W. L. Killion. Incumbent's commission expired December 1, 1941.

Raymond A. Landgraf, Klickitat, Wash., in place of R. A. Landgraf. Incumbent's commission expired April 1, 1942.

James E. Clark, Ryderwood, Wash., in place of J. E. Clark. Incumbent's commission expired April 20, 1942.

Elizabeth H. Harrow, Skamokawa, Wash., in place of J. R. French. Incumbent's commission expires June 25, 1942.

WEST VIRGINIA

John W. Fisher, Moorefield, W. Va., in place of J. W. Fisher. Incumbent's commission expired May 31, 1942.

WISCONSIN

Margaret L. Collentine, Argyle, Wis., in place of F. W. Muenich, removed.

Esther G. Cody, Lone Rock, Wis., in place of Esther Cody. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Walter J. Hyland, Madison, Wis., in place of W. J. Hyland. Incumbent's commission expired May 25, 1942.

Mable A. DeWitt, Sayner, Wis., in place of M. A. DeWitt. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Malcolm R. Dalton, Silverlake, Wis., in place of M. R. Dalton. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

Frank P. O'Meara, West Bend, Wis., in place of F. P. O'Meara. Incumbent's commission expired April 12, 1942.

James E. O'Leary, Wilton, Wis., in place of J. E. O'Leary. Incumbent's commission expires June 23, 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 22 (legislative day of June 18), 1942:

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Abe Fortas to be Under Secretary of the Interior.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE CONSULS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Walter W. Orebaugh
Orray Taft, Jr.

IN THE NAVY

PROMOTION FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be rear admirals for temporary service

Frank T. Leighton
Daniel J. Callaghan

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR SERVICE

To be a captain

Gail Morgan

To be commanders

Alvin I. Malstrom
Geoffrey E. Sage

To be lieutenant commanders

Loring O. Shock
Elmer O. Davis
Howard W. Taylor
Thurston B. Clark
Charles R. Watts
James R. Lee
William E. Howard, Jr.
Raymond O. Burzynski
Ralph K. James
John Quinn
Harry E. Sears
Harlow J. Carpenter

To be lieutenants

Norman D. Gage
Byron H. Nowell
Elbert M. Stever
David H. McClintock
Walter F. Henry

To be lieutenants (junior grade)

Grant O. Hansen
William J. Bush

To be assistant surgeons

William A. Reishtein
Hubert M. Poteat, Jr.
Richard C. Morrison
Henry J. Caes

To be passed assistant paymaster

Charles L. Harris, Jr.

To be assistant paymasters

Harmon S. Tolbert
Marion V. Fowler
Stanford F. Zimet
Daniel G. Cone

To be rear admiral

Theodore S. Wilkinson

To be commander

Milo R. Williams

To be lieutenants

James E. Johnson
Kenneth West
Hubert B. Harden
Frank L. Barrows

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PROMOTION FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be brigadier general for temporary service

Allen H. Turnage

POSTMASTERS

KENTUCKY

Robert Bailey Huddleston, Fulton.

MINNESOTA

Vera L. Tabaka, Longville.
Arthur Conlin, Monterey.

MISSOURI

Evelyn Steward, Sheldon.

OKLAHOMA

Eddie L. White, Leedey.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 22, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou whose wonderful patience holds the night in view and whose will our deepest hopes unfold, out of the deeps do we cry unto Thee. Here only do the purest affections have their birth and here spring reverence, love, and worship. Let the spirit of our great Teacher radiate and lighten the halls of our imagination, the galleries of memory, and the chambers of affection, that they may guard and keep in immortal remembrance the temple of man's soul.

Thou knowest that the road of life is hard and difficult and so often reveals the sad indictment of humanity. Help us, dear Lord, to wrap ourselves in the security of a courageous faith in a good God who is over all, above all, and blessed forevermore. In Him may we recognize no timidity; but pressing forward and bearing in our breasts the unfailing belief of triumph of the right, let us light the candle of patience at the lamp of the Christ, whose spirit never shrank in fear. Oh, may we register our allegiance and eternal loyalty to Him; in His name let us strike hands in the bond of union, strong and great, in deeds of service and self-sacrifice. In the name of our blessed Exemplar and Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, June 18, 1942, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6599) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate No. 55, to the foregoing bill, further insists upon its amendments No. 21 and 23 to the said bill; requests a further conference with the House on the amendments in disagreement; and appoints Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. LODGE, and Mr. WHITE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2319. An act to provide for the appointment of a district judge for the northern district of California in order to fill a vacancy in the office of an additional district judge heretofore authorized for such district; and

S. 2558. An act to further expedite the prosecution of the war by authorizing the control of the exportation of certain commodities.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution continuing the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation as an agency of the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5845) entitled "An Act for the relief of Alvira Manfredi."

ELMER J. HOLLAND—ELECTION TO COMMITTEES

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution (H. Res. 508), which I send to the desk and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That ELMER J. HOLLAND, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committees of the House of Representatives on Patents, Education, and World War Veterans' Legislation.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE SOUL OF AMERICA

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and include a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COX addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I submit a conference report and statement upon the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, for printing under the rule.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a brief table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my re-

marks in the Appendix and include a letter from Mr. John A. Barr, manager of labor relations of Montgomery Ward & Co.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, also I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include resolutions adopted by the annual convention of the National Association of Retail Grocers, together with a list of the officers and directors of that organization.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MASS LOYALTY OF OUR SOLDIERS

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I take the floor today to relate to the House a heartening incident which has just come to my attention, which once again demonstrates the mass loyalty to our Government of the boys in our armed forces, and which is strikingly significant of their fine and patriotic reaction to our action in raising their base pay to $50 per month.

Most of the members of Battery F of the Two Hundred and Forty-fifth Coast Artillery at Fort Hancock, N. J., are from the metropolitan area of my home city of New York, and quite a few of them, I am proud to say, are from the Sixteenth New York Congressional District. Virtually none of them has any income other than his Army pay and yet the ink was hardly dry on the President's signature to the pay-raise bill last week before each and every member of the battery had subscribed for at least one war bond. While, of course, this great record of Battery F cannot be surpassed by any other unit of the armed forces, yet I am equally sure that it is being emulated every day by other units of our Army and Navy in all camps and on every front. I am positive that all my fellow Members of the House join me in saluting and applauding the boys of Battery F of the Two Hundred and Forty-fifth Coast Artillery, and their officers, for their generosity and their high patriotism.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Mr. Richard Neuberger on the Alaskan Highway.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a report on a soil-conservation district in my own State, by the State coordinator.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

N. Y. A. CLERKS ON DRAFT BOARDS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this 1 minute to call attention to reports that have come to me through telegrams to the effect that N. Y. A. clerks in our local county selective-service boards have been removed on the ground that the work performed is not on a defense activity, and I want to suggest and emphasize that local county draft boards are a part of our national defense program and since we have pending appropriations for a continuation of the N. Y. A. to be used for defense purposes, clerks for these draft boards would be a part of our defense program, and their employment should be continued.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by Justice William O. Douglas, delivered before the Oregon Grange.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include therein a short news story covering a speech I made 4 years ago, and also a short editorial from yesterday's Washington Post, entitled "A Dynamic Congress."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter from a constituent as well as two observations of my own.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and quote briefly from an article in a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article from one of my State papers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include some editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

POSTAGE RATES ON BOOKS

Mr. BURCH, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (S. 337) to provide for permanent postage rates of 1½ cents per pound on books, for printing in the RECORD.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RICH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the legislative business on tomorrow, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article in yesterday's Columbus Citizen.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEAGALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an account of Flag Day ceremonies in Montgomery, Ala., and an eloquent address by Hon. Chauncey Sparks, who was recently nominated by the Democratic Party as Governor of Alabama for a 4-year term beginning January 1, 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

TRIPLE A OPERATING EXPENSES

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, on June 10, I refuted statements made in the press giving the impression that administration costs of the Triple A, in Oregon, were entirely too high and out of proportion to the benefits. I inserted a table, showing the actual costs in Oregon.

The statements I made have reached Oregon and are commented on by a daily paper in the wheat-producing area, the East Oregonian, of Pendleton, also by the competent county chairman, Mr. A. R. Coppock, of the Triple A, in Umatilla County, our greatest wheat-producing county.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the East Oregonian of June 17, 1942, entitled "Byrd's Figures."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

POLL TAXES

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include

therein a reply to a letter from the C. I. O. which they have written to Members of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter received from Clyde G. Morrill, of the Independent Oil Men's Association of New England, in which is included a statement in support of H. R. 7216 and S. 2567.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today it adjourn to meet tomorrow at 11 a. m.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this for the purpose of trying to finish up the large War Department bill tomorrow?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

APPOINTMENT POLICY OF O. P. A.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reports have been released recently to the newspapers to the effect that a Congress bloc seeks control of O. P. A. jobs, and that a curb on Henderson appointments will be asked in the appropriation bill now before the Appropriations Committee.

There is no foundation for such reports. The hearings on the bill have been completed and contain no reference to such limitation. No suggestion for any such provision has been made by any member of the committee at any time during the consideration of the bill.

The draft of the bill will be completed tomorrow, and while it is impossible, naturally, to predict its provisions in advance, I feel free to say that there is no possibility of any such provisions being incorporated in the bill when it reaches the House. Not a single member of the subcommittee favors such provision, and so far as I know no member of the Appropriations Committee itself wants such a limitation, and, in my opinion, the House would not support it.

In short, no member of the committee favors any change in the Administrator or has suggested Senate approval of his appointments, and the O. P. A. appropriation has been considered and reported in the shortest time physically possible since its receipt from the Bureau of the Budget. No credence is to be placed in any of the widely disseminated reports that the Committee on Appropriations has sought to curb the appointive power of the Administrator, has desired or suggested his resignation, or has delayed consideration of the estimate or the appropriation in any way.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has just concluded a statement with reference to stories that have appeared in the paper with reference to the appropriation Budget estimate now being considered by the Subcommittee on Deficiencies. I do not know where the articles in the newspapers emanate from, but it looks to me as if they came from someone who was trying to put the heat on to have the appropriation considered on something other than its merits. There is not a word of truth in any of those articles.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

CERTAIN EXTRA PAYMENTS TO JANITORS AND CUSTODIANS OF PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (S. 1622) to authorize payments to janitors and custodians of the public schools of the District of Columbia for services rendered for local boards of the Selective Service System, which is on the Speaker's desk.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That notwithstanding the provisions of section 6 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," approved May 10, 1916, as amended, or any other provision of law, janitors and custodians employed in the public schools of the District of Columbia shall be entitled to be paid additional compensation, computed at the regular rate of compensation received by them, for any services rendered, outside their usual hours of employment at either day or night sessions of such schools, during the period from October 16, 1940, to January 31, 1941, for local boards of the Selective Service System located in various public school buildings; and the appropriation for the operation and maintenance of the Selective Service System, contained in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941, approved October 8, 1940, is hereby made available for such purpose.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from West Virginia is recognized.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this legislation, which has passed the Senate, is to authorize the payments to janitors and custodians of public schools in the District of Columbia certain overtime which is payable to this class of workers for rendering service to local boards of the Selective Service System during the initial period of activity of such boards.

In order to accomplish the desired objective, it is necessary that the prohibition contained in our dual compensation act of May 10, 1916, be suspended. The proposed bill is intended to lift that prohibition and it applies to these school employees only for the period of the services that were rendered from October 16, 1940, to January 31, 1941. Not more than $1,300 will be obligated or expended under this bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMORIAL TO GEORGE EARLE CHAMBERLAIN

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2316) to provide for the placing in Gallinger Hospital of a memorial to George Earle Chamberlain and its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are authorized and directed to provide for the placing, with appropriate ceremonies, in Gallinger Hospital, Washington, D. C., of a bust of the late George Earle Chamberlain, formerly a Senator from the State of Oregon, or a suitable bronze plaque bearing his name and a proper inscription, as a memorial to his efforts and achievements on behalf of Gallinger Hospital.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated the sum of $500, or so much thereof as may be necessary, to be expended by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill, as indicated by its title, would be to provide for the placing of a suitable memorial to a late United States Senator from Oregon, George Earle Chamberlain, in Gallinger Hospital. This man was very active in bringing about its establishment. He worked for many years in an effort to secure a modern and adequate municipal hospital for the Nation's Capital.

The Senate believes that the memorial to Senator Chamberlain, which would be a plaque or a bronze bust on the grounds of Gallinger Municipal Hospital, is appropriate. Under section 2 of the bill as passed by the Senate not more than $500 would be authorized or appropriated to the Commissioners for carrying out the provisions of the legislation.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that the bill passes. Senator Chamberlain was not only a very distinguished statesman but

he was an illustrious Mississippian. He was born and reared in my State. Later he went to Oregon and served with distinction in the Senate for many years. He certainly deserves this recognition.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I thank the gentleman for his contribution to the subject matter. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXEMPTION OF CUSTODIAL EMPLOYEES OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BOARD OF EDUCATION FROM PROVISIONS OF SECTION 6 OF ACT APPROVED MAY 10, 1916

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6899) to exempt custodial employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education from the operation of the provisions of section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act, approved May 10, 1916, with Senate amendments thereto, and to concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 9, strike out all after "Columbia" over to and including "thereto", in line 2, page 2.

Page 2, line 9, strike out "and for nonrecreational purposes."

Page 2, line 14, after "compensation", insert "at a rate not in excess of the rate of pay received as an employee of the Board of Education."

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the House that the Senate amendments, other than the provisions of the bill as it passed the House, would provide that the extra compensation shall not exceed the amount of the regular salary.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, this completes the bills we have for today.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON INDEPENDENT OFFICES APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6430) making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6430) "making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows: That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 32, 113, and 114.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 9, 11, 24, and 115; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided further*, That not to exceed $80,000 of the appropriations in this Act for the Civil Service Commission shall be available for the salaries and expenses (including printing and binding) of the Board of Legal Examiners created in the Civil Service Commission by Executive Order Numbered 8743 of April 23, 1941"; and the Senate agree to the same.

C. A. WOODRUM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
JOE STARNES (except as to Senate amendment No. 24),
JOE HENDRICKS,
FRANCIS CASE (with certain reservations),
Managers on the part of the House.

CARTER GLASS,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
HARRY S. TRUMAN,
THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
GERALD P. NYE,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate remaining in disagreement to the bill H. R. 6430, making appropriations for the executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Nos. 9, 11, and 13, relating to the Board of Legal Examiners, Civil Service Commission. The House recedes with an amendment that not exceeding $80,000 shall be available for such purpose and with the understanding that such authorization is not to be regarded as giving permanent status to this activity and that appropriations for future years will be dependent upon passage by the Congress of substantive law authorizing a Board of Legal Examiners.

No. 24, relating to payment of compensation to Goodwin Watson, an employee of the Federal Communications Commission. The House recedes from its disagreement to the Senate amendment striking out this prohibition.

No. 32, relating to travel expenses, Federal Home Loan Bank Board. The Senate recedes from its amendment placing a specific limitation on the amount which may be used for this purpose.

Nos. 113 and 114, relating to the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Senate recedes from its amendments increasing the funds available for this activity and striking out the House provision providing one fund for accounting purposes.

No. 115. The House recedes from its disagreement to this amendment which provides that not less than $20,000,000 of funds available to the Maritime Commission shall be available for the construction of barges for the transportation of oil, gasoline, and so forth.

C. A. WOODRUM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
JOE STARNES (except as to Senate amendment No. 24),
JOE HENDRICKS,
FRANCIS CASE (with certain reservations),
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is a complete report and, if adopted, it will conclude, as far as the House is concerned, the independent offices appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1943.

With respect to amendments 9, 11, and 13, for quite some time we have had a controversy over the setting up of a Board of Legal Examiners as a part of the Civil Service Commission. The item has been in and out of this appropriation bill and it has been rejected in connection with one of the supplemental defense appropriation bills. As the matter now stands, in this report the conferees agree to let the Civil Service Commission have $80,000 to carry this Board through the fiscal year 1943, with the definite and distinct understanding that they will not ask for further appropriations unless there is substantive law setting up the Board of Legal Examiners. At the present time it is operating under authority contained in an Executive order. There is quite a wide difference of opinion as to whether it should or should not exist.

Amendment 24 relates to Dr. Goodwin Watson, who is an employee of the Federal Communications Commission. The House put in language preventing the payment of any funds for the salary of Dr. Goodwin Watson and the Senate struck out that language. The conferees have agreed to the Senate amendment.

Amendment 32 relates to travel expenses of the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, and is not in controversy.

Amendments 113 and 114 relate to the Tennessee Valley Authority. The Senate receded on those amendments and agreed to continue the language contained in the House bill.

Amendment 115 is an amendment wherein the Senate put in permissive authority for the Maritime Commission to use $20,000,000 of their funds for the construction of barges for the transportation of oil and gasoline. The House conferees have receded, which permits that language to go in. It is permissive authority for the Maritime Commission to use some of this fund, if they wish to do so, for the purpose I have mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. SASSCER] to extend his remarks in the RECORD.

Mr. SASSCER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein two speeches, one delivered by Dr. Yap, the distinguished Filipino lecturer, and the other by James B. Fitzgerald, past department commander of the American Legion of Maryland?

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I take this time in order to explain my position with reference to this supplemental conference report which, as the gentleman from Virginia has pointed out, covers five items and five items only, all the rest having been agreed to and disposed of.

I call your attention in passing to the fact that the report is signed by one House conferee "except as to Senate amendment 24," by another House conferee "with certain reservations," and that it is not signed at all by the senior Senator from Tennessee, Senator MCKELLAR, by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], or by myself.

I declined to sign this report because, in my judgment, no evidence has been put forward warranting the yielding by the House conferees in two particulars. I refer first to the so-called Board of Legal Examiners and second to the matter of the retention of Dr. Goodwin Watson on the rolls of the Federal Communications Commission.

What is the general proposal surrounding the so-called Board of Legal Examiners? It is a very far-reaching proposal, as I see it.

It means that every lawyer now on the Federal rolls and who wants to stay there is subject to the decision of the Board. It means that every lawyer not on the rolls but desiring to become so is subject to the decision of this Board. It carries with it, in my judgment, very great power in terms of influencing the interpretation of the law and, therefore, policy throughout the Federal Government as a whole. It carries with it the danger that this or that particular law school or this or that particular legal approach will have preference to the exclusion of others.

To whom are we going to turn over this great power? The Board is composed of six Government officials, headed by Charles Fahy, present Solicitor General, formerly with the National Labor Relations Board. It includes also Mr. J. Q. Cannon, principal legal adviser of the Civil Service Commission; Mr. C. J. Durr, member of the F. C. C.; Mr. E. H. Foley, General Counsel of the Treasury Department; Mr. Abe Fortas, General Counsel of the National Power Policy Committee; and Mr. G. D. Reilly, a member of the National Labor Relations Board.

It also includes two professors, Prof. Paul R. Hayes, from Columbia, and Prof. T. Van Hecke, from North Carolina. It also includes two practicing lawyers, Mr. Marion Smith, of Georgia, and Mr. P. J. Wickser, of New York; and a secretary, Mr. Herbert Wechsler, also from Columbia University.

Who are these gentlemen? Almost all of them are busy men; almost all of them have full-time jobs with little or no time to devote to this important work. The bulk of the work, as I see it, must fall on the shoulders of the secretary, Mr. Wechsler.

Who is Mr. Wechsler? He has had some very fine connections in the past, but the record also indicates that he was at one time a member of the legal advisory committee for the International Labor Defense, reliably said to be a legal arm of the Communist Party. It also indicates that he has been and was at the time of these hearings a member of the national board of the International Juridical Association, reliably said to be a strict Communist Party auxiliary organization.

Mr. Speaker, I very much question if this is the type of board to which we ought to turn over this important work, assuming that some such proposal as is now before us is ultimately to receive our approval.

How did the Board come into being? It came into being by Executive order after investigation by a Presidential committee, which divided three ways in its recommendations. It came into being over the initial opposition of the Civil Service Commission. And when the Congress was requested for funds in the first instance and denied them, if my information is correct, it was provided for pursuant to an order to the Civil Service Commission to go ahead and provide for it anyway out of funds which had been appropriated for other purposes.

The work of the Board to date is not encouraging from the standpoint of the purpose for which it was ostensibly set up. A very large portion of the younger men appointed have apparently come from the Harvard or Yale law schools. Appointments as a whole seem to bear little or no relation to population, the Western States being under their quotas, the State of New York having something like 200 percent of its fair share.

When the subcommittee in charge of this bill reported to the House in January, Mr. Speaker, it made the following statement, which I quote:

> The committee has given this proposition careful study and is of the opinion that the proposed method of selection of attorneys for the Federal service should not be put into effect until a plan can be devised on which there will be less divergence of opinion. In substantiation of this view, attention is invited to the fact that a majority of the President's committee on civil service improvement was unable to agree on a plan, that there were three conflicting reports, and that the plan finally adopted was approved by only four members of the Committee of Eight. The committee takes the position that the program should be deferred and the Congress given an opportunity to consider the subject and enact specific legislation to provide a procedure.

This was my position in January, Mr. Speaker, and it is my position now. I think a legislative committee should consider the whole subject. It should consider both the merits of the proposal and the type of board that is best suited to administer any proposal that may be approved, substituting legislative decision for executive action.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield very briefly because I have only a few minutes.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. Is it not a fact that now the Government agency is overbalanced to the extent that two-thirds of the members of the legal staffs come from three of the eastern schools, while all the rest of the country has one-third, and, under this proposal, local boards would be instrumental in recommending attorneys for appointments?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I cannot answer as to the two-thirds figure to which the gentleman refers. I think, however, if he will look at the data with respect to attorneys appointed since this Board was set up, he will find that what I have said in this connection is substantially correct, and it is not encouraging.

Mr. SAUTHOFF. How about the local boards making the recommendation?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think the recommendations will all be passed upon by the set-up here in Washington.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a word as to Dr. Goodwin Watson.

Dr. Goodwin Watson is in charge of the foreign broadcasting reception of the Federal Communications Commission. He is in a key position. He is responsible for the interpretation of all foreign propaganda.

In the course of the House hearings, beginning at page 321, you will find that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] introduced page after page of evidence which, in the absence of refutation, indicates clearly that Dr. Watson is not fit for his present position; first, by reason of previous subversive affiliations; second, by reason of documented public statements indicating his lack of sympathy with our form of government, and his belief in totalitarian principles.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. The evidence introduced by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES] was in the hands of Mr. Fly, Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, for about a month before the committee took any action. Shortly before the committee did take action Mr. Fly was warned that some action might be taken, and was asked if there was anything to be said in this connection. Neither he nor Dr. Watson, apparently, chose to appear before the House committee.

They did appear before the Senate Committee, but their testimony there was so unconvincing that the Senate committee reported the bill to the floor of the Senate with the Starnes amendment included in exactly the form in which the House had adopted it. It was only when the bill reached the floor that the amendment was stricken from the measure.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like this type of legislation. I do not believe any of us like it. But I like even less to find on the rolls of the Federal Government in important positions, in times like these, those who, as a result of affiliations or public utterances, appear to be out of sympathy with our form of government. Some evidence at least should be presented if the House conferees are to abandon the position which the House has taken in the matter.

There has been no roll call on either of these questions in the other body, Mr. Speaker. I believe the House should reject this supplementary conference report. I believe it should further insist on its position on both items. I hope it will be guided accordingly.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I shall take these few minutes to talk about this Board of Legal Examiners. It is a subject that concerns every Member of the House of Representatives, and if you study it more you will find that it concerns a great many people in your districts who are interested in the complexion of the lawyers in the employ of the Government.

As the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] has said, the Board of Legal Examiners was set up under an Executive order, which carried out the recommendations of a Board that was asked by the President to make recommendations. The Board was divided in its recommendations. The civil service did not endorse the recommendation that was made at the outset. However, after the experience they have had with it during this past year, members of the Civil Service Commission have stated that they believe it offers a solution to the problem of the selection and appointment of attorneys. I talked with Mr. Flemming, who is a member of the Civil Service Commisison, and he told me that he had changed some of his opinions as a result of seeing how the idea operates.

Personally I was not convinced by the general statement and impressions as to what had been or should be the result of passing on the attorneys by the Board of Legal Examiners. I asked several agencies for a break-down on the number of attorneys who had come from the States of the Union, the number of attorneys who had come from the several law schools. The figures are not exactly reassuring, but I think they point to a solution of the problem. They indicate what needs to be done. I shall ask permission to place the figures in the RECORD, including the civil-service table on percentages of population in the several States to indicate the percentage of the Federal attorneys that would be allocated to the different States, if we had a strict apportionment of attorneys on a basis of population. The several reports are too long to try to cover in 5 minutes. I believe that every Member of the House who is interested in the attorneys who have positions with the Federal Government, will find it of interest to study these figures.

The value of these figures is indicated in the appointments approved by the Board of Legal Examiners from July 1, 1941, through December 31, 1941. During that period approximately 1,300 appointments were made. That would be one attorney appointment for every 100,000 people in the United States.

During this period the State of New York has received 272 appointments, whereas on a strict apportionment basis the State of New York would have received approximately 10 percent or 129 appointments. The State of Illinois has received 102 appointments, whereas on a strict apportionment basis it would have received about 58, and so on. Not a very good distribution. Not better and perhaps worse geographically than under the old system of straight politics.

The law-school figures are similarly enlightening, or possibly I should say similarly discouraging. During that same period, out of this 1,300 total, Harvard Law School appointees to the number of 218 were selected, and Yale Law School 86. Probably the most dangerous tendency in our Federal attorney appointments is the tendency to inbreeding. And it will be an unfortunate day for America when all our attorneys are forced to one mold of thought. We need freedom of legal thinking. The only test, the only guaranty of truth in ideas is the opportunity to check opinions with those of varying views. With this in mind, three cardinal principles should be set up by statutory law for the guidance of the Board of Legal Examiners.

First of all there should be an examination for anyone who gets into the pool from which attorneys are to be selected. It should be an examination to determine technical qualifications.

Second, there should be an apportionment on the basis of population. That would not leave it to one, two, or three, or a half dozen law schools to furnish the legal policy and thinking for the entire country.

Third, the Board of Legal Examiners should be broken down into State or regional boards of local examiners, so that the selections would funnel through the State or regional boards rather than through one central board in Washington. These three things, I believe, will do much to improve the selection of attorneys in the Federal service.

However, Mr. Speaker, and I must speak briefly, at the present time we are confronted as we are in many other activities of Government, with the practical problem that today the Federal Government must employ a large number of attorneys and must do it quickly. Most of the appointments today are duration appointments, and for that reason I have gone along with the conference report, which appropriates funds for the legal examiners, with a definite understanding that funds will not be granted another year unless statutory law is enacted for that purpose.

I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include the tables and statements to which I have referred.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter follows:

I. LETTER FROM MR. FLEMMING

UNITED STATES
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 17, 1942.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CASE: Over the telephone you requested certain information concerning attorney appointments in the Government service, particularly appointments since July 1, 1941, the date on which the Board of Legal Examiners started operations. I am sending you figures which, for the most part, carry the story from July 1, 1941, to April 25, 1942, the date on which certain compilations were completed by the Board. It is hoped that the date is sufficiently recent to serve your purposes. No important changes in appointments have occurred since April 25, and therefore the current set of figures would be a slight expansion, fairly uniform all along the line.

I believe it is necessary to make a statement on the point of geographical distribution of appointments, insofar as such distribution relates to activities of the Board of Legal Examiners. As you know, the Board's future has been in an indeterminate state for several months. This fact has operated to deter the Board from embarking upon some of the more formal procedures contemplated in its basic program, specifically the recruiting of attorneys through competitive examination procedure. The Board concluded, and I think properly, that it would be unwise to engage on a national competitive recruiting program in the face of the uncertainty of the Board's own future. Pending determination of its own status on a permanent basis, the Board, by regulation, authorized the individual agencies of the Government to initiate their own attorney appointments. Persons so selected by the individual agencies are nominated to the Board of Legal Examiners, where their qualifications as individuals proposed for a specific job are adjudicated by careful appraisal of the experience and educational background, properly verified, and by oral examination where qualifications are not otherwise fully established.

Thus, the Board has had no direct participation in the matter of geographic or, in fact, scholastic distribution of appointees. It is quite probable that the program in which the Board has been engaged and the publicity which has been given to its work has resulted in focusing more attention in the Government legal service and, in all probability, a wider geographic distribution of appointments is taking place now over conditions of a year or 2 years ago. In addition to the foregoing, it is believed that the geographic distribution of attorneys represents some improvement over the traditional picture by reason of the number of regional offices established during the recent period.

From the outset, the Board of Legal Examiners has been on record as favoring a wider distribution of appointments in the legal service and, given an opportunity, will undertake to accomplish this result. Present emergency conditions require considerable flexibility in appointment procedures, and it may be that the Board will need a little time to work out the apportionment phases of its program. I would like to express the opinion, for whatever value you may put upon it, that taking current conditions into account, it would not be desirable to attempt a very rigid apportionment of attorney appointments or, for that matter, apportionment of eligibles on registers. The Commission's experience shows that competing employment, the inductions and enlistments into the armed forces, and other factors tend to make registers of eligibles highly unstable. Since practically all current appointments are for the duration of the emergency, and this applies to attorney appointments also, it is believed that at this time employing agencies should generally have as their mandate the attaining of the best qualified persons in the shortest possible time, and that these primary considerations should not be unduly restricted.

One of the specific features of the permanent program of the Board, and this is incorporated in its creating order, is the designation of appropriate regions or localities and appointment of regional or local boards of examiners, within or without the Federal service, to interview and examine applicants. Unquestionably, such a regional

program would work in the direction of a more general geographic distribution of attorney appointees.

The information I am enclosing sets forth figures on (I) total attorney appointments; (II) principal hiring agencies; (III) legal residences of attorneys appointed between July 1, 1941, and April 25, 1942; (IV) law schools of attorneys appointed between July 1, 1941, and April 25, 1942; (V) a statistical report on attorney appointments from the Office of Price Administration, giving data as of June 8, 1942. The information concerns the legal voting residences and law schools of all Office of Price Administration appointees. The appointees are divided into two groups: (1) departmental appointees who are employed in Washington, and (2) regional appointees, employed in offices throughout the country; (VI) a statistical report on attorney appointments in the Legal Division of the Treasury Department, including (1) legal residences of attorney appointees during the fiscal years 1937–41, (2) law schools of attorney appointees during the fiscal years 1937–41, (3) distribution of all attorneys in the Legal Division, Treasury Department, by legal residence as of October 31, 1941, and (4) distribution of all attorneys in the Legal Division, Treasury Department, by law schools as of October 31, 1941.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, *Commissioner.*

II. POPULATION PERCENTAGES FOR PURPOSES OF EMPLOYEE APPORTIONMENT

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C.

Each State is entitled to the same percentage of the total number of appointments in the apportioned service in Washington, D. C. that its population was of the total population of the States and Territories involved at the last census. A list of the percentages of the States and Territories is given below. (Percentages computed from Sixteenth Decennial Census, 1940.)

1. Alabama	2.1132
2. Alaska	.0541
3. Arizona	.3724
4. Arkansas	1.4541
5. California	5.1525
6. Colorado	.8379
7. Connecticut	1.2750
8. Delaware	.1988
9. District of Columbia	.4946
10. Florida	1.4154
11. Georgia	2.3301
12. Hawaii	.3158
13. Idaho	.3915
14. Illinois	5.8909
15. Indiana	2.5569
16. Iowa	1.8934
17. Kansas	1.3435
18. Kentucky	2.1227
19. Louisiana	1.7633
20. Maine	.6320
21. Maryland	1.3585
22. Massachusetts	3.2200
23. Michigan	3.9207
24. Minnesota	2.0829
25. Mississippi	1.6290
26. Missouri	2.8231
27. Montana	.4173
28. Nebraska	.9815
29. Nevada	.0822
30. New Hampshire	.3666
31. New Jersey	3.1032
32. New Mexico	.3967
33. New York	10.0546
34. North Carolina	2.6642
35. North Dakota	.4788
36. Ohio	5.1527
37. Oklahoma	1.7428
38. Oregon	.8128
39. Pennsylvania	7.3849
40. Puerto Rico	1.3943
41. Rhode Island	.5321
42. South Carolina	1.4171
43. South Dakota	0.4796
44. Tennessee	2.1750
45. Texas	4.7851
46. Utah	.4105
47. Vermont	.2680
48. Virginia	1.9975
49. Virgin Islands	.0186
50. Washington	1.2951
51. West Virginia	1.4188
52. Wisconsin	2.3404
53. Wyoming	.1870

As the total number of appointments varies, the number to which any State or Territory is entitled will vary in the same ratio.

Prepared by Service Record Division.

III. RECORD OF ATTORNEY APPOINTMENTS APPROVED BY THE BOARD OF LEGAL EXAMINERS, JULY 1, 1941, THROUGH APR. 25, 1942

I. Total appointments

Period:	*Number of appointments*
July 1, 1941, through Dec. 31, 1941	512
January 1942	196
February 1942	222
March 1942	[1] 186
Apr. 1 through Apr. 25, 1942	[1] 175
Total	1,291

II. Principal hiring agencies, July 1, 1941, through Apr. 25, 1942

Agency:	*Number of appointments* [2]
Office for Emergency Management	538
Department of Justice	147
War Department	[3] 79
National Labor Relations Board	73
Treasury Department	52
Department of Labor	47
War Production Board	47
Securities and Exchange Commission	40
Board of Economic Warfare	25
Federal Works Agency	20
Total	1,068

III. Legal residences of attorneys appointed between July 1, 1941, and Apr. 25, 1942

Names of States:	*Number of appointments*
Alabama	19
Arkansas	5
Arizona	3
California	95
Colorado	30
Connecticut	16
District of Columbia	40
Florida	16
Georgia	20
Idaho	5
Illinois	102
Indiana	15
Iowa	18
Kansas	9
Kentucky	9
Louisiana	7
Maine	5
Maryland	28
Massachusetts	64
Michigan	28
Minnesota	46
Mississippi	4
Missouri	42
Montana	3
Nebraska	13
New Hampshire	2
New Jersey	38
New Mexico	4
New York	272
North Carolina	12
North Dakota	3
Ohio	65
Oklahoma	8
Oregon	5
Pennsylvania	69
Puerto Rico	2
Rhode Island	4
South Carolina	6
South Dakota	3
Tennessee	14
Texas	42
Utah	7
Vermont	1
Virginia	32
Washington	9
West Virginia	14
Wisconsin	35
Wyoming	2
Total	1,291

[1] These totals do not include War Department appointments.

[2] These totals do not include transfers of attorneys from other Government agencies.

[3] These totals do not include appointments made in March and April 1942.

IV. Law schools of attorneys appointed between July 1, 1941, and Apr. 25, 1942

School:	*Number of appointees*
Harvard	218
Yale	86
Columbia	75
Michigan	43
Georgetown	41
George Washington	40
Pennsylvania	37
Northwestern	35
Minnesota	34
Chicago	33
Wisconsin	28
New York University	23
Columbus	21
Fordham	21
National	21
California	21
Virginia	18
Texas	17
Stamford	13
Boston University	12
Cornell	12
Colorado	12
Iowa	12
Western Reserve	12
Brooklyn Law School	11
Missouri	11
Washington College of Law	11
Washington University	11
Alabama Law School	9
Duke	9
Southeastern	9
Cincinnati	9
Emory	8
New York Law School	8
Ohio State	8
St. Johns	8
Maryland	8
West Virginia	8
Kansas School of Law	7
University of California, Los Angeles	7
Indiana	7
Nebraska	7
Southern California	7
Westminster	7
Temple	6
Boston College	6
Florida	6
Catholic University	5
Chicago Kent	5
Creighton	5
Cumberland	5
Notre Dame	5
University of Alabama	5
Southern Methodist	5
University of Kansas	5
North Carolina	5
Pittsburgh	5
Washington and Lee	5
All others [4]	163
	1,291

[4] This total includes the graduates of 78 law schools each of which is the school of origin for less than 5 attorneys appointed in this period.

IV. APPOINTMENTS BY AGENCIES

UNITED STATES CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., June 18, 1942.

Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. CASE: You telephoned requesting me to make an attempt to get statistics from a few Government agencies other than Treasury and the Office of Price Administration indicating the distribution of attorney appointees on the basis of legal residence.

Enclosed are figures which I was able to get from some agencies today. There are a few more which were not yet available, but I expect will be tomorrow. I will send them along as soon as received.

Very truly yours,

J. Q. CANNON,
Assistant to the Chief Examiner.

[Enclosure.]

IV–A. EXAMINING DIVISION

Distribution by legal residence of attorneys in four selected Government agencies

The following graph indicates the distribution by legal residence of persons presently occupying attorney positions in the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Trade Commission, and the Interstate Commerce Commission.[1] This information was tabulated from the Personnel Information Sheets (Form 3464) submitted to the Interdepartmental Placement Service of the United States Civil Service Commission by the employees of those agencies.

State	Securities and Exchange Commission	Interstate Commerce Commission	Federal Trade Commission
Alabama	3	2	6
Arizona		1	1
Arkansas	3		2
California	15		9
Colorado	2		2
Connecticut	8	1	1
Delaware		1	
District of Columbia	13	5	10
Florida	3	1	6
Georgia	3	1	6
Idaho	1		1
Illinois	33	2	9
Indiana	3	5	11
Iowa	5	1	6
Kansas	3	2	2
Kentucky	1	4	9
Louisiana			3
Maryland	11	9	12
Massachusetts	12	6	5
Michigan	3	3	3
Minnesota	6	2	5
Mississippi		3	6
Missouri	3	2	2
Montana			3
Nebraska	5	3	
Nevada			1
New Hampshire	1		1
New Jersey	8		6
New York	87	6	16
North Carolina	3	1	11
North Dakota			3
Ohio	21	4	13
Oklahoma	4	1	6
Oregon	1		1
Pennsylvania	5	3	2
Rhode Island	1	1	1
South Carolina	1		2
South Dakota		2	
Tennessee	5	1	11
Texas	10		7
Utah	1	1	5
Vermont	1		
Virginia	15	4	15
Washington	5	5	1
West Virginia	1	2	2
Wisconsin	5	3	4
Wyoming	1		
Total	312	88	228

[1] This memorandum deals only with 3 of 4 requested since the Federal Communications Commission did not submit personnel information sheets.

IV–B. OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION—STATES AND SCHOOLS OF APPOINTEES

These tables give the legal residences and law schools of all Office of Price Administration attorney appointees as of June 8, 1942. They are divided into two groups: Departmental appointees, who are employed in Washington, and regional appointees, who are employed in offices throughout the country.

The total number of appointments is as follows:

Departmental	352
Regional	389
Total	741

Legal voting residence—Departmental

State	Number	Percent
New York	88	25.00
Illinois	41	11.65
California	26	7.39
Minnesota	24	6.82
Pennsylvania	18	5.11
Ohio	18	5.11
Wisconsin	17	4.83
Massachusetts	13	3.69
Virginia	11	3.13
District of Columbia	10	2.84
Missouri	8	2.27
New Jersey	8	2.27
Texas	7	1.99
West Virginia	6	1.70
Colorado	5	1.42
Iowa	5	1.42
Connecticut	5	1.42
Michigan	4	1.14
Maryland	3	.85
Georgia	3	.85
Indiana	3	.85
Florida	3	.85
Tennessee	3	.85
Maine	2	.57
Washington	2	.57
Oregon	2	.57
Nebraska	2	.57
Kansas	2	.57
Montana	2	.57
Louisiana	2	.57
Rhode Island	2	.57
North Carolina	1	.28
Kentucky	1	.28
North Dakota	1	.28
Alabama	1	.28
Nevada	1	.28
Arizona	1	.28
Idaho	1	.28
Total attorneys	352	

Legal voting residence—Regional

State	Number	Percent
New York	52	13.37
California	43	11.05
Illinois	28	7.20
Massachusetts	26	6.69
Ohio	26	6.69
Missouri	21	5.40
Michigan	21	5.40
Texas	17	4.38
Georgia	15	3.86
Pennsylvania	14	3.60
Minnesota	13	3.34
Wisconsin	12	3.09
New Jersey	11	2.83
Colorado	9	2.31
Washington	9	2.31
Iowa	8	2.06
Maryland	7	1.80
Alabama	7	1.80
Oregon	4	1.03
Florida	3	.77
Tennessee	3	.77
Maine	3	.77
New Hampshire	3	.77
Indiana	3	.77
Delaware	2	.51
Utah	2	.51
Nebraska	2	.51
Vermont	2	.51
Arkansas	2	.51
Kentucky	2	.51
Oklahoma	2	.51
Connecticut	2	.51
Kansas	2	.51
Mississippi	2	.51
Rhode Island	2	.51
North Carolina	2	.51

Legal voting residence—Regional—Continued

State	Number	Percent
District of Columbia	1	0.26
Louisiana	1	.26
Idaho	1	.26
Virginia	1	.26
Wyoming	1	.26
New Mexico	1	.26
Montana	1	.26
Total attorneys	389	

Law schools—Departmental

Law school	Number	Percent
Harvard	72	20.45
Columbia	30	8.53
Yale	26	7.39
University of Chicago	22	6.26
University of Minnesota	20	5.67
University of Wisconsin	14	3.99
Northwestern	12	3.42
University of Michigan	10	2.85
University of Pennsylvania	10	2.85
University of California	10	2.85
New York University	9	2.57
George Washington University	6	1.71
Georgetown	5	1.42
Western Reserve	5	1.42
Cornell	5	1.42
University of Virginia	5	1.42
National University	5	1.42
Duke	4	1.14
University of Texas	4	1.14
Brooklyn University	4	1.14
West Virginia University	4	1.14
St. Johns University	4	1.14
Washington University, St. Louis	4	1.14
University of Iowa	3	.85
Hastings University	3	.85
University of Southern California	3	.85
Fordham University	2	.57
University of Missouri	2	.57
Boston University	2	.57
University of Colorado	2	.57
Marquette University	2	.57
Oxford University	3	.85
Stanford University	2	.57
Columbus	2	.57
University of Nebraska	2	.57
Chicago Kent College of Law	2	.57
Tulane University	2	.57
University of Cincinnati	2	.57
University of Tennessee	1	.28
Heidelberg University	1	.28
Buffalo University	1	.28
Woodrow Wilson University	1	.28
University of Florida	1	.28
University of Illinois	1	.28
Ohio State University	1	.28
University of Arizona	1	.28
Indiana University	1	.28
University of Pittsburgh	1	.28
University of Mississippi	1	.28
University of Oregon	1	.28
Notre Dame	1	.28
Howard	1	.28
Washington and Lee University	1	.28
Catholic University	1	.28
University of Washington	1	.28
Dickinson Law School	1	.28
University of North Dakota	1	.28
John Marshall School of Law	1	.28
University of Alabama	1	.28
Washington College of Law	1	.28
University of South Dakota	1	.28
Kansas University	1	.28
No formal legal education	4	1.14
Total attorneys	352	

Law schools—Regional

Law school	Number	Percent
Harvard	62	15.93
University of Michigan	24	6.16
Columbia	16	4.10
University of California	16	4.10
Yale	13	3.34
New York University	13	3.34
University of Minnesota	12	3.09
University of Wisconsin	12	3.09
Western Reserve	12	3.09
University of Pennsylvania	11	2.83
Northwestern	11	2.83
Cornell	8	2.06
University of Washington	8	2.06
University of Texas	7	1.80
Boston University	7	1.80
Emory University	7	1.80

Law schools—Regional—Continued

Law school	Number	Percent
University of Chicago	6	1.53
Stanford University	6	1.53
Washington University, St. Louis	6	1.53
University of Missouri	5	1.29
Ohio State University	5	1.29
Vanderbilt University	4	1.03
University of Virginia	4	1.03
George Washington University	4	1.03
University of Southern California	4	1.03
University of Iowa	4	1.03
St. Louis University	3	.77
Westminster College of Law	3	.77
Wayne University	3	.77
University of Colorado	3	.77
Fordham University	3	.77
Duke University	3	.77
Washington and Lee University	3	.77
University of Kansas	3	.77
University of Atlanta	3	.77
Brooklyn University	3	.77
University of Indiana	3	.77
Temple University	2	.51
Washington College of Law	2	.51
University of Maryland	2	.51
University of Santa Clara	2	.51
Dickinson Law School	2	.51
Chicago Kent College of Law	2	.51
University of Cincinnati	2	.51
Southern Methodist University	2	.51
University of Kansas City	2	.51
Georgetown University	2	.51
University of Denver	2	.51
Lebanon College of Law	2	.51
Baylor College of Law	1	.26
University of Buffalo	1	.26
Kings College, London	1	.26
Creighton University	1	.26
University of North Dakota	1	.26
Cumberland University	1	.26
University of Mississippi	1	.26
Detroit University	1	.26
Albany University	1	.26
John Marshall	1	.26
University of Arkansas	1	.26
Loyola	1	.26
University of Florida	1	.26
University of Utah	1	.26
Tulane	1	.26
Northeastern	1	.26
Hastings	1	.26
St. Johns University	1	.26
San Antonio University	1	.26
De Paul University	1	.26
University of Alabama	1	.26
Southwestern	1	.26
Youngstown	1	.26
St. Lawrence	1	.26
Wilmington University	1	.26
University of Baltimore	1	.26
Montana State University	1	.26
University of Louisville	1	.26
Willamette University	1	.26
Newark University	1	.26
Suffolk	1	.26
Valparaiso	1	.26
University of Nebraska	1	.26
No formal legal education	12	3.09
Total attorneys	389	

IV-C.—DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Attorneys by legal residence, District of Columbia and field as of Mar. 31, 1942

State:	
Alabama	9
Arizona	2
Arkansas	6
California	10
Colorado	7
Connecticut	3
Delaware	2
Florida	4
Georgia	10
Idaho	1
Illinois	14
Indiana	3
Iowa	11
Kansas	8
Kentucky	7
Louisiana	3
Maine	3
Maryland	6
Massachusetts	9
Michigan	---
Minnesota	6
Mississippi	4
Missouri	13
Montana	5
Nebraska	5
Nevada	---
New Hampshire	---
New Jersey	3
New Mexico	1
New York	29
North Carolina	11
North Dakota	2
Ohio	7
Oklahoma	5
Oregon	3
Pennsylvania	15
Rhode Island	---
South Carolina	9
South Dakota	4
Tennessee	10
Texas	19
Utah	3
Vermont	---
Virginia	14
Washington	3
West Virginia	4
Wisconsin	6
Wyoming	5
District of Columbia	9
Alaska	---
Canal Zone	---
Hawaii	2
Philippine Islands	---
Puerto Rico	2
Other Territories	---
Foreign countries	---
Miscellaneous	---
Total	317

IV-D.—DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

Distribution of attorneys by legal residence

State	Attorneys				Attorneys on military furlough		
	Departmental	Field	Total	Percent	Departmental	Field	Total
Alabama	1	3	4	2.4		1	1
Arizona		1	1	.6			
Arkansas		1	1	.6			
California	2	5	7	4.3		2	2
Colorado	1	2	3	1.8			
Connecticut		1	1	.6			
Delaware							
Washington, D. C.	4	1	5	3.0	1		1
Florida	1	1	2	1.2		1	1
Georgia	1	4	5	3.0			
Idaho	1		1	.6			
Illinois	3	8	11	6.6		2	2
Indiana		2	2	1.2	1		1
Iowa		3	3	1.8			
Kansas		2	2	1.2			
Kentucky	1	2	3	1.8		1	1
Louisiana	1	1	2	1.2		2	2
Maine	1		1	.6			
Maryland							
Massachusetts	6	5	11	6.6			
Michigan	1		1	.6			
Minnesota	2	2	4	2.4			
Mississippi		1	1	.6			
Missouri		3	3	1.8		1	1
Montana		1	1	.6			
Nebraska	2		2	1.2	1		1
Nevada		1	1	.6			
New Hampshire	1		1	.6			
New Jersey	2	2	4	2.4	1		1
New Mexico							
New York	18	11	29	17.5			
North Carolina	3	4	7	4.3			
North Dakota		1	1	.6			
Ohio	2	6	8	4.8			
Oklahoma		1	1	.6			
Oregon		1	1	.6	1		1
Pennsylvania	2	5	7	4.3	1		1
Rhode Island		2	2	1.2			
South Carolina	2	1	3	1.8		1	1
South Dakota		1	1	.6			
Tennessee	1	5	6	3.6			
Texas	1	3	4	2.4	1	2	3
Utah	2		2	1.2			
Vermont							
Virginia	1	1	2	1.2	1	1	2
Washington	2		2	1.2			
West Virginia	1		1	.6			
Wisconsin	5		5	3.0		1	1
Wyoming							
Alaska							
Hawaii							
Puerto Rico		1	1	.6			
Total	71	95	166	100.0	8	15	23

Law schools attended by attorneys

	Active	Military furlough
Alabama University	4	
Arizona University	1	
Boston College	3	
California University	3	2
Chicago University	5	
Chicago Kent College	1	
Colorado University	3	
Columbia University	16	
Creighton University	1	
Cumberland University	1	
Dallas Law School		1
DePaul Law School		1
Duke University	1	1
Emory University	3	1
Florida University		1
Fordham University	4	

Law schools attended by attorneys—Con.

	Active	Military furlough
Georgetown Law School	8	
George Washington Law School	7	
Georgia University	1	
Harvard Law School	20	3
Indiana University	1	
Iowa University	2	
Jefferson School of Law	1	
Kentucky University	1	1
Michigan University	4	1
Minnesota University	3	
Mississippi University	1	
Montana University	4	
National University	2	
Nebraska University	1	
New Jersey Law School	4	
New York University	2	

Law schools attended by attorneys—Con.

	Active	Military furlough
North Carolina University	2	
Northwestern University	4	1
Notre Dame University	1	
Ohio University	4	
Oregon University	1	
Oklahoma University	1	
Pennsylvania University	3	
Philadelphia College of Law	1	
Puerto Rico University	1	
St. John University	1	
St. Louis College of Law	3	
St. Paul College of Law	2	

Law schools attended by attorneys—Con.

	Active	Military furlough
South Carolina University	3	1
South Dakota University	1	
South Texas Law School	1	
South Western University		1
Suffolk University	2	
Syracuse University	1	
Temple University	2	
Texas State Teachers' College Law School	1	
Texas University	2	2
Tulane University	3	2
Virginia University	2	2

Law schools attended by attorneys—Con.

	Active	Military furlough
Wake Forest College	2	
Washington College of Law	2	
Western Reserve	1	
Washington University	2	
Washington University, St. Louis		1
William and Mary, College of	1	
Wisconsin University	6	1
Yale University	2	
Youngstown University	1	
Total	166	23

IV–E.—TREASURY DEPARTMENT—STATES AND SCHOOLS OF ATTORNEY APPOINTEES

NOTE.—The following table is of special interest because it gives the break-down over a period of years and thus a comparison with pre-Board of Examiner days is afforded.

Distribution of attorneys appointed in the Legal Division of the Treasury Department during the fiscal years 1937–41, by legal residence

State	1937		1938		1939		1940		1941	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	48	100	59	100	46	100	25	100	79	100
Alabama	3	6.3	2	3.4						
Arkansas	1	2.1							1	1.3
California	1	2.1	1	1.7	1	2.2	1	4.0	4	5.1
Colorado	6	12.5	1	1.7						
Connecticut	1	2.1					2	8.0	3	3.8
District of Columbia	1	2.1	9	15.3	6	13.0			9	11.4
Florida	1	2.1	1	1.7			1	4.0	2	2.5
Georgia	2	4.2								
Illinois	2	4.2	3	5.1	3	6.5	1	4.0	6	7.6
Indiana	1	2.1	1	1.7	2	4.3			1	1.3
Iowa							2	8.0	2	2.5
Kansas	2	4.2	1	1.7	1	2.2	1	4.0	1	1.3
Kentucky			2	3.4	2	4.3			2	2.5
Maine					1	2.2				
Maryland	3	6.3	2	3.4	3	6.5	1	4.0	5	6.3
Massachusetts	2	4.2	1	1.7	2	4.3			2	2.5
Michigan	1	2.1			1	2.2				
Minnesota	2	4.2	2	3.4	1	2.2	1	4.0	1	1.3
Mississippi	1	2.1	2	3.4	1	2.2				
Missouri	1	2.1	2	3.4						
Montana									1	1.3
Nebraska									2	2.5
Nevada			1	1.7						
New Jersey	2	4.2	1	1.7					1	1.3
New York	5	10.4	10	16.9	4	8.7	7	28.0	14	17.7
North Carolina	3	6.3	2	3.4	1	2.2			3	3.8
North Dakota	1	2.1								
Ohio	2	4.2	3	5.1	2	4.3	1	4.0	2	2.5
Oklahoma	1	2.1	1	1.7			2	8.0		
Pennsylvania	2	4.2			3	6.5	1	4.0	3	3.8
South Carolina			1	1.7	3	6.5	1	4.0	1	1.3
South Dakota									1	1.3
Tennessee			4	6.8	1	2.2	1	4.0		
Texas					5	10.9			4	5.1
Utah			1	1.7						
Virginia	1	2.1	3	5.1	2	4.3			3	3.8
Washington			1	1.7					1	1.3
Wisconsin			1	1.7	1	2.2	2	8.0	4	5.1

The following States were not represented: Arizona, Delaware, Idaho, Louisiana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Oregon, Rhode Island, Vermont, West Virginia, and Wyoming.

Distribution of attorneys appointed in the Legal Division of the Treasury Department during the fiscal years 1937–41, by law school

Law school	1937		1938		1939		1940		1941	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	48	100	59	100	46	100	25	100	79	100
Alabama, University of	2	4.3	2	3.6						
Baltimore, University of					1	2.3				
Boston University									1	1.3
Brooklyn Law School									1	1.3
California, University of									1	1.3
Catholic University	1	2.1					1	4.3		
Chicago, University of	2	4.3	2	3.6	1	2.3	2	8.7	4	5.2
Cincinnati, University of	1	2.1	1	1.8						
University of Colorado			1	1.8						
Columbia University	2	4.3	4	7.1	4	9.1	2	8.7	5	6.5
Columbus University	1	2.1	1	1.8	1	2.3			2	2.6
Cornell University	2	4.3			2	4.5	1	4.3	1	1.3
Cumberland University	1	2.1	1	1.8	1	2.3				
Denver, University of	1	2.1								
Duke University			1	1.8						
Emory University	1	2.1								
Florida, University of	1	2.1	1	1.8						
Fordham University			3	5.4			1	4.3		
Georgetown University	4	8.5	4	7.1	2	4.5	1	4.3	3	3.9
George Washington University	2	4.3	7	12.5	1	2.3	1	4.3	4	5.2
Harvard University	6	12.8	5	8.9	5	11.4	2	8.7	14	18.2
Indiana University			1	1.8	1	2.3			1	1.3
Iowa, University of					1	2.3			2	2.6
Kansas City Law School			1	1.8						

Distribution of attorneys appointed in the Legal Division of the Treasury Department during the fiscal years 1937–41, by law school—Continued

Law school	1937		1938		1939		1940		1941	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Kansas, University of	1	2.1					1	4.3		
Kentucky, University of			1	1.8	1	2.3				
Loyola University [1]									1	1.3
Maryland, University of			2	3.6	3	6.8	1	4.3	2	2.6
Michigan, University of	3	6.4	1	1.8	1	2.3			2	2.6
Minnesota, University of	2	4.3	1	1.8	1	2.3			1	1.3
Mississippi, University of			2	3.6						
Montana, University of									1	1.3
National University	1	2.1			4	9.1	1	4.3		
Nebraska, University of									1	1.3
New College, Oxford, England					1	2.3				
New York Law School	1	2.1								
New York University									2	2.6
North Carolina, University of	2	4.3	1	1.8					1	1.3
Northwestern University	1	2.1			2	4.5	1	4.3	2	2.6
Notre Dame, University of					1	2.3				
Ohio State University	1	2.1	1	1.8	1	2.3	1	4.3		
Oklahoma, University of							1	4.3		
Oxford University, England	1	2.1								
Pennsylvania, University of			1	1.8	2	4.5	1	4.3	2	2.6
St. John's College Law School	1	2.1							1	1.3
South Carolina, University of							1	4.3	1	1.3
South Dakota, University of									1	1.3
Southeastern University	1	2.1							1	1.3
Southern California, University of									1	1.3
Stanford University	1	2.1	1	1.8						
Suffolk Law School			1	1.8						
Syracuse University									1	1.3
Tennessee, University of			2	3.6						
Texas, University of					4	9.1			4	5.2
Virginia, University of	1	2.1	2	3.6	1	2.3				
Washburn College School of Law			1	1.8					1	1.3
Washington and Lee University			1	1.8						
Washington College of Law	1	2.1							2	2.6
Washington, University of [2]									1	1.3
Washington University [3]	1	2.1								
Western Reserve University			1	1.8					1	1.3
Wisconsin, University of			1	1.8	1	2.3	1	4.3	4	5.2
Yale University	1	2.1	1	1.8	1	2.3	.3	13.0	4	5.2
No law degree [4]	1		3		2		2		1	
Not stated [4]									1	

[1] Chicago, Ill. [2] Washington State. [3] St. Louis, Mo. [4] Not included in calculating percentages.

Distribution of attorneys in the Legal Division of the Treasury Department as of Oct. 31, 1941, by legal residence

State	Number	Percent
Total	482	100
Alabama	6	1.2
Arizona	4	.8
Arkansas	4	.8
California	17	3.5
Colorado	3	.6
Connecticut	5	1.0
District of Columbia	57	11.8
Florida	9	1.9
Georgia	5	1.0
Illinois	23	4.8
Indiana	10	2.1
Iowa	6	1.2
Kansas	14	2.9
Kentucky	12	2.5
Louisiana	1	.2
Maine	1	.2
Maryland	37	7.7
Massachusetts	16	3.3
Michigan	7	1.5
Minnesota	6	1.2
Mississippi	6	1.2
Missouri	9	1.9
Montana	3	.6
Nebraska	5	1.0
Nevada	1	.2
New Jersey	11	2.3
New York	63	13.1
North Carolina	12	2.5
North Dakota	2	.4
Ohio	18	3.7
Oklahoma	4	.8
Oregon	1	.2
Pennsylvania	20	4.1
Rhode Island	1	.2
South Carolina	6	1.2
South Dakota	2	.4
Tennessee	8	1.7
Texas	16	3.3
Utah	5	1.0
Virginia	25	5.2
Washington	5	1.0
West Virginia	5	1.0
Wisconsin	11	2.3

The following States were not represented: Delaware, Idaho, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Vermont, Wyoming.

Distribution of attorneys in the Legal Division of the Treasury Department as of Oct. 31, 1941, by law school

Law school	Number	Percent
Total	482	100
Alabama, University of	3	.7
Arizona, University of	3	.7
Atlanta University	1	.2
Baltimore, University of	1	.2
Boston University	4	.9
Brooklyn Law School	1	.2
Buffalo, University of	2	.4
California, University of	1	.2
Catholic University	3	.7
Chattanooga, University of	1	.2
Chicago, University of	13	2.8
Cincinnati, University of	5	1.1
Colorado, University of	1	.2
Columbia University	19	4.1
Columbus University	14	3.1
Cornell University	4	.9
Cumberland University	2	.4
De Paul University	1	.2
Duke University	1	.2
Emory University	1	.2
Florida, University of	2	.4
Fordham University	5	1.1
Georgetown University	51	11.1
George Washington University	52	11.4
Georgia, University of	1	.2
Harvard University	31	6.8
Illinois, University of	1	.2
Indiana University	5	1.1
Iowa, University of	4	.9
John B. Stetson University	1	.2
John Marshall Law School	2	.4
Kansas, University of	7	1.5
Kentucky, University of	2	.4
Loyola University, Chicago	1	.2
Los Angeles College of Law	1	.2
Maryland, University of	13	2.8
Miami, University of	1	.2
Michigan, University of	11	2.4
Minnesota, University of	5	1.1
Mississippi, University of	3	.7
Missouri, University of	3	.7
Montana, University of	3	.7
National University	52	11.4
Nebraska, University of	3	.7
New College, Oxford, England	1	.2
New York Law School	2	.4
New York University	2	.4
North Carolina, University of	4	.9
Northwestern University	6	1.3
Notre Dame, University of	1	0.2
Ohio State University	4	.9
Oklahoma, University of	1	.2
Oregon University	1	.2
Pennsylvania University of	5	1.1
Pittsburgh, University of	1	.2
St. John's College Law School	1	.2
South Carolina, University of	3	.7
South Dakota, University of	1	.2
Southeastern University	13	2.8
Southwestern University, Los Angeles	1	.2
Stanford University	1	.2
Suffolk Law School	1	.2
Syracuse University	4	.9
Temple University	1	.2
Tennessee, University of	3	.7
Texas, University of	8	1.7
Tulane University of Louisiana	1	.2
Utah, University of	1	.2
Valparaiso University	1	.2
Vanderbilt University	1	.2
Virginia, University of	5	1.1
Washburn College School of Law	3	.7
Washington College of Law	10	2.2
Washington and Lee University	3	.7
Washington, University of, Washington	2	.4
Washington University, Missouri	1	.2
West Virginia University	1	.2
Wisconsin, University of	10	2.2
Western Reserve University	4	.9
Yale University	9	2.0
No law degree	24	

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois yield to me to ask a question of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman has spoken upon the subject of legal exam-

iners. What does he say about this position for Dr. Watson?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The facts are, with the Watson case, as I read the testimony given in the Senate hearings, I am frank to state that if it had been up to me, I would not have employed Dr. Watson in the first place, but I believe that if we had brought that issue back to the House, it would have precipitated a debate that would be damaging to the war effort under present conditions. Therefore, I have gone along with the conference report.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. TABER. I think that one of the worst things for the war effort that is going on just now is the employment of people who are not fit for their jobs. I think that such a man as Watson never should have been employed by the Government. I could not vote to approve it. With reference to these lawyers there never has been a time in the history of the Government when so many incompetent lawyers have been employed, and I think largely as a result of this performance and the Civil Service Commission, they are a menace to the war effort. They delay it beyond measure. They create situations that require thousands and thousands of liaison officers, employed in every connection. It is time we stopped it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Illinois 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, in recent months the Congress has been very caustically criticized by the press, commentators, and columnists, and insofar as that criticism relates to the delegation of functions to some agency without guide lines, it occurs to me it is well founded. There is going to be a revulsion in the country one of these days. We invite criticism, we invite castigation, if we delegate power without guide lines, without direction of any kind to the point where an executive agency of the Government is controlled only within the limits of its own discretion in making the selection of Government personnel. That is particularly true of the issue before us today.

Here is a Board of Legal Examiners which was created by Executive order, created after a committee which the President had appointed had disagreed as to a plan. There were eight members of the committee. A celebrated engineer, Gano Dunn; Robert E. Wood, of Sears, Roebuck; Justice Frankfurter, and Justice Murphy, and four others served on the committee. That committee did not agree. They submitted three plans, A, B, and C. Four agreed on plan A, three agreed on plan B, and Justice Murphy submitted plan C which was a modification of the civil-service procedure with some amendments.

Here is an agency created by Executive order, and it proposes not only to qualify all the new lawyers who may come into the Government, but those who are in the Government today. I assume we have about 7,500 attorneys working for the Federal Government. One thousand two hundred and ninety-six have been selected in the last 10 months. Here is a board of legal examiners which proposes to do this: To secure recommendations from regional boards, who will be employed on a per diem basis. Those recommendations come to Washington. Here will be a board consisting of 26 people altogether, including clerical help, who will finally pass on an attorney's qualifications. All names in the country go on a register. Soon, you are going to hear about an unranked register. They all go on together. They get no score. There will be no 99.5 or 72.6, or anything else. They will all be on the register, unranked. Then the gentlemen who make the selection will sit down and determine without any limitation, who shall serve the Government in the field of legal work. One of the examiners could object to you on the ground that your political views or your political philosophy was not acceptable to him. He might object on the ground that your pants were not pressed or your hair not combed, or that your tie was not on straight. You will say that is fantastic, yet it lies within the power of the Board to do so. I have a 3-page affidavit that a young lad brought to my office one morning last week in which he makes six charges against a certain examining committee. He charges that they are unfair; that they are prejudicial; that they talked about a lot of extraneous matters. He was examined by a classmate of his who graduated out of Georgetown, but who did not have too bright a scholastic reputation in class anyway. But up on the board sits his classmate and passes on this boy who has served in the General Accounting Office for 5 years. He says, "You do not measure up."

That is what is going to happen on an unranked register. Are you willing to delegate that power? I am not. It occurs to me this is the time for substantive legislation on this subject by the Congress. Let the Board of Legal Examiners administer it, but let the Congress set down the directives for the administration of this authority.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Does the gentleman believe we can pick attorneys for the various types of duties for which attorneys are required, purely from their rank on an examination sheet? Does not the gentleman think it is necessary to consider personality and individuality for the particular type of legal work that is expected?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I do not. I think that first of all we should set down qualifications for the examiners, which is very, very important, and then set up a general type of examination, and what weight shall be attached to certain experience. Those are the lines within which such administrative board should operate. But today on the basis of the unranked register, they can range the whole field, and the most brilliant lawyer in the country may not have a chance with somebody else if it is not within the wisdom of the Board of Legal Examiners to give him a designation.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. We have heard criticism made that one absolute requirement in this service, certainly in some governmental services, is that the applicant must have a degree from a law school.

Under such a situation a lawyer who has been successful in practice for 10 or 15 years would be excluded, whereas somebody who had just come from the halls of a legal institution could be accepted. Am I not correct?

Mr. DIRKSEN. There are lawyers in the Government today who do not have a degree from an accredited or any other kind of school, as a matter of fact, but who got by the bar examination, and are rendering competent service, but the Board of Legal Examiners will be empowered to pass on every incumbent lawyer and may if they wish—certainly it is within their discretion—remove them. We hope, of course, we will not go that far; they could, of course, go that far.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The gentleman from Illinois did not categorically answer the question of the gentleman from Texas. There is, of course, no policy that particular types of lawyers would be excluded specifically. There would be no such policy.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That is exactly correct, but I will say over again that if we are going to delegate duties and functions of this kind we should lay down certain restrictions, we should lay down certain rules, we should lay down certain regulations within which the authority could be applied.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I wonder why no legislative authority has been enacted? I notice that the Executive order is over a year old. What is to prevent the enactment of proper legislative standards to guide this administrative body?

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman expresses my view. In the first place, it is not necessary; in the next there is no such hurry that we could not take some time and let this matter go over until the Civil Service Committee of the House could bring in a bill which would set down the limitations I have indicated in my remarks.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Would not this be true, that if we approve this appropriation without comment the matter will drift along; whereas if this item is pruned down there might be a little more pressure to proceed to have a legislative examination of this very important question?

Mr. DIRKSEN. We state in the report that it must not be considered as giving

permanent status to this agency, that this next fiscal year they shall have $80,000 for the administering of these functions to which we have consistently objected. I do not object to the creation of some efficient agency for qualifying lawyers but I do object to an agency which is not created by law and which is not supplied with certain definite standards to which it shall adhere in performing its task. Moreover, there is no requirement that such a board abide by the rule relative to apportionment of lawyers among the various States so that within its discretion an undue number can be selected from a few States or localities.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in agreement with this conference report with one exception. I endorse what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] had to say with reference to the Board of Legal Examiners. I think there should have been more unanimity of opinion of those responsible for its administration before we put it into operation. I believe further the Civil Service Committees of the House and the Senate should have considered this subject and recommended the Congress should pass substantive legislation before we undertook so radical a departure from our established civil-service procedure. My purpose in taking the floor at this time, however, was to address myself to a certain trend which distresses me very much indeed. This trend is toward the appointment of too many, all too many, men and women in the huge enmeshing bureaucracy which now almost throttles the administrative force of this Government who are not in sympathy with our system of government, our system of society, and with our traditional way of life. I measure these words. Dr. Goodwin Watson is merely a symbol of those forces. No one likes to single out one individual and make him an object of legislation. I can speak without fear of giving offense for I offered the amendment which forbade the payment of any funds for the compensation of Dr. Goodwin Watson and it was adopted by my colleagues in the full committee. It passed the House without a dissenting vote. I stated in the full committee that I had no sympathy with such procedure, but it was the only way I knew how to protest effectively against an abuse of administrative authority in appointing men and women to positions of responsibility in this Government of ours who had no faith in the efficacy of our system of government and our way of life but who sought to change it by whatever means were at hand into a socialistic regime. Dr. Goodwin Watson is an amiable gentleman, an ordained Methodist minister, a professor at Columbia—if that be a mark of distinction—a man who served in the Navy in World War No. 1, a man whose record I have gone over most carefully. Dr. Goodwin Watson was charged with having been publicly associated with 13 or more Communist-front or Communist-controlled organizations. I had a conference of an hour or more with him after the House had acted on this matter. That conference was marked by restraint and amiability on both sides. The good doctor admitted that he had been publicly associated with a number of these organizations.

He made no denial that these documents which were introduced in the committee records, and here are four folders, which is only a part of the history of Goodwin Watson, contained his basic philosophy of life, of government, and of society. Dr. Goodwin Watson has publicly stated that there should be Government ownership, control, and operation of the newspapers and the radios of this country. He has publicly praised the system of government in the Soviet Union. He has been one of those responsible for the promulgation of the program of New America, an organization dedicated to the purpose of the destruction of the capitalistic system and the substitution of a planned economy affecting the life of every citizen of this Republic. He further is associated with and endorses the statement of the aims of New America when it says these ends cannot be accomplished by gradual means.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 7 additional minutes.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I want to call your attention to the fact there will be a report to the Congress of the United States by the Department of Justice before June 30, 1942, with reference to the investigation which has been made of some 1,123 individuals who are employed or have been employed by the Federal Government, of whom it is alleged they have been publicly associated with, or connected with, subversive organizations. The investigation was made under authority of Public 135 of this Congress, which set aside or earmarked a certain sum of money for such an investigation.

These names were furnished to the Attorney General of the United States by the chairman of the Special Committee Investigating Un-American Activities. I here now repeat what I stated almost 2 months ago at the national executive committee meeting of the American Legion at Indianapolis, Ind., namely, the result of that investigation will be in the main a beautiful coat of calcimine for most of these individuals. The interdepartmental committee, which was set up to review these cases will, upon the records submitted to them, apply a double coat to the findings of the administrative heads of the Government agencies and bureaus by whom these individuals are employed.

I want to give you the facts in this matter. These people have been investigated by the F. B. I., which has made a factual report to the various administrative agencies as a result of its investigation. The F. B. I. was confined in its investigation as to the membership or the association of these respective members with Communist, Nazi, or Fascist front organizations, and to those alone. Now, get this: No conclusions were drawn by the F. B. I. and no recommendations were made by the F. B. I.

The F. B. I. report will be made to the various departmental heads, who in turn call the person who has been investigated and say, "Here is the record. What have you to say?" Of course, there will be an admission on the part of many, if not all, of them that they did contribute a certain sum of money; they did join some organization, but they did it without any subversive intent. The departmental head will probably take a very lenient attitude toward these people, and relatively few of them are likely to be dismissed or resign. Sad to relate, some few departmental heads have been associated with some of these front organizations. Since relatively few Federal employees are likely to be dismissed, I predict some "self-styled liberal," with quotation marks around "self-styled," either from the city of New York or from the great Commonwealth of Massachusetts, will take the floor and say the F. B. I. has exonerated these parties from any connection whatsoever with these Communist-front organizations, when, as a matter of fact, nothing could be further from the truth. Some administrative head will state that "I, John Doe, head of such-and-such Federal agency, following an investigation by the F. B. I., find that no administrative action is necessary." Such action and such statements will not give the House nor the Congress the facts, because in practically every case the F. B. I. has found or will find these people did belong to those organizations. Furthermore, these "self-styled liberals" and bureau heads will not tell the people and the Congress the fact the Federal Bureau of Investigation did not make any recommendations nor draw any conclusions, but only submitted factual statements. Therefore there will in reality be no exoneration, contrary to what may appear in the press and what may appear in these administrative reports concerning the investigation by the F. B. I.

I happen to know the Civil Service Commission has made recommendations that certain of these employees be discharged from the Federal Government and have had those recommendations overridden. It is an unusual and unfortunate situation when it becomes necessary for the legislative body of the Government to set aside money to conduct an investigation of this character. Regardless of intellectual ability and standing of these self-styled liberals, radicals, and Marxian-minded individuals who hold Government positions in these various agencies and bureaus, regardless of how well fitted they may be to do a particular job, the yardstick the Congress and the American people should apply to Federal employees is this: Not only what your particular ability is but also whether or not you are loyal and faithful to the Government you have sworn to uphold and to defend.

Mr. Speaker, there should be a national policy with reference to dealing with this

subject. This special committee should continue to investigate and to expose the activities and trend of subversive agents and propaganda, whether in or out of the Government bureaus and departments, but I think it is up to the departmental heads to take action in each individual case. The yardstick which should be applied is the ability and the loyalty of the individual to our way of life and to our system of government. With 130,000,000 people in this country, more than 98 percent of whom believe in our way of life and in our system of government, there should not be one single individual in the employ of a Federal agency who does not believe wholeheartedly in our system of government, has resolved to stand by it, uphold it, and make it a more efficient instrument for the promotion of the happiness, liberty, and welfare of our people. If there is any question concerning the loyalty of the individual, he should be summarily dismissed from the Government service.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS.]

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I certainly subscribe with a whole heart to the test and standard the gentleman from Alabama suggests, namely, the standard of whether or not a person is loyal to the American constitutional form of government. I do not believe anyone not so loyal should be employed by the Government. I think, however, that the House is on very, very dangerous ground indeed when it goes beyond that to the point of passing judgment on a person because of what that person's particular economic or social or political beliefs may be, provided only that that person definitely and all the way through is ready to abide by the democratic rules of the game and never to seek to accomplish any purposes by any other method except those rules.

I think there is another question also. I do not believe that people who are far out of sympathy with the general policies of the Government which the people have elected to office should be as a matter of policy employed, but I also believe that it is a very dangerous practice on the part of the National Legislature to neglect laying down general rules and standards, which we might do to a better extent than we have done yet, I agree, and then instead to judge the cases of individual people and to decide that those particular people, whether or not there is definite proof against them, are not fit people.

I cannot speak with great feeling about the instant case. But I do think that one or two things in fairness and justice ought to be brought out.

In the first place, Dr. Watson has submitted, as I understand, to the committees a statement on the part of Dean Russell of Columbia University, who will, I think, be regarded by the average person as a very eminent man. Dean Russell's statement is to the effect that in cases where Communists attempted to do certain things in connection with the university that Dr. Watson in all cases supported him against them.

In the next place, I think it fair to say that Dr. Watson came to see me and talked to me at great length, as he did to the gentleman from Alabama, and I understood him to make the statement that he had not had any definite connection with the organizations which were named, with one exception, that his name had been used by them but that he had not had any definite connection with them. I do not subscribe for one single moment to some of the things that Dr. Watson wrote in the past, and I want to make that very plain indeed, but his statement to me was to the effect that he is committed to the democratic constitutional form of government, that he is loyal to it absolutely, and that he seeks no other thing than that.

I asked him this question. I said, "My own thinking has gone through some evolution. I want to ask you this question. I want to ask you whether you do not believe that even though certain economic advantages might be gained in certain instances by an extension of governmental power and control, there may be attendant therewith certain losses from the standpoint of the development of people personally which are too great a price to pay for such purely economic end?" He said he did believe that, and he told me that his views as expressed in some of his earlier writings were no longer held by him. I felt that he was telling the truth.

At the very least, it seems to me that this is a case where a man comes now and professes, apparently with great earnestness, his loyalty, and I think that the House should take that into consideration, certainly, when it is considering these matters.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, most legislation when finally passed is the result of a compromise of views. It is not often that we get bills out and carry them through the mill from the beginning of the hearings in the committee to final passage and find that one particular idea or school of thought completely wins out all around. The democratic process is a composite of the views of a lot of different people all put together.

When the independent offices appropriation bill was sent to conference it had 123 amendments in it. Many of them were controversial. We had an amendment with respect to the Tennessee Valley Authority put in by the Senate that was extremely difficult to handle. The Senate finally yielded and agreed to the House views on the subject.

The bill is boiled down now to where, of the 123 amendments, practically with respect to only 2 of them has anyone any question to raise. One is the amendment relating to Dr. Goodwin Watson, who is an employee of the Federal Communications Commission. The other relates to the Board of Legal Examiners.

I do not know Dr. Watson. I have never seen him and never talked to him. Many other Members have seen him and talked to him. When we had this bill before the subcommittee the gentleman from Alabama laid before the committee some of the speeches and sayings and writings of Dr. Goodwin Watson. The attention of the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission was called to those statements. He left town and for some reason or other they were never answered in the committee.

Before the bill came to the floor of the House and, as I recall, while the full committee was considering it, an amendment was offered and adopted providing that none of the funds in that act should be used to pay the salary of Dr. Goodwin Watson.

I do not believe I need to assure the House how I feel about employing persons in the Government who are not fit to serve it. I have been burned in the public square in New York along with my distinguished colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] because of our efforts to clean out Communists and racketeers from the W. P. A. In fact, I think I have been burned in two or three different places. I believe in that respect I hold a record on it. I have not changed my ideas about it.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman is proud of the fact that he has been burned by that gang?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Exactly so; yes. I have preserved those pictures of WOODRUM and TABER hanging in the public square, and particularly the crowd of people who are gleefully enjoying the execution.

Let me say to you, however, that we are living in a changing world. Times are changing very fast. Economic and political views are changing. Although we must be scrupulously careful that unfit people do not serve the Government, I cannot think of a more dangerous procedure to adopt or to permit to be adopted regularly than to undertake to have a legislative body, after listening to one or two impassioned speeches, write into a bill either an approval or a disapproval of a man's political and economic views.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Is not this the difficulty? We cannot very well arrange to give a man a fair trial on the floor of this House when we attempt to invade the judicial function, and when we attempt to do the hiring or firing in individual cases, we may be trespassing on the executive function. The constitutional division of powers has some very practical aspects.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. And we should confine ourselves to setting up legislative standards for Government employment, and to enforcing the application of those standards by constitutional methods?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think the gentleman has stated the matter correctly.

Now I do not subscribe for a moment to some of those matters or most of the

matters to which the gentleman from Alabama has referred. Hearings were had before the Senate committee and Dr. Watson has talked to many of our colleagues. The attention of the Federal Communications Commission has been brought to this case. I do not for a moment think it is a case where the Congress, as a matter of legislation, should undertake to pass upon the economic and political views of this man. I have no doubt whatsoever, if he is unfit for the public service, that in his case, as has happened in other cases, he will find his way out of the service. I do say, and I say it regretfully, that it oftentimes seems to be too easy for people of this kind to get into the service. It is a good idea to call the attention of the Departments to them, but I repeat that it is an extremely dangerous procedure for us to undertake to take up in the Well of this House, with 10 or 15 minutes of debate, and pass, as a matter of legislation, approval or disapproval of a man's economic views.

I do not think there is any man here or anywhere else who has ever contended that Dr. Goodwin Watson is an active Communist or has ever been an active Communist, that they do not like, as none of us have liked, some of the economic and political views which he has expressed and which he says now, frankly, he does not adhere to. However, passing from that the Senate struck out the language prohibiting that salary, and the House acceded to the action of the Senate.

The other matter about which there has been discussion is with respect to the Board of Legal Examiners. It seemed desirable, and I do think now that it is desirable, that there should be a more careful method of selecting attorneys who are to go into the Government service. I have seen, as I think most of you have seen, some of the most ridiculous situations where lawyers, as well as physicians, have been selected for public service simply because their names were at the top of the civil-service register. I recall very distinctly in my own district that they set up a new veterans' hospital and there was a physician there who had been engaged in work when the hospital was first set up. He was doing the work and understood it. He had made the necessary examinations and was a specialist in that particular line, and everybody wanted him. The institution wanted him, and the veterans wanted him, because he understood their cases. But when they got the civil-service register his name was fifth or sixth on the list, and they took a young man from a different part of the country just out of a medical school, who did not know anything at all about the work. I think the Government official ought to have some measure of discretion in selecting the man who is going to be his attorney. If you have an important case to be tried and a man is going to represent you in that case, you want to have something to say about who that attorney is going to be. You are not so much concerned about whether he got a few points more than some other fellow in a legal examination. I believe the chief of a big agency, like the Office of Price Administration or the War Production Board or the Federal Communications Commission, if they need a lawyer for a certain thing, ought to have some measure of discretion in selecting the man who is not only legally qualified but is also temperamentally qualified for that particular type of work. I have never for a moment thought that a rated register is the logical or the sensible way in which to pick professional people for special jobs.

This Board of Legal Examiners was set up by Executive order after a committee, composed of Mr. Justice Stanley Reed, Mr. Justice Frankfurter, Mr. Justice Murphy, Attorney General Jackson, Mr. William MacReynolds, Mr. Leonard D. White, Mr. Robert D. Wood, and Mr. Gano Dunn, a special committee appointed by the President, had gone over the situation, had rejected several plans for a Board of Legal Examiners, and, finally, one of them was adopted, which is now in effect and has been for some time. Our committee has never looked with much favor on it because we did not like some of its operations, and we have kept it out of the bill. Here we compromise the matter by giving them enough money to run them for the next fiscal year, telling them at the same time that if the board is to continue, we want them to come to the Congress and have the matter passed on by the legislative committee and by the Congress. I submit that is a reasonable and logical compromise.

I hope very much the conference report will be agreed to as we have brought it in. It is not 100 percent, as I would like to see it, but I believe it is a good compromise job and will permit us to wind up one important piece of legislation before the end of this fiscal year.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman means, of course, by his statement with respect to legislative authority for this Board, that it ought to be authorized by legislation like the other departments and bureaus are.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. MAY. Until that is done, the committee will withhold further appropriations?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is right.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH) there were ayes 53 and noes 47.

So the conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the conference report was agreed to was laid on the table.

FORMER REPRESENTATIVE GEORGE E. WALDO

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I regret to announce to the House that a telegram has just been received from Pasadena, Calif., announcing the death of Hon. George E. Waldo, a member of the Fifty-ninth and Sixtieth Congresses. Mr. Waldo represented Kings County, Brooklyn. He was a staunch Republican and rendered conspicuous service while he was in Congress. I dare say there are very few men in this body now who were serving at the time that he was here.

George Ernest Waldo attended the public schools of Scotland, Conn., and Brooklyn, N. Y. He was for 2 years a student at Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y., class of 1872; studied law in New York City, was admitted to the bar in Poughkeepsie, N. Y., in 1876, and practiced law in New York City and later in Ulysses, Nebr. He returned from Nebraska to New York City in 1889, became a member of the New York Assembly in 1896, commissioner of records of Kings County, N. Y., 1899–1904. He was a delegate to the Republican National Convention in Philadelphia in 1900. Later he was elected as a Representative to the Fifty-ninth and Sixtieth Congresses of the United States. He decided not to run for reelection in 1908, returned to New York City and resumed the practice of law. It was in 1913 that he moved to Los Angeles, Calif., and later located in Pasadena, Calif., where he died on June 16 of this year, at the age of 91. Those relatives who survive this distinguished legislator may well feel proud of his fine record.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and for other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 42, 76, 86, and 87.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 37, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 72, 73, 74, 75, 77, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 88, and 89; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$78,715"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$475,358"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 18: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$221,545"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$905,047" and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$11,200"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "and the amount made available by this paragraph shall include the distribution of surplus commodities and relief milk and the certification of persons eligible for work relief and surplus commodities, including personal services without regard to such 12 per centum limitation"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$208,460"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 20, 34, 35, 36, 41, 71, 78, 90, and 91.

GEORGE MAHON,
JOHN M. HOUSTON,
HARRY P. EKAM,
ALBERT THOMAS,
KARL STEFAN,
Managers on the part of the House.

JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
CARTER GLASS,
JOHN H. OVERTON,
ELMER THOMAS,
PAT MCCARRAN,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments to the bill (H. R. 7041) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Salaries and expenses

Amendment No. 1, relating to the Department of Inspections: Provides for the amount proposed by the Senate, $289,245 in lieu of $285,245 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 2, relating to the Municipal Architect's Office: Increases the House figure of $66,880 to the Senate proposal, $70,080. This provides an assistant to the engineer in charge of the District of Columbia repair shop at $3,200 heretofore appropriated for under "Repairs and Improvements to School Buildings".

Amendment No. 3, relating to the Public Utilities Commission: Provides $78,715, in lieu of $82,515 as proposed by the Senate and $71,120 as proposed by the House. This will effect the disallowance of one financial analyst, CAF–11, $3,800, allowed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 4, 5, and 6, relating to the Surveyor's Office: Corrects appropriating language in conformity with reductions made in the appropriation by the House.

Amendments Nos. 7, 16, 27, 47, and 61: Limits the funds made available immediately to the payment of 1942 obligations.

Contingent and miscellaneous expenses

Amendment No. 8, relating to the limitation on the purchase of streetcar and bus fares: Increases such limitation to the amount proposed by the Senate, $17,000 in lieu of $12,375 proposed by the House.

Free Public Library

Amendment No. 9, relating to personal services: The amount agreed upon is $475,358, which is a compromise between the Senate amount of $480,358 and the House figure of $456,120. This agreement eliminates the following personnel for the Main Library added by the Senate: Senior cataloger, $2,000; assistant, binding division, $1,800; and assistant mechanic, $1,200.

Amendments Nos. 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14, all relating to expenses other than salaries for the establishment of a subbranch library in the Anacostia area: Effects the following increases, miscellaneous, $7,000; maintenance, alterations, etc., $5,500; and rent, $1,800.

Sewers

Amendments Nos. 15 and 88 (under highway fund), relating to rental storage property for construction materials: The House agrees to the Senate amendment striking out the appropriations of $5,040 and $3,360, respectively, for such purpose.

Electrical Department

Amendment No. 17, relating to purchase of non-passenger-carrying motor vehicle: The proposal of the Senate is agreed to, which reduces the amount from $74,340 to $70,540 and disallows the purchase of such vehicle.

Public schools

Amendment No. 18, relating to personal services of clerks, etc.: Adds $510 to the House proposal, $221,035, in lieu of the amount recommended by the Senate, $226,975.

Amendment No. 19, relating to personal services in the department of school attendance: Retains the Senate proposal of $44,100 in lieu of $42,700, the House figure.

Amendment No. 21, relating to instruction, etc., in vacation schools: Agrees to the Senate proposal of $38,045, an increase of $3,000 over the House amount.

Amendment No. 22, relating to the Community Center Department: Deletes the language and appropriation for this purpose because of consolidation of this and other items into the Recreation Department contained in subsequent amendments.

Amendment No. 23, relating to care of buildings and grounds: Accepts the Senate figure of $1,041,987, which is an increase over the House amount of $2,160 for two additional custodians (flying squadron) at $1,080 each.

Amendments Nos. 24 and 25, relating to maintenance of schools for crippled pupils and for the transportation of these and sight conservation pupils: Allows the Senate increases of $300 and $700, respectively.

Amendment No. 26, relating to purchase and repair of furniture, etc., in manual and vocational training, etc.: Accedes to the Senate increase of $3,000 over the House proposal of $78,240 for the expansion of the aviation course into a full-year program.

Amendment No. 28: Makes available unexpended balances of 1942 appropriations for furnishing and equipping buildings and additions during 1943 in the amount of $34,190.

Amendments Nos. 29 and 30, relating to school gardens: Limits expenditure for teaching of elementary science in school gardens to $700 and increases the House proposal, $4,800, by $200 for labor.

Amendments Nos. 31 and 32: The former provides for the painting and decorating of Brookland Elementary School at a cost of $2,000 and the latter brings about a reduction of $3,200 due to transfer of an assistant to engineer to the repair shop in Municipal Architect's office hitherto considered in amendment No. 2. Thus the appropriation for repairs and improvements to school buildings and grounds is reduced from the House figure of $598,350 to $597,150 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33: The appropriation for improvement of various municipal playgrounds and recreation centers is deleted and included in the appropriation for the Recreation Department considered in subsequent amendments.

Amendment No. 37: Makes funds appropriated in the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, for the completion of unfinished classrooms at the Lafayette School available also for furniture and equipment for those rooms. The amount affected by the amendment is $45,000.

Recreation Department

Amendments Nos. 38, 39, and 40: These amendments are the result of the creation of this department by the act of April 29, 1942, which consolidated all playground and recreational activities of the District in a Recreation Department. The amount for salaries and expenses of the new department is $364,894 as compared with $281,320 provided by the House for the Community Center Department, plus $5,600 for a recreation coordinator transferred from the National Capital Parks, or an increase of $77,974. To the appropriation of $25,000 proposed by the House for improvements to playgrounds and recreational centers and transferred to this department by the Senate amendment, the Senate has added $1,500 for reconditioning the Kenilworth field house damaged by a recent fire, and the House concurs therein.

Metropolitan Police

Amendment No. 42: The Senate recedes from its amendment for the erection of a new precinct station house at Forty-second Street and Benning Road NE., $40,000.

Amendments Nos. 43 and 44, relating to purchase, exchange, maintenance, etc., of motor vehicles: The House accedes to the Senate amendments which insert language allowing retention of certain motor vehicles upon the purchase of new ones and an increase of $11,963 above the House figure, $103,920, made available immediately for the payment of 1942 obligations. This increase is to meet necessary additional obligations not provided for in the 1942 Budget and for which an estimate has been submitted to Congress.

Policemen and Firemen's Relief

Amendments Nos. 45 and 46: The House agrees to the Senate reduction of $5,000 in the House figure, $1,360,000, and the deletion of the language providing for a study by the Treasury Department of contributions of participating members, etc. The study has been completed, and there is no longer need for the appropriation or the language.

Fire Department

Amendments Nos. 48 and 49: The House agrees to the Senate amendments which increase the limit of cost for two chief's automobiles from $2,200 to $3,000, and bring about a corresponding increase in the amount for the purchase of fire-fighting apparatus, etc., from $58,625, the House figure, to $59,425.

Amendment No. 50: The House accepts the Senate amendment for the construction of a new fire-engine house near North Capitol and Crittenden Streets, $110,000.

Health Department

Amendment No. 51: The House accedes to the Senate amendment increasing the appropriation for General Administration from $107,595 to $111,775.

Amendment No. 52, relating to Medical Services: The House accepts the Senate increase which provides for $725,510 in lieu of $704,830 proposed by the House. However, on arriving at this amount, an ajustment was made in personnel allowed, as follows: An additional 4 nurses at $1,800 were allowed in lieu of 5 as proposed by the Senate; and 5 additional medical inspectors in the school were agreed upon in lieu of 11 as proposed by the House and 4 as recommended by the Senate, these inspectors to be paid at the rate of $1,800 a year.

Amendment No. 53, relating to laboratories: The House agrees to the amount proposed by the Senate, $66,510, in lieu of $63,450 provided in the House bill.

Amendment No. 54, relating to inspections: The amendment retains the Senate figure $201,310 in lieu of the House amount, $178,490.

Amendments Nos. 55 and 56: The House agrees to deletion of the appropriation for construction of a northwest health center, $130,000, and accepts the reappropriation of funds in the amount of $4,800, available during 1942 for this same purpose, to repair and alter the Polk School building, which will be used as a temporary health center.

Amendments Nos. 57 and 58: These amendments provide for $50,000 for repairs, alterations, etc., to the Tuberculosis Hospital at Fourteenth and Upshur Streets NW., to make it suitable for use during the emergency for care and treatment of tuberculosis patients and $136,920 for operating and maintaining same, including personal services, purchase of furniture and equipment, etc.

Amendment No. 59, relating to Gallinger Hospital: This amendment provides $905,047 in lieu of $908,647 proposed by the Senate and $900,827 provided by the House. In arriving at this compromise an additional medical officer at $2,600 and a clerk-stenographer at $1,620 are added to the House proposal.

Amendment No. 60, relating to Columbia Hospital and Lying-in Asylum: The amendment allows $11,200 in lieu of $11,500 provided by the Senate. The item was not included in the bill by the House.

Public Welfare

Amendment No. 62, relating to personal services for the Board of Public Welfare: The amendment provides for the increase to $174,015 as proposed by the Senate in lieu of the House figure, $162,095.

Amendments Nos. 63 and 64: These amendments provide an increase of $1,240 over the House figure for an additional attendant at the Receiving Home for Children.

Amendment No. 65, relating to the Jail: Accepts the Senate increase of $250 for maintenance and support of prisoners, this additional amount to be used for furnishing uniforms and caps for guards.

Amendment No. 66, relating to the National Training School for Boys: The increase by the Senate of $14,600 over the House figure, $76,000, is accepted.

Amendment No. 67, relating to the Home for the Aged and Infirm: The amendment deletes House language specifying the salary and status of the superintendent.

Amendments Nos. 68, 69, and 70: The first of these amendments relating to Public Assistance reduces the House amount, $850,000 by $75,000, and makes available the same amount, $75,000, from unexpended balances of the 1942 appropriations; the second amendment (69) deletes House language made unnecessary by classification of the positions; the third amendment (70) deletes House language placing limitation on expenditures for distribution of surplus commodities and relief milk and the personal services in connection therewith, and inserts in lieu of the language proposed by the Senate, the following:

"and the amount made available by this paragraph shall include the distribution of surplus commodities and relief milk and the certification of persons eligible for work relief and surplus commodities, including personnel without regard to such 12 per centum limitation:".

Amendments Nos. 72 and 73, relating to Home Care for Dependent Children: The former increases the amount that can be expended for personal services by $6,000 over the amount proposed by the House, $18,000, and the latter decreases the appropriation from $388,000, as proposed by the House, to the Senate amount, $298,400.

Amendment No. 74, relating to assistance against old-age want: Makes a reduction of $75,000 under the amount provided by the House, $760,465, or $685,465, the Senate figure.

Amendment No. 75, relating to pensions for needy blind persons: Accepts the Senate increase of $4,800 over the House amount, $60,000.

Amendment No. 76, relating to ceilings on benefits under public assistance: Restores the House language deleted by the Senate which places ceilings on benefits under the various programs.

Amendment No. 77, relating to Sponsor's contributions to Work Projects Administration: Retains the language inserted by Senate for distribution of free lunches, milk for necessitous children, etc. in the event the enumerated projects are not operated by the Work Projects Administration of the District of Columbia.

Amendments Nos. 79 and 80, relating to transportation of indigent nonresident persons: Reduces the amount proposed by the House, $20,000 to $17,000 as recommended by the Senate, and accepts the Senate increase of $165 in the limitation on personal services.

Militia

Amendments Nos. 81, 82, and 83: Agrees to the Senate proposal of $10,800 for personal services in lieu of the House figure, $9,440; accepts deletion by the Senate of House language for compensation of the commanding general; and corrects totals accordingly.

National Capital Parks

Amendment No. 84: Provides a decrease of $5,600 as recommended by the Senate brought about by transfer of the recreation coordinator to the Recreation Department as heretofore explained.

Department of Vehicles and Traffic

Amendments Nos. 85 and 86: Provides $208,460 in lieu of $202,300 proposed by the House and $209,660 recommended by the Senate. The resulting increase of $6,160 above the House figure includes allowance of two additional engineers and the reclassification of three positions, but does not provide for the creation of a Registrar of Titles and Tags and deletes the entire amendment in this connection.

Motor Vehicle Parking Agency

Amendment No. 87: Restores the House appropriation of $16,200 deleted by the Senate.

Water Department

Amendment No. 89: Deletes language proposed by the House giving the Secretary of Treasury authority to sell United States securities held for and on account of the water fund in order to meet deficiencies in revenues therein.

Amendments in disagreement

The conferees have not agreed with respect to the following Senate amendments:

Amendment No. 20, relating to salaries of teachers and librarians.

Amendment No. 34, relating to employment of teachers from July 1 to September 15, 1942, by the United States Government.

Amendment Nos. 35 and 36, relating to payment of tuition in the public schools by nonresident children.

Amendment No. 41, relating to advancements by disbursing officer of the District of Columbia to the superintendent of the Recreation Department for conducting its activities under the trust fund created by the Act of April 29, 1942.

Amendment No. 71, relating to auditing, disbursing, and accounting of Public Assistance funds by the Auditor of the District of Columbia.

Amendment No. 78, relating to appropriation for the National Library for the Blind.

(The managers on the part of the House recommend a concurrence in the foregoing amendments in disagreement.)

Amendment No. 90, relating to detail of executive employees to investigating committees of Congress.

GEORGE MAHON.
JOHN M. HOUSTON.
HARRY P. BEAM.
ALBERT THOMAS.
KARL STEFAN.
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the appropriation for the District of Columbia for the fiscal year 1943 passed the House a few weeks ago and went to the Senate, where some minor amendments were made. Those changes, with few exceptions, have been worked out in conference. The conference report comes to the floor with the approval of a great majority of the House conferees. I do not believe any particular statement need be made to the House in regard to the conference report, unless someone desires to ask a question about it.

I yield now to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN].

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I have anything further to say than what the chairman of the subcommittee has said. The conference report is unanimously agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 23, line 29, strike out "$7,602,240" and insert "$7,589,840."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. MAHON moves that the House recede from its disagreement of the amendment of the Senate No. 20, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by the said amendment insert "$7,609,840."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 34: Line 3, page 33, insert "Section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act, approved May 10, 1916 as amended, shall not apply from July 1 to September 15, 1942, to teachers of the public schools of the District of Columbia when employed by any of the executive departments or independent establishments of the United States Government."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments Nos. 35 and 36 be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 35: Page 33, strike out lines 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14, as follows:

"No part of the appropriations made for the public schools of the District of Columbia shall be used for the free instruction of pupils who dwell outside the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That this limitation shall not apply to pupils who are enrolled in the schools of the District of Columbia on the date of the approval of this act."

Amendment No. 36: Page 33, insert in place of the matter stricken out in lines 9 to 14, inclusive, the following:

"The children of officers and men of the United States Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, and children of other employees of the United States stationed outside the District of Columbia shall be admitted to the public schools without payment of tuition."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 41: Page 37, line 10, insert "The disbursing officer of the District of Columbia is authorized to advance to the superintendent of recreation upon requisitions previously approved by the auditor of the District of Columbia and upon such security as the Commissioners may require of said superintendent sums of money not exceeding $500 at one time to be used for the expense of conducting its activities under the trust fund created by the act of April 29, 1942 all such expenditures to be accounted for to the accounting officers of the District of Columbia within 1 month on itemized vouchers properly approved."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 71: Page 61, line 13, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That all auditing, disbursing, and accounting for funds administered through the Public Assistance Division of the Board of Public Welfare, including all employees engaged in such work and records relating thereto, shall be under the supervision and control of the Auditor of the District of Columbia."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 78: On page 64, line 22, insert:

"NATIONAL LIBRARY FOR THE BLIND

"For aid and support of the National Library for the Blind, located at 1126 Twenty-first Street NW., to be expended under the direction of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, $5,000."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 90: On page 100, line 7, insert:

"SEC. 12. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3678 of the Revised Statutes, in any case in which the Senate or the House of Representatives by resolution has authorized, or hereafter authorizes, any of its committees to make an investigation relating to the activities of any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government, or relating to matters within the jurisdiction of any such department or agency, and the resolution providing for such investigation, or a supplemental resolution, either authorizes such committee to request the use of personnel of any such department or agency, or contains a provision under which the head of any such department or agency is requested to detail or assign to the committee such personnel (including legal assistants, experts, and investigators) as the committee may deem necessary, the compensation of any person detailed or assigned to the committee pursuant to any such request shall be paid out of the appropriations available to the department or agency by which such person was employed prior to the time of the passage of such resolution."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 90.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 91: Page 101, line 1, strike out "12" and insert "13."

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment No. 91.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. I would like to ask a question with reference to three items on page 34. The first item deals with the temporary construction of an 8-room addition to Benning School. The same language in connection with Van Ness School, and the same language in connection with Hillside Road School. When you speak of temporary buildings or temporary additions, does that mean that those additions will be built of frame material, wood construction, or will the exterior be brick with temporary interior construction?

Mr. MAHON. The gentleman is correct in assuming that the buildings will be purely of a temporary character. The Superintendent of Schools informed the committee that it was not possible to get priorities on the type of material necessary to build permanent school buildings.

Mr. HOLMES. What I had more reference to was the exterior construction. Will that be of brick or frame?

Mr. MAHON. I am sure that the exterior construction of these buildings will not be of such a permanent type as brick. I am not advised on the matter, however, to say to the gentleman that the buildings will be of any particular material.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I feel that the chairman of the subcommittee has certainly performed a real service in refusing to accept the Senate amendment relative to the detailing of help to select committees of the House and Senate by the executive branch of the Government. That amendment had no place in this bill. It had absolutely nothing to do with the government of the District of Columbia; but, in order to get around a decision of the Comptroller General, the Senate added the amendment. It was to take care of one special employee who had been detailed to a Senate committee. That matter has been adjusted to the satisfaction of that Senate committee and the Comptroller General, Mr. Lindsay Warren.

By reason of the decision of the Comptroller General, with which I am in full sympathy, it is going to be necessary, if select committees are to get certain help from the executive branch of the Government, to pass legislation.

My purpose in rising now is to say that I propose to have a meeting of the Committee on Accounts at 10:30 Wednesday to take up this question. Any Member of Congress who is interested in the subject will have a right to appear before the committee.

While in the end it is not going to cost the Government any additional money, still it will show an increase in the amount necessary for the contingent fund of both the House and Senate. I will qualify that statement in this way. It will not cost the Government any more money provided the executive branch does not use the amount we advance for reimbursement purposes to hire more help. One thing is certain; the proper way is to handle this question by a bill

or resolution and not by a rider on an appropriation bill.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In support of the statement made by the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] I fully agree with the position of the Comptroller General. Of course it has had an effect upon the Naval Affairs Investigating Committee to the extent that last week some 25 of the auditors and accountants had to go back to the departments.

I have taken this matter up with the Comptroller General, Mr. Warren, and they have worked out a joint resolution which I have given to the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Accounts, and I am glad to know that the matter will be taken up before that committee on Wednesday, and we can follow out the procedure suggested by the Comptroller General.

I think the committee has done a wise thing in eliminating from this bill the so-called McCarran amendment, because it has no bearing on anything in this bill, and it should be dealt with by the Committee on Accounts, so that the Accounts Committee can control the situation with reference to money being appropriated to reimburse departments for the personnel that may be sent to special investigating committees.

Mr. MAHON. I thank the gentleman and I agree with the gentleman's statement that that amendment had no place in the bill.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAHON. I yield.

Mr. STEFAN. I wish to say to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] and the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] that much of the information they have given us outside of the House had a great deal to do with the action of your committee in insisting upon our stand on this particular item. Originally we felt that it had nothing to do with this bill at all, and we are very happy that the House approves of our position.

I am sure that we had the same sympathetic feeling on the other side of the Capitol.

The SPEAKER. A motion to reconsider the various votes by which the amendments were acted upon is laid on the table.

FEDERAL SURPLUS COMMODITIES CORPORATION

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 311, continuing the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation as an agency of the United States, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Line 5, strike out "1947" and insert "1945."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, when the resolution was passed it extended the life of this corporation for 5 years. The Senate has amended that by changing it to 3 years.

Mr. PACE. Yes; which is in accord with the individual views of the gentleman from Kansas at the time it was proposed.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 13 (D) OF THE RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill H. R. 7212 to amend section 13 (d) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I shall not, will the gentleman from Tennessee explain the bill, the reason for the emergency?

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. Speaker, this bill affects only the State of Kentucky, and the necessity for it arises out of the very peculiar situation as a result of the passage of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act of 1939. Prior to the passage of that act the States administered their own unemployment compensation laws. When the act became effective it required all the States to turn into the Federal insurance fund moneys they had previously collected from employers. In order to make the States comply with this provision the act carried a proviso that any State which failed to turn in those funds by July 1, 1940, would be deprived of Federal grants under the Social Security Act. The State of Kentucky through its general assembly undertook to comply with the Federal act and passed a law which authorized the turning in of the funds which had been collected by July 1, 1940, but the court of highest jurisdiction in Kentucky held that act of the general assembly to be unconstitutional and invalid. As a result Congress was called upon to extend the time within which the State of Kentucky could comply to July 1, 1942, whereupon the General Assembly of Kentucky passed a second law. Again the court of highest jurisdiction of Kentucky declared it unconstitutional, but pointed out a way whereby the general assembly could meet the situation. The pending bill simply extends the time of compliance on the part of the State of Kentucky until July 1, 1944, or sooner if a special session of the legislature can be called.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PEARSON. I yield.

Mr. HOLMES. The act passed 2 years ago was unanimously approved by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. PEARSON. That is true.

Mr. HOLMES. This law expires on July 1 of this year, and in order that there may be another moratorium, an extension of time to give Kentucky an opportunity to carry out certain legal instructions which the court has actually placed on them, the pending bill is now found necessary.

Mr. PEARSON. That is correct. Unless this bill is passed that State will be penalized for something it has tried desperately to correct. I may say to the House in connection with this bill that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has reported it unanimously. It has the approval of the Federal Security Agency, the Railroad Retirement Board, and the Railway Executors' Association. It is highly important that the bill be passed before July 1 next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the proviso contained in the third paragraph of subsection (d) of section 13 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, as amended (which proviso relates to the postponement of withholding from certification for payment to States, in certain cases, of amounts for the administration of State unemployment compensation laws) is amended as follows:

(1) By striking out "until July 1, 1942" and by inserting in lieu thereof the following: "until July 1, 1944, or until a date 180 days after the adjournment of the first session of the legislature of such State beginning after July 1, 1942, whichever date is the earlier"; and

(2) By adding at the end of such proviso the following sentence: "An enactment of any State legislature providing for the transfer from the State's account in the Unemployment Trust Fund to the railroad unemployment insurance account of all interest earned upon contributions which are collected with respect to employment occurring after such enactment by such State pursuant to its unemployment compensation law and credited to its account in the Unemployment Trust Fund (until the total of such transfers equals the amounts which otherwise would be required to be withheld from certification under this subsection), shall be deemed an effective authorization and direction to the Secretary of the Treasury as required by this subsection: *Provided, however*, That if at any time after such enactment the provision for transfer therein contained for any reason fails to be operative to effect the transfers of interest as therein prescribed, and such State has not otherwise made an effective authorization and direction to the Secretary of the Treasury as required by this subsection, the Social Security Board shall immediately after such failure or, on the date otherwise provided in this subsection for the beginning of withholdings from certification, whichever is later, begin to make the withholdings from certification provided for in this subsection in the same manner and to the same extent as if such enactment by such State had not been enacted, except that the amounts of the certifications withheld shall be reduced by the total amount, if any, which has been transferred from interest pursuant to such enactment."

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 9, after the word "account", insert a paranthesis.

Page 2, line 17, after the word "subsection", change the colon to a semicolon and insert

after the semicolon "and for purposes of computing how the interest to be so transferred, amounts withdrawn by such State from its account in the unemployment trust fund after the date of such State enactment shall be considered to be a first charge against the amounts credited to such State's account prior to the date of such State's enactment."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AUTHORIZING THE CONTROL OF THE EXPORTATION OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2558) to further expedite the prosecution of the war by authorizing the control of the exportation of certain commodities, which is on the Speaker's table.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand this Senate bill is in the nature of an amendment to the present act, which expires this month, and that it provides a termination date of June 30, 1944.

Mr. MAY. The gentleman is correct. It extends the existing statute until June 30, 1944. The statute otherwise would expire on the 30th day of this month.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 714) is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. (a) The President is hereby authorized to prohibit or curtail the exportation of any articles, technical data, materials, or supplies, except under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe.

"(b) Unless the President shall otherwise direct, the functions and duties of the President under this section shall be performed by the Board of Economic Warfare.

"(c) In case of the violation of any provision of any proclamation, rule, or regulation issued hereunder, such violator or violators, upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000, or by imprisonment for not more than 2 years or by both such fine and imprisonment.

"(d) The authority granted by this section shall terminate on June 30, 1944, or upon any prior date which the Congress by concurrent resolution, or the President, may designate; except that as to offenses committed, or rights or liabilities incurred prior to such date, the provisions of this section and such rules, regulations, and proclamations shall be treated as remaining in effect for the purpose of sustaining any suit, action, or prosecution with respect to such right, liability, or offense."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR THE BETTER ADMINISTRATION OF OFFICER PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY DURING THE EXISTING WAR

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7160) to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy during the existing war, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, under the reservation of objection of the distinguished minority leader, I shall take a few minutes to make an explanation of what this bill does, because it is a very important bill.

The pending legislation has for its purpose the suspending during the period of the present emergency or war, what is known as the permanent selection law. It affects every officer in the Navy in reference to the matter of promotion. Under the law today officers are promoted by what is known as the selection system; that is annually a board meets and passes on the records of the officers to fill vacancies.

As you know, under the system in the War Department, all promotions are made by seniority. The Navy does not follow that system. The Navy keeps a record of all officers, which is kept in their individual files in the Navy Department, and annually the Secretary appoints a board consisting of nine officers to go over the records of the various officers to determine who is best fitted for a vacancy that may exist.

This bill during the emergency suspends that law and permits the Navy to bring into effect what is known as temporary promotions. We recently passed a bill providing for temporary promotions, and that will take the place of the permanent promotions of the officers under the permanent selection system.

In the Navy there are so many officers authorized, based upon the enlisted strength. For instance, for every 100 officers there is allowed by law 1 admiral, 4 captains, 8 commanders, 15 lieutenant commanders, 30 lieutenants, and 42 junior lieutenants and ensigns. This suspends the operation of that law for the reason that in the war it is impossible to say how many lieutenant commanders, how many commanders, how many captains, and so forth, you may need; therefore there must be a flexibility on account of the losses sustained in the various ranks and the needs of the service.

There are other things in this bill dealing with personnel, but the fundamental purpose of it is to set aside for the time being the method of promotion by a selection board and apply the principle of temporary promotion. In the committee report, which is carefully drawn, you will see a complete analysis of every section of the bill, showing exactly how the bill affects the various establishments. The Navy Department, since this bill has been reported out of the committee, called my attention to certain amendments that I will offer if unanimous consent is given to consider this bill.

We held a hearing on this bill. The Personnel Division of the Navy Department recommends it. It is an administration measure, and after we went into it thoroughly and carefully the Committee on Naval Affairs unanimously reported the bill.

That, briefly, is what the bill seeks to do, but I want to say—and I want to be frank and candid—this is important legislation, because it sets aside for the emergency the method of promotion heretofore used and goes to the temporary promotion system instead of what is known as the selection system heretofore established for the Navy.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. When the gentleman says "temporary" he means until after the war?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. During the emergency or during the war, under a previous bill, the Secretary of the Navy could grant a temporary promotion to an officer and that holds during the period of the emergency. If he retired, he would retire with that rank to which he has been temporarily promoted. For instance, a great many officers have been recently given temporary promotions for bravery. The naval officer who shot down six planes out in the Pacific recently has been made a lieutenant commander temporarily. After the war is over he may revert back to his former permanent rank.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Then this would be permanent legislation?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. This only holds good for 1 year after the emergency expires. Prior to the expiration of this law and after the war selection boards will be convened to pass on officers and confirm in their temporary grades those officers who have fully demonstrated their fitness for promotion.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I know how the method works, but do the positions that are given now become permanent?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; they are only temporary. No officer now gets a permanent promotion because we are suspending that law. We are putting in the place of that law a principle enacted some time ago of temporary promotions.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. For instance, if I am made a captain by this method, being a commander now, would I after the war go back and have to be approved in order to retain my rank as captain?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. You would unless the old selection system comes into effect, picks you up, and makes you a permanent captain.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BULWINKLE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of existing law insofar as they relate to periodic computations for the purpose of determining the authorized number of commissioned officers in the various grades of the line of the Regular Navy and of the Marine Corps, the permanent promotion or advancement of all officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the involuntary retirement or honorable discharge of commissioned officers of the Navy and Marine Corps by reason of failure of selection for promotion or advancement or upon the completion of designated periods of commissioned service, are hereby suspended: *Provided*, That an officer who on the date of this act has been recommended for permanent promotion or advancement by the approved report of a selection board, or who has

become due for permanent promotion or advancement by length of service or otherwise to a nonselection grade or rank, shall be immediately eligible for such permanent promotion or advancement, with or without the examinations required by existing law as the Secretary of the Navy may deem best for the interests of the service, and if so promoted or advanced he shall take rank from the date of this act or the date as of which he would have been permanently promoted or advanced in due course under existing law, whichever may be earlier; if not so promoted or advanced because of physical disability he shall be retired in the rank which he would have had on the retired list under existing law: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Navy's determination as to an officer's date of rank or any other matter in the administration of this section shall be final and conclusive for all purposes.

SEC. 2. The number of officers on the active list of the grade or rank of rear admiral entitled to the pay and allowances provided by law for rear admirals of the upper half, exclusive of those carried as additional numbers in such grade or rank, shall be one-half of the number of permanent and temporary officers of the line in that grade, four officers of the Medical Corps, three officers of the Supply Corps, and one officer of the Civil Engineer Corps, all of whom shall be the senior officers in the line or in their respective staff corps: *Provided*, That an officer carried as an additional number in the grade or rank of rear admiral shall become entitled to the pay and allowances provided for rear admirals of the upper half from the same date as the officer next junior to him: *Provided further*, That the foregoing numbers shall be exclusive of officers entitled to such pay and allowances solely by reason of their serving in the rank of admiral or vice admiral, or as chief of bureau, judge advocate general of the Navy, or director of budget and reports: *And provided further*, That no officer who has or may become entitled to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral of the upper half shall suffer a reduction of his pay and allowances solely by reason of the fact that the number of rear admirals may for any reason be reduced.

SEC. 3. The age limits now prescribed by law for original appointment to commissioned rank in any staff corps of the Regular Navy are hereby modified to the extent that any officer of the Naval Reserve eligible for such appointment upon heretofore or hereafter reporting for active duty subsequent to September 8, 1939, shall retain such eligibility so long as he remains continuously on active duty.

SEC. 4. The acts of August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 864, 34 U. S. C., 737), and October 8, 1940 (54 Stat. 1023, 34 U. S. C., 853c–2), are amended so as to provide that officers of the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve therein described shall be eligible for appointment to the Regular Navy or Marine Corps, as may be appropriate, if less than 25 years of age upon the successful completion of their training as aviation cadets or upon reporting for continuous active duty on board ships of the Navy, as the case may be: *Provided*, That each such officer hereafter appointed to the lowest commissioned grade of the Regular Navy or Marine Corps by authority of said acts shall take precedence according to his date of reporting for continuous active duty as an officer of the Naval or Marine Corps Reserve; each such officer so appointed to a grade above that of ensign or second lieutenant shall take precedence according to the date of rank stated in his reserve commission in the same rank.

SEC. 5. Personnel heretofore and hereafter temporarily appointed pursuant to and as defined in the act of July 24, 1941 (Public Law 188, 77th Cong.), shall be entitled to the pay and allowances of the grade or rank to which so appointed from the dates on which such appointments are made by the President, and their appointments, unless expressly declined, shall be regarded for all purposes as having been accepted on the date made, without formal acceptance or oath of office.

SEC. 6. Any officer of the Regular Navy below the grade of vice admiral transferred to the retired list upon attaining the age of 64 years while serving under a temporary appointment pursuant to the act of July 24, 1941 (Public Law 188, 77th Cong.), shall be retired in such temporary grade or rank with retired pay at the rate of 75 percent of his active-duty pay at the time of retirement, unless eligible for retirement in a higher grade or rank under some other provision of law.

SEC. 7. The act of July 24, 1941 (Public Law 188, 77th Cong.), is hereby amended as follows:

Section 1, change period to comma and add "and during such period thereafter as the President shall determine, but not later than June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the war or national emergency shall terminate."

Section 5, after "shall be", insert "by selection only."

Section 10 of the aforesaid act of July 24, 1941, is hereby amended so that temporary appointments made under authority of that act during the present war may continue in force until 6 months after the termination of this act.

SEC. 8. No officer shall suffer any reduction in pay or allowances by reason of any provisions of this act, all sections of which shall become effective on date of approval and, with the exception of section 4, shall terminate on June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the present war shall end.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the first committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 3, after the word "that", insert "in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, line 22, after the word "purposes", insert the following: *"And provided further*, That nothing in this act shall preclude the honorable discharge of any officer in accordance with section 12 (g) of the act approved June 23, 1938 (34 U. S. C. 404 (g)), where such officer has heretofore been named in the approved report of a selection board."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 3, strike out all of section 2 and insert the following:

SEC. 2. The number of rear admirals on the active list of the line entitled to the pay and allowances provided by law for rear admirals of the upper half, exclusive of those carried as additional numbers in such grade, shall be one-half of the number of permanent and temporary officers of the line in that grade: *Provided*, That each officer of the staff corps now or hereafter serving in the rank of rear admiral shall be entitled to receive the pay and allowances provided by law for rear admirals of the upper half when a line officer who was his junior in the rank from which the staff officer concerned was advanced becomes entitled to such pay and allowances pursuant to the foregoing but not earlier than the date upon which the staff officer is appointed to the rank of rear admiral: *Provided further*, That nothing contained herein shall operate to suspend the provisions of section 18 of the act of June 10, 1926 (44 Stat. 724), with respect to staff officers who on the date of this act have been recommended for advancement to the rank of rear admiral by the approved report of a selection board: *Provided further*, That an officer carried as an additional number in the grade or rank of rear admiral shall become entitled to the pay and allowances provided for rear admirals of the upper half from the same date as the officer next junior to him: *Provided further*, That the foregoing shall be exclusive of officers entitled to such pay and allowances solely by reason of their serving in the rank of admiral or vice admiral, or as chief of bureau, Judge Advocate General of the Navy, or director of budget and reports: *"And provided further*, That no officer who has or may become entitled to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral of the upper half shall suffer a reduction of his pay and allowances solely by reason of the fact that the number of rear admirals may for any reason be reduced.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 18, after the word "admiral", insert "and any officer of the Regular Marine Corps below the rank of lieutenant general."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I offer three amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

On page 7, strike out line 9, which reads as follows: "Section 5, after 'shall be', insert 'by selection only.' "

On page 7, after line 13, insert a new section 8, as follows:

"SEC. 8. The provisions of this act, except as may be necessary to adapt the said provisions to the Coast Guard, shall apply to officer personnel of the Coast Guard in like manner and to the same extent and with the same relative conditions in all respects as are provided for the officer personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps."

On page 7, line 14, change "Sec. 8" to read "Sec. 9."

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the committee report be printed in the RECORD at this point, and further that I be permitted to extend my remarks at this point and include an explanation of the three amendments just agreed to, so that the services may know exactly the interpretation the Department places upon these amendments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The committee report is as follows:

The Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 7160) to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy during the existing war, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill as amended do pass.

The amendments are as follows:

Page 2, line 2, after the word "That", insert the words "in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy."

Page 2, line 20, change the period at the end to a colon and add the following proviso: *"And provided further*, That nothing in this act shall preclude the honorable discharge of any officer in accordance with section 12 (g) of the act approved June 23, 1938 (34 U. S. C. 404 (g)), where such officer has here-

tofore been named in the approved report of a selection board."

Page 2, strike out section 2 beginning with line 21, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"The number of rear admirals on the active list of the line entitled to the pay and allowances provided by law for rear admirals of the upper half, exclusive of those carried as additional numbers in such grade, shall be one-half of the number of permanent and temporary officers of the line in that grade: *Provided*, That each officer of the Staff Corps now or hereafter serving in the rank of rear admiral shall be entitled to receive the pay and allowances provided by law for rear admirals of the upper half when a line officer who was his junior in the rank from which the staff officer concerned was advanced becomes entitled to such pay and allowances pursuant to the foregoing but not earlier than the date upon which the staff officer is appointed to the rank of rear admiral: *Provided further*, That nothing contained herein shall operate to suspend the provisions of Section 18 of the act of June 10, 1926 (44 Stat. 724), with respect to staff officers who on the date of this act have been recommended for advancement to the rank of rear admiral by the approved report of a selection board: *Provided further*, That an officer carried as an additional number in the grade or rank of rear admiral shall become entitled to the pay and allowances provided for rear admirals of the upper half from the same date as the officer next junior to him: *Provided further*, That the foregoing shall be exclusive of officers entitled to such pay and allowances solely by reason of their serving in the rank of admiral or vice admiral, or as chief of bureau, Judge Advocate General of the Navy, or director of budget and reports: *And provided further*, That no officer who has or may become entitled to the pay and allowances of a rear admiral of the upper half shall suffer a reduction of his pay and allowances solely by reason of the fact that the number of rear admirals may for any reason be reduced."

Page 5, line 4, after the word "admiral", insert the words "and any officer of the Regular Marine Corps below the rank of lieutenant general."

Amend the title to read as follows: "A bill to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps during the existing war, and for other purposes."

The purpose of this bill is to suspend existing provisions of law relating to the permanent promotion of all officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the involuntary retirement of such officers by reason of failure of selection. In addition, the bill amends other features of present laws in order that they may be better and more efficiently administered.

Experience gained under present operating conditions has demonstrated that it is impractical and inadvisable, during the present war, to continue to administer Navy officer personnel laws as they relate to permanent promotions and involuntary retirements or discharges.

During normal peacetime the selection boards are composed of officers serving at sea in the various type forces, as well as those employed on shore. The committee is of the opinion that it is inadvisable to withdraw such officers from their important assignments during war in order to permit them sitting as members of selection boards. Operating conditions during wartime, with attendant casualties, make it impossible to determine the actual number of commissioned officers upon which a correct legal distribution of line officers in the several grades can be made, as required by existing law. Furthermore, due to the uncertain status (missing, captured, dead, etc.) of officers, it is equally impossible to determine the dates upon which vacancies in grades may occur.

The proposed legislation provides, in brief, for the suspension of laws governing permanent promotions in the Navy and Marine Corps during the continuance of the existing war and until June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which such war is terminated. It preserves in general the right of permanent promotion to officers already selected for such promotion and to those who have otherwise become eligible for promotion or advancement. The only exception to this would be in the case of an officer who, since becoming eligible for promotion, has committed himself in such a manner as to indicate that he should not be advanced in rank. The bill contains appropriate provisions to insure that the proper number of officers of the rank of rear admiral become entitled to the pay of the upper half.

It also retains the eligibility of staff officers, Reserve aviators, and Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates to appointments and transfers to the Regular Navy. In certain cases, where necessary, the precedence of officers under the temporary selection procedure is provided for and clarified. There is a special provision preserving promotion rights where under war conditions the loss of records and unavailability of officers to execute formal papers is probable.

The temporary promotion law (Public Law 188, 77th Cong.) will be affected by the enactment of the proposed bill and it is amended so as to require temporary promotion by selection only. The temporary promotion law is also extended in time so as to parallel the proposed bill in that respect.

The committee are advised that the selective system envisioned in connection with the administration of this bill does not contemplate the use of regularly constituted statutory boards as provided in existing law. It is felt, however, that some form of selection is necessary in order that personnel whose records indicate a high degree of ability will receive first consideration. It is believed that the second amendment to Public Law 188 (77th Cong.), contained in section 7, will accomplish this purpose.

The following is an analysis of the bill by sections as amended:

SECTION 1

This section provides for—

(a) Suspension of present requirements that periodical computations be made to determine the legally allowable number of officers in each of the commissioned grades of the line of the Navy and Marine Corps.

(b) Suspension of all permanent promotions of line, staff, and warrant officers, whether due by seniority or the creation of vacancies, except for those already selected and those who have become eligible for promotion.

(c) Suspension of the provisions of existing law requiring the involuntary retirement or honorable discharge of officers by reason of failure of selection.

(d) Permanent promotion in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, of an officer who on the date of the approval of this act has been recommended for permanent promotion or advancement by the approved report of a selection board, or who has become due for permanent promotion or advancement by length of service or otherwise to a nonselection grade or rank (first proviso). Further provision is incorporated to permit the promotion of those officers without recourse to naval examining board or boards of medical examiners in instances where service conditions may not permit the officer concerned to appear before the boards.

The committee inserted in the first line of the first proviso after the word "That" (p. 2, line 2) the words "in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy." This was done in order to allow the Secretary of the Navy to withhold the permanent promotion of any officer, who, since becoming eligible for promotion, has committed himself in such a manner as to indicate he should not be advanced in rank.

The second proviso would fix, as final and conclusive, the promotion date of each officer on the list who is elegible for promotion in due course, the exact date of vacancy being unknown since it has been impossible to determine definitely the date of death in action of certain officers.

The committee added a third proviso to this section which will permit effecting the discharge, in accordance with present law, of one lieutenant whose professional record, in the opinion of a selection board, indicates an unsatisfactory performance of duty in his present grade and further indicates that he could not satisfactorily perform the duties of a higher grade.

SECTION 2

This section provides that advancements to the pay status of rear admirals of the upper half will not be suspended. In the absence of such provision, some officers might be denied the opportunity which now exists for entrance to the upper half pay status. As amended by the committee, this right will be preserved equally to officers of the staff corps and the line.

SECTION 3

This section does not relate to the present permanent promotion law. It stipulates, however, that no Reserve officer of a staff corps employed on active duty shall, because of wartime service conditions, be denied the opportunity of appointment to the Regular Navy if within the statutory age limits when assigned to active duty. As an example, an officer of the Medical Corps Reserve on active duty may be less than 32 years of age when assigned active duty; his wartime duty assignment may be such that he will not have opportunity to compete in the examinations for appointment to the Regular Navy until he has passed the statutory age limit. This section will continue his eligibility until he can compete in examination.

SECTION 4

This section preserves the rights of Reserve aviators and graduates of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps who are now eligible by law for transfer to the Regular Navy. Under the present law these officers must, on June 30 of the calendar year in which commissioned in the Regular Navy (or Marine Corps), be less than 26 years of age and have completed certain designated periods of service. In many of these instances wartime assignments prevent the completion of required physical examinations and other documentary evidence prior to reaching the maximum age limit. Accordingly, it is deemed equitable to continue the eligibility of these officers beyond the 26-year age limit, provided they were less than 25 years of age upon the date of reporting for active duty. This section also contains a new principle for establishing the order of precedence of these officers upon transfer. Under existing law, many of them are not given credit for precedence or promotion for some portions of their active duty as Reserve officers. The proviso of section 4 corrects this condition. If this bill is enacted into law, each officer will be assigned precedence exactly as if he had been appointed in the Regular Navy upon the date he reported for active duty in his rank, and his precedence will be determined in the same manner as that of Naval Academy graduates upon being commissioned.

SECTION 5

Under existing law, personnel temporarily appointed or promoted in grade are not entitled to the pay of the grade to which appointed or promoted prior to the date of execution of an oath of office. In many instances, officers so appointed or promoted

have been lost in action, presumably after having executed the oath of office form, and the form has been lost with the ship. Thus, the Navy Department is without positive knowledge that these officers were, in fact, serving in the higher grade when lost in action. Therefore, their dependents are denied the death benefits which would be based on the higher grade. This section will correct this situation and at the same time remove the necessity for useless paper work and much correspondence.

SECTION 6

In accordance with existing law an officer temporarily promoted to rear admiral or major general must, as a general rule, when retired, be retired in his permanent rank with the retired pay of that rank. With the suspension of permanent promotions, and if the present war continues for any great length of time, it is possible that some officers may attain the age of 64 years while temporarily serving as rear admirals or major generals. This section grants to such officers the same retirement benefits now accruing to other temporary rear admirals or major generals who may be retired by reason of physical disability.

SECTION 7

This section amends the present temporary promotion law to the extent that it would require temporary promotion by selection. It also extends the time during which temporary commissions may be continued. The time limit provided in this section parallels the period during which permanent promotion laws would be suspended.

SECTION 8

This section contains the usual savings clause and limits the date for the termination of the suspension of permanent promotions to June 30, of the fiscal year following that in which the present war shall end. Sufficient time is provided in which to make necessary adjustments prior to resumption of permanent law.

The committee is convinced that enactment of this bill will materially assist the Navy Department in administering its officer personnel, and thereby contribute to the successful prosecution of the war effort.

The committee unanimously recommend enactment of the bill, H. R. 7160, as amended.

The following letter from the Secretary of the Navy addressed to the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives, sets forth the views and recommendation of the Navy Department on this bill. The letter is hereby made a part of this report.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, June 10, 1942.

THE CHAIRMAN,
COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The bill (H. R. 7160) to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy during the existing war, and for other purposes, was referred to the Navy Department by your committee with request for its views and recommendation.

The principal purpose of the bill is to suspend permanent promotions in the naval service during the present war and for a stated period thereafter.

More specifically, the proposed legislation provides for the suspension of laws governing permanent promotions in the Navy and Marine Corps during the continuance of the existing war and until June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which such war is terminated. It preserves, however, the right to permanent promotions of all officers who have been recommended for permanent promotion or advancement by the approved report of a selection board on the date of the approval of this act. The bill contains appropriate provisions to insure that the proper number of officers of the rank of rear admiral become entitled to the pay of the upper half.

It also preserves the rights of staff officers, Reserve aviators, and Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduates to appointments and transfers to the Regular Navy. In certain cases, where necessary, the precedence of officers under the temporary selection procedure is provided for and clarified. There is a special provision preserving promotion rights where under war conditions the loss of records and unavailability of officers to execute formal papers is probable.

The temporary promotion law (Public Law 188, 77th Cong.) will be affected by the enactment of the proposed bill, and it is amended so as to require temporary promotion by selection only. The temporary promotion law is also extended in time so as to parallel the proposed bill in that respect.

The operating conditions during the present war have demonstrated the impracticability and inadvisability of attempting to continue to administer the present officer personnel law with respect to permanent promotions and involuntary retirements or discharges because of the necessity of withdrawing officers from sea duty to serve as members of selection boards, as well as the practical impossibility of making determinations of correct legal distribution of officers in grades and of the dates upon which vacancies in grade may occur. Many factors involved in permanent promotion are impossible of determination under war conditions.

In order to insure application of the act of the Marine Corps and retirement rights to Marine Corps officers similar to those afforded naval officers, the following amendments to the proposed bill are recommended:

Amend the title to read: "A bill to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps during the existing war, and for other purposes."

Section 6, page 5 of the bill, in line 4, after the words "vice admiral" insert the words "and any officer of the regular Marine Corps below the rank of lieutenant general."

In order to complete the administration of the action of the last selection boards and to preserve certain existing limitations in rank, the following additional amendments are recommended:

Section 1, change the period at the end to a colon and add: "*And provided further*, That nothing in this act shall preclude the honorable discharge of any officer in accordance with section 12 (g) of the act approved June 23, 1938 (34 U. S. C. 404 (g)), where such officer has heretofore been named in the approved report of a selection board."

Section 7, page 5 of the bill, after line 17, insert: "Section 3, after 'Marine Corps', in line 4, insert 'but not above the rank of captain in the Dental or Chaplain Corps,'."

In view of the above, the Navy Department recommends enactment of the bill H. R. 7160, amended as suggested.

The Navy Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there would be no objection to the submission of this recommendation.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK KNOX.

In compliance with clause 2a of rule XIII of the rules of the House of Representatives, there is herewith printed in parallel columns the text of provisions of existing laws which would be repealed or amended by the various provisions of the bill.

EXISTING LAW (Public 188, 77th Cong., sec. 1)	THE BILL (Sec. 7)
* * * That except as otherwise specified herein the authority granted by this act shall be exercised only in time of war or national emergency determined by the President.	The act of July 24, 1941 (Public Law 188, 77th Cong.), is hereby amended as follows: Section 1, change period to comma and add "and during such period thereafter as the President shall determine, but not later than June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which the war or national emergency shall terminate." Section 5, after "shall be" insert "by selection only."
SEC. 5. The temporary appointments under the authority of this act shall be in such numbers as the President may determine that the needs of the service require and in such manner and under such regulations as he may prescribe.	

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in addition to the amendments proposed by the committee to the bill H. R. 7160—Report No. 2238—I have offered and the House has agreed to the following amendments, brief explanations of which are appended:

Page 7, strike out line 9, which reads as follows:

"Section 5, after 'shall be', insert 'by selection only'."

Reason: With the suspension of all permanent promotions as provided by this bill, promotions of officers will be made on a temporary basis under the provisions of Public Law 188, approved July 24, 1941.

Section 5 of this act provides that the temporary appointments—or promotions—made under the authority of that act shall be "in such numbers as the President may determine that the needs of the service require and in such manner and under such regulations as he may prescribe."

As introduced, section 7 of the bill now under consideration would have amended the above act so as to require the appointments authorized therein to be made "by selection only."

After further consideration the committee is of the opinion that it is unnecessary and inadvisable to amend the temporary promotion law as proposed. It would appear that the existing law quoted above provides ample authority to make such promotions by selection if, in the discretion of the President, it is desirable to follow this procedure. The committee feels that it would be unwise to tie the hands of the President with respect to requiring him to follow a certain system in promoting officers of the Navy during wartime. He should, it is believed, have the widest possible discretion in this particular. This amendment will maintain the discretion which the President has previously had relative to the promotion, temporarily, of officers of the naval service.

On page 7, after line 13, insert a new section 8, as follows:

"SEC. 8. The provisions of this act, except as may be necessary to adapt the said pro-

visions to the Coast Guard, shall apply to officer personnel of the Coast Guard in like manner and to the same extent and with the same relative conditions in all respects as are provided for the officer personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps."

Reason: The purpose of this amendment is to make the provisions of H. R. 7160 applicable to officers of the Coast Guard in the same manner and to the same extent as they apply to officers of the Navy and Marine Corps. Section 11 (b) of the temporary promotion law—Public Law 188, Seventy-seventh Congress—authorizing the temporary appointment or advancement of certain officers of the Navy and Marine Corps and for other purposes, makes the provisions of that act applicable to officers of the Coast Guard.

Officers of the Coast Guard receive the same pay, allowances, and increases as now are prescribed for corresponding grades and length of service in the Navy; the same situation with regard to large and rapid expansion of personnel, temporary promotion, and precedence of officers obtains in the Coast Guard as in the Navy. It therefore appears appropriate and necessary that this uniformity should continue by including officers of the Coast Guard within the provisions of this measure.

On page 7, line 14, change "Sec. 8" to read "Sec. 9."

Reason: Necessary because of the insertion of a new section 8.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time and was read a third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps during the existing war, and for other purposes."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

House Resolution 504 was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF COMMISSIONED WARRANT AND WARRANT OFFICERS TO COMMISSIONED RANK IN THE LINE AND STAFF CORPS OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6496) to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 4, line 3, after "Corps", insert "and Coast Guard."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I may say that this bill deals with permitting warrant officers and chief warrant officers to be promoted to commissioned officers in the Navy. You must bear in mind that the bulk of the Navy officers of the Regular Establishment are graduates of the Naval Academy. There are probably only 75 officers in the Regular service, not Reserve officers, who come through what you might call the ranks of the Navy who enlist as seamen and work their way up.

This bill opens the door of opportunity to a far better extent than existed under present law. Under the existing law, only approximately 12 men a year could be fed from the enlisted rank, the warrant-officer rank, and the chief warrant-officer rank into the commissioned rank. This gives a broader latitude.

In writing the bill we left out the Coast Guard because at the time the Coast Guard was under the Treasury Department, but under the law, when the country is at war, the Coast Guard goes under the jurisdiction of the Navy, so it is our responsibility to legislate for the Coast Guard as well as for the Navy. Therefore, the amendment as to the Coast Guard was included.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think it is a very proper amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As I understand, this bill is a compromise bill in place of the so-called Boland bill that was before our committee for many years.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman is correct. Our deceased colleague from Pennsylvania, Mr. Boland, was very much interested in this legislation. After a long hearing we adopted the principle that was advocated by Mr. Boland and other Members of Congress to give these warrant officers an opportunity to become commissioned officers of the Navy.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. As chairman of the committee under which the Coast Guard falls, I heartily agree with the amendments which have been offered. I rise merely to dissent slightly from the statement the gentleman made about legislation with reference to the Coast Guard.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. My language was a little too broad, because the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries still handles the main legislation relating to the Coast Guard. However, there are certain things that fall within the province of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. BLAND. The question of jurisdiction, however, has never troubled the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs or myself. We have always agreed upon those things.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Do I correctly understand, then, that men in the Navy who are not graduates of the Naval Academy are now under this bill to be permitted to advance in rank?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They have always been permitted to do so but the opportunity has been so slim that no more than approximately 12 men a year could ever get in. We have broadened the opportunity because we think that after a man has been a warrant officer for 15 or 20 years or has been in the service for that length of time he should be given an opportunity to qualify for a commission in the Navy. We are opening the door of opportunity broader than ever before in the history of the Navy Department.

Mr. RICH. I congratulate the gentleman. He has been doing a lot of good in the way of legislation he has proposed. This bill gives an opportunity to men in the service who by their own initiative have gone ahead and made themselves valuable men. There is no reason why these men should not a long time ago have been permitted to advance to ranks up to the highest that can be given. I have always felt that there was no reason why a man had to be a graduate of Annapolis or West Point to have the qualifications to permit him to advance to the rank of admiral or general. That is my own opinion about it.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman's thought is along the same line as the thought of the committee in bringing in this bill, but we do not go quite to the extent of saying that you do not get just as good material out of the Academy as out of the ranks. However, we are extending the privilege which has heretofore existed, although not as broadly as the gentleman suggests, but it will be a great inducement to the young men who come into the Navy to work their way up to a commission.

Mr. RICH. I believe the gentleman misunderstood me. I did not say that a man who comes out of Annapolis is not as good as a man who comes up through the ranks.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. There is so much engineering in the Navy that you must have men who have a background of engineering education.

Mr. RICH. That is right, but you do not get ability or qualifications out of books, you get them out of practical application.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. CLASON. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to state that only 75 persons commissioned as officers of the Navy did not come from Annapolis?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think I am correct as to the Regular Navy. I am not talking about the Reserves who come in during the war; but that is true as to the Regular naval officers in the line of the Navy. There are only about

75 of them who are not graduates of the Naval Academy.

Mr. CLASON. In regard to the aviation branch of the Navy, are the personnel and officers of that who are in the line, graduates of Annapolis?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Aviation is in the line and the bulk of the aviation officers now are Reserves. That is where you are getting them now. They are Reserve officers. I am talking about the Regular established Navy, some 8,000 or 9,000 Regular line officers. All of them except probably 75 are graduates of the Naval Academy.

Mr. CLASON. Are there any line officers of the aviation branch of the Navy who are not graduates of the Naval Academy?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; a great many of them today. There are thousands of them.

Mr. CLASON. I am referring to Regular officers.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I do not know of any Regular officers in the Navy who is not a graduate of the Naval Academy assigned to aeronautics, except those commissioned after the last war and those taken in through the aviation cadet program.

Mr. CLASON. That is the point I was making, because of this book entitled "Victory Through the Air," by Seversky, who, apparently, was a consultant of General Mitchell in the years gone by. It seems to me that unless you do provide for persons becoming line officers of the Navy, otherwise than through the Naval Academy, as Regulars—

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We are doing that.

Mr. CLASON. I mean not as reservists, but as Regulars.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Under the law we passed with respect to aviation, some 300 to 400 have already been brought into the Navy as Regular officers since the war, but I am talking about opening the opportunity in peacetime for such men. In the past they only permitted about 12 a year.

This also permits the Coast Guard to have the same privilege as the Navy.

Mr. CLASON. I think further, with respect to that point, that so far as aviation is concerned, no one from civilian life has ever been allowed to become a regular line officer of the Navy until the outbreak of the war.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. We are doing it today, as just stated, as aviation cadets, after 1 year's training. Then they pass a regular examination and some 300 or 400 have already gone into the Regular Navy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. If the gentleman will permit, I may say further in answer to the gentleman's question, the bulk of these 75 officers that the chairman speaks about are from the last World War—naval aviators who are now in the line.

Mr. CLASON. I thought the chairman of the committee just told us that none of them was in aviation.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Yes; they are aviators.

Mr. CLASON. That is what I thought. We have passed many bills to take care of naval aviators.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I am absolutely correct in saying this. There were some 75 officers who had been commissioned from warrant rank in the Regular Navy when this bill was being considered, who were not graduates of the Naval Academy. This opens the doors to them more than ever before.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman this question: Everyone who takes this examination, if he is qualified and if the necessity arises where they need the officers, will be permitted to go into this corps. That is what I would like to see.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is fine.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BILL TO EXPEDITE NATIONAL DEFENSE

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6355) to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1940, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Line 5, after "by", insert "inserting after the word 'act' a comma and the following: 'as heretofore or hereafter amended or modified,'; and by."

After line 12, insert:

"SEC. 2. Section 4 of Public Law No. 100, Seventy-seventh Congress (approved June 3, 1941) is amended by striking out therefrom 'June 30, 1942,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'June 30, 1944.'"

After line 12, insert:

"SEC. 3. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person (1) in connection with any claim against or settlement with the United States under a contract with the United States or any department or agency thereof knowingly to make or cause to be made any material false statement to any officer, agent, department, or agency of the United States with respect to the number or identity of persons employed in the performance of such contract or any part thereof, the time such persons are or were engaged in the performance of such contract or part thereof, the compensation paid to such persons for such time, the amount or cost of materials or supplies used in the performance of such contract or part thereof, or any item of costs incurred in the performance of such contract or part thereof; (2) with the intent of defrauding the United States or wrongfully benefiting any persons at the expense of the United States, to make or cause to be made any unreasonable, exorbitant, or unnecessary expenditure for labor, supplies, materials, or services used in the performance of any such contract or any part thereof; or (3) with the intent of defrauding the United States, to make or cause to be made any false record, entry, account, voucher, certificate, affidavit, or deposition with respect to costs incurred in the performance of any such contract or any part thereof.

"(b) Any person who violates any of the provisions of subsection (a) shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both, and, in case such violation occurred in time of war, shall be adjudged by the court to have forfeited his United States citizenship and all rights thereof."

After line 12, insert:

"SEC. 4. The provisions of section 3 of this act shall be set forth in every contract to which such provisions are applicable; and every such contract shall require that the provisions of such section be kept conspicuously posted during the time such contract is being performed where they will be seen by the persons engaged in the work required to perform such contract and by the persons engaged in making or keeping records with respect thereto. Any contractor with the United States or any department or agency thereof under any such contract who fails or refuses to keep such provisions so posted shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction thereof, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the amendments?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the House that this is also a very important bill with very important amendments. I will try briefly to explain exactly the situation.

On June 28, 1940, the House passed what was termed "the speed-up bill." The main features of that act provide:

First. To authorize the Navy and War Departments to negotiate contracts instead of letting contracts by competitive bidding.

Second. It authorizes the establishment of priorities in the allocation of essential materials for War and Navy contracts and subcontracts, and for lease-lend orders.

Third. It fixes the regular hours of work in the Navy Department and Coast Guard and in their field services at 40 hours per week, and authorizes compensation for overtime to monthly, per diem, hourly, and piecework employees, and certain professional, subprofessional, and technical employees of the C. A. F. service.

Fourth. It authorizes the War and Navy and Treasury Departments to cause the removal of any employee whose removal is, in the opinion of the Secretary concerned, conducive to the furtherance of national security.

Mr. Speaker, all of those provisions expire under section 12 of the act of June 28, 1940, on June 30, 1942. Section 12 of the speed-up act provides:

The provisions of the preceding sections of this act shall terminate June 30, 1942, unless the Congress shall otherwise provide.

So, therefore, on January 28, 1942, we brought in the bill from the Naval Affairs Committee extending the provisions of the speed-up law, the important items I have just called your attention to.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusets. Mr. Speaker, how long is the extension?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Two more years, until June 30, 1944. When that bill reached the Senate, the Senate put on an amendment in the nature of section 3, and I think it is important to read it. It is as follows:

SEC. 3. (a) It shall be unlawful for any person (1) in connection with any claim against or settlement with the United States under a contract with the United States or any department or agency thereof knowingly to make or cause to be made any material false statement to any officer, agent, department, or agency of the United States with respect to the number or identity of persons employed in the performance of such contract or any part thereof, the time such persons are or were engaged in the performance of such contract or part thereof, the compensation paid to such persons for such time, the amount or cost of materials or supplies used in the performance of such contract or part thereof, or any item of costs incurred in the performance of such contract or part thereof; (2) with the intent of defrauding the United States or wrongfully benefiting any person at the expense of the United States, to make or cause to be made any unreasonable, exorbitant, or unnecessary expenditure for labor, supplies, materials, or services used in the performance of any such contract or any part thereof; or (3) with the intent of defrauding the United States, to make or cause to be made any false record, entry, account, voucher, certificate, affidavit, or deposition with respect to costs incurred in the performance of any such contract or any part thereof.

(b) Any person who violates any of the provisions of subsection (a) shall, upon conviction thereof, be punished by a fine of not more than $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both, and in case such violation occurred in time of war, shall be adjudged by the court to have forfeited his United States citizenship and all rights thereof.

When that amendment was submitted to the Senate, Senator WALSH, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, made this observation:

The other amendments deal with fraud on the part of contractors. During the hearing on the part of the bill it was brought to the attention of the committee that certain firms that possessed Government as well as private contracts were charging to the Government time spent by the employees on private contracts.

In other words, a concern having a Government contract, and also having a private contract, was charging against the Government contract the time that was spent on the private contract, and the purpose of this amendment is to prohibit that sort of thing. Senator WALSH further said:

The committee understands that in one instance it is alleged that a firm which possessed a contract to manufacture parts of vessels for the Navy, actually charged a part of the cost of performing such contract, material used, and labor employed on a job which was being performed for a private party.

It appears that the purpose of this procedure was to avoid returning to the Treasury the excess profits in accordance with the profits limitations of the Vinson-Trammell Act. The purpose of section 3 is to provide that persons convicted of violation of this act shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $10,000 or by imprisonment for not more than 10 years, or both, and in case such violation occurred in time of war, that they shall be adjudged by the court to have forfeited their United States citizenship and all rights thereof.

The whole purpose and intent of the Senate amendment is to keep down fraud in connection with negotiated contracts. We have been unable to write a law dealing with profit limitations, and there is no profit limitation concerned here at all, but it is seeking as far as possible to give the Government a square deal, a fair break, when the contractor has a contract for the Government, and a private contract at the same time. That is the whole amendment. I have not submitted this to the committee. It is so urgent that the terms of this bill be extended between now and the end of this fiscal year, that it was just a question of coming on over, and I am laying it before the House.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. And there is nothing in the amendment except to close the loopholes against fraud.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. That is the whole thing. That is all Senator WALSH had in mind, and was the intent of the Senate in putting this amendment on. It has no relation to profit limitations. There is no profit limitation on the statute books. They can make all the contracts they want to as far as the law is concerned, but this endeavors to prohibit certain fraudulent transactions, and the charging of time and cost of material to a Government contract, where it was used on a private contract.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. A very commendable amendment, I should say.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think so.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not a fact that if a substantial majority of the committee, including the chairman and myself, had had our way we would have reported out a profits limitation bill which would have been much more drastic and much more effective even than this Senate amendment?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman from Oregon is absolutely correct. I can see no justification for the sky being the limit during the war when our boys are making the supreme sacrifice which they are making.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. CLASON. Regarding the words in line 22, "wrongfully benefiting any person," what do you mean by "wrongfully"? Do you mean unlawful?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. "With the intent of defrauding the United States or wrongfully benefiting any person at the expense of the United States."

Mr. CLASON. Some contracts have come before our committee which have indicated that the contractor with the United States has charged, as you have stated, perhaps 70 percent of the executives' time as overhead against the Government contract, when perhaps 20 percent would be nearer correct. In that case they have not committed any crime, yet perhaps some person would say that is a wrongful benefit.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I would not say that. This is "with the intent of defrauding the United States or wrongfully benefiting any person at the expense of the United States to make or cause to be made any unreasonable, exorbitant, or unnecessary expenditures for labor, supplies, materials, or services used in the performance of any such contract or any part thereof."

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If he put down 70 percent of his time when he only used 20 percent, that is wrongful.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Certainly. If he makes any wrongful statement, then he is subject to the provision of this law.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Suppose that a contractor having a negotiated contract with the Government, by which he was manufacturing war materials, should figure that a certain article was going to cost a certain number of dollars to the concern to manufacture, figuring in his regular overhead. He so states to an Army officer with whom he is negotiating. After he gets into production he finds he is able to produce that article much cheaper than he figured on. Is it necessary or incumbent upon that man, under the terms of this law, to so state to the Army officer with whom he made that contract that he finds out that his figures were wrong and that he is able to produce it at less money? If he does not do that, he is liable to be penalized, is he not?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No; not at all.

Mr. RICH. Why, certainly, because he has already told the Army officer that he could produce that for, we will say, $200, and then he finds out it will only cost $150.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. But he has not made any false statement.

Mr. RICH. Now, that is where the trouble might lie. They might convict this man and fine him $10,000 or make him lose his citizenship, and the man himself did not intend to deceive.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. No. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has not read the provision. I will read it:

It shall be unlawful for any person in connection with any claim against or settlement with the United States under a contract with the United States or any department or agency thereof knowingly to make or cause to be made any material false statement to any officer, agent, department, or agency of the United States with respect to the number or identity of persons employed—

And so on, enumerating several things. If he does it knowingly, then he comes within the purview of this law.

Mr. RICH. Now, let me see. I am not thinking so much of the Army officials, but we have a lot of them in the Government who would like to tie up every manufacturing concern in this country.

Statements have been made in the O. P. M. that "when we can get small business it will not be long until we can clean up big business, and then we will have this country where we want it." That statement was made to me by a Member of the House of Representatives. I do not know whether it is true, but if it is, it is something that we ought to protect because whenever we go that far with men in public life today, who are going to wreck small business and then come along and wreck big business, then you have got nothing in this country but communism.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I agree with the criticism the gentleman from Pennsylvania is making, but I do not think he need trouble his mind about that, because that is not going to happen in this country.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman should not be too certain. We are just getting there so fast. If I had to deal with the gentleman from Georgia, I would trust him with anything, because I believe in him, but here you are giving this department a little too much leeway, and I am afraid that they are deceiving you, and I say that in the best spirit that I know, because I have every confidence in the world in the gentleman from Georgia. I do not want to see those birds down there put anything over on you.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. They are not going to put over anything.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does this apply to Army contracts as well as Navy contracts?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I would interpret this as applying strictly to naval contracts, because this is with reference to the Navy.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. HOOK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. HOOK. In the part of the bill that provides for the making of wrongful statements, in order to be convicted under this act would those wrongful statements have to be made with intent to defraud the Government?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I would say of course, of course. Otherwise there must always be an intent to do something. Acts, however, may disclose intent.

Mr. HOOK. I was interested in the word "or."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, under the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, Public Law No. 421, the President of the United States is permitted by Executive order, which he has issued, to give the power to Leon Henderson to cancel contracts made by the Government. They are the fellows I am talking about who made the statement: "We will clean up little business; then we will get big business." I hope the gentleman from Georgia will be sure there is nothing in this bill to further that program.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. To be fair to the amendment, I do not think the amendment need cause too much concern.

Mr. RICH. I hope the gentleman is right, because I am fearful.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTABLISHING THE NAVAL PROCUREMENT FUND

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 1957) to establish the naval procurement funds, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill in general terms is to simplify the accounting under the naval supply account. Such simplification is accomplished in the proposed bill by separating what is now known as the naval supply account into two new accounts to be known as the naval stock fund and the naval procurement fund.

The naval stock fund is for the purpose of handling the supply of materials purchased for Navy stock purposes. Such stock is promptly reissued and expended from this account. This was the original function of the naval supply account and will be continued under the new naval stock fund.

Because of the greater facility with which materials for uses other than naval stocks could be obtained for matériel bureaus a practice had grown up of purchasing such materials through the naval supply account. Upon their transfer and use by the matériel bureaus the naval supply account was reimbursed by credits from bureau appropriations for the materials thus purchased. Due to the greatly increased purchases by the matériel bureaus in the present war this use of the naval supply account has grown to such proportions that it has become unwieldy and makes an analysis of the stock supply function of the account virtually impossible. Therefore, the Navy Department has considered that the separation of the two actual functions of the present naval supply account should be separated and the two accounts segregated.

The establishment of the naval procurement fund will accomplish this purpose. It will require an initial appropriation which is authorized in the bill. The fund as so set up will constitute a revolving fund which will be replenished by transfers from the specific appropriations for the materials procured as the materials are obtained under the naval procurement fund and delivered to the respective bureaus.

In substance, the urgent necessity of simplifying accounting procedures under present conditions of purchases and supply in the Navy Department is recognized and a remedy is provided in the proposed legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established under the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts the naval procurement fund, and there is authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes of this fund: *Provided*, That thereafter expenditures may be made from the naval procurement fund for material (other than material for stock) and for personal and contractual services under such regulations as the Secretary of the Navy may prescribe: *Provided further*, That no expenditure shall be incurred under the naval procurement fund, which is not properly chargeable to available funds under a naval appropriation, and the naval procurement fund shall be promptly reimbursed from the appropriate naval appropriations for all expenditures properly chargeable thereto on the basis of transfer and counterwarrants prepared in the Navy Department and certified to the Secretary of the Treasury by a duly authorized representative of the Navy: *Provided further*, That such warrants when signed by the Secretary of the Treasury shall be entered in the appropriation accounts as of the fiscal year in which the expenditures were made and without revision by any officer of the Government; any adjustments between accounts subsequently found necessary in the audit and settlement of the accounts by the General Accounting Office shall be made as of current dates on the basis of new transfer and counterwarrants: *Provided further*, That the naval supply account fund shall be hereafter designated as the naval stock fund: *Provided further*, That the Paymaster General of the Navy is authorized to transfer to the naval procurement fund for payment any existing obligations under the naval stock fund which do not represent the acquisition of materials for stock: *And provided further*, That hereafter the naval stock fund shall be charged with the cost of transporting material purchased free on board cars or on wharf or free alongside vessels at points specified in contract to activities to which initial delivery is to be made only when the contract on which the material is being procured is drawn under that fund so that the issue price of the material may include the transportation charged to the appropriation under which each contract is drawn or to the corresponding current appropriation as may be available.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 2, line 16, after the word "counterwarrants:", add the following: "*Provided further*, That advance check payments may be made to the Naval Procurement Fund upon written request to the Paymaster General of the Navy from the appropriate naval appropriation for all or any part of the costs ultimately chargeable to such naval appropriation, subject to appropriate adjustments being made on the basis of the completed actual costs of the supplies, materials, equipment, and services involved:".

Page 3, line 11, beginning with the word "charged", strike out the balance of line 11, all of line 12 and through the word "available" in line 13, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "costs on materials so procured, and similar transportation costs on materials procured under other contracts shall be charged to the appropriation under

which each contract is drawn or to the corresponding current appropriation as may be available, or the Secretary of the Navy may direct any transportation costs to be charged directly to the proper appropriation which would otherwise be ultimately chargeable."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. RICH. This bill means we are going to have a simplified accounting system in the Navy, but that everything will be accounted for.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Absolutely. This is a step trying to get rid of red tape and to throw away typewriters.

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to announce to the House that this cleans up the calendar of the Naval Affairs Committee; we have no other bill on the calendar.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND FEDERAL JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the Senate amendments on the bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first Senate amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: On page 41, after the word "Division", in line 10, insert : *"Provided further,* That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the payment of any person hereafter appointed at a salary of $5,000 or more for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws unless such person is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

"Strike out the sum '$5,000' where it appears in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the sum '$7,500'."

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand this amendment is the same as the one which was in the bill last year.

Mr. RABAUT. It is.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman expect that the Senate will recede, or is he hopeful?

Mr. RABAUT. We were hopelessly deadlocked this morning.

Mr. McCORMACK. I may say to the gentleman that reluctantly some of us in the House agree to this amendment, because there are those of us who feel that appointments which by law do not require senatorial confirmation should not be confirmed there, and this practice of the other body is one that we deeply frown upon, if not resent. I have no objection to this amendment, but I did not want it adopted without my views being expressed along the line that any limitation of this kind is frowned upon by some Members of the House.

Mr. DITTER. May I inquire of the majority leader whether he is serving notice in advance the disposition he intends to make if the House would attempt with some of the other agencies to lodge in the other body the supervisory right it has had in times past of confirming those with salaries over $5,000? The press has carried considerable comment particularly about a feud between Mr. Henderson and some of the Democratic leaders. I am wondering whether our friend, the distinguished majority leader, is giving us advance notice as to the attitude we can anticipate on the part of the leadership with reference to the Henderson-New Deal feud that is presently on with reference to patronage.

Mr. McCORMACK. I do not know anything about the Henderson-New Deal feud referred to by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. The press has carried considerable about it.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, I am not responsible for what the press carries. Earlier in the day the chairman of the Appropriations Committee, the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, and the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] very ably answered anything that was carried in the press by saying that there was no foundation for the information carried in the press. I am expressing myself on this particular amendment. Naturally, the gentleman from Pennsylvania has been associated long enough with the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is speaking, to know that the gentleman from Massachusetts would not take one position one day and another position on another day.

Mr. DITTER. It is because of the consistency of the gentleman from Massachusetts, whom I admire so much, that I was apprehensive lest he were giving us a foregone conclusion as to what his attitude would be when this Henderson feud comes up.

Mr. McCORMACK. The apprehension of my friend from Pennsylvania about the gentleman from Massachusetts is profoundly appreciated.

Mr. DITTER. And I in turn appreciate the assurance of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Ms. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Does this apply to the Antitrust Division?

Mr. RABAUT. It does.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. If this procedure is continued on all appropriation bills in the Senate, then we are going to have an executive branch of the Government that is going to be run by personnel named by the Senate of the United States; is that not true?

Mr. RABAUT. There is a tendency in that direction.

Mr. COCHRAN. It seems to me it is about time the House stop receding on such amendments, even with an amendment, increasing the amount to $7,500.

Mr. RABAUT. I may say to the gentleman that in some of the bills that have been presented over there they have reduced this amount to as low as $4,500; that is, requiring approval by the Senate of all positions paying over $4,500. If this custom is indulged in, it will go to a point eventually where the other body will be approving $1,800 jobs.

Mr. COCHRAN. I think the best thing the gentleman could do would be to force a roll call on this amendment and let the Senate know the House is opposed to such language. There is such a thing as a legislative body going too far and to me it appears that is what we are doing here. Every time a Senator fails to get jobs, he wants to restrict appointments.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does it make any difference to a Republican which way it goes?

Mr. RABAUT. I could not very well answer that question. The gentleman has had so much experience that he can answer it himself.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. It seems to me this question is very much deeper than indicated by the rather profound discussion up to this point. In my opinion, it involves the question as to whether the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice is going to be able, under all the circumstances, to do a perfectly independent job. There will be occasions when it will be impossible to do what is necessary to protect it in its opportunity to do that.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. At this point, and following the suggestion made by the gentleman from California, would it not be possible to give those of us who believe there should not be Senate confirmation of the people in the Antitrust Division a chance to vote in order to show that attitude?

Mr. RABAUT. All you have to do is to vote against my motion.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman know of any great number of appointments that are to be made under this regulation having to do with salaries from $6,000 to $7,500?

Mr. RABAUT. I do not.

Mr. RICH. It is only a matter of form?

Mr. RABAUT. This is a blanket order which gives them the power to approve

a certain salary, a salary of $7,500 previously. In this amendment it is reduced to $5,000 and in some other bills it has been reduced to $4,500. The pending motion is to set the figure at $7,500 where it has always been.

Mr. RICH. Is there any endeavor on the part of the Senate or the House conferees to try to get this uniform in all departments of Government?

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman is touching a good subject, and I agree with him. It comes up in different bills at different times. That is how it has been worked in the past.

Mr. RICH. It seems to me the gentleman should make the point that all Government departments shall have the same salary stipulation, so far as this provision is concerned, so that it would not be taken up in one bill after the other. That would be a good thing for us to do.

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Then if we do not like this provision which relates solely to the Antitrust Division, we should try to vote down the motion; is that correct?

Mr. RABAUT. That, of course, is the gentleman's privilege.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The motion was rejected.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 23: On page 48, line 8, after "duties", insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the payment of any person hereafter appointed at a salary of $5,000 or more and paid from this appropriation unless such person is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 23 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: "Strike out the sum '$5,000' where it appears in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the sum '$7,500'."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, this is a provision similar to that just considered, except that it deals with special attorneys.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 23.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects, in one to include short testimony before the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and in the other a letter from the Assistant Secretary of State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

JAMES GILMORE AND MARIAN E. GILMORE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6557) for the relief of James Gilmore and Marian E. Gilmore, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$2,362.23" and insert "$2,000."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$1,479.31" and insert "$1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF JULIAN B. WIGGINS, DECEASED, AND ESTATE OF R. E. THOMPSON, DECEASED.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4554) for the relief of the estate of Julian B. Wiggins, deceased, and the estate of R. E. Thompson, deceased, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$4,000" and insert "$2,500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FRANCIS CORWIN CIRCLE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5070) for the relief of Francis Corwin Circle, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$7,500" and insert "$4,110.85."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. C. LEMON, LOUIS McCOY, AND PATRICIA McCOY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4941) for the relief of J. C. Lemon, Louis McCoy, and Patricia McCoy, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, line 8, strike out "$5,954.66" and insert "$5,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

L. W. MAREK, JR.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 2646) for the relief of L. W. Marek, Jr., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,500" and insert "$4,500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DAVID CARON

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5454) for the relief of David Caron, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$3,500" and insert "$2,500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM TIPTON, MRS. WILLIAM TIPTON, AND MRS. EULA NELSON

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6033) for the relief of William Tipton, Mrs. William Tipton, and Mrs. Eula Nelson, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$5,000" and insert "$4,000."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$3,500" and insert "$3,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CERTAIN CLERKS IN THE POST OFFICE AT DETROIT, MICH.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 5619) for the relief of certain clerks in the post office at Detroit, Mich., with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 2, after line 7, insert:

"SEC. 2. That for the purposes of the provisions of law governing the compensation payable to clerks in the Postal Service, the appointment of James E. Kane, formerly a clerk in the Burbank, Calif., post office, shall be held and considered to have been effective as of May 15, 1941."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MR. AND MRS. E. P. BALL

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6184) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. E. P. Ball, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "$3,590.59" and insert "$2,590.59."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARENCE J. METEYER, LESTER W. ENGELS, AND DOROTHY B. ENGELS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2424) for the relief of Clarence J. Meteyer, Lester W. Engels, and Dorothy B. Engels, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$4,624" and insert "$3,000."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "$3,517.70" and insert "$2,500."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MADELEINE HAMMETT ET AL.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5854) for the relief of Madeleine Hammett, Olive Hammett, Walter Young, the estate of Laura O'Malley Young, deceased, and the legal guardian of Laura Elizabeth Young, with Senate amendments thereto, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The clerk read the title of the bill.

The clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "$6,357.44" and insert "$5,000."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "$500" and insert "$100."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "$1,000" and insert "$768.46."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "$5,500" and insert "$5,000."

Page 2, line 1, strike out "$1,000" and insert "$100."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GERHARD R. FISHER

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 3398) for the relief of Gerhard R. Fisher, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment and ask for a conference.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, how does it happen that the gentleman did not agree to this bill?

Mr. McGEHEE. We have about 12 bills here that are not agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER.

MRS. CECILE HERZOG AND LUCILLE HERZOG

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5449) for the relief of Mrs. Cecile Herzog and Lucille Herzog, an infant, with Senate amendments thereto; disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER.

E. A. WILLIAMS

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5920) for the relief of E. A. Williams, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER.

CECILE McLAUGHLIN

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5496) for the relief of Cecile McLaughlin, with a Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER.

HENRY DALEY, GUARDIAN FOR JAMES RAY DALEY AND NORMAN FRANKLIN DALEY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5499) for the relief of Henry Daley, guardian for James Ray Daley and Norman Franklin Daley, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER.

EMIL LASSILA ET AL.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 4953) for the relief of Emil Lassila, Martha Lassila, Ellen Huhta, and Sylvia Huhta, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER.

CHARLES L. LAIR

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4370) for the relief of Charles L. Lair, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER.

BELLA COSGROVE

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the

Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 4355) to confer jurisdiction on the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to hear and determine and render judgment upon the claim of Bella Cosgrove, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER.

CHARLES E. YATES

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 5385) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Northern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Charles E. Yates, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. WINTER.

MRS. CLAUD TUCK

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 1694) for the relief of Mrs. Claud Tuck, as amended by the House, and agree to the request of the Senate for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER appointed the following conferees: Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER.

E. P. CORLEY

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I submit a conference report and statement for printing under the rule on the bill (H. R. 4092) for the relief of E. P. Corley, which I sent to the desk.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4092) entitled "An act for the relief of E. P. Corley", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figures "$500" insert $750; and the Senate agree to the same.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
THOMAS D. WINTER,
Managers on the part of the House

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
JOSEPH ROSIER,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

Managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4092) for the relief of E. P. Corley, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report. The bill as passed by the House appropriated the sum of $1,250 to E. P. Corley, Jacksonville, Fla., for injuries sustained on June 27, 1938, when he was struck by a motor vehicle operated in connection with the Works Progress Administration, while he was discharging his duties as a police officer of said city.

The Senate reduced the amount payable to Mr. Corley from $1,250 to $500, and at the conference, compromised amount of $750 was agreed upon.

DAN R. McGEHEE,
THOMAS D. WINTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report upon the bill, H. R. 4092, for the relief of E. P. Corley and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the statement of the conferees.

The Clerk read the statement of the conferees.

Mr. McGEHEE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question upon the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LARRABEE], be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act.

The SPEAKER. Is these objection?

There was no objection.

A JEWISH ARMY

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee for a Jewish Army, I speak to you today in behalf of 200,000 fighting men who, by Divine destiny or accident of birth, happen to be Jews. One hundred thousand of them live in the near and middle east, another 100,000 amongst those stateless Jews who are exiled from Europe because our enemy considered them the symbol of democracy. These 200,000 fighting Jews are chained by a certain group who refuse to arm the natives of those countries undergoing attack, just as the Chinese were not armed in Malaya.

The Jews of Palestine are chained, even as the British chained David Raziel, that new Jewish national hero. Raziel was imprisoned by the British for being the leader of a Jewish self-defense organization in Palestine, and when General Wavell was the commander in chief of the near eastern forces he sent for Raziel. He asked Raziel, in chains, "Are you willing to give your life for our cause?" and Raziel answered "Yes."

Raziel went with 14 Jewish comrades. His mission was to ambush and kill 150 German engineers who were waiting to blow up the oil wells at the first sign of a British move into Iraq, when that unhappy country staged a pro-Nazi, antidemocracy rebellion. Disguised as Arabs, the Jews ambushed the 150 Nazis, killed them all, and the British marched into Iraq without losing a single oil well, thus saving the essential oil for the use of the United Nations' war machine in that part of the world and for the British ships in the Mediterranean and for the planes and tanks in Egypt and Libya. David Raziel and his comrades died in this exploit.

There are 200,000 Raziels in Zion today, and they should be given the privilege to fight and die for democracy's survival. We, who are doing all in our power to influence peoples who are not as yet fighting to enter this war on our side, should certainly see to it that these 200,000 Jews, who have been waiting with a bitter eagerness and a fanatical desire since this war broke out, be given permission to do so.

I hope my colleagues in Congress will do all we can to see that this basic justice should not be denied to the descendants of Jephtha and Deborah, the Maccabees and Bar Cochba.

I dare to predict that before many months have passed the Jewish army, composed of stateless and Palestinian Jews, will be a reality, and then, when the German hordes dare to attempt to break through the Near East, as they necessarily will, they will hear on the plains of Galilee and in the Valley of the Dead Sea, and, yes, even at the gates of Jerusalem, the mighty battle cry of this first modern Jewish army. There, in the narrow, crooked, but romantic streets of old Jerusalem, where stood King Solomon's temple of peace, and where now stands the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, there, in the streets whereon walked Isaiah and Amos, the Prince of Peace and His Disciples, there—darkness will meet its end and the light will shine and that new era of peace toward which mankind has been looking forward for so many centuries will be ushered in.

The American Jew in this world-wide conflict is displaying the same courage, loyalty, and heroism that his forefathers displayed in every conflict since the Revolutionary War. No wonder George Washington took time out after his inauguration to visit the synagogue at Newport, R. I., and extend his greetings. The badge of courage was won by Jewish soldiers and sailors at Pearl Harbor and in every subsequent engagement.

Let us have done with incidents like the terrible Struma catastrophe, where hundreds of innocent women and children went down to a watery grave because of the misjudgment of the high commissioner in Palestine.

I should like to see the British Government give the command for the Jewish

army in Palestine to march. They will defend our cause with the same spirit as the ancient Jewish Maccabeans. There never were braver soldiers in all history.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a letter on pensions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, also I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the Ironwood Daily Globe on forests and selective logging.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a recent editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a newspaper article from the Baltimore Sun on naturalization.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. STEARNS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

OUR FOREIGN SERVICE IN TIME OF WAR

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, this war, like all others in which America has been involved, is making heroes. In the midst of the many anxieties that beset our country, we have been thrilled by the realization that the courage and devotion of the American fighting man, his initiative and intelligence, have suffered no diminution with the passing of the years. From Gen. Douglas MacArthur to mess attendant Dorie Miller, they have met the test. The public hears of their exploits by radio, press, and governmental report, and is justly proud of every one.

There is another class of public servants to whom, at any time, perhaps without a moment's warning, a crisis may arise that tests their mettle, calls for an instant decision on their own responsibility, and may threaten their very lives. I refer to the officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States, who represent us in foreign lands. Much of their work, though vitally important, is of routine character, and is too little understood or appreciated by our people, who do not always realize the difficulties under which it is performed, even in normal times. In time of war these men may be on the very firing line, and they have not the support which we at home, living in our own communities and among our own people, draw from each other, in dangerous situations.

There is too widespread an idea that a foreign officer's life consists of a round of social gaieties on some sun-kissed strand where trouble and danger never disturb them, and where a paternal Government meets all expenses with a generous salary and allowances. The reality is very different.

The Foreign Service as a whole is charged with a wide variety of duties among which may be mentioned: The conduct of negotiations with other governments, political and economic reporting, the promotion of American trade, the general protection of American interests, the issuance of passports and immigration visas, notarial services, the issuance of consular invoices for goods exported to the United States, assistance to American shipping, and reporting on a wide range of subjects for all branches of the Federal Government. Since the outbreak of the war in Europe the Service has also been charged with representing in a number of countries the interests of foreign governments. All of these functions have been made immeasurably more difficult by war conditions, and yet there must be a man on the spot for possible contingencies.

In the hall of the Department of State is a tablet commemorating Foreign Service officers who have lost their lives while on active duty, under heroic or tragic circumstances. Among the causes of death appear yellow fever, cholera, smallpox, malaria, drowning, earthquake, hurricane, volcanic eruption, and murder. A man exposes not only himself, but his wife and children, to cruel climates and pestilences, even to enemy action, and terrific hazards have been met and overcome in a spirit of quiet, unspectacular devotion to duty which is worthy of the best traditions of our Nation. He wears no uniform, and yet it is a matter of pride with him to go wherever he is sent, to accept his assignment with military discipline. The problems involved in maintaining a home and bringing up a family in foreign parts are not the least that he must face, and they are not simplified by the fact that the family cannot take root, but is liable to transfer from Ottawa to Surabaya, from Reykjavik to Brazzaville, and may in troublous times be cut off from contact with this country completely.

The Foreign Service officer of today is selected after exhaustive tests from a field of applicants representing every State in the Union, with a view to sending out men (and a few women) who will worthily represent America abroad. Those who have had occasion to know the facts realize how well they have done this in times of peace. As a former officer in the Foreign Service, I want the Congress to realize how well they have risen to the sterner test of war conditions.

One of the duties of the Foreign Service officer is to look after the welfare and safety of American citizens residing or traveling abroad. When disaster strikes a community, the protection and assistance of his nationals is as much a matter of honor with him as the duties of our combatant branches under fire.

As we look back, we can see that in a sense this war began with the Japanese attack on China. Since then, the American Ambassador to China and his staff have lived under the day-to-day threat of death from the air. At first in Nanking and Hankow, and during the last 3 years at Chungking, they have been subject to constant bombardment. From last May through October Chungking has suffered almost daily raids, frequently with more than 100 planes participating. More than two-thirds of the city has been destroyed; houses occupied by members of the Embassy staff have been injured, as well as its offices. Even though no personal injury has so far been incurred, it is clear that the task of representing our Nation near the beleaguered Chinese Government has not been pleasant nor easy.

Poland was the first nation in Europe to feel the force of the Nazi attack. When Warsaw was under siege in that tragic September of 1939, the staff of the Consulate General was moved to the chancelry of the American Embassy, just in time to avoid a heavy bombardment which destroyed the building they had left and would certainly have taken some lives if the move had not been made in time. Warsaw was subjected to daily bombings from the air, which became steadily more intense and so numerous that all count was lost of them; on some days there were as many as 9 raids by waves of 60 to 70 planes. About September 9, the city was shelled by field guns as well. Two officers and 2 clerks who returned to the Consulate General for some necessary records had just left 1 room of the office when a shell entered the room and exploded—a difference of 2 minutes barely saving their lives.

Officers who went out in cars endeavoring to find food for the refugees of American, British, and French nationality who had come to them for help, had to pass through streets raked by artillery fire. Nightly the sky was red from fires in many quarters; the number of civilians killed reached into the thousands and some of the bodies were hastily buried in lawns and nearby parks, others lying in the streets as the clerks went out on necessary errands. For 12 days the staff found themselves living in the midst of a battlefield, responsible for the welfare of a large number of civilian refugees, and yet not in a position to fight back.

As the Germans advanced across Europe over the bodies of helpless countries which had no chance of resistance, the same story comes back, of bomb attacks, damage and destruction of American property, and the narrow escape of our officers who were still on duty, staying to destroy codes and confidential documents to prevent their falling into German hands. In Norway, the Germans made many attempts to kill the Norwegian royal family, who were compelled to move frequently. The American Minister proceeded successively to five cities in order to remain in touch with the Norwegian Government. It will be recalled that the Assistant Military Attaché accredited to Finland, Sweden, and Norway was killed by a German bomb as he went to the assistance of the Minister's party at Dombas, Norway.

From the Netherlands, Belgium, and Yugoslavia we hear of the destruction of our consulates and the loss of personal effects by our officers. From France, too, there is a story of distress, even though for 9 months after the declaration of war Paris lived in comparative calm except

for the alarms and uncertainties of German planes overhead. During the summer of 1940 a bomb aimed at the French Air Ministry plunged halfway through the ceiling of the dining room where the American Ambassador was attending an official luncheon, but fortunately did no further damage than showering the party with plaster, exploding later when the room had been vacated. Not far away a Foreign Service officer on his way to a shelter after hearing the alarm passed through a shower of flying stones and metal fragments, barely escaping a deluge of large-caliber cobblestones thrown up by a hit in the street. After a week of bombardment by German planes, two subordinate officers assigned to the consulate at Havre were ordered to leave, and embarked on a ferry to cross the Seine. Two steamers nearby were struck by bombs and burst into flames; the German planes came lower and machine-gunned the steamers and then attacked the ferry, dropping about 25 bombs, all of which fell very near but fortunately did not hit it, though it was afterward machine-gunned. When the consul in charge returned to Havre after the fall of Paris, he found his apartment was being used as sleeping quarters by 50 German soldiers, and that in addition to looting it thoroughly, they had spread destruction and filth everywhere. Naturally, no reimbursement for his losses was ever made.

It is upon the British Isles that the most intense and long-continued attacks have fallen. We are all familiar with the countless stories of heroism and courage coming over here about men and women, soldiers, and civilians alike. During all this time of terrific air attacks, the personnel of the American Foreign Service have performed their duties without interruption, although the raids were characterized not only by their intensity at frequent and unpredictable times, but by their spread over a longer period than at any post in the Service except Chungking. From the early raids on Liverpool and London in August 1940, until the sporadic efforts in June 1941, our officers at one or another post were under fire nearly all the time. Our consulates at Plymouth, Bristol, Liverpool, and Manchester were completely gutted by fire and explosions. A dozen other cities were subjected to constant nightly—and sometimes daytime—raids during which many civilians were killed and injured and large numbers made homeless. The London Embassy, although not hit, had scores of bombs within three or four hundred yards, one of which hit former Ambassador Page's old Embassy three doors away and killed some British air force personnel, and another exploded in the living room of a Foreign Service officer's apartment while he was in the kitchen. No officer in Great Britain will ever forget the sound of guns and how it felt to have a couple of hundred German bombers overhead; nor will he forget the whistle of screaming bombs and the sight of incendiary fires scattered through his particular city. Almost miraculously, none of our American personnel at these British posts was killed or injured.

Stories of personal bravery have come from many points, and perhaps the following from Belgrade, Yugoslavia, is typical. In this city one side of the American Minister's residence was completely torn away by a bomb, and many of his personal effects were destroyed. A block away, an employee of the Legation was killed by a bomb as he was returning from saying good-bye to his son who was being mobilized. But the personal story to which I refer concerns a junior Foreign Service officer, who was under orders to report for duty at Belgrade from a nearby capital, and who reached the outskirts of the city during the height of the first bombardment. He was carrying a diplomatic pouch. Realizing that if he delayed, the bridge across the river which separated him from Belgrade might be destroyed, he proceeded directly into the bombardment, bringing the pouch through safely. Throughout the subsequent bombings of Belgrade, the Minister and his staff ignored the danger and carried on their work, under every conceivable disadvantage, and completely cut off from communication with the outside world, with diminishing food supplies, and very limited means of transportation. As the Yugoslavian Government was retreating, making successive moves to escape bombs and machine-gun fire, another officer of our Legation followed and stayed with it until they reached Greece; this officer later succeeded in returning to Belgrade through areas occupied by the German and Italian Armies, bringing with him a score of Americans who had been stranded on the coast. All railway bridges over the Danube having been destroyed, the only feasible means of exit from Yugoslavia was by river boat to Budapest. The Minister arranged to charter such a boat and eventually all Americans who deired to leave made their way safely out of the country with the Minister and his staff.

Greece itself was not to be safe for long, and since then this brave country has been through untold suffering. Our service men have not only had to endure the bombings and raids but have been subjected to the strain of witnessing the German invasion and their looting of the country, trying to deal with these invaders in an attempt to protect American interests and arrange for the evacuation of our remaining citizens. Still more terrible was the food shortage which began to appear soon after the outbreak of the war in 1939. Greece is not an agricultural country and even in normal times imports a large percentage of her foodstuffs. Our Foreign Service personnel found it increasingly difficult to get enough to eat. Meat was obtainable only once a week, and after the German occupation the small remaining stocks of food were seized. Before our people left, they were already witnessing the early stages of the distressing starvation which has since taken such a frightful toll of life and health in that heroic country, without being able to succor the Greeks in any way. As a result of this experience, most of our personnel who returned to the United States have been found to be suffering from serious blood deficiencies, and required medical treatment at a time when they are trying to replace the personal and household effects which they lost in Greece. A few of this staff postponed their return home for rest and recuperation, until they had completed, from Rome, the repatriation of Americans. Many of them immediately undertook long journeys back through southern Europe in order to fill urgent needs for personnel in the Near East.

As a result of this total war, we get stories of a similar nature from many far-flung posts of the United States Foreign Service—little groups of men, sometimes only two or three, carrying on their work in Malta, Arabia, Iraq, Penang, Singapore, Finland, Russia, Burma, and other places. From some of these, reports are still incomplete, and yet in all of them the hardships and hazards of war, bombardment, evacuation, or occupation by enemy forces are being borne with credit by the personnel. The consul at Malta has just reached Cairo with his family, reporting that the consulate was one of three buildings left standing in a street of 50 houses. These dangers are incident to the performance of their normal functions, while acting in line of duty.

It only remains to point out that the risks of travel from aerial and submarine attack have not at all diminished the necessity of moving our personnel from one distant point to another; transfers dictated by the needs of the Service continue as in normal times. Quite recently a vessel on which a consul from Africa and the wife of a consul at another African post were passengers was torpedoed off Cape Hatteras after having completed all but 20 hours of the long sea voyage from east Africa. Their ship sank within 12 minutes. After drifting in a lifeboat for 35 hours on a stormy sea they were picked up by a United States destroyer. Another Foreign officer has recently returned to this country after 3 months' sea travel from his last post in the Dutch East Indies, now in the hands of the Japanese. As he had to travel all this time on an unescorted vessel he was exposed to hazards which were truly serious and yet no more so than what other Foreign Service officers are undergoing in traveling to and from their posts—risks the same as those which our armed forces face. Another officer lost all his household effects by the sinking of the ship on which they were being brought back from London last October. He reoutfitted his family and recently started for his new post in Buenos Aires, only to lose everything for the second time by enemy action.

We hear little of all this. Very recently the press has spoken of the officers and employees who are now about to be sent home from their long detention in Japan and other enemy countries. Fifty have been detained by the Italians, 95 by the Germans, and about 250 by the Japa-

nese. All these men and their families will soon happily be in America again. But let us spare a thought for those still at their posts abroad, of whom we only get such laconic and formal reports as that which came through from Belgrade:

He proceeded directly into the bombardment, bringing the pouch through safely.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. I yield.

Mr. ROLPH. I would like to compliment the gentleman on his very splendid speech about the Foreign Service, and the men in the diplomatic corps. I would like to say from my experience that we have had wonderful service not only from the men abroad but also in the State Department here. I wish to compliment the gentleman for his wonderful statement about these fine, faithful servants.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman has been able to give us this very splendid tribute to an unsung service, not only because of his present interest in foreign affairs and this service, but because of his many years of able and distinguished service as a Foreign Service man himself. I know the gentleman from New Hampshire would not be prone to emphasize this experience at this time, but I feel I owe it to the House to call it to the attention of the House. I also want to join in the fine tribute the gentleman has paid to these men. I have talked with them myself as they have returned from some of these posts. The cool courage with which they have faced the dangers of their duties, without publicity or fanfare, is a matter to make us proud of those Americans.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. I thank my valued colleague on the Committee on Foreign Affairs for his too generous expression about myself, and for what he has said about the men of the Foreign Service.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's desk, my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] may be permitted to proceed for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHEPPARD). Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. JOHNS] is recognized for 45 minutes.

WHAT WOULD YOU HAVE DONE BEFORE AND AFTER PEARL HARBOR?

GUAM

Mr. JOHNS. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable said against this Congress because some of the newspapers, some of the commentators, and others say that when we were attacked at Pearl Harbor we were unprepared for an attack. In my own State of Wisconsin Members of Congress has been abused because some people are going about the State saying that the Members of Congress from my State are responsible for us not being prepared at the time of the attack at Pearl Harbor. I propose, during the time allotted to me, to cover some of the charges that have been made against not only the Congressmen from Wisconsin, but also Congressmen from other States who have voted the same as we Members of Congress from Wisconsin have voted.

In criticizing us, they go back to 1939, in February, when they say that we should have voted to fortify Guam. Of course, the people have been led to believe that Congress refused to fortify Guam after somebody had requested that it be fortified. It does not seem possible that people should be misled with any statements of this kind, but it has been passed out to them in speeches and through the newspapers that this is the fact, while everybody in Congress knows that such is not the fact at all.

I think it might be well to let the people know something about the island of Guam. I believe that many of them have the idea that it is an island so large that we could establish fortifications there to protect us from attack, but I think that when they know the size of the island, they will be of the same opinion that Congress was, that even though the island was fortified, which nobody intended that it should be, it would not protect us from attack.

Guam itself is an island about 30 miles long and 7 miles wide and has about 20,000 people. It is about 5,500 miles from our west coast, much farther than New York is from Berlin, Rome, or Moscow, and almost as far as Alexandria, Egypt. It is about 1,500 miles east of Manila, 1,400 miles south of Tokyo, and approximately 1,600 miles southwest of Wake Island, the nearest American possession to the east. Wake Island itself is about 2,000 miles west of Pearl Harbor, and Pearl Harbor is about 2,400 miles from San Francisco. South of Guam are the Caroline Islands; east and southeast, the Marshall Islands; north, other Japanese islands; and Guam is in the midst of this group of over 1,000 islands, and is the only American possession there. Japanese fortified islands are all around it, and they were mandated to Japan after the first World War, and Guam was taken over from Spain about the same time that we acquired the Philippine Islands.

Now, there is widespread disagreement as to whether the island of Guam should have been fortified or not. Some say that it should while others say that it should not. Some want to place the blame on Congress, as I have stated heretofore, for the loss of Guam, while others credit Congress with preventing another major disaster there. Recent events have proved that Congress was wise in not fortifying Guam because Japan has all of the islands surounding it fortified and if we had sunk $100,000,000 to $500,000,000 on the island in fortifying it, it would have been lost with the islands that Japan has taken. Other islands were fortified and Japan has taken them, and it cost, in some instances, a half a billion dollars to fortify them. But that is not the issue here. The question is—did Members of Congress vote not to fortify the island of Guam?

The committee that brought out the bill (H. R. 4278) to improve the harbor and expend $5,000,000 were divided. The arguments, of course, against appropriating anything to fortify the island were that in the event of war, the island would be taken by Japan and used against us; that if we spent millions in an attempt to fortify Guam, we would necessarily have to send a large number of soldiers to defend the investment who, in the event of war with Japan, would all be lost, which has proved true.

The Guam proposal was never even seriously considered by the Senate Naval Affairs Committee of Congress, as it reported out the bill with no provision for Guam in it and so far as the record shows, there was no effort made from the Senate floor to include the Guam item in the Senate bill after it had been taken out in the House and passed without the item in it.

In 1940 the House Appropriations Committee, and not the Naval Affairs Committee, reported another naval appropriation bill including $3,000,000 for improvement of Guam. The same arguments were used on both sides at that time, with the additional information that the improvements were for aviation purposes and that some one of the airways would profit by the improvement of the harbor. Again the Senate did not even consider the Guam provision after it had been taken out in the House.

The first Guam provision was stricken out of the bill on amendment by a vote of 205 to 168 and all of the Wisconsin Congressmen at that time, Republicans and Progressives, voted to strike it out. About 70 Democrats joined with them in doing so.

It might be interesting to give you a statement from the Naval Affairs Committee when the first item was up for consideration in February 1939. I quote from the report of the Naval Affairs Committee at that time:

Under the terms of the bill the Navy will be authorized (1) to build a breakwater at a cost not to exceed $2,200,000; (2) to dredge the harbor to remove coral heads, to provide channels for ships and for seaplane operations at a cost not to exceed $1,900,000; and (3) to build seaplane ramps and parking space, small power plant, and necessary accessories, at a cost not to exceed $900,000.

From the above it can be seen that there is no provision to fortify Guam, as has been widely and incorrectly understood to be the case. The improvements contemplated are no more than is done year after year by this country in improving our harbors so as to make them safe and tenable under all conditions for surface vessels as well as for aircraft.

During the debate on the bill in 1939, the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, Mr. VINSON of Georgia, said:

Opposition to this item has been based on the assumption that Guam is to be fortified and made into a strongly defended naval base for airplanes and submarines.

In view of this opposition, the committee has gone into this matter at great length, and I can assure you that there is no intention on the part of the Navy Department to fortify Guam or to do anything further than what is included in this bill.

That was to do some dredging to improve the harbor. The President never, at any time, asked Congress to fortify Guam and the only time that I know of that he ever made any reference to it at all, either before or since Pearl Harbor, was in his radio address to the people of the United States on the night of February 22, 1942, when he said, speaking of these numerous islands which are owned by Japan:

These islands, hundreds of them, appear only as small dots on most maps. But they cover a large strategic area. Guam lies in the middle of them—a lone outpost which we never fortified.

And then the President gives the reason why the island was not fortified. He further said:

Under the Washington Treaty of 1921, we had soundly agreed not to add to the fortification of the Philippine Islands. We had no safe naval base there so we could not use the islands for extensive naval operations.

Assistant Secretary of the Navy Edison, before the committee on January 31, 1939, said:

It is impossible to look into the future and see whether or not there will be need for future developments of Guam as an airplane base, but we may hope that the future international situation will not make it necessary to use Guam except as a commercial airport. If unforeseen changes in the international situation should indicate a necessity for further development of an airplane base then Congress will be so informed.

It is quite evident from the sources that I have quoted that not even the President of the United States contemplated fortifying Guam. The sole purpose proposed was to dredge it out for commercial purposes and the Congress felt that if commercial interests wanted to use the harbor for that purpose, they should pay for it—and not the people of the United States.

WARSHIPS

It has been stated that on May 8, 1939, I voted against the naval appropriations bill. I think it might be well for the people to know the real truth about this matter and why I voted against it.

In the naval appropriation bill was a provision for 23 vessels. A large amount of the total appropriation of $770,473,241 provided in the bill was made up of items covering these 23 vessels. This item of the total amount, which was $369,606,000, provided for 2 cruisers, 8 destroyers, 8 submarines, 2 seaplane tenders, 1 repair ship, and 2 battleships of 45,000 tons each which were estimated to cost between $93,000,000 and $115,000,000 apiece. If they cost $115,000,000 each, it would take $230,000,000 of the $369,606,000 to pay for these 2 battleships alone, and if they only cost $93,000,000, it would take $186,000,000 to pay for them, leaving only $183,606,000 for the other vessels. The membership of the House, a great many of the Members at least, felt that battleships were not what we needed at that time but that instead, we needed bomber planes and it seems that the judgment of those who thought along this line was very good, and it has been so proven because we hear very little about any battleship, no matter how large it is, in this war except those that have been sunk by bombers, but we do hear a great deal about bombing planes. Your Congressman voted against building these 2 large battleships in preference to bombing planes. If you feel that he made a mistake, then it was an error of judgment. Personally, I think that those who voted against the battleships and wanted bomber planes were thinking along the right lines, if the reports coming from this war are to be believed.

AIRPLANES

Someone has criticized me and others for our vote on June 22, 1939, to strike out 1,283 airplanes from the Army appropriation bill. It is true that not only I voted to strike out these airplanes, but all of the Congressmen from Wisconsin voted to strike them out as well as 70 Democrats, and on the final vote, there were 150 voting to strike out the item, 217 against it, and 63 Members of the House who did not vote.

The decision of those who voted to strike out the item was based largely upon the recommendation of the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives, which had made a very careful study of the matter and listened to all of the testimony, and were of the opinion that these 1,283 airplanes should not be built until such time as experts had studied the modern methods of building defense airplanes—and there was $3,000,000 provided in this bill for that very purpose. The committee reported to the House as follows:

If the 1,283 planes were not bought there would still be the full planned number of operating planes and 880 planes in the rotating reserve (2,163 minus 1,283). The committee questions the wisdom of proceeding with the immediate procurement of at least the 1,283 planes. It is highly probable that some of them, if ordered immediately, would be inferior as to speed with planes now in production abroad for comparable missions. It would seem sensible to wait upon improvements promised by studies now under way, unless national defense needs are deemed to warrant their construction now.

And the committee finally said that it was a matter for the President of the United States to say whether the planes were needed or not, and if they were, provisions would be made for them.

When this bill was up for consideration, I had this to say in connection with it on the House floor:

Mr. Chairman, I am interested, of course, in airplanes and the defense of our country. It seems to me that we could very easily dispense with some of the airplanes provided in the pending bill and in support of this contention—

I said:

Mr. Chairman, within the last 24 hours, I visited with Colonel Williams, the man who flew to Rome in 1929. Colonel Williams has had 26 years of experience in aviation. I asked him what he thought about the situation. He made the statement that if we would appropriate money for the purpose of experimenting with planes and for the purpose of developing them, so that if we needed the airplanes we could immediately go into production and knew where we could have them produced, we need not worry about defense in this country so far as airplanes are concerned. I think that is a sensible thought, and I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] will be agreed to.

Some of my critics, of course, overlooked the fact that on final passage of the bill I voted for it with the proviso in it for the airplanes.

VORYS AMENDMENT

Congressmen have also been criticized for voting for what was known as the Vorys amendment to the Neutrality Act, a bill forbidding the shipment of arms and military supplies to the Allies. Although the conference report of the two Houses was passed upon on November 2, 1939, the bill was up for consideration on October 19, 1939. At that time, speaking from the House floor, I said:

Mr. Speaker, I have listened with unusual interest to the debate in the House here on the present neutrality law, which was approved on August 31, 1935, amended and approved on May 1, 1937, and further amended and passed by the House of Representatives on June 30, 1939. It seems to me that the only serious question before either the Senate or the House of Representatives is section 1, subsection A, covering the "export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war."

To me the serious situation that presents itself to Congress is whether or not other nations have relied upon our position taken when this Neutrality Act was passed, and whether we now at this time can or should amend this act so as to help either one side or the other, or to place any one of the warring nations, or neutral nations, for that matter, in a different position than they were when the present war was declared in Europe.

* * * * * *

This Neutrality Act was passed in 1935. If it was a good neutrality law at that time when Congress was not under pressure from any source to pass the law, had plenty of time to deliberate before its passage, and it became the law of the land, not only for the United States but for the world, then it ought to be a good law now. If it was not a good law, it seems that Congress has had plenty of time to amend it, as there have been plenty of wars to try out our Neutrality Act. I hope that it will not seem presumptuous on my part if I call the attention of Congress to the fact that there have been wars almost continuously since the passage of this act, and our country has been able to remain absolutely neutral under it, and not a ship of ours has been sunk or one of our soldiers or sailors killed as a result of it, with the exception of the *Panay*, which was sunk by the Japanese, but apologies were immediately forthcoming and reparations paid. To me there does not seem to be much question but what if we amend this act at the present time and lift the embargo on arms and ammunition so that it may be shipped to the warring nations, that we have committed an unneutral act sufficient to justify a nation that might take exception to declare war on us for doing so.

* * * * * *

Plausible arguments are presented in behalf of such change, but may I call the Congress' attention to the fact that when it was sought to change the Embargo Act after the outbreak of the World War in 1914 Lord Grey, of England, then Foreign Secretary, asserted that any change in the Embargo Act during war was an unneutral act. President Wil-

son and Robert Lansing, then Counselor to the State Department and who later became Secretary of State, were of the same opinion, and the embargo was not changed in 1914. Both President Wilson and Secretary Lansing said that to change the neutrality laws and impose an embargo during the war was a violation of international law. We have the same question before this Congress now. The answer should be the same.

It is now proposed to change our neutrality law while the war is in progress and permit Americans to sell munitions of war to the belligerents. Henry S. Frazier, the technical expert and adviser to George W. Wickersham, when a member of the International Commission on Codification of International Law, an authority on the subject, has recently said that to change our neutrality law after the declaration of war by the belligerents so that we can favor one belligerent rather than another is itself an unneutral act and a violation of international law; and the nation that is harmed by such change of law can, under international law, attack American shipping because of this unneutral act.

* * * * *

Prof. John B. Crane, professor of economics at Northwestern University, says that the United States was dragged into the war with England in 1812 because the embargo was lifted.

I now call the attention of the House to an address by Hon. Key Pittman, chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, delivered before the Academy of Political Science in New York City on April 7, 1937. He was chairman of the committee at that time and is also chairman of the committee at this time and has charge of the neutrality bill which is now being considered in the Senate. I quote from his address delivered at that time:

"Our Government, in my opinion, undoubtedly has the legal right to place an embargo upon the export of any commodity. The Supreme Court of the United States, in a recent decision entitled 'United States versus Curtiss-Wright Export Corporation et al., seems to hold that the President possesses such power without expressed authority of congressional enactment. Certainly such an act is not prohibited by any so-called international law recognized or binding upon the United States. There is no existing treaty of which I have knowledge that would prohibit such an act. Two treaties which might have been so construed have been vitiated through the acts of the parties to such treaties. Whether the exertion of such right is moral, just, and wise during war is a grave question. It is for this reason that Congress has determined that any such restrictive legislation must be enacted during times of peace so that all future belligerents may have notice."

The chairman continued:

"As we must have some law, even for the governing of our own citizens during the war and as international law sleeps during war, we will have to make our own laws."

As to consequences that may and probably will result if we repeal the embargo on arms and ammunition, which really brings us back, as the President suggests, to international law, the chairman had this to say with reference to a similar situation in 1917. I quote:

"We relied upon international law as a justification for our citizens in traveling upon belligerent vessels. We relied upon international law as a justification for supplying the Entente Powers with arms, ammunition, implements of war, and all materials and supplies essential to the successful conduct of the war by the Entente Powers. We relied upon international law as a justification for the approval of our Government of the sale of the bonds of the Entente Powers in our country to enable them to successfully conduct the war. We relied upon international law in opposing the sinking of merchantmen by submerged submarines without notice. We relied upon international law for our declaration of armed neutrality. We relied upon international law for every assertion of our alleged neutral rights. This reliance brought us no benefits or protection and was our undoing. By our unrestrained supply of arms, ammunition, and other contraband of war to the Entente Powers, by our failure to force Great Britain to respect our undeniable neutral rights, we excited the German people and aroused their hatred until they had conclusively determined before we entered the war to engage in war with us, either during the pending contest or after this war was over. They undoubtedly had in mind that they would win the World War and that we would be made to pay the entire cost of it through a subsequent war with us in which they hoped and expected to have powerful allies."

The President of the United States, as late as February 29, 1936, when he signed a joint resolution of Congress continuing the embargo, said:

"By the resolution approved August 31, 1935, a definite step was taken toward enabling this country to maintain its neutrality and avoid being drawn into wars involving other nations. It provided that in the event of the Executive proclaiming the existence of such a war, thereupon an embargo would attach to the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war destined to any belligerent country. By the resolution I have just signed, the operation of the August resolution is extended and strengthened until May 1, 1937."

The President was greatly overjoyed and satisfied when he issued an embargo proclamation promptly after the outbreak of hostilities in Ethiopia, and at that time said:

"It is true that the high moral duty I have urged on our people of restricting their exports of essential war materials to either belligerent to approximately the normal peacetime basis has not been the subject of legislation. Nevertheless, it is clear to me that greatly to exceed that basis, with the result of earning profits not possible during peace, and especially with the result of giving actual assistance to the carrying on of war, would serve to magnify the very evil of war which we seek to prevent. This being my view, I renew the appeal made last October to the American people that they so conduct their trade with belligerent nations that it cannot be said they are seizing new opportunities for profit or that by changing their peacetime trade they give aid to the continuation of war."

* * * * *

To us in America, who believe so much in peace, it is hard for us to understand that there is a great war raging in most of the world today, and as I pondered over this situation I could not help but think of the late great Democratic teacher, William Jennings Bryan, who to me was one of the greatest teachers that the world has seen during the past century. In an address at Johnstown, Pa., on November 1, 1915, he said:

"We cannot single out a nation and begin to prepare against it without cultivating unfriendliness toward that nation; and we cannot make hatred a national policy for a generation without having our people anxious to fight as soon as they are ready to fight. If the nations at war had spent in the cultivation of friendship but a small percentage of the amount they have spent in stirring up hatred, there would be no war in Europe today. We should not transplant upon American soil this tree of hatred unless we are prepared to eat of the fruits of the tree, for it has been bearing its bloody fruit throughout the years."

Continuing further, in the same address, he said:

"If there is one lesson which history teaches more clearly than any other it is that nations which aspire to mere physical supremacy have no hope of immortality; the fact that they put their faith in force is proof that they have in them the seeds of death. The pathway of human progress is lined with the wrecks of empires which, when at the zenith of their power, thought themselves invincible."

It seems to me that a repeal of the embargo on arms would be only carrying out this very thought, and placing us in a position where we could not help in any way should the time ever come when we might bring about peace between the warring nations in Europe.

If you will bear with me for a moment, I would like to discuss the war propaganda that is now, and has been for a number of years, distributed in this country. There is no doubt but it is being used to excite the people, such as "a war to end all wars"—"to make the world safe for democracy"—"the United States should carry out 'the white man's burden' "—"the United States should save civilization in all parts of the world"—"the United States should crush militarism and establish disarmaments," and many such other expressions that are constantly flooding the country.

Of course, the slogans of the last war are dead, but we find new ones springing up overnight. The press and the radio are constantly sending out news and comment from Europe, that our coming into this war is only a matter of a short time and, of course, inevitable. We are told that our trade and industry would be immediately stimulated, that those who have been unemployed for years would be put back to work; but those of us who are old enough to remember the last war and how men were put to work and after the war was over were out of work, do not become excited about it. There were a few years of economic decline, then we had a few years of prosperity and now have had 10 years of unemployment, a financial depression, millions of people on relief, high taxes, and a debt of $45,000,000,000 staring us in the face, and all of this can be traced back to the waste of men and materials and the social and moral degeneracy which war must always produce. Just as long as there is a war between these foreign nations we will be flooded with propaganda trying to excite us to take part on one side or the other of these warring nations. We have our own ideals and most of them do not conform with that of dictatorship which now governs most European countries.

It seems to me that it is our duty to maintain a highly adequate defense at home and let Europe settle the troubles they have, which they themselves started. If I know the pulse of the American people, it is that we attend strictly to our own business and let the warring nations of Europe attend to theirs.

We may all have our sympathies because of blood relations and ties for certain warring nations in Europe, and some of us may have relatives and friends there, but we must not forget, first of all, that we are Americans, that it is our country, and it is to this country we owe our first duty and our only allegiance.

Should we enter the European war now, or even at some later date, it would mean the loss of freedom of speech and thought, as well as individual action, and it would not surprise me if we never were able to retain it again. Regardless of the outcome of the war, we have ample resources in our own country

to defend ourselves if it ever becomes necessary and we are threatened, and without any need to go abroad to do it.

We can best help the warring nations by having left after the war is over at least one place in the world where there is preserved the spirit of cooperation and freedom that we can give them to bring about harmonious relations between them again. That is what they will need more than anything else.

There is one thing that the American people must remember, and especially this Congress assembled, and that is that profits out of this war will not do America any good. Instead, such profits would be a curse to the American people. Out of such profits that we might get out of the blood of the peoples of Europe will arise stronger and stronger those forces that will drag America into the war when profits can no longer be made only from Europe but will have to be squeezed out of the blood of American boys. The only way to keep America out of war is to keep the profiteers from making profits out of the war.

There are several reasons why industry is not interested in any profits that it can make out of this war. The present defense plans of this country tend toward the immediate conscription of all industry, of manpower, of natural resources, at wages and prices well below those that prevailed during the last war. There will be no profits in a war, because they will be controlled by the Government. And this is as it should be. We will not find, I think, again when men will risk their lives at the front for $2 a day while those more fortunate stay at home and earn from $15 to $30 a day in industry. If there is any justification at all for war, it is on the grounds of defense, and we cannot achieve the utmost in defense with injustice to our men at the front. There is still a greater fear that our entering into a major war will have a very drastic effect on our system of government. Most industry believes in the soundness of our present system of government. They believe in the present form of government their industries will be able to contribute a great deal to the American people and thereby continue along its path of true progress.

War, of course, means censorship, dictatorial powers, and regimentation and Government management of industry, and I think we are all agreed that we have had enough of that during the past 6 years; but there is always the possibility that these emergency controls will not be relinquished at the end of the war, that the invasion of private rights will become permanent, and that private enterprise, as we know it, will disappear. Therein lies a real threat not only to industry but to democracy itself. In the end it becomes quite apparent to all of us that there are only losses in war—human, economic, and political. There are no enduring profits.

We must never forget that Europe took everything from the United States during the last World War and it has given nothing back to the United States during the time that we have had peace.

If there ever was a time when we as loyal Americans, and especially those of us who are fortunate or unfortunate enough to be in Congress at this time representing the people of the United States needed to think things through, that time is now. We must above everything else come to a conclusion based on reason. We cannot afford to lose our heads at this time. Of course, we realize that we are subjected to the most powerful propaganda to stir up our emotions that Congress has ever been subjected to, and our anxieties and fears will be played upon to the greatest extent.

Under such conditions man ofttimes acts emotionally instead of intelligently. By all means, we must use our reasoning powers.

We must remember that dead people cannot render service. The great service of youth is not to die, but to live for democracy. In the first World War the civilian dead equaled the military dead.

What was said in the address that I have just quoted was repeated by many other Members of Congress and when the conference report was finally adopted by the House on November 2, 1939, 245 Members voted for the report and 179 voted against it. Twenty-seven democrats were among the 179 who voted against it. When the conference report was up for consideration, I quoted from the speech that I had made in the House on October 19 and I further said at that time:

I have listened to the debate here in the House on the resolution; I have read practically all of the debates in the Senate, outside of those I listened to personally; and I am more convinced than ever that if we vote to raise the embargo on the shipment of arms and ammunition to belligerents that it may and probably will lead to very serious consequences.

* * * * *

There can be no objections to selling on a cash-and-carry basis such articles as will sustain life and preserve humanity, such as food, clothing, and raw materials carried in the buyers' own ships, which will only have a tendency to advance and carry on civilization.

Let us, in these final hours of this debate, realize that our entrance into this war may, and perhaps will, be the end of our system of democracy, under which our great institutions have been developing during the last 150 years, and which have made us the greatest Nation on earth. The greatest danger that could possibly face us is that of bankruptcy. We became prosperous by staying out of the last war. We brought on our great depression by going into it. When the time comes that it becomes necessary for us to repudiate our obligations or admit our inability to pay them, then our democracy ends. That is the reason that we have the war in Europe today, because at the end of the last war every nation involved in it, practically, was bankrupt, and it became necessary for them to repudiate their obligations. The result of that war was that since 1919 seven democratic nations, with population of more than 700,000,0000 people, have fallen into the hands of dictatorship, and we do not need to think very much to realize that when it comes to this new war, that these dictatorships seem to all think alike, Communism sleeps easily with nazi-ism, and those whose views were the opposite a year ago, now see eye to eye.

We were able under the present neutrality law to stay out of the Ethiopian war; we have been able to stay out of the Japanese-Chinese war; we were able to stay out of the Spanish civil war; and now let us stay out of this European war and keep the world safe for America when the time comes when we can be of real assistance to all of these warring nations, and we may be able to help them to a fair and just peace when they are through fighting. Let us maintain our high standard of living, and even though it be the last haven of peace and democracy, let us hope that we will be in position where we may offer our assistance in the way of furnishing our resources with proper security to help the warring nations to a just and lasting peace.

I shall vote to retain the present embargo. If we vote to lift it, and it brings this Nation into a war—which, in my humble opinion, it will—I shall be able to live the remaining years of my life with a conscience that will say to me, "You did not by your vote help to destroy humanity by lending your assistance to the killing of human beings."

If the embargo is maintained, America can always say to the rest of the world, no matter how long the war is prolonged, "We did not aid anybody in the destruction that only can come from arms, ammunition, and poison gas."

There cannot be very much question in the mind of anyone at the present time but that the lifting of the embargoes and the shipment of munitions to other nations has in large part been responsible for our being in the present war.

LEND-LEASE BILLS

Certain Members of Congress, including your own Congressman, have been criticized for voting against the lend-lease bill, the first one on February 8, 1941. I am quoting from the address that I delivered in the House at that time on the lend-lease bill. It covers my position, which I have never had any regrets for taking for the reasons outlined in this address:

Mr. Chairman, we have listened to the debate on this bill, and I, for one, have profited from getting the views of the different Members of the House on it. I have read the propaganda in the newspapers and listened to it over the radio. As I now look back in retrospect, I shudder at the similarity of the debates now and those back in 1916 and 1917 before we entered into the first World War to save the democracies of the world. How many of us at that time ever thought that in less than 25 years we would again be called upon to save the democracies of the world? Let us assume, for the sake of argument, that we again saved them. Just how long would it be until we would be called upon again to save them?

* * * * *

So today, I have reached the crossroads of my life. I sympathize with England and her Allies. I abhor the things that Hitler and the other totalitarian rulers stand for. But America was not responsible for creating any of them, unless it was our participation in the first World War.

Today, in my opinion, 95 percent of the people would favor aiding England. The only question is in what degree and in what way. The same percentage of the people want Congress to say in what degree and how much. They do not want it left to any one man to decide. That statement is made without any reservations and without any reflections on the President of the United States. He is no superman; he is human, and has made many mistakes during his administration. He is not to be criticized for that. Perhaps someone else would have made the same mistakes, but the fact remains that he made them. Our economic and social problems still remain unsolved in this coun-

try after 8 years. The question remains to be answered: If he cannot solve our own problems, no matter how honest and sincere he may be, can he solve the problems of the rest of the world?

* * * * *

To ask the people of the United States to finance this war and to assist in policing the world is the height of folly. Even though we should not get into this war any further and peace should come tomorrow, the standard of living will be lowered in this country for years. We have never fully recovered from our participation in the last World War. In 1916, just before we entered the first World War, the appropriation to run our Government was $1,114,490,704.09. The interest on our obligations for the present fiscal year will be more than it took to run our Government in 1916. Our public debt in 1916, just before we entered the last World War, was $1,225,145,568. The interest item in the budget for the fiscal year ending in 1942 is $1,225,000,000, within $145,000 of the amount of our public debt in 1916. Our public debt at the close of business on January 28 was over $45,000,000,000. To this, add the guaranteed obligations of the Government. We must raise our debt limit now in peacetime. What will it be when we start fighting? We are already in the war. We have become the munitions arsenal for the world.

With a picture of this kind staring us in the face, it does not seem to me that we are in a position to give much aid to anyone except ourselves. We must remember that with a debt 45 times larger than it was before the last World War, and the tremendous burden to carry it, it will not be as easy to get money from the people for loans as it was then. Many of them will recall that they were promised that loans made to the Allies at that time would be paid back. They have not forgotten that they were not, and that their tax burden has constantly increased since that time. They are also familiar with the amount we are now borrowing from the American people for every dollar we have been paying out. The limit of their patience may be reached much sooner than we anticipate.

This bill gives the President extraordinary powers. It is said, however, that we will limit these powers to 2 years. If it is safe to give him that power for 2 years, it would be just as safe for 4. Moreover, I do not believe there is any present Member of Congress who has served here during the past session of Congress who can remember of the President asking to be relieved of any of the great powers given him during the past 8 years. Whenever one of these bills comes up for consideration there is always an emergency existing requiring the extension of the power given under some heretofore enacted law. The safest way is not to grant such power to any one individual. Aid to England and her allies? Yes; but with a limitation as to the amount and with proper security. The British Empire boasts that the sun never sets on its possessions. That statement is literally true. If we were to ask England or any other country for a loan, I am sure that country would want security, and that would be especially true if we were in default to it on obligations heretofore incurred.

Section 3 (b) of this bill gives the President power to enter into such agreements for the giving away of the taxpayers' money as he sees fit. He can sell, lease, or give it away if he sees fit. Any consideration is sufficient. That is what the bill provides, and the American people should know it; and the people should not be led to believe that we are going to sell or lease something to someone.

The people of the United States, without question, are for representative government, which means their duly elected Congressmen must make decisions, and not any one man. In view of the uncertainty of life and the changes of time, to repose all this power in one man leaves the question open as to who that official may be in the future; how he may be influenced; and again, it is too much responsibility for any human being who has been or may be created, irrespective of in how much esteem he may be held.

It might be well to reflect on just how many men, dollars, and years it may be necessary to appropriate to accomplish the purpose of again making the world safe for democracy, and should we accomplish our objective, whether it would be worth the cost.

In its long history as a republic the United States has been engaged in several wars. It has never lost one. Wartime has too often brought curbs on the civil liberties of our people and our institutions and restricted their freedom of speech and action. In times of peace we have had time to look back on these restrictions and always with regret that they should have been invoked at all and frequently with shame at their severity. But with all their restrictions they were not comparable to the proposal in this bill to do away with constitutional guaranties.

Heretofore, when we have waged war, it has been only after full debate of the Congress, who are the people's representatives. Heretofore we have maintained, through all the stresses and strains of a war period, our constitutional form of government. The conclusion of peace has found the authority of Congress intact and the American people free to govern themselves through our American institutions. But now, in peacetime, we are asked to give up all of this.

Twenty-four years ago we went into the first World War to save democracy for the world, but especially for Europe, as we had it here. Here are some of the results: A treaty which insured another war; we succeeded in the destruction of constitutional or democratic government on the continent of Europe; established communism in Russia, nazi-ism in Germany, and fascism in Italy; we helped to make possible the spread of atheism and communism throughout the world casualties of some 500,000 American soldiers, the loss of more than $30,000,000,000 to our own country and the resulting war debts, depression, financial, and economic disaster, suffering, and misery to the American people, from which we have not as yet recovered. Can we expect to accomplish in a second World War what we failed to accomplish in the first?

Thomas Jefferson once said:

"For us to attempt to reform all Europe and bring them to back to principles of morality and a respect for the equal rights of nations would show us to be only maniacs of another character."

History shows that European fighting has never ceased. Their quarrels have never been settled and never will be, and for us to become entangled on one side and pay their bills and fight their battles seems to be most absurd.

I have watched with interest the development of the present war hysteria. It will gradually grow until objections to our entrance into the war will cease. Soon the whole Nation, pulpit and all, will take up the war cry, and then it will be too late.

At that time, on a motion to recommit the bill and extend a credit of $2,000,000,000 to Great Britain, I voted for this recommital for that purpose. I do not believe in giving our country away to any other country. I am perfectly willing to help somebody else but I want them to help themselves at the same time. On the motion to recommit, there were 160 for recommittal and 263 against. I voted against the bill on final passage because this proviso for lending money to foreign countries was not in the bill. There were 260 who voted to give the wealth of this country away to foreign countries and 165 who were against it. There is no question in my mind but that we are going to live to regret the day that we voted to burden the taxpayers of this country for the purpose of giving America away to foreign countries. We could just as well have loaned the money as to have given it to them, or agreed to give it to them.

I not only voted against this appropriation of $7,000,000,000 but I also voted against the second appropriation of $5,985,000,000 for the same reasons. After that, the administration put these lend-lease items in with other appropriation bills. I made a motion to strike out $8,000,000,000 more in these bills, which was defeated, and I voted for the bill with this amount in it and have voted for other bills with lend-lease funds in them because I did not want to vote against appropriations for our own national defense. Outside of these lend-lease amounts, and what I have stated heretofore I voted against, giving my reasons, especially for the battleships, I voted for every dollar that the President of the United States has said was necessary for our national defense. It would be interesting for those who read this address to know that when we were attacked at Pearl Harbor, if we did not have a proper national defense, it was not the fault of Congress or your Congressman, because Congress had voted $56,000,000,000 at that time, of which only $16,000,000,000 had been spent and the balance was available for national defense and it had been voted long enough before so that it could have been used, if someone had seen fit to do so, and there is no use in anybody going out and saying that Congress was to blame because we did not have a proper national defense, since every dollar that the President asked for, for national defense, he received and it was not the duty of Congress to say when we needed a defense, but that was the duty of the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEFENSE

One of my critics has said that in May 1940 the American people suddenly awoke to the realization that its Army and Navy were pathetically unprepared for modern warfare, but that I continued to slumber. I would not like to burden you with my subconscious mind during the time that I

was sleeping, but I would like to call your attention to my speech on the floor of the House on May 24, 1940, on a national defense appropriation bill for the Army and Navy. My speech will be found on page 6834 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session. In that address to the House I said:

I expect to vote for the defense bills for both the Army and Navy.

And that is exactly what I did do.

In doing so, I do it with some reluctance. Not because I do not believe in national defense, but I am in the dark as to just what will become of the money, when it is appropriated.

There has been over $7,000,000,000 that has been appropriated for national defense during the present administration, and I am now told that we are wholly unprepared—that we have only 58 airships that are not obsolete. To me, it is a tragedy that we, as a Nation, have been asleep.

We have been asleep, not only with our national defense, but in other matters as well. What have we to show for the other billions that have been spent in an increase of material wealth of the Nation?

I wish that there was something Congress could do to make the people of this Nation think. The only way I know of doing it, is by asking them to pay some of this money now. We cannot go on as we have been during the past 7½ years. The last Treasury statement I seem to have is May 21, 1940. It shows our public debt to be $42,772,285,920.32. Besides this we have guaranteed obligations of some $6,000,000,000 more. Our excess of expenditures over receipts this year, on May 21, was $3,352,509,292.12.

We are approaching our debt limit fixed by Congress of $45,000,000,000. The people of America do not want me to vote to increase it. They would much prefer (although it hurts to do so) pay now as we go. If we do, we will spend much less. You will find that out. Let us give the people a few lessons in economics.

The immortal, stalwart southern Democrat, Thomas Jefferson, in his day on the same subject, had this to say:

"To preserve our independence, we must not let our leaders load us with perpetual debt. We must make our election between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude."

Then there is another point. Do we fully realize where the money is coming from to meet the charges of government? Here are the words of another great southern Democrat, Senator BYRD, of Virginia:

"We work under the load of the most stupendous debt any nation has ever carried. Our taxes are reaching the point of diminishing returns and today are a decided factor in the high cost of living. Remember that more than half of the taxes collected by the Federal Government come from invisible taxation paid by the housewife, the laborer, and every one who eats or buys necessities."

Why was it that the Black Shirts were able to march upon Rome without resistance and take over the reins of government? It was Italy's debt that spelled its doom.

It was not until the German Government and its political subdivisions had incurred indebtedness and assumed obligations far beyond their power to meet; it was not until their bonds and their promises to pay had become worthless scraps of paper that the German people looked for and hailed the one who should come forward with a promise and pledge to lift them out of their hopelessness. And that man came. But before he came, tragic inflation, following national bankruptcy, had taken its toll.

Loss of confidence in its money, which, in the final analysis, is inflation, is the greatest tragedy that can happen to any civilized state.

Let us vote money for national defense, and before this Congress adjourns enact legislation, or a tax bill, that will bring in sufficient funds to take care of the amount appropriated to do so. As a loyal American citizen, I am ready to pay my share. I am sure all loyal American citizens feel the same way about it.

You have heard what I said on the House floor at that time. You have seen what has taken place since. You have seen our national debt increased; you hear every day, over the radio, in your newspapers, from the public platform, and from the man on the street, the danger of inflation. If I was asleep in May 1940, at the time that I made this address on the House floor, as my critic has said, then I want you to put me to sleep again for a time and let me look into the future again.

CONSCRIPTION BILL

Some Members of Congress have been criticized for their votes on the conscription bill passed on September 7, 1940. One of my critics has called attention to my own vote on this issue.

In order to get the background of what was going on at the time, it is necessary to go back to the bill which brought the National Guard into the United States Army. The bill was passed on August 15, 1940, just prior to the Selective Service Act. Many of the Members of Congress felt at that time that voluntary enlistments would be sufficient to meet any requirements of either the Army or the Navy during peacetimes. On August 14, 1940, when the bill was being considered, I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, in the Appendix, on page 5008, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, a statement showing that from January 1, 1940, to June 30, 1940, inclusive, all quotas required by the Army and the Navy had been filled, and speaking from the House floor on that day, I said:

I was very much interested to find out in the morning press that the program for compulsory military training would be delayed, because with a proper bill for voluntary enlistments passed by Congress, that would get all the men necessary by enlistment, and it would not be necessary to upset the whole economic system of the country by drafting people for military training and service.

From a study of the population of the different States and the enlistments from January 1, 1940, to June 30, 1940, it shows that we are getting the quotas that we are asking for, and with proper adjustment in the payment of reasonable wages or salaries to those that might enlist, we will have no trouble in getting men for military training, and for service, if need be, by voluntary enlistments.

At the present time, no Member of Congress, so far as I know, and no one in the United States, knows about the emergency that is claimed to exist and which requires compulsory military training in peacetime.

In making this statement, I do not want anyone to gather the impression that I do not believe in proper national defense and proper training of youth, but I believe there are places where it could be done, such as our high schools, colleges, and universities, to a much better advantage, especially for youth, than to take them into camp where they are trained only with the thought of going into war.

There was an amendment to this bill which, if it had passed and had been included in the conscription bill later, I would have felt like voting for the bill, and other Members would have felt like voting for it also. I prepared an amendment, which was the same as one prepared by the gentleman from Connecticut, Congressman MILLER. Both amendments were pending at the clerk's desk at the same time, but the gentleman from Connecticut, Congressman MILLER'S was called up first. The amendment provided that these men should be trained "within the continental limits of the United States, its island possessions, including the Philippine Islands, the Panama Canal Zone, and Alaska." There was long and spirited debate over this because many Members of Congress felt that if this was not in the bill, the youth of this country would be sent to all parts of the world. Recent events have justified their apprehension, for that is exactly what happened, as everbody now knows.

Just before the vote was taken on the bill, I said on the House floor:

This idea of wanting to talk about sending soldiers down into South America to protect somebody is all wrong. I would not have risen here this morning and talked at all, but I have an amendment similar to this one at the desk, and that is the reason I say this amendment ought to be adopted. The people back home feel that we are not going to go to war tomorrow. They feel that we are going to train somebody to get ready for war. If they thought for a moment we were going to pass this bill so that, if it became necessary, the President of the United States could send somebody down to South America to fight tomorrow, of course, they would not be for it. They do not believe there is any danger of this kind.

As far as the National Guard is concerned, it is not making any protest. They are good soldiers. They have their superior officers, and if they do any talking, they do their talking to them instead of to the country.

I hope the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut will be accepted, and if it is not accepted, I am going to vote against the bill.

The amendment was not accepted and I voted against the bill. What has happened since, and was predicted during the debate on this bill, indicates that those who voted against it at that time and desired to keep the training of these men within the confines of the United States and its possessions were not far out of the way in their judgment.

We then come to the selective-service bill, which was voted on on September 7,

1940. The debate on this bill, known as H. R. 10132, covered several days. It became very bitter because many of the Members of Congress were satisfied in their own minds that we were only getting ready to send the youth of this country into a war, and anyone who opposed it at that time was branded as partisan and an isolationist. I am going to quote from some of the speakers just briefly.

Congressman DEWEY SHORT, of Missouri, one of the outstanding orators of the House, said:

Little did we ever realize that we would live to see the hour when a President, in time of peace, when we are at peace with all the world, when no one has attacked us, when no one has assaulted us, when no one has insulted us, would ask the American people to grant him the dictatorial and tyrannical power to conscript the young manhood of this Nation in order that they might goosestep to the commands of generals and salute brass hats.

But we have lived to see that hour. The greatest issue for us this moment is whether America shall remain a democracy or become a dictatorship. It is whether we shall maintain our liberty and freedom or whether we shall become a regimented society. It is whether we shall remain a constitutional representative Republic or whether we shall become a totalitarian state.

Conscription in peacetime, sir, is an undemocratic, ignoble confession that the methods of Hitler are better and more effective than our own. He who advocates taking the young manhood of this Nation out of their homes, out of their professions, and from their families in times of peace, misinterprets the spirit and genius of the men who carved the destiny of this free Republic. We are called upon now, in addition to all the extraordinary powers already voted the Executive under the cry of emergency, to give him more power, concentrated in a single individual here in Washington. O Members of the House, you cannot consider this bill before us today alone by itself. You must consider it in the light of everything that has gone before and in the light of everything that is likely to follow.

I quote briefly from the Congresswoman from Cleveland, Ohio, Mrs. BOLTON, who has two sons in the Army at the present time. She said:

The effort of the administration and the proponents of the bill to brand as partisan and unpatriotic any criticism or opposition, certainly gives evidence that we have gone far away from fundamental American methods of thought and action. At a time when clear, calm, intelligent, discriminating criticism of both the definite proposals and the even more important implications should be the order of the day, it is truly tragic that we are as we are.

The methods used by this administration in all matters of national defense are so tied up with its steady march toward national socialism—you can call it dictatorship—that it is difficult for me to see how anyone who believes in the fundamental principles of American representative government can fail to see the implication of a peacetime draft bill.

Congressman LUDLOW, of Indiana, said:

I want my own position definitely known. First, I will continue to work as I always have done, day and night, in season and out of season, to help to keep America out of war and at peace with the whole world. Second, I will not vote to send our boys into the slaughter pens of foreign wars. Third, I will not vote to sow the seeds of disintegration in our American democracy by adopting such totalitarian measures as regimentation and peacetime conscription.

It might be well here to say that when the bill was being considered in the committee, and when the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy testified before the Military Affairs Committee, they were specifically asked if any information was in the possession of Government officials not known to Congress, the press, and the public about the emergency and they answered in the negative. No Member of Congress knew of any emergency at that time, and none had been pointed out to them by the White House or by anybody else.

In speaking on the floor of the House that day on this particular bill, I said:

Mr. Chairman, I have listened to the debate in the House on this very important bill, which I believe is the most important bill this House has considered since I have been here, and I suppose the most important that has been considered at any time since the World War.

Until I heard the message of the President advising Congress that he had traded 50 destroyers of our Navy to England, now at war with Germany, for some leases for air bases in the Western Hemisphere, I had an open mind on this bill. When I heard that message I knew it meant war.

I am against war, and for that reason I am against this bill. We must keep out of this war, unless we are attacked or the Monroe Doctrine violated.

Now, just what does this bill, which the people understand to be a training bill, provide? Subsection (6) of section 3 reads, in part, as follows:

"The President is authorized to select for training and service in the manner herein provided, and to induct into the land and naval forces of the United States, such number of men as in his judgment, whether a state of war exists or not, is required in the national interest for such forces."

There is no exception, except in times of peace, when the President cannot call more than 1,000,000 men.

Under subsection (C) of section 1, the National Guard can find out what they are training for if they do not already know.

If you read sections 8 and 10 of the bill, and do not come to the conclusion that you are in the Army or Navy as soon as this bill becomes law, then I do not understand the English language.

Here, we are asking for a law to conscript all men between the ages of 18 and 45 years of age. On August 14, 1940, I placed in the RECORD a statement showing all quotas for Army, Navy, and Air Service which had been filled by voluntary enlistment from January 1, 1940, to the end of June 30, 1940.

I was interested in knowing what Canada had done about getting their quotas filled, knowing they had been at war about a year. I wrote a letter to a friend in Toronto on August 8, 1940, and on August 14, 1940, this friend wrote me in part as follows:

"The situation in Canada is that, up to the present enlistments have been on a voluntary basis."

This is no time for leaders in America to lose their heads. Let us try out voluntary enlistment, and at least give it a trial. We might still have some patriotic people in the United States the President does not know about. We can at least try and find out. I, personally, cannot find many people for this bill, but I can find plenty who are against it.

One who studies its provisions, and who went through the World War, realizes better than youth can possibly realize today, that as soon as it goes into effect, they will find themselves regimented, and there will be no turning back.

They will soon hear the bands playing martial music, the flags will fly everywhere, and we, once a free people, may march under the head of a totalitarian government, as much as the people of Europe are marching today.

This bill, if passed, will upset our whole economic system, and everyone knows it will not take much to do it.

With the great burden the people are now carrying, we should sit down and read some history, especially the rise and fall of Rome, and the causes of the French Revolution. I am wondering if history is going to repeat itself. Let us avoid it if we can.

Your Congressman, as well as many other Members, was very much influenced in his vote on confining the training of United States youth to the United States and its possessions, by the testimony of General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army. I quote briefly from the hearings before a subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, considering General Marshall's request for appropriations for an increase in the ground and air forces of the Army:

Mr. WOODRUM. General, what are we building this force on? On what general policy? What are we going to defend?

General MARSHALL. This plan is entirely devoted to the problems as we visualize them in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. WOODRUM. The whole Western Hemisphere—not the continental United States?

General MARSHALL. Not the continental United States. We do not visualize any invasion of this country. An air raid or something of that sort is possible but, frankly, at the present moment we do not see it in the offing.

Mr. WOODRUM. And it is with that idea in view that we are building the forces for the defense of the Western Hemisphere?

It is well to remember that this bill passed the House with an amendment which provided for voluntary enlistment. I quote the language of the amendment, as follows:

(d) The President is authorized to issue a call as soon as possible after the date of enactment of this act, and another call at any time after January 1, 1941, for qualified men between the ages of 18 and 35 to volunteer for training and service for 12 months in the

land and naval forces of the United States under this act. Each such call shall be for not more than 400,000 men. The President is authorized to induct into such forces for such training and service so many of the men who volunteer pursuant to such call as are not in excess of the number of men for whom the call was issued. If, upon the expiration of 60 days after the issuance of either of such calls the President finds that the number of qualified men who have volunteered pursuant to such call is less than the number for whom the call was issued, he is authorized to select and induct into such forces such number of qualified men selected in accordance with section 3 (a) as, when added to the number who have volunteered pursuant to such call, will equal the number for whom he issued such call. Until the expiration of 60 days after the date of issuance by the President of the second call authorized by this subsection, no man shall be inducted into the land and naval forces of the United States under any provisions of this act other than this subsection. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to require or postpone, during either of such 60-day periods, the registration classification, or selection of persons to be adopted for training and service under this act.

This was later taken out of the bill. Your Congressman voted for this amendment in the bill, but later against the bill because other amendments were added to it which made it very objectionable and which should not have been included. On the amendment for voluntary enlistments, all of the Progressives and Republicans from Wisconsin voted for it and with us, 59 Democrats. The bill never would have passed the House if it had not been that it provided for 1 year's training and this amendment provided for the training being voluntary unless the quotas could not be filled by voluntary enlistments, and then the President would have the power to call the numbers to fill such quotas.

So far as I am concerned, I have no regrets for voting as I did on this bill, and I think all other Congressmen who voted likewise, especially those from Wisconsin, feel as I do.

COULD WE ANTICIPATE WAR?

Much has been said about certain Members of Congress who, according to their critics, did not appear to be for national defense. Of course, I am included in that list. On May 22, 1940, in a release to the newspapers, I said this:

The President's message to Congress asking for another billion dollars for national defense was in line with growing convictions throughout America that this country must modernize its armaments and prepare itself so well that the mailed fist of aggression cannot come to the Western Hemisphere.

I foresaw what might happen to this country and on April 2, 1941, in a release to the newspapers, I said:

The chief topic of conversation here in official Washington is—now that aid has been voted for Great Britain, will it get through to England? The President says that he is going to see that it does get through and Mr. Hitler says that he is going to see that it doesn't. Mr. Hitler has his plans, of course, with submarines, aircraft, and other raiders to back up his argument, and the United States has plenty of the same material. The only question is—will the President insist on using it? In other words, will we convoy our shipments to England with our Navy, and if we do, will it mean actual fighting in the European war? We who remember the first World War well remember what happened before as a result of carrying out a procedure of that kind. It was only a short time until we declared war. It is doubtful whether any war needs to be declared now because we are in it for a good many billion dollars and it is only a question of when the fighting will start.

In a release to the newspapers on July 16, 1941, I said that we had taken another step toward war. I quote:

Your Congressman, like all other Congressmen, was shocked when he learned that the President, without consulting Congress, had ordered American troops to Iceland, for the purpose, so he stated, of furthering our national defense. In the writer's opinion, this only brings us just a little bit closer to participation in the war. At least, we are nearer the seat of operations than we were and we cannot go very much farther without being in the actual fighting zone, and when we do, we will be in the war and Congress will have nothing to say about it. The only thing that Congress can do is to remain here in Washington and do its best to prepare an adequate national defense for our country.

The President's course was one which, he assured Congress, would keep us out of war. In my addresses on the floor, and in releases to the press, I said several times before we were attacked that our course would get us into the war. I am satisfied to leave it to you whether I was right or wrong. Who is to blame for getting us into the war, no one should discuss now; that is a matter that should be left to the historians to settle.

As late as November 13, 1941, 24 days before we were attacked by Japan, while we had under consideration House Joint Resolution 237 which was an amendment to the Neutrality Act to permit the President to arm or cause to be armed any American vessel as defined in such act, I said on the House floor:

Mr. Speaker, I am not interested today in preserving either bolshevism or nazi-ism in Europe. We have entirely too much of both in the United States today. I am only interested today in Americanism, and I am satisfied that it cannot be preserved by going to Europe to do it.

I am against the pending resolution because it means war. It means an endorsement of a shooting war which the President of the United States has already declared, and for that reason I am against it.

If America is to survive, we must take care of our own form of government. It is the opposite of all forms of government in Europe. We have only to analyze the situation we find ourselves in today to be convinced of the fact that if we enter this war it may leave us, as it will leave all of Europe, with a large part of Europe devastated and most of the youth as well as other citizens killed, starved, or dead of disease. The last World War left most of the nations in Europe bankrupt, and all that the war finally brought to Europe was nazi-ism and communism, neither of which believes in our form of government. It brought bankruptcy to most of the nations of Europe, and with our present financial condition in this country, if we participate in this war, it may mean bankruptcy for us and eventually communism or nazi-ism, or perhaps both, in this country.

Our country has grown to its present position among the nations of the earth by attending strictly to our own business.

OUR POSITION AFTER PEARL HARBOR

I have outlined my own position, and that of others who took the same position that I did prior to December 7, 1941, when we were attacked at Pearl Harbor. It matters not what we thought prior to December 7, 1941. This Nation was changed overnight from one that desired peace, to a Nation that wanted to defend itself in every possible way that it could and no one can say that any Member of Congress since that date has had anything in mind except to use every means to win this war. It is our first and greatest job. We have made great progress since December 7 and we are going to win this war. Just how soon, will depend on just how soon we can get prepared to do it. The great worry your Congressman and many other Congressmen have is what is going to happen to the country after we win the war and the peace that everybody throughout the world desires. I just want now to discuss with you briefly some things that have already taken place and some of the things that you have in store for you in the future.

These things, I think, are essential for us to do:

First. We must eliminate waste of every sort in our businesses and in our homes. We are notoriously the most extravagant race in the world. Now we must save every scrap of rubber, tin, aluminum, paper, brass, and strategic materials that we can.

Second. We must economize on all our expenditures. Even though the new gadget may not be made of strategic materials, it requires labor, which is fast becoming our most critical resource.

Third. We must save all the money we can, as we will need it later.

Fourth. We must buy War bonds and stamps with our savings and pay our taxes cheerfully.

Fifth. We must walk instead of ride whenever we can and use the bus or double up when we drive. Too many cars may still be seen along our highways with one man or one woman driving to or from work alone.

Sixth. We must be alert, improve our health and strength. We need both mental and physical vigor for what lies ahead.

Seventh. We must be alert to welcome and entertain service men on leave in our communities.

Eighth. We must move heaven and earth to keep our businesses going if we

can by shifting into war production or by any other method we can devise. If we cannot, then get a war job.

Ninth. We must cooperate wholeheartedly with the organized war agencies, and especially with efforts to stamp out treason.

Tenth. We must not neglect to plan for the future, because the future will be largely of our own making.

THE SMEAR CAMPAIGN

Members of Congress are very familiar with the smear campaign that was started against us, with the sources from which it came. As soon as people discovered who started it and the people who were back of it, they paid very little attention to it. The people realize, of course, that Congress may be criticized, but before the American people join in any campaign to discredit Congress, they had better consider soberly what the function of Congress is; why it behaves as it does, and what would happen if Congress took the implications of its maligners seriously and either became an echo of the Executive or disbanded. Congress is the representative of the people of the United States here at Washington and, contrary to the belief of some people, it does represent the people most of the time in a very realistic way. Fighting a war is not the prerogative of Congress but that of the Executive because he is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. It is not the duty of Congress to fight the war or to furnish the leadership but to give the Executive the things that he requires to fight the war with and to keep a firm connection between the Executive and the people. Because we have so much power centered in time of a crisis like war, Congress has an unusual duty to perform, as a part of its job in keeping the Government and the people in step, to see that incompetence is exposed and also all inefficiency in the war effort, even at times when the administration in power may be reluctant to have this done. It is the duty of Congress, also, to uphold civilian morale, even though sacrifices must be made to win the war. This covers some of the duties of Congress in order to be accountable to the people. Congress may be criticized for some of the things that it has done in the past but if a careful study was made covering the United States at the time, you would find that in their votes, Congressmen reflected quite accurately the sentiment of the American public at the time. Congress is the real bulwark of the people. If you wipe Congress out, then you have a totalitarian state with a dictator ruling.

I think our position now is pretty well summed up in a statement made by General Marshall, Chief of Staff of the United States Army, in an address made on June 2, this year, when he said:

America has steeled herself for a bitter struggle, with the implacable determination to hammer out a complete victory, decisive and final. The utmost courage and aggressiveness will be required for complete victory. No compromise is possible, and we must bring about the utter defeat of the Japanese and German war machines.

In that effort, you will find me, and, I think, all of the Congressmen in hearty accord and we will use our very best efforts to win this war, and, let us hope, a peace that will last over many years.

[Here the gavel fell.]

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BROWN of Ohio (at the request of Mr. HESS), for the balance of the week, on account of illness.

To Mr. HOOK, for 2 weeks, on account of important business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on two topics, in one to include a newspaper article, and in the other to include a letter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 6315. An act to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans; and

H. R. 7182. An act making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 416. An act for the relief of E. A. Walles, receiver of Delta Oil Co.;

S. 819. An act for the relief of the widow and children of Dr. Jo M. Ferguson;

S. 885. An act for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake, in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934;

S. 1707. An act to prevent the making of photographs and sketches of military or naval reservations, naval vessels, and other naval and military properties, and for other purposes; and

S. 2467. An act to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on the following dates present to the President, for his approval, a joint resolution and bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 19, 1942:

H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America.

On June 22, 1942:

H. R. 6315. An act to extend for 2 additional years the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans; and

H. R. 7182. An act making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. D'ALESANDRO. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.), pursuant to its order heretofore entered, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 23, 1942, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, June 25, 1942.

Business to be considered: Hearing on Federal Communications Commission.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1774. A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting report of statistical studies performed by the Department of Labor for other than Government activities during the period July 1, 1939, to December 31, 1941; to the Committee on Labor.

1775. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report of the Archivist on lists of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1776. A letter from the Administrator, Veterans' Administration, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of certain disbursing officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

1777. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting draft of a proposed bill to amend Article of War 114; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1778. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill for the relief of Beatriz Milan Vda. de Vasquez; to the Committee on Claims.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule III, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. PEARSON: Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. H. R. 7212. A bill to amend section 13 (d) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; with amendment (Rept. No. 2262). Referred to the

Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 7202. A bill to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue it in force during the existing war; without amendment (Rept. No. 2264). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HUNTER: Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress. H. R. 7223. A bill to provide for a method of voting, in time of war, by members of the land and naval forces absent from the States of their residence and serving within the continental United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2265). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOEHNE:

H. R. 7268. A bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Ohio River at or near Mauckport, Harrison County, Ind.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDMISTON:

H. R. 7269. A bill to authorize the burial in national cemeteries of citizens of the United States serving during the present war in the armed forces of governments of foreign countries at war with the Axis Powers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HARTLEY:

H. R. 7270. A bill to provide temporary additional compensation to postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads

H. R. 7271. A bill to increase the salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JACOBSEN:

H. R. 7272. A bill to expedite the prosecution of the war by making provision for an increased supply of rubber manufactured from alcohol produced from agricultural or forest products; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. R. 7273. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entitled "An act to provide books for the adult blind," approved March 3, 1931, as amended; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 7274. A bill to provide for speedy and summary notice in proceedings to condemn land for war purposes, and to accelerate the distribution of deposits and awards to the persons entitled thereto in such cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'ALESANDRO:

H. R. 7275. A bill to repatriate native-born women residents of the United States who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R 7276. A bill to provide funds for the prosecution of the war, and to relieve the American people of unnecessary interest burden; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CREAL:

H. R. 7277. A bill for the relief of H. F. Mathis; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts:

H. R. 7278. A bill for the relief of Lillian C. Ferreira; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 7279. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Crossett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3103. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 39 citizens of Ellwood City, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 860, as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3104. Also, petition of 91 citizens of Ellwood City, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 860, as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3105. Also, petition of 17 residents of Ellwood City, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 860, as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3106. Also, petition of 79 citizens of Ellwood City, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 860, as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3107. Also, petition of 65 citizens of Ellwood City, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 860, as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3108. Also, petition of 120 citizens of Ellwood City, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 860, as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3109. Also, petition of the Beaver Valley Holiness Association, West Bridgewater, Pa., urging the early passage of Senate bill 860, to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the land and naval forces of the United States, and to provide for the suppression of vice in vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3110. Also, petition of 82 citizens of Ellwood City, Pa., urging the passage of Senate bill 860, as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3111. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition presented by Rev. E. M. Dycus, pastor of the First Methodist Episcopal Church at Carrier Mills, Ill., signed by 56 members of said church, urging the passage of Senate bill 860 as a part of our national defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3112. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of sundry citizens of Appanoose County, Iowa, urging the passage of Senate bill 860, as a contribution to a wholesome defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917 and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3113. By Mr. WHEAT: Resolution of the Illinois Annual Conference of the Methodist Church in session at Galesburg, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3114. Also, petition of sundry residents of Oakland, Ill., urging the prompt enforcement of the May bill, which was enacted into law and signed by the President on July 11, 1941; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3115. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Decatur, Ill., urging the passage and enforcement of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3116. Also, petition of the members of the First Methodist Church of Decatur, Ill., urging the enforcement of the May bill, and prompt passage of the Sheppard bill (S. 860); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3117. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Business Women's Legislative Council of California, Los Angeles, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the joint income-tax return; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3118. Also, petition of the State Association of County Judges and Commissioners for North Texas, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to rationing of gasoline in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3119. Also, petition of the Austin Junior Chamber of Commerce, Dallas, Tex., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to rationing of gasoline in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3120. Also, petition of the National Farm Loan Associations, Mayville, N. Dak., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and Land Bank Commissioner loans be extended for a further period; to the Committee on Agriculture.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 23, 1942

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, the Reverend James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Infinite Spirit, Thou who hearest prayer, to whom we come with our weaknesses and tendencies, we pray Thee to satisfy us with Thy presence. Grant

to give us the spirit of an humble heart and preserve us from false pride and from the sin of presumption. Fill us with the blessing of gratitude that we may realize our dependence and the merciful gifts which Thou dost bestow. It is not what we do but what we are which constitutes the lasting benefactions to our fellow men. Heavenly Father, lead us along the paths of those noble souls of the years long, long ago. Out of their deep convictions they lifted high the torch of truth and from the mountain peaks of their vision, looking across the dark valleys to the hills of God, they prayed:

God be in my head and in my understanding;
God be in mine eyes and in my looking;
God be in my mouth and in my speaking;
God be in my heart and in my thinking;
God be in mine end and in my departing.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

On June 8, 1942:

H. R. 5955. An act for the relief of Harold W. Burch and Lucille M. Burch; and

H. R. 6802. An act making appropriation for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

On June 10, 1942:

H. R. 4845. An act to increase the rate of pension to World War veterans from $30 to $40 per month and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 315. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to provide Federal meat inspection during the present war emergency in respect of meat-packing establishments engaged in intrastate commerce only, in order to facilitate the purchase of meat and meat food products by Federal agencies, and for other purposes.

On June 11, 1942:

H. R. 4205. An act to add to the Cleveland National Forest, Calif., certain contiguous lands of the United States which can be most effectively and economically protected and administered as parts of said national forest.

On June 16, 1942:

H. R. 7036. An act to authorize the attendance of the Marine Band at the fifty-second annual reunion of the United Confederate Veterans to be held at Chattanooga, Tenn., June 23 to 26, inclusive, 1942.

On June 19, 1942:

H. R. 5204. An act authorizing the charging of fees for brand inspection under the Packers and Stockyards Act, 1921, as amended;

H. R. 6349. An act for the relief of Jeff Roberts;

H. R. 6597. An act for the relief of A. Mack Dodd and Henry Dodd;

H. R. 6598. An act for the relief of Leanna M. Stright; and

H. J. Res. 316. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the fiscal year 1942 for the training and education of defense workers.

On June 20, 1942:

H. R. 3352. An act for the relief of Alice W. Miller;

H. R. 5526. An act for the relief of James E. Savage;

H. R. 5870. An act to amend section 24 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917;

H. R. 6297. An act to provide for the issuance of a license to practice chiropractic in the District of Columbia to Dr. Wesley K. Harris;

H. R. 6782. An act to authorize the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to assign officers and members of the Metropolitan Police force to duty in the detective bureau of the Metropolitan Police Department, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 6804. An act to amend paragraph 31 of section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations to provide for the government of the District of Columbia for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1903, and for other purposes," approved July 1, 1902, as amended.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2412. An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes;

S. 2471. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, with respect to its application to officers and employees or educational, religious, eleemosynary, philanthropic, and cultural institutions, establishments, and agencies, commonly known as the Hatch Act;

S. 2586. An act to amend sections 1 and 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue the act in effect during the existing war, and for other purposes; and

S. 2598. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 6908. An act to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941; and

H. J. Res. 294. Joint resolution instructing the Secretary of War to henceforth designate the new lock in the St. Marys River at Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., as the General Douglas MacArthur lock.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2455. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty," to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7041) entitled "An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20 to the foregoing bill and that the Senate recedes from its amendments numbered 90 and 91 to said bill.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6430) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes."

CONGRATULATORY MESSAGE FROM THE CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES OF ARGENTINA

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C.:

On the one hundred and sixty-fifth anniversary of the creation of the flag of the United States of North America the honorable Chamber of Deputies of the Argentine Nation sends to the people of the great sister Nation, through you, a message of sympathy and American brotherhood and expresses fervent hopes for the triumph of the principles of democracy and liberty, which your flag so worthily represents and which your people are defending.

Respectful greetings to the Speaker.

JOSE LUIS CANTILO,
President of the Chamber of Deputies of the Argentine Republic.
CARLOS GONZALES BONORINO,
L. ZAVALLA CARBO, *Secretaries.*

VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—A. H. LARZELERE (H. DOC. NO. 803)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 5938, a bill for the relief of A. H. Larzelere.

The enactment would authorize and direct the Secretary of the Treasury to

pay to A. H. Larzelere, of Beverly, N. J., the sum of $746.64 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for 38 days of unused annual leave credited to him by the United States New York World's Fair Commission at the expiration of the world's fair on October 18, 1940—it appearing that this former employee was separated from the service of the United States without having taken all of the annual leave which had accumulated to his credit at the time of separation.

The Annual Leave Act of March 14, 1936 (49 Stat. 1161), makes a grant of leave in kind, only; that is, the right to be absent from duty for the prescribed period without loss of pay while maintaining a status as one of the "civilian officers and employees of the United States" included within the purview of the law. There is no provision of existing law for payment of the commuted value of leave not taken before separation from the service. Many similar claims have been necessarily disallowed by the Government. The approval of relief legislation upon behalf of the former employee named in this enactment would be giving him preferential treatment and, no doubt, would result in a flood of similar relief bills in respect to other former employees similarly situated.

For the above reasons, I do not feel justified in giving this enactment my approval.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 23, 1942.*

The SPEAKER. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal.

Without objection, the bill and the accompanying documents will be referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks and to include a telegram.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NEED FOR STANDARDIZING TANKS

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, all reports agree that the German victories in Libya were brought about partly because of the remarkable repair facilities utilized by the Nazi armies in Africa. The one lesson we can definitely learn from the fall of Tobruk is the importance of having our armaments, particularly tanks, easily and quickly maintained and repaired when that is necessary.

We are building a medium heavy tank in this country, the M-4, which is equipped with so many different engines that the problem of repairs and parts replacement is three times as great as necessary. Into this tank, which is manufactured by Chrysler, Ford, and General Motors, the Chrysler Co. is putting Chrysler automobile motors, the Ford Co. a special Ford tank motor, and General Motors a Diesel engine. Not only are these three engines different, but they utilize different forms of fuel.

Is it not time these tank engines be standardized? Failure to standardize them trebles the repair and replacement problem—a terribly important problem, as General Rommel's success has shown us. I trust that, at least, it will be possible to send the different kinds of tanks already in production to different theaters of the war, thereby avoiding some of this unnecessary confusion. But as for the future, every consideration of common sense points to the immediate need of putting into our M-4 tanks the best engine that can be made. The time needed for experimentation in this field has passed. The ordinary rivalries of commercial competition must give way before the compelling national need. The War Production Board should act, and act now, to require all the manufacturers in this field to build the one best engine for these tanks.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution adopted by the Commerce Association of New York, Inc., setting forth the facts concerning the unemployment situation in New York.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a radio address delivered by him.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to extend my own remarks, and to include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. JENKINS of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks on the wheat surplus.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter signed by a group of married selectees on the question of dependents.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a copy of a speech I made before the rural letter carriers of my district.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WARTIME PROHIBITION

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. CELLER addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PERMANENT POSTAGE RATE OF 1½ CENTS PER POUND ON BOOKS

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 337) to provide for a permanent postage rate of 1½ cents per pound on books, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. BURCH]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement follow:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 337) to provide for a permanent postage rate of 1½ cents per pound on books having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by the House amendment, insert the following:

"That the postage rate on books consisting wholly of reading matter or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for students' notations and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books, when mailed under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, shall be 3 cents per pound or fraction thereof, irrespective of the postal zone of destination thereof: Provided, That this Act shall not affect the rates of postage on books mailed by or to libraries and organizations as prescribed by the Act of February 28, 1925, as amended (39 U. S. C., 1934 ed., Sec. 293a)."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by the House insert the following: "An act to provide for a permanent postage rate of 3 cents per pound on books."

And the House agree to the same.

T. G. BURCH,
HARRY L. HAINES,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
WALTER C. PLOESER,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
JAMES J. DAVIS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 337) to provide for a permanent postage rate of 1½ cents per pound on books, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report.

The House conferees agreed to accept as the basis of the bill the language of the Senate bill to be amended in line 4 by inserting "or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for students' notations." This amendment was insisted upon by the House conferees in order that educational textbooks that have come into common use during the last two decades, commonly referred to as workbooks, might enjoy the same postage-rate privileges as other books.

It was then agreed that the preferential rate should be 3 cents per pound or fraction thereof, instead of the present 1½ cents set by Presidential proclamation. This change was insisted upon in order to eliminate as far as possible the deficit that has accrued each year since the preferential postage rate on books has been in effect.

It was then agreed that the following provision be inserted: *"Provided*, That this Act shall not affect the rates of postage on books mailed by or to libraries and organizations as prescribed by the Act of February 28, 1925, as amended (39 U. S. C., 1934 ed., sec. 293a)."

This amendment was to protect the present law giving to library books certain preferential rates.

It was then agreed that the title to the bill should be amended to conform to the contents thereof by striking out the figures "1½" and inserting in lieu thereof "3."

T. G. BURCH,
HARRY L. HAINES,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
FRED A. HARTLEY, Jr.,
WALTER C. PLOESER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL YEAR 1943

Mr. SNYDER, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 7280) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2260), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying report referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. POWERS reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 7280) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 81]

Andersen, H. Carl	Gamble	Mitchell
Baldwin	Gathings	Murray
Beam	Gifford	Myers, Pa.
Bell	Gilchrist	O'Day
Boykin	Gore	Osmers
Bradley, Pa.	Granger	Plauché
Brown, Ohio	Green	Reece, Tenn.
Buckler, Minn.	Harrington	Robertson, N. Dak.
Burdick	Hart	Robsion, Ky.
Byrne	Hébert	Rockefeller
Byron	Hook	Rogers, Okla.
Cannon, Fla.	Isac	Romjue
Capozzoli	Jarrett	Scanlon
Casey, Mass.	Jennings	Schaefer, Ill.
Clevenger	Johnson, Ind.	Schuetz
Cluett	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Schulte
Coffee, Nebr.	Kee	Scott
Cole, Md.	Kefauver	Shannon
Cooley	Kilburn	Sheridan
Copeland	Kocialkowski	Short
Culkin	Kopplemann	Sikes
Cullen	Kramer	Smith, Pa.
Dies	Kunkel	Smith, W. Va.
Disney	Landis	Sparkman
Domengeaux	Larrabee	Stearns, N. H.
Douglas	Lesinski	Sweeney
Ellis	Mans	Tenerowicz
Forand	Maciejewski	Thom
Ford, Leland M.	Mills, Ark.	Thomas, N. J.
Tinkham	Weaver	Winter
Vincent, Ky.	Wene	Worley
Wadsworth	White	Wright
Walter	Wilson	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and thirty-four Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. SNYDER, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7280) making appropriations for the Military Estabishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and pending that, may I ask the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] about time?

Mr. POWERS. What does the gentleman have in mind?

Mr. SNYDER. I suggest that we use 3, 4, or 5 hours, whatever the gentleman thinks would be advisable.

Mr. POWERS. Five hours, to be equally divided?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. POWERS. That is satisfactory to me, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SNYDER. The debate to be devoted to the bill.

Mr. POWERS. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. And to be equally divided.

Mr. POWERS. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate continue not to exceed 5 hours, the debate to be confined to the bill, and one-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7280, with Mr. BUCK in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 25 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I entertain no sense of pride in being in charge of this measure, because it happens to be the largest, in a money sense, ever presented to any appropriating authority.

It proposes appropriations aggregating $42,820,003,067. Just think of it—nearly $43,000,000,000, or more than the sum of all Federal expenditures over the 128 fiscal years beginning in 1789 and ending June 30, 1918, at which time we had

been in World War No. 1 more than 14 months.

Fundamentally, my friends, the reason we meet with this huge additional amount, as we have met with those which have preceded it—a total of something in excess of two-hundred-and-two-billion-odd dollars since June of 1940, including liquidated contract authorizations—is because following World War No. 1 there was relatively little sentiment in this country for strong military and naval establishments. Throughout the years I have had a hand in shaping military appropriation measures I have been actuated by the conviction that strong military and naval establishments would assure peace. I firmly believe today that if that view had been predominantly embraced, starting only from the time that we could see signs of unrest in Europe, there would be no war today, and we would not be confronted with the critical situation in which we find ourselves.

I will say this, however, in all candidness: It is my opinion that our measure of preparation would have been greater and accomplished more rapidly had the international situation not been unfolded in the piecemeal fashion that it was. Reasons of state no doubt dictated the policy pursued, but there are many who are wont tc go slowly when the way ahead is not entirely clear.

But, be that as it may, we are at war, and I know all of us on both sides of the aisle are working as a unit for a speedy and decided victory.

I remarked that we were confronted by a critical situation. The very capable Deputy Chief of Staff, Lt. Gen. J. T. McNarney, told our subcommittee that the War Department regards our present situation as the most critical which this country ever has encountered. That is the immediate reason for a measure of the proportions we are presenting today. Its size is dictated by the determination of needs by those in whom has been entrusted the Army's responsibility in the prosecution of the war—such men as Gen. George Marshall, Gen. "Hap" Arnold, Gen. Lesley McNair, Gen. Brehon Somervell, and their hand-picked staffs. We cannot be defeated under that kind of leadership.

There is one thing that does give me pride in having a connection with this bill, and that is to be able to witness the fruition of preparatory measures which it was my privilege to support and advocate in earlier appropriation bills. Much that has been accomplished is traceable to such provisions, and I am sure we all have cause to be profoundly proud of the magnificent way the Army has performed in all theaters where it has been engaged in combat.

The opening pages of the hearings on this bill are devoted to a roster of those who already have performed so gallantly. Such a list never can be complete because many an outstanding deed escapes notice in the thick of combat.

When it comes to passing out encomiums, I think we are prone to pass over those men of our armed forces, formerly in key positions, who laid much of the groundwork for the development and progress that has since occurred in readying our forces for the situation we are now in. I have in mind such men as Gen. Malin Craig and Gen. Adna Chaffe known to every one of you, and the splendid officers upon whom the former depended while Chief of Staff, and I have in mind large numbers of officers of the Regular Army, the National Guard, and the Officers' Reserve Corps who have since been assigned to less arduous tasks because of advancing years or physical hindrances. All had a part in building the machine which more recently has been molded into such a potent striking force.

The bill I hand you, as I have stated, proposes appropriations in the total sum of $42,820,003.67. Thus far for the current fiscal year we have appropriated in various measures for the Military Establishment the sum of $75,427,593,587. Of that sum $60,782,31+,300 has been appropriated since Pearl Harbor.

The whole thing has been a matter of progressive development of personnel and matériel. This bill is both for the support, maintenance, and operation of that which we have, and for and on account of still further expansion. It embodies all needs presently visualized by our military leadership up to December 31, 1942, in some respects, and for a longer period in others. That the programs in the making will require the provision of additional amounts later is a definite certainty.

I wish I were free to reveal to you the details. More than ever, now, the Department wishes to conceal information from the enemy. I might say that the total amount for equipment in this measure approximates $25,800,000,000, and of that amount $11,437,000,000 represents aid to our Allies under lend-lease procedure, raising the total for such employment to $32,170,000,000 by way of direct appropriations for the Military Establishment, and to $62,944,650,000 the value of aid that can be furnished in pursuance of all authorizations and appropriations heretofore made.

Included in the equipment program is the final increment for the Army of the 185,000 two-year airplane program, which we are told will be realized on schedule, namely, December 31, 1943.

I can report to you that every member of the subcommittee entertains the view that the Army is handling its huge problem as efficiently and economically as may be reasonably expected, considering its magnitude and ramifications.

It is doing everything in its power to avoid profiteering, and had undertaken the renegotiation of contracts from which it appeared excessive profits would be realized well before the Congress passed legislation on the subject in the latter part of April. Unquestionably, that legislation has helped the situation very materially and I am glad to acknowledge the fine work of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] whose legislative suggestions spurred practically all contractors to volunteer to renegotiate. I have some figures on what has been accomplished, which I am sure will interest you. Over the period April 15 to June 15, voluntary refunds, when all in, are expected to approximate $557,000,000. Offers of reductions are pending, aggregating $42,294,481. A reduction of $39,000,000 has resulted from a renegotiation conducted in April, and renegotiations are in process which promise a reduction in excess of $500,000,000. These amounts total roundly $1,137,000,000, which is most gratifying from the standpoint of the saving, and it is most gratifying in its reflection of the high caliber of our American manufacturers. There may be an exception now and then, but by and large the American businessman may be depended upon to go the limit in this war effort, even without profit. Their record of accomplishment thus far gives us all just cause to be proud. I should like to say that also of American labor.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The figures the gentleman has just cited relate solely to Army contracts, and do not cover the savings from renegotiation of Navy and Maritime Commission contracts.

Mr. SNYDER. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Chairman, the prodigious amounts it has been necessary to make available on account of this war have caused much wonderment in many quarters. I should like to dwell a bit upon that subject.

Since the President's national defense message to the Congress on January 12, 1939, there has been appropriated to date directly to the War Department roundly $85,000,000,000. That amount excludes the $43,000,000,000 in the measure now before us for consideration.

For that period of World War No. 1; that is, from April 6, 1917, to November 11, 1918, appropriations made directly for the Military Establishment totaled $24,401,517,507, and that sum includes appropriations that had been provided to carry on until July 1, 1919. As you know, there was little in the way of appropriation augmentation for the Military Establishment prior to the declaration of war on April 6, 1917.

Why that vast difference, which we have every reason to expect will be very considerably widened? Obviously the factors are many. Prior to Pearl Harbor the preparation period was longer than the entire duration of World War No. 1. In the other war we did not become the arsenal of democracy. In the other war, mechanical warfare had made but relatively little progress. And, in the other war our field operations did not extend into all quarters of the globe. We find therefore, a greater, a more thorough, and a more extensive training period, and we have a tremendously larger demand for defense or offense articles, as you may prefer, of every kind and description, and such defense or offense articles are developed to the maximum of the scientist's skill, mostly and highly mechanical, and tremendously costly. I am referring to modern fighting planes and their lethal weapons, to the much improved tank, to

armored cars and technical vehicles, to motor-propelled troop carriers and supply and servicing transportation, to motor-drawn and motor-propelled artillery pieces, and to automatic weapons, including rifles. The quantities are huge and the costs are high.

Let me give you some aviation figures, because aviation really is the chief contributor to the bill we are piling up. Aviation in World War No. 1 was in its infancy. Our whole bill for military airplanes in that war was $608,865,307. Now, get this: From July 1, 1939, to July 1, 1941, expenditures, actual and estimated, on account of military aviation by our War Department aggregate approximately $35,710,000,000. That includes complete planes and spares, operating and maintenance personnel, ground facilities, maintenance and operation of planes, and maintenance and operation of ground facilities. I do not have the overall figure for aviation in the bill now before us. Under the Air Corps head alone it is $11,316,898,910. The amounts under other heads I should say would bring the total close to $20,000,000,000.

As to why we are not better prepared and the employment of funds provided during the interim between World War Nos. 1 and 2 the record is clear. Annually over that period there has been presented to the Congress and the country the state of our Military Establishment, estimates of appropriations have been presented and published in great detail, exhaustive hearings have been held and published to the world, little, if any, having been off the record. The annual reports of the Secretaries of War and of the Chiefs of Staff have been available to all who cared to acquaint themselves with their contents. There was nothing hidden. There is no basis, therefore, for surprise.

The answer simply is that our Government never has favored the maintenance of a large peacetime Army, and that does not apply merely to men in uniform. It embraces implementation, because implementation is costly; particularly if accumulated in quantities to meet any potential M-day need. It is cost, in the last analysis, which has dictated our policy.

Unquestionably there was sound basis for heavy retrenchment immediately after and for a few years following World War No. 1. The Army but recently had demobilized. We had a force of highly trained officers and men running into the millions. We had—and they were not then outmoded—vast stores of military equipment and supplies adequate to arm and maintain a force of the magnitude just demobilized.

Obviously, however, such a reservoir could not be kept intact. The trained manpower could not continue indefinitely as first-line material. As to matériel, deterioration in storage annually would take a large toll, and there was certain to ensue progressive dissipation through use by Regulars and the civilian components.

Hence, attrition went on year after year until it put us in a state verging on complete unreadiness, insofar as any immediate military offense or defensive operations might be necessary on a scale of even modest proportions.

In the meantime the science of warfare was undergoing a pronounced change. The airplane, the tank, and the motor vehicle, as employed in World War No. 1, pointed to potential uses which the military mind was quick to grasp. The answer is the modern military airplane, the greatly improved tank, the armored car, mechanized and motor-drawn artillery, and mobile weapons of every type, and also radio communication. These have meant much research, much experimentation, and prolonged tests of pilot models.

These new and greatly improved types of implementation are tremendously costly, and unless a nation were planning to make war or observe literally the old axiom, "In time of peace prepare for war," there would be reason to go slow, first, from the cost standpoint, and secondly, from the standpoint of obsolescence or even obsoleteness, because of the rapidity of change inherent in all such developments.

Our Government, and I include the legislative branch, was content to go slow. We engaged in research and experimentation; possibly not as much as we should have, but not in any sense in vain. We kept fairly well abreast and in some respects ahead of developments in the field of aviation and I include in that term a complete military airplane; our tank development generally compared favorably with foreign development; we were not excelled in armored car types; in field pieces I question very much if our developments in the hands of troops were excelled anywhere and our semiautomatic shoulder rifle we know to be beyond compare. We had no appreciable quantity of any of these things and we utterly lacked facilities for producing them hurriedly in quantity.

There was no secret about any of this. We, as a nation, were just content to get by with the least outlay possible.

For the fiscal year 1920, the first fiscal year after World War No. 1, military appropriations aggregated about $795,000,000. At that time the Army still was in process of adjustment to post-war conditions. Ten years later appropriations aggregated $332,000,000. In 1934 they reached the low level of $277,000,000. The estimates for that fiscal year were formulated in the latter half of the calendar year 1932. Gen. Douglas MacArthur was then Chief of Staff, and, in the course of his statement to the committee, he said that the Budget estimates meant cutting operation and training activities to bare necessities. All augmentation, referring to implementation and ammunition, he said, were completely eliminated. Continuing, he said, all essential maintenance and repair projects would be either retarded or suspended. The enlisted strength for that fiscal year was 118,750 men. At that time we had something like 83,000 men scattered throughout the United States, and about 35,000 serving in the Philippines, in Panama, in Hawaii, and at other points outside the continental limits of the United States. The appropriation was made substantially in the aggregate amount proposed by the Budget.

Mr. Chairman, in all fairness, it should be said that the Budget did not represent the views of the War Department or of the highly distinguished officer who was then Chief of Staff. The country was still economy minded as regards Federal expenditures, whether for defense or any other purpose. It represented what the Budget Bureau deemed to be appropriate to recommend to the Congress, and that was the Budget the Chief of Staff and other officials of the War Department virtually were compelled to support.

Let me refresh your memories. Section 206 of the Budget and Accounting Act, approved June 10, 1921, and it is still the law, provides that—

> No estimate or request for an appropriation, and no request for an increase in an item of any such estimate or request, and no recommendation as to how the revenue needs of the Government should be met, shall be submitted to Congress or any department or establishment, unless at the request of either House of Congress.

That is a necessary provision to the success of an Executive Budget, but unless we wish to shirk our responsibility and hide behind a shield of that character, I maintain that the needs of our defense establishments, as determined by the regularly constituted heads thereof should be communicated to the Congress, if not in the approved Budget, then in the same document as a supplement thereto, in order that the Congress and the country may know not the needs as circumscribed by budgetary considerations, but the needs as visualized and advocated by our military and naval leadership, and, I should add, by the Secretary of State. If the Congress chooses to disregard the Budget and provide in more generous fashion for defense purposes to an extent that would upset Budget equilibrium, then it would devolve upon the Congress to take appropriate action to readjust income and outgo as projected in the Budget.

That, in my humble judgment, Mr. Chairman, is the way to avoid being caught short again in military and naval preparedness, or at least to make sure that every citizen has knowledge of the course that is being pursued, because, after all, it is their Army and their Navy and it is their money that must provide and maintain them.

I should like to say this, in conclusion: I have had a hand in shaping military appropriation bills since January 1936. The men I have served with have all possessed preparedness leanings. Practically all of them served at one time or another with our military forces. My observation has been that each one of them has been guided by his own conviction of the appropriateness of such provision as has been made or advocated, and I should say that is true of the House membership generally.

In retrospection possibly all of us can recall instances where, if better advised, we would have acted differently.

But, irrespective of the past, we are very definitely one today, as we always have been when a challenge has threatened or an attack made upon our country and our cherished institutions. In such circumstances this House may be depended upon to act with a singleness of purpose, as it is acting today. That is the way my subcommittee acts.

I can assure you that in DAVE TERRY, JOE STARNES, ROSS COLLINS, Judge KERR, GEORGE MAHON, LANE POWERS, ALBERT ENGEL, and FRANCIS CASE our Military Establishment is in safe and understanding hands. They all have distinguished records, and I am proud to be one of them and to have the honor of being their subcommittee chairman.

Lastly, I wish to say, most regretfully, that this probably will be the last defense appropriation measure in which our beloved friends and colleagues, DAVE TERRY and ROSS COLLINS, will have a part. As you know, each of them has signified his intention to continue his legislative career at the other end of the Capitol. They will add to the prestige of the upper body, as they have added to the prestige of this body, where they have greatly distinguished themselves and have won the respect, admiration, and esteem of every Member on both sides of the aisle. I know every Member here joins with me in wishing each of them every success in the world.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SNYDER. I yield to the gentleman from Oregon.

VISION AND FORESIGHT OF REPRESENTATIVE SNYDER

Mr. PIERCE. I think it quite fitting and proper that the attention of the House be called to the capable work of the subcommittee under the guidance of our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER]. It was their early action that made possible an effective start on our war air program, through providing power for production of aluminum.

Over 4 years ago, I went, with an experienced engineer, to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and asked him to look into the possibilities of rushing additional generators for the Bonneville plant to provide an emergency power reserve. At that time the P. W. A. grant to the lower Columbia River plant included only two machines totaling 86,000 kilowatts. The gentleman and his committee saw the necessity and authorized, within 2 years, eight additional generating units totaling 432,000 kilowatts. These kilowatts are responsible for over one-third of the base metals now going into our pursuit and bomber planes. When the last machine is brought into operation this plant will contribute about one-fourth of the metal required for our ultimate armored air program. Therefore, I wish to pay tribute to this outstanding contribution and an early, correct estimate of war production realities. This decision was made when it was not popular to provide such facilities for what was then mistakenly called an excessive power supply. He was outstanding in realizing the importance of this, as well as other projects, which strengthened our Nation for this day of trial.

I can recall how the gentleman told us there that the feeling of the committee was to cut down appropriations for military purposes, but he entered into the spirit of it, studied the program, and commenced to add to the kilowatts produced at Bonneville on the Columbia.

Whether or not the gentleman recalls it I do not know, but about that time the Governor of the State of Oregon, and the mayor of Portland, came here and said they did not know what we were going to do with all that power, and then the gentleman's committee gave us the appropriations which made it possible to finish that great project. The safety of our Nation now depends largely upon its output.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may desire to use.

Mr. Chairman, the appropriation bill we have before us this afternoon, as our chairman has so ably told you, is the bill for the War Department for the fiscal year of 1943, calling for a total appropriation of $42,820,003,067. It is going to be rather difficult for me to go into any great detail about this bill because, of necessity, there are many figures and many facts which cannot be disclosed. You will note our hearings contain about 342 pages. The actual testimony taken would probably run over 1,500 pages. The balance has been deleted because the major portion of the testimony must, as I say, of necessity be off the record.

The sixth supplemental appropriation bill provided for 3,600,000 men in our Army by the end of December 1942. This bill now provides for 4,350,000 men. It also provides for essential items for a number of men above that number. It also provides for critical items for a number of men over the additional number. The figures I cannot divulge, but I can say they are substantial.

If you will look at the committee report, starting on page 12 and ending on page 20, you will find, item by item, the various appropriations made for the various departments, and you will find how the total is obtained.

You will note the bill is $3,289,634,005 more than the figures submitted to us by the Budget. These figures are broken down on page 3, including amounts appropriated for recently enacted legislation as to pay of the Army, acceleration of personnel strength, new or enlarged demands not contemplated during processing stage of the estimates, and restoration of amounts originally intended to be deferred. This amount was deferred by the Budget and it amounts to $657,677,738. In other words, Mr. Chairman, the Budget had cut the War Department's requests by that much money and more.

As each departmental head came before us we asked him, among the many questions propounded, two very important ones: First, "Is this the amount of money you requested of the Budget?" The answer was usually "No." Secondly, "How much money are you going to need in the fiscal year of 1943 above what the Budget allowed you?"

We obtained from each departmental head the figures which make up the total of six-hundred-and-fifty-seven-and-some-odd-million dollars.

It seems rather strange to me, Mr. Chairman, in these times, that the Bureau of the Budget would arbitrarily cut a War Department appropriation and/or request in time of war. I think it may prove very interesting to the Membership as a whole, and I know it is going to prove very interesting to me, when I look up the figures to find out just what the Budget cut the War Department's requests over the past 10 years. I have never seen it, but I intend seeing that total figure and the break-down in the very near future. I shall probably have more to say on this Budget subject at a later date.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. POWERS. Yes.

Mr. JONES. In the past 10 years, is it not true that the Congress has allowed the Military Establishment all that the Budget has granted an estimate for and recommended to the Congress?

Mr. POWERS. That is entirely true.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield further——

Mr. POWERS. I am delighted to yield to my colleague the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The gross, over-all appropriations in the last 10 years by the Congress would probably run more than the Budget estimates prior to this bill.

Mr. POWERS. I should think so, very definitely. Further, may I reiterate that this bill is, in itself, a considerable increase over the Budget estimates.

Now, for a moment, Mr. Chairman, if I may, I would like to say a little something about the Air Corps. Again there are many figures I cannot use.

In this bill there are 23,250 planes for the Army. This is a matter of public record and it makes up the total of the President's request for 185,000 planes over a 2-year period for delivery by December 31, 1943. The Army share of that program, as has already been published, is 148,000 planes. This figure of 23,250 makes up the balance of the planes not appropriated for in other bills.

You know the Air Corps has done to date a magnificent job, and will do more than its part before this struggle is over. I wonder at times how many people realize the difficulties under which the Air Corps has been operating—the difficulties of organization, the difficulties of production and everything else incident to a tremendous expansion.

The Air Corps started out with 1,800 officers and about 40,000 men, and right now they have about 18,000 officers and 540,000 men, and before this conflict is over you will find the Air Corps will constitute one of the greatest branches of our armed forces.

Pilot training is progressing in grand shape. They started out with a 7,000-pilot program and eventually that will be 70,000. The mechanical program is also progressing nicely and will eventually comprehend 300,000 mechanics. The air group started at 54 and will shortly be many times that number.

From those figures you can get a general idea of the terrific and tremendous pressure the Air Corps has been under during these past few months and during these past several years.

For the past 10 years I have taken a great interest in the subject of insurance for fliers. I think every year's record will show some testimony in that respect, and I confidently report to the House now that the Government is providing an insurance policy of $10,000, paying for it on the life of every flying cadet and on the life of every enlisted man who is flying as a student. After they complete their flight training, the Government no longer pays the premium on the insurance policy. However, General Arnold assures us that the subject of insurance for fliers, although not definitely mandatory by law, is in such shape that practically every man in the Air Corps has sufficient coverage by insurance, so that aid and comfort will be given to his family in case something unforeseen might occur.

Another subject I have been vitally interested in over 10 years, so far as the Air Corps is concerned, is the subject of flight pay for flying surgeons. Years ago in my opinion many surgeons were drawing flight pay who definitely had no right to draw it. The matter was investigated. The number of flight surgeons was limited and additional pay for this service was cut to $720 per year. You will find in this bill that that restriction has been removed, and that every flight surgeon will receive the same flight pay as every other officer, namely, 50 percent additional. I am happy the committee has changed this, and I am happy to have been a part of the committee making that change, because of the testimony we heard this year. Since Pearl Harbor five flight surgeons have been killed and six flight surgeons are missing in action, either dead or captured. Flight surgeons are undergoing today the same hazards other combat fliers are undergoing, and I am happy to advise the House they will now receive full flight pay.

Mr. Chairman, I did not mean to take up quite as much time as I have, but I thought there were some few things in the bill the House would like to have explained. For myself, I might say it is rather a strange feeling to stand here as the ranking minority member of the committee and report out a bill of this magnitude. This is the largest appropriation ever made by any legislative body on the face of the earth. We may be criticized for appropriating this amount of money, but as I said in the committee this morning there are two very good reasons. One, we are at war, and, two, the War Department asks for it, and they know more about the need for it than we do.

When I think of a national debt of over $200,000,000,000, I shiver, but I would rather see that national debt go to any ethereal figure you might conceive to win this war and live in a democracy than to have the national debt zero and live under Hitler. To help save democracy is the chief purpose of this bill.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES].

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the present appropriation bill provides for $42,820,003,067. It is the largest single amount ever appropriated by a parliamentary body in the history of mankind. It is an amount which exceeds the total war costs of World War No. 1 in 1917 to 1918, and is an amount which brings the total expenditure for all war purposes during the past 3 fiscal years begining with the fiscal year 1941 to a total of $205,000,000,000. The basis for the estimates for this particular bill is as follows:

(a) The operation, housing, and maintenance of a war army which was planned to begin the fiscal year at an enlisted strength of 2,800,000 men, and to increase during the year to a strength of over 4,500,000.

(b) The operation and maintenance of war-aid activities abroad and in this country.

(c) An equipment program to include:

1. Essential and critical items, with maintenance for an expanding army in calendar year 1943.

2. Certain basic materials and equipment which are difficult to procure, to provide for the first half of calendar year 1944.

3. War-aid requirements for calendar year 1943.

4. A 23,550-airplane program, with related spare engines, spare parts, equipment, and munitions to complete the War Department's part of the program prescribed by the President in his speech of January 7, 1942.

This appropriation bill calls for approximately $11,000,000,000 for airplanes, $10,000,000,000 for ordnance, $9,000,000,000 for pay, subsistence, clothing, and welfare, and lesser amounts for other departments and other purposes.

I am not divulging information which has not heretofore been made public when I say it was originally planned to have 4,300,000 men under arms by December 31, 1942. I can assure you that on the basis of authoritative information from most reliable sources, this number will be exceeded during the fiscal year, and in the calendar year 1943 America will have a greater number of men under arms than she has ever had in all of her history. This Army will be the best equipped Army and the greatest striking force ever gathered together under the Stars and Stripes. It is hoped that in the calendar year 1943, through our own efforts and the grace of God we can administer a lethal blow to Hitler and his unholy associates and bring this greatest war, this greatest tragedy in the history of mankind to a successful conclusion.

There has been some criticism of the Congress in recent months with reference to the part the people's representatives have played in this greatest of all war efforts. Some of this criticism may have been justified. The constructive part of this criticism is welcomed by every one of us. But there has been much misinformation, much destructive criticism, which has not been helpful either in building morale or in assisting the war effort. Much of this destructive criticism has created a feeling of disunity and of doubt as to our ability to carry this program through. I think the Congress is to be congratulated for the wholehearted manner in which it has cooperated with the Chief Executive of this Nation since this Nation has unhappily been plunged into the greatest of all wars. There has been complete eradication of partisanship on the part of this great representative body in supporting the President of the United States since December 7, 1941. We have given to the President of the United States in the last 12 months powers unprecedented in the history of this Republic, and today he has more power than the chief executive of any other nation—powers that we as the representatives of the people of the United States have voted him to meet this great emergency; powers which will enable him to take quick and decisive action on the home front and in every theater of action in order to bring this war to a successful conclusion within the shortest space of time.

We have implemented those tremendous and soul-shaking powers with the greatest sums of money ever appropriated in the history of parliamentary government.

Therefore, criticism to the effect that we have delayed the war effort, as a body, is unfounded and not warranted by the facts. We have acted with speed at all times. How quickly the war is now won depends upon how well the over-all strategy is conceived and executed by the Chief Executive, as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. The responsibility now for the actual waging of this war passes, in a large measure, from our hands to the hands of the Chief Executive, and those he has gathered about him to help him to plan and execute this greatest military effort of all time. In his endeavor, so long as he acts conscientiously—and there is no question on our part but that he will—to use the vast powers granted him and the huge sums of money appropriated to implement the powers, he will have the wholehearted support of all Americans everywhere. It is an awful and solemn responsibility we have entrusted to the Commander in Chief at this time. Certainly this body is not responsible for any mistakes of strategy, nor the miscarriage of any plans in any field of operations. As I stated a moment ago, that has passed from our hands and it is not within our province. Now we must remain here on guard, eternally on guard, in an effort to see, insofar as it is within our power to do so, the powers granted and the moneys appropriated are exercised in the manner that we, as the people's representatives and the people themselves, wish. We must be ever on the alert to see that those powers are properly exercised. When there are abuses, if abuses should unhappily arise with reference to the exercise of those vast powers, and unwarranted and unnecessary extravagance in the expenditure of these funds, we must recapture the powers which rightfully belong to the people and effect economies by withdrawing or withholding or limiting appropriations heretofore made.

That, as I conceive it, is the duty of the Congress from this time forth, because it is impossible to conceive of what other

powers the Chief Executive could ask for and how he could expeditiously or otherwise spend any more money than is being given him by the Congress of the United States to prosecute this war effort.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. TERRY. It is the gentleman's opinion, of course, that while the American people realize we are spending these vast sums of money to equip our Army, they are willing to go along on the march to victory, whatever the cost.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Absolutely; with a Nation already plunged in war through no choice of its own there is unanimity of opinion to the effect the war must be won regardless of the cost in treasure and blood.

The Chief of Engineers stated in his testimony before the committee that during the calendar year 1943 his office would supervise more than 50 percent of all the construction in the United States. This gives you some idea of the vastness of this tremendous program. We feel this construction program is in good hands and safe hands when it is entrusted to the Chief of Engineers for supervision.

The Quartermaster General now becomes the greatest purchaser of food and clothing in the world, and it is interesting to note that after a rather sharp rise at the beginning of this war prices are now beginning to level off and there has not been an appreciable increase in the price of many of the articles purchased by the Quartermaster General within the past few months. Mass buying and mass production methods have, of course, had something to do with this particular phase of this war effort. It was also testified the effect of the so-called price-fixing bill has played a part in holding down the cost of certain of these items. Our chairman, in his most interesting and valuable contribution in the discussion of this bill, brought out the fact that more than $1,137,000,000 would be recaptured by the Government of the United States as a result of the renegotiating of contracts. Mass-production methods plus the genius of American business have enabled us to achieve this program with a reduction of the original estimates on cost. And this at a time when we are paying the highest wages in the history of the world, producing under stress and strain. The much-abused dollar-a-year men and businessmen through their genius for organization and through their devotion to duty and to country have been able to reduce the cost of manufacture of many of these items and have voluntarily returned to the Government of the United States this tremendous sum of money, and the end is not in sight. There will be further appreciable returns of money as a result of the renegotiation of contracts already entered into, so there will be a reduction of over-all cost when the final accounting comes.

I wish I were privileged to give you some of the figures and some of the information presented to our committee in confidential session. As the very able and distinguished gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] stated a moment ago, the more interesting and the more valuable part of these hearings could not be published for reasons known to us all, but I can assure you this subcommittee of yours went into the whole situation as closely and as carefully as it was humanly possible to do within the time allotted to us. The hearings were most exhaustive; there was a justification for every item contained in this tremendous bill; the War Department had worked on certain phases of it for a year or more. It can thus be said that it was most carefully considered by the War Department, and by your Subcommittee on Appropriations handling the bill. For the first time we present to you a War Department appropriations bill which was processed through the War Production Board. This was done for the purpose of ascertaining whether or not we had the present productive capacity to carry out this program when it was implemented by the construction program of the Maritime Commission and of the United States Navy.

The sums of money involved herein plus the money heretofore appropriated will strain to the utmost the existing industrial facilities of the United States of America to the end of the calendar year 1943.

There was some question in the minds of the subcommittee as to whether we would be able to procure the raw material necessary in order to turn out the finished product. I wish to invite the attention of the membership particularly to the testimony beginning on page 308 of the hearings of General Clay, representing the Service of Supply, one of the most brilliant and capable officers in the Army, many capable officers from the Quartermaster Corps and the Engineer Corps with their civilian and military aides, Mr. Leon Henderson, and representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior. You will find there a full and exhaustive discussion of the availability of raw materials to carry out this program, especially as it pertains to cotton, to wool, to leather, to gasoline, and to rubber. In the opinion of these experts, and I may say the statistics and over-all situation would seem to justify them in their position, there is an ample supply of cotton, of wool, and of leather available to us from domestic sources and foreign sources which we do not feel the enemy will be able to cut off from us. Furthermore, it would appear from the record we shall be able to meet the demands of this war effort without the necessity of rationing the civilian population of America with reference to these three items. It may be necessary to use certain substitutes in conjunction with wool in order to meet civilian demands.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I understood the gentleman to say that the source of gasoline would be strained to the utmost. I wonder if the gentleman intended to leave that impression on the country.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I am sure the gentleman misunderstood me. I believe I said it would strain the industrial capacity of America to the utmost to produce these articles by the end of the calendar year 1943.

Mr. DONDERO. But so far as the supply is concerned, the gentleman does not think there is any question about that in this country, does he?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Absolutely none. I will discuss that point, may I say to the gentleman, and perhaps answer some of the questions he has in mind.

I stated that insofar as the supply of wool, cotton, and leather are concerned there is a sufficient supply on hand or in sight and available to us over lines of supply which the enemy cannot cut off to enable us to meet this master program without rationing of the civilian population insofar as those particular items are concerned.

With reference to the twins, gasoline and rubber, America can produce more than 4,000,000 barrels of crude petroleum per day.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. In the halcyon days of 1929, and even now when we have the greatest national income in our history and the greatest war effort in our history, this Nation within its own borders can produce more gasoline than we can burn for civilian and military uses; therefore, the necessity of rationing gasoline on a Nation-wide basis is thoroughly unjustified from the standpoint of gasoline alone.

Mr. DONDERO. That is the subject I wanted the gentleman to discuss.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I shall be glad to do so.

Mr. DONDERO. Our supply is cut down by quotas so that these wells cannot produce the amount they are able to produce.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. We are amply able to produce more gasoline in this country than we can possibly use.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I would like to ask the gentleman from Alabama if he will kindly advise the membership of the House if there has been any special presentation made to his committee to enlarge upon the fortress type of long-range bomber in our contemplated program for which this appropriation is being made?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Indeed, there has been, and I intend to discuss the matter when I finish with this question of raw materials.

Turning to the rubber picture, you will find the figures given you in detail by General Clay and by Mr. Henderson and others with reference to the amount of crude rubber and synthetic rubber now on hand in the United States. You will find the amount of rubber that is necessary for the over-all picture. There is available to us 602,000 tons of crude rubber in this country and 162,000 tons to the United Kingdom. The over-all esti-

mate for the war effort, plus essential civilian uses, is estimated at 1,100,000 tons, approximately, during 1943.

We were told that conservation practices already in force and effect by the Army and by the civilian population of the country will further reduce the amount of rubber required for this program. A reduction has already been made of approximately one-third in the Army's requirements. We are convinced from the testimony, and I think I can speak for all of us, that every effort possible is being made by the Army at the present time to conserve the amount of rubber we have on hand—that is number one—and, secondly, to move in a constructive manner by producing synthetic rubber. Intelligent and comprehensive surveys and studies are being made of all the possibilities dealing with the production of synthetic rubber from alcohol, petroleum, guayule, golden rod, and from other agricultural products. Furthermore, studies are being made with reference to the production of synthetic rubber using coal as a base. For many years Germany and Poland, we understand, have used coal as a base for producing synthetic rubber. Very frankly, we were told by Mr. Henderson the proposal to ration gasoline is tied up with the conservation of rubber. He recognizes the fact, as every intelligent citizen recognizes, there is no shortage of gasoline in this country on a Nation-wide basis. He furthermore recognizes, as does every rational, sound-thinking American, we should cut to the bone the nonessential use of rubber in this country.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, the national economy would be vitally affected by a Nation-wide system of rationing of gasoline. The constitutional debt of many States of this Union of ours would be affected by a reduction in the sale of gasoline on an enforced basis. The money or revenue to operate State and local governments throughout this great Nation of ours is tied to a large extent to the revenues produced by taxes on gasoline and petroleum products.

Mr. Chairman, the lessons of this war are many and varied. The lines of communication and supply over which the United States of America must keep its field armies in motion are the longest in the history of the race. No man in all history has ever been faced with the problems with which General Somervell, Chief of the Service of Supply, is faced, but no nation in history has ever had an abler man to do the job than the United States of America has in General Somervell. Our committee was especially impressed by the outstanding ability of the men General Marshall has surrounded himself with to carry on this war effort. The Nation has never had an abler Chief of Staff than General Marshall. With McNair as chief of the ground forces, Somervell as Chief of the Services of Supply, and General Arnold, Chief of the Air Force, he has the ultimate in ability in the United States to assist in this war effort. Thus far no nation has produced three men who are equal in ability for the job as the three I have named. You can have every confidence this great war effort will be supervised and directed by the very best brains the American Army has.

I only wish you could have been privileged to have listened to the story of the performance of our ordnance and of our planes wherever they have been called into action. There is no disputing the fact we have the best equipped, the best clothed, the best housed, and the best fed army in the world.

Wherever our ordnance has come into contact with the enemy it has proved itself superior of the enemy. We have better tanks, we have better guns, and we have infinitely better planes when it comes to all-around performance. There are planes faster than our fighter planes, there are planes more maneuverable than ours, but there are none which excel ours in all-around conflict ability.

General Arnold told us that although the Japanese Zero fighter was faster than our fighter and more maneuverable, in actual combat our boys have been able to shoot down four Japanese planes for every American plane lost. This is a record unexcelled in the history of this conflict. Our fighter planes have more armor and more striking power, and are operated by the best pilots in the world.

With reference to the over-all strategy of this war, that is being changed by the victories achieved by the matchless performance of land-based and carrier-based planes in the Coral Sea, Midway, and the Aleutian Islands. No longer is there any room for debate about the superiority of the plane over the battleship. I call your attention to the fact in each of these three conflicts the surface craft of the United States and the enemy never came into contact with each other. The remarkable victories which were won by these dauntless fliers of ours were won entirely through the use of the airplane as a striking force.

I only wish I were privileged to reveal to you the tremendous losses inflicted upon the enemy surface craft and aircraft and the infinitesimally small price we paid in aircraft alone.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Some day when the thrilling history of these three combats can be revealed to you, they will tell you one of the most interesting stories in the history of human conflict. Out of the rain squalls and through the fleecy clouds of the Coral Sea our land-based Army planes and carrier-based planes, struck with devastating power, sending Japanese ships to the bottom and destroying scores of Japanese aircraft. At Midway a Navy patrol plane picked up the enemy hundreds of miles away from Midway, and land-based Army flying fortresses, the B–17's, in answer to the question propounded to me a moment ago by the very able gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD], proved their superiority not only over the Japanese surface craft but over the Japanese fighting planes. The Japanese fighters no longer pick a fight with the B–17 flying fortresses. These B–17's and B–26's struck with such speed and ferocity they turned back the powerful Japanese fleet before it could reach Midway. The Japanese naval losses were the greatest ever suffered by the Empire of the Rising Sun. Their losses in planes were terrible. The number of B–17's and B–26's lost were so small as to be infinitesimal and almost unbelievable.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for one more question on that point?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I would be happy to yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHEPPARD. May I ask if the testimony and also the publicity that has been released to date pertaining to the issue to which the gentleman has just referred were not most indicative of the vulnerability of the Japanese plane carriers?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. They were.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Would not that more or less directly involve itself with the strategy of production we are going to utilize in the future as a nation?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Unquestionably so. Unquestionably, more and more this war will be decided by the striking force of American land-based airplanes. Our fighter planes have speed, armor, and heavy fire power, and afford ample defense for our bombers when operating within their cruising radius. However, I repeat the land-based American bomber is the most striking improvement in modern warfare. It will change the course of strategy and largely decide the outcome of this war. No navy dare operate within its range without complete air protection. There has never been developed a weapon with the speed, range of action, maneuverability, and striking power of the four-engined American bomber. This is the outstanding lesson of World War No. 2.

Mr. KERR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KERR. I have noticed decided criticism being made throughout the country to the effect that although we are building and equipping efficient planes we are not making the proper arrangements to have the planes manned by well-trained pilots and men. I should like the gentleman to discuss that point for a minute or two.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. That criticism is not warranted by the facts. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] a moment ago gave you some statistics with reference to the number of pilots, enlisted men, and mechanics we had when this program was launched, the number we have now, and some idea as to the tremendous number who will be involved before the conflict is over. Let me say to those who say the American Army has not taken advantage of the lessons learned in this war thus far that such a statement is not in accord with the facts. When this tremendous Army of ours is built and equipped and called into service next

year, a third of it will be in the air force alone.

To answer your question, I say, first, the Army has the finest air pilot training program in the world; second, it has the best facilities; and, third, it is taking every advantage possible of the Civil Aeronautics Administration's program and of civilian instructors available throughout the country. The Army has made a particularly successful effort to enlist the very best men, the cream of American youth, as pilots and mechanics in our air forces. The results speak for themselves today.

Mr. MAGNUSON and Mr. PACE rose.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The gentleman has pointed out very ably the necessity of having aviation personnel. I am wondering whether or not in the discussions of the committee anything was said regarding the proposed training in a vocational way in the high schools and vocational-training units of the various States of the Union of young men between the ages of 16 and 20 along the lines of aviation.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. As I recall it, we had no testimony with reference to such a program before the committee.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Of course, a program of such type and character will probably be carried on through the Office of Education or the National Youth Administration.

Mr. MAGNUSON. As the gentleman points out, the Civil Aeronautics Administration's training program takes in men over that age, whereas the training to which I refer would include the youngsters.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. That is right.

Mr. PACE rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desires to make an announcement similar to one that was made some years ago, that when two or more Members are on their feet desiring to interrogate the speaker, in accordance with the rules of the House they should address the Chairman first and obtain recognition for that purpose. It is impossible for the Chair to know to whom the speaker yields or to proceed intelligently unless the Chair is first addressed and grants recognition.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I shall be delighted to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. The gentleman spoke a few moments ago about the superior quality of our tanks and guns. I have been somewhat disturbed at the treatment our tanks have been receiving from the 88 millimeter antitank guns with which the Germans in Libya are equipped.

I am not a military expert, but I understand that any tank equipped with a gun comparable to the 75-millimeter, as ours have been, will always encounter serious difficulty with an 88-millimeter or larger gun. Just newspaper reports are all I speak from but it seems that our tanks suffered rather severely from the 88-millimeter guns. I am sure our military authorities are awake to that situation—I hope they are—but is the gentleman permitted to comment on the treatment our tanks have received or are receiving?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. The answer, in part, is that our various latest models were not in operation in Libya. Secondly, that our 75's have been improved and the muzzle velocity stepped up to such an extent they are equal to or superior to the German 88. The other part of the answer is our tanks and our guns must be manned by people who know how to use them, to employ them to the best tactical advantage. Furthermore, I am sure the distinguished gentleman realizes, a man led into ambush can be slaughtered with weapons of inferior power, of course.

Mr. PACE. Does the gentleman contend that the 75-millimeter gun is comparable with the 88-millimeter gun?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. The testimony before us by the present Chief of Ordnance was to the effect, in answer to questions propounded to him by the very able gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], the 75-millimeter gun has been improved and the muzzle velocity stepped up to such an extent that it was equal or superior to the 88-millimeter gun. This was testimony of those who have spent a lifetime on the job.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the very able gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLLINS. It has been asserted by military authorities that the disastrous results that the British experienced in Libya were due to the superiority of the German guns in their tanks and self-propelled mounts over the guns in the British tanks.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. In some instances, if I recall correctly, the British had their 25's in their tanks.

Mr. COLLINS. There was a superiority of weapons in tanks.

Mr. PACE. I understood it was mostly the 88-millimeter antitank guns rather than the guns on the German tanks. There is no reason that the gentleman knows why we cannot have antitank guns of superior quality?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. We do have an antitank gun of superior quality, as I stated a moment ago.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to our distinguished chairman of the committee.

Mr. SNYDER. I think it should be brought out here that we did not have in Libya any of our medium tanks that have revolving 360° turrets on them, and we did not have any of the 75-millimeter guns in any of the tanks with the recent improvements in striking power on them.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I tried to develop those points, and I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Before the gentleman concludes, may I state that he was on the subject of aviation before we got into the matter of Libya and the tanks employed there. Would the gentleman tell the House how valuable has been the C. P. T. program under the C. A. A. in relation to pilot training for the Army?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I shall be happy to. The Chief of Air Forces stated the program referred to has been invaluable. The Army Air Force has taken full advantage of the opportunities offered, and through the C. P. T. have obtained some most excellent pilots.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Is the gentleman permitted to state to the House when these tanks of ours that were at the Libyan front were built?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. They were built since 1939. As the gentleman knows, it takes several months to get supplies around those tenuous lines of communication to the theater of action.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think it is very important that the country should know about that if it is not a military secret.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I will say to the gentleman that those tanks were not of the latest models produced by this country and they were not armored and equipped as are our latest models. There is no question ir the world, according to the experts, as to the superiority of our latest tanks and equipment.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, they were really obsolete?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Obsolete in terms of present-day models, yes.

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. CANFIELD. The gentleman has referred to the cost of World War No. 1 to the United States. Does the gentleman have that figure at hand now?

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Sheild, clerk of the Appropriations Committee of the House in World War No. 1, and its most efficient and courteous clerk now, informed me this morning the approximate over-all war cost of World War No. 1 was approximately $32,000,000,000. Approximately two billions were recaptured, leaving a net over-all cost of approximately $30,000,000,000.

We hope and pray the equipment and munitions provided by this bill will insure victory, full and complete, to our cause. Regardless of the cost we are determined to destroy those forces of evil who threaten the peace, liberty, and security of mankind.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. VAN ZANDT] such time as he may desire.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, in supporting this $42,000,000,000 Army supply bill, I am consistent with the po-

sition I have always taken since becoming a Member of Congress, of voting for every penny requested by the President for the national defense of our country.

This $42,000,000,000 Army supply bill represents the greatest amount of money ever appropriated by Congress or any lawmaking body in the world. As a matter of fact, this sum exceeds the total military cost of our Nation's participation in World War No. 1.

Today, with members of our armed forces stationed on the five continents and the seven seas of the world, every Member of Congress is conscious of the need for these appropriations. This is ably demonstrated by the various votes on appropriation measures, which reveal that Representative VITO MARCANTONIO, of New York, up until the time Russia entered the war, was the only Member of Congress to vote "No" on such proposals.

With the passage of this $42,000,000,000 item now before us, we will have appropriated for national defense the staggering sum of approximately $205,000,000,000.

The Army has been allocated nearly $125,000,000,000, with which it is expected to eventually build an army of from eight to ten million men and women. This Army will include armored forces, infantry divisions, and other component parts, including an Air Corps of 2,000,000 men and 125,000 airplanes.

The Navy, with an appropriation of $48,000,000,000, which includes the Marine Corps and Coast Guard, is enabled to embark on an expansion program that provides for a sufficient number of combat and supply ships to give us a two-ocean Navy manned by approximately one million and a half men and exceeding in the number of ships and tonnage that of any nation or combination of nations in the world.

The appropriations for the lend-lease program from its inception to the present date approximate $23,000,000,000.

While I did not approve of the proposal for the lend-lease program while our own armed forces were struggling with broom clubs and other makeshift weapons, it was my contention we should operate such a plan on the basis of 50 percent at home and 50 percent abroad. Yet since the program was adopted I have voted for every penny requested for lend-lease appropriations.

While the eyes of the whole world are focused on the battle of the Pacific, in some quarters we hear the criticism that Congress failed to fortify Guam and other Pacific outposts. The truth of the matter is that included in the $205,000,000,000 are the following appropriations:

Guam	$325,000
Wake Island	15,000,000
Johnston Island	6,000,000
Midway	22,000,000
Palmyra	4,000,000
Samoa	11,000,000
Hawaii	103,000,000
Philippine Islands	269,000,000

Congress, as far as Guam was concerned, was never asked to fortify that outpost. As proof of this statement we have only to read the remarks of the Honorable DAVID I. WALSH, Democratic United States Senator from Massachusetts, chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, who on February 13, 1942, as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, said on the Senate floor:

> No direct request for fortification—Guam—was ever put before the committees of the Senate or the House.

In line with Chairman WALSH'S statement are the following remarks of Representative CARL VINSON, Democrat from Georgia, chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee, who on February 21, 1939, said on the floor of the House, as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of that date:

> I can assure you that there is no intention on the part of the Navy Department to fortify Guam.

Thus the attempt to make a political issue over the alleged failure of Congress to fortify Guam is revealed by high-ranking Democrats as a futile effort to confuse the American people. In the words of Representative O'CONNOR, Democrat of Montana, those who continually harp on such an issue are simply "talking through their hats."

In addition to the appropriation for the Army, Navy, and lend-lease program, $8,000,000,000 have been included for the Maritime Commission to assist in expanding the ship-building program and to strengthen and maintain our merchant marine.

As the German and Italian submarines sink on an average of 2 vessels daily, our shipyards have stepped up production to the point of where at the present time we are building a ship in 46 days, and by August 1, 3 brand-new ships will be launched every 24 hours. The shipbuilding industry has expanded from 100,000 employees to approximately 1,000,000 in 2 years. This production record is America's answer to the submarine menace.

Mr. Chairman the $205,000,000,000 appropriation to date, as compared with the $145,000,000,000 for all purposes spent by the Government during the past 150 years of its existence, reveals the cost of war, and we are reminded that this is only the beginning.

While it is true that prior to Pearl Harbor I honestly disagreed with the President's policies on matters which I contended were definite steps toward war, I was sincere and followed my honest convictions because the majority of the people in my congressional district were against America's entrance into war.

Let me add that at no time have I been moved by petty partisan politics, and since the passage of the lend-lease program and the entry of America into war, I have consistently upheld the hands of the President by voting for every single penny he has requested, as well as supporting him in his efforts to bring the present conflict to a victorious conclusion.

Mr. Chairman, the $205,000,000,000 appropriated to date—and which is only the beginning—is for the purpose of giving the American people the greatest military machine the world has ever known and is designed to crush the forces of Hitler, Mussolini, and the war lords of Japan.

I repeat, I am supporting this $42,000,000,000 measure as I have supported every previous request by the President for an appropriation in the name of national defense.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the situation in the Atlantic, the situation in Libya, the situation in Asia, and in the East Indies, in the Aleutian Islands, and even on our own west coast makes it imperative that the American people realize what they are up against and that we provide every dollar and everything that is required for the ultimate victory of the United States. It will not do us any good, it will not be of any value to us to save money that is required to win the war, and, as a result of that saving, lose the war. It is perfectly apparent that the situation at the present time is critical enough so that it is absolutely necessary for us to produce everything that our factories are able to produce, to supply our own troops and the troops of other countries with the things that they need to win.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I would like to ask the gentleman from New York how much money has been provided for supplying our Allies in this bill.

Mr. TABER. In this bill there is $12,700,000,000, and in previous bills and authority to allocate funds there was a total of practically $50,000,000,000. This would make a total altogether of nearly $63,000,000,000.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Was the full amount sought by the Army and Navy granted?

Mr. TABER. The full amount asked for has been supplied.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will yield further, I take this opportunity to commend him for his interest and fine efforts in the national defense. The gentleman from the very first has realized the need of supplying our Allies and our own Army with the fullest equipment, material, and supplies necessary for the prosecution of this war. We must utilize the full productive capacity of America. We must see our Allies have as much material as we can get to them. It is vital to the war effort. We must also see to it that our own forces have the best war equipment possible. We all appreciate the fine efforts of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], the minority leader of the Appropriations Committee. He has been a tower of strength to his country and the world in a critical period.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further on that point?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. To make this emphatic, this $63,000,000,000, in round numbers, is the lease-lend operation. Is that correct?

Mr. TABER. That is true. That includes not only military items, but food, and that sort of thing that has to be supplied to our Allies to keep them going.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. And while we are on the subject, to fill out the picture, can the gentleman state, up to the present time, how much money has actually been expended, that has been allocated to our allies?

Mr. TABER. The amount that has been expended of the $18,000,000,000 of direct lease-lend appropriations is about $5,000,000,000, to this time, but of the amount that has gone forward out of the appropriations that have been made, over $30,000,000,000 for military purposes, it is a great deal more than that. I do not have that figure.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. SNYDER. I might say that all but a billion dollars up to this time has been obligated.

Mr. TABER. Out of the $18,000,000,000?

Mr. SNYDER. Yes.

Mr. TABER. I think that a great deal of the $30,000,000,000 that has been appropriated for military purposes has been allocated. I think that practically all of that has been obligated.

Mr. Chairman, I know that there was a feeling prior to Pearl Harbor on the part of some that we should not make these appropriations for those who are now associated with us in the war effort. Personally I have always realized that we must keep those who are associated with us going. At the present time it is just as important that they keep going as that we keep going. On the other hand, it is absolutely necessary that the American people realize that when we win this war, we have got to do it with our own boys, operating our own planes, and our own tanks, and our own guns. It is perfectly apparent that our Allies have been up against an awfully stiff proposition, and we are in a position where we have to go the limit. The item of upward of $10,000,000,000 alone for the pay and subsistence of our troops in this bill is evidence of the necessity that exists that our own boys do their part in this situation to save the world from Hitler and from the Mikado. I do not think that this is any time for anyone to think of anything except that we have to go down the line and win this fight. There can be no politics in it, there can be no personalities in it. It is absolutely necessary for all of us to pull together or we will all hang together. There is not any question but that if we do not pull together and if we do not see that the American people come out on top, and that our boys who are doing the fighting have enough to fight with, we will lose, and that is all. So that the American people will realize just how far we are going in this effort, I say to you that this, the regular 1943 appropriation bill for the War Department—and that is what this is—carries upward of $42,000,000,000. I say to you that this bill when it becomes a law, and those acts that have been previously passed for the war effort, will have carried $202,000,000,000 of cash appropriations and contract authorizations. In addition to that, as a result of legislation we have adopted, there has been made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation contract authorizations for materials to be used in the war effort for factories and other construction work, for stock piles and all that sort of thing, totaling $12,000,000,000 more. So that when this bill is passed the total involvement will run upward of $214,000,000,000. That is 10 times the amount of taxes that it is proposed will be raised when the Ways and Means Committee finishes its job upon taxation, which it is considering at the present time. Ten years of taxes right in the war appropriations and authorizations that have been made up to the time when this bill becomes law.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The date involved in those appropriations begins as of July 1, 1940; is that correct?

Mr. TABER. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Down to the present time?

Mr. TABER. That is correct. It includes all of those things, so far as I have been able to gather them together.

Now, that is a very serious situation. Perhaps it will bankrupt us, but bankrupt us or not it is a minor factor when it comes to the point of winning the war, because we have got to win. We have got to raise all the taxes that the people can bear. They are going to have to do without more things right along. We are going to have to get along without things that we have come to regard as necessities, but getting along without some things and reducing ourselves down until the time comes when we can win and when we can begin to restore the standard of living in America, is minor as compared with letting Hitler and the Mikado run over the world.

I hope that this bill will be passed without a destructive amendment or a vote in opposition on the part of any Member of the House.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I was particularly interested in the thought the gentleman expressed to the effect that American men will have to operate this equipment if it is to be operated successfully, wherever it is sent throughout the world, if I understood the gentleman's comment correctly.

Mr. TABER. I would not say that our boys were the only ones who would be effective, but I would say that our Allies have not at this time available sufficient men to operate enough equipment to clean up this situation, and we must not fool ourselves but what we have got to carry our share of the load.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, I get the impression from the gentleman's warning that as American people we must not assume that our productive capacity will do this job. We must not assume that simply producing this material and diffusing it throughout the earth will do the job, but that in addition to producing and shipping we must have the necessary military force to go along and finish up the undertaking.

Mr. TABER. There is no question about that, and it is going to take a great lot of men.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, we are considering today the largest single appropriation bill that was ever presented to the Congress of the United States or to any other legislative body in the entire history of the world.

This bill calls for an appropriation for our Military Establishment of $42,800,000,000, or more money than was spent in the World War by the United States. I am in favor of and am supporting this bill, and the eight billion naval expansion bill as a vital part of our all-out war program.

When war was declared after the dastardly attack by the Japs on Pearl Harbor, the American people made up their minds about one thing, that they were united on winning this war, cost what it may in blood, money, or tears. I believe the people back home are overwhelmingly in favor of this bill calling for an appropriation of $42,800,000,000, for one purpose and one purpose alone, that of winning the war as soon as possible. The American people, regardless of party, are united for an all-out war, all out in effort and all out in sacrifice to achieve victory, and to crush our enemies at the earliest possible moment.

There is no one in this Congress or elsewhere in America who can answer the vital question: How long will this war last? I certainly would not dare to make a prophecy. It may last 6 months or it may last 6 years. Therefore, the Committee on Appropriations, having the responsibility of providing funds for our Military Establishment, reported this gigantic appropriation bill because carrying out the will of the American people it wants to be on the safe side. This bill was prepared not for a war of 6 months or 1 year or 2 years but a war of 4, 5, or possibly 6 years. Therefore, the Committee on Military Appropriations very properly has presented an all-out bill of $42,000,000,000 providing for huge sums of money for all the different branches of our Army.

Let me say in the few minutes I have remaining that this war is down our alley. There is one thing I can say to you with absolute assurance and good faith, and that is that we will win the war. This war is down our alley, because in this great industrial Nation of ours we can build bigger tanks, bigger airplanes, bigger guns, bigger ships, and bigger and better armaments than all the Axis Powers combined. To do so we must have money. We must not merely have a few billion, but the $42,000,000,000 to carry out the war program in order to provide for future contingencies in order to make sure that we win the war, whether it is next year, as we devoutly pray, or the year after, or the year after that. As long as the Congress appropriates this money, the American people can and will produce the armaments, the ships, the airplanes, and the tanks to win the war. That is what this bill is. It is

a bill to win the war as soon as possible, no matter what it may cost in money or sacrifice. It must not be said that the Congress appropriated too little money or did it too late to furnish our armed forces with the best available weapons to insure our final victory. I am glad that this bill carries further appropriations for improvements at Stewart Airfield at Newburgh, N. Y., where the West Point cadets are to be trained to fly. I am sure that the Congress will not hesitate to provide every dollar necessary to make Stewart Field the finest, safest, and best-equipped flying field of its size in the world. It is proposed to train 1,500 cadets there and to maintain at Stewart Field 200 officers and 2,000 soldiers. The bill carries $75,000 for payment of civilian employees, more than half of which will be for civilian stenographers.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to discuss the details of this appropriation bill for the Military Establishment—the largest supply bill in the history of the Congress—for that has already been ably done by others. It was unanimously reported by the committee, and will be unanimously passed by the House. I am glad I helped to write it.

One Sunday afternoon during the early part of 1938 I was talking with one of the country's most worthy men. We were discussing present-day conditions and present-day thinking throughout the world. He was concerned about the concerted drive that was evidencing itself to destroy the confidence of the people in representative government, and he said in utmost earnestness that the history of mankind records the eternal truth that a nation reaches heights of greatness in proportion to the number of people who interest themselves in its political and economic affairs, and that a nation decays whenever its people cease to be jealous of their constitutional rights and prerogatives.

Since the date of this conversation these attacks upon legislative government have become more vicious and generally more unjustifiable. The people have heard these criticisms, some just and some unjust, so often that they can only believe there is no hope in legislative procedure. Whether it is true or not, if a saying is repeated often enough, it will come to be believed by the majority. Truth will win in a free field surely, but the present hostile atmosphere, some of which is being created for institutional purposes, is not conducive to clear thought or the exercise of fair judgment. It is time for us who believe in democracy to declare our belief and the reasons for the faith that lies in us.

In the present emergency the statement made most often concerns our military preparations in the last decade. Critics blandly assert that if Congress had done its duty and appropriated the funds asked for, the country would not have found itself ill-prepared for war on December 7, 1941.

I have been a member of the committee handling military appropriations continuously for many years, part of the time as chairman. In the circumstances, I feel that I am fully acquainted with military appropriations and that I have both the knowledge and the right to speak on the subject. To dispel the illusion of congressional culpability in this connection, I therefore wish to give you a résumé of appropriations for the military establishment for the 11-year period beginning with the fiscal year 1933, and including the bill that has been reported to the House today.

First of all, I direct your attention to two tables which I have painstakingly prepared and which I have submitted during the past 2 days to the War Department for verification, and which agree with War Department fiscal records:

TABLE I

	The President's Budget estimates	Appropriations
1933		
Annual bill (funds)	$301,030,642.00	$289,500,024.00
Emergency relief, military		15,164,000.00
Total	301,030,642.00	304,664,024.00
1934		
Annual bill (funds)	277,730,841.00	277,050,381.00
Contract authorizations	3,000,000.00	3,000,000.00
Reappropriation (barracks and quarters and other buildings and utilities)		1,203,700.00
Allotment from emergency funds		96,688,252.00
Total	280,730,841.00	377,942,333.00
In the 1934 appropriation the President impounded funds in all activities of the Military Establishment to the extent of	42,890,631.00	
The President also impounded, pursuant to the act of Mar. 20, 1933, title II, sec. B	19,538,137.00	
The President impounded, pursuant to the act of June 30, 1932, sec. 203	190,062.00	62,618,830.00
Total		315,323,503.00
1935		
Annual bill (funds)	260,624,208.00	255,526,147.00
Contract authorizations	[1]3,000,000.00	3,000,000.00
Deficiency	9,409,362.62	9,409,362.62
2 supplemental appropriations totaling	22,000.00	22,000.00
Pay restoration	15,904,584.54	15,904,584.54
Allotment from emergency funds		8,857,678.00
Total	288,960,155.16	292,719,772.16
1936		
Annual bill (funds)	317,459,277.00	341,348,204.00
Contract authorizations	3,000,000.00	7,686,753.00
First deficiency appropriation bill		165,000.00
Second deficiency appropriation bill		9,850,000.00
Allotment from emergency funds		9,551,451.00
Total	320,459,277.00	368,601,408.00

[1] Air Corps.

TABLE I—Continued

	The President's Budget estimates	Appropriations
1937		
Annual bill (funds)	$375,025,510.00	$383,104,859.00
Contract authorizations	8,000,000.00	10,669,786.00
Deficiency	8,040,000.00	5,140,000.00
Contract authorizations		3,000,000.00
Allotment from emergency funds		18,069,820.00
Total	391,065,510.00	419,984,465.00
1938		
Annual bill (funds)	416,486,461.00	415,263,154.00
Contract authorizations	10,462,000.00	21,887,394.00
Deficiency	1,921,875.00	1,921,875.00
Allotment from emergency funds		74,939,334.00
Total	428,870,336.00	514,011,757.00
1939		
Annual bill (funds)	436,408,835.00	459,401,254.00
Contract authorizations	19,126,894.00	34,045,394.00
Reappropriations		4,250,474.00
First deficiency appropriation bill	800,000.00	800,000.00
Second Deficiency Appropriation Act	102,504,287.00	71,600,743.00
Contract authorizations	59,701,000.00	46,801,000.00
Allotment from emergency funds		31,097,625.00
Total	618,541,016.00	647,996,490.00
1940		
Annual bill (funds)	520,305,868.00	[2]508,789,824.00
Contract authorizations	20,700,000.00	40,205,988.00
Reappropriations	5,000.00	5,000.00
Third deficiency appropriation bill	9,937,300.00	9,937,300.00
Contract authorizations	8,503,000.00	8,500,000.00
Supplemental appropriations—funds requested	239,002,500.00	223,393,047.00
Contract authorizations	70,497,500.00	[3]70,497,500.00
Allotment from emergency funds		18,220,400.00
Total	868,948,168.00	879,554,059.00
1941		
Annual bill (funds)	853,356,754.00	[4]1,499,323,322.00
Contract authorizations	87,780,500.00	323,229,636.00
Total	941,137,254.00	1,822,552,958.00
Second deficiency appropriation	135,000.00	135,000.00
First supplemental military, 1941:		
Funds	775,788,040.00	821,002,047.00
Contract authorizations	254,176,761.00	254,176,761.00
Total	1,029,964,801.00	1,075,178,808.00
Second supplemental defense, 1941:		
Funds	1,662,265,417.00	1,793,372,532.00
Contract authorization	2,249,730,000.00	2,251,730,000.00
Total	3,911,995,417.00	4,045,102,532.00

[2] Includes $68,615 appropriated for Salaries, Contingent Expenses, and Printing and Binding for Bureau of Insular Affairs, which was transferred to Department of Interior.

[3] Reduction was due to a reduction of funds for educational orders, as the estimates exceeded authorizing legislation.

[4] Includes $19,607 transferred to Post Office Department.

TABLE I—Continued

	The President's Budget estimates	Appropriations
1941		
Third supplemental defense, 1941:		
Funds	$1,577,277,314.00	[5]$1,248,013,082.00
Contract authorizations	150,000,000.00	150,000,000.00
Total	1,727,277,314.00	1,398,013,082.00
Fourth supplemental defense, 1941: Funds	680,118,000.00	695,118,000.00
Fifth supplemental defense, 1941:		
Funds	1,716,225,000.00	1,997,811,100.00
Contract authorization	[6] 2,096,086,197.00	2,093,453,254.00
Total	3,812,311,197.00	4,091,264,354.00
First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act for 1941: Funds (military activity)	2,400,000.60	2,400,000.00
Public Res. No. 99 approved Sept. 24, 1940: Funds	338,263,902.00	338,263,902.00
First Deficiency Act, fiscal year 1941	137.00	137.00

[4] Includes $24,825,108 Selective Service System transferred to Independent Offices.

[5] $1,236,208,254 was provided in cash in 1942 regular appropriation act.

Summary, fiscal year 1941, military activities, War Department

Estimates	*Appropriations*
$941,137,254	$1,822,552,958
135,000	135,000
1,029,964,801	1,075,178,808
3,911,995,417	4,045,102,532
1,727,277,314	1,398,013,082
680,118,000	695,118,000
3,812,311,197	4,091,264,354
3,400,000	3,400,000
338,263,902	338,263,902
137	137
[1]12,444,605,022	13,469,028,773
1,236,208,254	
11,208,394,768	

[1] Includes $1,236,208,254 of contractual authority for which a cash appropriation was made on the 1942 regular appropriation act.

1942 annual appropriation bills

	The President's Budget estimates	Appropriations
Funds	$6,386,064,698	$10,384,821,624
Contract authorizations	187,145,695	183,145,695
	6,573,210,393	10,567,967,319
Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941: Funds	6,500,000	6,500,000
First Supplemental Defense, 1942: Funds:		
House	4,770,065,588	
Senate	4,860,872,988	4,253,957,663
NOTE.—This bill as passed by the House Appropriations Committee: $4,760,203,813.		
Third Supplemental Defense, 1942: Funds	6,687,369,046	7,376,026,583
Added in Senate at request of Budget Bureau	691,882,685	
	7,379,251,731	
Fourth Supplemental Defense, 1942: Funds	12,525,872,474	12,525,872,474
Fifth Supplemental Defense, 1942: Funds	22,888,901,900	23,485,737,900
Sixth Supplemental Defense, 1942: Funds	17,579,311,253	17,394,677,343

Summary, fiscal year 1942, military activities, War Department

The President's Budget	*Appropriations*
$6,573,210,393	$10,567,967,319
6,500,000	6,500,000
4,770,065,588	[4]4,253,957,663
[3] 7,379,251,731	7,376,026,583
12,525,872,474	12,525,872,474
22,888,901,900	23,485,737,900
17,579,311,253	17,394,677,343
71,723,113,339	75,610,739,282

[1] Ordnance Reserve taken out in Senate but was put back in later bills.

[2] Includes $691,882,685 added in Senate at request of Bureau of the Budget.

NOTE.—These totals in estimates and appropriations, since they each include contract authorizations, should be reduced by the sum total of contract authorizations. This is necessary in order to reach the total money appropriated

1943 annual appropriation bills

	The President's Budget estimates	Appropriations
Funds	$39,532,309,062	
Reported by the House	42,820,063,067	

GRAND TOTAL

Estimates	*Appropriations*
$125,962,423,114.16	[1] $135,642,626,800.16

[1] Includes amount reported by the House for 1943.

In other words, Congress has appropriated during this 11-year period nearly $10,000,000,000 in excess of the President's Budget estimates.

TABLE II

	The President's Budget estimates	Appropriations
1933		
National Guard	$31,413,369	$31,413,369
Organized Reserve Corps	6,354,348	6,354,348
Citizens military training [1]	6,692,008	6,692,008
1934		
National Guard (bulk)	27,486,667	35,621,498
Organized Reserve Corps	5,822,159	6,354,348
Citizens military training [1]	4,920,909	5,975,431
1935		
National Guard	24,628,289	28,075,034
Organized Reserve Corps	3,986,859	4,278,859
Citizens military training [1]	4,104,814	4,117,601
1936		
National Guard	30,956,341	34,130,866
Organized Reserve Corps	5,617,674	6,372,178
Citizens military training [1]	4,323,246	6,461,204
1937		
National Guard	36,491,555	38,004,559
Organized Reserve Corps	6,656,883	8,574,195
Citizens military training [1]	6,076,896	6,869,746
1938		
National Guard	39,640,877	41,109,187
Organized Reserve Corps	9,443,000	9,837,833
Citizens military training [1]	6,539,470	6,403,470
Reappropriation of unexpended funds, citizens military training		517,850
1939		
National Guard	[2]42,173,805 [2]1,271,151	42,126,528 1,271,151
Organized Reserve Corps	11,211,500	11,722,340
Reappropriation for Organized Reserve Corps		513,443
Citizens military training [1]	5,607,900	6,607,388
Reappropriation for citizens military training		502,354
1940		
National Guard	43,775,105	45,578,305
National Guard (supplemental)	7,753,383	7,642,340
Organized Reserve Corps	12,425,200	12,802,557
Organized Reserve Corps (supplemental)	479,304	479,304
Citizens military training [1]	6,809,042	7,248,444

[1] Includes Reserve officer training, 55 C schools, etc.

[2] Reappropriation.

TABLE II—Continued

	The President's Budget estimates	Appropriations
1941		
The National Guard [3]	$96,800,240	[4]$88,466,967
The National Guard (fifth supplemental estimate)	1,867,000	1,867,000
Organized Reserve Corps	24,068,020	32,107,455
Organized Reserve Corps (first supplemental)		11,063,626
Organized Reserve Corps (third supplemental estimate)	86,161,608	86,161,608
Citizens military training [1]	7,274,068	7,215,317
1942		
National Guard	24,081,180	[4] 25,331,180
Organized Reserve Corps	1,767,000	1,767,000
Citizens military training [1]	5,808,900	5,808,900
1943		*As reported by House*
National Guard	99,900	$99,900
Organized Reserve Corps	100	100
Citizens' military training	5,482,000	5,482,000

[1] Includes Reserve officer training, 55 C schools, etc.

[3] The funds appropriated in 1941 were not entirely expended, because the Guard went into Federal service during 1941.

[4] The reduction was made because the National Guard Association asked that field training be reduced from 28 to 21 days, that drills be reduced from 60 to 48 and the revised cost of motor vehicles could be reduced by $1,000,000.

Back in the lean years of 1932, 1933, and 1934, when there was distress and suffering throughout the country, when banks were failing because of depression conditions, and when the cry for economy was on the lips of everyone, the military establishment was given funds in excess of Budget estimates. Congress had little to do with the division of the funds by items in the appropriation bills. It generally accepted the allocations made by the general staff to the several branches of the Army, although, I think, it should have insisted that a larger proportion be spent on modern equipment, for the Constitution directs Congress to provide an Army and a Navy, and an Army and a Navy that is not equipped with modern weapons is doomed to defeat.

Back in those lean years, however, the Military Appropriations Subcommittee, even though violently criticized, did insist upon a reallocation of some funds for modernization of the Army.

For the fiscal year 1933 the tables presented show that the funds received for the Military Establishment amounted to $3,633,382 more than Budget estimates. Actually, the purchasing power of appropriations for 1933 are $8,000,000 greater than is indicated in table I, for the prices of commodities decreased by that figure after the Budget estimates were made up.

One of the principal proposals of a forward-looking nature in the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1934 was to group all travel items under one head so that there would be greater flexibility and permit a better check to be kept on expenditures for travel by the War Department.

Congress, upon recommendation of the Military Appropriations Committee, wrote into the appropriations bills for 1933, 1934, 1935, and later years a provision permitting the Chief of the National Guard Bureau to use the savings from appropriations made to that agency to motorize the National Guard and to con-

vert its weapons into mobile equipment. Gen. George Leach, the then Chief of the National Guard Bureau, was eminently successful in carrying out this congressional wish, and by the end of the fiscal year 1935 the National Guard was almost fully motorized. It is interesting to note that the first funds to purchase the high-speed Buquor adapter for the 75-mm. guns were written into an appropriation bill in conference back in the early thirties.

For the fiscal year 1934 Military Establishment appropriations were $34,591,662 above the Budget estimates. Reduced commodity costs, however, and reduced pay to military and civilian personnel because of the provisions of the Economy Act, amounted to nearly $2,500,000 which the Congress had to deduct from the bill after it came from the Budget.

It will be noted that for the fiscal year 1934 Congress increased appropriations for the National Guard by $8,134,831. This was done to give the Guard 48 drills rather than 22 as recommended by the Budget.

Chemical Warfare appropriations were increased by $100,000, $75,000 of which was for experimentation in developing new chemicals, and the remainder for chemical warfare weapons.

I can best describe the worth-while progress the Congress made in writing the appropriation bill for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year 1935 by quoting from my speech in reporting the bill to the House March 7, 1934:

There are quite a number of changes that have been made by the committee in the estimates. The principal worth-while changes that have been made in this bill relate first to the desire of the committee to furnish the Military Establishment with some modern implements of war. We have 13 worth-while tanks; we have 4 armored cars; we have 80 automatic rifles; and that is about all. It is a pitiable condition. So we added, in addition to about $800,000 that is in this bill for tanks, combat cars, and automatic rifles, $2,119,200 for these purposes. This will be the beginning of real implementation of foot soldiers.

We will be able to secure enough tanks fully to mechanize one regiment of Cavalry, considering the tanks on hand and being bought this year. In addition, we will be able to mechanize two companies of Infantry.

The General Staff of the Army is very much pleased with this provision. It is 100 percent in line with the splendid statement of General MacArthur on mechanization made to the Hearst newspapers only a few days ago.

In addition to this, the committee restores about $400,000 to chemical warfare. Likewise, we have provided money so that one officer from the National Guard of each State may go to the Chemical Warfare School. We intend to teach these soldiers modern military methods and ways of making war and that hiding behind a tree is not the last word in military strategy.

Furthermore, there is carried in this bill other increases for chemical warfare in the way of mechanized vehicles for the discharge of chemical shells, something they have been asking for for a number of years, but which they have been unable to get on account of budgetary limitations. We appropriated the money for this object last year, but it was withheld because of budgetary limitations, and we are reappropriating it this year.

The Air Corps especially wanted an additional $1,000,000 provided for experimentation. They want to experiment with foreign engines. They want to experiment with worth-while accessories to airplanes. We did not feel that we should cut down the money for any of the projects included in the Budget, especially for the purchase and operation of airplanes. Therefore, we have added $1,000,000 for experimentation for the Air Corps over and above the amount recommended by the Budget.

Out of that increased appropriation to the Air Corps a million dollars for experimentation the flying fortress was born. It is my considered opinion that this is the greatest military weapon ever devised and that it will be the deciding factor in bringing victory to us and our democratic Allies.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I shall be happy to yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. I have seen a statement written several years ago and signed by the present Chief of the United States Air Corps, Lt. Gen. Henry H. Arnold, in which he gives credit to the gentleman from Mississippi now speaking for originating this very flying fortress.

Mr. COLLINS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HAINES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I shall be happy to yield.

Mr. HAINES. I know the gentleman from Mississippi would be too modest to take the credit that certainly is due him, but his has been a voice crying in the wilderness for many years for a mechanized army. I feel that the Membership of the House at this time should pay him a tribute in recognizing his great contribution to the present war effort.

Mr. COLLINS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I shall gladly yield.

Mr. POWERS. I cannot let your remarks go by without stating to the House that I served under the gentleman from Mississippi back in the early thirties when he was chairman of the War Department Appropriations Subcommittee. Truly his was a lone voice, pleading year after year for mechanization of air and ground forces, and for armor and greater fire power for our armed forces. His theories of those years have been accepted today and are being adopted and when used are proving effective, thank heavens. You paid dearly then for your advocacy of the use of machinery in warfare, as you were criticized by the press and military leaders as few men have for your forward thinking ideas.

Mr. COLLINS. I thank the gentleman.

Mrs. BOLTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLLINS. I am pleased to yield to the gentlewoman from Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON. It is my very happy privilege to echo what these gentlemen have said. I know as intimately perhaps as anyone not a Member of the House could know the work the gentleman from Mississippi did throughout this decade for the upbuilding of the Military Establishment, and I want to add my voice in thanking him for the arduous work he has done.

Mr. COLLINS. I sincerely thank the gentlewoman from Ohio. Her fine husband labored with me many years ago in trying to modernize the Army of the United States.

I am submitting a table showing the additional appropriations, over Budget estimates, made for mechanized equipment for the 1935 fiscal year:

Signal Corps (mica ray)	$45,000
Air Corps	1,000,000
Ordnance	2,119,200
Gages, jigs, and dies	41,000
Chemical warfare equipment	420,347

In addition to these items, an additional appropriation of $5,000,000 was added in conference to the Air Corps for planes, experimentation, and for gasoline and lubricants.

Likewise, in 1936, 1937, and all other annual appropriation bills down to the present, Congress has added funds to Budget estimates for the strengthening of our Military Establishment and the modernization of our military equipment in the air and on the ground, year after year, for example, having appropriated additional funds for the purchase of airplanes in excess of Budget estimates.

In closing I wish to pay my sincere respects to Gen. George Marshall, the Chief of Staff of the armed forces of the country—the outstanding military leader in the United States today. America is fortunate that Gen. George Marshall is the Chief of Staff of its Army. He is gifted with unusual and exceptional qualities, with courage and foresightedness. He has been quick to perceive our needs and eager to embrace and adapt the worth while. Americans will be forever grateful to him for his success in creating and implementing a modern military force capable of bringing victory to the democratic nations.

This is the time for united action on the part of all of the people and all of the branches of our Government—united action to win this war. Our Chief Executive through the years has done a splendid job in recommending funds for the Military and Naval Establishments. Congress likewise has done its duty. And the people of the country are enthusiastically rallying behind the Nation's war effort. Just and intelligent criticism of mistakes is always welcome and should be helpful, but unfair criticism, thoughtless recrimination tend only to confusion and disunity. Whatever mistakes have been made are being remedied speedily. The dark days of today will change to brighter ones, and whatever trials may lie before us, however long and hard and dark the road we travel, I am confident that under the strong and enlightened leadership of our President we shall prove worthy of our heritage and gain the victory upon which depends the fate of civilization throughout the world.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how the time stands?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. PACE). The gentleman from New Jersey has consumed 34 minutes, the gentleman from Pennsylvania 1 hour and 35 minutes.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentlaman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, the great majority of the nations of the world are at war. It seems too bad that we have had to be drawn into this terrible catastrophe. It seems to me our place should have been that of leader of the nations of the world trying to settle the disputes that have arisen amongst the nations, settle them around the peace table, but that is not our lot; we are at war. It behooves each and every Member of the Congress, each and every citizen of the United States to do what he can at this time to win this war. We have a real job on our hands, and it is going to require two-fisted, hard-boiled, able men to win it; it is going to require the best brains of the country. There is no time for pussyfooting or quibbling. Notwithstanding my earlier feelings—I was against war until the time of Pearl Harbor—I am for winning it today, but we are not going to win it unless we utilize every bit of manpower and all of our resources to the very utmost of the intelligence we as American citizens possess. Let us look for just a little at some of the things that have happened and see what the situation is. Here we are with 25 or 30 Members present on the floor, yet there is up for consideration the largest appropriation bill in the history of the world, amounting to $48,821,943,067.

Do they all know what it is all about?

We were called into an appropriation committee meeting this morning at 11 o'clock and a little bit after 12 we reported this bill. I presume it is all right to believe that the subcommittee knew something about the bill, but I do not think there is anyone else on the Appropriations Committee who does have a complete knowledge of this bill and I do not think there is anyone on the committee who can digest within 2 or 3 hours such a bill as this.

Mr. POWERS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I only have 10 minutes.

Mr. POWERS. I will yield the gentleman 2 minutes if the gentleman yields to me.

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman, then.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman is making a very unfair and untrue statement when he says that no member of the Appropriations Committee knows the details of or much about this bill.

Mr. RICH. I did not say that.

Mr. POWERS. The gentleman intimated that.

Mr. RICH. I did not. I said outside of the subcommittee of which the gentleman is a member. I said I did not believe that the members of the Appropriations Committee knew what was in this bill except the members of the subcommittee who had lived with it, and the gentleman is one of them.

Mr. POWERS. The members of the Appropriations Committee know just as much about this bill as they know about any and every appropriation bill that a subcommittee brings before them. If the gentleman will read the committee report, if he will read the hearings, he will know something about it, too.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I cannot yield.

Mr. STEFAN. The gentleman is making an unfair statement. Why does he not yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman. Are you a member of the subcommittee?

Mr. STEFAN. I am a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that for almost a year we have been going down to the War Department and securing knowledge and information on appropriations and also about certain things that the War Department is doing, and I claim I know something about these appropriations.

Mr. RICH. I am telling the gentleman what I know about this bill. I know something about it, and I think I have about as average intelligence as the majority of the Members of Congress; at least, I think so.

Mr. STEFAN. I resent the gentleman saying that I do not know anything about this. I know something about the bill.

Mr. RICH. I am glad the gentleman does.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to my agreement with the gentleman, I yield him 2 additional minutes.

Mr. RICH. Now, Mr. Chairman, let us see where we are. I am glad there are some members of the Appropriations Committee who know something about it, because I have talked to a good many of them, and they have had 1 hour to digest this appropriation bill, covering $42,000,000,000, but that is more than I can do—understand the spending of $42,000,000,000 in 1 hour. I will say that is going some. I cannot fathom it. I want the public to know it, I want the people back in my district to know it, and I want the world to know it. We have a lot of bright people in Congress, I must admit, but we also have a lot of people here who have a lot to learn. I cannot spend forty-two billion in 1 hour and know all about it, especially when we could not ask many questions.

The Treasury report of June 19 shows that we are in the red to the extent of $74,000,000,000. Since the 1st of January we have had appropriated and passed through the House bills appropriating $23,439,000,000 for operation of regular departments. We have passed through the House 11 bills for the national defense involving $70,000,000,000. The total appropriations that have gone through the House of Representatives have amounted to $101,890,000,000 since the 1st of January. Add this bill here appropriating $42,820,000,000, and you get a total of $144,712,000,000.

We have never had any such appropriations like that in all the history of the world by any nation of the world.

Let me call your attention to what has been happening in the last few years. In 1933 we were in the red $1,800,000,000; in 1934, in the red $2,900,000,000; in 1935, in the red $3,200,000,000; 1936, in the red $4,600,000,000; in 1937, in the red $3,100,000,000; in 1938, in the red $1,400,000,000; 1939, in the red $3,500,000,000; 1940, in the red $3,600,000,000; and in 1941, in the red $5,100,000,000. We expect to be about $19,000,000,000 in the red at the end of this year, and next year the figures are estimated to be in the red $56,000,000,000. Those figures are outstanding and astounding and disheartening as well as alarming.

The Revolutionary War cost this Government $504,288,328; the War of 1812 cost $246,785,373; the Mexican War cost $195,087,436; the Civil War cost the Union $11,667,533,483, and the Confederate side $1,520,033,632; the Spanish-American War cost $1,015,554,728; and the first World War, $41,765,000,000.

The latter figure is the sum that we spent for the whole of the first World War, yet today we are making appropriations of more than a billion dollars over what we spent for all of the first World War in this one bill. I wonder, I wonder, and I wonder if you know what it is all about. I do not think that you do and I say it kindly and mean it sincerely.

Mr. Chairman, the point I make is that the Members just cannot digest this great sum in a few hours. You do not understand it. You do not know what this is all about. I asked who wrote this bill and I was advised that the War Department sent it up here. Well, I think we have just as good men in our Army, in our Navy, and in our air force as any nation in the world, but this thing has come on them so quickly, and we have been so used to squandering and spending money that we are not trying to save the dollars. We are just appropriating everything and putting ourselves in the hands of the Chief Executive and the Army. Bankruptcy is facing us in such extravagant spending.

In this bill, section 13 appropriates about $12,700,000,000 for lend-lease.

Mr. TERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman give me 5 minutes? I will yield to him if he will.

Mr. TERRY. I do not have that time.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman has lots of time. Give me 5 minutes.

Mr. TERRY. I cannot yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. RICH. No time; no money; no Treasury; broke; busted; wrecked.

Is all the time on the gentleman's side allotted?

Mr. TERRY. I cannot yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Give me 3 minutes and I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TERRY. I would rather not ask the question. I think it is better policy.

Mr. RICH. I would like to get some time here. We tried to get time in the committee and we could not get it. Now we are trying to get time on the floor and we cannot get it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman from New Jersey give me 5 minutes more?

Mr. POWERS. For the benefit of the RECORD I may say that the gentleman asked me for 10 or 15 minutes when we started. I said, "Will 10 minutes be sufficient?" He said, "Yes; it will." I said, "You have 10 minutes." All my time has been allotted, and I explained that to the gentleman. I gave the gentleman 2 additional minutes. I am sorry. If I had the time, he could have it. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. RICH. Five hours for forty-two billion spending; going some.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I did not expect to speak on this bill today, but I could not permit to pass unchallenged the statement made by my good friend from Pennsylvania to the effect that Congress is passing bills without knowing what they are about. Naturally and obviously, with 12,000 bills coming before the House annually each Member cannot familiarize himself with every detail of every bill. However, this House has had a great deal of information available with regard to every appropriation bill that has come before the House for passage. This is my eighth year in the House and my sixth year on the War Department Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee. I believe the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations have in every instance brought before the House detailed statements as to what the appropriations have been for, together with a great deal of testimony, sometimes as high as 2,000 pages of printed testimony with regard to one bill.

Obviously, when we have before us an appropriation bill of this type, affecting the war effort, a great deal of the testimony cannot be placed in the record. The other subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of which I happen to be a member, the Labor-Federal Security Agency Committee, labored for 12 solid weeks before bringing before the House the bill the House finally passed.

No one has been more critical of the Army than I have, and I do not believe anyone in the House has devoted more time to trying to eliminate waste in the Government than I have.

I have believed, and I now believe, that this war will probably put this country into bankruptcy. A $200,000,000,000 debt, with about $134,000,000,000 assessed valuation, can mean nothing except bankruptcy or inflation. Until Pearl Harbor I had hoped we would avoid it, but I have come to the conclusion that there are things that are worse than bankruptcy. While I am going to continue to hold the Army accountable for every dollar we are giving them, while I am going to try to eliminate all the waste possible, I am going to give the Army and Navy all the money they need to win this war, including money they may waste, even though we may have to pay off our war debt on the basis of 10 cents on the dollar, either through inflation or otherwise. The most important thing today is to win this war. We are all unanimous on that, including the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

I call the attention of the House to the committee report. On page 12 and following pages of that report you will find a detailed statement of what the appropriation was in 1942 for each specific purpose, the revised Budget estimates for 1943, the amount recommended in the bill by the committee for 1943, the increase or decrease in each item of the 1943 Budget over 1942.

Let us consider these items. Under the heading "Finance Department," on page 13—I am picking out the larger items—you will find $6,007,367,501 for pay of the Army. That money will be paid out in accordance with the act of Congress that was recently passed increasing the pay. Every Member of the House is familiar with or ought to be familiar with the Army rate of pay from a general down to a buck private. When you say you do not know anything about the bill you are simply confessing that you have not kept up with the Army pay bill which has just gone through. We certainly know what this $6,000,000,000 is for.

The next item is "Travel of the Army," $549,525,958.

Under the heading "Quartermaster Corps" we find the item of "Subsistence," $1,433,299,450. The record shows that the food cost per soldier is 62 cents a day.

Then there is the item of $1,433,299,450 for clothing and equipage. The War Department has in the files of the Quartermaster Corps a statement showing the exact number of articles of clothing required per soldier, including those in reserve, together with the cost. We know what is going to happen to that money. It will be spent for clothing and equipage.

On page 14 you find the item of "Army transportation," $3,721,692,958, covering motorcars and other costs of transportation.

Next is the item of "Signal Service of the Army," $2,617,506,025. That means what? It means all the instruments that go into airplanes, all the equipment, this new detector you have heard so much about; all equipment of that kind comes under the Signal Corps, and those of us on the committee know practically every item that is available. We had 10 or 12 books, each one 2 inches thick, giving us the detailed information about these items, but obviously we cannot put them into the record.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. MAHON. I think the committee has about 10 books, and they are now on the Clerk's desk.

Mr. ENGEL. There are the books on the Clerk's desk now, 10 books of information.

Naturally, when you multiply 6,000,000 men by 365 days by 62 cents for food costs you are going to get a large amount. It is not the sum of money involved so much as it is the number of men that counts.

Now let us go on with some more of these items. Engineer Corps of the Army will spend over $2,000,000,000 for military post construction. This includes work at Army posts, construction work in America, in Europe, and all over the world.

There is nearly $10,000,000,000 for ordnance equipment. This includes guns, automobile equipment, and various instrumentalities of that type. We know what that money is for. We know practically every item about that because there are details in that book showing the number of guns and the amount of equipment in detail.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MAHON. It is interesting to point out, is it not, that of that approximately $10,000,000,000, none of it goes for plant construction but for actual construction of the implements of war?

Mr. ENGEL. That $10,000,000,000 is all for implements of war, including self-propelled mounted artillery, machine guns, and all the guns that go into the tanks and into the airplanes—semiautomatic rifles. That is all armament.

I might mention the appropriation for Chemical Warfare Service of $620,000,000, and I want to say here and now that the Chemical Warfare Service has been doing a wonderful job.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Reverting to the statement made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] a few moments ago, I am sure the gentleman, as well as all the other members of the Appropriations Committee, has been called to what we might term the secret chamber of the War Department during the past few years, and it was there that we were given an inventory of our equipment and we were told the necessity for other equipment, and at the same time justification was given in detail, but not on the record.

Mr. ENGEL. The Military Affairs Committees of the House and Senate and the War Department Subcommittee on Appropriations of both bodies were invited monthly to the War Department. Sometimes they came up here. They would give us an itemized statement of every gun they were manufacturing and state everything in detail. They would tell us how the program was coming along and give the number of guns they intended to make and each item of equipment. They gave us a statement each month as to whether they were behind or ahead of schedule on the various items of equipment. The gentleman from Pennsylvania undoubtedly heard some of those statements.

I do not like statements going out to the public to the effect that the House does not know what it is doing. I want to say that the Members of the House have the most complete information on these appropriation bills and it is absolutely unfair to the individual Members of the House on both sides of the aisle to make statements to the contrary. I have been on this committee for 6 years. I have been in the House 8 years, and I have yet to find one instance where there has been any politics.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan 5 additional minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. I have yet to find one instance where there has been any politics

in the Appropriations Committee. I have yet to find one instance where the War Department subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee, sitting day after day, sometimes for weeks, has decided a question in a political way or in a way that d'd not have the best interests of the country at heart.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman is on the subcommittee having this bill in charge?

Mr. ENGEL. I am.

Mr. RICH. And the gentleman has spent weeks in the meetings of the committee and the gentleman certainly ought to know something about it and we congratulate the gentleman on his knowledge, as well as all the other members of the committee.

Mr. ENGEL. I do not pretend to know everything about it.

Mr. RICH. I want to ask the gentleman this question. You have in the bill, as section 13, at page 58, for lease-lend $12,700,000,000. According to the report here you have given for lease-lend, under the War Department and the Navy Department, a sum total of $62,944,000,000. Does the gentleman know what that money is being used for and where it is going?

Mr. ENGEL. Statements have been given the House by the Appropriations Committee with respect to every lease-lend measure passed and in every instance we have had before our committee an itemized statement, showing how much was spent for food and how much for guns and how much for each item requested. All lease-lend money appropriated down to this bill except approximately a billion and a quarter dollars has been obligated. So far as I am concerned, I want the Army and the Navy to have all the money they can legitimately spend.

If they waste any of this money, I want to say again that Congress is going to hold them responsible.

May I say one thing more? As a result of the work of this House and the criticism on the floor of this Chamber and in the other body, and as a result of the committee work done by the House and Senate, the War Department has a group of experts that go over each major contract. They find out whether a price is too high, whether the cost of the materials has come down or the cost has been reduced because of mass production. They go back to the companies involved and make those companies renegotiate the contract. The Air Corps alone has saved $240,000,000 in the last few months through renegotiating contracts in this way. I am going to vote for all the money they ask for and then hold them accountable for any waste when the proper time comes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. If you make all these appropriations and ycu expect to hold the Army accountable for them after this is over, does not the gentleman think we had better have the right kind of supervision and know that every dollar is being spent properly? That is the gentleman's duty and that is my duty.

Mr. ENGEL. When you have a certain number of men, you know it costs a certain amount per man to clothe him a year and you know what the money is being spent for. When you know there are a certain number of men to whom you have to furnish rations, you know what that is going to cost you. I am going to do all I can to have the prices reduced, but in the meantime I am not going to hamstring the Army by withholding appropriations.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. I take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, to congratulate the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]. I know that every Member of this House, on both sides of the aisle, will recall that in January 1941 the gentleman from Michigan as a one-man committee made it possible for the membership of this House to know something about waste of money in the construction of cantonments, and since the time the gentleman from Michigan made his report this House and this Congress has had committees at work with the result that today we can show where the Naval Affairs Committee has made it possible to show an approximate saving of over half a billion dollars, and the other committees have shown savings of approximately $1,000,000,000 in the matter of renegotiated contracts with prospects of future savings to the taxpayers of the country. I feel it speaks highly for the gentleman from Michigan and those who are trying to eliminate waste in Federal expenditures.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield now to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I am for this $42,000,000,000 bill, the greatest appropriation ever made on this planet. Its very size is staggering, incomprehensible. This bill takes more than all the assets of all the insurance companies of the United States—more than the cost of the World War to us. This means something more than spending money, for we have not the money. This means appropriating the energies of our people, the resources of our land, to war. No man here can fully comprehend what this means. No man here knows the details covered in this single appropriation.

No Member of Congress not on the committee can tell what is included in the broad items of this bill, for nearly every page of the brief hearings before us contains this phrase, repeated again and again, "Discussion off the record."

Nevertheless, I am for this bill. I am taking it on faith—faith in the Commander in Chief, the Army officials and experts who say we need it for victory; faith in our Appropriations Committee, who have heard in detail of our needs; faith in the Republic and its ability to endure and triumph; faith in the cause in which we are united with the freedom-loving people of the earth.

I see two of my children here in the gallery today. I know they will have to sacrifice through the years to help pay for this appropriation; but if the resources, the energy, the power we turn over today are used wisely by our leaders in the long struggle, my children will be free, though they may suffer and sacrifice. I have faith in our power and resources, the courage and wisdom of our leaders, the justice of our cause, and the infinite worth of freedom. This is why I am voting for this bill.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield now 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I have watched appropriation bills before this House during the past 4 years as closely as any Member. I want to pay tribute to this subcommittee for its valuable service to the country. My only regret is that it is not possible for us to provide double the amount in order to bring this war to a more speedy conclusion. The more money we appropriate, the more materials and equipment we provide, the sooner this war will be over and the sooner will our boys be returned to their homes and loved ones. All of us in America should recognize that. I know the members of this committee personally. I know the gentleman who just spoke, the industrious gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL]. What the distinguished gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. STEFAN] had to say about him is 100 percent correct. I know the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS], and the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], two of the members on the minority side of the committee who have been watchdogs of the Treasury insisting on 100 percent value for every dollar expended. In fairness, the majority side of the committee deserves commendation. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY], the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STARNES], the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON], and the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KERR]; all of them rendered valuable service. I wish the nondefense appropriations were watched as carefully as these defense appropriations are watched. We have many conference reports on nondefense appropriations coming back here this week end for final consideration. I trust that the cuts we made on the floor of the House will not be restored. This is a time to spend billions for defense and not one penny for wasteful nondefense items.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON].

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Chairman, as has been stated a number of times, this bill providing for $42,000,000,000 for the activities of the War Department for the fiscal year which begins next month is the largest bill ever considered in the history of this Government.

When the bill was submitted to our committee it was a shock to me to observe the tremendous proportions involved, but when I consider the task confronting the American people, the sum does not seem so large.

A very distinguished preacher and evangelist of past years, John Wesley, on one occasion said, "The world is my parish." He envisoned the whole world in his horizon. We must today envision the entire world in considering the perils which confront our Nation. The whole world is a gigantic battlefield. The issue to be decided involves the destiny of this Nation for generations to come.

With that kind of viewpoint the sum does not seem so large. Of course, it is a large sum, but if this money is translated into the weapons of war, as much of it will be, in my opinion it will be a determining factor in the victory which we expect of American arms.

So I say that the money part of the cost, so far as I am concerned, shall be cheerfully given. It is even more cheerfully given when I know that in proportion to the money we wisely spend and the weapons we create and build we shall have a diminishing sacrifice of human life upon the battlefields of the several continents and oceans of the world.

Some of this money is going to be wasted. We know it in advance. It is inevitable. We live in a world that is full of human elements, but we cannot sit idly by when the world is on fire and question this and that item, when we can never be sure of the exact needs of the future in a time such as this.

I hope that much of the money we appropriate in this bill will, in a certain sense, be wasted. That may seem to be a paradoxical statement. I mean to say that I hope that victory will come before much of this money is spent and before the weapons provided for are used, but I do not predict that such will be the case.

Moreover, I mean to imply that I hope chemical warfare, for example, will not come into play in this great World War. Yet we are appropriating in this bill $620,000,000 for chemical warfare. Will somebody say in the future that Congress was crazy for appropriating that money because perhaps it might not be used? I think not. During the fiscal year 1942 for chemical warfare we appropriated $1,067,461,000. So it is apparent that in the fighting of a great war it does not take the genius of military strategists to understand that we must prepare for numerous unknown eventualities that may possibly confront us during the prosecution of the war. Naturally much that is prepared, much for which money is spent, will never be used, but nevertheless it must be available in order that we may be prepared to meet the thrusts of the enemy and carry the battle to the enemy as events unfold upon the checkerboard of this world conflict.

Every man knows that had we not, and had not our Allies in this war spent millions and billions of dollars on chemical warfare, the enemy would have already employed the use of gas on a devastating scale and reaped a frightful harvest in the destruction of human life.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MAHON. In the very nature of things, we cannot accomplish the ideal situation in our preparation for the prosecution of the war. Of one thing we can be sure. We should not underestimate the power of our enemies. That is one of the easiest ways to lose an athletic contest or a war. It has been true that perhaps even some in high authority have to a considerable extent discounted the power of the enemy. That should never have been true and it should no longer be true.

Our enemies have been preparing for war while we have been engrossed in the pursuits of peace. While our young men have been taught to hate war, the young men of the nations which oppose us have been taught to glorify war and to prepare for the conquest of their neighbors by the force of arms. Their children have for years been indoctrinated in the arts of war.

Even a much inferior nation which has been training and preparing for war for a generation can offset for a time the potential might of a great peace-loving nation like our own. We are foolish, indeed, if we fail to realize that our enemies can strike and strike hard. When we consider the task which is confronting us, there is every justification why we in the Congress should appropriate even the great sum of $42,000,000,000, provided in this bill in order that we may be more able to save our country and save freedom for the world.

Our plight perhaps in many ways has grown more desperate and more difficult, but our strength has increased tremendously. We have almost forgotten, yet it was only a short few months ago that we were asking about the morale of the Army and some were wondering whether or not the soldiers were willing to fight, when men in the colleges were meeting together and pledging that they would never fight in defense of their country. And we were wondering about unity. Much was said about unity, yet we never hear much about the word unity any more because when we were stabbed in the back on December 7, 1941, we realized, one and all, that everything we held sacred and dear was at stake. And so America united moves forth to battle, fully aware of the fact that regardless of cost America must and America will win.

Some have said in criticism that we were appropriating great sums of money but that we could not win the war by the appropriation of money. Of course not, but I want to tell this Congress that the money we are appropriating is being translated into the weapons of war in a truly remarkable fashion. If you will study the facts and if you could know the confidential information the War Department has given this committee, every Member of this House would have cause to be proud of the American laboring man, American industry, and of the American soldier from those who pilot the flying fortresses to those who do the less spectacular tasks in this great war. In the field of production some criticism is due here and there but on the whole a very splendid job is being done.

This bill, debated as it has been in the House for a few short hours, will have a tremendous effect upon the outcome of this war and the course of the years. I am glad to be a member of the committee reporting this bill—glad to have some small part in this great crusade which we in a sense here are launching for the cause of human liberty and to the end that the sacrifices of human life may be brought to a minimum, to the end that we may not only furnish weapons to ourselves but to the Chinese who desperately need them and to others who fight with us. I am glad to see an American gun in the hand of anybody who is upholding the cause of this country on the battlefields of this war.

We cannot foresee the future; we can only prepare for the future to the best of our ability. We know that the days ahead are dangerous ones. Our hearts are made sad when we contemplate the human sacrifices which have been made and must yet be made.

It is my hope that in providing this money in this bill victory will be made more certain and sure, that it may come sooner, and that the human sacrifices may be greatly reduced.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I am prompted to take the floor this afternoon in view of a discussion that occurred during the hearings on this bill when Lieutenant General Somervell, commanding general of the Services of Supply, was testifying. I want you to read that testimony in the hearings; it is of vast importance. It relates to a subject which I may say I have been sleeping on since last November, the question of some of the States of this country and some of the localities of this country levying taxes on national defense expenditures. The situation developed by reason of a decision of the Supreme Court in what is commonly called the Alabama case wherein the court held that the constitutional immunity the country enjoyed in reference to such taxes did not extend beyond the prime contractors; in other words, all purchases made by the prime contractor from the material man, the supply man, and others, were in the opinion of the Supreme Court subject to the State and local taxes where such States and communities had such laws on their statute books. Only 22 States of the union and just a few cities have sales taxes.

The discussion I refer to follows, in part:

Mr. SNYDER. There is another matter I want to talk to you about. There is legislation pending to exempt war purchases and services from State, Territorial, and local taxation. It is stated in the report of the Ways and Means Committee on H. R. 6955 that witnesses representing the Army and Navy estimates that savings resulting from the

legislation may amount to as much as $2,000,000,000 up through June 1943. The pending estimates, I understand, do not anticipate the enactment of such legislation.

General SOMERVELL. That is right, sir. We cannot assume that it will pass.

Mr. SNYDER. Has anyone in the Department made any survey of a rather careful nature of the economies to the War Department that would flow from the enactment of such legislation?

General SOMERVELL. It is pretty general. I can submit figures for the record on that.

Mr. CASE. Is there any attempt being made or any progress being made in the matter of having the States voluntarily to forego their State sales taxes on Army purchases?

General SOMERVELL. It has not gone very far.

Mr. CASE. I know that my State they had a conference about it, and the State agreed to waive the sales tax on Army purchases.

General SOMERVELL. Certain others have not been as cooperative.

Mr. SNYDER. I understand that the Department's witnesses before the Ways and Means Committee advocated the enactment of the legislation, and I take it that you approve of that course.

General SOMERVELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SNYDER. Is it still the position of the Department that these taxes should be saved to the Federal Treasury?

General SOMERVELL. Yes, sir. We feel that these taxes are just a raid on the Federal Treasury by the States, which is absolutely uncontrolled. If Congress feels that the States should be subsidized, let them be subsidized by putting it on the basis of legislation, rather than leaving it to the States themselves.

Mr. ENGEL. The law permits them to levy a sales tax only as applied to purchases made by the contractor. In other words, the taxes are levied where the contractor makes the purchase.

General SOMERVELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. ENGEL. Under most of these contracts, the contractor does the purchasing of the material that enters into the construction?

General SOMERVELL. Yes, sir. For example, a very large component of some contracts is steel, and we buy practically no steel outright. The person who has the contract buys the steel.

Mr. ENGEL. Then, as to your tank and machine-gun production, that is done on the unit-cost basis?

General SOMERVELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. ENGEL. And on the unit-cost basis, does not the contractor or manufacturer buy all the material?

General SOMERVELL. Yes, sir; and the tax has to be paid.

Mr. SNYDER. If such a law were passed, would there be an appreciable amount of labor saved which could be otherwise employed with profit to the war effort? I understand that the present practice entails much legal and investigative work.

General SOMERVELL. Yes, sir; the administrative work is quite extensive in connection with the payment of taxes and the verification of the amounts.

Mr. SNYDER. That is going on every day?

General SOMERVELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. SNYDER. And it is getting larger, I imagine.

General SOMERVELL. Yes, sir; because the program is getting larger.

Mr. SNYDER. This proposed legislation would facilitate your work and assist in other respects than saving the money that is spent.

General SOMERVELL. Yes, sir. The administrative personnel involved in the verificaton of the correctness of the amount of tax paid, and of whether it has been paid, would be eliminated.

* * * * *

Mr. STARNES. You were asked by the chairman a moment ago to give your position and that of the War Department with reference to the sales taxes which the States have levied on certain articles. What is the War Department's attitude with reference to how the States may be reimbursed for this loss of revenue which is rightfully theirs to carry on the various functions of State and local governments?

General SOMERVELL. Of course, we do not agree with your premise, sir. We think that if the States need a subsidy you gentlemen in Congress should decide what that should be on a Nation-wide basis and not let each State decide what it ought to be. In other words, Alabama now contacts us at a certain rate, Arkansas at another, and California at another

Mr. STARNES. You realize, of course, that it was an Alabama sales-tax case which came to the Supreme Court, and on which this issue turned?

General SOMERVELL. Yes, sir.

Mr. STARNES. And we in Alabama are very much concerned over the question involved. We feel that the Supreme Court decision was eminently correct, and we would certainly like to know what would be proposed in lieu of those State taxes to take care of our State treasury in order that we might meet our bonded indebtedness and carry on the current affairs of the State government, which, insofar as cooperating with the war effort is concerned, has no apology to make to any of the 48 sovereign States.

General SOMERVELL. I am just a soldier, sir, but I should say that the course to pursue would be the one which I outlined.

Mr. STARNES. That the Federal Government should reimburse them for those taxes?

General SOMERVELL. No; I do not think they should be reimbursed. I think that is where we do not agree. We do not agree that you have any rights to that. Now, the other thing is: If you feel that to carry on your State government you need a subsidy from the Federal Government, the Congress ought to decide what that ought to be, not on the basis of the fortuitous location of a military installation in your State but on what your legislative body might decide.

Mr. STARNES. Of course, we do not want any subsidy from the Federal Government. At the same time we do not want the Federal Government to step in and tell us that we cannot exercise our constitutional and God-given rights.

General SOMERVELL. You see my point. In other words, California might say 10 percent and Alabama 1 percent. You can see the inequity of distribution of Federal funds on that basis.

Mr. STARNES. That is true. Of course, you know, as Mr. ENGEL so aptly called attention to a moment ago, that that tax applied only to certain articles, and articles that were purchased by a contractor from private business concerns; it strikes me that to deny the States to subject us to taxes on items of this nature where the ordinary contractor is doing work for others in a civilian capacity would be entirely unfair and unjust.

I introduced a bill last November to cure this situation. If you will read the language of the decision of the Supreme Court you will find there practically an invitation to the Congress to enact legislation that would exempt the Government from the payment of such taxes. The decision in effect states that it is constitutional for the Congress to take such action. I introduced that bill to get the matter before Congress; it was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means. The Under Secretary of War and the Under Secretary of the Navy together with the ranking generals of the Army and admirals in the Navy appeared before the committee and pleaded for the enactment of the legislation.

On the basis of the expenditures then made, appropriations and authorizations existing, the officials estimated that if the Congress did not pass such legislation it would cost approximately a billion five hundred million in taxes or more. When you take into consideration the fact that since last November we have increased appropriations, obligations, and authorizations until, including this bill, we have sent the total to $214,000,000,000, the amount of taxes we are going to be required to pay if the legislation is not passed will not be a billion five hundred million but four or five billions of dollars. That is not my statement; it is the unofficial statement of those in the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and the Federal loan agencies who are acquainted with this situation.

Following that hearing the bill was amended by the Ways and Means Committee to meet some of the objections of representatives of States who appeared before the Ways and Means Committee. Representatives of the States of California, Illinois, Michigan, Arkansas, and Indiana appeared before the Ways and Means Committee. The new bill was introduced by the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. DOUGHTON]. It was later again amended after the hearing before the Rules Committee. As I have previously stated, the Rules Committee departed from usual practice and called some of the witnesses who testified before the Ways and Means Committee. The bill amended was reintroduced and then reported by the Ways and Means Committee by a vote of 17 to 6.

The rule, however, has never been reported. I feel that when a great committee like the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill by a vote of 17 to 6, this House has a right to consider it, especially in view of the amount of money involved.

That great committee, the Ways and Means Committee, tomorrow, after its deliberations that have gone on for a period of months, will turn over to the Legislative Drafting Service the work of drafting the revenue bill, with the provisions agreed upon to meet the demand of the Treasury Department to raise $8,700,000,000 additional in taxes.

By the passage of this bill to which I have referred, and, as I previously stated, it is recommended practically by the Supreme Court in its decision, there is an opportunity to save four or five billion dollars. I urge that the House be given an opportunity to consider the bill in the House.

May I say that my own State is affected. We have a 2-cent sales tax.

No State of the Union has any of this money yet, but they are fighting for it and they are going to get it if we do not take some action. Not only what we

spend in the future will be taxed but what we have spent in the past.

Now let me impress upon you that the taxes of every State and city that has a sales tax has increased by leaps and bounds because 50 percent of the expenditures go for labor. Labor spends its money with the retailer, the retailer spends it with the jobber or wholesaler, and the jobbers and wholesalers spend it with the manufacturers or producers. All of those expenditures are subject to the sales tax. That will not be disturbed.

In the State of Missouri our sales-tax revenue increased $10,000,000 last year due to national defense expenditures. The money labor spent made this possible. With the tremendous amount of national defense contracts that we have in the State of Missouri now I predict it will run up to fifteen or twenty million dollars during the calendar year 1942. But whether it does or not, I want to repeat exactly the words used by General Somervell, and which I have previously used on the floor of the House; it is a raid upon the Treasury of the United States for the States and cities for whom we are fighting this war to say to the Government of the United States: "We want you to pay for the privilege of manufacturing the vessels, the planes, the tanks, and the munitions of war, and so forth, to protect us, the States and the cities."

I dislike to mention a specific State, but the State of California is bearing down and bearing down on the Government every day demanding this money. It was shown by the hearings before the Ways and Means Committee that California has more national defense contracts than any State in the Union. It has a thousand-mile shore line and off that shore today are war ships and planes patrolling the coast to protect California from attack. On land the Army has tanks, planes, and tens of thousands of men waiting for the enemy to dare come on to the State of California, still the State of California says to the Federal Government: "We want you to pay us for the privilege of manufacturing that which is needed to protect us." Is it not foolish on the face of it?

Yes, I agree with General Somervell that this is a raid upon the Treasury of the United States. I say this legislation should be passed. I feel it is unjust to the people of the country as a whole to do otherwise. Take the great State of New York, the great State of Texas, the great State of North Carolina, and others that pay such a tremendous tax to the Federal Government. North Carolina says, "If the other States do not ask for the money we will not ask for it."

Do you think New York State is going to sit idly by, do you think Texas is going to sit idly by, do you think other States of the Union are going to sit idly by without demanding these taxes? They do not have sales-tax laws now. It seems to me that those States that do not want a sales tax imposed upon their people will be forced in self-protection to pass a sales-tax law in order to get their share of the expenditures if other States are to receive them.

There is another thing that enters into this matter, and General Somervell brought it out. We instruct General Somervell in this bill to spend so much money for supplies.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, we have likewise instructed the Navy to build a certain number of vessels, we have instructed the Maritime Commission to build a certain number of cargo ships, we have appropriated some $12,000,000,000 to the R. F. C. and other loan agencies to lend money for expansion and so forth in connection with the prosecution of this war. If we are forced to pay taxes you are not going to get the number of ships for the Navy, you are not going to get the tanks, you are not going to get the planes, you are not going to get the munitions of war for which we appropriated this money and for which we wanted it spent if part of the money has to go to the States to pay the sales tax, the use tax, storage tax, and other taxes unless you reimburse them for the amount of the taxes.

Not a State in the Union has received this money as yet. The War and Navy Departments are holding off in the hope that the Congress of the United States will take action.

As I said the departments have appealed to the Ways and Means Committee, they have appealed to the Rules Committee, and General Somervell has appealed to this subcommittee for the passage of such legislation. Therefore, I repeat again, I hope that the House will have an opportunity to express itself on the matter.

Let it be borne in mind that officers of the Army and Navy, as well as General Somervell the other day, said that the demand being made upon them for taxes has resulted in slowing up production. Read the testimony if you doubt what I say.

Mr. Chairman, I am reminded of a little story.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] made a statement the other day in reference to an agricultural appropriation bill. The amount in the bill was hundreds of millions of dollars. The gentleman from New York said when he was a young man his father who was then in Congress came home and was very much excited. His father stated that the House had passed an appropriation bill that day for the expenses of the Department of Agriculture amounting to a million dollars and he wondered what was going to become of the country. I wonder what the people of that day would think now when we are passing an appropriation bill for $42,000,000,000.

My view is that the $42,000,000,000, every nickel of it, should be spent for the prosecution of this war and not to enrich the treasury of any State or city in this country, through the medium of sales or any other kind of taxes.

Now I desire to refer to another matter.

Mr. Chairman, this bill affords an excellent opportunity to call to the attention of the country just how Members of Congress, regardless of political affiliations, are cooperating in an effort to bring this war to an early and successful conclusion. Here you find 24 Democrats and 15 Republicans working as one to provide the Army with funds for every conceivable activity under the jurisdiction of the War Department. In going over the hearings we find the 9 members of the subcommittee cooperating, and if anyone feels politics play any part in their deliberations they have but to read the hearings.

The nine members of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SNYDER], chairman, and his associates, Mr. TERRY, of Arkansas, Mr. STARNES of Alabama, Mr. COLLINS of Mississippi, Mr. KERR of North Carolina, Mr. MAHON of Texas, Mr. POWERS of New Jersey, Mr. ENGEL of Michigan, and Mr. CASE of South Dakota, seem to have but one object in mind—complete cooperation; and they deserve the commendation of the House and the country for their labors. To support this statement and to give you an idea of what confronted them, let me call attention to the original Budget estimate which was $6,388,091,747. That proved to be but a drop in the bucket, because the revised estimates aggregated $39,417,827,337. No one ever dreamed that we would ever be confronted with an Army supply bill containing such a tremendous amount of money. Of course, it is necessary for the committee to have confidence in the officers of the Army. The officers appeared before the committee explaining in detail what they had been doing in the past, their planning, and what they seek to do in the future. Much of the testimony is in print but quite naturally a great deal was discussed off the record, for military reasons.

In going over the hearings I was impressed by the testimony of Lt. Gen. B. B. Somervell, commanding general, Services of Supply. In order to show the feeling existing between the Army and the committee, I am going to quote briefly from the hearings:

Mr. SNYDER. General, you have an unusual comprehension of this whole world-wide problem, because your experience has been very rich along broad lines. You have demonstrated to us here before the committee, as well as by your actions, that you are doing an extraordinarily good job, and we have every confidence in you.

General SOMERVELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate very much your expression of confidence. Our work thus far is just the beginning of a tremendous task which is ahead. Both my subordinates and myself will bend every effort to successfully accomplish this task. We believe we can do it. Your confidence and support act both as a spur and a reward.

Your committee has been very sympathetic with our problems. You have appreciated both the magnitude and difficulty of our task. You have supported us not only with funds which are so necessary to the successful prosecution of this war, but also with many suggestions and kind words which indicate a broad understanding and appreciation, on the part of the committee, of the problems with which we are confronted. For this we are very grateful.

I now quote the ranking Republican member of the committee:

Mr. POWERS. General Somervell, I say this absolutely from the heart; I think you are doing a magnificent job. I think you have one of the most difficult jobs any military man ever had in the history of the world, and I think every member of this committee agrees with me; and I certainly hope that the people of the United States some day will show their appreciation of you for the work that you have done, that you are doing, and that you will do. I think it is grand.

That is all I have to say.

General SOMERVELL. I appreciate very much your expression of confidence. I want to say on the part of the War Department how much your support during these years that I have appeared before you has helped in the tremendous task we face. We always know that we can count on you for wholehearted and vigorous support of any measure which will help us win the war.

Mr. STARNES. General Somervell, since I have seen fit to agree with you on matters of policy, more strongly perhaps than any other member of this committee at times, I want to echo what Mr. POWERS has said. I think the United States Army and the people of the United States are extremely fortunate in having you in your present position, and I think there is no man in the service who can excel you in ability and devotion to duty; I think you are doing one of the grandest jobs in history in supplying armies in every continent.

General SOMERVELL. I want to thank you, Mr. STARNES, both for your most generous praise and also and more important for the great assistance you have rendered the War Department both in Congress and out of it. We always know our problems will receive your most careful attention and support.

Mr. SNYDER. General, we want to thank you for the valuable information you have given us, and we want you to know that we are with you to the limit. We want you to feel free to call upon us at any time, and if there is any help that we may be able to give you we will be glad to do so.

Mr. Chairman, I could quote at length if space would permit, but the point I want to bring out is the cooperation of all members of the committee, Democrats and Republicans. It is such cooperation that will, in my opinion, win the war for us.

Mr. Chairman, there is but one more appropriation bill to come. I challenge anyone to point out where the Members of this House have failed to give to the fighting forces everything that has been requested and that is so necessary to bring about the defeat of the enemy. True, we are not on the firing line, but under our form of government the legislative branch must of necessity play a vital part in this war, and the manner it is carrying out its duties is a credit to every Member of this House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, the amount of money involved in this bill is staggering, but when you take into consideration the information obtained off the record and on the record by your committee during the past 2 years it is not surprising. It may not be generally known by other Members of the House but I am divulging no secret when I say for the past 2 years members of the Appropriations Committee have been invited to the secret chambers of the War Department once each month where we have been furnished an inventory of our military equipment and facts showing the necessity for additional supplies. At the first meeting we were shown by charts, maps, graphs, and figures the numerical strength of the Army, Navy, and Air Corps; the number of rifles, machine guns, tanks, airplanes, battleships, cruisers, torpedo boats, supply of munitions, and so forth, on hand. Later we were shown the projected schedule of production, and from month to month we have watched the progress made in the production of each and noted whether such production has kept pace, fallen behind, or exceeded the schedule. In the meantime, the program has changed and enlarged in keeping with changed conditions.

Of course, it would not be proper to reveal the figures showing the increase in production or suggest the extent to which the program is now enlarged, but I think I should say that the projected program justifies every item provided for in this bill. I know there is no disposition on the part of any member of the committee to mislead any Member of the House by failure to disclose or publish the justifications in detail, for to do so would be furnishing information that could be used by the enemy. My experience on the committee has convinced me of the absolute necessity of our fighting forces not to reveal their plans, the extent and nature of their equipment or their method or manner of operation. We all know that wars are won by strength and strategy, but history reveals that probably they are won more often by strategy than strength and there can be no strategy without secrecy.

I am not a member of the subcommittee that reported the bill but I am sure each item has been considered in detail and that every dollar will be used to better prepare our fighting forces for success. It is true some money may be misspent but we hope none will be wasted in the sense we usually speak of waste, for, paradoxical as it may seem, we could point out a number of items where we can express the hope the money for some of the items herein may be misspent. For example, the amount carried in a former bill added to that carried in this bill for chemical warfare alone will approximate $2,000,000,000 and we certainly hope there will be no necessity to use it, but no one knows what Hitler will resort to before this war is over. He would not hesitate to use poison gas if he knew we would not be able to retaliate. We are in a war to the finish and we must be prepared to meet any and every emergency. The appropriations in this bill are for that purpose, even though there may be provision for some things that may not be needed.

It is hard to contemplate $42,000,000,000. If it were converted into silver dollars, no one man could count them within a lifetime, not even in a thousand years. If one person should begin counting at the rate of $1 per second, or $28,800 per 8-hour day, for 312 days per year, it would take him upward of 4,600 years to count it, or it would take 100 men 46 years to count it. It is not only the largest appropriation made by Congress at any one time in the history of our country but it is the largest appropriation made at any time by any country in the history of the world. But we realize we are facing the greatest problem we have had to face at any time in our history—the actual defense of our lives, our homes, our families, our everything. Certainly it is an enormous price we are having to pay, but I think a father expressed the feeling of most of us a few days ago when he said:

It is not too much to pay for one family, provided it is mine.

I am sure he did not mean to place a higher value on his family than any other man would place on his. The chances are the head of any family feels the same way about it.

If it were a matter left entirely with me I imagine I would undertake to do the job with less money, but it is not my responsibility to plan and run the Army, the Navy, or the Air Corps, or to figure out how much equipment it will take to win this war. However, it is in part my responsibility to supply these agencies with the necessary funds and equipment to prosecute the war to a successful conclusion. Section 8, article 1 of the Constitution provides that Congress shall have power "to raise and support armies; to provide and maintain a Navy." This power carries with it the responsibility to provide the necessary funds when the occasion arises. The occasion is here. It has been here since last December 7, when we were attacked without warning by the armed forces of Japan at Pearl Harbor, where approximately 3,000 Americans were killed. It is now the responsibility of the Congress to provide sufficient funds and equipment to meet and defeat the enemy. Those in charge of our armed forces have surveyed the situation in great detail and say the cost of necessary equipment with which to do the job is approximately $42,800,000,000. The matter has been formally submitted to the Congress, and the question before us is, What are we going to do about it? I do not know that I can state my position more definitely than I expressed it on this floor 4 months ago, when I said:

The urgent and tragic need right now is additional fighting equipment, and the purpose of this bill is to expedite its production. The necessity for haste is so pronounced that to me it seems almost unpatriotic to spend days talking about peacetime recreation, peacetime occupation, or peacetime legislation. We should realize the war is on. The battle is raging, and men in the front lines are begging for weapons to protect their own lives and to preserve the country they love.

Not only the young men in the armed forces are interested in this bill but their fathers and mothers are greatly interested. Many of them have sons already on the firing line—sons whose lives they are willing to sacrifice on the altar of their country provided they are given an equal chance for life with equal equipment for use in combat. I feel that I speak the sentiment of a lot of these fathers and mothers, for I happen to be the father

of one of these boys in the front line somewhere in the Pacific and I am anxious to see that he and his comrades, wherever they may be, are furnished with such equipment as will give them at least an equal chance in the battle for liberty and freedom. His father and mother will not complain if he should fall in mortal combat equally armed with his antagonist, but I am unable to contemplate my feelings if I should learn he has sacrificed his life because the Congress of the United States or the people for whom he is fighting failed on account of strikes, selfish bickerings, and incident delay to furnish him with sufficient bombs or necessary equipment to defend himself in battle with a merciless foe. On the other hand, I would be mortified and feel like an unworthy sire of a courageous and patriotic son if he should return home in defeat, humiliation, and shame, place his hand upon my shoulder, look me in the face and say: "Father, we did the best we could with what we had to do it with, but the battle was lost while you and others debated what effect an hour's work per day would have on the social life of the country after the war."

There may be some things in this bill I would not support under ordinary circumstances, but since it is designed to expedite our war effort it is my purpose to support the bill in toto.

Of course, we are charged with the responsibility of scrutinizing every item and seeing that it is fully justified before it is approved, because a dollar misspent under the name of defense is just as burdensome to the taxpayer as a dollar misspent for nondefense.

It will be observed from a break-down given in the committee report that $11,000,000,000 of this appropriation is for the Army Air Corps. Again, if it were left with me, I would have probably made the amount twenty-five or thirty billion dollars, because I have felt from the beginning that this war will be won by superiority in aircraft, and if I were inclined to be boastful or to say "I told you so" I would call attention to my feeling and judgment more than 3 years ago when I introduced H. R. 4429, Seventy-sixth Congress, first session, a bill to take at least 4,000,000 bales of cotton then in the hands of the Commodity Credit Corporation and convert them into munitions of war, such as wings for airplanes, bombs, explosives, and so forth. If we could have had this equipment 1 year ago, England and her allies might have been able to terminate this war, or if Hitler had known such equipment were available there may not have been a war. My further interest in this suggestion was demonstrated early in 1941, when it was my privilege to offer and secure approval of an amendment in committee increasing the appropriation by $7,000,000, to be used exclusively for pilot training. I now regret it was not 10 times that amount.

Mr. Chairman, you will pardon these personal allusions, but I refer to them only for the purpose of demonstrating my thought and feeling in making sufficient preparation to win the war. While I know that the production of many necessary items is far in advance of schedule and I am possibly overanxious about expediting the production of our war equipment, I know there is a popular demand for our forces to get into the fight and take the offensive at the earliest possible date, and my anxiety is due to the burning desire to see that when a soldier, sailor, or pilot goes into battle he is "armed to the hilt," both in the way of fighting equipment and training technique. Mr. Chairman, I shudder at the thought of seeing a young man lost in battle for lack of equipment, especially if it could be said the loss was due to failure on my part to furnish such equipment, or if it were due to lack of cooperation on the part of those in charge of its distribution. A rumor was going around a few days ago which I sincerely trust is not true, for I was shocked to hear it reported that possibly several naval pilots were lost flying old and antiquated planes at Midway when the Army could have supplied them with new and modern bombers but failed to do so.

I am convinced that when this war is over, a large part, if not the greater part, of the successful results will be attributed to the efficiency in aircraft. There are others who believe that superiority in air forces may, in the last analysis, be the determining factor in the successful outcome of this war. Too much emphasis, therefore, cannot be placed upon the necessity for enlarged and efficient aviation training. We are spending enormous sums in constructing highly developed fighting, observation, and bombing planes. Great sums are being provided for training pilots and operators. Every effort is being made to select the best available young men for this purpose. The program so far has been commendable in practically every respect, although nobody feels that we have done everything that might be done in the way of training. I have a strong and pronounced feeling that those who are willing to take their chances in the air should first be trained to the highest possible degree in every essential factor entering into the operation of an airplane, particularly those who operate the fighting and bombing planes.

Every pilot should not only be familiar with what we might call aircraft alphabet but he should have its vocabulary on the tip of every finger. It is not sufficient to know how to operate an airplane motor and learn a few characteristics of a plane, but a pilot should be able to analyze and interpret in the twinkling of an eye the multitude of contributing factors entering into the operation of a plane, such as its natural and logical behavior at certain heights, the speed at which it is going, the load carried, and a dozen other matters; and he should be so familiar with such matters he would be able to make correct decisions within a split second. All of this requires application and training to a degree not to be found in any other method of combat. It may be that special consideration should be given to training young men in aviation at least 1 year preparatory to entering pilot-training courses, and I am, therefore, suggesting and emphasizing that in lieu of our previous program of furnishing aid to college students in consideration of a certain amount of work done in college or on the campus we might use an equivalent or even a larger amount in assisting such young men in colleges where a prescribed course is given in aviation training, because no one yet knows how many pilots we may need, but, whatever the number may be, the total may be decreased somewhat in proportion to increased efficiency in training. We are spending large sums of money in training men and women to enable them to make planes perfectly, because it would almost be murder to send a man aloft with an unworthy plane. Eleven billion dollars carried in this bill are for the purpose of furnishing our pilots with the best possible training and the best possible equipment, not only for the purpose of making them better fighters but to afford them a better chance to return.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. WILLIAMS].

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, the stupendous size of this appropriation bill shows the spirit of Congress and the people and their intention to win the war regardless of cost. I am glad to support this legislation. The months immediately ahead of us are fraught with more serious consequences than any like period in the annals of mankind. The destiny of the human race may not be finally decided during this time but in all probability the ultimate outcome of the world struggle will be clearly indicated. This is by far the most gigantic conflict ever waged upon this earth. A greater variety and a more deadly class of weapons are being used than ever before. The war is being fought on many fronts around the world. More men are engaged in it than in any previous war. Every principle of civil and religious freedom is at stake. The forces of paganism, savagery, and brutality are arrayed against the ideals of Christianity, tolerance, and individual liberty. The question is, Shall man be free or slave? Shall an enlightened civilization be preserved or shall all the progress, all the institutions, all the hopes and aspirations for which the race has toiled and prayed, for which it has fought and died, be blacked out and cast into hopeless ruin? The ruthless ambition of the Nazi regime and the pagan war lords of Japan to dominate the world must be crushed. Only in final victory can we have complete assurance of freedom from pillage and enslavement by these barbarians and from the cruel treatment and fiendish torture of our men and the bestial assaults and brutal defilement of our women by these pagan savages. The squatty, squinty-eyed Japanese have boasted that they would dictate the terms of peace in the White House at Washington. These things must not happen here.

Into this seething caldron of death and destruction the United States has been drawn. We have been a peace-loving people. But we have had our Valley Forge and our Gettysburg. We have seen our own Capital assaulted and burned. Our troops climbed the heights

of San Juan Hill to drive out the last vestige of tyranny and oppression from the western continent. Our boys marched all the way from Chateau-Thierry to the Argonne and to a glorious victory. We went through those experiences and trying times with unswerving resolution and courage and in the present crisis we will not hesitate or falter.

The United Nations engaged in this struggle against the Nazis and Japanese comprise an overwhelming majority of the earth's population and they possess most of its material resources. There are those who speak lightly of the nations allied with the United States in this war. Our enemies seek by every trick and device to spread suspicion and discord; to create confusion and chaos and to plant racial and religious hatred in the hearts of the people. It is the same old plan—divide and conquer. They point out that the United Nations are composed of peoples of every race and creed, that their governments represent a great variety of political beliefs, that they are scattered to the four corners of the earth, and that they have no community of interest and no common cause for which to fight. These critics and pessimists say that China has been looking through its dreamy eyes for centuries with apparent indifference upon the world's progress and belongs to a past and decadent age. For the last 5 years China, under the most adverse conditions and against frightful odds, has been fighting a war against aggression and its struggle for freedom has few equals in world history and today it is a very valuable ally. We are told that Russia with her communistic form of government is foreign and hostile to our institutions and way of life. Very few in this country endorse Russia's political ideals but that is a matter for the people of that nation to determine and not for us to decide for them. Their matchless resources of materials and manpower have been mobilized and converted into one of the greatest war machines in modern times. They are fighting a heroic and a stubborn battle on a 2,000-mile front. We shudder to think what might have happened if Russia had joined the Axis Powers against us.

India with its motley array of teeming millions and with its varying religious creeds and different tribal organizations and claims has many valiant men on the fighting front. Its help is valuable even if it is rather passive and not active and aggressive.

Mexico and the Central and South American republics in bygone days have been considered unstable and unreliable by some. It was said over and over again when we were seeking to extend them credit to develop their resources that they were not entitled to it. However, in the face of all these criticisms, this administration through trade and credit policies has established a relationship of good will and friendship which makes them our close and valuable allies. They are now working hand in hand with us to preserve civilization.

England has been the subject of many jeers and jests. Such as "England would fight this war to the last American," and that the English refer to the United States as "Uncle Shylock." No nation in history ever faced a darker hour than England after the fall of France in 1940. No people was ever subjected to more hardships. Their courage and fortitude were put to the supreme test. They came through the fiery furnace. They have made the greatest sacrifices that any people ever made to keep representative government and individual freedom alive. Again, what would have happened to us if England had succumbed and her Navy passed into the hands of Germany in 1940?

Millions of people in the nations that have been overrun and plundered by the barbarians are our allies in mind and spirit and are looking for a chance to successfully revolt and throw off the yoke of slavery and oppression under which they now live. To all of those the light of hope is held out and the confident assurance is given that the time of their deliverance is near. They are valuable at least on the psychological front and their unbroken and unconquered spirit is a constant nightmare to the Axis dream of world domination and power.

Despite all the diversity of interest and differences in race, religion, and government, the United Nations have a common tie and a unity of purpose, and that is to destroy the Axis Powers and bring to the world a new order where the peoples of the earth may live in security and peace. There must be complete unity and political, economic, and military accord and harmonious action among all these nations. Such cooperation to be effective and successful depends upon the existence of mutual confidence and trust in the minds and hearts of all the peoples. If this true spirit of coalition and unity exists, subversive propaganda will fail and the determined effort which such a spirit engenders will bring consternation and fear to the ranks of the enemy. In this hour of supreme test and trial national selfishness and prejudice must be merged and forgotten in the all-consuming desire and demand that mankind shall live in a world at peace where liberty and justice prevail. This kind of unity and determination cannot be defeated.

The world knows and recognizes that the ultimate outcome of this war depends largely upon the resources and productive capacity of the United States and that this Nation is playing a major role in the fight. The conversion of our peacetime activities into war production borders on the miraculous. When the President in his message to Congress suggested the need of 50,000 airplanes annually, the idea was laughed at. We are now producing at that rate, and next year it will be at least twice that number. When a two-ocean Navy was advocated many said there was no need for such naval force. We are now preparing to construct a five-ocean Navy to dominate the waters of the globe. Every vessel christened has slid down the ways ahead of schedule. Airplanes are coming off the assembly lines faster than the most optimistic ever predicted. Tanks, guns, and munitions are flowing from the factories in an endless stream. We are producing more arms, munitions, and implements of war than all the Axis Powers combined.

In the prosecution of this stupendous war program the President of the United States is Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and under the Constitution and authority granted him by Congress has far-reaching and absolute powers. Every war President from Washington to Roosevelt has been denounced and reviled. They have been called usurpers, arrogant dictators, and even traitors. History and experience show that all these charges are without the slightest foundation in fact and that they emanate from people with a jaundiced eye and a dwarfed and shriveled mind.

In this great crisis the world is fortunate and the United States is especially blessed to have as the central and commanding figure on the stage of action our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt. The President, through the power and influence of his great office, used every means at his command to prevent war. When the threatening storm clouds began to gather over Europe, he plead and begged the ambitious dictators to avoid a conflict of arms. When the war started, he still tried to appeal to reason and did everything possible to prevent its spread. He has had an uncanny insight into the future and has foretold with the accuracy of prophetic vision many coming events. Years ago he advocated an enlarged and improved navy and a bigger and more efficient air force. He early asked for the modification and repeal of portions of the Neutrality Act in order that the nations of Europe that were threatened with invasion by Germany could obtain war materials and equipment with which to defend themselves. His ideas and recommendations were ridiculed by some and were slow to meet with the necessary support in Congress. It was only after a long and bitter fight that some of his suggestions were enacted into law. In the light of subsequent events, it is not too much to say that he was right in every instance. Those who once laughed, booed, and scoffed at his predictions and recommendations are now compelled to admit that they were wrong and that he was right.

He has a thorough knowledge and a clear understanding of world affairs, and he has courage and determination. He has the fighting spirit of Andrew Jackson; the patience, the calm, and the fortitude of Abraham Lincoln; and the altruism and vision of Woodrow Wilson. He has grown from day to day in the estimation and esteem of his own countrymen, and the eyes of all the oppressed peoples in this war-torn world are looking to him for leadership and deliverance. He will not fail them. No man in history has ever had placed upon his shoulders the burdens and responsibilities that are now being so bravely borne by the President.

Next to the President in power and importance in the successful prosecution of the war is Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board. Under

Executive order of the President, he has the final say as to what action to take and the things to be done in the war-production effort. He has done a splendid job and deserves the highest praise and commendation for his great work. We from Missouri are especially proud of this distinguished Missourian and of his great achievements.

The details of production for war purposes, the use of war equipment, and the war and naval strategy are necessarily left to the Executive and administrative agencies of the Government. In supreme command over all these activities is the President of the United States. How many and what kind of guns, vessels, and airplanes, and how much ammunition must be produced and where and by whom, are determined by those engaged in the war-production field. How the armed forces, the vessels, and fighting equipment shall be distributed and used is a matter to be determined by Army and Navy experts and strategists in consultation with the President. In other words, the various departments, agencies, and boards appointed by and under direction of the President are responsible for the actual prosecution of the war. That this work has been ably and well done must be admitted by all. The great skill, efficiency, and speed with which the enormous war-production program has been carried on has surprised the world. The marvelous success of the hazardous task of transporting, convoying, and landing our materials and men abroad has startled and astounded our enemies.

However, the Executive and the various agencies would be impotent and powerless to carry on the war without the cooperation and support of Congress. After all, Congress makes the appropriations and provides the funds which make the prosecution of the war possible. Many unkind, intemperate, indiscriminate, and even false and vicious accusations and charges have been made against Congress. There has been a suspicion in some quarters that there is a plan of organized propaganda to destroy the confidence of the people in representative government. This much should be said. Congress has been in almost continuous session for the past 2½ years and has done much hard, grueling, and nerve-racking work and enacted more important and far-reaching legislation than was ever passed by any legislative body on earth in a like period of time.

No war Congress ever met the intricate, vast, and involved problems incident to armed conflict in a more able manner or on a higher plane of patriotic statesmanship than this. The miraculous results achieved are conclusive proof of the untiring, honest, and sincere efforts of Congress. There may have been some isolated individual cases of indiscretion and impropriety but in all fairness this Congress is entitled to the confidence, support, and praise of the people.

Today the resources, the temper, the spirit, and the real character of the American people are being tested as never before. In no age or nation have the people responded to the call with such promptness, patriotism, unanimity, and determination. Only a few subversive elements and scattered foreign groups who do not seem to understand or appreciate the true greatness and real worth of our Nation have remained to belittle, ridicule, or condemn our war effort. Their conduct can be explained only upon the ground of misinformation or as actuated by selfish or vicious motives. There is no excuse for either and neither will be tolerated by the patriotic people of this great Nation. This does not mean in any manner to curtail the freedom of speech or of the press. Although I may not believe a word these critics say and know their utterances are unfair and unjust, I will defend their right to say it. On the other hand, this is no time for carping criticism or unfounded conjectures or suspicions that have no basis in fact and exist only in the fertile imagination of uninformed or selfish groups.

All of the changes from a peacetime to a war economy have taken place without any serious dislocation of our national life.

To be sure, the people have necessarily been subjected to inconveniences which at times may be irksome. Losses will be incurred. Readjustments will have to be made, and some hardships endured. No unnecessary restrictions or burdens should be imposed. No one likes priorities, or rationing, or curtailment of civilian production, or price fixing, or inflation, or the payment of heavy taxes. Above all no one likes war. These are all distasteful and annoying, and call for personal sacrifice. Everyone knows that living and carrying on business as usual must be abandoned for the duration. We all know that winning the war comes first, and that all things else are secondary. We all know that we are face to face with the grim and serious business of war. That is why the American people will patiently and bravely bear and endure whatever privations are necessary without murmur or complaint. I refuse to believe that our people will growl and whine, and criticize and condemn, because of a pinch of sugar, a pound of rubber, or a gallon of gas while our boys at the front are enduring every hardship and even making the supreme sacrifice in order that our Nation may be saved and our liberties preserved. With our very existence hanging in the balance there will be no quibbling about little things.

To win the war will require hard work, untiring effort, many hardships, and constant sacrifices by all. The war will be won by the unflinching bravery and undying valor of courageous boys fighting in the air and on every land and sea. The war will be won in the fields, in the mines, and in the factories by the sweat and toil of millions. It will be won in legislative halls and around executive, strategic, and diplomatic council tables. It will be won in the marts of trade and in the far-away countryside places. It will be won in the schools, the churches, and the homes. It will be won by the silent prayers of mothers and the firm resolves of fathers. It will be won by the strength and courage of men and by the love and loyalty of women. But it will be won. When it is ended, there will be many unheralded and unknown heroes. Many deeds of valor and sacrifice will go unnoticed and unsung. But when the conflict is over and the victory is won, there will be glory enough to go around. When that resplendent day comes there will be a glow of pride and joy in the hearts of all who contributed their share to the ultimate triumph of justice and righteousness over the ruthless and cruel forces of tyranny and wrong. When that happy times comes, let us all hope that the trails blazed by Woodrow Wilson during the last war will lead us to the goal which we then missed.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 8 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY], a member of the committee.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I do not intend to speak at length on this bill. The details of it have been thoroughly covered by the splendid chairman of our subcommittee and other Members who have preceded me. I do want to refer briefly, however, to some of the remarks that were made by one of the preceding speakers [Mr. RICH of Pennsylvania] with reference to the size of this bill, $42,300,000,000. He said very vehemently that we could not digest that sum. That is true. I cannot comprehend it, and I think that if other Members here on the floor today were perfectly frank they would admit that they cannot comprehend it, nor are they able to analyze the immensity of $42,800,000,000.

Something was said about the cost of the Revolutionary War and the Civil War. I heard a very interesting statement made by the chairman of our subcommittee this morning to the effect that in proportion to the total income of the United States and its population during the Civil War, more money was spent on that war than we are appropriating today. So you have to think relatively, you have to consider the sphere of action, the equipment, the munitions, and all the other items and expenses that go into a modern army.

Forty-two billion eight hundred million dollars is a stupendous sum. We cannot digest it, as the gentleman said, yet we cannot swallow Hitlerism. It is far preferable to expend $42,800,000,000 at this time than to take a chance on seeing the flickering light of democracy fade out of a darkening world.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TERRY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. We may not be able to digest it, but we can translate it into guns, ships, tanks, submarines, and all the other implements essential to winning this war.

Mr. TERRY. The gentleman is correct. So I say to you, we cannot hesitate, we cannot waver as to whether or not we shall appropriate this money. When the final roll is called, I know there will not be one dissenting vote on this bill.

The American people realize, of course, that this is a stupendous sum, yet the American people are behind the Congress of the United States in appropriating any sum of money which will assure them to a reasonable extent—they cannot guarantee it—an ultimate victory.

A question has been raised here today about lend-lease, about our lending money or leasing equipment to our Allies. Every tank we can turn over to the soldiers of the United Nations, every rifle we can put in their hands, every plane we can turn over to them to use in foreign lands, means the saving of the life of an American soldier.

Mr. Chairman, World War No. 1 was fought for the freedom of the seas. The war today is fought for the freedom of the air. That is the reason we are placing in this bill today an amount of money that will provide for the building of 23,000 additional planes, a part of the President's program of 185,000 planes to attain freedom of the air. After this war we will not be concerned about freedom of the seas, what we will be concerned about will be who dominates the skies above the seas that surround us.

Before Pearl Harbor it was argued on the floor of the House that with 3,000 miles of ocean on each side of us we were safe from attack; that the barriers presented by the Atlantic and the Pacific Oceans isolated us; that we had the defense of these vast waters. Yet since Pearl Harbor we have found that instead of these seas being barriers they are merely highways bringing the enemy to our shores.

The news in the press today is gloomy indeed and the world-wide picture is somber. Libya has been overrun. Tobruk has fallen to the Nazis; Sevastopol, Egypt, and the Suez Canal are threatened. After being held in check all winter and spring Hitler is again on the march. The fate of Europe is in the balance. For the first time since 1812 a foreign foe has landed on American soil. Britain is faltering and the brave Russians are asking for a second front in order to relieve the pressure on them. The United States is asked to supply not only guns, planes, and tanks, but we are sending our soldiers to all the continents and our sailors are on the seven seas. The sons of America will be thrown into the breach to stem the tide of nazi-ism now rolling across the world.

So I say to you that in appropriating these huge sums, these stupendous sums, these amounts beyond the comprehension of the ordinary citizen, we are complying with the wishes of the American people. There will be no criticism of the Members of this House for their following the recommendations of the President of the United States, General Marshall, General Somervell, and those other men in high places in the Army and Navy in whose hands we have placed the destiny not only of America but of all the world.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE], a distinguished member of the Subcommittee on War Department Appropriations.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, most of those who have spoken on the bill this afternoon have been very naturally impressed by the large figures the bill carries. A year ago the distinguished chairman of our subcommittee presented to each individual member of the committee a copy of the Army appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1942 in special binding. He went to a little personal expense and had our names printed on them, and then he signed his own name; that is, he gave us an autographed copy. He pointed out that that bill at that time, carrying $10,300,000,000, was the largest appropriation bill in the history of the Congress. He said to me when he presented my copy to me, "You may not be particularly proud of this at this time, but if you will keep it long enough and hand it down to your grandchildren, they will undoubtedly appreciate it." That was a year ago, and it was a bill for $10,300,000,000.

Today, the bill covering the fiscal year 1943 comes in here with $42,800,000,000, more than four times as much. That suggests something of the rate at which we are traveling. It suggests more than that—the measure of the determination of the American people to win this war.

I recognize that many Members of the House may feel that it is hard to grasp the details of a bill which comes in with such an amount of money. It is natural that a Member here or there has a question as to the justifications for the bill and what was in it, but to them and to the people of the country I say that the work of the Appropriations Subcommittee for the War Department has not been a matter of receiving a Budget estimate calling for so much money and merely saying yes or no. We have not given a blank check. This bill represents, as most appropriation bills do, the work of the committee for many, many days and weeks. On the table at which the chairman and the clerk of our subcommittee sit are several volumes of justifications. The stack is a foot and a half high. There were, I think, 10 volumes of justifications, meaning several hundred typewritten pages of detailed break-downs on the items in this bill. They represent the accumulated work of months for men in the War Department who were assigned to prepare them, and I am sure I speak for the other members of the subcommittee when I speak a word of appreciation for the work of General Carter and General Helmick and Colonel Richards and Colonel Moore, and other officers on their staffs in the assistance they gave to the subcommittee during the hearings. For the most of 2 weeks we were working every day on this bill. When the House recessed from Thursday until Monday meant nothing to us except that we could work steadily on these estimates without the interruption of calls to the floor.

The printed hearings that you have before you and which run 348 pages are only a portion of the testimony that was taken on this bill. A lot of it was off the record and, probably, in this set of hearings more than in most hearings, you will find the words "here was a discussion off the record." Off the record because the subject of the discussion concerned matters which it was not advisable to put in the printed record for the information of the enemy.

In some of those "off the record" discussions, which I wish every Member of the House might have heard, questions arose on which there was some difference of opinion. Personally, from the review that we had of the Battle of the Coral Sea and the Battle of Midway, I felt that there was new argument for uniting our air forces and placing them under one command. I see here several members of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I am hoping that that legislative committee will give new consideration to the question of a unified command for the air forces.

It is true that in the Battle of Midway there were flyers from the Marine Corps, flyers from the Navy, and flyers of the Army Air Forces, but those who review the details of that battle, glorious as it was in its results for American arms, will, I believe, see a need for an increased unity in air command.

Now I want to turn to some of the details that this bill represents. Most of those who have spoken have covered more adequately than I could the over-all picture that this bill presents, the total number of men, the total number of planes, and have given you some suggestion of the firing power and the striking power of the army that this bill seeks to create and maintain for the coming year.

I want to point out that in our hearings we considered little things, too.

Members have noted that in the bill this time we carry language providing that most of the funds are interchangeable or that funds may be merged, and yet I want to assure the Members of the House, as we were assured by the War Department, that this does not represent any deviation from the specific purposes for which these appropriations are being made as indicated by the table in the report on the bill. It represents merely an attempt to give a certain flexibility so that under combat and field conditions, if the men who are carrying the battle to the enemy find it necessary to expend more in one direction than was indicated, or could be foreseen at the time of the justifications, they will have permission to do so without being subject to court martial for violation of law. We are further assured by the Finance Department of the Army that when expenditures are made in excess of the break-down that was given to us in the justifications, that will be reported to the committee at our next hearing. So there will be a check on these expenditures according to the estimates that were submitted.

Members of the House who are interested in getting some detail on the bill can well study the committee report which has been prepared by the clerk of the committee, Mr. Pugh, who, as everyone recognizes, is the best posted man on Army and Navy finance in the United States.

On page 3 of the report I think you will be interested in noting where the funds run above the Budget estimates. Recently enacted legislation is respon-

sible for $1,414,000,000 being in this bill over and above the Budget estimate. This item of $1,414,000,000 covers pay increases that the House and the Senate voted to the men in the armed forces.

The increases also cover the cost of increasing the number of cadets at the Military Academy. They cover an item for the family allowances of men in the armed forces which the House recently voted.

The total of $3,289,000,000 which was added to the bill over the Budget estimate by the committee also includes some $782,000,000 for the acceleration of personnel strength which has been decided upon by the General Staff following the preparation of the estimates. Other items which have been increased will be found listed and explained at page 3 of the committee report.

Members of the House who are bothered by a lack of information on the bill, will find it worth while to read the testimony of General Reybold with regard to construction. Two billion dollars goes for construction in this bill. The committee did not just hand that $2,000,000,000 over to General Reybold, or to the Corps of Engineers, as a blank check. We asked in detail as to how the money was to be spent, and when and for what purposes. We went into the question of land purchases, because the Corps of Engineers has a land acquisition section now charged with the acquisition of land. There is a substantial amount for the purchase of some land that had previously been leased. We were told that as a matter of experience, it had been found that it would be cheaper for the Government to purchase certain land than to restore it to its original condition, as was called for by the original plan in connection with particular camps or cantonments. Nevertheless, the subcommittee went on record in the report as urging leasing rather than purchase if the land owners on new projects want to retain ownership and will waive restoration of land condition.

Further, in our consideration of the construction item, we called attention to the National Guard camps in the country, and other installations, which may not be used to capacity. The committee was interested in getting the complete use of existing facilities and in appropriating no more money than was necessary to do the job that now has to be done.

We have heard a great deal of discussion at times when we have had Army and Navy bills on the floor, about modernizing the Army. Some people think that while we are in the midst of a war, we do not have time to keep abreast of the developments, and yet I am sure that the members of the subcommittee believe that that is the time when you must keep abreast of developments. So, some of the funds for the Air Corps and for ordnance, are for making changes in the equipment. On page 35 of the hearings Members will see a list of several hundred million dollars in the bill for experimentation, research, and development; $113,000,000 in the bill is for research and development for the Air Corps, and $50,000,000 for research and development of the Signal Corps, and $46,000,000 for research and development for the Ordnance Corps, and $7,000,000 for research and development for the Chemical Warfare Service and other items of that character. The War Department and the committee responsible for these appropriations are determined that the men who are on the firing line for us shall have the very best there is and the latest there is with which to fight.

A good deal of discussion has occurred on the floor of Congress and in the newspapers in the last few weeks in respect to the Alaskan Highway.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Dakota has expired.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself an additional 10 minutes. The committee has been concerned with some of the questions that have been raised with regard to the route selected for the construction of the Alaskan Highway. We were also concerned when we found in this bill an estimate for a very sizable sum for the survey of a railroad route to serve between the United States and Alaska. We went into that at some length, and you will find at different points in these hearings on-the-record testimony in regard to that. I call your attention particularly to the testimony of General Sturdevant, in which he says the route selected was selected for military reasons. He said very definitely that the War Department was not concerned with tourist travel, or with the views of the Canadian railroad, and was not concerned with the wishes of any chamber of commerce, but was concerned with supplying air fields along the established ferry route. Thus it was a purely military reason that dictated the selection of the route being worked on at the present time. And those of you who have been glad that General Mitchell pointed the way for certain development in our military policy will recall that General Mitchell said that the nation that controls Alaska will control the military destiny of the world.

The committee was concerned with the growing number of accidents in the air in so-called routine training operations.

General Arnold told us that while they had anticipated some rise in the accident rate, owing to the increased number of boys involved, yet he thought the rate was going up too rapidly. Members of the committee, you will find, asked him as to some of the causes of these accidents. We asked him about sabotage. We asked him about some of the things that could not be on the record.

I cite that to show that the committee was concerned with that problem and we did not simply say "The War Department has asked for so much money and here is a blank check." We tried to find out as much as we could legitimately about the expenditure of the money and the use to which it would be put.

Then there is the subject of horses. I recognize that a great many Members of the House think that the horse is a past number in military operations, yet those of us who have heard the testimony as to possible theaters of action before the war is ended, recognize that it is not wise to discharge all horses from duty. So you will find testimony in the hearings on the importance of maintaining a certain amount of horse cavalry. While this bill does not carry funds for the purchase of additional cavalry horses, yet it does carry funds to maintain horse cavalry at a certain level.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; I yield to the gentleman who has been making a study of airplane accidents.

Mr. NICHOLS. I was tremendously interested in what the gentleman had to say with respect to the established military road across Canada to Alaska. I am glad to know that the committee, of which the gentleman is a member, has interested itself in this subject. I also appreciate that it is a very delicate question and one that probably cannot be discussed in any semblance of detail on the floor. But I would like to ask the chairman of the subcommitee and the gentleman from South Dakota if they would not take a little time and go a little more thoroughly into the Alaskan situation now. You would find some very interesting things, probably some things that might shock you a little and might shock members of the committee. They are of such a nature, as I said, that they cannot be discussed on the floor of the House. Certainly some things are happening in Alaska and there are some things that are not happening in Alaska that ought to be happening, that have constrained me to the opinion, after an 8,000-mile flight through there about a month ago, that perhaps somebody in the War Department needs a little urging by some committees of this body or some individuals in this body to compel the War Department to perhaps pay a little more attention to the situation up there.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. SNYDER. I may say to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] that the committee has been fully advised by the War Department and by the Army engineers up to date as to what is going on; perhaps not all the details. Your committee was up there 2 years ago and looked over the whole situation and came back and made some recommendations, and they were all carried out. Others were not carried out. It is the intention of this committee at the first opportunity to go back there again.

Mr. NICHOLS. I will say that when the gentleman says the committee has been advised by the War Department of all the things going on up there, I have devoted some time in the last few days, practically a week altogether, talking to members of the War Department, to my amazement. I would say to the gentleman that there are many things that are happening up there that they do not know about, and many things that should happen that they do not know about.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am sure the gentleman from Oklahoma is genuinely concerned for the problems of Alaska, which are the problems of the

United States in this war at the present time. There is some discussion by General Somervell in the record and further testimony by General Sturdevant at page 226 and pages 234–235, dealing with the matter, but I think the problems of which the gentleman speaks were of a nature that were off the record, as far as any discussion which we had is concerned. As the chairman has already mentioned, there has been a discussion in the subcommittee of a further personal investigation of conditions in Alaska and affecting Alaska.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. SHANLEY. Have you broken down the amount of air appropriations so as to be able to tell us what will be used for cargo planes?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The figures of the amount for cargo planes were of the character that are not placed on the record. The gentleman will find in the hearings some testimony on the subject of air cargo and transport.

Mr. SHANLEY. The Army has been in the vanguard of all those who believed in the use of aircraft for cargoes. I know also that they are attempting to reach the high mark—but perhaps they will not arrive at that this year—of the Nazis, who use 16 percent of all their air transports in transportation of cargoes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The committee discussed that with General Somervell and with others who appeared before us. We were assured that the Army was going into the field of air transport to the extent that it felt advisable. We were advised that there was some problem as to the relative priorities of different types of materials and it involved the question of decision as to which was most important.

Mr. SHANLEY. When you use the expression air transport, do you mean transportation of personnel or cargo, or both?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Both.

Members at different times have expressed concern over the growing tendency of the Government in its various branches to purchase printing equipment or multigraphing equipment or multilithing equipment and going into the printing business generally. Personally I was pleased to have the assurance of Quartermaster General Gregory that it would be the policy of the War Department not to purchase any more printing equipment, but to buy printing from commercial establishments. We also developed that this was the policy of the Air Forces. In the hearings at pages 205 and 206 you will find a list of items, which I think totals about $10,000,000, for the purchase of printing for the Air Forces.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] has already referred to the testimony the committee took on the subject of State taxation on war contracts. You will find the testimony of General Somervell on this subject on page 42 of the hearings. Now in closing, I want to speak a few minutes on what should be reassuring to those who are chary of a bill carrying such large amounts. The gentleman from Pennsylvania expressed considerable concern over the figure and others are concerned over the amounts being spent in the war effort. I want to call your attention to the testimony in the hearings on the subject of the renegotiation of contracts and to the statement that is given in the report of the committee that the prospective savings through the renegotiation of contracts at this time approximate $1,137,000,000. I hold in my hand a confidential memorandum prepared for the committee.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Briefly; yes.

Mr. RICH. If through renegotiated contracts you have saved over a billion dollars does not that show the Government departments did not do a good job in letting the contracts in the first instance? Otherwise there would not have been a refund of over $1,000,000,000.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. On the contrary, it shows that the War Department did a good job in getting production under way and now is doing a good job in getting some price adjustments where it has been found that costs could be reduced after initial costs were met. It will be remembered that the mandatory renegotiation of contracts where excessive profits developed was initiated by an amendment which I offered and which the House adopted during consideration of the sixth supplemental defense bill about 3 months ago. As finally worked out after conference with the Senate, it became section 403 of the sixth supplemental [Public, 528]. As to the way it has worked, I want to give to the membership the testimony of General Reybold. General Reybold is the Chief of Engineers. It will be remembered that the amendment provides for the withholding of final payments on contracts until there is a certificate of costs and a renegotiation of price when that is indicated. Two questions were raised when the amendment was under consideration: One, will this slow up the war effort? Two, will it accomplish anything that is not being accomplished on a voluntary basis? So, here is the question I asked General Reybold during our hearings on this bill:

Did the placing of that provision for renegotiation of contracts in the sixth supplemental appropriation bill give you any opportunity for securing renegotiated contracts which you did not possess before that provision was put into law?

General Reybold replied:

Yes; I think it is a very good provision, and it enables us to negotiate contracts without having to sit around indefinitely to find out what is the proper cost.

It has been necessary in the prosecution of the war to give letters of intent, for the War Department to go to a contractor and say: "Here is something we need. We want you to get busy on it. We have not had time yet to get all the detailed specifications out, but we are going to give you a contract on this; we want you to go ahead on it."

Sometimes it was work on which neither the Government nor the contractor had any experience on which to base costs. So the Government had to agree to a price that would induce the contractor to undertake the risks involved. Then, when actual production revealed or developed costs, the Government sought to obtain an adjustment of the price. Until that cost-limitations amendment was adopted the Government had no power to require renegotiation regardless of what excessive profits might be found. So I asked General Reybold this further question:

Has it brought or is it indicated that this amendment will bring any substantial reduction in cost that could not have been obtained had renegotiation been left on a voluntary basis?

General Reybold answered:

Yes, sir.

I have here the memorandum from the War Department on the savings that have been achieved between April 15 and June 15; that is since the amendment was adopted. In renegotiations since that time, the various services report price savings of $596,000,000, as follows: Signal Corps, $11,000,000; Air Corps, January 1 to date, $243,000,000; Ordnance Department, $200,000,000; the Corps of Engineers, $1,847,000; Chemical Warfare, $190,000. The memorandum goes on to state that the Price Adjustment Board which has been set up to carry out the mandate of Congress on this renegotiation provision has had conferences with some 43 other companies whose names I am not going to put in the RECORD, because the matter is under negotiation at the present time, but it is estimated that those renegotiations will save $900,000,000. The memorandum also lists 6 other companies who have made offers of reductions which will save over $41,000,000.

The War Department has taken this excess-profits or excessive price situation seriously and has used the lever that was given by the amendment to the sixth supplemental bill. Here is a set of the instructions, six pages, which is provided to contractors, and here is a summary data sheet consisting of about 10 large pages of columnar distribution asking 83 different questions of contractors and materialmen. This information becomes the basis of price adjustment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman from Pennsylvania should recall that the $1,137,000,000 saving here reported is only for the War Department. The Navy Department and the Maritime Commission also are working on savings through the renegotiation of contracts as directed by section 403 of the supplemental bill. The gentleman will find that this probably represents a recapture by the Government in the way of a reduction of prices of some $2,000,000,000. That this will be a substantial saving I am sure the gentleman will agree.

Mr. RICH. I congratulate the committee on turning back that $2,000,000,000 to the Treasury. The point I want to make is that in all good regulated business they know what a contract is going to cost, at least they have some idea

of the cost of a particular item. Then they negotiate that contract with the idea that it is good business both for the seller and the purchaser to do that, and we do a good job. But here we are giving money lavishly to everybody, and that is the reason we have the waste, that is the reason we have to renegotiate the contracts. That is the point I make.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The gentleman himself is a manufacturer and he ought to speak with the experience of a manufacturer. He deals in woolen goods. If he were to turn from the manufacture of woolen goods to explosives he would find when he started out, when he first set up the factory, that during the first few months of his operation the expenses would probably be pretty high. If we were to ask him to turn from the manufacture of woolen goods to the production of munitions he would expect that he would get some allowance so that he could build up his experience and take care of a heavy first cost. That is exactly what has happened in respect to many articles of procurement.

The War Department has had to go to rubber companies, it has had to go to clothing manufacturers, it has had to go to cement manufacturers and ask them to change their factories over in order to go into the production of something in which they had no experience. After they have had some experience then they have been able to say: "We can reduce the cost on this." And if savings have not come by voluntary cooperation of the manufacturers, the amendment, section 403, in the sixth supplemental bill provided a method for the renegotiation of contracts on the basis of experience and established costs.

It is true that we are not going to win this war by merely throwing dollars at the enemy. It is also true that we are not going to win this war without throwing some dollars into the battle. In the first part of the printed hearings you will find 17 pages of heroes' names, men who have been awarded the Purple Heart, men who have been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, men who have been awarded the Silver Star, all heroes in this war since December 7. There are 17 pages, line upon line, of those names. That list will grow before the war is over. We will sorrow as the list grows but we shall be proud of it because it will represent the determination and the courage and the sacrifice of the American people. We are going to triumph in this war. We put on the sword to defend our own Nation and to defend our own liberties, and we shall not sheath the sword until liberty and order have been restored throughout the world.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, at the outset of my observations let me address myself to my good friend the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], for whom I entertain a deep and profound affection. In his remarks he intimated difficulty in digesting the astronomical amount carried in the pending bill, but I believe that the measure does lend itself to reasonable analysis.

Many years ago when Congress first appropriated a billion dollars for a 2-year period, it occasioned both surprise and concern. Thereupon Tom Reed, Speaker of the House, made his famous remark that "This is a billion-dollar country." In like manner it may be observed today as we prepare to appropriate forty-two billion in the instant bill bringing the total war expenditure for the fiscal years 1941, 1942, and 1943 to a total of $205,000,000,000 that it is a $200,000,000,000 country and that it might be a $200,000,000,000 war. This flows from the magnitude of the struggle, the vastness of the area in which it is being prosecuted, the mechanization of conflict, the emphasis of air power, and the enormous transport problems with which we are today confronted in bringing war to the enemy.

A measure of this kind revolves itself in terms of arithmetic. I believe it was Aristotle who long ago observed that—

> Arithmetic, oh stranger, is the greatest of all sciences and the mother of invention.

The ancient sage Plato also observed in his Dialogues that the first men of the state should be admonished to learn arithmetic. Let us then apply this ancient science so that a measure of this proportion might become better understandable.

Consider for a moment the item of more than ten billion for pay and subsistence of the Army. If it costs slightly over 62 cents per day to provide adequate food for a soldier and that unit cost is multiplied by the number of soldiers in service, you have at once the gross amount required for food for a day and for a fiscal year. That is mere arithmetic. Since the War Department long ago contrived a unit figure for providing necessary clothing for a soldier, the unit cost multiplied by the number of soldiers provides the total amount necessary for clothing. Recently Congress revised the Pay Act for men in the armed services. If one multiplies the monthly pay decreed by statute for each enlisted man and each officer in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps, he at once derives a figure which will be required to provide regular pay checks for the men in the services.

In like measure arithmetic applies when one considers the large amounts set out in this bill for ordnance and for airplanes. Those chargeable with the prosecution of the war have determined the additional number of light and medium tanks, shells, small arms, and ammunition, machine guns, and other instrumentalities of war which they deem necessary for victory. The cost per unit in each case has been fairly well determined by production costs which now obtain for these instrumentalities and by the simple process of multiplication one can determine how much a thousand machine guns, a thousand tanks, a million rounds of ammunition, or any other quantity will cost. Consider the airplane program. The bill provides for more than 23,000 planes and it may be assumed that this embraces bombers, fighters, and other types, the cost of which are all known from past experience. Thus, if it is proposed to purchase a given number of B-17's, P-40's, or P-38's, the process of multiplication will once more provide the total in determining the over-all cost.

The report discloses that there are 10 or 12 major categories involved in the bill, showing the total for each. All have been determined by the War Department on the basis of units or numbers of each times the cost, and when a gross total is finally struck it adds up to an amount in excess of $42,000,000,000. I might observe generally that it is probably easier for the War and Navy Departments, dealing as they do with tangible items and factors, to contrive an appropriation than it would be for other departments of Government which deal largely in intangible services. Let me, therefore, conclude this segment of my remarks by observing to my good friend from Pennsylvania that this bill, nothwithstanding the astronomical amount, is after all the product of the science of arithmetic.

It is interesting that this measure should come to us in an hour of concern and anxiety. There have been dark hours before. There may be other dark hours before we behold the effulgent dawn of victory.

Early April of this year was such a dark period. It was in fact a mixture of darkness and hope. It was the month in which the Congress observed the twenty-fifth anniversary of our entry into the first World War. It was the month of brightness, when the hearts of all Christians were buoyed by the rich promise of the open sepulcher on Easter morn and when the hope which has been warmly running down the corridors of time for more than 1,900 years touched the hearts of men and women in all corners of the earth. It was the month in which we received the disquieting news of the surrender on Bataan. It was the month in which the mission of Sir Stafford Cripps returned from India after what appeared to be a fruitless quest. Truly those were dark days, and today we glean from the daily press disquieting news which also brings anxiety and distress.

There was scant comfort in the fall of Tobruk, knowing as we do its strategic importance in the command of Africa and the important reaches of the Mediterranean where bombers can cross in a good hour and command the destiny of southern Europe. There was scant comfort in the news that a wedge had been driven into the outer defense of Sevastopol and I find from communion with other Members of this body that they too have shared this concern and anxiety.

But the darkness must inevitably be followed by dawn and from every bleak despair, there must devolve a note of transcendent hope. We shall express that hope today in unanimously giving our hearts and hopes to this appropriation bill as a mark of faith in the complete and ultimate victory for our armies, cost what it may. There can be no turning back on the road which we have chosen to pursue. There can be no peace without victory.

The magnitude of the pending bill diminishes somewhat when measured

against the magnitude of the present conflict. Let me remind you that today we fight on a 20,000-mile front. A line drawn from the eastern front of Russia across the dark expanses of the Atlantic and then extended across our own country and across the vast reaches of the Pacific indicates that this line of operations today completely dwarfs in magnitude, a line on which we fought in the days of the first World War. That war was prosecuted on a front which extended from Switzerland to the English Channel. It was infinitesimal compared with our present task.

Consider the Pacific Ocean as but one of the theaters of operations. More than 400 years ago when Magellan came through the roaring straits, which bear his name, and steered his vessels into the quiet waters and limitless ocean, he called it the Pacific but had not the remotest concept of its size. It remained for geographers centuries later to sound and chart this vast expanse of water and to ascertain that it contained 63,000,000 square miles, which is 8,000,000 square miles larger than all the aggregate land surface on the face of the earth. In this vast watery domain our Navy today upholds the best traditions of the service and of the Nation. It must serve the North Pacific, which includes our own coast lines, Alaska, and the Aleutians. It must serve the equatorials, which includes the islands that are so essential to the maintenance of our supply and communication points. It must serve the South Pacific reaches where gallant MacArthur is giving direction to our efforts from Australia.

The Atlantic Ocean is in a sense but a lake compared to the Pacific, yet it is of such magnitude that submarines which harry our coasts and supply lines have become a truly difficult problem, which adds to our immediate dismay.

It is a four-dimensional struggle where mechanical monsters on land, on sea, in the air, and below the surface of the mighty ocean are contending for mastery and advantage.

It is a struggle of titanic proportions when measured in terms of manpower for it is fair to assume that on the earth there are today as many as 40,000,000 men in uniform. The climatic range of the struggle is worthy of observation for it extends from areas where the torrid and devitalizing heat of an African sun, the unspeakable humidity of oriental jungles and the biting cold of the frozen wastes of the North have all affected the cause of the conflict which has already moved into its third year.

Our troops are already dispersed into many areas of the earth and so I reaffirm what I said a brief while ago that the very magnitude of this all-engulfing struggle by contrast diminishes the size of the appropriation which we are about to approve.

I am sensible of the fact even as you are sensible that the expenditure of this vast sum cannot do other than have a definite profound and leisurely impact on the internal economy of the country. It represents an amount which in normal times was equal to one-half of the annual national income of this great country. To divert material for the fabrication of the instruments of victory which are provided in this measure and to set in motion a vast moving stream of purchasing power, it cannot do other than bring inconveniences, hardships, and sacrifices to our people. There will be instances where civilian industry must be precluded from materials to sustain its life and if the shutters must go out on some business enterprises, it will mean the extinction of jobs and definite dislocations for humble and devoted people everywhere. As the effect of war comes closer with its burdensome touch, it may prove to be an hour of test for our stamina and fortitude.

It is not so difficult to understand that when the serene and peaceful daily living of millions of people is dislocated and modified by the touch of Mars, the people may well express the hope that they are coming into this dislocating change which touches every section, every family and every living person in the whole earth. People whose hearts know only neighborly and quiet living may shudder at the continuing carnage and shambles. They may hope for escape out of genuine and anxious concern for the very future of civilization itself. It will not be unnatural for bruised hearts, exhausted bodies, and crushed hopes everywhere in the world to hope for an end of conflict and when it comes, it will prove as a test for our spiritual fortitude and stamina in going through to complete victory.

I know as you know what the answer of our people will be even as General Grant long ago said that he proposed to fight it out on the wilderness line if it took all summer. So shall we with equal determination propose to fight it out to complete victory if it takes one or more summers to achieve that result. Should it take longer, the cost in treasure, in blood, in sweat, in tears, and in sacrifice will be greater, so we express the hope that through inspired leadership and an effective air armada, a courageous and well-equipped Army, and a gallant forceful Navy we may the sooner bring conflict to a termination.

The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] stated earlier today that he proposed to take this measure on faith.

Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that its acceptance is predicated on faith and arithmetic. Arithmetic determines the cost of tanks, planes, rifles, supplies, equipment, and other items for which provision is made in this measure. At that point our faith begins for the number of these items has been determined by those who are chargeable with victory and we must have faith in their capacity, their judgment, and their skill to bring such victory to our arms. They are the men in the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps who have been schooled in the military and naval institutions of the country, who since youth have been instructed in the art of war and to whom we must look for a direction to our military and naval effort. I shall emphasize my faith in them until that faith has been shaken or destroyed by clear incompetence and incapacity to do the job.

It is a definite design for the victory which we seek. A design which embraces not one but five armies, each of whom is indispensable to ultimate victory.

There is the combat army consisting of the very flower of the young men who today are dispersed into more than a score of stations in the world ready to do their duty. They are the young men who today are found in Australia under MacArthur, who are found in Ireland and Iceland, who are found in Africa and Alaska, who are found in the islands of the Pacific and in the reaches of the Caribbean ready to brave tropical heat and all manner of conditions to serve their country in an hour of need.

It is not unlike the combat army which soldiered in other generations with George Washington, with Andrew Jackson, with General Scott, with General Grant, with General Pershing, except that the mode of fighting, the magnitude of the task, and the type of equipment with which they must be armed is quite different.

Earlier in the day my good friend from Pennsylvania referred to the cost of the Revolutionary War, the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the War of 1898, and the World War. There can be no accurate comparison because in each case the type of warfare is essentially different. Today we pursue mechanized conflict. It requires a vast investment per man for the machinery with which war is fought. Weapons are far more mobile and more complicated. Ranges are greater. The tempo of war is swifter. The expenditure for ammunition is greater. The maintenance of supply and communication lines is an infinitely greater task than it was in any other generation known to mankind. The service of repairs to maintain the effectiveness of planes, tanks, and weapons is a considerable undertaking in itself. In one basic respect the conflict of today is not unlike the conflict of yesteryear and that is that the fortitude, stamina, courage, and the capacity of the young American soldier of today is the equal of the soldier who fought at Valley Forge, at New Orleans, at San Juan, at Gettysburg, and at Chateau-Thierry. They carry on in the same tradition which makes the young American a great and resolute soldier.

Behind him stands the production army producing the instrumentalities with which he must be equipped and upon which we must rely against a skilled foe for victory.

Behind him stands the farm army tilling the soil and making it produce the food and subsistence which will sustain him whether he be in camp or in the theater of combat.

Behind him stands the home-front army consisting of those millions of God-fearing men and women who buy bonds, pay taxes, and resolutely manage the affairs of the country so that their internal economy may be maintained intact.

Finally, there is the administrative army, consisting of the Commander in Chief, the officers in the War and Navy Department, to give direction to the war effort, the executive heads who direct

the civilian war agencies of the Nation, and the Members of Congress whose obligation is under the Constitution to provide an army and navy for the security of the Nation. In proportion as there is efficient coordination between the five armies who are the design for victory, so will the complete and ultimate victory be the sooner achieved.

It is a matter of deep concern whether victory comes early or late. Let me suggest to your attention that in the last 11 hours of the first World War, extending from midnight November 10, 1918, to that eventful hour of 11 o'clock on November 11, 1918, our casualties consisted of 213 killed and 1,079 wounded. It does make a difference whether this conflict terminates a year sooner, a month sooner, a week sooner, a day sooner, an hour sooner, because that difference will be measured in terms of blood and tragedy. If we appropriate this huge sum representing as it does the largest single appropriation bill in the history of the Republic, let us invest in it the fervent hope that this expenditure will bring about an earlier termination of the struggle and result in the saving of precious lives of young Americans who might otherwise be sacrificed upon the altar of war.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois this question. I am not so much concerned about what we will do from a military standpoint with the money which is being appropriated or what the military forces will do, but I am concerned about what this Congress will do or what this House will do toward seeing that a proper study is made and operated in such a way that the appropriations do not destroy the economy of this country and leave an empty barrel here for the boys to come back to after they have won the military victory. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] this afternoon made the observation that he believed that these appropriations would lead to bankruptcy in the United States. It is my firm opinion that bankruptcy is not necessary but if we, the Congress, piddle around in connection with some of the unsound financing that is being done, then I think we can be charged with the loss of the peace after the war is over, and I wonder if the gentleman would comment on that.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I will be glad to comment on that and I want to make two observations. The first one is general in its nature. This is the first time in the history of our country when minds schooled in fiscal affairs and in finance have wondered whether or not we are going to steer into bankruptcy. We never have. It is not the first time in the history of the world that the best minds of other countries have been engaged in similar thinking. It was in 1801 that Wilberforce, the great educator in Great Britain, said:

I cannot marry because the future is so dark and dismal.

In 1848 Disraeli, the great Prime Minister that he was, said:

I can see no future in industry and commerce in Great Britain.

Wellington, in 1852, said:

I thank God that I shall be spared the consummation of the destruction that is gathering about us.

It is not the first time men have talked that way. So, first of all, out of the pages of history I find a rather resilient kind of philosophy and, secondly, I share the solicitude of my friend from Michigan in the sense that it is the responsibility of Congress to hold down nonessential spending, to hold the load down as much as possible. Not only is the size of the debt an important consideration, but also what it costs to carry it from year to year. A $200,000,000,000 debt at two and a half percent means $5,000,000,000 for the privilege of borrowing money from your people year after year. The whole revenue was only $4,000,000,000 when you came to this Congress in 1933. Now we think in terms of a carrying charge of $5,000,000,000 a year.

Yes, it is of concern. It means that the tax revenues are going up. This year the Treasury is collecting $16,700,000,000. The Ways and Means Committee will have their bill on the floor here in a few weeks. In the next fiscal year we will be collecting $24,000,000,000 or maybe $25,000,000,000. It is an unheard of sum. We have collected or will collect 16.7 billion dollars, and very few skilled financiers felt that it could be siphoned out of the great reaches of the country without great economic dislocation or bankruptcy. But we have done it. So we will continue to do it, and people will buy bonds and we will move forward, and I believe we will hold our country intact. But let me say to you, that we have got to hold down nondefense spending wherever possible for, after all, every dollar that we spend for something that is dispensible, simply takes away from the concentration of the war effort and adds to the total load and simply writes a larger score at the top which we must appropriate year after year.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois 5 additional minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But, so far as the country is concerned, coming out of it, well, if we do not lose our sense of direction, and I think we will not, we shall preserve the will and the intelligence necessary to steer through. After all, our greatest weapon is our determination to preserve the Republic with the essential freedoms which make it a great land.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman says that we have to keep down nondefense spending. Let me ask him this question: Are we doing it?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Oh, I say to my friend that for 9 days I have been with the Agriculture Appropriation Committee and had some little hand in chopping $48,000,000 out of that bill, but another body saw fit to restore it all, and in fact to restore more than that amount. We can stop it. We will have it back some time soon with that amount before the end of the fiscal year, and it will have to be determined whether we will accept or not what another body has inserted in the bill after it left the House. If we stand up on our hind legs and say that we will not recede in our position, then we are keeping faith with our colleagues in this body and making a faithful accounting of our stewardship.

Mr. RICH. And we are going to have another conference report here on Thursday, the Interior Department appropriation bill on which that other body put everything back that we knocked out, insofar as nondefense spending is concerned.

Mr. DIRKSEN. And on Thursday I will be here, fighting shoulder to shoulder with the gentleman, and see that we resist that effort upon the part of the Senate to increase nondefense spending. I shall be here to join with the gentleman.

Mr. RICH. And our Republicans here are taking the floor this afternoon, and if we could get them to influence the Democrats over there to give us some help, we might get some place.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I wonder, where my friend the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is? This afternoon he discussed this matter of a sales tax on defense expenditures in the various States. After all, there are two sides to that story. In the first place, do not forget that when the Federal Government, through a duly constituted officer like Leon Henderson, undertakes to impose gasoline rationing on many States after those States have committed themselves to highway programs that are now being built, and that coupons will be clipped off bonds that have to be retired, it means that the long hand of the Federal Government has reached into the State fiscal set-up and seriously disturbed it.

Secondly, when the Federal Government rations other goods, when the War Production Board diminishes the amount of materials available for civilian industry, it is diminishing the amount of goods on which sales taxes can be collected and thereby dislocates the financial program of the States.

While I am not prepared to indicate to the committee this afternoon the proportion of the amounts that might be involved, I do suggest that there are two sides to that story, and if an effort is made to bring out a revenue bill that shall give immunity to every dollar of defense expenditure from sales taxation, it should be carefully scrutinized to see that we do not disturb the whole fiscal picture of the States and compel them to go about seeking new sources of revenue, in order to maintain their program intact, and to meet the obligations they have made long ago. After all, the commitments and obligations of the States

are quite as sacred as those of the Federal Government.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman has made a magnificent statement indicating the various factors involved, making for success or failure toward achieving victory. He has expressed confidence in our military leaders, and I have the same confidence. He states that the Congress of the United States has had its part to do in laying the financial foundations of the war through passing such bills as this and he thinks that that has been done pretty well. The gentleman has pointed out that this is a different war from that which George Washington and others knew. This is a war of machines as well as of men so far as the battlefield is concerned, but is it not also true that dollars are fighting as much as are tanks and airplanes? Is it not fully as much the responsibility of those who administer these funds which we are appropriating to see to it that they contribute most toward victory? The function of two of our committees of the House is to see that those funds are not wasted but that there is efficiency in the administration of them.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has again expired.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 minutes more.

Mr. DIRKSEN. What difference does it make when you think in terms of dollars translated into terms of tanks and planes, when you have the Federal Government on one side economizing a little, and then compelling the States to take an equivalent amount of dollars out of the taxpayers' pockets, because you have disturbed the State's fiscal program. Taxation of Federal dollars ought to be measured in terms of their incidence on the pocketbooks of the taxpayers for that is where the burden ultimately lodges.

Mr. MURDOCK. The gentleman misunderstood my interruption. I was trying to interrupt in an earlier portion of the gentleman's speech not involving a tax question. In thinking of the factors contributing to victory, I wish to refer to the relative importance of efficiency in spending these huge sums that we are appropriating, as compared with the armed forces using the equipment on the battlefield. Congress has done its part. It remains to be seen whether those who administer these funds can make the dollars fight as effectively as our armed men can make the equipment fight.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I am sorry. I did not quite catch the import of my friend's question.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. I want to congratulate the gentleman on the very splendid speech he has made this afternoon. I would like to know whether or not it is the opinion of the gentleman that all of this money is being spent wisely? Have you any doubt as to the fact that the War Department and the Navy Department are spending every nickel of this money with the greatest efficiency and for the best possible use?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me answer the distinguished gentleman from New York by saying this: When the last war was over the Congress appointed a War Expenditures Committee. They filled some 25 large volumes with testimony.

That Committee was under the chairmanship of Representative Graham, of Illinois. It performed an outstanding piece of work. A score or more of reports were filed, dealing not only with war expenditures but with the disposition of war equipment after conflict terminated. The whole matter was thoroughly explored and many instances of waste and extravagance were uncovered.

A like function is now being performed by several committees of the House and Senate. They have done good work. Notable work has been done by the House Committee on Naval Affairs in securing the renegotiation of contracts with substantial savings to the Treasury.

This work, however, should be carefully organized. A joint committee of House and Senate, staffed with an adequate body of experts, investigators, accountants, and armed with proper authority could save time for heads of the executive agencies, eliminate lost motion and duplication and do a more far-reaching job in adducing information for the guidance of Congress in making appropriations for the war effort.

Such a committee will doubtless be created when the war ends and it might be well to create it at once and let it function as the war progresses because it will be in the interest of efficient expenditure.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Chairman, I dislike to dignify by answering any statement made by such a venomous radio commentator as Walter Winchell, whose reputation for resorting to personal abuse and vilification over the radio is well known to all Members of Congress and to the American people.

This brave naval lieutenant commander, who fights with words instead of bullets, is the foremost smear artist, purveyor of hate and disunity in America. He is invincible in peace but invisible in war, yet continues to publicly flaunt the Navy uniform without serving in our armed forces in the midst of the greatest war in our history.

This invisible-in-war radio commentator stoops to any low-down device, and by the use of innuendoes, inferences, half-truths, and falsehoods slanders Members of Congress who served in combat units overseas in the last war, and impugns their patriotism.

Last Sunday Lt. Comdr. Walter Winchell, speaking over the blue network and referring to some alleged Nazi advertisement, said:

> That this ad, which originated with Nazi Agent Viereck, was traced to a Congressman's office through which it was printed. That Congressman—hear me out—was the Honorable HAMILTON FISH.

His whole object was to infer that I was responsible for the printing of this ad. It is a damnable lie. I had no knowledge of the existence of this ad or anything whatever to do with it. I have investigated the charge, and no such ad was ever printed or sent out from my office. If Mr. Hill, a former clerk, had any connection with it, he did so outside of my office and without my knowledge or consent.

These low-down, dastardly, and false attacks against Members of Congress are part of a smear campaign to undermine the faith and confidence of the American people in the Congress of the United States. It is about time that the Congress enacted legislation to protect itself against such putrid attacks and slanderous propaganda over the radio.

I agree with the gentleman from Georgia, Representative VINSON, chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee, who said, in effect, "Let Winchell put on the uniform and enter the Navy or take off the uniform and get out of the Navy."

I believe Winchell's contemptible and malicious attack on me and on my patriotism and Americanism was for the purpose of trying to defeat me for being a noninterventionist prior to Pearl Harbor. However, such fanatical and abusive attacks on my patriotism and loyalty, coming from individuals outside of my district, if continued, will only help to renominate and reelect me by enormous majorities. The American people are fair-minded and do not like personal abuse. The people of my district do not need any advice from Walter Winchell in New York City, particularly advice based on falsehoods and malice.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON].

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, today we have before us a bill calling for the expenditure of $42,000,000,000. I intend to vote for this measure because I believe that the expenditures of this money will be in the best interest of our Republic.

I was recently reading a speech by former President Hoover, in which he called attention to the fact that as a civilian he had the privilege, shared by few civilians, of being present at the battle of the Somme, and to see the land over which 1,500,000 human beings were fighting for their lives. President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill are talking in the White House today of opening a second front. We do not know where, but we do know that already our boys are fighting on many fronts and in all parts of the globe. We also know that there was a memorial dedicated at Ypres by the British Government to 150,000 British soldiers who died on a comparatively small segment of the Franco-German lines in the last war.

I do not want American boys to be sacrificed without giving them the very last ounce of the very best weapons and matériel that our inventive genius can produce. For that reason I expect to vote and I shall vote for this bill, believing that this Government and the men who are in control of our armed forces today are going to see to it that this money is wisely spent, and that wherever our boys fight they are going to have the very best equipment against the enemy.

In this connection it is somewhat disturbing at times to read criticisms. Of course, criticisms are valuable, but in one of the books which is known today as one of the 10 best sellers, Victory Through Air Power, Major de Seversky states that—

> Even now, we are building aircraft types which were already obsolete when started, under the impression that "just planes" are enough.

That carries me back to 1939, before the Axis war against England and France had broken out, to a time when we were talking about another Army appropriation bill. Everybody was going to vote and did vote for the bill, just as we are going to vote for this bill. But on the floor of the House there were suggestions made, with the purpose of improving the bill, as there will be when this bill is read and amendments are offered. The contributions were not with the expectation of the sponsor that his idea would be accepted but in order to point out what he believed to be weaknesses which ought to be corrected.

I remember at that time the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] offered some amendments. I remember that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BROWN] and others joined in the debate and asked questions. It appeared that what the gentleman from New Jersey had in mind was that certain sums of money which were included in the bill for reserve military airplanes should be expended for the purpose of aeronautical research instead of for obsolescent types of planes. Later in a motion to recommit the bill offered by him he provided that about $9,000,000 should be used for such research. That motion to recommit was voted down, although many Members of Congress, like myself, voted for it just before we voted in favor of the passage of the bill. We knew the motion to recommit would be defeated, but we were anxious to call attention to our belief that this particular bill should have carried a provision to spend at least $9,000,000 on aeronautical research that our military and naval planes might be improved at the earliest possible date. Four million dollars of that money was to be spent at Moffett Field in Sunnyvale, Calif. It is strange enough that while he expected his motion to be voted down, as it was voted down, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] and those of us who voted with him, had the privilege of knowing 3 or 4 months later that the land had actually been secured by the Government for such research facilities at Sunnyvale, where $16,000,000 have now been expended or will be spent to bring into being the greatest scientific laboratories and research facilities for aeronautics in the world, far greater than those at Langley Field. The administration and the military leaders thus endorsed and actively approved at that time Congressman POWERS' proposal—most wisely.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Of course, the Sunnyvale Research Laboratory is established. How much better it would have been had certain voices been listened to when 2 or 3 years ago it was asked that such laboratories as that should be moved from the coastal regions to the interior parts of our country.

Mr. CLASON. We shall always have these sectional disputes, but as far as I know nothing has ever happened to hurt the facilities either at Langley Field or at Sunnyvale, and I am sure this war is going to be fought through without any invaders doing any damage to either of these places.

Mr. POWERS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. POWERS. I am interested, of course, but surprised that the gentleman is discussing the 1939 research and development. We then asked for $9,000,000 for research and development for the Air Corps. Does the gentleman realize that in this bill there is a total of $220,000,000 for research and development, $113,000,000 of this being for the Air Corps? Yet we could not get $9,000,000 in 1939.

Mr. CLASON. The gentleman has made an interesting contribution to the discussion. I think everybody here must be just as much interested as I am in these figures. They show conclusively that those who voted with the gentleman from New Jersey, Congressman POWERS, were right in 1939. We would have had better planes for our Army today if his proposal had been added to that 1939 War Department appropriation bill. They also show that shortly after the gentlemen from New Jersey [Mr. POWERS] made his fight on the floor of the House for that purpose, and because of it, the administration and the majority of Congress were both aware that there was a need for this money to be used. And so it was made possible for these facilities to be established. Today this War Department appropriation bill contains a provision to expend $113,000,000 for aeronautical research and development, 12 times as much as was requested of and refused by the majority of this body just 3 years ago when we sorely needed it. In that debate, strangely enough, the gentleman from New Jersey pointed out, as de Seversky is pointing out weaknesses today, that the types of airplanes then being used and built by the United States Army were not comparable to those in existence and in the hands of our potential enemies for the reason that they did not carry sufficient armor and sufficient armaments, or have self-sealing fuel tanks. That is why the types of planes with which our military forces were equipped on the day in 1939 when England went to war with Germany were already obsolescent, if not obsolete. Likewise, it is evident that the obsolescent planes covered by the amendments offered by the gentleman from New Jersey in those June days of 1939 were never constructed, fortunately. New types of planes were developed. The new type planes have been built with money appropriated by the Congress since England entered the war and after provision for more aeronautical research had been made.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POWERS. I yield.

Mr. DINGELL. Did not our own General Arnold laugh at De Seversky's suggestion that we have long-range fighters? Had we possessed long-range fighters we might never have lost Wake and the Philippines.

Mr. CLASON. I do not know the answer to the question about General Arnold asked by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. It is, as a matter of fact, true.

Mr. CLASON. But I will say that I personally have the highest confidence in Lieutenant General Arnold.

Mr. DINGELL. I do not.

Mr. CLASON. In my opinion he is one of the outstanding men, one of the great military leaders of our country today, and I certainly will back him to the limit as the commanding general of our Army Air Forces.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLASON. I yield.

Mr. TERRY. In reference to the program in 1939 to which the gentleman referred, it was stated on the floor of the House at that time that the program was a 2-year program and that it would have the benefit of any improvement in airplanes as the program went ahead.

Mr. CLASON. I have no doubt but what the gentleman is making a correct statement, but I do not believe he voted for the motion to recommit which would have made possible the expenditure of $9,000,000 for research facilities which we needed so badly then and are now being made available.

In closing, I wish once again to bring to your attention an excerpt from an article by ex-President Hoover to which I have already referred. This article portrays most vividly and most directly the reasons why every Member of Congress will vote for the expenditure of the tremendous sums mentioned in this bill. As a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I have devoted much time to investigations carried on by our members. You have heard Chairman MAY, of the committee, tell you today that these investigations have already saved hundreds of millions of dollars of the public moneys, and further investigation as well as the results of investigations already held will save many more hundreds of millions of dollars. I believe that the wisest course is to prevent wasteful expenditures. It is the duty of the administration and those directly in charge of Government contracts to see to it that not one dollar of this huge appropriation

is spent inefficiently or wastefully. It is the duty of Members of Congress to continue close investigation of the progress of our national war program to make certain that waste is not permitted and to disclose all facts which will prevent raids on the Public Treasury. In so doing, however, nothing must be allowed to stand in the way of the actual production of the needed military and naval weapons. We want every American soldier, sailor, and marine to have the very best, in sufficient amounts and ahead of time. We want to prevent insofar as possible the sacrifices of human lives as our young men go to the battlefronts in ever-increasing numbers. We must not forget the lessons of World War No. 1.

The words of ex-President Hoover are as follows:

First, let me say something from this experience of what war really is. Those who lived in it, and our American boys who fought in it, dislike to recall its terribleness. We dwell today upon its glories—the courage, the heroism, the greatness of spirit in men. I, myself, should like to forget all else. But today, with the world driving recklessly into it again, there is much we must not forget. Amid the afterglow of glory and legend we forget the filth, the stench, the death of the trenches. We forget the dumb grief of mothers, wives, and children. We forget the unending blight cast upon the world by the sacrifice of the flower of every race.

I was one of but few civilians who saw something of the Battle of the Somme. In the distant view were the unending trenches filled with a million and a half men. Here and there, like ants, they advanced under the thunder and belching volcanoes from 10,000 guns. Their lives were thrown away until half a million had died. Passing close by were unending lines of men plodding along the right side of the road to the front, not with drums and bands but with saddened resignation. Down the left side came the unending lines of wounded men, staggering among unending stretchers and ambulances. Do you think one can forget that? And it was but one battle of a hundred.

Ten million men died or were maimed for life in that war. There were millions who died unknown and unmarked. Yet there are miles of unending crosses in a thousand cemeteries. The great monument to the dead at Ypres carries the names of 150,000 Englishmen who died on but a small segment of the front. Theirs was an inspiring heroism for all time. But how much greater a world it would be today if that heroism and that character could have lived!

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, those of us who have followed closely the course of this afternoon's debate have heard again and again from Members who have stood in the Well of the House the interpretation of the staggering sum of over $42,000,000,000 involved in the appropriation bill now before us.

May I simply interpret it in another fashion and say that the great sum involved in this one bill equals to each man, woman, and child in the United States of America the sum of $324?

We realize the prosecution of this war in 1942 and in the months that are ahead is vastly different from any conflict which has ever been fought in the history of mankind.

In the Napoleonic wars it cost $300 to kill a man. It is estimated that in the War between the States the figure was up to $5,000. In World War No. 1 it went far beyond that amount and rose to $21,000. As of today those who are expert in the matter of figuring in the terms I am using say it costs $50,000 for each soldier who is killed.

In the month of May we spent $4,000,000,000. If this war goes into next year, by that time we shall be spending not $4,000,000,000 but possibly seven to ten billions of dollars each month the war continues.

A few days ago I was in Gettysburg, the scene of that famous and decisive battle in the War between the States. The guide there told me that in those three days of fighting 1,300,000 pounds of ammunition was used by the armies of the North and the South. "Think of it," the guide said, "1,300,000 pounds." I then told him of the contrast of that figure of 3 days' fighting with only 90 minutes of bombing by the Royal Air Force over Cologne, when sky heroes dropped 6,700,000 pounds of ammunition of one type or another on the industrial network of that great enemy manufacturing community.

Yes; this is a different type of war than we have ever been called to face. We will be sending in increasing numbers millions of our finest manhood to fight, not as in World War No. 1, on an extended battle front in Europe, but on more than 30 battle fronts throughout the world. As we debate this afternoon there continues to come to our attention unfavorable news from the war sectors. Tobruk has fallen and the Axis control the important Libyan base of Bengazi.

We must recognize that air power is the deciding factor in victory or defeat. We learn of the Yankee flyers who have joined in the defense of Egypt. In just a moment I shall speak briefly, in the time allotted, to point out what I believe to be a weakness in our planning for increased strength in the skies.

Before doing so, and conscious of what Members have said today, there are millions of our fellow countrymen who realize we are facing an economic impasse and perhaps bankruptcy of this Nation and of the world. This causes the men and women who are interested in the winning of this war to think also of the consequences that will come when peace has been restored.

It is for this reason that I emphasize at the present time that every extravagance in personal life, every excess in the operation of Government at home lessens by just that much the money and the equipment and the manpower which we send to fight our foes during the coming days.

It is easy, and it is often unfair, for a Member of this House to stand in the Well and to criticize the military authorities of our country. That would be the furthest though in my mind this afternoon, for the record of the individual who now addresses you has been one of uniform support for the preparedness program both before and after the tragedy at Pearl Harbor. I desire only to be constructive in my comment.

I invite your attention and focus your thought on the tremendous amount of money which is being expended or will be expended under the bill's provisions, particularly the sum of more than $11,000,000,000 for the Army air force. It is the largest item in this bill, about one-fourth of the sum to be spent. In other appropriation bills that have come before us it has been sometimes one-third and one-half of the total amount requested. I shall not want to be a carping critic. I honestly lay before the membership of the House a statement built upon fact and fact alone.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, on March 20 of the present year the Army air force of this country indicated, and did not intimate, that it desired the Civil Aeronautics Administration of this country to train pilots on a really big scale. It embodied a plan for giving precombat training through the facilities and the equipment of the civilian pilot-training program of 45,000 men. That was the program laid down. May 20 came and the Army came back and modified its request and said in effect, "We need facilities only for the training of 13,500 men."

Let us see the picture. The civilian pilot-training program of this country at the present time has in actual use various types of training planes which are giving the manpower that will fly the sort of training which is vital. Two thousand six hundred and fifty of these planes are now being used. Twelve thousand nine hundred other planes are available for use. What a tragic waste. In other words, the civilian, pilot-training program of this country is training only 27,000 men who later will go into combat flying, but the operators have facilities to train 180,000.

This is not my own opinion. Every fact I am presenting, I believe, is a part of the record. In other words, only 15 percent of the available equipment and the instructors of the civilian pilot-training program are used in giving to the United States additional men who will fly every type of combat plane into the sky to bring about a speedier victory to this Republic. Let this Congress realize what I have said is factual. We must change this situation. Let us investigate carefully. Let the individual Members themselves check with the Army and with the Civil Aeronautics Administration, and based on that study let us make full use of these potential civilian facilities to the end that this war will be brought to a speedier conclusion in behalf of America and her Allies.

A few days ago I received a letter from a flying service which complained of the failure of the Army to use civilian facilities. It was pointed out, and I quote:

That the Navy arranged quickly and efficiently for Civil Aeronautics Administration training.

The writer goes on to say:

That the Army has taken no definite action to train these boys. They are idling around awaiting procedure. This is a serious matter. These boys are chewing the bit waiting to be trained to be able to crush our enemies.

That view indicates a cross section of the country on this subject. We must have full potential use of C. P. T. facilities. Let us remember that there were 19 boys in the group of 79 who flew with General Doolittle on the successful bombing of Tokyo, who were trained by the C. P. T. program before they entered the Army Air Corps. The Civil Aeronautics Administration is ready to continue a job well done. American Aviation Daily, in the issue of June 17, said:

Indignation is rising over refusal of a few key Army officers to make any substantial use of pilot-training facilities.

We are in a total air war, and I have been informed that the Army continues to recruit thousands of pilot applicants, who are simply furloughed and wait for months before being sent to preliminary flight training. I have been told that some of these boys have waited for 6 months. Let no quibbling longer mar our air force training program. Let us expect General Arnold, for whom I have the highest esteem, to carry forward, as he assured us in his testimony on June 16 when he said:

We are using every source available to get them trained as quickly as possible.

Members of the Congress, we have a responsibility, not to find fault but to help in weeding out the trouble. We cannot allow pilot training to bog down. We have failed to make use of the independent operators all over America who have the facilities for doing a needed primary and secondary training schedule for our future combat pilots.

Let us meet the challenge.

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, namely:

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, in the first paragraph of this bill it is stated:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943 and for other purposes.

We have nothing in the Treasury, it is empty.

Mr. Chairman, America has 6 percent of the world's area and 7 percent of the population. I believe that we are possibly spending 50 percent of the cost of this World War. If we consider the amounts that are being spent by the other nations of the world, I am sure you will find that this country has spent a great deal more than 50 percent of the whole sum total that has been spent during the present year we are working in. We are doing this with 6 percent of the world's area and 7 percent of the population.

I do not want to begrudge anyone anything, but I wonder if we are doing the right thing today so far as lend-lease is concerned? You know you can make these appropriations but the public, the people of the United States, have got to pay the bill or else we are going to go into bankruptcy. As I stated before we have appropriated over $101,000,000,000 this year already.

We have in the present bill, section 13, for lease-lend $12,700,000,000. That will make a total that we have given the President of the United States for lease-lend of $62,944,000,000. Think of that! You are giving the other nations of the world that amount of money. As long as we are going to give to the other nations we are going to be pretty good fellows, we are going to be fine fellows. Anybody who can hand anything out is a fine fellow but some day this has got to stop. If you are handing out things too fast you will be sorry and so will the American people.

Let me call your attention to the statement made by the President of the United States on June 15, appearing on page 5220 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, when he made his fifth lease-lend report, House Document No. 799:

For the 3 months ending May 31, 1942, lend-lease aid amounted to more than $1,900,000,000. for the 15 months' period from March 1941 through May 1942, aid totaled $4,497,000,000 in goods and services. We are now making aid available at a monthly rate equivalent to $8,000,000,000 per year.

We are making aid available at a monthly equivalent to $8,000,000,000 a year. If we do not appropriate anything for lease-lend in this bill, at that rate the President will have enough for lease-lend the way he is spending it, according to his own statement and according to his own figures, to last about 5 years. If this is the case, then why do you want to put in here $12,700,000,000 more for lease-lend? I just cannot fathom it. I do not believe it is wise, I do not believe it is sensible, and I do not think we ought to do it. But unless the Democratic side of the House makes an offer to take it out, it cannot be taken out.

Unless you on the majority side are going to take out this provision, you are going to make this appropriation, and I think you ought to do differently. I do not think it wise or expedient.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 15. The appropriations contained in this act which are available for the procurement or manufacture of munitions of war of special or technical design may be used for the development and procurement of gages, dies, jigs, and other special aids and appliances, production studies, factory plans, and other production data, including specifications and detailed drawings, in accordance with the provisions of sections 120 and 123 of the National Defense Act, as amended. Such appropriations may also be used for the purchase of letters patent, applications for letters patent, and licenses under letters patent and applications for letters patent that pertain to such equipment or material for which the appropriations are made.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last five words.

Mr. Chairman, while we are discussing this appropriation bill affecting expenditures for the War Department I wish again to bring to the attention of the House a situation that exists in the city and the State of New York. Our Governor, our Mayor, and various business organizations have petitioned the War and Navy Departments to utilize 350,000 unemployed men in our city and particularly in our industries. We are anxious that the War Department establish a branch of the Quartermaster's office in New York City for many reasons, particularly because we are in a position to furnish many materials. New York City, in its garment trade, provided 49 percent of the Nation's requirements with respect to various garments. Now, we find we are practically supplying none. We have hundreds of thousands of these skilled workers out of employment and only recently we find that most of our men have gone to Philadelphia and as far west as Indiana to contact the Quartermaster's Office.

I am bringing this to your attention because our officials feel that the situation is sufficiently acute to warrant our attention. I am presenting this in a constructive way, because I believe that if the War Department will utilize all of our facilities it will be a substantial contribution toward victory.

The following communications indicate and substantiate my remarks:

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y., June 18, 1942.

Hon. MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: May I call your attention to the attached resolution adopted by the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc., setting forth the facts concerning the unemployment situation in New York City and pointing out the economic implications both to the city and to the Nation.

We urge you to do all in your power to correct this condition.

Yours very sincerely,
NEAL DOW BECKER,
President, Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc.

RESOLUTION OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK, INC.

Subject: Unemployment in New York City and means of correction.

Convincing evidence has been gathered by the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc., that, owing to dislocations in industry caused by the war, New York City is facing a condition of widespread unemployment and loss of industrial production which, unless checked, will work great injury to the city.

Evidence submitted to the association and statements by labor and city officials show the following:

1. On May 30, 1942, 321,000 New York City residents were seeking employment through the United States Employment Service here. This represents an increase of 17,000 over April 30 registration figures of the same agency. The total unemployed is undoubtedly larger.

2. The number of unemployed will be greatly increased after August 3 by the iron and steel conservation order M-126, curtailing fabrication and assembly of some 400 iron and steel products not needed for war. This order will shut down hundreds of plants.

3. Thirty thousand clothing workers in the metropolitan area face unemployment for the duration of the war unless the Government allocates an increased share of work on Army

and Navy uniforms and other textile products to New York shops.

4. Forty thousand members of the Building Trades Council are unemployed and are willing to accept jobs in shipyards or war production plants at wage rates prevailing in those plants.

5. As consumer goods industries are stifled by war production, the falling off in nondefense production will ultimately be reflected in decreased employment among distributors of consumer goods.

6. A survey by this association sometime ago showed that the city had considerable idle machine-tool capacity. It also has millions of square feet available in factories. It has thousands of vacant apartments.

With labor, housing, and buildings available it will be more economical for the Government in meeting the future needs of the war to make use of existing facilities here rather than to use greatly needed materials to build new structures elsewhere.

New York City is furnishing the Government with more taxes and is buying more war bonds than any other community in the country. Within its confines live nearly 6 percent of the population of the United States. To permit the city's economic structure to continue to deteriorate would have a deleterious effect on the entire country and detract seriously from the ability of the city, its industrialists and its citizens to support the war effort.

This association, therefore, expresses its keen approbation of the efforts which Gov. Herbert H. Lehman and Mayor F. H. LaGuardia are now making to induce the various agencies of the Federal Government to increase the number of war contracts let to New York City establishments and pledges its cooperation to insure the success of these efforts.

It is directed that the facts herein stated be placed in the hands of the President of the United States and of the heads of departments responsible for the placing of war contracts; and it is further directed that the facts be called to the attention of the Members of Congress from New York State to the end that their assistance may be enlisted in this effort to promote the welfare of New York City and increase its productive value to the Nation.

COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY
ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK,
New York, N. Y., June 20, 1942.

Hon. MARTIN J. KENNEDY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am placing in your hands herewith copy of a letter and an accompanying memorandum which this association has sent to the President, the Secretary of War, and the Quartermaster General concerning the desirability of establishing a Quartermaster Procurement Office in the metropolitan area.

We ask your support in this effort to facilitate the placing of contracts with local manufacturers.

Sincerely yours,

T. J. MILEY,
Secretary, Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc.

COPY OF LETTER TO PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT, SECRETARY OF WAR STIMSON, QUARTERMASTER GENERAL GREGORY

JUNE 20, 1942.

The Commerce & Industry Association of New York, Inc., recommends the immediate establishment in the New York metropolitan area of an Army Quartermaster Procurement Office which would have the power to negotiate contracts for Army requirements of textiles and other items manufactured in this district directly with the manufacturers located here.

Reasons for such action are set forth in the accompanying memorandum representing the conclusions from an inquiry among textile concerns as to why they were not getting more war work.

Our local unemployment situation is such that contracts are sorely needed. Since the city has comparatively few large defense plants, its war contribution can be maintained only if a great many of the small manufacturers here obtain their full share of orders.

The wide dispersion of industry in small plants around New York City provides an element of safety so far as bombing attacks are concerned in comparison to the large concentrated plants being established elsewhere, and we think this factor should be given more consideration in the allocation of defense business to this area.

Sincerely yours,

COMMERCE & INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION OF NEW YORK, INC.,
THOMAS JEFFERSON MILEY, *Secretary.*

MEMORANDUM RE ESTABLISHMENT OF ARMY QUARTERMASTER PROCUREMENT OFFICE IN NEW YORK CITY

(Approved June 18, 1942, by executive committee of the Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc.)

The 1939 census shows that approximately 43.5 percent of the total value of apparel and other finished products made from fabrics and similar materials in the United States are manufactured by the needle-trades industry in the New York City area. New York City is, therefore, recognized as the center of the needle-trades industry in the United States.

On June 11, the Army quartermaster in Philadelphia awarded contracts for the manufacture of 1,300,000 cotton mattress covers, among other items. This was a negotiated contract where the bidders had to sit down with the Army to negotiate their contracts, and we understand most contracts are let on a negotiated basis at the present time. One firm in New York City obtained a contract for 65,000 of these mattress covers, or just 5 percent of the total order, and the balance went to firms in Iowa, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Missouri, Louisiana, and Tennessee.

An important reason why greater use is not made of the facilities of New York City concerns is that there is no quartermaster procurement office in New York City that can give out actual contracts, even though the Quartermaster Corps buys more materials that are capable of being manufactured with facilities already existing in New York City than does any other procurement agency of the armed forces. This means that the procurement officers in these other cities have less efficient means of checking up on the facilities and abilities of the New York City textile firms who do submit bids. This also means that the large number of textile manufacturers in New York who wish to bid on war work must go to the Quartermaster Procurement Office in Philadelphia, or Jeffersonville, Ind., if they wish to bid effectively on such work. This is obviously out of the question for most of them, with the consequence that when the work is allocated in accordance with the amount of bids received from various areas, and the bids are negotiated on the basis of higher wage costs and other factors, New York City has not obtained a fair share of the Quartermaster Corps purchases in this category in proportion to the importance of the textile trades in New York City.

The Quartermaster Corps maintains procurement offices where actual contracts are placed in the following cities: Philadelphia, Pa.; Boston, Mass.; Jersey City, N. J. (foodstuffs primarily); Jeffersonville, Ind.; Chicago, Ill.; Washington, D. C.; San Francisco, Calif.; Baltimore, Md.; Detroit, Mich., and San Antonio, Tex. However, it has no procurement office in this, the Nation's largest city, merely a planning office which cannot give out any contracts.

The Commerce and Industry Association of New York, Inc., recommends that the Army give immediate consideration to the desirability of establishing a Quartermaster procurement office in the metropolitan area, so that the Quartermaster Corps can deal more directly with the firms with which it might want to do business in this area, and so that the firms in this city of 7,500,000 population can deal more efficiently with the Quartermaster Corps. If this suggestion were followed, it merely would be establishing a procedure similar to that already used by the Army ordnance, chemical warfare, and engineer procurement offices established in New York City, and should result in more war orders being placed by the Quartermaster Corps with the textile and other industries already established in New York City. This would manifestly be of advantage to the Government as well as to the local concerns.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, it has been mentioned on the floor already this afternoon, that there has been appropriated for this war some $205,000,000,000. It is probably true that before we have finished winning this war, as we will——

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield just to correct that figure?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Yes; I yield.

Mr. DIRKSEN. That should be for the 3 fiscal years, 1941, 1942, and 1943.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I am much obliged to the gentleman.

There has been appropriated for purposes of national defense that amount of money. It is probably true that before we have finished winning this war, our national debt will reach at least $200,000,000,000, and maybe more. This is part of the price of liberty. It is going to be paid and it can be paid and it will be paid, and the Nation is not going to be bankrupted in the process.

But it will mean, if the debt goes to $200,000,000,000, an annual interest charge of $5,000,000,000 at 2½ percent. That is more than the total revenue of our Federal Government in any year prior to this war, except only 1920.

I simply want to point out this. The Congress of the United States has its choice as to approximately one-half of that debt whether it shall be an interest-bearing debt or whether it shall be a non-interest-bearing debt. And if half this debt could be noninterest bearing exactly half that interest burden would be removed.

During the fiscal year into which we are now entering it is estimated that we will expend from sixty to seventy billion dollars in winning this war. Of that amount, it is estimated that approximately $27,000,000,000 can be raised by taxes. We hope it can be. It is estimated that at the most optimistic figure, $12,000,000,000 can be sold in bonds to individuals who will pay for them with already existing money they have saved and earned to purchase them. The balance of some $21,000,000,000 will be new money, created by somebody to finance this war. At present that money is being

created by the banks of this Nation, sometimes by commercial banks and sometimes by Federal Reserve banks in the form of new book credits, which are used to purchase interest-bearing bonds of the United States and its people. It is important, it is vitally important, to our people's future, that if new money is to be created by any agency, it be created under the sovereign power of this Congress given to it by the Constitution, which provides that Congress shall have the power to coin money and regulate its value. That portion of the debt brought about by the creation of new money should be a non-interest-bearing debt. We have given to the Federal Reserve banks the power of banks of issue. They are private banks, and if they are to exercise that power, it ought to be exercised without cost to the American people, particularly in times like the present. The commercial banks of the Nation ought never to exercise the power to actually create money. We have the power to keep the increase in the interest-bearing national debt down to about $12,000,000,000, the amount of war bonds which we hope will be sold to the people or to corporations for money they actually possess. Or, if we continue to pay interest to private institutions for the act of creating America's money, we can let that increase in interest-bearing debt amount to as much as $33,000,000,000.

The financial future of our country will be largely determined here in this body. It depends primarily and basically upon our power to produce real wealth, upon our keeping our production at a high level after this war is over. But it depends also upon our having the wisdom to introduce one or two absolutely unassailable corrections in our monetary system, the first of which is that whenever new money is to be created it should be the Nation as a whole that benefits from that act, and the second is that the amount of our money in circulation should always depend upon and be related intimately to the need for that money, which in turn means the production, distribution, and exchange of real goods and services. But for the amount of the medium of exchange of the Nation to depend upon the size of its debt is a doctrine, I believe, which must be seen to be fallacious and which can lead to difficulties in the future from which our people should be spared.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

In order to keep the record straight and for the information of the House and of the country, I wish at this time in a brief way to call the attention of the membership to a most unusual procedure in the House Military Affairs Committee this afternoon. That committee by a very slight majority vote has filed in the House this afternoon what purports to be a final report on the investigation of the war activities for the past year, pursuant to a resolution passed by this House a little more than a year ago. That committee was divided into three subcommittees and I undertake to say on the whole that they have done a magnificent job. They have done much for the best interest of the war program, to say nothing of the vast amount of money they have saved for the taxpayers. However, when it comes to the conclusions filed by that committee this afternoon, particularly the recommendations of that committee, I, along with Mr. HARTER, Mr. EDMISTON, Mr. COSTELLO, Mr. BROOKS, Mr. SPARKMAN, Mr. KILDAY, Mr. DAVIS, and Mr. FITZGERALD voted against the conclusions and the recommendations in that report, and are filing a minority report, which I hope and feel sure the membership will keep an open mind about before passing final judgment. I might say, because it is well within the truth, that the committee was called together this morning, and we had under consideration for a while a War Department bill. This report, consisting of a good many hundreds of pages, including testimony and findings, was submitted to the committee, and along with it was this document which I hold in my hand, comprising 77 pages, not one word of which was written by a member of the committee, and I think it is also well within the truth to say that that report has not been read in its entirety by a single member of the committee.

This report which I now hold was presented to the general membership of the committee when it reconvened at 2 o'clock this afternoon upon the demand of the chairman, although the House was in session on this the largest War Department bill in all history. Upon my motion I asked that that report be laid over until this next Friday morning, June 26, at 10:30 o'clock, in order that the membership might read it and digest it, and that it make a fair and judicial determination of the issues involved. That motion was voted down, whereupon my colleague from Texas [Mr. KILDAY] moved that the report be referred to a committee of three in order that they might read and digest it, and report back to the full committee, and that motion was voted down. The thing I object to about this, and I believe that every fair-minded Member of the House will concur in, is the fact that there is a most serious indictment in some of this language, which is the language of the attorney for the committee, not only of the War Department, the War Production Board, the Rural Electrification Administration, and other agencies, but the entire administration and even the Congress itself.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Do I understand that the report, comprising 77 pages, was presented to the committee this morning and acted upon the same day?

Mr. THOMASON. Yes; it was not considered for even 1 hour. It was submitted to the committee by the chairman at 2 o'clock this afternoon in the form in which it is now being presented to the House and was reported to the committee by a very slight margin of votes at about 2:30 p. m. We were not resorting to dilatory or obstruction tactics. We begged and pleaded in every way we could think of for a day or two in which to read and study the report, but to no avail. The steamroller was perfectly oiled.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. And action was taken by the committee without the committee having an opportunity to read the report?

Mr. THOMASON. I repeat, that as far as I know, not a single member of the committee has read the report in its entirety. Not a word was written by the committee. Not a member of the committee can tell at this minute all that is in it. So I am asking the membership of the House to withhold judgment, because in these critical days when we are in the most serious war in all history, it seems to me we need unity. Above all, we should be fair and just. I want to state the facts without any feeling and let you be the judges. I repeat that in these terrible days when unity is so much needed by the American people, we ought to be fair in our appraisals not only of those in authority but of ourselves and anybody having any connection with this war program. Certainly there were some irregularities that needed to be corrected, and that has been done. Certainly some criticism is due to certain people and certain agencies, and that will be done; but with a blanket indictment like this that has not even been read or studied 1 minute by the committee as a whole, I say that I hope you will withhold judgment. This is no time for politics or partisanship. This is no time to smear people unless they deserve it. This is a time for fair play, and calm, judicious action. Eight of my colleagues and I object to snap judgment and hasty action. If democracy is to survive, the game must be played according to the rules.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that the Clerk read.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I have a motion to strike out the last word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, I was about to say I was just a little surprised at the remarks of my colleague from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], the ranking majority member of the House Military Affairs Committee. But I will not say that. I will say that I am just a little bit disappointed. Some 15 months ago before the House of Representatives ever took notice of the fact that a war program was on, as far as passing a resolution to investigate the war effort was concerned, I personally started hearings before the entire House Military Affairs Committee to investigate the war effort. I wanted to know how the people's money was being expended, and I am still determined to know. After I had conducted hearings for 3 months, it became commonly circulated around the House of Representatives that we were bringing about revelations that were startling in the extreme. The printed hearings were available, and when the membership had opportunity to read the hearings the

House then proceeded to authorize an investigation on a resolution relating to both the House Military Affairs Committee and the House Naval Affairs Committee. When that was done I immediately called the committee in session and in an effort to be extremely fair and courteous to all of the members of that committee, I appointed the three ranking Democrats, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER], and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS], in the order of their rank, as chairmen of three special committees. I then allocated to those committees the remaining membership of the committee, as nearly equal as possible, and I contented myself with the humble position of being an honorary member of all of them, by virtue of being chairman of the major committee.

I then directed them to proceed to make investigations and report back to the committee with interim reports, and from time to time they did so. Every time a report came up I took the position that the gentleman on the special committee were men of caliber, men of character and ability, that they were fair and honest and wanted to deal honestly with the public and the War Department. I therefore asked approval of all of their interim reports. When this report came to the floor of the House today it was not a thing in the world except in substance a reiteration of the interim reports for which they have all voted heretofore, and which they have all signed. The only minority report was by the gentleman on the other side of the House in one instance, except the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. FITZGERALD], who dissented in one instance, as far as I remember.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Yes; I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SPARKMAN. I dissented on two of the interim reports, and was joined in every case with other Members.

Mr. BROOKS. I dissented to two of them also.

Mr. MAY. Yes; and the gentlemen are all, according to the gentleman from Texas, going to file another dissenting report now.

I take the position that if the time has come in this country when a congressional committee, charged with the investigation of the expenditure of $200,000,000,000 cannot come out and talk plain about mistakes made, and criticize people who are entitled to be criticized, we had better adjourn and go home.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. Not now.

There is not a line in this report that is not the whole, eternal, and everlasting truth. I am back of it. I stand for it. I have signed my name to it. I have faith in it. I am willing to be responsible for it. Hereafter, when I continue the investigations, they may be continued before the whole committee. I will not say whether they will or not, but they may be. But the investigation is going on, and the hundreds of millions of dollars we have already saved, the hundreds of millions of dollars that we will continue to save, had better be saved now instead of waiting for a time to come when we have another Teapot Dome to the discredit of this country, and the Government itself.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last three words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I shall not consume the entire 5 minutes. I merely want to observe the following, that the statement that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON] held in his hand represents the amplified conclusion, as I understand, of all three special subcommittees. Each member of the Military Affairs Committee is a member of one subcommittee. I am a member of the subcommittee headed by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER]. I signed the interim reports of the subcommittee. The so-called data, or detail, which is the basis and substance of this report, represents the culmination of all the interim reports of all the subcommittees which have been passed and adopted by the subcommittees and by the full committee.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. In just a moment.

A statement was read to the Military Affairs Committee at the regular meeting this morning which represented general conclusions and recommendations. I heard every word of it, and so did every man who was present. A vote was taken today and a majority of the committee approved that conclusion with its recommendations, and naturally all of the interim reports of all of the subcommittees up to date.

I regret very much that any member of the Military Committee has seen fit to insert this issue, if it be one, in the consideration of this other very important bill. There is a proper time to discuss this, and it is not today. I may say that the Military Committee has voted on it, and after the last man is out in the ninth inning they do not change the score.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I want to call attention to the fact that the three special committees investigating the war effort, and to which our chairman has referred, are headed by my colleague the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HARTER], and the third by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FADDIS]. Mr. THOMASON and Mr. HARTER agree with my position and voted against this report and will join in the minority report. I happen to be the ranking majority member on the third committee, that headed by Mr. FADDIS. We worked long and hard on the things committed to our care and we have had the sad experience, on several occasions, of having filed intemperate reports which destroyed the effect of the work we had done, or at least militated against it to a vast degree.

We went to the committee meeting this morning and a copy of this report was presented. None of us had ever seen it before. Copies were not available until this afternoon about a half hour before the committee voted. No, gentlemen, the time has not come in this country—may it never come—when a congressional committee dare not criticize those who have failed to carry out their duty; but, I say that the time has not come in the Congress of the United States or in the Military Affairs Committee of this House when we cannot take even an hour or an afternoon to read a report concerning how billions of dollars have been expended by the persons charged with that obligation. That is what was done here. No Member read this report and it goes out to the Nation as containing the views of the committee. Those who want to have the responsibility upon their conscience of what is said in this report may do so. However, that responsibility will not be mine. We sit in this House today knowing that Tobruk has fallen, knowing that Sevastopol is under attack, knowing that the Japanese are in the Aleutian Islands, and that Egypt stands next. We know that remarkable strides have been made in production and the conversion of industry. Are we going to give to the American people the implication contained in this sort of statement:

"There has been an improvement, but unbelievable red tape, top-heavy organization, and a lack of orientation to a state of war still lead the parade in wartime Washington."

Unfortunately there is red tape. In spite thereof we have converted industry. We are producing war material in unexpected quantities.

Do you want to send such statements out at a time when the American people should have absolute confidence in those who are conducting the war effort? Are you going to say that Washington is interested only in red tape when we know what has been accomplished? Are you going to endorse the next statement that is made to the effect that all that has been done is to create another board? This statement carries the implication that Donald Nelson is doing nothing to promote this war. He may be only an individual to you as he is to me, but to the American people he stands as a symbol. He is the one who is going to lead the productive effort of this war and win it or lose it to the extent that he produces. He needs the confidence of the American people. I was in Detroit last week. Having seen what I saw there no one can tell me that the productive effort of this country has not been converted to war production.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KILDAY. I will not yield because the gentleman did not yield to me.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman repeat what he said about Nelson?

Mr. KILDAY. I repeat that anyone who tells me the productive effort of this country has not been converted to the war effort, tells me something I know to be untrue. Let us be big, let us be men.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that the gentleman is not talking to the bill or any amendment thereto. I withdraw the point of order with the statement that I shall call to order any other Member who does not confine himself to a discussion of the important appropriation bill now under consideration.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's point of order is well taken, if he desires to insist on it.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order as to the gentleman who is now addressing the House, but I shall make the point of order if this out-of-order business is continued after this address concludes.

Mr. KILDAY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Oregon for his indulgence. I take the position that the Congress and the Committe on Military Affairs right now while it is considering this $40,000,000,000 appropriation bill for the War Department is in a position to do something, something real, something constructive for the war effort. It could come forward with a statement to the American people of the truth of the situation as it exists. The production lines of the Chrysler Tank Arsenal are moving, as did the automobile lines a few weeks ago. The production lines of the Ford Willow Run plant are ready to begin quantity production. They are operating. They are ready to revolutionize airplane production, as Henry Ford revolutionized automobile production.

I say to you, whoever wants to have this on his conscience in this dark hour of American history may do so. For myself I disavow any responsibility for a report covering 15 months of activity which no Member conducting that activity has read. They admitted to me on the committee that no one of them had read it. Oh, they say it is only a reiteration of what has been said before. If that is so, why this undignified haste? Why, if it has been said before, did we have to adopt it this afternoon within 15 minutes or a half hour after it was placed in our hands? You form your own conclusions. Look at the division of the committee and maybe you will find the answer.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, the gentleman from California [Mr. BUCK], Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7280) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same back to the House without amendment, with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 355, nays 0, not voting 77, as follows:

[Roll No. 82]

YEAS—355

Allen, Ill.	Day	Holland
Allen, La.	Delaney	Holmes
Anderson, Calif.	Dewey	Hope
Anderson, N. Mex.	Dickstein	Houston
	Dingell	Howell
Andresen, August H.	Dirksen	Hull
	Disney	Hunter
Andrews	Ditter	Imhoff
Angell	Domengeaux	Jackson
Arends	Dondero	Jacobsen
Arnold	Doughton	Jarman
Barden	Downs	Jenkins, Ohio
Barnes	Drewry	Jennings
Barry	Duncan	Jensen
Bates, Ky.	Durham	Johns
Bates, Mass.	Dworshak	Johnson, Calif.
Baumhart	Eaton	Johnson, Ill.
Beam	Eberharter	Johnson, Luther A.
Beckworth	Edmiston	
Beiter	Eliot, Mass.	Johnson, Okla.
Bender	Elliott, Calif.	Johnson, W. Va.
Bennett	Elston	Jones
Bishop	Engel	Jonkman
Bland	Englebright	Kean
Bloom	Faddis	Keefe
Boehne	Fellows	Kefauver
Boggs	Fenton	Kelley, Pa.
Bolton	Fish	Kelly, Ill.
Bonner	Fitzgerald	Kennedy, Martin J.
Boren	Fitzpatrick	
Bradley, Mich.	Flaherty	Kennedy, Michael J.
Bradley, Pa.	Flannagan	
Brooks	Folger	Keogh
Brown, Ga.	Ford, Miss.	Kerr
Bryson	Ford, Thomas F.	Kilburn
Buck	Fulmer	Kilday
Buckley, N. Y.	Gale	Kinzer
Bulwinkle	Gamble	Kirwan
Burch	Gavagan	Kleberg
Burgin	Gearhart	Klein
Butler	Gehrmann	Knutson
Byron	Gerlach	Kramer
Canfield	Gibson	Lane
Cannon, Fla.	Gillie	Lanham
Cannon, Mo.	Gossett	Lea
Capozzoli	Graham	Leavy
Carlson	Granger	LeCompte
Carter	Grant, Ala.	Lesinski
Cartwright	Grant, Ind.	Lewis
Case, S. Dak.	Gregory	Ludlow
Celler	Guyer	Lynch
Chapman	Gwynne	McCormack
Chenoweth	Haines	McGehee
Chiperfield	Hall, Edwin Arthur	McGranery
Clark		McGregor
Clason	Hall, Leonard W.	McIntyre
Claypool		McKeough
Cochran	Halleck	McLaughlin
Coffee, Wash.	Hancock	McLean
Cole, N. Y.	Hare	McMillan
Collins	Harness	Maciora
Colmer	Harris, Ark.	Magnuson
Cooley	Harris, Va.	Mahon
Cooper	Hart	Manasco
Copeland	Harter	Mansfield
Costello	Hartley	Marcantonio
Courtney	Healey	Martin, Iowa
Cox	Hébert	Martin, Mass.
Cravens	Heffernan	Mason
Crawford	Heidinger	May
Creal	Hendricks	Merritt
Crosser	Hess	Meyer, Md.
Culkin	Hill, Colo.	Michener
Cunningham	Hill, Wash.	Miller
Curtis	Hinshaw	Mills, La.
D'Alesandro	Hobbs	Monroney
Davis, Ohio	Hoffman	Moser
Davis, Tenn.	Holbrock	Mott
Mundt	Rich	Stratton
Murdock	Richards	Sullivan
Myers, Pa.	Rivers	Sumner, Ill.
Nelson	Rizley	Sumners, Tex.
Nichols	Robertson, N. Dak.	Sutphin
Norrell		Taber
Norton	Robertson, Va.	Talle
O'Brien, Mich.	Robinson, Utah	Tarver
O'Brien, N. Y.	Rockwell	Tenerowicz
O'Connor	Rodgers, Pa.	Terry
O'Hara	Rogers, Mass.	Thill
O'Leary	Rolph	Thomas, N. J.
Oliver	Romjue	Thomas, Tex.
O'Neal	Russell	Thomason
O'toole	Sabath	Tibbott
Pace	Sacks	Tolan
Paddock	Sanders	Traynor
Patman	Sasscer	Treadway
Patrick	Satterfield	Van Zandt
Patton	Scanlon	Vinson, Ga.
Pearson	Secrest	Voorhis, Calif.
Peterson, Fla.	Shafer, Mich.	Vorys, Ohio
Peterson, Ga.	Shanley	Wadsworth
Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Sheppard	Ward
	Sheridan	Wasielewski
Pheiffer, William T.	Short	Weiss
	Simpson	Welch
Pierce	Smith, Maine	Wene
Pittenger	Smith, Ohio	West
Ploeser	Smith, Pa.	Wheat
Plumley	Smith, Va.	Whittington
Poage	Smith, Wash.	Wickersham
Powers	Smith, Wis.	Wigglesworth
Priest	Snyder	Williams
Rabaut	Somers, N. Y.	Wolcott
Ramsay	South	Wolfenden, Pa.
Ramspeck	Sparkman	Wolverton, N. J.
Randolph	Spence	Woodruff, Mich.
Rankin, Miss.	Springer	Woodrum, Va.
Rankin, Mont.	Starnes, Ala.	Wright
Reece, Tenn.	Steagall	Young
Reed, Ill.	Stearns, N. H.	Youngdahl
Reed, N. Y.	Stefan	Zimmerman
Rees, Kans.	Stevenson	

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—77

Andersen, H. Carl	Gillette	Rockefeller
	Gore	Rogers, Okla.
Baldwin	Green	Sauthoff
Bell	Harrington	Schaefer, Ill.
Blackney	Hook	Schuetz
Boykin	Izac	Schulte
Brown, Ohio	Jarrett	Scott
Buckler, Minn.	Jenks, N. H.	Scrugham
Burdick	Johnson, Ind.	Shannon
Byrne	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sikes
Camp		Smith, W. Va.
Casey, Mass.	Kee	Sweeney
Clevenger	Kocialkowski	Talbot
Cluett	Kopplemann	Thom
Coffee, Nebr.	Kunkel	Tinkham
Cole, Md.	Lambertson	Vincent, Ky.
Crowther	Landis	Vreeland
Cullen	Larrabee	Walter
Dies	Maas	Weaver
Douglas	Maciejewski	Whelchel
Ellis	Mills, Ark.	White
Fogarty	Mitchell	Whitten
Forand	Murray	Wilson
Ford, Leland M.	O'Day	Winter
Gathings	Osmers	Worley
Gifford	Plauché	
Gilchrist	Robsion, Ky.	

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Bell with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Gore with Mr. Rockefeller.
Mr. Plauché with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Boykin with Mr. Tinkham.
Mr. Hook with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Camp with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Kopplemann with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Landis.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Kunkel.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. H. Carl Andersen.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Clevenger.
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
Mr. Whelchel with Mr. Gillette.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Murray.
Mr. Casey of Massachusetts with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Cole of Indiana with Mr. Lambertson.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Talbot.

Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Byrne with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. Gilchrist.
Mr. Green with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Jarrett.
Mr. Maciejewski with Mr. Jenks of New Hampshire.
Mr. O'Day with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Sauthoff.
Mr. Scrugham with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Sweeney with Mr. Vincent of Kentucky.
Mr. Thom with Mr. White.
Mr. Whitten with Mr. Worley.
Mr. Rogers of Oklahoma with Mr. Kocialkowski.
Mr. Schulte with Mr. Walter.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. Mitchell.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the minority views on the investigation report filed today by the Committee on Military Affairs pursuant to House Resolution 162 be printed with the majority views, notwithstanding the fact that the minority report is not available today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and include certain excerpts, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I have received from the Bureau of the Budget.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF DEFENSE HIGHWAY ACT OF 1941

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill (H. R. 6908) to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert, "That (a) section 6 of the Defense Highway Act of 1941, approved November 19, 1941 (Public Law No. 295, 77th Cong.), is hereby amended by striking out the figure '$150,000,000' and inserting in lieu thereof '$260,000,000, of which $10,000,000 shall be available for access roads to sources of raw materials.'

"(b) The first sentence of section 6 of such act is hereby amended by inserting, after the word 'construction', a comma and the word 'maintenance.'

"(c) The first sentence of section 6 of such act is hereby further amended by inserting before the period, at the end thereof, a colon and the following: '*Provided*, That such certification for access roads to sources of raw materials and industrial sites may be made by the Chairman of the War Production Board.'

"(d) Section 6 of such act is hereby further amended by inserting before the period, at the end thereof, a colon and the following: '*Provided further*, That during the continuance of such emergency the Commissioner of Public Roads is authorized to enter into contracts in amounts not exceeding the total of such authorization.'

"SEC. 2. The term 'strategic network of highways,' as defined in the first section of such act, shall include the principal highway traffic routes of military importance in Puerto Rico, approved by the War Department on December 8, 1941, and the principal highway traffic routes of military importance in the Territory of Hawaii, approved by the War Department on December 20, 1941."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an address entitled "The Birth of Our Liberties," by Dr. Fred T. Wilson.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Bakersfield Californian which concerns the Central Valley project and the completion of the Friant Dam.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Josepn Earl Perry, commissioner of banks of Boston, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein remarks by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on the subject of rubber.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein the new pay table for the men of the Army and allowances for dependents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and to include therein a radio address and certain excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a copy of the Legionnaires' War Credo, by the national commander of the American Legion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein communications from certain citizens of Philadelphia and an exchange of correspondence between myself and the Under Secretary of State, Mr. Sumner Welles, regarding the sinking of the steamship *Struma*.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD made in Committee of the Whole today and to include therein a short resolution and a letter from the Commerce and Industry Association of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the pending legislation and to include therein a statement made before the joint hearing of the subcommittees of the House Rivers and Harbors Committee and the Senate Committee on Commerce.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article from the New York Times and a tribute for His Hellenic Majesty.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. BATES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to insert therein an article appearing in the Haverhill Sunday Record of Sunday last.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

SPECIAL ORDER

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House heretofore made, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. DICKSTEIN] for 15 minutes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, owing to the lateness of the hour, I withdraw my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HESS, for 4 days, on account of official business.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2412. An act to provide benefits for the injury, disability, death, or enemy detention of employees of contractors with the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2471. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, with respect to its application to officers and employees of educational, religious, eleemosynary, philanthropic, and cultural institutions, establishments, and agencies, commonly known as the Hatch Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 2598. An act to amend the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to permit consolidations and mergers of domestic telegraph carriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 24, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, June 24, 1942, for consideration of war housing, room 245, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, June 25, 1942.

Business to be considered: Hearing on Federal Communications Commission.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1779. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated December 23, 1941, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers and two illustrations, on a review of reports on the Connecticut River and tributaries with a view to determining the advisability of extending the authorized project for flood protection of Hartford, Conn., to include flood-protection work on Gully Brook, requested by a resolution of the Committee on Flood Control, House of Representatives, adopted on May 28, 1941 (H. Doc. No. 804), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Flood Control, and ordered to be printed, with 2 illustrations.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SNYDER: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 7280. A bill making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2266). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 2032. An act to amend section 7 (a) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), to authorize interdepartmental procurement by contract; with amendment (Rept. No. 2267). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SECREST: Committee on the Library. H. R. 7273. A bill to amend section 1 of the act entiled "An act to provide books for the adult blind," approved March 3, 1931, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2271). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MAY: Committee on Military Affairs. Interim general report filed by Special Committee No. 3 on Matériel, Procurement, and Personnel pursuant to House Resolution 162, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session. Resolution authorizing the Committee on Military Affairs and the Committee on Naval Affairs to study the progress of the national defense program; without amendment (Rept. No. 2272). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 6951. A bill to amend subsections (b) and (d) of section 77 of the Judicial Code so as to transfer the county of Butts from the Macon division of the middle district of Georgia to the Atlanta division of the northern district of Georgia; without amendment (Rept. No. 2273). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER: Committee on War Claims. S. 272. An act for the relief of Fairbanks, Morse & Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2268). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER: Committee on War Claims. S. 273. An act for the relief of the R. S. Howard Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2269). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER: Committee on War Claims. S. 274. An act for the relief of the Wm. Wrigley, Jr., Co.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2270). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 7281. A bill amending Public Law No. 873, Seventy-sixth Congress (approved October 21, 1940); to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. SUMNERS of Texas:

H. R. 7282. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Disabled American Veterans of the World War," approved June 17, 1932, so as to change the name to "Disabled American Veterans," and to extend membership eligibility therein to American citizens, honorably discharged from the active military or naval forces of the United States, or of some country allied with the United States, who have been either wounded, injured, or disabled by reason of such active service during time of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 7283. A bill authorizing the assignment of personnel from departments or agencies in the executive branch of the Government to select committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 7284. A bill to authorize the construction of a military supply highway to Alaska; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 7285. A bill to provide for the reimbursement of certain Navy personnel and former Navy personnel for personal property lost or damaged as a result of the fire which destroyed the Administration Building, Naval Operating Base, Norfolk, Va., on January 26, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 7286. A bill authorizing the head of the department or agency using the public domain for war purposes to compensate holders of grazing permits and licenses for losses sustained by reason of such use of public lands for war purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MYERS of Pennsylvania:

H. R. 7292. A bill to prevent discrimination against blind persons and persons with impaired visual acuity in the administration of the civil-service laws and rules; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LYNCH:

H. R. 7293. A bill to continue the pay of all persons in the armed forces of the United States for 1 year after the termination of the present conflict; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 7294. A bill to prohibit discrimination with respect to employment in the service of the United States or employment resulting from expenditures made by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 7295. A bill to provide allowances for uniforms and equipment for warrant officers of the Army of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mrs. NORTON:

H. Con. Res. 72. Concurrent resolution authorizing the Committee on Labor of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before a subcommittee of said Committee on Joint Resolutions establishing a Post-Emergency Economic Advisory Commission and a National Unemployment Commission; to the Committee on Printing.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BOGGS:

H. R. 7287. A bill for the relief of Joseph Spear; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 7288. A bill to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of certain disbursing officers; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 7289. A bill for the relief of Dennis Hall; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 7290. A bill for the relief of Beatriz Milan Vda. de Vazquez; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN:

H. R. 7291. A bill for the relief of William Weitz; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3121. By Mr. BULWINKLE: Petition of Rev. L. L. Jessup, pastor, Second Baptist Church of Shelby, N. C., and sundry citizens of Cleveland County, N. C., urging the enactment of House bill 4000 or Senate bill 860 to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3122. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Burke County, N. C., urging the passage of House bill 4000 or Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3123. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of the Missionary Society of the Wampum (Pa.) Presbyterian Church, favoring Senate bill 860, which provides for elimination of the sale of liquor in and around the camps where soldiers are located; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3124. By Mr. JOHNSON of California: Resolution adopted by the Long Beach Chapter No. 2, Mothers of the Armed Forces of America, of Long Beach, Calif., urging Congress, the President, or any other governmental agency having jurisdiction thereof to rescind all the civil rights of all Japanese-Americans in the jurisdiction of the United States for the duration, and that those Japanese funds now frozen in the United States be immediately utilized for the purpose of maintenance and organizing the able-bodied Japanese 18 to 50 into a so-called agricultural corps; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 24, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

God be merciful unto us and bless us and cause His face to shine upon us, that Thy way may be known on earth, the saving grace of all nations. Let the people praise Thee, O God. Let all the people praise Thee. Oh, let the nations be glad and sing for joy, for Thou shalt judge the people righteously and govern the nations of the earth. Oh, let the people praise Thee, O God, let all the people praise Thee; then the earth shall give forth her increase and God, even our own God, shall bless us, and all the ends of the earth shall fear His name. Through Jesus Christ. Amen.

The reading of the Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to House Resolution 502, the Chair declares the House to be in recess for the purpose of holding memorial services as arranged by the Committee on Memorials.

Accordingly the House stood in recess to meet at the call of the Speaker.

MEMORIAL SERVICE PROGRAM

JUNE 24, 1942

Prelude, sacred selections (11:15 to 11:45) United States Navy Band Orchestra
Presiding Officer—The Speaker of the House of Representatives
Invocation—The Chaplain Dr. James Shera Montgomery
Lead, Kindly Light (Buck)—Male Quartet
Scripture reading and prayer—The Chaplain
Roll of deceased Members—The Clerk of the House of Representatives
Devotional silence.
Address—Hon. EDWARD J. HART, Representative from the State of New Jersey
Crossing the Bar (Barnby)—Male Quartet
Address—Hon. FRANK CROWTHER, Representative from the State of New York
The Long Day Closes (Sullivan) Male Quartet
Taps—Oscar Short
Benediction—The Chaplain

MEMORIAL SERVICE

The Speaker, Mr. RAYBURN, presided.

The Chaplain, Rev. Dr. James Shera Montgomery:

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of Thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love Thee and worthily magnify Thy holy name. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The male quartet sang Lead, Kindly Light (Buck).

The CHAPLAIN:

Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed by Thy name. Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread and forgive us our trespasses as we forgive those who trespass against us. Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil, for Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever.

Amen.

Let us hear the word of the Lord. Almighty God, hear our prayer taken from the Holy Bible.

Jesus said: I am the resurrection and the life: he that believeth in Me, though he were dead, yet shall he live; and whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die.

The eternal God is thy refuge and underneath are the everlasting arms.

The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom shall I fear? the Lord is the strength of my life; of whom shall I be afraid?

The righteous live forever, and the care of them is with the Most High; with His right hand He shall cover them, and with His arm He shall shield them.

For we know that if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens.

The Lord is my Shepherd; I shall not want.

He maketh me to lie down in green pastures: He leadeth me beside the still waters.

He restoreth my soul: He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for His name's sake.

Yea, though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me; Thy rod and Thy staff, they comfort me.

Thou preparest a table before me in the presence of mine enemies; Thou anointest my head with oil; my cup runneth over.

Surely goodness and mercy shall follow me all the days of my life: and I will dwell in the house of the Lord forever.

Let not your heart be troubled: ye believe in God, believe also in Me.

In My Father's house are many mansions: if it were not so, I would have told you. I go to prepare a place for you.

And if I go and prepare a place for you, I will come again, and receive you unto Myself; that where I am, there ye may be also.

I am the way, the truth, and the life:

Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin:

And yet I say unto you, That even Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these.

Wherefore, if God so clothe the grass of the field, which today is, and tomorrow is cast into the oven, shall He not much more clothe you, O ye of little faith?

Yet hope will dream and faith will trust
For He who knows our needs is just,
Somehow, somewhere, meet we must.
Alas, for him who never sees
The stars shine through his cyprus trees!
And hopeless lays his dead away.
Nor sees the breaking of the day
Across the mournful marbles play!
Who hath not learned in hour of faith
The truth to flesh and sense unknown
That life is ever lord of death
And love can never lose its own!

If, on a quiet sea,
Toward heaven we calmly sail,
With grateful hearts, O God to Thee,
We'll own the favoring gale.

But should the surges rise,
And rest delay to come,
Blest be the tempest, kind the storm
That drives us nearer home.

ROLL OF DECEASED MEMBERS

Mr. Alney E. Chaffee, reading clerk of the House, read the following roll:

BYRON PATTON HARRISON, Senator from the State of Mississippi: Born August 29, 1881; lawyer; district attorney, second district of Mississippi, 1905–10; delegate Democratic National Conventions, 1908, 1920, 1924, temporary chairman, 1924; chairman of the Democratic State convention, 1916; Member, House of Representatives, Sixty-second, Sixty-third, Sixty-fourth, Sixty-fifth Congresses; elected to the United States Senate 1918, 1924, 1930, 1936; President pro tempore of the Senate and chairman of the Committee on Finance at the time of his death June 22, 1941.

ANDREW JACKSON HOUSTON, Senator from the State of Texas: Born June 21, 1854; soldier; lawyer; graduate of West Point Military Academy; one of the organizers of the Travis Rifles at Austin, Tex., during the reconstruction period, 1874; formed a troop of cavalry, Roosevelt Rough Riders; clerk, United States district court, 1879–89; United States marshal, 1902–10; Prohibition Party candidate for Governor of Texas, 1910 and 1912; appointed to the United States Senate on April 21, 1941, serving until his death June 26, 1941.

ALVA MOORE LUMPKIN, Senator from the State of South Carolina: Born November 13, 1886; lawyer; judge; member, State house of representatives, 1911–13; member, Conciliation Commission, United States and Uruguay, in 1914; acting assistant attorney general, South Carolina, 1918; member, State board of pardons, 1922–23; acting associate justice, State supreme court, 1926–34; Federal judge, United States District Court, Eastern and Western Districts, South Carolina, May 22, 1939, until his resignation on July 21, 1941; appointed to the United States Senate on July 17, 1941; died August 1, 1941.

ALVA BLANCHARD ADAMS, Senator from the State of Colorado: Born October 29, 1875; lawyer; attorney, county of Pueblo, 1909–11; member charter convention, city of Pueblo, 1911; member board of regents, Colorado State University, 1911–12; city attorney, Pueblo, 1911–15; chairman Pueblo County Council of Defense, 1917–18; major in Judge Advocate General's Department, 1918–19; Member of the United States Senate, under appointment, from May 17, 1923, to December 1, 1924; elected to the United States Senate in 1932 and again in 1938; died December 1, 1941.

STEPHEN BOLLES, First Congressional District of Wisconsin: Born June 25, 1866; reporter; correspondent; editor; press superintendent, Pan American Exposition, 1901; chief, graphic acts, and president, international jury of awards, Universal Exposition, St. Louis, 1903; director of publicity, Jamestown Exposition, 1907; trustee, Janesville Public Library, 18 years; Member of the Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses; died July 8, 1941.

ALBERT GREIG RUTHERFORD, Fifteenth Congressional District of Pennsylvania: Born January 3, 1879; lawyer; soldier; received degree of bachelor of law, University of Pennsylvania, 1904; enlisted Company D, Thirteenth Infantry, Pennsylvania National Guard, 1904, captain Company K, Thirteenth Infantry, 1908, major and inspector, Third Brigade, 1910, major and judge advocate general, 1917; lieutenant colonel Second Pennsylvania Reserve Militia in 1918; Member of the Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, and Seventy-seventh Congresses; died August 10, 1941.

EDWARD THOMAS TAYLOR, Fourth Congressional District of Colorado: Born June 19, 1858; educator; lawyer; received degree of bachelor of law, University of Michigan, 1884; county superintendent of schools, Lake County, 1884; deputy district attorney, 1885–86; district attorney, 1887–89; county attorney, Garfield County, two terms; city attorney, Glenwood Springs, five terms; elected to the State senate in 1896, 1900, and 1904; Member of the Sixty-first to the Seventy-seventh Congresses, inclusive (17 successive Congresses); chairman of the Appropriations Committee Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, and Seventy-seventh Congresses; died September 3, 1941.

LEE EDWARD GEYER, Seventeenth Congressional District of California: Born September 9, 1888; educator; received degree of bachelor of arts, Baker University, Baldwin City, Kans.; graduate work at the University of Wisconsin, the University of Southern California; legislator; member, California State Assembly, sixty-seventh assembly district, 1934–36; Member Seventy-sixth and Seventy-seventh Congresses; died October 11, 1941.

LAWRENCE JOSEPH CONNERY, Seventh Congressional District of Massachusetts: Born October 17, 1895; reporter; lawyer; businessman; soldier; served on the Mexican border in 1916 in Company A, Ninth Massachusetts Infantry; World War in Company A, One Hundred and First Regiment, United States Infantry, from March 25, 1917, until honorably discharged March 24, 1919; served 19 months in France, taking part in all major operations, engagements, and battles of the One Hundred and First Infantry, Twenty-sixth (Yankee) Division; graduated from the law department of Georgetown University, Washington, D. C., in 1926; Member of the Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, and Seventy-seventh Congresses; died October 19, 1941.

PATRICK JOSEPH BOLAND, Eleventh Congressional District of Pennsylvania: Born January 6, 1880; businessman; contractor; member, Scranton School Board, 1907–9; member of the Scranton City Council; county commissioner of Lackawanna County, 1915–19; Member Seventy-second, Seventy-third, Seventy-fourth, Seventy-fifth, Seventy-sixth, and Seventy-seventh Congresses; appointed majority whip during the Seventy-fourth Congress, serving until his death, May 18, 1942.

Mrs. NORTON, a Representative from the State of New Jersey, standing in front of the Speaker's rostrum, placed a memorial rose in a vase as the name of each deceased Member was read by the Clerk.

Then followed 1 minute of devotional silence.

The CHAPLAIN. Let us pray: O Love Divine, blessed is the hope and faith which Thou hast woven into the very heart of our being; they will live in some higher realm where longings and aspirations are fulfilled. Thou hast curtained the future with night and we know not what a day will bring forth, yet we praise Thee for the light upon the mountain where the lights of men pale in the splendor of the dawn. Look down upon those today who have been stricken by grief; through love's vigil, they are passing through the shadows. We pray Thee to fold them close to the breast of love; temper their sorrow with the vision of that Light that knows no shadow of turning and by which the valley is exalted and the way made clear. Be with us all, giving strength to walk through joy and sorrow, until we reach the last horizon of earth's journey then let us hear the voices calling out of the darkness, directing our ways in paths unknown. In our dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

Hon. EDWARD J. HART, a Representative from the State of New Jersey, delivered the following address:

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, once again, in continuance of a commendable custom, we have foregathered in solemn veneration of the memories of those who have left us for that mysterious land "whence no traveler returneth." But 1 short year ago they worked by our side, gave us the benefit of their counsel, the joy of their companionship, shared our tasks, and strove with valiant hearts and minds to increase the power and influence of this blessed land.

Since then the sable pall of death, the dark curtain of eternal night, has dropped between us, shutting off from our further view their sweet and friendly faces. Death has set the seal of eternity upon their brows and the beautiful hath been made permanent.

In this sweet hour of love and remembrance our feelings ought not to be marked by an undiluted sadness. "It is as natural to a man to die," says Lord Bacon, "as to be born." And none of us knows the day or the hour. Man's early observation and experience enforce upon his consciousness the inevitability of death, and always as he toils in the teeming market places or walks along the cool, sequestered path of mortal life there is cast before him the dark shadow of impending doom. To those who choose to dwell amid "the wide, weltering chaos of infidelity" death can be conceived of only as a grisly gorgon hovering over a fathomless pit of black despair. But we know that our Redeemer liveth. And this precious and unquenchable truth bathes us in a radiant glow of hope. For us death is not Pluto, king of the dark unknown, but, rather, Azrael, brother and friend, lord of this mansion of life.

Ofttimes we are affrighted by the vastness we behold about us. Our sense of proportion is distorted by the infinity of space. We gaze upon the vast mountains that divide a continent or upon the everrestless sea whose menacing roar can never be subdued, and our first thought is of our comparative insignificance in the order of nature. Sometimes in the country on a crisp, clear autumn evening, we shut the cottage door and step out to gaze upon the starry wilderness of worlds that gem night's radiant brow, and in its refulgence, feel as a little babe swaddled by the hands of Erebus into helpless quiescence. Then suddenly, adown the centuries comes ringing the voice of eternal truth.

Heaven and earth shall pass away, but My word shall not pass away.

Again we are refreshed by the cool, sweet breath of hope. Again we know that although—

we are but a mere speck among a myriad worlds, yet we are greater than the sum of them; having our roots in the dark places of the earth, but our branches in the sweet airs of heaven.

These mighty manifestations of the material world which we have beheld are but God's footstools, but there is within us an immortal soul which is His very image and likeness. Yes; a human soul—a grander creation than the Alps or the Andes, for it shall outlive them; a soul moved by aspirations that outrun the universe, and possessing a destiny that shall outlive the stars. Our sadness then, today and always, deriving from the loss of these dear colleagues whom we mourn, will be tempered by the faith and hope we carry in our hearts.

Were they to whom we pay this tribute of our love numbered among those whom the world calls great? We do not need to know. They were men of honor who strove to the limit of their abilities to perform well the high and important duties with which they were entrusted. They labored in forgetfulness of self. They loved their God; they loved their

country; they loved their families and their homes. And we loved them. They were our colleagues. More, they were our comrades and our brothers, our companions in life's fitful journey. We recognize in them symbols of that great humanity of which each of us forms equally a part; we see them only as children of the living God and realize that here after all, beyond temporal greatness, is the real, substantial, and universal distinction of every man that is born of woman. It is this idea of the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God which is destined by the irresistible sweep of its power to destroy in God's good time every vestige of tyranny on earth. It lies at the foundation of democracy. It is this same idea upon which our country is builded; it is the indestructible cornerstone of our civil polity, and at once the reason and justification of the sublime service in which we now participate. Whatever the next world holds in store, we are bidden in this to seek and serve God in our fellow men. These dear departed asked naught of life but leave to serve, to live, and to commune with their fellow men, and from the lap of earth to look up into the face of God. That may be called their greatest glory.

We shall not pause then to inquire into the measure of their greatness. Not all who are called great are truly great. Many of the noblest heroes sleep in unremembered graves. For greatness is a term entirely related to opportunity. From the contemplation of God's glorious universe, we can see the possibility of greatness in small things as well as in the large. If we meditate upon the processes of nature we shall learn the necessity of perfection in the smallest act. God's infinite skill is not exhausted nor concentrated in the structure of a firmament, in drawing the orbit of a planet; in laying the strata of the earth; in rearing the mountain cone. The care for the bursting flower is as wise as the forces displayed in the rolling star; the smallest leaf that falls and dies unnoticed in the forest is wrought with a beauty as exquisite as the art displayed in the sturdy oak. Omnipotent skill is stamped on the infinitely small as on the infinitely great.

The lesson of religion, urged and enforced by examples in nature, is the inestimable worth of common duties, as manifesting the greatest principles; it bids us attain perfection, not by striving to do dazzling deeds but by making our experience divine; it tells us that the real hero will ennoble the humblest field of labor; that nothing is mean which can be performed as duty; but that religious virtue, like the touch of Midas, converts the humblest call of conscience into spiritual gold.

Our observation infallibly informs us that it was in accordance with this lesson that our colleagues strove and wrought. And of all who have sincerely ordered their lives in conformity with this ennobling ideal we cannot think that they are really dead. "If man is immortal," we are told, "he as truly lives in the past as he will in the future." The light of a faithful life dies not, nor does he who lived it. His body indeed is interred in earth's cold bosom, but the light of that life, like the light of the departed sun, shines on undimmed and renews its cheering radiance as day by day it is revived to the children of earth.

And what a spiritual tonic it is for us that we should thrust aside our ordinary pursuits and come here to sweetly linger over the memories of those who no longer answer the call of the roll. What a supreme benefit to ourselves that in this sweet communion of spirit we should revive those happier days ere yet their earthly lives were ended. Here we renew our better resolution; here we dwell upon the infinite mercy and love of an everlasting God. Here we contemplate the glories and bliss of that immortality which our better natures will not permit us to forget. There are those who scoff at immortality. These do but seek with vain and boasting tongue to smother the aspirations of every human heart. "If there is no existence for man beyond the present state, how," asks the olc divine, "can we explain the attributes with which he is endowed and which stamp him as a moral being? What powers, what capacities are involved in his nature. What capacity to enjoy and what power to impart happiness to others. Who can reflect on the nature of such a creature, his intelligence, his susceptibility, his will, his conscience, the dignity, the excellence of which he is capable, the moral victories and triumphs he may win, his fitness to hold on his way with archangels, strong in advancing all that good which infinite wisdom could devise and infinite benevolence could love, the graces with which he may be adorned, and the beatitudes with which he may be blessed, and not believe that he is made to be one with a God who has created him, a partaker of His blessedness, a companion of His eternity?" It is into that blissful eternity that our dear colleagues have gone. From their labors here they have been called away. We do not believe, to quote the graphic words of Shakespeare, that they have gone to "a blind cave of eternal night." The sparks of their noble lives flickered a little while and then went out. The lute is silent. The chords made of their heartstrings are broken. While with us all the "sense of death is most in apprehension," we feel justified in indulging the buoyant hope that they have been translated to a better and brighter home beyond the grave, "where the air is filled with solemn, delightful music, and the sky is aglow with the splendor of sunlight and perpetual spring; where the rumbling waters are dashed with the fragrance of rare and beautiful flowers and the garlands, woven from the lilies of the valley, are forever white and green."

Henry Ward Beecher so often spoke of death as a coronation. And so it is. Henceforth, when we speak of it, let it be only as the pathway to a nobler life. Let us strip it of its awful significance, and think of it only as the working out of God's infinite mercy and goodness. We cannot escape it, but we can do much to rob it of its dread. It is the universal experience which all must undergo who have breathed and moved in material form. Grace, strength, health, the glory of the world, the bud, the blossom and the fruit of all mundane possibilities, "all that beauty, all that wealth e'er gave," must blight, wither, and perish at its touch.

The universe—

Says Britain's fine prose poet, Michael Fairless—

The universe is full of miracle and mystery; the darkness and silence are set for a sign we dare not despise. The pall of night lifts, leaving us engulfed in the light of immensity under a tossing heaven of stars. The dawn breaks, but it does not surprise us, for we have watched from the valley and seen the pale twilight. Through the wondrous sabbath of faithful souls, the long day of rosemary and rue, the light brightens in the east; and we pass on toward it with quiet feet and opening eyes, bearing with us all of the redeemed earth that we have made our own, until we are fulfilled in the sunrise of the great Easter Day, and the peoples come from north and south and east and west to the city which lieth foursquare—the beatific vision of God.

Let us live always in expectancy of that delectable vision. Let us live in faith and honor, and in that spirit of unselfish service which animated the careers of our separated colleagues, and which alone can bring us to a realization, full and complete, of the glory and purpose of the manifold garment of God.

The male quartet sang Crossing the Bar (Barnby).

Hon. FRANK CROWTHER, a Representative from the State of New York, delivered the following address:

Mr. CROWTHER. Mr. Speaker, on this solemn occasion we are assembled to pay tribute to the memory of our departed colleagues. We have not come in a spirit of mourning and sorrow but rather to scatter a few flowers on the pathway of memory and to renew our faith in a blessed immortality.

Joy and sorrow are closely intermingled in this busy world of ours. The happiness incident to the birth of a precious baby is ofttimes curbed by the death of its mother, and repeatedly on the highway of life the bridal procession must tarry while the funeral train passes by. Even after great victories in battle the shouts and huzzahs of the populace are hushed as vanquished foes are borne to their last resting place.

But the king and his jester must answer the call; the great and the humble and the spear of the prince and the staff of the pauper shall lie side by side.

Life is a privilege. The noontide fades
And shadows fall among the winding glades;
The joy blooms wither in the autumn air,
Yet the sweet scent of sympathy is there.
Pale sorrow leads us closer to our kind
And in the serious hours of life we find
Depths in the soul of men which lend new worth
And majesty to this brief span of earth.

Life is a privilege. If some sad fate
Sends us alone to seek the exit gate;
If men forsake us as the shadows fall,
Still does the supreme privilege of all
Come in that reaching upward of the soul
To find the welcoming presence at the goal,
And in the knowledge that our feet have trod
Paths that lead from and must lead us back to God.

This service is one that carries us away from the busy whirl of today and transports us to the land of yesterday, filled with fond memories of those who have left us for a little while. Scarcely one of us but what sit and muse and grow fanciful as the floodgate of memory is opened and we live again the joys and sorrows of a lifetime.

The fond mother in fancy sees her first-born who was taken away in his baby days, and there comes to her an intuitive knowledge that had he been spared he would have been her pride and joy. Son and daughter in fancy see again their dear old father and mother who finally went to their reward after weary months of illness. Even communities pause in the midst of their activities to pay tribute to the memory of those whose life work and achievements have made them characters of historic interest.

And so we are assembled to turn back the pages of the record of yesterday, and as we listened to this roll call of the departed we in fancy could see our colleagues as we knew them in the days of their health and strength, of which they gave their full measure in the performance of their duties.

No measure of sacrifice on our part would have been too great if we could have saved their lives to their families and friends. But the power to stay the hand of the grim messenger is not vested in us, and we bow in humble submission before the awful majesty of death. Life, after all, is but a vapor, which appeareth for a little while and vanisheth away, and there shall be no remembrance of the wise no more than the fool forever; life is ever promising and seldom fulfilleth, ever lived in the present, and the present is no more by the time you have said it. One day calls another a day and makes joy to follow joy and tears to follow tears.

Life is a constant struggle and conflict between the victor and the vanquished, while the bitterness of the strife withers the laurels of the conqueror and rankles in the hearts of the defeated.

Success is not often measured by the degree of happiness, peace, or contentment attained but rather by the battles won and trophies captured from the vanquished foe.

Fortunate is the man who can so live that his success in material things has not dwarfed his spiritual stature. Death to him is but the zero hour of the great adventure, and he sings with the psalmist:

Yea though I walk through the valley of the shadow of death, I will fear no evil. Thy rod and Thy staff they comfort me.

But man is as frail and as prone to err as he has been for centuries, and in spite of the great moral uplift and banishment of bigotry during the last century we are still possessed of the tendency to exaggerate the faults of our neighbor and belittle his efforts for good. So few of us during our life journey walk the center of the path of rectitude with never a step to the right or to the left that in order to be true to ourselves we should be less hasty and caustic in our criticism and heed well the admonition:

Let he that be without sin cast the first stone.

The ancient Arabs had a saying that "death is a camel that kneels before every man's tent," and so in the midst of the battle of life comes death, the implacable foe of person, time, or place. Ever walking by our side, it cannot be avoided and none may escape it. Its sway is universal and the hour of its coming is uncertain. In joy or sorrow it finds us out and we must follow at the summons. Even as our departed friends were called, to us shall come perhaps without warning the grim messenger who shall dash the cup of life all fragrant with love and success from our lips and we shall stand as strangers at the gates of eternity. What will our earthly life, our lofty hopes, our success or failure matter to us at that time? How paltry and insignificant our own individuality, and how small will seem the part we played in the drama of the universe. There we shall stand in the presence of the Everlasting Judge, and human imagination dare not take a step farther, dare not enter that presence for between us and the soul of departed friends there is a veil which we cannot penetrate, and its secret will not be revealed to us until we too pass behind it from the light which is darkness to the full light of perfect knowledge.

What a flood of happy recollections come tumbling down the stream of memory as we look back upon the friendships developed by years of association with these departed friends. To us they have told their story of humble beginnings and early hardships which, in men of sterling worth and integrity, serve but to urge them on to their goal of achievement. Many of them had attained positions of high honor in their States, and yet their ambition had been to serve their country in a representative capacity. They came from all walks of life—successful bankers and businessmen, lawyers of outstanding ability, and occasionally from the ranks of professional men and the clergy. They all contributed to the sum total of knowledge and ability that is so necessary in a national legislative body. To the younger Members of the House they were a source of inspiration, and to us all they were united in the bonds of real friendship.

These departed colleagues to whom we this day pay tribute all experienced the joy and satisfaction resulting from the real friendships that they formed during their years of service. We read in prose and poetry of deathless friendships and we all know just what that means. In this greatest of deliberative bodies, neither invective, sarcasm, nor partisanship can sever the bonds of real friendship.

There is no friend like an old friend
Who has shared our morning days;
No greeting like his welcome,
No homage like his praise.

Fame is the scentless sunflower
With gaudy crown of gold,
But friendship is the breathing rose
With sweets in every fold.

The passing of these distinguished Members was a loss not only to their immediate families but a loss to the Nation. They had served for periods varying from a few months to a quarter of a century and their achievements will be a source of inspiration to us and to future generations. What better record can a man leave than that of the full performance of duty? Such a record is the result of the possession not only of marked ability but of undaunted courage and a high sense of honor.

To men of this caliber the Nation is indebted for their tireless energy and devoted service. To them the Master said, "In my Father's house are many mansions. I go to prepare a place for you," and our faith in a blessed immortality tells us that we shall see them again in that "house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens."

Without this abiding faith in the hereafter, death would be indeed an appalling mystery, life would be a tragedy, and love and devotion a mere mockery.

We all dread to think of the hour of parting when those nearest and dearest to our hearts shall be taken out of our lives. But the great wealth of our love and devotion will not be lost to us, for it shall be gathered into the treasury of the kingdom and shall be returned to us a hundredfold when we, in our turn, shall follow the unnumbered generations into gladness eternal.

Oh, may I join the choir invisible
Of those immortal dead who live again
In minds made better by their presence;
Live in pulses stirred to generosity,
In deeds of daring rectitude; in scorn
For miserable aims that end with self;
In thoughts sublime that pierce the night like stars
And with their mild persistence
Urge men's search to vaster issues.

Hope not the cure of sin till self is dead.
Forget it in love's service
And the debt thou cannot pay the angels shall forget.
Heaven's gate is shut to him who comes alone
Save thou one soul
And it perchance may save thine own.

God in His infinite wisdom does not permit us to darken our lives with the thought of death. He bids us raise our eyes to the heavens and ever have an abiding faith in our fellow men; to cultivate self-respect in place of self-regard; to walk humbly with Him in the quietness of the dim valley and the dark stream ever believing that an all-merciful Providence has a place and a joy for even the most humble of His creations.

Whether this life journey be long or short, let the record established by our departed colleagues continue to be an inspiration to us as time marches on. At this hour when this world of ours is torn and bleeding by cruel war, let us not cry out as did King Richard, "Now is the winter of our discontent," but rather may we declare that this is the springtime of our opportunity, to serve God and home and country.

Amidst our trials and tribulations, our ambitions, and our temptations, let us

remember the closing stanza of that literary gem by Bryant:

So live that when thy summons comes to join
The innumerable caravan that moves
To that mysterious realm where each shall take
His chamber in the silent halls of death,
Thou go not like a quarry slave at night,
Scourged to his dungeon;
But, sustained and soothed by an unfaltering trust,
Approach thy grave like one who wraps the drapery of his couch about him,
And lies down to pleasant dreams.

The male quartet sang The Long Day Closes (Sullivan).

Mr. Oscar Short, United States Marine Band Orchestra, sounded taps.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., pronounced the following benediction:

The Lord bless you and keep you; the Lord make His face to shine upon you and be gracious unto you. The Lord lift the light of His countenance upon you and give you peace. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

AFTER RECESS

At the conclusion of the recess the Speaker called the House to order.

ELECTION OF MEMBER, WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following resolution, House Resolution 509, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That JAMES P. MCGRANERY, of Pennsylvania, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing committee of the House of Representatives on Ways and Means.

The resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of House Resolution 502, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Members, the House will stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

ADJOURNMENT

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 9 minutes), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 25, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10 a. m. on Thursday, June 25, 1942, for consideration of war housing, room 245, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Thursday, June 25, 1942.

Business to be considered: Hearing on Federal Communications Commission.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1780. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to amend the act approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 864), entitled "An act increasing the number of naval aviators in the line of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes," was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. House Joint Resolution 327. Joint resolution to accord privileges of free importation to members of the armed forces of other United Nations, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2274). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII,

Mr. PETERSON of Florida introduced a bill (H. R. 7296) to restore to active duty certain retired officers of the Regular Army, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3125. By Mr. BISHOP: Petition of sundry citizens of Anna and Carterville, Ill., protesting against the rationing of gasoline in southern Illinois; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3126. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the North American Gasoline Tax Conference, Pacific region, relative to gasoline rationing; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

3127. Also, resolution of the California Legislature, joint committee on water problems, adopted at Bakersfield, Calif., May 16, 1942, relative to the completion of the Central Valley project; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 1942

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 18, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Charles W. Sheerin, D. D., rector of the Church of the Epiphany, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our heavenly Father, we come before Thee asking for Thy grace and Thy mercy in all that we undertake. Give unto us the spirit of wisdom and understanding that we may know Thy purpose for us in these days of stress and strain. When we are downcast, lift us to Thy presence where we may see light in darkness. When we are weak, make us strong with the knowledge of Thee. Grant, we beseech Thee, that this body may be ever guided by Thee, and that the people of this country may be led into Thy paths where we cannot stumble and into Thy light where clear vision is open to us. Take us into Thy safekeeping so that we shall be led by Thy spirit to a true victory of righteousness and a just peace. All of which we ask in the name of Him who came to redeem mankind, our Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, June 22, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

VISIT OF KING OF YUGOSLAVIA TO THE SENATE—ORDER FOR RECESS AND APPOINTMENT OF COMMITTEE

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the King of Yugoslavia will visit the Senate at 12:20 o'clock. I move that at 12:20 o'clock the Senate stand in recess in order that it may receive the King of Yugoslavia, and that the Chair appoint an appropriate committee to escort the King into the Chamber.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered; and the Chair appoints the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] the committee to escort the King of Yugoslavia into the Chamber.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 22d instant,

The following message from the House of Representatives was received during the recess of the Senate by the Secretary of the Senate:

That the House had passed without amendment the following bills of the Senate:

S. 1622. An act to authorize payment to janitors and custodians of the public schools of the District of Columbia for services rendered for local boards of the selective-service system;

S. 2316. An act to provide for the placing in Gallinger Hospital of a memorial to George Earle Chamberlain; and

S. 2558. An act to further expedite the prosecution of the war by authorizing the control of the exportation of certain commodities.

That the House had passed the bill (S. 1957) to establish the naval procurement fund, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

That the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 337) to provide for a permanent postage rate of 1½ cents per pound on books.

That the House insisted upon its amendments to the bill (S. 1694) for the relief of Mrs. Claud Tuck; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

That the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills and joint resolution of the House:

H. R. 2646. An act for the relief of L. W. Marek, Jr.;

H. R. 4554. An act for the relief of the estate of Julian B. Wiggins, deceased, and the estate of R. E. Thompson, deceased;

H. R. 4941. An act for the relief of J. C. Lemon, Louis McCoy, and Patricia McCoy;

H. R. 5070. An act for the relief of Francis Corwin Circle;

H. R. 5454. An act for the relief of David Caron;

H. R. 5619. An act for the relief of certain clerks in the post office at Detroit, Mich.;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. E. P. Ball;

H. R. 6908. An act to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941; and

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution continuing the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation as an agency of the United States.

That the House had severally agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House:

H. R. 2424. An act for the relief of Clarence J. Meteyer, Lester W. Engels, and Dorothy B. Engels;

H. R. 5854. An act for the relief of Madeleine Hammett, Olive Hammett, Walter Young, the estate of Laura O'Malley Young, deceased, and the legal guardian of Laura Elizabeth Young;

H. R. 6033. An act for the relief of William Tipton, Mrs. William Tipton, and Mrs. Eula Nelson;

H. R. 6355. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1940;

H. R. 6496. An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and Staff Corps of the Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6557. An act for the relief of James Gilmore and Marian E. Gilmore; and

H. R. 6899. An act to exempt custodial employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education from the operation of the provisions of section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act, approved May 10, 1916.

That the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4092) for the relief of E. P. Corley.

That the House had severally disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the following bills of the House; asked conferences with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conferences:

H. R. 3398. An act for the relief of Gerhard R. Fisher;

H. R. 4370. An act for the relief of Charles L. Lair;

H. R. 5496. An act for the relief of Cecile McLaughlin; and

H. R. 5920. An act for the relief of E. A. Williams.

That the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5385) for the relief of Charles E. Yates and the Motor Facts Sales Co.; asked a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. WEISS, and Mr. WINTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

That the House had severally disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the following bills of the House; asked conferences with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. McGEHEE, Mr. KEOGH, and Mr. WINTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conferences:

H. R. 4355. An act for the relief of Bella Cosgrove;

H. R. 4953. An act for the relief of Emil Lassila, Martha Lassila, Ellen Huhta, and Sylvia Huhta;

H. R. 5449. An act for the relief of Mrs. Cecile Herzog and Lucille Herzog (an infant); and

H. R. 5499. An act for the relief of Henry Daley, guardian of James Ray Daley and Norman Franklin Daley.

That the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7160. An act to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps during the existing war, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7212. An act to amend section 13 (d) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; and

H. R. 7280. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 1622. An act to authorize payment to janitors and custodians of the public schools of the District of Columbia for services rendered for local boards for the Selective Service System;

S. 2316. An act to provide for the placing in Gallinger Hospital of a memorial to George Earle Chamberlain;

S. 2455. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty," to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes;

S. 2558. An act to further expedite the prosecution of the war by authorizing the control of the exportation of certain commodities;

H. R. 2424. An act for the relief of Clarence J. Meteyer, Lester W. Engels, and Dorothy B. Engels;

H. R. 2646. An act for the relief of L. W. Marek, Jr.;

H. R. 4092. An act for the relief of E. P. Corley;

H. R. 4554. An act for the relief of the estate of Julian B. Wiggins, deceased, and the estate of R. E. Thompson, deceased;

H. R. 4941. An act for the relief of J. C. Lemon, Louis McCoy, and Patricia McCoy;

H. R. 5070. An act for the relief of Francis Corwin Circle;

H. R. 5454. An act for the relief of David Caron;

H. R. 5619. An act for the relief of certain clerks in the post office at Detroit, Mich.;

H. R. 5854. An act for the relief of Madeleine Hammett, Olive Hammett, Walter Young, the estate of Laura O'Malley Young, deceased, and the legal guardian of Laura Elizabeth Young;

H. R. 6033. An act for the relief of William Tipton, Mrs. William Tipton, and Mrs. Eula Nelson;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. E. P. Ball;

H. R. 6355. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1940;

H. R. 6430. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6496. An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6557. An act for the relief of James Gilmore and Marian E. Gilmore;

H. R. 6899. An act to exempt custodial employees of the District of Columbia Board of Election from the operation of the provisions of section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act approved May 10, 1916;

H. R. 6908. An act to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941;

H. R. 7041. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution continuing the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation as an agency of the United States.

MESSAGE FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE TO THE COMMISSAR FOR FOREIGN AFFAIRS OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD a copy of a message sent by our Secretary of State to the Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUNE 22, 1942.

Message addressed to the Commissar for Foreign Affairs of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by the Secretary of State:

"I extend through you to the Government and people of the Soviet Union on behalf of the Government and people of the United States congratulations upon the success with which you have resisted the brutal aggression of Nazi Germany and have thus frustrated the plans for world conquest so overconfidently laid by our common enemy. For 1 year the peoples of the Soviet Union have been engaging the armies not only of Nazi Germany but also of those other European countries the governments of which have accepted Nazi dictation. In this struggle the armed forces of the Soviet Union, with the heroic support of the entire population, have so acquitted themselves as to win the admiration of the liberty-loving peoples of the world and to earn a place in history beside those Russian armies which over a century and a quarter ago did so much to ruin the plans of another aspirant to world conquest.

"During the past year the American people, although themselves threatened by aggression from several directions, have gladly shared their arms and supplies with the Soviet Union. It is planned that during the coming year these arms and supplies will pour forth from our factories and countryside in an ever-widening stream until final victory has been achieved.

"We are confident that before the end of another year the instigators of this war will have been given to understand how seriously they have underestimated the determination and the ability for effective action of the peace-loving nations and will have learned that in an aroused world aggressors can no longer escape the consequences of acts resulting in human suffering and destruction."

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, TREASURY DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 225)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a supplemental estimate of appropriation for

the Treasury Department, fiscal year 1942, amounting to $8,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE PERTAINING TO THE NAVY (S. DOC. NO. 226)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a proposed provision pertaining to appropriations "Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel" for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RENEWED GERMAN TERRORISM IN POLAND

A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting copy of a note with enclosure, dated June 13, 1942, received from the Ambassador of Poland requesting that the text of the appeal resolved on June 10, 1942, by the National Council of Poland in London, England, relating to the new wave of German terrorism in Poland be communicated to the President of the Senate (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

STATISTICAL STUDIES BY THE LABOR DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of Labor, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of statistical studies performed by the Department of Labor for other than Government activities during the period July 1, 1939, to December 31, 1941 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (4), Navy, Agriculture (4), and the Federal Security Agency, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

Petitions from Grace Methodist Church, Emanuel Baptist Church, Evangel Tabernacle, Bethany Covenant Church, the First Baptist Church, United Presbyterian Church, the Salvation Army, the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and the Ballard Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Mount Vernon, Wash., and the Big Lake Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Washington, praying that the importation, manufacture, and sale of alcoholic beverages in the United States of America, its Territories and possessions, be immediately abolished and prohibited for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions from the First Christian Church, the Toledo First Presbyterian Church, the Association of Presbyterian Women of the First Presbyterian Church, and the Seventh-Day Adventist Church, all of Centralia, Wash., praying that the importation, manufacture, and sale of alcoholic beverages in the United States of America, its Territories and possessions, be immediately abolished and prohibited for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Petitions bearing 667 signatures of citizens of Peoria, Lawrenceville and Lawrence County, Greenup, Casey, Sullivan, Springfield, Allenville, Morrison, Danville and suburbs, and Farmington, Ill., praying for the passage of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program, and to give to the young men of today the protection their fathers had in 1917; ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions bearing 93 signatures of citizens of Reno and Sparks, Nev., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program, and to give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions bearing 38 signatures of citizens of Portland, Oreg., praying for the passage of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program, and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917, and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions bearing 830 signatures of citizens of Providence, Pawtucket, Central Falls, Barrington, Lincoln, Cumberland, and Woonsocket, R. I., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to the vital defense of our Nation, and to give to the young men of this war the protection their fathers had in 1917; ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions bearing 337 signatures of citizens of Lynchburg, Waynesboro, and Pamplin, Va., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program, and to give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917; ordered to lie on the table.

Petitions bearing 514 signatures of citizens of Bellingham, Seattle, and Chelan County, Jefferson County, Kirkland, and Wenatchee, Wash., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program, and to give to the young men of today the protection their fathers had in 1917; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of members of Batesville Grange, No. 1605, Woodson County, and the Batesville United Brethren Church, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

PROHIBITION OF LIQUOR SALES AND SUPPRESSION OF VICE AROUND MILITARY CAMPS—PETITIONS

Mr. NYE presented several telegrams from citizens and organizations in the State of North Dakota, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORTUNA, N. DAK., *June 19, 1942.*

Hon. GERALD P. NYE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Please present Senate urgent plea present emergency and morale of American people demand passage S. 860.

FORTUNA WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION.

VALLEY CITY, N. DAK., *June 20, 1942.*

Hon. GERALD P. NYE,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.:

Please make known to Senate our considered belief that interests of country and of civilian morale will best be served by passage of S. 860.

VALLEY CITY'S WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION.

PARK RIVER, N. DAK., *June 18, 1942.*

Senator GERALD P. NYE,
United States Senate
Washington, D. C.:

Twenty parents of boys in service and the Women's Christian Temperance Union of this community requests your influence and vote in favor of S. 830.

MRS. NELLIE M. CROSS.

FARGO, N. DAK., *June 20, 1942.*

Hon. GERALD P. NYE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.:

Please present to Senate our urgent request that in view of our present emergency and in the light of an experience long enough to thoroughly prove inadequacy of present set-up, you reenact legislation of 1917 to clean up areas around camps by passing Sheppard bill, S. 860.

GENERAL OFFICERS NORTH DAKOTA WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN TEMPERANCE UNION,
BESSIE M. DARLING, *President.*

GILBY, N. DAK., *June 19, 1942.*

Hon. GERALD P. NYE,
United States Senator, Senate
Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

Grand Forks district Women's Christian Temperance Union representing 250 members urge you to please make known to Senate our considered belief that interests of country and of civilian morale will be best served by passage of S. 860.

MARY E. MUIR, *President.*

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference four petitions bearing the signatures of 65 citizens of the city of Tampa, Fla., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the petitions presented by the Senator from Florida will be received and lie on the table.

Mr. DOWNEY presented a petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Ripon and vicinity, California, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed in the RECORD, without all the signatures attached, as follows:

PETITION FOR S. 860

To the Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States:

Whereas in the War Act of 1917 the Congress of the United States included legislation forbidding the exploitation of the men in the Army and the Navy by liquor and commercialized vice, even though liquor was then forbidden in any military unit; and

Whereas in the Selective Service Act the Congress of 1940 called the young men of the present time to train for defense of our Nation if need be, and there now exists for these young defenders no defense from the activities of what Gen. George C. Marshall, Chief of Staff of the Army of the United States, referred to as "a sordid business for the accumulation of money," namely, the traffic in alcoholic beverages, and since beer is now sold in the camps by Government authority, and since commercialized prostitution in camp areas threaten health, morals, and efficiency of service: Now, therefore,

We, the undersigned citizens of Ripon, State of California, do respectfully petition you to vote for S. 860 as a contribution to a whole-

some defense program and a reenactment of legislation similar to that of 1917, and so give to the young men of 1942 the protection their fathers had in 1917.

Stuart Thomson, Ripon; Charles G. Ioppini, Ripon; W. L. Rowan, Modesto, Calif.; Ruth D. Latham, Ripon, Calif.; May Ward Denton, Ripon, Calif. (and sundry other citizens of Ripon and vicinity, California).

PROTEST AGAINST MANUFACTURE OF BEVERAGE ALCOHOL

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, and appropriately referred, a memorial signed by Alfred P. Smith, 1205 New York Street, Lawrence, Kans., and several hundred other citizens of Lawrence, Kans.

There being no objection, the memorial was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, without the signatures attached, as follows:

To the UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C.

HONORED SIRS: In view of the drastic need for sugar, molasses, and other similar products in our defense program, we, the undersigned citizens, voters of Kansas, do vigorously protest the use of these products in the manufacture of beverage alcohol for the duration of the war.

COMMITTEE REPORTS FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the Senate of the 22d instant,

The following reports of committees were submitted during the recess of the Senate:

On June 23, 1942:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 7232. A bill making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1507); and

H. J. Res. 324. Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943; with amendments (Rept. No. 1508).

On June 24, 1942:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 2592. A bill to provide for better administration of officer personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps during the existing war, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1510);

H. R. 6807. A bill to establish a Women's Auxiliary Reserve in the Navy, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1511);

H. R. 3152. A bill to suspend restrictions during the present war and for 1 year thereafter upon the service of certain officers of the Marine Corps in the Marine Corps headquarters, Washington, D. C.; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1512);

H. R. 7159. A bill authorizing the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1513); and

H. R. 7184. A bill to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1514).

By Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

S. 2590. A bill to amend section 13 (d) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1515).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Appropriations:

H. R. 7181. A bill making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 1509).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2600. A bill to expedite the prosecution of the war by making provision for an increased supply of rubber manufactured from alcohol produced from agricultural or forest products; without amendment (Rept. No. 1516).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

H. R. 7137. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to marketing quotas for peanuts, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1517).

By Mr. McNARY, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 2308. A bill providing for taxation by the States and their political subdivisions of certain real property acquired for military purposes; with an amendment.

By Mr. GUFFEY, from the Committee on Mines and Mining:

S. 2515. A bill to amend the Federal Explosives Act, as amended, by removing from the application of the act explosives or ingredients in transit upon aircraft in conformity with statutory law or rules and regulations of the Civil Aeronautics Board; without amendment (Rept. No. 1518); and

H. R. 6295. A bill to suspend the requirement for the performance of annual labor on certain mining claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 1519).

By Mr. McFARLAND, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation:

S. 2440. A bill for the relief of the Bridgeport irrigation district; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1520);

S. 2554. A bill to provide that the transmountain tunnel constructed in connection with the Colorado-Big Thompson project shall be known as the Alva B. Adams tunnel; without amendment (Rept. No. 1521); and

S. 2604. A bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Republican River; without amendment (Rept. No. 1522).

By Mr. BROWN, from the Committee on Banking and Currency:

S. 2565. A bill to amend sections 12A and 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 1523).

EXPENSES IN CONNECTION WITH CONTEST OF THE SEAT OF THE JUNIOR SENATOR FROM WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, reported a resolution (S. Res. 267), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of said committee, such sums as may be necessary, not exceeding $4,000, for the payment of expenses, including attorneys' fees, incurred by Clarence E. Martin and others in connection with the contest of the seat in the Senate from the State of West Virginia now occupied by Senator JOSEPH ROSIER.

OBLIGATIONS INCURRED IN CONNECTION WITH PROCEEDING RELATIVE TO SEAT OF THE JUNIOR SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections, reported a resolution (S. Res. 268), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, authorized by Senate Resolution 81, agreed to March 10, 1941, to consider the question of whether WILLIAM LANGER was entitled to retain his seat in the Senate to which he was certified as having been elected on November 5, 1940, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate for the payment of obligations incurred in connection with the said proceeding, including attorneys' fees, $16,500, in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for such purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 22, 1942, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 416. An act for the relief of E. A. Wailes, receiver of Delta Oil Co.;

S. 819. An act for the relief of the widow and children of Dr. Jo M. Ferguson;

S. 885. An act for the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934;

S. 1707. An act to prevent the making of photographs and sketches of military or naval reservations, naval vessels, and other naval and military properties, and for other purposes; and

S. 2467. An act to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second, time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 2621. A bill to amend further the Civil Service Retirement Act approved May 29, 1930, as amended; to the Committee on Civil Service.

By Mr. BUTLER:

S. 2622. A bill for the relief of William Weitz; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 2623. A bill authorizing the construction of certain public works in the basin of the Connecticut River for flood control; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 2624. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to authorize black-outs in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes," approved December 26, 1941, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VAN NUYS:

S. 2625. A bill to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period; and

S. 2626. A bill to provide for speedy and summary notice in proceedings to condemn land for war purposes, and to accelerate the distribution of deposits and awards to the

persons entitled thereto in such cases; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 2627. A bill to amend the act approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 864) entitled "An act increasing the number of naval aviators in the line of the regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2628. A bill amending Public Law No. 873, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved October 21, 1940; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 7280) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

COMPOSITION OF THE UNITED STATES NAVY—AMENDMENTS

Mr. CLARK of Missouri submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7184) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO SUSPEND THE RULE—AMENDMENT; FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 22d instant, Mr. McCARRAN filed with the Secretary of the Senate the following notice in writing:

In accordance with rule XL of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby give notice in writing that it is my intention to move to suspend paragraph 4 of rule XVI for the purpose of proposing to the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, the following amendment, namely: On page 37, after line 14, to insert the following:

"Loans to students in technical and professional fields (national defense): To assist students (in such numbers as the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall determine) participating in accelerated programs in degree-granting colleges and universities in engineering, physics, chemistry, medicine (including veterinary), dentistry, and pharmacy, as follows:

"Loans: For loans to students to enable them to pursue college courses, who attain and continue to maintain satisfactory standards of scholarship, who are in need of assistance and who agree in writing to participate, until otherwise directed by said Chairman, in accelerated programs of study, in any of the fields authorized hereunder, and who agree in writing to engage, for the duration of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, in such employment or service as may be assigned by officers or agencies designated by said Chairman, such loans to be made by such colleges or universities or public or college-connected agencies from funds paid to them upon estimates submitted by them as to the amounts necessary therefor, $7,500,000: *Provided*, That in case it shall be found that any payment to any such college, university, or public or college-connected agency is in excess of the needs thereof for the purposes hereof, refund in such excess shall be made to the Treasurer of the United States and the amount thereof credited to this appropriation. Loans hereunder shall be made in amounts not exceeding tuition and fees plus $25 per month and not exceeding a total of $500 to any one student during any 12-month period, said loans to be evidenced by notes executed by such students payable to the Treasurer of the United States at a rate of interest at 2½ percent per annum. Repayments of such loans shall be made through the colleges, universities or other agencies negotiating the loans and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided*, That indebtedness of students who, before completing their courses, are ordered into military service during the present wars under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, or who suffer total and permanent disability or death, shall be canceled. The foregoing loan program shall be administered in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Commissioner of Education with the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

"Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Education in the administration of the foregoing program, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and exchange of equipment; printing and binding; travel expenses, including not to exceed $2,500 for actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Commissioner of Education, $100,000: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any purchase from this appropriation when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $100."

Mr. McCARRAN also submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

(For text of amendment referred to, see the foregoing notice.)

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, THE FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, ETC.—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 18, line 10, to strike out beginning with "For all necessary expenses" through "$500,000", and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"For all necessary expenses to carry into effect the provisions of the act of June 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C., ch. 3A), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the purchase and exchange of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals; the purchase (including exchange), operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; hire, with or without personal services, of work animals, animal-drawn and motor-propelled vehicles, and water craft; printing and binding; travel expenses, including not to exceed $2,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Corps when specifically authorized by the Federal Security Administrator; transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940, and regulations promulgated thereunder; construction, improvement, repair, and maintenance of buildings, but the cost of any building erected hereunder shall not exceed $25,000 as follows:

"For pay, subsistence, medical services, etc.: For pay, subsistence, travel, clothing (and repair thereof), medical services, including hospitalization, fees and travel of physicians, dentists, veterinarians, and nurses; burial of enrollees, payment (not exceeding $50 for any one transfusion) to any enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps or other individual furnishing blood for transfusion to the veins of an enrollee or discharged enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps undergoing treatment in a hospital authorized to treat such patient, $48,499,288.

"For all other necessary expenses, both field and departmental, in connection with the administration of camps and work projects, $28,030,512.

"The Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps may authorize the exchange of motor-propelled and horse-drawn vehicles, tractors, road equipment, and boats, and parts, accessories, tires, or equipment thereof, in whole or in part payment for other vehicles, tractors, road equipment, or boats, or parts, accessories, tires, or equipment of such vehicles, tractors, road equipment, or boats."

FLAG DAY ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the President on Flag Day, Sunday, June 14, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH TO AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF ARCHITECTS

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah, at Detroit, Mich., on June 23, 1942, before the American Institute of Architects, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR SMATHERS AT NEW BRUNSWICK, N. J.

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator SMATHERS at a celebration in New Brunswick, N. J., June 23, 1942, by the firm of Johnson & Johnson on the occasion of receiving the Navy award for excellence, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR MEAD TO THE FEDERAL BUSINESS ASSOCIATION

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him at a testimonial luncheon by the Federal Business Association at the Commodore Hotel, New York, on June 19, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

FREEDOM OF THE PRESS—ADDRESS BY ASSOCIATE JUSTICE WILLIAM O. DOUGLAS

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable William O. Douglas, Associate Justice, Supreme Court of the United States, before the Oregon Newspaper Publishers' Association, at Gearhart, Oreg., June 20, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SECRETARY ICKES AT PITTSBURGH, PA.

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "The Monster of Munich," delivered by Hon. Harold L. Ickes, Secretary of the Interior and Petroleum Coordinator for War, before the rally sponsored by the American Slav

Day Committee of Pittsburgh, at Kenwood Park, Pittsburgh, Pa., on June 21, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

AMERICA IN WAR AND IN PEACE—ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR FRANCISCO CASTILLO NAJERA

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. Francisco Castillo Najera, Ambassador of Mexico to the United States, on April 27, 1942, before the Economic Club of Detroit, Mich., on the subject America in War and in Peace, which appears in the Appendix.]

ORGANIZATION OF PEACE—ADDRESS BY AMBASSADOR FRANCISCO CASTILLO NAJERA

[Mr. CHAVEZ asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Dr Francisco Castillo Najera, Ambassador of Mexico to the United States, before the Academy of Political and Social Sciences in Philadelphia, April 10, 1942, on the subject Organization for Peace, which appears in the Appendix.]

CRITICISM OF CONGRESS—ADDRESS BY EDWARD J. FLYNN

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an abstract of the address delivered by Edward J. Flynn, chairman of the Democratic National Committee, at Copley Plaza Hotel, Boston, Mass., during a conference on Women and the War, sponsored by the Women's Division of Democratic National Committee, June 15, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE IMPORTANCE OF CONGRESS IN WARTIME—ADDRESS BY DR. FRANK KINGDON

[Mr. HUGHES asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by Dr. Frank Kingdon, of the Union for Democratic Action, on June 20, 1942, on the subject The Importance of Congress in Wartime, which appears in the Appendix.]

PRIVATE PUBLICATION OF INFORMATION AS TO FOREIGN POLICY—ARTICLES BY ARTHUR KROCK AND DAVID LAWRENCE

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Arthur Krock, published in the New York Times of January 25, 1942, and an article by David Lawrence, published in the Washington Evening Star of June 24, 1942, relative to the publication by private sources of official information regarding foreign policy, which appear in the Appendix.]

EXCERPTS FROM BROADCAST BY FULTON LEWIS, JR., ON SYNTHETIC RUBBER

[Mr BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD excerpts from three broadcasts by Fulton Lewis, Jr., on the subject of synthetic rubber, which appear in the Appendix.]

COMMENTS ON THE BOOK, THE PROBLEMS OF LASTING PEACE

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD comments by various Americans on the Problems of Lasting Peace, which appear in the Appendix.]

PROPOSED ESTABLISHMENT OF AIR SCHOOLS—EDITORIAL FROM MEMPHIS COMMERCIAL APPEAL

[Mr. STEWART asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of Sunday, June 21, 1942, entitled "Make Them Air Academies," which appears in the Appendix.]

SCANDINAVIA IN FIRING ZONE

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Buffalo Evening News of March 10, 1942, entitled "Scandinavia in Firing Zone," which appears in the Appendix.]

RETURN TO REPUBLICAN FIRST PRINCIPLES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. MCNARY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled, "The Return to Republican First Principles," delivered by Senator WILEY before the Tenth Congressional District Convention of the Republican Party, at Hayward, Wis., on June 21, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7232, making appropriations to supply deficiencies, and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be read by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7232) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7232) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I have no objection to the present consideration of the bill. I am not, however, familiar with the bill, and I think its general objectives should be stated by the able Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall be very happy to do so.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HILL. In view of the visit of the King of Yugoslavia in a few minutes, I think it would be advisable to have a quorum call at this time so that Members of the Senate may be notified and may be present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Butler	Green
Andrews	Byrd	Guffey
Austin	Capper	Gurney
Bailey	Chavez	Hayden
Ball	Clark, Idaho	Hill
Bankhead	Clark, Mo.	Hughes
Barbour	Connally	Johnson, Calif.
Bilbo	Davis	Johnson, Colo.
Bone	Downey	Kilgore
Brewster	Doxey	Lee
Bridges	Ellender	Lucas
Brown	George	McCarran
Burton	Gerry	McFarland
McKellar	Reed	Tobey
McNary	Rosier	Truman
Maloney	Russell	Tunnell
Maybank	Schwartz	Tydings
Mead	Shipstead	Van Nuys
Millikin	Smathers	Wagner
Murdock	Smith	Walsh
Murray	Stewart	Wheeler
Norris	Taft	White
Nye	Thomas, Idaho	Willis
O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.	
Pepper	Thomas, Utah	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] is absent from the Senate on important public business.

The Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. AUSTIN. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on public business.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Senator from Oregon asked that the purpose of the bill be explained, and I shall be glad to explain it. The bill carries appropriations of $53,000,000, of which $38,000,000 are to cover deficiencies in the Post Office Department. As the Senator knows, that Department is practically self-sustaining.

There are also appropriations of between three and four million dollars for refunds of customs duties which have been allowed. The other items are largely for the payment of judgments and claims. Fifty thousand dollars has been added by the Senate committee for miscellaneous items which have been approved. There are two or three other items to which I am quite sure the Senate will agree without any question.

I renew my request that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to state the amendments of the Committee on Appropriations.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—General Appropriations—Senate", on page 2, after line 8, to insert:

For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, fiscal year 1942, $50,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 4, after line 16, to insert:

UNITED STATES COMMISSION FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

The unexpended balance of the appropriation of $5,000 for the expenses of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson, contained in the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941, and continued available for the fiscal year 1942 by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, is hereby continued available for the same purposes until June 30, 1943.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "District of Columbia—Settlement of Claims and Suits", on page 6, after line 21, to insert:

For the payment of claims in excess of $250, approved by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of the act of February 11, 1929, as amended by the act approved June 5, 1930 (45 Stat. 1160; 46 Stat. 500), $1,250.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of Agriculture", on page 9, after line 5, to insert:

Orchard rehabilitation loans: Not to exceed $400,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for "Orchard rehabilitation loans" made available for 1942 in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, is hereby continued available for the same purposes until June 30, 1943.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 9, after line 11, to insert:

FOREST SERVICE

Forest-fire control, Department of Agriculture (emergency): The first proviso in the item "Forest-fire control, Department of Agriculture (emergency)" in the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, approved April 28, 1942 (Public Law 528, 77th Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows: "*Provided*, That there shall not be expended from this appropriation on non-Federal lands in any State any amount in excess of the amount made available by the State, or private agencies, or individuals for the purposes of forest-fire prevention and suppression."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of the Interior—Government in the Territories," on page 12, after line 16, to insert:

Relief and civilian defense, Hawaii: In providing for the protection, care, and relief of the civilian population of the Territory of Hawaii, for which an allocation of $15,000,000 was made to the Secretary of the Interior from the appropriation "Emergency fund for the President," contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942 (allocation letter No. 42-56, dated January 12, 1942) receipts from sales of materials, supplies, or foodstuff, and from charges for furnishing services and facilities, acquired or furnished thereunder, shall be deposited to the credit of said allocation and shall be available for expenditure for the purposes thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Navy Department—Office of the Secretary," on page 15, line 18, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 218 and", and in line 20, after the name "Congress", to strike out "$1,792.47" and insert "$1,963.04."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 15, after line 20, to insert:

BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS

Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel: The appropriation "Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel" for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 shall be available for the pay and allowances, authorized by law, of the personnel provided for under this head.

The amendent was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Department of State—Miscellaneous", at the top of page 22, to insert:

International Committee on Political Refugees: The unexpended balance of the appropriation "International Committee on Political Refugees", continued available to June 30, 1942, by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, is continued available for the same purposes until June 30, 1943.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 22, after line 6, to insert:

Agrarian Claims Commission, United States and Mexico: The unexpended balance of the appropriation "Agrarian Claims Commission, United States and Mexico," made available for 1942 in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, is continued available for the same purposes until June 30, 1943.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title II—Judgments and Authorized Claims—Property Damage Claims", on page 26, after line 1, to insert:

(b) For the payment of claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the following respective departments and independent offices, under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in the sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), as fully set forth in Senate Document No. 219, Seventy-seventh Congress, as follows:

Executive Office of the President: Coordinator of Information, $103.95;
Federal Security Agency, $563.35;
Federal Works Administration, $999;
Department of the Interior, $1,052.73;
Navy Department, $463.70;
War Department, $14,509.20;
In all, $17,691.93.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the remaining items in the bill are for the payment of judgments and claims which have been allowed. I ask unanimous consent that the amendments affecting those items be agreed to en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the amendments are agreed to en bloc.

The amendments agreed to en bloc are as follows:

On page 27, line 1, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 221 and";

On page 27, after line 8, to insert: "War Department, $870."

On page 27, line 10, after the words "In all", to strike out "$6,674.27" and insert "$7,544.27."

On page 29, line 9, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document No. 220 and";

On page 29, line 14, after the word "Administration", to strike out "$13,629.90" and insert "$84,111.62."

On page 29, line 21, after the name "Navy", to strike out "$124,655.05" and insert "$127,325.31."

On page 29, line 23, after the name "War", to strike out "$41,657.69" and insert "$47,346.17."

On page 29, line 24, after the words "In all", to strike out "$412,805.74" and insert "$491,646.20."

On page 40, after line 23, to insert: "(b) For the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the General Accounting Office under appropriations the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (31 U. S. C. 713), and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1939 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (5 U. S. C. 266), as fully set forth in Senate Document Numbered 224, Seventy-seventh Congress, there is appropriated as follows:

"Independent offices: For Interstate Commerce Commission, $5.

"For pay of personnel and maintenance of hospitals, Public Health Service, $4.33.

"For general administrative expenses, Public Buildings Branch, Procurement Division, $29.75.

"For repair, preservation, and equipment, public buildings, Procurement Division, $7.80.

"For salaries and expenses, Veterans' Administration, $27.62.

"Department of Agriculture: For control of emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases, $231.

"For salaries and expenses, Extension Service, $1.49.

"For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture (transfer to Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation), $344.12.

"For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture (transfer to Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, act of June 28, 1937), $154.85.

"For retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates, Department of Agriculture, $14.13.

"For development of water facilities, arid and semiarid areas, Department of Agriculture, $3.50.

"For conservation and use of agricultural land resources, Department of Agriculture, $167.91.

"For salaries and expenses, Soil Conservation Service, $21.73.

"For National Industrial Recovery, Interior, soil-erosion prevention (transfer to Agriculture), $45.50.

"For loans and relief in stricken agricultural areas (transfer to Farm Credit Administration), $37.

"Department of Commerce: For establishment of air-navigation facilities, Civil Aeronautics Authority, $513.80.

"Department of the Interior: For industry among Indians, $4.59.

"Department of Justice: For miscellaneous expenses, United States courts, $12.27.

"For salaries and expenses, Federal Bureau of Investigation, $30.82.

"Department of Labor: For salaries and expenses, Division of Labor Standards, Department of Labor, $23.27.

"Navy Department: For aviation, Navy, $371.76.

"For ordnance and ordnance stores, Bureau of Ordnance, $9,843.82.

"For pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy, $37.27.

"For pay and allowances, Coast Guard, $23.52.

"Treasury Department: For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, $976.14.

"War Department: For general appropriations, Quartermaster Corps, $9.90.

"For Air Corps, Army, $55.75.

"For Army transportation, $27.05.

"For barracks and quarters, Army, $22.27.

"For National Guard, $4.79.

"For Organized Reserves, $34.12.

"For pay, and so forth, of the Army, $106.

"For pay of the Army, $11.55.

"For Reserve Officers' Training Corps, $1.72.

"For replacing clothing and equipage, $18,427.84.

"For clothing and equipage, Army, $10,167.04.

"For Civilian Conservation Corps (transfer to War), $9,381.45.

"For emegency conservation work (transfer to War, Act June 22, 1936), $3.60.

"Post Office Department—Postal Service (out of the postal revenues): For rent, light, fuel, and water, $240.

"Total, audited claims, section 204 (b), $51,426.07, together with such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign currency and interest as specified in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office."

On page 44, line 18, after the word "in", to insert "Senate Document Numbered 222 and", and in line 19, after the name "Congress", to strike out "$29,429.93" and insert "$31,848.49."

On page 45, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 208. For payment of interest on claim of the State of Vermont for $7,322.48, settled by the Comptroller General in accordance with Public Law 199, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved July 30, 1941, and which has been certified to the Seventy-seventh Congress in Senate Document Numbered 223, $232.31.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That concludes the amendments of the committee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on behalf of the Committee on Appropriations I offer an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 22, after line 13, it is proposed to insert the following:

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Administrative expenses, Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936, Treasury Department: For transfer to the Post Office Department to cover registry fees and postage on mailings of bonds issued under the provisions of the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act of 1936, fiscal year 1942, $6,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. I offer another amendment on behalf of the committee, which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to insert a new section on page 47, after line 2, as follows:

SEC. 305. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein for the fiscal year 1943 shall be available from and including July 1, 1942, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1942, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, my colleague the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] is at home on matters connected with his service in the Senate, and I suggest that another Senator be appointed a conferee in his stead and absence.

Mr. McKELLAR. It just happens that on the deficiency appropriations subcommittee the Republican Senators are the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], all three of whom are out of the city. If the Senator from Oregon will suggest some other Republican member of the Committee on Appropriations I shall be very happy to have him named. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] could be appointed. Would that be satisfactory?

Mr. McNARY. Yes. I only want the minority to have representation. I do not care who the conferee is, particularly.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] would be the next in line, and I shall be very happy to have him substituted for the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN].

Mr. President, I ask that the name of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] be substituted for that of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] as a conferee on the part of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair appoints the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] in the place of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN].

POSTAGE RATE ON BOOKS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 337) to provide for a permanent postage rate of 1½ cents per pound on books, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the text of the bill, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by the House amendment, insert the following:

"That the postage rate on books consisting wholly of reading matter or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for students' notations and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books, when mailed under such regulations as the Postmaster General may prescribe, shall be 3 cents per pound or fraction thereof, irrespective of the postal zone of destination thereof: *Provided*, That this act shall not affect the rates of postage on books mailed by or to libraries and organizations as prescribed by the act of February 28, 1925, as amended (39 U. S. C., 1934, ed., sec. 293a)."

And the House agree to the same.

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the title of the bill and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the language inserted by the House insert the following:

"An act to provide for a permanent postage rate of 3 cents per pound on books."

And the House agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARL HAYDEN,
JAMES J. DAVIS,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

T. G. BURCH,
HARRY L. HAINES,
J. PERCY PRIEST,
FRED A. HARTLEY, JR.,
WALTER C. PLOESER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 324, making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope the Senator does not propose to proceed with the joint resolution at this time. I should like to have better order, so that we may hear, because I have some amendments which I wish to offer.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what is the measure to which the Senator from Tennessee refers?

Mr. McKELLAR. We are now nearly at the hour when, under a previous order, the Senate must take a recess; but I may state to the Senator from Oregon that the measure to which I have called attention is House Joint Resolution 324, making appropriations for work relief and relief, in other words, it is the W. P. A. bill.

Mr. McNARY. I do not want action on that measure at the present time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am not asking for action on it, but I should like to ask unanimous consent at this time that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with and that the bill be considered for amendment.

Mr. McNARY. I did not know that the bill had been made the unfinished business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not as yet been made the unfinished business.

Mr. McNARY. Then I am satisfied, and I desire that that status remain.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well; that is entirely satisfactory.

VISIT TO THE SENATE OF HIS MAJESTY, PETER II, KING OF YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, in compliance with the order already entered, I ask that the Senate now stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the order previously entered, the Senate will now stand in recess.

Thereupon (at 12 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.), the Senate stood in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate being in recess, at 12 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.,

His Majesty, Peter II, King of Yugoslavia, escorted by the committee appointed by the Vice President, consisting of Mr. HILL, Mr. MCNARY, Mr. CONNALLY, and Mr. CAPPER, entered the Senate Chamber, accompanied by Dr. Momchilo Nintchitch, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Yugoslavia; Mr. Radoje Knezevich, Minister of the Royal Court; Major Svetislav Vohoska, aide de camp to the King; Hon. Constantin Fotich, Minister to the United States from Yugoslavia; Mr. Ilija Jukich, Assistant to the Foreign Minister; Mihaljo Gavrilovich, chef de cabinet of the Minister of Foreign Affairs; Col. Thomas J. Betts, United States Army, military aide to the King; Captain J. L. Callan, United States Navy, naval aide to the King; and Mr. Ratsko Petrovich, First Secretary to the Yugoslavian Legation.

The King of Yugoslavia, having been escorted to the place on the rostrum in front of the Vice President's desk and the distinguished visitors accompanying him having been escorted to places assigned to them,

The VICE PRESIDENT said: Members of the Senate and distinguished visitors, His Majesty, the King of Yugoslavia.

ADDRESS BY KING PETER II OF YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. President and Members of the Senate, it is with profound emotion that I speak today to the Senate of the United States. In this hall of historic wisdom the experience of your statesmanship has guided the destinies of this great country. It has always striven to conduct its foreign affairs with friendship to all nations. For that unfailing friendship which you have ever shown toward my people, both in times of peace and war, I wish to express my gratitude.

Today the people of Yugoslavia, who have without stint paid their contribution to the common cause, continue to fight for their deliverance. They fight alone, barred from contact with their fellow-soldiers from other lands; but they fight in confidence that the United States and other powerful Allies will support them in their struggle. From these silent warriors of the far-away mountains I bring a comradely salute to the people of the United States.

A short week ago I was in London, where all who have found sanctuary, as has my government, draw strength and inspiration from the quiet patience and grim determination of the British people to persevere until the inevitable victory is won.

By a cruel twist of fate I have never been able to address the representatives of my people. A few days after the beginning of my reign all our homes and institutions were shattered by the ruthless invasion. In the days of my early youth I always looked forward to the moment when, like my father, I should stand in the modest parliament buildings in the city of Belgrade and speak to the elected representatives of the Yugoslav people. Fate had willed otherwise. Our people, together with the other nations of the world, have been thrown into a struggle, the outcome of which will decide for many centuries whether those nations are to live in freedom or eke out a miserable existence in slavery.

This war is indivisible; and there can be no freedom anywhere if even the smallest country in any part of the world is enslaved. We did not choose it that way. The ruthless leaders of Germany, Italy, Japan, and other accomplices told us that we must all be destroyed. They are all our enemies. All of them must be defeated, and all of us must be victorious. That is why the soldiers of the United Nations are all fighting the same battle. They may never have seen or heard of one another, but they are all united by the same destiny. The warriors of General Mikhailovitch, who fight in our gorges; the gallant British soldiers and sailors who died in the defense of freedom; the brother people of Russia, who have stirred the imagination of the entire world by their heroic resistance; and the brave American fighting men who are giving their lives on every ocean and on every continent of the globe—with them are the men and women of every freedom-loving nation united in their purpose, united in their determination to defeat the common enemy.

It is for all these reasons that I do not feel a stranger in the Congress of the United States. The Congress represents the will of the American people; but it is also a champion and guardian of those ideals and principles for which we all fight.

Yugoslavia, like the United States, is a country composed of simple, hard-working people. Before this war was thrust upon us, 16,000,000 Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes lived together, bound by the same customs, speaking the same language, and striving in common for peaceful progress and protection of all our citizens. Gradually the different elements of our nation learned to respect and trust each other. Some adjustments and reforms have been needed, and these would have been made. We needed time to erase all our differences and to correct the mistakes of the past; but time was not given us. The conspiracy of Germany, Italy, Hungary, and Bulgaria wrecked the patient work of decades. Faced with the choice of resistance or dishonor, we accepted war, and were obliged to abandon our peaceful task of creating a more perfect union.

Hundreds of thousands of our men have already fallen in battle or been massacred in cold blood. The sacrifice of all those men will inspire and guide me in my reign. With God's help I shall devote all my efforts to assuring those for whom they died a life worthy of this great sacrifice. Many who were not killed or enslaved by the Germans, Italians, Bulgarians, and Hungarians continue to fight under the indomitable leadership of my first soldier and devoted friend, Gen. Draja Mikhailovitch. I think I can say to them, with your approval, that the might of the United States stands firmly by their side.

We shall win this war; but we must also win the peace which will follow it. Never again must we permit the calamity of war to fall upon us. Never again must we permit a band of tyrants to plunge the entire world into misery and dishonor. A lasting peace can never be attained until we purge the nations which today are raging against us of wicked men whose lust and greed have wrecked many a peace-loving country such as mine. It is only when nations, great and small, no longer fear the specter of aggression that they will be able to devote all their energies to the pursuit of peace among the nations and their security and welfare.

We have welcomed and willingly accept the principles of the Atlantic charter, with all its vast implications. In international relations we have already put its provisions into effect by signing a treaty of close political and economic union with our friend and neighbor, Greece. We hope that in the future this treaty will be adhered to by our other neighbors after they have rid themselves of those who are responsible for the crimes which have been committed in their names.

The four freedoms which your great President pledged to his own people will be the aim for which we will strive. We shall judge our citizens not by their political views, not by their racial or religious affiliations, but by their conduct in the present struggle. Those who fought with us shall share with us in the blessings of victory. My country has set her standard in the forefront of those who fight for freedom. We do not count the sacrifice and suffering. We do not measure the want and toil. We look only to the goal of victory, which once was dim and distant, but to which we are now drawing nearer. [Prolonged applause; Senators and occupants of the galleries rising.]

Following his address, His Majesty the King of Yugoslavia and the distinguished visitors accompanying him were escorted from the Chamber.

WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS

At 12 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m., the Senate reassembled; when it was called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. LUCAS in the chair).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 324, making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942.

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, before the recess and the address of the able King of Yugoslavia, the distinguished Senator from Tennessee moved that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 324. May I have the parliamentary situation related?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Tennessee moved that the

joint resolution be taken up for consideration, and objection was raised by the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McKELLAR. As soon as I can obtain recognition by the Chair I shall renew the motion to take up House Joint Resolution 324.

Mr. McNARY. I shall courteously yield to the Senator for that purpose.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is very kind.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I wish to direct an inquiry to the able Senator. The joint resolution, I assume, was reported conformably with the unanimous consent order of a few days ago permitting bills to be reported from the committee during the recess, which would make it proper to consider the measure today.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McNARY. However, I do not believe the able Senator from Tennessee would wish to force upon the Senate the consideration of a measure it was not prepared to consider.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course not, but if the Senator will yield——

Mr. McNARY. If that should be adopted as the practice hereafter, I would very definitely make certain that no unanimous-consent agreement of that kind was made, because such agreements rest in fellowship and in a spirit of amenity. I do not know that I shall object to this request. The joint resolution comes here without an opportunity being afforded many of the Senators to study and consider it. There is another bill to follow which affects the C. C. C. and the N. Y. A., as I recall.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is correct.

Mr. McNARY. The very able assistant leader, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] courteously spoke to me a moment ago to ascertain whether I would want that bill to come up. I do not think I would want that bill and the one under discussion brought up today. The bill concerning the N. Y. A. and the C. C. C. presents issues which we should have an opportunity to consider. When a committee reports a bill during a recess, and a motion is made to proceed to its consideration on the very day when the Senate reassembles, no one has a fair opportunity to consider it, so I would expect, if I should make the request, that this measure would go over until Monday.

Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. McCARRAN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. McNARY. I yield first to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say to the Senator that I am confronted with this situation: The joint resolution and the bill referred to must be passed by the first of July, which will be next Wednesday. Otherwise we shall be without a law as to the W. P. A., the Department of Labor, and the Federal Security Agency. I hope that first we can pass the relief appropriation measure. I do not thing it will take very long to pass the measure providing appropriations for W. P. A., as the Senate committee has made very few changes in it as it passed the House. However, consideration of the other measure may take a little longer. I suggest to my able friend from Oregon that if we are to complete the consideration of and pass the appropriation bills by the end of the fiscal year, it would be much better to proceed today so far as we can with the consideration of these two measures, and if necessary, let the second of them go over until tomorrow, because they will have to go to conference, and it is necessary that they be passed before the first of July. I want every Member of the Senate who desires to speak regarding them to have an opportunity to do so. If any Member cannot be heard on them today, let us adjourn until tomorrow, and then pass these very necessary appropriation measures. We should pass them. We have some different notions about the N. Y. A. and the C. C. C., but I am sure that today and tomorrow we can argue those items of the bill, and I hope very much that we can complete their consideration.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am not overimpressed by the rush proposal made by the Senator from Tennessee. For some time we have been taking 2- or 3-day recesses. Why have not these measures previously come before us?

Mr. McKELLAR. The reason why these bills have not previously come before the Senate is that since January 5, 1942, I do not believe any committee of any parliamentary body in all the world or which ever was in the world or, as been suggested to me, ever will be in the world [laughter] has been busier or will be busier than the Appropriations Committee of the Senate has been. The truth of the matter is that sometimes after long committee sessions when I get home at night I feel almost unable to think. We have constantly been holding hearings. We have been taking testimony.

I am sure other members of the Appropriations Committee will verify my statement that probably we have heard over a thousand witnesses testify since the first of January. Of course, that is somewhat of a guess; but at times we have had dozens of men appear before the committee. I do not think any other committee has ever done quite so much work; and I hope that the Senator from Oregon will not condemn us, since we have steadily, daily and nightly, considered the appropriation bills almost the entire year. These two measures are still not passed. I hope that in the days remaining between now and next Wednesday we may pass them.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I shall not indulge in any hyperbolical humor. Of course, the Senator from Tennessee has been a busy man.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am talking about the committee; I am not talking about the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McNARY. I appreciate that; but, with all due deference to the Senator's sense of modesty, he is probably the busiest of the busy members of the committee. I want that specially emphasized and understood.

However, that does not answer my inquiry. If the committee is so overworked we had better add to the committee or divide the committee into two or three sections.

Mr. McKELLAR. We may have to do that.

Mr. McNARY. I ask the Senator to wait, please; I have not yielded.

I shall reminisce for a moment. I recall that 15 or 20 years ago when the Appropriations Committee asked that all appropriation bills be taken away from legislative committees, so that it could do all the work, at that time I prophesied what is happening today, and what has happened heretofore. I am not censuring the committee. The fact is, Mr. President, that it lies close to my heart, because on two subcommittees of the Appropriations Committee I sit as an ex officio member.

However, it so happens that these measures have been before the Congress since the 1st of January, and have not yet been passed. I am willing to be reasonable, and I always am. I have permitted unanimous-consent requests to be granted upon the theory that the Senators having particular bills in charge would be reasonable and considerate of absent Senators and those who were not familiar with the proposed legislation. There will never be any running over me on that proposition. I am willing that the Senate consider House Joint Resolution 324; but, so far as the other measure is concerned, I want it to go over, whether it goes over until tomorrow or until Monday. I want an opportunity to look into the provisions of the bill and to study the hearings somewhat; and I am speaking for a number of other Senators, some of whom are here and some of whom are absent. I did not expect these two measures to be rushed forward today.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. I shall yield in a moment. I am willing to be reasonable and considerate, and I always try to be. I am willing to agree that we take up House Joint Resolution 324, but I want the other measure to go over.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McNARY. I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The Senator from Oregon yields the floor. The Senator from Alabama is recognized.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I do not think anyone could be more reasonable or more helpful than the distinguished minority leader has been. He is always most helpful and most cooperative. However, in fairness to the Appropriations Committee, I think it should be said that the committee cannot consider these measures until they come over from the House of Representatives; and as I note the dates on the different measures, they have been in the Senate for only a very short time. We are confronted with the situation that they must become law

by Tuesday night of next week. I well understand the feelings of the Senator from Oregon. Under the circumstances, if it is agreeable to him, I suggest that we proceed to consider the measure providing appropriations for relief, and then later a recess can be taken until tomorrow.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. HILL. Yes; I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I tried to attract the attention of the able senior Senator from Oregon while he was on his feet. We are very anxious to have action taken on the bill having to do with appropriations for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency. Some items of the bill probably will be debated quite at length on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HILL. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. To what bill does the Senator now refer?

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill providing appropriations for the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency.

Mr. McNARY. Does that bill carry the appropriations for the C. C. C. and the N. Y. A.?

Mr. McCARRAN. It includes the appropriations for the C. C. C. and the N. Y. A. It is the desire of the Senator having that bill in charge on the floor that as many Senators as possible may be present when the bill is considered; but at the same time we must remember that the end of the month is approaching, and the beginning of the next fiscal year will be at hand in a few days. After we pass the relief appropriations measure which now is being conducted by the Senator from Tennessee, I am wondering if it would be agreeable to have the Department of Labor and the Federal Security Agency appropriations bill made the unfinished business, so that we might proceed with its consideration tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I tried to make my position clear and distinct. I do not want the bill referred to by the Senator from Nevada to come up today. I said I was willing to have it come up tomorrow or Monday. I and other Members of the Senate want an opportunity this afternoon, this evening, and tomorrow to study the bill and to read something of the record which has been made.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I think we might proceed to consider the relief appropriations measure. After that measure is passed several smaller bills in which Members are interested might be disposed of. Thereafter, just before we recess this afternoon, the Senator from Nevada might move to make the Federal Security Agency and the Department of Labor appropriations bill the pending business, so that it would come before the Senate when we meet tomorrow.

Mr. McKELLAR. I renew my motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House joint resolution 324, making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I have moved that the bill be considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hesitate to invite debate on a subject as to which we are unable at the moment to obtain all the facts.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Are we not still in the morning hour?

Mr. HILL. Let me suggest to the Senator that a recess was taken until this morning, so there is no morning hour today, but this is the same legislative day as that of Monday last.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, would my friend from Louisiana object to having action taken on the motion to consider the joint resolution, and then the Senator could be recognized.

Mr. ELLENDER. That would be agreeable if I may be recognized following the adoption of the motion to consider the joint resolution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 324) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

THE FALL OF TOBRUK AND THE PROGRESS OF THE WAR

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hesitate to invite debate on a subject as to which we are not able, at the moment, to obtain all the facts. I refer to the fall of Tobruk. Our cause has suffered a most disastrous blow, and the Middle East is doubtless in grave danger. The British and American peoples are all wondering what the excuse will be this time, who will be the goat, or will the familiar cry of "too little and too late" be the theme song.

Be that as it may, there seems to be no plausible reason for the Germans to be in full possession of Libya at this time. Since the control of North Africa is so necessary for the defense of the Middle East, why did not the British follow through on at least one of two occasions, when they drove the enemy within 400 miles of Tripoli? If that course had been followed, the chances of making the inhabitants of Tunisia an ally would have been excellent. The reason advanced for not following through on at least one occasion was that an attempt should be made to save Greece. It will be recalled that the field command was overruled in the matter, and the promised attempt to save Greece was made in the face of odds too numerous to be counted.

If my memory serves me aright, on another occasion troops were withdrawn in order to help a situation in Iran and Iraq, again, as I am advised, over the objection of the field command. In those two instances and probably in many others, the defeats suffered are attributable, in large part, to a compromise on momentous decisions. It was, no doubt, a difficult task to attempt to make people understand that in order to win some important territory it was necessary to make political sacrifices in other places, even to the extent of breaking solemn promises. These compromised decisions may, in large part, be advanced as the primary cause for the loss of North Africa and with it, most of the Mediterranean Sea. With a virtual Axis control of the north and south shores of the Mediterranean Sea, the Allied Nations are not in a very enviable position, and it will mean the further taxing of our already overtaxed shipping facilities. Distances to important battlefields have been increased by thousands of miles.

I would be curious to know why it was that the large convoy that recently landed in India was not partially diverted to Libya, and also why many men and large quantities of implements of war were placed many miles to the east of Libya. Might it not be that it was felt that the enemy would reach that spot some day and such material would become useful for defense? Why were not steps taken to move them into battle, not to defend but to attack, to attack, to attack, and to put the enemy to flight, rather than be awaiting the enemy's moves and wondering where lightning would next strike?

Some erred in their estimates of the strength of Singapore; others in the striking power of the Japs. When that became known, were any compromises made affecting some momentous strategic decisions, which, if not compromised, might have saved Burma and, in turn, the all-important Burma Road? Only the future will tell. No, Mr. President, something must be done now, before it is too late, to designate a real leader and place in his hands the absolute power of decision. Such leadership must be clothed with unlimited authority to make decisions which in his judgment will win battles and secure quick victory.

Whether it would be possible to obtain full cooperation in that regard from Russia at this time remains to be seen, but such a leader must be and should be acclaimed at once.

Now the question arises, Who will that superman be? We in America will, no doubt, carry the brunt of this war as time goes on. Although at war only 6 months, we now are training an Army of almost four and a half million men, with a goal of probably 10,000,000. We are spending funds now measured in astronomical figures not only for ourselves but for our Allies. Every nation at war is looking to us for help; and I nominate for the post of supreme leader none other than our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt. This nomination is not being advocated because of our material involvement in this conflict but be-

cause I feel that our great President has the necessary qualities of leadership, self-confidence, vision, fearlessness, determination, fortitude, and, last but not least, the skill to animate others.

I have no fault to find with the brave soldiers, sailors, and airmen of the British Isles. Their gallantry and courage in battle will go down in history as equal to that of any nation now at war or in past wars.

The British peoples have suffered much and have withstood well the strains of a cruel war. We in America are alarmed over the apparent apathy of British military leadership and its inability to cope with the Axis. I believe that the same views are maintained by a large number of Britishers who, judging from press reports emanating from London, are demanding that some drastic steps be taken in order to correct, if possible, past mistakes.

Mr. President, let me speak in plain English. I believe that a vast majority of the American people, as well as a substantial number of the British people, are nauseated and disgusted, or may I say "sick and tired" of the continuous inactivity of millions of soldiers now stationed on the British Isles, awaiting an attack that may never come. The same spirit of defense that has spelled disaster in the past is still prevalent. I predict that if those well-equipped soldiers are permitted to remain idle, Hitler will take them on when he clears some of the atmosphere in the Middle East. Time is of the essence. Boldness should be our byword for, unless action is taken soon, we will be in this war for a long, long time.

Mr. President, if such inactivity should persist, I will insist that some of our convoy ships be shifted so as to protect our own shipping, and in so doing I feel confident that more good will follow for our cause than the continued use of such convoy forces to help feed and clothe and arm an inactive British Army.

Mr. President, I admire Mr. Churchill. He is a great political leader. Judging from press reports, I have no doubt that he will be given a vote of confidence when he returns to England. In the past he has been able to win over his people by sheer oratory. I will never forget his speech of February 15, 1942, when Singapore fell. He lamented its fall, but consoled his people when he said:

> The first and greatest of events is that the United States is now unitedly and wholeheartedly in the war with us. The other day, I crossed the Atlantic again to see President Roosevelt. This time we met not only as friends but as comrades standing side by side and shoulder to shoulder in a battle for dear life and dearer honor in the common cause and against the common foe.
>
> When I survey and compute the power of the United States, and its vast resources, and feel that they are now in it with us, with the British Commonwealth of Nations, all together, however long it lasts, till death or victory, I cannot believe there is any other fact in the whole world which can compare with that. That is what I have dreamed of, aimed at, and worked for, and now it has come to pass.

In other words, we have lost the Battle of Singapore, said Mr. Churchill, but I have won the battle of making the United States an active participant in this war on our side. I am patiently waiting to learn what political victory will now be offered to the British people to counteract the major military defeat suffered at Tobruk.

Mr. President, I am not attempting to criticize the British Nation as a whole, and far be it from me to endeavor to create disunity, but I have merely discussed a few fragments relating to the course of the war, insofar as British military leadership is concerned.

While I am on my feet, I shall ask Senators to indulge me a little further. Beware a traitor. He will strike when we least expect it. He will wait for his opportunity to dart at his prey. I do not trust the Vichy government. As an armchair diplomat, without a full knowledge of the facts, but judging merely from newspaper observations, we have been too gracious with Laval and his clique. Those leaders are praying for a Hitler victory, which to my mind, is contrary to the wishes of the brave French people. I am convinced even if we should break with Vichy, we would maintain the good wishes of the real French patriots. My guess is that they despise Laval, Darlan, and other followers as much as they hate Hitler. I presume that we have been patient with them in the hope that the French Fleet would not be used against us, but let Hitler make a good showing in the Middle East, and we will see what happens. My prediction is, we will have another cowardly "thrust in the back" a la Mussolini.

Mr. President, furthermore, while I am on my feet, let me say that there is another most serious problem confronting our Nation, and that is adequate coastal defenses in air power and shore equipment. We are told that our war production has reached stupendous figures and that the bottleneck might be shipping. By the way, that bottleneck will become more serious unless we stop submarine sinkings under our very noses. If that should come about, may I not suggest that during this impending bottleneck of shipping instead of clogging our ports with war materials, some of it be diverted for our own protection. I believe I express the views of many Americans when I say it is better to have implements of war where we can use them in case of necessity, rather than store them and subject them to possible capture. Such a contingency may be remote, but it is not beyond the realm of possibility.

Mr. President, further reverting to the submarine menace, the sinkings have reached scandalous proportions and the most humiliating feature of this tragedy is that a good many ships have been sunk within a stone's throw of our shores and under our noses, as I have just suggested. If we do not beware, I should not be surprised if in the near future some enemy submarine should attempt to sail up the Potomac. That may seem far-fetched. Mr. President, but they have entered our peaceful Gulf of Mexico in swarms and I am informed that some have even come up the mouth of the great Mississippi and taken a crack at the famous jetties. So far I have not been able to observe any substantial excuses for permitting such a menace as now cripples our shipping. It may be that our "protectors" again underestimated the power of the Axis. It may be that they merely provided protection against a few marauders who might attempt a few token attacks. I may be wrong, but the scourge is threatening our coastwise shipping lanes, and if permitted to continue, it may cripple vital airplane production. Tons of bauxite from South America are absolutely necessary for our airplane production.

I am glad to say that, according to my information, those in authority are now taking adequate steps. It is to be hoped that quick and direct action may be taken at once. Better late than never may be applied at the moment to soothe the wrath of some of us. The use of more small boats which can be easily and quickly built to patrol our sea lanes near the coast, with their operators cooperating with land-based planes, might turn the trick. Large boats might do a better job, but by the time they are built and equipped, real tragedy may be facing us. I hope that some of our honored naval officers will take advantage of some of the simple and, I think, plausible suggestions made to them by men in civilian life, men who have probably forgotten more about the building and equipping of small boats than most of them have ever known. In short, at this critical period of our existence, it might be apropos for some of our officials to shed their gold braid, come to earth, and listen to the advice of experienced and practical men and women of our Nation who are bending every effort to win this war.

Mr. President, when I first considered making a few remarks I did not think it would require such a long time. I apologize to my colleagues and thank them for their indulgence.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts:

On June 22, 1942:

S. 2066. An act to make permanently effective the act regulating interstate and foreign commerce in petroleum and its products.

On June 23, 1942:

S. 416. An act for the relief of E. A. Wailes, receiver of Delta Oil Co.; and

S. 2467. An act to provide family allowances for the dependents of enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard of the United States, and for other purposes.

CLAIMANTS WHO SUFFERED LOSS BY FLOOD IN, AT, OR NEAR BEAN LAKE, MO.—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 228)

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair) laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred

to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 885, a bill "For the relief of certain claimants who suffered loss by flood in, at, or near Bean Lake, in Platte County, in the State of Missouri, during the month of March 1934."

The bill would direct the payment of specified amounts to certain property owners whose lands were flooded as the result of a rise of water in the Missouri River.

It has been asserted by the claimants that the damage was the result of an improper construction of certain dikes erected by the War Department. A private bill was thereupon enacted to refer the claims to the District Court of the United States for the Western District of Missouri for determination. After a trial on the merits, the court found that the dikes had been constructed by competent engineers, in accordance with the best engineering principles, and in a careful and prudent manner; and that the engineers had no reason to apprehend that the dikes would not successfully accomplish their intended purpose, or that they would cause the overflow of the claimants' lands. Accordingly the court rendered judgment in favor of the Government. An appeal was taken to the Circuit Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit, which affirmed the judgment of the trial court.

It appears from the foregoing facts that the claimants have had their day in court and that their claims were determined on the merits by a judicial tribunal having jurisdiction. No reason seems discernible why the judgment of the court should be reversed by legislative action, or why the Government should assume a liability which the courts have held does not exist, even after the Government had waived its sovereign immunity against suit.

In the light of these considerations, and of the fact that it has not heretofore been the policy of the Government to assume responsibility for consequential damages resulting to adjoining property owners from the construction of public improvements in navigable waters, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 25, 1926.*

FIRST NATIONAL BANK OF HUNTSVILLE, TEX.—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 227)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I return herewith, without my approval, S. 2309, a bill for the relief of the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex., and the Canton Exchange Bank, of Canton, Miss., and the First National Bank of Canton, Miss.

This legislation relates to two distinct claims on the part of different persons arising out of two different series of transactions.

Section 1 of the bill proposes to reimburse the First National Bank of Huntsville, Tex., in the sum of $105.61, representing the amount of two Treasury checks in favor of Jesse Cooper Hickman, cashed by the bank on the endorsement of Mrs. Hickman as temporary guardian. It appears that the checks were erroneously canceled by the Treasury Department and that the bank sustained a loss as a result of this mistake. The provisions of section 1 appear to be unobjectionable.

Sections 2–5 of the bill would relieve the Canton Exchange Bank, of Canton, Miss., of liability to the Government in the sum of $791, and the First National Bank of Canton, Miss., of liability to the Government in the sum of $234, constituting the aggregate amount of Government checks which were honored and cashed by the banks, although the endorsements on the checks had been forged. Substantially the same provisions were contained in a bill (H. R. 4411) which was vetoed by me on November 7, 1941. In my veto message I made the following statements:

> Whether the banks are liable to reimburse the Government under such circumstances is a question for judicial determination. If the banks are not liable, it is reasonable to assume that the courts will so hold. If liability exists no reason appears discernible why the banks should be relieved of it by legislative action affecting two specific institutions.
>
> I am informed that similar claims have arisen against other banks and have been successfully prosecuted in the courts, and that other similar claims are now pending. I do not feel warranted in approving legislation which would extend preferential treatment to two institutions, while other financial institutions have been and are being required to meet similar obligations that the law imposes on them in such matters.

The provisions of the present bill differ from the previous measure by the addition of an express reservation of the rights of the United States against the person who forged the endorsements. Even in the absence of such reservation, however, the United States would undoubtedly have a right to recover against him for his misappropriations. Consequently, the additional provision does not seem to lead to a conclusion different from that which was reached in respect to the prior measure.

Under the circumstances, I am constrained to withhold my approval from the bill.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 25, 1942.*

CRITICISM OF AMERICA'S WAR EFFORT

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, during the past few days the British have sustained a defeat in Libya, the Russians are being hard pressed, the Japs seek to establish a base on a desolate island in the Aleutians, and they steal up in the night and fire a few shells at random on our Pacific coast. Hitler's sharks take heavy toll of our merchant ships on the Atlantic coast. The situation, at most, indicates that we are not going to win the war as speedily as we had hoped to win.

All this does not mean we will lose the war. Daily our strength increases, and right will prevail.

But in these hours, when every man and every woman should be encouraged to redouble their efforts, we are confronted with an avalanche of criticism. The press and the radio is filled with a rehash of old mistakes made in the past and predictions of others at hand or prophesied to come. Is it the intent to discourage the general public? Or is it just lack of realization of the effect of all this hue and cry? At any rate, most of those who now "knock" follow a course they pursued in the past.

Mr. President, I have no quarrel with those who hoped for peace when the world-war clouds were in the making. The people of this Nation are peace loving. That many able men and women did not earlier see the real threat of Hitler and his Prussian army is to be regretted. But since Pearl Harbor there is no excuse for propaganda or a course which at best can only work to distract our attention from the all-important necessity to stand united and win the war.

If it is necessary to "knock," let us "knock" the "knockers." In due time we will bring to justice those who have been criminally negligent and those who are guilty of actual crime. First things come first. The situation today warrants a restatement of just what is involved in this war.

Mr. President, we are engaged in total war. Everything we have and hold dear is at stake. Freedom or slavery for us and for our posterity depends upon victory or defeat.

If we lose, we lose everything: Independence, self-government, liberty, freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press. Our great and small industrial enterprises will be taken over by the Fascist-Nazi overlords of victor nations to liquidate the war costs of our enemies, and the result will be outright confiscation. Our foolish Fascist-philosophy sympathizers will be treated with deserved contempt and robbed of their very shirts.

Our farmers will become mere serfs under conditions more brutal than anything suffered by the Saxons after William the Conqueror enslaved the English farmers. There will be an American Domesday Book as tragic as that made by William in 1085–86.

Our industrial workers will become slaves, spurred to their tasks by the whips and lashes of taskmasters; their condition will be even worse than is that today of the toilers in Germany and the nations which have fallen under her brutal control.

The Pacific coast will become the dumping ground of the spawn of the fast-breeding Japanese. Strutting, arrogant German militarists and oily Japanese will infest Washington and tell us what to do and when and how to do it.

If we lose this war the education of our youth, our cultural refinement, our whole way of life will deteriorate and decline.

We should stand united as one people intent only on winning the war—winning it, too, as speedily as possible. To that end we should, we must, bend every energy, our every resource and power, forgetting all else. "United we stand, divided we fall" is tragically true for America today.

Are we united, or are we being distracted and divided by domestic issues, by personal ambitions, by thoughtless and often ill-advised criticism of those who must carry on the war, those who must produce the food, those who only can produce the ships, the planes, the tanks, the guns, and the ammunition, and the clothing, and all other things our fighting forces must have, and have quickly?

Are there those among us who say or feel they will not give their best to win the war if they believe or know that another is receiving some undue advantage or actually stealing by war contracts? Shall we lessen our own efforts to save democracy and safeguard our Nation and our children and posterity because others fail us?

Do we repeat and spread gossip, rumors, and stuff that may be cunning Nazi propaganda? Are there those who by design or negligence and carelessness contribute to our disunity and work to the advantage of the common enemy who seeks to destroy us all?

Are there those who magnify the difference between labor and management, and minimize or ignore the achievements of the War Production Labor Board in bringing about cooperation and understanding with a resultant lessening of work stoppage, and an increased production in defense plants?

Mr. President, I need not answer these questions. Each of us can search his own conscience and do his own thinking, and find his own answers, remembering how much is at stake in this war.

Mr. President, the devil's motto is "Divide and conquer." By that method he spreads over the earth doubt, discord, disease, destruction, and death. Today the devil's master servant is Hitler, intelligent, powerful, ruthless, cunning, and evil.

"Divide and conquer." Hitler began by dividing and conquering the people of his own nation. He came to power by dividing labor and seducing capital. He has enslaved the one and destroyed the other. He blinded their eyes by appealing to old and latent racial hatreds. Are we? He resurrected the long dead religious animosities of the Middle Ages and fanned them to life. He sought to substitute the pagan gods of mythology for the religion of love and the brotherhood of man. To the poor he promised plenty; to the oppressed he promised release from oppression; to the thrifty and saving he promised security. Being the tool of the father of all lies, he lied to all. To the Prussian war aristocracy he promised war and dominion over the earth. War he gave them, but dominion over the earth depends upon what we do here in the United States of America. To gain time he made an alliance with Japan and induced that military power to wage war upon this Nation.

Mr. President, Hitler and his war machine have destroyed, one by one, nation after nation. He kept the democratic nations apart until he had destroyed half of them. It required Pearl Harbor to unite the remaining democracies. Some of the destroyed democracies he suddenly overcame by military force while pretending friendship and the sanctity of treaties; others he conquered by dividing their citizenry into quarrelling groups; and yet others were betrayed by traitors within and fools who did not understand.

Mr. President, our own motto is "United we stand, divided we fall." Those who seek to create doubts, divisions, and disunity among our people are traitors or fools. We have not a moment's time to lose. We must either unite and stand, or we shall divide and fall. No one knows this better than Hitler. He also knows that he cannot overcome us by sheer brute force if we do not waste our time quarrelling among ourselves. If Hitler can set man against man, class against class; if he can divert our minds to matters that can be considered after we are equipped and have destroyed him; if he can focus our attention upon individual instances of evils that exist, and on how and when the remedy shall be applied; if he, through his agents, can blind men's judgment by bribery whether with money, expectation of economic power, or hope for political preferment; if he can do these things, Mr. President, then he can conquer the United States of America.

Hitler himself cannot divide us, of course. He must, and unfortunately he does, operate through secret agents, aided by the folly of ruthless racketeers highly placed in some of our national business nad service club associations and organizations; racketeers whose sympathies are for fascism in preference to democracy; racketeers who are circularizing every chamber of commerce and every businessmen's service club in the United States with false and misleading statements and half truths calculated to create discord and discontent; racketeers who though they may want us to win this war, yet insist upon discrediting democratic processes while we are fighting.

There are whisperers who inculcate class, racial, and religious hatreds. They unwittingly are using Hitler's most effective weapons of propaganda.

There are orators and public speakers, eager for popular applause, who trim their sails to every changing breeze, fanning the fires of discontent, hoping to reap some personal benefit.

There are chains of great newspapers and other avenues of public expression, so used as to aid in confusing the patriotic masses of our people. Their object is to discredit the President and the Congress.

In the language of Alexander Pope, they—

> Damn with faint praise, assent with civil leer,
> And without sneering, teach the rest to sneer;
> Willing to wound, and yet afraid to strike.

Mr. President, Hitler knows quite well the strength of democracy in peace, and how it labors at a disadvantage in time of great stress. He knows of our freedom of speech, our freedom of press, our individualism, our inalienable right to criticize those in official life. He seeks to profit by our freedoms.

Mr. President, the men and women of this Nation are intelligent, and they are patriotic; their judgment is just in every case when they are in possession of the facts. They want above everything else to win this war, to win it speedily, and thus to save our own democratic way of life. They are willing temporarily to forego the correction of some domestic and economic evils if in their good judgment such temporary delay will aid us in gaining victory over Hitler and Japanese barbarians.

Mr. President, Hitler's propaganda machine is in full operation in this Nation today. It is cunning even as the devil is cunning. To deceive the people of this country it spreads lies adroitly covered by appeals to our patriotism, even as the devil quotes scripture to accomplish his purpose. Following in the wake of this Nazi machine are camp followers, blinded by private ambitions and secret hatreds, intent on gathering unto themselves personal advantage. They do not consciously seek the loss of this war or the defeat of democracy, but by their course they imperil both.

The public is also being misled by a few criticaster columnists whose evident task is to spread poison against the present administration. Why is it that these publicists, day by day, under cover of pretentious protestations of patriotism, invariably misquote or garble facts and on that basis criticize everything? They seldom praise anything. They never mention the good work being done by the Commander in Chief, the War and Navy Departments, the Congress, the War Production Board, the National Labor Board, by labor toiling at the bench, by farmers and their wives and children toiling to produce the food needed for our armed forces, by our Allies, by our civilian population, and by yet other millions now avoiding starvation through the philanthropic work of the Red Cross, all of whom are speeding our productions and guaranteeing the successful conduct of this war.

Mr. President, in addition to the falsifying circulars being mailed to all chambers of commerce and service clubs, cunningly worded advertisements are being printed in daily newspapers throughout the country, pretending to urge upon the people the necessity for more unity and more speed in our war program, but in fact worded and designed to create doubt and confusion among the people and to foment strife and discord. The devil himself could not have composed appeals better calculated to arouse passions, discord, and disunity and to retard the speed and progress now being secured and gained by those charged with the defense of this Nation. No protestations of loyalty and good intentions can excuse this seditious campaign to mislead the people of this Nation. It should be of interest to the American people to know that extracts

from these advertisements and propaganda circulars are broadcast over the radios in Germany and Japan and sent out over the world by short-wave from those countries. The Nazis thereby improve the morale of their own people and discourage those who fight to regain their lost liberties.

Mr. President, I said the people want the facts; that the people are fair, and that when they are in possession of the facts on any matter their judgment is sound and just.

The people have been led to believe that here in Washington there is vast confusion and a lack of intelligent administration in our war-production program. Business and professional men come to Washington for a few days, sometimes for less than a day, seeking contracts, priorities, money, or jobs. If those on business do not secure immediate action or do not find an official who can at once say "Yes" or "No," they naturally are disappointed. Most men realize the volume of public business being transacted. Others go back home and tell the folks that all is confusion and that officials in Washington are confused and tied up in useless red tape.

How great has been the volume of necessary war business transacted here in Washington since early in 1940 in preparation for defense and in preparation and prosecution of the war?

The War Department alone has entered into the following number of contracts and open-market purchases: 1,221,400 in the fiscal year 1940; 1,609,387 in 1941; and 4,083,580 in the first half of 1942. The number of contracts made by the Navy Department was 409,186 in 1940; 608,813 in 1941; and 525,523 in 8 months of the fiscal year of 1942; the Bureau of Ships negotiated 470 contracts in 8 months of 1942. In the Navy Department's Bureau of Yards and Docks 688 contracts were negotiated in the fiscal year 1940; 792 in 1941; and 398 in 8 months of the fiscal year 1942. Mr. President, these official figures do not include contracts made for defense and war purposes by other agencies. The grand total would be well over eight and one-half million contracts and purchase orders. To all this is to be added the enormous volume of business transacted by other departments and by the Lend-Lease Administration. Neither should we overlook the volume of necessary Federal public housing now under construction, the War Production Board, priorities, and price controls.

Is it reasonable to expect that in this vast volume of public business, transacted under the necessity for speed and more speed, there will not happen occasional improvident contracts, or that here and there men dealing with the Government will not attempt by legal or illegal means to defraud the Government? But this administration and the Congress will ferret them out, reduce their gains, and punish their frauds. Either by present action, or by the income and other taxation, moneys mulcted from Uncle Sam will be returned to the Federal Treasury.

The people should know that the Congress, and not the calamity howlers, muckrakers and space writers, uncovered these excessive profits and frauds. The people should know Congress will apply the remedy and perfect the legislative machinery necessary to that end.

Mr. President, critics who seek to mislead our people say we are falling behind in the heavy schedules of production set by the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, and that labor and management are lagging. I do not have the figures to this date, but recent reports showed that battleships were going down the ways months ahead of schedule. Airplane production had increased fourfold since June 1940; airplane engine production was 9 months ahead of the schedule set for 1942; machine-tool output was 8 times normal; merchant-ship production rose from 28 ships in 1939 to 95 in 1941 and has doubled since; naval ships from 5 in the first 1941 quarter to 55 in the last quarter. A year ago we had 45 shipyards with 170 ways. Today there are 64 shipyards with 460 ways. Production of all goods, war and civilian, today is 20 percent above last year.

There are other examples of improvement in production: A war-housing project, larger than the city of Laramie, Wyo., was to be constructed from scratch in 300 days but Federation building journeymen and labor finished the job in 160 days and added a reservoir, sewage disposal plant, and 20 miles of road. In Cleveland, a $2,000,000 fire destroyed an important war-production plant, Federation building tradesmen rebuilt it in 5 days. At San Francisco Bay where ground was broken for the new 8-way Todd shipyard in January 1941, Federation members worked with such speed that by August a 10,000-ton ship had been built and launched from a new way, followed by a second 10,000-ton ship from another new way 2 weeks later. These are but samples of speed.

In November 1941, total time lost on war work from strikes amounted to eight-hundredths of 1 percent of time worked; in January 1942 it was four-thousandths of 1 percent of time worked. Recently 1 week—not month—in June 1942 showed an increase in strike or stoppage man-days lost over the preceding week in May. Compared with the man-days worked the increase was like a drop of water in a bucket. Yet the high priest of all anti-Roosevelt, anti-labor, anti-New Deal columnists fairly shrieked with joy and reeked with malice as he proclaimed the inconsequential reverse trend. Does he hope to start a row between a Democratic President and the Democratic majority in Congress, or to induce the people to lose confidence in both President and Congress itself, regardless of the politics of its membership?

Mr. President, I shall not discuss proposed labor legislation or labor conditions as they are today. Instead, I shall quote a recent release by the War Production Board, of which Donald Nelson is the head. The article goes by question and answer, as follows:

WHAT IS LABOR DOING IN THE WAR

Question. Are strikes holding up war production?

Answer. No; the records show that labor is cooperating wholeheartedly. Strike idleness in relation to war production during the first quarter of 1942 was one-fifteenth of the corresponding period of 1941.

Question. What about the charge that the Government is doing nothing about workers being forced to pay exorbitant fees to unions?

Answer. The Government and leading labor unions are taking action against such practices. The Government has investigated complaints of this kind and has secured cooperation from unions in correcting any injustices. Any worker who believes that he had to pay an exorbitant fee to get or to keep his job should write to the War Production Board, and a prompt investigation will be made.

Question. Does labor refuse to work more than 40 hours a week?

Answer. No; 7 out of 10 workers in war industry today are putting in 48 hours or more every week. In the critical machine-tool industry workers are putting in from 50 to 70 hours a week. In 4 out of 5 aircraft factories labor works from 44 to 54 hours weekly. In the Nation's shipyards nearly 70 percent of the labor force works between 46 and 52 hours a week.

Question. If workers are willing to work a long week why aren't all war plants working around the clock?

Answer. These are the principal reasons why some war plants are not working around the clock:

1. Shortages in critical materials.

2. Many industries have not yet been fully converted from peacetime production to war production.

3. Often bottlenecks develop in war plants and prevent around-the-clock production.

All these problems are being attacked. The fact that every day plants are operating longer hours is proof that solutions are being found.

Question. Don't labor laws prohibit a work-week longer than 40 hours?

Answer. No. There is no law that prohibits working more than 40 hours a week. The wage-hour law simply provides that workers should be paid at the rate of time and a half for hours over 40 in any week.

For example, Andy Jones, a war worker, earns 70 cents an hour for 40 hours of straight time, or $28. He works 10 hours overtime and is paid 70 cents straight time for each of these extra hours, or $7, and 35 cents overtime for each of the 10 hours, or $3.50. The additional $10.50 makes his total earnings $38.50 for 50 hours of work.

Question. Why not get rid of this overtime pay?

Answer. Anyone who wants to abolish overtime pay is really urging that $3.50 be cut from Andy Jones' pay. Andy needs that $3.50 to help meet rising living costs.

At the same time that food, rent, and living costs are going up, the family incomes of many workers are going down as breadwinners are called into the armed services.

Workers are as eager as any other Americans to prevent inflation. Fair prices and fair wages form the balance which labor seeks.

Question. What has labor done?

Answer. Here are a few examples:

1. One thousand construction workers fought side by side with the marines at Wake Island.

2. Thousand of workers risk their lives daily to man our merchant ships and tankers on the seven seas.

3. Three billion dollars worth of Defense bonds, according to the most conservative estimates, will be bought by the membership of organized labor this year. Among the Congress of Industrial Organization unions the Auto Workers already have pledged $50,000,000, the Amalgamated Clothing Workers another $50,000,0000; the Textile Workers, $25,000,000; the Marine and Shipbuilding Workers, $15,000,000; the Retail Clerks, $15,000,000; William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor, already has

pledged $1,000,000,000 from American Federation of Labor locals.

4. Workers completed the battleship *Alabama* 9 months ahead of time. At Cleveland, Ohio, even before the war started workers took only 5 days to rebuild a $2,200,000 defense foundry wrecked by fire.

5. Labor unions in New York, Philadelphia, and other cities are conducting systematic campaigns among their members, securing volunteer blood donors for Red Cross blood banks.

6. In Washington, D. C., more than $130,000 was contributed to civilian defense when building tradesmen donated a day's pay each. Workers at the Spartan Aircraft Co., Tulsa, Okla., donated their services one Sunday in March for the construction of a naval training plane. Workmen on the new Navy Building at Arlington, Va., gave 1½ days' pay to the Navy Relief Society. To aid Navy relief workers at a Vallejo, Calif., plant gave a day's pay and raised an additional $6,300. American labor is all-out for victory.

Mr. President, nearly all production of war machinery is of a precision nature requiring utmost concentration and extreme care and skill. It has been proved by industry in the United States and Britain that excessive hours of work actually result in a decrease in the productive capacity of employees and an increase in accidents and delays. Also, where the alert mind, the quick eye, and nimble hand keep pace with a moving assembly line or a machine automatically dropping some defense part or gadget, long hours of close application may result in defective material, and a defective plane or the jamming of rifle or gun when most sorely needed.

The fact that labor-management differences are being adjusted by mutual realization that all are engaged in a common purpose to speed production for war purposes is evidenced by the facts I have already mentioned. Should that trend be reversed and congressional action by mutual agreement or otherwise become necessary the people may be assured that necessary legislation will result. The Congress is thoroughly conscious of its duties and responsibilities. It has not failed the people, and it will not fail them. Neither will it be coerced into unwise legislation by false propaganda of men or interests having a personal ax to grind.

Mr. President, President Roosevelt is by our Constitution the Commander in Chief of our armed forces. His are tremendous responsibilities, and he meets them courageously from day to day, from hour to hour—hours that reach far into the night.

The Army and Navy must fight this war and win it. From admiral and general down to the newest buck private they are loyal and willing to make the supreme sacrifice whenever duty calls. Who could replace them?

On the assembly lines, in the shops, the factries, the mills, in the warehouses, on the railroads, on the sea, and in the mines, and on the farms and ranches more than 20,000,000 men and women, individuals, employers, and employees are working to a common end, to win this war. Who can replace them?

Let us all be sparing and reasoned in our criticism. Let us be quick to praise. Let us be careful lest we remove the lid from Pandora's box and release a pandemonium of greater evils in attempting to remedy the lesser evils from which we suffer.

Mr. President, in conclusion, let me repeat, "United we stand, divided we fall." We have no time to lose. Hitler's motto is "Divide and conquer." Under whose banner shall be stand? And while we cry "Remember Pearl Harbor," let us not forget the dangers and pitfalls of Nazi and Fascist propaganda. Let us refuse the advise of those who counsel internal quarrels and distracting controversy.

SUGAR-RATIONING PROGRAM

Mr. THOMAS of Idaho. Mr. President, problems arising from the operation of the sugar-rationing program are becoming increasingly serious. The rigid restrictions upon sales of sugar to consumers are now having the effect of discouraging production. Such a trend, if allowed to continue, will be calamitous in the light of the objective of obtaining greater supplies for ourselves and for the nations associated with us in the war.

The farmers are feeling the effects of too drastic a curtailment in the amount of sugar which may be purchased for ordinary use and for canning.

The processors have been unable to market the normal amount of sugar manufactured from last year's crop of beets. In consequence, the farmers in my State have just been told that the payments to them will be delayed and possibly will amount to less than they had expected.

Furthermore, the farmers face a possible inability to sell all of their 1942 crop. If the processors fail either to empty their warehouses or to find additional storage space they will be forced to curtail operations. I note that a Texas refinery already has been shut down because of this situation.

I have received copies of a printed notice sent by the Amalgamated Sugar Co. to beet growers in Idaho. In this notice the farmers are informed that additional payments due to them on the 1941 crop cannot be made at this time because of the lack of a market for the sugar. For a corresponding period a year ago sales by this company were 68 percent greater than this year.

The company says in its notice:

The rationing program has almost entirely halted sugar buying by dealers and manufacturers. Unless sugar rations are increased, it will be necessary to market a large part of the present inventory in areas where the net return will be substantially lower, and this, of course, will be reflected in the grower's final return from the crop.

There is no justification for the drastic rations that are being imposed upon sugar consumers. Reliable sugar experts and statisticians maintain that there is no existing sugar shortage that warrants the present consumption restrictions. The ration should be not less than 1 pound per week and there should be no restriction upon the use of sugar for home canning.

Mr. E. T. Taylor, master of the Idaho State Grange, one of a number of persons who have written to me in connection with the notice sent to farmers by the Amalgamated Sugar Co., comments as follows:

The above statement, by the largest sugar company in Idaho, demonstrates that something is radically wrong with the sugar restrictions put in by Mr. Henderson.

These regulations are going to cripple the sugar-manufacturing business of the country, and as you are well aware, Idaho will be hard hit by this blunder on the part of Mr. Henderson.

Again, this unnecessary exercise of power over the consumer of sugar is destroying the fruit business with one swift stroke. With the restrictions placed on canning sugar, the purchase of fruit for canning will be most disastrously restricted. All it takes to wreck the fruit market is to have this perishable commodity pile up with a little surplus. The bottom falls out overnight.

In the name of the thousands of grangers in Idaho who grow sugar beets and who produce fruit, I am asking that you take this up immediately with Mr. Henderson. The slightest delay will wreck the cherry business, which is now just being harvested. The later fruits will also suffer the same fate that the cherry industry is now facing.

It seems clear that the sugar-rationing program has been badly bungled by the administrative officials.

Congress, through the proper committees, should look into the situation with a view to forcing a correction of mistakes before it is too late.

Because of the confusion which exists as to the real situation respecting sugar, I think it is desirable to have inserted in the RECORD a comprehensive summary appearing in a market letter of LOWRY & Co., of New York City, under date of June 19. In the letter it is stated that there is enough sugar in the United States and destined from Hawaii to more than meet the balance of this year's requirements, based on present rationing, even if not an additional pound is imported from Puerto Rico and Cuba.

I ask unanimous consent to have the market letter appear in the RECORD immediately following my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOWRY & CO., INC.,
New York, June 19, 1942.

NUMBER 21. SUGAR REVIEW

Now that the major portion of our offshore production is completed, and we have a full 5 months of partly and completely rationed consumption behind us, it may not be amiss to review briefly the developments in sugar to date, and perhaps endeavor to get a glimpse of what the future holds in store for the industry. The review of sugar for the past 18 months might be conveniently divided into three phases, viz: what happened, what was done about it, and where do we stand today. We shall discuss the background briefly:

1. WHAT HAPPENED: THE PERIOD OF ACCUMULATION OR HOARDING, AND THE LOSS OF SUPPLIES

The historical facts are generally quite well known: Early in 1941, as a result of the belief that we might not have sufficient tonnage to move all our off-shore supplies, and in the words of Dr. Bernhardt, in one of his appearances before a congressional committee:

"With the announcement of the policy of maximum aid to Britain about a year ago, with the passage of the lend-lease bill, and with the battle of the Atlantic threatening shipping facilities, a certain amount of alarm

about our sugar supplies spread throughout the country."

The distribution of refined sugar in continental United States took on an accelerated pace and by the end of the first quarter a million tons more sugar had disappeared into invisible supplies than during the similar period of 1940. A large part of this abnormal distribution was being added to the reserves of manufacturers, industrial users, and housewives, although because of the rising purchasing power the per capita consumption was no doubt increasing also. The second quarter was relatively normal but with Japan's march into Thailand and the gathering storm clouds in the Pacific another scare developed. Dr. Bernhardt again says:

"The price of sugar began mounting so rapidly in anticipation of a possible shortage of sugar or shipping that the Office of Price Administration imposed a ceiling price on sugar."

The Government, however, did not admit at the time that there was any shortage in supplies or any prospect of a shortage. A reprint from the Report of the Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration says that the ceiling price was necessary—

"To protect the American public from rampant speculation in sugar, which has been pushing prices far above levels justified by large supplies on hand."

And the Price Administrator himself in imposing the ceiling order says:

"I find that the supplies of sugar are ample; in fact, they exceed those supplies which were required to satisfy consumption last year and are sufficient this year to provide consumers with the highest per capita consumption on record."

After the August–September stocking period, distribution again dropped back to about normal. But despite the Government's first effort at control and reassurance, the public did not eat into its reserves. When the figures were finally footed up at the end of the year 1941 we found that approximately 8,100,000 short tons had been distributed—an increase of about 1,200,000 tons over the preceding year. A similar stocking movement was going on in other countries that could provide the cash and the tonnage; visible stocks of raw sugar that had weighed so heavily for the past decade almost totally disappeared from the producing centers of the Western Hemisphere. This build-up of "invisibles" simply meant that the supply was being carried for future use in pantries, etc., instead of in producers' warehouses.

2. WHAT WAS DONE ABOUT IT: THE CAMPAIGN FOR INCREASED PRODUCTION AND CONSERVATION OF SUPPLIES

After Pearl Harbor the firmness of prices and scarcities along the North Atlantic seaboard were no longer attributed to "speculation." The Government then began a campaign of "enlightenment" to inform the people of the fact that we had probably lost 1,000,000 tons of supplies from the Philippines; that there was some doubt about receiving the Hawaiian crop; that large quantities of Cuban sugar would have to be turned into molasses for the production of defense alcohol and munitions, as had been done in 1941; and that we would have to ship large quantities to our Allies. The keynote of all official conversations was the necessity for greater production and lessened consumption because of the "shortage" in supplies. Early in December primary distributors of sugar were requested to limit their distribution to immediate needs. This was soon implemented by an Office of Price Administration order that placed sugar on a priority basis. Receivers were first limited to 1940 use, and then various percentages were applied to some specified prior period as a base.

To stimulate production, Cuba was encouraged to increase plantings; all restrictions on domestic cane and beet plantings were removed, and the expiring Sugar Act was extended to December 31, 1944, with an increase in the base rate of benefit payments to growers from 60 cents to 80 cents per hundred pounds of recoverable sugar. The Sugar Act, designed to limit production, was now used to stimulate production because the—

"Growers felt that it was unfair to ask them that they take the risk of planting a crop, the return from which would not be determinable for so long a period, without assurance in the event the war terminated in the interval and the industrial-alcohol demands went down again, with the reappearance of surplus sugarcane, the hoarded wartime accumulations of sugar stocks were drawn upon for current needs, and surpluses began to reappear, that they would not be forced to market their crop without the protection of the quota system."

Further steps to assure increased production was the purchase of the 1943 Cuban crop by the Defense Supplies Corporation and the negotiations of the State Department leading to a reciprocal trade agreement with Peru. Again quoting Dr. Bernhardt:

"Every effort will be made by the Department and other agencies of the Federal Government who are interested in the alcohol, sugar, and molasses situation to increase production as much as possible."

Not satisfied with the measures already taken, the Office of Price Administration early in the year began insisting on the necessity of individual card rationing. Because of the operation of a defined price ceiling that prevented a buyer in the East from obtaining his supplies from New Orleans or Colorado and other western States, there was a maldistribution of the supplies actually available within our borders. The beet carry-over of 1,400,000 tons was barely scratched during January and February, and refined sugar became virtually unsalable in the Gulf area at a time when the Northeast was clamoring loudest for sugar. Later, relief was afforded through a change in this ruling. The card rationers, either because they misjudged the cause or used it as an excuse, first argued that individual rationing was necessary due to an actual shortage or anticipated shortage of sugar. Even before the system was put into operation offshore production figures, the reduction of Cuban molasses, and consequent increase in raw sugar and domestic cane and beet plantings began to disprove the necessity of hard-and-fast rationing on the score of scarcity alone. Later it appears that Washington thinking, while not explicitly stated in so many words, was governed by the idea that reserves should be built up by reduced consumption, and, finally, as stocks accumulated faster than anticipated, it was held in some quarters that as a card-rationing system might become necessary for a great many articles, sugar was a good guinea pig to commence with because of its universal use. That kind of thinking is in direct contrast to the industry's attitude. They stress the point that sugar is produced for use and should be consumed to the extent that it can be made available for consumption; that there are ample reserves carried by producers either in warehouses or in the fields in the form of growing crops. The current argument against an increased ration appears to be based on the lack of transportation. Yet, someone undoubtedly can estimate within reason what this is likely to be.

How the trade and the public view the situation

All this apparent "change of pitching" has caused a great deal of confusion in the public mind and has even created some doubt that sugar rationing in any form is necessary. As we have frequently stated, we believe the American people are quite ready to accept any restrictive war measures when the reasons for them are clearly stated. Facts and figures speak for themselves. Concealment leads to suspicion. They resist when there is any doubt. For example, they saw no reason for preventing the normal flow of supplies by rail from the overstocked South and West when the East was experiencing ocean-shipping difficulties. Today the trade and a large section of the population are aware of the fact that there is enough sugar in the United States and destined from Hawaii to more than meet the balance of our year's requirements, based on the present rationing, even if not an additional pound of sugar is imported from Puerto Rico and Cuba. Therefore to the extent that additional supplies are imported from the Caribbean area it is difficult to make out a case with the public against increasing the ration to that extent. It is generally felt that it represents overzealousness and is little short of ridiculous that hospitals and the Red Cross should be held on a 50-percent basis. Also industry contends that the farmer's wife and others should receive an ample supply of sugar for preserving fruits, berries, and other foodstuffs. Bear in mind that this sugar is needed today, not to be eaten overnight but for future use, and its consumption extends over the following 12 months. In fact, it is merely stored in jars instead of in its original form in some producer's warehouse. Next, industrial users who give employment to many people and whose product has a food value, should have an increased ration as soon as practical; and finally, it is desirable (but perhaps not of first importance) that the individual consumer be given more than his present allotment of 8 ounces per week. With respect to the individual, it is, of course, impossible to find and apply an equitable hard-and-fast yardstick. The assumption that it can be accomplished on a "mathematical" instead of a "need" basis is erroneous. Some households use more than others; a laborer or a growing child needs more sugar than an infant or a clerical worker. For a great many 8 ounces per week is 100 percent of their normal consumption. A contrary policy was adopted by the gas rationers: They attempted to deal with the problem from a "need" standpoint, recognizing that some required and should have more gas than others. It only goes to show how involved is the problem and how difficult its solution when a Washington group try to regulate everything having to do with the daily life of so many people. There would be less criticism when assured that the ration kept pace with actual or prospective supplies.

A great deal of the foregoing has to do with questions of policy to be decided by the officials charged with the procurement and distribution of sugar supplies. Some of the questions, a great many of them in fact, are related to our war effort. Perhaps not even the War Shipping Administration or the Allied Board of Strategy can say how much tonnage will be available for bringing sugar from Cuba, Puerto Rico, and Hawaii during the remainder of the year; nor how much of it will be sunk en route. It is less difficult to say that beet sugar can be moved by rail from Colorado to Maine in November and December. But, decisions must be made; and once made, the effects are far-reaching. Each ton of sugar unnecessarily moved or consumed may be interfering with the movement of a tank or a plane; and likewise, the building of needless reserves increases the present and post-war difficulties of the producers.

The sugar producer cannot, of course, know all the factors involved. He can only see and feel the impact of adopted policies as they affect him; but that he has a problem is clearly shown by the third division of the subject:

2. WHERE DO WE STAND TODAY, AND WHAT OF THE FUTURE?

At the end of May 1942 our statistical picture was roughly as follows (in short tons raw value):

Reasonably available supplies for 1942 without further imports	
Stocks at Jan. 1, 1942; raw and refined; cane and beet	2,300,000
Estimated recovery of invisible stocks	500,000
Receipts of raw and refined offshore sugar to May 31, estimated	1,750,000
Total	4,550,000
Available in 1942 from growing domestic crops:	
Cane (estimated total crop of 600,000 tons) available	300,000
Beets (crop 1,900,000 tons) available	600,000
(I) Total available for 1942 without further imports	5,450,000
Nearby offshore supplies that require ocean transportation	
Cuba (total available, including carry-over)	3,776,000
Less receipts to May 31 included above	1,060,000
Total	2,716,000
Puerto Rico	1,100,000
Less estimated receipts included above	400,000
Total	700,000
Hawaii (estimated crop)	850,000
Less receipts included above	250,000
Total	600,000
Full duty sugars (a pure estimate)	50,000
(II) Total to come forward; or in stock at Jan. 1, 1943	4,066,000
Additional stocks on hand Jan. 1, 1943, forming a nucleus for 1943 consumption; not included in the estimated availables for 1942	
Unused domestic cane	300,000
Unused domestic beet sugar	1,300,000
(III) Estimated total stocks of domestic producers Jan. 1, 1943	1,600,000

From these indicated supplies that total 11,116,000 tons we naturally have to deduct the 1942 consumption of the United States, and shipments to Great Britain, Canada, and our various Allies on lend-lease. What will these quantities be?

Various estimates of 1942 consumption have been made from time to time, some of them purporting to be semi-official. We have seen a figure of 5,300,000 short tons, which is the highest to come to our notice. The trade magazine Sugar, in its June issue, figures absorption at 4,800,000 short tons. They arrive at this figure by assuming a consumption of 2,300,000 tons during the first 4 months of the year, when no limitations were placed on individual purchasers. To this they add some 2,500,000 tons as the estimated consumption from May 1 to December 31, on the basis of present ration percentages. In our report of May 7, on a strict mathematical ration basis, we estimated distribution at 3,800,000 tons. Since that time there has been some liberalization of the program with respect to home canning; but despite this we find it hard to figure the consumption much above 4,500,000 tons (unless we accept the estimate of consumption during the first 4 months of the year as made by Sugar; which we consider on the full side).

But for the sake of argument, since there appears to be a growing trend toward further relaxation of restrictions, suppose we accept the estimate of Sugar as a compromise figure between the high and the low estimates. Table I of our statistics shows that we have, or will have within our own borders, enough sugar to meet this demand without the necessity of importing an additional pound of offshore sugar. This, of course, presupposes the most efficient distribution, and leaves all warehouses and pantries bare—on a strictly hand-to-mouth basis. But on the basis of statistics alone, the sugar is here; the manner of its distribution is another question.

No one seriously believes that offshore importations are going to cease. The remaining Hawaiian supplies are looked upon as fairly certain. Transports and cargo vessels going to Hawaii, Midway, and possibly to Australia and the Aleutians are expected to provide sufficient space on the return voyage. Puerto Rico is clamoring for more tonnage and it is believed that Army transports and miscellaneous supply vessels plying the Caribbean and returning from South America can bring in at least another 400,000 to 450,000 tons during the 7-month period May 1 to December 31.

This brings us to Cuba. At May 31 it is estimated that the island had 2,716,000 short tons of exportable sugar in stock. This includes a small carry-over from the 1941 crop; makes allowance for sugar already diverted to the production of molasses, and receipts in the United States to the end of May. (Cuba's own figures possibly differ by the amount of "afloats" which are not included in our receipts; and possibly by some small shipments to Canada and other Allied markets). Here again the shipments for the remaining 7 months are a pure guess; but on the basis of past performance let us suppose we can get 940,000 short tons more, which would round off 1942 imports to an even 2,000,000 tons; and assume an arbitrary 500,000 tons shipped to our Allies on lend-lease. Our tentative picture would then be as follows at December 31, 1942:

Tentative sugar picture at January 1, 1943

Total available within the United States during 1942 (item I above)		5,450,000
Estimated receipts May–December 1942:		
Cuba	940,000	
Hawaii	600,000	
Puerto Rico	400,000	
Full-duty sugars	50,000	
		1,990,000
Estimated total available		7,440,000
Less 1942 consumption estimate, as above		4,800,000
Stocks held by refiners or stored by Government at Jan. 1, 1943		2,640,000
Additional stocks:		
Cuba—Exportable sugar	3,776,000	
Less exports—United States and lend-lease	2,500,000	
		1,276,000
Puerto Rico—Exportable crop	1,100,000	
Less exports, as included above	800,000	
		300,000
Domestic cane and beets, as under item III above	1,600,000	
Total stock Jan. 1, 1943, in United States or nearby producing centers		5,816,000

It will be observed that this figure of indicated stocks in the United States or nearby producing areas on January 1, 1943, is well in excess of our estimated 1942 consumption and would provide for similar requirements next year without any new crop production whatever, and still leave a million tons for some increased rationing and statistical losses or errors. However, we know that behind these stocks there is new-crop production in sight well in excess of 8,000,000 tons, and possibly as much as 9,000,000 short tons. Cuba has a growing cane supply now in the fields sufficient for possibly 5 to 5½ million short tons total sugar equivalent; Puerto Rico possibly 1,250,000; Hawaii can be set down conservatively perhaps at 800,000; domestic cane 500,000 and domestic beets at not less than 1,500,000 and perhaps considerably more.

This brings us to the final question of what is to be done about it. Obviously, the method of handling the carry-over, plus the sugar to be produced, will present some knotty problems to the administrators of the sugar program, who must accept responsibility for the welfare of producers, as well as consumers. The producer's greatest concern is the fundamental problems of financing and storing the next crop. The problem of storage has to be dealt with, and it must be determined where supplies are to be held. The industry is not geared to provide warehouse space for huge quantities of surplus sugar. In the past it has been a problem in a slow market how to take care of a production that extends not over a 12- but a 5-month period. The producer's attitude has been to convert his stock into money by passing supplies along to the consumer as fast as the latter is willing to receive them. Unless relief is afforded through movement, places or areas without storage capacity would have to be shut down. Dealing with just one feature, beet producers are already beginning to wonder where the crop to be produced this fall can be warehoused, and, in turn, the same applies to all other producing areas. Left to themselves, the cane producers would unquestionably leave the excess supply where it can be carried the cheapest, viz, in the growing stalk in the fields; but do the policy makers desire this, having in mind the attendant unsatisfactory economic conditions affecting labor that is dependent for its livelihood upon the taking off of a full crop?

Clearly a 100-percent carry-over in the fields is unthinkable. So we must decide whether a full crop—or what percentage thereof—is to be made, and whether, through a direct Government purchase or otherwise, the necessary finances are to be provided to take the crop off, store and hold the surplus until it can be disposed of. Whether the war ends in 1 year or 5 years, a program of full take-off implies that at the end of the war the Government would have under its control whatever surplus sugar might exist. Presumably such sugar would then be disposed of as rapidly as possible to those stricken countries that have been on short rations for so long, and any excess gradually liquidated at so much per year over a given period, with new crop production correspondingly curtailed during this period of liquidation.

If partial crops are decided upon, the question immediately arises as to which areas must bear the reductions. The problem will be further complicated by the fact that stocks in producing centers at the end of the year will not be evenly distributed. If, for example, Puerto Rico, or Hawaii, or some continental area is without a carry-over, then, obviously, that area is in a better position to make a full crop, without the embarrassment of storage difficulties, than some area that is congested with unshipped stocks. Have we, after the lapse of a few months, reached the point where the Sugar Act must be dusted off and again put to its original purpose of limiting production and, through quotas, sharing the market?

We have called attention to some of the problems confronting Government and the industry. If embraced in their entirety by a long-range, comprehensive program, and not hacked at in piecemeal fashion by too many not completely integrated departments, a great many will smooth themselves out. The consumer has a right to know that he will receive the maximum quantity of sugar that can be made available, either as actual sugar or in the form of sugar products. Producers certainly are entitled to know what the probable stock position will be at the beginning of the year—whether they will be called upon to furnish warehouse space to store such stocks and what disposition is to be made of them. Since the production of any article requires a certain amount of long-range planning, they can also reasonably ask for an indication of what is expected from them in 1943. Are they to go it alone; will all crops be purchased by the Government; what are our probable requirements; and what reserve stock pile does the administration aim at? The post-war liquidation program is also of vital concern to the producer, as he must plan now to face the problems of surplus stocks, curtailed production, and increasing competition from rehabilitated sugar countries.

MAINTENANCE OF THE BEEF SUPPLY

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I have just recently returned from a rather extended visit to Nebraska, where I made several trips to various sections of my State. I had an opportunity to see and talk with many of my friends and constituents, and particularly with representative cattlemen from all parts of the State, at the annual convention of the Nebraska Stock Growers Association at Lexington, Nebr., on June 12.

While there I found Nebraska farmers greatly concerned about the present policy of forcing down agricultural prices and the depressing effect of that policy on the production of foods and other agricultural products that are vitally needed. They are particularly concerned about the effect of this price policy on the production of beef, and about the adequacy of our beef supply if the policy is continued. They cannot understand why their Government should, on the one hand, call for greater production, and on the other hand, push down prices to the point where they cut down production. They cannot understand how the Government can expect to get the beef production it wants by following such a policy; and I do not blame them, for I cannot understand it either.

In order fully to realize how this price regulation is hampering beef production, it is necessary to realize that cattle feeding, the process which takes the range steer as a framework and puts on him the beef we eat, is a manufacturing process just like any factory operation. The producer or farmer who feeds cattle has to watch his costs just as any corporation management does. If the cost of his raw materials, which are principally feeder cattle and corn, plus other items such as labor and equipment, is greater than the price he will receive for the finished steer, of course, he will not continue to produce beef, and he should not be expected to do so, any more than we expect any manufacturing concern to produce and sell below cost. He will probably put his corn under Government loan and put his cattle back on grass or sell them for slaughter without finishing them, in which case we simply will not have the beef we need.

That is just what is happening today. Farmers are finding that they cannot afford to buy feeder calves or steers, fatten them, and then sell them at the present ceiling prices. There has been heavy liquidation of herds all over the Corn Belt, and those feed lots are not being refilled. This has been recognized by the Department of Agriculture, which states in one of its recent publications that as a result of the ceiling—

It is probable that cattle will be marketed after a shorter feeding period than in recent years. This will tend to reduce supplies of long-fed, well-finished cattle.

Naturally, if feeders are going to finish their cattle on grass in the 900- to 1,000-pound class instead of the 1,250- to 1,350-pound class, it does not require much arithmetic to realize that we are not going to get as much beef.

Unfortunately we simply cannot spare this beef. We shall need all the beef we can produce. As an illustration, I invite the attention of the Senate to an order published only a few days ago by the Office of Price Administration, freezing the stocks of all the canned beef on hand today in the United States, and freezing the stocks of all canned beef now in process of being imported to this country.

The expansion of hog production has not resulted in enough even to take care of lend-lease needs. The Department of Agriculture is taking about 40 percent of Federally inspected pork production, and these purchases will leave a big gap that can be filled only by increased beef production. Yet even before this price ceiling went into effect, the number of cattle on feed in the Corn Belt was already less than last year. In fact, the Bureau of Agricultural Economics has actually announced that meat supplies for domestic consumption will be less than last year, in the face of the fact that our military and civilian requirements for meat have greatly increased. It is evident that meatless days before the year is out are almost a certainty.

This question is, after all, something for consumers to worry about much more than producers. It is the consumer of beef who will have to take the consequences. Are we really protecting the consumer if we prevent the production of adequate meat through our unwise price policy? That is something for Mr. Henderson to think about. Is it more important to have cheap beef, or to have enough beef? Just what is it the consumer wants most of all? Does the Senate really believe that consumers prefer to be rationed, rather than pay a price made necessary by advancing costs of production? Surely no one really believes that the average American likes to be told by a super-Gestapo just how many ounces of meat he may eat. Of what use is a price ceiling to the consumer if he can find no meat to buy at that price? Is that what is called protecting the consumer?

I believe our greatest mistakes in dealing with these questions of supplying essential civilian goods have occurred because we have been talking about price too much and about production too little. Production is the important thing; no system of prices can be permitted to stand in its way. We have recognized already, in connection with tanks, guns, ships, and all the other things we have needed for direct military purposes, that price was no object, and that we had to pay whatever those things cost to produce. Now let us at least adopt the logic of consistency, and recognize that agriculture is in every way as essential as are other war industries, and that we must be prepared to pay a price sufficient to cover costs if we expect to get the production we want.

Unfortunately, we have placed our entire civilian economy—for certainly any man who can control all prices, subject to no appeal, is a sort of economic czar—in the hands of a man whose title is that of Price Administrator. His function is to keep down prices, not to maintain the flow of commodities; his reputation will stand or fall according to the movements of the cost of living. Naturally, his chief preoccupation is with prices, and any question of supply is subordinated to that consideration. The inevitable result is that rigid price regulations are sabotaging production in every industry, and nothing can be done except by appealing to the Price Administrator, for his decision is final.

Some of us feared precisely this result at the time the Price Control Act was being considered, and we combined under the leadership of the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] to write into the law a provision giving the Secretary of Agriculture a veto over all price regulations affecting agriculture. But that provision of the act, section 3 (e), has been forgotten or ignored, or abolished by administrative usurpation, for Secretary Wickard's name does not appear on either the general maximum price regulation, which sets prices for a number of agricultural commodities, or even on the recent amendment to the ceiling on beef. Certainly, if Wickard gave his "prior approval" to either of these orders, it must have been in a quiet whisper in a small room with all the doors closed. But by losing control over prices, the Department of Agriculture has lost the only method it had of directing production into the proper channels, and control of production has been delivered over into the hands of those who do not understand our agricultural needs, and who do not have primarily in view the success of the farm production program.

Now the Price Administrator has declared that the general maximum price regulation must not be punctured. I do not know what it is that has made March prices so sacred. I had always supposed that March prices were much like prices at other times of the year; in other words, temporary adjustments to changing circumstances, not meant to be maintained rigidly forever after. Naturally, the circumstances which made March prices possible at that time have changed; many of them had already changed before the G. M. P. R.

went into effect, and they are still changing. In view of the fact that the Office of Price Administration has no control whatever over some important items of cost, such as wage rates and enemy submarines, it is a certainty that prices will continue to change. In these circumstances, the only honest thing to do is to recognize that adjustments will have to be made, rather than to make a fetish of some arbitrary date.

I am happy to note that the Price Administration has apparently come to see this, and that the March level of prices is already in process of being punctured. I submit that it will be much better to recognize the necessity of these changes in prices than to fall back immediately on that standard panacea, that favorite cure-all of the New Deal for all its aches and pains, a Federal subsidy.

Speaking for the group I am concerned about at the moment, I can say without hesitation that American cattlemen do not want a subsidy, and would prefer not to accept the Government check that always seems to carry with it a system of Government control of the last detail of their operations. All they ask is that the consumer pay a fair price, sufficient to cover their costs, and with that assurance they can be depended upon to produce the maximum quantity of beef of which they are capable. That is the only request that American cattlemen have to make of their Government. They do not ask for any other Government assistance; they do not come before us with a plea for huge appropriations. If the Government does not recognize their needs, and if the impending shortage of meat materializes before the end of the year, how then shall we explain to consumers why they must do without the food they want and need in what was formerly a land of plenty. I hope the Government will not find it necessary to apologize for such a shortage. We have heard enough excuses from this administration for other shortages which might have been prevented, such as the shortages of sugar and rubber. I believe the American consumer has become just a little tired of glib explanations to justify past derelictions. Excuses are a poor substitute for delivery of the goods. In this case, the explanations will make rather poor reading, when everyone knows that we have our raw materials, feeder cattle and corn, already on hand, and that the only thing that can keep us from manufacturing them into meat is the type of price regulation we are having to suffer now.

Agriculture has met its production goals from the very first. It has done so without quarreling about rates of profit, hours of labor, or working conditions. If production shall suffer, it will not be because of strikes, limited hours of work, or any effort to take advantage of the war emergency. It will be because of the loss of labor to higher-paid jobs in industry, because of inability to obtain essential equipment, and because of the attempt to put and to keep prices down below advancing costs.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. BUTLER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Senator familiar with the condition that exists in Cincinnati today? In that city there are about 17 small beef packers. The prices which have been fixed are such that those packers are losing money on every head of beef cattle which they purchase. They came to Washington; they had a hearing before the O. P. A., but the O. P. A., instead of in any way assisting them, reduced the price of beef cuts from 22 cents to 21 cents. At the same time there is no legal limit on the price of beef cattle, and the price of beef cattle today in Cincinnati is such—the quality perhaps is not so good as that of the beef cattle in Chicago; those sold in Cincinnati are about 800-pound beeves—the price of those cattle today is such that the beef packers to whom I refer who have been in existence for nearly a hundred years are going out of business. There simply will not be a market in that locality for beef cattle. There will be some reduction of production, as the Senator suggests, by reason of the price of the cattle.

It seems to me obvious that the Price Control Administration should fix, first, the price of the raw material at a figure that would produce what is necessary, and then allow a proper margin, with a very reasonable profit for the producers and distributors. Even though it should result in some increase in the ultimate price cost, that increase proportionately would be very small.

Furthermore, if that should not be done, the small packers will be put out of business, and in the end there will be no packers in business except the large ones, who are able, by reason of their reserves, to carry through the period of loss; and they do not lose so much, anyway.

Mr. BUTLER. The Senator's statement is certainly accurate. The only difference between the situation which faces the small packer, whose condition is certainly an unfortunate one, and the situation which faces the producer, the man who is manufacturing the beef products, is that the small packers can to some extent organize themselves into a group and visit Washington and call upon the O. P. A., take up their problems, and possibly obtain some sort of relief. There is no such representation for the producer, however, except through those of us who are making the laws in the first place and those who are endeavoring to administer them after they are made.

I should like to invite the attention of the Senate to the question in all seriousness. I realize that there is but one main objective, and that we all have our eyes on that one objective, which is to win the war; but I do think that the policy of "no puncture of the price ceilings" should be modified so as to take care of the situation I have mentioned today.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the following bill and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7234. An act to exempt from duty personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to accord privileges of free importation to members of the armed forces of other United Nations, to enemy prisoners of war and civilian internees and detainees, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bill and joint resolution were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 7234. An act to exempt from duty personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to accord privileges of free importation to members of the armed forces of other United Nations, to enemy prisoners of war, and civilian internees and detainees, and for other purposes.

CONSTRUCTION OF AIRCRAFT CARRIERS

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I understand that later in the day the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] will call up for consideration House bill 7184, which provides, among other things, for the construction of 500,000 tons of aircraft carriers. It is with very sincere gratification that I shall support this naval authorization bill reported by the Naval Affairs Committee, because it gives at least very substantial recognition to the supreme importance of airplane carriers in winning the war.

Without making any claim whatsoever to being an expert on naval tactics, it seems to me it can be accepted conclusively that, just as aircraft have been such decisive factors in this war, it is equally evident that carriers, up to this time, have been too much neglected in our war equipment. Without adequate aircraft carriers, it follows that our Air Force cannot be effective over sea distances too great for land-based operations. The war in the Pacific has demonstrated that aircraft carriers are absolutely essential to enable our Air Force to be effective.

Our naval-construction program necessarily must be planned some years in advance, due to the long time required to construct battleships, carriers, cruisers, and other heavy vessels.

Time and time again, Mr. President, I have expressed the hope that our naval construction program would be revised in he light of the importance, demonstrated so fully in the past few months, of the carrier as being among the most effective of all naval vessels. I am not prepared to say that the heavy battleship has not even now a large place in naval warfare, but I do say that the carrier, as compared to the battleship, has not been given the recognition it deserves. It is a matter of public record that our battleships greatly outnumber our carriers, despite their ineffectiveness in this war to date, and the present building program needs revision to make up this deficiency.

Unfortunately, time is working against us. If we are to win the war, it is all important now to win the battle of time. Today the American Nation is in more desperate peril than at any time in its history. These momentous battles now

being fought will, in my judgment, determine largely the duration, and possibly they could determine the outcome of the war.

Of course, I recognize that a revision and adjustment of the naval construction program to bring about a largely increased production of airplane carriers may interfere temporarily with the production of some of the battleships under construction, but I think the time has come, Mr. President, to recognize that in all probability, so far as human judgment can forecast, America is in for a long, desperate, and costly war. If any errors have been made in our war preparations, steps to bring about most decisively the ultimate victory which we must have should not be delayed further. We must plan for a lengthy war, and unless we plan deliberately and efficiently, unless we are able to meet the enemy with the most modernized and effective implements of war, there can be only disaster ahead of us.

For myself, I have supreme confidence in our ultimate victory, but we must not underestimate the great difficulties which confront us. I welcome the bill to which I have referred as a step toward giving recognition to the airplane carrier, but we must go further than that, for, unless there is a revision of the present naval building program, it will be a long time before the carriers provided for in the pending legislation will be ready for action. The program of converting other types of warships to carriers should also be given the right-of-way.

Our facilities, both in shipbuilding plants and in materials, are now being fully utilized for our present production program, which includes a heavy proportion of battleships. The smaller carriers proposed in this bill by the Navy will mean quicker construction, and everything should be done to commission new carriers as early as possible. Even 500,000 tons, as substantial as it is, in my judgment, will be not at all adequate for a long war.

I repeat, the great air force this country is now assembling can be fully effective only if used in coordination with an adequate fleet of aircraft carriers.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LEE. The Senator's remarks are very interesting. In the light of the recent battle of Midway, as well as the one in the Coral Sea, I wonder if the Senator was not impressed with the argument made by Seversky that the large airplane carrier may soon be as out of date as the heavy battleship, because it is so vulnerable, as was shown in those battles.

I wonder also if the Senator is not impressed by the thought at which he hinted a moment ago, that perhaps we should put more emphasis on smaller carriers, which can more quickly be launched, and the sinking of which would result in less loss.

Mr. BYRD. I agree with the Senator from Oklahoma, and I am very glad that the Navy is now undertaking the construction of 11,000-ton carriers, with capacity to carry from 60 to 75 planes. I think that is a great step toward the full and effective use of the carriers.

Mr. LEE. There is one further point which I think is worthy of consideration. The range of planes has been so increased in the last 12 months that it tends to make the heavy airplane carrier more obsolete, because of the possibility of locating land-based planes and operating them.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator is correct in that statement, if we have land bases; but, as the Senator knows, we do not have them in the Pacific.

Mr. President, no less important is the construction of cargo ships. The sinking of cargo ships in the west Atlantic by submarines constitutes a real menace to our successful prosecution of the war. The fact that the loss of as many as 13 United Nations' merchant ships was announced in 1 day, bringing the total to 320 since America entered the war, is ominous and should not be underestimated in its ultimate effect on our victory.

It is, of course, perfectly obvious that until we have great superiority in cargo ships, which means a tremendously increased number, our war activities abroad will be greatly hampered.

I state no military secret when I quote Government officials as having announced that the sinking of cargo ships has been in excess of their construction since Pearl Harbor.

I yield to on one in my admiration for the American Navy. As a member of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, I have taken deep interest in all matters relating to the development and progress of the Navy, believing as I always have that our Navy is the first line of defense of America. But, without criticism, as I know the difficulties are great, we must face frankly the fact that some means must be devised to control the submarine menace along the Atlantic, as it has reached a stage that makes continued losses in shipping at a rate faster than we can build a supreme peril to winning the war.

It is the belief of competent experts that enemy submarines are based somewhere in striking distance of the Atlantic coast. It is imperative that such bases be broken up. Every indication is that these bases are in and around the Caribbean Sea.

If it is necessary to do so for our own protection, I think the control of the island of Martinique should be taken over by the United States. The presence of French planes and French warships at Martinique has forced our Navy to maintain an off-island patrol there for months. If the need is urgent enough, I believe America is justified in taking over this island, as the real French people with whom we will deal after we win the war are those who want America to win.

The time has come for a drastic revision, as I see it, of our war effort, so that we will place first things first, as the time element is operating strongly against us. What is the use of building thousands and thousands of tanks if the ships are lacking with which to transport the tanks so as to come in contact with the enemy? We need many things to win the war, but what we need imperatively are aircraft carriers, cargo ships, and an abundance of the most effective airplanes and destroyers.

In order to obtain these first things first quickly we must not only exclude the civilian population from utilizing the essential materials required for the construction of this vital equipment, but we must readjust our war-production program so as to give priority to the war machines which are now most urgently needed.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I have been very much interested in what the Senator from Virginia has had to say. I agree with him thoroughly as to the need for more airplane carriers. He has spoken of the great amount of our tonnage which has been sunk by submarines. It has seemed to me that just as the airplane is the answer to the airplane, the submarine cargo carrier will be and must be the answer to the submarine.

In that connection I will say that I addressed a communication to the Secretary of the Navy under date of May 23, in which I asked him two questions. The first question was:

> Disregarding the angle of economy and shortage of critical materials, do you think it would be possible to construct a submarine capable of carrying 7,500 tons of cargo?

The answer to the question made by the Secretary of the Navy was:

> The answer to this question is that the construction of such a submarine is feasible.

My second question was:

> If such a vessel were constructed, do you think it would be comparatively safe from submarine attacks while proceeding submerged at a depth of 100 feet?

The answer of the Secretary of the Navy to that question is:

> In answering this question I feel that such a vessel would be comparatively safe from submarine attacks by gunfire or torpedoes while proceeding submerged at a depth of 100 feet.

Mr. President, I am sure we must continue to build surface ships, but I am also convinced that we should turn our attention to constructing as rapidly as possible and in as great numbers as possible cargo-carrying submarines, which the Secretary of the Navy says are feasible, which can be constructed, and which would be comparatively safe from the attack of the enemy submarines. I hope that along with the program for airplane carriers, along with the program for the development of the airplane, whose place in this war we now fully appreciate, we will also go forward with a great program for the construction, without delay, of submarine cargo carriers.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Alabama has performed a very useful service in bringing that matter to the attention of the authorities. I, myself, have been interested in it, but have not had an opportunity to obtain the information. I think the program has great possibilities.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I was much interested in the statement made by the able Senator from Virginia with respect to German submarines having bases in the Caribbean Sea. I am wondering whether the Senator can give to me his authority for that statement.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I could not give that information definitely. It has been the generally accepted theory that the bases must be somewhere within striking distance of the Atlantic seaboard. It would be difficult to give any definite information. If the Senator from Virginia knew where the German submarines were based he would have given the information to the proper authorities a long time ago.

Mr. LUCAS. I merely rose for the purpose of saying that in my discussion with those who have charge of our naval affairs I gained the impression that the submarines were operating strictly from German bases, either from Germany itself or from the controlled countries, and because of their long range it would not be difficult at all for submarines to come to this side of the Atlantic and stay some 50 or 60 days, and then return to their home bases. The fact that the Senator made that observation intrigues me no little.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, there is a difference of opinion about that matter. I have talked with some very intelligent and well-informed Navy officials who thought there was a base somewhere in the Atlantic closer than Germany. Of course, there is no certainty about it, and no one knows it, but they think there is a base somewhere in the Caribbean Sea.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for one further observation with respect to airplane carriers?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I am in accord with the Senator's statement with respect to airplane carriers. However, I think in connection with the statements made by the able Senator from Virginia the record should show at this point that under the treaty of 1921, which was entered into as the result of the Disarmament Conference, the United States was definitely prohibited from going into the construction of airplane carriers in excess of a certain tonnage, and that tonnage, according to the testimony given before the Naval Affairs Committee, had such limitations as to place this country at a tremendous disadvantage, insofar as properly preparing our naval defense was concerned. That treaty did not expire until 1936. Up to that time we had no choice except to stay within the limitations on tonnage laid down by the treaty.

Since that time the Navy has been requesting appropriations each year for additional airplane carriers, and they present now the large program which we have before us at the present time. I simply wanted to place that statement in the RECORD, because it is important for the country to know that up until 1938, at least, the Navy, or the country itself, could not do a single thing with respect to additional airplane carriers because of the treaty limitations, and since that time I think we have made as rapid progress as possible.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, does not that make it more imperative now that the airplane carriers be given a priority or right-of-way?

Mr. LUCAS. Yes; and that is what is being done.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. The statement made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] is slightly inaccurate.

Mr. LUCAS. I should like to have the Senator from Massachusetts correct the statement in the respect in which it is not accurate.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator from Illinois is correct about the provision of the treaty, but during the time of the operation of the treaty, although we had the right under the treaty to maintain given tonnages in different classifications, we failed to provide such tonnages, so that in 1934, when under the present administration we realized that there was a failure to keep the tonnage in airplane carriers up to what we were entitled to under the treaty, though we were limited under the terms of that treaty, we passed a measure providing for an increase in aircraft carriers to the extent of 135,000 tons. That was on the theory of authorizing by law the building up of aircraft carriers to at least the treaty strength in that class of ships.

As the Senator has indicated, the next authorization was made on May 17, 1938, and increased aircraft carriers by 40,000 tons; on June 14, 1940, for aircraft carriers an increase of 79,500 tons; and on July 19, 1940, for aircraft carriers an increase of 200,000 tons. Again, the act of December 23, 1941, authorized an increased construction of 150,000 tons of combat ships without designating their category. As a matter of fact, I understand most of this tonnage may be put into aircraft carriers. So the bill to which the Senator from Virginia has referred, and with respect to the importance of aircraft carriers, which he has explained, and which is the position of all the members of the Naval Committee, would mean more than doubling since 1934 our authorization in tonnage for aircraft carriers. It is true that we had up to 1937 no authority other than to build up to treaty strength. We could not go beyond it. However, under the Coolidge and Hoover administrations, when we were trying to set an example of peace to the world, we had allowed our tonnage to fall below what we were entitled to under the treaty's strength.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. What the distinguished Chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee has said is correct. I thank him for correcting me. What I wish to point out and emphasize is, as the chairman has said, that after the 1921 conference we, as a peace-loving nation, attempting to demonstrate our sincerity of purpose to the world in wanting no more wars, sank millions of dollars' worth of the finest battleships in all the world, while Japan, England, and a few other nations merely sank blueprints.

Mr. WALSH. And proceeded to strengthen and build up their navies in the categories which were not in the treaty, so as to have much more powerful navies than we had.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Following that we permitted our tonnage, insofar as aircraft carriers are concerned, to decrease. In other words, during the Hoover and Coolidge administrations, we did not build up to the strength to which we were entitled under the treaty. Then, as the Senator has said, in 1934 we authorized the building of tonnage of aircraft carriers in line with the treaty.

Mr. WALSH. If the Senator will permit me to emphasize what he has said, at the time of considering the act of 1934, which was an act to raise the under-age strength of combatant ships under the international limitations treaty, we had not built up to our strength in capital ships, of 525,000 tons; in aircraft carriers, of 135,000 tons; in cruisers, of 343,770 tons; in destroyers, of 190,000 tons; and in submarines of 68,298 tons. We had allowed our tonnage to deteriorate and were not up to the strength of 1,262,068 tons to which we were entitled under the 5–5–3 treaty ratio.

The Vinson-Trammell Act, as Senators know, was the first act to attempt to build our Navy up to treaty strength.

The Senate may recall also that when the treaty of 1930 was before the Senate I offered a resolution that the ratification of the treaty should be with the understanding that the Government should proceed to build up to treaty strength. I further pointed out that during the 8-year period from 1922 to 1930, while we were relying upon the cooperation of other nations to make some real effort toward naval disarmament, the other 4 powers who signed the Washington Treaty had built or authorized 400 ships to our 11 ships. This revelation of what other nations were doing and the extent to which we had abandoned our naval program surprised and alarmed the country.

I did more than merely present this alarming situation. I then and there offered an amendment, as follows:

Resolved, That the Senate of the United States in the event this treaty is ratified, favors the substantial completion by December 31, 1936 [this was the date when the limitation treaty would terminate and did

actually terminate although efforts were made to continue it], of all cruisers mounting guns in excess of 6⅛ inches, all aircraft carriers, all destroyers, and all submarines permitted under the treaty for the limitation and reduction of naval armament, signed at London on April 22, 1930.

I desire now to quote from my three speeches during that debate in 1930:

There is a feeling among many that we are growing indifferent to our own national security. * * * One thing is certain, that the ratification of this treaty, defining the naval needs of our country in the light of the naval needs we concede to other nations, places a new and grave responsibility on us. We must now adopt the policy of actually confessing inferiority, * * * or support a policy that insures us naval armament at least to the degree that other nations are willing to concede to us.

I closed my appeal in these words:

I maintain that if these nations build to that combat naval strength, and we fail to do it, we are guilty of the highest degree of negligence. * * * I for one do not propose to allow this treaty [then under debate] to be ratified without stressing the importance of providing for building our Navy up to the actual parity named. * * * To do otherwise is to legalize and practice inferiority before the world.

The amendment was defeated but not until after those proposing the ratification of the treaty promised publicly on the floor of the Senate they would support my plea and cooperate in helping to build our Navy up to this treaty strength.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER [Mr. ROSIER in the chair]. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask the chairman of the Naval Affairs Committee whether it is not true that since 1936 all restrictions on building have been removed?

Mr. WALSH. On December 31, 1936, all treaties limiting naval armaments expired, and from that day to this every nation in the world has been free to build all the tonnage it saw fit to build in every category. There was a slight limitation by reason of an agreement which our Government entered into with the British, which was maintained until 2 years ago, particularly with reference to the size of certain guns on naval ships. However, the Senator is correct.

It is only fair to the Navy Department to say that after that date the Navy Department proceeded to map out a program of expansion of the Navy, to correct the deficiencies which had developed. The act of 1938 provided for an increase of approximately 23 percent in our Navy above the provisions of the 1934 act, which would have put us on a level with the 5–5–3 ratio if the money had been provided. We have proceeded to expand from that time on.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. In connection with what the Senator from Illinois and the Senator from Massachusetts have said, the reason we had such large carriers as the *Lexington* was that those ships were turned into carriers from battle cruisers which were built under the 1916 program. It was fortunate that we were able to turn battle cruisers into aircraft carriers, which are so useful.

I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] a question. I came into the Chamber while he was making his interesting remarks on the subject of cargo-carrying submarines. Has the Senator any statistics as to how long a time would be required to build that type of submarine?

Mr. HILL. I am sorry to say that I do not know how long would be required; but it is my opinion that if we should enter upon the production of such submarines as we have gone into the production of ships and other things, we could turn them out pretty fast.

Mr. GERRY. The designs for such submarines are available, and we have ways on which to build them, and other necessary facilities. We should not be at the same disadvantage as though we had to start de novo.

Mr. HILL. We should not be starting from scratch at all, as the Senator says.

Mr. GERRY. I was wondering about the practical side. Does the Senator have any information as to how long a time would be required to build such vessels?

Mr. HILL. I cannot tell the Senator.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. BREWSTER. In the light of the historical allusions, which paid very fine tribute to the peaceful intentions of the Hoover and Coolidge administrations, I think one more item should be added to clarify the record. I am sure we do not want to provoke partisan discussion; but during that period the world in general was very much in hope of getting away from the construction of armaments. Since 1936, when all restrictions were removed, we have been free to build as powerful a navy as seemed proper for our needs, although even now we have not achieved the goal desired.

In 1938, under the present administration, it was proposed, for the first time in our history, that the number of naval aircraft should be limited to 3,000. That was not under Hoover, Coolidge, or Harding. That was the serious proposal of the administration to the Committee on Naval Affairs of the House. It was earnestly defended before the Naval Affairs Committee of the House, and at that time was actually incorporated in the bill for expansion which was reported to the House. It was only as the result of very serious objection by some of those who saw the significance of the development in the field of aircraft that the restriction was finally removed. Instead of the language proposed by the administration, that naval aircraft should be not more than 3,000, the wording was changed by amendment on the floor to provide for not less than 3,000.

I cite this circumstance merely in the interest of recognizing that not even in recent years has omniscience always prevailed. Even as late as 4 years ago there were those who did not recognize the profound revolution which was coming in naval warfare as the result of the development of aerial power.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I did not expect to provoke any political challenge on the part of the Senator from Maine when I mentioned the Hoover and Coolidge administrations. I could have referred to the last 10 or 12 years, and the statement would have been just as accurate. I regret that the Senator has seen fit to imply, at least, that I was attempting to place any political significance upon the remarks I made. If there is any one thing the Senator from Illinois does not want, it is politics involved in the war effort, and if I made a statement that offended the Senator from Maine in that respect, I will gladly strike it from the RECORD. I said what I did in the best of faith. At the time referred to, the Senator from Illinois was a peace-loving citizen and he believed then that perhaps we had fought the last war we were going to fight. We all made mistakes in those days, and we have made mistakes in this administration. There is no one I know who is perfect. However, facts are facts, and I was merely relating what the facts were with respect to the airplane carriers. I regret that the Senator from Maine saw fit to imply that I was attempting to inject any politics into this debate.

I have received, Mr. President, all types and kinds of letters from my constituents at home during the great emergency through which we are all passing, and in reply I have continually told my people in Illinois that I had only one thing in mind, and that was to do whatever I could, with my limited ability, capacity, and judgment to help in winning the war for the United Nations over the totalitarian termites of the earth. I have consistently told them, as I tell Senators now, that insofar as politics is concerned, it does not influence me with respect to any phase of the war program, and I believe it should not be a consideration in this great national effort.

This is an all-inclusive war, in which Democrats and Republicans and all others should cooperate without any regard to politics. In my opinion, that is the way the Naval Affairs Committee at the present time is operating. I will debate with a Democratic Senator in the Naval Affairs Committee as readily as with a Republican Senator with respect to some policy or some problem that is before that committee, and the record will show that in the past I have done so.

I desired to make this simple statement in order to clear the record. The Senator from Illinois was attempting to explain what seemed to him to be very important, so far as the Navy is concerned, in connection with the building of airplane carriers. He was in no way attempting to inject any politics into the debate or the discussion.

Mr. BYRD. What the Senator from Virginia has been attempting to empha-

size is that while the passage of the authorization for 500,000 tons of aircraft carriers will be very encouraging, that in itself, with the appropriation bill to follow, does not mean the carriers will be built quickly unless there is a revision of the naval building program so that carriers may take the place of some other warships which are already being provided for under the program. It takes 4 years to commission a battleship, it takes 3 years to commission a large airplane carrier, and it takes 18 months to commission an 11,000-ton airplane carrier.

I think, Mr. President, there should be a revision of the naval building program so that whenever possible, airplane carriers may be substituted for heavy battleships, or for any other vessels which are not so important as airplane carriers. I think the conversion of cruisers which have not gone too far in construction to make it impossible should be given first consideration, because I think it is imperative to increase the number of aircraft carriers we have, whether they be small or large. I am not at liberty to state how many first-class aircraft carriers we now have. I think it is a matter of public knowledge, but I shall not state it on the floor of this Senate. However, that number is pitifully small when compared to the need of carriers in the battles and under the war conditions which now confront us.

I make this statement today, Mr. President, in the hope that there will be a revision of the program so that the construction of airplane carriers may be expedited, even though it is done at the expense of battleships and other heavy ships, and that material be given priority in the construction of carriers.

WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 324) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator from Tennessee yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to proceed with the discussion of this appropriation bill for a little while.

Mr. LEE. Is not the bill open to debate?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is open to debate, but I appeal to the Senator and other Senators to let us proceed with the pending bill. We must dispose of these appropriation bills, and there are one or two more. We must pass them by next Wednesday. Otherwise we shall be without appropriation acts with reference to the departments involved. It will take but a few minutes to pass these measures. After that, another bill is to be made the unfinished business, and then all Senators will have opportunity to speak. At the present time I want to discuss the bill and explain it, so that we may pass it, which I think will be done almost immediately. I appeal to the Senator to let us proceed.

Mr. President, last year we appropriated $875,000,000 for the W. P. A. This year the amount recommended is $280,000,000, representing an extremely large decrease. Added to the $280,000,000 included in the pending bill is $56,000,000 plus, which will make the total amount about $336,000,000. According to the bill that amount is to be expended in the following way:

Highways, roads, and streets, and related facilities	$100,000,000
Public buildings	12,600,000
Public recreational facilities	3,100,000
Conservation work	3,100,000
Water and sewage systems, etc.	36,800,000
Airports and other transportation facilities	20,000,000
Educational, professional, and clerical projects	69,200,000
Sewing and other goods	18,900,000
Sanitation and health	3,100,000
Vocational training for national defense	35,000,000
Other	12,600,000

Mr. President, that represents a very great decrease in the amount that was expended last year, and it involves a large decrease in the administrative expenses. The House allowed $16,000,000 for administrative expenses and the Senate committee added $1,000,000. The House struck out the words "The Work Projects Administration shall continue to maintain in each State an Office of State Administrator for such State." The Senate committee included that provision. It also included a provision that "No part of the funds made available in this joint resolution shall be used for the maintenance of regional offices," so as to make the regional office a direct State function.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Will the Senator tell us how many employees there will be for the W. P. A. altogether, not workmen, but employees in the administrative force, for the coming year?

Mr. McKELLAR. The average number of workers was 970,000. That number will be reduced to 400,000, or 59 percent. Based on the total amount available for expenditures during the fiscal years 1942 and 1943, the reduction in 1943 under 1942 will be 64 percent.

Mr. TAFT. What I really was wondering about was what number of administrative employees there will be after the change is made?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall find that information in a moment, and shall give the figures to the Senator. I thought the information was at hand, but the figures are given in percentages and not in numbers of employees.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, or does he prefer to finish his statement on that particular point?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ROSIER in the chair). Does the Senator from Tennessee yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I notice that at the bottom of page 3 of the report reference is made to the probability that the older workers will obtain a considerable number of the jobs which are to be provided for by the appropriation. Will the Senator state what will be the effect of the reduction in the appropriation and program upon the women workers, such as those who have been working in the sewing rooms of the country? Will they be continued, or will they be discontinued?

Mr. McKELLAR. They will be continued. If the Senator will look on page 4 of the report he will find that $18,900,000 will be provided for persons working in sewing rooms and in similar places.

Mr. PEPPER. Will that item take care of all those who have been taken care of under the sewing-room program?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it will not take care of all of them, because last year the estimate for that purpose was larger. The 1942 estimate for that purpose was $44,600,000. The appropriation will be reduced; but there will be no trouble in that connection, because it is very difficult to obtain workers of that class, as all of us know.

Ours is a very busy country just now; and even for projects such as this, projects of a public nature, there is more difficulty in obtaining workers than there is in obtaining them for other lines of endeavor.

Mr. PEPPER. On the contrary, the impression which I have received has been that in private employment there were not anything like enough jobs for workers of that class.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say to the Senator that this provision was recommended by the W. P. A., by the Bureau of the Budget, by the President of the United States, adopted by the House committee, by the House of Representatives, and in substantially the same form and in the same amount by the Senate committee. It seems to me that those in charge of the work should know something about it; and the sum proposed seems to me to be a very reasonable one, and they have felt that way. The Senator knows that a great many persons in the country believe that the W. P. A. should be abolished at this time. The committee has not felt that way, but has felt that with the great reduction proposed, a reduction from the $875,000,000 appropriated last year to the $280,000,000 proposed to be appropriated this year, and with an unexpended balance of an additional $56,900,000, these matters can be taken care of today, when employment is greater than ever before.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the suggestion which I wanted to make, if the Senator will allow me to say so, was that the appropriation for the Work Projects program has never been made on a scientific or factual basis.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me say to the Senator that I do not know that it could be so made. It probably has not been. The program was established as a matter of relief, as the Senator knows; I believe he was here at the time. In 1933, when it was first established, it was not done on a scientific basis. It was done on a basis of necessity. My recollection is that we appropriated $4,800,000,000 that year. It was not scientifically done; no. It was done for human relief; it was done as a matter of necessity, because

people were hungry. People had no work, and we were obliged to provide work for them. The appropriation has not been made, it will not be made, and it cannot be made, on a scientific basis.

Mr. PEPPER. I am afraid I was at fault in not making my suggestion clear. What I meant to say was that the program has never adequately met the need at any time since it has been in effect. The committee has never admitted at any one time, and neither has either House of Congress, to my knowledge, that there were in this country a certain number of unemployed men and women and boys and girls who needed to be provided for, and then on the basis of the number of needy persons, made adequate provision for them. I think the same thing is true with respect to the sewing rooms, because I do not believe that the women who have been working in the sewing rooms in this country under the forty-odd million dollar annual appropriation made last year have found jobs in private employment. I do not believe they will find jobs in private employment. Yet, instead of saying that there are a certain number of persons whom we must take care of by appropriating money from the public purse if they are not going to find employment in private life, we simply say, "Well, we will reduce the appropriation from $44,000,000 to $18,000,000 because everyone knows there is a great shortage of workers in the country, and we do not need the appropriation."

What I suggest is that the problem has not yet been approached from a factual basis, and I do not think the measure now under consideration constitutes any exception.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, in my judgment the Senator is entirely mistaken about the matter. Of course, he may be correct, and the W. P. A. Administrator may be mistaken. His assistants, who were present and who testified, may be mistaken. The committees of the two Houses of Congress may be mistaken. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget, who has made the estimate after the most careful study with the W. P. A. Administrators, may be mistaken. Our great President may be mistaken. He and all the others may be mistaken; only the Senator from Florida may be correct. However, my own belief is that the Senator from Florida is mistaken, and that all these officials of the Government are not mistaken. I believe they are correct; I believe they told the truth when they came before the committee; I believe the committee has obtained the facts, and I hope the Senate will adopt the provisions recommended by the committee.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I merely wanted to make the observation that it is a new experience for the committee and the Congress to begin to take and to follow the statement of need made to the Congress by the Administrators of the Work Projects Administration. Time after time I have seen them plead at the door of Congress for the money with which to take care of the people who needed jobs, but I have yet to see appropriated even approximately the amount of money necessary to be appropriated in order to give jobs to those who could not get work anywhere else; and I do not believe the present case is any exception.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. BALL. I desire to inquire about the provision contained in section 33, lines 9 to 11, on page 30. That provision prohibits the use of any of the funds to pay the salaries or expenses of regional offices. I was rather disturbed about that, because I believe that the regional office in my own region has contributed greatly to the efficient operation of the W. P. A. The State director is so close to the State and local agencies that he is in rather a poor position to resist pressure for elimination of excess employees or curtailment of unnecessary projects, whereas the regional director is close enough to the States not to make any mistake about the picture, but far enough away so that he can take the heat.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement in answer to the remarks of the Senator from Minnesota, if I may have the permission of the Senator from Tennessee to do so.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is my purpose to offer an amendment striking out the language now in the bill—language which was put there by the committee—eliminating the regional set-ups.

It is my judgment, in furtherance of the amendment which I shall offer when the consideration of the bill reaches that point, that if we do not maintain a reasonable and substantial regional set-up, then the State administrators will be compelled to come directly to Washington for authority to do anything within their respective States. We of the West, especially those farthest from the Capital, realize how difficult it is to have administrative bodies in Washington understand the importance of some particular project in a far-distant State.

It seems to me—and I am incorporating the idea in the amendment—that the regional activities and the regional set-ups should be curtailed as to expense proportionately with the curtailment of the State set-ups.

Mr. BALL. I am very glad to hear that the Senator will offer such an amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President——

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall yield in a moment. The House left out section 32, which had been in all previous bills on this subject. That section reads as follows:

> The Work Projects Administration shall continue to maintain in each State an office of State administrator for such State.

The omission of that section made it perfectly apparent that what they proposed to do—and the testimony showed that was the purpose—was to abolish many of the State administrators and rely on regional administration.

I not only doubt the wisdom but I doubt the authority of regional administrators, as our Government is based on a community of States. All operations of government, both of the Federal and State Governments, are through States; they are not through regions. There is nothing in our Constitution about regions; no suggestion as to regions appears anywhere in it. It would be like a fifth wheel to a wagon. A regional director has no authority; he is merely a sort of communicator between the State director and the Washington office.

It happens that my State, I will say in reply to the Senator from Nevada, whom I esteem most highly, and who is such a great friend of mine, as I am of his—is a thousand miles from Washington; we have a State administrator who is a good administrator, and we have no trouble in the world in obtaining what we want.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the Senator right there if I may interrupt him——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. One reason why the State of Tennessee is so successful in every particular is the valiant champion it has on the floor of the Senate at all times.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator, but, by the same token, Nevada is a great deal better represented.

I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I do not know whether it is time to say it, but at some stage of the discussion——

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield to the Senator now; I know what the Senator has in mind, and I am glad to yield to him.

Mr. HUGHES. At some stage of the discussion, I wanted to say that I think, without any authority under the law, Delaware has suffered from the administration of the W. P. A. As will be recalled, Delaware adjoins the State of Maryland. The active administrator is a native of the State of Maryland. I have no quarrel with my good friend from the State of Maryland; we are on good terms; but I think, without any authority, since the last appropriation bill was passed, the administrator has seen fit to set up a region and in that regional set-up the State of Delaware was placed under the State of Maryland. But for the provision to which the Senator from Tennessee refers, and which is similar to section 32 in the previous bill, the office of State administrator and everything else connected with the administration of the W. P. A. in Delaware would have been taken over by the State of Maryland. They took over practically everything except the administrator, whom they could not take over because of section 32. The result has been that Delaware is governed, so far as W. P. A. is concerned, by the State of Maryland, and every day of the year employees of the State of Maryland administration come into my State and look over the shoulder of the few who are left there on W. P. A. work. It has caused a great deal of bad feeling and a great deal of annoyance. I do not want that condition to be continued and I hope this provision, if adopted, will take care of it.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I merely wish to say to the Senator from Delaware that I cannot understand how the W. P. A. could have so acted with this provision in the law last year,

as it was in the law last year. I will read it.

Mr. HUGHES. I questioned it myself, I will say to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I will read it to the Senator:

SEC. 32. The Work Projects Administration shall continue to maintain in each State an office of State administrator for such State.

Mr. HUGHES. The view the State administrator took was, of course, that that only meant that he had to keep an administrator in Delaware.

Mr. McKELLAR. And that was done, I suppose.

Mr. HUGHES. Oh, yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. And his duties were nominal, I judge from the Senator's statement?

Mr. HUGHES. He had to go to the director of the State of Maryland for practically everything and was subject to his control.

Mr. McKELLAR. In order to prevent that very thing taking place, if the Senator will look on page 30 of the joint resolution, he will find that we added section 33, which reads as follows:

No part of the funds made available in this joint resolution shall be used for the maintenance of regional offices.

That would absolutely prevent such a state of affairs as the Senator has described in his statement.

Mr. HUGHES. I think it would.

Mr. McKELLAR. It unquestionably would; and I hope the Senator will vote to retain it in the joint resolution, because I do not think we ought at this time to maintain regional offices in the country when we have had to reduce the amount of the fund to be administered in the States by State officials appointed by the State.

Mr. HUGHES. I am quite in accord with the Senator's statement, and I shall support that amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the joint resolution be dispensed with, that it be read for amendment, and that the amendments reported by the committee be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

A CRITICAL HOUR IN THE WAR

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, we have now been at war less than 7 months and yet our soldiers and our weapons are inflicting damage on the enemy in every theater of war throughout the world.

Our Navy, with its accompanying air force, won a brilliant victory at the Gilbert Islands, then again at the Coral Sea, and again just recently at Midway, thus wresting from the Japanese supremacy in the Pacific Ocean.

Our land troops are in Iceland, Ireland, England, and Australia. Our Air Force has already bombed Tokyo, the oil fields of Rumania, and blasted the Italian Fleet in the Mediterranean. But this is only the beginning, for the stream of men and weapons from America to the battlefields is increasing every month.

Donald Nelson, the Chairman of the War Production Board, said recently we were over the hump so far as production is concerned. What he meant was not that we had reached our peak. We have not. What he meant was that we now have our factories tooled up and changed over ready for the manufacture of weapons so that from now on out we may expect miracles from our production lines, and Mr. Nelson's promise is that we shall not be disappointed.

These facts, however, Mr. President, should not cause us to lose sight of the grave situation which confronts the United Nations today. We must not minimize the importance of the fall of Tobruk. It is entirely possible that this is only the beginning of a series of military reverses as the enemy makes his desperate attempt to knock China and Russia both out of the war.

The fall of Tobruk is indeed bad news. It means that Hitler has broken through the ring of steel which the United Nations were forging around him. To minimize that is to deceive ourselves.

To criticize the British for the surrender of Tobruk is to double Hitler's victory. There is no doubt about it, the cause of the Allied Nations suffered a great loss with the fall of Tobruk, but why should we double that loss by criticizing one of our Allies?

What could help Hitler's cause more than to have us criticize the British for the fall of Tobruk? Such criticism plays right into the hands of the Axis.

Napoleon once said, "Give me allies to fight," on the theory that he could drive a wedge between them by the use of propaganda. It is to be expected that the Axis propaganda machine will spread the poison against the British in the United States, in Russia, in China, and all the other Allied Nations.

It is to be expected that every military reverse which the United States may suffer in the future will be followed by a wave of propaganda having for its purpose to drive a wedge between the Allies.

Before we criticize the British for the fall of Tobruk, let us consider whether or not there would be any logical reason why the British would surrender.

Do you think that they have forgotten the bombing of London? Do you think that they no longer remember the women and children who have been murdered by Nazi bombs?

Have they not poured out enough British blood to give them every incentive to fight a good fight? Then what do they stand to lose? They stand to lose the British Isles. They stand to be overrun before the United States. Therefore, we should temper our judgment with logic and the force of logic in this case drives us to the conclusion that there is no justification for us to criticize our Allies.

The British people, of course, are at liberty to criticize their Prime Minister. There has even been talk and newspaper comment in London that Prime Minister Churchill may fall as a result of the defeat at Tobruk.

But let me say first that I do not believe that the people of England will stand from under their fighting Prime Minister, but I wish to say that the fall of Prime Minister Churchill would be a much greater blow to the cause of freedom than the fall of Tobruk or any other great military stronghold.

The fall of Winston Churchill would greatly weaken the confidence of the American people in the British Government and the British arms.

Mr. President, the United Nations must bind themselves together with the strong ties of mutual interest. We have a common cause and as long as the soldiers of any of the Allied Nations are pouring out their blood for liberty, that makes them our allies and entitles them to our loyalty.

We must not play Hitler's game by falling out among ourselves. France played Hitler's game by fighting each other more than they fought the enemy.

France had numerically the largest army in the world. The Maginot line was conceded to be the most impregnable military fortress ever constructed, yet France lacked the spirit of unity.

In the dark hour when Hitler's blitzkrieg was moving toward Paris, the French people started blaming each other. They destroyed confidence in their own government. Even after the battle had begun, they started changing public officials and military leaders. They were completely demoralized on account of the confusion which they had brought upon themselves. They lacked that one essential to victory—national unity.

I firmly believe that if the French people had fought as one man against Hitler, they would be free today. If they had been united, the Government of Paris, with its feet firmly planted on the strong foundation of that national unity could have hurled the same defiance to Hitler that Churchill flung from the cliffs of Dover when he said:

We shall fight on the beaches; we shall fight on the landing grounds; we shall fight in the hills; we shall fight in the fields and in the streets. We shall never surrender.

But this noble challenge would have lost its meaning if the people of England had not been solidly back of their Prime Minister.

Today, with the glorious examples of Wake Island, Bataan, and Corregidor fresh in our minds, we stand united as one man, giving to our Commander in Chief the full measure of our loyalty.

But not only must we be united as a nation, we must be united as allies. Not many days ago we had in this Chamber a distinguished visitor, King George of Greece. As I gripped his hand, I could not but recall the immortal reply he gave to Hitler when Hitler demanded of Greece full collaboration.

King George said:

The infamy is too great for so small a country. The blood of too many Britons is in the soil of Greece for Greece to forget.

The United Nations are today bound together by blood, bound by the blood of our sons, and Hitler and all of the fiendish propaganda of Goebbels will not be able to pry us apart.

WE MUST PREPARE ON GRANDER SCALE

Mr. President, there is one other point I wish to bring out at this time. There has recently been a spirit of overoptimism on the part of the United States. The brilliant victories which our boys won in the Coral Sea and at Midway temporarily caused us to lose sight of the entire picture in all of its grim realities.

By nature I am an optimist but I was never accused of underestimating an antagonist. Let us see what the situation actually is today.

The Japanese have a foothold on the Western Hemisphere near Alaska. China has been cut off from almost every source of supplies. India, under the leadership of Ghandi, is today favoring the Axis as against the Allied Nations. Sevastopol and Kharkov are at this very hour threatened.

Hitler has broken through the steel ring which the United Nations were forging around him and is now straining at the Russian line and threatening the Russian oil supply. With Tobruk captured, Egypt, Suez, and the Near East lie before the victorious Nazis.

Whether or not the United Nations will be able to prevent them from joining forces with Japan through India remains to be seen. With North Africa now under Axis control, Hitler may turn his attention to South America from the West Coast of Africa, where his bombers and sea-borne invasion would have only 1,500 miles of ocean to cross.

Mr. President, this is not a pretty picture, but we must face it. I feel that we have been too optimistic all along. I am convinced that our people want us to be utterly frank. I am convinced that they are willing to endure any hardship in order to win this war.

Mr. President, we must face the future with a firm determination and calm resolve to accept the good with the bad. I am convinced that the indomitable spirit of the American people will stand up during the darkest hours that may come to us.

I am convinced that the courage of civilians is comparable to the fighting spirit of the soldiers.

Now, therefore, let us translate this into the program for the future. Our program is still too small. We may just as well face the facts. The United States must have an Army of 10,000,000 men. We must lay our plans for a minimum of 5 years of war.

A marvelous job has been done in training and equipping our soldiers, but we must do more. We must train more men and train them faster. Our armed forces can be much more rapidly increased now because we have more trained men who can train others. Therefore, we must augment and accelerate our armed forces immediately.

CLEAVER KELLEY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BROWN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4153) for the relief of Cleaver Kelley, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses, as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
JOSEPH ROSIER,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
THOMAS D. WINTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

JOSEPH SOULEK—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BROWN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5439) for the relief of Joseph Soulek, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1 and 2.

PRENTISS M. BROWN,
JAMES H. HUGHES,
ARTHUR CAPPER,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

DAN R. MCGEHEE,
THOMAS D. WINTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill; asked a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. SCRUGHAM, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LEAVY, Mr. SHEPPARD, Mr. RICH, Mr. CARTER, and Mr. JONES were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 324) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first amendment reported by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Federal Works Agency—Work Projects Administration", in section 1, on page 7, line 16, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$16,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$17,000,000"; and in line 25, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$16,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$17,000,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, in section 30, on page 29, line 8, after the words "State or", to strike out "regional" and insert "other"; and in line 9, after the word "appropriations", to strike out "(except persons now serving as such under other law)."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 5, to insert:

SEC. 32. The Work Projects Administration shall continue to maintain in each State an Office of State Administrator for such State.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 33. No part of the funds made available in this joint resolution shall be used for the maintenance of regional offices.

Mr. MCCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment to the committee amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 30, after line 8, in the committee amendment, it is proposed to strike out lines 9 to 11, both inclusive, being section 33, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

SEC. 33. The costs of maintaining regional offices of the Work Projects Administration shall be so reduced that all of the administrative expenses incurred for the maintenance of such regional offices during the fiscal year 1943 will not bear a larger proportion to the total administrative expenses of the Work Projects Administration for the fiscal year 1943 than the expenses incurred for the maintenance of such regional offices during the fiscal year 1942 bore to the total administrative expenses of the Work Projects Administration for the fiscal year 1942.

Mr. MCCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Andrews	Green	Reed
Austin	Guffey	Rosier
Bailey	Gurney	Russell
Ball	Hayden	Schwartz
Bankhead	Hill	Shipstead
Barbour	Hughes	Smathers
Bilbo	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Brewster	Kilgore	Taft
Bridges	Lee	Thomas, Idaho
Brown	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Burton	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Butler	McFarland	Tobey
Byrd	McKellar	Truman
Capper	McNary	Tunnell
Chavez	Maloney	Tydings
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Wagner
Connally	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Murdock	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	White
Doxey	Norris	Willis
Ellender	Nye	
George	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-three Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

DETECTION OF SUBMARINE SUPPLY BASES IN WESTERN HEMISPHERE

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the sinking of ships in the Atlantic Ocean, both in the North and South Atlantic, and the Caribbean Sea, has become one of the most important phases in the war. We are appropriating vast sums of

money, and we have devoted a considerable part of our economic man power, and a great deal of the priorities as to material, to the building of merchant ships. I suppose that today practically 2,000,000 men are directly and indirectly employed in the building of transports and merchant ships. The sinkings which are occurring in the Western Hemisphere are very seriously eating into the effectiveness of our shipbuilding program.

Some months ago I wrote to the Navy Department suggesting that the Navy offer a reward of either $25,000 or $100,000 for any information which would lead to the detection of Axis bases in the Western Hemisphere. The Department wrote me at that time that they appreciated the suggestion, but did not believe they needed to do that, that they felt that submarines were being supplied by Axis mother ships sent across the ocean from Germany.

Their opinion may be accurate, and I have no information to the contrary, but in view of the large number of submarines operating in the western Atlantic, it occurs to me as being not at all improbable that the submarines are being supplied in whole or in part from bases, or supposedly friendly ships operating from bases, located in the Western Hemisphere.

This afternoon I have renewed my request to the Navy Department for our Government to offer a reward of $25,000 or $100,000 for any information that will lead to the finding of any base from which, in whole or in part, Axis submarines are being supplied. I believe they are being supplied in whole or in part from bases in the Western Hemisphere.

There are many rumors now being published in the newspapers that a base may be located in the northern part of South America. There is some information tending to show that from either Cuba or Mexico small groups of people are attempting to supply these submarines by supposedly friendly shipping.

I should like to see such a reward offered. If no evidence is presented showing that bases are located in the Western Hemisphere, then the reward will never have to be paid. On the other hand, if we are able to find any bases, and break them up, we shall have done much to preserve our status in shipping, which is certainly vital to the whole war effort.

I feel constrained to make this statement publicly because I believe it is in the common interest of the national defense that such a reward be offered. I believe it would stimulate the people in all countries of the Western Hemisphere to try to search for bases. Many places on the coast line of the Western Hemisphere are spafsely settled, communications are difficult, and a reward of this kind would, in my judgment, stimulate persons to look here and there and everywhere in the hope of such bases being detected.

I publicly express the hope that the Navy Department will now, out of funds at its disposal, offer a reward of $25,000 or $50,000 or $100,000 for information which will lead to the location of bases from which, perhaps, Axis submarines are being supplied. If we can break up the bases and compel the submarines to go all the way back to Germany for oil and other supplies we shall have saved many ships which otherwise will go to the bottom, if these submarines are being supplied from bases in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. Does not the Senator think that in making such a suggestion he is asking the Navy Department to do something which would greatly embarrass it? I think the Navy Department should make an extraordinary effort and should use every possible means to discover these bases; but to resort to the ordinary method of detecting or catching some criminal by offering a reward would perhaps be considered a reflection on the Navy. It might be thought that it was not able to do its job and could not do what might be done by offering a reward and having private individuals work for us. The Senator's suggestion impressed me that way.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not agree at all with the Senator. I do not think there would be the slightest embarrassment to the Navy Department.

Mr. HUGHES. I think it would be an embarrassment to the Government.

Mr. TYDINGS. On the contrary, I think the Navy Department would accept the suggestion with alacrity. I think that the greatest embarrassment that can come to the Navy Department is to have sinkings continue without the Navy being able to stop them. I think the Navy is making every effort to stop them. However, we must keep in mind the fact that the coast line of South America, and, indeed, the whole geography of the West Indies are different from the coast line and geography of the United States. In South America and the West Indies are large areas with scarcely any means of communication, with no roads, no flying fields, no railroads, few ship callings, if any at all, and there are many places at which Axis bases could be established and maintained for a long while without being detected. It is said that the mouth of the Amazon River is approximately 200 miles wide—a tremendously great gulf, with many tributary streams. The region is very sparsely settled, and it may be that in any one of those places there are storage tanks, munitions dumps, and the like.

It strikes me as rather odd that the Axis submarines can be so effective in the Caribbean and along the North Atlantic coast, thousands of miles from Germany. The suggestion about their being supplied from a mother ship may be correct; but I should like to see all the thousands of people in the South American countries, and, indeed, in our own country, stimulated to make a search so as to make sure that there is no possibility that Axis submarines are being supplied from a base in the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Delaware?

Mr. TYDINGS. I shall yield in a moment. First, I should like to point out that in the years following the last war it was discovered that on the mainland of Mexico there had been maintained vast quantities of German stores from which submarines and other vessels could have been outfitted. Since such bases were maintained in that war, it is not impossible that similar bases are being employed in this war.

I now yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HUGHES. It occurred to me that what the Senator has just said about the maintenance of German supplies in Mexico during the last war may be true, because I recall that Mexico was not one of our allies then, as it is now; also, it had not declared war.

Mr. TYDINGS. Most of the countries of South America have not declared war as an ally of ours in the present war.

Mr. HUGHES. I agree with the Senator, and I think it very probable that in some of the South American countries—for instance, in the regions in the vicinity of the mouth of the Amazon River of which the Senator speaks—there may be Axis supply bases. Nevertheless, it does not seem to me that the South American countries are playing the part of allies if they do not find out about those things.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not think the Senator comprehends the difficulties offered by the territory of South America.

Mr. HUGHES. I have seen much of it.

Mr. TYDINGS. We are likely to look at it as we look at North America. In South America it is possible to go for thousands of miles without finding a good road.

Mr. HUGHES. I realize that.

Mr. TYDINGS. For thousands of miles there are no telegraph lines, no automobiles, no airfields. Therefore, no matter how friendly may be the government or the people of a South American country, there is ample opportunity for the Axis Nations to establish a base there without even the government or the people of the country in which the base is located knowing a thing about it. What I want to have done is to have the people in each of those countries and in our own country exhaust every possible opportunity of searching for and locating such bases.

I want to leave this thought with the Senate: It is not only a question of saving ships; but many hundred lives have been lost; and certainly if there is any embarrassment to the Navy Department in respect to receiving the suggestion to which I have referred, I think its embarrassment is very small as compared with the possibility not only of saving our ships but of saving the lives of United States seamen and seamen of South American countries.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. STEWART. Does the Senator know whether the possible or probable establishment of bases on the isle of Martinique or other islands in that vicinity might have a bearing upon the situation?

Mr. TYDINGS. It is quite possible.

Mr. STEWART. Has any exploratory work been done in that field?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not know; but I assume that the Navy, in addition to performing its other duties, has made as extensive a search as possible of all that area in an attempt to ascertain whether Axis submarines are being supplied in whole or in part from bases in the Caribbean. On several occasions I have been through some parts of the Caribbean, as I know other Senators have. It is a place where submarines or submarine bases can be hidden quite easily. There are a great many uninhabited islands in that area. Anyone who has traveled through that very beautiful island-dotted sea will realize that submarines might well be supplied from islands there and might escape detection by persons passing by.

At any rate, I think this Government should make an extraordinary effort to find out whether there are any Axis bases in the Western Hemisphere, and I think that no stone should be left unturned in the attempt to bring to light the possibility that such bases may be maintained there. Our losses have now reached such proportions that the orthodox methods will not be sufficient. We should offer to all the people of the Western Hemisphere a reward sufficient to cause them to exert their energies in ever greater degree in order to discover where Axis bases are located, and thus cut down our losses and their losses, and the loss of lives of our citizens and also of citizens of the countries of our South American friends.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield to the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. HUGHES. I simply wish to remark that I am in entire accord with what the Senator says. I think that every effort should be made to discover where the submarines are obtaining their supplies, because the present situation is intolerable.

The Senator also speaks of the loss of lives. I have in my pocket a telegram which I have received from the father of a young man whom I have known since his infancy. He formerly lived in the county in which I live. Yesterday the young man lost his life in the sinking of one of our vessels. He was one of those aboard a merchant vessel whose duty it was to man the guns. His ship went down in 10 minutes from the time it was torpedoed, and almost all the officers and crew have been lost. I think that something should be done at once to do away with this intolerable situation.

Mr. TYDINGS. Let me say to the Senator that, as I stated before, this is not the first time I have made this suggestion. About 90 days ago I made the same suggestion. The Navy Department had it under consideration for some time, but at that time did not think it was wise. That is the reason I am speaking of it today, because I believe it is so sound and simple, and has the promise of so much success—and certainly of no injury even if it is not efficacious—that it should receive public support. I am hopeful that it will receive public support so that every avenue will be explored in a successful endeavor to break up the submarine menace and the possibility of further loss of life as the result of the sinking of ships.

This matter was first called to my attention by one of the leading citizens of my State, Mr. Jacob Epstein, a very fine and upstanding citizen who has been one of our leading lights in all civic endeavor, a great philanthropist, and a very successful businessman. He has repeatedly brought this matter to my attention as a possible means of solving the problem of the submarine menace. The more I think of it, the more I believe he has the germ of a splendid idea; and I am hopeful that the Navy Department will accept the idea and carry it out.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TYDINGS. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I am in hearty accord with the suggestion which has been so ably initiated by the able senior Senator from Maryland. In many instances the people of my State have actually stood on the seashore and seen tragic sinkings of American vessels. So I should like to see adopted not only the Senator's suggestion, but also one in which I believe the Senator from Maryland and other Senators will interest themselves. That is the pecuniary and honorary recognition of the gallant men who in so many instances have given their lives in this war in serving on ships on the sea.

Mr. President, I do not believe that in all human history any greater epics of heroism have been written than those written in this era when so many men have gone down not only to sea, but to their graves, in ships. I have been looking forward to seeing the President establish some method of honoring merchant seamen. I think they are just as much sailors as are the sailors in the Navy, and just as much serving in the war as are sailors who lose their lives while serving in the Navy. They are just as much entitled to decoration as are our Army airmen and men of the armed forces generally. All of us recall that in England certain recognition has been provided for civilians who exhibit heroism in the war. I wish the able Senator, who is a member of the Committee on Naval Affairs, would interest himself in this meritorious suggestion and try to have established some special form of decoration which would be appropriate to merchant seamen. In addition to that, I am sure that the Finance Committee is going to note with particular interest Senate bill 2620, which we had under discussion a few days ago. The fact that for the first time that bill proposes to embody in the law a provision for benefits being payable by the Government to merchant seamen who sustain disability in the performance of their duty. Under existing law, if they lose their lives, as I understand, their dependents get $5,000, but if a man was burned so that he was totally disabled for the rest of his life he would not get a dime under the existing arrangement, unless the company which employed him chose to give it to him.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am in thorough sympathy with the objectives of the Senator from Florida; I will be glad to confer with him, and if he will take it up with the Navy Department and show me the correspondence, and a bill can be formulated, I shall be glad to join with him. I should be glad to do it myself, but so long as he has already undertaken to make a study of the matter, I should prefer to have the information he has obtained. I am in thorough accord with what he seeks to accomplish, and I think the idea is a very commendable one.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DOWNEY in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House had disagreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate, and requested a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments to the Interior Department appropriation bill which are still in disagreement, agree to the further conference requested by the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to, and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. RUSSELL. I submit a conference report on the agricultural supply bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be read.

The report was read as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate and amendments of the House to certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6709), making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 46, 47, and 48, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$528,798"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amend-

ment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$26,624,730"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$12,766,446"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,830,075"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$886,446"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$7,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to said amendment numbered 79.

Amendment numbered 101: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figure "10" proposed by said amendment, insert the figure "7"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figure "10" proposed by said amendment, insert the figure "7"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 42, 43, 44, 81, 83, 85, 86, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, and 97.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
E. D. SMITH,
GERALD P. NYE,
CHAS. L. MCNARY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHARLES H. LEAVY,
D. D. TERRY,
ROSS A. COLLINS,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the conferees on this bill have encountered a great deal of difficulty in attempting to reach an agreement on various amendments. We have discussed the amendments at great length and have thoroughly canvassed the position of the respective Houses on them.

This is the second report from the conferees. I shall state the items affected by this report. One is the appropriation for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics. The House and Senate agreed to divide the amount appropriated by the Senate in the partial restoration by the Senate of the Budget estimate for this item.

We also settled the appropriation for forest-fire prevention and for maintenance of forest roads and trails in the conference report. The conference report allows an additional million and a half dollars for forest-fire protection to the national forests, and likewise a million and a half dollars additional to be expended under the terms of the Clark-McNary Act in combating forest fires in State forests and on private land.

The amendment relating to the maintenance of forest roads and trails, wherein the Senate allowed a million dollars additional above the House figure, was likewise divided, and the item in the bill is now $7,000,000, as provided by the conference report. All that is not for maintenance; some two and a half million dollars, in round figures, are to discharge existing obligations for the construction of roads in the national forests.

Those matters are embraced within the report. It will be necessary for the House to take action on them separately because they are agreeing to Senate amendments with amendments.

There are still in disagreement, Mr. President, the amendments of the Senate numbered 81, 83, 85, 86, 90, 91, 95, 96, and 97. Among these is the Senate amendment which provides that soil-conservation payments to farmers shall be included in computing the parity payments to be made to farmers; in other words, to determine whether or not the farmer has secured parity.

I do not apprehend that there will be any great difficulty in regard to some of these amendments; but the amendments on which the conferees seem to be hopelessly deadlocked are those which allow the sale of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat for feeding purposes and to utilize Government-owned grain for rubber and alcohol and the appropriations for the Farm Security Administration. The Senate conferees have exhausted every argument that is known to them on these amendments; we have made any number of offers of compromise, but we have been met with the flat rejection of every proposition which has been submitted. We have undertaken to work out an agreement which will recognize the right of the Senate to appropriate funds and to amend appropriation bills originating in the House. The Senate amendments are within the Budget estimates, but the representatives of the House have been adamant in their position that the Senate had no right or justification for changing the action of the House in any degree. The Senate conferees have been reasonable but we have heretofore insisted on the right of the Senate as a coordinate body to take a part in the enactment of appropriation bills.

Mr. President, I think it is wholly possible that we may not reach any agreement with the House conferees under the present instructions, and I, therefore, desire to ask the Senate with regard to certain amendments to take a record vote, so that the Senate conferees will know whether or not they are justified in further insisting upon the position of the Senate on these matters. It seems possible that we may not be able to agree and get a bill and for that reason the Senate conferees request another expression from the Senate on these items.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. First, the Chair must inquire, Is there any objection to the present consideration of the conference report? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the report is agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move now that the Senate further insist upon its amendments numbered 81, 90, 93, and 97.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia. Without objection, the motion is agreed to.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I think that a vote should be taken. I have no desire to ask for a roll call, but I personally desire to vote against the motion.

Mr. RUSSELL. I may say that on the controversial items I intend to ask for a roll call. I therefore intended to make the motion in two parts.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I beg the Senator's pardon. I thought he was asking for a vote on the amendments en bloc. I have no objection to the course he is following.

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendments just voted on by the Senate were only those affecting totals and the less important items. Now, I move that the Senate insist on its amendment No. 83, and on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Which amendment is that?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is the amendment which changes the House provision regarding the sale of grain to which the Commodity Credit Corporation has title. There are really three of these amendments which are necessary to carry out the purposes of the action of the Senate, and I cannot conceive of there being any objection to voting on them together. It will avoid three roll calls. So, if there is no objection, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendment No. 83, which is the amendment changing the word "and" to "or," which Senators will recall was discussed at some length when the bill was pending before the Senate; amendment No. 85, which permits the sale of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat for feeding purposes; and amendment No. 86, which provides that no grain shall be sold for less than 85 percent of the parity price, be considered together.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, when a similar request was submitted at the time the bill was before the Senate I objected to it until we narrowed the issue to the last amendment mentioned by my colleague. I do not care to object now, but I desire to have the RECORD show that I am not concerned with any one of the three amendments except the last; that is, the amendment which authorizes the sale of a stated number of bushels of wheat for 85 percent of the corn parity price. It is only on that amendment that I would vote "nay."

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to take the floor, if the junior Senator from Georgia has concluded.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not care to keep the floor, but I do ask for the yeas and nays on my motion.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. HILL. Before the vote is taken, I desire to suggest the absence of a quorum. Does the Senator from Kansas wish to discuss the proposal before the Senate?

Mr. REED. Yes; and I should like to proceed now.

Mr. RUSSELL. I think there should be a quorum present, and I suggest the absence of a quorum. Then Senators will have the benefit of the remarks of the Senator from Kansas.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Nye
Andrews	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Ball	Green	Pepper
Bankhead	Guffey	Reed
Barbour	Gurney	Rosier
Bilbo	Hayden	Russell
Bone	Hill	Schwartz
Bridges	Hughes	Shipstead
Brown	Kilgore	Stewart
Burton	Lee	Taft
Butler	Lucas	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McKellar	Truman
Clark, Idaho	McNary	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tydings
Connally	Maybank	Van Nuys
Davis	Mead	Wagner
Downey	Millikin	Walsh
Doxey	Murdock	White
Ellender	Norris	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-three Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I desire the attention of the Senate for about 10 minutes upon a subject of paramount importance to the United States and to the world. It is of such importance that it transcends any jealousy between farm organization leaders or any friction between farm organizations. The trouble is that this question has not up to this time been considered on its merits. That is all I am asking of the Senate at this time.

Let me go into the immediate feed situation. The section of the United States from which I come has long been the granary of the United States. It is now the granary of the world. We are not only having to feed our own people, we are having to feed the world. The necessities in the way of feed take the form of condensed foods, of peculiar and particular value, such as fats and oils and other foods which require the minimum amount of space in shipping.

There are on the farms of the United States today the largest number of livestock the farms of this country ever held—beef cattle, dairy cattle, sheep, hogs, chickens—and they require more feed. It is not a matter to be easily disposed of, it is a matter of stern necessity, that these animals be fed, for the good of this country and of the world.

What is our situation with regard to the grain which is primarily the feed for livestock? On October 1 of last year there was a carry-over of corn of about 646,000,000 bushels. This year, on the 1st of October, there will be a carry-over of about 518,000,000 bushels. The animals now on the farms will in the 12 months from October 1 consume 375,000,000 bushels of corn more than we will produce this year. All these figures are based on the best estimates available at this time. One hundred and forty-three million bushels of corn next year, which will be left of the carry-over on October 1, is below the line of safety, and such a condition should not be tolerated. That is the important question before the country; that is the question at issue here.

Mr. President, I do not think there would have been any issue before us except for the jealousy between farm organization leaders and friction between farm organizations, and I wish to bring the question back to its merits.

On the 11th of June I placed in the RECORD a statement which had been prepared for me by the Department of Agriculture, which will be found at page 5135 of the RECORD. The figures I have quoted I took from that statement.

Mr. President, as I have said, corn is the prime grain used for feeding; no other grain is found to be so generally useful, whether in feeding cattle or hogs. Wheat can be used as a substitute. There is a difference of opinion between the conferees on the part of the Senate and the conferees on the part of the House. The Senate conferees ask that the Secretary of Agriculture be authorized to sell for feeding purposes 125,000,000 bushels of wheat which is now owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation. We put in the measure the provision that it should not be sold at less than 85 percent of the corn-parity price.

I wish to call to the attention of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is interested in the particular phase of the question, to the fact that 85 percent is about the loan value of corn, and being the loan value of corn, it is about the going price of corn at this time. So there is no desire anywhere to break the price of corn, to do any injustice to the corn grower. We discussed this question in the early stages of the consideration of the bill, and I think I can fairly say that I thought the differences, so far as the Senate is concerned, were resolved.

Mr. President, I come from the greatest wheat-producing State in the Union. I am not asking for any favors for wheat. I am trying to preserve a safety factor in the matter of feed available for sheep, hogs, dairy cattle, and beef cattle.

I shall speak very briefly, but I again want to emphasize the importance of this question. There is now on hand an unmanageable surplus of wheat. In the course of a year the country consumes for bread, for seed, and in the natural disappearance of wheat, about 630,000,000 bushels of wheat. I repeat, that includes about 525,000,000 bushels out of which is made flour for bread for the people. About sixty or sixty-five million bushels are required for seed, depending on the acreage that is planted. Then about 25,000,000 bushels of wheat simply disappear; no one knows where that wheat goes; it is used for chicken feed and wasted on the farm. That makes up a total of 630,000,000 bushels of wheat consumed by the country in the course of a year.

We raise from 775,000,000 to 800,000,000 bushels of wheat annually. In addition to our domestic requirements we used to export much wheat, but we have lost our export trade. So, on the 30th of June there will be 630,000,000 bushels of wheat carried over into next year, which is sufficient wheat, Mr. President, to make all the flour and to furnish all the seed that will be needed next year if we do not harvest a single bushel of wheat this year.

So when we come to consider the situation as to grains we find we have an unmanageable surplus of wheat. We have no unmanageable surplus of corn. As a matter of fact, as I pointed out a few moments ago, and as will be found in the statement which I placed in the RECORD on the 11th of June, the margin of safety with respect to the carry-over of corn on October 1, 1943, is too low.

Mr. President, at this point I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks a table which has been prepared for me by the Department of Agriculture in the last hour, showing the annual production in bushels of corn from 1930 to 1941, and the annual carry-over for the same years.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

	Production	*Carry-over*
1930	2,080,421,000	126,332,000
1931	2,575,611,000	167,771,000
1932	2,931,281,000	270,333,000
1933	2,399,632,000	386,321,000
1934	1,461,123,000	337,090,000
1935	2,303,747,000	65,076,000
1936	1,507,089,000	179,547,000
1937	2,651,284,000	66,222,000
1938	2,562,197,000	363,093,000
1939	2,602,133,000	585,543,000
1940	2,460,624,000	694,804,000
1941	2,672,541,000	645,759,000

With 1937–41 average yield, and with acreage indicated March 1, 1942, it could be estimated that the 1942 corn crop will be 2,600,000,000. A carry-over of 500,000,000 to 550,000,000 is expected.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I challenge the attention of the Senate again to this point. We had a drought in 1934 and we raised only 1,461,000,000 bushels of corn in that year. The average crop is 2,600,000,000 bushels, and we need more than 2,600,000,000 bushels of corn now because of the unprecedented numbers of livestock on the farms. It is the desire of the Secretary of Agriculture, and of the President, and of the people of the country, for that matter—there is no division of opinion on this subject—that we shall feed all the livestock we can get on the farms in order to furnish food for our own country and for our Allies. Any serious disaster to the corn crop this year would put us down to a margin of carry-over so low as not to be safe, and next year we would actually be at a point below our actual requirements.

For example, we can find between extreme drought years and extreme good corn years, from one year to the next, a variation in production of corn as high as 1,100,000,000 bushels. We plant about 90,000,000 acres to corn. It is easy for weather conditions to cause a variation of two or three bushels an acre, and if anything untoward should happen, if we were to have great damage by insects, if we were to have too much rain, or too little rain, we could easily have a variation in corn production this year of two or three bushels to the acre, and if that should happen, we would be in distress before October 1, 1943.

Mr. President, I do not want to detain the Senate any longer. I have tried to make the matter clear. It is a subject to which I have given earnest consideration. I have worked closely with the Secretary of Agriculture. I know what is in his mind. He does not want to break the price of corn. He is anxious, and so am I, that we shall have a supply of feed available, and if anything happens to the corn crop, he wants permission to sell wheat for feeding at a price that will not break the price of corn, but will make wheat available for feeding purposes. For hogs, particularly, wheat has about the same feeding value as corn.

On the question of parity I will say that I am one of the Senators who has been vocal on this particular farm question, and I was vocal on the question years and years before I was a Senator. I have done everything I could in private and public life to improve the condition of agriculture; no one could get me to do anything which I thought would injure the farmer or agriculture; but I do not want an academic discussion of the parity question to take place. I do not want jealousy between farm organization leaders, I do not want friction between farm organizations to come in here at this important hour and cause us possibly to take a step which would threaten the welfare of the country.

Mr. President, I appeal to the Senate to support the Senate conferees, and to maintain the Senate's position upon this question.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered. The Clerk will call the roll.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. I should like to have the question stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the Senate insist upon its amendments numbered 83, 85, and 86.

Mr. BYRD. What are the amendments?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, these are the amendments which relate to the disposition of 125,000,000 bushels of wheat for feed at a price not below 85 percent of corn parity.

Let me point out further, while I am on my feet, that under the provisions of the House bill the Government of the United States could not utilize 1 pound of the grain which is the property of the Government, in the manufacture of synthetic rubber or in the manufacture of alcohol to produce high explosives to use in this war, unless it paid 100 percent of parity to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

In my opinion—while I do not represent an area which produces grain for commercial uses to any large extent—that is a very shortsighted policy for grain producers to take, because new outlets and new markets would be provided for grains, which might be the salvation of the farmers in years to come. The House conferees have taken a position which would forbid the use of Government-owned grains, despite the staggering surpluses which are now depressing prices, even for the manufacture of synthetic rubber, unless 100 percent of parity were paid to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the Senate insist upon its amendments numbered 83, 85, and 86. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McNARY (when Mr. VANDENBERG's name was called). The senior Senator from Michigan is absent because of illness. He has a pair with the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER]. I am advised that if the Senator from Michigan were present he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. The senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent on important business in one of the departments. I am advised that if he were present and voting he would vote "yea."

Mr. STEWART. I have a general pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. I therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. NORRIS. On this vote I am advised that if the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. BONE. I announce that my colleague [Mr. WALLGREN] is unavoidably detained.

Mr. CHAVEZ. My colleague [Mr. HATCH] is necessarily absent. If he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senators from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY and Mr. SPENCER], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] are detained on business in various Government departments. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "yea."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public business. If present, he would vote "yea."

My colleague, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], is absent on public business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on public business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is necessarily detained. He has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. If present, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 46, nays 13, as follows:

YEAS—46

Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Andrews	Green	Reed
Ball	Guffey	Rosier
Bankhead	Gurney	Russell
Barbour	Hayden	Schwartz
Bone	Hill	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Brown	McFarland	Truman
Burton	McNary	Tydings
Butler	Maloney	Van Nuys
Byrd	Maybank	Wagner
Capper	Mead	Walsh
Chavez	Murdock	White
Downey	Norris	Willis
Doxey	Nye	
Ellender	O'Mahoney	

NAYS—13

Bilbo	Lee	Taft
Clark, Mo.	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McKellar	Tunnell
George	Millikin	
Hughes	Shipstead	

NOT VOTING—37

Austin	Glass	Radcliffe
Bailey	Hatch	Reynolds
Barkley	Herring	Smathers
Brewster	Holman	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Spencer
Bulow	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Bunker	Kilgore	Tobey
Caraway	La Follette	Vandenberg
Chandler	Langer	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	Lodge	Wheeler
Danaher	Murray	Wiley
Davis	O'Daniel	
Gillette	Overton	

So Mr. RUSSELL's motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate insist on its amendment No. 91.

This is the amendment providing authorization for the Farm Security Administration to borrow $40,000,000 from the R. F. C. to loan to the farmers who are sharecroppers or tenants, to enable them to purchase farms. This appropriation is within the Budget estimate, and it is $10,000,000 below the appropriation for the current year.

As I have said before in discussing this amendment, there has been a perfectly amazing record of repayments. Ninety-nine percent of all the farmers who have borrowed these funds have kept their loans current. When we consider the disaster which befell agricultural crops in various sections of the country, that is a perfectly amazing record. One hundred and twenty percent of the maturities have been paid; in other words, the borrowers have anticipated their payments. In spite of that, we have been unable to secure any agreement whatever with the House of Representatives in this matter. We have offered every conceivable compromise, and I should like to have a record vote so that when we go back into the conference on this matter the Senate conferees may know whether the Senate sustains them in insisting upon this amendment. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. As I understand, the Senate committee allowed only a little less than half the Budget estimate which was $55,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. The item to which the Senator is referring was the rehabilitation item of the bill. That will be passed upon later. We had allowed the full amount of the Budget estimate, which was $40,000,000, for loans to tenants and sharecroppers to enable them to become home owners.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL].

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NORRIS (when Mr. LA FOLLETTE's name was called). The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is necessarily absent. If he were present and voting on this motion he would vote "yea."

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). I have a pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. I make the same announcement as on the previous vote.

Mr. HILL (when Mr. WHEELER's name was called). The senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent on important business in one of the departments. I am advised that if he were present he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BONE. My colleague, Mr. WALLGREN, is necessarily detained from the Senate.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I announce the absence of my colleague the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH]. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senators from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY and Mr. SPENCER], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HUGHES], and the Senators from Montana [Mr. MURRAY and Mr. WHEELER] are detained on business in various Government departments.

Mr. MCNARY. My colleague the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] is absent on public business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. He is necessarily absent.

The Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] is necessarily absent. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "yea." He has a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER].

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] is absent on public business. If present, he would vote "yea."

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on public business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is necessarily detained. He has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. If present, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 52, nays 7, as follows:

YEAS—52

Aiken	Green	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Guffey	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Reed
Bankhead	Hayden	Rosier
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Kilgore	Schwartz
Bone	Lee	Shipstead
Brown	Lucas	Smathers
Burton	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Butler	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	Maloney	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Tunnell
Connally	Mead	Van Nuys
Downey	Millikin	White
Doxey	Murdock	Willis
Ellender	Norris	
George	Nye	

NAYS—7

Bridges	McKellar	Tydings
Byrd	Taft	Walsh
Gerry		

NOT VOTING—37

Austin	Bulow	Danaher
Bailey	Bunker	Davis
Barkley	Caraway	Gillette
Brewster	Chandler	Glass
Brooks	Clark, Idaho	Hatch
Herring	Murray	Tobey
Holman	O'Daniel	Vandenberg
Hughes	Overton	Wagner
Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	Wallgren
Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds	Wheeler
La Follette	Smith	Wiley
Langer	Spencer	
Lodge	Stewart	

So Mr. RUSSELL's motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, two amendments are left in disagreement. Those two amendments, on which the Senate has not yet acted, relate to the appropriations for the administration of the land grant and rural rehabilitation section of the Farm Security Administration, as well as the loans for rehabilitation. If there is no objection, I think we can save time by voting on those two amendments together. One naturally complements the other, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that those two amendments be considered together.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I now move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments numbered 95 and 96.

I may point out, Mr. President, in order to refresh the recollection of other Senators, who have not been living with this question quite so intimately as I have for the past several weeks, that these are the two items for the rehabilitation of loans to farmers who have no considerable credit elsewhere. Both Senate items are below the Budget estimates. I think the administration item is some $14,000,000 below the Budget estimate, and the loan item is $55,000,000 below the Budget estimate.

I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. President.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a letter addressed to the President, under date of June 20, signed by James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union; Murray Lincoln, executive secretary of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation; William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor; Philip Murray, president of the C. I. O.; J. G. Luhrsen, executive secretary of the American Railway Labor Executives Association; L. G. Ligutti, executive secretary of the National Catholic Rural Life Association; and Benson Y. Landis, of the Federal Council of Churches. The letter goes directly to the issue which is under consideration at the moment.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 20, 1942.*

President FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You have requested Congress to do its part toward insuring adequate supplies of essential foods for the war efforts of our Nation and of our Allies. You have proposed to keep milk, meat, and other key foodstuffs flowing freely by expanding the output of the underemployed family-type and small farmers through increased Farm Security Administration appropriations and by keeping the food-price structure on a reasonable level so that an inflationary spiral will not shrink up the supplies.

Specifically, you asked that a sum of $293,598,000 be appropriated by Congress for the rehabilitation and other programs of the Farm Security Administration. The Senate approved an appropriation of $222,800,000 by the preponderate vote of 48 to 16. The House, on the other hand, has at this writing, without a record vote, insisted on an appropriation of only $127,070,000 for the Farm Security Administration. This is $166,528,000 less than you recommended and $95,730,000 less than the Senate approved.

The House figure not only vitiates any hope that hundreds of thousands of family-type and small working farmers, now underemployed, may be given facilities fully to utilize their labor in all-out production of essential foods; it hamstrings the programs of the Farm Security Administration now in operation.

Specifically you have asked that the Government be authorized to sell some of its wheat and corn for feeding purposes at 85 percent of the corn parity price. Explaining this request as based on the desire to keep prices of livestock and dairy products within the price structure now established to prevent an inflationary spiral, you have pointed out that the wheat and corn grower is guaranteed parity prices for his grain through Soil Conservation and other payments regardless of what disposition the Government makes of its surplus stocks.

The House has heeded the unfounded arguments of certain corporate and speculative farm interests that no justification has been shown for Farm Security appropriations to increase food production on family-type and smaller farms. It has listened to the assertion of these same interests that the grain feeding proposal will undermine the price of all farm commodities. It rejected without a record vote the grain feeding formula which the Senate accepted by a vote of 62 to 18.

We who sign this letter to you, including representatives of farm organizations, are convinced that there is concrete and important evidence of the real need to provide additional facilities for underemployed small farmers to utilize their own labor capacities to the limit. The present manpower situation, with its shortage of agricultural day laborers in numerous areas, confirms this. We are equally convinced that the fears about your grain feeding formula torpedoing farm commodity prices in general are without basis. We are confident, Mr. President, that public opinion will support your position solidly on these crucial problems once that opinion realizes their major significance. At stake is in very fact an important element in the question of scarcity or abundance, of possible defeat or certain victory, both on the battle front and at home. The fats and oils shortage is a pertinent example. We earnestly urge you to take this problem to the people of our Nation immediately.

The people do not realize that even under the Senate-approved appropriations for farm security—although they are about $70,000,000 less than you recommended—the 576,000 families which would be helped by them can produce in 1943, exclusive of their home consumption, 1,211,630,000 pounds of milk; 307,406,000 pounds of pork; 26,440,000 pounds of chicken; 136,740,000 dozen eggs; 4,210,000 bushels of tomatoes; 3,225,000 bushels of peanuts; and 1,422,000 bushels of soybeans.

The people do not know that the estimated increase in food production by these low-income farmers would be enough to supply an army of 2,400,000 men with their needs in milk, cheese, and eggs for an entire year and their needs in potatoes, pork products, and butter for 6 months.

The people do not appreciate that the release of stipulated amounts of wheat and corn at 85 percent of corn parity involves roughly 5 to 10 percent of the annual pork and lard production or from 750,000,000 to 1,500,000,000 pounds, about 5 percent of the fluid milk production or 6,000,000,000 pounds, about 5 percent of the egg production or between 200,000,000 and 250,000,000 dozen eggs. These items of livestock, dairy, and poultry production are just samples of the shrinkage which might well occur if the ratio is not maintained as you suggest between the price of feed grains and the price of those products under the anti-inflation price structure.

The facts have been obscured by a welter of accusations and counteraccusations. This is particularly true regarding the Farm Security Administration which has been subjected to a baseless barrage of smearing attacks. It is noteworthy that these attacks have come solely from farm interests committed to the high-price-through-scarcity concept. Recognizing this, it is easy to understand why these interests label the expenditures of Farm Security as nonessential. But such understanding only emphasizes the utter falsity of the labeling. These expenditures are basically important to our war effort. Hitler and his Axis partners must be gloating at the headway thus far made in the attempt to slash these funds.

Our earnest request to you stresses the immediate war urgency of these problems because we sincerely believe the food necessities and manpower situation warrant that stress. We have only hinted at the importance of the Farm Security operations in relation to corporate and large-scale commercial farming. The future of agriculture in our Nation is involved. It is a question of deep concern to labor and to all elements in our population dedicated to the democratic way of living. We are sure you will see that what happens now in agriculture will shape what happens after victory has been won.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES G. PATTON,
President, National Farmers Union.
MURRAY LINCOLN,
Executive Secretary, Ohio Farm Bureau Federation.
WILLIAM GREEN,
President, American Federation of Labor.
PHILIP MURRAY,
President, Congress of Industrial Organizations.
J. G. LUHRSEN,
Executive Secretary, American Railway Labor Executives Association.
L. G. LIGUTTI,
Executive Secretary, National Catholic Rural Life Association.
BENSON Y. LANDIS,
Federal Council of Churches.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I give notice that when the Senate next convenes I shall discuss the question of agricultural exports.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] that the Senate further insist upon its amendments numbered 95 and 96 to the agricultural appropriation bill, House bill 6709. On this motion the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CHAVEZ (when Mr. HATCH's name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] is absent. If present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. NORRIS (when Mr. LA FOLLETTE'S name was called). Mr. President, making the same announcement as that which I previously made regarding the absence of the senior Senator from Wisconsin, I announce that, if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. BONE (when Mr. WALLGREN'S name was called). In connection with this vote I make the same announcement as that which I earlier made concerning my colleague.

Mr. HILL (when Mr. WHEELER'S name was called). The senior Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] is absent on important public business in one of the departments. I am advised that, if present and voting, he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senators from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY and Mr. SPENCER], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], are detained on business in various Government departments.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are necessarily absent. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER].

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is necessarily detained. He has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. If present, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 48, nays 9, as follows:

YEAS—48

Aiken	Guffey	Nye
Andrews	Gurney	O'Mahoney
Ball	Hayden	Pepper
Bankhead	Hill	Rosier
Barbour	Hughes	Russell
Bilbo	Kilgore	Schwartz
Bone	Lee	Shipstead
Brown	Lucas	Smathers
Burton	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Chavez	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Connally	Maybank	Truman
Downey	Mead	Tunnell
Doxey	Millikin	Van Nuys
Ellender	Murdock	White
Green	Norris	Willis

NAYS—9

Bridges	Gerry	Taft
Byrd	McFarland	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McKellar	Walsh

NOT VOTING—39

Austin	George	Overton
Bailey	Gillette	Radcliffe
Barkley	Glass	Reed
Brewster	Hatch	Reynolds
Brooks	Herring	Smith
Bulow	Holman	Spencer
Bunker	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Butler	Johnson, Colo.	Tobey
Caraway	La Follette	Vandenberg
Chandler	Langer	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Lodge	Wallgren
Danaher	Murray	Wheeler
Davis	O'Daniel	Wiley

So Mr. RUSSELL's motion was agreed to.

REPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance, to which were referred the following bill and joint resolution, reported them each without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

H. R. 7234. A bill to exempt from duty personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders (Rept. No. 1524); and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to accord privileges of free importation to members of the armed forces of other United Nations, to enemy prisoners of war and civilian internees and detainees, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1525).

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, from the Committee on Finance I have reported favorably House bill 7234 and House Joint Resolution 327, and announce that it will be my purpose when the Senate meets tomorrow to call up these two measures, because the Treasury is very much interested in their early consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill and joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 324) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Nevada (Mr. MCCARRAN) on page 30, in lines 9 to 11, to strike out all of section 33, and in lieu thereof to insert certain language.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I shall not attempt to detain the Senate long, but I deem the matter of sufficient importance to discuss it briefly.

The Senate Appropriations Committee placed in the pending bill, which is the Work Projects Administration appropriation bill, the following language:

SEC. 33. No part of the funds made available in this joint resolution shall be used for the maintenance of regional offices.

There are six regional offices in the United States under the administration of the Work Projects Administration. By these regional offices certain States are grouped for supervisory purposes under a regional office. There are six such groups. It is my contention that if this language remains in the bill it would be far better were we to refuse to appropriate at all for the Work Projects Administration. The reason for my thought in that respect is that, while the committee retains the State administration, as it should retain it, the State administration in some insances is thousands of miles away from the Capital City. The State administration would be entirely under the national administration in Washington, although in many instances, indeed in most instances, there is little or no sympathetic understanding between the Washington administration and the State administration.

This is especially true in the western section of the country, and the States farthest away from the city of Washington.

What is more, Mr. President, the language now in the bill was placed there by the Senate Committee on Appropriations. Let me say frankly that while I am a member of that committee, this provision was entirely overlooked by me when it was adopted by the committee. I did not realize then the harm which I now see and understand. If the language remains in the bill as it was placed in it by the committee, on the 1st day of July six regional set-ups will be without any administrative funds whatever, they will not have enough money even to wind up their regional affairs. There will be regional functions to be performed without any power on the part of the regional administration to function. In other words, the language of the pending bill would cut off an administration which has been set up, and which has been administering the affairs of W. P. A. through regions for the past several years, ever since W. P. A. was started. At one time there were seven regions. The W. P. A. has consolidated until it has six.

I now ask that the clerk read the pending amendment so that the Senate may understand it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 30, it is proposed to strike out all of section 33, lines 9 to 11, and in lieu thereof to insert the following:

SEC. 33. The costs of maintaining regional offices of the Work Projects Administration shall be so reduced that all of the administrative expenses incurred for the maintenance of such regional offices during the fiscal year 1943 will not bear a larger proportion to the total administrative expenses of the Work Projects Administration for the fiscal year 1942 than the expenses incurred for the maintenance of such regional offices during the fiscal year 1942 bore to the total administrative expenses of the Work Projects Administration for the fiscal year 1942.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, boiled down to the last word, the amendment means that there must be a scaling down in the administrative expenditures, just as the committee and the Congress have provided for a scaling down in the State expenditures. The whole matter would work uniformly; the State expenditures would be reduced; the regional expenditures would be reduced, and the national expenditures would be reduced; but to cut off one function of this well-working administration without giving it anything whatever with which to operate would merely destroy the efficacy of the entire set-up.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. LEE. Am I to understand that the effect of the Senator's amendment would be to save the regional offices?

Mr. McCARRAN. My amendment is designed to save the regional offices but to provide that the expenditures within the regions, and in the regional offices shall be scaled down proportionately to the scaling down of the State administrations.

Mr. LEE. Will the Senator yield to me to ask the Senator in charge of the bill a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. LEE. I ask the Senator from Tennessee was it the purpose of the committee to eliminate the regional offices?

Mr. McKELLAR. It certainly was.

Mr. LEE. I wish to say that I am very much in favor of doing so. I have never seen any need for the regional offices. They have merely been one step of delay, making once removed the questions we had to take up with Washington.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me say to the able Senator from Oklahoma that if he believes the regional offices involve one step of delay, when he comes to consider the work in his own State administered from the offices in Washington, he will find that they are two or three steps of delay.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I have never seen any particular function performed by the regional office or establishment which could not be performed by the State officials. Is not that true in Reno, Nev., and elsewhere?

Mr. McCARRAN. The regional office which has to do with the region in which the State of New Mexico exists is an office which knows and understands the problems of that particular section, and knows and understands the needs of the State of New Mexico. The office of the national administration is about 3,000 miles removed from the State of New Mexico and from an understanding of the needs of the State of New Mexico.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Let me say to the Senator from Nevada that the regional director of W. P. A. in New Mexico is as far from Santa Fe, N. Mex., as is Washington. He happens to come from Spokane.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know what his home State is; I know he has been administering the office, and I take it perhaps the Senator from New Mexico understands why he is opposed to that office.

Mr. CHAVEZ. I am opposed to any regional office. I think the people of New Mexico know more about the needs of New Mexico than anyone who might come from somewhere else, no matter how good he may be, whether he is from Reno or Spokane.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator from New Mexico and the Senator from Nevada voted to retain State administrations.

Mr. CHAVEZ. That is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. And the State administrations will not be interfered with by the amendment.

Mr. CHAVEZ. But the Senator from New Mexico voted against retaining the regional director in W. P. A., and he will vote against any regional director under any other agency.

Mr. McCARRAN. That may be true; I did not happen to hear what the Senator had to say about that matter, and that was my misfortune.

In the bill there is a provision to do away with the regional offices. If we are to do away with this whole administration, well and good, but let us do it in such a way that it will be orderly. Let the regional offices at least function so that as time passes they will be eliminated in an orderly way. To eliminate them next Wednesday will mean that the whole administration will go out, and that the affairs of the regional offices cannot even be wound up.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I shall take but a moment in discussing this question. There are six regional offices, and I wish to state their locations. One is in New York City. I never heard of very much trouble about getting from New York City to Washington. Another is in Atlanta, another in New Orleans, another in Chicago, another in St. Paul, and a sixth one at Salt Lake City.

The Administrator, Mr. Dryden, made this statement in answer to a long question I asked him:

> As you know, Senator, we are the agency that really originated State administrations, and we are the pioneer in that field among the Federal agencies.

At another place Mr. Dryden stated:

> I am proposing this year to curtail the regional offices.

The majority of the committee believed that the regional offices in W. P. A. were a fifth wheel on the wagon, that the regional director in New Orleans could not be familiar with the Alabama and Mississippi problems, that, with the drastic curtailment being made, there was no necessity for regional offices. There might have been some possible necessity for them when we were spending $4,800,000,000 a year; at that time conditions were somewhat different; but now we are spending about $300,000,000 a year, $280,000,000 being carried in the bill now before us, and there being a carry-over of $56,000,000. That is all we are spending this year. Under those circumstances there is a vast curtailment of W. P. A., and those connected with it do not see the necessity of these offices. They say they are going voluntarily to reduce the number anyway. It will save the Government $750,000 in cash if we abolish them, according to the testimony. Why should we retain this fifth wheel on the wagon when we can save $750,000 which can be used for the needy of the country? I feel that the committee's action should be upheld, and I very much hope that the Senate will uphold the committee's action.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I was interested in what the Senator said with respect to $750,000 being saved. I was under the impression that no money would be saved at all as a result of the elimination of the regional offices.

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, yes; the cost of the regional offices alone amounts to $750,000.

Mr. LUCAS. But the committee's action does not decrease the appropriation?

Mr. McKELLAR. No; it does not affect the appropriation. It simply saves that much money to be distributed among the needy, and it seems to me that persons could be found—I hope not as many as formerly—but I think persons could be found who are needy, for whom this fund should be used, rather than being distributed to the regional offices of the country.

Mr. LUCAS. Is there any testimony in the record which shows what will happen to the regional directors and to the personnel in the event the language of the bill is retained?

Mr. McKELLAR. They can all get work in the Government. The Government is very desirous of obtaining the services of men and women all over the country at this time, and there will be no question about their being transferred to departments where their services are needed.

Mr. LUCAS. I was wondering whether the regional directors and personnel of the W. P. A. will not merely be sent into the different States and become part of the State organizations.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not of W. P. A., so far as I know. Wherever they can be affiliated with the W. P. A. in other capacities I have no doubt that will be done. If not, they can always get jobs at the present time. There is no trouble at all about that.

Mr. LUCAS. What I wanted to find out definitely was whether or not there would be a decrease in the appropriation.

Mr. McKELLAR. No; there would not be.

Mr. LUCAS. There would be no decrease in the appropriation. It is merely an administrative matter?

Mr. McKELLAR. It is an administrative matter.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I desire to oppose the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. I know how the present plan has worked in my State. The Senator from Nevada said the States would not be interfered with if his amendment should prevail. I wish to say that in my State we have not had a thing to do with the W. P. A. since the regional government, so to speak, in W. P. A., was set up. A ditch cannot be cleaned out in the State of Delaware unless the regional control agrees to it. The man in charge in Delaware has not been on a single project in the State of Delaware since regional government was established. The result of its establishment has been to make a farce of the W. P. A. in my State.

I am told that for a long time Delaware was the only State in the Union which had been completely wiped out so far as the W. P. A. was concerned, but now I understand that there are six regions in a similar situation.

Mr. President, in the first place we object to the regional directors, because we do not get any cooperation from them at all. In the second place, the establishment of regional directors removes from the State any authority it may have had at any time with reference to W. P. A. The regional directors control ever single dollar of expenditure, and the State directors have nothing whatever to do with it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. If the language now contained in the bill should be retained, it would mean that the State administrator would have nothing to do with the work. What is more, the work would be administered entirely from the city of Washington, which is entirely removed from the State, and the Senator would find his State administrator having to appeal to Washington at every turn.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I do not think that statement is correct at all. I believe that under the language of the bill as recommended by the committee the work will go back to the State authorities, where it was until it was taken over by the regional authorities. If adoption of the language of the bill results in taking the work to Washington, or to New York, or Boston, or to any other place, we are in favor of it. We are in favor of a change.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I wish to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. We have here involved a matter of administrative policy which is quite clear. Speaking from experience during the depression period, and speaking for the region which consists of the States of Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Ohio, and West Virginia, I will say that it was quite impossible during the depression to obtain action of a responsible kind from the national administration, without the regional office. There may be a question as to whether it is advisable to have national relief and national work projects at all, but if we do have them, as was necessary then, I believe it is absolutely necessary to decentralize the administration. It is impossible to operate every work project in America from Washington. I believe it is a practical thing to operate work projects from the regional standpoint. I believe that if the amendment does not add $1 to the appropriation, but merely redivides the money already appropriated, so that there will be an intervening agency between the States and the National Government, it is in the interest of a sound and intelligent administration to retain the regional offices.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays on my amendment.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, I hope the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada will prevail. There has been much complaint about bureaucracy

in Washington. It is said that if the language of the bill is retained it will be necessary to come all the way from one's State to Washington to have projects and other matters in connection with W. P. A. approved. I do not know what the situation is in other areas, but, so far as the southeastern States are concerned, I will say that I have never heard one complaint with respect to the administration of the regional office. The plan works well there because I think the regional director understands the people of the region with which he is dealing. If we cut off the regional office it will make necessary hunting through a bureaucracy in Washington in order to have projects and other matters acted upon.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. ANDREWS. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. The Senator from Florida said that if the language of the bill were retained, it would mean that those who were interested in certain projects would have to come to Washington. I cannot understand that argument at all. Projects all have to be approved at the main office. The director here is in control. It will be necessary to come here anyway, either personally or by agent.

Mr. President, the situation in my State, as I stated earlier today, is that the director happens to come from the State of Maryland, and he took over the work in the State of Delaware and placed it under the office in the State of Maryland. There is a mere skeleton setup under the local director in Delaware. All the activities are taken from that State and placed under the Baltimore office. The one in charge there tells us what to do, and he sends agents to Delaware to look after the projects. The result is most embarrassing.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, that is not the fault of the system; it is the fault of the person in charge.

Mr. HUGHES. Whenever they have the power to do such things they will continue to do them. The situation cannot be changed unless the change proposed in the bill is made.

Mr. ANDREWS. I think it is not the fault of the system. I believe the system is all right. The State of Delaware is unfortunate in the matter of the director and the way the situation is managed there, it seems to me.

Mr. HUGHES. The same director manages the Maryland office also.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, we do not find any fault with the system in our State. Our State management works efficiently. By the time the project gets to Washington it is disposed of almost automatically, because there is someone handling it who knows what he is doing.

Mr. HUGHES. Under the power he has the regional director can place the administration of projects located in the Senator's State in an office located in another State.

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, as a matter of principle, there is no difference between a State doing business with a bureaucrat within the State and a State doing business with a bureaucrat in a city several hundred miles away. In one instance there may be greater State control. I think the only thing involved is the question of saving $750,000, to be used in caring for the poor of the Nation through the W. P. A.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN] to the committee amendment on page 30, in lines 9 to 11. On this question the yeas and nays have been demanded and ordered. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. I am informed that if he were present he would vote as I intend to vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. HILL (when Mr. WHEELER's name was called). The senior Senator from Montana is absent at one of the departments on important business. I am advised that if he were present and voting he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. BONE. I announce that my colleague [Mr. WALLGREN] is unavoidably absent.

Mr. LEE. My colleague the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] was called from the Chamber on official business.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senators from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY and Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senators from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY and Mr. SPENCER], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], and the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] are detained on business in various Government departments.

Mr. MCNARY. The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] are necessarily absent. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has a general pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent because of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER].

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] has a general pair with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. He is unavoidably detained.

The result was announced—yeas 22, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—22

Andrews	Guffey	Rosier
Ball	Kilgore	Shipstead
Barbour	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Bone	McCarran	Truman
Brown	Mead	Walsh
Burton	Murdock	Willis
Clark, Mo.	O'Mahoney	
Downey	Pepper	

NAYS—32

Aiken	Green	Nye
Bankhead	Hayden	Russell
Bilbo	Hill	Schwartz
Bridges	Hughes	Smathers
Butler	Lee	Stewart
Byrd	McFarland	Taft
Capper	McKellar	Thomas, Idaho
Chavez	McNary	Tunnell
Connally	Maloney	Tydings
Doxey	Maybank	White
Gerry	Millikin	

NOT VOTING—42

Austin	Gillette	Overton
Bailey	Glass	Radcliffe
Barkley	Gurney	Reed
Brewster	Hatch	Reynolds
Brooks	Herring	Smith
Bulow	Holman	Spencer
Bunker	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	Johnson, Colo.	Tobey
Chandler	La Follette	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Langer	Van Nuys
Danaher	Lodge	Wagner
Davis	Murray	Wallgren
Ellender	Norris	Wheeler
George	O'Daniel	Wiley

So Mr. MCCARRAN's amendment to the committee amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 30, lines 9 to 11.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I offer a perfecting amendment.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Let it be stated.

Mr. HAYDEN. On page 30, line 10, in the committee amendment, after the word "used," I propose to insert the words "after September 1, 1942." That will allow a little time to liquidate the offices. They cannot be liquidated next Tuesday.

Mr. MCKELLAR. I have no objection to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] to the committee amendment on page 30, line 10.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, because there may be no record vote on the joint resolution I wish to record my opposition to any appropriation at this time for W. P. A. It seems to me perfectly obvious that this is an entirely unnecessary function of the Federal Government today. It seems to me perfectly obvious that that agency was created solely to meet a great depression. Certainly no one can claim that there is any depression whatever today. I believe that any man can find work somewhere in the United States if he goes out after it.

When we came to convert the automobile industry we heard a great deal of criticism because of the fact that we did not act soon enough. We finally found that the only way to do it was to stop the manufacture of automobiles. Once that was done, though it threw men out of work, we found we could go ahead with the conversion, and employ

all those men in war work. The only way to get these men into war work is to stop employing them through the Federal Government on W. P. A. Now is the time to convert W. P. A. into war work.

We have a manpower problem in the United States today. We are drafting 300,000 or 400,000 men into the Army every month. During this entire summer the farmers have been unable to obtain the labor necessary to do the work on the farms. The manpower problem will constantly increase. It seems to me more than obvious that employment by the Government on W. P. A. should cease. Most of the work which is being done is good work. Senators no doubt receive cards every day describing projects in their States. They probably cannot be criticized. This is one which I received about 2 months ago, describing a W. P. A. music project in Ohio:

The Works Projects Administration maintains two dance orchestras and one concert orchestra for the entertainment of the public free of charge. It is understood, of course, that no admission shall be charged. * * * May we offer you one of these orchestras to play in the recreation quarters of your plant during lunch hour or rest period?

I find a project of the Ohio State Archeological and Historical Society having to do with architecture, industry, and agriculture in the State of Ohio, or elsewhere, and preparing maps and photographs, editing and writing material.

A number of these projects relate to the improvement of public roads and sewers, all of which are valuable projects, but which today are being discontinued. The States themselves are unable to proceed with such projects because they are unnecessary to the progress of the war.

Next I find a State-wide project in Ohio, $73,000, to collect, salvage, and conduct operations with respect to microfilming noncurrent Federal records. The sponsor is The National Archives.

There is a fair number of projects conducted directly for the Army, but today there is a shortage of men. Every one of the Army projects could be handled by contract at less expense to the Government, and with possibly half the manpower which is being required for the W. P. A. projects.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield for a question.

Mr. PEPPER. In view of the fact that the W. P. A. wage is so low I wonder to what the Senator attributes the fact that people will remain on W. P. A. in preference to seeking employment in private enterprise.

Mr. TAFT. Largely because the work is easier and it is convenient to them to remain where they are, and they do not want to change. Why did not the automobile plants convert more quickly? Because it was easier to go on manufacturing automobiles. There is an inertia which is natural. People want to stay where they are. It is proposed to employ only 400,000 men. Why employ any? Why go on with any Government work projects?

Mr. President, several years ago the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR], and I offered a plan for Federal assistance to State relief. That plan should be studied. Evidently it is being studied, for the President himself, in his message to Congress, has practically taken the position that the time to abolish the W. P. A. has about come. Why wait another year before getting to that point? The President states in his message on this very bill:

For the period beyond the fiscal year 1943, the provision of work and other forms of aid for those who cannot be absorbed in private employment must be considered as an integral part of comprehensive measures for social security and public assistance. I am now giving attention to proposals for revising and extending the Social Security Act and expect to make recommendations to the Congress for such legislation as may be necessary to extend the protection of our social-security measures to provide alternative means of meeting the needs presented by the residual group now being aided by the Work Projects Administration.

No doubt during the year the President will recommend that the W. P. A. be abolished. I can see no reason why Congress should not take the lead in that movement. The country at large is demanding that Congress assume some leadership. We should not wait for the President to tell us what to do on every measure before us. If the W. P. A. can be abolished 6 months from now, it can be abolished now; and it seems to me the time has come when the Congress should say that we can save $300,000,000. We can devote it to war purposes. I venture to say that no individual in the United States would suffer for more than a few weeks, if at all. In fact, I venture to say any individual on the W. P. A. roll would probably be better off 3 months from now if the W. P. A. were abolished today.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill to which I have referred as having been introduced by the Senator from Michigan, the Senator from New Jersey, and myself be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[76th Cong., 1st sess.; S. 2721; in the Senate of the United States, June 28 (legislative day, June 22), 1939; Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. BARBOUR, and Mr. TAFT introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Special Committee to Investigate Unemployment and Relief]

A bill to amend the Social Security Act to provide for grants to States for direct relief and work relief

Be it enacted, etc., That the Social Security Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new title:

"TITLE XII.—GRANTS TO STATES FOR DIRECT RELIEF AND WORK RELIEF

"It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States Government to discontinue on July 1, 1940, the administration of direct relief and work relief (which shall not be construed to include the activities of the Civilian Conservation Corps) and to assist thereafter only in financing the administration of such relief by the States and the local subdivisions thereof. The Administrator shall cooperate with the States and local subdivisions and assist them to set up the necessary records, personnel, and organization to handle work relief, and on July 1, 1940, he shall discontinue the direct administration of relief.

"(a) The term 'needy individual' means any person who lacks self-support and who lacks resources from which may be derived support adequate to provide a reasonable standard of subsistence compatible with decency and health for such individual and for persons legally dependent upon such individual living in the same household, and includes such persons legally dependent upon such individual living in the same household.

"(b) The term 'State' shall include the District of Columbia and the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

"APPROPRIATION

"SEC. 1202. For the purpose of enabling each State to extend and improve, as far as practicable under the conditions in such State, plans for providing financial assistance, including both direct relief and work relief, to needy individuals not otherwise receiving assistance or benefits as referred to in titles I, II, III, IV, and X of this Act, or for whom the assistance or benefits received as referred to in such titles is inadequate to provide a reasonable subsistence compatible with decency and health, there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, the sum of $1,250,000,000, and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated for each fiscal year thereafter a sum sufficient to carry out the purposes of this title. The sums made available under this section shall be used for making payments to States which have submitted, and had approved by the Board, State plans for such services.

"SEC. 1203. A State plan for direct relief and work relief within the meaning of this act must—

"(1) Provide that it shall be in effect in all political subdivisions of the State;

"(2) Provide for financial participation by the State, or by political subdivisions thereof, or by both, in the cost of such relief;

"(3) Either provide for the administration of the plan by a single permanent State agency, or provide for the administration of the plan by agencies of political subdivisions within the State, supervised by such single permanent State agency; and shall provide that such State agency be directed and controlled by a relief board of not less than five persons, no more than a bare majority of whom shall be members of any one political party;

"(4) Provide that all officials (except board members) and employees of such State agency, and of all agencies of political subdivisions administering the plan, shall be selected and protected in their tenure of office by civil-service laws of the States;

"(5) Provide that the State agency and the agencies of political subdivisions within the State will make such reports in such form and containing such information as the Board may, from time to time, require;

"(6) Provide that there shall be no unreasonable discrimination between needy individuals within the jurisdiction of the State, and particularly no discrimination on account of race or color;

"(7) Provide for the periodic reexamination and reconsideration of all individuals receiving direct relief or work relief under the plan;

"(8) Provide that the State agency may enter into reciprocal agreements with the appropriate agencies in other States for the care, treatment, and redomiciling of transient needy individuals; and

"(9) Provide the exact manner in which the share of the State or the subdivisions, or both, shall be paid into the relief fund.

"(b) The Board shall approve any plan which fulfills the conditions specified in subsection (a), except that it shall not approve any plan which imposes, as a condition of eligibility for work relief under the plan—

"(1) Any residence requirement which excludes any resident of the State who has resided therein continuously for 1 year immediately preceding the application; or

"(2) Any citizenship requirement which excludes any citizen of the United States.

"SEC. 1204. (a) From the sums appropriated therefor, the Secretary of the Treasury shall pay to each State, which has an approved plan under this title for each quarter beginning with the quarter commencing July 1, 1940, an amount, which shall be used exclusively as financial assistance, equal to two-thirds of the total of the sums expended during such quarter as financial assistance by the State and the political subdivisions therein under the State plan, in which expenditures shall be counted—

"(1) Payments of direct relief, both in cash and in kind, with respect to needy individuals who at the time such payments were made were not inmates of any public institution; and

"(2) The ascertained cost of all work-relief projects on which only needy individuals (other than supervisors) are employed, and 80 percent of all expenditures are direct payments to such needy individuals: *Provided, however,* That the total amount paid to any State for any quarter shall not exceed such State's quota as calculated under paragraph (b) (1) of this section.

"(b) The method of computing and paying such amounts shall be as follows:

"(1) The Board shall, prior to the beginning of each quarter, fix the total amount which it will distribute during such quarter to all the States out of the amount or amounts appropriated by Congress for the entire fiscal year; it shall then calculate the quota of each State for such quarter by apportioning 90 percent or more of the amount it has fixed for all the States, among the several States in the following manner:

"(a) One-third in the ratio which the population of each State bears to the total population of all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census;

"(b) One-third in the ratio which the number of unemployed individuals in each State bears to the total number of such individuals in all the States, as shown by the latest available Federal census of unemployment, including the unemployment census of 1937, or by the latest available statistics with respect to unemployment supplied by Federal or State agencies;

"(c) One-third in the ratio which the prevailing average of wage rates, as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the Department of Labor in each State, bears to the prevailing average of wage rates for all of the States, as similarly determined.

"(2) A sum not to exceed 10 percent of the amount or amounts appropriated by Congress for the entire fiscal year may be apportioned among the States or local subdivisions thereof by the Board without regard to any limitations as to amount or percentage prescribed by this title: *Provided,* That such apportionment shall be made only among such States or local subdivisions which have made written application therefor and only when the Board, after a complete hearing, finds that by reason of disaster, or extraordinary conditions of unemployment, or extraordinary conditions of inability to finance relief, such States or local subdivisions are unable to provide adequate relief within their boundaries, and the President approves such findings.

"(3) The Board shall, prior to the beginning of each quarter, estimate the amount to be paid to the State for such quarter, under subsection (a) of this section, but not exceeding the quota fixed under paragraph (b) (1) of this section, plus such sum as may be apportioned under paragraph (b) (2), such estimate to be based on (a) a report filed by the State containing its estimate of the total sum to be expended in such quarter in accordance with the provisions of such subsection and stating the amount appropriated or made available by the State and its political subdivisions for such expenditures in such quarter, and if such amount is less than one-third of the total sum of such estimated expenditures, the source or sources from which the difference is expected to be derived; (b) records showing the number of needy individuals in the State and (c) such other investigation as the Administrator may find necessary.

"(4) The Board shall then certify to the Secretary of the Treasury the amount so estimated by it, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which it finds that its estimate for any prior quarter was greater or less than the amount which should have been paid to the State under this act for such quarter, except to the extent that such sum has been applied to make the amount certified for any prior quarter greater or less than the amount estimated by the Board for such prior quarter.

"(5) The Secretary of the Treasury shall thereupon, through the Division of Disbursement of the Treasury Department and prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, pay to the State, at the time or times fixed by the Board, the amount so certified.

"SEC. 1205. In the case of any State plan for financial assistance under this title which has been approved by the Board, if the Board, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency administering or supervising the administration of such plan, finds—

"(1) That the plan has been so changed as to impose any residence, citizenship, or other requirement for relief prohibited by section 3 of this title, or that in the administration of the plan any such prohibited requirement is imposed, with the knowledge of such State agency, in a substantial number of cases; or

"(2) That in the administration of the plan there is a failure to comply substantially with any provision required by section 1203 of this title to be included in the plan;

"the Board shall notify such State agency that further payments will not be made to the State until the Board is satisfied that such prohibited requirement is no longer so imposed, and that there is no longer any such failure to comply. Until it is so satisfied it shall make no further certification to the Secretary of the Treasury with respect to such State."

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, in partial reply to the distinguished Senator from Ohio, the records show that the Senator's State is not in the condition in which some of the other States find themselves. The number of contracts which have been awarded to industries in his State in the war program would equal the number in six Southern States. That statement also applies to several other States which I could name. The people of Ohio are not in the condition the people of Florida find themselves. Many old couples went to Florida several years ago to retire. They had bonds, from which they could clip the coupons. They had accumulated something to live upon in the latter days of their lives, but the Hoover depression struck them, and they have nothing left. There are many thousands of them in my State today; indeed, a large percentage of the old people there have nothing to do and no way of making a living. There are more of them in the State of Florida than in any other State of the Union. The percentage is much higher than it is in any other State. I am sorry the Senator from Ohio has left the Chamber, because I should like to tell him that I am sure there are in Florida a thousand people from the State of Ohio for whom we are today endeavoring to get help. There are thousands of women there from other States of the Union, not from Florida, making their living in the sewing rooms. The conditions are pitiful. But the job is not only ours in Florida; it is the job of the United States to provide those people some decent way by which to make a living.

This is not the last time this question will come before the Senate. It will appear again whenever the necessity arises to mention relief.

Mr. GUFFEY. To what depression did the Senator refer?

Mr. ANDREWS. We call it the Hoover depression.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 30, lines 9 to 11, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next committee amendment.

The next amendment was, on page 30, after line 11, to insert:

SEC. 34. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1942, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1942, and the date of the enactment of this joint resolution in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments. The joint resolution is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the joint resolution.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed, and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 324) was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the Senate insist on its amendments, ask for a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. BRIDGES conferees on the part of the Senate.

LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7181, to provide appropriations for the Department of Labor and Federal Security Agency. I have no desire to go further with the bill this evening.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, before the motion is put, I should like to ask the

Senator from Nevada a question. I shall be here tomorrow. I shall not be here on Monday or for some days thereafter. There is a bill which is very much desired by the Federal Reserve Board, and which was unanimously reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency. I am sure that its consideration will not take more than 5 or 10 minutes, and I wish the Senator would agree to yield to me tomorrow for the purpose of having action upon it.

Mr. McCARRAN. That will be satisfactory.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with amendments.

AMENDMENT OF RAILROAD UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE ACT

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there is a House bill on the Vice President's table, House bill 7212, which passed the House unanimously. An identical Senate bill has been unanimously reported by the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce. The bill affects only the State of Kentucky. The Senate bill was introduced jointly by both Senators from Kentucky. It simply proposes to extend the time within which the State of Kentucky may pay certain funds out of the State unemployment fund into the Federal unemployment fund. The purpose of extending the time is merely to give the Legislature of Kentucky time in which to act. The bill has the approval of the Railroad Retirement Board, the Federal Security Administration, and the railway labor executives. In fact, it has the approval of all parties who may be affected. It affects only the State of Kentucky. The bill has been unanimously passed by the House, and, as I have said, an identical Senate bill was unanimously reported by the Senate committee.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 7212) to amend section 13 (d) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I join in the request of the Senator from Alabama.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, Senate bill 2590 will be indefinitely postponed.

CHARLES L. LAIR

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair) laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4370) for the relief of Charles L. Lair, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BROWN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

E. A. WILLIAMS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5920) for the relief of E. A. Williams, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BROWN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

CHARLES E. YATES AND THE MOTOR FACTS SALES CO.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5385) for the relief of Charles E. Yates and the Motor Facts Sales Co., and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BROWN. I move the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. ROSIER, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

CECILE McLAUGHLIN

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5496) for the relief of Cecile McLaughlin, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BROWN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. ROSIER, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

BELLA COSGROVE

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4355) for the relief of Bella Cosgrove, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BROWN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. ROSIER, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

EMIL LASSILA AND OTHERS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4953) for the relief of Emil Lassila, Martha Lassila, Ellen Huhta, and Sylvia Huhta, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BROWN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

MRS. CECILE HERZOG AND LUCILLE HERZOG (AN INFANT)

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5449) for the relief of Mrs. Cecile Herzog and Lucille Herzog (an infant), and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BROWN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

GERHARD R. FISHER

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3398) for the relief of Gerhard R. Fisher, and requesting a conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BROWN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. WILEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

HENRY DALEY, GUARDIAN, ETC.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5499) for the relief of Henry Daley, guardian of James Ray Daley and Norman Franklin Daley, and requesting a conference with the Senate

on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. BROWN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, agree to the request of the House for a conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. BROWN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. CAPPER conferees on the part of the Senate.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES FILED DURING RECESS

Under authority of the order of the 22d instant.

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted during the recess of the Senate:

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

James Lawrence Fly, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1942 (reappointment).

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Capt. Timothy J. Keleher, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 11th day of June 1942 and to continue during his assignment as a member of the Army and Navy Munitions Board;

Capt. Arthur G. Robinson, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from June 16, 1942;

Admiral Thomas C. Hart, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of admiral pursuant to an act of Congress approved June 16, 1942 (S. 2285);

Rear Admiral Charles S. Freeman to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 17th day of June 1942 and to continue during his assignment as commander of the Northwestern Sea Frontier;

Capt. Carleton H. Wright to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 15th day of May 1942;

Several majors (temporary), to be majors in the Marine Corps from April 29, 1942; and

Sundry citizens, to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from April 20, 1942.

NOMINATION OF THOMAS F. MEANEY—REPORT OF THE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. SMATHERS. I am authorized and directed by the Committee on the Judiciary to report favorably to the Senate, with recommendation for confirmation, the nomination of Thomas F. Meaney, of New Jersey, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey, vice Thomas Glynn Walker, resigned. I ask that the nomination be placed on the Executive Calendar. In this connection, I should like to say that tomorrow I shall have to be in New Jersey, and I do not intend to ask that this nomination be considered until Monday of next week.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The report will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

ARMY NOMINATIONS REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Military Affairs, I report favorably sundry nominations for temporary appointment in the Army, and ask unanimous consent for their present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nominations? The Chair hears none.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations be confirmed en bloc. They are routine nominations for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alexander Murchie to be United States Attorney for the district of New Hampshire.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of United States marshals.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations of United States marshals be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the diplomatic and foreign service.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the nominations in the diplomatic and foreign service be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Lawrence Fly, of Tennessee, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1942.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, at the request of two absent Members of the Senate, I ask that the nomination go over until Monday.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination will go over until Monday.

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Loraine Rollins to be register of the Land Office at Evanston, Wyo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I move that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, yesterday I reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs several nominations in the Navy. One of them is the nomination of Admiral Thomas C. Hart, and another is the nomination of Charles S. Freeman, both of whom are retiring as of July 1. I ask to have these nominations, as well as the other nominations in the Navy, confirmed today, and that the President be immediately notified, so that there will be no difficulty about these officers receiving their promotions before July 1. I ask that the Navy nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Marine Corps.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the nominations in the Marine Corps be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Marine Corps are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. WALSH. I ask that the President be notified forthwith of the nominations in the Navy and in the Marine Corps confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all other nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 46 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, June 26, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 25 (legislative day, June 18), 1942.

MUNICIPAL JUDGES FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

William E. Richardson, of the District of Columbia, to be appointed for a 10-year

term as chief judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, new position.

Nathan Cayton, of the District of Columbia, to be appointed for an 8-year term as associate judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, new position.

Andrew McCaughrin Hood, of the District of Columbia, to be appointed for a 6-year term as associate judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia new position.

George P. Barse, of the District of Columbia, to be appointed for a 10-year term as chief judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, new position.

Walter J. Casey, of the District of Columbia to be appointed for a 10-year term as associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, vice himself.

Brice Clagett, of Maryland, to be appointed for an 8-year term as associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia vice Hon. George C. Aukam, deceased.

Nathan Ross Margold, of the District of Columbia, to be appointed for an 8-year term as associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Robert E. Mattingly, term expired.

Aubrey B. Fennell, of the District of Columbia, to be appointed for a 6-year term as associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Nathan Cayton, elevated.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

George H. West, of Kansas, to be United States attorney for the district of Kansas, vice Summerfield S. Alexander, resigned.

James B. Frazier, Jr., of Tennessee, to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Tennessee. Mr. Frazier is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired May 26, 1942.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Anton J. Lukaszewicz, of Wisconsin, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Wisconsin. Mr. Lukaszewicz is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 24, 1942.

William Ryan, of Illinois, to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Illinois. Mr. Ryan is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired June 8, 1942.

Joseph A. McDonald, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 4, district of Alaska. Mr. McDonald is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 12, 1942.

William T. Mahoney, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 1, district of Alaska. Mr. Mahoney is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired April 22, 1942.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Hon. George F. Alexander, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 1, district of Alaska. Judge Alexander is now serving in this office under an appointment which expired March 12, 1942.

MEMBER FEDERAL BOARD FOR VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Dr. Paul H. Nystrom, of New York, to be member of the Federal Board for Vocational Education (reappointment).

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. William Henry Harrison, Army of the United States, for temporary appointment as Brigadier General in the Army of the United States, under Public Law No. 252, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved September 22, 1941.

Colonel Carl Raymond Gray, Jr., Corps of Engineers (Reserve), for temporary appointment as Brigadier General in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 37, National Defense Act, as amended by an act of Congress approved June 15, 1933.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Capt. Milton Omar Beebe, Jr., Medical Corps Reserve.

Capt. Felix Claudius Feamster, Medical Corps Reserve.

Capt. Winston Clarkson Hainsworth, Medical Corps Reserve.

Capt. Laurence Mercer Hursh, Medical Corps Reserve.

Capt. John Joseph Maloney, Medical Corps Reserve.

Capt. Edward Kernaghan Mills, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. John Charles Benson, Jr., Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. Edward Lloyd Seretan, Medical Corps Reserve.

First Lt. William Morrow Webb, Medical Corps Reserve.

APPOINTMENT BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Lt. Col. Norman Paul Williams, Infantry, with rank from August 30, 1940.

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENT IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS

Brig. Gen. Charles Wolcott Ryder (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Edwin Pearson Parker, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Charles Hunter Gerhardt (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. James Lester Bradley (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Terry de la Mesa Allen (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. John Shirley Wood (colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Geoffrey Keyes (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Paul Woolever Newgarden (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Brig. Gen. Roscoe Barnett Woodruff (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

TO BE BRIGADIER GENERALS

Col. Troy Houston Middleton (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Solomon Kilburn (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. John Theodore Pierce (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. William Earl Chambers (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. William Kelly Harrison, Jr. (lieutenant colonel, Cavalry), Army of the United States.

Col. Floyd Lavinius Parks (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Abram Franklin Kibler (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. William Claude McMahon (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Lt. Col. Robert Miller Montague (major, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Wilton Burton Persons (lieutenant colonel, Signal Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Percy William Clarkson (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Edward Stanley Ott (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. William Maynadier Miley (major, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Paul Vincent Kane (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Samuel Lusker McCroskey (lieutenant colonel, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Fred W. Miller (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Lyman Louis Lemnitzer (major, Coast Artillery Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Thomas Lyle Martin (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Alan Walter Jones (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Willard Stewart Paul (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Joseph Cowles Mehaffey, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Robert LeGrow Walsh (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Allen Frederick Kingman (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Harold Whittle Blakeley (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Donald Wilson (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. James Taylor (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Holmes Ely Dager (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. John William Leonard (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Jesmond Dene Balmer (major, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

Col. Harry Russell Kutz, Ordnance Department.

Col. David Norvell Walker Grant (lieutenant colonel, Medical Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. John Reed Hodge (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Lawrence Hyskell Hedrick, Judge Advocate General's Department.

Col. David Goodwin Barr (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Henry Balding Lewis (lieutenant colonel, Adjutant General's Department), Army of the United States.

Col. James Raymond Alfonte, Quartermaster Corps.

Col. Raymond Foster Fowler, Corps of Engineers.

Col. Allen Russell Kimball, Quartermaster Corps.

Col. Robert Chapin Candee (lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Delmar Hall Dunton (major, Air Corps; temporary lieutenant colonel, Air Corps; temporary colonel Army of the United States, Air Corps), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Paul Stivers (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Charles Andrew Willoughby (lieutenant colonel, Infantry), Army of the United States.

Col. Lester Johnson Whitlock (lieutenant colonel, Field Artillery), Army of the United States.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. Charles W. Crosse to be a rear admiral in the Navy for temporary service, to rank from the 10th day of January 1942, and to continue during his assignment as commander, Subordinate Command, Service Force, Pacific Fleet.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 25 (legislative day of June 18), 1942:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY

Alexander Murchie to be United States attorney for the district of New Hampshire.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

M. Frank Hammond to be United States marshal for the southern district of Texas.

Neale D. Murphy to be United States marshal for the district of Rhode Island.

Donald A. Draughon to be United States marshal for the district of Puerto Rico.

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

PROMOTIONS IN THE FOREIGN SERVICE

To be Foreign Service officers of class 2

Raymond H. Geist
Loy W. Henderson

To be Foreign Service officers of class 3

Selden Chapin
George F. Kennan
Samuel Reber
Robert Lacy Smyth
Angus I. Ward

To be Foreign Service officers of class 4

Maurice W. Altaffer
William W. Butterworth
Paul C. Daniels
Cecil Wayne Gray
A. Dana Hodgdon
George H. Winters

To be Foreign Service officers of class 5

LaVerne Baldwin
Warren M. Chase
Oliver Edmund Clubb
Raymond A. Hare
Bertel E. Kunihoim
Rufus H. Lane, Jr.
James S. Moose, Jr.
William T. Turner

To be Foreign Service officers of class 6

George V. Allen
Robert Y. Brown
Albert E. Clattenburg, Jr.
Robert D. Coe
John B. Faust
Claude H. Hall, Jr.
R. Borden Reams
Charles S. Reed 2d
Arthur R. Ringwalt

To be Foreign Service officers of class 7

Robert A. Acly
Fritz A. M. Alfsen
Edward Anderson
Hiram Bingham, Jr.
Ralph J. Blake
Carl H. Boehringer
Hedley V. Cooke, Jr.
Sherburne Dillingham
Douglas Flood
Miss Constance R. Harvey
Reginald S. Kazanjian
Edward P. Maffitt
Ernest de W. Mayer
George E. Miller
Reginald P. Mitchell
William D. Moreland, Jr.
Shiras Morris, Jr.
Paul H. Pearson
Archibald R. Randolph
Frank A. Schuler, Jr.
Elvin Seibert
Jay Walker
Joe D. Walstrom
Rolland Welch
H. Bartlett Wells

To be Foreign Service officers of class 8

Maurice M. Bernbaum
Stephen C. Brown
Leslie W. Johnson
Fred K. Salter
Milton Patterson Thompson

REGISTER OF LAND OFFICE

Loraine Rollins to be register of the land office at Evanston, Wyo.

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

General officers

The nominations of Charles Wolcott Ryder et al. to be general officers for temporary appointment in the Army of the United States, which were received today by the Senate.

(NOTE.—A full list of the names of the persons whose nominations to temporary appointments in the Army of the United States were confirmed by the Senate today may be found in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for today under the caption "Nominations.")

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENT TO THE RETIRED LIST

Admiral Thomas C. Hart, when retired, to be placed on the retired list with the rank of admiral.

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Charles S. Freeman to be vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from June 17, 1942, and to continue while commander of the Northwestern Sea Frontier.

Carleton H. Wright to be rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from May 15, 1942.

Arthur G. Robinson to be rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from June 16, 1942.

Timothy J. Keleher to be rear admiral, for temporary service, to rank from June 16, 1942, and to continue while a member of the Army and Navy Munitions Board.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

PROMOTIONS

To be majors

Frank H. Schwable
Peter A. McDonald
Fred D. Beans

To be second lieutenants

Gerard T. Armitage
Charles D. Barrett, Jr.
Thomas H. Barry
Frank J. Clarke
Hugh Corrigan
Edward C. Cushman, Jr.
Joseph P. Daly
Donald K. Dayton
Jay C. Griffith, Jr.
James A. Harris
Arthur W. Larson
Preston St. C. Malone
Nathaniel S. Mewhinney
William A. Murphy
Harry B. Smith
George Swinston, Jr.
John S. Todd
Paul T. Torian

POSTMASTERS

MINNESOTA

Evelyn M. Kolhei, Cottonwood.
Malter B. Gullickson, Peterson.

PENNSYLVANIA

Hazel E. Hetrick, Beavertown.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Reverend Edward G. Latch, minister, Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Eternal Father of our spirits, our refuge and strength, our present help in time of trouble, we lift our hearts to Thee in prayer. We thank Thee for Thy mercies which are new every day and fresh every morning. We thank Thee for Thy loving care which is ever about us. Always Thou art sustaining us. Make us worthy, we beseech Thee, of all Thy good gifts.

We pray for strength and courage amid the temptations of this hour. We pray for understanding and a purity of purpose that with clear heads and clean minds we may ever seek the truth—the truth that makes men free.

Bless the leaders of our Nation with Thy never failing guidance, assure them always of Thy presence and keep them in the path of their higher moods we pray through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

ACCORDING THE PRIVILEGES OF FREE IMPORTATION TO CERTAIN GROUPS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 327, to accord privileges of free importation to members of the armed forces of other United Nations, to enemy prisoners of war, and civilian internees and detainees, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present considertion of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That all articles imported into the United States, its Territories or possessions, including the Canal Zone and the Virgin Islands, consigned or addressed to members of the armed forces of the United Nations, other than those of the United States, who are on duty therein, which articles are intended for their personal or official use, shall be admitted free of all duties and internal-revenue taxes imposed upon or by reason of importation and all customs charges and exactions: *Provided, however,* That if the Secretary of the Treasury shall find that any of the other United Nations does not accord similar treatment to members of the armed forces of the United States, the privileges herein granted shall, after collectors of customs have been officially advised of such finding, be accorded to members of the armed forces of such nation only to the extent that similar treatment is accorded to members of the armed forces of the United States.

SEC. 2. In order to implement the provisions of article 38 of The Convention Between the United States of America and Other Powers Relating to the Treatment of Prisoners of War, signed at Geneva on July 27, 1929, ratified by the President on January 16, 1932, and proclaimed on August 4, 1932 (47 Stat. (pt. 2) 2021, 2043), all articles consigned or addressed to enemy prisoners of war and enemy civilian internees and detainees in the United States, its Territories or possessions, including the Canal Zone and the Virgin Islands, shall be admitted free of all duties and internal-revenue taxes imposed upon or by reason of importation and all customs charges and exactions.

SEC. 3. All articles made by members of the armed forces of the United Nations interned or detained as prisoners of war by any enemy country or made by nationals of the United States interned or detained by any enemy country as enemy nationals shall, when imported into the United States, its Territories or possessions, including the Canal Zone and the Virgin Islands, be admitted free of all duties and internal-revenue taxes imposed upon or by reason of importation and all customs charges and exactions.

SEC. 4. The exemptions from duties, taxes, charges, and exactions provided for by this joint resolution shall be subject to com-

pliance with such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe.

SEC. 5. This joint resolution shall be effective as to articles entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after the date of its enactment and before the expiration of 6 months after the termination of the unlimited national emergency proclaimed by the President on May 27, 1941.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter that has been considered by the Ways and Means Committee and unanimously reported, but I think it of sufficient importance to ask for some slight explanation from the chairman of the committee before the question of the passage of the resolution is put.

Mr. DOUGHTON. This action was requested by the Treasury Department. The joint resolution was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means after careful consideration yesterday.

Section 1 of the joint resolution provides that articles used by the armed forces of the United Nations other than the United States imported for personal use shall be admitted free of customs duties and internal-revenue import taxes. Very frequently the people back home send wearing apparel, cigarettes, chocolates, and things of that kind, and it is the purpose of the first provision of the resolution to admit such articles free of duty, provided other nations accord similar treatment to the forces of the United States in like circumstances.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOUGHTON. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. TREADWAY. I think it might be well for the gentleman from North Carolina to explain a little more in detail how this resolution came to be reported so quickly, namely, at the request of the Treasury Department, in view of the large number of troops that are scattered in foreign countries to whom our people want to send little gifts, such as cigarettes, socks, or things of that kind; and the same treatment must be accorded prisoners we may have on the border countries, like the State of Texas.

Mr. DOUGHTON. Section 1 does not deal with prisoners, but deals with armed forces. Prisoners and interns of enemy countries are dealt with in section 2. Section 2 provides that articles imported for their use shall be admitted free of import duties or internal-revenue taxes.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, the only remark that I care to add is that the resolution was thoroughly explained. It seems to be simply a humane measure, treating our people and foreign enemies in the same general way in relation to their families.

Mr. DOUGHTON. I thank my distinguished colleague for his contribution. If we expect prisoners of war of the United Nations or of the United States who are in the service of the United Nations to be accorded humane treatment, we must extend such treatment to prisoners of war and interns of other nations in this country.

The resolution was earnestly recommended as rather an emergency measure by the Treasury Department. The Committee on Ways and Means heard representation and statements made by Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Sullivan, in whom we all have confidence, and we were convinced that it was not only an important measure but a necessary one to insure humane treatment of our own people in accordance with the regulations of warfare.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXEMPTION FROM DUTY OF PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS BROUGHT INTO THE UNITED STATES UNDER GOVERNMENT ORDERS

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7234) to exempt from duty personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER]?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may we have the bill explained?

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, this bill, H. R. 7234, is unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means at the very urgent request of the State, War, Navy, and Treasury Departments. The committee considered the matter very carefully and unanimously reported the bill favorably.

The purpose of the bill is to exempt from duty personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders. It provides for the importation of personal and household effects of any person in the service of the United States or his family or of any person evacuated to the United States if such articles are forwarded to the United States by reason of Government instructions regarding the movement of the owner of the article even though the owner thereof by reason of military operations or wartime conditions does not intend an immediate return to this country and, in fact, may be precluded by the event of war from ever returning to this country.

In effect, the bill simply provides that the household and personal effects of our people on duty in foreign countries who were caught there by reason of the war may be sent to this country without having to pay the duty on them. Of course, they could bring them in without paying the duty, but obviously they cannot come to bring them in because they are either required to stay there on duty or some of them are detained and cannot bring their personal and household effects back to this country.

Your committee was advised of a report from the collector of customs at San Francisco that they have about 90 shipments of household goods and effects of Army officers and Navy officers that have been sent to this country where the officers had to remain in foreign countries and those shipments out there are being held in the Customs Service.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. With pleasure.

Mr. TREADWAY. I simply desire to confirm the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee and to say that the minority members of the committee thoroughly agree with the request that this bill be promptly passed.

Mr. COOPER. None of these articles are to be offered for sale.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COOPER. With pleasure.

Mr. RICH. This equipment, furniture, and things are owned by our own people who are in foreign lands?

Mr. COOPER. Yes.

Mr. RICH. It would not permit them under present-day conditions to go out and purchase a lot of equipment and material that they expected to use if they do not have it in their possession at the present time?

Mr. COOPER. No. It is only intended to take care of the things they have with them and want to send back here for safekeeping.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOPER. With pleasure.

Mr. GEARHART. It will only apply to those articles of household furniture, and so forth, that the Government orders brought in?

Mr. COOPER. Exactly. They have to be brought in under instructions of the Government.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe, the personal and household effects of any person in the service of the United States, or of his family, or of any person evacuated to the United States under Government orders, may be brought into the United States or any of its possessions, pursuant to Government orders or instructions, without the payment of any duty or tax imposed upon, or by reason of, importation.

SEC. 2. This act shall be effective with respect to articles entered for consumption or withdrawn from warehouse for consumption on or after December 8, 1941, and shall have no force or effect on or after the day following the proclamation of peace by the President. The free entry herein authorized shall apply to any effects described in section 1 which are in customs custody on the effective date of this act, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 490 and 491 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FILING OF MINORITY VIEWS

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until midnight tonight to file the minority views of members of the Committee on Military Affairs to Report No. 2272.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. THOMASON]?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 13 OF CLASSIFICATION ACT OF 1923, AS AMENDED

Mr. SABATH, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 510, Rept. No. 2276), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 6217) to amend section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Civil Service, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of such consideration the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN]?

There was no objection.

THE HONORABLE JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, we are going to win this war. One of the most convincing portents is the unified cooperation of the membership on this floor regardless of party affiliation, in a splendid effort to throw into the balance all the resources of the Nation. We are all Americans united in a common cause and motivated by the fixed determination that in this war we shall not fail.

I call to witness the fact that in this united action no man has been more dedicated and cooperative than the distinguished minority leader the Honorable JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

No Member on either side of the Chamber but knows his devotion to the cause and his consistent cooperation with the majority leadership in working to the end, so essential to our war effort. No one knows it better than our beloved Speaker and our sincere and able majority leader.

In light of this record it came as a shock to all of us to read in this morning's papers that the President in calling a war conference of paramount importance, a conference including the legislative leaders of both the House and the Senate, failed to include the able and patriotically dedicated minority leader.

It is with a great satisfaction, which I know will be shared by all, that I announce to this chamber that the newspapers were at error. JOE MARTIN was invited and did attend this conference at the White House this morning.

I know I speak the mind and heart of every Member here when I say that a war conference which includes legislative leaders without JOE MARTIN would contribute neither to a spirit of fairness nor the promotion and security of that unity which President Roosevelt himself has insisted is so essential in this time of national crisis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HILL of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an address I made over KFKA, at Greeley, Colo., on June 20, 1942, and also to extend my remarks and to include an article appearing in the Mountain States Beet Grower on sugar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HILL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, and to include therein a speech delivered by the distinguished commentator, Al Sisson, over radio station WHAM, Rochester, N. Y., at the Bausch & Lomb celebration on Saturday, June 20, 1942.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'BRIEN]?

There was no objection.

SCRAP RUBBER CAMPAIGN

Mr. KLEBERG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a report on the scrap rubber campaign, in two divisions, alphabetically and by States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

[Mr. KLEBERG addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

AXIS PROPAGANDA

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. ALLEN of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, in view of some things that occurred on the floor of this House this week, I want to tell you about a letter I have just received. It comes from a young man in the Army in Ireland, who is very close to me. I tell this with the hope that Members of this House may be more guarded in what they say on this floor.

This young man has a small radio, and is able to hear the broadcasts from Germany easily. He writes me that the German radio stations pick up things said in this House and make propaganda of it. He then states that "Members of Congress ought to be very careful about what they say on the floor." Make no mistake about it, my friends, what you say here reaches the Germans, and quickly, too. I am not arguing against criticism; we welcome just criticism always, but we ought to be very guarded about statements made on this floor because such statements are regarded as official, and are subject to be turned into Axis propaganda. In behalf of our men in the services, and as a father who has surrendered his all in this struggle, I appeal to you to see to it that Hitler and his bunch may not derive comfort from unguarded remarks made in this House.

CONTINUATION OF PAY OF ALL PERSONS IN THE ARMED SERVICES OF THE UNITED STATES FOR 1 YEAR FROM THE DATE OF THEIR DISCHARGE

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, I introduced, last Tuesday, H. R. 7293, which would continue the pay of all persons in the armed services of the United States on or after December 8, 1941, and prior to the termination of the present conflict, for a period of 1 year from the date of their honorable discharge.

When we passed the Selective Service Act we sought to provide that the trainees would get their old jobs back. Since we have been in the war, however, priorities and scarcity of materials have driven or will drive many employers out of business, and with this loss of business will go loss of employment opportunities for many after the war. By a continuance of service pay for 1 year for the honorably discharged it will give them aid when aid is most needed, it will help them support themselves and their families while they are looking for work, it will prevent a glut of the labor market, and then above all it will keep them off the W. P. A. or other relief rolls.

I sincerely trust that the Military Affairs Committee will act speedily and favorably on this bill, for I know it would have a splendid reaction on the morale of our armed forces to know that the Government will not abandon them when the fighting is over.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the agricultural appropriation bill may have until midnight tonight in which to file a conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend my remarks, and further to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I had intended later today to address the House for about 15 minutes with respect

to the attempt of the Henderson camel to stick its nose farther under the tent. I shall be precluded from doing that by reason of the engagements of the day, my own and the program which is before the House, but I propose to extend my remarks and put something in the Appendix. Those of you who are opposed to the bureaucratic attempts of this man to assume to control the minutest details of your lives had better read it and see whether or not you agree with what I say.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

[Mr. PADDOCK addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from Ed Hammer, president of the Wyoming Automobile Dealers' Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in two places, in one to include a short paragraph from the Christian Herald, and in the other to include the text of a minority report filed by myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. RIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a very able address by Mr. Charles Fahy, Solicitor General of the United States, to the Federal Bar Association.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter from the President addressed to the teachers of the United States.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

COLLECTION OF FEDERAL INCOME TAXES

Mr. McLEAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

[Mr. McLEAN addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a tribute to the memory of our late colleague, Colonel Rutherford.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BENNETT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include a radio address delivered by myself on Memorial Day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the National Rivers and Harbors Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered at the seventy-fourth annual meeting of the Institute of Architects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may include two extensions of remarks in the RECORD; in one to insert an editorial from the Houston Post; and in the other to include a letter from Mr. John L. Bogert, editor of the Marine Journal.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

THE RUBBER SITUATION—MORE ACTION, FEWER ADJECTIVES NEEDED TO SOLVE RUBBER PROBLEM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I believe there is considerable merit in the position taken by the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. ALLEN] that Members of Congress should be careful in making remarks that will give aid and comfort to the enemy. I think, moreover, that this philosophy can be carried further and extended to include high administrative officials of this Government, who should be careful not to make statements that will confuse and perplex the American people.

We have had a long series of jigsaw puzzle statements by high officials concerning the rubber situation. I hope Members of the House will read the remarks made by Fulton Lewis on Monday and Tuesday, wherein he makes some serious charges to the effect that certain interests in this country are sabotaging the rubber program.

We read in the papers of June 20 a statement made by Wendell Lund, after being in the Government about 30 days, saying that the War Production Board is going to requisition the tires of private automobiles in this country. I think the time has come to enact some such legislation as I have introduced in the bill H. R. 7253, which has for its purpose the setting up of a rubber administrator who can speak authentically on the rubber situation in this country, and which is now before the House Banking and Currency Committee. In this way the responsibility for rubber production and utilization can be definitely fixed in this country and an end can be put to the motley chorus of inconsistent, ill-considered, and incompetent statements which administration spokesmen have been making to perplex and plague the people.

Members of Congress and private citizens can help substitute action for adjectives in a solution of the rubber situation by insisting on the immediate consideration of H. R. 7253.

THE TAXICAB STRIKE

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, a few moments ago a gentleman called attention to Hitler's radio relating things that occurred on the floor of the House. I am sure that Hitler's radio must have been busy yesterday telling about the taxicab strike in Washington. I commend the District Committee for its fine work in bringing that strike to an end, and especially commend the work of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES] who performed a great service in suggesting the method by which the strike was ended. At the same time I call attention to the arbitrary and officious way in which the chairman of the Utilities Commission of the District of Columbia acted on that occasion. I think it is high time that we got rid of some of these dictatorial and officious bureaucrats who are provoking these unnecessary conditions which are so abhorent to the American people. Calvin Coolidge once said that it is a crime to strike against the public welfare. How much more reprehensible it is to strike against the Government during wartime. This strike in this, our Capital City, carried with it an ominous note. A little more intelligent administration and foresight on the part of Mr. Hankin would have prevented this occurrence. It is well that it was effectively handled by the District Committee and experienced men like the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. BATES], who knew how to cope with this situation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MARSHALL FIELD 3D AND RALPH INGERSOLL

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

LET US GET THE INTERPARLIAMENTARY UNION FUNCTIONING AGAIN

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VORYS of Ohio addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

HIS MAJESTY, KING PETER II, OF YUGOSLAVIA

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, there is in the city today a distinguished king of a great people, His Majesty, Peter II, of Yugoslavia. I think it is fitting and proper that the Members should have the privilege of meeting this distinguished guest. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House stand in recess, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RECESS

Thereupon, at 12 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m., the House stood in recess.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints as a committee to escort our distinguished visitor to the Chamber the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], the gentleman from New York [Mr. BLOOM], and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON].

At 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m., the committee escorted His Majesty, King Peter II, to the Chamber, and he took his place on the rostrum at the Speaker's side.

The SPEAKER. Members of the House of Representatives, it is my privilege upon your part to welcome into this Chamber the head and ruler of a great people who for centuries have stood in the forefront, fighting for what they conceive to be human liberty. Today it is my great pleasure, my high privilege, my distinguished honor to present to you a kingly young man, His Majesty, Peter II, King of Yugoslavia.

King Peter delivered the following address:

Mr. Speaker, Members of the House of Representatives, it is with profound emotion that I speak today to the Congress of the United States. In this Hall of historic wisdom the experience of your statesmanship has guided the destinies of this great country. It has always striven to conduct its foreign policies with friendship to all nations. For that unfailing friendship which you have ever shown toward my people, both in times of peace and of war, I wish to express my gratitude. Today, the people of Yugoslavia who have without stint paid their contribution to the common cause, continue to fight for their deliverance. They fight alone, barred from contact with their fellow soldiers from other lands, but they fight in confidence that the United States and their other powerful allies will support them in this struggle. From those silent warriors of the faraway mountains I bring a comradely salute to the people of the United States.

A short week ago I was in London, where all who have found sanctuary, as has my government, draw strength and inspiration from the quiet patience and the grim determination of the British people to persevere until the inevitable victory is won.

By a cruel twist of fate I have never been able to address the representatives of my own people. A few days after the beginning of my reign all our homes and our institutions were shattered by a ruthless invasion. In the days of my early youth I had always looked forward to the moment when, like my father, I should stand in the modest parliament building in the city of Belgrade and speak to the elected representatives of the Yugoslav people.

Fate had willed otherwise. Our people, together with the other United Nations of the world have been thrown into a struggle the outcome of which will decide for many centuries whether these nations are to live in freedom or eke out a miserable existence in slavery. This war is indivisible, and there can be no freedom anywhere if even the smallest country in any part of the world is enslaved. We did not choose it this way. The ruthless leaders of Germany, Italy, Japan, and all their accomplices told us that we must all be destroyed. They are all our enemies; all of them must be defeated and all of us must be victorious. That is why the soldiers of the United Nations are all fighting the same battle. They may never have seen each other or even heard of each other but they are all united by the same destiny—the warriors of General Mihailovitch who fight in our gorges, the gallant British soldiers and sailors who die in the defense of freedom, the brother people of Russia who have stirred the imagination of the entire world by their heroic resistance, and the brave American fighting men who are giving their lives in every ocean and on every continent of the globe. With them are the men and women of every freedom-loving nation, united in their purposes, united in their determination to defeat the common enemy.

It is for all these reasons that I do not feel a stranger in the Congress of the United States. The Congress represents the will of the American people but it is also a champion and a guardian of those ideals and principles for which we all fight.

Yugoslavia, like the United States, is a country composed of simple, hard-working men. Before this war was thrust upon us, 16,000,000 Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes lived together, bound by the same customs, speaking the same language, and striving in common for peaceful progress and protection of all our citizens. Gradually, the different elements of our Nation learned to respect and trust each other. Some adjustments and reforms have been needed and these would have been made. We needed time to erase all our differences and to correct the mistakes of the past. But time was not given us. The conspiracy of Germany, Italy, Hungary, and Bulgaria wrecked the patient work of decades. Faced with the choice of resistance or dishonor we accepted war and were obliged to abandon our peaceful task of creating a more perfect union.

Hundreds of thousands of our men have already fallen in battle or been massacred in cold blood. The sacrifice of these men will inspire and guide me in my reign. I shall, with God's help, devote all my efforts to assuring those for whom they died a life worthy of this great sacrifice. Many who were not killed or enslaved by the Germans, Italians, Bulgarians, and Hungarians continue to fight under the indomitable leadership of my first soldier, and devoted friend, Gen. Draza Mihailovitch. I think that I can say to them, with your approval, that the might of the United States stands firmly by their side.

We shall win this war. But we must also win the peace that will follow it. Never again must we permit the calamity of war to fall upon us. Never again must we permit a band of tyrants to plunge the entire world into misery and disaster. A lasting peace can never be attained until we purge the nations which today are ranged against us of wicked men whose lust and greed has wrecked many a peace-loving country such as mine. It is only when nations great and small no longer fear the specter of aggression that they will be able to devote all their energies to the pursuit of peace among the nations and of security and welfare within them.

We have welcomed and willingly accepted the principles of the Atlantic Charter, with all its vast implications. In international relations we have already put its provisions into effect by signing a treaty of close political and economical union with our friend and neighbor, Greece. We hope that in the future this treaty will be adhered to by our other neighbors after they have rid themselves of those who are responsible for the crimes which have been committed in their names.

The four freedoms which your great President pledged to his own people will be the aim for which we will strive. We shall judge our citizens not by their political views, not by their racial or religious affiliations, but by their conduct in this present struggle. Whoever fought with us shall share with us in the blessings of victory.

My country has set her standard in the forefront of those who fight for freedom. We do not count the sacrifice and suffering; we do not measure the want and toil. We look only to the goal—the

victory which once was dim and distant but to which we now draw near.

At the conclusion of the address, King Peter took his place in the Well of the House and received the Members.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the proceedings which occurred during the recess will be printed in the RECORD.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's table today and any other special orders that may have been entered, I may address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of wooden shipbuilding, and include an article published in the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a brief address.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KOPPLEMANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an address made by myself last Sunday evening over the radio in Hartford, Conn.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the La Crosse (Wis.) Tribune and Leader Press entitled "Give Us the Truth."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLMES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting an editorial from the Worcester Telegram in connection with postal employees' pay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to say to my colleague there are a number of things in this bill that should affect the House very greatly. It seems to me they should be brought to the attention of the House. I would like to know if it is possible for us to explain for a few minutes just what this conference report provides before we do away with the reading of the conference report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I wish to assure the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, one of the conferees, that he will have sufficient time, and other Members will later, after the statement is made on the report.

Mr. RICH. Then is it possible for us to get 5 or 10 minutes now on this report?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Not until after the statement has been read.

Mr. RICH. Then we take up the amendments that are in disagreement?

The SPEAKER. The question, then, is on the adoption of the conference report, after the statement is read.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Of course, as the Speaker has stated, the debate will be on the conference report, and the gentleman will have time to debate that at that time.

Mr. RICH. That will be all right.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will read the statement.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8, 32, 37, 39, 69, 105, 113, 151, 152, 180, and 295.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 43, 45, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 96, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 110, 114, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 135, 136, 137, 138, 144, 147, 148, 149, 150, 153, 154, 155, 158, 160, 163, 164, 165, 166, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 179, 184, 185, 186, 189, 190, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 208, 210, 211, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 263, 264, 265, 267, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 280, 281, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, and 297; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$967,170"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,615,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,350,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Fire protection of forests, forest industries, and strategic facilities (national defense): For an additional amount to be added to the appropriation contained in the 'Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942' for 'Fire protection of forests, forest industries, and strategic facilities (national defense)' $96,000, to be immediately available, of which not to exceed $8,000 may be used for personal services in the District of Columbia."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$49,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$95,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$708,480"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$115,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$132,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$107,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$35,350"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$15,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$215,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$70,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$85,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,830,505"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,640,870"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$926,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$46,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$39,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended to read as follows: ": *Provided*, That not to exceed $40,000 of said amount may be used for exterminating wolves and coyotes"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 115: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 115, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$368,252"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 132: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$45,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 133: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 134: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 134, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 139: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 139, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$377,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 140: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 140, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$80,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 141: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$176,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 142: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 142, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,580,215"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,753,465"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 145: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 145, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$401,645"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 146: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 146, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 157: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 159: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 159, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 161: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 161, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 167: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 167, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$900,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 168: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 168, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$629,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 169: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 169, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 170: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 170, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$527,325"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 178: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 178, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 181: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 181, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,308,335"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 182: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 182, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$170,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 183: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 183, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$975,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 187: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$341,180"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 188: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 188, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,722,090"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 191: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 191, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$356,755"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 209: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 209, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$55,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 254: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 254, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$10,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 262: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 262, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "$368,940, of which $25,000 shall be available immediately"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 266: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 266, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"Economic value of birds and animals: For investigating the economic value of North American birds and animals in relation to agriculture, horticulture, and forestry, including methods of conserving beneficial and controlling injurious birds and animals, $50,000."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 268: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 268, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 269: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 269, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$201,835"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 270: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 270, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$916,450"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 276: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 276, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,927,690"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 277: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 277, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,252,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 278: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 278, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,180,490"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 279: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 279, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$935,125"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 296: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 296, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 9. Of the total amount available under this Act for traveling expenses, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed, on or before August 1, 1942, to cover into the surplus fund of the Treasury the sum of $315,000, and in addition, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to reserve from expenditure the total sum of $6,700 under amounts available for traveling expenses in appropriations made in this Act from the reclamation fund-special fund, Colorado River Dam fund, and Colorado River Development fund: *Provided*, That the sum covered into the surplus fund of the Treasury and the sum reserved from expenditure shall be in addition to reductions in amounts available for traveling expenses resulting from decreases in the appropriations made by this Act below the Budget estimates: *Provided further*, That where appropriations in this Act are expendable for travel expenses, expenditures for such purpose shall not exceed the amount set forth therefor in the Budget estimates submitted for the appropriations."

And the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 109, 111, 112, 156, 162, 171, 192, 199, 200, 201, 212, 213, and 214.

JED JOHNSON,
J. G. SCRUGHAM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
Managers on the part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
GERALD P. NYE,
RUFUS C. HOLMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendments relating to travel expenses

The following amendments are those in which travel expense only is involved: Nos. 3 to 6, inclusive, 11 to 14, inclusive, 16 to 23, inclusive, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 43, 47 to 59, inclusive, 61, 70 to 86, inclusive, 91, 96, 114, 116, 119, 123, 124, 125, 127 to 131, inclusive, 135, 144, 149, 150, 153, 155, 158, 163, 172, 174, 179, 184, 189, 190, 193 to 198, inclusive, 202, 207, 208, 215 to 253, inclusive, 255, 256, 257, 259, 264, 265 267, 271, 272, 273, 274, 282 to 292, inclusive, 294 and 296. The House made numerous reductions in individual items under the amendments set forth above. The Senate restored these reductions and inserted a paragraph providing for a 10-percent reduction. The conference report inserts the Senate proposal amended to provide that the amounts deducted shall be covered into the surplus fund of the Treasury, and with the further restriction that expenditures shall in no case exceed the amount set forth therefor in the Budget estimates submitted for the appropriations. A total of $315,000 will be covered into the surplus fund of the Treasury under the provision recommended by the conferees.

Office of the Secretary

No. 1: Appropriates $967,170 for salaries, office of the Secretary, instead of $855,650, as proposed by the House, and $1,002,170, as proposed by the Senate. The increase of $111,520 above the House figure represents approval by the conference committee of $8,000 for the salary of the Chief of Research and Planning Branch, Division of Power, $28,520 for the Power Policy Committee, $50,000 for the Division of Information, and $25,000 for the Division of Investigations.

No. 2: Appropriates $126,145, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $120,785, as proposed by the House, for the Division of Territories and Island Possessions.

No. 7: Appropriates $2,615,500 for the Bituminous Coal Division, instead of $2,442,254, as proposed by the House, and $2,620,500, as proposed by the Senate, the reduction of $5,000 being applied to communication service.

Nos. 8 and 9: Appropriates $1,350,000 for soil and moisture conservation operations, instead of $1,300,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of $50,000 in the House figure being provided to restore $10,000 for travel expenses and $40,000 for soil and moisture conservation operations under the Bureau of Reclamation, being in addition to the amount which would have been allocated to this Bureau from the appropriation contained in the House bill. The House proposal, $100,000, for personal services in the District of Columbia, is inserted, in lieu of $120,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $96,000 for fire protection of forests, as proposed by the Senate.

Bonneville Power Administration

No. 15: Provides $1,700,000 for operation of transmission facilities and expenses of marketing, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $1,350,000, as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

No. 24: Appropriates $610,040, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $604,280, as proposed by the House, for salaries in the office of the Commissioner.

No. 25: Appropriates $49,800 for general expenses, in lieu of $46,820, as proposed by the House and $50,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 29: Appropriates $325,000, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $165,000, as proposed by the House, for the acquisition of land for Indians.

Nos. 32 and 33: Appropriates $95,000 for expenses of supervising mining operations on Indian lands, instead of $90,000, as proposed by the House, and $100,000, as proposed by the Senate, and provides that $10,000 of such sum shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House.

No. 34: Appropriates $708,480, for developing agriculture and stock-raising, instead of $693,180, as proposed by the House, and $708,980, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 35: Appropriates $115,000 for encouraging industry and self-support among Indians, in lieu of $100,000, as proposed by the House, and $125,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 36, 37, and 38, relating to funds for loans to Indian-chartered corporations: Appropriates $132,000, in lieu of $112,200, as proposed by the House, and $150,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides $20,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House, in lieu of $27,800, as proposed by the Senate; and makes $107,000 available for services and expenses in the field, in lieu of $83,000, as proposed by the House, and $113,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 39: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate providing $22,500 for expenses of the National Indian Institute. The action of the conferees does not necessarily mean that they are opposed to the continuance of this activity. However, it is the opinion of the House conferees that this organization should not be given a more or less permanent status by placing funds for it in an annual appropriation bill. The activity is now being financed from emergency funds available to the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. If continuance of the Institute is regarded as essential by the Interior Department the House conferees believe funds for such purpose should be secured from the agency now supporting it and that the matter of providing funds on a regular annual basis should not be determined at the present time.

Nos. 40, 41, and 42: Appropriates $35,350, for Indian arts and crafts development, instead of $30,000 as proposed by the Senate; provides that $15,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $13,500, as proposed by the Senate and $16,000, as proposed by the House, and places a limit of $6,500 on the amount which may be paid as salary for any employee engaged on this work, in lieu of $5,000, as proposed by the Senate and $7,500, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 44, 45, and 46, relating to operation and maintenance of irrigation systems: Appropriates $215,000 for such purpose, in lieu of $218,475, as proposed by the Senate, and $193,275, as proposed by the House; makes funds for miscellaneous projects in Arizona and New Mexico available for "projects", in lieu of "project"; and provides $70,000 for administrative expenses, in lieu of $65,000, as proposed by the House, and $71,725, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 60: Appropriates $166,000 for operation of the Wapato irrigation system, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $159,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 62: Appropriates $85,300 for protection of project works, in lieu of $31,900, as proposed by the House, and $90,000, as proposed by the Senate. Funds are provided for the Fort Hall project, Idaho, and the Duck Valley project, Nevada, on a 10 months' basis; and $3,600 has been eliminated for the Wind River project, Wyoming, due to the receipt of information that such service would be ineffective owing to the wide area covered by the project.

Nos. 63, 64, 65, 66, and 67, relating to construction and repair of Indian irrigation projects: Inserts $50,000 for the Fort Peck project, Montana, instead of $10,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $15,000 for the Warm Springs project, Oregon, and $50,000 for the Wind River project, Wyoming, provides $136,750 for administrative expenses, and corrects the total for such items; all as proposed by the Senate.

No. 68: Appropriates $5,830,505 for the support of Indian schools, in lieu of $5,731,005, as proposed by the House, and $5,874,755, as proposed by the Senate. Funds are provided for the care of children attending the following mission schools:

St. Agnes (Oklahoma)	$7,500
St. Stephen's (Wyoming)	2,500
Papago Missions (Arizona)	6,000
St. Michael's (Wyoming)	1,750

St. Paul's (Montana)	$6,000
Immaculate Conception (South Dakota)	7,250
Old Goodland (Oklahoma)	20,500
Total	51,500

An increase of $40,000 has been provided for educational work under the Minnesota State education contract. A Senate proposal to provide $6,900 for education of Indian children in Terrabonne Parish, La., has been eliminated.

No. 69: Appropriates $334,375 from Indian tribal funds for educational purposes, as proposed by the House, in lieu of $335,775, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 87, 88, 89, and 90, relating to conservation of health among Indians: Appropriates $5,569,713, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,479,835, as proposed by the House, for such purpose; and provides $23,475 for continued operation of the Fort Yuma Hospital, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 92, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, and 108, relating to general support of Indians and administration of Indian property: Appropriates $2,640,870 for general expenses of administration, in lieu of $2,605,870, as proposed by the House, and $2,646,870, as proposed by the Senate; provides $926,500 for relief of needy Indians, in lieu of $750,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,100,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which $46,250 shall be available for administrative expenses, in lieu of $30,000, as proposed by the House, and $59,500, as proposed by the Senate, including $39,700 for personal services in the District of Columbia, in lieu of $35,000, as proposed by the House, and $44,400, as proposed by the Senate; provides that not to exceed $40,000 of funds appropriated for the reindeer service may be used for exterminating wolves and coyotes; appropriates tribal funds for the employment of a 1 year's basis of attorneys or agents for the Klamath Indians, Oregon, Uintah and Ouray, Utah, Menominee Indians, Wisconsin, Makah, Washington, Northern Cheyenne Tribe, Montana, and Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Montana; corrects the total for expenditures from tribal funds for support of Indians; provides $14,375 for the care of children attending the St. Benedict's Mission, Minnesota; all as proposed by the Senate; and provides $25,000 for expenses of tribal councils, as proposed by the House, in lieu of $35,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 110: Appropriates $1,255,000 for construction of roads on Indian reservations, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $1,148,000, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 113 and 115, relating to construction and repair of buildings on Indian reservations: Strikes out the provision of the Senate appropriating $25,000 for general repairs at Carson, Nev., and adjusts the total appropriation for construction items due to such elimination, taking into account the restoration of $1,642 for travel expenses explained heretofore in this statement.

Bureau of Reclamation

Nos. 116 and 117: Appropriates $148,000 for expenses in the office of the Commissioner, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $135,850, as proposed by the House, of which $41,000 is made available for necessary expenses, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $28,850, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 120, 121, and 122, relating to the Minidoka project, Idaho: Appropriates $114,000 for operation and repair of such project, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $13,925 for operation, as proposed by the House.

No. 126: Appropriates $17,000 for operation of the Vale project, Oregon, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 132: Appropriates $45,000 for the operation and maintenance administration, in lieu of $34,855, as proposed by the House, and $54,400, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, and 143, relating to construction of projects from the reclamation fund: Appropriates $50,000 for the Sun River project, Montana, and $100,000 for the Deschutes project, Oregon, in lieu of $100,000 and $200,000, respectively, as proposed by the Senate; provides $6,000 for the Hyrum project, Utah, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $825,000 for the Riverton project, Wyoming, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $65,000, as proposed by the House; provides $377,700 for general investigations, in lieu of $250,000, as proposed by the House, and $500,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $176,500 for administrative expenses, in lieu of $100,000, as proposed by the House, and $200,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which $80,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, in lieu of $50,000, as proposed by the House, and $90,000, as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the totals of appropriations from the reclamation fund.

Nos. 145 and 146: Appropriates $401,645 from the Colorado River development fund for surveys, in lieu of $150,000, as proposed by the House, and $450,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which $9,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, in lieu of $5,000, as proposed by the House, and $10,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 147 and 148: Appropriates $700,000 for protection of project works, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $400,000, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 151 and 152: Appropriates $1,000,000 for continuation of construction, All-American Canal, as proposed by the House, in lieu of $1,250,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which $5,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House, in lieu of $10,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 154, 157, 159, 160, 161, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, and 170, relating to construction of projects from the general fund: Appropriates $1,250,000 for the Gila project, Arizona, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $250,000, as proposed by the House; $6,500,000 for the Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, in lieu of $4,829,100, as proposed by the House, and $7,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; $750,000 for the Tucumcari project, New Mexico, in lieu of $299,925, as proposed by the House, and $800,000, as proposed by the Senate; $400,000 for the Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $99,975, as proposed by the House; $2,000,000 for the Provo River project, Utah, in lieu of $1,286,760 as proposed by the House, and $2,200,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides that not to exceed $2,000,000 of funds for the Grand Coulee Dam project, Washington, may be used for construction of the pumping plant, reservoir, and dams in Grand Coulee, and inserts subsection numbers for the several items provided for under the project; appropriates $900,000 for the Roza division of the Yakima project, Washington, in lieu of $399,940, as proposed by the House, and $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $629,500 for investigations, in lieu of $500,000, as proposed by the House and $750,000, as proposed by the Senate; and provides $527,325 for administrative expenses, in lieu of $450,000, as proposed by the House, and $600,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 173: Strikes out the provision of the House relating to utilization of the services of enemy aliens, and restores similar language broadened to provide that the services of such persons may be used also in connection with the construction of Federal reclamation projects and other work.

Geological Survey

Nos. 175, 176, 177, 178, 180, 181, 182, 183, 185, 186, 187, and 188, relating to the Geological Survey: Appropriates $1,000,900, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $498,515, as proposed by the House, for geologic surveys, of which $480,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $300,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $647,980, for strategic and critical minerals, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $245,980, as proposed by the House, of which $100,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, in lieu of $45,000, as proposed by the House, and $125,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides $25,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia in connection with mineral resources in Alaska, as proposed by the House, in lieu of $26,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $1,208,335 for gaging streams, in lieu of $1,241,795, as proposed by the House, and $1,363,130, as proposed by the Senate, of which $170,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, and provides that $975,000 shall be available only for cooperative purposes, in lieu of $970,000, as proposed by the House, and $980,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $246,370 for printing geologic and topographic maps, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $341,180 for mineral leasing, in lieu of $326,670, as proposed by the House, and $352,850, as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the total for Geological Survey appropriations.

Bureau of Mines

Nos. 191, 203, 204, 205, 206, 209, 210, and 211, relating to the Bureau of Mines: Appropriates $356,755 for testing fuel, in lieu of $283,305, as proposed by the House, and $376,755, as proposed by the Senate; provides $744,000, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $93,925, as proposed by the House, for the production of alumina from low-grade bauxite, aluminum clays, and alunite, permits the purchase of buildings for such work, as proposed by the Senate in lieu of restricting such purchase to one building, as proposed by the House, and makes $16,000 available for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $2,275,000 for investigation of deposits of critical and essential minerals, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $997,500, as proposed by the House, provides that $55,000 of such sum may be used for personal services in the District of Columbia, in lieu of $33,000, as proposed by the House, and $68,000, as proposed by the Senate, and provides $1,500 for printing and binding, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $1,000, as proposed by the House.

National Park Service

No. 254: Appropriates $10,000 for the Travel Bureau, in lieu of $9,820, as proposed by the House, and $50,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Fish and Wildlife Service

No. 258: Appropriates $914,715, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $906,715, as proposed by the House, for propagation of food fishes.

No. 260: Appropriates $472,720, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $400,000, as proposed by the House, for inquiry respecting food fishes.

No. 261: Continues available during the fiscal year 1943 the unexpended balance of an appropriation of $2,500 for the International Board of Inquiry for the Great Lakes Fisheries amended to provide that such sum shall be available for printing the report of the Board, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 262: Appropriates $368,940, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $194,710, as proposed by the House for investigation and research with a view to assisting the fishery industries.

No. 263: Appropriates $86,220, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $80,000, as proposed by the House for the fishery market news service.

No. 266: Appropriates $50,000 for investigations in connection with the economic value

of North American birds, in lieu of $71,550, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 268 and 269: Appropriates $201,835 for biological investigations, in lieu of $131,660, as proposed by the House, and $231,660, as proposed by the Senate, of which $35,000 in made available for investigations of the relations of wild animal life to forests, in lieu of $27,500, as proposed by the House, and $40,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 270: Appropriates $916,450 for control of predatory animals, in lieu of $700,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 275: Appropriates $15,840 for an Alaska fur-seal investigation, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 276: Corrects a total.

No. 277: Appropriates $1,252,800, in lieu of $1,250,000, as proposed by the House, and $2,250,000, as proposed by the Senate, for Federal aid in wildlife restoration under the act of September 2, 1937.

No. 278. Corrects a total.

No. 279: Provides that not to exceed $935,125 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, in lieu of $893,605, as proposed by the House, and $951,505, as proposed by the Senate.

Government in the Territories

Nos. 280 and 281: Appropriates $24,390 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $19,690, as proposed by the House, for expenses in the office of the Governor of Alaska, of which $12,380 may be used for clerk hire, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $7,780, as proposed by the House.

No. 293: Appropriates $130,000, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $114,800, as proposed by the House, for defraying the deficit in the treasury of the municipal government of St. Croix, V. I.

No. 295: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate excepting from the provision of section 7 of the bill (relating to membership in an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government by force or violence) persons in the field service engaged for a period of less than 60 days in connection with emergency work involving the loss of life or property.

No. 297: Corrects a section number.

Amendments reported in disagreement

The following amendments are reported in disagreement. The subject matter of such amendments, and the action proposed to be recommended with respect thereto by the managers on the part of the House, are as follows:

No. 109: Relating to per capita payments to enrolled members of the Seminole Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 111: Relating to condemnation of land within the Grand Portage Indian Reservation in Cook County, Minn., for highway purposes. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 112: Relating to condemnation of land within the Seneca Indian School property in Ottawa County, Okla. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 156: Relating to funds for the Central Valley project, California.

No. 162: Relating to the operation and maintenance of camp and construction facilities at the Grand Coulee Dam project, Washington. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 171: Corrects a total.

No. 192: Relating to the construction and equipment of an experimental plant for synthesis of motor fuel, Pittsburgh, Pa. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 199: Relating to construction and equipment of a Northwest Electrodevelopment Laboratory. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 200: Relating to construction and operation of plants for research in connection with to the gaseous and solid fuel reduction of iron ores. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 201: Relating to the construction and equipment of helium plants. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 212: Relating to the application of section 3709, Revised Statutes, in connection with certain appropriations. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 213. Relating to appointment of skilled and unskilled labor without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, of persons employed at experimental plants and laboratories of the Bureau of Mines. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 214: Corrects a total.

JED JOHNSON,
J. G. SCRUGHAM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the report represents an agreement on nearly every important item in this bill. We were unable to agree on one or two important matters, notably the Central Valley project in California, and that matter will be discussed when the amendments in disagreement are under consideration.

The bill as agreed upon up to this point is $6,375,000 below the Budget estimates. Of course, our recommendations represent a compromise between the House and the Senate on the differences between the two Houses. Although the amount agreed upon is approximately $17,000,000 in excess of the bill as it passed the House, it should be remembered that the Senate received and considered additional Budget estimates totaling nearly $10,000,000 after the bill had passed the House. Much of the remaining $7,000,000 added by the Senate is to provide funds for work vital to the prosecution of the war.

I shall not at this time go into a detailed discussion of all the amendments involved, but later will be glad to answer any questions that may be asked.

You will recall that when the bill was before the House the question of travel expense was under consideration. Every paragraph in the bill containing funds for travel was cut by the House, many of them drastically. The Senate restored those reductions and inserted just one paragraph providing for a general 10-percent cut.

The conference report inserts the Senate proposal amended to provide that the amounts deducted shall be covered into the surplus fund of the Treasury, and also to provide that the expenditures for travel shall in no case exceed the amount set up for such purpose in the Budget estimates. Under the provision contained in the report $315,000 will be covered into the surplus fund of the Treasury. The action of the conference in this connection follows the general policy adopted in connection with other appropriation bills heretofore acted upon.

At this time, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania desires, I shall be pleased to yield him 5 minutes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WHITTINGTON). The gentleman from Missouri makes the point of order that a quorum is not present. The Chair will count. [After counting]. Ninety Members are present, not a quorum.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 83]

Andersen, H. Carl	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Osmers
Baldwin	Harrington	O'Toole
Barry	Harter	Paddock
Beckworth	Hébert	Pearson
Blackney	Heffernan	Peterson, Fla.
Boykin	Hess	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Brown, Ohio	Hoffman	Plauché
Buck	Hook	Reece, Tenn.
Buckler, Minn.	Houston	Robertson, N. Dak.
Buckley, N. Y.	Izac	Robsion, Ky.
Burch	Jarrett	Rockefeller
Burdick	Jenks, N. H.	Rogers, Okla.
Byrne	Johnson, Ind.	Romjue
Byron	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Sacks
Casey, Mass.	Kee	Schaefer, Ill.
Clark	Kelley, Pa.	Schuetz
Cluett	Kennedy, Martin J.	Schulte
Coffee, Nebr.	Kennedy, Michael J.	Scott
Cole, Md.	Keogh	Secrest
Cole, N. Y.	Kleberg	Shannon
Culkin	Klein	Sheridan
Cullen	Kocialkowski	Sikes
Day	Landis	Smith, Pa.
Delaney	Larrabee	Smith, W. Va.
Dies	McGranery	Sumners, Texas
Dingell	Maas	Sweeney
Douglas	Maciejewski	Thomas, N. J.
Drewry	Marcantonio	Tinkham
Eberharter	Mason	Vincent, Ky.
Ellis	Merritt	Vreeland
Fish	Mills, Ark.	Wadsworth
Fogarty	Mitchell	Walter
Forand	Murray	Weaver
Ford, Leland M.	Myers, Pa.	Wene
Gathings	O'Day	White
Gavagan	O'Leary	Wilson
Gifford	Pace	Wolverton, N. J.
Gilchrist	Patman	Worley
Green	Patrick	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. On this roll call 318 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, far be it from me to order a call of the House so the membership might hear me speak on this conference report, but I would like to say to the House that the Appropriations Subcommittee on the Interior Department sat about 6 weeks early this spring holding hearings on this bill; they spent 3 days in conference among themselves going over the bill before they met with the Senate conferees, and were in conference with the managers on the part of the Senate for 2 days. During this time we discussed the appropriations for the Interior Department.

The bill as it passed the House carried $162,157,965; the amount of the bill

as it passed the Senate was $186,924,998, making a difference between the two bills, an increase on the part of the Senate, of $24,767,033.

The Senate added 297 amendments to the House bill. As I say, before we met with the Senate conferees we agreed upon our policy. We did not agree to do nearly the things in our own conference that we did when we met with the Senate conferees. They seemed to have hypnotized our conferees.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RICH. I cannot yield now; if I have time later I will.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, there were 297 amendments in disagreement. On these the House receded in 214 instances. The House receded with an amendment on 59 of the Senate items. The Senate receded on 11 amendments out of the 297, and there are in disagreement 13 amendments which will be taken up later on in the day, providing we do not agree to the conference report. It will be up to the House to decide what to do with the report and these amendments in disagreemen..

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. TABER. On that basis the House record is 3 percent.

Mr. RICH. I say that the House conferees surrendered.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Is it not a fact that after the bill went to the Senate supplemental reports came in from the administration requesting items amounting to nearly $10,000,000? We did not have those items before us in the House.

Mr. RICH. We always get such last minute requests. There never is an appropriation bill considered but what some Member of Congress goes to the Budget during its consideration trying to secure additional funds. It is nothing new, nothing at all; it is something that happens in every bill.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. LEAVY. The gentleman states that the Senate added 297 amendments and that the House receded on 214. Would it not be fair to state that 157 of these were travel items, some as low as a dollar and a dollar and a half, and that the travel items were all cared for in a single amendment on which we all agreed?

Mr. RICH. There is a good deal of truth in what the gentleman states about these amendments, but let me say that in the House we considered those amendments, and in our own conference we were pretty much of the idea that we did a pretty good job in the House and that we ought not to let those travel items be raised. We should not yield to the Senate. We should hold fast. Nevertheless, when we do yield to the Senate and give them what they want for traveling expenses we ought to find out if we can do without a lot of this traveling.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, far be it from me to give any false impression about this, even to my colleagues with whom I disagree, because I think they are a fine bunch of fellows. I do not agree with the things they do, however. We can have a difference about things, yet be good fellows here, so that I am not going to give in to anybody if I think he is wrong. He has got to convince me. I am like the old preacher, I have to be convinced with my own convincer.

Let me call attention to some of the increases that the House did agree to; I do not think they should have agreed. There is the Bituminous Coal Division, an increase of $173,246. We ought to cut it down $500,000 to a million dollars instead of increase it.

There is the Soil Moisture Conservation program, an increase of $50,000. We should not have increased it a penny.

Here is fire protection in the forests, with an increase, and they put in a lot of new language in here, if you will read amendment No. 10. We have given as high as $2,000,000 at a time for forest protection in other bills and we should not have increased that item.

There is the Bonneville power project, an increase of $350,000. We should not have increased that in this bill.

Here is item 29, acquisition of Indian land. The Budget Bureau impounded the money last year. Let me call attention to these items in the traveling-expense division which were increased by $160,000.

Here is item 68 for Indian schools. We agreed to care for all the children and we gave them all the schools that the Department said they wanted, but just because some members of the committee wanted additional schools the conferees acquiesced after we agreed that we would stand pat. There is where we completely surrendered to the Senate.

Then there is item 97, which has to do with the eradication of reindeer in Alaska, $40,000. I was told in committee that the reason that that was changed was because the wording was such that they could spend the whole amount or $90,000. May I say to the House in the best spirit I know how that I was double-crossed on that amendment, because they knew we wanted to take $40,000 off the reindeer item. When they came to write this up afterward, I went to the Clerk, and I talked to Senator HAYDEN, and I talked to other members of the committee. I think I was double-crossed on the amendment because all they did was to use the word "may" while I wanted them to use the word "shall." They would not do that after they said we would use $40,000 for that particular purpose of killing wolves and coyotes. If there was a misunderstanding that is one thing, but there certainly was not any misunderstanding so far as I am concerned, because I went back to them and I tried to get them to correct it, but I could not do so.

We will call your attention to a lot more items in this bill that should not have been agreed to in conference providing we agree to the conference report. We must be saving and economical and I am sure the conferees were not and the money is not available for many of these items which I consider wasteful and extravagant.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, this conference report that we are considering today represents the most abject surrender on the part of the House conferees that I have ever witnessed during my term of office in the Congress of the United States. As has been stated by the previous speaker, the House receded on 214 amendments. We receded with an amendment, which is equivalent to a surrender, on 59 additional items, making a total of 273 amendments. The persuasiveness of the House conferees was successful in convincing the Senate that it should recede on a sum total of 11 amendments out of 297.

Mr. Speaker, this bill should go back to conference. This bill should be considered in the light of the action of the House. I protested in conference time after time when the Senate insisted on increasing the amount where the House by a vote here had overridden the action of the committee and reduced the amount. The Senate paid no attention to the House action.

I regret to say that my fellow conferees evidently forgot about the House action. You will remember that on the floor of the House we cut several hundred thousand dollars out of this bill. Did that mean anything to the conferees when we were over there? Not a thing. The record here tells that more eloquently than I can speak it. If a bill ever deserved to go back to conference for further consideration, this is the bill. It is possible to cut several million dollars out of the bill without injuring the services in any way.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Is it the gentleman's recommendation to the House that we turn down the approximately $25,000,000 added by the Senate, or is there some of it that we should agree to?

Mr. CARTER. There may be some that should be agreed to. But may I say to the gentleman from Virginia that there are certain sums here that are in disagreement that could be still further reduced without doing the least bit of injury to anybody, and there are certain sums we have agreed to that should be further reduced. Then there are certain other sums that should be eliminated.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. In those 13 items that the House conferees did not agree to, how much money is involved?

Mr. CARTER. Approximately $10,000,000.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. How will the vote come before the House now to do what the gentleman says we should do?

Mr. CARTER. Instead of voting to adopt the conference report, vote against

adopting the conference report, and it goes back to conference, where it can be given further consideration. The proper vote on the pending motion is "No."

May I say to the membership of the House that if a bill ever deserved additional consideration by the conferees, who had instructions from the House on a number of matters that they entirely disregarded, this is the bill. This bill should be sent back to conference, where several items should be entirely eliminated and many reduced by substantial amounts.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the parliamentary situation before the House at the moment is this: Shall the conference report as reported by the conferees be adopted? It includes every amendment except some 13 amendments that have been reported in disagreement. It is my belief that the conference report should not be adopted. I am persuaded from such examination as I have been able to make that the report ought to be voted down, and very decisively.

There is involved something of a principle here today. The House subcommittee labored for more than 6 weeks on this bill. I know something about those hearings. They sat 5 days a week, 6 days a week sometimes, from 10 until 12:30 or 1 o'clock, and then resumed again at 2 and labored on until 5:30 or 6 o'clock. It was hard, arduous work. For 6 weeks they labored with the details of this Interior Department appropriation bill.

The Senate committee, however, spent exactly 8 days with this bill. If you need any confirmation of that fact, all you need do is examine the Senate hearings and find that they sat on May 1, May 4, May 5, May 6, May 7, May 8, May 13, and May 15.

If you are willing to make public confession that the mental dexterity, agility, and ability in the other body is considerably superior to that on this side of the Capitol, it will be all right with me, but I do not propose to make that kind of a confession. I am persuaded that in view of their capacity and integrity, the work of the members of the House subcommittee, steeping themselves in this bill for 6 weeks, constitutes an infinitely better exploration and examination of these items than what they gave over on the Senate side. Then to come along and recede on hundreds of items certainly does not augur well for the capacity of the House conferees, and I refuse to put the stamp of approval on that kind of a confession, as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Will the gentleman, in such limited time as he has, pick out for us the major items for which he thinks these conferees should further contend?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Take a look at the Bureau of Reclamation. Take a look at the Bureau of Mines. Examine some of the other agencies. There you see the totals, there you see the increases.

Let me submit that the Budget estimate which came to the House was $180,000,000. When the committee reported the bill they reported it $18,000,000 under the Budget. They did an excellent job. The $9,000,000 in supplemental estimates went to the Senate committee after the bill left the House. Then the Senate reported a bill of $186,000,000, which is $24,700,000 over the bill as it passed the House. Let us be a little mindful of the dollars and cents. Twenty-four million dollars is more than chicken feed in my country.

We have just finished here the consideration of a bill carrying $42,000,000,000 for the military. We must do everything possible to hold down expenditure, in the light of this war and the necessity for a concentration of the war expenditure, so that victory may be the more expeditiously obtained if we concentrate on the war expenditure. That is all the more reason why every dollar should be saved, for in proportion as this debt level goes up, so the carrying charge becomes greater and the burden upon our people in the years to come, recurring every year in the form of an annual interest charge will be so much more burdensome. It should be held down to the lowest possible level of which we are capable at the present time. That is our duty to the taxpayers of the country.

It has been said here that the House receded on 214 amendments. Assuming that 149 of those amendments are for travel, that still leaves 64, while the Senate receded on only 11.

It is not a question of being arbitrary or capricious. It is a question of whether after 6 weeks of labor the House committee fooled the House on this bill and then went over to the Senate to accept every increase and then returned to the House to recant its earlier action. This is important and is a step not to be lightly taken unless we propose to yield to the Senate complete control of the public purse.

I labored along with the subcommittee when they had the bill on the floor, and I do not propose to make that kind of a confession today. So I am going to join with my colleagues in the hope that we can vote down the conference report and send it back to conference for further consideration. That is fair to the House and to those who deliberated so earnestly and diligently for a long time in the preparation of this bill. Finally, it does involve an increase of $24,000,000. That is something.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am against this conference report, because it still has the earmarks of a logrolling bill. It still has in it an information bureau costing $2,430,777, and when you take out the necessary amount to handle the correspondence of the Department of the Interior, that leaves approximately $1,500,000 for information service of the Department of the Interior in this bill. For the information service of Interior alone this bill carries 10 times as much as Mr. Mark Sullivan estimates would be necessary for the entire Government—every independent establishment and agency of the Federal Government.

In connection with this conference report, I asked the Department of the Interior to prepare for me a statement of the portions of the Senate amendments that were passed without Budget estimates. In 33 Senate amendments, Budget estimates have been exceeded by $7,472,225. Remember, they have passed amendments that went over the estimates of the Budget Bureau by nearly $7,500,000.

Now, it seems to me that the only way you can cut all of these ill-considered amendments, since they are so voluminous that they cannot be discussed in my 5 minutes of this allotment of 1 hour's time, is for the House to send this committee back to conference with the mandate of the House to dispose of these amendments from the standpoint of our national emergency. I sincerely believe there has been too much provincial attitude taken by the members of the conference committee.

This is a country in war. This is a time when we must put first things first, and the first thing we must do is to utilize properly the manpower and the money of the country and send the equipment and the tools necessary for the men on the fighting fronts on the seven seas and the far-flung battlefields of the world.

I am against this conference report because there is too much attention being paid to the reelection of the conference committee members rather than to the good of the country. I earnestly request this House to turn down the conference report.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. When the members of the Ways and Means Committee say they are going to report out a bill providing for the raising of $6,000,000,000 in taxes, although they were told by the President to bring out a bill for $9,000,000,000, and they further say that they do not know where to get that money by taxing the people, does not the gentleman believe we ought to begin saving with respect to our appropriations because by doing so we help to reduce the deficit?

Mr. JONES. It might be a good idea for some of the men of the Ways and Means Committee who have struggled with the $6,000,000,000 tax bill for several months to sit in a conference committee and witness the back-scratching provincial consideration that is given by the spenders on this conference committee.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BEITER. The gentleman has given the figure of seven and a half million dollars over and above the Bureau of the Budget requests. Can the gentleman furnish the House the amount of the requests received from the various departments after the bill had passed the House? What does that amount to?

Mr. JONES. That amounts to $9,579,810, but that is not a fair comparison because the 33 amendments of the Senate I have cited to you a minute ago are $7,472,000 over the Budget. So $7,472,000 of the Senate version of the bill is not accounted for by the supplemental estimates and are no defense for the increases that will be appropriated if this conference report is adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact that there is one item here amounting to $200,000, which will be brought back to the House for the House to decide, and if we agree to that, it is going to cost at least $15,000,000.

Mr. BEITER. What item is that?

Mr. RICH. That is the power plant in the Central Valley in California.

Mr. BEITER. Was not that recommended by the War Production Board or someone there who asked for it?

Mr. RICH. There is always somebody recommending something.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield, the War Production Board has declined a priority for that particular item.

Mr. JONES. On that particular item we will later have debate by reason of the disagreement between the House and the Senate. That will be discussed on the floor later.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. May I just say that the War Production Board recommended, however, the item contained in this bill for a preliminary study of the project?

Mr. JONES. We will go into that matter later.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY].

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I do not come down into the Well of the House for the purpose of defending this conference report, because it needs no defense. It is a fact there has been disagreement among our conferees, but the report here with the single exception of one item, as I recall it, has a majority of the conferees supporting it. It has been signed by five of the eight members. I am satisfied that my good friend from Ohio did not mean to reflect upon his fellow conferees when he made a statement from which the inference might be drawn that trades had been made for the purpose of getting political advantage. I challenge him or I challenge anyone to point to a single item in this conference report that would, in any way, support such a charge.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. I do not think the gentleman meant so much for political advantage as he did for advantage to the members of the conference in getting something for their own districts. You recall about the schools that we were asked by some of the conferees to establish after we had agreed among ourselves. What were they put in the bill for?

Mr. LEAVY. There are items in here that are in the districts of the members of the Interior Subcommittee and also in many other congressional districts. The fact that an activity happens to be in the district of a Member of Congress and he secures an appropriation for it, is not, or even remotely to be taken as, an implication of unfairness or of seeking personal advantage.

It is evidence of the fact that the Member knows those things concerning that item and can present the case from first-hand knowledge, so as to convince his fellows on its merits, whether it be in conference, in Committee of the Whole, or in the House.

The suggestion is now being made here that you should vote down this conference report. I cannot believe for a moment that that suggestion is made with intent that it should so be done.

On next Tuesday, June 30, we come to the end of the fiscal year 1942. At midnight on June 30 every dollar that is needed for the operation of a great Government Department, the Interior, will be tied up. We would be in the position of completely tying the hands of the Interior Department from continuing. Numerous activities directly involved in the Nation's war efforts would cease or we must pass some emergency legislation that would reenact appropriations for the current year, and they are much greater than the appropriations carried in this bill for many of these activities.

Let us see if we were overreached by the Senate conferees. Two hundred and ninety-seven amendments were placed on the bill by the Senate. One hundred and fifty of them, better than 50 percent, dealt with items of travel pay and cuts, running as low as a dollar or a dollar and a half. A single amendment at the end of the bill was introduced to take the place of the 150 amendments; this reduced travel pay throughout the Department to the extent of 10 percent. The 150 House items in the aggregate reduced it about 25 percent. The House conferees fixed the reduction at 19 percent. Surely on that there is no particular reason to criticize the conferees.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. CARTER. I understood the gentleman to say that those of us wanting to recommit the bill are not doing it with sincerity. I challenge that statement and say that the gentleman is in absolute error. I am not here to waste the time of the House, or the gentleman's time. My time may be of no particular value——

Mr. LEAVY. Oh, Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further. When the gentleman gets up and asks a question then tries to consume my whole 5 minutes, I must decline to yield. It seems to me it would be the height of absurdity to send this bill back under the conditions I mentioned. I do not see how we could accomplish anything further. The conferees would be the same as they are now.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Washington has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 3 minutes more.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, let us see if even with the increases the Senate made in this bill it exceeds the Budget estimates. The Senate increased the appropriations of the House by $24,767,033. The entire amount appropriated in the Senate bill was $183,521,903. The amount for the current year is $238,000,000. This is $54,470,000 more than the bill we have here, and when you add the further reduction made by House conferees it is a reduction of over $60,000,000, all this in spite of the tremendous war increases. This conference shows we are not only under the amount the Senate reported, but we are under the Budget by over $6,000,000, and I want you to get this also: After this bill left the House and went to the Senate supplemental estimates for large sums for war purposes came down—something like $5,000,000 for the Bureau of Mines, and the Geological Survey was increased very substantially, and there were other substantial increases. We will have an opportunity to vote on the Senate items in dispute, such as the Central Valley item and some 12 others, but if you vote the conference report down, let me ask, What have you accomplished by sending the bill back to conference?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I regret I cannot yield now. The bill would go back to the Senate for further conference on Monday or Tuesday, and at midnight on Tuesday, June 30, would be the last moment when existing appropriations are available, and unless special legislation were enacted into law we would leave the Department of the Interior without any money.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I am sure that no one wants to do that. I yield for a question.

Mr. RICH. If we had a conference, we could back today, and work things out and do a whole lot better. The question I want to ask is this: One item in the bill which the Senate reduced was for arts and crafts in the Indian Bureau. Is not that the fact?

Mr. LEAVY. I am talking about the Senate receding.

Mr. RICH. The only item that the Senate reduced was the expenditure for

arts and crafts in the Indian Bureau. Is that not right?

Mr. LEAVY. I am not sure whether the gentleman is right or wrong.

Mr. RICH. They did reduce that item, did they not?

Mr. LEAVY. Possibly.

Mr. RICH. And the House conferees put it back in?

Mr. LEAVY. That would be no reason to reject this conference report.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I am going to take the floor today for the express purpose of setting a precedent as far as my activities as a Member of this House are concerned. Since I have been honored with the position that I occupy upon the Appropriations Committee I have studiously applied myself to its business. Unfortunately at this time I find myself in opposition to the members of my own political party who comprise the membership of this subcommittee.

When we passed this bill out of committee and brought it to the floor of the House we had reduced the bill $17,682,421 under the Budget estimate. Further cuts amounting to $476,880 were made on the floor of this House with the acquiescence of the majority of the membership.

Then as a committee, following the usual routine of procedure, we went into conference among ourselves and discussed the bill after it came back from the Senate. There were certain discussions pertaining to what the attitude of the committee would be when it went into conference with the gentlemen of the Senate. Unfortunately there is still disagreement in the membership of our committee.

I want to call specific attention to Members of this House who over a long period of time have manifested and indicated their interest in reclamation as it applies to the benefit of the farming public throughout reclamation districts in the United States, to the following comment, and I quote from the hearings as follows:

> We observe in this bill, Mr. Chairman, that there is very little money that will go directly to irrigation.

To this, Senator HAYDEN said:

> Well, I asked the question of Mr. Page yesterday, that here is a bill that carries about $80,000,000 for reclamation, and I asked him how much of that had to do with irrigation and how much had to do with power. And, to my surprise, he said there was about a million and a half in the bill for irrigation and practically all of the rest of the money goes to the development of hydroelectric power.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. At this time I would rather finish my statement. I will be happy to yield to my distinguished colleague in a moment. I decline to yield at this time.

In bringing this to your attention what is the picture? It is a picture that is not pleasant. We men of the West have given every effort that we possibly could to carry on a program of reclamation that was constructive, and, desperately needed in the western country. When the time comes that we as Members of this House, prostitute a reclamation appropriation for some other purpose which does not reflect benefit to the farming elements for which the appropriation was originally intended, then I say to you gentlemen the agriculturalist in the West is going to be in a most difficult position.

I do not want to take the time of my colleagues unnecessarily. I feel that it is most unfortunate that I find myself in disagreement with my splendid friends who constitute the rest of the membership of my committee, but I feel I would be derelict in my duty as an officer representing the people of the State of California if I did not bring this subject matter forcefully to your attention. It is something that is going to be far-reaching as policy in the future, not alone as it applies to the situation up to date. Although I concurred in a majority of the recommendations that you have before you, there are some that are in disagreement with the Senate, and those have been brought back. I am going to say to you frankly that I as an individual have had an opportunity since the conference to go into the representation that has been made for the additional funds, and I feel that the House is entitled to send this bill back to conference, because if you do your representatives can do a lot better job than they did in the first instance.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHEPPARD. Yes; I yield for a question.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Did you not sign the conference report?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] 4 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, for many good reasons, I shall vote against this conference report. Time will not permit me to discuss the many major items which are objectionable. I desire, however, to call to the attention of the House the fact that the conferees have of their own accord changed the language of amendment No. 266. When the provision to which I refer was stricken from the bill in the House it read, "Food habits of birds and animals." After the appropriation of $50,000 had been stricken out in the House by an overwhelming vote, it appears that the Senate reinstated the item and increased the amount to $71,550. After changing the language so as to make it sound a little less ridiculous, it appears from the report that the House conferees made a successful effort and obtained Senate agreement to the change in the language and the reduction in the amount but, at the same time, provided the same $50,000 which the House had stricken from the bill.

The present provision is, of course, legislation on an appropriation bill and the appropriation is, of course, for identically the same purpose for which it was originally intended; that is, to investigate the food habits of birds and animals. I would like very much for some member of the committee to explain why the conferees changed the language of this provision if it were not indeed for the purpose of making the provision sound less ridiculous, and for the purpose of camouflaging the item so as to make it less noticeable and objectionable.

The membership of the House will recall that at the time I offered an amendment to strike this item from the bill when the bill was before the House neither the chairman of the subcommittee nor any other member of the committee was able to offer a single word in defense of the appropriation or a single argument in behalf of the same. I now challenge the chairman of the subcommittee to defend this item before the Congress and the country.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the time has come for the Federal Government to stop pouring money into rat holes and spending the taxpayers' money on wild-goose chases. This item just provides $50,000 for some bureaucrat to carry on some pet hobby of his own. The idea of investigating food habits of birds and animals at a time like this! In addition to this item there are other items in this bill which cannot be defended.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield.

Mr. CARTER. As I remember, the gentleman's motion struck out the entire amount for the study of bird life and habits. Am I correct?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CARTER. Then the Senate restored the entire amount that was stricken out?

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. CARTER. Does not the gentleman feel that this bill should go back to conference so we can remedy some of these things?

Mr. COOLEY. I certainly do feel that the bill should go back to conference.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes; I yield.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. As I understand it, the gentleman does not think that we should spend this money to study or to investigate wild-goose chases at this time.

Mr. COOLEY. Certainly, I do not think so. I do not believe that Members of Congress can go before the people of their districts in this critical hour in the life of our Nation and defend any such an appropriation as this.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I am glad to yield to my colleague.

Mr. BARDEN. Do I understand that this $50,000 is to be used in the study of the propagation, protection, and method of feeding of the wild birds of the country?

Mr. COOLEY. No. The language of the bill as it originally came to the House was for the purpose of investigating the food habits of birds and animals.

Mr. BARDEN. Is not that the effect of it?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not know. No member of the committee has heretofore been bold enough to defend this item or to explain its purposes fully.

Mr. BARDEN. The reason I am asking the question is to remind the gentleman that the Federal Government collects millions of dollars in taxes each year from sportsmen for the protection of wild game and the study of wild life.

Mr. COOLEY. Suppose we made the investigation contemplated by this item and ascertained the true facts in connection with the food habits of wild birds and wild animals, how in the name of high heaven can we do anything about it?

I appreciate the fact that the item we are now discussing is just one of the small items in a very large appropriation bill but who among you is willing to go home and say to the people you represent that you are willing to spend $50,000 of taxpayers' money to employ Government agents to snoop around in the fields and forests of America, trying to obtain information concerning the habits of birds and animals? Even if birds and animals do have some bad habits it seems to me that we could well afford to wait until after this emergency before trying to reform them.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California who addressed the committee a moment ago said that a large part of the money in this bill assigned to reclamation was not to be used for reclamation proper but for power production. Let me say in this connection that in our reclamation program we have, of course, power production incidental to reclamation, but in this time of war we must produce more power; so a great deal of the money now being spent through the Reclamation Bureau is for the production of power. That marks no change in our reclamation policy whatsoever.

I find so many Members here saying that we must not furnish money now for the great Interior Department or for the Agriculture Department because we must make guns and weapons of war. Did we not just 2 days ago vote forty-two thousand million dollars to carry on this war program in a military sense? Why then should we hesitate to provide for this corresponding war program, being simply another phase in producing the power necessary to make the airplanes and machines of war? It seems to me some are straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel in regard to these two bills. I favor both bills in order to produce food, fiber, and fuel to sustain the men and run the machines of war.

The Reclamation Bureau is carrying on a great engineering work and producing hydroelectric power, but this power is needed directly for the factories of the West. That part of the money which is assigned to reclamation proper in this bill is multiplying by two, three, or four the productivity of the land for food production. I want to call your attention to the enormous productivity of those acres irrigated. We are told that food will win the war. It is expected that Arizona alone, mostly under irrigation, will produce this year $100,000,000 of food and fiber for victory.

If I had time I would like to demonstrate to the gentleman who just preceded me that there is a great significance to this matter of protecting our bird life. Our feathered friends protect us somewhat from our insect enemies. If we understood both the birds and the insects better, we could have more protection. Let us not, only a few days before the end of the fiscal year, jeopardize one of the great departments of our Government because of a small item which some cannot justify.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, in my opening statement a few moments ago I gave the House the facts and figures concerning this report. I made it plain then that this report was the result of a compromise between the two Houses. I did not go into detail and discuss the item under discussion, about which my good friend, the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina, is so much disturbed and about which he has poked so much fun. I do not pretend to say that I would personally defend every item in this bill, but on the other hand, since the gentleman from North Carolina has stated that no one has stood on the floor to defend the little item in question, which was formerly unfortunately under the caption of "Food habits for birds," let me say to him and the House that the committee made investigation of this item and found that it is an important worth-while activity.

Maybe the gentleman from North Carolina is unfamiliar with the fact that the Government of the United States has a considerable sum of money invested in this investigation; possibly my good friend who ridicules this particular item never heard of the large laboratory in Maryland and another in Colorado in this connection. I wonder if the gentleman really knows what is being done in the matter of investigations? Perhaps my good friend who scoffs and ridicules this item does not know of the work to eradicate pests of the country in several States of the Union. Maybe the crow and other pests are unknown in the great State of North Carolina but they are a real menace in Oklahoma. They have done a lot of damage in my own State of Oklahoma in destroying small grains. These problems just cannot be laughed off.

Let me read to you what the report from the Biological Service says:

> When damage is caused to agricultural crops by birds, food-habits work is of vital importance in determining species responsible for damage and in providing the basis for developing selective, effective, and economical methods of control.

You see, it is one thing to get up here and laugh, scorn, and ridicule the committee, and it is another thing to at least have an inkling of the real facts.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No; I regret I cannot yield just now. Frankly, I am surprised that the gentleman from North Carolina would seriously insist on sending a bill back to conference because this committee continues an activity that has been in force now for several years, doing a good job, even in the gentleman's own State of North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am sorry, in a moment I shall be glad to yield. Oh, yes; this item can be defended from the standpoint of economy and good administration. I have no apology for defending it. This Department has done a marvelous job, and this, I repeat, is an important and worth-while activity. Under this small appropriation the Department has been successful not only in eradicating and eliminating such pests in the gentleman's State and in several other States, but has made valuable and worth-while investigations in many other respects.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. No; not just now.

Mr. COOLEY. Do not get mad about it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman has made several speeches ridiculing this particular item and has challenged me to defend it.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am delighted to defend the work of the Biological Survey without apology. It is a matter in which every farmer in my State is interested. Not only that but every sportsman of the country is backing this fine work of the Biological Survey. As I stated a moment ago, the Nation has a big investment in the highly specialized personnel and in laboratories and equipment for this work and cannot afford to lose them during the present period when every effort is being made to increase agricultural production.

This is no laughable matter, it is serious with the farmers throughout the country, and for the gentleman to attempt to replace facts with scorn and ridicule is not in keeping with his usual good judgment and clear-cut statements.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I yield to my good friend, the able and clever gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from North Carolina did not laugh, the House laughed when he mentioned this item. I want to call the gentleman's attention to page 139 where you have a million dollars in this bill for the control of predatory animals.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, yes; a reduction from the amount allowed last year. Now, may I express the hope that the able gentleman really knows the difference between predatory animals and birds.

Mr. COOLEY. Oh, yes; there is quite a difference.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma) there were—ayes 53, noes 95.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Obviously a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 143, nays, 169, not voting 120, as follows:

[Roll No. 84]

YEAS—143

Allen, La.	Granger	Peterson, Fla.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gregory	Peterson, Ga.
Angell	Haines	Pierce
Barden	Harris, Ark.	Pittenger
Bates, Ky.	Healey	Poage
Beam	Hendricks	Priest
Beiter	Hill, Colo.	Rabaut
Biand	Hill, Wash.	Ramsay
Bloom	Hobbs	Ramspeck
Boggs	Holland	Rankin, Miss.
Bonner	Hull	Rankin, Mont.
Bradley, Pa.	Imhoff	Rivers
Brooks	Jackson	Robinson, Utah
Brown, Ga.	Jacobsen	Rockwell
Bryson	Johnson, Okla.	Sabath
Buck	Johnson, W. Va.	Sauthoff
Burgin	Kefauver	Scanlon
Byron	Kelly, Ill.	Scrugham
Camp	Kerr	Shanley
Cannon, Mo.	Kirwan	Smith, Pa.
Capozzoli	Knutson	Smith Wash.
Cartwright	Koppiemann	Somers, N. Y.
Chenoweth	Kramer	Sparkman
Cochran	Lane	Spence
Coffee, Wash.	Lea	Starnes, Ala.
Collins	Leavy	Steagall
Cooper	Lesinski	Sullivan
Costello	Lewis	Sumners, Tex.
Courtney	McCormack	Tarver
Cravens	McGranery	Tenerowicz
Crosser	McIntyre	Terry
D'Alesandro	McKeough	Thom
Davis, Ohio	McLaughlin	Thomas, Tex.
Davis, Tenn.	Maciora	Thomason
Doughton	Magnuson	Tolan
Downs	Mahon	Traynor
Eberharter	Manasco	Vinson, Ga.
Eliot, Mass.	Mills, La.	Voorhis, Calif.
Englebright	Murdock	Ward
Fitzgerald	Myers, Pa.	Weiss
Fitzpatrick	Nelson	Welch
Flannagan	Norrell	Whelchel
Ford, Miss.	Norton	Wickersham
Ford, Thomas F.	O'Brien, Mich.	Williams
Gearhart	O'Connor	Woodrum, Va.
Gehrmann	O'Neal	Wright
Gibson	Patman	Young
	Patrick	Zimmerman

NAYS—169

Allen, Ill.	Celler	Dworshak
Anderson, Calif.	Chapman	Eaton
Andresen, August H.	Chiperfield	Edmiston
Andrews	Clark	Elliott, Calif.
Arends	Clason	Elston
Arnold	Claypool	Engel
Barnes	Clevenger	Faddis
Bates, Mass.	Cole, N. Y.	Fellows
Baumhart	Colmer	Folger
Bell	Cooley	Fulmer
Bender	Copeland	Gale
Bennett	Cox	Gamble
Bishop	Crawford	Gerlach
Boehne	Creal	Gillette
Bolton	Culkin	Gillie
Boren	Cunningham	Gore
Bradley, Mich.	Curtis	Gossett
Bulwinkle	Dewey	Graham
Butler	Dirksen	Grant, Ala.
Canfield	Disney	Grant, Ind.
Carlson	Ditter	Guyer
Carter	Domengeaux	Gwynne
Case, S. Dak.	Dondero	Hall, Leonard W.
	Durham	
Halleck	Ludlow	Shafer, Mich.
Hancock	McGehee	Sheppard
Hare	McGregor	Short
Harness	McMillan	Simpson
Harris, Va.	Martin, Iowa	Smith, Maine
Hébert	Martin, Mass.	Smith, Ohio
Heidinger	Meyer, Md.	Smith, Va.
Hinshaw	Michener	Smith, Wis.
Holbrook	Miller	South
Holmes	Monroney	Springer
Hope	Moser	Stearns, N. H.
Howell	Mott	Stefan
Hunter	Mundt	Stevenson
Jarman	Nichols	Stratton
Jenkins, Ohio	O'Hara	Sumner, Ill.
Jenks, N. H.	Oliver	Taber
Jennings	Paddock	Talbot
Jensen	Patton	Talle
Johns	Pheiffer, William T.	Thill
Johnson, Calif.	Ploeser	Tibbott
Johnson, Ill.	Plumley	Treadway
Johnson, Luther A.	Reed, Ill.	Van Zandt
Jones	Reed, N. Y.	Vorys, Ohio
Jonkman	Rees, Kans.	Wasielewski
Kean	Rich	Wheat
Keefe	Risley	Whitten
Kilburn	Robertson, Va.	Whittington
Kilday	Rodgers, Pa.	Wigglesworth
Kinzer	Rogers, Mass.	Winter
Kunkel	Rolph	Wolcott
Lambertson	Russell	Wolfenden, Pa.
Lanham	Sanders	Woodruff, Mich.
LeCompte	Satterfield	Youngdahl

NOT VOTING—120

Andersen, H. Carl	Hart	Pearson
Baldwin	Harter	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Barry	Hartley	Plauché
Beckworth	Heffernan	Powers
Blackney	Hess	Randolph
Boykin	Hoffman	Reece, Tenn.
Brown, Ohio	Hook	Richards
Buckler, Minn.	Houston	Robertson, N. Dak.
Buckley, N. Y.	Izac	Robsion, Ky.
Burch	Jarrett	Rockefeller
Burdick	Johnson, Ind.	Rogers, Okla.
Byrne	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Romjue
Cannon, Fla.	Kee	Sacks
Casey, Mass.	Kelley, Pa.	Sasscer
Ciuett	Kennedy, Martin J.	Schaefer, Ill.
Coffee, Nebr.	Kennedy, Michael J.	Schuetz
Cole, Md.	Keogh	Schulte
Crowther	Kleberg	Scott
Cullen	Klein	Secrest
Day	Kocialkowski	Shannon
Delaney	Landis	Sheridan
Dickstein	Larrabee	Sikes
Dies	Lynch	Smith, W. Va.
Dingell	McLean	Snyder
Douglas	Maas	Sutphin
Drewry	Maciejewski	Sweeney
Duncan	Mansfield	Thomas, N. J.
Ellis	Marcantonio	Tinkham
Fenton	Mason	Vincent, Ky.
Fish	May	Vreeland
Flaherty	Merritt	Wadsworth
Fogarty	Mills, Ark.	Walter
Forand	Mitchell	Weaver
Ford, Leland M.	Murray	Wene
Gathings	O'Brien, N. Y.	West
Gavagan	O'Day	White
Gifford	O'Leary	Wilson
Gilchrist	Osmers	Wolverton, N. J.
Green	O'Toole	Worley
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Pace	
Harrington		

So the conference report was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Burdick for, with Mr. Hartley against.

General pairs:

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Baldwin.
Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Mason.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Landis.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Pace with Mr. Douglas.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Secrest with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Tinkham.
Mr. Burgin with Mr. Johnson of Indiana.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Day.
Mr. Green with Mr. Gilchrist.
Mr. Pearson with Mr. Powers.
Mr. Beckworth with Mr. Murray.
Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Blackney.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. McLean.
Mr. Coffee of Nebraska with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.
Mr. Houston with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.
Mr. Plauché with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Randolph with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Hook with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.
Mr. Kee with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Harter with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Burch with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Duncan with Mr. Rockefeller.
Mr. Ellis with Mr. Jarrett.
Mr. Gathings with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. May with Mr. Buckler.
Mr. Romjue with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Leland M. Ford.
Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Buckley.
Mr. Harrington with Mr. O'Toole.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Izac.
Mr. Sacks with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson.
Mr. Richards with Mr. Heffernan.
Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Larrabee.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Flaherty.
Mr. Forand with Mrs. O'Day.
Mr. West with Mr. Dingell.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Casey of Massachusetts.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Maciejewski.
Mr. Sutphin with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Worley.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Klein.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Dies.
Mr. Kocialkowski with Mr. Snyder.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Merritt.
Mr. White with Mr. Wene.
Mr. Rogers of Oklahoma with Mr. Schulte.
Mr. Mitchell with Mr. Sasscer.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate and request a further conference with the Senate, and that the Chair appoint conferees.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Chair appoints the following conferees: Messrs. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, SCRUGHAM, FITZPATRICK, LEAVY, SHEPPARD, RICH, CARTER, and JONES.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, an old friend of mine, the Very Reverend Celestin J. Steiner, S. J., formerly of Detroit, but now president of Xavier University in Cincinnati, Ohio, has brought to my attention the very able address of His Excellency the Most Reverend John T. McNicholas, O. P., S. T. M., archbishop of Cincinnati, at the one hundred and second commencement exercises of Xavier University.

I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The address referred to follows:

Xavier University is observing tonight the one hundred and second anniversary of the close of its scholastic year.

Men of Xavier have marched uninterruptedly down the century. They have had always in their alma mater a wise mother who recognized her obligation to prepare young men for total life, the life of time and eternity, of earth and heaven, the life of adversity and prosperity, the life of peace and of war.

Education that really fits young people for total life is that development which makes them instructed and self-governed men. True education means that a moral character has been formed, that the habits of religious-mindedness have been acquired, that a normal, sane judgment and a laudable human ambition guide individuals in the performance of everyday duties, that the necessary means are employed to attain one's eternal destiny. Men of Xavier, the heritage bequeathed you by your founders and preserved by their successors to this very hour is precious beyond price.

You have been trained in a liberal arts school, in a Catholic school. You have been guided by teachers molded in the spirit and traditions of Ignatius. They have done everything humanly possible to impress upon you, during your formative years, the advantage of acquiring knowledge through hard work and persevering efforts; they have done more—by word and example they have trained you to be self-disciplined men in mind, in emotions, in will, and in heart. Men of Xavier, if you reflect seriously in the years to come, if you try consistently to follow the principles you have learned in your alma mater, and if you show only the ordinary gratitude that must be expected of every alumnus of this institution, you will thank God daily for having brought you under the influence of the Jesuit fathers, whose lives have been dedicated with inspiring disinterestedness and noble sacrifice to your intellectual formation and to your moral and spiritual well-being.

Our country is now involved in war. Men of Xavier, your education for total life gives you the correct attitude of mind toward your country engaged in war; it prepares you to make sacrifices, however great, according to your qualifications; it makes you acknowledge the authority of our country as supreme in defending its citizens, its structure of government, its freedom, and its way of life. You respectfully regard that authority as having its source in God. You know that the war in which we are now engaged was forced upon us. Our Government could make no other choice. You know that our country is engaged in a total war, but our conception of a total war is not that of totalitarians. Our Government, thank God, prosecutes even a total war according to the principles of a moral code. You are happy, I am sure, that our Nation today, under our Commander in Chief, is marvelously united, even in the gruesome thing of war. Disloyalty to our country at war is simply impossible in any true son of Xavier. We can, without fear of contradiction, say the same of every worthy son of any Catholic college in our land. Our country need have no fear of subversive activities or even of disloyal thoughts in any Catholic college.

The Catholic Church knows the horrors and evils of war. She has dealt with them for 2,000 years. Volumes might be written on the Catholic Church and war. More than human prudence has guided the church during the centuries in dealing with nations at war. We have, today, evidence of the wisdom, prudence, and courage of him who loves equally all peoples and all nations and who, in this dark and sad hour, is guiding the bark of Peter. Pope Pius XII, speaking for the whole church, resourcefully opposed the opening clash of arms of the nations. For 3 years His Holiness's efforts for peace have been heroic. Pope Pius XII, in his relations to the nations at war, is the example of the most perfect impartiality of which a human being is capable. His authentic voice inspires confidence; his counsels have the accumulative wisdom of all his predecessors. His plea for moderation even in war must be accepted, unless men are to revert to a savage state; his principles of peace, founded on the natural and divine law, must be followed, if justice, the dignity of every human being, and the love of all men are to prevail in the peace treaties.

Our President has long labored to have our country see the whole world and to make America understand both its relationship and its obligations to the nations of the world. Just as we find individuals who are characterized by right-thinking and right-heartedness, so we find right-thinking and right-hearted nations. Our President has consistently asked the United States to cooperate with the right-thinking and the right-hearted countries; he has the support of our Congress and of our citizens in throwing our mighty armed forces and boundless resources against the cruel might of the wrong-thinking and wrong-hearted nations of the world.

These decisions of our Government are probably the most far-reaching that have ever been made in our history. They will likely change seriously the whole course of events in our country and will influence all the nations of the world. This is all the more evident when we reflect that we are not only engaged in a global war but we are in the midst of a world revolution, which will affect every nation and the life of every survivor of the war. The momentous decisions of our country can be terrifying, not because of America's wealth or manpower or exhaustless resources or fabulous war production but because of our new position will be one for good or for evil.

If America recognizes that the reconstruction of society and of the world is basically a moral question and insists on fixed moral values, then we can thank God for the revolutionary change which has taken place in our country and for the determination with which our President has insisted that the giant strength of our Nation be drawn from a moral and spiritual source. It was inspiring to have our Commander in Chief tell us that we are not engaged in a war of revenge but in one that will win a just peace for all. We are confident that we shall win the war. But we have no assurance of the just peace desired by our President, unless moral principles govern the rulers of nations and the framers of peace treaties. If, on the other hand, when peace comes, our country be influenced by materialism, by atheistic communism, by pseudo-liberalism, and by a short-sighted opportunism, then the gravest dangers face America—the dangers of regimentation, of might constituting right, of the eventual rejection of moral values, and of that confusion and chaos which will give the subversive forces the opportunity to destroy the American way of life.

As we are at the crossroads, let us confidently hope and pray that America will ever stand for God and for right, for all the freedoms that do not imply abuse, for the supreme importance of moral values. If these be the unalterable decisions of our country, then peace will bring a new day and a new destiny for America. Then we may welcome the vision and courage of our President in asking that America continue, in peacetime, to collaborate with the right-thinking nations of the world. A sane national judgment, a true national heart, and a national soul ever stirred with the conviction that all its citizens have as their eternal destiny—God—must give to America a preeminence in the council of the nations, perhaps the leadership of the world.

We must think of our new duties and of our new position not in a proud spirit, not with boastful words on our lips, but with humility and prayer that the United States may do what is best for its own citizens and, then, may be as helpful as possible to all the nations of the world. I am certain that the men of Xavier can be counted upon to be true and loyal citizens of America, whatever the future may be.

Tonight, 75 graduates of Xavier University go forth from the college of liberal arts. They are divided into 4 categories: Those receiving the degree of bachelor of arts, bachelor of philosophy, bachelor of science, and bachelor of science in business administration. I am informed that a third of these young men will receive their commissions as second lieutenants in the Field Artillery of the United States Army and will soon enter upon their active duties. May I extend my very sincere congratulations to all the graduates, and may I assure the second lieutenants of this graduating class that the Archdiocese of Cincinnati is proud of them. It is happy to know that Xavier University not only is teaching theoretical patriotism but that it is actually serving our country in the greatest crisis of its history.

Among the men of Xavier we find representatives of all the professions—judges, physicians, lawyers, editors, businessmen, prelates of the church, ranking officials of the secular and regular clergy, fathers of truly Christian homes, and worthy citizens.

Achievements alone do not satisfy Xavier. With the Ignatian spirit, it looks into the future; it is anxious to continue its training of men. I hope its president, Father Steiner, will have the wholehearted cooperation of the clergy and, especially, of the parents in sending their sons to Xavier, that they may be trained for total life. I cannot commend too highly the instruction given, the discipline of mind and heart acquired, and the moral and religious character formed at Xavier University. I earnestly ask priests, parents, Catholic benefactors, and all the men of Xavier to do the most they can to double the student body at this university during the coming year. This will be a true service to our country and to the church.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. O'CONNOR] is recognized for 20 minutes.

THIS NATION'S PART IN WAR AND WORLD PEACE

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, when I filed my petition for renomination and reelection I made the statement that I thought politics should be adjourned for the duration of the war. All of our efforts, I said, should be diverted to the war effort and issues prior to Pearl Harbor dropped.

I might say that on this theory I filed for reelection to the House of Representatives, despite the urgings of many of my friends and constituents in Montana to seek nomination and election to the United States Senate, which I knew would bring to the forefront all past issues. There is no place for politics in wartime, I told my friends.

However, it seems that politics must go on in spite of the most terrible war that has ever stricken our Nation, and I regret more than I can say that it now becomes necessary to give the reasons why I voted for or against certain measures.

Before taking up the record, I desire to emphasize what I have always said since President Roosevelt became a candidate for the Presidency in 1932, and his record as President confirms all I said, to the effect that he is one of the

greatest humanitarians that ever lived. Look at the countless measures he has initiated, and which I have supported, all benefiting the common people. In addition, I think he is the most idealistic person, living or dead, who ever held public office. What I have to say here is not by way of criticism of anything that has been done in the past by the administration, but, as I have been maliciously misrepresented and attacked, the people are entitled to know the whys and the wherefores.

We are at war and it is the duty of every American, man, woman, and child, to do his or her share to win this war and make whatever sacrifices are necessary, including life itself, in order to win. Personally, I have a grandson who enlisted as a private in the Air Corps and who is today somewhere in Europe. The smearers and politically ambitious in my own State no doubt prompted by either poor business or political ambitions leave me no other course but to make the record clear.

First, let me say that Congress is doing every bit possible to aid the war effort. Congress cannot fight a war. It is true Congress has been criticized, but let me repeat what Speaker SAM RAYBURN said at a press conference on March 18, 1942, and which was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

> Congress has given the President every law and every dollar he has asked for defense purposes. (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, March 18, 1942, p. A1079.)

Congress is not infallible, nor do I claim infallibility. No doubt, mistakes have been made by all, and no doubt the saying that the hindsight is better than the foresight applies to all.

CONGRESS LOOKED INTO FUTURE

In 1937 and 1938 Congress urged the development of stock piles of strategic materials, including rubber, to be used in case of war, but nothing was ever done about it. Look at our rubber shortage today.

A year ago Congress authorized the construction of pipe lines to carry oil and gas to defense areas as a war measure. Only a week or so ago the powers that be got around to carrying this out.

Four years ago Congress gave authority for the construction of a highway to Alaska. Three months ago the administration got around to carrying out the bidding of Congress.

Seven years ago Congress authorized the construction of six Army air bases, and two were built before Pearl Harbor.

PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT'S PRE-WAR STATEMENTS TO PUBLIC AND PRESS ARE CITED

In an address at Chautauqua, N. Y., August 19, 1936, President Roosevelt said, among other things:

> Peace, like charity, begins at home; that is why we have begun at home.
>
> I have seen children starving. I have seen the agony of mothers and wives. I hate war.
>
> The effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.
>
> Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches, would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.
>
> We are not isolationists except insofar as we seek to isolate ourselves completely from war.

That statement was the basis of my platform in 1936, in 1938, and again in 1940. That was the kind of isolation that our people believed in. That was the basis of our national Democratic platform in 1936 and in 1940. I followed the President through those years. I pledged the people, in addition, that I would never vote for a measure which would, in my opinion, lead this country into war.

On May 16, 1933, the President told Congress:

> Permanent defenses are a nonrecurring charge against governmental budgets, while large armies, continually rearmed with improved offensive weapons, constitute a recurring charge. This more than any other factor today is responsible for governmental deficits and bankruptcy.

In September 1937 the President again gave emphasis to the speech heretofore quoted from when at Bonneville he said:

> As I look upon Bonneville Dam today, I cannot help the thought that, instead of spending, as some nations do, half their national income in piling up armaments and more armaments for purposes of war, we in America are wiser in using our wealth on projects like this which will give us more wealth, better living, and greater happiness for our children.

On October 5, 1937, at Chicago, just a few days after the Bonneville speech, the President declared literally that aggressor nations should be quarantined.

A HALF-BILLION-DOLLAR DEFENSE PROGRAM

In 1938 President Roosevelt recommended a 20-percent increase in naval tonnage just to keep up or abreast with the navies of Great Britain, Japan, and other countries.

In January 1939, after Austria and after Munich, the President asked the Congress for one-half billion dollars for an immediate defense program to be spent over a period of 2 years or more. At this time, and on January 12, 1939, the President told the Congress:

> No responsible officer advocates building our air forces up to the total either of planes on hand or of productive capacity equal to the forces of certain other nations.

FOUR BILLION FOR 5-YEAR PROGRAM

On May 16, 1940, after Poland had fallen—with Russia fighting on the side of the Axis, Denmark and Norway had been downed, the Low Countries were in peril, and the invasion of France was going on, the President presented to the Congress a 5-year program to cost $4,000,000,000. To all of these demands, with alacrity, the Congress agreed, as did I.

TWO-OCEAN NAVY

Two days before the submission of the above plan to the Congress and on May 14, 1940, President Roosevelt, according to the New York Times, said:

> Anyone who believed in a two-ocean Navy was just plain dumb.

On June 12, 1940, the President signed a bill providing for a two-ocean Navy, which bill I supported and voted for.

Also in May 1940 the President called for an annual productive capacity of 50,000 airplanes. No steps were taken to provide for the necessary aluminum. A "fuss" was later raised about aluminum and estimates for the necessary aluminum were raised from 360,000,000 pounds in 1940 to 1,700,000,000 pounds in 1942.

SELECTIVE SERVICE ACT

In a press conference on May 28, 1940, the President stated that there was no thought in Government to revive the draft system, according to the New York Times of May 29, 1940. The President stated:

> Mr. Roosevelt underscored his observation that the present defense program was not to be compared with that of 1917. * * * There was no thought in Government today to revive the draft system, whether of men or money.

Through the initiation of a Member of the House and a Member of the Senate a selective draft bill was passed providing for conscription of manpower and within 3 months the President signed the selective-service bill.

On the 5th day of June 1940, the President, no doubt feeling that he and the Congress had provided for a sufficient defense for our country, advised Congress to go home. New York Herald Tribune of June 5, 1940, stated:

> President Roosevelt said he saw no good reason why Congress should continue in session for the duration of the emergency, as desired by the Republican Members. Sarcastically he said the situation does not require Congress to remain in session except for the laudable goal of delivering speeches.

VERY LITTLE DEFENSE SPENDING

According to figures compiled by a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House, during the 7 years from 1933 to 1940, the President spent about twenty-two billions for recovery and relief. During this same period he spent $6,553,000,681 for national defense; that from March 4, 1933, to June 1940 Congress voted more than eighteen billions to be expended solely at the discretion of the President. Out of these funds the administration spent for defense purposes $636,248,097.

It is claimed by many that reasonable foresight would have disclosed the necessity of creating stock piles of vital materials. For instance, we had made no adequate preparation for steel, aluminum, copper, rubber, sugar, and other vital materials. Speaking of sugar, in early 1940 I said if we were going to be the bread basket of the world we must also be the sugar bowl of the world and begged the administration to increase our sugar-beet quotas in this country, but to no avail, and, on the contrary, in 1941 the administration decreased our quotas from 17 to 21 percent. Our transportation facilities had not been organized and we were woefully short of military equipment.

SHOUTS OF ISOLATIONISM

Now, shouts of isolationism by certain individuals, whose motives might be fathomed are made, regardless of the disunity such charges will create. They want to bring the issues before the American people today prior to Pearl Harbor,

Pearl Harbor unified this Nation and closed debate on everything that happened before, and this country would have remained unified were it not for the malicious individuals of whom I am speaking.

As conclusive evidence of this statement and to show the unanimity of the House of Representatives since Pearl Harbor, the House passed the war declaration by a unanimous vote, save one, and, since, every bill asked for by the President and every dollar he has asked from the Congress has been granted without a dissenting vote. Only the day before yesterday the largest appropriation bill in the history of the world of over forty-two billion dollars was passed by a vote of 352 to 0. I have voted for every such bill.

My purpose at all times was to prepare my country for any eventuality and my purpose was that when we had sufficiently taken care of our own country by way of war equipment and materials, then we should give such as we could spare, without imperiling our own security, to the democracies that were fighting the aggressor nations. Remember we were committed, under the Monroe Doctrine, not only to defend the shores of our own country, but likewise the thousands of miles of shore line in the Western Hemisphere, which was and is some job of itself—the truth of which is being demonstrated at this time by the sinking of our ships right along our own shores by enemy submarines in view of thousands and with Japan already with her feet planted on our territory.

I want to make this matter clear. My purpose in citing the various statements of the President in connection with our foreign policy and referring to the various acts of Congress and the appropriations asked for by the administration up to the time the President addressed the joint session of Congress in January 1941, at which time he asked for lease-lend authority, is not intended in any way to be in criticism of him or of the administration.

Remember Abraham Lincoln said:

> There is an important sense in which the Government is distinct from the administration. One is perpetual, the other temporary and changeable. A man may be loyal to his government and yet oppose the peculiar principles and methods of the administration.

I quoted the President just as nearly as I could to show what our foreign policy was up until the time he asked for lease-lend authority and to enable me to more fully answer the criticism that has been directed against me on account of some of my votes. It seemed to me at that time, under the then conditions, that when the President asked for lease-lend authority there was a marked departure from our previous foreign policy. Accordingly I opposed such measures as I thought would get us into the war as somewhat similar measures to some of those proposed, I felt, got us into the war 25 years ago.

LEASE-LEND

I opposed the lease-lend bill on many grounds. First I thought Congress was abdicating insofar as all foreign affairs were concerned. The Senate, under the Constitution, has the power to reject or confirm treaties with foreign countries. The lease-lend bill gave the President, whoever he may be, the power to bypass the Constitution and make any agreement he wishes to with any nation he so desires. He can give any country he sees fit anything that he wishes and forgive repayment of same if he so desires. Recently the press quoted the President as saying:

> We do not expect repayment.

The Senate, you will observe, has no power to pass upon such agreements. I could visualize the lease-lend power being used in post-war settlements. Again the Johnson Act was in full force then placing a ban on loans to foreign nations at war who had not repaid their debts to us. The Lease-Lend Act permitted the plowing around of the Johnson Act and the making of loans or gifts. I thought the repeal of the Johnson Act should have been considered by Congress first.

In the President's message to the Congress asking for the lease-lend bill he set forth four freedoms which were to be established everywhere in the world. Among them was freedom from want. I could not go for this because since the beginning of our country we have not been able to establish freedom from want here. In one word, when the Congress passed the lease-lend bill it placed the future destiny of this country, insofar as its relations with foreign countries are concerned, in the lap of the President, whoever he may be.

NEUTRALITY ACT

I said on the floor of the House during debate on the neutrality bill on October 15, 1941, that to repeal this law or to modify it this time would be giving the green light or go sign to carry on an undeclared war on the water and in the air. I gave great credit to President Roosevelt for enforcing its provisions in such a way that we had lost scarcely any ships and few, if any, American lives. After the repeal of this law we increased our convoying of ships in the Atlantic and split the Pacific Fleet for that purpose. One hundred and thirty-eight Congressmen, including myself, voted against repeal. Our opposition, it is claimed by a few, caused Pearl Harbor. In answer to this statement I quote Mr. Michelson, publicity director of the Democratic National Committee, and Winston Churchill.

Mr. Michelson said:

> Piratical foray would never have eventuated had not our country, the one agency that could have forbidden the Japonification of the Far East, been tied up in the war of the Atlantic so that it had to divide its forces to meet the Asiatic threat.

Winston Churchill said when he addressed the House and the Senate on December 26, 1941:

> If the United States has been found at a disadvantage at various points in the Pacific Ocean, we know well that it is to no small extent because of the aid which you have been giving to us in munitions for the defense of the British Isles and for the Libyan campaign, and, above all, because of your help in the battle of the Atlantic, upon which all depends, and which has in consequence been successfully and prosperously maintained.

In this connection may we observe that among the proposals submitted to Japan by the Secretary of State on November 26, 1941, 11 days prior to Pearl Harbor, was that:

> The Government of Japan will withdraw all military, naval, air, and police forces from China and Indo-China.

WARNED AGAINST JAPAN

In connection with our relations with Japan, and on June 27, 1939, during debate in the House, I made this statement—CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 8007:

> Japan is our greatest menace.

I said that the President should slap an embargo on all shipments of war material to Japan as the act of 1937 provided. I pointed out at that time that we were selling to Japan scrap iron, pig iron, high-test gasoline, and other articles to slaughter innocent Chinese. These same materials are today being used against us and are being used to kill our American boys, and stated that the President should have slapped an embargo on shipment of such materials to Japan as was provided for in the act of 1937.

ARMING OF MERCHANT VESSELS

My principal reason for voting against such a measure was well expressed by Admiral Stark, who once said—and I quoted him on the floor of the House during the debate:

> No armed guard vessel was officially credited with fatally damaging an enemy vessel.

A poorly armed ship is worse than one with no arms at all, as under international law it invites attack without warning. During debate on this measure I also pointed out that gunnery was a profession; that if we were to arm these ships, we had better man them with experienced gunners instead of a crew of men who knew no other trade than sailing merchant vessels over peaceful seas.

FORTIFICATION OF GUAM NEVER ASKED

More untruths have been flung over the country about the fortification of Guam than anything that has occurred in Congress since I have been here. The question of fortification of Guam was never before Congress to be voted upon.

An item of $5,000,000 for dredging the harbor and for aviation facilities at that isolated outpost, 5,500 miles from San Francisco, the closest point on the American Continent, was eliminated in the House on February 23, 1939, by a heavy vote of 205 to 168. I was one of the 205. This item was included in the annual Navy authorization bill, calling for an expenditure of $52,000,000 for our Navy. I voted for the passage of this bill as amended, just as I have voted for every other bill which provided for the building up of our forces and the protection of our country.

The record of the debate on the Guam item shows that this $5,000,000 amount was eliminated for the following reasons:

First. It seemed like a useless expenditure of money to waste on a harbor and other facilities that might eventually fall into the hands of an enemy and be used against us, unless the island was to be fortified thoroughly. England spent over four hundred millions of dollars over a period of 20 years fortifying Singapore, and now it is in the hands of the Japanese.

The fortification of Guam would have cost from 140 to 150 million dollars, and it would have taken a long time to complete it.

Here is a break-down of how the $5,000,000 expenditure eliminated by the House in 1939 would have been spent. It was inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 21, 1939, by Representative DREWRY, of Virginia, for many years a member of the House Naval Affairs Committee:

Breakwater	$2,200,000
Dredging out harbor mooring area	800,000
Dredging inner lagoon and connecting channel	1,070,000
Dike	120,000
Pier	120,000
Grading filled area	70,000
Seaplane ramps	120,000
Ssaplane parking area	120,000
Ssawall	90,000
Power service	30,000
Gasoline storage	160,000
Water supply	50,000
Roads and walks	20,000
Small-boat pier and boathouse	15,000
Equipment and storage	15,000
Total	5,000,000

On February 21, 1939, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON], chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee, and in charge of the bill, said during debate on this Navy bill:

Opposition to this item has been based on the assumption that Guam is to be fortified and made into a strongly defended naval base for airplanes and submarines. In view of this opposition the committee has gone into this matter at great length, and I can assure you that there is no intention on the part of the Navy Department to fortify Guam or to do anything further than what is included in this bill.

Later the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] said:

I repeat again, nothing in this bill authorizes fortifications at Guam. We hope the necessity will never arise.

On February 3, 1942, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, was quoted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as saying:

A proposal to improve the harbor at Guam—not to fortify it—was defeated in the House, and I think the record should show that the Navy Department never really asked for the fortification of Guam.

Later the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] said:

No direct request for the authorization for the fortification of Guam was ever put before the committees of the Senate or the House.

The President, Commander in Chief of our Army and Navy, did not ask for it; the Navy Department did not ask for it; the Budget Bureau did not ask for it; the chairman of the House Naval Affairs Committee did not ask for it. In fact, not a dime was requested of Congress for this purpose.

President Roosevelt, in a radio broadcast February 22, 1942, said:

Those islands, hundreds of them, appear only as small dots on most maps. But they cover a large strategic area. Guam lies in the middle of them—a lone outpost which we never fortified.

Under the Washington Treaty of 1921, we had solemnly agreed not to add to the fortification of the Philippine Islands.

Immediately after this war started, the Japanese forces moved down on either side of the Philippines to numerous points south of them—thereby completely encircling the islands to the north, south, east, and west.

So you can see the President referred to Guam's remote situation when he stated, and I quote:

Guam lies in the middle of them—a lone outpost.

Some of these hundreds of islands, which came into the possession of Japan after the first World War, had been heavily fortified by the Japanese. It was argued that, encircled by a vast chain of Jap forts, it would have been impossible to defend Guam even if heavily fortified, would have been a death trap for any garrison stationed there.

PIONEER IN FIELD FOR HIGHER PAY FOR SERVICE MEN

Consideration of the selective-service legislation was had in the summer of 1940. Remember we were then at peace. The Wadsworth bill for conscription provided a monthly base pay of $5. Later this was raised to $21.

I introduced an amendment to make the base pay $50 per month. I also introduced an amendment which would give service men the assistance of State and Federal courts in getting their jobs back when they returned. I also introduced an amendment which, if passed, would have required private employers to rehire the men when they returned. All of these amendments were defeated.

In addition to the foregoing, this bill was acted upon by the Congress long before the last election, and my vote was an issue in the last campaign. The people of my district approved my vote on this issue as well as my record theretofore by a vote approaching two to one over my opponent.

Congress recently passed a special bill making the pay of our service men $50 per month. This now has been signed by the President. Representative RANKIN, of Mississippi, during debate on the bill in the House on May 12, 1942, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, page 4117, declared that I pioneered in the field for higher pay for our service men.

SEIZURE OF SHIPS

This bill gave authority to take over belligerent nation's ships in our ports to do with as we saw fit. I supported a motion to recommit which provided that we could not take the ships of one nation at war and then turn them over to another warring nation. I quote Congressman Geyer, of California, who said:

I certainly am opposed to this measure to seize the ships of one warring nation and turn them over to her enemies. By what stretch of the imagination does anyone arrive at the conclusion that such an act is the act of a neutral country? How can we hope to keep out of this terrible conflict and commit such acts of war? (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 7, 1941, p. 3724.)

I would have voted for this bill had it contained this provision.

I have voted for every measure that was asked for to build up our own forces. I voted against every measure which I thought would involve us in the war—at least until we were prepared. Remember we were then at peace and we were pitifully unprepared for war as the indisputable record since conclusively shows.

One of the issues of the New Republic magazine had this to say about me:

JAMES FRANCIS O'CONNOR, Democrat, of Livingston, Mont., came to the House in 1935. During the last term he has served principally as a stooge for BURTON K. WHEELER. An active America Firster, O'CONNOR was a familiar sight on America First platforms throughout the country. He has been a bitter and sarcastic critic of the President and the administration.

The foregoing is a tissue of lies. First, I did not come to the House until January 1, 1937. Second, I have never been a stooge or "yes man" for anybody. Senator WHEELER and I never talked over a single vote cast by either of us. All of the controversial bills were passed in the House before the Senate acted upon them. My record had been made on those bills before Senator WHEELER'S. Third, I was never an America Firster, active or otherwise. I never appeared or spoke at any meeting fostered by the America First Committee, save two. One was at Brooklyn, N. Y., and the other at Butte, Mont. I spoke over the radio but three times in connection with our foreign policy. I have never, by act or word, criticized the President personally. I have never criticized the administration except as I thought in a constructive way.

With equal malice my attackers have accused me of voting myself a pension; another untruth. With equal malice they have accused me of having an X rationing card for gasoline, which is another lie, as I have no rationing card of any description.

The Dies committee in a report to Congress just a few hours ago, charged that subversive activities aimed at destroying our representative form of government were on the loose in the United States. The Dies committee charged that such men as Luce and his Time magazine, the New Republic, and others, through scoffing at the legislative branch of our Government, are making every effort to obliterate the Congress of the United States as a coequal and independent branch of our Government.

Many of the efforts to purge individual Members (such as that by Time and the New Republic) are based upon an assumption which reflects discredit upon the entire legislative branch of the Government—

The report declares—

That assumption consists of the view that the sole remaining function of Congress is to ratify by unanimous vote whatever wish is born anywhere at any time in the whole vast structure of the executive branch of the Government down to the last whim of any and every administrative official.

We seldom hear a demand that the powers with which Congress is vested by the Constitution be transferred in toto to the executive branch of our Government and that Congress be adjourned in perpetuity—

The Dies report continues.

The creeping totalitarianism by which we are menaced proceeds with subtler methods. The senior United States Senator from Wyoming has called attention to the work of men who "in the guise of criticizing individual Members of Congress are actually engaged in an effort to undermine the institution itself."

The Dies committee, continuing its charges, says the whole structure of the organization known as the Union for Democratic Action, which the committee says is a "spearhead of a campaign of creeping totalitarianism," the New Republic, and others are staffed or controlled by known Communists or those controlled or sucked in by Communists. The Dies committee cites the communistic record of each.

CANNOT PLEASE EVERYONE

It is generally known that you cannot please everyone all of the time.

A Representative's vote should be based upon the wishes of the majority of his constituents and the information which he has at hand and is able to acquire through his position and from it all he should form a conclusion representing the combined will of his people and of himself. This I tried to do.

From my correspondence and talks with the people in my district my votes met with the approval of 80 percent of my constituents at the time these votes were cast. As proof that you cannot please everyone I was given credit by some Montana newspapers for having saved the extension of the Draft Act by my vote as it carried by only 1 vote. By others I was condemned for this vote as they claimed that had the extension of the draft not been granted the administration would not have gone as far as it did and we would not have been attacked.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, every measure that I have been herein discussing was passed by the House and Senate and approved by the President on the theory that those measures would keep us out of war and keep us at peace. That statement was made by the majority leader of the Senate, of the House, and by the Speaker of the House in the course of the debates, and remember the Speaker of the House said "the President got every law and dollar that he asked for from Congress," and yet we are in war. Is not it paradoxical to say that those who futilely opposed these measures were obstructionists?

Since 1940 I have voted for $192,233,542,000 for preparedness and war purposes. Could anyone motivated by honesty, sincerity, and Americanism say that I have been an obstructionist?

I have supported and voted for every bill since I have been a Member of Congress to improve the conditions of the farmer, the laboring people, and the people generally of my State and country. I have worked and will continue to work as long as I am in Congress for the increasing of our production of sugar beets and other agricultural products and for the development and conservation of our natural resources such as water and minerals.

Mr. LEAVY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I will be glad to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LEAVY. And the gentleman might well add to agriculture and mining, the welfare of the Indians. He has been an outstanding champion in the three fields. By reason of my place on the Interior Subcommittee on Appropriations, I have been in an unusual position to judge the value and efforts of various western Members of Congress in connection with the development in the fields of reclamation, mining, agriculture, and Indian welfare. The gentleman from Montana is too modest to even make brief reference to his exceptional accomplishments during the time he has been in Congress in these fields. The State of Montana will never know the whole story of the rare and exceptional contribution to its welfare during the time the gentleman has served in Congress in these fields. He has served his constituency in these important matters that are so vital to their prosperity, welfare, and happiness, in a manner not exceeded by any man from the great western half of the United States. I make this statement because I feel the gentleman is entitled to it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I thank the gentleman from Washington.

I will continue my efforts in behalf of making more secure the lives of our aged people and the unfortunates. I also will do everything possible to safeguard the rights of our Indians.

Since coming to Congress I have pursued a policy of trying to improve the conditions of ex-service men and their dependents. We have great fighting forces and their dependents which will claim my future sympathetic attention.

In conclusion, we are at war. The die is cast. The President is the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy. It is the duty of every one of us, man, woman, and child, to follow him and uphold his hands in the conduct of this war. We have just one job now to do, and that is to win.

In regard to what our course should be after we have won, the conditions that will exist then among nations is at this time, of course, unpredictable, but in the light of the history of our part in the other war and the history of the current war, a person would be less than a fool to say that this Nation should not cooperate in bringing into existence some sort of an institution, the purpose being to preserve peace and prevent a recurrence and providing some means of enforcing its decisions. If we are going to have to fight these wars and pay for them, we had better have a part in the preliminary decisions that cause them.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. STARNES of Alabama, for 2 weeks, on account of official business.

To Mr. DAVIS of Ohio, for 1 day, on account of important public business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Washington News.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a table on the attorneys in one of the Government departments.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2424. An act for the relief of Clarence J. Meteyer, Lester W. Engels, and Dorothy B. Engels;

H. R. 2646. An act for the relief of L. W. Marek, Jr.;

H. R. 4092. An act for the relief of E. P. Corley;

H. R. 4554. An act for the relief of the estate of Julian B. Wiggins, deceased, and the estate of R. E. Thompson, deceased;

H. R. 4941. An act for the relief of J. C. Lemon, Louis McCoy, and Patricia McCoy;

H. R. 5070. An act for the relief of Francis Corwin Circle;

H. R. 5454. An act for the relief of David Caron;

H. R. 5619. An act for the relief of certain clerks in the post office at Detroit, Mich.;

H. R. 5854. An act for the relief of Madeleine Hammett, Olive Hammett, Walter Young, the estate of Laura O'Malley Young, deceased, and the legal guardian of Laura Elizabeth Young;

H. R. 6033. An act for the relief of William Tipton, Mrs. William Tipton, and Mrs. Eula Nelson;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. E. P. Ball;

H. R. 6355. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1940;

H. R. 6430. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6496. An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and

staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6557. An act for the relief of James Gilmore and Marian E. Gilmore;

H. R. 6899. An act to exempt custodial employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education from the operation of the provisions of section 6 of the Legislative, Executive, and Judicial Appropriation Act approved May 10, 1916;

H. R. 6908. An act to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941;

H. R. 7041. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution continuing the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation as an agency of the United States.

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 1622. An act to authorize payment to janitors and custodians of the public schools of the District of Columbia for services rendered for local boards of the selective-service system;

S. 2316. An act to provide for the placing in Gallinger Hospital of a memorial to George Earle Chamberlain;

S. 2455. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty," to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes; and

S. 2558. An act to further expedite the prosecution of the war by authorizing the control of the exportation of certain commodities.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, June 26, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, at 10:30 a. m., on Friday, June 26, for consideration of war housing, room 245, old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, June 30, 1942.

Business to be considered: Hearing on Federal Communications Commission.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, July 9, 1942, at 10 a. m. H. R. 1616, to amend section 509, as amended, of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. DOUGHTON: Committee on Ways and Means. H. R. 7234. A bill to exempt from duty personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders; without amendment (Rept. No. 2275). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SABATH: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 510. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 6217, a bill to amend section 13 of the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2276). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama: Special Committee to Investigate Un-American Activities. House Resolution 26 and House Resolution 282 of the Seventy-seventh Congress, first session; without amendment (Rept. No. 2277). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FULMER: Committee on Agriculture. H. R. 3956. A bill to amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to permit exchange of land with private owners; with amendment (Rept. No. 2278). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CAMP: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7142. A bill relating to the payment of fees, expenses, and costs of witnesses and jurors and the accounting therefor, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2279). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. House Joint Resolution 323. Joint resolution to create a commission for the emergency safeguarding of the Capitol and other buildings in the legislative group, and other buildings under the Architect of the Capitol; without amendment (Rept. No. 2280). Referred to the Committee of the While House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SECREST: Committee on the Library. H. R. 7157. A bill to enable the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two-hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans; with amendment (Rept. No. 2281). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. STEAGALL: Committee on Banking and Currency. H. R. 7158. A bill to amend the Federal Reserve Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2282). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Patents. S. 895. An act to provide for the registration of trade-marks used in commerce, to carry out the provisions of certain international conventions, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2283). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7211. A bill to facilitate the disposition of prizes captured by the United States during the present war, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 2287). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. KILDAY: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2973. A bill for the relief of George O. Hanford; without amendment (Rept. No. 2284). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 537. A bill for the relief of Stanley McMahan; without amendment (Rept. No. 2285). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SPARKMAN: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 2970. A bill for the relief of Hyram Colwell; without amendment (Rept. No. 2286). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COCHRAN:

H. R. 7297. A bill authorizing the assignment of personnel from departments or agencies in the executive branch of the Government to certain investigating committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. HARE:

H. R. 7298. A bill to provide that grants-in-aid by the United States to any State shall be computed on the basis of the ratio of the per capita income of the United States to the per capita income of such State in lieu of being computed on the basis of equal matching of funds by the United States and such State; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 7299. A bill to provide for reciprocal privileges with respect to the filing of applications for patents for inventions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. O'LEARY:

H. R. 7300. A bill to provide for 6 months' Reserve service with pay for the personnel of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard after the termination of the war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 7301. A bill to amend Article of War 114; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MEYER of Maryland:

H. R. 7302. A bill to authorize and direct the United States Maritime Commission to construct towboats and barges adapted for use in the transportation of oil, gasoline, fuels, and other commodities within the Atlantic intracoastal waterway territory, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H. R. 7303. A bill to extend the time for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge or bridges across the St. Louis River at or near the city of Duluth, Minn., and the city of Superior, Wis., and to amend the act of August 7, 1939, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 7304. A bill prohibiting the payment of contingent fees for services in connection with the procurement of naval contracts, requiring certain warranties in naval contracts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WEISS:

H. R. 7305. A bill relating to the acquisition of foreign silver by the United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLAYPOOL:

H. R. 7306. A bill for the relief of Floyd E. and Lena Mae Drummond; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CULKIN:

H. R. 7307. A bill granting an increase of pension to Ella E. Dennis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 7308. A bill for the relief of Gerald Estell Proctor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGREGOR:

H. R. 7309. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3128 By Mr. BEITER: Petition of sundry citizens of Akron, N. Y., urging enactment of Senate bill 860 in order that the young men who are in training for service in defense of the country shall be protected from the influence of alcoholic beverages in canteens and territory surrounding military camps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3129. Also, petition of Clarence Grange, No. 892, Clarence, N. Y., urging favorable action on the Sheppard bill, Senate No. 860, to prohibit the sale of all alcoholic liquors in or near military camps or naval bases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3130. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of members of the Youth Fellowship of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Perry, Dallas County, Iowa, urging passage of legislation which will provide the largest possible protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquors; to the Committee on Military Affairs

3131. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 82 adult citizens of the United States and residents of the State of Pennsylvania, requesting members of the Senate and House of Representatives to keep the Sheppard bill (S. 860) from becoming law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3132. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition presented by Mrs. Earl Taylor, of Flora, Ill., signed by 16 residents of Clay County, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 860, which provides for the elimination of the sale of liquor in and around the camps where soldiers are located; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3133. By Mr. HILL of Washington: Petition of various citizens of Ellensburg, Kittitas County, Wash.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3134. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of D. C. Williamson and 50 others of Axtell, Kans., petitioning the President of the United States as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, together with Congress assembled, to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, sale, or gift of all alcoholic beverages during the war; also, as citizens of a nation founded on Christian principles, requesting and petitioning the leaders of our Nation to regard the command of the Almighty Creator to cease from labor and all worldly activities on the Lord's Day, and that neither we nor our employees work on that day, that we may keep it holy, for thus only can He bless and help us as we recognize and obey His divine commands; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3135. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the North American Gasoline Tax Conference, Pacific region, relative to proposal that all persons in any way connected with contracts for the national defense be relieved and exempted from State taxation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3136. By Mr. WOLFENDEN: Petition of the Baptist Church of Upland, Pa., favoring Senate bill 860, which provides for elimination of the sale of liquor in and around the camps where soldiers are located; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JUNE 26, 1942

(Legislative day of Thursday, June 18, 1942)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. James H. Miers, D. D., minister, Fourth Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, we lift our hearts to Thee on this occasion, thanking Thee for the privilege of meeting in health and strength. We are here before Thee to represent this great country, to assist those who make its policies, and carry them out in the years and months to come. We ask that they may be given special wisdom, special breadth of vision, so that Thy will may be carried out through them in the policies of the country as a whole.

We pray for our men who are in the armed forces of America. We pray wherever they are that Thou wilt spread Thy wings over them, and underneath them may there be Thine everlasting arms.

We trust it is in Thy will to give us the victory for those forces, which we believe are the forces of righteousness now represented by us. Therefore, our God, we pray that Thou wilt make us worthy of the victory which we hope in time will come.

And now, as this great deliberative body meets together to consider the policies which will mean much for us and for the world, guide them we beseech Thee by the fullness of Thy Holy Spirit, and may all that they say or do be begun, and continued and ended in Thee. And to Thee we shall give the praise and the glory, world without end; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, June 25, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Connally	Lucas
Andrews	Davis	McCarran
Bailey	Downey	McFarland
Ball	Doxey	McKellar
Bankhead	Ellender	McNary
Barbour	George	Maloney
Bilbo	Gerry	Maybank
Bone	Green	Mead
Bridges	Guffey	Millikin
Brown	Gurney	Murdock
Burton	Hayden	Murray
Butler	Hill	Norris
Byrd	Hughes	Nye
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Kilgore	Pepper
Clark, Mo.	Lee	Radcliffe
Reed	Stewart	Tydings
Rosier	Thomas, Idaho	Wagner
Russell	Thomas, Okla.	Walsh
Schwartz	Thomas, Utah	Wheeler
Shipstead	Truman	White
Smith	Tunnell	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senators from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY and Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is absent attending a wedding in his family.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent because of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

NOMINATIONS OF JUDGES OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA MUNICIPAL COURT OF APPEALS AND MUNICIPAL COURT—NOTICE OF HEARING

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in accordance with the rule of the Committee on the Judiciary, I hereby give notice that on Thursday, July 2, 1942, at 10:30 a. m., in the Judiciary Committee room, hearings at which all interested persons may appear will be held on the following nominations:

Hon. William E. Richardson, of the District of Columbia, for a 10-year term as chief judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, a new position.

Hon. Nathan Cayton, of the District of Columbia, for an 8-year term as associate judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, a new position.

Hon. Andrew McCaughrin Hood, of the District of Columbia, for a 6-year term as associate judge of the Municipal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia, a new position.

Hon. George P. Barse, of the District of Columbia, for a 10-year term as chief judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, a new position.

Hon. Walter J. Casey, of the District of Columbia, for a 10-year term as associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, vice himself.

Hon. Brice Clagett, of Maryland, for an 8-year term as associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. George C. Aukam, deceased.

Hon. Nathan Ross Margold, of the District of Columbia, for an 8-year term as associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Robert E. Mattingly, whose term has expired.

Hon. Aubrey B. Fennell, of the District of Columbia, for a 6-year term as associate judge of the Municipal Court for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Nathan Cayton, elevated.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of State and Agriculture (3), United States New York World's Fair Commission, Federal Security Agency (2), Federal Trade Commission, United States Civil Service Commission, and The National Archives, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition, which, with accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIAL

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate or presented and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A petition of sundry citizens of Ocean Park, Wash., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of beverage alcohol; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Preston and Stafford, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions of sundry citizens of Catonsville and Baltimore, Md., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

A memorial of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to establish zones in which the sale of alcoholic beverages will be prohibited in areas used for military or naval purposes and adjacent areas; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. HILL (for Mr. WHEELER):

A petition, numerously signed (transmitted by Maude C. Behner of the Montana Council of Churches, of sundry citizens of Billings, Mont., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2628) amending Public Law No. 873, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved October 21, 1940, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 1526) thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 25, 1942, that committee presented to the President of the United States the following enrolled bills:

S. 1622. An act to authorize payment to janitors and custodians of the public schools of the District of Columbia for services rendered for local boards for the Selective Service System;

S. 2316. An act to provide for the placing in Gallinger Hospital of a memorial to George Earle Chamberlain;

S. 2455. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional pay for personnel of the United States Navy assigned to duty on submarines and to diving duty," to include additional pay for diving in depths of less than 90 feet under certain conditions, and for other purposes; and

S. 2558. An act to further expedite the prosecution of the war by authorizing the control of the exportation of certain commodities.

BILL INTRODUCED

Mr. McNARY introduced a bill (S. 2629) to further amend section 3 of Public Law No. 270, approved June 7, 1924, providing for forest perpetuation and extension, by increasing the annual authorization therefor and extending aid in combating tree insects and diseases, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ELIMINATION OF USE OF SILVER IN THE ARTS

[Mr. McCARRAN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the Journal of Commerce and Commercial of June 26, 1942, entitled "Silver Arts Uses To Be Eliminated as War Measure," which appears in the Appendix.]

AVIATION AS A WEAPON—ARTICLES BY MAJ. ALEXANDER P. DE SEVERSKY

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD two articles by Maj. Alexander P. de Seversky on the subject of aviation as a weapon, one from the New York Herald Tribune of June 19, 1942, and the other from the Washington Times-Herald of June 20, 1942, which appear in the Appendix.]

TRUMAN AND NELSON—ARTICLE FROM NEW REPUBLIC

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New Republic of June 29, 1942, entitled "Truman and Nelson," which appears in the Appendix.]

LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in conference with the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], I have agreed that they might ask for the consideration of two or three bills; but I must insist that no considerable time be consumed in their consideration, because the bill I have in charge is an appropriation bill, and it must be passed with expedition, since the end of the fiscal year is approaching.

FREE-IMPORTATION PRIVILEGES TO CERTAIN PERSONS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House Joint Resolution 327, according certain privileges to members of the armed forces of various nations. I think, with merely a word of explanation, it will take practically no time at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) to accord privileges of free importation to members of the armed forces of other United Nations, to enemy prisoners of war and civilian internees and detainees, and for other purposes.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President the joint resolution is recommended by the Treasury Department; it has had the unanimous support of the Committee on Finance, and is intended to permit the admission, free of tariff or other taxes, of articles which are sent to internees or those who have been detained in camps. It covers such things as trinkets, cigarettes, and articles of similar nature, which are intended for the personal use only of detained prisoners of war.

One provision carries out a treaty to which we are subscribers, a treaty made several years ago, dealing with the treatment of prisoners of war.

Mr. McNARY. Let me ask the able Senator whether the so-called obligation rests wholly on treaties. Are we bound by treaty to carry out provisions of this kind?

Mr. GEORGE. One provision is in pursuance of a treaty, the other is a reciprocal provision. Where like treatment is given Americans who may be interned or detained in any enemy country, we grant similar rights. It is based on reciprocal treatment of our citizens.

Mr. McNARY. How many cases would it cover?

Mr. GEORGE. I am not able to say. There are some German prisoners in this country, and there are some Japanese who are detained in the United States at this time. It is not a matter of very great consequence so far as the number is concerned, but received in small packages from the homeland are chocolate bars, for instance, or packages of cigarettes, articles which would bear a tax. The Treasury Department wishes to handle the matter without collecting the taxes.

It is a reciprocal arrangement, except to the extent that we are obligated by treaty to which we are parties.

Mr. McNARY. Are natives of the United States who are now detained in foreign countries accorded the same privileges in those countries proposed to be extended to foreigners detained here?

Mr. GEORGE. We are so advised, and where such treatment is not accorded, the obligation on our part will not attach.

Mr. McNARY. If it is wholly reciprocal, I should have no objection, but if it is one of the one-sided arrangements about which we hear so much, I am opposed to it.

Mr. GEORGE. It is reciprocal, except where there is a treaty with an enemy country to which we are parties covering the treatment of prisoners of war.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading of the joint resolution.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 327) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EXEMPTION FROM CUSTOMS DUTY OF PERSONAL AND HOUSEHOLD EFFECTS

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7234, to exempt from duty personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7234) to exempt from duty personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement with reference to this bill similar to that I made relating to the joint resolution just passed.

The bill is recommended by the Treasury Department; it has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Finance, and it is intended to cover principally the household and personal effects of American officers who have been evacuated to the United States, or have been ordered home. Under existing law they may send their personal effects into this country, but they must receive them within 1 year, or, if they have been transferred to a warehouse, they must receive them personally within 3 years. The bill is intended to permit the household and personal effects to be delivered to any agent or any member of the family of the American officer or citizen who is ordered to the United States.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Would it include newly purchased household effects?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, no; only such household and personal effects as have been used for 1 year, not new articles; and it would not include articles imported for the purpose of sale.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill H. R. 7234 was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

REGROUPING OF FEDERAL RESERVE BANKS

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2565, to amend the Federal Reserve Act.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2565) to amend sections 12A and 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (a) of section 12A of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 263), is amended by striking out the second and third sentences thereof and substituting the following: "Such representatives shall be presidents or first vice presidents of Federal Reserve banks and, beginning with the election for the term commencing March 1, 1943, shall be elected annually as follows: One by the board of directors of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, one by the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve Banks of Boston, Philadelphia, and Richmond, one by the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve Banks of Cleveland and Chicago, one by the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve Banks of Atlanta, Dallas, and St. Louis, and one by the boards of directors of the Federal Reserve Banks of Minneapolis, Kansas City, and San Francisco. In such elections each board of directors shall have one vote; and the details of such elections may be governed by regulations prescribed by the committee, which may be amended from time to time. An alternate to serve in the absence of each such representative shall likewise be a president or first vice president of a Federal Reserve bank and shall be elected annually in the same manner."

SEC. 2. The sixth paragraph of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 462b), is amended to read as follows:

"Notwithstanding the other provisions of this section, the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, upon the affirmative vote of not less than four of its members, in order to prevent injurious credit expansion or contraction, may by regulation change the requirements as to reserves to be maintained against demand or time deposits or both (1) by member banks in central reserve cities or (2) by member banks in reserve cities or (3) by member banks not in reserve or central reserve cities or (4) by all member banks; but the amount of the reserves required to be maintained by any such member bank as a result of any such change shall not be less than the amount of the reserves required by law to be maintained by such bank on the date of enactment of the Banking Act of 1935 nor more than twice such amount."

SEC. 3. The ninth paragraph of section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended (U. S. C., title 12, sec. 464), is amended by striking out the proviso thereof, so that the paragraph will read as follows:

"The required balance carried by a member bank with a Federal Reserve bank may, under the regulations and subject to such penalties as may be prescribed by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, be checked against and withdrawn by such member bank for the purposes of meeting existing liabilities."

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I have discussed this matter with the acting majority leader, the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the minority leader, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. The bill has been unanimously reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency of the Senate, and I am advised that a similar bill has been unanimously reported to the House of Representatives by the House Committee on Banking and Currency.

Briefly, the bill slightly regroups the Federal Reserve banks which elect the members of the Open Market Committee. Under existing circumstances it happens that the Boston bank has not had a representative on the Federal Reserve Board. By the proposed regrouping that situation would be taken care of.

Second. It authorizes the Federal Reserve Board to change its reserve requirements in the three classes of banks, as they are classified by the Federal Reserve Board, banks in central reserve cities, in reserve cities, and the so-called country banks. Again it is a technical matter that will enable the Board better to expedite its handling of reserve requirements in the expedition of Government financing.

Third. Because of a decision of a district court in New York, an unexpected liability upon officers of Federal Reserve banks was imposed. The Federal Reserve Board and the Treasury Department and those of us in the Senate and the House who are familiar with such things feel that this liability is rather unfair. It arose in what is known as the Penney case. There are conflicting decisions. The effect of the amendment would be to remove such possible liability in the future. It would not affect existing situations.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, there was so much disturbance in the Senate I found difficulty in hearing the explanation made by the able Senator from Michigan. The bill comes from the Committee on Banking and Currency?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I understand it was reported favorably unanimously?

Mr. BROWN. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. I recall that a few days ago the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] spoke to me about this bill. He is called from the city at this time. Yesterday he told me that the bill conforms to his views. I think there was some modification made in the bill from its original pattern.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] was consulted before the bill was introduced, and his ideas, as well as mine and those of the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the chairman of the committee, were included within the bill. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that the bill is entirely satisfactory to the Senator from Ohio; he is anxious to have it passed.

Mr. McNARY. I assume that to be so from what he stated yesterday. I have no objection to the bill.

Mr. BROWN. Perhaps it would be well, Mr. President, for me to explain the bill briefly by sections.

Section 1 of the bill provides for regrouping the Federal Reserve banks for the purpose of electing their five representatives on the Federal Open Market Committee. At present one representative of the Federal Open Market Committee is elected by the Boston and New York Reserve banks but in practice the

Boston Reserve Bank has never had a representative serve as a member of the committee but only as an alternate to the President of the New York Reserve Bank, who has served continuously. The effect of the change in existing law made by section 1 of the bill would be to require that a representative of the Federal Reserve Bank of New York be a member of the committee at all times, and the regrouping provided for by such section also makes it possible for the president of the Federal Reserve Bank of Boston to serve from time to time as a member of the committee, as do the presidents of the other Reserve banks. Your committee believes that it is desirable in the public interest that the changes contemplated by section 1 of the bill be made.

Section 2 of the bill amends section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act so as to authorize the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to change the reserve requirements of member banks in central reserve cities within the limits of the present law without necessarily making a change in the reserve requirements of member banks in reserve cities. Under the present law the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, in order to prevent injurious credit expansion or contraction, may change the requirements as to the maintenance of reserves by banks located in reserve and central reserve cities or by member banks located elsewhere, but it may not change the reserve requirements of member banks in central reserve cities without at the same time changing those of member banks in reserve cities. In order to provide the necessary flexibility with respect to reserve requirements, especially in connection with heavy withdrawals of deposits from banks throughout the country in order to meet Federal tax liabilities and to prevent a depressing effect upon the Government security market as a result of such withdrawals. It is felt that the Board of Governors should be empowered to change the reserve requirements of member banks in central reserve cities without at the same time changing the reserve requirements of other member banks.

Section 3 of the bill amends section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act by repealing the provision prohibiting member banks of the Federal Reserve System from making new loans or paying dividends while their reserves are deficient. There is retained, however, in the law the existing statutory authority of the Board of Governors to prescribe penalties for deficiencies in reserves. It is believed that the retention of the penalty provision will be a sufficient deterrent against deficiencies in reserves, as the penalties may be varied from time to time as circumstances may require under rules and regulations prescribed by the Board of Governors.

A favorable report on the bill has been received from the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System and also from the Treasury Department. In a letter to the chairman of the committee by the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Bell, it was also stated that the Bureau of the Budget had advised the Treasury Department that the bill was in accord with the President's program.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill S. 2565 was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

ADMINISTRATION OF OFFICER PERSONNEL OF THE NAVY AND MARINE CORPS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. There are several important naval bills upon the calendar. The consideration of one of them is to follow the pending bill when it shall have been disposed of. There is one bill, however, which must be signed by the President before June 30. Ninety-one naval officers will be retired unless the bill is signed before that date. The consideration of the measure will take but a few minutes, and, with the indulgence of the Senator from Nevada, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2592, Calendar No. 1553.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2592) to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps during the existing war, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 7160) to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps during the existing war, and for other purposes, which was read twice by its title.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, as the House bill is identical with the Senate bill, I ask that the House bill be substituted for the Senate bill and be now considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. WALSH. The purpose of the bill is to suspend existing provisions of law relating to the permanent promotion of all officers of the Navy and Marine Corps, and the involuntary retirement of such officers by reason of failure of selection. In addition, the bill amends other features of present laws in order that they may be better and more efficiently administered.

Experience gained under present operating conditions has demonstrated that it is impractical and inadvisable, during the present war, to continue to administer Navy officer personnel laws as they relate to permanent promotions and involuntary retirements or discharges.

During normal peacetime the selection boards are composed of officers serving at sea in the various type forces, as well as those employed on shore. The committee are of the opinion that it is nadvisable to withdraw such officers from their important assignments during war in order to permit them sitting as members of selection boards. Operating conditions during wartime, with attendant casualties, make it impossible to determine the actual number of commissioned officers upon which a correct legal distribution of line officers in the several grades can be made, as required by existing law. Furthermore, due to the uncertain status—missing, captured, dead, and so forth—of officers, it is equally impossible to determine the dates upon which vacancies in grades may occur.

The bill provides, in brief, for the suspension of laws governing permanent promotions in the Coast Guard, Navy, and Marine Corps during the continuance of the existing war and until June 30 of the fiscal year following that in which such war is terminated. It preserves in general the right of permanent promotion to officers already selected for such promotion and to those who have otherwise become eligible for promotion or advancement. The only exception to this would be in the case of an officer, who, since becoming eligible for promotion, has committed himself in such a manner as to indicate that he should not be advanced in rank. The bill contains appropriate provisions to insure that the proper number of officers of the rank of rear admiral become entitled to the pay of the upper half.

The committee are advised that the Navy Department intends to use the selective system in connection with the administration of this bill but does not contemplate the use of regularly constituted statutory boards as provided in existing law. It is felt, however, that some form of selection established by regulations is necessary in order that personnel whose records indicate a high degree of ability will receive first consideration.

I ask for the present consideration of the House bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Massachusetts:

There being no objection, the bill H. R. 7160 was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, Senate bill 2592 will be indefinitely postponed.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President I ask unanimous consent that the Vice President be authorized to sign House bill 7160, which was just passed by the Senate, during the recess of the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

SUSPENSION OF REQUIREMENT FOR PERFORMANCE OF ANNUAL LABOR ON CERTAIN MINING CLAIMS

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. GUFFEY. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 6295.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6295) to suspend the requirement for the performance of annual labor on certain mining claims.

Mr. GUFFEY. Mr. President, I shall ask the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to explain the bill to the Senate,

as it largely affects mining industries in his State. The bill has the endorsement not only of himself but of his colleague and of the Representative from that State.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in explanation of the measure called up by the Senator from Pennsylvania, I wish to say that throughout the country, and especially the mining sections the Government, for war purposes, has either instituted condemnation proceedings or has taken possession of large tracts of the open public domain. In many of the tracts taken over for war activities by the Government there exist mining claims of various character, both lode-mining and placer-mining claims, which have in the past been located by legitimate locators, and have been held, and the annual work thereon done pursuant to law from year to year. Now that the Government has taken over these tracts, the owners of the mining claims are prohibited from doing the annual assessment work because of war activities in the areas.

The purpose of the bill is to make it possible for the ownership to continue in the locators of the mining claims and to suspend the obligation of doing the annual assessment work for the period during which the Government is occupying the premises and for 1 year thereafter. The purpose of the bill is simply to carry out the authority of the law with reference to assessment work on mining claims, but to permit those who have mining claims within territory taken over by the Government for war purposes to be relieved of doing the annual assessment work.

Mr. President, I ask for the present consideration of the measure.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill (H. R. 6295) to suspend the requirement for the performance of annual labor on certain mining claims was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

COMPENSATION OF HOLDERS OF GRAZING PERMITS AND LICENSES FOR CERTAIN LOSSES

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration at this time of Senate bill 2599, Calendar 1546.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the same understanding may prevail, that if there is any controversy or threatened controversy with respect to the measure it will have to go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK]?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2599) authorizing the Secretary of War to compensate holders of grazing permits and licenses for losses sustained by reason of use of the public lands for war purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys, with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause, and to insert in lieu thereof the following:

That whenever use for war purposes of the public domain or other property owned by or under the control of the United States prevents its use for grazing, persons holding grazing permits or licenses and persons whose grazing permits or licenses have been or will be canceled because of such use shall be paid out of the funds appropriated or allocated for such project such amounts as the head of the department or agency so using the lands shall determine to be fair and reasonable for the losses suffered by such persons as a result of the use of such lands for war purposes. Such payments shall be deemed payment in full for such losses. Nothing herein contained shall be construed to create any liability not now existing against the United States.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the title of the bill is rather enticing in its composition. I should like to have the Senator from Utah explain the purposes of the bill.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, this is a bill introduced by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND] for himself and in behalf of seven or eight other western Senators. I think the Senator from Arizona conferred with the distinguished minority leader, and also with the distinguished acting majority leader, the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL]. Since the declaration of war vast tracts of land in a number of Western States have been taken by the Government for war purposes. As a result of the taking of these lands for war purposes, in numerous instances livestock operations which have been carried on for many years, even prior to the Forest Reserve Act, prior to the enactment of the Taylor Grazing Act, and since the enactment of those laws, have been disrupted.

Under the Taylor Grazing Act and the forest reserve law permittees and licensees who are allowed to use the public lands for grazing purposes do not acquire a vested interest in the lands. All they acquire is a permit or license to graze livestock on the lands. As a general rule, the permit extends for a period of 10 years.

The grazing permit is an integral part of the livestock operation. To take away from a livestock operator the right to use the land for grazing purposes results in just as much damage as would the taking of his fee-title land. The War Department, the Navy Department, the Department of Justice, the Grazing Service, and the Forest Service have agreed that under present law the damages resulting from such taking cannot be compensated; that is, the permittee cannot be compensated for loss of use of the grazing lands on which he holds a permit or license. The result in many instances in the West, especially in the States of Arizona and New Mexico, is that scores of livestock operators have been put out of business and forced to sell their livestock. As a further result there is a very serious depreciation in the value of their fee-title land, such as their farms and ranches. Under the existing law they can be paid no compensation. All the bill proposes to do is to authorize the payment by the Secretary of War or the Secretary of the Navy, as the case may be, of reasonable compensation for the damage suffered by livestock operators.

In the past few weeks delegations of livestock men from the West, together with State land officials from the Western States, have conferred with the Federal departments and agencies on this question. They have unanimously come to the agreement that a very serious injustice is being done to those who are forced out of business and damaged as a result of the taking of the land for war purposes.

In the hearings before the Public Lands Committee there were present representatives of the War Department and of the Navy Department, a representative of the Forest Service, and a representative of the Grazing Service, who unanimously agreed that a serious injustice was resulting, and one which should be compensable. They unanimously agreed that the bill should be passed, granting authority to the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to compensate reasonably livestock producers for damages sustained. I hope there will be no opposition to the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator for his very clear and terse explanation of the bill. I think it is a worthy measure. I have no objection to it.

Mr. CHAVEZ. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN], I should like to make a brief statement with reference to the pending bill.

In my State the War Department took over 1,000,000 acres of land. On that land were hundreds of stock owners, many of whom had possibly 160 acres of land in fee simple, and perhaps 20,000 acres leased from the Federal Government. The leased land was of great value to the stock growers. As stated by the Senator from Utah, when the Government took over the land it allowed only for the land held in fee simple, plus the improvements. In many instances the Government has taken over land and improvements, and forced the stock grower to look elsewhere for pasture, or to sell his stock. The bill was proposed with the idea of compensating that class of citizens.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McFARLAND. The junior Senator from New Mexico, who has just spoken, was also a co-sponsor of the bill. I am sorry that his name did not appear on it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill S. 2599 was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the head of the department or agency using the public domain for war purposes to compensate

holders of grazing permits and licenses for losses sustained by reason of such use of public lands for war purposes."

CARL L. JONES

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. STEWART. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House bill 2014, Calendar 1374.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 2014) for the relief of Carl L. Jones.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims, with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "the sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$3,000."

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] the bill was reported from the Claims Committee by me, and has been on the calendar for several weeks. It involves a claim growing out of personal injuries resulting from an accident in the operation of a C. C. C. truck.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

Mr. STEWART. I have discussed this matter with the members of the committee. I ask that the committee amendment be rejected, and that the bill be passed as it originally came over from the House.

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

DIVERSION OF WATERS OF THE REPUBLICAN RIVER

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 2604, Calendar 1566, a bill granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact for the diversion of the waters of the Republican River.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill (S. 2604), granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Republican River, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That consent of Congress is hereby given to the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact not later than June 1, 1945, providing for an equitable division and apportionment among the said States of the waters of the Republican River and all of its tributaries above its junction with the Smoky Hill River in Kansas, upon condition that one suitable person, who shall be appointed by the President of the United States, shall participate in said negotiations as the representative of the United States and shall make report to Congress of the proceedings and of any compact entered into: *Provided*, That any such compact shall not be binding or obligatory upon any of the parties thereto unless and until the same shall have been ratified by the legislature of each of said States and approved by the Congress of the United States.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated a sufficient sum to pay the salary and expenses of the representative of the United States appointed hereunder: *Provided*, That such representative, if otherwise employed by the United States, while so employed shall not receive additional salary in the appointment hereunder.

LIMITATION OF WELL SPACING IN OIL FIELDS—CONSERVATION ORDER M-68

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I regret to say that because of the fact that the bill which is the unfinished business before the Senate must become law before Wednesday next, I shall be unable to yield further, after yielding to the Senator from Illinois.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator from Nevada for yielding for a few brief observations relative to Conservation Order M-68.

Some time ago the Petroleum Coordinator's Office adopted a regulation, known as Conservation Order M-68, limiting well spacing in the oil fields of this country to 40 acres of surface area. This order has seriously crippled the oil industry in the State of Illinois and other States throughout the Union. Especially has this order injured and impaired the independent oil operators throughout the country.

Before this spacing regulation was issued by the Petroleum Coordinator in December of last year, Illinois was producing approximately 387,000 barrels of oil a day. In the short space of 6 months thereafter, the production of oil had declined to 274,000 barrels a day. Thus we see a decline of approximately 113,000 barrels of oil a day in the State of Illinois alone.

It should be remembered in connection with the oil operations in Illinois that 81 percent of the new fields in Illinois have been discovered by independent operators, and not by the big companies. As a result of M-68 these independent operators have practically gone out of business; and yet without them the oil development in Illinois would have seriously lagged.

Without the independent oil operator, taking the chances which he takes in wildcatting in every new oil field which is developed, we should not have the oil production in the Nation which we have at this particular moment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, as a matter of fact, is not the purpose of the order to which the Senator is referring to put the small independent operators, who did the exploration work, out of business in the interest of the large established oil companies? At least, that is the inevitable effect of it, whether it is the purpose or not.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator for his statement. I am forced to agree, much as I dislike to do so. The big oil companies can stand by and wait, because of the tremendous reserve capital that they have. They can do their exploration work later, while the independent fellow, who is operating on small financial capital, must go out of business as a result of order M-68.

Mr. President, it is my understanding that the Coordinator's office is now asking for 325,000 barrels of oil a day from Illinois and is getting only 274,000 as a result of failure to change well spacing in that and surrounding States. Illinois is only a short distance from the eastern seaboard. Had the wells in Illinois been permitted to operate without the interference of order M-68, there is a serious question in my mind whether the recent order directing the big pipe line to be constructed from Texas to Illinois would have been necessary. That may be a rather farfetched statement, but I cannot reach any other conclusion. It should be remembered that Illinois is one of the Nation's greatest oil-producing States. It should also be remembered that the big pipe line will end in the richest oil section of our State. From this terminus branch lines will be constructed to various sites along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers in order that they can barge this oil to the eastern seaboard. Donald Nelson thought the pipe line an unnecessary expenditure. He wanted to use the steel and other materials that will go into the Texas-Illinois pipe line for planes, ships, and tanks.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Will the Senator from Illinois yield?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As strengthening the conclusion of the Senator from Illinois, the representative of the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator, who appeared before the subcommittee of the Commerce Committee which was investigating the oil situation, in justifying the necessity for this big pipe line from Longview, Tex., to the vicinity of Salem, Ill., did so on the ground that the production in Illinois was falling off very materially, and that Illinois could not supply the field, in spite of the fact that the falling off of production in Illinois is unquestionably caused by the very order the Petroleum Coordinator himself had issued.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, the conclusion of the Senator from Missouri is inescapable as to the reason for the failure to be able to produce the necessary oil in Illinois, as it is well able to produce it. Had the independent operators been able to go on with their discovery of oil in Illinois, there is no question about the amount we could produce without destroying the reserve.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What I desired to call to the attention of the Senator is the fact that it is the official explanation of the Office of Petroleum Coordinator, in urging that this pipe line be constructed from Long View

to the vicinity of Salem, which the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator has always favored, that the necessity for it has been because of the falling off of production in Illinois. Of course, they do not emphasize that they themselves are responsible for the falling off in Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I have discussed this question upon many occasions with various independent operators in my State. I am frank to say that in the beginning, when they came to me and laid this situation before me, I was somewhat skeptical of their premise. The more I studied the conditions about which they complained, and the more I listened to these men, the more I was convinced that the small independent operator was being driven out of business as the result of Order M–68. I was also convinced that these men were attempting to have Order M–68 amended for patriotic reasons, primarily, and, secondly, for the purpose of saving themselves.

It is well to say in passing that as a result of the continued activities on the part of the independent oil operators in my State, there was a recent modification of Order M–68, but the modification does not go far enough. It will only result in the drilling of a few additional wells.

Therefore, Mr. President, I am introducing an amendment to H. R. 6999, which will permit all oil operators to drill oil wells to a depth of not to exceed 3,300 feet, with a further provision that oil wells may be drilled only with equipment that has already been fabricated. I sincerely hope that the Committee on Commerce, which is handling H. R. 6999, will give this amendment most serious consideration, and that witnesses from Secretary Ickes' office and independent oil operators in Illinois, Indiana, and other sections will be brought before the committee in order that they may testify and present their case to this honorable committee.

I am very grateful to the Senator from Nevada for giving me this time.

I now present the amendment and ask that it be appropriately referred.

The amendment submitted by Mr. LUCAS, intended to be proposed by him, to the bill (H. R. 6999) to promote the national defense and to promptly facilitate and protect the transport of materials and supplies needful to the Military Establishment by authorizing the construction and operation of a pipe line and a navigable barge channel across Florida, and by deepening and enlarging the Intracoastal Waterway from its present eastern terminus to the vicinity of the Mexican border, was referred to the Committee on Commerce and ordered to be printed.

LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill now pending, when it came to the Senate, carried $1,058,951,660. The amount of the increase recommended by the Senate committee, that is, the net over-all increase, is $14,620,966. Senators will note, as we go along, that reductions have been made in various items. The sum which I have last mentioned is the net increase.

The amount of the bill, as reported to the Senate, and as it is now before the Senate, is $1,073,572,626. The amount of the appropriation for the current year, which will expire next Tuesday, the last day of June, is $1,261,039,498. The regular and supplemental estimates, as furnished by the Bureau of the Budget for 1943, amount to $1,177,593,741.

The Senate will note that the committee report recommends less than the Budget Bureau estimate authorized. The bill as reported to the Senate is under the estimates for 1943 by $104,021,115 and under the appropriation for 1942 by $187,466,872. So, the Senate will note that the committee recommends less than was appropriated for the current year.

Under the Department of Labor the Senators will note several amendments, and I think it best to note them as we go along, as the items are being read by the clerk.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the formal reading of the bill be dispensed with, that the bill be read for amendment, and that committee amendments be first considered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair.) Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will proceed to state the amendments proposed by the committee.

The first amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, under the heading "Title I—Department of Labor—Office of the Secretary", on page 2, line 18, after the word "motortrucks", to insert "purchase (including exchange) at a cost not to exceed $1,500, of one motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicle for the official use of the Secretary of Labor"; and on page 3, line 9, after the word "foregoing", to strike out "$191,030" and insert "$192,530."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 17, after the word "field", to strike out "$932,500" and insert "$1,250,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 5, line 11, after the word "binding", to strike out "$930,735" and insert "$975,635."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Children's Bureau", on page 8, line 13, after the word "expenses", to strike out "$317,310" and insert "$345,310", and in line 14, before the word "may", to strike out "$272,557" and insert "$296,606."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Federal Security Agency—Miscellaneous and contingent expenses", on page 17, line 7, after "401–409)", to strike out "$1,730,884" and insert "$1,775,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Civilian Conservation Corps", on page 19, line 13, after the word "war", to insert "or the Civil Aeronautics Administration", and in line 14, after the word "Departments", to insert "or agency."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "National Youth Administration", on page 25, line 15, after the word "of" where it occurs the second time, to strike out "17" and insert "16."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 9, after the word "education", to strike out "$5,000,000" and insert "$4,000,000; to provide continuance of part-time employment for needy students in schools below the college level to enable such persons to continue their education, $3,000,000; in all $7,000,000."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, with reference to the committee amendment just stated, let me ask the Senator from Nevada whether that means a reduction of a million dollars?

Mr. McCARRAN. It means a reduction of a million dollars from the amount allowed by the House, the House having allowed $5,000,000. We reduced that item to $4,000,000, and allowed $3,000,000 to provide for continuance of part-time employment for needy students in schools below the college level, in order to permit such students to continue their education.

Mr. BYRD. As a matter of fact, the net result is an increase of $2,000,000; is it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is an increase of $2,000,000; that is correct.

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, on page 9, under the heading "Maternal and child welfare," I notice an item of $375,795 for "supplies; services; equipment; newspapers, books of reference, and periodicals." Can the Senator from Nevada tell me what that item covers?

Mr. McCARRAN. Would the Senator object to letting us proceed in the regular order to consider first the committee amendments? The item to which the Senator refers is not a committee amendment. I suggest that, if satisfactory to the Senator, after we have considered the committee amendments we revert to the item to which he has referred.

Mr. GERRY. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 26, line 9.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment reported by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 26, line 24, after the numeral "2", to strike out "$3,275,000" and insert "$3,500,000."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 27, line 21, after the words "fiscal year", to strike out "1941" and insert "1942."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Education and training, defense workers (national defense)", on page 43, line 9, before the word "who", to strike out "youth" and insert "persons", and in line 16, after the words "by the", to strike out "Director of the Labor Division of the War Production Board, or by such other officer as may succeed to the functions of

such Director" and insert "Chairman of the War Manpower Commission."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 44, line 9, after the words "by the", to strike out "War Production Board" and insert "Chairman of the War Manpower Commission."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Public Health Service", on page 51, line 12, after the words "field work", to strike out "$8,101,050, of which not to exceed $142,212 may be transferred to the appropriation 'Pay, etc., commissioned officers, Public Health Service'" and insert "$15,000,000, of which (1) not to exceed $142,212 may be transferred to the appropriation 'Pay, etc., commissioned officers, Public Health Service', and (2) not to exceed $195,000 may be transferred to the appropriation 'Traveling expenses, Federal Security Agency', for the traveling expenses of the personnel of the Division of Venereal Diseases, which shall be in addition to the sum contained in such appropriation for such Division."

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, at that point let me remark that the appropriation bills previously passed this year have carried a reduction of 12 percent in the amounts available for travel expenses of most of the departments. Is any such provision contained in this bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. No such provision is contained in it, for the reason that both the House and the Senate committee gave only the amounts which we thought were absolutely indispensable to carrying out the functions and work of the respective departments. Let me say to the Senator from Virginia that with respect to the pending bill, and especially that portion of the bill which addresses itself to the Federal Security Agency, we have, by laws enacted in years past, authorized the services involved to function largely, as I choose to term it, on wheels. In other words, the rendering of those services must be interspersed and spread over the entire country. The performance of such service requires many traveling agents, many traveling representatives, many solicitors, many representatives of all kinds; and when the committee undertakes to cut down the appropriations for travel pay we are confronted with the problem of how to reduce the appropriations for travel pay and travel allowances and yet at the same time have the services function properly.

Mr. BYRD. Can the Senator inform us whether the committee has proposed an increase or a decrease in the appropriations for travel expenses, as compared with the amounts appropriated for such purposes for the previous year?

Mr. McCARRAN. There has been a decrease, I may say.

Mr. BYRD. A decrease?

Mr. McCARRAN. Generally speaking, there has been a decrease.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator have before him information as to the amount of the decrease?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not have the information at hand, but I shall try to obtain it for the Senator in a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 51, line 12.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next amendment proposed by the committee will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 54, line 21, after the word "to", to insert "conduct independently or to"; on page 55, line 7, after the name "Surgeon General", to insert "without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes", in line 10, after the word "hospitals", to strike out "located not more than 300 miles from ocean or Gulf coast", and in line 11, after the word "procure", to strike out "without regard to section 3709 of the Revised Statutes."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the subhead "Social Security Board", on page 63, line 16, after the word "thereunder", to strike out "$2,467,670" and insert "$7,467,670."

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Nevada a question about that item. The proposed $5,000,000 increase in that item, as I understand it, is to be used by the United States Employment Service, taken over by the Federal Government last December, for a survey of manpower requested by the Manpower Commission; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; that is not correct.

Mr. BALL. The item is a nonrecurring item, as I understand.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is. Let me explain a little further. The item came to the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations during the time when the bill was in the hands of the committee. It came by way of a supplemental estimate from the Bureau of the Budget, with a letter of transmittal from the President asking for $19,500,000 to carry out the services of the employment agency. The item was very strenuously advocated by Governor McNutt, at the head of the Federal Security Agency, and by the Bureau of the Budget. My attention is called to the fact that Governor McNutt is now the head of the Manpower Commission.

The object and aim of the estimate of $19,500,000, taken in its entirety, was that a survey of the entire country be made from which we could determine our manpower available for war purposes. In other words, we haye authorized the registration of nearly all the manpower of the country up to the age of 65 years. The question is where that manpower fits in. We know that men from 45 to 65 years of age will scarcely be accepted for the regular run of service in the Army; but through all the classes there must be those who can serve their country in some way and who, indeed, are anxious to serve in every possible way. So the object was to make a survey of the available manpower and then a survey of the places where certain classes of labor are required, and, if possible, bring the two together.

The committee in passing upon the matter believed that many of the side issues, so-called, of the Budget estimate could be left out; and instead of recommending $19,500,000, we recommended only $5,000,000 for the purposes of the proposed survey which is to register and catalog, so to speak, all the labor available throughout the country.

Mr. BALL. If the Senator will yield further, referring to the item of $79,650,000, in line 24, which, as I understand, is to cover the administrative cost of both unemployment compensation, which is paid by grants to the States, and the United States Employment Service——

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. As I understand, the Budget estimate of $19,500,000 additional included $6,000,000 for the survey for which the committee allowed $5,000,000; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BALL. The other $13,500,000 was largely to supplement the funds of the Employment Service; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. Let me say in full answer to the Senator that I have before me a copy of the estimate, which is broken down as follows:

I. Nation-wide occupational inventory, $6,000,000.

It was for that item that the committee allowed $5,000,000. Under that head comes:

Classification of skills, interviewing persons with necessary skills, filing of questionnaires.

All that comes under the heading "Nation-wide occupational inventory."

Mr. BALL. That item is a nonrecurring one, is it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct; the item is a nonrecurring one.

II. Collection of labor-market information, $700,000.

The committee believed that, for the time being, at least, we could get along without that.

III. Farm placement, $2,759,173.

The committee believed, in view of the conditions prevailing throughout the country, that we could get along, for the time being, without that item.

Under the farm-placement item comes the "Location and referral of farm workers." We believed that could be deferred because there are other agencies that are working along the same line.

No. IV of the break-down is:

Additional placement and registration activities, $10,040,827.

The committee believed that that item could be deferred, and we did not allow it. What is more we cut down the $6,000,000 request to $5,000,000.

Mr. BALL. I have been investigating the appropriation for the current year in the regular appropriation bill and, as I understand, for both these services there was an appropriation of sixty-two and a half million dollars, which was supplemented last January by a deficiency appropriation of $10,000,000, giving them seventy-two and a half million dollars to operate the two services, plus $3,100,000 paid by all the States, which gave them $75,600,000, or about $4,000,000 less than is allowed for next year in this bill. But, as I understand, the work of the Employment Service has increased tremendously since war was declared, and it has actually spent since January 1, for the

6 months, $21,000,000. Those are the figures I get from the Service. Of this $79,650,000 in the bill, the unemployment compensation grants to the States as budgeted already for the first 6 months are $20,456,000, which would make the total for the year going to unemployment compensation about $41,000,000, which if subtracted from $79,650,000, will leave about $38,650,000 for the United States Employment Service, which actually means operating it for the year on a basis of about $3,350,000 less than the basis on which they have been operating for the last 6 months.

Mr. McCARRAN. That may be true, but it was the opinion of the committee that, in view of the fact that Congress is practically always in session, if they have legitimate reason to believe that there would be a deficiency they could come before the Congress and request an additional amount.

Let me say in this regard—and I think the Senator will agree with me—that in view of the fact that we are passing through a difficult war period and are looking for every dollar we can possibly find we must curtail and say to this Service, "You are compelled to curtail your activity just as much as possible, yet at the same time carry on your functions as efficiently as is possible." That was one of the thoughts uppermost in the minds of the committee when they passed on this and did not allow $19,500,000, as requested by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. BALL. Knowing the tremendously increased load placed on the Employment Service, and I consider it was a mistake for the Federal Government to take it over, because it worked better when it was operated in conjunction with the State unemployment compensation setups, but since December 7, when all placements in war industries have been channeled through the United States Employment Service so as to carry out the directives of the W. P. B. and the Manpower Commission and other bodies, their load has tremendously increased, I question whether it is wise actually to give it less money for the next year than it has operated under for the past 6 months.

Of course, if the Senator is taking the position that they can go on at about the present level, and then if they need a deficiency can come in later, that is a different situation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Speaking for myself and not for the committee I think if we were to appropriate $30,000,000 in place of $19,000,000 we would find that it would be absorbed in some way or other. That is the reason I take the other view of it; in other words, I believe in curtailing, and then let them come in and show a reason for an additional amount if an additional amount is needed. I think as we go on those who are seeking work in this country will find work; they have found it to a large extent already. While this agency may have rendered very valuable service to the country; at the same time, it seems to me that their burdens and their obligations will be lessened as time goes on. We can only judge it from that standpoint.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 63, line 16.

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The next committee amendment will be stated.

The next amendment was, on page 68, after line 16, to insert:

No part of the appropriations contained herein under the heading "Social Security Board" shall be expended for the salary of any person who directly or indirectly is receiving compensation for services from any person, corporation, or association employing any person enrolled under the Social Security Act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title IV—National Labor Relations Board',' on page 73, line 8, after the word "law", to strike out "$2,128,130" and insert "$2,174,130."

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, under the heading "Title V—National Mediation Board—National Railroad Adjustment Board," on page 75, line 15, after the word "equipment", to strike out "$215,060" and insert "$230,060"; in the same line, after the word "which", to strike out "$55,000" and insert "$70,000"; in line 16, after the word "for", to strike out "services of referees at a rate of"; and in line 17, after th words "per day", to insert "and expenses of referees."

The amendment was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That completes the committee amendments.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. I desire to offer an amendment to the bill. Has the Senator from Nevada an amendment to offer?

Mr. McCARRAN. I think there are one or two committee amendments that have not as yet been completed. Will the Senator defer offering his amendment until the committee amendments are acted upon?

Mr. BALL. I thought it was announced by the Chair that the committee amendments had been completed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have an amendment, which I desire to offer and of which notice was given.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 37, after line 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

Loans to students in technical and professional fields (national defense): To assist students (in such numbers as the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall determine) participating in accelerated programs in degree-granting colleges and universities in engineering, physics, chemistry, medicine (including veterinary), dentistry, and pharmacy, as follows:

Loans: For loans to students to enable them to pursue college courses, who attain and continue to maintain satisfactory standards of scholarship, who are in need of assistance, and who agree in writing to participate, until otherwise directed by said Chairman, in accelerated programs of study, in any of the fields authorized hereunder, and who agree in writing to engage, for the duration of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, in such employment or service as may be assigned by officers or agencies designated by said Chairman, such loans to be made by such colleges or universities or public or college-connected agencies from funds paid to them upon estimates submitted by them as to the amounts necessary therefor, $7,500,000: *Provided*, That in case it shall be found that any payment to any such college, university, or public or college-connected agency is in excess of the needs thereof for the purposes hereof, refund of such excess shall be made to the Treasurer of the United States and the amount thereof credited to this appropriation. Loans hereunder shall be made in amounts not exceeding tuition and fees plus $25 per month and not exceeding a total of $500 to any one student during any 12-month period, said loans to be evidenced by notes executed by such students payable to the Treasurer of the United States at a rate of interest at 2½ percent per annum. Repayments of such loans shall be made through the colleges, universities, or other agencies negotiating the loans and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided*, That indebtedness of students who, before completing their courses, are ordered into military service during the present wars under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, or who suffer total and permanent disability or death, shall be canceled. The foregoing loan program shall be administered in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Commissioner of Education with the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Education in the administration of the foregoing program, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and exchange of equipment; printing and binding; travel expenses, including not to exceed $2,500 for actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Commissioner of Education, $100,000: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any purchase from this appropriation when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $100.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in this amendment I am very much interested; it was submitted to my subcommittee and also to the full committee. Today the Selective Service organization of the Army is rightfully and necessarily, in my judgment, authorizing deferment of young men who are taking special courses in schools such as instruction in engineering, physics, chemistry, medicine, including veterinary medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, and like courses. When they have completed their studies, they will be of great service to the armed forces of the country.

When a student is taking special work, or devoting his entire time or majoring in work in those particular sciences, he is rightfully deferred until he completes his studies. The reason for that is that the Army requires men who are qualified along those lines.

There is great demand today for doctors in the Army; in fact, the Army is going to be exceedingly short of doctors. There is great demand today for veterinarians in the Army, and we are going to be short of them. There is great

demand today for chemists in the Army, because the war is to a large extent a chemical war. There is large demand in the Army for those skilled in these various lines of work.

We are expending much money along other lines, and it is my thought that this country could do no better than appropriate a sum so that when qualified young men have reached the stage in their education where they may matriculate as freshmen, or become sophomores or juniors or seniors in a college from which they can get a degree in one of these courses, the Government can say to them, "We want you to pursue your courses, and if you find yourselves without funds or without means to pay your way in pursuing the work, we will make you a loan of not to exceed $500 for any one calendar year, and we will make you successive loans, from the freshman year to the senior year, not to exceed $500 for any one calendar year, in order that you may pursue your courses and become qualified to serve your country in the activities to which you have devoted your energies." It will be with the understanding that the student signs an obligation to repay the Government, through his institution, with interest at the rate of 2½ percent. If the student is called into the military service of the United States, the obligation will be entirely liquidated.

The Department of Education estimated that it would require $10,000,000, and that that was a proper appropriation for this worthy work. The committee felt that $7,500,000 would be sufficient, and I believe that with the appropriation of that amount we can do a splendid work in aiding in the education of young men and young women in this country in skills in which they can serve their country, in places where the country is calling for service, and will be calling for service in the future.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator has referred to the great need of the Army for doctors, dentists, and pharmacists. I should like to point out that the Army has priority in requiring the services of those who have skill in those professions, but that there is a very serious condition among some of our civilian populations due to the lack of a sufficient number of doctors, dentists, and pharmacists. The situation is particularly acute in the rural areas. I have been advised that in my own State, in some eight or nine rural counties, the population of which is very sparse, there is not a single active physician. Certainly such a provision as that advocated by the Senator, which will enable young men and young women to be trained in these skills, is absolutely essential if we are adequately to protect the health and lives of the civilian population, as well as provide adequate medical treatment for those in the armed forces.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I agree with my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. I merely add that the activity of the National Youth Administration in the rural areas in training young people is one of the greatest works being done in South Carolina.

I should also like to say that that activity has made it possible for many a poor boy and girl to get an education through loans and to carry on, as otherwise he or she never would have been able to do.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator. Let it be understood, however, that the money would not be expended under the National Youth Administration. It would be disbursed under the Department of Education of the United States.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, it is not clear to me whether the money is to be paid back or not.

Mr. McCARRAN. The recipient will obligate himself to pay it back with interest at two and a half percent, but if he is taken into the military service during his course of study, then the obligation will be liquidated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, if I may, I withdraw the suggestion of the absence of a quorum. I see the Senator now present who had asked me to have a quorum called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Wyoming? The Chair hears none, and the order directing the calling of the roll is vacated.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I offer another amendment, which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill a new section, as follows:

SEC. 704. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1942, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authorities, all obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1942, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McCARRAN. Some time ago we adopted the provision in the bill having to do with the National Youth Administration. I overlooked a promise I had made to the able senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] that I would defer that until the last of the committee amendments.

Mr. McKELLAR. We will let it go for the present. The Senator has another amendment to offer, I understand.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall insist on the committee amendments being disposed of.

Mr. McKELLAR. They have been disposed of, have they not?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall object to any being taken up out of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I send an amendment to the desk which I desire to offer.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 4, line 11, it is proposed to strike out "$150,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$200,000."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, this amendment relates to the appropriation for the Department of Labor for carrying on its safety work in war industries. The Department had $200,000 available for the current fiscal year, and the appropriation was cut by the House to $150,000. With war industries expanding so rapidly, and new and green employees being hired, I think this safety work is extremely important, and that cutting it down at this time is simply shortsighted economy. I know that in 59 industries in Minnesota this program in a year has reduced the accident frequency from 36 per million man-hours to 27. Most of the work is actually done by safety engineers of large companies who donate their time, and the only expense to the Department is its full-time regional supervisors to coordinate the work.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from Minnesota that this matter was fully discussed before the committee. The Department asked for an additional $50,000. The estimate was for $200,000. The Department had $200,000 for the current year. The House cut it to $150,000. It was the judgment of the committee that the Department could get along with $150,000 for this purpose.

Mr. President, again I come back to the same story that might be repeated with respect to every item in the bill. We cut these items with the greatest of reluctance, with the realization that perhaps such cut might impair the service to some extent.

Let me say to the Senate that with the demand for money which is being made every day for war activities to defend the country, I am sorry to say that we shall, before the war is over, have to curtail a great deal more in the matter of appropriation of money for various Government organizations. So, with respect to the service in question, however meritorious it may be—and the service performed by the Department in this respect is meritorious—the committee thought best to leave in the bill the figure which was fixed by the House. That is the position taken by the committee, and the Senator having the bill in charge cannot now yield.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I should like to say that the $200,000 was spent by the Department of Labor in actually

supervising the work of volunteer safety engineers all over the country, a work worth several million dollars, and that this cut of $50,000 will cripple the program to a much greater extent than the amount would indicate, at a time when our war industries are expanding very rapidly, with green employees, and often with green management.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURDOCK in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL]. [Putting the question.] The ayes seem to have it——

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask for a division.

On a division the amendment was rejected.

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in the amendment on page 37, after line 14, providing for $7,500,000, which was agreed to a moment ago, there is in line 2 the following language with respect to loans to students:

To assist students (in such numbers as the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall determine) participating in accelerated programs in degree-granting colleges and universities.

I assume students in institutions granting the regular liberal arts college degrees would be eligible for such loans?

Mr. McCARRAN. If their work were preparatory to one of these courses.

Mr. BUTLER. That is the understanding?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is my understanding.

Mr. BUTLER. That answers my question.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that the Senate revert to that portion of the bill pertaining to the National Youth Administration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I understand that the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] desires to oppose this proposal, and I promised that I would give him the opportunity to present his statement in opposition to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state that all committee amendments have been agreed to. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendments, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, does the Senator from Tennessee now desire to present any opposition to that portion of the bill dealing with the National Youth Administration?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am not under any obligation one way or the other to make any motion about it.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, what is the parliamentary situation?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, fairness is fairness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair has just stated that the bill is open to further amendment, and that if there be no further amendments to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I now ask the Senator from Tennessee if he desires to make any motion with respect to the National Youth Administration portion of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Not at this time.

Mr. McCARRAN. In view of the fact that we were for days considering these matters before the committee, it seems to me that the able Senator from Tennessee——

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I am not going to quibble about the matter. I have not made any motion with respect to the National Youth Administration. It is not my purpose to do so at this time. The Senator can proceed in any way he likes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment which I ask to have stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 18, line 10, it is proposed to strike out the language beginning with "For all necessary expenses", through "$500,000", and insert in lieu thereof the following:

For all necessary expenses to carry into effect the provisions of the act of June 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C., ch. 3A), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the purchase and exchange of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals; the purchase (including exchange), operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; hire, with or without personal services, of work animals, animal-drawn and motor-propelled vehicles, and watercraft; printing and binding; travel expenses, including not to exceed $2,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Corps when specifically authorized by the Federal Security Administrator; transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940, and regulations promulgated thereunder; construction, improvement, repair, and maintenance of buildings, but the cost of any building erected hereunder shall not exceed $25,000 as follows:

For pay, subsistence, medical service, etc.: For pay, subsistence, travel, clothing (and repair thereof), medical services, including hospitalization, fees and travel of physicians, dentists, veterinarians, and nurses; burial of enrollees, payment (not exceeding $50 for any one transfusion) to any enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps or other individual furnishing blood for transfusion to the veins of an enrollee or discharged enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps undergoing treatment in a hospital authorized to treat such patient, $48,499,288.

For all other necessary expenses, both field and departmental, in connection with the administration of camps and work projects, $28,030,512.

The Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps may authorize the exchange of motor-propelled and horse-drawn vehicles, tractors, road equipment, and boats, and parts, accessories, tires, or equipment thereof, in whole or in part payment for other vehicles, tractors, road equipment, or boats, or parts, accessories, tires, or equipment of such vehicles, tractors, roads equipment, or boats.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, I did not clearly hear the amendment as it was read. Will the Senator explain the amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. I propose to do so.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Delaware desire to have the amendment again stated?

Mr. HUGHES. No, Mr. President; if the Senator from Nevada will explain it.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the bill as passed by the House eliminated any appropriation for the continuation of the Civilian Conservation Corps. It is not necessary for me to say to the Senate that one of the early activities in legislation of the present administration was to establish the Civilian Conservation Corps. The aim and object in creating that corps was that we might take from the highways and byways and out of the alleys and streets of congested cities young men 17, 18, 19, 20, and 21 years of age and give them an opportunity to learn to do something with their hands. We created the Civilian Conservation Corps and gave opportunity to millions of boys throughout the length and breadth of this land which they had never had before. Young men who up to that time really believed that their country was bounded on one side by the Hudson and on the other side by the East River learned that it was bounded on one side by the Pacific and on the other by the Atlantic. They learned the vast expanse of territory and the vast resources which existed between those two great oceans. They learned from actual observation that they had a country which was worth living in and worth dying for. There were enrolled in the Civilian Conservation Corps several million young men who thereafter had a year or more of training in civilian conservation work. To put an estimate on the work they did in dollars and cents would be beyond the ability of anyone. Those young men went onto the plains, they went out into the forests, they went to the little streams in the mountains and built impounding dams and reservoirs; they built roads; they cleared away trees; they built facilities of all kinds throughout the entire country.

Moreover, through the years of its existence the Civilian Conservation Corps has proved itself to be one of the most effective fire-fighting agencies the country has ever had. When one of these young men of 17, 18, or 19 years of age is sent out with a group of his fellows to meet the onslaught of fire, he is fearless. He is trained to meet it, and he does effective work. That is not conjecture; it is not theory; it has actually been proved.

The Civilian Conservation Corps has been very much curtailed in many respects. Today in the Civilian Conservation Corps there are not only young men of the ages of 17, 18, and 19, but there are 15,000 ex-service men who fought in the former war. It may be asked how they happened to engage in Civilian Conservation Corps work. When the bonus marchers came to Washington some years ago the President saw fit to afford them the benefits of the nearby Civilian Conservation Corps camps. From that nucleus the participation of ex-service men grew until today approximately 15,000 ex-service men who fought

for their country in the former war are being taken care of and are performing a certain amount of work in the open, for which they are paid something to sustain themselves and their dependents. As I say, they are in the open, where they can look up at the sun and have a realization that there is something more in life than merely existing in some institution. They have the realization that they can do something at least partially to earn the money which is paid them.

When the bill passed the House it contained no provision for the Civilian Conservation Corps. I have before me a communication from Governor McNutt, who is now the head of the Civilian Conservation Corps, submitting a break-down statement showing that $17,000,000 would be required to liquidate the Civilian Conservation Corps. Governor McNutt attaches the following statement to his letter to me:

For all necessary expenses to enable the Secretary of War to provide for the liquidation of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the conservation and disposition of all the property, of whatever type (including camp buildings, accessories, equipment, and machinery of all types) in use by said Corps, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; payment for accrued annual leave of employees separated from the Government service due to the discontinuance of Corps operations; and for such travel (including the return of enrollees to their homes) and other necessary expenses as may be incurred in connection with liquidation of said Civilian Conservation Corps, from the unexpended balances of the appropriations made to the Civilian Conservation Corps in the "Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1942," not exceeding $17,000,000.

The break-down for that amount was presented to me. The items are:

Travel of enrollees, $2,400,000.

Pay and subsistence of enrollees, $5,000,000.

Salary of personnel and expenses relative to their employment, $7,000,000.

Transportation and storage of supplies, $2,600,000.

I mention that only to show that it is not a matter to be lightly dealt with. The $500,000 allowed by the House to liquidate the agency would not accomplish anything. As a matter of fact, it would not last a week.

The President of the United States is interested in this matter. Sometime ago, in Senate bill 2208, we included the following provision:

SEC. 901. The President is empowered to direct the Administrator of the Federal Security Agency to assign the manpower of the Civilian Conservation Corps, to the extent necessary, to protect the munitions, aircraft, and other war industries, municipal water supplies, power, and other utilities, and to protect resources subject to the hazards of forest fires.

At that time we made provision for the use of the Civilian Conservation Corps to do the very thing which the President now suggests may have to be done.

While the bill was pending before the subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman, the head of the Bureau of the Budget called me on the telephone and said, "I have just received a call from the President in which I was directed to deliver to you the following language and expression of the President. My secretary took it down over the telephone from the head of the Bureau of the Budget. This is the President speaking to the committee and to the Senate through the Bureau of the Budget:

I wish you would make it clear on my behalf to the Appropriations Committee of the Senate that elimination of the Civilian Conservation Corps will call for a wholly separate appropriation to take its place in two of the Civilian Conservation Corps activities.

The first is the need for forest-fire protection, especially along the Pacific coast back as far as the Rockies where we must guard against Japanese incendiary bombs and incendiary fires during the dry season. This is essential for our national future.

The second is the building of roads and other facilities for camps. These have to be built by someone and I would have to ask for a separate appropriation or let the work out by contract instead of having it done by the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Make it clear that the abolishment of the Civilian Conservation Corps saves the Nation no money.

Mr. President, I wish the Senate to be fully advised in the matter. The provision for the Civilian Conservation Corps was voted down by the subcommittee. It was also voted down by the full committee. I am presenting this amendment because I believe that the Civilian Conservation Corps is one of the most worth-while agencies of the Government. My amendment proposes to limit the number of camps to 350. According to the testimony before the committee by representatives of the War and Navy Departments and of the War Production Board, and according to the language of the President himself, the camps would be located in Army camps throughout the country, and the enrollees would do work which would otherwise have to be done by other civilian labor. If the Civilian Conservation Corps is not continued, civilian labor in the various Army camps must be performed by other labor, which will cost much more.

The President directs the attention of the committee and of the Senate to the fact that the vast wooded belt from the Rockies to the Pacific, which contain great forest assets which belong to this country, is one of the most hazardous places we have because of the danger from invasion by those who would set incendiary fires. The dry season is approaching, and the stretch of country from the Rockies to the Pacific has its dry season. When the dry season is on, then all the more is a forest subject to fire. As I said in the beginning, there is no fire fighter in the open who is better equipped to fight a forest fire than is the C. C. C. boy, who has been trained and organized under the C. C. C. activities and program. He has proven it.

It will be said by those who will oppose the amendment that these camps are not now located in the forest areas. That may be true, and there are not enough camps provided by the amendment to protect all the forest areas, but so far as they can protect the forest areas they will be utilized. They will be utilized for two purposes, and the President specifies those purposes. They will be utilized for work within the Army camps throughout the length and breadth of the country, and they will be utilized for purposes of fire prevention.

Mr. HUGHES. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. HUGHES. Has the Senator any information as to where the camps now remaining are located?

Mr. McCARRAN. We have information as to where they will be located. I have not information at this moment as to where they are presently located, but the Senator from Tennessee is waiting to give me a shot in the ribs in just a minute or two, as to where they will be located under the curtailed program. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I would not do that for anything.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if the Senator from Nevada will yield, I cannot answer the question of the Senator from Delaware completely, but in the testimony given before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor on March 30 last, General Ulio, Adjutant General of the Army, described companies working on military reservations at the time the testimony was given, about 2 months ago. He said the companies are working in all of the nine corps areas. "Company" is the new military designation for the camp. So far as the personnel is concerned, a C. C. C. camp is composed of 200 men. He states the locations as follows:

First Corps Area, 2; Second Corps Area, 8; Third Corps Area, 11; Fourth Corps Area, 43; Fifth Corps Area, 3; Sixth Corps Area, none, but 3 were approved at that time; Seventh Corps Area, 5; Eighth Corps Area, 5; Ninth Corps Area, 10.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator. Further answering the Senator from Delaware, and anticipating what my good friend the Senator from Tennessee will tell us, I shall state what the estimated distribution of 350 camps for the fiscal year 1943 will be. For a list of the number of camps, by States, I refer to page 300 of the hearings before the Senate subcommittee.

Connecticut	1
Maine	1
Massachusetts	1
New Hampshire	1
Rhode Island	1
Vermont	1
Total I	6
Delaware	0
New Jersey	6
New York	6
Total II	12
District of Columbia	1
Maryland	8
Pennsylvania	8
Virginia	16
Total III	33

Alabama	5
Florida	13
Georgia	31
Louisiana	10
Mississippi	8
North Carolina	21
South Carolina	11
Tennessee	8
Total IV	107
Indiana	6
Kentucky	6
Ohio	4
West Virginia	2
Total V	18
Illinois	7
Michigan	6
Wisconsin	4
Total VI	17
Arkansas	7
Iowa	1
Kansas	5
Minnesota	5
Missouri	10
Montana	1
Nebraska	1
North Dakota	1
South Dakota	4
Total VII	35
Arizona	3
Colorado	4
New Mexico	2
Oklahoma	7
Texas	20
Wyoming	1
Total VIII	37
California	28
Idaho	7
Montana	7
Nevada	1
Oregon	15
Utah	7
Washington	16
Wyoming	4
Alaska	0
Total IX	85

Mr. WALSH. On what theory are these allotments made to the various States? Is it on the basis of the number of applicants in each State, or the need of fire-fighting facilities in the various localities?

Mr. McCARRAN. I must answer largely from conclusion. Two hundred of them are placed, or will be placed, in Army camps. One hundred and fifty of them are to be placed where they will be most accessible for forest-fire prevention.

Mr. WALSH. Then the fact that a greater number of people in one community are seeking to enter these camps than in another community is not the determining factor. Is that not true?

Mr. McCARRAN. I cannot answer. I wish I could. I am taking the locations of the camps as a reason for their existence.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. The personnel of the camps does not necessarily come from the State. In Wyoming quite a number of our camps were manned by men from Boston and some from New York.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to dwell briefly on that suggestion. The testimony shows that boys from the East were transported to the West and put into camps in the West, and boys from the West were transported to the East or South and put into camps there. I think that was a worthy activity, because it gave the boys a general idea of what the country was like.

Mr. President, a reduction to 350 camps and the curtailment from $246,000,000, the appropriation for the current year, to $48,000,000 for the coming year is certainly reducing very rapidly a facility the Government has established. That may be proper because of the demand for boys to enter the military service.

Let me say, Mr. President, that many boys of 17, 18, and 19 years of age cannot be inducted into military service. These camps will afford the very first step toward training the boys for military service. A boy of 17 is selected from a congested city and placed in a camp, where he learns, first of all, to live with his fellows. He learns to have respect for authority and to do something with his hands, whereas, as a matter of fact, during the better part of his life he had not known he could do things with his hands.

Out of these camps there have come some of the finest engineers the country has today. As a side issue, let me say that I was told by a high-ranking Army officer that these camps have furnished some of the best cooks who have gone into the Army camps. They have been trained in the Civilian Conservation Corps to understand how to handle men and how to handle and prepare food. I mention that merely to show that the contention which has been made that a Civilian Conservation Corps enrollee does nothing is absurd. He has learned in the university of life something that will stay with him and abide with him for the future.

I hope the amendment will be adopted. It provides for an appropriation of $48,000,000 as against $200,000,000 for the current year. It is an amendment that will permit the Civilian Conservation Corps to reduce its numbers, and yet take care of a certain group who will afterward become, by reason of their training, worth-while as soldiers, if necessary, and as civilians in time of peace.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I wish to endorse very heartily the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nevada. I have peculiar reasons for appealing to Members of the Senate to agree to the amendment proposing the larger appropriation. I must admit that the reasons prevailing in the Pacific coast area are not national; but the Pacific coast is now one of the great battlegrounds of this Nation, and the impairment of our military forces there would equally affect the State of Tennessee, the State of Virginia, the State of Massachusetts, and all the other States, however remote from the Pacific coast.

It is almost impossible to exaggerate the vulnerability to damage by fire of our entire mountain area, from Mexico to Canada. This year, Mr. President, already alarming and destructive fires have occurred. They have impeded our war effort, and have cost millions of dollars. Many of our trained fire fighters have been drafted into the Army.

Mr. President, unless we act more energetically and wisely than we are now acting, it is well within the bounds of probability that great fires will devastate the Pacific coast area to such an extent that the damage to the military effort could not be measured in billions of dollars. When I say that I am not exaggerating.

C. C. C. camps have been located throughout the Pacific coast area principally because of their strategic value in fighting fires. Our forestry officials have discovered that young boys of 18, 19, and 20 years of age are better adapted to fire fighting and are more effective in that work than are men of any other age group. In this particular hour, when above all other things needed in the Pacific coast area we need protection against fire, I can imagine no more costly way for Members of the Senate to economize than by abolishing the C. C. C. camps. In this hour of desperate need, the boys now in those camps could not conceivably do any work more vitally necessary for the Nation's safety than the work they are now doing.

Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee that I have been told by many Army officers in California that the finest material they have ever had for noncommissioned officers has come from the C. C. C. camps. The boys are hardened and prepared for military experience. They have been subjected to discipline; at 17, 18, or 19 years of age they are ready for the Army.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. In the hearings upon the pending bill, Major General Ulio said exactly what the Senator from California has just said about the character of the young men who come out of the C. C. C. camps and enter the Army.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thank the Senator for his contribution. I notice that the Senator from Nevada is on his feet. Does the Senator from Nevada desire that I yield to him?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; I am simply holding the floor.

Mr. DOWNEY. I thought the Senator had yielded the floor.

Mr. McCARRAN. I did not intend to yield the floor. I desire to retain the floor; but, of course, I am glad to have the Senator from California proceed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California has been recognized and has the floor at this time.

Mr. DOWNEY. I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada in a few moments.

Mr. President, I think I voice the common sentiment of the people of the West when I say that one of the most valuable investments this Nation has ever had is its C. C. C. camps and their personnel, and that the most unfortunate day to do away with those camps would be this day, when our vulnerability to and danger from fire, both by incendiary bombs and by sabotage, are so extreme that even on the floor of the Senate I shall not paint the picture—a picture which may well come into being, a picture of almost

our entire area being destroyed by fire. That is a possibility, Mr. President. Every fire expert knows it, and every fire expert realizes that one of the best and cheapest safeguards against that danger is the camps which some Members of the Senate now seek to destroy entirely.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I take it that the Senator from Tennessee desires to be heard; if so, I yield to him at this time.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should like to have the Senator make whatever statement he wishes to make regarding the matter.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have made my preliminary statement; but I do not wish to yield the floor, because I am in charge of the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Very well.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator in charge of the bill a few questions.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well.

Mr. BROWN. Let me say that I am open-minded on the subject. I am generally inclined to go along with committee recommendations; but I have followed the argument made by the Senator from Nevada, and it is impressive to me.

One thing which disturbs me is this: Under existing circumstances, where are we to get the men to man these camps? Will men be available to put into the Civilian Conservation Corps camps?

Mr. McCARRAN. I can answer the Senator only by repeating in substance the statements made before the subcommittee by Mr. McEntee, who is in charge of the Civilian Conservation Corps, and by others, that it will be entirely possible to obtain enrollees to man 350 camps, and perhaps more.

Many of the enrollees come from congested centers. There is in the RECORD a statement to which attention will be drawn. The statement is that in the past 35 percent of the enrollees have come from rural areas. That statement will be dwelt upon at length, with the thought in mind of showing Members of the Senate that the enrollees should not be taken from rural areas because rural labor is essential to farm life. However, the boys who enroll from rural areas are not necessarily from the farms. They are from rural areas; it may be from farming areas or it may be from areas beyond the limits of cities. However, they are boys who will not go onto the farms. They have other lines of activity in their minds. That has been true all through the history of the Civilian Conservation Corps. A boy who would go into a factory or into a craft would not now go into the Civilian Conservation Corps. A great many boys and young men are attracted to that life because they see a chance for activity, a chance to earn something, and a chance to get into the open. I take it that the enrollees would be enlisted to a great extent from the larger groups in congested centers.

Mr. BROWN. I presume there would be a considerable number of enrollees from those who are rejected for Army service by reason of physical or other defects.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BROWN. How many is it anticipated will be required to man the 350 camps?

Mr. McCARRAN. There are 200 men to a company, and a camp is a company.

Mr. BROWN. In other words, about 70,000 altogether. Is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; about sixty-five or seventy thousand altogether.

Mr. BROWN. One thing that concerns me in the picture is this: At one time, when I was representing the eleventh congressional district in the House of Representatives, I think the statement was made—and it was no particular credit to me—that that district had in it more camps than there were in any other district in the country. There were a very large number of such camps throughout the forest regions of northern Michigan.

There must be a tremendous investment of Federal money in them. What provision is made at the present time for the maintenance of those camps? I know the lumber woods pretty well. If they are simply allowed to remain unserviced, they will be gone; they will not be any good; and, unquestionably, there will be, as the Senator very well points out, a great demand for these camps, after the war is over, to take care of our excess manpower. Is there any provision being made for the maintenance of the large number of camps which necessarily are vacant and will be vacant for some time?

Mr. McCARRAN. The provision of the bill is—and it was put in by the House—that these camps and the equipment and the housekeeping utensils and the like shall be turned over to the Army, if the Army wants them. Those which are not to be taken care of by the Army, and are not utilized by the Army, may be turned over to municipalities, counties, cities, and other organizations of that kind.

Mr. BROWN. Does not the Senator fear, unless there is some manpower in the C. C. C. itself to service the camps, that a great many of them will simply fall into ruin?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is the statement made to me by Mr. McEntee, who is in charge of the Civilian Conservation Corps; indeed, the statement need scarcely be made to anyone, because it is self-evident that an unoccupied building in the wilds or in the woods will very shortly deteriorate, and it will be only a short time when there will be no building there, as a matter of fact. So it was drawn to my attention, and I draw it to the attention of the Senate, that for the purpose of taking care of this situation alone, a considerable sum of money will be required. I think I read it to the Senate a moment ago, but I take leave to read it again. I think it comes under this head:

> Transportation and storage of supplies pending transfer to the War Department or some other agency of the Government, and expenses incidental thereto, $2,600,000.

Mr. BROWN. Is that in the bill or is it in the Senator's proposed amendment?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is what it will cost if the bill goes through as it comes from the House.

Mr. BROWN. I call the Senator's attention to one other fact. I appeared before the Appropriations Committee and asked that $1,000,000 be added to the agricultural appropriation bill for the purpose of saving the roads which the Civilian Conservation Corps has built in northern Michigan. I am most familiar with the situation there. The committee accepted the proposal, and the Senate adopted it. I understand that it, in conference, has been largely cut.

In my own State six camps would still remain, according to the statement made by the Senator. If his amendment is adopted, is it probable that the enrollees of the six C. C. C. camps in Michigan could be used and would be used for the purpose of maintaining the roads in forest areas which, if not maintained, I assure the Senator, will be almost a total loss; in other words, all the money we have put into these roads would have been uselessly spent, and they are a very material factor in preventing forest fires and in opening forest areas for citizens of Michigan. If the Senator's amendment would, throughout the country generally, provide some small amount of manpower which could be used for the maintenance of these roads, I should be very much inclined to support the proposal, because we will lose many million dollars spent upon these highways unless something of that kind shall be done.

Mr. McCARRAN. I could best answer the Senator from Michigan perhaps in the language of the President, most of which I read to the Senate a moment ago. It is found on page 478 of the hearings.

The second reason for maintaining the Civilian Conservation Corps "is the building of roads and other facilities for camps. These have to be built by someone."

That does not answer the Senator's question exactly, but my judgment would be that there would be six camps in Michigan. I can only conjecture that the natural thing would be to utilize the enrollees of one or more of those six camps to keep in repair the roads already constructed.

Mr. BROWN. I know that has been the practice in the past; for instance, if a camp was located, we will say, in one county and some 75 miles away another camp was located, when the first camp was abandoned the enrollees of the other camp maintained the forest roads which had been constructed by the first camp. I am very fearful that unless that shall be done we will lose the tremendous investment we have made in the forest trails.

Mr. McCARRAN. The expression of the able Senator from Michigan is worthy of being dwelt on at length, because, if we terminate entirely the Civilian Conservation Corps, as would be done by the bill that is now before the Senate, we will have lost everything in the way of investment that we have put into the

Civilian Conservation Corps. It would be really a travesty, a sad thing.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President——

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, in regard to the maintenance of roads and parks, I will say to the Senator from Michigan that in the Shenandoah National Park all the camps have been taken out. It is not my understanding that it is proposed to make any substantial improvement in the roads under this limited program.

On May 25 Director McEntee made this statement before the committee:

> The estimate presented here is for 350 C. C. C. barrack camps. It is proposed that approximately 200 of these will be assigned to work on military reservations and strategic areas and 150 will be assigned to essential natural resource protective projects. In addition to these barrack camps in the continental United States, this estimate provides for the operation of projects on certain Indian reservations and projects in Alaska, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

So 200 of them, I will say to the Senator from Michigan, will be assigned to work on military reservations and 150 will be assigned to essential natural-resource protective projects. Six camps for an entire State, I may say, could do very little, in my judgment, for the maintenance of roads.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada permit me to interrupt him further?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN. I may say to the Senator from Virginia that if my own proposal to the Appropriations Committee providing for $1,000,000 for the maintenance of these roads had been adopted, it was adopted by the Senate, but I understand that it has been heavily cut now, although it is still in conference between the House and the Senate——

Mr. BYRD. What department would have the spending of the $1,000,000?

Mr. BROWN. The Department of Agriculture. The amendment is in the Agricultural appropriation bill, which is in charge of the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL]. If that appropriation had been retained in the bill—I understand it was not retained—I would be inclined to vote against the proposal of the Senator from Nevada, but I know that six Civilian Conservation Corps camps in the forest area of Michigan, intelligently directed, could save hundreds of miles of forest trails which otherwise would be lost, and their saving would be accomplished by the expenditure of very little money. A little log bridge with a stream running under it washes out and nothing is done; there is nobody to maintain it. Yet it could be repaired by the expenditure of $10 with one truck and two or three men. Once the bridge is gone, however, the whole road is out.

It was with great regret that I learned that my proposal was rejected by the House conferees. I do not blame the Senate conferees in the slightest, because I know they battled for it; but I want to save these roads; they are worth much more than the $48,000,000 the Senator from Nevada is talking about. If it will save those roads, I shall favor his proposal.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me to ask the Senator from Michigan a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. Has the Senator from Michigan any idea where the six camps in Michigan are located?

Mr. BROWN. In the northern area.

Mr. McKELLAR. I know, but does the Senator know whether they are near the roads which are to be built?

Mr. BROWN. The roads to be maintained. I am talking about the maintenance of roads.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am just reminded by the record that a gentleman testified before the committee, on the invitation of the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], and stated there were wonderful forests in California. They brought a map, with great red areas marked upon it, and said, "Here are the forests of California which these boys have saved." I have the record and will read it in a few moments. None of the camps were in a forest area. What good will the camps do to the forests of California unless the camps are placed in the forests or near the forests?

So far as the roads are concerned, I am quite sure that if the Senator from Michigan intends to vote for the proposal here offered on the theory that he is to get roads built in Michigan, he is going to be the most disappointed Senator I have ever known.

Mr. BROWN. The Senator from Tennessee misapprehended what I said. I am not asking that a single mile of new road be built. I am asking that the roads upon which we have spent millions of dollars, forest trails, be maintained. That was my purpose in appearing before the agricultural subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations. I did not ask for the construction of any new roads. I want the roads which are already built to be saved for the people of the United States.

Mr. McCARRAN. I could answer the Senator from Tennessee by saying that as in other sections of the country, where roads or series of roads or trails have been constructed by one Civilian Conservation Camp, and that civilian camp has been abandoned or moved away, another, even remote from that spot, would come and keep the roads in repair. That has been the custom and practice.

In answer to the suggestion of the Senator from Tennessee that a great area of California was shown on the map in red as being a forest area, and that there were no camps in the vicinity, the real truth of the matter is that there were no camps in the red area, and there was no forest in the red area either. I know every foot of that country. There is nothing but manzanita brush all over the red area. It is just north of Los Angeles, and between Los Angeles and the Tehachapi range. There is not a tree on it; nothing but snow brush. That may be called forest in some places.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not yield at wish to say at the very outset of my remarks that no man more actively and earnestly supported the C. C. C. camps, when they were first instituted in 1933, than did I. As every Senator knows, the purpose in establishing the C. C. C. was to take care of the young boys of the country who had no work, who had nothing to do, who were compelled to loaf, who were without funds to support themselves. To my mind, the Government very wisely established camps to take care of those boys.

The prime purpose of the camps was to give the boys a semblance of employment, at any rate, to keep them out of mischief, to help them maintain themselves in every way possible. Under the financial condition which then confronted this country, it was absolutely necessary that that should be done.

Today the picture has entirely changed. I cannot give a better illustration of it than to quote the testimony of the distinguished junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], who is now, I believe, a colonel in the Army. About 6 months ago, I think it was, Mr. McEntee was before the Senate Committee on Appropriations, when he was the head of the C. C. C., as he still is. The Senator from Massachusetts asked Mr. McEntee why it was that trucks with advertisements on their sides were going around the streets of Boston, as he had seen them, drumming up members for the C. C. C., advertising for boys to come in and accept the benefits of the C. C. C.

Mr. President, this illustrates what a change has come about in this country. Someone—as I recall, it was the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN]—asked a question of the distinguished Senator from Nevada a while ago as to where we would be able to get them if we provided for 70,000 boys. That is a very pertinent question. Where would we get the 70,000 boys? We will either take them from among the very young boys, who should be in school, or take them out of the Army; or perhaps we would take them out of industry. The boys simply cannot be gotten.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President——

Mr. McKELLAR. I will yield to the Senator a little later. I have outlined the statement I wish to make, and at its conclusion I shall be glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. President, in its time the C. C. C. was a proper activity. I voted for every appropriation ever made for it, from the beginning until this year. I have never failed to vote for appropriations to maintain it, because I thought it was needed. But now, when it is no longer needed for the boys, when it is no longer needed for the Army, when we are in a war which staggers the imagination in its ramifications throughout the world, why should we continue a wholly unnecessary, a wholly extravagant, a wholly wasteful activity such as this?

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I will ask the Senator to excuse me for just a few minutes.

Mr. LEE. I wish to ask a question on the point the Senator is discussing.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not yield at this time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Oklahoma is smiling. He may make a speech on this subject later.

Mr. President, what are the questions before us? Two have been suggested, that we should keep these camps, because 200 of them are going to be at military camps, and that it is proper to keep them there so the C. C. C. boys can wait on the Army and do the chores around Army camps which ordinarily civil labor must be employed to do. I challenge Mr. McEntee to furnish figures to show that such work can be done more cheaply by the C. C. C. boys, as he said it could. He never brought us any such figures.

Mr. President, if ever there was a frightful and wasteful and extravagant proposal it is that which is made with respect to these C. C. C. camps at military camps.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] a few moments ago said, as I understood him, that under his amendment only $48,000,000 was to be appropriated for this purpose.

I read from the amendment:

For pay, subsistence, medical services—

And so forth. For the boys——

$48,499,288.

Right underneath that I read again:

For all other necessary expenses, both field and departmental—

Notice that the word "departmental" is used—

In connection with the administration of camps and works projects, $28,030,512.

The proposed appropriation is not $48,000,000; it is $76,000,000 plus.

Mr. President, Senators should have heard Mr. McEntee's testimony. He testified that when he turns these camps over he makes an allotment to the Army for each camp. The Army is then responsible for paying out the money, for managing the boys, for the administrative features, of course, and we have two organizations doing the same thing. We have the War Department administering the act as well as the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps. I believe Mr. McEntee said that the War Department administered it only in the daytime and that at night his organization administered it.

Those boys must do a great deal of night work to require an appropriation of $28,030,512 for the field and departmental work. If his organization had proposed to turn these 200 camps over to the Army and turned that part of the proposed appropriation, $28,000,000, over to the Army and let the Army administer it, that would be a different thing; but when his organization asks for $28,000,000 for the administration of a fund of $48,000,000, which is proposed to be appropriated for the enrollees, that means that about two-fifths of the total amount goes to administration and only three-fifths goes to the purposes proposed to be administered. Two-fifths is a large percentage to be used for administration. Ordinarily 5 percent is regarded as a large amount for administration. In this case, however, it is 40 percent for administration. Forty-eight million dollars is proposed to be appropriated for the boys, and $28,000,000 for those who are looking after the boys, and they are turning the administrative feature of the work over to the Army in 200 camps.

Mr. President, that is not all. The Civilian Conservation Corps organization does not in many cases do any practical managing of the boys, because 150 of the camps are turned over to the Department of Agriculture and to the Department of the Interior, and the management and control and administration of the boys in those camps is really in the hands of those two Departments.

So, Mr. President, when it comes to the question of cost, the proposed appropriation would be a frightful waste of the people's money at a time when the Government needs money as it never before in its history has needed it.

Are Senators going to put the C. C. C. officers ahead of the Army of the United States? That is really what is proposed to be done. If the amendment shall be adopted, we shall appropriate money which ought to be used at this time for the Army. We must win the war. We ought not to dissipate our resources in any such way as is here proposed.

Mr. President, I next come to a discussion of the matter of fire control. A map of California, which was produced before the committee, was very significant. It was brought before the committee by Mr. Loveridge, Assistant Chief of the Forest Service, Department of Agriculture.

I read from his statement:

Mr. LOVERIDGE. Mr. Chairman, in line with your request that I conserve time as much as possible, I have prepared a brief statement.

I shall not read it all. He continues:

In 1940 some 3,500,000 man-days—

Mr. President, each one of those boys had better be working a full day instead of a man-day. Whenever I hear a witness talking about man-days I do not have much confidence in his testimony.

In 1940 some 3,500,000 man-days of their time was devoted directly to fire-control duties, and 6,500,000 man-days additional on other work necessary to fire protection. * * *

That is the background. We now have facing us the toughest fire-control problem we have ever had because, as you know, important new war industries have been located in forest areas. * * *

Located in forest areas. Where are those forest areas? A secret map of California was brought to us. I presume the map is a military secret. I shall not disclose it. I shall not refer to the map. I shall not divulge military secrets. I shall not violate confidences reposed in us. A large map of California was brought before the committee, and the witness pointed out to the committee the forests, which were marked in red on the map. This is the testimony in respect thereto, and I hardly know how to express myself concerning it—well, I shall simply read the testimony without expressing myself about it:

Mr. LOVERIDGE. The record there shows 28 in California.

Senator McKELLAR. In the whole State?

Mr. LOVERIDGE. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Twenty-eight in California, and I want to know how many in the red area.

I was speaking of the red area shown on the map in California. Mr. President, I am afraid the junior Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is not listening to what I am saying, but I want him to hear it because I like the Senator. There are 28 camps in the forests included in the red areas.

Mr. LOVERIDGE. What is the number in southern California, Mr. Morrell?

Senator McKELLAR. No; not in southern California but in that wooded area—forested area.

I am reading the actual testimony:

Senator McKELLAR. No; not in southern California, but in that wooded area—forested area.

Referring to the area marked on the confidential map:

Senator McCARRAN. The Senator is now referring to the proposed allocation of camps in the program, if this program is carried out.

Senator McKELLAR. Maybe Mr. McEntee can tell us how many there are.

Mr. McENTEE. Not anywhere near enough. I know that, Senator.

Senator McKELLAR. Well, I would like to know how many there are. Maybe you could help us out on that. All we want to know is how many of them there are.

Meaning in the red or wooded area. Mr. McEntee's answer was:

There are 28 camps in California.

He is supposed to be the head of the C. C. C. He had farmed out all of this part to the Interior Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the War Department; and, of course, he did not know where they were. His answer was:

There are 28 camps in California.

I ought to have been perfectly willing to accept that answer, but I was not.

Senator McKELLAR. I understand that; but I want to know how many there are in this wooded district that he says is exceedingly important.

Mr. McENTEE. May I put it this way, Senator?

He was giving me the "run around." I have had that done before, by witnesses and others.

Mr. McENTEE. May I put it this way, Senator? We had a fire in the Lake Superior area 4 years ago, and we moved camps from as far away as Ohio in there.

Up to that time, he had not said that there were none in the wooded area. I am reminded of something which happened when I was a boy. I was clerking in a country store. My employer had one of the worst little sons I ever saw in my life. His name was Hurst Whittington. I was in the back room working on the books. Mr. Whittington came back to see me about something, and we were talking over my desk. In a few moments Mr. Whittington went out into the main part of the store. Presently he uttered a cry of horror. He found that someone had left the molasses faucet open and that about 50 gallons of molasses had run out while he was in the back room. He went to the front door and called to his young son, "Whoo, Hurst!" The little fellow came running out from under the

store, crying, "Papa, I didn't do it. Papa, I didn't do it." [Laughter.]

So here is McEntee——

Mr. McCARRAN. In the molasses.

Mr. McKELLAR. In the molasses; yes. [Laughter.]

I continue with the testimony.

Senator McKELLAR. I understand that, but I want to know how many there are in this wooded district that he says is exceedingly important.

He brought a great map to show how many there were, and how necessary it was to protect this wooded district in California. His answer was:

Mr. McENTEE. May I put it this way, Senator? We had a fire in the Lake Superior area 4 years ago, and we moved camps from as far away as Ohio in there. The distance over the State wouldn't make any difference, as long as there are roads to get men in there.

If the Senator's house were on fire and he had to send out to Wyoming for a fire engine, it would not arrive before the house had burned down. So, in the case of a forest fire, much of the forest would be burned before a group of boys could be brought from Idaho or Michigan.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? The Senator refers to Wyoming and to my house.

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. SCHWARTZ. I should be perfectly satisfied to have the fire department in the lower part of town. I should not want it in my front yard. Anyone who has been in the forest areas in the West, where forest fires occur, knows that it is a very common thing to bring in men from a distance of 200 miles. We rush them in pretty fast. We do not keep them there all year sitting around watching to see if there is going to be a fire.

Mr. McKELLAR. Did the Senator ever have a C. C. C. camp brought in to look after a fire?

Mr. SCHWARTZ. No; but I saw the C. C. C. camps moved in to look after forest fires around Cody. Five of the boys are now buried there. They were burned to death in the woods. Use is made of them to put out big fires. Sometimes they are brought in from a distance of 200 miles.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me continue with the testimony. I was a little persistent:

Senator McKELLAR. I will put it another way. Are there any camps in that area that the witness has designated as tremendously important timbered region? Are there any camps in there?

Mr. LOVERIDGE. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Where is that camp?

Mr. LOVERIDGE. There are at least three that Mr. Morrell's record indicates.

Senator McKELLAR. Where are they on the map?

Mr. LOVERIDGE. There is one in about this locality [indicating]. I can give you the approximate locality.

Senator McKELLAR. That is north of Los Angeles?

Mr. LOVERIDGE. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. In the same county?

Mr. LOVERIDGE. I suppose so. Los Angeles covers all that county.

Senator McKELLAR. That is what I understand. Where is the next one?

Mr. LOVERIDGE. There is one not far from San Bernardino. San Bernardino also, you will recall, is not far from Los Angeles.

By the way, that is not in the red district.

Senator McKELLAR. Now, where is the next one?

Mr. LOVERIDGE. San Bernardino is 60 miles east of Los Angeles, and there is one at Kline, Calif., out from San Diego. That again—this is San Diego [indicating], and this will be up in this timbered country here.

Senator McCARRAN. Timbered country?

Mr. LOVERIDGE. Yes, sir.

Senator McCARRAN. Now, are there any camps at all in that red area there?

Does that red indicate timber country?

Mr. LOVERIDGE. That is covered with chaparral and other brush.

Senator McCARRAN. That is not timber country.

Senator McKELLAR. He said it was timber.

Senator McCARRAN. I know he did testify that it was timber country, but what he means by that, Senator, is that it is covered with a heavy growth of what we call underbrush or low brush, generally known as chaparral.

Let me say to the distinguished Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] that if he is expecting to have the C. C. C. camps save California from fires, may God have mercy on him, because, in my judgment, the C. C. C. camps would not save the country from fires.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question, and not for a speech?

Mr. McKELLAR. Inasmuch as I have referred to the Senator, I am glad to yield to him.

Mr. DOWNEY. Can the Senator tell me whether or not the testimony shows how many of the California camps would be at military posts and how many outside?

Mr. McKELLAR. The testimony does not show.

With reference to fire control, in the Appropriations Committee not long ago my distinguished friend the Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] offered an amendment to increase the appropriation for fire control in the Department of Agriculture from $5,000,000 to $17,000,000. It gave me the greatest pleasure to vote for it and support it on the floor. Why? Because the fire fighters provided for by that appropriation are trained, and the work is done in an economical and proper way. Let me say to Senators from the West, in whose States forests are located, that I shall always maintain that attitude in dealing with protection against forest fires. However, when I am asked to appropriate $48,000,000 for boys—and I understand that the age would be reduced to 16—to fight forest fires, to turn the activity over to the War Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of the Interior, and pay the administrators in Washington $28,000,000 for administration, I cannot do so conscientiously. I feel that I owe my country the duty of saving money for the more important business of saving our Nation.

Mr. President, I shall now leave the subject of forests except as to the prevention of forest fires. The principal argument here revolves around the prevention of forest fires. Do Senators know where the greatest forests in America are located?

Mr. BONE. In the States of Washington and Oregon. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. Oh, no. The greatest forests belonging to the United States are located in the Territory of Alaska. They contain more wood than do the forests in any other region. They contain the finest kinds of wood. If it is the desire of the proponents of the amendment under discussion to save forests, would they not make provision to locate at least one camp in Alaska to prevent fires in some of the forests there?

Referring to the record, I find that the allotment for Alaska is represented by a zero. There are no camps for the prevention of forest fires in Alaska. The people there will have to do the best they can to save those forests.

Mr. President, I invite attention now to the cost of the proposal. In my judgment, the cost of doing the necessary work by private labor would be almost a bagatelle compared with the cost of maintaining this organization. We know what the cost will be. It will be at least 5 times greater than would be the cost if civilian workers did the work.

I know Mr. McEntee has a somewhat fantastic proposition to offer which he thinks will save the Government something like $62,000,000. I have no doubt he is a well-meaning man, but he does not know about costs. Let us consider this for a moment. There is one area that has only one camp, as I recall, namely, the Chicago area. Under the new arrangement there will be only one camp located there.

I asked Adjutant General Ulio how much it would cost to keep the camps in condition by employing civilian labor. He said he would get the information and have it put into the record. We have never received it. It cannot be obtained; but there can be no doubt that it would be very much less than the figure I have indicated.

The amendment would provide for 200 camps, which are absolutely unnecessary. Civilian labor can do the work very much better. It would put these camps, which would be set up by the Government, in competition with civilian labor. Why should it be done? Why should we adopt a measure which would result in setting up a governmental instrumentality to compete with civilian labor? It is not the proper thing to do, and we should not do it. When our boys had nothing to eat, very little to wear, and nothing to do, it was necessary for the Government to resort to the measures which were then adopted, but it is unnecessary to do that now. Our country was never so prosperous as it is today. It is proposed not only to maintain many boys, but, in addition, we are asked to maintain administrators to the extent of $28,000,000, and of that I do not approve.

Mr. President, I come to the next item. I have already spoken of the two items of overhead under this amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may we have order? I want the able Senator from Tennessee to be heard. It will be quite necessary for him to be heard.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator just quoted $28 000,000 as the amount for the administrative expenses of the C. C. C. camps. Can he tell us what proportion that $28,000,000 bears to the wages paid to those in the

C. C. C. camps who do the actual work, and also to the total expenses of the C. C. C. camps?

Mr. McKELLAR. I shall furnish the figures to the Senator in a few moments. I do not have them in mind, but I will say that I believe the salaries of the administrators in proportion to those of the men in the C. C. C. camps are approximately 5 or 6 to 1. If the Senator from Maine has the figures I will yield to him.

Mr. WHITE. I am not sure I have the information, but I have a figure of $1,054 per man per year. There are roughly 70,000 men, making an aggregate of about $70,000,000. I therefore conclude that the payments to the men would amount to about $70,000,000 as against administrative expenses of about $28,000,000. I am not sure of those figures.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the expenses and salaries of the C. C. C. amount to about $28,000,000, and the boys in the camps get $48,000,000. But that is liberal. That is not as costly as the N. Y. A., the administration of which requires an even larger part of the appropriation. No more extravagant set-ups were ever established by the Government.

Mr. President, in conclusion, I desire to talk about the boys. Where are we to get them? Where are the boys coming from? It has been said that they will come from the cities. I do not believe there will be many boys from the cities. In my section of the country 40 percent of the C. C. C. boys come off the farms. I am sorry the able Senator from South Carolina left the Chamber, because I should like to cite his experience in making further proof of my contentions. The Senator from South Carolina has a farm of 500 acres. He is cultivating only 30 acres, because he cannot get any labor on his farm. His manager is plowing and hoeing 30 acres of cotton. Where will we get the taxes with which to run this war if we are to take the boys out of industry and take them off the farms? Where are we going? It is a serious matter, Senators. It is not merely a question of $76,000,000 for this extravagant organization; that is not the sole question. Where are we going when we spend money in this way? We should not do it. Under the conditions confronting us every dollar possible should be expended in the prosecution of the war. I am a thousand percent for an all-out effort to win the war, and I know every other Senator shares my views.

Under such circumstances why should we throw away the money on extravagance here in Washington? Why should we duplicate the overhead? I leave the question with the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], on page 18, beginning in line 10, to strike out certain words and to substitute therefor certain language relating to the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Nye
Andrews	Green	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Guffey	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barbour	Hill	Rosier
Bilbo	Hughes	Russell
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Schwartz
Bridges	Kilgore	Shipstead
Brown	Lee	Smith
Burton	Lucas	Stewart
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McNary	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tunnell
Connally	Maybank	Tydings
Davis	Mead	Wagner
Downey	Millikin	Walsh
Doxey	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Norris	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I wish to take a moment or two of the time of the Senate to speak in favor of the amendment of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. I do not wish to discuss the merits or demerits of the arguments which have been made. I take the stand, as one who has sponsored and supported the C. C. C. since its inception, the stand just taken by the Senator from Tennessee, that the C. C. C. organization was quite essential and necessary. I go a step further than the Senator from Tennessee, and say that the C. C. C., as an organization, has justified itself from the social standpoint, from the economic standpoint, from the military standpoint and from the educational standpoint. Considering those four factors the C. C. C. has a splendid record.

Many of the things the C. C. C. organization has done are things which still have to be done. In normal times many of the things which it has done it cannot do now, because these are not normal times, and, as has been pointed out, the efforts of all the country should be turned in one direction. Yet we must remember that the population of our country is not static, it is fluid, and if we are to use all the elements of our country in the most economic way, which is the basic theory of the Selective Service Act, we must never lose sight of the fact that there are a million young boys around the age of 17 or becoming 17 each year.

It is all very well to say that all the boys in the C. C. C. camps should be doing something else. Perhaps they should. Any one of us here who will review his life will probably say that there was many a time in his life when he should have been doing something else than what he was doing. We have not all had a record of 100-percent perfection and efficiency in our lives, and the hundred or the thousand or the million C. C. C. boys, and the million boys of C. C. C. age, have not a record of 100 percent of perfection and efficiency in their lives.

They cannot do the things that it is suggested they should do. It is said they should be in the Navy. The Navy will take boys of 17 years of age, but all the boys of this country cannot reach a naval recruiting office. It is said they should be in the Army. If a boy of 17 years of age should enlist in the Army he would commit fraud and would be subject to discharge; likewise a boy of 16 years of age who tried to enlist in the Army would commit a fraud. A boy of 18 years of age can, with his parents' consent, enter the Army; but they have not all gone into the Army and many of them will not go. Yet there is tremendous economic worth in this group of young boys, and that worth should be used at a time such as this when the value of every man's effort is worth while. It is said C. C. C. boys should go into the munitions industry, and, of course, they should; but how can they? Is it not realized by Senators that there is at this very time an unemployment problem even in the city of New York? Is it not realized that there has been a dislocation of our whole economic life, as a result of our war effort, and that the city of New York, which, in the last war, was practically the only port from which munitions and war supplies were sent out is today in many respects a sort of ghost city, because there are 78,000 empty apartment houses in New York City? That is not the case in Washington.

The proposal with regard to the discontinuance of the C. C. C. has been placed before us in a message sent in directly by the President of the United States. The Budget Bureau made certain recommendations for the C. C. C., which recommendations were ignored by the House of Representatives. The President has told us that if we do not appropriate the money recommended for the C. C. C. establishment, we will have to appropriate more money for accomplishing the same economic purposes which are being accomplished by the C. C. C.

I wish to argue the points which I am going to try to make from the social standpoint, from the economic standpoint, from the educational standpoint, and from the military standpoint, because all these factors are to be considered when we pass judgment upon the pending amendment.

These boys should go into munitions plants, it is said. Let them get into the munitions plants, if they can. Every Senator who has had experience with the employment of labor, even at a time when there is a great demand for labor in various industrial plants of the country, must realize that the standard for employment is higher than it has ever been in the history of the country. Personnel directors are making greater demands upon the persons they employ. Let a 17-year-old untrained boy try to get into one of the munitions plants. A plant would be criminally negligent if it employed persons without training.

Where are these boys to get their training? How are they to get their training? The schools have not been able to give it to them, and there are many reasons why that is so. There are very many boys who do not go to the schools, I am sad to have to say.

There are some things which have to be done and which are actually being done. In December 1941, immediately after Pearl Harbor, the Secretary of War, because we needed it, because the

military necessities of our country demanded it, requested that certain C. C. C. facilities be handed over to the Army. What have these boys and what have these organizations been doing for the Army? They have constructed narrow-gage railways, they have constructed and repaired roads and bridges, they have constructed firebreaks and lookout towers. Firebreaks and lookout towers are as essential around military camps as they are in the midst of forests. They are more essential around the great munition-building areas, which are being established, even upon the desert. I am thankful the Army of the United States is taking care to protect us from the ordinary hazards.

C. C. C. boys are working on truck trails for fire suppression; the construction of training aids, such as bayonet courses, rifle ranges, antitank ranges, and pistol ranges. All these facilities are essential in the fundamental training of soldiers. They are constructing telephone lines and power lines. These boys are doing what trained labor would have to do if the work were left to ordinary trained labor.

The argument has been made that they are depriving trained labor of a livelihood. This is no time to make an argument of that kind. Trained labor is well taken care of. Trained labor is getting jobs, except in isolated places where there have been changes as the result of the trends of our business outlook.

C. C. C. boys are fencing military reservations, an extremely essential and necessary activity. They are clearing wooded areas for fire prevention. They are clearing maneuver and impact areas. They are clearing bombing fields. They are clearing, grading, and seeding or sodding landing fields for aircraft. They are taking care of drainage in these areas. They are carrying on mosquito-control work on the military reservations.

Mosquito control includes measures of control other than drainage. They are spraying mosquito-breeding areas. They are still carrying on soil-conservation work, because on our military reservations, even when they are working on them, there is necessity for taking care of soil conservation where grading is to be done, where soil has been shifted. A rainstorm will come and destroy much of the ground, and it must have care.

I cannot help adverting for a moment to one point about the C. C. C., which everyone seems to have forgotten, in reference to a condition which has been with us from the beginning of our country. Those who like to read about the forethought of the founders of this Republic will be happy to know—I am sure all Senators, especially the Senators from Virginia, know this—that the problem of soil erosion was with the fathers just as it is with us today, and Patrick Henry pointed out that the man who prevents the formation of a gully is the greatest of patriots. So the C. C. C., in its ordinary conservation work, is performing a task which, under Patrick Henry's definition, makes the members patriots.

Mr. President, that is not all. If a boy has an aptitude for training, and studies in the evening, he is able to work on topographic mapping and survey work, an essential in all military activity. The removal of and salvage of material from abandoned buildings on military reservations is one of the activities of the C. C. C. They are also engaged in the construction of safety paths and roads at arsenals, and erosion control on storage igloos at ordnance plants. Oh, how essential that is in the great storehouses where powder and ammunition are kept, when we realize how much damage can be done by slight neglect.

They are engaged in the operation of sawmills. Thus we might go on. This catalog of things which are being done is not a catalog which I worked out myself, it was worked out by The Adjutant General of the Army of the United States, wherein he pointed out the need for a continuation of the work being performed. It is 100-percent military, and it is contributing to the military effort.

Mr. President, in times like the present, in arguing for something we generally are satisfied when we prove that something is essential to the military effort. I have been on the Committee on Military Affairs since the beginning of my term in the Senate, and I know something of the feelings of Members of Congress when it comes to military necessity. The President of the United States has said that the continuation of the C. C. C. is a military necessity. The Secretary of War has testified that their work is necessary. The Adjutant General of the Army has not only testified as to what they are doing, but has pointed out that if the C. C. C. boys do not continue to do this work, then the Department will have to turn to that field which has so few men to contribute, the regular labor rolls.

Mr. President, we do not have to take the testimony of the Army as to the value of the C. C. C. We all know that if we had been preparing for the great emergency which faces us today, we could not have done a finer thing than to have started the C. C. C. organization. It has provided the Army of the United States with that single thing which was so much lacking in Hitler's army when Hitler expanded his army under compulsory military training from the treaty army of 100,000 men up to 4,000,000 men.

Hitler was able to do that because of the training the 100,000 men had, but Hitler was lacking in one thing, he was lacking in something which we have. After he had expanded his army he did not have the non-coms necessary for the expanded army, because, except in his boys' training camps, there had not been such training as has been afforded by the C. C. C. camps. The United States Army has been able to turn to the C. C. C. for men who have had the socializing influences of camp life—not of military training in the ordinary sense—for men who could become leaders of squads and leaders of larger units. The Army has been able to turn to the C. C. C. for cooks, for truck drivers, for helpers, for persons of that kind. The training which the C. C. C. boys have had has made the expansion of our Army very much easier.

Mr. President, I said when I began my remarks that the existence of the C. C. C. could be justified with respect to all purposes for which it was set up. It can be justified economically right now in the war effort. Seventy thousand boys can be had from a pool of boys who will not find employment in any other way, who will be made better by their employment in the C. C. C., and who will be prepared for military activity when the draft law calls them.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I have before me a letter from the American Legion, Department of Illinois, in which the adjutant advises me that if the C. C. C. is eliminated some 15,000 World War veterans will be affected. I wonder if the Senator could give me any information as to how these World War veterans fit into this picture.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I shall let the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] do so, because he has already given that information, I believe.

Mr. LUCAS. Has the Senator from Nevada already made such an explanation?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have made an explanation, but I shall make it briefly again.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator be so kind as to do so?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. It came about in the initial stages of the C. C. C. in this wise. About 1933 or 1934, after the C. C. C. had been set up, what is known as the bonus march on Washington occurred. A number of ex-service men marched on Washington in the bonus drive. Those boys were taken care of for a few weeks in C. C. C. camps near Washington, and that gave impetus to a movement out of which has grown a population of some 15,000 ex-service men in camps out over the country. Those ex-service men are living the camp life; they are doing C. C. C. work; they are being taken care of under the C. C. C. program. Those 15,000 are not only ex-service men, but quite a number are what are called territorials, such as Indians, and men from our Territories.

Mr. LUCAS. Are these men segregated in separate camps?

Mr. McCARRAN. They are in their own camps.

Mr. LUCAS. Is it necessary to be a veteran of the last war before one can get into such a camp?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. What type of work have those veterans been doing in the C. C. C. camps?

Mr. McCARRAN. Approximately the same type of work as that done by the other enrollees.

Mr. LUCAS. If I may ask a further question, is there any evidence in the record of what may or may not happen to these men who have done this work, in the event the C. C. C. is eliminated?

Mr. McCARRAN. They will be returned to their places of residence at the expense of the Government.

Mr. LUCAS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I may add a word further in respect to the veterans in the C. C. C. organization. Many of the veterans who have served in the past 9 or 10 years have, through their C. C. C. activity, obtained the type of

skill which has permitted them to become leaders of groups in the C. C. C. These men have been able to better themselves. It has not been a static group by any means. It has been not simply a group of 15,000 individuals, but it has been a changing group of about 15,000 from time to time. Now, after 10 years, to turn loose the 15,000 men of the veterans' group, including the least skilled among them, many of whom are less adaptable to get the kind of training that would fit them for other places, would result in great hardship. In the history of the United States probably no more harsh thing has ever been suggested to a group of veterans than the policy suggested with respect to the C. C. C. at the present time. Of course the President would have to find other provisions for these men. We owe it to them. No one goes into a C. C. C. camp who can obtain work elsewhere. We all know that. We ought to think about it, and think about it hard before destroying an institution which has done much good.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a further question?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield to the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] a moment ago made the suggestion in a private conversation with the Senator from Illinois that we are in some way obligated to take care of these 15,000 veterans. I do not quite understand how that can be.

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MEAD. It seems to me we have a moral if not a legal obligation to these veterans, because when we signed them up, when they enlisted, they enlisted with the understanding that they would be given a certain limited period of service. They have that period of service coming to them. I do not believe we can abruptly terminate it merely by cutting off this appropriation. It occurs to me that we not only will be called upon to pay their transportation home, but we will be called upon to liquidate the obligation we owe to them for the remainder of the term of enlistment.

Mr. LUCAS. Of course, it would be fairly costly to the Government if we should have to liquidate 15,000 World War veterans overnight. I do not have any notion of what the cost might be. It could not be done for a song.

Mr. MEAD. Under the terms of the hastily proposed elimination of the C. C. C. it would cost all the way from $15,000,000 to $30,000,000 to liquidate the organization. This matter was never given the consideration it merits, and if it had been given the consideration it merits it would have been brought in here under entirely different auspices.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, there is one more item to which I wish to refer, and in doing so I may become quite serious, because to me it is one of the most serious things which faces our country. Everyone knows, in spite of what has been said about the forests of the Pacific coast in the argument previously made, that the forests in the West are what are termed dry forests.

For several months in every year those forests exist without any rain. There are no great rivers running through them. There are no great marshes in them, and there are no great sloughs in them. They are indeed tinder boxes. The State of California, south of San Francisco, can burn from one end to the other without meeting obstruction from a single fire break which Nature has put there. The desert lands are just as easy to set fire to. Portions of Oregon and Washington also are dry. The Rocky Mountain forests are dry.

Mr. President, Japan is a forest land. Of course, someone thoughtlessly might say that if they burn our forests we will burn their forests. I am going to say something that cannot be measured statistically, but I know Japan from the top to the bottom of its islands. Japan cannot be burned. In the first place, there is a forest service there which is over 700 years old. Japan is thickly populated. There is heavy moisture and there are many rivers in Japan's forests. If we are to make comparisons between Japan's ability to burn our western coasts and our ability to burn her forests, I should say that we should have to drop bombs in the ratio of 100 to 1 to do damage equal to that which the Japanese might do.

Anyone who has lived on the desert or in the West knows the value of water, which we do not have. He knows the terror caused by forest fires which go through dry forests. To repulse the invader is one thing; but to fight a forest fire wilfully started at intervals is another thing. We are going to tremendous expense to move out of those areas persons of whom we cannot be sure. The military areas in the West are very extensive. The Army is taking every possible precaution, and every one of the C. C. C. camps will contribute to taking care of the evacuee problem in the West.

Mr. President, I desire to have my views on record. Let me say, as seriously as I can possibly say anything, that the greatest worry I have from an attack on the western coast is the ability of the enemy to drop incendiary bombs at intervals throughout our forests. That is no military secret, as was the matter to which the Senator from Tennessee referred. It is known to every schoolboy in the world. Everyone who studies geography knows that the western section of the United States is termed "desert land." It is dry most of the year.

Mr. President, I have no right to do so, but I ask the Senator from Nevada to request a yea-and-nay vote on his amendment, which I am sure he will do. I want the Senate put on record in the midst of the war. I want Senators who, in the midst of war, would vote to strike down an auxiliary of the Army of the United States to bear the responsibility of doing so. I do not wish to have that responsibility weighing on my shoulders.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MCCARRAN].

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Nye
Andrews	Green	O'Mahoney
Bailey	Guffey	Pepper
Ball	Gurney	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Hayden	Reed
Barbour	Hill	Rosier
Bilbo	Hughes	Russell
Bone	Johnson, Calif.	Schwartz
Bridges	Kilgore	Shipstead
Brown	Lee	Smith
Burton	Lucas	Stewart
Butler	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Byrd	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McNary	Truman
Clark, Mo.	Maloney	Tunnell
Connally	Maybank	Tydings
Davis	Mead	Wagner
Downey	Millikin	Walsh
Doxey	Murdock	Wheeler
Ellender	Murray	White
George	Norris	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, if we are to abolish a function of Government which has been created by specific legislation, if it is the intendment of the Congress to abolish something which the Congress established by law, if it is thought that the usefulness of some governmental agency has come to an end, then let us approach that subject and that problem as we approached it in the beginning, and make arrangements by legislation for the orderly dissolution and the orderly liquidation of that which has served pursuant to a law which we enacted.

To abolish unsystematically and unmethodically and thoughtlessly, if you please, an agency by merely cutting off the appropriation which enables it to function, seems to me to have but little place in an orderly legislative body. If we cut off the appropriation for this governmental agency the result will be that we will leave it unprovided for, with functions of the law unperformed. Some of the functions provided in the law are the return of the enrollees of the Civilian Conservation Corps to their respective homes, which is provided for under the system through which the Civilian Conservation Corps has been operating. Other functions are connected with the care of the camps and the equipment, which will be left out in the field uncared for, unguarded, unprotected. What was purchased through hundreds of millions of dollars of governmental expenditures will be left derelict, and without any system of preservation or protection, if the bill goes through without proper amendment.

Mr. President, I am a little surprised at my good friend from Tennessee criticizing those who he has said refused information, although they promised to give information. Let me say that Mr. McEntee, who was requested by the Senator from Tennessee to give certain information, brought the information to the clerk of the committee. The information was voluminous. It could not go into the record. The clerk of the committee called the Senator and asked him if the record should be sent up to his office. He said "No." It was of such a nature, containing that which was regarded as military secrets, matters of military confidence as to the exact placement of

certain equipment in camps, that the information was returned to the office of the official furnishing it. The Senator from Tennessee has no real complaint in that respect.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall yield in a moment. I desire to finish my statement.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am sure the Senator will yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Not a single item of information called for by the Senator from Tennessee was denied or refused him by any one who came before the committee.

I now yield to the Senator from Tennessee for a question.

Mr. McKELLAR. What I asked for from The Adjutant General and the under officer in the military department was that information he furnished as to how much it cost last year to operate these camps in the areas where there was but one Civilian Conservation Corps camp, and how much it would cost to employ civilians to do the work which it is proposed to have done by the boys in these camps. He never reported back. I have a recollection of making only one request of McEntee for information and the clerk told me that he had a ton or more of material for me to examine at night. He called me about 5 or 6 o'clock in the afternoon; I had been through a hard day's work, and I did not intend to go through a ton of material during the evening and night.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, let me say, in that respect, that Mr. McEntee had been that day through a cross-examination of the able Senator from Tennessee, and he had been experiencing somewhat of a hard day also. Anyone who sits under the cross-examination of the Senator from Tennessee for 1 day will remember it for some time thereafter. [Laughter.]

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. The able Senator from Tennessee, in opposing my amendment, says that the proposed expenditure is unnecessary and wasteful. I can only reply in the language used by the President of the United States when he sent a message through the Bureau of the Budget to the Committee on Appropriations, that this expenditure is absolutely essential. He gave two vital and specific reasons why the Civilian Conservation Corps should be retained; first, to protect the forests of America, and second, to perform duties in the military training camps of the United States.

The Senator from Tennessee made another statement which to my mind is unwarranted by the record: He stated that the work of the boys in the camps would be to wait on the soldiers. That is not true; it is not borne out by the record. The record is to the contrary.

Let me state to the Senate what the boys would do, according to the testimony given to us by a representative of the Army:

Laying cable for harbor control communications.
Airport construction.
Magazine construction and firebreaks around magazines.
Coast Artillery emplacement construction.
Small gun and cannon emplacements.
Razing undesirable structures.
Artillery ranges and observation posts.
Auxiliary water-supply systems.
Equipment storage buildings and sheds.
Small dams to impound water for fire protection.
Parking areas and guardrails.
Drill fields and parade grounds construction.
Painting military buildings.
Salvaging all types of critical materials.
Camouflage work of all types.
Excavations for buildings, air-raid shelters, etc.
Installation of telephone and power lines.
Sewage-disposal systems.
Construction of sidewalks, curbs and gutters, and rock walls.
Construction and maintenance of roads and trails.
Laying water and sewer lines.
Construction of recreation areas, athletic fields, and bathhouses.
Construction of target ranges.
Survey and boundary work.
Clearing for maneuver areas.
Sawing of lumber for military purposes.
Selective cutting.
Fire hazard reduction.
Grading, top-soiling, seeding, and sodding, and planting in barracks areas and along roads and streets.
Fire fighting on reservations.
Clearing for roads and railroads.
Mosquito-control work.
Landscaping work.
Erosion-control work.
Tree preservation.
Drainage work on reservations.
Fence construction.
Moving families from military reservations.

If those things constitute waiting on soldiers, then I do not know what waiting on soldiers is. There is not a single, solitary word in the record before the committee which even indicates that the boys are called upon to wait upon soldiers. As a rule the American soldier does not ask anyone to wait on him; nor would civilian labor, if it were brought into the Army camps, wait upon the soldiers. So enough of that.

The Senator from Tennessee made much of the matter of the location of the camps, and dwelt at great length upon one subject. He asked, "Do you know where the greatest forest that belongs to the United States is located?"

My good friends the Senator from Oregon and the Senator from Washington hastened to reply. The Senator from Washington very properly said, "In Washington." The Senator from Tennessee said, "No; not in Washington, not in Oregon, not in the Atlantic States, but in Alaska." He then said, "Not a single camp is located in Alaska."

Mr. President, the Alaskan forests, whatever they are, are protected by Nature; because in Alaska the humidity, the fall of rain and snow, the continuation and perpetuity of the snowfall, and the condition of the terrain constitute a protection to those forests. Nature protects the Alaskan forests, and there are only a minimum of fires in Alaska.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that the boys are being called on to do what the Army has heretofore had civilian employees do; and in that sense it seemed to me that the boys were waiting on the Army in doing whatever chores might have to be done around the Army camps.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let us see if these are chores:

The danger exists along the great western slope from the Rockies to the Pacific, where the underbrush and undergrass become dry because of the dryness of the late season. Vast areas in the West are covered by what is known as cheat grass, which becomes so dry that shortly after the middle of July a cigarette thrown from a car at the side of a road may start a fire which may spread and burn over millions of acres, and yet damage scarcely one tree. All the farms, the countryside, the towns, the villages, and the homes in that area are subject to such fires; and in those areas the Civilian Conservation Corps has been extremely useful.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Michigan.

Mr. BROWN. Relative to what has just been stated by the Senator from Nevada, let me say that the Senator from Tennessee suggested that most of the camps would be located in California, where they would be of no great benefit in the work of preventing and fighting forest fires. The Senator then asked me about Michigan. I have ascertained where the camps in Michigan are located. Five of the six are located in counties in the northern part of the State, which have large forest areas and where the fire-fighting ability of the C. C. C. enrollees would be, and is, most valuable and necessary.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me dwell on one other phase of the matter brought out by way of forceful argument by my good friend the Senator from Tennessee. He referred to 28 camps allocated to the State of California. Then he said that in the committee we were shown a map having on it a large red area indicating the forests of California. However, if he had read a little further in the record he would have found that, in reply to a question from the chairman of the committee, it was disclosed that that area is what is known as a chaparral area.

Mr. McKELLAR. I read that statement.

Mr. McCARRAN. The vast area extending north from Los Angeles to the Tehachapi Range is covered by chaparral, manzanita, and snowbush, which are among the greatest means of spreading fire. The Senator asked, "Why was not a camp placed in that area?" Of course, a camp would not be placed in the very midst of an area which might take fire, so that the camp itself would be destroyed. If a camp were so located, as much of the time of the enrollees would be required in working to protect the camp as in fighting the fire in the forest. So the camps are set apart from the forests, apart from areas which might be subject to fire.

Again, the Senator dwelt at some length on the costs of administration. Let me read what is disclosed by the testimony of Mr. McEntee in the House hearings:

Mr. ENGEL. I know about that, but let us confine ourselves to the question for the moment. You gave us a figure the other day

that of the $49,000,000 proposed originally approximately $21,000,000 was for administration.

Mr. McENTEE. I do not think so.

Mr. ENGEL. That is what was put in the record, I think.

Mr. TARVER. Pardon me, I think the record indicates that the $21,000,000 will be for administration and for the purchase of materials.

Mr. ENGEL. All right; will you put in the amount for administration of that $80,000,000?

Mr. McENTEE. Yes; stating what it consists of.

Mr. ENGEL. I want you to also put in the record the amount that is going to be used for the purchase of materials.

Mr. McENTEE. Yes.

The information requested follows: The salaries of personnel which may be classed as administrative expenses amount to a total of $6,757,027. Of this sum $1,523,983 is departmental and the balance of $5,233,044 is outside of Washington. The total permanent positions in the Department are 704.3 and outside of Washington—other than camp personnel—are 2,741.7, making an aggregate of 3,456 positions which might be termed administrative.

Let me dwell on that subject for a moment. The Senator complains because the War Department has been brought into the Civilian Conservation Corps picture. That was done at the very outset by the suggestion, indeed, the wise suggestion, of the President. The War Department takes care of the enrollee from the time he leaves his home until his return, and between the hours when he is at work and the hours when he returns to work; it takes care of all the camp life, all the camp training. The Army provides the food for the enrollees and it is prepared under Army supervision. The reason for that was that the Army was better equipped and better trained to carry on that program than any other group we had at that time or have had since.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I merely want to read to the Senate and the Senator the words of his own amendment:

For all other necessary expenses, both field and departmental, in connection with the administration of camps and work projects, $28,030,512

Mr. McCARRAN. So what?

Mr. McKELLAR. That is the cost of administration, as I have just stated.

Mr. McCARRAN. But the cost of equipment, material, and other items is brought into that $28,000,000. Of that $28,000,000 there will be approximately $1,523,900 for the payment of services. The Senator knows that the statement that $28,000,000 is to be expended in order to disburse $28,000,000 is not borne out by the record and has no place, in fact, in this picture.

Mr. President, I am about to conclude, so far as the presentation of this matter is concerned. I desire again to suggest to the Senate what to my mind is an orderly system—an orderly way—of doing this. If, in the judgment of Congress, the Department of the Interior—and I use the Department of the Interior merely as an example—had outlived its usefulness and no longer performed a useful function in our Government, would the orderly courageous way to dispose of the Department of the Interior be to cut off appropriations for it? Not at all. That would be the most destructive and useless way of doing it. I apply the same principle here. If the Civilian Conservation Corps has outlived its usefulness, if it is a function set up by congressional act which we now think should be done away with, let us be courageous about it, and say to the people of this country by a legislative act we did away with the Civilian Conservation Corps, not by cutting its throat and allowing it to stand as a skeleton, and losing that which has been invested by the Government in it.

I leave the amendment with the Senate, and I ask for a yea-and-nay vote on it.

Mr. HILL subsequently said: Mr. President, the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is out of the city and not able to be present for the vote on the C. C. C. amendment. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD prior to the yea-and-nay vote on the amendment an editorial written by the distinguished senior Senator from Wisconsin captioned "The folly of wrecking C. C. C."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FOLLY OF WRECKING CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

(By Senator ROBERT M. LA FOLLETTE, JR.)

For 9 years the Civilian Conservation Corps has stood out as one of the finest organizations set up by the Federal Government. It has done a splendid job, and the general public has almost universally acclaimed it. Throughout those 9 years, it has been building roads, improving our forests, developing our parks, preventing soil erosion, fighting fires, and performing heroic services in areas that have suffered disaster from wind, flood, or fire.

More than that, it has been building health and character among nearly 3,000,000 boys who have been enrolled in the Corps.

Yet in the face of this great record there is a grave possibility that the entire organization, the whole program, and the fruits of 9 years of experience in building the Civilian Conservation Corps will be destroyed. The House of Representatives, by a very small margin, has refused to provide any appropriations to continue the Civilian Conservation Corps beyond July 1. It is now up to the Senate to decide whether it wishes to acquiesce or fight for the reinstatement of the item in the appropriation bill.

WORKING FOR THE ARMY

There is no reasonable question of the Civilian Conservation Corps' importance to the Nation's war effort. Time and time again in recent months when the Civilian Conservation Corps has been under consideration in congressional committees, representatives from both the Army and Navy have enthusiastically praised the work it has been doing.

Approximately 150 camps are now doing important work for the Army in developing military reservations, and Mr. McEntee, Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps, has testified that the Army has requested more than 50 camps in addition to this number, with every prospect that still more may be needed later.

These Civilian Conservation Corps boys are building roads, bridges, clearing out gunnery ranges, and doing a wide variety of jobs essential to putting the Army's training grounds in usable condition. The soil-erosion work, much of the conservation work, and the other peacetime jobs have had to be sacrificed to meet the needs of the Army in this emergency, showing how important the Civilian Conservation Corps is to our armed forces.

But there is another compelling reason why the Civilian Conservation Corps should not be abolished. Not much is being said publicly about it, but informed people know that we may be face to face this year with a very real menace here at home—the menace of forest fires.

EFFECT ON FOREST FIRES

This is war, and the enemy is not likely to overlook the havoc that can be wrought by forest fires, especially in the Northwest, where millions of acres of precious timberland lie exposed to saboteurs or even raiding airplanes.

The United States Forest Service reports that in some areas they have relied on the Civilian Conservation Corps for 75 to 85 percent of the manpower necessary for forest-fire protection. The Civilian Conservation Corps boys are the best fire fighters the Forest Service has ever had.

The State forester of West Virginia reported last year that "reduction of camps resulted in 20 percent increase in areas burned in areas having camps last spring." Kentucky reported, "Burned 20,000 acres; could have held to 10,000 if 1941 Civilian Conservation Corps camps available." Massachusetts protested, "Efficiency reduced 65 percent by loss of Civilian Conservation Corps camps." The same story comes in from State after State.

It certainly is not economy to abandon the Civilian Conservation Corps in the face of these facts. The cost of operating the Civilian Conservation Corps is small compared with the losses that may be suffered from a few disastrous fires. The Civilian Conservation Corps is a very real form of fire insurance, and this is the worst conceivable time to think of defaulting on the premium.

CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS BOYS MAKE BETTER SOLDIERS

It is claimed that the Civilian Conservation Corps is unable to enroll enough boys to keep going at full strength; at the same time the Army is hinting that it may ask for the drafting of boys 18 and 19 years old for military service.

Responsible officials of the Civilian Conservation Corps are confident that they can secure enough enrollees to maintain 350 camps, and possibly more. With 350 camps, it is estimated that about 90 would be placed in the forest areas and the rest devoted to work on military reservations.

Furthermore, Army officers have testified repeatedly to the effect that Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees are much better prepared for military training than men who have not had this type of experience. They have been built up physically. In the course of its existence the Civilian Conservation Corps has rehabilitated over a half a million youths and raised them from a condition where they could not pass the physical requirements to a condition satisfactory for enrollment.

It has provided vocational training such as the Army needs. It has been stated that 25 percent of the Army cooks today were formerly in the Civilian Conservation Corps. It has been training radio technicians, auto mechanics, photographers, map makers, skilled medical orderlies, truck and tractor operators, aircraft assembly mechanics—every one a skill of great value to the Army.

The Civilian Conservation Corps has been doing a very important job in the Nation's war effort with efficiency and commendable results. It has, furthermore, latent possibilities for still greater service in either war or peace.

To scrap an organization with such a constructive record would not be economy; it would be folly.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], on which the yeas and nays are demanded.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. NORRIS (when Mr. LA FOLLETTE'S name was called). The senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is necessarily absent from the city. If he were present and voting on this question, he would vote "yea."

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN]. I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and will vote. I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS. I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote. If permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. BONE. I announce that my colleague [Mr. WALLGREN] is necessarily absent from the Senate.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senators from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY and Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] would vote "yea" and the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING]. If present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea," and the Senator from Iowa would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is absent attending a wedding in his family.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. CAPPER] is detained on public business. If present and voting, he would vote "nay."

I announce the following general pairs:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER].

I also announce the following pairs on this question:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] who would vote "nay" with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] who would vote "nay" with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER] who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] who would vote "nay" with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS].

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] who would vote "nay" with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS] who would vote "nay" with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] who would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 32, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—32

Aiken	Hayden	Norris
Andrews	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Kilgore	Pepper
Bone	Lee	Rosier
Brown	Lucas	Russell
Chavez	McCarran	Schwartz
Downey	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Doxey	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Mead	Truman
Green	Murdock	Wagner
Guffey	Murray	

NAYS—32

Bailey	Gerry	Shipstead
Ball	Gurney	Smith
Bankhead	Hughes	Stewart
Barbour	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Bridges	McKellar	Tunnell
Burton	Maloney	Tydings
Butler	Maybank	Walsh
Byrd	Millikin	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Nye	White
Connally	Radcliffe	Willis
George	Reed	

NOT VOTING—32

Austin	Davis	Overton
Barkley	Gillette	Reynolds
Brewster	Glass	Smathers
Brooks	Hatch	Spencer
Bulow	Herring	Taft
Bunker	Holman	Tobey
Capper	Johnson, Colo.	Vandenberg
Caraway	La Follette	Van Nuys
Chandler	Langer	Wallgren
Clark, Idaho	Lodge	Wiley
Danaher	O'Daniel	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question the yeas are 32, the nays are 32. The Senate being equally divided, the Chair votes in the affirmative.

So Mr. McCARRAN'S amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator's motion is not in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the motion of the Senator from Tennessee be laid on the table.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Vice President has just decided that the motion was out of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is not in order, having been made by a Senator who voted on the losing side. The request for reconsideration must be made by one voting on the prevailing side.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered.

Mr. HILL. I move that that motion be laid on the table.

Mr. McCARRAN. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered; and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN answered in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Nevada made a motion that the vote by which the amendment was agreed to be reconsidered. The Senator from Alabama attempted to make a motion to lay that motion on the table. Are we now voting to lay on the table the motion to reconsider, or are we voting to reconsider the vote?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The vote is on the motion to lay on the table.

Mr. HILL. I wanted that made clear.

Mr. AIKEN. I understood we were voting to reconsider the vote, and I voted in the negative. On the vote to lay on the table, I vote "yea."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. McCARRAN. A vote in the affirmative is a vote to lay the motion to reconsider on the table, and a vote in the negative is a vote against it being laid on the table. Is that correct?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator is correct. The clerk will proceed with the calling of the roll.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. STEWART (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair and its transfer as on the previous vote, I vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. DAVIS. I announce my pair as on the previous vote and withhold my vote.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senators from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senators from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY and Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. WALLGREN] are necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] would vote "yea," and also that if present and voting, the senior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] would vote "yea" and the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER] would vote "nay."

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] is paired with the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Idaho would vote "yea," and the Senator from would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] is absent attending a wedding in his family.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] is absent because of illness.

I announce the following general pair:

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER].

I also announce the following pairs on this question:

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY] who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS].

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who would vote "yea."

The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who would vote "nay," with the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], who would vote "yea."

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 32, nays 32, as follows:

YEAS—32

Aiken	Hayden	Norris
Andrews	Hill	O'Mahoney
Bilbo	Kilgore	Pepper
Bone	Lee	Rosier
Brown	Lucas	Russell
Chavez	McCarran	Schwartz
Downey	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Doxey	McNary	Thomas, Utah
Ellender	Mead	Truman
Green	Murdock	Wagner
Guffey	Murray	

NAYS—32

Bailey	George	Reed
Ball	Gerry	Shipstead
Bankhead	Gurney	Smith
Barbour	Hughes	Stewart
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	McKellar	Tydings
Butler	Maloney	Walsh
Byrd	Maybank	Wheeler
Capper	Millikin	White
Clark, Mo.	Nye	Willis
Connally	Radcliffe	

NOT VOTING—32

Austin	Gillette	Reynolds
Barkley	Glass	Smathers
Brewster	Hatch	Spencer
Brooks	Herring	Taft
Bulow	Holman	Tobey
Bunker	Johnson, Colo.	Tunnell
Caraway	La Follette	Vandenberg
Chandler	Langer	Van Nuys
Clark, Idaho	Lodge	Wallgren
Danaher	O'Daniel	Wiley
Davis	Overton	

The VICE PRESIDENT. On this question the yeas are 32, the nays are 32. The Senate being equally divided, the Chair votes in the affirmative.

So the motion to lay on the table was agreed to.

Mr. HUGHES subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to make an announcement, if I may. When the vote was taken on the motion to lay on the table the motion for reconsideration of the vote by which the so-called McCarran amendment was agreed to, my colleague the junior Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] had had to leave the Chamber, so he was absent when the vote was taken. Had he been present he would have voted "nay." I wish to have this announcement appear in the RECORD.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7232) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, with the exception of Senate amendment numbered 6, and that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 324) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. JOHNSON of West Virginia, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and that they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 337. An act to provide for a permanent postage rate of 3 cents per pound on books; and

H. R. 7212. An act to amend section 13 (d) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

INSPIRATION TO INCREASE SCRAP-RUBBER COLLECTION

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as we know, the American people have been called upon by the President to gather scrap rubber. The campaign is now in full sway, and progress has been made and much rubber gathered. This morning I received a letter from a 5-year-old girl who lives at Independence, La. I should like to read her letter into the RECORD. Accompanying her letter is her dolly, which she sent to me. It is a rubber doll. I now hold it in my hands for all Members of the Senate to see. I wish I could have it incorporated in the RECORD, with all of the inscriptions appearing on it.

The young lady's letter is dated Independence, La., June 20, 1942, and reads as follows:

INDEPENDENCE, LA., *June 20, 1942.*

Hon. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
United States Senator,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: I must do my bit, so I am sending to you my rubber dolly, for Mummy said the scrap-rubber collection is your idea.

I am 5 years old. I love my dolly, but love our Uncle Sam better. And it will be good if all the little girls would give up their rubber dollies.

May God bless our President and you.

Sincerely,

MISS BEVERLY ANN PECORA.

On the rubber doll is inscribed the young lady's name, "Beverly Ann Pecora, 5 years old." On the right foot of the doll is an inscription, "Kick them with this footie." [Laughter.] On one side of the head is inscribed, "Soak the Japs for me, baby." [Laughter.] On the other side of the head is the inscription "Go get 'em, baby." [Laughter.]

I wish that all the young people of the Nation would add their efforts to those of this patriotic youngster so as to increase our much-needed rubber supply. I desire to congratulate this young constituent of mine for sacrificing her dolly, and I predict that should such a spirit of sacrifice predominate in this country it will mean a quick end to the war.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment.

Mr. BROWN. I offer an amendment, which I ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 14, line 17, it is proposed to strike out "$300,000" and insert "$696,000."

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I may say that the amendment involves a very small amount of money, the sum of $396,000. I have been reliably informed that at least one member of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, which first cut this appropriation from the amount fixed by the Budget, to which my amendment would restore the figure, has changed his views, and that if the Senate puts the amount back there is a fair chance that the House committee will agree to it. I ask the Senator from Nevada if he will not accept that amendment?

Mr. GERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BROWN. I yield.

Mr. GERRY. To what does the amendment refer?

Mr. BROWN. The amendment proposes that the sum of $396,000, which was

cut from the Budget estimate for the training of apprentices, shall be restored.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am content to take this matter to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I propose a clarifying amendment on page 66, after line 12. On that page there is a provision—

That no portion of the sum herein appropriated—

That is for social security—

Shall be expended by any Federal agency for the salary of any person who is engaged more than half of the time, as determined by the State director of unemployment compensation.

Nothing is said about the time when that shall take effect. Unless the time is fixed a great deal of confusion in the accounts of all the different States will result. So, without changing the meaning of the language of the bill, I suggest adding the following at the end of line 12:

This proviso shall be applicable as to the first pay roll after the State director shall have made the determination in question; and such determination, when made, shall remain in effect for the period covered by this appropriation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I discussed the matter with the Senator at the beginning of the session today, and I am content to take his amendment to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 66, after line 12, it is proposed to insert:

This proviso shall be applicable as to the first pay roll after the State director shall have made the determination in question; and such determination, when made, shall remain in effect for the period covered by this appropriation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments, and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill H. R. 7181 was read the third time and passed.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendments, request a conference with the House thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. WHITE conferees on the part of the Senate.

COMPOSITION OF THE NAVY AND CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7184, Calendar 1557.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7184) to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I am about to make a rather unusual request. Rule XXXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate reads as follows:

RULE XXXV. SESSION WITH CLOSED DOORS

On a motion made and seconded to close the doors of the Senate, on the discussion of any business which may, in the opinion of a Senator, require secrecy, the Presiding Officer shall direct the galleries to be cleared; and during the discussion of such motion the doors shall remain closed

I now move that the doors be closed. I should like to make a brief explanation. The bill under consideration will necessitate——

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest to the Senator from Massachusetts that he make his explanation before making the motion.

Mr. WALSH. I think that is proper. I accept the Chair's suggestion.

The bill under consideration will of necessity require a discussion and presentation of the policy of the Navy with relation to the building of battleships and airplane carriers, and perhaps open up some other aspects of our Navy problem that ought not, in my opinion, or in the opinion of the Navy, to be discussed in public, lest it be helpful to the enemy. While there have been rumors about what that policy of the Navy is, yet it has not been authentically stated, and I am in a position, from information given to me by the Navy, to state that policy as I understand it. There is nothing sensational about the request for a session with closed doors. Nothing extreme or alarming is going to be said by me in executive session, but it is my judgment, and it is the judgment of those of my colleagues with whom I have discussed this matter, that in the interest of our own country, and its welfare and its military defenses, the discussion ought to be held behind closed doors.

I move that the doors be closed, that the Senate may proceed with the consideration of legislative business in secret session.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I second the motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will clear the galleries and close the doors.

The Senate thereupon (at 4 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) proceeded to deliberate with closed doors.

At 5 o'clock and 53 minutes p. m., on motion of Mr. WALSH, the doors were reopened.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I send forward an amendment, and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 3, line 10, it is proposed to strike out the word "battleships"; and on page 3, line 13, before the period, to insert a colon and the following: *"Provided further,* That no battleship shall be constructed after the date of the enactment of this act under authorization heretofore made unless the construction of such battleship has been commenced, or a contract for such construction has been made, prior to such date of enactment."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, this amendment would merely have the effect of enacting into law the policy which has been announced on behalf of the Navy Department, that they have no intention at the present time of constructing any more battleships. It seems to me that, inasmuch as the bill itself contemplates a program which will occupy all the facilities of the United States for some time to come, there is no necessity or desirability for the whole authorization to be left in effect. If it should later be determined by the Navy Department that it were necessary to build a battleship, it has been demonstrated that there would be no delay in the consideration of their request, and it seems to me that it would be better for the Treasury and better for the whole program to have a definite policy enacted.

I do not intend any reflection on the policy of the Navy Department or of anyone else, but it is merely sound, common business sense.

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, let me ask him if any of the battleships or how many of the battleships have been contracted for.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Massachusetts can answer that question better than I can.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I gave that information in executive session.

Mr. HILL. I understood the Senator from Massachusetts did not wish to give that information in open session, and that is one of the reasons why we went into session with closed doors.

Mr. HUGHES. We are not now in a session with closed doors; we are in open session.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Massachusetts did not want to give that information in open session, so we went into session with closed doors.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the amendment of the Senator from Missouri amounts to freezing any further building of battleships by the Navy until further action shall be taken by the Congress. I regret that I am unable to accept the amendment of the Senator from Missouri. I personally feel that we should rely upon the assurance of the Navy that they will not undertake to build any further battleships without conferring with the Naval Committees of Congress. In the closed session I gave at length the views of the Navy Department on this subject, and I hope the amendment will be defeated.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not for a moment question the intention of the

Navy Department as expressed to the Naval Affairs Committee. But policies of importance are changed from time to time, sometimes without notice, and it seems to me that the evidence is overwhelming, and acquiesced in by the Navy itself, against the further construction of battleships at this time. If the amendment were enacted, if the Navy should change its mind as to the desirability of building battleships, and if it should conclude that the available facilities and the available material should be diverted back to battleships, it should come to Congress and announce the change of policy before it proceeded under an old authorization. I have no desire to detain the Senate at great length on the matter.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I hope the Senate will vote down the pending amendment. I do not think it appropriate for one to present an amendment which will provoke debate on questions that we discussed today in secret session. I could advance many reasons to show why the amendment should be defeated, but I would have to resort to certain information which I deem confidential. In the past the Senate has simply authorized that a certain designated tonnage be built into warships and the type of each ship was left entirely in the discretion of the Navy Department. At times, as in the pending bill, a certain specified tonnage is stipulated for a certain class of ships, but never is the number of ships designated.

The reason for that is patent. We should not let the enemy know the number and type of ships we contemplate building, nor should we let him know that we will discard certain types. Events may occur within a short period that will compel us to build the battleships and cruisers that have been temporarily deferred and it would be to our decided advantage to keep the enemy guessing.

I believe the Navy Department has done and is now doing a good job under such a system. It is now actively putting all of its force behind our war effort and I believe it would be unwise to make changes at this time.

I repeat, Mr. President, my earnest hope that the Senate vote to defeat the amendment of the distinguished Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I wish to record my hearty agreement with the sentiments expressed by the Senator from Louisiana. I hope Congress will not undertake to tie the hands of the Navy. The Navy knows much better than does the Senate what vessels it needs and when it needs them. I am perfectly willing to trust to the responsible authorities of the Navy as to whether or not any type of ships shall be constructed.

We are in the most tremendous struggle in which this country has ever been involved. We need the Navy, we need aircraft, we need armies, and for God's sake let the Senate not set up its judgment as to the different classifications of ships we should have, and when, and how they should be built.

I am willing to stand by the naval authorities. I think it would be a serious mistake for the Senate in this hasty fashion to undertake to lay down a naval policy with respect to when and where and how some particular classification of ships shall be constructed. We heard in the closed session the very fine and complete statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], and it seems to me that everyone who heard the statement ought to be convinced that we should not adopt the amendment; that we should not intervene in the Navy's plans in respect to this matter.

I was particularly struck by certain portions of the Senator's statement in which he made it very clear that the time of the battleship is not past; that its utility is still necessary in certain situations, in contests of long range and of heavy armaments. So I hope the Senate will not adopt the amendment of my distinguished friend the Senator from Missouri.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I agree with what the Senator from Texas has said about the very impressive and weighty statement made by the Senator from Massachusetts in closed session. To my mind, that statement conclusively proves that battleships ought not to be built at this time. To my mind, the statement of the Navy Department itself that the building of battleships is to be indefinitely postponed makes the amendment desirable. The amendment is not a reflection on the Navy. It is not an attempt to override the discretion of the Navy. Its purpose is simply to enact into law the policy which the Navy Department itself has adopted and announced.

Why should we leave an authorization hanging over, to be carried into effect years from now, when the whole situation may have changed, as it has already changed since the authorization was originally made? If the Navy Department next month changes its mind and sends us a recommendation for the construction of battleships, we know that both bodies of Congress will give favorable consideration to any recommendation the Navy Department may make. The amendment does not make any reflection on the Navy. It is not even calling attention to the change in the policy which the Navy has seen fit to make by reason of the limitation of our facilities and by reason of desirable priority with respect to materials. The Navy Department, like every one else, has learned from the lessons of this war. But it is a fact that it is not intended to pursue the building of battleships, and if the program of naval building contemplated in this very bill is to be carried forward in the most expeditious manner, battleships cannot be built. The amendment simply provides for leaving that to the future determination of Congress on the recommendation of the Naval Affairs Committees. So far from the amendment being any reflection upon the Navy Department, or upon the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], as suggested by the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], I desire to say that I submitted this amendment yesterday to the Senator from Massachusetts, and it at that time met with his approval.

Mr. PEPPER and Mr. ELLENDER addressed the Chair.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], who was first on his feet.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I wish to make an observation when the Senator shall have concluded.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I now yield to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER].

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, does not the Senator from Missouri feel that the adoption of his amendment would change our policy with respect to the method of authorizing the building of warships? Ever since I have been in the Senate, we have simply authorized that a specified tonnage of warships be built, and left the size, the tonnage of each ship, and other characteristics to the sole discretion of the Navy Department. I am of opinion that the adoption of the Senator's amendment would change that policy.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the amendment carries out the policy announced by the Navy Department itself.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I subscribe to the sentiments which have been expressed in opposition to the amendment. I respect the convictions and the opinion of the able Senator from Missouri. Certainly on the surface of things it appears that his opinion is in accord with the trend.

I think the observation of the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER] is very pertinent. No hearing has been held by the Committee on Naval Affairs with respect to the matter. I have no technical information before me concerning it. No committee report has been made upon such a proposal. I do not think the Senate should be called upon to pass its judgment on a matter of broad policy such as this, even though we respect the sincerity and conviction of the Senator from Missouri and even if many of us may superficially have an inclination to vote favorably on such a proposal. I think the matter is a technical one, and that it should be left constantly flexible and subject to the changing judgment and timely conviction of the Navy Department, and at this late hour in the afternoon, when the Senate has not had the advantage of technical knowledge or a recommendation by the committee, I hope the Senator will not feel obligated to press the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to make a similar observation. Not being a member of the Naval Affairs Committee but having complete faith in the Navy, I think it would be wise not to do anything which might in any way affect the great work which the Navy is doing.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, as I understand the announced policy with respect to what the Navy proposes to do, it was not an abandonment at all of the building of battleships, but it was rather indicated that they needed other vessels at the moment more than they needed battleships, and simply deferred

the building of them until they could go ahead with other instrumentalities of naval warfare.

I shall not vote tonight to send a message to the Mikado, "Come on over; we are not going to have any battleships to resist you." I shall not vote to tell the European Axis Powers to come on over; that we are not to have any more battleships; that the Senate is to act as the Secretary of the Navy from now on, and that we are to decide what kind of vessels are to be built and when they shall be built. I believe the policy of the Navy can be trusted, and that battleships for certain functions, as already indicated by those who know, are still useful. I shall not vote for the amendment offered by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Texas does not have to vote for any amendment for which he does not want to vote. The Senator from Texas is pursuing the course of simply setting up a straw man for the purpose of knocking him down when he asserts that he will not send a message to the Mikado or to Hitler. The policy of the Navy Department was very perfectly stated in the letter written to the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH]:

> The Navy Department has deferred indefinitely the construction of the last five battleships authorized by the Congress, and before undertaking the further construction of these battleships the Navy Department will consult the Naval Affairs Committees of the two bodies of Congress in these respects.

It seems to me the Navy Department might as well consult the two committees of the Congress.

My amendment proposes to write into the law the announced policy of the Navy Department itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK].

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill (H. R. 7184) was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7232) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, and that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6 to the bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I had intended to move that the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 6, which refers to an appropriation for the Territory of Hawaii which was inserted in the bill in the committee; but I am told by our leader that he has some agreement with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY]. Under those circumstances, I should rather have the matter go over until Monday. I should like to have it disposed of. I now give notice that at the earliest time when I can obtain recognition on Monday I shall make a motion to recede from the amendment of the Senate numbered 6.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the matter will be passed over until Monday.

AUTHORITY TO SIGN BILLS, ETC.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that during the adjournment of the Senate following today's session the Vice President be authorized to sign bills, and that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the House of Representatives.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AUTHORIZATION FOR COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask that during the adjournment of the Senate the Committee on Appropriations may have permission to file reports on bills and resolutions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

WIDOW AND CHILDREN OF DR. JO M. FERGUSON—VETO MESSAGE (S. DOC. NO. 229)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying bill, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate:

I am returning, without my approval, S. 819, 77th Congress, "An act for the relief of the widow and children of Dr. Jo M. Ferguson," which would direct the Veterans' Administration to cancel an alleged overpayment in the sum of $7,051.94, charged against Dr. Jo M. Ferguson for disabled emergency officers' retirement payments received by him, and to pay to the widow and children of Dr. Ferguson the sum of $7,666.21, as the net balance of insurance policy K–18334 issued to Dr. Ferguson and the civil-service-retirement fund credited to Dr. Ferguson at the time of his death on September 21, 1938.

It appears that on August 3, 1920, while an employee of the Government, Dr. Ferguson filed an application for disability compensation based on his service as a captain in the Medical Corps of the Army from October 18, 1918, to July 11, 1919, setting forth the disabilities which he contended had been incurred as the result of such service. This contention was supported by affidavit evidence upon the basis of which a disability rating was granted, and Dr. Ferguson received disability compensation, pension, and emergency officers' retirement pay, totaling $10,084.76.

It further appears that as a result of an investigation of the case, the Veterans' Administration found that Dr. Ferguson knowingly and intentionally submitted false evidence in support of his claim for compensation in violation of the provisions of section 504 of the World War Veterans' Act of 1924, and that as a consequence he forfeited all rights and claims and benefits to which he otherwise might be entitled. This finding was reviewed on appeal and sustained, and the veteran's rights declared forfeited. The amount which had been paid Dr. Ferguson, $10,084.76, therefore became an overpayment, or, in other words, a debt due the United States.

Against the overpayment to Dr. Ferguson of $10,084.76, the Veterans' Administration computed credits, at the time of his death on September 21, 1938, of $10,699.03, this amount being composed of the balance due on his Government insurance policy together with salary deductions to his credit in the civil-service-retirement fund. The total credits, therefore, exceeded the total indebtedness by $614.27.

The present enactment does not question the finding of fraud in this case, but, in effect, holds that the penalty attached to such finding, as prescribed by section 504 of the World War Veterans' Act of 1924, should be applied only to the disability compensation and pension paid, and should not run against emergency officers' retirement payments of $7,051.94. Thus, the enactment provides for the cancellation of the overpayment charge on account of the emergency officers' retirement payments, and for the payment to Dr. Ferguson's widow and children of the equivalent amount of the overpayment charge, and of the excess credit of $614.27, or a total payment of $7,666.21.

I find myself unable to subscribe to the view that the finding of fraud in this case should not be considered applicable to the emergency officers' retirement payments. Emergency officers' retirement pay is provided in lieu of disability compensation. The law providing for payment of disability compensation and the Emergency Officers' Retirement Act, as amended, are inseparable in material aspects. Section 504 has been uniformly construed as requiring forfeiture for fraud of emergency officers' retirement pay, as well as disability compensation, and this ruling has been consistently followed in every case in which forfeiture for fraud has been imposed and has never been overruled in any final court proceeding. To construe the law otherwise in the instant case would result in granting the widow and children of Dr. Ferguson benefits which have been denied to many others similarly situated.

For these reasons I feel obliged to withhold my approval of this bill.

I desire, however, to inform the Congress that I am advised by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs that, in accordance with the provisions of Public, No. 866, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved October 17, 1940, which have the effect of prohibiting further collection of Dr. Ferguson's indebtedness from the proceeds of his Government insurance policy, the net balance of such policy in the amount of $6,359—which represents

a major portion of the amount of the payment contemplated by the present enactment—is payable in equal shares, upon application therefor, to Dr. Ferguson's widow and the two children.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *June 26, 1942.*

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

By Mr. KILGORE, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

Sundry officers for appointment or promotion in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law; and

Sundry officers of the Reserve Corps and Army of the United States for appointment as second lieutenants in the Regular Army, under the provisions of law.

ARMY NOMINATIONS REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, from the Senate Committee on Military Affairs I report two routine nominations for temporary appointments in the Army, and ask unanimous consent for their present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The nominations will be stated for the information of the Senate.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. Carl Raymond Gray, Jr., Corps of Engineers (Reserve), for temporary appointment as brigadier general in the Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 37, National Defense Act, as amended by an act of Congress approved June 15, 1933.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Col. William Henry Harrison, Army of the United States, for temporary appointment as brigadier general in the Army of the United States, under Public Law No. 252, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved September 22, 1941.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

NOMINATIONS PASSED OVER

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, there are two nominations on the calendar which, under a previous agreement, I ask to have go over. One is the nomination of James Lawrence Fly to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission, a reappointment, and the other is the nomination of Thomas F. Meaney to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey. I ask that those two nominations go over until Monday, under a previous agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc, and that the President be immediately notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc, and the President will be immediately notified.

That concludes the Executive Calendar.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 6 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Monday, June 29, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 26 (legislative day of June 18), 1942:

DIPLOMATIC AND FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE CONSUL GENERAL

Sam E. Woods, of Mississippi, now a Foreign Service officer of class 1 and a secretary in the Diplomatic Service, to be also a consul general of the United States of America.

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT

Capt. Charles Lowman Decker, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from June 11, 1941.

PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO BE COLONEL WITH RANK FROM JUNE 19, 1942

Lt. Col. Frank Joseph Riley, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel).

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 26 (legislative day of June 18), 1942:

IN THE ARMY

TEMPORARY APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be brigadier generals

Carl Raymond Gray, Jr.
William Henry Harrison

POSTMASTERS

FLORIDA

William S. Griffiths, Opa Locka.

MICHIGAN

Otto E. Farwell, Barryton.
Rhea Henderson, Kingston.
Earl G. Abbott, Sterling.

MINNESOTA

John M. Donlin, Arlington.
Teresa L. Wolf, Staples.
Leonard L. Krouss, Stewart.
Lura V. Frahm, Triumph.

NEW MEXICO

James H. Bell, Mesilla Park.

NORTH CAROLINA

Wythe M. Peyton, Asheville.
Berder B. Long, Cullowhee.
James J. Parker, Murfreesboro.
Wilbur R. Dosher, Wilmington.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Thomas B. Hallman, Aiken.
Pretto H. White, Ehrhardt.
Lorna M. Hutson, Hardeeville.
George M. Faile, Kershaw.
James M. Muirhead, Mount Pleasant.
William S. Gibson, Sharon.
George C. Cartwright, York.

TEXAS

Oscar W. Koym, East Bernard.

VIRGINIA

Thomas W. Cooke, Gloucester.
Marcellus B. Garnett, Mathews.
Eddie L. Southard, Stanardsville.

WEST VIRGINIA

John W. Fisher, Moorefield.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, JUNE 26, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Edward Gardiner Latch, pastor of Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, who art the author and sustainer of life, the help of all who put their trust in Thee, we pause in Thy presence to pray that our lives may be built, not upon shifting sands but upon the rock of eternal truth. Help us to keep ourselves, our homes, and our Nation dedicated to Thee and to the cause of truth, of justice, and of freedom upon the earth.

Deliver us from all superficiality, from all half-truths, and from a too indulgent living. Discipline our lives that we may see clearly, talk intelligently, walk courageously, and faithfully do our duty to Thee and to our country, whose we are and whom we endeavor to serve.

We pray in the name of Him who ever summons the human spirit to life, to liberty, and to the pursuit of happiness, our Lord and Master, Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without

amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7212. An act to amend section 13 (d) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7232. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. BRIDGES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 324. Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing joint resolution, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. GLASS, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. NYE, and Mr. BRIDGES to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill 6709 entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists on its amendments Nos. 81, 83, 85, 86, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, and 97 to the foregoing bill.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 6845) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. NYE, and Mr. HOLMAN to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 3398) entitled "An act for the relief of Gerhard R. Fisher," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. WILEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4355) entitled "An act for the relief of Bella Cosgrove," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. ROSIER, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 4370) entitled "An act for the relief of Charles L. Lair," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 4953) entitled "An act for the relief of Emil Lassila, Martha Lassila, Ellen Huhta, and Sylvia Huhta," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. TUNNELL, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 5385) entitled "An act for the relief of Charles E. Yates and the Motor Facts Sales Co.," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. ROSIER, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5449) entitled "An act for the relief of Mrs. Cecile Herzog and Lucille Herzog (an infant)," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 5496) entitled "An act for the relief of Cecile McLaughlin," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. ROSIER, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 5499) entitled "An act for the relief of Henry Daley, guardian of James Roy Daley and Norman Franklin Daley," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. HUGHES, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 5920) entitled "An act for the relief of E. A. Williams," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BROWN, Mr. ELLENDER, and Mr. CAPPER to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the reports of the committees of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to bills of the following titles:

H. R. 4153. An act for the relief of Cleaver Kelley; and

H. R. 5439. An act for the relief of Joseph Soulek.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 337) entitled "An act to provide for a permanent postage rate of 1½ cents per pound on books."

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agency:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of War.
4. Federal Security Agency.

THE CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES OF CHILE

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following communication:

SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF NORTH AMERICA:

The Chamber of Deputies of Chile has been informed of the cordial message of greeting which the House of Representatives of the United States sent to it and the evidences of gratitude expressed therein because of having had the honor of receiving in its midst the friendly visit made by a delegation of honorable members of parliament of the great sister nation. This chamber must say to your high body that the fate which enabled it to give warm greetings to your illustrious members has served, because of the kind and cordial words which were exchanged on that occasion, to tighten yet more the bonds of deep and fraternal friendship which unites the two countries. The Chamber of Deputies of Chile, in acknowledging your message, expresses fervent wishes for the prosperity of the great country of the north and for the welfare of its most worthy representatives. In transmitting this resolution of the chamber over which I preside, I wish to express to you my own feelings of friendship for the United States of North America and my warmest wishes for your personal happiness. May God keep you.

PEDRO CASTELBLANCO AGUERO
L ASTABURUAGA,
For the Secretary.

LETTER FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House the following letter from the President of the United States:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., June 23, 1942.

HON. SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Early this year Mr. John Marshall Gamble of Santa Barbara, Calif., sent to me a very old silver ladle which belonged to Jonathan Dayton, Speaker of the House of Representatives from 1795 to 1799.

I thought this might be a very interesting thing for you to have in the House of Representatives to exhibit with my compliments and those of Mr. Gamble. If you do not have any facilities for exhibiting it, you might send it to the National Museum.

Very sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including an article by David Lawrence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and the other business of the House, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an article by Brig. Gen. John McAuley Palmer, which appeared in the Infantry Journal for June, entitled "Two Views of War," a very interesting and informative discussion.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

WORK RELIEF BILL

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. J. Res. 324) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees:

Messrs. CANNON of Missouri, WOODRUM of Virginia, LUDLOW, SNYDER, O'NEAL, JOHNSON of West Virginia, RABAUT, JOHNSON of Oklahoma, TABER, WIGGLESWORTH, LAMBERTSON, and DITTER.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1942

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill (H. R. 7232) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, together with the Senate amendments thereto, be laid before the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would suggest that all amendments, except amendment No. 6, be taken up together and considered at once.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I make that as a part of my request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 2, after line 8, insert:

"For miscellaneous items, exclusive of labor, fiscal year 1942, $50,000."

Page 4, after line 16, insert:

"UNITED STATES COMMISSION FOR THE CELEBRATION OF THE TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF THOMAS JEFFERSON

"The unexpended balance of the appropriation of $5,000 for the expenses of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson, contained in the First Supplemental Civil Functions Appropriation Act, 1941, and continued available for the fiscal year 1942 by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, is hereby continued available for the same purposes until June 30, 1943."

Page 6, after line 9, insert:

"For the payment of claims in excess of $250, approved by the Commissioners in accordance with the provisions of the act of February 11, 1929, as amended by the act approved June 5, 1930 (45 Stat. 1160; 46 Stat. 500), $1,250."

Page 8, after line 11, insert:

"Orchard rehabilitation loans: Not to exceed $400,000 of the unexpended balance of the appropriation for "Orchard rehabilitation loans" made available for 1942 in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, is hereby continued available for the same purposes until June 30, 1943."

Page 8, after line 11, insert:

"FOREST SERVICE

"Forest-fire control, Department of Agriculture (emergency): The first proviso in the item 'Forest-fire control, Department of Agriculture (emergency)' in the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, approved April 28, 1942 (Public Law 528, 77th Cong.), is hereby amended to read as follows: '*Provided*, That there shall not be expended from this appropriation on non-Federal lands in any State any amount in excess of the amount made available by the State, or private agencies, or individuals for the purposes of forest-fire prevention and suppression.'"

Page 13, line 18, after "in" insert "Senate Document No. 218 and."

Page 13, line 19, strike out "$1,792.47" and insert "$1,963.04."

Page 13, after line 19, insert:

"BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS

"Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel: The appropriation 'Pay, subsistence, and transportation of naval personnel' for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 shall be available for the pay and allowances, authorized by law, of the personnel provided for under this head."

Page 19, after line 13, insert:

"International Committee on Political Refugees: The unexpended balance of the appropriation 'International Committee on Political Refugees,' continued available to June 30, 1942, by the Secod Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, is continued available for the same purposes until June 30, 1943."

Page 19, after line 13, insert:

"Agrarian Claims Commission, United States and Mexico: The unexpended balance of the appropriation 'Agrarian Claims Commission, United States and Mexico,' made available for 1942 in the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, is continued available for the same purposes until June 30, 1943."

Page 19, after line 14, insert:

"OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

"Administrative expenses, Adjusted Compensation Payment Act, 1936, Treasury Department: For transfer to the Post Office Department to cover registry fees and postage on mailings of bonds issued under the provisions of the Adjusted Compensation Payment Act of 1936, fiscal year 1942, $6,000."

Page 22, after line 25, insert:

"(b) For the payment of claims for damages to or losses of privately owned property adjusted and determined by the following respective departments and independent offices, under the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide a method for the settlement of claims arising against the Government of the United States in the sums not exceeding $1,000 in any one case," approved December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), as fully set forth in Senate Document Numbered 219, Seventy-seventh Congress, as follows."

Page 22, after line 25, insert:

"Executive Office of the President."

"Coordinator of Information, $103.95."

Page 22, after line 25, insert:

"Federal Security Agency, $563.35."

Page 22, after line 25, insert:

"Federal Works Administration, $999."

Page 22, after line 25, insert:

"Department of the Interior, $1,052.73."

Page 22, after line 25, insert:

"Navy Department, $463.70."

Page 22, after line 25, insert:

"War Department, $14,509.20."

Page 22, after line 25, insert:

"In all, $17,691.93."

Page 23, line 8, after "in" insert "Senate Document numbered 221 and."

Page 23, after line 14, insert:

"War Department, $870."

Page 23, line 15, strike out "$6,674.27" and insert "$7,544.27."

Page 25, line 14, after "in" insert "Senate Document Numbered 220 and."

Page 25, line 18, strike out "$13,629.90" and insert "$84,111.62."

Page 26, line 1, strike out "$124,655.05" and insert "$127,325.31."

Page 26, line 3, strike out "$41,657.69" and insert "$47,346 17."

Page 26, line 4, strike out "$412,805.74" and insert "$491,646.20."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:

"(b) For the payment of the following claims, certified to be due by the General Accounting Office under appropriations the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (31 U. S. C. 713), and under appropriations heretofore treated as permanent, being for the service of the fiscal year 1939 and prior years, unless otherwise stated, and which have been certified to Congress under section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (5 U. S. C. 266), as fully set forth in Senate Document Numbered 224, Seventy-seventh Congress, there is appropriated as follows."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:

"Independent Offices: For Interstate Commerce Commission, $5."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:

"For pay of personnel and maintenance of hospitals, Public Health Service, $4.33."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:

"For general administrative expenses, Public Buildings Branch, Procurement Division, $29.75.'

Page 37, after line 5, insert:

"For repair, preservation, and equipment, public buildings, Procurement Division, $7.80."

Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For salaries and expenses, Veterans' Administration, $27.62."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"Department of Agriculture: For control of emergency outbreaks of insect pests and plant diseases, $231."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For salaries and expenses, Extension Service, $1.49."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture (transfer to Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation), $344.12.
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For exportation and domestic consumption of agricultural commodities, Department of Agriculture (transfer to Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, act of June 28, 1937), $154.85."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For retirement of cotton pool participation trust certificates, Department of Agriculture, $14.13."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For development of water facilities, arid and semiarid areas, Department of Agriculture, $3.50."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For conservation and use of agricultural land resources, Department of Agriculture, $167.91."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For salaries and expenses, Soil Conservation Service, $21.73."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For National Industrial Recovery, Interior, soil-erosion prevention (transfer to Agriculture), $45.50."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For loans and relief in stricken agricultural areas (transfer to Farm Credit Administration), $37."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"Department of Commerce: For establishment of air-navigation facilities, Civil Aeronautics Authority, $513.80."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"Department of the Interior: For industry among Indians, $4.59."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"Department of Justice: For miscellaneous expenses, United States Courts, $12.27."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For salaries and expenses, Federal Bureau of Investigation, $30.82."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"Department of Labor: For salaries and expenses, Division of Labor Standards, Department of Labor, $23.27."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"Navy Department: For aviation, Navy, $371.76."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For ordnance and ordnance stores, Bureau of Ordnance, $9,843.82."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For pay, subsistence, and transportation, Navy, $37.27."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For pay and allowances, Coast Guard, $23.52."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"Treasury Department: For salaries and expenses, Bureau of Engraving and Printing, $976.14."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"War Department: For general appropriations, Quartermaster Corps, $9.90."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For Air Corps, Army, $55.75."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For Army transportation, $27.05."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For barracks and quarters, Army, $22.27."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For National Guard, $4.79."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For Organized Reserves, $34.12."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For pay, and so forth, of the Army, $106."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For pay of the Army, $11.55."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For Reserve Officers' Training Corps, $1.72."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For replacing clothing and equipage, $18,427.84."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For clothing and equipage, Army, $10,167.04."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For Civilian Conservation Corps (transfer to War), $9,381.45."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"For emergency conservation work (transfer to War, Act June 22, 1936), $3.60."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"Post Office Department—Postal Service (out of the postal revenues): For rent, light, fuel, and water, $240."
Page 37, after line 5, insert:
"Total, audited claims, section 204 (b), $51,426.07, together with such additional sum due to increases in rates of exchange as may be necessary to pay claims in the foreign currency and interest as specified in certain of the settlements of the General Accounting Office."
Page 37, line 15, after "in" insert "Senate Document No. 222 and."
Page 37, line 17, strike out "$29,429.93" and insert "$31,848.49."
Page 38, after line 5, insert:
"Sec. 208. For payment of interest on claim of the State of Vermont for $7,322.48, settled by the Comptroller General in accordance with Public Law 199, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved July 30, 1941, and which has been certified to the Seventy-seventh Congress in Senate Document No. 223, $232.31."
Page 39, after line 17, insert:
"Sec. 304. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein for the fiscal year 1943 shall be available from and including July 1, 1942, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1942, and the date of the enactment of this Act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."
Page 39, line 18, strike out "304" and insert "305."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the Senate returns the bill with a total of 74 amendments, adding $208,899.90 to the amount carried by the bill as it left the House.

The Senate amendments may be said to fall into three general categories, as follows:

First, there are judgments and claims against the Government which are authorized and which have been duly adjudicated aggregating $151,479.90. Of course, there is nothing to do but to pay them.

Second, there is an item of $50,000 for contingent expenses of the Senate. Of course, that is a matter of the domestic economy of the Senate and concerns their housekeeping bills.

Third, there is $6,000 for the reimbursement of the Post Office Department by the Treasury Department for handling adjusted-service bonds. That is automatic and is the minimum that could be provided for the purpose.

There are also a few reappropriations which involve no additional funds.

There is nothing controversial in any of these amendments, and the subcommittee in charge of the bill, and the conferees on the part of the House are unanimous in recommending their approval. That leaves only one amendment still undisposed of, amendment No. 6, and after disposition of the pending motion, it is my purpose to ask the House to take separate action on that amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri has clearly stated the question and I shall not have any objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendments referred to.

The amendments were agreed to.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask now that Senate amendment numbered 6 be reported.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 6: Page 11, after line 3, insert:
"Relief and civilian defense, Hawaii: In providing for the protection, care, and relief of the civilian population of the Territory of Hawaii, for which an allocation of $15,000,000 was made to the Secretary of the Interior from the appropriation "Emergency fund for the President", contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942 (allocation letter No. 42–56, dated January 12, 1942), receipts from sales of materials, supplies, or foodstuff, and from charges for furnishing services and facilities, acquired or furnished thereunder, shall be deposited to the credit of said allocation and shall be available for expenditure for the purposes thereof."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, this amendment sets up a revolving fund in connection with a Presidential allocation of $15,000,000 for relief in the Hawaiian Islands. It seems to the House committee that this is subject to question. We doubt the wisdom of providing a revolving fund from executively allocated moneys. Under the circumstance the committee is inclined to recommend that needs of this character be considered by direct appropriation.

I move, therefore, that Senate amendment No. 6 be disagreed to.

The motion was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial entitled "Enemies We Fight."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LETTER FROM HIS EXCELLENCY ELIE LESCOT, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF HAITI

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point a letter which I have received from the Honorable John Campbell White, Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of the United States at Port-au-Prince, Haiti, together with a letter from His Excellency Elie Lescot, President of the Republic of Haiti. This correspondence concerns the resolution adopted by the House of Representatives expressing thanks for the hospitality accorded the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Depart-

ment of State when it visited Haiti recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Port-au-Prince, Haiti, June 13, 1942.

The Honorable LOUIS C. RABAUT,
Chairman of the Subcommittee of the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. RABAUT: I had the pleasure of delivering to President Lescot the other day the handsomely bound resolution of the House of Representatives expressing thanks for his hospitality at the time of your visit to Haiti.

He has requested me to convey his thanks to the House. In this respect I cannot do better than to enclose copies, with English translation, of his letter.

I trust that you are well and that we may have the pleasure of seeing you again down here before long.

Sincerely yours,

J. C. WHITE.

[Enclosures.]

[Translation]

NATIONAL PALACE,
Port-au-Prince, June 10, 1942.

His Excellency Mr. J. C. WHITE,
Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary, Legation of the United States of America, Port-au-Prince.

SIR: I take pleasure in acknowledging receipt of your letter of the 8th of June current, under cover of which I was especially pleased to find the beautiful, magnificently presented resolution of the House of Representatives of the United States. I shall always keep it as a precious possession.

I was profoundly touched by this gesture of the Representatives of your country which is in line with all the steps that they undertake, and I request you to be my interpreter to them, and to tell them of the pleasure which they have given me and to transmit to them my lively thanks.

I avail myself of this occasion, sir, to renew to you the assurance of my high consideration.

E. LESCOT.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORTS ON APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that beginning today, and until July 1, it may be in order for the House to consider conference reports on appropriation bills, notwithstanding the fact that the conference reports have not been printed in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I shall not object, because I believe that is necessary in order to complete the work of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, but I do feel that before these reports are called up reasonable notice should be given to the membership that they are coming up.

Mr. McCORMACK. I thoroughly agree with what the gentleman from New York says, and I might say that in the agreement with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], that was thoroughly understood. However, that was something that could not well be put in a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. TABER. It is thoroughly understood.

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly, and I would be very glad to suggest whatever reasonable period the gentleman has in mind.

Mr. TABER. There ought to be time enough for the members of the committee to be here and there ought to be time enough before a vote is taken to at least give Members a telephone ring on both sides that the matter is coming up.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can assure the gentleman that that will happen. I think we can leave that rest safely in the hands of the Speaker.

Mr. TABER. I think that is satisfactory.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

SCRAP RUBBER

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no accurate knowledge as to how much rubber exists in various governmental departments and agencies and buildings under their supervision, including the buildings we ourselves occupy. I do want to suggest, however, in connection with the current drive to collect all possible scrap rubber that, as a means of setting an example the heads of all governmental agencies and departments might appoint emergency committees for the purpose of seeing to it that all possible available rubber scrap in any governmental agency be delivered over to the scrap drive.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Would it not be a good idea for the Government to take over all these rubber mats that are in the House Office Buildings and the Senate Office Building?

Mr. VOORHIS of California. That is one of the things I had in mind.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Pataskala (Ohio) Standard.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

CONGRESS HAS ALWAYS VOTED LIBERAL APPROPRIATIONS FOR OUR PACIFIC POSSESSIONS

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VAN ZANDT addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTRA COPIES OF REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I have had several inquiries from Members of Congress as to whether they can get additional copies of the report from the Committee on Un-American Activities on the Union for Democratic Action, in its attempt to purge Members of Congress. Upon inquiry I find from the secretary of our committee that there were only 1,000 copies printed. That means less than an average of two for each Member. The secretary also informs me that one Member of Congress has asked for 250 copies.

There is a way to solve this problem but it is up to the House and not to our committee; that is, to introduce a resolution to have printed the necessary number of copies of this report if you desire them.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MASON. Yes; I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. I will say to the gentleman that I feel the Superintendent of the House document room can have a House report reprinted without a resolution. The reason I think we should be careful about passing resolutions of this kind is this: One of the select committees had the House Committee on Printing bring in a resolution to print 9,000 copies of every hearing they held. Those hearings are piled in the halls of the Old House Office Building and most of them never have been used. They further rented a basement of a house on C Street at $20 a month to store those hearings. The Committee on Accounts told them to get the hearings out of that basement or pay the rent themselves.

Mr. MASON. I had nothing like that in mind. I am simply presenting the problem to the House and it can do as it pleases.

[Here the gavel fell.]

THE AMERICAN FLAG

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, some days ago there was a splendid resolution passed in this House with reference to our flag. At that time the question was brought up as to whether or not there were places in the United States which

the law required the flag to be flown 24 hours a day. There is no law on the statute books which requires that it shall float 24 hours a day, but there are five places where by custom or precedent it is flown 24 hours a day: Over the Capitol in two places; over any fort or ship in battle; over Francis Scott Key's grave in Frederick, Md.; over the War Memorial at Worcester, Mass., and over Taos, N. Mex.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that after the business of the day and any other special orders that may have been entered, I be permitted to address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I have two requests. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an editorial from the New York Herald-Tribune.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GEARHART. Second, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL CEMETERY FOR THE NORTHWEST

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. ANGELL addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a communication sent to me by a group of constituents.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Hon. Harry Slattery, the R. E. A. Administrator.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

WILLKIE AND THE COMMUNISTS

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

AUTHORIZING INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROCUREMENT BY CONTRACT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2032) to amend section 7 (a) of the act of of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), to authorize interdepartmental procurement by contract.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman tell us what the amendment is?

Mr. MAY. Yes; I shall be pleased to make an explanation.

The House committee reported a bill identical with this except for three words. These three words which differentiate the Senate bill from the House bill I propose to strike out by an amendment which I intend to offer.

The difference relates to this particular question: These departments are frequently required to exchange materials with other departments. Sometimes one department will have surplus materials it does not need, but which another department does, and it was originally provided in the bill that it should apply to all departments and agencies of the Government. The House committee struck out that general provision and limited it to apply to the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and the Civil Aeronautics Administration. We did not want trading going on among too many departments.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 (a) of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for fortifications and other works of defense, for the armament thereof, and for the procurement of heavy ordnance for trial and service, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes," approved May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417; 31 U. S. C. 686), entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative branch of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1933, and for other purposes," is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 7. (a) Any executive department or independent establishment of the Government, or any bureau or office thereof, if funds are available therefor and if it is determined by the head of such executive department, establishment, bureau, or office to be in the interest of the Government so to do, may place orders with any other such department, establishment, bureau, or office for materials, supplies, equipment, work, or services, of any kind that such requisitioned Federal agency may be in a position to supply, equipped to render, or obtain by contract, and shall pay promptly by check to such Federal agency as may be requisitioned, upon its written request, either in advance or upon the furnishing or performance thereof, all or part of the estimated or actual cost thereof as determined by such department, establishment, bureau, or office as may be requisitioned; but proper adjustments on the basis of the actual cost of the materials, supplies, or equipment furnished, or work or services performed, paid for in advance, shall be made as may be agreed upon by the departments, establishments, bureaus, or offices concerned: *Provided*, That if such work or services can be as conveniently or more cheaply performed by private agencies, such work shall be let by competitive bids to such private agencies. Bills rendered, or requests for advance payments made, pursuant to any such order, shall not be subject to audit or certification in advance of payment."

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment: After line 23 insert: "*Provided*, That the War Department, Navy Department, Treasury Department, and Civil Aeronautics Administration may place orders, as provided herein, for material, supplies, equipment, work, or services, of any kind that any requisitioned Federal agency may be in position to supply or to render or obtain by contract: *Provided further*,".

The committee amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 2, line 13, after the word "supply", strike out the comma and insert the word "or."

On page 2, lines 13 and 14, strike out the words "or obtain by contract."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to consider was laid on the table.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "An act to amend section 7 (a) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), to authorize interdepartmental procurement by contract, upon orders placed by the War Department, Navy Department, Treasury Department, and Civil Aeronautics Administration."

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a brief poem entitled "At Half Mast," by Mr. Carlisle.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday next, after the disposition of the regular business of the day and other special orders, I may address the House for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

COUNTY FAIRS

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, the Office of Defense Transportation, through the director, Mr. Eastman, has asked for the discontinuation, for the duration, of

county fairs and similar activities, which would include 4–H Club fairs and exhibits. This request was in order to preserve our supply of gasoline, rubber, and transportation facilities.

I take the floor today to protest against this request because there has been no protest from the Office of Defense Transportation regarding the continuance of professional racing and other sports which attract huge crowds. These crowds use untold amounts of gasoline, rubber, and a great amount of our transportation facilities. If Mr. Eastman wants our farm communities to stop our county fairs and our 4–H Club activities for the duration I am sure we will do that if it will help win the war—but the same treatment should be accorded to these places where horse racing is going on and other places which attract such tremendous crowds of people. Let there be no discrimination in our effort to win this war quickly. Our farming people will do what is asked of them but we want equality.

I call the attention of this House to the fact that the farmers are asked to raise the food which is to keep alive our Army, Navy, the armies and navies of our Allies, and also our civilian population. Our county fairs have concentrated on showing of the products of our farms. They bring together our farmers to discuss better ways and means of raising your food. Our county boards have made legal contracts with entertainment people for fairs already arranged. Our 4–H Club boys and girls have prepared for a year to show their livestock. These farm boys and girls should be given the opportunity to carry out this year's business to a conclusion. They have cared for their calves, hogs, and sheep in view of showing at county and State fairs this fall. If we must close these kind of fairs, in my opinion it should be done after the season is completed so that hundreds of show herds now prepared for exhibition can be shown. I make this suggestion to the membership of the House after some communications I have had with the farmers in my district who are as interested as all of us are in winning this war.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL] may extend his remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include an editorial from the Washington Post.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. PADDOCK]?

There was no objection.

CLEVELAND'S DONATION OF A BOMBER

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the mayor of Cleveland was here yesterday, but he did not come with hat in hand or with his mitt sticking out, asking for Federal funds. Instead, he presented Secretary Morgenthau with a check for $300,000 to purchase a bomber.

The campaign of the Cleveland News to purchase a bomber for MacArthur has been carried through to a sensational and brilliant conclusion. Cleveland factory workers, labor organizations, employers, rich and poor, men, women, and children, have poured more than $300,000 into a victory fund, which shows America's determination and generosity.

Cleveland's bomber for MacArthur is a symbol of the real unity of our Nation. Without compulsion, without pressure, thousands of Clevelanders gave cheerfully and eagerly of their funds to send their token to Tokyo.

The Cleveland News and the people of Cleveland are to be congratulated upon this achievement. It should serve as a model for the entire Nation no less than as a direct answer to the dictators of the Axis.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a communication, and also to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include a Flag Day address at Valley Forge.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HOBBS]?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL—1943

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the full report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate and amendments of the House to certain amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6709) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, 47, and 48; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$528,798"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 21: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$26,624,730"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$12,766,446"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed by said amendment insert "$15,830,075"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$886,034"; and the Senate agree to the same

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$7,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 79: That the House recede from its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 79, and agree to said amendment numbered 79.

Amendment numbered 101: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 101, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figure 10 proposed by said amendment, insert the figure "7"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 102: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the figure 10 proposed by said amendment, insert the figure "7"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 42, 43, 44, 81, 83, 85, 86, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, and 97.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
D. D. TERRY,
ROSS A. COLLINS,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
CARL HAYDEN,
M. E. TYDINGS,
J H. BANKHEAD,
E. D. SMITH,
GERALD P. NYE,
CHAS. L. MCNARY,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes

of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate and on certain House amendments thereto, to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report, as to each of such amendments, namely:

Corrections of totals, etc.

The following amendments are in correction of totals, allocations, correction of the text, etc.: Nos. 21, 40, 41, 46, 47, and 48.

Bureau of Agricultural Economics

Amendment No. 19, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $778,798, instead of $278,798 as proposed by the House. The conferees have agreed to recommend $528,798.

Forest Service

Amendment No. 38, national forest protection and management: Provides an increase of $3,000,000 to strengthen forest fire control and an increase of $20,000 for expansion of recreational facilities at Mount Charleston near Las Vegas, Nev. The conference report eliminates the latter item, of $20,000, and provides an increase of $1,500,000 for the forest-fire-control item.

Forest roads and trails

Amendment No. 45: Appropriates $7,500,000, instead of $6,500,000 as proposed by the House. The conferees have agreed to recommend $7,000,000.

Agricultural conservation program payments

Amendment No. 79: Provides that tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by the United States Government who comply with the program shall be entitled to the same payments for such compliances as other producers. The House has voted to recede and concur in the amendment with an amendment providing that tenants or sharecroppers on cropland owned by any State and who comply with the program shall also be entitled to such payments for such compliances. The House recedes from its amendment to this amendment and agrees to the original Senate amendment. This action is taken in view of advices from the Department that tenants and sharecroppers on croplands owned by States may now be paid for compliances referred to and that the language proposed to be added by the House is not needed.

Interchange of appropriations

Amendments Nos. 101 and 102: Authorizes interchange within bureaus of not to exceed 10 per centum, instead of not to exceed 5 per centum of the amounts appropriated as proposed by the House; and authorizes the addition of not more than 10 per centum to any one item, instead of not more than 5 per centum as proposed by the House. The conferees have agreed with respect to each of these amendments that 7 per centum be substituted for 5 per centum and 10 per centum proposed by the House and by the Senate, respectively.

Amendments in disagreement

Amendments numbered 43, 44, and 93 relate to totals.

Amendment No. 42, forest-fire cooperation: Appropriates $5,000,000, instead of $2,500,000 as proposed by the House. The managers on the part of the House will move to recede and concur with an amendment fixing the amount at $4,000,000.

Parity payments

Amendment No. 81: Provides that the agricultural conservation payments shall be taken into account and added to the farmer's market returns in determining the amount of the parity payment to which he may be entitled.

Commodity Credit Corporation

Amendment No. 83, relating to Government-controlled stocks of grain which may be sold for less than parity for feeding purposes or for manufacture of alcohol, etc.: The House provided that grain may be sold below parity if it "has substantially deteriorated in quality *and* is sold for feeding purposes or the manufacture of alcohol"; while the Senate provided that grain may be sold below parity if it "has substantially deteriorated in quality *or* is sold for the purpose of feeding or the manufacture of" certain industrial alcohols, acetone, and rubber. The question of merit in the Senate amendment lies in its substitution of the word "or" for the word "and".

Amendment No. 85: The Senate proposes that not more than 125,000,000 bushels of wheat be sold for feeding purposes.

Amendment No. 86: The Senate proposes that "no grain shall be sold for feed at a price less than 85 per centum of the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made."

Farm Tenant Act

Amendment No. 90, salaries and expenses: Appropriates $2,000,000, instead of $1,250,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 91, loans: Authorizes $40,000,000, instead of $25,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation

Amendment No. 95, rehabilitation services and assistance: Appropriates $50,319,557, instead of $25,319,557 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 96, loans: Authorizes $125,000,000, instead of $70,000,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 97, land purchase program: Authorizes the completion of commitments outstanding on June 30, 1942.

M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
D. D. TERRY,
ROSS A. COLLINS,
W. P. LAMBERTSON,
EVERETT M. DIRKSEN,
CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this is the second conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill. The subject matters which are included in the report are not numerous. I shall make brief reference to them and then undertake to answer any questions which may be propounded to me by Members of the House.

Some very substantial subject matters are still in disagreement and, of course, after consideration of the conference report it is expected that these will be taken up one by one and disposed of in accordance with the wishes of the House.

The conference report proposes to dispose of the difference between the two Houses with reference to the appropriations for the Bureau of Agricultural Economics by accepting one-half of the increase which has been proposed by the Senate. You will recall that upon passage of the bill through the House, the House adopted an amendment which reduced the funds of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics by $1,000,000 below the amount which had been reported to the House by the committee, the committee having already reduced the amount $50,000 below the Budget estimate.

The Senate upon consideration of this item in the bill increased the amount for that Bureau by one-half of the House cut; that is, by $500,000. It is the proposal of the conference report to accept one-half of such increase, $250,000, which will bring the amount of the bill as it provides for this Bureau to $800,000 below the amount of the Budget estimate.

I feel that will be satisfactory to the most ardent advocates of economy, although there are some of us who feel that the amount of appropriation provided will be insufficient to provide for the adequate carrying on of the work of this very important Bureau and in the event that our fears should prove well founded, it is anticipated that appropriate request will be submitted by the Budget to the deficiency committee and will receive the consideration of that committee.

The second important item which has been in dispute, and which is proposed to be provided for by the conference report, is that relating to the appropriation for national forest management and fire protection. You will recall that the Senate increased the amount provided in the House bill by $3,000,000 for the purpose of fire protection in our national forests. When the first conference report on this bill was before the House, upon motion submitted by myself as chairman of the House conferees the House by a vote of 174 to 171, a majority of only 3, decided to insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment. Since that time the Senate Committee on Appropriations has refused to make provision for the continuance of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Action to that effect had already been taken by the House. It is unquestionably true that the entire removal of the activities of the Civilian Conservation Corps from our national forests will very greatly tend to increase the danger of fire and increase the necessity for the Government to make other provision for the protection of those forests in lieu of that protection which has heretofore been afforded by units of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Under these circumstances, the House conferees felt that the House would approve an agreement with the Senate to divide the amount which had been provided by the Senate increase. In other words, the conference report contemplates the addition of $1,500,000 to these particular funds instead of the amount of $3,000,000 as proposed in the Senate amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 6 additional minutes.

The conferees have also reached agreement insofar as they are authorized to do so with the Senate with reference to the item for cooperative fire protection; that is, with regard to the funds which are appropriated under the Clarke-McNary Act for cooperative fire-protection work with the several States. However, that amendment is legislative in character, as it exceeds the amount of the existing authorization and is not included in the conference report; but if and when the conference report is adopted, the conferees will submit a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment reducing the amount of

the Senate increase by $1,000,000; that is, leaving the Senate increase over the House provision $1,500,000 instead of $2,500,000, as provided in the Senate bill.

There are some other amendments included in the conference report which relate to totals, and also an amendment relating to the interchange of funds between organizations within bureaus.

I think there is perhaps nothing else of such importance that I should undertake to discuss it at this time, unless some Member of the House desires to ask some question.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. I notice that the Senate has increased by $1,000,000 the amount for forest roads and trails. I wonder if the Members of the House and of the committee of conference appreciate what is at stake in these forest roads and trails to open up the mineral resources so vitally needed by the Government for strategic purposes now in defense of our country.

Mr. TARVER. I regret that I overlooked making reference to that amendment. I think the fact that the Members of the House committee of conference do appreciate the very important nature of the problem which the gentleman has mentioned is indicated by the circumstance that we have agreed in this conference report, subject, of course, to the approval of the House, to increase the amount for forest roads and trails by $500,000 beyond the Budget estimate. Surely the gentleman could ask no more.

Mr. WHITE. I am not asking any more, but I want to get across to the House and to the members of the committee of conference that this section, where all these minerals are, is strictly under the control of the Government and dependent on the Government for the construction of roads. There is no settlement there.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, the gentleman is aware of the fact that as far as the construction of new roads to deposits of important strategic minerals is concerned, the Congress has made provision for the construction of such access roads in other legislation and by other appropriations. This provision is largely for the maintenance of existing forest roads and trails.

Mr. WHITE. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the Forest Service has a big road-building organization staffed with engineers and equipment. Under the legislation about which the gentleman is talking there is no provision to use that force at all. The work must be done by the Bureau of Public Roads, and it must be done under another plan. It is so much more economical for the Forest Service to step in and build these roads with the organization and machinery on the ground rather than wait for a new outfit to come into a country with which it is not familiar and about which it knows little.

Mr. TABER. I have heard the gentleman express his opinion on this subject matter before. I think the conferees have been very liberal in the handling of this particular problem.

Mr. PACE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. PAGE. I notice that a number of what might be called important items in disagreement are still in disagreement. Do the conferees propose to move to recede and concur in those amendments or to insist on disagreement to the amendments?

Mr. TARVER. May I say to the gentleman from Georgia that the conferees desire the instructions of the House. We are merely the servants of the House. It is very essential that action on this bill be completed by the 1st of July, otherwise no funds will be available for carrying on any of the activities of the Department of Agriculture during the next fiscal year. Therefore, in a spirit of seeking to know the wishes of the House certain motions will be offered with reference to the several amendments that are still in disagreement. We hope to have authoritative expression from the House relative to those subject matters. Of course, the House will control.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. What has been done with Senate amendment No. 86?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman will find a statement relative to all of these amendments in the conference report. I shall have to see what is in that amendment.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The Senate amendment proposes that "no grain shall be sold for feed at a price less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made."

Mr. TARVER. That amendment is in disagreement, may I say to the gentleman, and will come up later.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a statement showing the status of the bill at the present time; that is, the appropriations contained in the bill as it passed the House and as it passed the Senate, and the amount still in disagreement, together with a comparison with similar information as to the act for the present fiscal year.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The statement referred to follows:

Department of Agriculture appropriation bill, 1943

	1942	As passed House	As agreed to, to date	Increase as agreed, over bill as passed House
Direct appropriations	$1,127,623,854	[1] $648,170,517	$652,761,791	+$4,591,274
Reappropriations	26,209,866	18,384,620	18,384,620	
Contractual authorization (on parity)		(2)	(2)	
Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan authorizations (farm-tenant loans, Farm Security loans, and Rural Electrification Administration loans)	270,000,000	105,000,000	10,000,000	
Permanent appropriations	104,813,084	139,087,795	139,087,795	
Trust funds	219,636,206	168,026,867	168,026,867	

[1] The total as passed the Senate is $680,395,695.
[2] Authorization to make commitments up to full parity.

Amendments still in disagreement

	House	Senate	Senate increase above House
Direct appropriations:			
Farm Tenant Act	$1,250,000	$2,000,000	+$750,000
Farm Security Administration	25,319,557	50,319,557	+25,000,000
Total, direct appropriations	26,569,557	52,319,557	+25,750,000
Reconstruction Finance Corporation loan authorizations:			
Farm Tenant Act	25,000,000	40,000,000	+15,000,000
Farm Security Administration	70,000,000	125,000,000	+55,000,000
Total, loans	95,000,000	165,000,000	+70,000,000

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time, and, having none, I move the previous question on the adoption of the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Evidently there is not a quorum present.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, when the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 85]

Baldwin	Capozzoli	Ellis
Barry	Casey, Mass.	Fenton
Bates, Ky.	Celler	Fish
Beckworth	Clason	Fogarty
Blackney	Cluett	Forand
Bolton	Coffee, Nebr.	Ford, Leland M.
Boykin	Cole, Md.	Gale
Bradley, Mich.	Cole, N. Y.	Gavagan
Bradley, Pa.	Crosser	Gifford
Brown, Ohio	Cullen	Gilchrist
Buck	Davis, Ohio	Green
Buckler, Minn.	Delaney	Haines
Buckley, N. Y.	Dickstein	Hall,
Burch	Dies	Edwin Arthur
Burdick	Douglas	Harness
Byrne	Drewry	Harrington
Byron	Duncan	Hart

Harter	Mitchell	Scott
Heffernan	Murray	Secrest
Hess	Myers, Pa.	Shannon
Hoffman	O'Day	Sheridan
Hook	O'Leary	Short
Isne	Osmers	Sikes
Jarrett	O'Toole	Smith, Pa.
Johnson, Ind.	Pfeifer,	Smith, Wash.
Johnson,	Joseph L.	Smith, W. Va.
Lyndon B.	Plauché	Somers, N. Y.
Kee	Ploeser	Starnes, Ala.
Kelley, Pa.	Powers	Sutphin
Kennedy,	Randolph	Sweeney
Martin J.	Rankin, Mont.	Thomas, N. J.
Kennedy,	Reece, Tenn.	Tinkham
Michael J.	Reed, Ill.	Tolan
Keogh	Robertson,	Traynor
Klein	N. Dak.	Vincent, Ky.
Kocialkowski	Robsion, Ky.	Vreeland
Landis	Rockefeller	Walter
Larrabee	Rogers, Okla.	Weaver
Lea	Romjue	Weiss
Lynch	Sacks	Wene
McGehee	Sasscer	Whelchel
Maas	Satterfield	Wilson
Maciejewski	Scanlon	Wolverton, N. J.
Marcantonio	Schaefer, Ill.	Worley
Merritt	Schuetz	Youngdahl
Mills, Ark.	Schulte	

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GORE). Three hundred and one Members have answered to their names, a quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. TARVER, further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Clerk report the first amendment in disagreement and I ask unanimous consent that amendments Nos. 42, 43, and 44 be considered together, since amendment No. 43 and amendment No. 44 merely relate to totals and therefore will be determined by the action taken on amendment No. 42.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 42: Page 47, line 18, strike out "$2,500,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

Amendment No. 43: Page 47, line 19, strike out "$68,800" and insert "$74,830."

Amendment No. 44: Page 48, line 3, strike out "$17,175,635" and insert "$22,704,285."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer certain motions with reference to the three amendments read, which are at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$4,000,000."

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$72,418."

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment insert "$20,184,285."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Georgia yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me observe that the conferees are in entire agreement on the three amendments that the gentleman now proposes to discuss. They embrace only some additional funds for forest-fire cooperation on which we are agreed due to the action of the House and the Senate on the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Mr. TARVER. Yes, I undertook to explain to the House in connection with the consideration of the conference report that the conferees have agreed upon this item with the Senate, and that the reason it was not included in the conference report was simply on account of the fact that it is legislative in character since it exceeds the amount of the authorization contained in the Clarke-McNary Act for forest-fire cooperative work. I think unless there is some misunderstanding on the part of someone, personally, as to what the amendment provides or some desire to understand it more clearly, I shall not undertake to consume further time.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I would like a little more detailed information, as it is a matter of very great interest to me, on the $3,000,000 increased item and the increase of $1,500,000 for forest control. I would appreciate if the gentleman would explain to the House just what the difference is between the House and the Senate conferees on these two items.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman evidently was not present when I discussed that matter in the consideration of the conference report. The conference report contains an agreement for one-half of the Senate increase. That is, the amount for the national forest-fire protection work is increased by one and one-half million dollars, instead of by $3,000,000, as proposed by the Senate. This agreement increases the amount for forest fire cooperative work beyond the $2,500,000 carried in the House bill by $1,500,000, making the total amount available, if this motion is adopted, for forest fire cooperative work with the States, $4,000,000 instead of the amount which was available for the present fiscal year of $2,500,000.

Mr. MOTT. May I ask the gentleman whether the conferees have agreed on that item, or is that item still in disagreement?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] and myself in a colloquy just a moment ago indicated to the House that we are in entire agreement and that the Senate has already agreed to the motion as proposed by myself in behalf of the conferees. If this motion is adopted, it will end the matter so far as that item is concerned.

Mr. MOTT. There is no disagreement between the House and the Senate.

Mr. TARVER. That is correct.

Mr. MOTT. On the forest-fire control item.

Mr. TARVER. That is correct.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

PROTECTION FROM FOREST FIRES

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to take just a moment to compliment the Subcommittee on Appropriations in charge of this agricultural appropriation bill for their provision of an appropriation to protect our great forests from destruction by fire. The necessity for this protection was never greater in our entire history than it is today.

California has a dry season, which sometimes is almost a drought, from April to October, and during this period some of the finest forests in the world are subject to these forest fires. Their importance cannot be overstated. The boys of our C. C. C. camps built splendid firebreaks, through these forests, but they are a thing of the past and the protection which they gave must now be furnished by the other agencies of the Government.

Those forests along the Pacific coast and adjacent thereto are primarily redwoods and pines. The great California redwoods are not only the largest living things on this earth but they are also the oldest. They were already great trees when Moses was found by Pharaoh's daughter among the bullrushes.

Forest fires on our coast range have been known to form a blanket of smoke out over the Pacific for scores of miles, forming a perfect smoke screen which sometimes lasts for days over wide areas of the coast.

The annual loss in the United States from forest fires averages between thirty-five and forty million dollars—a loss which can be substantially reduced by adequate protection.

We have sadly neglected our forests in America while other nations, particularly in Europe, have taken great care of theirs. The once great forests that stretched across the country have been devastated and in many places ruined. When they are gone they are gone forever. The only real forests we have left for the future generations are along the Pacific coast and in the Intermountain States. If incendiary bombs should be dropped among them to start forest fires, there are some great centers of population which would be cut off from all escape. We must take adequate steps to forego such a catastrophe.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 81: After line 14, insert "and the applicable rate of the payments under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, for the purposes of the 1942 agricultural conservation program."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendment numbered 81, and on that I yield myself 5 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to ask the House to have a roll-call vote with reference to the adoption or not of the motion which I have just submitted in behalf of the House conferees. The language of the Senate amendment to which we are asking that you disagree, would include within the farmer's market price for his product, in determining whether or not

he may be entitled to parity benefits, the amount of soil-conservation benefits earned by him in the soil-conservation and domestic allotment program. The matter has been thoroughly discussed several times on the floor of the House in connection with the pending bill and it would, in my judgment, avail nothing for me to undertake to cover the subject matter again.

It would be useless to review the various arguments that have been submitted against the inclusion of this language in the language of the appropriation bill relating to parity payments. Suffice it to say that the Congress in the passage of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, in making provision for parity payments to the producers of five basic agricultural commodities, made no such provision as is here proposed by the Senate amendment, and the language inserted by the Senate first made its appearance in the agricultural appropriation bill for the present fiscal year. It was agreed to by the House conferees and by the House last year upon the understanding upon the part of at least a part of the membership of the House conference committee that the agreement related to parity payments as provided for in the bill for the present fiscal year only. There appears to our mind, and I think that in saying this I speak for every member of the House conference committee, for the three Republican as well as the five Democratic members—and if any one of them disagrees with what I say, now would be an appropriate time and place for him to say so—I believe that I speak for all of the members of the conference committee when I say that I can conceive of no justification whatever for charging the farmer with these soil-conservation benefits earned by him, and in connection with the earning of which he incurred considerable expenditure, for labor, materials, fertilizer, and for seed, in determining the amount that he receives for the particular basic agricultural product, which he produces.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Let me say to the gentleman from Georgia that I entirely agree with the motion that he offers now, and I believe that we ought to have a record vote on that motion to indicate to the Senate conferees how the House feels about it.

Mr. TARVER. I thank the gentleman for that statement. I will say this in conclusion: I do not propose to consume further time of the House. If the basis for making parity payments should be changed so as to provide for the inclusion of these soil-conservation benefits in determining market price of the farmers' products, that change ought not to be effected from year to year in an appropriation bill, but it ought to be effected through the passage of legislation reported from the appropriate legislative committee. It is a matter for legislative consideration and not for consideration in connection with this annual supply bill.

Mr. PIERCE. Does this amendment affect the 125,000,000 bushels of wheat?

Mr. TARVER. This does not involve that subject matter, which will be gone into in a later part of the bill.

Unless there are some further questions and unless somebody desires to speak on this subject matter, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, on that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 244, nays 49, answered "present" 1, not voting 138, as follows:

[Roll No. 86]

YEAS—244

Allen, Ill.	Ford, Miss.	Meyer, Md.
Allen, La.	Ford, Thomas F.	Michener
Andersen, H. Carl	Fulmer	Mills, La.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gale	Monroney
Andresen, August H.	Gathings	Moser
Angell	Gehrmann	Mott
Arends	Gibson	Mundt
Arnold	Gillette	Murdock
Barden	Gillie	Nelson
Barnes	Gore	Nichols
Baumhart	Gossett	O'Connor
Beam	Graham	O'Hara
Beiter	Granger	O'Neal
Bell	Grant, Ala.	O'Toole
Bender	Grant, Ind.	Pace
Bennett	Gregory	Patman
Bishop	Guyer	Patton
Bland	Gwynne	Pearson
Bloom	Hallock	Peterson, Fla.
Boehne	Hare	Peterson, Ga.
Boggs	Harris, Ark.	Pierce
Bonner	Harris, Va.	Pittenger
Boren	Healey	Plumley
Brooks	Hébert	Poage
Brown, Ga.	Heidinger	Priest
Bryson	Hill, Colo.	Ramsay
Bulwinkle	Hinshaw	Ramspeck
Burgin	Hobbs	Rankin, Miss.
Butler	Holbrock	Rankin, Mont.
Byron	Holland	Rees, Kans.
Camp	Hope	Richards
Cannon, Mo.	Houston	Rivers
Carlson	Howell	Rizley
Cartwright	Hull	Robertson, Va.
Case, S. Dak.	Hunter	Robinson, Utah
Chenoweth	Imhoff	Rockwell
Chiperfield	Jackson	Rodgers, Pa.
Clark	Jacobsen	Rolph
Claypool	Jarman	Russell
Clevenger	Jennings	Sanders
Cochran	Jensen	Sasscer
Coffee, Wash.	Johns	Sauthoff
Collins	Johnson, Calif.	Scrugham
Colmer	Johnson, Ill.	Shafer, Mich
Cooley	Johnson, Luther A.	Shanley
Cooper	Johnson, Okla.	Sheppard
Copeland	Johnson, W. Va.	Smith, Va.
Courtney	Jonkman	Smith, Wis.
Cox	Keefe	Snyder
Cravens	Kefauver	South
Crawford	Kelly, Ill.	Sparkman
Culkin	Kerr	Spence
Cunningham	Kilday	Springer
Curtis	Kinzer	Steagall
D'Alesandro	Kirwan	Stefan
Davis, Tenn.	Kleberg	Stevenson
Day	Knutson	Stratton
Dewey	Kopplemann	Sullivan
Dirksen	Kramer	Sumner, Ill.
Disney	Kunkel	Sumners, Tex.
Domengeaux	Lambertson	Sutphin
Dondero	Lane	Talbot
Doughton	Lanham	Talle
Downs	Lea	Tarver
Duncan	Leavy	Terry
Durham	LeCompte	Thom
Dworshak	Ludlow	Thomas, Tex.
Eberharter	McGregor	Thomason
Edmiston	McIntyre	Tibbott
Elliott, Calif.	McKeough	Van Zandt
Engel	McLaughlin	Vinson, Ga.
Englebright	McMillan	Voorhis, Calif.
Fitzgerald	Maciora	Wadsworth
Fitzpatrick	Mahon	Ward
Flaherty	Manasco	Welch
Flannagan	Mansfield	West
Folger	Martin, Iowa	Wheat
	Mason	Whitten
	May	Whittington
		Wickersham
Williams	Woodruff, Mich.	Youngdahl
Winter	Wright	Zimmerman
Wolcott	Young	

NAYS—49

Anderson, Calif.	Hartley	Paddock
Andrews	Hoffman	Pheiffer, William T.
Bates, Mass.	Holmes	Rabaut
Canfield	Jenks, N. H.	Reed, N. Y.
Crowther	Jones	Rich
Dingell	Kean	Rogers, Mass.
Ditter	Kilburn	Simpson
Eaton	Lesinski	Smith, Maine
Eliot, Mass.	Lewis	Stearns, N. H.
Elston	McCormack	Taber
Faddis	McLean	Thill
Fellows	Magnuson	Treadway
Gamble	Martin, Mass.	Vorys, Ohio
Gerlach	Miller	Wasielewski
Hall, Leonard W.	Norton	Wigglesworth
Hancock	O'Brien, Mich.	Wolfenden, Pa.
	Oliver	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Smith, Ohio

NOT VOTING—138

Baldwin	Haines	Plauché
Barry	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Ploeser
Bates, Ky.	Harness	Powers
Beckworth	Harrington	Randolph
Blackney	Hart	Reece, Tenn.
Bolton	Harter	Reed, Ill.
Boykin	Heffernan	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bradley, Mich.	Hendricks	Robsion, Ky.
Bradley, Pa.	Hess	Rockefeller
Brown, Ohio	Hill, Wash.	Rogers, Okla.
Buck	Hook	Romjue
Buckler, Minn.	Izac	Sabath
Buckley, N. Y.	Jarrett	Sacks
Burch	Jenkins, Ohio	Satterfield
Burdick	Johnson, Ind.	Scanlon
Byrne	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Schaefer, Ill.
Cannon, Fla.	Kee	Schuetz
Capozzoli	Kelley, Pa.	Schulte
Carter	Kennedy, Martin J.	Scott
Casey, Mass.	Kennedy, Michael J.	Secrest
Celler	Keogh	Shannon
Chapman	Klein	Sheridan
Clason	Kocialkowski	Short
Cluett	Landis	Sikes
Coffee, Nebr.	Larrabee	Smith, Pa.
Cole, Md.	Lynch	Smith, Wash.
Cole, N. Y.	McGehee	Smith, W. Va.
Costello	McGranery	Somers, N. Y.
Creal	Maas	Starnes, Ala.
Crosser	Maciejewski	Sweeney
Cullen	Marcantonio	Tenerowicz
Davis, Ohio	Merritt	Thomas, N. J.
Delaney	Mills, Ark.	Tinkham
Dickstein	Mitchell	Tolan
Dies	Murray	Traynor
Douglas	Myers, Pa.	Vincent, Ky.
Drewry	Norrell	Vreeland
Ellis	O'Brien, N. Y.	Walter
Fenton	O'Day	Weaver
Fish	O'Leary	Weiss
Fogarty	Osmers	Wene
Forand	Patrick	Whelchel
Ford, Leland M.	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	White
Gavagan		Wilson
Gearhart		Wolverton, N. J.
Gifford		Woodrum, Va.
Gilchrist		Worley
Green		

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mr. Beckworth with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Ploeser.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Landis.

Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Cannor of Florida with Mr. Harness.

Mr. Burch with Mr. Gilchrist.

Mr. Plauché with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Murray.

Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Powers.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Cartwright with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Clason.

Mr. Randolph with Mr. Fenton.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Gearhart.

Mr. Satterfield with Mr. Wolverton of New Jersey.

Mr. Chapman with Mr. Short.

Mr. Secrest with Mr. Leland M. Ford.

Mr. Creal with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Vincent of Kentucky with Mr. Cole of New York.

Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. O'Brien of New York.
Mr. Sikes with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Cluett.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Tinkham.
Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.
Mr. Norrell with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Scott.
Mr. Green with Mr. Fish.
Mr. Barry with Mr. Maas.
Mr. Haines with Mr. Osmers.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Gifford.
Mr. Coffee of Nebraska with Mr. Wilson.
Mr. Buck with Mr. Rockefeller.
Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Robsion of Kentucky.
Mr. Weaver with Mr. Hess.
Mr. Drewry with Mr. Reed of Illinois.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Jarrett.
Mr. Hart with Mr. Vreeland.
Mr. Crosser with Mr. Jenkins of Ohio.
Mr. Whelchel with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.
Mr. Harter with Mr. Marcantonio.
Mr. Cullen with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.
Mr. Bradley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Heffernan.
Mr. Joseph L. Pfeifer with Mr. Romjue.
Mr. Sabath with Mr. Kee.
Mr. Kelley of Pennsylvania with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.
Mr. Schuetz with Mr. Klein.
Mr. Costello with Mr. Larrabee.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Cole of Maryland.
Mr. Lynch with Mr. Smith of West Virginia.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Merritt.
Mr. Fogarty with Mrs. O'Day.
Mr. Sacks with Mr. Byrne.
Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson with Mr. Hook.
Mr. Izac with Mr. Sheridan.
Mr. Smith of Washington with Mr. Davis of Ohio.
Mr. Maciejewski with Mr. Buckley of New York.
Mr. Dies with Mr. McGranery.
Mr. Tenerowicz with Mr. Forand.
Mr. Scanlon with Mr. Sweeney.
Mr. Tolan with Mr. Traynor.
Mr. Weiss with Mr. Wene.
Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania with Mr. White.
Mr. Worley with Mr. Casey of Massachusetts.
Mr. Kocialkowski with Mr. Harrington.
Mr. Patrick with Mr. Rogers of Oklahoma.
Mr. Schulte with Mr. Mitchell.
Mr. Smith of Pennsylvania with Mr. Shannon.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that amendments 83, 85, and 86 be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I am disposed to object to the request, but I reserve the right to object to state the situation and ask the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] a question.

The first amendment, amendment No. 83, is the "and or" amendment. As I understand, the effect of that is to require that before grain is sold below parity, if the House language is insisted upon, sale of the grain must be in two conditions. First, that it shall have deteriorated, and second, that it shall be sold for the purpose of feed or the manufacture of alcohol.

Mr. TARVER. That is a fact.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The Senate proposal is to use the word "or" instead of the word "and," so that the grain could be sold below parity either if it had deteriorated, or if it were used for feed or the manufacture of alcohol.

Mr. TARVER. No; I think the gentleman is laboring under a mistaken impression there. If the word "or" is substituted it can be sold for the purpose of feeding, whether it is deteriorated or not, and for the manufacture of alcohol.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I think the gentleman is stating exactly what I tried to state.

Mr. TARVER. I am sorry. I misunderstood the gentleman.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the House should recede on that point and the Senate language is accepted, by the use of the word "or" instead of the word "and," then the grain may be sold below parity if it meets one of the two conditions. That is, either if it had deteriorated or if it were to be sold for feed or the manufacture of alcohol. Therein lies the danger which alarms the people who are interested in farm prices. That is, that there is no limit to that, and especially taken in connection with Amendment No. 86 it would mean that if the grain were sold for the purpose of manufacturing alcohol it could be sold at any point below parity. Amendment No. 86 gives protection to 85 percent of the corn price only if it is sold for the purpose of feed.

Mr. TARVER. May I say to the gentleman that the conferees are in accord with regard to the question of the subject matters of these three amendments being substantially identical. That is, only one problem is involved. If the gentleman insists on objecting, of course, we would have to take them up separately and consume a great deal more time in discussion than would otherwise be true. But when the bill was last before the House we considered them together. The Senate on yesterday considered them together, and I can conceive of no reason for the separation.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Of course, I realize the desirability of saving time in the consideration of the matter, but if the House insists upon its position with respect to the first amendment, then the other amendments become more or less immaterial. If the House should accept the first amendment, then it might want to insist on the other two or it might not. I merely wish to keep the door open and shall not debate the matter.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, the gentleman may offer motions to recede and concur, with or without amendments, with regard to either of the three amendments separately, and no right on his part would be jeopardized simply by agreeing to consider the three amendments together.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I recognize that, except that I think the situation as to the importance of a vote on the next two amendments will be materially different if the House insists on adherence to the use of the word "and" instead of the word "or."

Mr. TARVER. Of course, the gentleman means that there would be perhaps three roll calls and 3 hours of debate instead of 1 hour of debate and one roll call. If the gentleman desires to object, of course, that is his privilege.

Mr. McCORMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman's position is that the next amendment in disagreement has different aspects than the following two amendments. Is that correct?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Exactly. If the House insists on its position on the first amendment, then the second amendment becomes relatively immaterial. The vote could be different on the second and third amendments.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can see the gentleman's position, but as I understand the gentleman's position, he is not contending that there could not be a vote on both 84 and 86 together?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. So that the gentleman is not insisting on three separate votes. The gentleman's contemplated position is not three separate votes, but he feels that this one has different elements involved than both 85 and 86?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. That is correct; yes.

Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 83: Page 81, line 13, strike out the word "and" and insert the word "or."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. Would it be in order to move to consider amendments 83, 85, and 86 together?

The SPEAKER. That can be done only by unanimous consent.

Mr. TARVER. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 83.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

There is, I think, only one substantial motion involved in these three amendments. The action which may be taken in the House in connection with amendment numbered 83 should in my judgment be decisive of the action with regard to amendments numbered 85 and 86. We intend to ask that we may have a roll call on amendment numbered 83. I think that is vital to further consideration of the agriculture appropriation bill. The Senate has the right in my judgment to expect the House to go on record with reference to the proposal here involved. The Senate has had two record votes on the language which it has inserted in this proviso.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Not at this time.

The Senate had its last record vote on yesterday, and by a vote of 46 to 13 insisted upon the retention of the lan-

guage contained in these three amendments.

I have no interest in these three amendments except as it may lie within my humble ability to point out the facts to the Representatives from those areas of the country which are directly concerned with the market prices of wheat and corn. The area which I represent is not so concerned except that it does not produce enough of these commodities for the use of its own people and is therefore a purchasing area so far as commercial wheat and corn are concerned rather than a producing area. I do not believe the question of fair prices for agricultural commodities may be subdivided into sections or areas, or that the interests of one type of producers may be considered separately and apart from the others, and although cotton is not here involved in the consideration of these amendments, I intend so long as I can to stand by the Representatives from the wheat- and corn-producing areas of the country in insisting that the Government shall not use the stocks of grains, corn and wheat, which it has accumulated to manipulate the prices of these commodities in the markets of the country and to depress the prices of these commodities in order to keep down, as is the announced purpose, the cost of living to the people of the country who are not engaged in agriculture.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. In just a few minutes, if the gentleman will permit me to proceed.

We are spending $202,000,000,000 plus in the war program appropriated during these 3 fiscal years. A great deal of this money unfortunately is probably being wasted. I say this without attributing any improper conduct to any particular administrative official, but I think this statement is undoubtedly true. Down here in southwest Washington at this time they are building an underpass. One of the foremen told me 2 or 3 days ago that he handed out checks to the Negro laborers who were employed there and that each week they each make from $80 to $103. In some instances he hands out checks of $103 to individual laborers for 1 week's work at common or ordinary labor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has consumed 5 minutes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Down in my own little city in Georgia I know of a number of cases which may be illustrated by one which came closely under my personal observation where a man who had never made more than $3 a day in his life went to Tullahoma, Tenn., to Government work and came back a few days afterward waving a check for $29.75 for 2 days' work. Instances of this kind may be multiplied by the hundreds of thousands throughout this country.

If I vote to have the Government sell farm products for less than parity I must go back to my farmers and say to them that I voted to impose this sacrifice upon them at a time when they might otherwise have secured parity and other farmers throughout the country might have secured parity; that I did it in order to keep down the cost of living for these individuals who are already receiving insofar as they are engaged in defense industry, incomes largely in excess of any they ever received before in their lives. Labor as a whole in the United States is, according to evidence delivered before our subcommittee, receiving 379 percent of the average which it received in the period from 1909 to 1914, the period which is adopted as the base for the determination of what constitutes parity for the five major agricultural commodities. I am not willing so far as I am concerned to vote to have the Government undertake to destroy the hope that parity might be at this time achieved in the program which it has carried on for several years with that objective in view.

Mr. HOPE rose.

Mr. TARVER. Let me say this further, then I will yield: This is not a question which affects my area but principally every grain-growing and corn-producing area of the United States.

I have offered this motion to insist on the House disagreement to the Senate amendment. If you feel that the interests of your people require that you should vote to agree to the Senate amendments or that you should agree to those amendments with modifications, I certainly will be pleased to yield to you to offer such a motion as a substitute for the one which I have submitted as you may desire to offer. But let us try to settle this matter here today once and for all. Let us call the roll, let us stand up and be counted, and if a majority of this House is willing to let the Government sell grain which has not deteriorated for feed purposes or to sell it for other purposes for which it would otherwise have to be obtained from grain dealers in the open market, at less than parity, then do so by your vote and the conferees, of course, will be relieved of this burden in the further consideration of this bill. But if you do not believe that ought to be permitted, then go on record to that effect, and let us continue in an endeavor to arrive at a conclusion with the Senate prior to the 1st of July when this bill should become effective.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. There is no limit in this bill below the 85-percent parity at which the Government can sell this wheat?

Mr. TARVER. At not less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Of corn. But it can sell for less than 85 percent of parity; is that correct?

Mr. TARVER. I do not so understand it. I understand the limitation to be as to the 125,000,000 bushels of wheat that it may not be sold at less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn.

Mr. HOPE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. As the gentleman knows, I have favored the Senate amendment and I still favor it, but I am willing to send the bill back to conference if the gentleman feels that the conferees have a reasonably good chance to get together.

Mr. TARVER. I do not think the conferees can settle this question. We have been engaged in an effort to settle it for several weeks, as the gentleman knows. We cannot reach an agreement with the Senate. If the gentleman feels that this amendment of the Senate ought to be adopted, either in the form which the Senate approved it or in modified form, he ought to offer a motion, fight for it, and see if the House will adopt his amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps first we should take an inventory. The latest figures available to me as to the amount of corn and wheat, both in storage, owned by the Federal Government, as of April 24, 1942, and under loan are about as follows: We own 70,000,000 bushels of corn and we have under loan 260,000,000 bushels of corn, making a total of 330,000,000 bushels. We own outright from the 1940 wheat crop 110,000,000 bushels. We have under loan of the 1941 crop 332,000,000 bushels, and we anticipate under loan of the present crop 350,000,000 bushels, making a total of 792,000,000 bushels of wheat and 330,000,000 bushels of corn that will be available and that will be at the disposition of the Commodity Credit Corporation under the provisions of the paragraph which we are now discussing.

Let us see what they propose to do with this grain. When this bill was before the House we said: "You cannot sell it below parity." We said also, "We will make two conditions. You can sell it below parity if you sell it for relief." We said also that "You can sell it below parity if it is deteriorated and you can sell it for feed or you sell it for the manufacture of alcohol." We also said, "You can sell it below parity if you sell it for seed." That is where we stopped.

Here is all this grain at the disposal of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and it must be sold at parity except if substantially deteriorated it may be sold for feed or alcohol. Outside of that it must be sold for parity.

The bill went to the Senate. What did they say? They concurred in what we said in part. They said, "You can sell it for relief below parity." They said, "You can sell it if it is substantially deteriorated," and at that point they struck out the word "and" and inserted the word "or" which is the amendment before us. What does that little transformation of two conjunctions do? Here is what it does. They can sell grain, and that means corn and wheat for feed in any amount except for that little proviso that we will get to directly. They can sell any amount of corn and wheat for the manufacture of ethyl alcohol and butyl alcohol, acetone, or rubber at any price. There is no limit. Do you think there is a limit? Mr. Hudson, of

the Commodity Credit Corporation, in a memorandum to the Appropriations Committee which was inserted in the bill appropriating $42,000,000,000 for the Military Establishment, indicated that they actually sold some of that grain for 24 cents a bushel. That is what they can do. With the exception of grain for feed they can sell this entire store of grain for any price.

They go further. They said, "You can sell it below parity for seed." Then they tacked on two limitations, namely, the other two amendments that will be considered directly. They said, "You cannot sell over 125,000,000 bushels for feed." It says nothing about wheat for breakfast food or for milling or for a thousand and one other purposes, but just for feed. That is the only limit.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. This amendment has nothing to do with the one hundred and twenty-five million that comes up later?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes. Those are two qualifying amendments, but the vital part of it is what we are considering now. In addition to the limit of 125,000,000 bushels for feed, they said: No grain for feed to be sold for less than 85 percent of corn parity.

The market on wheat today is $1.30 per bushel. The market on corn today is about $1 per bushel. Take wheat, which ought to bring $1.30 and sell it for 85 percent of corn parity, and it means that $1.30 wheat will be sold for 85 cents, if for feed. That, in a nutshell, is what the qualifying proviso will do.

That is what they are doing, that is what they have been doing, and that is what Mr. Hudson testified before the Senate committee, as you will find on page 259 of the Senate hearings.

There is no doubt as to what the facts are. Here are about 1,100,000,000 bushels of corn and wheat of which they can dispose. They will dump 125,000,000 bushels of wheat for feed, and your market is going down. Then what? You know what is going to happen to the price of corn, you know what is going to happen to the price of wheat. You know that if they make 575,000,000 gallons of alcohol to dehydrate, powder, which they propose to do, they can give it away if they like unles this language is put in the bill. Every bushel dumped into the market at a price below parity will displace grain which the farmer now holds and so affects the price.

I say to you farmers from Nebraska and Kansas that you have as much of a stake in this today as we have out in the Corn Belt, because your market will go to pot along with ours; make no mistake about that.

They want to do this for the feeders. How amazing. The May figure of the Department of Agriculture shows that beef was $2.53 per hundred above parity in May of this year, yet it is proposed to take from the corn farmer and the wheat farmer whose grain is below parity today and in addition subsidize the feeder whose livestock is $2.53 per hundred above parity today. Mutton is about parity, beef is about parity, hogs are about parity. Are the feeders to be subsidized at the expense of the corn and the wheat farmer, whose grain is substantially below parity today? Corn is still 15 to 20 cents a bushel below parity. When we go along with this language of the Senate, we will take a loss of at least 23 cents a bushel on every bushel of wheat that they sell. That is not my testimony; it is the testimony of Mr. Hudson, who is running the show down there.

You will finally break down the market from the parity level. In this bill we direct the Secretary of Agriculture to pay full parity for 1942. Break the market, let the price come down, and then what? You have to dip into the Federal Treasury and take larger and larger amounts in order to bring the farmer up to parity. Last year it was $212,000,000. It may be $500,000,000. When you bring that price down, having directed the Secretary of the Treasury to pay parity, you are going to dip into the Federal Treasury and take public funds once more to make up the gap, and then every cent per bushel of break there is in the grain market, on corn and wheat, the cost to Uncle Sam and to the taxpayer will be infinitely greater. Why should this be done? Frankly, I cannot understand it.

They say it is for storage, that there is an acute storage problem. Perhaps there was. I noticed, however, this statement in a Washington paper yesterday morning:

> Grain storage crisis averted, so trade believes.

That was an Associated Press dispatch dated at Chicago June 20. They are meeting that storage situation a little at a time. But I say to you very frankly today that this certainly is no time to take a chance on breaking the grain market of the country, at a time when the costs of the farmers are going up.

What does the Department of Agriculture say about it? They say in the May issue of the Agricultural Situation that more people were hired on farms and higher prices were paid for farm labor than at any time in the last 12 years. As farm costs advance, is it fair to imperil the price and reduce the wage?

The Farm Bureau is against this. The National Grange is against it. Oddly enough, the American Live Stock Association, representing 85,000 feeders, speaking through Mr. E. W. Sheets, who testified before the Senate committee, is against it.

If they say it is required for feed, I direct your attention to page 5 of the Agricultural Situation, issued by the Department of Agriculture for May, in which they say this:

> The output of high-protein feeds will be considerably larger, about 15 percent larger, than in 1942–43.

That same bulletin, issued in May by the Department of Agriculture, states:

> The hog supply will be 15 percent larger than last year.

If they say it is needed for other meat and milk, this is what their own bulletin says:

> Farmers this spring have been breaking all former records in the production of meats, milk, and eggs.

There has been nothing persuasive brought to the attention of our committee or the committee of conference to indicate why we should recede from our position, so I say to you today that the motion now pending, to further insist upon our disagreement to the Senate amendment and to send this back to conference on a yea-and-nay vote, should be decisively upheld by this House.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY].

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, this item restricting the sales of farm products held by the Commodity Credit Corporation has been under consideration since this bill was sent to the Senate by the House more than a month ago. It has narrowed down until the issue here involved does not impress me as being of great importance insofar as wheat farmers are concerned. The issue now merely relates to the method of obtaining parity prices for wheat farmers.

I am sure that everyone will agree that this controversy in no way involves either cotton farmers or tobacco farmers. Since cotton and tobacco are the two principal money crops grown in my district, I think that I am in a position to discuss this matter impartially and without any degree of selfishness. While the farmers of my district are not very materially affected by the provision, I am, notwithstanding, most naturally interested in the welfare of all the farmers who might be affected. It appears to me that this is a fight between wheat growers and corn growers. It is entirely possible that the provisions inserted by the House committee and approved by the House would result in slightly higher market prices for some commodity than would be obtained by the amendment inserted in the Senate, which I understand is agreed to by the Secretary of Agriculture, the president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the President of the United States. However, any differences in the prices on the market would be made up by payments to the farmers so that the total to the producers of these commodities would not differ under the two proposals.

The Senate proposal would allow the Commodity Credit Corporation to continue to sell its surplus stocks in essentially the same manner as sales have been made in recent months. No sales of cotton or wheat have been made below parity in recent months. Sales of wheat and corn have been made at about 80 percent of parity in order to encourage the production of livestock. However, since more than 90 percent of all the corn produced is used in feeding livestock, the total income of farmers is not affected by the price at which corn is sold.

In recent months tobacco, wool, beef cattle, hogs, and most dairy products have averaged above parity. Since last December the combined average price of farm commodities has been near the parity level. In addition, farmers have received conservation and parity payments. The Secretary of Agriculture and those associated with him believe that it will not be possible to get the livestock production needed in the war effort if prices

of feed crops are substantially advanced. Many Members of this House from the wheat-producing areas believe that the House provisions would work to their disadvantage in that they would tend to restrict the use of wheat for feed and cause wheat stocks to accumulate until there would be no storage space available for succeeding crops of wheat. I am advised that wheat storage facilities are now greatly burdened. I understand that we have a full year's supply of wheat on hand and that storage facilities on farms are filled to overflowing and elevators throughout the country are likewise filled, and I have been told that much wheat now in storage is not adequately protected. I discussed this situation this morning with Governor Townsend, the present Administrator of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, and with Mr. J. B. Hutson, president of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and I was advised that in an effort to relieve the situation the Commodity Credit Corporation has obtained prefabricated bins sufficient to store 100,000,000 bushels of wheat and that these bins have been made available to farmers. I was also advised that the Office of Agricultural Defense Relations has recently obtained a priority order for 125 carloads of nails, which have been made available to farmers in the construction of additional storage facilities.

The distinguished gentleman from Georgia has said to the House that he is willing to abide by the judgment of the wheat growers of the country. I see here in front of me my distinguished and able friend the gentleman from Oregon, Governor PIERCE, who represents one of the great wheat-growing areas of the country, and the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the ranking minority member of the House Committee on Agriculture, and many other Members from wheat-growing areas, most of whom I believe are in favor of the Senate amendment. I think that this problem should be regarded as national in its scope, rather than confined to any particular section. Yet, at the same time, I have a very profound respect for the views of Governor PIERCE, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], and other gentlemen from wheat-producing areas, and I believe that they are right in the position they have taken in favor of the Senate amendment. I understand that wheat is now selling for 80 percent of parity, whereas the loan provides a floor of 85 percent of parity. The law requiring the Commodity Credit Corporation to make loans at 85 percent of parity to wheat producers also provides that it shall not be required to make loans unless the wheat is safely stored and protected. As I see it, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Senate, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the President, by insisting upon being permitted to sell wheat below parity for feed purposes are merely trying to convert a surplus commodity—that is, wheat—into livestock, so that a meat shortage might be prevented, I am sure that none of us want to see the time when meat will be rationed, and it appears entirely possible if feed prices are advanced too high, livestock production would not be sufficient to take care of lend-lease shipments and our own needs without some form of rationing. Notwithstanding the present controversy, the administration can under existing law and authority lend or lease at a price less than parity, or for that matter, without any price being fixed at all, all of the stocks now on hand. In other words all of the grain now in storage and controlled by the Commodity Credit Corporation could be given to England or to Russia or to our other Allies, but by the position taken by the House the same grain could not be sold to the producers of livestock in this country at less than parity price, even though an increase in the production of livestock is now admittedly essential in the war effort. The effect of the Senate amendment is to permit the Government to acquire wheat from farmers at parity prices and to sell the wheat to the producers of livestock at a price somewhat less than parity, to the end that livestock producers might be induced to produce the meat requirements of the war program.

I, of course, do not know what the President will do, but I predict that if the House insists upon disagreeing to the Senate amendment, this bill will be vetoed and the news will then go out to the country that the President has vetoed a bill providing parity payments to farmers. This, of course, is entirely erroneous. Those who are opposing the Senate amendment are today trying to lead the House to believe that the principle of parity is involved in this controversy. It is not here involved. I am for parity for the farmers; always have been and always shall be, but the result of the action taken on this amendment might be to actually prevent farmers being eligible for even the 85-percent parity loan which has heretofore been provided. Unless some of the wheat now in storage is disposed of and storage facilities are made available for the new crop, farmers will not in all probability be able to meet the storage requirements of the Commodity Credit Corporation so as to be eligible for loans. I do not believe that this agency of the Government should have its hands tied, especially when the Commodity Credit Corporation is trying to meet the needs of the crisis which we are now facing.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Not just now. I only have a few minutes.

I cannot see the logic of the arguments which have been made in opposition to the Senate amendment. The sale of wheat below parity is necessary because of a lack of storage facilities and because much of the wheat now in storage is deteriorating, and further because we need to encourage the production of beef and pork with which to feed the fighting forces of our Nation and the fighting forces of our Allies.

If wheat cannot now be sold in the market place for more than 80 percent of parity, it certainly appears that the wheat now being harvested will find its way into Government loans if proper storage facilities can be provided, and it, therefore, naturally follows that the new crop will be added to the crop now in storage, and we will have a tremendous surplus of wheat accumulating which will reflect itself as a great burden upon the market, and it appears that if this procedure is followed, we are leading right into another Farm Board catastrophe and at a time when we can ill afford to permit such a situation to occur.

Out of the discussion of Commodity Credit Corporation sales policies has emerged the belief on the part of some that this agency of the Government is going out of its way to hold down farm prices; that if the prices for corn and wheat were left to themselves they would rise to parity and above. As a matter of fact, if it were not for the Federal programs for wheat and corn, the price for both commodities not only would be below parity, but they probably would be far below 85 percent of parity. The reasons for this are evident when we look at the supply of corn, wheat, and other feeds. The supply of corn and other feed is at record high levels and we will have a carry-over of wheat on July 1, 1942, of about 630,000,000 bushels, another record. There is so much more wheat on hand than is needed for domestic consumption and export that wheat, were it not for Federal programs, would be used for feed in such quantities that the price for all grains would be far below present levels.

We have stored up stocks of feed, thus protecting farm prices and income, on the theory that the grain would be available for use in time of emergency. This is the essential idea of the ever-normal granary. If we ever had an emergency, we have one now. We should be free to use our feed in the manner which will best help win this war. I do not see how we can defend any proposal which will tie our hands and prevent us from using our resources to the fullest extent in this grave, grave period in our history.

This matter has now been before us for more than a month. The leaders in the Senate and the executive branch of the Government have agreed upon the proposition. The Senate seems unwilling to accept the proposal of the House and in the light of all of the circumstances I believe that in the long run it will be to the interest of farmers for us to accept the Senate's proposal and thus end the many uncertainties that will continue to exist in the minds of farmers and the country generally until this matter is disposed of. I, therefore, urge you to accept the Senate amendment and end the controversy.

There is a bill pending before the House Committee on Agriculture which provides for 100-percent parity loans on agricultural commodities. The chairman of the committee has been authorized to conduct hearings and to invite the Secretary of Agriculture, the President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Chairman of the War Production Board, and the Price Administrator to appear before the committee for the purpose of discussing this very controversial subject. It is an important matter and should be given careful consideration by a legislative committee. Those of you who are interested in obtaining parity loans should give consideration to

the bill now pending, for that, and not this, is the way to obtain parity prices for farmers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I concur in the position taken by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] on this amendment, and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Georgia may prevail and that the conferees may be instructed to insist upon their disagreement.

My chief purpose, however, in asking for this brief time is to revert, with the permission of the House, to amendment No. 42, which we have just adopted. That is the amendment which provides an addition of $4,000,000 for forest-fire protection. I want to congratulate the chairman and the House conferees for at least partially receding from the position they took on the matter of forest-fire protection at the time the subject was originally in the House. You may recall that at that time a number of us from the Pacific coast, including myself, made a new point in behalf of an increased appropriation for forest-fire protection because, as we contended, there was added danger to the west coast forests on account of the probable bombing and bombardment of the Pacific Northwest, which, under certain conditions, might destroy the forests.

You are aware, of course, that a few days ago the Oregon coast was bombarded by a Japanese submarine. Many, no doubt, wondered why the Jap submarine took the trouble to do that. The fact is that at least a part of the reason for that bombardment was to set the Coast Range forests on fire. The submarine dropped nine shells on the beach, and the forests in that area come right down to the beach. It happened at the time to be wet weather. Had it been in our dry season, which begins next month, the probability is that one or more of those nine shells might have started a very destructive forest fire. We need this additional money in order to protect against just such a repetition of this bombardment, or the possibility of a more effective bombardment by Japanese long-range bomber aircraft.

I was called from the Chamber just before the distinguished gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] made his explanation in chief of this amendment. What I wanted to ask him when I interrogated him a few moments ago, was why the House conferees did not go the whole way and accept the $5,000,000 Senate increase instead of the $4,000,000 compromise. The parliamentary situation, of course, was such that nothing could be done about it, but I am very glad to have the additional $4,000,000, and I wish to compliment and congratulate the chairman for this very liberal concession.

I do want to say this word of warning to the House, however: The chances are, on account of the situation which now obtains in the Aleutians, that until the Navy and the Army are able to take care of that situation and bomb the Japs entirely out of that area—and I hope and have good reason to believe that will be only a short time—we may expect a repetition of what happened on the coast a few days ago, and we may expect it to be repeated as long as the Japs have a foothold at Kiska Island. For this reason, we may have to ask for additional money for forest-fire protection in a very short time; and if we do, I hope the House will grant it to us, so that if the forests are again endangered by enemy activity we may have the facilities to take care of the situation promptly and effectively.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I quote now what the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] said in the Senate yesterday:

> Let me point out further, while I am on my feet, that under the provisions of the House bill the Government of the United States could not utilize 1 pound of the grain which is the property of the Government in the manufacture of synthetic rubber or in the manufacture of alcohol to produce high explosives to use in this war, unless it paid 100 percent of parity to the Commodity Credit Corporation.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] very plainly said that we have to get this grain from the broker. We do not have to get it from the broker. We have it now. It belongs to the Government, is in its possession now, and it is the Government-owned grain only that we are going to use. I suggest in reference to protecting the price of corn that, if you will add, at the end of line 23, in amendment No. 86, the words "or at less than the prevailing price of corn in the locality where it is sold," you will protect the price of corn. I admit that relates to feeding only; there is a difference between feeding and manufacturing synthetic rubber and explosives for our soldiers to use. We had no idea when this legislation was first considered that we would ever want to use grain for alcohol to put into explosives, and we had no idea of using grain in the manufacture of synthetic rubber, but now we are at war, and we do need it for that purpose. Are you going to tell your Government that it cannot use that which it has and which it owns, for that purpose, to prosecute the war?

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman half a minute more. I do this to correct the gentleman from Missouri. I said this grain, if not used for feeding purposes, would have to be procured by the Government from the broker through the grain dealers on the open market.

Mr. COCHRAN. I understand we have more in the hands of the Government now than we will need under the provisions of this proposal for alcohol and rubber.

Mr. TARVER. I simply corrected the quotation the gentleman undertook to quote from my remarks, and he inadvertently incorrectly did so.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of the House amendment, there is no limitation on the amount of wheat the Government can sell at any price for alcohol or rubber purposes. So that point is out of the way. For many years we have fought for parity prices for the farmer. That has been the objective of the Members of Congress from the agricultural sections, and that point has been sustained by Congress on numerous occasions. The farmers particularly do not like to get money out of the United States Treasury. They would rather receive parity prices in the market places, because they know that it is not sound for the Government to continually pay out money from the Treasury, especially at a time when we are operating under such tremendous war burdens.

The Department of Agriculture may have several reasons why they want to keep prices down below parity. I will give you one of them. You know a large organization has been built up in the country under the name of the Agricultural Adjustment Administration, the triple A, and they would like to keep that organization because their work consists in regulating and controlling production in the United States among the farmers on all basic commodities. They send out checks to the farmers of the country. They want to continue to send out those checks to the farmers, and they want to continue to maintain their organization and they know that under the law the moment these farm prices get to parity, there is an end to the entire triple A program. Therefore, they want to continue holding all farm prices down under parity, so that checks may go out and they may continue their tremendous organization throughout the United States for personal and political purposes.

I do not think the prices of farm products are tremendously high at the present time. Just look back at the 1920's, when we were paying much more than we are today, and I think, after all, we from the agricultural sections, should stick by the principle of parity, so that the farmers may get their money in the market places and not from the United States Treasury.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL].

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] said the question of parity was not involved; that the statute is still on the books, and that the Government had to pay parity just the same; but I submit to you this question in arithmetic: If they beat down the price both on corn and wheat, that means a lower price on all livestock down below parity, and the Government then has to come and buy all the rest and pay parity price, where is the economy?

You read on the highest authority the other day that under this lease-lend we do not expect any repayment. Then why not give this away if you have got too much of it? We are giving food to all our Allies. Charge it off. Charge noth-

ing. Do not even take that paper scrap. That is one way to get rid of it and not reduce every farm-commodity price.

No. This is an adroit and smooth manner, yet clumsy, of attempting to repeal the parity law without calling it so by name. You could not do that, with the vote by which it was passed in this House. But you want to do it, in effect.

Every man coming from any section of America who remembers the World War and this war knows that the prices of farm products and wages went up together, and that Woodrow Wilson had to pull wheat down and freeze it at $2—a price at which it never will sell in this war. At the beginning of this war, wages immediately jumped to the first World War wages, but farm prices never traveled very far in that direction, and are far from it now. That great disparity stands there. But what little gains were made, you now propose to give it the knock-out drops. Then you have this propaganda, "Pay off your debts." How can a farmer pay off his debts with his farm labor doubled and everything which he buys with the farm-product dollar moved up in price? How is he going to pay his debts? This disparity is staring him in the face. That is why we want parity today, to maintain at least some degree of equality.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, amendment No. 83, on which we are soon to vote, strikes out the word "and" and inserts the word "or." As a result grain which has deteriorated or grain that is sold for the purpose of feeding or for the purpose of manufacturing into alcohol can be sold below parity. As a matter of fact, those sales that have been made on this alcohol proposition away below parity have not actually affected the market. The sales have been going on for 6 months and they are still going on below parity, without affecting the market. That is a new activity. It means money out of the Federal Treasury when those sales are made for that purpose, in one place or another, either out of war money or out of commodity credit money. It does not make very much difference which.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Not at this time. I do not have the time. If they are not to call grain "deteriorated in quality" by a kind of loose construction which will permit them to call any grain which is over a year old and has been in storage that long "deteriorated," perhaps this language might be needed in order to provide the grain to make alcohol. I cannot see where any farmer is hurt a bit by the adoption of this amendment and I shall favor it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. FULMER].

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I believe every Member of this House will agree that during my long service in Congress I have put forth every effort possible in trying to help solve the problems of the farmer and in giving serious consideration to farm legislation. In other words, I have specialized in this line of work in Congress. I realize at this moment it is not the time or the place to write legislation or pass legislation while considering this appropriation bill that will do many things that should be done and that I am interested in having done, but I do believe in the future, especially after this emergency, we should go into all of these farm problems of which there are many. We should revamp much of our farm legislation so as to put it on a sound common-sense business basis and see to it that farmers get that which they have been promised and that which they are entitled to.

We are operating today under confusion with speculation up and down every day, Congress, the House and the Senate, disagreeing; Henderson and Wickard going, in a great many instances, in different directions. Farmers are up in the air with more problems today than ever in the history of the country. I want to say to you without going into the many questions that have been debated here today that I want you to back the House conferees and send this back to conference. I may state to you that during the last 2 or 3 days I have been doing quite a lot of missionary work and I believe that if we send this item back to conference we can work this out on a sound, common-sense, satisfactory basis to all concerned, and bring something back to the House that each of us can agree upon, and settle this problem satisfactorily to the farmers, the consumers, and the White House.

I want to say to my friends who represent consumers and labor—and I represent both—in trying to be helpful to the farmers, that class of people who operate as individuals, and who are helpless and hopeless in controlling and managing their business as to proper marketing and in securing fair prices, that I have always endeavored to try to be fair to labor and to the consumers of this country.

I request that you send this item back to conference. I am not at liberty to tell you just what I have on my mind, but I believe we have a definite arrangement whereby we will work this out in conference perfectly satisfactorily to everybody, do away with all confusion and speculation, give to farmers 100-percent parity without a subsidy, and permit the selling of surplus products in such a manner that will be satisfactory to Wickard, Henderson, and the President.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I would be perfectly willing to send this amendment back to conference if I felt that the conferees might be able to get together on a reasonable solution of the differences between the House and the Senate. A while ago, however, I asked the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee whether he had any hope that it would be possible to get together. At that time he informed me he had no such hope. If when we vote today to instruct the conferees, it means that we are urging our conferees to stand irrevocably by the position of the House when we know that the Senate has twice voted to take a diametrically opposite position. Therefore, I feel that I cannot vote to send the bill back to conference with such instructions and no hope of a compromise because if I must make a choice, I favor the Senate provision.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield, although my time is very limited.

Mr. TARVER. I feel that if the gentleman from South Carolina has any substitute proposition in mind, he ought not to keep it a secret but he ought to offer it here as a substitute motion and let the House vote on it.

Mr. HOPE. I think there is something to what the gentleman says. However, I want to speak directly to this amendment. I do not believe that those of us who are in favor of parity price on farm products, in favor of a parity program—and I am talking now to my friends from the corn-producing areas—I do not believe that we can afford to have this present program of loans break down. The only thing that keeps the price of farm products—that is the basic commodities—where it is today, and I am speaking especially of the grains, is the loan program. You cannot keep the loan program going unless you have some control and unless you have some way of disposing of your surplus; it will break down as the Farm Board program broke down.

The price of corn is what it is today, the return to the corn farmer is what it is today, because of the fact he can get a loan at 85 percent of parity. If this program breaks down in any particular—and it is going to break as far as wheat is concerned unless you find some way to move this great surplus of wheat—if you cannot move that, the program is going to break down and then you will get a lot less for corn, wheat, and all these other commodities than you are getting for them today.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, our brilliant colleague from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN] who made the big argument forgets the fact that we have a legislated price for wheat and corn and have had for years. Had we not had such a price the corn farmers would have been broke and the wheat farmers would have been broke. Only the fact that the farmers had a place where they could go and turn the wheat and corn over to the Government and get, on a nonrecourse note, 85 percent of parity has kept them going. Corn and wheat farmers cannot afford to lose the farm program.

A few years ago we raised 80,000,000 acres of wheat. That has been cut down under the quotas until now it is 55,000,000 acres. That wheat acreage is the minimum under the law. The Department will, perhaps, come to us in a few days and ask us to cut the wheat acreage again. How are you going to vote against that with millions of bushels of wheat in storage and no place to sell it?

I am for the Senate amendment. I cannot see the logic of the position of those who argue so eloquently here for a farm program and deny the Government the right to sell the surplus. We are in danger of breaking the program which has helped so many. I was raising wheat when we had a farm program under Hoover. I held 60,000 bushels of wheat, and I saw it drop 30 cents a bushel in just about 3 days. It just broke the country.

I would vote to raise to full parity the loan value on basic commodities. I would also vote to give the Government the right to sell that wheat anywhere at any price they can get.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE].

RUBBER FROM AMERICAN FARMS

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, a story of vital significance to American agriculture, and to the corn and wheat farmers of Indiana and the Middle West, has been unfolding before the Gillette Committee of the Senate in connection with its investigation of the manufacture of synthetic rubber from surplus farm products.

It is a story which deserves, but has not been receiving, front-page headlines—a story with a direct bearing on the problem of surplus grains—a story of how this administration, confronted with a golden opportunity to accomplish something of genuine benefit to agriculture, is muffing the chance and preparing to sell out to the great oil combines.

Committee witnesses have pointed out that, since our principal sources of raw rubber have been wiped out by the Japanese, the war needs of this country in the way of rubber have become so acute as to be almost desperate. New sources for at least 700,000 tons of rubber a year must be developed immediately, the committee has been told.

Where is this much-needed rubber coming from? What new sources of supply are to be developed? These are vital questions that the Gillette Committee has set out to answer.

The answer, of course, is synthetic rubber. It would take years to develop adequate sources of natural rubber on this continent, and time is of the essence. Synthetic rubber is the only practical alternative and our military leaders have known this since December 7.

Synthetic rubber of good quality can be produced rather simply from a chemical substance known as butadiene, which in turn can be derived from two sources—from high-proof alcohol, made from corn, wheat, and other surplus grains, and from petroleum products.

The question therefore arises—and this question is now plaguing official Washington—Shall our future source of synthetic rubber be surplus farm products or shall it be petroleum? Whatever source is chosen now will probably become a permanent source; thus, we have a clash between agriculture on the one hand and the petroleum interests on the other. The Government is the referee. The decision it makes now will be final.

The production of rubber from surplus farm products—from corn and wheat and rye, even from potatoes and sorghums—is not a mere scientist's dream. A procession of chemists has demonstrated to the Gillette committee, without exception and without dispute, that it can be done. It is a proven process, a practical reality.

Germany, for example, has been doing it for years. Today in Germany there are estimated to be 36,000 small plants, scattered throughout farm areas, for the production of rubber from farm products, and the production of alcohol to be used for power. There were 1,600 such plants existing in Poland before the Nazi invasion.

Polish scientists who perfected the process for producing rubber from grain alcohol are in America today. Their process has been tested in American laboratories, by our own chemists, who have found it practical and workable. It is a simple process, and in actual tests, using corn and wheat, our chemists have been able to produce between 6 and 7 pounds of rubber per bushel of grain.

Committee witnesses have testified that plants for the production of synthetic rubber from farm products can be established throughout the Middle West, convenient to the source of supply, and can be placed in operation within 6 months. The plants would cost approximately $20,000,000 for a capacity of each 100,000 tons of rubber per year, using only a small amount of critical materials Thus, the Government program of 700,000 tons a year would involve an initial investment of approximately $140,000,000.

The production of synthetic rubber from petroleum products, on the other hand, is a much costlier and slower process. The initial investment in money and in critical materials would be considerably larger. And it would take at least four times as long to get such processing into operation.

In the face of these facts—in this controversy between the agricultural and petroleum interests—what do you suppose the Government is doing? The Government, or rather the New Deal bureaucrats in charge of the Government, has taken a position in support of the oil combines and in direct opposition to the farmers of America. It has decided to allocate $650,000,000 for the construction of synthetic rubber plants in this country, and every dollar—mark this carefully—is being allocated to the petroleum industry. Agriculture is being cut off without a nickel.

This $650,000,000 is being advanced to the millionaire owners of the country's largest oil companies—to Du Pont, to Standard Oil, to Pure Oil, to Shell, to Gulf, to Sinclair, to Socony-Vacuum, to Cities Service, and several others—to finance the construction of synthetic-rubber plants capable of producing 700,000 tons annually from petroleum products.

In return for these millions, what will the Government get? It will get rubber, yes; but how soon? Conservative estimates indicate that it will take at least 2 years to get these plants into operation. Two long years of waiting for rubber that our planes, tanks, trucks, and armored units need today—desperately. At least 3 or 4 years before rubber is available for civilian use, in the form of tires for defense workers, farmers, and others, who even now are threatened with gasoline rationing as a rubber-conservation measure.

After the war, which will end, God willing, sooner or later, these Government-financed plants will be owned and controlled by the great oil companies, and their profits will flow into the pockets of a selfish group of eastern millionaires.

This, then, is the bill of goods that the petroleum interests have sold to a gullible Government. This is the program which the lobbyists and dollar-a-year men of the great oil companies are putting over at the expense of the people, and of American farmers in particular.

Summing up briefly, if the petroleum industry obtains a monopoly on the production of our synthetic rubber needs:

First. It will cost the Government $650,000,000 to finance the program.

Second. It will take at least 2 years to get production under way.

Third. Large amounts of critical metals will be required.

Fourth. After the war the plants will be owned and controlled by a few millionaire oil barons and operated for their exclusive enrichment.

On the other hand, if agriculture were to have control of the program:

First. It would cost the Government only $140,000,000.

Second. It would take only 6 months to get plants in operation.

Third. Critical materials required would be much smaller.

Fourth. After the war, plants using surplus grains would serve as a steadying influence in our agricultural economy, perhaps averting a post-war depression, and benefits would accrue to millions of our citizens rather than a few millionaires.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us consider another phase of this picture. For the past several years the Government has been paying out millions of dollars in subsidies to encourage farmers to decrease production of corn and wheat. Even today the farmers in my district are being penalized for overproducing. In spite of this fact, the present surplus of corn and wheat is so large that storage facilities are taxed to capacity, and there is danger that some of the present crop will be left to rot in the fields.

Testifying before the Gillette committee, Secretary of Agriculture Wickard reported that the current wheat supply is the largest in history, and that we will start the new crop year, July 1, with a carry-over of 630,000,000 bushels. When

this year's crop is harvested, he estimates we will have a total supply of almost 1,500,000,000 bushels.

Secretary Wickard urged that at least 80,000,000 bushels of wheat be used each year to produce 200,000,000 gallons of alcohol, using existing distilleries. This in turn would produce approximately 240,000 tons of synthetic rubber.

Carrying Secretary Wickard's recommendation even farther, Senator GILLETTE has pointed out that if agriculture were given the job of producing our entire annual rubber requirements—700,000 tons—approximately 230,000,000 bushels of surplus grain would be taken out of storage bins, and off the market, each year.

Evidence received by the committee, however, makes it clear that the war program not only excludes agriculture from the production of rubber, it contemplates no expansion whatever of distilling facilities for the production of grain alcohol.

Group after group has come to Washington—from Nebraska, from Missouri, from South Dakota, from Illinois, and from other States—and asked for means to establish grain alcohol plants in their territories. In every instance, they have been turned down, sometimes by dollar-a-year men still drawing pay from the petroleum industry.

One cooperative group from Nebraska, headed by Dr. Leo M. Christensen, of the University of Nebraska chemurgy project, and other imminent scientists, came here and said they were ready to develop five Midwest plants for the production of butadiene from alcohol, immediately. They were told that money would not be forthcoming from any Government agency for financing their plants.

So they returned home and raised the money—every dollar of it. Back in Washington they said, "We have our funds. We don't need Government financing." They were then informed that they could not have the materials, that they were needed in the war effort.

Not daunted, they sent men out over the country to obtain options on second-hand equipment which was standing idle in plants closed by the war. They succeeded in obtaining 80 percent of the required equipment in this fashion, without help from the Government. Returning here, with the options in their pocket, they requested priorities on the remaining 20 percent. The answer they received was: "We do not care if you need only 2 percent. You cannot have it."

Mr. Speaker, the obvious and sensible thing for the Government to do, if it is really interested in finding a solution to our agricultural problems, is to take the surplus grain it has stored away and use it in the production of grain alcohol and butadiene. We could then obtain a large supply of synthetic rubber in a short time, and by doing so could reduce the present surplus of grain which constitutes such a problem to the farmers of the country. The Government has it on hand and owns it. If it is kept it will deteriorate in value and serve as a constant threat to the corn and wheat parity programs.

But, instead, the Government is granting millions of dollars to the large oil companies to enable them to manufacture rubber out of petroleum products, shipping the petroleum long distances and tying up our already overburdened transportation system. It has turned a deaf ear to those of us who wish to use surplus grains for the manufacture of rubber, in plants conveniently located in the farm States, adjacent both to raw materials and to markets for byproducts.

The only possible reason we can imagine for this is the powerful influence the petroleum interests have in the War Production Board and other agencies of the Government. Either that, or this administration has forsaken the farmers completely and just is not interested in providing constructive, permanent outlets for surplus farm products and developing a sound economy for agriculture, independent of Government subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, from the standpoint of cost of production, of speed in acquiring supplies of much-needed rubber, of accomplishing the greatest good for the greatest number, and from the standpoint of a fair and equitable solution to our agricultural problems, I want to plead with my colleagues to exert their utmost influence in behalf of surplus farm products as the speediest, most economic and most practical source of synthetic rubber.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks at this point to include a letter from Mr. Hassil E. Schenck, president of the Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., and a newspaper article from the Washington Star of June 24, 1942.

The letter and news story follow:

INDIANA FARM BUREAU, INC.,
Indianapolis, Ind., June 16, 1942.

Hon. GEORGE W. GILLIE,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GILLIE: As you are a member of the House Agricultural Committee, I wish to present what I think to be an issue of great import in the ultimate solution of the economic farm problem for the future.

There has been a controversy for a number of years as to the blending of high-proof alcohol with gasoline as an efficient motor fuel. Numerous tests and experiments have revealed the efficiency of such a blend, but it has been vigorously opposed by the petroleum interests because this fuel alcohol would supplant something like 10 percent of the gasoline for motor consumption.

Now, we have the possible use of high-proof alcohol made from corn, wheat, and other commodities containing starch and from which can be made the substance butadiene from which synthetic rubber is made. This is identical with the butadiene which is made from petroleum products and for which the petroleum industry in America is fighting to gain a monopoly. I have absolute proof of the sound economy of the making of synthetic rubber from high-proof alcohol as compared with that made from petroleum products. We are made to wonder at the attitude of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in supplying funds to the petroleum interests rather than to the grain interests of our country.

To produce rubber from petroleum will cost $93,000,000 for a capacity of each 100,000 tons of rubber per year and will require approximately 2 years to get such processing into operation. To produce rubber from grain will cost approximately $25,000,000 for a capacity of each 100,000 tons of rubber per year and can be placed in operation within a 6-month period from the date the "go" sign is given for the construction of such plants.

Since the sources of rubber from the Dutch East Indies have been completely annihilated, and since it will be at least 7 years before there can be any further sources of rubber from these islands, there is naturally a clamor as to what the sources of rubber in our country shall be. Whatever becomes the source in this 7-year period will in all probability become a permanent source; consequently, the clash between petroleum and agricultural interests of our country.

The directing head of the Sun Oil Co. owns and controls the National Farm Journal and employs an editor who is also the executive official of the National Chemurgic Council, apparently for the specific purpose of protecting the petroleum industry at every instance where petroleum and agricultural interests clash.

The Standard Oil Co has a close-working relationship with the National Distilleries—which incidentally constitutes the largest distilling corporation in America—and with an overlapping personnel, apparently for the specific purpose of protecting the petroleum interests when conflicts occur.

Now comes H. V. Kaltenborn, one of the highest-paid news analysts of the world, a broadcaster over National Broadcasting Co., and paid by the Pure Oil Co. In his June 15 broadcast he severely criticized any attempt at making synthetic rubber from grain and advocated petroleum as the source, and presented statements contrary to the facts as revealed by scientific studies by individuals and groups interested in the earliest production of rubber supplies for our country.

If the petroleum industry becomes the source of synthetic rubber for the future, the money will flow into the pockets of a small group of millionaire interests, and furthermore, will tend to deplete the future source of supply as all oil wells are sooner or later exhaustible For agriculture to become the future source of the synthetic rubber supply of our country will mean that the income will flow into the pockets of millions of our citizens rather than a few millionaires, and the supply will be replenishable year after year.

The farmers of America drifted away from their own source of power when they turned from horses and mules to the tractor. They made grains cheap and petroleum products high. We now have an opportunity to recover for the farmer a constructive outlet for a considerable portion of his products, which, in my opinion, will go further in solving the future economic problems of agriculture than any other steps which could be taken at this time.

From the opposition to the manufacture of rubber from grain exerted by the petroleum industry it appears that the petroleum interests would rather have the war prolonged another 1½ years than have the petroleum industry lose out on the opportunity to manufacture rubber for carrying on the war and for domestic purposes.

Yours very sincerely,
HASSIL E. SCHENCK,
President, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.

[From the Washington Evening Star of June 24, 1942]

SENATE UNIT APPROVES RUBBER SUPPLY AGENCY USING FARM PRODUCTS—LEGISLATION WOULD GIVE ORGANIZATION SUPREME AUTHORITY OVER FIELD

The Senate Agriculture Committee approved legislation today to create a rubber supply agency to have supreme authority in

the field of increasing synthetic rubber production from agriculture and forest products.

The President would appoint a director whose duty it would be, the legislation said, to "make available at the earliest possible time, an adequate supply of rubber which, when added to rubber being supplied by other agencies, will be sufficient to meet the military and civilian needs."

Meanwhile, a pioneer experimenter in synthetic rubber told a Senate Agriculture Subcommittee that the country had sufficient raw materials now to produce enough rubber for military needs.

The Senate group, seeking a method of producing an abundant domestic supply of rubber from alcohol derived from grain, heard Dr. O. R. Sweeney of the Ohio State College of Agriculture, contending that grain was the sole source available in enough quantities to meet the Nation's rubber needs.

"Therefore," he asserted, "it would be advisable to make alcohol from grain and produce it in quantities as rapidly as needed and convert it into rubber.

"If we do this within the year, we will be able to produce enough rubber for our war needs."

Dr. Sweeney also declared that from his experiments and other knowledge of synthetic rubber production, the use of alcohol was a cheaper process.

"It would be more complicated and would take longer to produce it from petroleum than from grain," he added.

Mr. GILLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter and an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GILLIE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the remainder of the time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there is only one question before the House. The question you are voting on here is, Are you going to cut the farmer's pay? Of course, there is the incidental question, Will you preserve parity or destroy parity?

Out of all the welter of legislation for all other groups Congress has given the farmer only one and that is parity. This amendment proposes to destroy parity. It proposes to destroy it now and destroy it after the war. It proposes to eliminate the only safeguard you have ever given the farmer, the only assurance of a living price for his products; and his products are his wages. So in voting to cut parity you are voting to cut the farmer's pay.

The farmer works longer and harder than any other group. Is there anyone on this floor now who will dispute that statement? If so I give him the opportunity to rise now and be heard. No one rises, of course not. The farmer works from sunup until sundown, he works every day in the week, he does not take off Saturday and the stock must be fed Sunday. He works longer and harder than any other group in America.

The farmer receives less pay than any other group in America. Will anybody here dispute that statement? If so, let him speak now or forever hold his peace. The per capita income of the farmer is about one-fourth of that of the nonfarmer.

The farmer works harder and receives less pay and he does the job better than any other group in America today. He is producing the most essential munitions of war and he has continued to produce it until we have surpluses piled up on every side. The farmer works longer and does a better job and receives less pay than anybody else. And now in this amendment it is proposed to reduce even that little pay, and a vote for the amendment is a vote to sell his products at less than parity—a vote to reduce his pay.

Are you going to do that? Are you going to single out the man who works the hardest, who does the best job, who gets the least—and cut his pay—when everybody else is reaping the richest harvest in history?

I do not believe this House or the American people are that heartless.

The farmer is the only worker in America who supplements his own work with the work of his family. On the farm the man's wife and the man's children work with him, all for the one wage. When you vote to reduce the pay of the farmer by selling at less than parity, you are voting to reduce the pitiable pittance that the farmer's wife receives for her labor and the meager pay the farmer's children receive. Are you going to do that? I do not believe this House will do it. I do not believe that the American people will permit you to do it.

The American farmer is less adequately nourished than any other worker in America. I have been on dairy farms which sold cream every day but did not serve a drop of cream on their table. I have been on farms where they raised cattle and never served beef on their table. I have been on farms which sold eggs every day and never served an egg on the table except the eggs that were cracked, broken, or unsalable. Everything that was salable had to go to market to pay the interest and the taxes.

That was proven when the statistics were compiled of men who were rejected in the draft because of malnourishment. The greatest number, the larger percentage of men in my State, were rejected from the draft who came from farms because they had not had the proper diet than were rejected from the city. Let me tell you, if any of you people are out of a job, if you are hungry, and if you will go to the farmer's house and ask him either at the front door or the back door, the farmer will share his meager fare with you. I do not believe that the American people who dine sumptuously every day on cream, eggs, beef, and ham that the farmer raises, are going to ask the farmer for a handout at less than it costs the farmer to produce it. Yet that is what you propose to do here.

My good friend said that he raised cotton and he raised tobacco in his country, therefore he was not concerned, but the future of the whole agricultural industry is bound up in this amendment. If you break parity for one, you break parity for all. What happened when they began to sell at less than parity? Not only wheat, corn, and rye, and oats dropped immediately and drastically, but cotton went down $15 a bale, and it stayed down until they got assurances that no more cotton would be sold by the Government. A Member on this floor who raises cattle told me not more than 30 minutes ago that as a result of this campaign against farm prices the price of his cattle had declined on an average of $30 a steer. O Mr. Speaker, when you affect one American farm product you affect all farm products. They are following the Hitler method, "divide and conquer." They are taking us one at a time and if you sit here and let them rob one, it is only a question of time before they get around to you.

The attitude of labor has been referred to. I am prolabor. Judged by my votes for labor bills, I belong to the labor bloc. I have voted for every bill that was calculated to improve the status of labor that has ever been presented to this House in the last 20 years.

I have followed William Green and Samuel Gompers, of revered memory, from my youth up. Samuel Gompers and William Green and Philip Murray have contributed more to human progress, have done more to foster American prosperity, and have added more to the sum total of human happiness than half the Governors, Congressmen, statesmen, and politicians throughout the Nation in the last half century.

I have followed them because I believed labor and agriculture have a common cause. Both must win their bread with their hands. Both of them fight the battle of the weak against the strong. Both have been exploited by commercialized greed. So they have a common cause. For years these leaders of men have preached the doctrine of the rights of the toiler, the right of the man who earns his bread by the sweat of his brow to a fair wage. Never yet have I heard them advocate a cut in the pay of a man who bears his share of the burden of life. And I do not believe they advocate it now. I do not believe any one of them favors cutting the farmer's pay. I say here and now, not a single labor leader in America is for this amendment. I ask the House to vote down the amendment and give the farmer and his wife and children at least a parity wage for their toil and sacrifice.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. All time has expired.

Without objection, the Clerk will again report the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House still further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 83.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. On that motion, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 177, nays 125, answered "present" 1, not voting 129, as follows:

[Roll No. 87]

YEAS—177

Allen, Ill.	Barden	Boren
Allen, La.	Barnes	Brooks
Andersen, H. Carl	Baumhart	Brown, Ga.
	Bender	Bryson
Andresen, August H.	Bennett	Butler
	Bishop	Byron
Arends	Boggs	Camp
Arnold	Bonner	Cannon, Mo.

Cartwright	Howell	Pittenger
Case, S. Dak.	Jackson	Ploeser
Chiperfield	Jacobsen	Plumley
Claypool	Jarman	Poage
Clevenger	Jennings	Priest
Collins	Jensen	Ramspeck
Colmer	Johns	Rankin, Miss.
Cooper	Johnson, Ill.	Rankin, Mont.
Copeland	Johnson, Luther A.	Rees, Kans.
Courtney	Johnson, Okla.	Richards
Cox	Johnson, W. Va.	Rivers
Cravens	Jones	Rizley
Crawford	Jonkman	Robinson, Utah
Creal	Keefe	Rockwell
Crowther	Kelly, Ill.	Rodgers, Pa.
Cunningham	Kerr	Russell
Davis, Tenn.	Kinzer	Sanders
Day	Kleberg	Shafer, Mich.
Dirksen	Knutson	Short
Domengeaux	Kramer	Smith, Ohio
Dondero	Lambertson	Smith, Wis.
Doughton	Lanham	Snyder
Duncan	Lea	South
Dworshak	LeCompte	Sparkman
Edmiston	Ludlow	Springer
Elliott, Calif.	McGregor	Steagall
Engel	McIntyre	Stefan
Englebright	McLaughlin	Stevenson
Fitzgerald	McMillan	Stratton
Flannagan	Magnuson	Sumner, Ill.
Ford, Miss.	Mahon	Sumners, Tex.
Fulmer	Manasco	Talbot
Gathings	Mansfield	Talle
Gibson	Martin, Iowa	Tarver
Gillie	Mason	Tenerowicz
Gore	Michener	Terry
Gossett	Mills, La.	Thomason
Graham	Moser	Tibbott
Granger	Mott	Van Zandt
Grant, Ala.	Mundt	Vinson, Ga.
Grant, Ind.	Nelson	West
Guyer	Nichols	Wheat
Gwynne	Norrell	White
Halleck	O'Hara	Whitten
Hare	O'Toole	Whittington
Harris, Ark.	Pace	Wickersham
Harris, Va.	Patman	Williams
Hébert	Patton	Winter
Heidinger	Pearson	Wolcott
Hill, Colo.	Peterson, Fla.	Wolfenden, Pa.
Hill, Wash.	Peterson, Ga.	Wright
Hobbs		Zimmerman

NAYS—125

Anderson, Calif	Gamble	Pheiffer, William T.
Anderson, N. Mex.	Gearhart	Pierce
Andrews	Gehrmann	Rabaut
Angell	Gerlach	Ramsay
Bates, Mass.	Gregory	Reed, N. Y.
Beam	Hancock	Rich
Beiter	Hartley	Robertson, Va.
Bell	Healey	Rogers, Mass.
Bloom	Hinshaw	Rolph
Boehne	Holbrock	Sabath
Bulwinkle	Holland	Sauthoff
Burgin	Holmes	Scrugham
Canfield	Hope	Shanley
Carlson	Houston	Sheppard
Carter	Hull	Simpson
Chapman	Hunter	Smith, Maine
Chenoweth	Imhoff	Smith, Pa.
Clark	Jenks, N. H.	Smith, Va.
Cochran	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Wash.
Coffee, Wash.	Kean	Spence
Cooley	Kefauver	Stearns, N. H.
Costello	Kilburn	Sullivan
Culkin	Kirwan	Sutphin
Curtis	Kopplemann	Taber
D'Alesandro	Kunkel	Thill
Dewey	Lane	Thom
Dingell	Lesinski	Thomas, Tex.
Disney	Lewis	Tolan
Ditter	McCormack	Treadway
Downs	McGranery	Voorhis, Calif.
Durham	McLean	Vorys, Ohio
Eaton	Maciora	Wadsworth
Eberharter	Martin, Mass.	Ward
Elliot, Mass.	May	Wasielewski
Elston	Meyer, Md.	Welch
Faddis	Miller	Wigglesworth
Fellows	Monroney	Woodruff, Mich.
Fitzpatrick	Murdock	Woodrum, Va.
Flaherty	Norton	Young
Folger	O'Brien, Mich.	Youngdahl
Ford, Thomas F.	O'Connor	
Gale	O'Neal	
	Paddock	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Hall, Leonard W.

NOT VOTING—129

Baldwin	Blackney	Bradley, Mich.
Barry	Bland	Bradley, Pa.
Bates, Ky.	Bolton	Brown, Ohio
Beckworth	Boykin	Buck
Buckler, Minn.	Hess	Powers
Buckley, N. Y.	Hoffman	Randolph
Burch	Hook	Reece, Tenn.
Burdick	Izac	Reed, Ill.
Byrne	Jarrett	Robertson, N. Dak.
Cannon, Fla.	Jenkins, Ohio	Robsion, Ky.
Capozzoli	Johnson, Ind.	Rockefeller
Casey, Mass.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Rogers, Okla.
Celler	Kee	Romjue
Clason	Kelley, Pa.	Sacks
Cluett	Kennedy, Martin J.	Sasscer
Coffee, Nebr.	Kennedy, Michael J.	Satterfield
Cole, Md.	Keogh	Scanlon
Cole, N. Y.	Kilday	Schaefer, Ill.
Crosser	Klein	Schuetz
Cullen	Kocialkowski	Schulte
Davis, Ohio	Landis	Secrest
Delaney	Larrabee	Shannon
Dickstein	Leavy	Sheridan
Dies	Lynch	Sikes
Douglas	McGehee	Smith, W. Va.
Drewry	McKeough	Somers, N. Y.
Ellis	Maas	Starnes, Ala.
Fenton	Maciejewski	Sweeney
Fish	Marcantonio	Thomas, N. J.
Fogarty	Merritt	Tinkham
Forand	Mills, Ark.	Traynor
Ford, Leland M.	Mitchell	Vincent, Ky.
Gavagan	Murray	Vreeland
Gifford	Myers, Pa.	Walter
Gilchrist	O'Brien, N. Y.	Weaver
Gillette	O'Day	Weiss
Green	O'Leary	Wene
Haines	Oliver	Whelchel
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Osmers	Wilson
Harness	Patrick	Wolverton, N. J.
Harrington	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Worley
Hart	Plauché	
Harter		
Heffernan		
Hendricks		

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. McGehee for, with Mr. Baldwin against.

Mr. Harness for, with Mr. Leonard W. Hall against.

Mr. Gilchrist for, with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey against.

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Kilday with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Leavy with Mr. Oliver.

Mr. McKeough with Mr. Sasscer.

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Randolph.

Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Burdick.

Mr. Kee with Mrs. Bolton.

Mr. Shannon with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Forand with Mr. Traynor.

Mr. Sikes with Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Boykin.

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, on this roll call I have a pair with the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. HARNESS. If he had been present he would have voted "yea." I voted "nay." I therefore withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 85 and 86 be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 85: On page 81, line 18, after "Agriculture", insert a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That not more than 125,000,000 bushels of wheat may be sold for feeding purposes."

Senate amendment No. 86: On page 81, beginning in line 20, insert the following: ": *Provided further*, That no grain shall be sold for feed at a price less than 85 percent of the parity price of corn at the time such sale is made."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House still further insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments Nos. 85 and 86.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Senate amendments Nos. 90 and 91, relating to the Farm Tenant Act and the appropriation made for the carrying out of the provisions of that act, be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 90: On page 84, line 19, strike out "$1,250,000" and insert "$2,000,000."

Senate amendment No. 91: On page 81, line 22, strike out "$25,000,000" and insert "$40,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendments with certain amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 90 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$1,625,000."

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 91 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in the said amendment, insert "$32,500,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. May I inquire of the gentleman from Georgia if the motion he has just made is approved by a majority of the conferees or by a majority of the subcommittee in charge of the bill?

Mr. TARVER. May I say to the gentleman that I expect to explain that matter fully in connection with my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, these two amendments relate to the farm-tenant land purchase program, one of them relating to the item of administrative expenses and the other to the item making provisions for loans.

When the bill was reported by the subcommittee to the full committee, it

contained a provision for $45,000,000 in loans. The Budget estimate for administrative expenses was $2,500,000.

The House reduced the provisions for these items to $1,250,000, one-half of the Budget estimate for administrative expenses, and to $25,000,000, or $20,000,000 below the figures in the bill as reported from the committee for the loan feature of the program. When the bill went to the Senate, the Senate increased the item for administrative expenses to $2,000,000, which was still $500,000 below the Budget estimate, and increased the figures for the loan program to $40,000,000 which was exactly the amount of the Budget estimate.

We have been in conference with the Senate with regard to these differences for quite a long while. Apparently, we have exhausted every possibility of arriving at an agreement concerning these appropriations, unless the House would be willing to accept the compromise motion which I have offered and which, if it is adopted, would divide in half the differences between the House and the Senate, appropriating for the administrative expense item $1,625,000 instead of $2,000,000 as proposed by the Senate, and an amount which would be $875,000 below the Budget and appropriating $32,500,000 for the loan program, which would be $7,500,000 above the House figures and $7,500,000 below the Senate figures and, likewise, below the Budget.

Your subcommittee which serves as conferees on this bill, is evenly divided on this question. The motion which I have offered has not been offered in behalf of the conferees, but only in behalf of four of the conferees, including myself, which four constitute one-half of the committee on conference.

We have been advised that if the House should approve this compromise motion the Senate will accept. That is, accept the compromise, and the difficulties with reference to this particular portion of the bill will be eliminated. It is impossible, as I am sure you understand, that the House conferees in conference should be able to procure Senate acceptance of every House position. Especially is this true when half of the House conferees believe that the Senate position is fair.

So, under these circumstances we are appealing to you by offering this compromise motion to permit the enactment of this legislation by the first of the next fiscal year. Unless we can reach a basis for compromise, and this seems to be a fair basis, there does not appear any possibility of agreement.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I will yield to the gentleman later.

The Senate on yesterday voted, as I recall, 52 to 7, to insist upon its position with reference to these particular amendments. This is an overwhelming majority. The Senate is a coordinate legislative body. If we are to arrive at legislation in connection with this bill, that is, if we are to pass an appropriation for the Department of Agriculture at all, we must accord to their viewpoint proper consideration.

I do not think it is appropriate at this time to reenter into a discussion of the arguments pro and con with regard to the farm-tenant-land-purchasing program. I am one of those who have observed in my own district and among a farm population which is two-thirds tenant, wonderful results. There have been wonderful accomplishments, not only for the tenants who have participated by being granted loans, but by improving the morale of all tenants, most of whom have not secured loans but yet have held up before them the incentive of so improving their farm records and their business records in the management of their crops as to show that they would probably repay a loan if one should be granted. Those who have been the beneficiaries of this program have repaid in excess of 99 percent of their current obligations, and prepayments of obligations not yet due would bring the amount to 120 percent of their obligations.

As against this, the business interests of this country who have borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are delinquent on their loans to the extent of 7.7 percent, while the percentage of delinquencies on these loans is less than 1 percent. When the poor American farm tenant is able to establish a record like that and make repayments to his Government of almost 100 percent of his current liabilities and some 6 or 7 percent above the percentage of repayments made by the business interests of this country into whose laps have been poured billions of dollars from the Federal Treasury, he is indeed making a record of which he is entitled to be proud.

But aside from that, I am appealing to you upon the basis of compromise and the enactment of this bill in some reasonable form to agree to the compromise proposal which I have submitted. It does not represent what I would do if the decision were left to me. I would not decrease this program at all, but I am endeavoring to find some basis upon which this matter of dispute may be satisfactorily worked out between the two Houses.

I now yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I would like to ask the gentleman what suggestion the conferees intend to make with regard to amendments No. 95 and No. 96.

Mr. TARVER. I think we ought to defer discussion of those amendments until we reach them, I will say to my colleague. I think we ought to pass upon these matters one at a time, but we hope in connection with those amendments also to offer a compromise proposal for the consideration of the House.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. As I understand the position of the gentleman, this appropriation bill is for the next fiscal year, beginning July 1, which is Wednesday of next week?

Mr. TARVER. That is correct.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. And unless some compromise is made, and the bill finally passed, the fiscal year will begin without appropriations for this important work, and, as I understand, that is the motive that actuates the gentleman in offering this compromise?

Mr. TARVER. Yes. Unless we provide appropriations for the Department of Agriculture, the situation will be serious.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. Do I understand the gentleman to say that he believes the Senate and the Senate conferees will agree to the compromise that the gentleman has just offered?

Mr. TARVER. The Senate conferees have indicated that there is a very strong sentiment against any recession on the part of the Senate, but they have also indicated that if the House will agree to this compromise, they will recommend to the Senate that the House position be accepted.

Mr. JENSEN. I thank the gentleman. I think the motion of the gentleman ought to be agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I apologize to the House for talking again about this matter, but this keeps coming back here and there is nothing new which can be said on it. However, let us get clearly what is before us. The chairman of the subcommittee is not speaking for the majority of the subcommittee. He is speaking for half of that committee, not the majority of them. Under the rules, we have to defeat the gentleman's motion before we can even vote to insist upon the position of the House, strange to say, because the gentleman has taken an attitude that is his now and not an attitude of the majority of the subcommittee. Under his motion to concur with an amendment, we have to vote upon it before we can vote on the original position of the House, as he has already explained to us. This is the easiest thing in the whole agricultural appropriation bill on which to insist on the House position. There is nothing in this at all that is in any way connected with national defense. Back there on some of these other amendments we did have something of that kind, but here is an amendment put in by another body that insists upon selling the surplus with a concealed intention of reducing the price to save inflation, and now they come in here with something which is really inflationary, a proposition to loan money to buy land when land values are rising. This is something not needed at this time. If there is anything in the world that is inflationary, it is to loan men money to buy land when the price is advancing, and when it has nothing to do with defense. I hope, without taking any more time, that we will defeat this motion of the gentleman from Georgia, and then the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] can make his motion to insist upon the position of the House that we

have maintained here once or twice on a record vote overwhelmingly. This has nothing whatever to do with defense.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY].

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, the conferees have met twice on these amendments and changes in the bill, and they have spent many hours in trying to get together. The Senate feels just as strongly in favor of the amendments that it has inserted as some of the Members of the House felt when they lowered the amounts that were reported out by the subcommittee. I feel we should follow the suggestion made by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, Judge TARVER, and accept the compromise proposition of splitting the difference. Splitting the difference, of course, is a very ancient method of settling disputes, but, taking it by and large, it generally arrives at an equitable disposition, at a time when each side thinks that it is right.

I feel that the farm-tenant purchase program under the Bankhead-Jones Tenant Act is one of the best legislative programs that has been put through the House. It gives an opportunity to landless tenants to become farm owners. Under the program that was established we provided for loans from the R. F. C., and when the record is that these loans are being repaid 99 percent, and the borrowers—these men who are put on these small farms—are carrying out their contracts and paying their interest, insurance, and the amount of the installments, it seems to me that we should go along with the program, even though some may not call it a 100-percent war program. It is a war program to the extent that the Agricultural Department is calling upon the small farms in the country to produce food for victory, which is so essential now, and which will become more essential in the days to come, when this country of ours will be called upon to feed the starving peoples of the world.

There is no getting away from the fact that the United States, the people of America, will be called upon to feed starving Europe, to feed France and Poland and Czechoslovakia, and the other people who cannot get their food in any other way. That will be the obligation of this country, and we will need this food for that purpose.

On the question of rehabilitation loans, I want you to consider that these loans are made to the poorest group of people in the United States; that they have repaid the loans, over 80 percent, and that the repayments are made largely because of the supervision that has been given the loans by the Farm Security Administration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON].

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I shall support the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER], chairman of the subcommittee, which compromises the amount of difference between the Senate and the House on Senate amendment 91, relating to the appropriation for the farm-tenant land-purchase program.

He has so well stated the case and the reasons for the compromise that I shall not discuss it further at this time, except to say that the 97-percent repayments made by the farmers to whom these loans are made should of itself be persuasive that this money is well spent.

The commercial loans made by the R. F. C. and other Government agencies do not begin to compare with this record of the farmers in repaying these loans.

The wonderful record made by the farmers in these repayments calls to mind that the farmers have not been getting very much recognition for the good work they have been doing. There is no class of our citizenship which has more patriotically supported the war program than the farmers of America. They were told by the Government to produce more food, and that food was equally important, and they have been carrying out this request of the Government.

A letter from one of the county agents in my district states that they are working 12 and 16 hours a day, the women driving tractors, children working long hours, many of their boys in the Army, no strikes and no complaining, and the food which the Government has asked for is being produced in abundance, in spite of all handicaps.

The patriotic example set by this group of citizens is entitled to the highest commendation, and sometimes I think that Government officials, the press, and the Congress overlook giving credit where credit is due.

The farmers in my section of the State have had adverse weather conditions, excessive rains, insects, and shortage of labor, and they have been making a crop under great difficulties, but there has been no complaining and they have been carrying on as patriotic Americans.

I trust that our high Government officials, the press, and the radio commentators, when they are singing the praises of those who are contributing to our Government in winning this war, will not overlook the farmers of America, who are playing their part heroically and faithfully, and with pecuniary benefits far less than that of any other group in America.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, the judgment of the House is always pretty substantial when it gets all the facts.

There is involved here an increase over the amount in the House bill for administrative expenses for the Farm Tenant Act of $375,000, plus $7,500,000 increase over the position of the House for loans. That is a very substantial amount of money.

It is contended that we ought to vote for it on the ground that the program under which Uncle Sam buys farms for tenants over a period of 40 years at 3 percent, stocks them, builds the necessary outbuildings, ought to be continued at a high level, and particularly now. With that position I thoroughly disagree. I think I can assign a half dozen reasons why I disagree, reasons which in my humble judgment are quite persuasive.

The first reason is that we have got no business expanding a program of this kind when land values are rising. Who says they are rising? The Department of Agriculture. Examine their official bulletin for May. What do they say? For the Nation as a whole, land values have increased in the last year 7 percent. In the State of Indiana they increased 14 percent. Here is what the author of the article, over the signature of the Department, says in the last paragraph:

> A continuation of last year's trend would, in a number of areas, soon put market values above those which could be supported by the expected future earning power of the land.

The Department says that if they continue this year as they have done—and this money is for this fiscal year—that the earnings from the land will not support the investment. Do you propose to put the seal of approval upon the expansion of this program under those circumstances? I do not.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] just stated that these lands were delinquent by only 1 percent. He does not tell the whole story. We have been in the business of buying farms for 4 years. We have bought 23,000 farms for tenants. That is an average of about 6,000 a year. But over 10,000 of those tenants got loans, and 124 of them got outright grants. That is what the record shows. I will take that kind of a program and never have a delinquency if you will just give me enough money to give them a loan every year to keep them from becoming delinquent.

Yes. There is another side to the story. We are going to buy 4,700 farms in this next fiscal year, and the man who is going to administer it, Mr. Baldwin, states to our committee that the number of farms that exchanged hands in the 12 months of 1941, for reasons of foreclosure and credit distress, was 575,000. Five hundred and seventy-five thousand farms changed hands, and Uncle Sam dips into that great reservoir and lifts out an infinitesimal amount and invests his money, in an hour when land values are rising, when a great many of these tenant purchasers have to be supplemented with loans and grants to keep them going. Is that such a successful program? I doubt it very much.

If you want to see what the basic credit situation is at the present time, I submit to you that the record will show that 60 percent of all farm-loan associations in the country are delinquent today and cannot make a loan. It is in the record. There are 3,583 of these associations that make loans to buy farms, and 2,047 are so delinquent now, according to the Farm Credit Administration testimony before our committee, that they cannot make loans today. There is something basically wrong. Shall we

throw good money after bad by expanding this program and supporting that motion and adding $7,500,000 more for more loans and $375,000 for administrative expenses when this whole matter needs intimate exploration and revamping?

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. TERRY] speaks eloquently about food for victory, food for freedom. Is it going to make any difference whether John Doe who is on that farm now, farms it and provides milk and meat and eggs and poultry, or whether Jim Brown, who lives down the road about 10 miles, finally finds himself the recipient of a Federal loan whereby he can buy that farm?

Is that going to make any difference as far as the sum total of "foods for freedom" is concerned? I am just afraid that too much of this is predicated on the philosophy of keeping these folks in debt, and perhaps we ought to have a complete reappraisal and revaluation of this whole program before we add more money to it. It is too early to tell how this will come out. Oh, yes. Provide loans and grants and obviously on the books of the Farm Security Administration you can keep them from becoming delinquent. But let the experience of 2 or 3 or more years come along. Let there be readjustment after the period of conflict, when there is torsion upon the whole economic fabric of the world, and then see what the score is.

We saw what it was in 1929; farmers were buying land for $500 an acre out there in the State of Illinois just after the last war. After a while they were licking their chops and nursing their wounds as it went down to the point where it would not even liquidate the mortgage. That is when farm values dropped and the price of commodities dropped, and we may go through that maladjustment all over again. So there is not a good, sound, defensible reason for expanding the program at this time. This is a time for caution.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY].

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, in order that we may get clearly the matters in controversy here I want to take just a moment to point them out.

The first amendment is an amendment dealing with farm tenants which combine with the amendment for the expense and then there are two further amendments coming up under farm security, one dealing with the general expense for the operation of the agency of $50,000,000, and the other dealing with rehabilitation loans. I am going to discuss only two now involved, but I want to say that of the four the two major amendments are not direct appropriations at all out of the Federal Treasury. The Farm Tenant Act item of $40,000,000, by the amendment which has been offered by the chairman of the House conferees making it $32,500,000, is money borrowed from the R. F. C., and it is money that is being and has been repaid to the extent of about 97 or 98 percent. The rehabilitation loan was raised by the Senate to $125,000,000. In the House bill it was $70,000,000. This likewise is money borrowed from the R. F. C. and is money that is being repaid with interest similar to the Farm Credit or farm-land bank loans. My friend from Illinois refers to the farm-land-bank units being in default. The difference is here, these people are all farmers who are so low in the scale of credit that they cannot get money from any other agency, a commercial bank, farm-loan bank, or any other agency, and yet their history over the 4 or 5 years where this type of loan has been advanced is that they are paying them back, making a remarkable record.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. If I have time, I will yield later.

Practically 97 or 98 percent of the loans that are made to them are being paid back.

It is argued that you are not changing this terrific current of increasing tenant farmers but that you are creating new tenants out of farmers. This program never was intended to eliminate tenancy overnight. It would take a program of billions of dollars to do that; nevertheless it is a step in the right direction. If America is going to survive as the kind of America we want her to be it will be because the man who operates the farm owns the farm, and this program goes a long way in that direction. Personally, if I had my way, I would have receded on the Senate amendments in full, and have given Farm Security the whole amount provided by the Senate amendment. This cannot be done. We here in the House must compromise when we finally reach what seems to be an impasse, and that is the situation here. I think the House certainly should make this concession of striking a difference between the two amounts, because they are both far under Budget estimates.

The statement that this has nothing to do with national defense is not based upon facts, because aside from the three basic crops, corn, wheat, and cotton, we actually have a shortage now, and I am willing to predict that in less than a year, probably within 6 months, there will not only be rationing of tires, gasoline, and sugar, but there will be rationing of at least a dozen farm crops.

This program does what? It tremendously increases that type of crop that is not included in the corn, wheat, cotton, program; it involves some 300,000 farmers, who would be given a chance to help produce essential foods.

I hope the amendment offered by the chairman will prevail.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] 5 minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, may I call attention to an interesting coincidence? The question of appropriations for this purpose has come before the House for debate over a period of years more frequently than any other item in the agricultural appropriations bill, and in all the years in which it has been the most voted-on item in the Agricultural appropriations bill, never on a roll call has the House failed to defeat it by an overwhelming majority. And here it is again this year.

The three distinguished gentlemen who have spoken are the only three members of the eight members of the conferees' committee who spoke in behalf of this proposition—only three out of the eight. I do not believe there are three more able men in the House, and I am certain there are no more valuable men in the House than these three, but in all these years, on every vote, they have been in favor of the largest appropriation for this purpose that could be secured. Never yet in any year have they failed to fight for every dollar they could get for this purpose in the committee, in the subcommittee, in the House, and in the conference; and every year they have gone to conference reluctant in their support of the House position.

Mr. TERRY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? He mentioned my name.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No; I did not mention the gentleman's name, but I am glad to yield to him.

Mr. TERRY. He implied that I was one of the guilty parties.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No, not guilty. The gentleman has a right to his opinion, and it is a well-founded opinion from his point of view, but it has never been the opinion of the House.

Mr. TERRY. I may say to the gentleman that when our subcommittee reports an item and approves it, I stand with the subcommittee. I do not do like the gentleman does.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman stays with the subcommittee, but not with the House. I cannot express too strongly my admiration and my regard for all three of these gentlemen, and I say this from the heart. They have as much right to their views as I have to mine, and perhaps with better logic, but I am calling attention to the fact that never has their opinion agreed with the opinion of the House, and they as conferees are supposed to represent the House. They have made a strong appeal for the Senate position; there is no doubt about that. I am supporting the House position in accordance with our instructions when we were appointed to represent the House. I may be wrong. I am wrong many times, and I do not claim to be right this time. But I am certain I am carrying out the instructions imposed on our committee by a majority vote of the House on two separate occasions.

And the position of the House is sound. The House does not propose to discontinue tenant loans. It provides $25,000,000 for that purpose. But the Senate is not satisfied. It wants $40,000,000. The House does not propose to withdraw funds from a single farmer who has benefited by this law in the past. The House not only preserves the rights and privileges of all who in the past have been selected for these benefits but it in addition provides for $25,000,000 more new loans. It is a very modest retrenchment. It would be impossible to effect within reason a more conservative economy in this heavy expenditure. There might be some justification for deserting the House position

and going over to the Senate position if the House proposed to discontinue all funds or even discontinue new loans. But that is not the proposition before us. The House still makes generous provision for this dubious experiment. It offers $26,625,000. Why should not that be sufficient in these stringent times?

Each of the three conferees who has asked to have the $25,000,000 increased has stressed the fact that all this money would be paid back with interest. I ask my good friend, the gentleman from Georgia, if we appropriate the additional $50,000,000 which the Senate asks in the first amendment, will any of it ever be paid back?

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I am very sorry to inform the gentleman that his discussion concerns an amendment which is not under consideration. He is discussing the first amendment to the Farm Security Administration appropriation and not the farm-tenant land-purchase amendment which we now have under consideration.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is correct. I had my finger on the next paragraph. Will the gentleman tell us if any of the appropriation for expenses will be paid back in any form?

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman stated that we had provided $25,000,000 for expenses. He must have reference to the Farm Security Administration, because this item as proposed in the substitute is for $1,625,000.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I ask the gentleman if a dollar of the $1,625,000 will ever come back to the Government?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes. The gentleman knows that in this case, as in the case where we maintain the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the benefit of business, the administrative expenses do not come back, but the gentleman has never raised any objection, so far as I know, to the payment of the administrative expenses of that lending corporation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is discussing a question entirely foreign to the subject before us. We are assured that the loans will be repaid with interest—that it will all come back to the Treasury—but not a dollar of this item for expenses, or the millions that have been spent for that purpose in the past, will ever be paid back.

And even if it would be paid back, this is the wrong time to buy land. Wallace's Farmer, and similar dependable publications—even Mr. A. G. Black, Governor of the Farm Credit Administration—have warned the farmer against buying high-priced land; have emphasized the inflationary effect of Government loans for purchase of land at this time. After the last war, when the bottom was knocked out of farm prices and millions of farmers and a large percentage of farm banks lost their shirts, the experts all said it was because the farmer had bought land during the war. Now we are in another war and instead of encouraging the purchase of land the Government should discourage inflationary land purchases until the war is over and we get back to normal conditions and normal prices.

Let us wait until after the war to buy land and let us wait until money is available for the purpose. The Government has no money to tie up in Utopian enterprises at this time. Every dollar the Government provides for this purpose must be borrowed. Every dollar the Government hands over in this appropriation must come from the sale of War bonds and War stamps. Some of it must come from the stamps bought by children with their pennies to help win the war.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. But, Mr. Speaker, the serious feature of this question is that it is not solving the tenant problem. Tenancy in the United States, according to the last report, is increasing at the rate of 40,000 a year. Although we were spending these millions of dollars to solve the tenant problem and have been spending millions for years, the number of tenants has steadily increased, and is still increasing, at the ruinous rate of 40,000 a year. Only one thing will cure tenancy and that is to pay the farmer a parity price for his products. Then he can buy his own land.

Mr. Speaker, this is a proposal to appropriate millions for ineffective, wasteful, nonessential, nondefense expenditures. The motion should be voted down.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I want to emphasize that while the chairman has tried to split between the House and Senate conferees on this question, the House of Representatives and its conference committee refused to raise either of these items a dollar in conference.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who has just addressed the House is a very lovable person, and it is with deep regret that I take issue with him concerning any matter. He is the chairman of the committee of which I am a member. But the gentleman did not attend a single hearing of our subcommittee when the evidence was developed with reference to this subject matter.

We were in session some three and a half months. The only two hearings of our subcommittee that he attended were the ones at which the Secretary of Agriculture testified and the one at which Mr. O'Neal, the head of the Farm Bureau Federation, testified. Although frequently invited, he declined to attend and hear the evidence of other witnesses.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I am certain the gentleman would want the House to know that at the time to which he refers I was in attendance on the sessions of the Subcommittee on Deficiency Appropriations, reporting to the House bills for the national defense carrying the largest appropriations ever made for the Army and the Navy. They required careful consideration and it was, of course, impossible to attend two committee meetings at once. I had been in charge of this bill for a number of years and even longer a member of the subcommittee over which the gentleman now presides so much more ably than I did. I was thoroughly familiar with this bill and especially with this item in the bill. In addition, I have read all the testimony pertaining to the motion. It is the same motion which the gentleman makes every year and which he loses every year.

Mr. TARVER. The effect of the gentleman's statement is that he knows more about the bill, not hearing the evidence, than I do after hearing the evidence. That may be true. However, attending to his duties on the deficiency committee and his other duties has not prevented his attending the meetings of the conference committee. Notwithstanding his failure to hear the evidence relating to these items, he has more pronounced views regarding them than some of the members of the conference committee who did hear the evidence.

I have presented this motion in behalf of four members of the conference committee, constituting one-half of its membership. I sought and secured from the Speaker of the House of Representatives on the occasion of the consideration of the first conference report on the agricultural appropriation bill a ruling to the effect that I am authorized to submit such a motion under the circumstances that now exist.

This proposal is submitted as a matter of compromise. I hope you will not get away from that fact. We made provision for loans in the amount of $50,000,000 for the present fiscal year for this purpose. This proposal is $17,500,000 under that figure.

The gentleman from Missouri says the House has never had a roll-call vote approving appropriations for loans for the tenant land-purchase program. I have not had occasion to investigate the RECORD as to whether the House has voted approval on roll-call votes, but I do know that loan provisions in the amount of $50,000,000 could not have been made without votes of the House of Representatives. Anybody who wanted a roll call, if one was not had, could have asked for it, and, if supported by one-fifth of those present, could have procured it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Statements which are not justified have been made concerning the operation of this program. One was made by the gentleman from Illinois, who intimated, if he did not positively aver, that some of the payments made by tenants on their loans were made from grants of the Farm Security Administration. That charge was made before our subcommittee. We investigated it thoroughly and sought evidence of the existence of the charge if such evidence existed, but although we repeatedly called upon witnesses who

intimated that such repayments were being made in that manner and invited the attendance of any witnesses who might have knowledge of any such repayment ever having been made from a grant, we never secured the evidence of a single witness to any transaction of that sort. I therefore feel justified in saying to you that any charge that these tenants are repaying their loans from moneys granted to them by the Farm Security Administration is absolutely without foundation. Not a single witness in the United States, as far as I know, is in position to aver positively that any such fact comes within his own knowledge.

We want, if possible, to wind up the consideration of this bill this evening. In view of the fact that the committee is evenly divided, four to four, that the appropriation is $7,500,000 below the Budget, if you accept the figures that we have offered here, that it is an equal amount below the Senate figures, that the Senate has voted by a vote of 52 to 7 to insist upon its position but indicates that it would accept this compromise if it is voted up, I ask you in your good judgment to approve it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Is it not true that the Farm Security Administrator never supplied the committee with the data as to whether or not the money had been used for repayment and said he could not unless he could go through all of his files, and that, while we asked for this information, it never was forthcoming to the committee? That is a statement of fact.

Mr. TARVER. I regret I must disagree with my colleague. The Farm Security Administrator testified that no such repayments had been made and no grant had been made which could be utilized for such a purpose.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As I understand the motion now pending, it is a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Therefore, those who desire to maintain the position of the House will have to vote down the motion, in order to insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and, the Chair being in doubt, the House divided; and there were—ayes 56, noes 95.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 131, nays 159, not voting 142, as follows:

[Roll No. 88]

YEAS—131

Allen, La.	Gore	Pace
Andersen, H. Carl	Gossett	Patman
Anderson, N. Mex.	Granger	Patton
Arnold	Gregory	Peterson, Fla.
Barden	Hare	Peterson, Ga.
Barnes	Harris, Ark.	Pittenger
Beam	Healey	Poage
Bloom	Hill, Wash.	Priest
Boggs	Hobbs	Rabaut
Bonner	Holbrook	Ramsay
Boren	Holland	Ramspeck
Brooks	Hull	Rankin, Miss.
Brown, Ga.	Hunter	Richards
Bryson	Imhoff	Rivers
Byron	Jackson	Rizley
Camp	Jarman	Robinson, Utah
Cartwright	Jensen	Russell
Chapman	Johnson, Luther A.	Sabath
Claypool	Johnson, Okla.	Sanders
Coffee, Wash.	Kelly, Ill.	Sauthoff
Cooley	Kerr	Sheppard
Cooper	Kirwan	Smith, Pa.
Courtney	Kramer	South
Cravens	Lane	Sparkman
Cunningham	Leavy	Spence
Curtis	McCormack	Steagall
Davis, Tenn.	McGranery	Sullivan
Dingell	McIntyre	Sumners, Tex.
Domengeaux	McMillan	Tarver
Downs	Magnuson	Terry
Duncan	Mahon	Thom
Eberharter	Manasco	Thomason
Edmiston	Mansfield	Tibbott
Eliot, Mass.	Mills, La.	Tolan
Engel	Monroney	Van Zandt
Fitzgerald	Mundt	Vinson, Ga.
Fitzpatrick	Murdock	Voorhis, Calif.
Flaherty	Nelson	Welch
Flannagan	Nichols	White
Folger	Norrell	Whitten
Ford, Thomas F.	Norton	Wickersham
Gehrmann	O'Brien, Mich.	Wright
Gibson	O'Connor	Young
	O'Hara	Zimmerman

NAYS—159

Allen, Ill.	Fellows	Lesinski
Anderson, Calif.	Ford, Miss.	Lewis
Andresen, August H.	Fulmer	Ludlow
Andrews	Gale	McGregor
Angell	Gamble	McLaughlin
Arends	Gathings	McLean
Bates, Mass.	Gearhart	Maciora
Baumhart	Gerlach	Martin, Iowa
Beiter	Gillie	Martin, Mass.
Bell	Graham	Mason
Bender	Grant, Ala.	May
Bennett	Grant, Ind.	Meyer, Md.
Bishop	Guyer	Michener
Boehne	Gwynne	Moser
Bulwinkle	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mott
Butler	Hall, Leonard W.	O'Neal
Canfield	Halleck	Paddock
Cannon, Mo.	Hancock	Pheiffer, William T.
Carlson	Harris, Va.	Pierce
Carter	Hartley	Ploeser
Case, S. Dak.	Heidinger	Plumley
Chenoweth	Hill, Colo.	Rankin, Mont.
Chiperfield	Hinshaw	Reed, Ill.
Clevenger	Holmes	Reed, N. Y.
Cochran	Hope	Rees, Kans.
Colmer	Howell	Rich
Copeland	Jacobsen	Robertson, Va.
Costello	Jenks, N. H.	Rockwell
Cox	Jennings	Rodgers, Pa.
Crawford	Johns	Rogers, Mass.
Creal	Johnson, Calif.	Rolph
Crowther	Johnson, Ill.	Scrugham
Culkin	Johnson, W. Va.	Shafer, Mich.
D'Alesandro	Jones	Shanley
Day	Jonkman	Short
Dewey	Kean	Simpson
Dirksen	Keefe	Smith, Maine
Disney	Kilburn	Smith, Ohio
Ditter	Kinzer	Smith, Va.
Dondero	Kleberg	Smith, Wis.
Doughton	Knutson	Snyder
Durham	Kunkel	Springer
Dworshak	Lambertson	Stearns, N. H.
Eaton	Lanham	Stefan
Elliott, Calif.	Lea	Stevenson
Elston	LeCompte	Stratton
Englebright	Luce	Sumner, Ill.
Sutphin	Treadway	Wigglesworth
Taber	Vorys, Ohio	Wolcott
Talbot	Wadsworth	Wolfenden, Pa
Talle	Ward	Woodruff, Mich.
Tenerowicz	Wasielewski	Youngdahl
Thill	Wheat	
Thomas, Tex.	Whittington	

NOT VOTING—142

Baldwin	Haines	O'Toole
Barry	Harness	Patrick
Bates, Ky.	Harrington	Pearson
Beckworth	Hart	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Blackney	Harter	Plauché
Bland	Hébert	Powers
Bolton	Heffernan	Randolph
Boykin	Hendricks	Reece, Tenn.
Bradley, Mich.	Hess	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bradley, Pa.	Hoffman	Robsion, Ky.
Brown, Ohio	Hook	Rockefeller
Buck	Houston	Rogers, Okla.
Buckler, Minn.	Izac	Romjue
Buckley, N. Y.	Jarrett	Sacks
Burch	Jenkins, Ohio	Sasscer
Burdick	Johnson, Ind.	Satterfield
Burgin	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Scanlon
Byrne	Kee	Schaefer, Ill.
Cannon, Fla.	Kefauver	Schuetz
Capozzoli	Kelley, Pa.	Schulte
Casey, Mass.	Kennedy, Martin J.	Scott
Celler	Kennedy, Michael J.	Secrest
Clark	Kecgh	Shannon
Clason	Kilday	Sheridan
Cluett	Klein	Sikes
Coffee, Nebr.	Kocialkowski	Smith, Wash.
Cole, Md.	Kopplemann	Smith, W. Va.
Cole, N. Y.	Landis	Somers, N. Y.
Collins	Larrabee	Starnes, Ala.
Crosser	Lynch	Sweeney
Cullen	McGehee	Thomas, N. J.
Davis, Ohio	McKeough	Tinkham
Delaney	Maas	Traynor
Dickstein	Maciejewski	Vincent, Ky.
Dies	Marcantonio	Vreeland
Douglas	Merritt	Walter
Drewry	Miller	Weaver
Ellis	Mills, Ark.	Weiss
Faddis	Mitchell	Wene
Fenton	Murray	West
Fish	Myers, Pa.	Whelchel
Fogarty	O'Brien, N. Y.	Williams
Forand	O'Day	Wilson
Ford, Leland M.	O'Leary	Winter
Gavagan	Oliver	Wolverton, N. J.
Gifford	Osmers	Woodrum, Va.
Gilchrist	Pace	Worley
Gillette	Patman	
Green	Patton	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Burdick for, with Mr. Baldwin against.

Until further notice:

Mr. Clark with Mr. Winter.
Mr. Hébert with Mr. Fenton.
Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Brown of Ohio.
Mr. Pearson with Mr. Miller.
Mr. West with Mr. Hoffman.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. O'Toole.
Mr. Burgin with Mr. Faddis.
Mr. Collins with Mr Kopplemann.
Mr. Houston with Mr. Williams.
Mr. McGehee with Mr. Smith of Washington.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri and Mr. TARVER rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Missouri rise?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I rise to move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a parliamentary inquiry. It was my purpose to offer a motion as I have done in connection with the same subject matter on previous occasions. I had risen for the purpose of offering a motion to further insist upon the dis-

agreement of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 90 and 91. I wish to inquire whether or not I am privileged, as chairman of the House conferees, to offer that motion?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, my motion is to further insist.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I was on my feet before the gentleman from Missouri rushed over between me and the microphone and offered his motion.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, it is a long-established rule of procedure that when a vital motion made by the Member in charge of a bill is defeated, the right to prior recognition passes to the opposition. That is the position in which the gentleman finds himself. He has made a major motion. The motion has been defeated. Therefore the right of recognition passes to the opposition, and I ask to be recognized to move to further insist.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard with regard to that statement?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. The question has never been raised so far as I have known in the course of my experience of some 16 years upon an appropriation bill conference report, but if as the gentleman states the right of making the motion passes to the opposition, it should pass to my Republican colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] with whom the gentleman from Missouri has been associated in the defeat of the motion offered by the chairman of the subcommittee. I have desired to offer the motion myself in the absence of the exercise of that privilege by the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask for recognition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia has the floor.

Mr. TARVER. I have completed all I desire to say except that I desire to offer the motion if it is permissible; otherwise, I insist that the right should pass to the opposition and to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

The SPEAKER. The Chair is of the opinion that the gentleman from Missouri has been properly recognized to offer a motion. The gentleman will state his motion.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 93. On page 86, line 16, strike out "$3,341,182" and insert "$3,295,575."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 93.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to submit a unanimous-consent request. Amendments No. 95 and No. 96 relating to the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration and to the loan provisions for the Farm Security Administration may, in my judgment, be considered together. I ask unanimous consent that that be done.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the two Senate amendments.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 95: Page 83, line 3, strike out "$25,319,557" and insert "$50,319,557."

Senate amendment No. 96: Page 88, line 9, strike out "$70,000,000" and insert "$125,000,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motions, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 95 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$37,819,557."

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 96 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed in said amendment, insert "$97,500,000."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes. I do not desire to unduly impose upon the patience of the House at this late hour in the day. I hope that the House will bear with me for a moment as I undertake to explain the situation which exists with reference to these two amendments and the action which is being sought at your hands by the motions which I have submitted.

Last year the direct appropriations for grants and rural rehabilitation, and administration expenses was approximately $64,000,000. The Budget estimate for the present fiscal year for this item is $50,319,557, which amount the House reduced by $25,000,000, cutting it substantially half in two. Since that time the President has submitted an additional Budget estimate for some $14,000,000 plus, in addition to the $50,000,000 plus, which had been first recommended. Therefore, the House figures are substantially $39,000,000 below the Budget request of approximately $64,000,000.

With regard to the loan provision, the Budget estimate at the time the House considered the bill was $75,000,000 and your subcommittee reduced that by $5,000,000, making the amount $70,000,000. Since that time the President has submitted an additional Budget request and recommended in addition to the $75,000,000 as originally submitted, $105,000,000 plus, making a total for loans as recommended by the Budget of $180,000,000 plus. The Senate fixed the amount at $125,000,000, which is substantially $55,000,000 below the Budget. The House figure having been $70,000,000, it is sought by this motion to effect a compromise between the House figure and the Senate figure of $125,000,000, making the amount of loans $97,500,000 instead of $180,000,000 plus as recommended by the Budget, a reduction below the Budget of more than $80,000,000.

With regard to the item of direct appropriation, the motion submitted is also a compromise motion, and proposes to split the difference between the House and the Senate figures which would still leave the amount provided in this item some twenty-six million or twenty-seven million dollars below the amount of the Budget estimate. That is all I care to say except to call attention to the language of the Budget estimate approved by the President, in which the request was transmitted for the additional $105,000,000 for loans, and $14,778,000 more for administrative expenses, and it is as follows:

"In order to stimulate the production of food for the more efficient prosecution of the war effort there is hereby appropriated the sum of $14,778,000 in addition to the foregoing sum of $50,319,557 for the same purposes and to be available for the same objects and to be expendable under the same conditions, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized to advance $105,500,000 in addition to the foregoing sum of $75,000,000 for the same purposes and objects and under the same conditions."

The additional appropriation and loan authorization are requested as a part of the food-for-freedom program. In order to meet our food requirements and those of our Allies, it is clearly apparent that every effort must be made to increase our production of agricultural commodities to the fullest possible extent. No farmer should be precluded from doing his part because of lack of credit. To this end the Department of Agriculture has informed both private and Federal credit agencies of our food needs and urged their maximum cooperation in the extension of the necessary credit. However, notwithstanding the facilities presently available, there are thousands of low-income farmers who cannot obtain sufficient credit to participate fully in the food-for-freedom program.

Studies of the Department of Agriculture reveal that, even with all other farm groups operating at maximum production, the production of the low-income farm group is vitally needed to assist us in reaching the food-production goals required for the successful prosecution of the war. It, therefore, proposes a strong attack on this problem which will make use of the facilities of the Farm Security Administration and will quickly and effectively reach the maximum number of low-income farmers with guidance, supervision, and adequate credit.

The foregoing supplemental estimate of the appropriation and the authorization pertaining to the item of appropriation contained in the Budget for 1943 are to provide for contingencies which have arisen since the transmission of the Budget for the fiscal year 1943. I recommend that they be transmitted to Congress.

Very respectfully,

HAROLD D. SMITH,
Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Your Commander in Chief has called upon you for approval of loans for the Farm Security Administration program, aggregating over $180,000,000. We are asking you by this compromise motion to approve loans only for $97,500,000. He asked you to approve administrative expenses, grants, and rural rehabilitation to the extent of $64,000,000. We are asking you by this compromise motion to approve such items only to the extent of

$37,000,000, plus. The amendment is offered as a compromise. It does not, in all respects, represent my views. I think it is offered with the approval of four members of the conferees. We are anxious, as I have indicated earlier, to complete consideration of this bill by the 1st of July, and it is hoped that the amendment as submitted may be agreed to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. TARVER. Upon request of the ranking member on the gentleman's own side, we are attempting to cut this time down.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But I was not any party to that kind of a request.

Mr. TARVER. I understand; but the House is tired and it is getting late, and I think that is fair.

Mr. DIRKSEN The gentleman took 5 minutes, and there is no reason why the minority should not have 5 minutes. That is only fair.

Mr. TARVER. I do not desire to be unfair to the gentleman. I am trying to conform to what I believe to be the wishes of the House. If I yield the gentleman 5 minutes, I have to yield perhaps to several other gentlemen time in proportion.

Mr. DIRKSEN. But there is a matter of $50,000,000 involved here. I am willing to stay here a half an hour or more for that much. Will not the gentleman yield me 2 additional minutes?

Mr. TARVER. I yield the gentleman 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, there is involved in this motion $12,500,000 in cash and $27,000,000 in loan authority. As I said before, that is no chicken feed. I am willing to stay here as long as it takes and fight it out on this line, because that is substantial money in my language.

I am opposed to this proposal. I am opposed to this compromise, because I think it is wrong. I think this is one of the most wasteful and extravagant organizations that has ever existed in the history of this Republic. It is rather funny that they talk about foods for freedom, and about the new food goals, when as early as September Secretary Wickard revised the schedule upward. Nine months later they come in before the Senate with a supplemental estimate. Where were they all the time if that was so important?

It is a duplicate organization. They have had 17,000 on the pay roll for last year. That is the equivalent of five infantry regiments. Home advisers; farm advisers, in dupication with the Extension Service of the country; area agents; district agents; county agents; going everywhere and advising, for which they have expended $18,500,000 on personnel last year. They have had $741,000,000 since they have been in business for loans and grants. That is over a period of 6½ years—$741,000,000 for loans and grants. Do you know how much it took to administer that. It took $276,000,000. Think of it: Loans and grants $741,000,000, and their pay roll, supplies, and travel account has been $276,000,000. There is no business that could exist under God's canopy under that kind of basis except the Federal Government. They spent $198,000,000 for salaries to administer $741,000,000 in loans and grants. And are they travelers? They have spent $29,000,000 for travel since they have been doing business.

Are you going to put the seal of approval on that sort of business and give them another $12,500,000 in cash and another $27,000,000 in loan authority? O. K., but I am not. I am willing to stay here all night in order to resist this sort of thing, because I think it is extravagant. I think it is wasteful. I think it is mismanaged. I think it is done under the tutelage and philosophy of Rexford Tugwell, of whom Mr. Baldwin, the Administrator, was a disciple. We had to take him over the coals in the committee no end of times, and admonish the gentleman that this country was not yet ready for socialism.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. COX. There has been pending before the Rules Committee an application for a rule on a resolution to investigate.

Mr. DIRKSEN. They need it.

Mr. COX. The record made by this outfit, the Farm Security Administration, has been such as should convince anybody that it ought to be liquidated. The idea that it is on its way out is the reason why that resolution has not been reported. The record of the Farm Security Administration is the worst of any agency ever set up by the Government.

There are many things about the Farm Security Administration which bear a bad odor.

Now, they talk about more milk and more meat and more food for freedom. I have here a list of eight cheese factories in Illinois that were closed last week because they have crowded down the price, and because the warehouses are full in Chicago.

There is, therefore, no outlet for the farmer's milk, and the consequence is that they in some areas get $1.25 a hundred and cannot even produce milk for that; and yet they talk about producing more milk and more cheese when, as a matter of fact, our cheese factories are shutting down. I am reliably informed that 47 cheese factories have closed down in the last couple of weeks, but I have a list of only 8.

Are you going to put the seal of approval upon an administrative item of $50,000,000 to go out and teach people to do this, that, and the other thing when there is no hope of disposing of what they produce? I am not.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. I merely wish to say this to the gentleman and for the benefit of the membership, that I have two Carnation Milk factories in my district, two Pet Milk factories, and several small cheese factories. While the farmers have been encouraged to increase their production, they cannot now get cost of production for their products; nor can the milk haulers secure tires from the O. P. A. to haul milk to these factories.

Mr. DIRKSEN. I think it is time we ended this business of spending $1 in administrative expense for virtually every $2 of help extended, and I am not going along on a proposition of that kind.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, if it be something bad to enable the really poor group of farmers in this country to purchase enough livestock to balance their farming operations, to enable them to get the seed they need to take their part in the production of the food we and our Allies desperately need; in fact, if it be bad policy to enable those people to be better farmers than they were before and to give them a chance to get a decent living, then this is a bad proposition. It is somewhat appalling to me that every time we consider a proposition that really helps poor people someone gets up on the floor and attacks it. As a matter of actual fact, the so-called administrative expenses the gentleman from Illinois referred to include not only the servicing of the loans and the assistance of these farmers in working out their farm problems but it also includes many other things, some of which the Farm Security Administration has been directed to do because of the war itself. The job it does in attempting to mobilize and move about in mobile camps farm labor is one of the most necessary jobs there is to be done right now. All that expense is included in what the gentleman calls administrative expense. As a matter of fact, the answer to all the gentleman complains about as to why we have had an accumulation of certain farm products is that we have not been able to ship the things as rapidly as was expected. I myself have proposed on this floor what ought to be the answer to that; namely, we should have a means of getting that food into the hands of the people of this country who need it. We have figures coming out of the Federal Security Agency about undernourishment—there are 9,000,000 undernourished children in the country. There is where some of these surpluses should go—purchased from the farmers under section 32 at a parity price. The item we have here now applies to a group composing about 40 percent of the farmers of America. They have in the past produced but 12 percent of the total farm output. But they are and have been counted upon to account for 40 percent of the increased production of eggs, 50 percent of the increased production of tomatoes, 35 percent of the increased production of pork which is needed in connection with the food-for-freedom program. These figures are only examples.

Mr. Speaker, if the membership is going to say that they can pass an appro-

priation bill for $40,000,000,000—forty thousand million dollars—for necessary military expenses connected with direct combat with the enemy, but that you cannot spare $40,000,000 for the purpose of substantially increasing the production of necessary food in the only section of your farm population where any large increase in production is possible, then I think your program is indeed illogical. After all, it has been said that food will win the war; in fact, we know it is the first and most primary element, and here is the only program offered you which can result in substantially increasing food products.

Why should we not protect small agriculture? I am interested not only in protecting the small business man but also in protecting the small farmer. Let the small family-size farm operator produce as much as he can now, when he has a chance to make a little money. Let the little farmer make a little bit of money and put himself in a position where he can keep his farm when the war is over, for the whole future of America depends on our always having an agriculture that is carried on by men who own family-size farms. When we lose that we shall have lost one of the three or four most basic elements of democracy itself.

For these reasons I shall support the motion of the chairman, the gentleman from Georgia.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in total war. And we are losing the war. In the last week the enemy has broken through the Russian front and have taken some of the strongest positions. In Africa they have driven back the Allied forces and are striking at vital objectives. They have taken Sumatra, Burma, the Indies, and the Philippines and are sweeping the gallant Chinese back in critical retreats. They have occupied, and are holding, territory in continental America. We are fighting on our own doorstep and their U-boats are patrolling Atlantic waters at the gates to our coastal cities. And yet at this time of gravest national peril, when we are straining every national resource to meet the enemy, we are confronted with this amendment to use money we have not got for such a purpose as this.

The Ways and Means Committee has just completed the draft of the revenue bill. And it is two and a half billion dollars short of the mark set by the Treasury. The request was for a measure that would provide eight and a half billion dollars. The bill as drawn will raise only $6,000,000,000. We are two and a half billion dollars short and yet we are asked to fritter away over a hundred million dollars additional on this one item. Remember we are already making a large appropriation for this purpose. But the Senate amendment and the gentleman's motion want to add to it over a hundred million dollars.

We need that hundred million dollars in planes and tanks and guns. We need it right now on the Russian front. We need it desperately this afternoon on the African front. We need it, and more, on the Chinese front—not to mention Alaska, San Francisco, and New York.

I appeal to the House to vote down this amendment and use this money to equip our men—use it to win the war.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman from Kansas tell the House what the position of the leading farm organizations are with reference to this particular item?

Mr. LAMBERTSON. The National Grange and the Farm Bureau are unequivocally opposed to this. I have two letters here bearing this out from the national leaders of the two great farm organizations.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, Napoleon said that the Army travels on its belly. We were told in the last war that food will win the war. May I say to the Members of the House that this is one of the most important appropriations that we have in this bill. I wish I had more time so I could tell you what the Farm Security organization has been doing in the State of Idaho. I would like to tell you how they came in and saved the great apple industry by making loans to the apple growers when a freeze had taken their crop and there was no other source open to them to get money. I would like to tell you how they are going into the cut-over land district and assisting the farmers in making two blades of grass where one grew before. I would like to tell you how much more cream and butter is brought into our creameries by the people who were assisted by this Administration.

We are in a great war. Our theater of operations will probably be in the Pacific. We have a bottleneck through the Rocky Mountains which prevents us from getting food from the Eastern States to the Pacific area. The Farm Administration has gone into the Northwest and assisted the farmers and is helping these people. This money will go directly into the production of food. It will increase the number of cows on the farm, it will increase the number of chickens, it will increase the amount of butter and eggs.

I have not time in 2 minutes to tell you the whole story of what it has done, but this is an important appropriation and I hope the House will support the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes in conclusion of the debate to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY].

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I doubt if I can persuade anyone to change his view upon this matter, but I shall assume that there are some who still have an open mind on this matter and who will listen to argument.

I am supporting the position of my chairman in regard to this amendment. The conferees divided fifty-fifty. We can settle this matter for this year at least by adopting the motion offered by the chairman of the conference committee. I do not agree with the two brilliant and distinguished members of the conference, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN.] I differ widely with them. In the first place, may I say that the gentleman from Illinois who always makes a stirring, and if you are interested in figures, a persuasive argument, occasionally in a burst of oratory and in the passion of argument he overstates his facts and he sometimes uses language that in a calmer moment I am sure he would not use. His reference today to Farm Security is wholly unjustified. Mr. C. B. Baldwin, Administrator, is an outstanding patriotic American, a man of rare courage. He is the type of American that made this Nation great and to whom we must depend upon to preserve it now and in the future.

Here is an agency that far from having a bad odor has rendered a service to the American farmer through the years of depression that is superior to any other relief agency that we have had in that field and, mark you, the money involved now, the major amount of money, is money, again I repeat, as I said concerning the farm-tenancy proposition, that comes back. It is a loan to the low-income farmer. Do you think that it would have had the endorsement in the last week of these organizations if it did not have merit:

James G. Patton, president, National Farmers' Union; Murray Lincoln, executive secretary; William Green, president, American Federation of Labor; Philip Murray, president, Congress of Industrial Organizations; J. G. Luhrsen, executive secretary, American Railway Executives Association; Monsgr. L. G. Ligutti, executive secretary, National Catholic Rural Life Association; and Benson Y. Landis, Federal Council of Churches.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman has mentioned the names of eminent labor leaders whose names are household words. I respect their opinions. But this is an agricultural bill. Can the gentleman also favor us with the opinions of farm leaders? What is the position of the National Grange and the American Farm Bureau Federation, the great national farm organizations?

Mr. LEAVY. I have not been advised. The State Grange in the State of Washington is very much in favor of this. I favor if it for no other reason than the fact that I have seen the apple industry in my district, an industry that had a value of a quarter of a billion dollars when the depression hit, put back on its feet. Today they are not asking Farm

Security for anything. They have repaid in large part the money. If we allow this money, we allow food for over 2,000,000 soldiers in at least five staple commodities, which is just so much food that would not be produced, if this appropriation is denied. Not only that, by this appropriation, we lift 300,000 liberty-loving American farm families to a standard where they have a degree of economic independence. The American way of life becomes a reality to them. It is these people who are furnishing some of the best young men to preserve America. The parents and brothers and sisters of these fine young soldiers are justly entitled to be permitted to do their part in this war effort, and at the same time enjoy the very limited security that will come from these funds.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COOPER). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. A vote against the motion is a vote to sustain the position of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. A vote against the pending motion is a vote for the defeat of the pending motion.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the chairman of the subcommittee has made this motion without authorization by a majority of the managers on the part of the House, it is only fair that the House understand the effect of this vote. Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I desire to know if a vote against the pending motion is not a vote to sustain the position which the House took when it sent the bill to conference.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. EBERHARTER. The question raised by the gentleman from Missouri is not a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be again read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Clerk will again read the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

There was no objection.

The Clerk again read the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TARVER) there were—ayes 59, noes 120.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and eight-five Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 119, nays, 156, not voting 157, as follows:

[Roll No. 89]

YEAS—119

Allen, La.	Hare	Pierce
Arnold	Harris, Ark.	Pittenger
Barden	Healey	Priest
Boggs	Hill, Wash.	Rabaut
Bonner	Holbrock	Ramsay
Brooks	Holland	Ramspeck
Brown, Ga.	Hope	Rankin, Miss.
Bryson	Hull	Richards
Burgin	Hunter	Rivers
Camp	Imhoff	Rizley
Cannon, Fla.	Jackson	Robinson, Utah
Carlson	Jarman	Russell
Cartwright	Johnson,	Sabath
Claypool	Luther A.	Sanders
Coffee, Wash.	Johnson, Okla.	Sasscer
Cooper	Kelly, Ill.	Sauthoff
Courtney	Kerr	Scrugham
Cunningham	Kirwan	Shanley
Curtis	Knutson	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Kopplemann	Smith, Pa.
Dingell	Kramer	Snyder
Domengeaux	Lane	South
Downs	Lea	Sparkman
Eberharter	Leavy	Spence
Edmiston	McGranery	Stefan
Eliot, Mass.	McIntyre	Sutphin
Elliott, Calif.	McMillan	Tarver
Fitzgerald	Maciora	Tenerowicz
Fitzpatrick	Magnuson	Terry
Flaherty	Mahon	Thom
Flannagan	Manasco	Van Zandt
Folger	Mills, La.	Vinson, Ga.
Ford, Thomas F.	Mundt	Voorhis, Calif.
Gearhart	Murdock	Ward
Gehrmann	Nichols	Welch
Gibson	Norrell	White
Gore	O'Brien, Mich.	Wickersham
Granger	O'Connor	Williams
Grant, Ala.	Patman	Wright
Gregory	Peterson, Fla.	Zimmerman

NAYS—156

Allen, Ill.	Dworshak	Lesinski
Andersen,	Eaton	Lewis
H. Carl	Elston	Ludlow
Anderson, Calif.	Engel	McGregor
Anderson,	Englebright	McLaughlin
N. Mex	Fellows	McLean
Andresen,	Ford, Miss.	Martin, Iowa
August H.	Fulmer	Martin, Mass.
Angell	Gale	Mason
Arends	Gamble	May
Barnes	Gathings	Meyer, Md.
Bates, Mass.	Gerlach	Michener
Baumhart	Gillie	Monroney
Beiter	Gossett	Moser
Bell	Graham	Nelson
Bender	Grant, Ind.	O'Hara
Bennett	Guyer	Pace
Bishop	Gwynne	Paddock
Bloom	Hall,	Patton
Bulwinkle	Leonard W.	Peterson, Ga.
Butler	Halleck	Ploeser
Canfield	Hancock	Plumley
Cannon, Mo.	Harris, Va.	Poage
Carter	Hartley	Reed, N. Y.
Chapman	Heidinger	Rees, Kans.
Chenoweth	Hill, Colo.	Rich
Chiperfield	Hinshaw	Robertson, Va.
Clevenger	Hobbs	Rockwell
Cochran	Holmes	Rodgers, Pa.
Colmer	Howell	Rogers, Mass.
Cooley	Jacobsen	Ralph
Copeland	Jenks, N. H.	Shafer, Mich.
Costello	Jennings	Short
Cox	Jensen	Simpson
Cravens	Johnson, Calif.	Smith, Maine
Crawford	Johnson, Ill.	Smith, Ohio
Creal	Johnson, W. Va.	Smith, Va.
Culkin	Jones	Smith, Wis.
D'Alesandro	Jonkman	Springer
Day	Kean	Stearns, N. H.
Dewey	Keefe	Stevenson
Dirksen	Kilburn	Stratton
Disney	Kinzer	Sullivan
Ditter	Kleberg	Sumner, Ill.
Dondero	Kunkel	Taber
Doughton	Lambertson	Talle
Duncan	Lanham	Thill
Durham	LeCompte	Thomas, Tex.
Thomason	Wheat	Wolfenden, Pa.
Tibbott	Whitten	Woodruff, Mich.
Treadway	Whittington	Young
Vorys, Ohio	Wigglesworth	Youngdahl
Wasielewski	Winter	
West	Wolcott	

NOT VOTING—157

Andrews	Hall,	O'Toole
Baldwin	Edwin Arthur	Patrick
Barry	Harness	Pearson
Bates, Ky.	Harrington	Pfeifer,
Beam	Hart	Joseph L.
Beckworth	Harter	Pheiffer.
Blackney	Hébert	William T.
Bland	Heffernan	Plauché
Boehne	Hendricks	Powers
Bolton	Hess	Randolph
Boren	Hoffman	Rankin, Mont.
Boykin	Hook	Reece, Tenn.
Bradley, Mich.	Houston	Reed, Ill.
Bradley, Pa.	Izac	Robertson,
Brown, Ohio	Jarrett	N. Dak.
Buck	Jenkins, Ohio	Robsion, Ky.
Buckler, Minn.	Johns	Rockefeller
Buckley, N. Y.	Johnson, Ind.	Rogers, Okla.
Burch	Johnson,	Romjue
Burdick	Lyndon B.	Sacks
Byrne	Kee	Satterfield
Byron	Kefauver	Scanlon
Capozzoli	Kelley, Pa.	Schaefer, Ill.
Case, S. Dak.	Kennedy,	Schuetz
Casey, Mass.	Martin J.	Schulte
Celler	Kennedy,	Scott
Clark	Michael J.	Secrest
Clason	Keogh	Shannon
Cluett	Kilday	Sheridan
Coffee, Nebr.	Klein	Sikes
Cole, Md.	Kocialkowski	Smith, Wash.
Cole, N. Y.	Landis	Smith, W. Va.
Collins	Larrabee	Somers, N. Y.
Crosser	Lynch	Starnes, Ala.
Crowther	McCormack	Steagall
Cullen	McGehee	Sumners, Tex.
Davis, Ohio	McKeough	Sweeney
Delaney	Maas	Talbot
Dickstein	Maciejewski	Thomas, N. J.
Dies	Mansfield	Tinkham
Douglas	Marcantonio	Tolan
Drewry	Merritt	Traynor
Ellis	Miller	Vincent, Ky.
Faddis	Mills, Ark.	Vreeland
Fenton	Mitchell	Wadsworth
Fish	Mott	Walter
Fogarty	Murray	Weaver
Forand	Myers, Pa.	Weiss
Ford, Leland M.	Norton	Wene
Gavagan	O'Brien, N. Y.	Whelchel
Gifford	O'Day	Wilson
Gilchrist	O'Leary	Wolverton, N. J.
Gillette	Oliver	Woodrum, Va.
Green	O'Neal	Worley
Haines	Osmers	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Burdick for, with Mr. Baldwin against.

General pairs until further notice:

Mr. McCormack with Mr. Mott.
Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Wadsworth.
Mr. Boehne with Mr. Case of South Dakota.
Mr. Woodrum of Virginia with Mr. Talbot.
Mr. Boren with Mr. William T. Pheiffer.
Mr. Steagall with Mr. Johns.
Mr. Sumners of Texas with Mr. Andrews.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Beam with Mr. O'Neal.
Mr. Tolan with Mrs. Byron.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 97: Page 89, line 7, insert "except for the completion of commitments outstanding on June 30, 1942."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its

disagreement to Senate amendment No. 97.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendments that are still in disagreement and ask for a conference with the Senate and that conferees be appointed on the part of the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. If there is no objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees: Mr. TARVER, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. LEAVY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. PLUMLEY.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill today may be allowed to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2014. An act for the relief of Carl L. Jones;

H. R. 6295. An act to suspend the requirement for the performance of annual labor on certain mining claims;

H. R. 7160. An act to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps during the existing war, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7234. An act to exempt from duty personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to accord privileges of free importation to members of the armed forces of other United Nations, to enemy prisoners of war and civilian internees and detainees, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the Joint Select Committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following Departments and Agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of State.
3. Federal Security Agency.
4. Federal Trade Commission.
5. The National Archives.
6. United States Civil Service Commission.
7. United States New York World's Fair Commission.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech made recently by Mr. Kyle.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein two articles from the New York Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a newspaper article from the Charleston News and Courier.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLBROCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a news item from a newspaper in Ohio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Louis P. Lochner, on war transportation in Germany.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars, in one to include a letter and in another a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an article appearing in the current issue of the Los Angeles Times.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] be permitted to extend his remarks and include an article by Arthur Krock.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] for 10 minutes.

ARMY AND NAVY METHOD OF PROCUREMENT

Mr. WOODRUFF of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the whole country as well as Members of Congress who have always had a high regard for the Army and Navy methods of procurement, and for the integrity and the traditions of the armed services, have been shocked by the accusations of "reckless spending" contained in the House Military Affairs Committee report. This report was a strongly worded document, asserting "nearly every conceivable type of extravagant waste" had been discovered in its investigation of the War Department's business dealings.

This report was especially shocking and disquieting to those Members of Congress who have served on committees having to do with the affairs of the armed services. Not only have such Members come to have a high regard for the traditions of the military and naval services, the Marines and the Air Corps, but they have come to place great reliance on both the judgment and integrity of the officers charged with so administering the affairs of the armed services as to maintain those high traditions of efficiency, honesty, and courage.

It must be said in all fairness that under the conditions of haste, hysteria, and political cross-fire due to the condition of unpreparedness in which the United States was caught by the attack on Pearl Harbor, the Army and Navy officers are operating under the greatest handicaps they have ever had to contend with in any war in which this country has been engaged. The very conditions—not to mention the predilections of many of the bureaus in the administrative departments of the Government—have made for waste and extravagance. It is only fair to say further that time is of the essence in the job of fighting a war while trying to prepare the means by which the war can be fought. The fact we were unprepared for this conflict when we were launched into it by the attack on Pearl Harbor was most distinctly not the fault of the military or naval officials charged with the responsibility of being ready for war. They could go no further than higher authority would permit. These officers were frank to the fullest extent possible with both the executive officials and the committees of Congress in the information they gave as to the unprepared condition of America. It should be remembered that it was the Chief of Staff himself, Gen. George C. Marshall, who on May 17, 1940, disclosed to a Senate committee our complete and shocking unpreparedness. it is obvious to any fair-minded person that the old adage, "Haste makes waste," is especially applicable to our present national situation.

All of this is not to say that the House Military Affairs Committee report was not justified, or was not constructive. It must be said that if the report was justified, it was constructive. The members of the committee who rendered the report are the best judges of its justification. Those Members of Congress who have always had such a high regard for the Army and Navy method of doing things, feel sure—and they most ardently hope—that not only will the Army clean up very promptly any weak spots in its efficiency, the waste spots in its spending, and expunge and punish those responsible for any spots which indicate anything worse than inefficiency, but that the Navy will do likewise.

The Congress and the country must be careful to make a clear-cut distinction

between waste which is the inevitable result of haste and waste which may result from neglect, indifference, inefficiency, or worse.

This is a gravely serious question, because the whole Nation must depend, in the final analysis, upon the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps. Any justified weakening in the public confidence in the military and naval services would be a tragedy of inexpressible proportions and effect to the United States of America. The services must be kept above suspicion of waste, extravagance, inefficiency, or unfair dealings. The grand traditions of both branches of the service must be maintained in their highest form. Whatever basis may exist for the report of the House Military Affairs Committee must promptly be removed. The Nation must stand solidly behind its armed services, and those services must deserve to the fullest extent the confidence reposed in them by the people.

I am one Member of Congress who most firmly believes that both services will profit by the criticisms which have been expressed and that they will, under all circumstances, rise to the great heights of unselfish devotion they have heretofore bestowed upon their country.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS] for 5 minutes.

THE RED CROSS BILL AND VESTED RIGHTS

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the hour is late, but I believe the House should be informed of the progress made to date on the bill to protect the Red Cross name and emblem from commercial exploitation.

On April 3, President Roosevelt sent a message to Congress asking action on a bill "designed the more effectively to carry out our obligations under the Red Cross Convention of 1929" by barring commercial use of the name and emblem in the United States in a year. The message, draft bill, and report from Sumner Welles were referred to the Foreign Affairs Committee, and our chairman, Representative BLOOM, introduced the bill, H. R. 6911.

Elaborate hearings were conducted. Representatives of the American Red Cross, among them the Honorable Norman Davis, chairman, and Miss Mabel Boardman, secretary, and representatives of the State Department, Department of Justice, and the Surgeon General's Office testified in favor of the bill. The principal commercial users testified at length. We learned that there are about seven of these, basing their rights on use prior to 1905 under existing law. Each commercial user feels it has a vested right to use the Red Cross name and emblem to identify its own goods; each commercial user spoke highly of the American Red Cross and protested that it wanted to cooperate in the work of the American Red Cross, but not one of them has ever advertised that it was not connected with the American Red Cross or that its goods were not endorsed by the American Red Cross, although this is the fact.

One commercial user suggested that the commercial advertising was beneficial to the Red Cross, but none of them suggested that Congress should expand the commercial use of the label to more products and additional companies, in order to help the American Red Cross. There was no evidence of commercial use of the Red Cross in America before 1864, when the International Red Cross was founded, or before 1881, when the American Red Cross Society was incorporated by Congress.

We learned that no other English-speaking country permits the commercial use of the Red Cross and that such use in our country has caused international protests. Toward the end of the hearings, our chairman received an additional letter from the President urging favorable action on the bill and saying "To great numbers of loyal Americans it seems almost a sacrilege for any person for private material benefit to use an emblem created by international agreement solely for humane purposes," and letters urging action were received from the Secretary of War, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Attorney General. On May 27 the public hearings closed. The last committee meeting on the bill was held last Tuesday.

H. R. 6911 seems to be dead, as a new bill has been introduced, including the White Cross of Switzerland, and two more "committee prints" have been studied. I have been assured that all of our committee want to help the American Red Cross, but questions about treaties, history, trade-marks, constitutional law and vested rights seem to keep coming up to perplex, divide, confuse, and delay the committee. We find it impossible to draft a bill that will protect the Red Cross from commercial exploitation and still permit its exploitation.

After nearly 3 months this bill, backed by the President and four Cabinet members as required to carry out our international obligations and to further the war effort, is still in committee. No further committee meetings have been announced and recess is coming on.

This is all the progress I can report on the Red Cross bill.

Speaking for myself, I would like to see the American Red Cross name and emblem protected by prompt action on this bill; I believe in considering vested rights even in wartime, although we have destroyed overnight the "vested rights" of many businesses and businessmen in our war effort, but I believe no one has a vested right in the good will of another, and particularly, no one has a vested right to label and advertise his goods, directly or indirectly, as connected with or endorsed by this great international institution of mercy and aid to the suffering; I believe the International Red Cross and the American Red Cross, with its 29,000,000 members and 3,000,000 voluntary workers, have a vested right in the emblem under which they serve—a right to have no man profit commercially from its use.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma filed a conference report and statement on the Department of the Interior appropriation bill.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. HAINES, for 5 days, on account of being indisposed.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7212. An act to amend section 13 (d) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 337. An act to provide for a permanent postage rate of 3 cents per pound on books.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2424. An act for the relief of Clarence J. Meteyer, Lester W. Engels, and Dorothy B. Engels;

H. R. 2646. An act for the relief of L. W. Marek, Jr.;

H. R. 4092. An act for the relief of E. P. Corley;

H. R. 4554. An act for the relief of the estate of Julian B. Wiggins, deceased, and the estate of R. E. Thompson, deceased;

H. R. 4941. An act for the relief of J. C. Lemon, Louis McCoy, and Patricia McCoy;

H. R. 5070. An act for the relief of Francis Corwin Circle;

H. R. 5454. An act for the relief of David Caron;

H. R. 5619. An act for the relief of certain clerks in the post office at Detroit, Mich.;

H. R. 5854. An act for the relief of Madeleine Hammett, Olive Hammett, Walter Young, the estate of Laura O'Malley Young, deceased, and the legal guardian of Laura Elizabeth Young;

H. R. 6033. An act for the relief of William Tipton, Mrs. William Tipton, and Mrs. Eula Nelson;

H. R. 6184. An act for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. E. P. Ball;

H. R. 6355. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to expedite national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 28, 1940;

H. R. 6430. An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6496. An act to authorize the appointment of commissioned warrant and warrant officers to commissioned rank in the line and staff corps of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6557. An act for the relief of James Gilmore and Marian E. Gilmore;

H. R. 6899. An act to exempt custodial employees of the District of Columbia Board of Education from the operation of the provisions of section 6 of the Legislative, Execu-

tive, and Judicial Appropriation Act approved May 10, 1916;

H. R. 6908. An act to amend the Defense Highway Act of 1941;

H. R. 7041. An act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 311. Joint resolution continuing the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation as an agency of the United States.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Saturday, June 27, 1942, at 11 o'clock a. m.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, June 30, for consideration of H. R. 7153, room 1304, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, June 30, 1942.

Business to be considered: Hearing on Federal Communications Commission.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, July 9, 1942, at 10 a. m. on H. R. 1616, to amend section 509, as amended, of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7143. A bill to expedite the payment for land acquired during the war period; with amendment (Rept. No. 2289). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 7286. A bill authorizing the head of the department or agency using the public domain for war purposes to compensate holders of grazing permits and licenses for losses sustained by reason of such use of public lands for war purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2290). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. H. R. 7297. A bill authorizing the assignment of personnel from departments or agencies in the executive branch of the Government to certain investigating committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2291). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 7282. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Disabled American Veterans of the World War," approved June 17, 1932, so as to change the name to "Disabled American Veterans," and to extend membership eligibility therein to American citizens, honorably discharged from the active military or naval forces of the United States, or of some country allied with the United States, who have been either wounded, injured, or disabled by reason of such active service during time of war; with amendment (Rept. No. 2292). Referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah: Committee on the Public Lands. S. 925. An act for the relief of Lemuel T. Root, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2293). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS F. FORD:

H. R. 7310. A bill to amend section 12b of the Federal Reserve Act to provide for the deduction of certain credits from assessments due Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation by certain insured banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi:

H. R. 7311. A bill to amend section 6 of Public Law No. 2, Seventy-third Congress, March 20, 1933, as amended; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. MANSFIELD:

H. Res. 511 Resolution authorizing the Committee on Rivers and Harbors of the House of Representatives to have printed additional copies of the hearings held before said committee on the bill (H. R. 6999) for the extension of the Gulf Intracoastal Waterway and construction of a barge channel across northern Florida; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. Res. 512. Resolution authorizing the printing of the manuscript of an article showing that the vote cast by Congressman Matthew Lyon, of Vermont, was the deciding factor in the election of Thomas Jefferson as the third President of the United States, be printed as a House document; to the Committee on Printing.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SATURDAY, JUNE 27, 1942

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Edward G. Latch, Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father of all mercies, we give Thee most humble and hearty thanks for Thy goodness to us and to all men. "Behold what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us that we should be called the sons of God." Enable us, we pray Thee, to enter into our heritage as Thy children and to enter into our heritage as the leaders and citizens of a great country. Help us, O God, to keep our Nation great—great in character, great in truth, and great in righteousness.

Guide, we beseech Thee, the deliberations of this body that with wisdom, courage, and fidelity we may do our work, avoiding all selfishness, seeking ever for cooperation and looking unto Thee, the source of all our being and the goal of our highest endeavor.

In the hour of high decision, be Thou our guide and in our inmost souls be Thou our Saviour and friend. We pray through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7184. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7181. An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the foregoing bill, requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. WHITE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 2565. An act to amend sections 12A and 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended;

S. 2599. An act authorizing the head of the department or agency using the public domain for war purposes to compensate holders of grazing permits and licenses for losses sustained by reason of such use of public lands for war purposes; and

S. 2604. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Republican River.

ASSIGNMENT OF PERSONNEL FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS TO SELECT CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 7297) authorizing the assignment of personnel from departments or agencies in the executive branch of the Government to certain investigating committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what does this bill do?

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, this bill is necessary because of the decision of the Comptroller General relating to the detailing of employees of the executive branch of the Government to select committees of Congress. The Comptroller General held it was illegal to detail employees of the executive branch of the Government in certain cases to select committees of Congress and pay those employees from the appropriation for the department or agency. No one can dispute his decision.

At the present time, as a result of that decision, your committees, such as the Vinson committee, the May committee, the Bland committee, the Patman committee, and other committees, are not functioning. They were required to send back to the executive departments and agencies the employees who were detailed to them. The same situation exists in the Senate with reference to the Truman committee and other committees.

The purpose of this bill—and, remember, it is permanent legislation—is to permit the detailing of these employees to the committees when it is determined that they have the qualifications necessary to do the work that the select committee desires. But the most important part of the bill is that the Congress is going to be required to reimburse the department or agency in the amount of the salaries of the employees who are detailed. In other words, the House is going to be required to appropriate money for its select committees, to reimburse the executive branch of the Government for the employees from the executive branch who are detailed to the legislative branch.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why is that necessary?

Mr. COCHRAN. Because the Comptroller General has rendered a decision that it was illegal to detail employees from the executive branch of the Government and pay them from appropriations for that department or agency.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If we pass a resolution authorizing this, and it was signed by the President, they would be obliged to do it. It would not be necessary to give them any additional money?

Mr. COCHRAN. I doubt if the President would sign such a bill. We have this resolution worded in such way that they cannot ask for help unless they have the money available to their credit. The only check that we have on our select committees with reference to this law is that they must get the money from the Committee on Accounts. The Committee on Accounts will try and hold them down.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Are they going to get two salaries?

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, no; absolutely not.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. COCHRAN. I will.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the departments then employ other people to take the places of those who are transferred?

Mr. COCHRAN. There is a provision which provides that the money for reimbursement is covered into the Treasury unless they find it necessary to employ somebody to fill the vacancy.

Mr. DONDERO. If they do not employ somebody else they should not be reimbursed.

Mr. COCHRAN. They have to be reimbursed, but we have a provision in this bill that requires them to cover that money into the Treasury.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. If they were assigned for 3 months, would they draw a year's salary?

Mr. COCHRAN. Oh, no; only 3 months' salary.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. The representative of the Comptroller General said this was the only legal way it could be done, in their opinion, and this resolution you have brought in is legal.

Mr. COCHRAN. Two representatives of the Comptroller General, including the Chief of the Legal Division and a representative of the Bureau of the Budget, sat with the Committee on Accounts and helped draw this bill. All of them expressed the opinion that this will meet the decision of the Comptroller General, Mr. Warren.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman whether these men are to be transferred from other bureaus and departments of the Government for a certain specified time while they are working with the special committees?

Mr. COCHRAN. They retain their status with the department while they are working for special committees of the House and Senate.

Mr. CARTER. Well, who is doing their work while they are working with the special committees?

Mr. COCHRAN. That is for the department to tell you. I do not know.

Mr. CARTER. If the department can get along without them while they are working for the special committees, why should not the job be abolished?

Mr. COCHRAN. Well, that is up to the Appropriations Committee to do it and not to me. The gentleman happens to be a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CARTER. That is one thing I am trying to do here today. I want the gentleman from Missouri to understand that I am trying to save money to the extent of a few millions of dollars.

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes; I know what the gentleman is trying to do. That is a job for the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CARTER. I hope I may have the cooperation of the gentleman from Missouri in doing it.

Mr. COCHRAN. We will meet that bridge when we come to it. Let me say that last year at one time there were detailed to the House and Senate employees whose total salary amounted to $350,000; and that is the time that the President, through the Bureau of the Budget, objected to the detailing of so many departmental employees.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. Does the gentleman know in how many instances where departments have detailed employees here for a month or two that they have employed somebody else to take the place of that employee?

Mr. COCHRAN. Under the situation that existed they could not get substitutes because they did not have the money; we did not reimburse them.

Mr. REED of New York. The executive department has plenty of money it can spend as it desires.

Mr. COCHRAN. No; it does not. Read the appropriation bills. They specify just how the money shall be used. They are allowed so many employees of each class.

Mr. REED of New York. But the Chief Executive has money he can use any way he wishes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I think the gentleman's resolution is a good one. There are lots of times when departments can spare men to help these investigating committees, and it will be an economy so far as the operation of the Government is concerned, because they can catch up in their work eventually. By getting these men from the departments we get men of experience, and I think it will help the House investigating committees. I believe it to be a matter of economy.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that the gentleman has objected to this very thing being done in years gone by? The gentleman objected that the investigating committees of the House should have any help from any of the departments. It was the gentleman's position that no department should be allowed to aid any House investigating committee in its work. Is not that a fact, that the gentleman objected to it in the past?

Mr. COCHRAN. Our select committees have asked the departments all the time for men, and they have got most of the men they asked for. True, I was not in sympathy with many of the requests made; our select committees went too far.

Mr. SABATH. Is it not a fact that we also passed a law at one time prohibiting the investigating committees from asking the detail of employees from the departments?

Mr. COCHRAN. No; we did not. We included in all the resolutions a provision authorizing the select committee to request that the departments detail certain employees to assist them. We do not make it mandatory, but since the President made his objections last year through the Bureau of the Budget that provision has not been included in sub-

sequent resolutions setting up these special committees.

Mr. SABATH. What committees now need this extra help from the departments?

Mr. COCHRAN. The committee of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. VINSON] is absolutely not functioning. He has been forced to turn back 20 auditors and accountants. When you take into consideration the amount of money that investigating committee has saved the Government, I am not going to be put into the position of hamstringing that committee in its work. Four other committees are affected.

Mr. SABATH. That applies also to the May committee, does it not?

Mr. COCHRAN. Yes. I yield now to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. McCORMACK. My understanding is that the position of the gentleman from Missouri has been absolutely consistent. The gentleman from Missouri, as I understand—and if I am wrong, I wish to be corrected—the gentleman from Missouri has taken the position that special committees should not get as assistants employees of the departments whose salaries were paid by the departments, but the gentleman from Missouri has never taken the position that qualified employees who could assist special committees should not be utilized if the legislative branch of the Government paid their salaries while they were serving the special committees. Am I correct?

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct. Under the decision of the Comptroller General a department cannot send men down here unless we reimburse the department. I felt all the time such a decision would some day be rendered.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am merely making this observation so the RECORD will show that the position of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] is absolutely consistent and clear, and that the resolution he reports from his committee is consistent with the position he has always taken.

This resolution will enable special committees to get the services of the men who are eminently qualified, and it also places the responsibility of paying their salaries while they are in the service of the special committees upon the legislative branch of the Government. It also prevents a lot of confusion and misunderstanding. It would also prevent the special committees from stepping into the executive branch and getting a larger number of employees than they would ordinarily need, because the control of the payment of their salaries while serving the special committees rests with the Congress of the United States through the Accounts Committee.

Mr. COCHRAN. The gentleman is absolutely correct.

Mr. SABATH. This House has heretofore, through the Accounts Committee, refused to appropriate any reasonable amount for some of the committees that have been doing good work.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. MAY. The situation is simply this with our committee. We have only had a few employees borrowed from the Government, not over five I think at any one time. But if they are not loaned from these departments that have them and chargeable to their funds, why it will be taken out of the funds of the House and we will exhaust our funds in paying these people.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. In this connection may I say to the gentleman from Missouri that this resolution will enable the committee to get men who are qualified, men who have had experience in this work, without having to go out and get raw material and training them, which will take up a lot of time and expense. I can see absolutely nothing wrong with this resolution. The fact is, I think it is necessary for these committees that are doing this investigation if they are to function properly.

Mr. HOLMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. HOLMES. This does not affect the standing committees that have legislative matters under consideration?

Mr. COCHRAN. No.

Mr. HOLMES. Whereby a department might come up and give us some assistance?

Mr. COCHRAN. That matter was discussed. The head of the Comptroller's legal division told us they would not be disturbed.

Mr. NICHOLS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. NICHOLS. I am for the resolution. At this time particularly it is absolutely impossible to find qualified personnel to do this job for these committees, and I have had some experience in this matter. If we do not have the means of getting this qualified personnel from the administrative branch, we simply cannot get it, and I want to compliment the gentleman for the work he has done. I think it is important that this resolution pass.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. I simply want to endorse what the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. NICHOLS] has said. I have been trying for 6 months to get some assistance along this line.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN]?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the head of any department or agency in the executive branch of the Government may detail or assign personnel therein to any committee of the Senate or House of Representatives duly authorized by resolution thereof to make an investigation relating to the activities of any department or agency in the executive branch under the following conditions: (1) The resolution providing for such investigation, or a supplemental resolution, either authorizes the committee to request the use of such personnel, or contains a provision under which the head of any department or agency is requested to detail or assign personnel to the committee: *Provided*, That in the case of resolutions heretofore passed, such request shall be deemed to have been contained therein for the purposes of this act; (2) the personnel so detailed or assigned may, in the opinion of the head of the department or agency, be detached from duties therein without impairment of the public service; (3) the qualifications or experience of the personnel to be so detailed or assigned, in the opinion of the chairman of the investigating committee, particularly fit them for the work of such committee; and (4) the appropriations of such department or agency from which the personnel so detailed or assigned is paid shall be reimbursed monthly from funds available to the committee prior to the detail or assignment in the amount of the salaries of such personnel while on such detail or assignment: *Provided further*, That such reimbursements shall be expended by any such department or agency only to the extent necessary to replace sums used to employ substitute personnel for personnel so detailed or assigned and any reimbursements not so needed shall lapse and be carried to the surplus fund of the Treasury.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMPENSATION TO HOLDERS OF GRAZING PERMITS

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2599) authorizing the head of the department or agency using public domain for war purposes to compensate holders of grazing permits and licenses for losses sustained by reason of such use of public lands for war purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. ROBINSON]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, just what does this resolution do?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the purpose of this bill is to pay people who have grazing privileges or licenses on the public land the value of these privileges or licenses where the land is taken for a higher use such as, for instance, a bombing range. For example, the Army has gone into certain States in the West and selected bombing areas where people have grazing privileges. Under the law as it now stands there is no way that the Army can pay any money for these licenses or privileges because the Department of Justice has held that the owners of these permits and licenses have no vested interest. In many instances the Army was ready to make payment of the amount that in their opinion should be paid and had agreed with these persons to pay this amount when they found that they had no legal right to make this payment. The purpose of this

bill is to give the heads of the governmental division the right to determine what amount should be paid and to make this payment.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The Government owns this land?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is true.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How much is paid for the grazing privilege?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. They pay so much each year, and this amount varies in the different sections of the country.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will we be in the position where the Government will pay more for the right to go over its own land than it is receiving from the person who feeds his cattle on it?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. They might in some instances, but they have no right to pay anything under the present law. So that we will get the full picture of it, may I say that when the situation arose representatives of the Department of Justice, the Department of Agriculture, the War Department, and the Interior Department all met and agreed that something would have to be done, and they prepared this bill that is now before us. The bill was considered in the Senate and unanimously passed by that body. It was considered by the Public Lands Committee of the House and unanimously passed by that committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How much money is involved?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Very little.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. How much?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I cannot say exactly. There are maybe 25 or 30 men involved who will get all the way from a few dollars up to perhaps a thousand dollars or more for their grazing privileges.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Can the gentleman not give some kind of a guess?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. My guess would be there is not $10,000 involved in the whole matter. This is only a guess.

Mr. HOLMES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HOLMES].

Mr. HOLMES. The gentleman says that these men who are now enjoying these grazing privileges paid nothing for them in the first place?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No; that is not correct. They have paid for these grazing privileges. In some instances they have gone onto the land and they have made numerous improvements on the land and in some instances they have been grazing the land for a number of years.

Mr. HOLMES. In other words, they made a material expenditure in order to improve the land by fencing and doing other improvements to make it worth while?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The gentleman is absolutely correct. Now, the Government comes along and proposes to take it, but cannot compensate them under the present law.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I rise to confirm what the chairman of the committee has just said, that this legislation has been worked out with all the departments concerned; in fact, the War Department has virtually asked for the legislation. It has been reported by a unanimous vote of the Committee on Public Lands. I think it is desirable legislation to facilitate the war program throughout the West.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. These public lands are leased by the Interior Department to cattlemen and sheepmen who want to use these lands for grazing purposes?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. RICH. Do these men pay in advance for the privilege of going onto these lands?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Most of them pay in advance.

Mr. RICH. The Department makes a contract with these men to use the land for grazing purposes?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. RICH. The Federal Government owns the land. Now, the Army wants to use the land for bombing purposes or other purposes necessary for war. Does it in any way make a contribution to anyone who does not have a contract with the Government for grazing?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No; it does not, to anyone who does not have a contract for grazing.

Mr. RICH. Then the only thing the War Department would do would be to pay for the actual amount of money invested in these lands by the individual through the Interior Department, is that correct?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Largely so.

Mr. RICH. There is the point. We are not going to pay any more for the privilege of letting the Army do something, in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill. If there is any "nigger in the woodpile" in that respect, this bill cannot go through, because we are not going to do that any more. We have been paying enough to people for things that belong to the Government. We are not going to let one branch of the Government pay individuals because a contract has been made or because somebody else has been using public lands. I do not think that is right, and I do not think it should be done.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I agree with the gentleman. As far as I know, there is nothing in this bill that contemplates any such procedure.

Mr. RICH. I have a great deal of confidence in the gentleman from Utah, but if there is anything in this bill that in any way causes the Army to pay individuals for something because they happen to be on Government lands, then I am against the bill. I want to be so recorded. I hope you will not pass it through if that is the case.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. If I understand the gentleman correctly, I thoroughly agree with his position.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. The gentleman stated that the contracts are written in advance. Has the gentleman a copy of one of these contracts?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No; I do not have a copy here.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. What are the contents of these contracts? What do they provide?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The contract provides that the landowner can go on these lands and graze his cattle or sheep for a certain payment.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am talking about the Army contract now, to drop bombs on this land.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The Army does not make any contract. The Army simply goes there and says, "We want this land for bombing purposes."

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Then I did not understand. Have there been any figures mentioned in connection with this bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I think figures have been mentioned, but I am not familiar with all the figures.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I am not quite satisfied with the presentation.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. If the gentleman does not care to discuss this with me, I will simply object.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman has yielded to me.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Very well, then, I will simply object, if that is the way the gentleman feels about it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The reason I yielded to the gentleman from North Carolina is that I thought perhaps he had a better explanation than I had in answer to the gentleman's question.

Mr. BULWINKLE. May I ask the gentleman this question: Suppose I have some cattle and have not paid the rent on the land. If the Army takes over that land, can I then bring a claim for speculative damages against the Government because I do not have a feeding place?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. The answer to that is, absolutely not. You have no right to bring any action against the Government for any grazing.

Mr. BULWINKLE. I am talking about the claims.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. No claim at all. You have no right at all, and the Department of Justice has so held. This bill gives you the right only to receive such sum as the Army wants to pay you.

Now I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. I do not want to be understood as obstructing this program or as desiring merely to object. I am simply trying to find out what is involved in the way of money payments. It is true that these grazing lands are not costing the people who use them a great

deal of money. What the lands are worth I do not know. However, I would like to have some figures to show what this will cost.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona to reply to that. Many of the lands in question are in his State.

Mr. MURDOCK. This bill cannot set up figures or a formula for recompense, but it will be far less than what is given up. These areas are in all the Western States where the Taylor Grazing Act prevails. The public domain is used by cattlemen or livestock people under permits. The permits are cancelable by the Government, but rarely are canceled in peacetimes and are valuable. The cattlemen or the livestock people, the sheep men, too, have to pay the Government for the grazing permits. Now, however, the War Department wants to take over certain of these areas to use as bombing ranges. This means that all livestock there must be removed. The permits are canceled. This means that the livestock man is thrown out of that area and must go some place else to find other grazing lands or go out of business. Today the Government is calling upon western livestockmen to produce meat, hides, and wool in ever-increasing quantities. Our problem here is to facilitate the war effort in both respects by making quickly available to the War Department the needed areas without unfairness to stockmen and with the least maladjustment of livestock production. Now, all this legislation does is to permit the War Department to make financial adjustments with these stockmen not only for their patented lands but for the grazing permits which are canceled.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. That answers the question. In other words, what we are really aiming at here is to compensate the people who rented this land for their losses.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to know if this is a matter to be considered by the House or is it just a private conference?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, if you are going to do all that the gentleman has just said you are going to do, it will come to more than $10,000.

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Much of this land is in the State of Arizona and also in Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I want to say in reply to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. SMITH] and for his particular information and for the information of the gentleman from Massachusetts——

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I reserve the right to object, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. O'CONNOR. There is a lot of this territory in my State of Montana, and so far as paying for grazing in this territory by the stockmen is concerned, they all pay in advance all that it is worth.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In what way?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Because this gives the Government the right to go on that territory and use it for bombing purposes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. It is the Government's own land.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes; but the gentleman must understand that our stockmen get permits for running cattle and running sheep on them and they pay for those permits in advance from year to year, and the permittee has preferential rights that are very valuable to them.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Why could not this all be adjusted when they make the yearly contracts?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course, at the time the permit is granted neither knows that it will be necessary to cancel them. Bear in mind that everything must give way to our war efforts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is right and that is what we are trying to do.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Vested rights and everything else must give way when necessary and the purpose of this bill is to give the War Department the right to go on that land and use it regardless of the permits, by paying the damages.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. The Government has that power now. The War Department can go on this land and use it for war purposes, but this bill provides payment to the grazers.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I understand that while the War Department may have the power to do that without pay, at the same time the man who pays for the use of the land from year to year, when we are at peace, has some preferential rights in the matter and his rights should be respected so far as pay is concerned, as in many instances they are vital to him.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman should withdraw his bill for the moment or until we know more about this matter.

Mr. MURDOCK. May I say that the leases are for 10-year periods?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the request at this particular time.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments, disagree to the Senate amendments and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, has the gentleman from South Carolina discussed this matter with the minority members?

Mr. HARE. Yes.

Mr. ENGEL. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the subcommittee had a meeting this morning and went over the bill.

Mr. TABER. And the request is agreeable to the gentleman?

Mr. ENGEL. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HARE, TARVER, THOMAS of Texas, CANNON of Missouri, ENGEL, and KEEFE.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LEAVY. I have two requests to make, Mr. Speaker. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article from an issue of Pic magazine dealing with the work of my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Also, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from a constituent of mine on the subject of undermining Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by inserting an address I delivered at the graduating exercises of the United States Coast Guard Academy on June 19.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a suggested code for critics during wartime, which was prepared by Archibald MacLeish, Gordon M. Allport, and Dr. H. H. Murray, of Boston. A part of it is in parallel columns, and I ask unanimous consent that it be so printed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report upon the bill (H. R. 6845), making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 37, 39, 43, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 91, 96, 105, 113, 114, 115, 118, 119, 123, 124, 125, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 135, 144, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 155, 158, 163, 172, 174, 179, 180, 184, 189, 190, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 202, 207, 208, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256,

257, 259, 264, 265, 266, 267, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 277, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, and 297.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 15, 24, 29, 45, 63, 64, 65, 88, 89, 90, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 120, 121, 126, 136, 137, 147, 148, 160, 164, 165, 166, 173, 176, 185, 186, 203, 204, 205, 210, 261, 280, and 281; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "967,170"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "2,447,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,340,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Fire protection of forests, forest industries, and strategic facilities (national defense): For an additional amount to be added to the appropriation contained in the 'Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942' for 'Fire protection of forests, forest industries, and strategic facilities (national defence,' $95,900, to be immediately available, of which not to exceed $8,000 may be used for personal services in the District of Columbia."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$47,320"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$703,680"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$115,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$32,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$15,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$210,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$65,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$165,930"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$85,130"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$134,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$551,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,822,505"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sur proposed insert "$5,551,936"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,620,870"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$925,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$44,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$39,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ", including not to exceed $40,000 of said amount to be used for exterminating wolves and coyotes"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,253,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "40,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$147,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$113,875"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 132: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$43,855"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 133: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 134: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 134, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 138: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$724,840"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 139: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 139, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 140: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 140, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$80,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 141: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 142: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 142, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,475,840"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,647,060"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 145: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 145, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$399,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 146: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 146, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 154: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,249,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 157: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,249,070"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 159: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 159, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 161: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 161, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 167: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 167, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 168: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 168, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 169: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 169, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 170: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 170, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$525,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 175: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 175, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$997,015"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 177: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 177, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$644,580"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 178: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 178, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 181: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 181, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,298,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 182: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 182, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$170,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 183: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 183, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$975,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 187: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$339,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 188: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 188, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,691,090"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 191: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 191, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$356,205"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 206: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 206, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$742,875"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 209: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 209, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$55,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 211: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 211, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,167,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 258: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 258, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$910,715"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 260: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 260, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$467,080"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 262: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 262, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$365,540, of which $25,000 shall be available immediately"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 263: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 263, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$85,690"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 268: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 268, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 269: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 269, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 270: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 270, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$748,550"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 276: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 276, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,661,570"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 278: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 278, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,911,570"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 279: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 279, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$921,505"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 109, 111, 112, 156, 162, 171, 192, 199, 200, 201, 212, 213, and 214.

JED JOHNSON,
J. G. SCRUGHAM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT F. RICH,
Managers on the part of the House.

CARL HAYDEN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
GERALD P. NYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal yeaf ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendments relating to travel expenses

The following amendments are those in which travel expense only is involved: Nos. 3 to 6, inclusive, 11 to 14, inclusive, 16 to 23, inclusive, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 43, 47 to 59, inclusive, 61, 70 to 86, inclusive, 91, 96, 114, 118, 119, 123, 124, 125, 127 to 131, inclusive, 135, 144, 149, 150, 153, 155, 158, 163, 172, 174, 179, 184, 189, 190, 193 to 198, inclusive, 202, 207, 208, 215 to 253, inclusive, 255, 256, 257, 259, 264, 265, 267, 271, 272, 273, 274, 282 to 292, inclusive, 294 and 296. The House made numerous reductions in individual items under the amendments set forth above. The Senate restored these reductions and inserted a paragraph providing for a 10 percent reduction. The conference report restores the House proposals, resulting in a reduction of approximately $561,000.

No. 1: Appropriates $967,170 for salaries, office of the Secretary, instead of $855,650, as proposed by the House, and $1,002,170 as proposed by the Senate. The increase of $111,520 above the House figure represents approval by the conference committee of $8,000 for the salary of the Chief of Research and planning Branch, Division of Power, $28,520 for the Power Policy Committee, $50,000 for the Division of Information, and $25,000 for the Division of Investigations.

No. 2: Appropriates $126,145, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $120,785, as proposed by the House, for the Division of Territories and Island Possessions.

No. 7: Appropriates $2,447,500 for the Bituminous Coal Division, instead of $2,442,254, as proposed by the House, and $2,620,500, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 8 and 9: Appropriates $1,340,000 for soil and moisture conservation operations, instead of $1,300,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,500,000, as proposed by the Senate, the increase of $40,000 being for soil and moisture conservation operations under the Bureau of Reclamation. The House proposal, $100,000, for personal services in the

District of Columbia, is inserted, in lieu of $120,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 10: Appropriates $95,900 for fire protection of forests, in lieu of $96,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Bonneville Power Administration

No. 15: Provides $1,700,000 for operation of transmission facilities and expenses of marketing, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $1,350,000, as proposed by the House.

Bureau of Indian Affairs

No. 24: Appropriates $610,040, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $604,280, as proposed by the House, for salaries in the office of the Commissioner.

No. 25: Appropriates $47,320 for general expenses, in lieu of $46,820, as proposed by the House and $50,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 29: Appropriates $325,000, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $165,000, as proposed by the House, for the acquisition of land for Indians.

Nos. 32 and 33: Appropriates $90,000 for expenses of supervising mining operations on Indian lands, as proposed by the House, instead of $100,000, as proposed by the Senate, and provides that $10,000 of such sum shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House.

No. 34: Appropriates $703,680, for developing agriculture and stock-raising, instead of $693,180, as proposed by the House, and $708,980, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 35: Appropriates $115,000 for encouraging industry and self-support among Indians, in lieu of $100,000, as proposed by the House, and $125,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 36, 37 and 38, relating to funds for loans to Indian-chartered corporations: Appropriates $125,000, in lieu of $112,200, as proposed by the House, and $150,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides $20,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House, in lieu of $27,800, as proposed by the Senate; and makes $100,000 available for services and expenses in the field, in lieu of $88,000, as proposed by the House, and $113,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 39: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate providing $22,500 for expenses of the National Indian Institute. The action of the conferees does not necessarily mean that they are opposed to the continuance of this activity. However, it is the opinion of the House conferees that this organization should not be given a more or less permanent status by placing funds for it in an annual appropriation bill. The activity is now being financed from emergency funds available to the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs. If continuance of the Institute is regarded as essential by the Interior Department the House conferees believe funds for such purpose should be secured from the agency now supporting it and that the matter of providing funds on a regular annual basis should not be determined at the present time.

Nos. 40, 41, and 42: Appropriates $32,750, for Indian arts and crafts development, instead of $30,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides that $15,000 shall be available for personal services in the District of Columbia, instead of $13,500, as proposed by the Senate and $16,000, as proposed by the House, and places a limit of $6,500 on the amount which may be paid as salary for any employee engaged on this work, in lieu of $5,000, as proposed by the Senate and $7,500, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 44, 45, and 46, relating to operation and maintenance of irrigation systems: Appropriates $210,000 for such purpose, in lieu of $218,475, as proposed by the Senate, and $193,275, as proposed by the House; makes funds for miscellaneous projects in Arizona and New Mexico available for "projects", in lieu of "project"; and provides $65,000 for administrative expenses, as proposed by the House, instead of $71,725, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 60: Appropriates $165,980 for operation of the Wapato irrigation system, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $159,000, as proposed by the House.

No. 62: Appropriates $85,130 for protection of project works, in lieu of $31,900, as proposed by the House, and $90,000, as proposed by the Senate. Funds are provided for the Fort Hall project, Idaho, and the Duck Valley project, Nevada, on a 10 months' basis; and $3,600 has been eliminated for the Wind River project, Wyoming, due to the receipt of information that such service would be ineffective owing to the wide area covered by the project.

Nos. 63, 64, 65, 66, and 67, relating to construction and repair of Indian irrigation projects: Inserts $50,000 for the Fort Peck project, Montana, instead of $10,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $15,000 for the Warm Springs project, Oregon, and $50,000 for the Wind River project, Wyoming, provides $134,750 for administrative expenses, and corrects the total for such items.

No. 68: Appropriates $5,822,505 for the support of Indian schools, in lieu of $5,731,005, as proposed by the House, and $5,874,755, as proposed by the Senate. Funds are provided for the care of children attending the following mission schools:

St. Agnes (Oklahoma)	$7,500
St. Stephen's (Wyoming)	2,500
Papago Missions (Arizona)	6,000
St. Michael's (Wyoming)	1,750
St. Paul's (Montana)	6,000
Immaculate Conception (South Dakota)	7,250
Old Goodland (Oklahoma)	20,500
Total	51,500

An increase of $40,000 has been provided for educational work under the Minnesota State education contract. A Senate proposal to provide $6,900 for education of Indian children in Terrebonne Parish, La., has been eliminated.

No. 69: Appropriations $334,375 from Indian tribal funds for educational purposes, as proposed by the House, in lieu of $335,775, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 87, 88, 89, and 90, relating to conservation of health among Indians: Appropriates $5,551,936, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $5,479,835, as proposed by the House, for such purpose; and provides $23,475 for continued operation of the Fort Yuma Hospital, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 92, 93, 94, 95, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, and 108, relating to general support of Indians and administration of Indian property: Appropriates $2,620,870 for general expenses of administration, in lieu of $2,605,870, as proposed by the House, and $2,646,870, as proposed by the Senate; provides $925,000 for relief of needy Indians, in lieu of $750,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,100,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which $44,750 shall be available for administrative expenses, in lieu of $30,000, as proposed by the House, and $59,500, as proposed by the Senate, including $39,700 for personal services in the District of Columbia, in lieu of $35,000, as proposed by the House, and $44,400, as proposed by the Senate; provides for the use of $40,000 of funds appropriated for the reindeer service for exterminating wolves and coyotes; appropriates tribal funds for the employment on a 1 year's basis of attorneys or agents for the Klamath Indians, Oregon, Uintah and Ouray, Utah, Menominee Indians, Wisconsin, Makah, Washington, Northern Cheyenne Tribe, Montana, and Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Montana; corrects the total for expenditures from tribal funds for support of Indians; provides $14,375 for the care of children attending the St. Benedict's Mission, Minnesota; all as proposed by the Senate; and provides $25,000 for expenses of tribal councils, as proposed by the House, in lieu of $35,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 110: Appropriates $1,253,000 for construction of roads on Indian reservations, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $1,148,000, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 113 and 115, relating to construction and repair of buildings on Indian reservations: Strikes out the provision of the Senate appropriating $25,000 for general repairs at Carson, Nev., and adjusts the total appropriation for construction items due to such elimination.

Bureau of Reclamation

Nos. 116 and 117: Appropriates $147,850 for expenses in the office of the Commissioner, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $135,850, as proposed by the House, of which $40,850 is made available for necessary expenses, in lieu of $41,000, as proposed by the Senate, and $28,850, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 120, 121, and 122, relating to the Minidoka project, Idaho: Appropriates $113,875 for operation and repair of such project, in lieu of $114,000, as proposed by the Senate, and $13,925 for operation, as proposed by the House.

No. 126: Appropriates $17,000 for operation of the Vale project, Oregon, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 132: Appropriates $43,855 for the operation and maintenance administration, in lieu of $34,855, as proposed by the House, and $54,400, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, and 143, relating to construction of projects from the reclamation fund: Appropriates $50,000 for the Sun River project, Montana, and $100,000 for the Deschutes project, Oregon, in lieu of $100,000 and $200,000, respectively, as proposed by the Senate; provides $6,000 for the Hyrum project, Utah, as proposed by the Senate, instead of $1,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $724,840 for the Riverton project, Wyoming, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $65,000, as proposed by the House; provides $375,000 for general investigations, in lieu of $250,000, as proposed by the House, and $500,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $175,000 for administrative expenses, in lieu of $100,000, as proposed by the House, and $200,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which $80,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, in lieu of $50,000, as proposed by the House, and $90,000, as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the totals of appropriations from the reclamation fund.

Nos. 145 and 146: Appropriates $399,750 from the Colorado River development fund for surveys, in lieu of $150,000, as proposed by the House, and $450,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which $9,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, in lieu of $5,000, as proposed by the House, and $10,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 147 and 148: Appropriates $700,000 for protection of project works, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $400,000, as proposed by the House.

Nos. 151 and 152: Appropriates $1,000,000 for continuation of construction, All-American Canal, as proposed by the House, in lieu of $1,250,000, as proposed by the Senate, of which $5,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the House, in lieu of $10,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Nos. 154, 157, 159, 160, 161, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, 169, and 170, relating to construction of projects from the general fund: Appropriates $3,999,475 for the Davis Dam project, Arizona-

Nevada, as proposed by the House, in lieu of $4,000,000, as proposed by the Senate. Appropriates $1,249,750 for the Gila project, Arizona, instead of $1,250,000, as proposed by the Senate, and $250,000, as proposed by the House; $6,249,070 for the Colorado-Big Thompson project, Colorado, in lieu of $4,829,100, as proposed by the House, and $7,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; $750,000 for the Tucumcari project, New Mexico, in lieu of $299,925, as proposed by the House, and $800,000, as proposed by the Senate; $400,000 for the Lugert-Altus project, Oklahoma, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $99,975, as proposed by the House; $2,000,000 for the Provo River project, Utah, in lieu of $1,286,760, as proposed by the House, and $2,200,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides that not to exceed $2,000,000 of funds for the Grand Coulee Dam project, Washington, may be used for construction of the pumping plant, reservoir, and dams in Grand Coulee, and inserts subsection numbers for the several items provided for under the project; appropriates $800,000 for the Roza division of the Yakima project, Washington, in lieu of $399,940, as proposed by the House, and $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $625,000 for investigations, in lieu of $500,000, as proposed by the House, and $750,000, as proposed by the Senate; and provides $525,000 for administrative expenses, in lieu of $450,000, as proposed by the House, and $600,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 173: Strikes out the provision of the House relating to utilization of the services of enemy aliens, and restores similar language broadened to provide that the services of such persons may be used also in connection with the construction of Federal reclamation projects and other work.

Geological Survey

Nos. 175, 176, 177, 178, 180, 181, 182, 183, 185, 186, 187, and 188, relating to the Geological Survey: Appropriates $997,015, in lieu of $1,000,900, as proposed by the Senate, and $498,515, as proposed by the House, for geologic surveys, of which $480,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $300,000, as proposed by the House; appropriates $644,580, for strategic and critical minerals, in lieu of $647,980, as proposed by the Senate, and $245,980, as proposed by the House, of which $100,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, in lieu of $45,000, as proposed by the House, and $125,000, as proposed by the Senate; provides $25,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia in connection with mineral resources in Alaska, as proposed by the House, in lieu of $26,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $1,298,800 for gaging streams, in lieu of $1,241,795, as proposed by the House, and $1,363,130, as proposed by the Senate, of which $170,000 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, and provides that $975,000 shall be available only for cooperative purposes, in lieu of $970,000, as proposed by the House, and $980,000, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $246,370 for printing geologic and typographic maps, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates $339,750 for mineral leasing, in lieu of $326,670, as proposed by the House, and $352,850, as proposed by the Senate; and corrects the total for Geological Survey appropriations.

Bureau of Mines

Nos. 191, 203, 204, 205, 206, 209, 210, and 211, relating to the Bureau of Mines: Appropriates $356,205 for testing fuel, in lieu of $283,305, as proposed by the House, and $376,755, as proposed by the Senate; provides $742,875, in lieu of $744,000, as proposed by the Senate, and $93,925, as proposed by the House, for the production of alumina from low-grade bauxite, aluminum clays, and alunite, permits the purchase of buildings for such work, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of restricting such purchase to one building, as proposed by the House, and makes $16,000 available for personal services in the District of Columbia, as proposed by the Senate: appropriates $2,167,500 for investigation of deposits of critical and essential minerals, in lieu of $2,275,000, as proposed by the Senate, and $997,500, as proposed by the House, provides that $55,000 of such sum may be used for personal services in the District of Columbia, in lieu of $33,000, as proposed by the House, and $68,000, as proposed by the Senate, and provides $1,500 for printing and binding, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $1,000, as proposed by the House.

National Park Service

No. 254: Appropriates $9,820 for the Travel Bureau, as proposed by the House, in lieu of $50,000, as proposed by the Senate.

Fish and Wildlife Service

No. 258: Appropriates $910,715 in lieu of $914,715, as proposed by the Senate, and $906,715, as proposed by the House, for propagation of food fishes.

No. 260: Appropriates $467,080 in lieu of $472,720, as proposed by the Senate, and $400,000, as proposed by the House, for inquiry respecting food fishes.

No. 261: Continues available during the fiscal year 1943 the unexpended balance of an appropriation of $2,500 for the International Board of Inquiry for the Great Lakes Fisheries amended to provide that such sum shall be available for printing the report of the Board, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 262: Appropriates $365,540 in lieu of $368,940, as proposed by the Senate, and $194,740, as proposed by the House, for investigation and research with a view to assisting the fishery industries.

No. 263: Appropriates $85,690 in lieu of $86,220, as proposed by the Senate, and $80,000, as proposed by the House for the fishery market news service.

No. 266: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate appropriating $71,550 for food habits of North American birds.

Nos. 268 and 269: Appropriates $200,000 for biological investigations, in lieu of $131,660, as proposed by the House, and $231,660, as proposed by the Senate, of which $35,000 is made available for investigations of the relations of wild animal life to forests, in lieu of $27,500, as proposed by the House, and $40,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 270: Appropriates $748,550 for control of predatory animals, in lieu of $700,000, as proposed by the House, and $1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

No. 275: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate appropriating $15,840 for an Alaska fur-seal investigation.

No. 276: Corrects a total.

No. 277: Appropriates $1,250,000, as proposed by the House, in lieu of $2,250,000, as proposed by the Senate, for Federal aid in wildlife restoration under the act of September 2, 1937.

No. 278: Corrects a total.

No. 279: Provides that not to exceed $921,505 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia, in lieu of $893,605, as proposed by the House, and $951,505, as proposed by the Senate.

Government in the Territories

Nos. 280 and 281: Appropriates $24,390 as proposed by the Senate, instead of $19,690, as proposed by the House, for expenses in the office of the Governor of Alaska, of which $12,380 may be used for clerk hire, as proposed by the Senate, in lieu of $7,780, as proposed by the House.

No. 293: Appropriates $114,800, as proposed by the House, in lieu of $130,000, as proposed by the Senate, for defraying the deficit in the treasury of the municipal government of St. Croix, V. I.

No. 295: Strikes out the proposal of the Senate excepting from the provision of section 7 of the bill (relating to membership in an organization that advocates the overthrow of the Government by force or violence) persons in the field service engaged for a period of less than 60 days in connection with emergency work involving the loss of life or property

No. 297: Corrects a section number.

Amendments Reported in Disagreement

The following amendments are reported in disagreement. The subject matter of such amendments, and the action proposed to be recommended with respect thereto by the managers on the part of the House, are as follows:

No. 109: Relating to per capita payments to enrolled members of the Seminole Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 111: Relating to condemnation of land within the Grand Portage Indian Reservation in Cook County, Minn., for highway purposes. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 112: Relating to condemnation of land within the Seneca Indian School property in Ottawa County, Okla. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 156: Relating to funds for the Central Valley project, California.

No. 162: Relating to the operation and maintenance of camp and construction facilities at the Grand Coulee Dam project, Washington. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 171: Corrects a total.

No. 192: Relating to the construction and equipment of an experimental plant for synthesis of motor fuel, Pittsburgh, Pa. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 199: Relating to construction and equipment of a Northwest Electrodevelopment Laboratory. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

No. 200: Relating to construction and operation of plants for research in connection with to the gaseous and solid fuel reduction of iron ores. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 201: Relating to the construction and equipment of helium plants. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

No. 212: Relating to the application of section 3709, Revised Statutes, in connection with certain appropriations. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 213: Relating to appointment of skilled and unskilled labor without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, of persons employed at experimental plants and laboratories of the Bureau of Mines. The House managers will recommend concurrence in the Senate amendment.

No. 214: Corrects a total.

JED JOHNSON,
J. G. SCRUGHAM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT F. RICH,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, as Members will recall, this is

the second report of the conferees on the annual appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year of 1943, carrying appropriations for 26 important agencies of the Government. It will be recalled that when the previous report was presented and considered in the House on Thursday of this week I made the frank statement to the Members of the House that I, as chairman of the committee, was not altogether satisfied with the report. I did say, however, that it seemed to be the best compromise that we were able to secure between the House and the Senate at that time. The House evidently felt otherwise, and by a margin of some 14 votes, with about 150 absentees, sent the bill to conference to see what further concessions we could get from the distinguished body at the other end of the Capitol.

I am glad to report to the House that we now have a bill wherein there have been considerable additional savings made, especially on some controversial items. I do not mean to say by that that I am completely satisfied with every item in this report. In my experience here I never have seen a perfect bill of this magnitude. Never have I seen a major appropriation bill that every member of the committee was entirely satisfied with. Nevertheless, I honestly feel that this is the best compromise that we were able to secure. To be perfectly frank, members of the conference representing the Senate, who have receded on 171 amendments, to 43 for the House, suggested a continuing resolution rather than any further concessions on some of the more important matters that were in controversy. That, of course, would result in hamstringing the Department and eliminating a major portion of funds for the war effort so essential in development of strategic minerals and other materials in connection with the prosecution of the war.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Arizona, who has long been a tower of strength in this House, especially in respect to many important reclamation projects and other matters affecting the activities under the Department of the Interior. Thanks sincerely.

Mr. MURDOCK. The reason for my concern is obvious. Coming as I do from the West I am interested in a bill which pertains to the western half of this country, which is involved here, not only in regard to reclamation, but in regard to mining and many other phases. Do I understand the gentleman to say that we will, at the end of the fiscal year, be compelled to take more drastic action if nothing is done soon in respect to this report?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Oh, yes. I will say to the gentleman that if the conferees of the House and the Senate are unable to reach some sort of an agreement, or if the House should be unable to agree on a bill before next Tuesday midnight, it would be necessary to pass a continuing resolution. I am sure that no Member on either side of this aisle, regardless of his attitude on the only amendment now actually in controversy, the Central Valley project, desires to take the responsibility for an unhappy situation of that kind. Let me add here that the committee has worked long and faithfully and I am delighted to announce that with the exception of the one amendment mentioned the conferees are now in agreement on this controversial measure.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. The gentleman from Oklahoma is making the most vital statement which I think the Members of the House ought to be present to hear.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi makes a point of order that there is no quorum present. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 90]

Baldwin	Haines	Pearson
Barry	Hall, Edwin Arthur	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Bates, Ky.	Harness	Pheiffer, William T.
Beckworth	Harrington	Plauché
Bender	Hart	Powers
Blackney	Heffernan	Randolph
Bolton	Hendricks	Reece, Tenn.
Boykin	Hess	Reed, Ill.
Bradley, Mich.	Hoffman	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bradley, Pa.	Hook	Robsion, Ky.
Brown, Ohio	Izac	Rockefeller
Buck	Jarman	Rogers, Okla.
Buckler, Minn.	Jarrett	Romjue
Buckley, N. Y.	Jenkins, Ohio	Sacks
Burch	Johns	Satterfield
Burdick	Johnson, Ind.	Scanlon
Byrne	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Schaefer, Ill.
Byron	Kee	Schuetz
Camp	Kefauver	Schulte
Capozzoli	Kennedy, Martin J.	Scott
Casey, Mass.	Kennedy, Michael J.	Secrest
Celler	Keough	Shafer, Mich.
Clark	Kilday	Shannon
Clason	Klein	Sheridan
Cluett	Kocialkowski	Sikes
Coffee, Nebr.	Landis	Smith, Pa.
Cole, Md.	Lane	Smith, W. Va.
Cole, N. Y.	Larrabee	Somers, N. Y.
Crosser	Lesinski	South
Crowther	Lynch	Starnes, Ala.
Cullen	McGehee	Sweeney
Delaney	McGranery	Tinkham
Dickstein	McKeough	Traynor
Dies	Maas	Vincent, Ky.
Dingell	Maciejewski	Vreeland
Domengeaux	Marcantonio	Walter
Douglas	Merritt	Weaver
Drewry	Miller	Weiss
Edmiston	Mills, Ark.	Wigglesworth
Ellis	Mitchell	Williams
Faddis	Murray	Wilson
Fenton	Myers, Pa.	Winter
Fish	O'Day	Wolverton, N. J.
Flannagan	O'Leary	Woodrum, Va.
Forand	Oliver	Worley
Ford, Leland M.	Osmers	Wright
Gavagan	O'Toole	
Gifford	Pearson	
Gilchrist	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	
Gillette	Pheiffer, William T.	
Green	Plauché	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call, 288 Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. PEARSON (at the request of Mr. GORE), for 3 weeks, on account of important business.

To Mr. WOLVERTON of New Jersey (at the request of Mr. EATON), for 1 week, on account of illness.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the majority leader how long we expect to continue today and what the program is for next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I am very glad the gentleman from Massachusetts asked me those questions.

The important thing today, of course, was to get bills to conference that were in a position to go to conference. It seems to me it is unnecessary to proceed further today. The bills are in conference. We can accomplish just as much Monday and Tuesday, and give the conferees more opportunity to consider the matters pending.

It is my intention very shortly to offer a motion to adjourn to Monday at 12 o'clock. On Tuesday we may come in at 11 or 10 o'clock, if necessary. On Monday and Tuesday we can work late. We will have to go along Monday and dispose of all that we can and finish up on Tuesday. I do not see much that can be gained today by the House continuing in session.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman any knowledge as to what we may expect in the way of legislation after we conclude the appropriation bills next week?

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand that on Monday the first supplemental national defense bill for 1943, which is the last appropriation out of the committee, will be brought up. Of course, there will be various conference reports. On Monday and Tuesday the appropriation bill and the conference reports will have the right-of-way.

On Wednesday, I am hopeful that we can bring up the bill H. R. 6217—a bill to amend the Classification Act of 1923—the custodial bill. I am hopeful that we can call up S. 2404, a bill to authorize officers and enlisted men of the armed forces of the United States to accept certain medals and decorations. I am hopeful that may be brought up on Wednesday.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] has a very important bill from his committee. I would like to ask him if he expects the bill to be reported out soon.

Mr. LANHAM. I may say that the hearings have been concluded. The committee will meet in executive session on Tuesday. If the bill is reported out at that time, then just as soon as we can get a rule we would like to take it up for consideration, because the Army, the Navy, and the Maritime Commission are pressing for its passage.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What I am trying to get at is, Fourth of July is on next Saturday. Some Members would like to know what arrangements

are expected to to be made concerning a possible adjournment over that holiday?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is my intention to adjourn from Thursday night over until the following Monday. Does the gentleman from Texas expect to have a rule on his bill so that it may be considered on Thursday?

Mr. LANHAM. If the bill is reported and the Rules Committee acts promptly and grants a rule, of course we expect to be ready.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, that is very uncertain and very contingent. I mean on account of it being reported out on Tuesday. The Rules Committee would have to meet practically forthwith. You would have to get a rule by Wednesday in order to get it considered on Thursday. We will adjourn over from Thursday until Monday. Aside from the appropriation bill which I have mentioned, we have those two other bills that will be in order next week. I understand the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY] has a bill, S. 2586, and I understand he has conferred with the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. There is no objection to that. I should think we might take that up now, if the gentleman is ready.

Mr. McCORMACK. We might permit that bill to be called up at the present time.

REQUISITIONING CERTAIN ARTICLES AND MATERIALS FOR USE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 2586) to amend section 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue it in force during the existing war.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this bill in another form has been up several times before in the House. Will the gentleman state how the matter of payment for the requisitioned material is provided for in this bill?

Mr. MAY. It is the provision which was included in the bill originally; it requires that the President fix a fair and reasonable market value of the materials. If the man who owns the property is unwilling to accept the valuation fixed by the President he is then to be paid 50 percent of the value of the property as determined by the President and permitted to sue the Government for the remainder, whatever he wants to sue for.

Mr. HINSHAW. As the gentleman knows, in the previous bill we had a provision which stated that the material requisitioned must be unnecessary to the operation of the plant. Is that stricken out of the bill?

Mr. MAY. I do not think it is affected at all, because I was opposed to the Government's taking such things myself and contended for the Taber amendment for a long time.

Mr. HINSHAW. Under this bill can they take out of a plant a piece of machinery that is necessary to the operation of the plant and thereby shut down its operation?

Mr. MAY. They would take over the plant in its entirety in such a case, is the way I understand it, and I hope I am correct.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is what I hoped to see. With the gentleman's assurance, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will not agree to a bill of this nature until I know what the extent of the powers granted are; for example, can they requisition small firearms like shotguns and things like that? We had this issue up on the floor at the time the original bill was passed. What does it do in that regard?

Mr. MAY. The gentleman knows that that was dealt with in the original legislation and the House voted very emphatically on it here, and that was put in the original bill. All this bill does is to extend that particular provision for the duration of this war instead of letting it expire on next Tuesday at midnight.

Mr. BOREN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, does this bill provide not only for the requisitioning of plants, materials, and things necessary for the war effort, but also small vessels, harbor craft, and things like that?

Mr. MAY. I should like to give this information to the House for its benefit: The situation is simply that in the prosecution of the war the Government of the United States, under the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act, has sold the foreign governments who were fighting against the Hitler regime millions and millions of dollars worth of property. There has accumulated in the hands of railroads and other transportation facilities destined for the harbor of New York at this time—in that harbor alone—more than 8,000 carloads of materials, and it is still on railroad sidings taking up space and immobilizing freight cars. This same condition exists all up and down the Atlantic seaboard. The purpose of this legislation is really to authorize the President to deal with that situation. He does not care anything about shotguns.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BLAND. I understood the gentleman from Kentucky to make the statement that all this bill did was to extend the expiration date of legislation which had already been passed.

Mr. MAY. It does, but all of the things that have been mentioned are personal property.

Mr. BLAND. And is personal property added to the legislation?

Mr. MAY. It is not added; no. A machine gun, of course, is a piece of personal property just the same as is a shotgun that belongs to a farmer.

Mr. BLAND. I thought something was said about seizing vessels in harbors.

Mr. MAY. If we had sold a vessel to Belgium before that country was conquered and the vessel was still in our waters and we wanted to get hold of it to sell it to some other country, it could be done under this bill.

Mr. BLAND. What I want to know is whether the Military Affairs Committee is undertaking to take control of matters pertaining to the merchant marine as it did in a report the other day.

Mr. MAY. Not at all; we would not do a thing like that.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, again reserving the right to object for the purpose of asking a question: Does this bill give authority to the President to seize small vessels or small craft in harbors to use for the war effort?

Mr. MAY. If it is personal property he could take it if it became necessary.

Mr. BLAND. I understand, then, the gentleman dictinctly states that it is not intended that this bill shall cover that class of vessels, small vessels in harbors?

Mr. MAY. That is exactly right.

Mr. MAGNUSON. But the authority does exist under the bill for the President to seize them to further the war effort.

Mr. MAY. If it is personal property, and is needed, he would have the right to do it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY]?

Mr. WEST. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, is this the old gun-seizure bill that we have in here again?

Mr. MAY. Yes; but it has been amended according to your wishes and it protects you against seizure of any guns.

Mr. WEST. What is the hurry?

Mr. MAY. Guns are not involved here at all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first sentence of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"That whenever the President determines that it is necessary in the interest of national defense or prosecution of war to requisition and take over for the use or operation by the United States or in its interest any military or naval equipment or munitions, or component parts thereof, or machinery, tools, or materials, or supplies necessary for the manufacture, servicing, or operation thereof, ordered, manufactured, procured, or possessed for export purposes, the exportation of which has been prohibited or curtailed in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the act approved July 2, 1940 (Public, No. 703, 76th Cong.; 54 Stat. 714), as heretofore or hereafter amended, or any other law, he is hereby authorized and empowered to requisition and take over for the said use or operation by the United States, or in its interest, any of the foregoing articles or materials, and to sell or otherwise dispose of any such articles or materials, or any portion thereof, to a person or a corporation of the United States

whenever he shall determine such action to be in the public interest."

SEC. 2. That section 3 of said act of October 10, 1940, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. The authority granted in this act shall remain in force until June 30, 1944, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President by proclamation may designate."

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

A similar House bill, H. R. 7202, was laid on the table.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD at this point a short statement covering the amendments included in the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. ANDREWS]?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

STATUTES AFFECTED

By section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940 (54 Stat. 712), the President is empowered, whenever he determines that it is necessary in the interest of national defense, to prohibit or curtail the exportation of any military equipment, or munitions, or component parts thereof, or machinery, tools, or materials, or supplies necessary for the manufacture, servicing, or operation thereof, to issue a proclamation prohibiting, curtailing, or regulating such exportation. The last sentence of section 6 provides that the authority therein granted shall terminate June 30, 1942, unless the Congress shall otherwise provide.

The act of October 10, 1940, provides in substance that whenever the President shall determine that it is necessary in the interest of national defense to requisition and take over for use or operation by the United States or in its interest any of the articles, materials, or equipment described in section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940, the exportation of which has been denied in accordance with that section, he is authorized to requisition or take over such property and to sell or otherwise dispose of any such articles or materials or any portion thereof, whenever he shall determine such action to be in the public interest.

By section 3 of the act of October 10, 1940, the authority granted by that act is made to terminate June 30, 1942, unless the Congress shall otherwise provide.

The general requisitioning statute of October 16, 1941 (55 Stat. 742), requires that before requisitioning property for use in the national defense the President must determine (1) that its use is needed for the defense of the United States; (2) such need is immediate and impending and will not admit of delay or resort to any other source of supply; and (3) all other means of obtaining the use of such property upon fair and reasonable terms have been exhausted.

NECESSITY FOR EXTENDING ACT OF OCTOBER 10, 1940

The act of October 16, 1941, which authorizes the requisitioning and taking over of property belonging to citizens of the United States provides every reasonable safeguard for the protection of private rights, and authorizes the taking of such property only under these circumstances and after the determinations and on the conditions therein specified. As to property intended for export, which frequently belongs to aliens, no such restrictions and safeguards are necessary, since protection of the interests of the United States, as distinguished from the rights and interests of the private citizen, is the principal concern.

Before requisitioning and taking over the property of the citizen, the public need therefor must be determined. The identity of the owner or his authorized representative must be ascertained, and all other means of obtaining the property upon fair and reasonable terms must be exhausted. The citizen thus is assured that he will not be compelled to give up his property unless it is urgently needed for the defense of his country. As to articles ordered, manufactured, procured, or possessed for export, the exportation of which has been prohibited or curtailed, the same degree of care in ascertaining identity of the owner and exhaustion of all means other than requisitioning for obtaining the property is not and should not be required. Title to property manufactured for export may have passed to aliens, or such property may be in transitu when needed for defense purposes. For those reasons, the act of October 10, 1940, authorizing the requisitioning of such property, is much less restrictive and exacting than the act of October 16, 1941. If the terms of the 1940 statute expire on June 30, 1942, as now provided, the requisitioning of property originally produced or possessed for but denied exportation could be accomplished only by complying with the exacting requirements and meeting the conditions specified in the 1941 statute with resulting delays and difficulties. Such delays and difficulties may embarrass and seriously hinder the successful prosecution of the war effort.

AMENDMENTS PROPOSED

Although S. 2586, as introduced, was prepared by the War Department, representatives of that Department appeared before the committee, recommended amendment of the bill, and explained the necessity therefor. It was pointed out that, as introduced, S. 2586 provides for the extension of the provisions of the act of October 10, 1940, only, without providing for extension or other continuance in effect of the embargo provisions of section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940, it then being understood that the Board of Economic Warfare would prepare and submit a draft of legislation for extending or continuing in effect the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940. That Board prepared a draft of bill which was introduced as S. 2558, which has been favorably reported by this committee, and is now on the calendar. By that measure, however, it is proposed to amend section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940, to provide that the President may prohibit or curtail the exportation of any articles, technical data, materials, or supplies, except under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe. It is felt, therefore, that as to property ordered, manufactured, procured, or possessed for export purposes, the exportation of which has been prohibited or curtailed in accordance with the provisions of section 6 of the act of July 2, 1940, which is not requisitioned and taken over on or before June 30, 1942, there may be some serious question as to the method of procedure or the right to requisition, if the embargo provisions of section 6 are allowed to expire and no provision is made for continuing them in effect or for preserving the existing situation as to such property.

It was reported to the committee that some 8,000 carloads of various materials which had been ordered by or for countries since subjugated and occupied by German forces were denied exportation at the port of New York alone, most of which are now congesting railroad yards and warehouses in that city. Negotiations have been and now are being conducted for the purpose of acquiring such of this material by bargain and sale as can be used in the war effort and its removal and distribution as rapidly as possible, thus releasing railroad rolling stock for use elsewhere, as well as relieving the congestion in freight yards and warehouses. However, it is possible to move this material only at about the rate of 50 carloads a week. Considerable accumulation will still be on hand not only in New York but in other ports when the terms of the existing statutes expire. In many instances acquisition of such property by bargain and sale has been impossible and resort to requisitioning frequently has been necessary. It is desired to preserve intact the right to requisition such property as it now exists.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include a statement by Arthur Besse, chairman of the National Association of Wool Manufacturers, on the repudiation of Government contracts. This is additional data to that which I inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD on page A2355.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BELL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

AUTHORIZING DISABLED VETERANS TO BECOME MEMBERS OF PRESENT ORGANIZATION OF DISABLED VETERANS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of H. R. 7282, to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Disabled American Veterans of the World War," approved June 17, 1932, so as to change the name to "Disabled American Veterans," and to extend membership eligibility therein to American citizens, honorably discharged from the active military or naval forces of the United States, or of some country allied with the United States, who have been either wounded, injured, or disabled by reason of such active service during time of war, which has been unanimously approved by the Committee on the Judiciary that has to do with amending of the charter authorizing disabled veterans to become members of the present organization of disabled veterans.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS]?

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the distinguished gentleman from Texas explain this bill to the Members of the House?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill proposes an amendment of the charter of the disabled veterans' organization so that persons who are disabled in this war may become members of the existing organization. I think that is all the bill does.

Mr. SPRINGER. My understanding is that this bill was reported unanimously by the Committee on the Judiciary of the House and it is also requested by the D. A. V.?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is correct.

Mr. HANCOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HANCOCK. Does the gentleman think this establishes a policy whereby

the veterans of the present war will be eligible for all the present veterans' associations?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. No, sir; it only makes it possible for veterans who are disabled in this war, if they want to do so, to join the existing organization of disabled veterans in order that they may avail themselves of whatever facilities that organization affords.

Mr. HANCOCK. Well, we have the Order of the Purple Heart.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. This deals with only one.

Mr. HANCOCK. We have the Gold Star Mothers and others.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. This deals with only one thing, as the gentleman will remember.

Mr. HANCOCK. I am wondering if this establishes a precedent and a policy?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I cannot answer that question as to precedent and policy. It does do the thing which I have indicated. We either have to do that or leave these boys who were recently wounded without any such facilities as the present organization affords.

Mr. HANCOCK. Does the request come from the wounded men of the present war or from the organization now in existence, the D. A. V.?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. It comes from the organization now in existence, but they tell us that they have requests from wounded men of the present war that this be done.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. If there is any objection, I will withdraw my request.

Mr. MICHENER. I do not think there should be objection, and I do not think there will be when the Members understand. This bill does for the disabled veterans just what the law did, permitting veterans of all wars having foreign service to join the Veterans of Foreign Wars. It is hoped that there will be but one organization of disabled veterans. Veterans disabled in any war in defense of the country should be permitted to so unite. That is all this bill contemplates.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. The gentleman is evidently correct. I may say in that connection, dealing with policy, that I believe the Committee on the Judiciary agreed that that probably would be a better policy. I am very much obliged to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Is it not true that as a matter of fact the present war is a continuation of the first World War, that there was just an armistice instead of a peace?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Anyhow, the boys who are hurt in this war are just as badly hurt as if they had been hurt in the other.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. And they would like to be organized, too. It is helpful for them to have an organization already that they can join if they wish to. They are disabled and cannot organize easily themselves. I am sure the disabled veterans will appreciate the help of the gentleman from Texas, Judge SUMNERS, in this matter.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am not so sure that the contributions that have recently been made add to the desirability of the bill. This matter ought to be one for determination by the boys concerned, it seems to me, rather than for legislation by Congress.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is exactly true. Nobody is forced to join this organization. They have a perfect right not to join or to organize another one if they want to, this only provides a facility and leaves the whole matter optional.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If I ununderstood the remarks of the gentleman from Michigan correctly, they might be interpreted as expressing a legislative policy that Congress thought it desirable to have just one veterans' organization. I think there would be some objection to an expression of that sort without debate.

May I say further that at the State convention of the American Legion in my State last week a representative from the national office of the American Legion made the statement that they would welcome the joining of the boys of this war. Of course, that is all right. As a Legionnaire I would welcome them, but the boys of this war may have their own ideas about it. I am not so sure that the Congress ought to indicate whether the boys should all go into one organization. I would leave it to them.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I think we may indicate that they can do as they please about it. If they want to join this organization, why should Congress prevent them from doing it?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I have no objection to that statement, but I do object to the statement that this ought to indicate the policy or the desire of Congress.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I have no power to control the statements that Members make, but, as far as the legislation is concerned, it is purely permissive.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. And as purely permissive legislation, there is no objection, but I want the RECORD to show that it is purely permissive as the legislative history in the passage of the bill.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. This measure will not cost the Federal Government a dime, as I understand. It merely permits the amendment of the charter of the Disabled Veterans of the World War so as to permit the wounded or disabled veterans of this war to join. I can see no reason on earth why anybody should object to it.

Mr. SHORT. It is wholly optional with the men whether they join or not. It makes it possible for them to avail themselves of the existing facilities.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEARHART. Has the World War organization or representatives of that organization requested this legislation?

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Yes; they have asked that the charter be amended. They have represented to us that individuals who have been wounded have sought to join their organization, but under the charter they cannot do it. They ask that the charter be so amended that these wounded soldiers may have the facilities this organization provides, provided the wounded soldiers want to have them.

Mr. GEARHART. I am for it under those conditions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the last sentence of section 1 of the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Disabled American Veterans of the World War," approved June 17, 1932 (47 Stat. 320; title 36, U. S. C., 1940 ed., sec. 90a), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"The name of this corporation shall be the 'Disabled American Veterans.' "

SEC. 2. That section 3 of such act of June 17, 1932, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 3. That the purposes of this corporation shall be—

"To uphold and maintain the Constitution and the laws of the United States; to realize the true American ideals and aims for which those eligible to membership fought; to advance the interests and work for the betterment of all wounded, injured, and disabled American veterans; to cooperate with the United States Veterans' Administration and all other public and private agencies devoted to the cause of improving and advancing the condition, health, and interests of all wounded, injured, and disabled veterans; to stimulate a feeling of mutual devotion, helpfulness, and comradeship among all wounded, injured, and disabled veterans; to serve our comrades, our communities, and our country; and to encourage in all people that spirit of understanding which will guard against future wars."

SEC. 3. That section 5 of such act of June 17, 1932, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5. Any man or woman who was wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled in line of duty during time of war while in the service of either the military or naval forces of the United States of America, and who has been honorably discharged or separated without dishonor from such service, or who may still be in active service in the armed forces of the United States, is eligible for membership in the Disabled American Veterans. Others who were disabled while serving with any of the armed forces of any nations associated with the United States as allies during any of its war periods, who are American citizens, and who were honorably discharged, are also eligible. The Disabled American Veterans shall not have honorary members."

SEC. 4. That section 6 of such act of June 17, 1932, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 6. That the organization shall be nonpolitical and nonsectarian, and as an organization shall not promote the candidacy of any person seeking public office."

SEC. 5. That section 8 of such act of June 17, 1932, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 8. That said corporation, and its State and local subdivisions, shall have the sole and exclusive right to have and to use in carrying out its purposes the name 'Disabled American Veterans.'"

SEC. 6. That section 9 of such act of June 17, 1932, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 9. That the said corporation shall, on or before the 1st day of January in each year, make and transmit to the Congress a report of its proceedings for its preceding fiscal year, including a full and complete report of its receipts and expenditures."

SEC. 7. That section 10 of such act of June 17, 1932, is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 10. That, as a condition precedent to the exercise of any power or privilege herein granted or conferred, the Disabled American Veterans shall file in the office of the secretary of each State in which chapters thereof may be organized the name and post-office address of an authorized agent in such State, upon whom legal process or demands against the Disabled American Veterans may be served."

With the following committee amendment:

On page 3, line 4, strike out "without dishonor."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DRAFTING OF FARM LABOR

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I am disturbed by the failure of the Manpower Board and the Selective Service System to enunciate and make clear a policy with regard to the drafting of farm labor. I have in my hand an auction sale bill which starts out this way:

Having been called to the Army, I will sell the following property.

And so forth. Then Mr. George Anderson lists his cattle, his horses, his poultry, and his farm machinery—tractor, disc, plows, mowers, wagons, cultivators, and so forth—that he must sell right in the middle of the crop season because he has been called to service.

I have here a letter about a young farmer, perhaps 30 years of age, who bought a section of land 4 years ago. He has 500 acres of crop, 300 of it in small grain some heading out, around 100 head of hogs; 50 head of cattle; and his own farm machinery. He has been called and must go and leave that crop and this stock in the middle of the year, without anybody to take care of it.

At different times I have discussed the problems with Selective Service headquarters, who have said that the problem is up to the local boards, but that does not answer the problem, as I shall point out in an extension of these remarks in the Appendix, where I shall place an editorial from the Belle Fourche (S. Dak.) Post dealing with the subject. I shall also place there copies of correspondence with the War Manpower Board dealing with this and related problems. It is a serious question as the sale bill and the letter I have cited indicate. Are farmers to sell out and leave their fields? Is that producing food for victory? The local boards do not know what to do. Something should be done, and it has got to be done in Washington.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

(Mr. CLAYPOOL asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include therein a resolution adopted by the New Mexico Miners and Prospectors Association relating to the taxation of mining properties during the emergency.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, some of the members of my committee are wondering whether we are going to consider first the conference report or the bill which is to be reported Monday by the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. McCORMACK. I had not considered that matter directly, and I prefer not to make a decision now. If the debate on the bill is too long it is my thought the conference reports should come up first.

PREVENTION OF POST-WAR DEPRESSION

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read a paragraph from a letter that I received from a soldier who happens to be one of my constituents. It says:

It is heartening to know that our Commander in Chief and Congress are not only thinking of the present but also of the future. The sad years that followed the last war are still fresh in our memory. We are glad to serve our country and give up some of the most productive years of our lives. We do hope that, starting from scratch again, we will be able to have economic security through industrious effort on our part. The privilege to serve our country as a member of the armed forces is ours and we ask no favors for this, nor do we want any. We do encourage and recognize every effort that is made by our leaders to ward off a post-war depression.

I submit this for the attention of the House as the opinion of a soldier.

LOCAL DRAFT BOARDS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I listened with a mighty lot of interest to the remarks of the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

The conditions which the gentleman recited in South Dakota, particularly in the Belle Fourche area, which is right across the line from my district, are familiar to me, and the instant case is typical of many cases happening in my own State. Today, it is nearly impossible for the farmers to get help. The result is that many of them are closing themselves out, liquidating their business and quitting. Something should be done.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. EBERHARTER. Is it not the fault of the local draft board because they do not follow directions?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I realize the fact that the local draft boards have a lot to do with it, but here is the difficulty. The boys who are drafted do not feel that it is patriotic for them to ask for deferment and neither do their employers ask for deferment, simply because they are afraid they will be smeared with not being patriotic. The result is that many of our farmers will have to quit business unless the policy is changed. I have told the Selective Service officials here in Washington that they should advise the local boards on their own initiative to defer farm boys and farm help where the facts appear that their presence on the farm is necessary without claiming deferment by either the draftee or his employer. Food is just as essential to win this war and people who serve their country in the capacity of producing are just as patriotic as those who are in uniform. That should be made clear by the Selective Service officials.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein certain correspondence concerning the price of silver.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from Jay C. Colburn, of Harlan, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have been requested to have inserted in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the National Editorial Association at their convention at Quebec, and I therefore ask unanimous consent so to do.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

MISS OLIVE A. McCAY

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DIMOND. Mr. Speaker, I address the House today in order to pay public tribute to a patriotic, generous citizen of Alaska, one of my constituents. Her name is Miss Olive A. McCay, and she resides at Wrangell, Alaska, where she is engaged in the fox-farming business. Some time ago she sent some fox pelts for sale to the firm of Lampson, Fraser & Huth, Inc., of New York. In a letter dated at Wrangell, Alaska, May 21, 1942, she wrote to the firm as follows:

> You have a blue-fox pelt which was shipped March 23. It wasn't much of a skin, but when you auction it, would you auction it "for defense" and send all that it brings to the War Department to pay bounty on a few Jap scalps as a present from me?
>
> Next winter I will send you a good one to offer for the same cause.
>
> All this, of course, if it isn't too much trouble for you—just thought it a good idea.

I am pleased to state, Mr. Speaker, that the pelt was sold for $100 to a member of the firm, Mr. Robert W. Fraser, who has written me, saying that he will resell the pelt and turn over the proceeds to any service organization that Miss McCay or I may recommend. Mr. Fraser's generosity and patriotic spirit are equally deserving of applause.

Upon inquiry, I found that the money can be sent to the Treasury Department, and be used as nearly as possible for the purpose stated in Miss McCay's letter, although we all realize that her reference to "scalps" is purely figurative. It is encouraging to note that this is only the first contribution that Miss McCay will make. It is obvious that if every American were animated by such actively generous and patriotic impulses, there would not be any difficulty in financing the war, and the outcome of it would be early and favorable. Miss McCay and Mr. Fraser truly merit the praise and commendation of all Americans.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIMOND. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SHORT. It is rather interesting to note that both Alaska and Hawaii lead all parts of continental United States in their purchase of War bonds, and I may also add that, much to our chagrin, the city of Washington is one of the lowest in the whole Nation.

Mr. DIMOND. I thank the gentleman from Missouri for putting that fact into the RECORD at this point, because I am much too modest to mention it myself, so far as Alaska is concerned. But all honor to Hawaii, which did surpass Alaska on this occasion. I did not think it was possible, but Hawaii contributed in the purchase of War bonds something more than 600 percent of its quota, and Alaska came second. The rest of the country is somewhere farther down the line. Hawaii has been a battlefield and may be again. A part of Alaska is a battlefield now. Our people actually know what war is.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two editorials, one from the Chicago Times and one from the Chicago Sun.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio address by Attorney Allen K. Swann, of Evansville, Ind., with respect to the oil situation, and the lifting of regulation M-68.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include some excerpts from a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table, and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2565. An act to amend sections 12A and 19 of the Federal Reserve Act, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

S. 2604. An act granting the consent of Congress to the States of Colorado, Kansas, and Nebraska to negotiate and enter into a compact for the division of the waters of the Republican River; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 7160. An act to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps during the existing war, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7234. An act to exempt from duty personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to accord privileges of free importation to members of the armed forces of other United Nations, to enemy prisoners of war and civilian internees and detainees, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 7160. An act to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps during the existing war, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7212. An act to amend section 13 (d) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act;

H. R. 7234. An act to exempt from duty personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to accord privileges of free importation to members of the armed forces of other United Nations, to enemy prisoners of war and civilian internees and detainees, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, June 29, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. on Tuesday, June 30, for consideration of H. R. 7153, room 1304, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m. Tuesday, June 30, 1942.

Business to be considered: Hearing on Federal Communications Commission.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, July 9, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1616, to amend section 509, as amended, of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANHAM:

H. R. 7312. A bill to increase by $600,000,000 the amount authorized to be appropriated for defense housing under the act of October 14, 1940, as amended; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. LEAVY:

H. R. 7313. A bill to provide relief to the owners of former Indian-owned land within the Oroville-Tonasket irrigation district, Washington, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. McLEAN:

H. R. 7314. A bill to amend section 56 of the Internal Revenue Code, providing for the collection of taxes on income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 7315. A bill for the relief of Lamar Calloway; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. IMHOFF:

H. R. 7316. A bill for the relief of Dr. J. M. Scott and Mrs. J. M. Scott; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. R. 7317. A bill granting a pension to Daniel J. McGrath; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 7318. A bill for the relief of Benjamin Hume Simons; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3137. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of 44 citizens of Des Moines, Iowa, urging the immediate passage and strict enforcement of House bill 2475 and Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3138. Also, petition presented by Louie Ingle, of Bondurant, Iowa, and signed by 117 residents of Polk County, Iowa, urging passage of Senate bill 860, which provides for the elimination of the sale of liquor in and around military camps and naval bases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3139. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition of Marie Tolbert and sundry citizens of Clay County, Ill., urging the passage of legislation to forbid the manufacture and sale of alcohol for beverage purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3140. By Mr. JONES: Petition of Helen Malich, and 41 voters of Celina, Ohio, supporting Senate bill 860 as a contribution to a wholesome defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3141. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolution of the Vermont Hotel Association, opposing the enactment into law of House bills 7101 and 7108, or any similar bill the purpose of which is to establish prohibition in areas used for military and naval purposes, and in areas adjacent thereto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3142. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of Grand Parlor, Native Sons of the Golden West, San Francisco, Calif., relative to contemplated project to erect a dam on the South Fork of the American River; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

3143. By Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin: Petition of sundry citizens of Janesville, Wis., urging favorable action on House bill 6156, repeal of land-grant rates; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

3144. By Mr. WOLFENDEN of Pennsylvania: Resolution of the Women's Republican Club of Delaware County, Pa., recommending that the people's money be spent for the actual requirements of the prosecution of a victorious war; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

MONDAY, JUNE 29, 1942

Stephen L. Richards, of Salt Lake City, Utah, a member of the Council of Twelve Apostles of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints, offered the following prayer:

We bow before Thee, our Heavenly Father, in humble prayer. We thank Thee for the manifold blessings Thou hast bestowed upon us, in this our beloved country. Our hearts are filled with gratitude for the sacred institutions of America which are founded in Christian virtue and righteousness.

O God, preserve these inspired concepts and establishments in the earth. Let not the adversary of light and truth destroy freedom, and worship, and divine faith. Bless all those, the world over, who give themselves to the cause of liberty. May they be conscious of the fact that it is Thy cause, subserving the noble lineage, the free agency, the dignity, and the majesty of man.

Remember, O Lord, those who bear arms to sustain these holy causes of freedom and Christ. Make them potent. In Thy mercy preserve their lives and their virtue, and may they have the comfort to know that their service has Thine approval.

Bless the homes from which they have come. Let Thy spirit bring consolation and fortitude to aching and anxious hearts, and assuage the sorrow of those bereaved.

Unite the people, Father, in purpose and effort, and in prayerful solicitude for the common good. May pride and arrogance and self-sufficiency give place to true humility that recognizes Thy sovereignty and the dependence of all on Thy providential care. Forgive our errors and our weaknesses. Help us to turn from wrong and unprofitable ways, that we may more closely approach Thee in the hour of our need.

Bless those who direct the Nation. May they truly be Thy servants, as they serve the people and the great cause. Inspire the minds and hearts of the lawmakers. May vision and great wisdom be their portion. Remember him, O Father, who bears the responsibility of leadership—our President. Uphold his hands. Endow him with great gifts—gifts of the spirit, to see the way and the light and to follow the course Thou dost direct.

We pray for the early triumph of righteousness and truth. We pray for peace, founded in the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. All this we do humbly, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, June 26, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF A BILL

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also announced that on June 25, 1942, the President had approved and signed the act (S. 1707) to prevent the making of photographs and sketches of military or naval reservations, naval vessels, and other naval and military properties, and for other purposes.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE DURING ADJOURNMENT—ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Under authority of the order of the 26th instant,

The following message from the House of Representatives was received by the Secretary of the Senate during the adjournment:

That the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 7160. An act to provide for the better administration of officer personnel of the Navy and Marine Corps during the existing war, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7234. An act to exempt from duty personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders; and

H. J. Res. 327. Joint resolution to accord privileges of free importation to members of the armed forces of other United Nations, to enemy prisoners of war and civilian internees and detainees, and for other purposes.

TAMPA SHIPBUILDING & ENGINEERING CO. (S. DOC. NO. 230)

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the report of an investigation by the Comptroller General of the United States relative to the construction by the United States Maritime Commission of certain vessels under contracts with the Tampa Shipbuilding & Engineering Co. and the sale thereof to the Navy Department, transmitted to the Senate on June 11, 1942, and referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, be printed as a Senate document.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LABOR RACKETEERING IN KANSAS

Mr. REED. Mr. President, on a previous occasion I spoke in this Chamber somewhat at length on the extent of racketeering by organized labor on the construction of defense projects. I based my statement at that time on personal observation near my home town. I had extended that observation by cooperation with the office of the Chief of Engineers of the Army, and I put into the RECORD some very exhaustive information on the subject. The construction near my home town has been completed. However, in Kansas there are a dozen defense projects under way, and racketeering goes on without check.

A great newspaper outside my home State recently commented upon the reason why I announced as a candidate for Governor of Kansas in the Republican primary. I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point, as a part of my remarks, an editorial from the Independence (Kans.) Daily Reporter of June 25, 1942, incorporating the comment to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RACKETEERING AN ISSUE

Outside the State of Kansas, as well as within it, the campaign of Senator CLYDE REED against racketeers wearing the cloak of organized labor is attracting attention because of the recognition that something of the sort is imperatively needed in the United States.

The importance of the Al Capone brand of racketeering in years gone by was not just to Chicago, but to the Nation as a whole for Capone and imitators who sprang up elsewhere represented a threat to the integrity of our form of government.

The racketeers who have invaded the labor union field likewise are a threat not only to union labor but to our whole system of free enterprise, that form of business and industrial organization which has outstripped the whole world in production of wealth.

A sample of how REED's drive to throw the racketeers out impresses outstate observers is the following editorial from the Tulsa World:

"In a bold and sacrificial stroke, Senator CLYDE REED, of Kansas, has made labor racketeering in defense work the big issue in the often-heated and sometimes explosive State of Kansas. In so doing, he has probably started something nationally. Capitalizing upon war necessities seems to have gone pretty far in most parts of the country. Senator REED says he is convinced, after considerable study, that the labor racketeering in defense plants amounts to at least $30,000,000. He bases his calculations on the known collections in representative sections where war plants abound.

"To bring the subject to a show-down, Mr REED, who has 2 full years to serve as Senator, announces for the Republican nomination for Governor. The action was unexpected all around. Kansas politics is usually full of surprises, but this was a stunner, and everybody knew he means business. Mr. REED proposes to go directly to the people with the racketeering issue. He was impelled, he said, by observations in his home town, Parsons, where big defense works came on and where extortionate fees were charged people for the privilege of working for the Government in an emergency. This cruel and unnecessary drain is believed by many to be an impediment to national defense.

"The idea of fighting labor extortion is not original with Mr. REED. The anger and apprehension caused by such doings have been voiced over the country, and Congress attempted to do something about it. The body of which Mr. REED is a member killed an effort to make labor union leaders responsible and to put a limit upon their depredations. The Senator delivered himself of a comprehensive speech on the subject, giving facts and figures. He became so convinced himself that he cast all restraint to the winds and started a test campaign.

"So far as we know, this is the first absolute antiracketeering campaign in the country. Kansas is not particularly a union labor State, but unionism is influential. What Mr. REED's chances for being Governor are we do not know, but we know that his offering of himself for a knock-down and drag-out fight is important far outside Kansas. It is an issue the people of the United States must face sooner or later, and we are going to witness at least one important attack this year."

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Butler	Downey
Andrews	Byrd	Doxey
Bailey	Capper	Ellender
Ball	Caraway	George
Bankhead	Chavez	Gerry
Barbour	Clark, Idaho	Green
Barkley	Clark, Mo.	Gurney
Bilbo	Connally	Hatch
Bridges	Danaher	Hayden
Burton	Davis	Hill
Hughes	Norris	Taft
Johnson, Calif.	Nye	Thomas, Idaho
Lee	O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.
Lucas	Pepper	Thomas, Utah
McCarran	Radcliffe	Truman
McFarland	Reed	Tunnell
McKellar	Rosier	Tydings
McNary	Russell	Vandenberg
Maybank	Schwartz	Wagner
Mead	Shipstead	Walsh
Millikin	Smathers	White
Murdock	Smith	Wiley
Murray	Stewart	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senators from Washington [Mr. BONE and Mr. WALLGREN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senators from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE and Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent from the Senate.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 2586) to amend sections 1 and 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue the act in effect during the existing war, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2032) to amend section 7 (a) of the Act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), to authorize interdepartmental procurement by contract, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARE, Mr. TARVER, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. KEEFE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 42, 43, and 44 to the bill, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate; that the House still further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 81, 83, 85, 86, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, and 97 to the bill, asked a still further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. TARVER, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. LEAVY, Mr. TERRY, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. LAMBERTSON, Mr. DIRKSEN, and Mr. PLUMLEY were appointed managers on the part of the House at the still further conference.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 7282. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Disabled American Veterans of the World War," approved June 17, 1932, so as to change the name to "Disabled American Veterans," and to extend membership eligibility therein to American citizens, honorably discharged from the active military or naval forces of the United States, or of some country allied with the United States, who have been either wounded, injured, or disabled by reason of such active service during time of war; and

H. R. 7297. An act authorizing the assignment of personnel from departments or agencies in the executive branch of the Government to certain investigating committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and for other purposes.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communications and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, TREASURY DEPARTMENT, OFFICE OF SECRETARY (S. Doc. No. 234)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department (Office of the Secretary), fiscal year 1943, amounting to $27,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, TREASURY DEPARTMENT, BUREAU OF INTERNAL REVENUE (S. Doc. No. 233)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department (Bureau of Internal Revenue), fiscal year 1943, amounting to $525,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE (S. Doc. No. 232)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of Justice, fiscal year 1943, amounting to $175,000 (with an accompanying paper);

to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (S. DOC. NO. 231)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1943, amounting to $232,000 (Petroleum Conservation Division) (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

RELIEF FROM LIABILITY FOR CERTAIN OVERPAYMENTS, VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to relieve certain employees of the Veterans' Administration from financial liability for certain overpayments and allow such credit therefor as is necessary in the accounts of certain disbursing officers (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

EXTENSION OF PERIOD FOR PAYING OVERTIME RATES OF COMPENSATION

A letter from the Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation extending the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under certain acts (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Military Affairs

PETITIONS

Mr. CAPPER presented petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Paola and Reading, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments, which were ordered to lie on the table.

SECOND DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 26, 1942.

Resolved, That the House agree to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7232) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, with the exception of Senate amendment No. 6; and

That the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate No. 6 to said bill.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate recede from its amendment No. 6, providing for relief and civilian defense in Hawaii. The House refuses to agree to the amendment and I am making this motion in order that the bill may be enacted.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I was temporarily in the rear of the Senate Chamber, and did not hear the motion the Senator made.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have made a motion in regard to the action of the House on Senate amendment No. 6 to the second deficiency appropriation bill, as it is called.

When the bill was before the Senate, the following amendment was inserted on page 12:

Relief and civilian defense, Hawaii: In providing for the protection, care, and relief of the civilian population of the Territory of Hawaii, for which an allocation of $15,000,000 was made to the Secretary of the Interior from the appropriation "Emergency fund for the President," contained in the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942 (allocation letter No. 42-56, dated January 12, 1942), receipts from sales of materials, supplies, or foodstuff, and from charges for furnishing services and facilities, acquired or furnished thereunder, shall be deposited to the credit of said allocation and shall be available for expenditure for the purposes thereof.

In my judgment, the amendment was really legislation; at any rate, the House objected to the inclusion of the provision in the deficiency bill. They wish to have further time to consider it. I have no doubt such a provision will be contained in the next deficiency appropriation bill which shall be brought forward, but, as I have stated, the House desires to have further time; so they have not agreed to the amendment. That is the only point of difference in respect of the bill. For that reason I am moving that the Senate recede from its amendment so that the bill may become law.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to.

RATIONING OF GASOLINE AND SUGAR

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, I have received a telegram which I think Senators would like to hear. It reads:

HARTSVILLE, S. C.,
June 27, 1942.

Senator ELLISON D. SMITH,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.:

Major oil companies announce effective Monday price advance 2½ cents on gasoline and 2 cents on tractor and heating fuel. This advance, together with previous advances, exceeds the difference in tanker and freight rates to South Carolina and will cost the people of South Carolina between four and five hundred thousand dollars per month. Independent refineries have been quoting and delivering gasoline and fuel oils via rail in South Carolina in competition with and some cases at lower prices than majors with pipe-line connections. This means that citizens of South Carolina are paying tribute to the major oil companies and are also assisting in paying the freight for the people of the Northeastern States where the only transportation shortage exists. When will our so-called representatives in Congress wake up to the game being played destroying thousands of little filling-station businesses in the Ickes district while giving the majors all they ask; have you asked why the Carolinas, Georgia, and Florida, who have no transportation shortage, are Ickified and western New York and Pennsylvania are not?

A. E. MORRISON.

My reason for reading the telegram is to call attention to the fact that the cost of producing gasoline has not increased materially. With the late Senator La Follette, father of the present senior Senator from Wisconsin, I was on a subcommittee appointed to investigate the cost of cracking oils in order to extract gasoline, and it is my recollection that we found the cost of putting gasoline into the pipe line and onto the tanker carriers was less than 3 cents a gallon. That represented the overhead, getting the product ready for distribution.

The rationing of gasoline is an insult to the intelligence of the American people. We have been told that on the eastern seaboard it is necessary to ration gasoline in order to conserve rubber. No official dared say there was not an abundance of gasoline, because everyone knows there is a superabundance. However, in order to conserve rubber we are rationed, and can get only enough to operate our cars very short distances, while in a great portion of the country, especially in those sections where gasoline is produced, there is no rationing.

Mr. President, I thought everyone in our country used rubber. Our civilization is now predicated upon rubber and gasoline. I wonder how long Congress is going to submit to this cockeyed procedure. Be it said to the everlasting honor of American people, they are so accustomed to obeying orders that when some miserable, misfit order is issued they obey it; but I am wondering what will be the effect when the people wake up and find what has been done to them and what is being done to them.

We find that an order has been issued raising the retail price of gasoline 2½ cents a gallon. It is perfectly clear to any sensible person that the gasoline dealers should say, "You have cut our sales, now make up the loss to us by way of the price?" That is what has been done.

Mr. President, I happen to know the persons who have sent this message to me. They are good, honorable, law-abiding citizens. We as Senators sit here day after day and permit actions to be taken, the correctness or propriety of which we should have knowledge of, and which should be given the sanction of the legislative body, and not be the result of the ipse dixit of some one man. The handling of the oil and gasoline situation has done more to disrupt or to demoralize the even tenor of the American spirit than has any other thing.

Mr. President, while I am on my feet I wish to call attention to the rationing of sugar. I have received a telegram with respect to that matter which I should have brought with me. It is from a wholesaler who protested that he has no more warehouse room in which to store sugar, and that he will be obliged to store it in the open if he cannot find any other way to dispose of it. Yet we were told that sugar was needed to produce alcohol for the production of buta—buta something.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Butadiene.

Mr. SMITH. Yes; that is what I had reference to. So many new technical names are used that I cannot keep track of them. I remembered the "beauty" part of the word. It was said that sugar was needed to produce alcohol with which to make synthetic rubber. The Gillette committee received evidence to the effect that not a pound of sugar is needed for that purpose. But I presume the sugar interests hope that the same thing will occur in this war that occurred in the last war. Sugar then went up to 25 cents a pound. When the war was over, however, there was a greater supply of sugar

on hand than the country ever had before.

I hate to be a Member of a legislative body and have outsiders play us for suckers. If there is a real, honest shortage in rubber, we could have gone at the problem in a different way. Why could we not have said to our people, "Mark you, when the tires on your cars are worn out you will not be able to obtain any more. You will run on them until they are worn out, and when they are you will find yourself on the ground."

In place of that the people were told, "You must go so many miles an hour." Yesterday the people of Washington were startled because they found that the filling stations had been locked up because they had no more gas.

The way we are being gerrymandered and regimented is sinful; just as though we were the creatures of some tremendous power over which we have no control. I, for one, am sick of it.

With respect to sugar, I think a bill or resolution should be introduced in the Senate repealing the order rationing sugar.

Mr. President, I wanted to call attention to the gasoline rationing for the reason that the owners of thousands upon thousands of little filling stations are being deprived of their businesses without having any means of making a livelihood. They could not plant a crop now if they were so disposed. We allow the owners of the little filling stations, and the local gasoline handlers, to become absolutely impoverished and broken, and yet those who produce the gasoline are reimbursed by an increase of 2½ cents a gallon.

I call this matter to the attention of the Senate. There is not a Member of the Senate who is not affected by the order. If we allow this thing to continue God knows where rationing will stop.

I have not taken the cuff off my trousers as yet. Perhaps I will be put before a firing squad before long for not doing so. But I cannot buy any new ones. I have to wear the old trousers which had the cuffs on them, and I have not cut them off.

Mr. President, we have degenerated and fallen into depths of subservience—for whose benefit Members of the Senate can guess. None of us seem to have the intestinal fortitude to stand up and protest against this orgy of "cockeyed" doings.

The telegram I read is one of dozens of others along the same line. I read this one because it went into the matter a little more fully than did the others. I read it for the purpose of calling attention to the increase in price of gasoline of 2½ cents a gallon.

In my State we have imposed a tax, as I recall, of 5 cents a gallon—I will ask my colleague if that is correct.

Mr. MAYBANK. The tax in South Carolina is 6 cents.

Mr. SMITH. That is the State tax. It has furnished sufficient funds to pay the interest on our road bonds.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. One cent of the tax goes to the counties, 5 cents to the State, and in addition a cent and a half is paid to the Federal Government.

Mr. SMITH. I thank my colleague.

The State tax is 6 cents. The proceeds from that tax pay the interest on our road bonds, and we have as fine a system of roads in our State as is to be found in any other State in the Union. Now, by reason of the order reducing the amount of gasoline which may be sold, we are cut off from much of that revenue without any concern being manifested on the part of those issuing the order. That one sweeping order has resulted in destroying many filling stations and wiping out much revenue which came to the State. That has come about by reason of the fact that the Congress has delegated power to someone else.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, will my colleague yield to me?

Mr. SMITH. I yield.

Mr. MAYBANK. I should like to say also that the reduction in income from the 1-cent tax which goes to the counties is resulting in great loss to the county governments. I received a telegram similar to that which my colleague has read. I must admit that I never have seen and never can see the reason for the rationing of gasoline in South Carolina and in Georgia in view of the existing pipe line.

Mr. SMITH. Yes, Mr. President; we have not come to the bottom of this matter, nor have we found the real reason for the action taken. Like the people of the country, we in the Senate sit here and listen to the orders which are issued, orders which we ourselves should pass upon and authorize. If we, in place of delegating our power, as we have, had provided for a commission composed of worthy men from the North, South, East, and West, which after consultation had canvassed the situation and said to the people, "It is our order that you conserve gasoline and rubber," it would not have had the bad effect of the order which has been issued, the reason for which no one seems to know.

Mr. President, this order by which the producers will be reimbursed and the small dealers will be destroyed, is the most blatant exhibition of abuse of power delegated by the Congress. I have read this telegram. At some other time I shall name the source of all this mess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The presentation of petitions and memorials is still in order.

VISIT OF WINSTON CHURCHILL TO FORT JACKSON, S. C.

Mr. MAYBANK. I rise with particular pride to say a few words in connection with an Associated Press dispatch published in the Washington Evening Star of Saturday, June 27, 1942. I will read the opening words of the article:

FORT JACKSON, S. C., June 24.—Winston Churchill saw a spectacular display of America's expanding might today at the Army's largest infantry training post, where crack paratroops——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, has the Senate concluded the routine morning business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. The presentation of petitions and memorials is still in order.

Mr. McNARY. I ask for the enforcement of the rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Has the Senator from South Carolina something to present for the RECORD?

Mr. MAYBANK. I was going to say a few words in connection with an article from the Washington Evening Star, which I wish to have incorporated in the RECORD. I shall not read the article, Mr. President, but I ask that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks. It is an Associated Press article from Fort Jackson, S. C., June 24.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHURCHILL SHOWN DISPLAY OF UNITED STATES MIGHT AT FORT JACKSON—PRIME MINISTER'S VISIT TO BIG TRAINING POST WEDNESDAY REVEALED

FORT JACKSON, S. C., June 24.—Winston Churchill saw a spectacular display of America's expanding might today at the Army's largest infantry training post, where crack paratroops plummeted from the sky by the hundreds and live ammunition from big field guns whistled directly over his head and burst near enough for him to feel the jar and concussion.

Britain's Prime Minister inspected Fort Jackson's activities minutely, even prying into soldiers' packs and working the breech block of a 75-millimeter gun.

COMPLIMENTS INFANTRYMEN

He saw some of the plain, essential drudgery of life in an Army camp. And, complimenting a company of infantrymen on a mass calisthenics exercise, he said:

"I know you all are waiting and longing for the day, which is coming, when all this work and preparation will be turned into a mighty effort of war to make sure that right and justice will prevail in the world."

Talking to reporters later, he said he was "enormously impressed" by the maneuvers. He predicted the day would come when British and American Armies would march into oppressed countries, not as invaders but as liberators who would help their peoples throw aside the "cruel, barbarian yokes."

The Prime Minister's trip to Fort Jackson was considered a military secret until he had returned to England. The Army referred to him, in making advance arrangements, as the guest.

TRAVELED IN SPECIAL TRAIN

Freeing himself temporarily from the tension of war-strategy conferences in Washington, Mr. Churchill spent most of the day on this 62,000-acre military reservation where young men by the tens of thousands are training to smash the Axis.

A special train brought the Prime Minister from Washington, along with Secretary of War Stimson and top-ranking men of the American and British military commands. He flew back to Washington after staying 5½ hours.

Mr. Churchill inspected a guard of honor, reviewed three infantry combat teams, watched the demonstration by parachute troops, viewed various infantry training activities, lunched with a group of generals, and observed a realistic combat problem.

The latter, along with the paratroop operation, supplied the nearest thing to actual battle conditions.

IMPRESSIONS OF VISIT

Talking to reporters, Mr. Churchill gave his impressions of his visit:

"We were enormously impressed," the Prime Minister declared, "by the thoroughness and precision with which the formation of a great wartime Army of the United States is proceeding. The parachute display was quite the most remarkable I have ever seen.

"Our enemies have gained great successes by modern methods, but what I see here shows that in the long run we shall have been found not only to have profited by their example but to have turned their methods to an even better account in a good cause. This is a matter which ceaselessly engages the thought and studies of all those engaged in prosecuting the plans for the war.

"The day will come when British and American armies will march into countries, not as invaders but as liberators, aiding these people who have been held down under cruel barbarian yokes."

The Prime Minister told how it always refreshed and cheered him to visit the United States, to which he has ties of blood and friendship. (His mother was an American.)

"And with your great President and distinguished naval and military leaders," he asserted, "I feel that we are working with men of iron will, tireless energy, foresight, and inflexible purpose. If there is any rivalry between us, it will only be to show who can be the best comrade in a long, hard struggle."

CHURCHILL VISIT TO FORT SUGGESTED BY ROOSEVELT

Prime Minister Churchill told President Roosevelt that he was most impressed by "the faces of the men" during his review of American troops in simulated battle action at Fort Jackson, S. C., last Wednesday.

Stephen T. Early, White House secretary, disclosed that the trip was arranged Tuesday at the suggestion of Mr. Roosevelt, who told Mr. Churchill he hoped that he would be able to see personally one of the great divisions of the American Army in action before he returned to London.

"Both the President and Prime Minister," Mr. Early said, "were pleased by the cooperation of the American press and radio during Mr. Churchill's visit."

"It gave another opportunity," Mr. Early said, "for a demonstration by the press of cooperation with its government in time of war, under the voluntary censorship arrangement."

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, after the last war, when Camp Jackson was abandoned, the State of South Carolina took it over, and for many years, through the great work of the National Guard units of Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, the camp was kept active. Some 2 years ago the people of South Carolina, the citizens of Columbia, and others who had kept this great camp going for many years, returned it to the Federal Government.

About a year ago our great Commander in Chief, President Roosevelt, visited that post, and following his visit he made a statement to the effect that he was greatly impressed. Shortly before its name had been changed from Camp Jackson to Fort Jackson. I notice from the article that the President himself suggested to the Prime Minister that he make this visit. The Prime Minister saw the troops, which are equal to any in the world.

As junior Senator from South Carolina, I wish to pay my respects to the citizens of South Carolina and the National Guard men of Tennessee, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, who filled in the gap to keep this great place going between the first World War and today, when our great Army is making such fine use of it.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, is the morning business concluded?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. The presentation of petitions and memorials is still in order.

Mr. GEORGE. I wish to have a word to say about the telegram put into the RECORD by the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], but I withhold my remarks until the routine morning business shall have been concluded.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FILED DURING ADJOURNMENT

Under authority of the order of the 26th instant,

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, from the Committee on Appropriations, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 7280) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, reported it on the 27th instant with an amendment, and submitted a report (No. 1527) thereon.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. LUCAS, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

S. Res. 268. Resolution authorizing the payment of certain obligations incurred in connection with the right of WILLIAM LANGER to a seat in the Senate from the State of North Dakota; without amendment.

By Mr. SCHWARTZ, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 2606. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by making it a criminal offense to possess unlawfully or to reproduce various certificates issued pursuant thereto; without amendment (Rept. No. 1528).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

H. R. 5503. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to stipulate to the exclusion of certain property from condemnation proceedings; with amendments (Rept. No. 1529).

ENROLLED BILL PRESENTED

Mrs. CARAWAY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on June 27, 1942, that committee presented to the President of the United States the enrolled bill (S. 337) to provide for a permanent postage rate of 3 cents per pound on books.

EXPENSES IN CONNECTION WITH CONTEST OF THE SEAT OF THE JUNIOR SENATOR FROM WEST VIRGINIA

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, as chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably from that committee, without amendment, Senate resolution 267, and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 267) reported by Mr. Green, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections on June 25, 1942, and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, upon vouchers approved by the chairman of said committee, such sums as may be necessary, not exceeding $4,000, for the payment of expenses, including attorneys' fees, incurred by Clarence E. Martin and others in connection with the contest of the seat in the Senate from the State of West Virginia now occupied by Senator JOSEPH ROSIER.

OBLIGATIONS INCURRED IN CONNECTION WITH PROCEEDINGS RELATIVE TO SEAT OF THE JUNIOR SENATOR FROM NORTH DAKOTA

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 268. I request that the resolution be read in full, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 268) reported by Mr. GREEN, from the Committee on Privileges and Elections on June 25, 1942, and referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, was read as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Privileges and Elections, authorized by Senate Resolution 81, agreed to March 10, 1941, to consider the question of whether WILLIAM LANGER was entitled to retain his seat in the Senate to which he was certified as having been elected on November 5, 1940, hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate for the payment of obligations incurred in connection with the said proceeding, including attorneys' fees, $16,500, in addition to the amounts heretofore authorized for such purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. McNARY. I did not have an opportunity even to record an objection.

Mr. LUCAS. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. President, before this resolution is considered I should like to ask the chairman of the subcommittee which handled this report what the arrangement is with respect to the statement made on page 3 of the report of the subcommittee, as follows:

It was agreed by attorneys on each side that attorneys' fees be treated as lump sums to each side, to be prorated in accordance with some agreement already reached between themselves, and for this purpose your subcommittee recommends that instead of the sum of $15,000 for the attorneys on each side, as suggested by them, that the sum of $16,000 be divided between them; that is to say, $8,000 to each side.

I make the inquiry for this reason: Of course, the disbursing officer would have to know to whom the money is to be paid so far as attorneys' fees are concerned. Has the Committee on Privi-

leges and Elections designated the amount which each attorney who sat around the table on one side of the case or the other is to receive? Or will the disbursing officer simply give the total amount to some one attorney and let him divide it among all the attorneys?

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, in answer to the Senator's question, I suggest that the chairman of the Committee on Privileges and Elections [Mr. GREEN] is present. The report by the subcommittee has been made to the full committee. I think perhaps the chairman of the committee should make the reply.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, in answer to the question, let me state that in the opinion of the committee the attorneys on each side should come to a unanimous agreement as to the division. If they cannot do so, it will be necessary for the committee to divide the sum. However, it was understood that the attorneys would reach an agreement among themselves and that the money would be paid out on the basis of such agreement. They would all have to sign the voucher, so there would be no trouble so far as the disbursing officer of the Senate or the Comptroller is concerned.

Mr. LUCAS. Am I to understand from the Senator from Rhode Island that the attorneys have not reached an agreement as to the proper distribution of their fees? I raise the question solely from the standpoint of what the disbursing officer will have to do. The Senator from Illinois, as chairman of the committee, will have to sign the vouchers, and I should like to know how the vouchers are to go through.

Mr. GREEN. The disbursing officer would require the joint receipt of all the attorneys.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. My attention was diverted by another matter, and I did not catch the full statement of the Senator as to the amount involved in the way of attorneys' fees and to whom it is to go. What are the facts in that connection?

Mr. LUCAS. The amount which the committee has recommended is $16,000, to be divided among all the attorneys who participated in the contest.

Mr. BARKLEY. How many were there?

Mr. LUCAS. There was Morgan Ford, of Fargo, N. Dak.; Francis Murphy, of Fargo, N. Dak.; Thomas W. Hardwick, of Sandersville, Ga.; Dennis A. Lyons, of Washington, D. C.; H. C. Lowry, of Washington, D. C.; O. R. McGuire, of Washington, D. C.; and Edward R. Burke, of Washington, D. C.—seven, all told.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand, the list of attorneys given by the Senator includes those on both sides.

Mr. LUCAS. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. In ordinary election contests in the House of Representatives, some of which have dragged along until the end of the term involved, $2,000 is usually allowed for attorneys' fees. I am not sure that there is any definite rule in the case of an election contest. This proceeding partook of the nature of a contest over the right of a Senator to his seat. It seems to me that $16,000 is a considerable amount of money to pay attorneys. Six attorneys seem like an unusually large number. I presume that in addition to attorneys' fees of $16,000 there are other expenses. What is the amount of the other expenses?

Mr. LUCAS. According to the committee report, claims for traveling and other expenses have since been allowed to the extent of $3,017.10. The original claims were larger, but that was the amount which was allowed. Also, as I understand, the second report of the subcommittee allowed $777.64 for expenses by Morgan Ford, of Fargo, N. Dak. I think I am correct in that statement.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. President, I should like to make a statement in this connection. Several Senators, including myself, have received telegrams from the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER] requesting that this matter go over until his return, which will be some time this week, because he wishes, to use his words, to "fight the report." Whether he thinks the amounts are too large or too small, I do not know. However, he has made that request. I sent word to him that, so far as I was concerned, I should be glad to wait until his return this week.

Mr. BARKLEY. In view of the lack of detailed information among the Members of the Senate and in view of the fact that the total amount of all the items is considerable, it occurred to me that considerable time might be required for the Senator from Illinois to explain each of the items, and that it might be well to postpone consideration of the resolution until a later date.

Mr. LUCAS. Such a course will be perfectly agreeable to me. I spoke to the minority leader about the matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed on the calendar.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, just one moment, please, before the resolution is placed on the calendar. This is a fairly important matter——

Mr. BARKLEY. Yes; I think it is. I agree with the Senator.

Mr. LUCAS. And I should like to discuss it a little further. My primary reason for rising was the nature of the report which has been made by the subcommittee of the Committee on Privileges and Elections. In other words, at the present time the report does not disclose the character of the distribution which is to be made to the various attorneys who are to receive the $16,000. Obviously, some arrangement will have to be made. The members of the Committee on Privileges and Elections ultimately will have to come to some agreement, I take it, if they can agree among themselves, as to what each lawyer is entitled to receive, in order that the disbursing clerk of the Senate may be able to write the proper orders for the various and respective sums.

Mr. BARKLEY. As I understand from what the Senator has said, the resolution proposes a lump-sum appropriation of $16,000, without designation of the method by which that amount is to be distributed among the attorneys. Is that correct?

Mr. LUCAS. Precisely so.

Mr. BARKLEY. They will have to get together and agree among themselves; and if they do not get together and agree, we shall have to handle the matter and again designate in the resolution how much each one is to receive.

Mr. LUCAS. That is obviously correct; and that is why I raised the question to ascertain whether the Committee on Privileges and Elections has made any arrangement which the report does not disclose.

Mr. President, for the benefit of the Senate, I think the full report of the subcommittee should be printed in the RECORD in order that the Senate may know exactly what is being done in this case. I ask unanimous consent at this time that the report of the subcommittee be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(The report appears in the RECORD following the remarks of Mr. LUCAS.)

Mr. McNARY and Mr. McFARLAND addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Illinois yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. LUCAS. I yield first to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I arose originally to object to consideration of the resolution today. I have received a telegram from the Senator from North Dakota asking that consideration of the resolution go over until later in the week, because he is unable to be present before that time. A few days ago I conferred with the chairman of the committee and also with the very distinguished chairman of the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, and I understood that the resolution would not be brought up until the Senator from North Dakota was present. Inasmuch as the Senator from Illinois is willing to comply with that request, I suggest that we proceed accordingly.

Mr. LUCAS. I have no objection to having consideration of the resolution deferred; but I think that the Senate is entitled to know the contents of the report of the subcommittee. Throughout the country there has been considerable discussion relative to the Langer case; and in fairness to everyone, I think it is important that a complete record be incorporated into the RECORD.

I now yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I merely desired to ask a question. Has the Senate already voted $16,000, or is there merely a recommendation that $16,000 be appropriated?

Mr. LUCAS. The resolution is now being presented to the Senate for the purpose of having the Senate pass upon it.

Mr. McFARLAND. I thank the Senator. I was not present when he began his remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be placed upon the calendar.

REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman, Committee on Privileges and Elections, United States Senate:

Your subcommittee, composed of Senators MEAD, MURDOCK, WILEY, TUNNELL, and the undersigned, having under consideration the bills for attorneys' fees and expenses in connection with the * * * protest to the seating of WILLIAM LANGER as Senator from North Dakota, submit the following report:

LANGER PROTEST

The summary of claims for expenses in connection with this matter is as follows:

Statement of unpaid expenses in re a protest to the seating of WILLIAM LANGER as Senator from North Dakota (prepared for the Committee on Privileges and Elections from data and claims in its files May 19, 1942):

ATTORNEYS FOR RESPONDENT

To whom due	Nature of claim	Amount
Morgan Ford (nephew of respondent) Petterson Building, Fargo, N. Dak.	Professional services: Investigating, 15 days at $25.	($375.00)
	Travel, 1,502 miles at 7 cents.	105.14
	Lodging, 14 days	30.00
	Meals, 15 days at $1.50	22.50
	Telegraph and telephone.	50.33
	Total	207.97
Francis Murphy, Fargo, N. Dak.	Professional services: 92 days at $——.	----------
	Transportation, 2 trips to Washington and return.	280.00
	Expenses, hotel, meals, etc., at $10.	920.00
	Total	1,200.00
Thomas W. Hardwick, Sandersville, Ga.	Professional services: 67 days at $——.	----------
	Transportation, 5 trips to Washington and return at $40.	200.00
	65 days expenses at $10.	650.00
	Total	850.00
Dennis A. Lyons, Shoreham Bldg., Washington, D. C.	Professional services: 125 days, at $——.	----------
	Secretarial service	10.00
	Telegraph and telephone.	79.32
	Brief and transcript expense.	242.00
		331.32
	Total out-of-pocket expense claimed.	2,589.29

ATTORNEYS FOR PETITIONERS

O. R. McGuire, Southern Bldg., Washington, D. C.	Professional services	----------
	Stenographic assistance.	$13.00
	Expense of brief	167.80
		180.80
Edward R. Burke, Southern Bldg., Washington, D. C.	Professional services	----------
	Western Union Telegaph Co.	8.01
		8.01
H. C. Lowry, Southern Bldg., Washington, D. C.	Professional services	----------
	Total out-of-pocket expense claimed.	188.81

MISCELLANEOUS

To whom due	Nature of claim	Amount
A. J. Klandt, State Capitol, Bismarck, N. Dak.	Witness fees	$69.00
	Mileage	170.00
		239.00
	Grand total	3,017.00

It is recommended that the expenses claimed be allowed to the claimants in the sums as shown, namely:

Morgan Ford, Fargo, N. Dak	$207.97
Francis Murphy, Fargo, N. Dak	1,200.00
Thomas W. Hardwick, Sandersville, Ga	850.00
Dennis A. Lyons, Washington, D. C.	331.32
O. R. McGuire, Washington, D. C.	180.80
Edward R. Burke, Washington, D. C.	8.01
A. J. Klandt, Bismarck, N. Dak	239.00
Total	3,017.10

It was agreed by attorneys on each side that attorneys' fees be treated as lump sums to each side to be prorated in accordance with some agreement already reached between themselves, and for this purpose your subcommittee recommends that instead of the sum of $15,000 for the attorneys on each side as suggested by them that the sum of $16,000 be divided between them; that is to say, $8,000 to each side.

It is the sense of your subcommittee that a special subcommittee be named to study and report to the committee some set of rules and regulations outlining a proper basis for fixing attorneys' fees and allowance of claims growing out of contests for future guidance of this committee and the Senate. Certainly such procedure would tend to more uniformity in handling such expenditures and could be made an effective measure for discouraging unwarranted contests.

Respectfully submitted.

HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *May 20, 1942.*

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT OF SUBCOMMITTEE

Hon. THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN,
Chairman, Committee on Privileges and Elections, United States Senate:

Your subcommittee, composed of Senators MEAD, MURDOCK, WILEY (absent), TUNNELL, and the undersigned, having under consideration additional bills of the contestee and his attorney for fees and expenses and personal expenses of the contestee in connection with the protest to the seating of WILLIAM LANGER as Senator from North Dakota, submit the following report:

Statement of unpaid expenses, Morgan Ford, Fargo, N. Dak.

Item	Amount claimed	Amount recommended for payment
Investigations in Bismark, Jan. 16 to 25, 1941, at $25 per day	$225.00	----------
Room at Patterson Hotel, 9 days	18.00	$18.00
Meals, 9 days at $1.50 per day	13.50	13.50
Telephone calls (local)	.80	.80
Telegram to Senator LANGER	.33	----------
Trip to Bismark and return, 412 miles at 7 cents per mile	28.84	[1] 20.60
Investigations in Bismark, Mar. 13 to 16, 1941, at $25 per day	75.00	----------
Meals, 3 days at $1.50 per day	4.50	4.50
Room, 3 days at $2 per day	6.00	6.00
Trip to Bismark and return, 418 miles at 7 cents per mile	29.26	[1] 20.90
Investigations in Minot, Mar. 25 to 27, 1941, at $25 per day	75.00	----------
Hotel in Minot, 2 days	6.00	$6.00
Telephone calls (local)	.10	.10
Meals, 3 days at $1.50 per day	4.50	4.50
Trip to Minot and return, 672 miles at 7 cents per mile	47.04	[1] 33.60
Investigations in Minot, Oct. 8 to 9, 1941	25.00	----------
Mileage and expenses	21.10	[2] 17.89
Legal services performed in Bismarck Oct. 9 to 13, 1941, 4 days at $25 per day	100.00	----------
Mileage and expenses	25.72	[2] 23.15
Legal services performed in Bismarck, Oct. 15 to 16, 1941, 2 days at $25 per day	50.00	----------
Expenses and mileage to Fargo Oct. 31 to Nov. 22, 1941, 23 days at $25 per day	15.65	[2] 14.08
Mileage to Washington and return trip	575.00	----------
Nov. 3 to 19, 17 days' expenses in Washington at $10 per day	146.70	[2] 104.75
Jan 16 to 22 to Washington and return at $25 per day	170.00	170.00
Plane trip to Washington and return	125.00	----------
Expenses	115.00	115.00
Long-distance telephone calls to Senator LANGER and other points.	125.00	[3] 60.00
Tax on telephone calls	127.40	127.40
Telegrams to Senator LANGER and other points	7.75	7.75
Tax on telegrams	13.99	8.22
Total	1.10	.90
	2,178.28	777.64

[1] Claimant requested 7 cents per mile. The committee allowed the investigators only 5 cents and all Government agencies have a maximum mileage rate of 5 cents per mile. Thus the committee recommends mileage at 5 cents per mile.

[2] These items were lump sums without separating expenses from mileage. Since in other items claimant figured 7 cents per mile it was thought just to make a flat 10-percent reduction in these case.

[3] This item is reduced from $115 expense for 6 days in Washington to $60, or $10 per day to bring it in line with all other similar items allowed the other attorneys in the case.

All items for attorneys' fees were omitted as a lump sum of $8,000 to attorneys on each side was recommended by your committee for legal services, and Mr. Ford should receive such compensation for his services from that source.

Senator LANGER appeared before your subcommittee in connection with the above bill and his own statement of expenditures in excess of $800, which he sought to explain and amplify by pencil notations on the original claim. The original letter addressed to the chairman, on which Senator LANGER had made pencil notations, was returned to him for retyping.

The subcommittee took separate votes on the claim of Mr. Ford and on that of Senator LANGER. It is recommended that the claim of Mr. Ford for expenses be allowed in the amounts shown. On the claim of Senator LANGER it was voted to refer it back to the full committee without recommendation. Senator TUNNELL requested that his objection to the payment of both be noted in the record.

Respectfully submitted.

HUGH BUTLER,
Chairman.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

S. 2630. A bill granting a pension of $50 per month to all widows of Civil War veterans who have attained or hereafter attain

the age of 65 years; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 2631. A bill to provide for recording the assignment of certain interests in patents; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. STEWART:

S. 2632. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to settle claims for damages to private property resulting from sewage disposal at Camp Forrest, Tenn.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred as indicated:

H. R. 7282. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the Disabled American Veterans of the World War", approved June 17, 1932, so as to change the name to "Disabled American Veterans", and to extend membership eligibility therein to American citizens, honorably discharged from the active military or naval forces of the United States, or of some country allied with the United States, who have been either wounded, injured, or disabled by reason of such active service during time of war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 7297. An act authorizing the assignment of personnel from departments or agencies in the executive branch of the Government to certain investigating committees of the Senate and House of Representatives, and for other purposes; to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

PAYMENT FOR ACCRUED LEAVE TO CERTAIN MEMBERS OF THE CAPITOL POLICE

Mr. LUCAS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 269), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to members of the Capitol police force assigned to duty at the Senate Office Building such sums as may be necessary to reimburse them for accrued leave accumulated under regulations of the Capitol Police Board and unused by reason of entering the armed forces of the United States, upon vouchers approved by the Sergeant at Arms of the Senate.

DETAILED STUDY OF LEGISLATIVE AND EXECUTIVE BACKGROUND OF THE DEFENSE SET-UP—WITHDRAWAL OF MANUSCRIPT

On motion of Mr. HAYDEN, it was

Ordered, That leave be granted to withdraw from the files of the Senate the manuscript containing a detailed study of the legislative and executive background of the defense set-up of the United States prepared by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress.

FLAG DAY ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a Flag Day address delivered by him at Milwaukee, Wis., on June 14, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY AT UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURE

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before members of the University of Wisconsin, College of Agriculture, experiment station staff, on June 13, 1942, at Madison, Wis., which appears in the Appendix.]

ADDRESS BY STANLEY K. HORNBECK AT UTAH STATE AGRICULTURAL COLLEGE COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Mr. Stanley K. Hornbeck, adviser on political relations, Department of State, at the commencement exercises of the Utah State Agricultural College, at Logan, Utah, on June 1, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

IMPORTANCE OF RELIGION—ADDRESS BY LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR POLETTI, OF NEW YORK

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by Lieutenant Governor Poletti, of New York, at St. Augustine Presbyterian Church, New York City, June 21, 1942; which appears in the Appendix.]

FLAG DAY ADDRESS BY MAYOR JOSEPH J. KELLY, OF BUFFALO

[Mr. MEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Joseph J. Kelly, mayor of Buffalo, N. Y., in connection with the celebration of Flag Day, which appears in the Appendix.]

CRITICISM OF ALLIED WAR EFFORT—EDITORIAL FROM SHREVEPORT (LA.) TIMES

[Mr. ELLENDER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Shreveport Times of June 26, 1942, entitled "The Question of Criticism Again," which appears in the Appendix.]

ONWARD OLD GLORY—POEM BY SEAN O'DOHERTY

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a poem by Sean O'Doherty, of New York, entitled "Onward Old Glory," which appears in the Appendix.]

POWERS OF SENATE SPECIAL SILVER COMMITTEE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 261) submitted by Mr. MCCARRAN May 28, 1942, was read as follows:

Resolved, That the special committee created pursuant to Senate Resolution 187, Seventy-fourth Congress, agreed to August 16, 1935, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed, in addition to the authority conferred by such resolution of August 16, 1935, to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the origin of, and the necessity for, the amendment made on March 2, 1942, to Preference Rating Order P-56 (relating to preference ratings for deliveries of materials for mining enterprises) under which mines are excluded from the benefits of such order if more than 30 percent of their production in dollar value consists of gold or silver, or both. In connection with such investigation, the committee shall ascertain and determine the extent to which consideration was given in making the amendment to such order on March 2, 1942, to the effect of such amendment on (1) the mining industry in general; (2) the economy of hundreds of communities which are wholly dependent upon mines producing gold or silver, or both; (3) the creation of additional unemployment in mining communities; (4) the extent to which silver may be used in the war effort as a substitute for strategic minerals; (5) the activities of prospectors searching for new discoveries of strategic minerals needed for the war effort; and (6) the losses in tax revenue to the Federal, State, and local governments resulting from the closing of mining enterprises which are unable to secure materials for their continued operation.

The committee is further authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the production, or the lack of production, of silver, strategic and critical metals and minerals, and other metals and minerals which are essential or necessary to the successful prosecution of the present war.

The committee shall report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, the results of its investigations pursuant to the additional authority conferred by this resolution, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, after conferring with the senior Senator from Kentucky, the leader of the majority, I offer several amendments to the resolution. I ask that the Senate proceed to consider the amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will proceed to state the amendments offered by the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. BARKLEY. Before the amendments are stated I should like to make a brief statement. I have conferred with the Senator from Nevada, and he has agreed to modify his resolution, which pertains to the functions of the silver committee which was established in 1935. The resolution creating the committee was presented, as I recall, by the late Senator Pittman of Nevada. He became the chairman of the committee. Subsequently, following his death, the Senator from Oklahoma became the chairman.

The pending resolution would extend the jurisdiction of the committee slightly. In its original form it extended it, as it seemed to me, too broadly, because it authorized the committee to enter upon an investigation of all metals and all strategic materials. Inasmuch as the resolution of 1935 was originally a silver resolution, it has occurred to me that it is not necessary to increase the jurisdiction of the committee because the question of metals and strategic materials has been investigated and is now under investigation by three or four other committees. The Senator from Nevada has agreed to modify his resolution accordingly; and I have no objection to the resolution as modified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendments proposed by the Senator from Nevada will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 2, line 4, after the word "on", it is proposed to strike out "(1) the mining industry in general; (2)" and insert "(1)"; at the beginning of line 7 to strike out "(3)" and insert "(2)"; in line 8, after the word "community", to strike out "(4)" and insert "(3)"; in line 9, after the word "minerals", to strike out "(5)" and insert "(4)"; at the beginning of line 11, to strike out "strategic minerals" and insert "gold or silver"; in the same line, after

the word "and", to strike out "(6)" and insert "(5)"; in line 17, after the word "of", where it occurs the second time, to insert "gold and"; and in the same line, after the word "silver", to strike out "strategic and critical metals and minerals, and other metals which are essential and necessary for the successful prosecution of the present war" and insert "in the United States and its territories", so as to make the resolution read:

Resolved, That the special committee created pursuant to Senate Resolution 187, Seventy-fourth Congress, agreed to August 16, 1935, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed, in addition to the authority conferred by such resolution of August 16, 1935, to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the origin of, and the necessity for, the amendment made on March 2, 1942, to Preference Rating Order P-56 (relating to preference ratings for deliveries of materials for mining enterprises) under which mines are excluded from the benefits of such order if more than 30 percent of their production in dollar value consists of gold or silver, or both. In connection with such investigation the committee shall ascertain and determine the extent to which consideration was given, in making the amendment to such order on March 2, 1942, to the effect of such amendment on (1) the economy of hundreds of communities which are wholly dependent upon mines producing gold or silver, or both; (2) the creation of additional unemployment in mining communities; (3) the extent to which silver may be used in the war effort as a substitute for strategic minerals; (4) the activities of prospectors searching for new discoveries of gold or silver needed for the war effort; and (5) the losses in tax revenue to the Federal, State, and local governments resulting from the closing of mining enterprises which are unable to secure materials for their continued operation.

The committee is further authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation with respect to the production, or the lack of production, of gold and silver in the United States and its Territories.

The committee shall report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, the results of its investigations pursuant to the additional authority conferred by this resolution, together with its recommendations, if any, for necessary legislation.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. Morning business is concluded. The calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives relating to the agricultural appropriation bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6709, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 26, 1942.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 42 to the bill (H. R. 6709) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$4,000,000";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 43 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$72,418";

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 44 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert $20,184,288"; and

That the House still further insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate No. 81, 83, 85, 86, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, and 97 to said bill and ask a still further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 42, 43, and 44.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, to what bill do the amendments relate?

Mr. RUSSELL. The amendments relate to the agricultural supply bill for the year 1943. I may state to the Senator from Oregon that no progress has been made in arriving at any agreement on the amendments which are still in disagreement; and I wish to move that the Senate insist further on those amendments and send the bill back to conference.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 42, 43, and 44.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendments numbered 81, 83, 85, 86, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, and 97.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Georgia.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. RUSSELL. I move that the Senate agree to the request of the House for a further conference, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. McNARY conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6599, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 22, 1942.

Resolved, That the House further insist upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 21 and 23 to the bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate further insist on its amendments numbered 21 and 23, ask for a further conference thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees upon the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Vice President appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. WHITE the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

STATUS OF APPROPRIATION BILLS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in one of the morning newspapers there was an article with reference to the status of appropriation bills which is described as a legislative jam. My investigation and information lead me to believe that before tomorrow night the appropriation bills will all have been enacted with the possible exception of the agricultural bill, which has been in conference for many weeks, as we all understand, growing out of the amendment of the Senate authorizing the sale of 125,000,000 bushels of grain under certain conditions, the House having in the bill originally prohibited the sale of any surplus commodities except under very limited circumstances. It seems that the conferees have not been able to agree on that item, and that, probably, is the main point which has been the subject of disagreement, and which has been found, so far, impossible of solution. I am still hoping that before tomorrow night the conferees may get together so that we will not have to pass a joint resolution to continue the appropriations for the Agricultural Department until the agricultural bill for the coming fiscal year shall have been passed by both Houses. Outside of that, I think there is every likelihood that the other appropriation bills will have been passed before the expiration of the present fiscal year.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, there is on the calendar an appropriation bill which must pass before midnight tomorrow. If it should fail of passage, the War Department and the Air Corps would be without funds for the support and maintenance of those Departments. It has been stated that this bill should have been acted on before this date; but, Mr. President, under our practice, the supply bills are acted on first by the House of Representatives; and after that body acts on them they come to the Senate and we take action. This particular bill, which is House bill 7280, carries a very large amount of money, the amount being $42,820,003,067.

During the past year, Congress has appropriated approximately $75,000,000,000 for the support, maintenance, and expansion of the Army. This bill carries only a little more than a half of the amount already appropriated for the same purpose, except that the amounts heretofore appropriated were for expansion purposes as well as for maintenance. This bill likewise carries funds for expansion as well as for maintenance.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. I understood the able Senator to say that during the last year $75,000,000,000 have been expended for the Army?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I stated that sum had been appropriated for the Army.

Mr. McNARY. Very well; appropriated. Of that amount, how much has been actually expended?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I cannot give the Senator accurate information, but relatively a small proportion, I should say, not to exceed $15,000,000,000, probably.

Mr. McNARY. Then we have a backlog of some $45,000,000,000 that have been authorized and appropriated.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, while a large amount has been appropriated, the major portions of the appropriations have been allocated, and much that has not been allocated as yet has been committed. Under the procedure of the War Department, after the money is made available, the Department proceeds to make its plans and specifications and then, as soon as possible, contracts are let; but in many cases letters of commitment are issued. They are not in the nature of contracts, but rather proposals with plans and specifications which outline the program.

Of the vast sum appropriated, the major portion has been allocated. Under the procedure of the War Department, the funds which are made available are not paid out until the goods have been delivered. As I understand, in all construction work contracts are let. The contractor must be financially able to carry the work along, and as the work progresses the bills are paid by the contractor, and then according to the contract at stated intervals the contractor submits estimates. As such estimates are approved by the proper officials of the War Department, payments are made. So the work is done and the bills are paid by the contractor before the Government is called upon to make reimbursement.

While we have appropriated large sums of money, as stated, many thousands of contracts are in existence. These contracts will not have been completed in some instances for months. In such cases the money will not be paid until the planes, the tanks, the guns, and the construction work are completed or deliveries are made. That is the reason why only a comparatively small amount of money has actually been paid out by check by the Treasury Department. The construction program is going on and the goods are in process of manufacture. As soon as the planes and tanks and guns and what not are delivered, then the bills will be audited, and thereafter the checks will be issued. Of the vast sum which has been appropriated, save some $14,000,000,000 which was made available late in April, there is not very much that has not been allocated, either under contract or by letters of intent. So it is not a fair and correct statement to say that there is a backlog of $45,000,000,000 because that is not the case. The testimony is that even when this bill passes, before the year is over, contracts will be in existence for all the money appropriated by this bill and all the money that has been heretofore appropriated for the War Department. The question is whether the Congress will prefer to pass one bill carrying out the program of the War Department, and not have to do, as we have done this year, consider and enact as many as six or seven bills, each carrying smaller amounts.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President——

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think my information is authentic that there are really $35,779,000,000 which have been uncommitted and unobligated and are still available as fresh virgin money. That amount will certainly hold over for a few days.

I desire to make myself clear. I shall object to the consideration of this bill today and probably a little time can be saved if the Senator will allow me to state my reasons.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. They are very friendly ones. We have enough money on hand, unobligated and uncommitted, to carry on the conduct of the war without any impairment whatsoever. That might be sufficient reason for letting the bill go over for a few hours.

Here, Mr. President, we find on our desks, as rather a surprise to all of us, a bill carrying approximately $43,000,000,000 and containing 60 pages. It first reached our desk this morning, and the report consists of 92 pages, supported by brief hearings for 4 days. The able Senator now comes in and asks for immediate consideration of this proposal for a huge, unprecedented, unexampled expenditure of public funds.

I shall not discourse upon the rightfulness of the expenditures, or refer to wastages which have been demonstrated by committees of the House and of the Senate. I am only asking for the display of a little good judgment, a little calmness and coolness, so that some of us may have an opportunity to read this long bill, read the 92-page report, and possibly, if we have enough good luck during the day or evening, or in the nighttime, or in the dim hours of the morning, to search the records of the hearings which have been held.

I think it is an unusual and most extraordinary request, after a bill is laid on our desks, with a few Members of the Senate present, no one having notice that the bill would be brought up for consideration, that at the eleventh hour we should be asked to rush the bill through, when there is a backlog of $36,000,000,000 now available for the Military Establishment.

Mr. President, I have attempted to be reasonable at all times. At times I have been impatient at the manner in which business has been conducted in the Senate. This bill should have been brought over to the Senate earlier. I am not blaming the Senate committee, but responsibility rests upon someone in office and on committees to get these bills here in time for just, fair, reasonable, sound, and comprehensive study of them. To bring in a bill at this late hour, and ask for consent to take it up because the fiscal year will end tomorrow, is not the proper way to legislate; it is just pushing the Members of the Senate around without regard to their partial or full understanding.

In the name of decency, out of respect to orderly procedure, we should have at least 1 day to consider a bill proposing to appropriate $43,000,000,000, a sum quite a bit larger than all the expenses of the last war 25 years ago, a sum which I recall a few years ago—yes, a few months ago—was considered the limit of the debt which this country should assume to carry.

I recall the argument made here by a very dear friend of all of us, now gone, the late Senator Harrison, when he stated on the floor that we could not pass the $45,000,000,000 limit without impairment and dislocation of our economic structure. I recall the very distinguished and able conservator of public funds and resources and credit, the distinguished Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], pleading over and over again that our appropriations not go beyond fifty or sixty billion dollars. But now, in one fell swoop, the Senate is asked to pass a bill appropriating $43,000,000,000, without reading it, without knowing anything about it, a bill which the Senator in charge thought so important that he spent a sufficient amount of time to compile a report of 93 pages, but we are not to look at it.

Mr. President, I am sure we should be a little more deliberate in handling public funds, and more considerate of the uses to which they are to be devoted. I am not impressed with the argument that all the money that goes into paying for the war is properly used and correctly used, and not wasted. We hear a great fuss about keeping down expenses. Some of the committees, as indicated in their reports, and some of us with eyes to see, realize that there are wastes, but I do not know whether we can take them out of this bill or not. However, something should be done in the way of giving thought and meditation and study to measures such as that before us.

I believe that if we should pass this bill over today without considering it, we could take it up tomorrow under better lights and stronger guidance and a more determined and complete judgment, and still have it through in time to get it to the President tomorrow night. But

if we should not, I repeat, of the $75,000,000,000 which have been appropriated in the last year, there is still uncommitted, still unspent and unobligated, practically $36,000,000,000.

In order to prevent undue haste and lack of discrimination and judgment, and for the purpose of providing opportunity for study, I shall object to the consideration of the bill today. I have always tried to be fair in these matters, however, and I am willing that the Senate might convene at 11 o'clock tomorrow, that we might take the bill up, and the Senator could explain it and its various provisions carrying this huge sum of money. If that shall be done, I shall not further object.

I am willing to show my further good faith by suggesting that the bill be made the unfinished business and the special order for tomorrow at 11 o'clock. It passed the House in a relatively short time. That would give us time to read the very long, and, I am sure, excellent, report, to peep into the hearings, and to read the bill and discover what it proposes. It will permit us to acquire some knowledge of its objectives. I am willing to consent to such an arrangement.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have not made a request for unanimous consent, and neither have I made a motion that we proceed to the consideration of the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, we may go further than that. Under the agreement, the report was filed during the recess, and anyone might object the day the report was made, and the objection would be good. I stand in that position.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Let me say to the Senator from Oregon that I think his position is entirely tenable, and I think there will be no trouble in arriving at an agreement that the bill may go over until tomorrow, when we will take it up and give it such consideration as the Senate may desire.

I did wish to make a statement to the Senate for the RECORD as to why the bill comes here just 1 day before the last day of the fiscal year. Under our system we may not act on appropriation bills until they reach the Senate. We cannot control the Bureau of the Budget; we cannot control the other body of the Congress. We have to wait until the other body acts. Then, when an appropriation bill comes to the Senate, it is our duty to give it such consideration as we see proper.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I tried to make it clear that I was not censuring the committee. I did not put my finger on anyone. I said someone, or some committee, was responsible for this hurry-up order and last-minute rush. Of course, the Senator's committee has acted promptly, and I am not finding fault with the Senator's attitude. I think he has been very fair, and it has always been a great joy to work with him. He is doing what his committee expects him to do. But I also have my reason for objecting to present consideration. I am willing to have the bill made the unfinished business, and have it taken up tomorrow as soon as the Senate convenes, about noon.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I desire to make another statement before we come to some agreement.

This bill passed the House late last Tuesday. The Senate was not in session on Wednesday. The bill did not reach the Senate until Wednesday.

Mr. BARKLEY. It reached the Senate on Thursday.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It was accepted by the clerk on Wednesday, under the agreement. It did not reach the Senate until we reconvened on Thursday, but the subcommittee, knowing of the importance of the measure, and that it must be given consideration prior to the termination of the fiscal year, proceeded to hold hearings the day the bill arrived, on Wednesday. Hearings were held on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, and on Saturday the committee met and gave consideration to the provisions of the measure. The House committee held hearings at great length, and the Senate committee examined every feature of the bill so far as it was possible to do so in the short space of time allotted.

The Senate committee asked officials of the War Department if they had any suggestions or recommendations with respect to changes to be made in the measure after it passed the House, and they replied that they had no suggestions to make. They did not ask that any amendment be made to the bill, and they did not ask that any legislative restriction be adopted.

The Senate committee recommended one amendment to the bill. In the House it was provided that little publications, or big publications, for that matter, at Army camps, in the way of newspapers or magazines, could solicit advertising.

That provision was placed in the bill on the floor of the House. If it remains in the bill, it will make it possible for little newspapers or big newspapers published in connection with the operation of Army camps to go as they do, to the nearby cities, or nationally, for that matter, and solicit advertising, of whatever kind. No doubt they need the advertising to support the papers, but our committee thought it not proper to place this in the bill, so the committee recommends to the Senate that the provision be stricken out. If that provision shall go out, then there will be no other change in the House text as the bill arrived in the Senate. No recommendations have been made with reference to changes in amounts. We do not reduce any appropriation, and do not add to any.

Mr. President, inasmuch as I have discussed the matter this far, I ask to have placed in the RECORD at this point a break-down of the total sum of $42,820,003,067.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Break-down of total appropriation

Personnel (pay, subsistence, clothing, medical care, and welfare)	$10,739,559,342
Training and education	44,097,840
Signal Corps	2,617,506,025
Air Corps	11,316,898,910
Engineer Corps	874,132,192
Ordnance	9,948,319,237
Chemical Warfare	620,546,241
Seacoast defenses	97,249,641
Transportation, including equipment	3,721,692,958
Construction and maintenance of establishments	2,445,945,000
Miscellaneous supplies, equipment, and services	158,403,730
Miscellaneous, including administrative expenses	229,967,951
Civil components	5,684,000
Total	42,820,003,067

Mr. HILL. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Did the Senator bring out the fact that the bill did not pass the House of Representatives until June 23? In other words, it has not yet been over to the Senate a week.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I made the statement that it passed the House on the 23d, which was last Tuesday.

Mr. HILL. That is correct.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. It did not reach this body until the 24th, or last Wednesday. On that day the subcommittee began hearings, and there has been no delay on the part of the subcommittee in connection with its consideration of the measure.

Mr. HILL. I am not a member of the subcommittee, nor am I a member of the full committee, but I do know how persistently and how conscientiously the subcommittee has devoted itself to the consideration of the bill since it went to the subcommittee.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I think the RECORD should show how these bills are made up. It will take only a moment.

The War Department has its Budget Division. After the General Staff decides on its program, the Budget Division is assigned the task of making up the estimates to carry out the program. When the estimates are prepared by the War Department, they in turn are submitted to the Budget Bureau, and at an appropriate time the Budget Bureau hears the justification made by the proper bureaus of the War Department.

In this particular case, approximately a month was devoted to the hearings on the several items. After the Budget Bureau had acted and approved the estimates, they in turn were sent to the House of Representatives. The House committee, as I have stated, held extensive hearings with respect to the estimates, and the justifications offered to sustain them. So, when the bill comes to the Senate, all that work is back of us. There is first the War Department's consideration, there is a month's consideration by the Budget Bureau, and then there is the consideration that was given

by the House of Representatives. So, when the bill came to the Senate with all this background, having only such a short time for consideration, the subcommittee has seen fit to make its report, which was approved by the main committee, and the bill is now before the Senate.

I suggest to the Senate that the break-down of the estimates for the bill are put up in books. I exhibit to the Senate 1 of the books. It is a book an inch and three-quarters thick. Each of these books contains the break-down estimates for each bureau of the War Department. There are 10 of these books. Senators can imagine the task it would be for a committee of the Senate, or for any committee, to go through 10 books of this kind and determine exactly where each of the dollars appropriated will eventually go.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMATHERS in the chair). Does the Senator from Oklahoma yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. It might be advisable, since the question was raised with respect to the preparation of the bill, to call attention to the fact that in the hearings, beginning on page 69, and proceeding through page 74, and elsewhere, there is a very detailed statement by Brigadier General Helmick with respect to the manner in which the estimates were prepared. That record will show that the general was closely examined by members of the committee throughout his testimony, developing a clear statement as to the care with which the estimates were prepared.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Let me say further for the record, Mr. President, that while these books are open to the inspection of the members of the committee and will be open to the inspection of any Member of the Senate, yet the data contained in these books is not to be made public for reasons that are obvious to the Members of the Senate.

The hearings on the bill appear not to be voluminous, in view of the fact that the bill carries such a large sum. The reason the hearings are not seemingly more complete is due to the fact that much of the testimony given by the officials was off the record. We held hearings for 4 days. One hearing started at 2 o'clock and ended after 6 o'clock. The others were about as long. I presume that two-thirds of the testimony given before our subcommittee was off the record, and even after the record was made, it was submitted to the gentlemen who gave the testimony, and much of it was thereafter deleted. Perhaps on second thought those who had testified thought they had said something that should not appear in print. That is the reason the hearings are not seemingly more extensive.

I may say in justification of the bill that it is intended to carry out the administration's program. The administration's program for the production of airplanes up to the end of 1943 is 185,000 in number. This bill carries money to pay for 23,550 planes. It carries money for the construction of tanks and various forms of automotive weapons of warfare. The exact number of tanks, of course, is not divulged, although the information is available to Members of the Senate.

Mr. President, at this point I ask to have placed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks a statement taken from the New York Times of June 26. It is a formal statement prepared and authorized by the President. Following that statement I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a second statement from the Maritime Commission. These two statements give all the information that is thought proper to publish as to what the bill contains. The bill, however, appropriates the money necessary to carry out the program of the War Department in the prosecution of the war.

There being no objection, the two items from the New York Times were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The formal statement by the President was as follows:

"We ordinarily do not release production figures because they might give aid and comfort to the enemy. I am going to give today just a few which are definitely going to give the Axis just the opposite of 'aid and comfort.'

"We are well on our way toward achieving the rate of production which will bring us to our goals.

"In May, we produced nearly 4,000 planes and over 1,500 tanks. We also produced nearly 2,000 artillery and antitank guns. This is exclusive of antiaircraft guns and guns to be mounted in tanks.

"And here is a figure which the Axis will not be very happy to hear—in that 1 month alone we produced over 50,000 machine guns of all types—including infantry, aircraft, and antiaircraft. That does not include submachine guns. If we add those in, the total is well over 100,000. All these figures are only for 1 single month.

"While these figures give you some idea of our production accomplishments, this is no time for the American people to get overconfident. We can't rest on our oars. We need more and more, and we will make more and more. And we must also remember that there are plenty of serious production problems ahead—particularly some serious shortages in raw materials, which are receiving the closest consideration of the Government and industry."

The President's statement gave no figures on shipbuilding, but the Maritime Commission announced recently that 58 vessels were delivered in May and that 75 ships were launched.

THE PRESENT ARMAMENT GOALS

The current armament goals of the United States in 1942 are:

Sixty thousand airplanes, including 45,000 combat craft.

Forty-five thousand tanks.

Twenty thousand antiaircraft guns.

Eight million deadweight tons of merchant shipping.

Expenditures for arms production now are running at the rate of about $3,800,000,000 a month, about two and one-half times the rate of spending immediately before Pearl Harbor. Donald H. Nelson, War Production Board Chairman, said that the over-all production of the United States and the other United Nations now exceeded that of the Axis, but that our enemies had huge reserves which must be overcome.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I ask that the bill be made the unfinished business, for consideration as early as is agreeable tomorrow.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I announce that I have some things I desire to say during the morning hour, but I seem to have been the only Senator who respected the morning hour.

Mr. McNARY. May I inquire what was the request made by the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That the bill be made the unfinished business for consideration tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. I have no objection to that course.

RATIONING OF GASOLINE

Mr. GEORGE. I have objection at the present time.

Mr. President, I allude to the telegram which was read to the Senate and placed in the RECORD earlier today by the senior Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and I desire to make a statement regarding it. As I understand—and I preface my remarks by that statement—as I understand, the Office of Price Administration, and perhaps other agencies of Government concurring, have placed a two and a half cent per gallon increased price on gasoline, and a corresponding price on crude oil, even down to kerosene. That price is to be paid by everyone in the Eastern States. Not by everyone in the United States—bear that in mind—but only in the curtailment area, the Eastern States, 17 of them.

What happens with the money? The money is to be paid into a pool, and that pool is to be composed of those oil companies who voluntarily enter the pool. All those oil companies furnishing gas in the eastern restricted area, by voluntarily becoming members of the pool will be reimbursed out of the pool for increased cost of transportation to the eastern seaboard. When the large producers enter the pool and are permitted to charge to the dealers, who in turn must, of course, charge to the consumers, two and a half cents per gallon more for gasoline in the restricted area, the producing companies who thus voluntarily become members of the pool are to receive out of the pool compensation for extra cost of transportation to the seaboard, or to the Eastern States, as I have just stated.

Mr. President, this particular program is one of the most forceful illustrations of a bad decision followed by subsequent steps which are not only without justification, but which are positively iniquitous in a free country under any circumstances.

Mr. President, this is the situation. In April of this year the Price Administrator announced gasoline rationing. The Secretary of the Interior, as the Petroleum Coordinator for War, exercised authority vested in him, I assume, to announce certain curtailment areas. He made the announcement and defined those areas.

Practically the only area restricted was the area comprising the 17 seaboard Atlantic States.

Very early in May I brought to the attention of the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator for War and to the Price Administrator the fact that Georgia, Florida, and South Carolina had been included in the restricted area.

Senators, bear in mind that Georgia is served by two pipe lines, one from Baton Rouge, La., striking the State on the western border and going through the State into South Carolina. Another from Port St. Joe on the Gulf, coming up through the State, entering near the southwest corner, running into almost the geographical center of the State, on to Atlanta and on to Chattanooga. The first distributing station on that line is in the State of Georgia. In other words, the first opening of the pipe line from Port St. Joe, Fla., to the environs of the city of Chattanooga is in the State of Georgia, and the last opening on that line is in the State of Georgia. That line alone is capable of transporting and does transport more gasoline than the State of Georgia uses in an average year, and decidedly more than it is permitted to use under rubber rationing, tire rationing, and other restrictions that have been placed on the consumers of gasoline and the distributors of gasoline, to say nothing of the quantity of gasoline that can be transported through the pipe line from the producing fields; that is, from Baton Rouge, at least, into Georgia, and through Georgia into the Carolinas.

Now we were told that it was necessary to ration gasoline in order to conserve rubber. If that is true, there is no possible justification for the refusal to ration gasoline throughout the Nation. It cannot be the duty of one State or of a few States to conserve rubber, if that is the justification, and the time has come for plain speaking on this subject. It is said that we must conserve rubber. If so, let us make the rationing Nationwide. The people of Georgia have never said otherwise. The people of Florida and South Carolina have not said otherwise. Let the rationing apply to the whole country. The acid test is whether they will do it or not.

It is said that we must conserve transportation facilities. What kind of justification can we advance for the conservation of transportation facilities at the expense of a single section of the country, particularly my State, when not the slightest justification exists for putting it in the restricted area?

It is said that we must ration gasoline not only to conserve rubber and transportation facilities, but also in order to have a supply of gasoline for the Atlantic seaboard. Granted that that is a sound reason. Why was not the burden distributed among all States which furnish gasoline for the seaboard or Eastern States?

Mr. President, I have received most courteous replies from both the Office of Price Administration and from the Petroleum Coordinator for War. The Petroleum Coordinator for War made it perfectly plain that he had nothing to do with the restrictions which were placed upon the sale, or the price ceilings which were placed upon gasoline, but that he was concerned with the question of curtailment of areas; and he submitted the reasons which I have briefly discussed.

What is the situation? Look at it factually. The Georgia pipe line which runs from the Gulf has several openings, the first one almost on the Georgia-Florida line. Alabama is not rationed. Trucks are coming into Georgia to the stations on the pipe line, taking gasoline out of the State of Georgia, and carrying it into Alabama, where it is sold under no restrictions. Tennessee is in the same fortunate position. Trucks come into Georgia, or cars are driven into Georgia, and receive gasoline from the pipe line serving Georgia. There is no complaint upon that point. However, the gasoline is transported across an imaginary line into Alabama or Tennessee, where it is wholly unrestricted.

There is and can be no justification for the order as it is written, and as it has been enforced. The injustice of it is now revealed in the order which becomes effective today. That is to say, the producers of oil, by voluntarily entering into a pool, may advance the price of gasoline—indeed, must advance the price of gasoline—2½ cents a gallon on all the gallonage sold within the area, including that sold to the people of Georgia along the two pipe lines which go through that State.

Of course, the dealer must pay 2½ cents a gallon more for it, and the consumer must pay 2½ cents a gallon more for it. The farmer must pay 2½ cents a gallon more for the gasoline with which to get to market with his perishable fruits and vegetables, which the War Department and the Department of Agriculture have asked him to grow in increasing quantities.

Where does the money go? The 2½ cents goes only to the big oil producers. They put it into the pool, and they take it out again, to equalize their cost of transporting the oil—into Georgia? Not at all. Into other States? Yes. How can a levy of that kind be justified? A tax is levied upon all the consumers of gasoline in Georgia, paid into a pool, and then distributed to all the great producers who furnish oil in that area, and who have become voluntary members of the pool. How can such a tax be justified?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. The net result of the arrangement is that the entire burden of increased costs is shifted to the consumer.

Mr. GEORGE. Exactly. It is shifted to the consumers in this area alone, and, as I complain, particularly to the consumers in a State which should never have been included in the area. Certainly it should not have been shifted to the consumers even in the area. If it should be borne by the consumers, it should be borne by all consumers.

Mr. WHITE. In the case of my particular State it is shifted to a locality where a $100,000,000 tourist business is ruined by the regulations already in effect.

Mr. GEORGE. Yes. I thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I have been very patient about this. I have tried to see the matter as it is; and I have tried to think that perhaps an effort was made to meet a national problem.

As I see it now, this is the situation: Mr. Henderson—and I speak with all respect for Mr. Henderson because I think he is a very capable and able man who has a hard job—made the initial mistake of thinking that he could put a price ceiling on a product with no price restrictions on the two great factors which enter into and control the cost of production, namely, the labor cost and the raw-material cost. Sooner or later the lid on the ceiling is bound to fly off. It is bound to be blown into smithereens unless he can get a large appropriation to pay subsidies to the processors, manufacturers, and producers of the articles sold.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The Senator will probably recall that within the past few days Mr. Henderson has been quoted in the press and over the radio as explaining the increase in the price of oil by saying that Congress failed to approve legislation authorizing the Office of Price Administration to pay subsidies. The Senator will recall that when the bill authorizing subsidies was under consideration in the Senate it was criticized by various Members of the Senate. The criticism became almost universal, and when notice was given that a motion would be made to recommit the bill those in charge of the bill withdrew that portion of the bill providing for subsidies.

I think it is worth commenting upon, since the Senator has opened this discussion, that the fundamental reason why the Senate refused to give its consent to the subsidy provisions of that bill was that no standards whatever were contained in the bill as it came from the Banking and Currency Committee. The authorization was so broad that those who were to administer the subsidy would have had authority to pay subsidies to any person, group, or association, without making a report to any person, any group, or even to the Congress.

When that action was taken the country was filled with reports—many of which, I am told, emanated from subordinates in the Office of Price Administration—that the real cause of congressional objection was purely a matter of patronage.

I take this opportunity to say that the objections which I heard with respect to the subsidy provisions of that bill were based wholly upon the fact that they would have vested in the Office of Price Administration such complete and arbitrary power over the economy of the country as has never before been even suggested. Congress was to have been forgotten. No rule or standard was to be laid down, but the Office of Price Administration was to be permitted to pay whatever it chose, to whomever it chose, under any circumstances it chose.

Mr. GEORGE. The Senator from Wyoming is correct. I had intended to mention the fact to which he has adverted. The Senate was unwilling to grant a large appropriation to be placed in the hands of the Price Administrator, the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or any other agency, to be used with little or no direction.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. For my own information, let me ask what area the proposed order would take into consideration.

Mr. GEORGE. The 17 Eastern States or Atlantic Seaboard States, extending from Maine to Florida, with some excepted areas.

Mr. McNARY. The order includes the District of Columbia, does it not?

Mr. GEORGE. Oh, yes; it includes the District of Columbia. As I have just said, the order includes the 17 Eastern Seaboard States with some excepted areas. There are two or three excepted areas in West Virginia and some in western Pennsylvania.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. In the morning newspaper I read an article in which it was stated that the areas in West Virginia and Pennsylvania which have heretofore been excepted from the order are now included; that is to say, that the oil fields in West Virginia and Pennsylvania which originally were exempted because the oil was right there and did not involve transportation, have now been included, and the gasoline obtained from oil coming from those fields has been made subject to the increase of 2½ cents a gallon.

Mr. GEORGE. Perhaps that is correct.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, I should like to ask him if the increase of 2½ cents a gallon accurately reflects the additional cost of transportation in the State of Georgia. As I understand the matter, the use of the pipe line does not involve an additional cost of any such amount as 2½ cents a gallon for delivery, and trucks from the Senator's State and pipe lines in another State can furnish the oil to South Carolina at an increased cost a great deal less than the increase of 2½ cents a gallon.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not able to answer as to whether or not the additional cost would amount to that much a gallon. The point I am trying to make is that if it is necessary to reimburse the oil producers in order to equalize their added costs——

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I can supply one figure which Mr. Henderson furnished me. The cost of rail transportation, assuming they can transport as much as 900,000 barrels a day, is approximately $1,000,000 a year. That is the amount of subsidy which would be necessary in order to avoid any price increase in the Eastern States. How that fits in with the increase of 2½ cents a gallon, I cannot say.

Mr. GEORGE. I am not familiar with that. However, I was not considering the matter so much from that standpoint.

I wish to say this with reference to the statement made by the Senior Senator from Wyoming: The provision of the bill to which he referred, making an appropriation for the purpose of enabling the Price Administrator and others to pay the subsidy, was eliminated. I am aware of the fact that throughout the country, and even at this time, it is not difficult to find in newspapers a statement that the provision was eliminated because of Mr. Henderson's failure to recognize the patronage prerogative of Members of Congress. The statements have gone even further than that. It is said that the Federal appropriation to administer the act has been ruthlessly cut, and without justification, solely or primarily because the Congress resented Mr. Henderson's failure to recognize the prerogatives of Members of the House and the Senate relative to the appointment of administrative officers in their States.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. RUSSELL. I merely wanted to point out the absurdity of that contention. At the time when the bill was before the Senate there was in the bill a provision which required the confirmation of the appointees within the States. So that could not have been the motive of any action by any Senator against the subsidy program. The amendment was agreed to on the floor of the Senate, but was later eliminated in conference. It required the confirmation of State directors. However, as I said, it was subsequently eliminated. No question with regard to appointments has arisen.

In my opinion, the criticism has been very unfair; and I have never been able to understand how that situation could possibly have affected the action of the Senate in dealing with that particular question.

Mr. GEORGE. I thoroughly agree with my colleague, Mr. President; and, more than that, I intend to vote for the appropriation for the Office of Price Administration whatever the committees of the Congress decide is necessary to enable Mr. Henderson properly and adequately to enforce the law; and I shall do so without regard to the persons appointed in any State by the Administration. I have no concern about such appointments.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. I have always understood that the purpose of price fixing was to prevent inflation. Is that correct or is it not? The Senator is chairman of the Finance Committee, the money committee of the Senate. I ask him whether the statement I have made is a correct statement.

Mr. GEORGE. That is correct, as I always understood the matter. The purpose was to prevent rapid rises in the cost of living, which constitute one element of inflation.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should say the principal element of inflation.

Mr. GEORGE. They are a primary stage of the disease.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. If the administrator of a great industry such as the gasoline industry increases the price 2½ cents a gallon, when it does not cost a great deal more than that to operate an automobile a mile, it seems to me that he is progressing toward inflation. Does it not look that way to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. GEORGE. I was not discussing that feature. I cannot see that such an increase is anti-inflationary, at any rate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Certainly it is not anti-inflationary.

Mr. GEORGE. No; I think not.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to say to the Members of the Senate that, so far as appointments are concerned, the men Mr. Henderson appointed in my State were highly honorable men so far as I know. I know nothing against them. I had nothing to do with their selection; but I have no complaint to make of Mr. Henderson on that score. However, I am becoming very much alarmed about the effect of price fixing on the small businesses of the country. I am simply wondering if by putting ceilings on some prices, and raising other prices, we shall hurt small business to the extent that we may not be able to get as much money in taxes for the war next year as we do even this year.

Mr. GEORGE. Let me say again that I am not at all concerned about any political aspects of the matter, and that I shall vote at the proper time to give to Mr. Henderson adequate funds with which to administer the law, without any thought of who has been appointed, or where. I am not concerned with that at all. I do not want to discuss that feature of the matter at all.

However, Mr. President, what I do desire to discuss is the fact that there is an arrangement made by which the big oil companies may enter into a pool; and, if they do so, they may advance their prices 2½ cents a gallon within certain areas of the United States. Where is Thurman Arnold? Where is the Anti-Trust Division of the Department of Justice? Has the Attorney General approved that kind of a combination for that purpose?

Mr. President, the oil companies by voluntarily entering into the agreement may advance their price to the dealer; and Mr. Henderson then is willing to let the dealer sell at an advance of 2½ cents a gallon to the consumer; but the money goes into the pool, and then goes back to the oil companies. Mr. President, in effect it is permitting an agency of the Government to levy a tax of 2½ cents a gallon on everyone in the restricted area who uses gasoline, the proceeds of the tax to be paid over to a special class. I think I was one of those who raised some objection to the provision for subsidy

which was contained in the bill to which the distinguished Senator from Wyoming referred. My primary reason and my sole reason, at last, is that once the Price Administrator is given the power to reimburse any producer, processor, and manufacturer for the losses which they may sustain by virtue of a price ceiling which has been fixed by the Office of Price Administration, then the Government enters the widest field for the expenditure of public money. It enters an unrestricted field; and the subsidy cannot be paid to one and denied to another, as was said on this floor. For that reason I have opposed and I shall continue to oppose the payment of subsidies. It not only opens the widest possible field for the expenditure of public money, but it opens the field for favoritism, for all of the evils which can beset a free government.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield to the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A moment ago the Senator very properly asked whether the Department of Justice had been consulted with respect to the order, and asked where Thurman Arnold was at the time it was made.

The Senator's remarks prompted me to send for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 10, 1942, the day when the price-control bill was under debate upon the floor of the Senate. That was the day upon which it was passed. Section 5 of the bill was unsatisfactory to many of us who felt that, as it was reported, it would open the door to exactly the sort of thing which has now occurred. I submitted the text to Mr. Arnold and to the Department of Justice; and under date of January 9, I received a letter from Mr. Arnold. It appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 10, 1942, at page 241.

Let me read one paragraph from Mr. Arnold's letter:

> Our objection to section 5 at it appears in the original draft comes from the fear that it might be interpreted as authorizing a delegation of power by the Administrator to private groups and as sanctioning the arrangements they might later make pursuant to such delegation of power. Our experience in investigating trade associations indicates that a very large number of voluntary agreements, innocent enough on their face, are cloaks for illegitimate price fixing or unlawful restraints of trade.

Section 5 was changed somewhat in conference. The members of the conference representing the Senate and representing the House of Representatives were, I think, mindful of the fear that had been expressed upon the floor that this provision authorizing the Office of Price Administration to call trade groups together and fix prices would lead to abuse. I think they endeavored so to draft the language to avoid that danger.

Mr. GEORGE. I had a recollection that they had tried to safeguard the exercise of this authority.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think it may be appropriate to read section 5 of the Price Control Act as it now appears in the statute. This is the way the law now reads in section 5 of the act of January 30, 1942:

VOLUNTARY AGREEMENTS

SEC. 5. In carrying out the provisions of this act the Administrator is authorized to confer with producers, processors, manufacturers, retailers, wholesalers, and other groups having to do with commodities, and with representatives and associations thereof, to cooperate with any agency or person, and to enter into voluntary arrangements or agreements with any such persons, groups, or associations relating to the fixing of maximum prices, the issuance of other regulations or orders, or the other purposes of this act, but no such arrangement or agreement shall modify any regulation, order, or price schedule previously issued which is effective in accordance with the provisions of section 2 or section 206. The Attorney General shall be promptly furnished with a copy of each such arrangement or agreement.

It will be observed, of course, that consultation with the Attorney General is not required until after the fact. So I have no doubt that the inquiry which I have made of the Department of Justice by telephone will presently be answered by information that the Attorney General was not consulted in advance. That, of course, is pure speculation; but a reading of this language seems to me to make it clear that it was not the purpose of Congress to authorize any such pooling arrangement as the Senator from Georgia has described.

Mr. GEORGE. I thank the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. President, I may not have accurate information regarding the pooling arrangement, but, as I said in the beginning of my remarks, I had obtained the best information available to me regarding its terms and its conditions.

I do not mean to say, for a moment, that the Price Administrator may not be justified in fixing a maximum price within certain areas above the price obtaining in other areas, even in the case of gasoline. That is a different question altogether, to my way of thinking. If that were done, then, the distributors, the gas stations, and everyone handling gasoline would have some compensation for the restrictions under which they are now operating. For instance, in Georgia the stations, the distributors, are permitted to receive only say 50 percent of the normal supply; so they are cut 50 percent of a normal supply by one order, and are cut by the rationing of rubber, the rationing of tires, and then, with that handicap, they must charge their consumers 2½ cents a gallon more for gasoline, when not a cent of it goes to the distributor, not a cent of it goes to the dealer, not a cent of it goes to the little village stations, to any of the helpers at the stations, or to any of the people in the particular community in any way, but it goes into a pool to be paid to the large oil-producing companies that supply the oil to that area.

If Mr. Henderson has made a mistake, or if conditions have now made it proper that he fix the maximum price of gasoline in one area above the price for another area, let it be fixed, let the people pay it, but let the people in that area have what benefit may accrue or whatever increased volume of business may come to them by virtue of increased price or sales. Do not resort to schemes of this kind under which the whole economy of the State or of the area, for that matter, though I am speaking particularly with reference to Georgia, is affected adversely by the levy of 2½ cents a gallon additional price or tax to be taken out of the State and paid over to the producers.

My understanding is—I do not state it is a fact—that into this pooling arrangement independents are not invited to participate, but only the large producing companies that furnish gas in the curtailment area. I do not charge that to be true, because I have had no opportunity to examine all the facts. I do know, however, that the substantial facts are that every consumer of gasoline in Georgia, every humble farmer whose melons and other perishable crops have been rotting in the fields because they could not get the gas with which to move them, the dealer, in many instances, having sold the 50-percent supply allotted to him before the farmer came around to be served, must now pay 2½ cents a gallon more, and that money goes directly through a pipe line into the treasury of the producing companies. It does not enter into the economy of the community paying the tax at all.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. GEORGE. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I desire to ask the Senator whether he has any information as to the arrangements contained in the agreement with respect to the disposition of the fund which will be created by this extra 2½ cents a gallon. I am mindful of the Senator's statement that he is advised and informed that the fund goes to the big oil companies. Not having any direct information myself about it, but knowing that the reason for the development of this order has been that the transportation of oil by tanker has been superseded by transportion by rail, I am wondering whether or not it may be the fact that this order requires that the total sum shall be used to pay the costs of transportation.

The Senator will recall that a year ago the railroads of the country were transporting less than 100,000 barrels of oil a day to the East coast.

Mr. GEORGE. I recall that.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But they are now transporting more than 700,000 barrels a day. It is also true that the expense of transporting this enormous quantity by rail is much greater than transporting it by tanker.

Mr. GEORGE. That is true.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. If it be true that this arrangement provides that this sum shall be used to defray the cost of transportation, that of course would affect the judgment which most of us would pass upon the question.

Mr. GEORGE. I said in the beginning that it was paid to the oil-producing companies to cover the increased cost of

transporting the oil to the eastern seaboard.

Mr. President, what I desire to say particularly is found in the fact that the State of Georgia is served, as I have already stated, from the terminal points of the Planters Pipe Line and the Southeastern Pipe Line. The Southeastern Pipe Line traverses the State, and on an actual survey the maximum truck haul from the openings in that line is 183 miles to reach any part of the State. The weighted average truck haul from these terminal points on this line to destinations in Georgia would be less than a hundred miles.

By the use of the Southeastern Pipe Line alone, combined with approximately one hundred 4,000-gallon transport trucks, the whole State of Georgia can be served without the use of tank cars. In fact, it is being served without the use of tank cars now, except to a very minor extent.

While I do not represent the neighboring States, I may make a statement applying to the State of Florida, the State of South Carolina, certainly, and perhaps the statement could be made with reference to all the Southeastern States, Mississippi, Tennessee, Alabama, Georgia, South Carolina, North Carolina, and Virginia, that together, under normal conditions, they use approximately 142,000 barrels a day. Under restrictions now existing they use much less.

The capacity of the two pipe lines, with certain branches to which I have referred, is equal to the total consumption in all the Southeastern States.

How can there be justification for the taxing of the people of a single State an additional amount of two and a half cents a gallon for gasoline to cover the cost of transporting oil into other States? The question answers itself.

Mr. President, I shall have more to say about this order I am not asking that gas rationing be extended to the whole of the United States. Perhaps there are sound reasons why that should not be done. But if we are to be advised that the conservation of rubber is the justification, then Nation-wide rationing is in order. If the object is to conserve transportation facilities, we have them, trucks and pipe lines, adequate and more than adequate to supply every gallon of gasoline used in the State of Georgia.

If the object is to conserve transportation facilities, the answer is the same.

None of those facilities transport gasoline outside Georgia or outside the adjacent States of Tennessee and South Carolina. True, some of the gasoline going through the pipe lines may be carried into some other State. As I have already stated, much of it is carried into other States which are not rationed at all.

If this latest order affecting gasoline is to be justified on the ground that it will conserve the use of railway tank cars, then the answer, so far as Georgia is concerned, is that with the pipe lines and the local trucks, the demand in Georgia can be supplied.

What is the justification? There is no justification, save the tenuous one that if we do not let the gas go on through the lines which traverse the State from north to south and from west to northeast, then there will not be enough gas to go into some distant State.

Very well; if that be the reason, how in the name of conscience can the people of my State be also taxed an extra 2½ cents a gallon to pay for the transportation of oil in tank cars into some distant State?

Mr. President, I will not submit to this injustice, and again and again I will stand here until it is righted.

Mr. President, I do not think anyone will say that I want to retard the war effort. However, I am not willing to submit long to unjust and unfair discriminations of this kind, in the name of national defense and national unity, because this practice does not promote national unity. This procedure will not win the war. Repeated often enough and on a sufficiently wide scale, it will defeat the war effort. It will break down the morale of the American people.

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I concur in the contention that this order will do no good in South Carolina. It will create more misunderstanding because of the pipe line which runs through our State, as it does through the State of Georgia. Our people are willing to sacrifice, if necessary, their boys, their money, and everything they have. They ask only that the order be explained, and that they be informed why there should be the loss of a tax of 5 cents a gallon to the State, 1 cent to the county, and 1½ cents to the Federal Government. They desire to know why they should be called upon to pay an additional tax of 2½ cents a gallon, by reason of the price increase, in order to aid transportation elsewhere, when it is unnecessary.

Mr. President, our people want to do their part to help win the war, if we will but tell them what it is necessary for them to do. If it is necessary for them to refrain from the use of gas, they will willingly cooperate; but do not force upon them arbitrary orders which no one in South Carolina or Georgia will ever be able to understand.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I subscribe fully to the statements of the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from South Carolina as to the inclusion of those States in the rationing field. I believe, however, that the Senate should realize there is an exceedingly complex problem involved in the matter of the price of gasoline and its distribution. I ask to have inserted in the RECORD at the close of my remarks a letter from Mr. Henderson, under date of June 11, 1942, dealing with the general subject.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit I.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I should like to call attention to a few points. One great difficulty is in the tremendously increased cost of distribution. Having fixed the price, the officials have imposed all kinds of additional costs on the distribution of oil; for instance, by requiring the companies to reverse the flow in their pipe lines and requiring the same companies to transport oil from the shortest distances.

I believe it will be necessary to adopt a plan to pool the additional expense involved in the tremendously important task of getting the gasoline to the Atlantic coast, no matter what the cost of the transportation may be, because that cost is imposed in such a way as to be entirely discriminatory between the different companies engaged in the transportation of oil.

Mr. Henderson's letter seems to me to make that clear. He says:

The normal requirements for petroleum and petroleum products in the eastern seaboard area are 1,500,000 barrels daily, of which 95 percent in past years has been shipped in tankers. In the fall of 1941 it was estimated that the necessary tank-car shipments to the East coast would perhaps approach 200,000 barrels daily. However, as a result of the submarine campaign and the diversion of tankers, movements by rail have increased from an average of 77,000 barrels daily during the week of January 17 to approximately 700,000 barrels daily in recent weeks. Meanwhile the movement of petroleum products by ocean tankers, which normally is at the rate of nearly 1,500,000 barrels daily, has decreased to less than 200,000 barrels daily and will be further decreased as ocean tankers are diverted to other destinations.

Transportation by rail has increased many times the cost of moving petroleum and petroleum products to the eastern States. A plan for meeting these increased costs is now in operation. This plan involves a pooling arrangement whereby there is an equitable sharing of revenues and excess transportation expenses by the oil companies supplying the Atlantic coast area with petroleum products. It was drawn up by the companies involved and has been approved by the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator. To meet these increased costs price increases totaling 1.2 cents per gallon on gasoline, 0.4 cent on kerosene, range oil, and No. 1 fuel oil, 0.6 cent per gallon on other distillate fuel oils, and 45 cents per barrel on heavy fuel oil, were approved by this office prior to the General Maximum Price Regulation issued on April 28, 1942. The pool has already incurred an estimated deficit of approximately $20,000,000 over and above what has been received by these additional price increases that have been incurred.

This letter was written on June 11, before this last plan, to which reference has been made, was worked out.

It is further estimated that the present arrangements will fall short of recovering the extra transportation expenses incurred on an annual basis by approximately $70,000,000 if the rate of shipment averages 800,000 barrels daily, and by about $100,000,000 if the rate of shipments average 900,000 barrels daily. To meet these deficits, the oil industry has requested the Office of Price Administration to grant further price iricreases. This procedure, however, would require price increases of such magnitude as to imperil the entire price-stabilization program which has been developed by this office in accordance with the national policy laid down by Congress.

I am, therefore, asking, as an emergency war measure, that funds be made available through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to meet the additional costs of transportation encountered by the members of the pool to the extent that they are not now and may not in the future be completely compensated for by price increases already provided for by this office.

Of course, the Administrator has a very difficult problem when he comes to decide who shall pay that additional cost, and certainly we must face the fact that either he must hold prices where they are and authorize a subsidy, which may or may not amount to $100,000,000 a year, or he must find the place to levy an additional price to cover the increased cost of gasoline. I cannot see any possible justification for including Georgia and South Carolina in that increased price, but I can see some argument for spreading the price over the entire United States. I can also see some argument for imposing it only in those districts that have to pay the additional costs. That has been done in the case of coal. A coal subsidy is being paid on coal transported to New England. Personally I think the subsidy theory—although I can see some justification for it in extraordinary cases—is a mistake. I believe increased cost ought to be covered by increased price. Whether the increased cost should apply to the few States to which the cost of transportation is increased, or to the entire United States, I do not venture to say, but I think the difficulty with South Carolina and Georgia is not so much the fact that they are included in the price as that they are included in the rationing area. It seems to me they ought to be removed from the rationing area entirely, but I believe the Senate probably will finally have to decide how this problem shall be dealt with.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Would it not seem to be an easier and more equitable method of meeting a situation of this kind to provide that the increased costs of transportation should be met by the Government itself, through the R. F. C., or through some other agency, so that it would fall upon the whole country rather than, as in this instance, having the cost fall upon a part of the country?

Mr. TAFT. I do not know that I have formed any definite conclusion. I think the method of imposing the additional cost caused by war on the entire country is a somewhat doubtful one, but I think there is more justification for a subsidy to cover increased cost of transportation than there is for any other purpose. I seriously question whether the Administrator has any power today to provide subsidies to cover increased transportation costs. As I read the act, it does not authorize anything but subsidies to producers. It seems to me that if such a policy were to be adopted it ought to be submitted first to Congress, and it ought to be limited, and ought to be passed on by the Senate and by the House of Representatives.

EXHIBIT 1

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., June 11, 1942.

HON. ROBERT TAFT,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR TAFT: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of May 29, 1942, inquiring as to the status of the subsidy covering movements of coal by rail into New England as well as asking for details in connection with extra transportation costs of petroleum and petroleum products into the east coast area and the subsidy necessary to maintain petroleum product prices.

The question on the subsidy for coal movements to New England will be discussed in a separate letter. This communication will deal with the problem of petroleum transportation to the east coast.

As you know, the sinking and diversion of oil tankers has created critical problems in our domestic economy and our war effort. The most serious problem is that of assuring an adequate supply of petroleum and petroleum products for civilian and war purposes to the eastern seaboard area. So critical has the situation become that many factories and industries devoted to the manufacture of war materials for our Army and Navy may be compelled to close down unless further steps are taken immediately to assure adequate supplies of petroleum and petroleum products to this area.

When this problem arose for the first time last fall, the Petroleum Coordinator directed that any deficit in supplies on the Atlantic coast area be made up by rail and other overland methods of transportation which are not ordinarily used for this service. As a means of implementing these emergency measures, I undertook, then, to assure the companies involved that price increases would be authorized to compensate for the additional out-of-pocket costs occasioned by the use of the higher cost methods of transportation.

The normal requirements for petroleum and petroleum products in the eastern seaboard area are 1,500,000 barrels daily, of which 95 percent in past years has been shipped in tankers. In the fall of 1941, it was estimated that necessary tank-car shipments to the east coast would perhaps approach 200,000 barrels daily. However, as a result of the submarine campaign and the diversion of tankers, movements by rail have increased from an average of 77,000 barrels daily during the week of January 17 to approximately 700,000 barrels daily in recent weeks. Meanwhile the movement of petroleum products by ocean tankers, which normally is at the rate of nearly 1,500,000 barrels daily, has decreased to less than 200,000 barrels daily, and will be further decreased as ocean tankers are diverted to other destinations. As you know, efforts are being made jointly by the Petroleum Coordinator, the War Production Board, and the Rationing Division of the Office of Price Administration to restrict all but the most essential uses of petroleum products by limiting fuel-oil deliveries, by encouraging conversion wherever possible of fuel-oil consumption to coal, and by the rationing of gasoline for noncommercial consumers. Nevertheless, unless overland movements of petroleum products are further increased, the eastern seaboard territory cannot be assured of an adequate supply of petroleum products indispensable to the success of the war effort.

Transportation by rail has increased many times the cost of moving petroleum and petroleum products to the Eastern States. A plan for meeting these increased costs is now in operation. This plan involves a pooling arrangement whereby there is an equitable sharing of revenues and excess transportation expenses by the oil companies supplying the Atlantic coast area with petroleum products. It was drawn up by the companies involved and has been approved by the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator. To meet these increased costs price increases totaling 1.2 cents per gallon on gasoline, 0.4 cent on kerosene, range oil, and No. 1 fuel oil; 0.6 cent per gallon on other distillate fuel oils, and 45 cents per barrel on heavy fuel oil were approved by this Office prior to the general maximum price regulation issued on April 28, 1942. Since overland movement of petroleum products with these higher costs have greatly increased, these price increases have been quite inadequate to meet the charges against the pool. The pool has already incurred an estimated deficit of approximately $20,000,000. It is further estimated that the present arrangements will fall short of recovering the extra transportation expenses incurred on an annual basis by approximately $70,000,000 if the rate of shipment averages 800,000 barrels daily, and by about $100,000,000 if the rate of shipments average 900,000 barrels daily. To meet these deficits, the oil industry has requested the Office of Price Administration to grant further price increases. This procedure, however, would require price increases of such magnitude as to imperil the entire price stabilization program which has been developed by this Office in accordance with the national policy laid down by Congress.

I am therefore asking, as an emergency war measure, that funds be made available through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to meet the additional costs of transportation encountered by the members of the pool to the extent that they are not now and may not in the future be completely compensated for by price increases already provided for by this Office. The operation of the plan now in effect is subject to the review of public accountants retained by the companies. It is also now being reviewed by this Office. It is tentatively suggested that the most feasible device for making funds available would be by payment to the trustee of the pooling arrangement at regular periods for disbursements to the membership of the plan to the extent that, and in proportion as, they have not been fully reimbursed for additional transportation expenses incurred.

If sufficient funds are not forthcoming promptly, I am fearful that the petroleum supply program of the Atlantic coast will collapse. We are advised that already some companies are refusing to ship petroleum products to the eastern coast and many important independent distributors are facing bankruptcy. These latter have been required to build up large inventories of fuel oil for sale in the fall and the winter. Unless they are in a position to recover the added costs, a number of them may be compelled to go out of business. Since this problem is of vital importance to the millions of people living in the eastern seaboard States, and to the success of our war efforts, I am hopeful that appropriate means can be found at once to solve this critical problem.

If there are any data or additional information you desire in connection with this problem, please do not hesitate to communicate with us.

Very truly yours,

LEON HENDERSON,
Administrator.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am sure no one will fail to recognize the extreme difficulty of the task the Office of Price Administrator has to administer. I am ready to acknowledge it and to testify moreover that Leon Henderson is doing an honest and efficient job.

Discussions of this kind seem to me, however, clearly to illustrate the funda-

mental defect of the original price-control theory. The selective price-control system, it was predicted at the time it was adopted, would be almost certain to fail. The incident described here today illustrates its failure. At the time the Price Control Act was under consideration it was pointed out and urged upon the Banking and Currency Committee that a much more effective method than to clothe the Administrator with power to fix ceilings with respect to certain items would be to freeze the prices, including wages, and raw materials costs of all kinds. If that had been done there would have been no farm price problem affecting the country, there would have been no wage problem affecting the country, there would be no problem of squeezing the little producer between increasing costs and a fixed ceiling. There would be no talk about subsidy.

The people of the country as a whole—all classes, farmers and workers, professional men and women, those who are engaged in business, whether in big business or in little business, all alike—are willing to do whatever is necessary to win this war, and I think all are ready to make the sacrifice that would be required by agreeing that prices for services and commodities should not be raised for the duration; that freezing of the entire system would eliminate every single question of subsidy and discrimination of which we have heard so much today and of which we will hear so much in the future.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, I do not agree with the Senator with respect to what the freezing of the price system would have imposed upon us; but one thing is clear, it certainly would not have resulted in avoiding the subsidy question, because if we had frozen the price of gasoline, for instance, there would have been this same loss of $100,000,000; and if we are going to adhere to the price-ceiling theory we would have to subsidize that increased cost.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. But that increased cost would be due to an actual war incident—namely, the sinking of tankers and the change for war purposes of the method of transportation from tankers to tank cars. That change, since it was made necessary by the war, is a change for which a Government payment can be justified.

Mr. TAFT. But practically every change in condition is a war purpose. The change in wages is a war purpose. I do not think we can maintain a frozen price ceiling on products in time of war. I think the system will fail; and I think Mr. Henderson's attempt partially to impose it today will fail, partly, as the Senator from Wyoming said, because it is not done 100 percent; but also, I think, because of the impossibility of maintaining in wartime a frozen price ceiling on everything.

INTERDEPARTMENTAL PROCUREMENT BY CONTRACT

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 2032) to amend section 7 (a) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), to authorize interdepartmental procurement by contract.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I move that the Senate disagree to the amendments of the House; ask for a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. LEE, Mr. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY conferees on the part of the Senate.

REQUISITIONING OF ARTICLES AND MATERIALS FOR WAR PURPOSES—CORRECTION IN ENROLLMENT OF BILL

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, both the Senate and the House have passed Senate bill 2586, but in the passage of that measure a clerical or typographical error occurred in the title. It will be necessary that the error be corrected by the adoption of a Senate concurrent resolution.

I submit a concurrent resolution, and ask for its present consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 29), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 2586) to amend sections 1 and 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue the act in effect during the existing war, and for other purposes, to change the title so as to read: "An act to amend sections 1 and 3 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes' approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue the act in effect during the existing war, and for other purposes."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the concurrent resolution?

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was considered, and agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. THOMAS] that House bill 7280 be made the unfinished business, to be taken up on the convening of the Senate tomorrow?

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I rose and perhaps said that I reserve the right to object, but I have no objection to the request.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I shall make this observation inasmuch as the present action is taken, because of my objection to the consideration of the bill today. I wonder if the able Senator in charge of the bill does not want to fix an hour for beginning its consideration.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If the bill is made the unfinished business it will be before the Senate until it is disposed of, at any opportune time.

Mr. McNARY. I did not know that the request was made to make the bill the unfinished business.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; my request is that the bill be made the unfinished business, and then be called up tomorrow.

Mr. McNARY. Very well. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7280) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Appropriations with an amendment.

MATERIAL, NOT MONEY, WILL WIN THE WAR

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the War Department appropriation bill has now been made the unfinished business of the Senate, and in view of the fact that it carries an appropriation amounting to $42,820,003,067, I am prompted to make a few observations.

Mr. President, the war is not going to be won by money. It will be won by material. The Appropriations Committee of the Senate, and, indeed, the Appropriations Committee of the House, and both bodies, have approved every request for war appropriations that has been made.

On numerous occasions when officials representing the Navy Department and the War Department came before the committee, members asked if request was being made for sufficient funds to carry on the war program. In some instances appropriations which should have been increased were not increased at the time, to be followed later—in only a few months, perhaps—by requests for additional funds. Congress has appropriated more money than the imagination of man can conceive. This only emphasizes the fact that we need material rather than dollars. In this bill there is a provision for an appropriation of $9,948,000,000 for ordnance. Ordnance is made of steel, and there is a shortage of steel in the United States. We shall appropriate ten billions for guns, but we have no assurance that we have steel enough to make them.

I am prompted to call attention to these facts, Mr. President, because on last Thursday the Wall Street Journal saw fit to devote a whole column to deprecating a suggestion that, faced by a shortage of steel, the country should test the so-called sponge-iron process. I shall not read the whole column. I merely wish to read the headings, but I shall ask to have the article printed at the close of my remarks.

Steel makers say sponge iron not feasible process.

From Pittsburgh there is a story under the heading:

Senator's claims denied.

The sponge process for making iron, advocated by Senator O'MAHONEY (Democrat, Wyoming) in a criticism of the steel industry, is an "old chestnut" that has been tried and

rejected, Pittsburgh Steel and research experts said yesterday.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit A.)

SPONGE IRON AND THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I suppose it is immaterial and irrelevant that I did not criticize the steel industry. I had no thought or purpose of criticizing the steel industry. I think the steel industry has made a perfectly remarkable showing in the circumstances; but the fact that spokesmen for the steel industry are willing to charge that such criticism was made, and are themselves willing to allege that the sponge-iron process is an old chestnut, and the fact that the Wall Street Journal is willing to devote a whole column to that attack, tends to confirm in my mind the suspicion that the big steel companies which have dominated the iron and steel industry in this country, for some reason of their own do not want to see the sponge-iron process adopted.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wyoming did not discover the sponge iron process. I am not a technician. I know nothing about the process, except as it has been described to me by persons whom I believe to be experts. My views with respect to this matter are based largely upon the testimony of the Bureau of Mines. Experts from that Bureau have told me repeatedly during the past year that the sponge iron process is a feasible process. Under date of June 20 I received a letter from Dr. R. R. Sayers, Director of the Bureau of Mines, in which he said:

The technical feasibility of low-temperature reduction of iron ores has been proven by large-scale tests of the Bureau of Mines and of other investigators.

I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit B.)

WAR DEPARTMENT NEEDS STEEL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I have pointed out that we are appropriating $9,948,000,000, or almost $10,000,000,000, for the manufacture of ordnance, and that guns cannot be made without steel. I call attention to the fact that in the testimony before the Appropriations Committee last Friday the representatives of the War Department said that they foresaw inability to obtain all the steel which will be required to carry out this program. Not only is that a fact, Mr. President, but the shortage of synthetic rubber, the shortage of aviation gasoline, the shortage of toluol, which is an essential element in the manufacture of TNT, and the shortage of ammonia can all be ascribed to the fact that we do not have compressors enough to manufacture those commodities. Compressors are made of steel.

So, Mr. President, we have the record. There is not enough steel for ordnance, not enough steel for synthetic rubber, not enough steel for aviation gasoline, not enough steel for toluol, and not enough steel for ammonia, yet the Wall Street Journal is busy distributing around the country the remarks of experts of big steel companies to the effect that the suggestion that the Government try a method of producing sponge iron is an old chestnut which should be disregarded.

STEEL NEEDED FOR CARGO SHIPS

Not only is it true that the War Department is confronted with a shortage of steel, but every other war agency faces a similar problem. The Maritime Commission has been unable to obtain the steel which it needs and has asked for, for the manufacture of cargo vessels. Since last July there has not been a single month when the Maritime Commission has been able to receive from the War Production Board its full request for steel. The deficit at this moment is 169,000 tons of steel. Admiral Land tells me that that is enough to manufacture 60 vessels, at a time when submarines are destroying the facilities for transporting our men and material to the fighting fronts, where both are needed—60 vessels which have not been built because we have not had enough steel; yet the Wall Street Journal rushes out to decry any attempt on the part of the Government to find some way of meeting this deficit in steel.

THE NAVY NEEDS STEEL

Last week, following a secret session of the Senate, we passed a bill authorizing appropriations of approximately $8,000,000,000 for the Navy, to make possible the construction of 500,000 tons of aircraft carriers, 500,000 tons of cruisers, and 900,000 tons of destroyers and other subsidiary vessels. All of this requires steel, and the Navy Department has been unable to obtain sufficient steel to meet its program. Indeed, the shortage has been such that the Navy Department has been asked by the big steel companies to use bessemer steel. Bessemer steel, because it is an outmoded form of steel, is brittle and fragile, and not suited to the manufacture of the armor which is needed upon our war vessels, our aircraft carriers, our cruisers, and our battleships, and needed for our tanks. Only high-class steel should go into the construction of such necessary war equipment; and yet the fact that a Senator has suggested the use of the sponge-iron process to meet this sad deficit is decried in the Wall Street Journal.

Mr. President, I have before me a letter from Admiral van Keuren, Chief of the Bureau of Ships of the United States Navy, in which he asserts that bessemer steel does not meet the specifications of the Navy for these purposes. I ask that the letter be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(See exhibit C.)

RAILROADS NEED MORE STEEL

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Not only is it true that we do not have steel enough to manufacture the guns which our men need, or steel enough to build our Navy, or steel enough to build the cargo vessels to carry our men and munitions into the war zones, but it is also true that the railroads of the country do not have enough steel. I have before me a letter from Mr. J. J. Pelley, president of the American Association of Railroads, written in response to my request, in which he points out that the railroads of the country have not been permitted by the War Production Board to obtain the amount of steel which it is necessary to build the freight cars and locomotives which they have on order.

The railroads have performed a perfectly magnificent work in this emergency. We have had no such snarling of traffic as that which took place in the World War. The traffic has moved easily and smoothly from one end of the country to the other. The railroads have carried the soldiers and the munitions. The railroads, Mr. President, according to Mr. Pelley's letter, are doing more work today than they did in 1929, and yet they are operating on only about two-thirds as much steel.

I read the concluding sentence of Mr. Pelley's letter to me:

You will notice that in 1929 the American railroads used almost twice as much steel as they will be able to get in 1942, notwithstanding the fact that business being transported in 1942 in ton miles is much in excess of the volume of business handled in 1929.

Although the railroads have asked for more than six and one-half million tons of steel this year, the War Production Board probably will not be able to allocate more than four and one-half million tons. Because of the lack of steel, the railroads probably will be unable to obtain 525 locomotives already on order. Without locomotives, freight cars cannot run. Without locomotives, we shall be bound to have chaos upon the railroad system; and yet because of the shortage of steel, the War Production Board has been compelled to cut down the allocations for the construction of needed freight cars and needed locomotives.

Mr. President, what I say is not in any degree or sense whatsoever a criticism of the War Production Board. I think that under the leadership of Mr. Donald Nelson, Mr. W. L. Batt, Mr. A. I. Henderson, and other officials, the Board has been doing a perfectly remarkable job. Its effort has been to take the short—for our purposes—amount of steel and allocate it as evenly as possible among all the various war agencies which require steel.

This is not a question of the efficiency of the War Production Board. It has been efficient. This is only a question of whether or not an attempt shall be undertaken to provide a subsidy for the scrap iron which has vanished because we sold most of it to Japan.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. Is it not entirely within the jurisdiction of the War Production Board to decide whether or not

a project for the production of sponge iron shall go ahead, as the Senator is requesting?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I think that the Defense Plant Corporation now has authority to authorize such a project.

Mr. MURDOCK. Let me make the further observation that in a recent conference which I had with the War Production Board, I was definitely given to understand that the Defense Plant Corporation could not go ahead with such a project as that which the Senator is now so ably discussing without first getting the approval of the War Production Board.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I think that is correct.

Mr. MURDOCK. The Senator says that is correct, and yet he says he has no criticism whatever of the War Production Board; that he thinks it is doing a wonderfully efficient job. I wonder if probably that is not the reason why we get no results down there—because we are a little too reluctant to place the blame where it belongs. I have had the same experience as that which the Senator has had, on aluminum, on magnesium, and on steel. Months and months ago Henry Kaiser came before the War Production Board with a project engineered and worked out for the production of sponge iron. Where did he get with it? He got about the same treatment, I imagine, as that which the project the Senator is talking about has had. If the War Production Board has the final say on the approval of projects such as that about which the Senator is talking and if it is impossible to get any approval from it, I wonder who is to blame.

CONFIDENCE IN WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am glad the Senator interrupted me, because, of course, he has described the situation exactly as it exists. However, I am not occupying a contradictory position when I agree with the Senator and still at the same time assert my confidence that the War Production Board as a whole is endeavoring to do the proper thing.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not want to take the Senator's time, but I should like to cite what I think is an important incident which recently occurred in connection with the War Production Board. I agree with what the Senator from Wyoming says, that taken by and large the War Production Board has done a remarkably fine job; but I do believe that there are in the War Production Board certain men who, by reason of former affiliations, some of them down here as dollar-a-year men, are not interested in bringing into production facilities which, when the war is over, may compete with the organizations with which they have been affiliated.

It so happens that in the southern part of Missouri we have iron deposits of very high ferrous content. There are millions of tons of it, perhaps as much as 100,000,000 tons.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Almost as much as we have in Wyoming.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Most of it is found in land owned by the Government itself, forest reservations. Immediately adjacent to those large deposits of iron ore are large Government-owned forests which would be entirely suitable for the making of charcoal; and only a few miles away are large deposits of limestone entirely suitable for use in the making of pig iron and steel.

A group of some of the leading public-spirited citizens of southeast Missouri was apprised of the sponge iron process. Let me point out that the ore itself is suitable for use in blast furnace production, so far as that is concerned. They wrote a letter to the War Production Board, and were invited to come to Washington to interview the Board. However, when they arrived in Washington they were confronted by a man by the name of Hobart, who, as I understand, is on leave from the Republic Steel Co., who rather rudely informed the members of the delegation, who were accompanied by a distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, that he was the superior of the man who had invited them to come to Washington, and that he could tell them in advance that there was no more chance of those iron-ore deposits being utilized than there was of a snowball in hell. The delegation explained to him that they had no financial interest of any kind or character in the matter, but were simply acting from patriotic motives. He said that he had no interest whatever in their patriotic motives or in patriotic motives actuating people, but that he was interested only in the policy of the War Production Board.

It does seem to me that with all the work of the War Production Board and all the work it has done on the whole, its officials are acting as policemen in keeping private citizens from bringing into use private facilities which might ultimately compete with the facilities of their own companies in Missouri.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I am greatly obliged to the Senator for his observations.

The subcommittee of which I have the honor to be chairman had presented before it, as long ago as last July, testimony by President Baldwin of the Missouri Pacific Railroad about Missouri iron ore. Officials of the Union Pacific testified with respect to untouched iron ore deposits in Wyoming, Utah, Idaho, California, and other States. I shall make reference to that later on.

Of course, it is true that in the War Production Board and the O. P. M. there have been persons who by virtue of training or experience have been unable to see the possibilities of any process which would tend to react against their particular corporations after the war is over. Mr. President, I think that in many instances such a situation perhaps is due to an honest mistake; but when I find the Wall Street Journal rushing to the denunciation of an attempt to produce more iron, then I begin to wonder if there is not something more than mere suspicion to the thought that in subordinate places in the War Production Board there are those who, for purposes which are not in the interests of the country as a whole, are preventing a full development of all of our resources.

It is only fair to remark, however, that it is necessary for the heads of a great organization such as the W. P. B. to consult experts, and it is only natural that such experts should be guided in their expression of opinion by their training and their predilections. When they give an opinion condemning a certain process or a certain project it becomes rather difficult for those at the head to overthrow it. But whatever may be the facts, Mr. President, there can be no excuse in the present critical condition of the country for failing to make a thorough and complete test of the sponge-iron process.

I sponsored an amendment to the Interior Department appropriation bill authorizing an appropriation of $600,000 to enable the Bureau of Mines to make commercial tests. I am in hope that the conference report, which agrees upon this appropriation, will be adopted by the House and by the Senate today. If it shall be adopted, I know that the Bureau of Mines will immediately undertake the experiment; but if what I am told is true, Mr. President, it should not be necessary to wait for an experiment of that kind. When we consider that this appropriation bill contains an item—I call it an item—of almost $10,000,000,000 for ordnance, how can anyone hesitate at all at an expenditure of ten or twenty million dollars to make a complete and forthright test of this process?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President——

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. President, in making my observations a few moments ago, when I interrupted the able Senator from Wyoming, I did not want to take the position and do not now take the position of criticizing W. P. B. They have done a great deal in my State in the exploitation of our natural resources. They are expanding the steel industries there. They have also provided for the building of a plant to utilize alunite in the production of aluminol, for which I am very grateful; but I feel exactly as does the Senator from Wyoming with reference to sponge iron.

When we are expending billions upon billions of dollars for guns, tanks, and all other kinds of war munitions, I think it is very unwise economy to refuse to provide money for an experiment such as that having to do with sponge iron. My purpose in rising at this time, however, again to interrupt the Senator, is to inquire if the conference report shall include the item about which the Senator speaks, providing the money for this investigation and for pilot-plant experimentation of the sponge-iron process, and the Bureau of Mines comes to W. P. B. and to the country, and says, "We place our approval on this process," how much does such approval mean to W. P. B.? Is such approval sufficient to enable them to go ahead?

I was down there last week and carried with me the approval by the Bureau of Mines of a process for the reduction of alunite to aluminol. The gentleman with whom I talked in W. P. B. said, "Oh, yes; it is all right for the Bureau of Mines to approve this project, but we are not satisfied with what the Bureau of Mines does; we want to turn it over now to the Academy of Science and see what they say about it."

So I ask the Senator this question: Facing the crisis which the country faces today, have we time to appropriate money for the Bureau of Mines to make investigations of processes and then to submit its approval of the processes, and then have W. P. B. say, "That is not sufficient, we now want someone else to do it"? That is the very thing, Mr. President, if the able Senator will allow me a further observation, to which I am objecting. I cannot understand, when we authorize a Government agency to make scientific investigations and report back to the Congress and to the public whether or not a process is feasible, and the agency submits its report and approves the process, why that is not sufficient to enable W. P. B. to proceed.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I am of the opinion that after this discussion today the War Production Board will not follow the lead of the Wall Street Journal, but will be much more likely to follow the suggestions which are made here upon the floor of the Senate.

There can be no doubt that from the very beginning of the war effort there have been men in positions of power who are more interested in the conditions which will exist after the war than in mobilizing all our resources to prosecute the war to early victory; but I am confident that Mr. Donald Nelson and those who surround him will not permit such obstacles to stand in the way of an all-out military policy on the part of the United States.

It is clear, from the evidence which I have submitted today, that we need steel with which to manufacture guns, we need steel with which to manufacture ships, we need steel with which to manufacture freight cars and locomotives, we need steel with which to manufacture war vessels, we need steel in the manufacture of synthetic rubber, aviation gasoline, and explosives, and I am confident that no agency of the Government will stand between that need and an immediate all-out effort to provide the steel which the world needs to save democracy—certainly not at the behest of the Wall Street Journal.

The question asked by the Senator from Utah prompts me to call attention to a letter which I received under date of May 5, from Mr. William L. Batt, who was then Director of Materials; and let me say, Mr. President, that I gave this letter out, together with all other evidence I had, at the time of my testimony before the Gillette committee last Tuesday. In this letter Mr. Batt stated:

There are several methods of producing sponge iron and apparently some millions of dollars have been spent in an effort to arrive at a commercially feasible product. All the known sponge-iron processes were reviewed by our people recently, but all save one were discarded as impossibilities. This one case seemed somewhat promising and a moderate amount of money has been made available through the Defense Plant Corporation for carrying on some further experimentation. Even in this case, no great hopes are entertained, but this particular method seemed to hold out the only promise at all among the sponge-iron processes, and it is being tried in order to be sure that we are exhausting all possibilities.

STEEL MEN WANT SPONGE IRON

Mr. President, I have in my office letters from steel men and iron men from all parts of the country who believe in the sponge-iron process, and who want it tried. We have the testimony of the head of the Bureau of Mines and his experts. Their studies on the sponge-iron process have been published over a period of years. Who is right I do not know. Whether the sponge-iron process is feasible or not I do not know, but the number and ability of the experts who say that it is a feasible process are sufficient to justify us in demanding an immediate and complete attempt to produce sponge iron.

Why is that necessary? I have here a clipping from the Detroit Free Press of the 6th of June of this year reporting a meeting held in Detroit, attended by Mr. Charles H. McArthur, of the W. P. B., and by Robert W. Wolcott, president of the Elkins Steel Co., and chairman of the Scrap Committee of the American Iron & Steel Institute.

According to this story, Mr. McArthur, speaking in Detroit, said that the war effort is expected to require 50,000,000 tons of scrap a year. He spoke about the salvage campaign sponsored by the War Production Board, cooperated in by the O. P. A., in an attempt to gather 10,000,000 tons of scrap iron by Christmas.

Why is the scrap iron needed? Because pig iron, which is manufactured by the coke-oven process, contains carbon, which is a deleterious substance so far as steel is concerned. Scrap iron is used for the purpose of diluting the carbon in the mix from which the steel is made. So pig iron, with its carbon content of about 4 percent, and scrap steel, from which the carbon has been to some extent removed, are mixed together in varying proportions, sometimes as little as 30 percent of pig iron, sometimes as much as 50 percent. But by the degree to which the proportion of pig iron is increased, the amount of carbon in the finished steel is likewise increased, and when the carbon is increased, then the quality of the steel is lowered.

SHORTAGE OF SCRAP

In the Washington Post of June 23 I found the following item, an Associated Press dispatch from New York, dated June 22:

Lack of scrap forced steel mills this week to schedule operations at 98 percent of the capacity compared with 98.3 percent a week ago, the American Iron and Steel Institute reported today.

The decline dropped potential production for the week to 1,664,600 net tons of ingots compared with 1,669,700 tons last week.

A month ago operations were at 99.6 percent of capacity for an output of 1,691,800 net tons and a year ago 99.9 percent of a slightly smaller capacity for 1,612,300 tons.

Mr. President, here we have the testimony of the American Iron and Steel Institute that the production of steel in the United States is falling off, in the face of this great demand, because of the lack of scrap.

The virtue of the sponge iron process is that it produces a substitute for scrap; and, as indicated by the Senator from Missouri a few minutes ago, there are in Missouri, in Wyoming, in California, in Idaho, and in many other States, even in some of the States of the East—deposits of iron which are not being developed because of the lack of a process such as the sponge iron process.

UNTOUCHED DEPOSITS OF IRON

In Wyoming, within 50 miles of the capital, Iron Mountain towers above the plains, with some sixty million to eighty million tons of iron ore in sight. Experts say that this deposit contains 400,000 additional tons for every foot of depth below the surface.

The Sunrise Mines in Wyoming are being only partially developed. I am informed the output of iron ore could be materially increased in this area if such a process were available for the reduction of ore in the immediate vicinity. Under the present system this ore has to be transported hundreds of miles south, to Pueblo, Colo., where coking coal is available. The great virtue of the sponge-iron process is that it does not require coking coal.

In the vicinity of Casper, Wyo., there is a large deposit of hematite ore. It has not been surveyed, but is at least 80 feet wide and at least 33 feet deep, and is exposed for more than a mile. Assays which have been made of this ore show that it has an iron content of as high as 40 percent. As the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] has said, there is an iron mountain in Missouri. There is also an iron mountain in Idaho, about 25 miles northeast of Huntington, Oreg. Like the iron mountain in Wyoming, it is absolutely undeveloped.

Testimony before the subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys of which I am chairman indicated that there are millions of tons of iron ore in Utah, only a part of which is being developed. There are deposits of iron ore in South Dakota, as well as in California. A consulting engineer of the Denver & Rio Grande Railroad testified that 16 counties of Colorado contain deposits of iron ore.

So it goes throughout the country. We have the ore, but it is not being developed.

The testimony from every expert who knows anything about steel or iron is all to the same effect, that steel is a vital necessity.

I have an editorial from the Iron Age of June 25, 1942, which reads as follows:

SEMIFINISHED STEEL EXPORTS CUT SCRAP

Loss of scrap involved in large shipments of ingots and semifinished steel to the United Nations is a matter which is bound to be of concern to war-production planners. Hundreds of thousands of tons of home scrap,

which will be lost to America's Allies in the next few months, will represent strategic material to their steel plants but will broaden the scrap deficiency in this country. With scrap demand already heavy, and with prospects of an acute shortage next winter, the loss of home scrap involved in the lend-lease shipments will weigh heavily on the iron- and steel-scrap industry. Steel-mill scrap buyers are not optimistic over the prospects of accumulating sufficient stocks for the winter.

In addition to hampering the operations of nonintegrated mills, greedy for material which now must be sent abroad or diverted to some other essential use, the heavy lend-lease orders will affect earnings of some steel producers. Steel manufacturers already hold that semifinished prices are below cost in many cases. With the profits being made on finished products, they face a considerable loss of revenue by shipping semifinished material.

This week the steel- and metal-working industries were struggling to appraise a number of important developments. Lend-lease difficulties were bewildering, but that was not all. The prospect of having a steel wage increase, as well as the closed shop, imposed by the National War Labor Board within the next few days is of itself a headache for which no remedy seemed in reach.

The steel wage increase, generally expected to develop out of the little steel cases now before the War Labor Board, is likely to be around 6 cents an hour. Some variation of the closed shop is likely to be ordered by the Board. Objections that a steel wage rise would (1) hasten inflation, which is perhaps the greatest danger confronting the Nation; and (2), increase the burden on the Federal Treasury by diverting industrial tax payments to wages, apparently have been cast aside by the three-man panel making the steel wage report to the War Labor Board.

I ask that there be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks an article which appeared this morning in the New York Herald Tribune entitled "War Obstacles From Depletion of Steel Feared."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit D.)

STEEL IS THE BASIC NEED

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, there can be no question that steel is the primary and most essential need of this country in its present war effort. The testimony is complete. There can be no denying it. In my judgment, the War Production Board should not hesitate 24 hours in undertaking immediate development of sponge-iron plants wherever they can be set up. The importance of such action is indicated again by the fact that the War Production Board has issued an order to the effect that no defense plant which cannot be completed by July 1, 1943, will be approved—all because of the shortage of steel. So our war effort is being cut down because we do not have the steel.

What possible explanation could there be for the refusal of some steel men to entertain the thought of using the sponge-iron process? There can be two explanations. First, that the process is indeed not feasible. However, that contention is rebutted by the fact that the Bureau of Mines says that its tests have demonstrated that it is feasible. It is rebutted also by representations which have been made to me and to other Senators.

The second argument is that the blast furnaces from which the present supply of pig iron comes are, for the most part, controlled by the dominant steel companies. The sponge-iron process is of such a character that it can be utilized in small plants capable of producing only 25 or 50 tons of iron a day or in large plants. If, indeed, the sponge-iron process is feasible, a sponge-iron plant could be erected at the mouth of every iron mine in America. It would make available the iron in the United States, the iron in Mexico, the iron in Canada, iron wherever it is found, but it would break down control. Is that, Mr. President, the explanation of the fact that the Wall Street Journal rushes into print to decry the sponge-iron process against the testimony of the Bureau of Mines? That is a question which the War Production Board must answer.

EXHIBIT A

[From the Wall Street Journal of June 25, 1942]

STEEL MAKERS SAY SPONGE IRON NOT FEASIBLE PROCESS—INDUSTRY ALREADY HAS SPENT MILLIONS IN ATTEMPT TO DEVELOP METHOD—GOVERNMENT MAY TRY ITS HAND

Is sponge iron the answer to the scrap problems confronting the steel industry?

Criticism of steel companies because of their failure to adopt a sponge-iron process has brought this subject to the front. Opinions on the matter are contradictory. The steel makers themselves, however, are agreed that the process offers no solution to present problems.

Sponge iron is produced by a direct process in contrast to the indirect blast furnace method now used. From 1850 to the present time, several millions of dollars have been spent in attempts to develop a sponge-iron process that could compete with the indirect methods.

These attempts have embraced practically every known type of apparatus suitable for the purpose, including pot furnaces, reverberatory furnaces, regenerative furnaces, shaft furnaces, retort furnaces, electric furnaces, and various combination furnaces. Many reducing agents also have been tried such as coal, coke, graphite, distillation residues, fuel oil, tar, producer gas, coal gas, and water gas. All these processes have been abandoned.

The blast-furnace process for the extraction of iron from its ores consists of charging a mixture of ore, fuel, and flux in proper proportions through a specially constructed opening in the top of a tall cylindrically shaped furnace, while heated air is simultaneously blown in near the bottom through openings, called tuyères, the nitrogen of the air together with the products of combustion and reduction passing upward and escaping through openings at the top. These operations of the process, being almost continuous, are accompanied by the periodic removal of a part of the impurities in the form of slag and by a like removal of metal through a larger opening at the bottom.

CONGRESS MAY FINANCE PRODUCTION

The Department of the Interior contends that the technical feasibility of low temperature reduction of iron ores has been proven by tests. An appropriation of $600,000, now before Congress, has been requested to permit the construction and operation of two commercial size units, each with a capacity of 30 to 50 tons of metal daily.

One of these proposed units will operate on solid fuel, the other on gaseous reduction.

On the other hand, the War Production Board, in its effort to get out all the steel possible, has reviewed the known sponge-iron processes and discarded all but one as being impossible. A moderate sum has been obtained from the Defense Plant Corporation for carrying on experiments with the one process which has been retained.

Members of the Board, reportedly, do not have any high hopes that even this isolated process will prove satisfactory. Nevertheless, they will try it out to make certain that all possibilities of getting more iron have been exhausted.

INDUSTRY CLAIMS PROCESS EXPERIMENTAL

Research and other authorities in the steel industry who have looked into the sponge-iron subject are emphatic in their statements that the processes are entirely in the experimental stage, and they are not certain that the product would be satisfactory for producing the so-called tailor-made steel required in the prosecution of the war.

Declaring that construction of sponge-iron units would cost less than half per ton of capacity than the blast furnaces using coke, they maintain that the industry would have adopted the sponge-iron process long ago if it could have been assured that the product would be satisfactory in the open-hearth furnaces and for finishing operations.

Approximately 18 blast furnaces are under construction or are planned for the coming months. The saving with sponge-iron units would be tremendous, but if difficulties were encountered in the output of the raw steel or the finished products, the loss would be extremely serious at this time.

Should it be found that the sponge-iron process resulted in flaws in the finished products, the production of the steel ingots would be lost entirely. The open-hearth furnaces are now working at capacity. There are sufficient finishing facilities for nearly all the war needs, and within a few months additions to capacity will bring up the total. The supply of raw steel is inadequate, however, due in great part to the fact that such a large volume is again being exported in the ingots or semifinished material.

SENATOR'S CLAIMS DENIED

PITTSBURGH.—The "sponge" process for making iron, advocated by Senator O'MAHONEY (Democrat, Wyoming), in a criticism of steel industry, is an old chestnut that has been tried and rejected, Pittsburgh steel and research experts said yesterday.

Commenting on the Senator's charge that industry's refusal to adopt this method was costing production increases, spokesmen for many of steel manufacturers unanimously reported process was not only too costly but also not feasible.

Added to this was opinion of Prof. Willibald Trinks, of Carnegie Institute of Technology, nationally famous research expert, that "equipment required is expensive * * * and you need a lot of it."

He added:

"Why, if it was any good, Hitler would have sponge-iron plants all over Germany. But instead, he built blast furnaces."

Veteran steelmen recalled that the United States Steel Corporation built an experimental plant at Lorain, Ohio, at a reputed cost of $1,500,000, some years ago to test sponge process, but eventually scrapped machinery and dismantled plant.

One spokesman for industry said:

"Process has never proved itself, although research work has been done on it for 25 years or more. If it were economically feasible steel companies would have hurried to adopt it."

Another spokesman said production costs would zoom and staggering burdens would be created through use of process.

EXHIBIT B

BUREAU OF MINES APPROVES SPONGE IRON

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, June 20, 1942.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: With reference to our telephone conversation on June 19, concerning the Bureau's proposed investigations of low-temperature reduction of iron ore to demonstrate the practicability of sponge-iron reduction as an effective means of overcoming the present shortage of scrap for the manufacture of steel:

The technical feasibility of low-temperature reduction of iron ores has been proven by large-scale tests of the Bureau of Mines and of other investigators. The results of these tests have indicated that installation and operating costs of commercial sponge-iron plants will be considerably lower than for the production of blast-furnace pig iron. Because of the small unit size and relative simplicity of low-temperature reduction equipment, plants for this purpose can be installed in a much shorter time than can iron blast furnaces of the same capacity.

A commercial scale melting test in the open-hearth furnace, using sponge iron produced in the Bureau's tests, showed that sponge iron is a satisfactory substitute for either scrap or pig iron in the charge to open-hearth steel furnaces. Sponge iron of higher purity and lower carbon content than blast-furnace pig iron can be produced. This sponge iron would be an ideal and necessary substitute for low-carbon scrap of which a serious shortage is expected within a few months.

For the above reasons, it is the opinion of the Bureau of Mines and of other Government agencies concerned with essential materials for the prosecution of the war that commercial sponge-iron plants should be installed with a minimum of delay in order that the quantity and quality of the Nation's steel production will not be lessened because of the shortage of scrap.

Although the technical feasibility and commercial practicability of sponge-iron production has been proven by actual tests, as yet there has been no commercial production of this product in this country and the most suitable equipment and optimum operating conditions are yet to be determined by testing in commercial-size equipment.

Several processes, some of which use solid fuel and others of which use gaseous fuel, have shown promise of commercial success. Some areas of the country are very favorable for solid fuel reduction, others for gaseous reduction. It is believed that the quickest and most practical procedure for installing sponge-iron plants would be to construct and test a commercial-size unit which will provide data for determining optimum operating conditions and which can be duplicated for additional units in commercial plants.

It is expected that the $600,000 appropriation now being considered by Congress will be adequate for a 1-year program of constructing and operating two commercial-size units, each with a capacity of from 30 to 50 tons of metal per day. One unit will use solid fuel reduction and the other gaseous reduction.

Your continued interest in low-temperature iron-ore reduction is appreciated, and it is hoped that the Bureau program under consideration can be started and carried out with the greatest possible speed.

Cordially yours,

R. R. SAYERS, *Director.*

EXHIBIT C

NAVY DOESN'T APPROVE BESSEMER STEEL FOR PLATE

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF SHIPS,
Washington, D. C., June 13, 1942.

Hon. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR O'MAHONEY: This is in reply to your request for information regarding the amount of bessemer steel used by the Navy Department in structural steel, armor plate, and hull plate.

Bessemer steel is permitted by Navy Department specifications on such items as lap and butt welded steel pipe, and on certain low-grade steel castings. Bessemer steel is not specified in the specifications for structural steel shapes, armor plate, or hull plate since steel made by this process is not uniform and contains numerous oxides. For these reasons steel made by this process will not meet the physical and chemical requirements of Navy Department specifications.

Past experience has been that only steel made by the open hearth electric furnace or crucible process will meet the requirements. It is believed that less than 5 percent of steel used by the Navy Department is made by the bessemer process.

Sincerely yours,

A. H. VAN KEUREN,
Chief of the Bureau of Ships.

EXHIBIT D

[From the New York Herald Tribune of June 29, 1942]

WAR OBSTACLES FROM DEPLETION OF STEEL FEARED—DIFFICULTY IN OBTAINING SUPPLIES FROM WAREHOUSES NOTED IN TRADE SURVEY

Serious interruption of war production may result from depletion of steel warehouse stocks, as contractors and subcontractors find it increasingly difficult to obtain many items needed for essential purposes, according to the magazine Steel. Unless warehouses are placed in a better position to replenish stocks they will be unable to perform their function, and steel users depending on their stocks will be left without adequate source of supply, the survey warns.

Most observers of the scrap market foresee a repetition of last winter's shortage, in spite of the present supply meeting steel-making needs. Intensive pressure to bring out material from every source possible is keeping up the flow and, in some instance, progress is being made in a small way in building some reserves.

With shipbuilding assuming first place in the war program, producers of structural shapes find their field changing rapidly from material for land installations to sections used in ship construction, according to the trade journal. Private construction, it was pointed out, has been halted and plants for war purposes are not taking as much steel as formerly, though some are still under way or planned.

Better distribution to shipyards is being achieved and inventories are being held to a minimum consistent with capacity production. In addition to plates and shapes for hull construction, a large aggregate tonnage is being consumed by manufacturers of deck equipment and other special assemblies. Numerous converted plants are engaged in this class of fabrication, with the same priorities as for ships, the magazine points out.

Cancelations continue on orders for which priority is so low that delivery is unlikely within many months, it is disclosed. Some of this tonnage bears ratings that until a short time ago were considered high. Congestion in the higher ranges of priorities is so great that it is said more ratings of AA may be issued, to rank above the present A priorities, according to Steel.

Steel operations last week declined one-half to 1 point to 98½ percent, after maintaining 99 percent or higher since the 1st of May. With ceiling prices on steel and iron materials unchanged, composite prices are steady, finished steel at $56.73, semifinished steel at $36, steel-making pig iron at $23.05, and steel-making scrap at $18.17.

REPORTS ON THE REFUGEE AND FOREIGN WAR RELIEF PROGRAMS

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Appropriations:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 29, 1942.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a report, prepared by the American Red Cross, of obligations under the appropriation of $50,000,000 for refugee relief contained in section 40 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1941, as extended by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, and the appropriation of $35,000,000 for foreign war relief contained in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, approved December 17, 1941.

Submitted pursuant to the provisions of section 40 (d) and title III, respectively, of the above-mentioned appropriation acts, this report is of necessity an interim report prepared as of April 30, 1942, since the refugee and foreign war relief programs are still in progress, and since, furthermore, there is now pending in Congress a proposal to consolidate and extend the availability of the appropriations into the fiscal year 1943. A final report must await the conclusion of the war relief program.

There are also transmitted herewith reports from the Treasury Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the War Department, which are serving as purchasing agencies under the programs of refugee and foreign war relief. It will be noted that the reports of these Departments are prepared on an obligation basis as distinguished from the report of the American Red Cross which is prepared on the basis of requisitions submitted to these Departments.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry

nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

Peirson M. Hall, of California, to be United States district judge for the southern district of California, vice George Cosgrave, retired;

George F. Alexander, of Alaska, to be United States district judge for division No. 1, District of Alaska;

Joseph A. McDonald, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 4, District of Alaska; and

William T. Mahoney, of Alaska, to be United States marshal for division No. 1, District of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committee, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James Lawrence Fly, of Tennessee, to be a member for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1942.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I previously asked that that nomination go over. I shall not renew my request.

Mr. HILL. Did I understand the Senator to ask that the nomination not be acted on today; that it go over for the day?

Mr. McNARY. No, Mr. President. Last Friday I made the request that the nomination go over until Monday—that is, until today. I do not desire at this time to renew my request that it go over any further.

Mr. HILL. Then, the question is on the confirmation of the nomination.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

THE JUDICIARY—NOMINATION OF THOMAS F. MEANEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas F. Meaney, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey.

Mr. SMATHERS. I move that the nomination of Thomas F. Meaney to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey be confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, there will be considerable debate on this nomination. I suggest that the nomination be temporarily passed over so the Senate may consider and act upon the remaining nominations on the Executive Calendar, which probably will bring forth no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. SMATHERS. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair hears no objection, and the nomination is temporarily passed over.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE ARMY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Army.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Army be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Army nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

That completes the Executive Calendar, with the exception of the nomination passed over, which will be stated.

NOMINATION OF THOMAS F. MEANEY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Thomas F. Meaney to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	George	Pepper
Andrews	Gerry	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Rosier
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Barbour	Hayden	Schwartz
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hughes	Smathers
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Burton	Lee	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McNary	Truman
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Tydings
Connally	Millikin	Vandenberg
Danaher	Murdock	Wagner
Davis	Murray	Walsh
Downey	Norris	White
Doxey	Nye	Wiley
Ellender	O'Mahoney	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Thomas F. Meaney to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, at the time I suggested the absence of a quorum, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] had the floor. I assume he wants to speak before a vote is taken on the nomination.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, that assumption is entirely erroneous. I have no desire whatever to speak at this time. I have been listening for 2 months to find some reason why the nomination of this gentleman should not be confirmed, and unless I hear it in the arguments of those who are opposing his nomination this afternoon, I shall say nothing.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, it is quite immaterial to me whether or not the able Senator from New Jersey makes a speech, but I understood from the program and from his own statement that he was going to speak first, and that two or three other Senators were to follow him. If there has been a change in the plan, very well.

Mr. SMATHERS. There has been no change, Mr. President. I never intended to speak first. I wanted to see if any Senator would raise some question which I should answer. If any point is raised which I should answer I shall speak. If there is not, I have no intention of speaking. I am ready now to vote on the nomination.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, after speaking with the Senator from New Jersey, I understood what the program was to be; that is, that he was going to speak first, and would probably speak for a half hour. We have proceeded on the theory that that was to be the program. If the Senator desires to speak I shall be glad to have that program carried out. If he does not desire to speak, I shall proceed.

Mr. SMATHERS. I regret, Mr. President, that my distinguished colleague the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] reached any such conclusion. I never intended to speak first. I desire a vote on the nomination.

Mr. NORRIS. If that is the way the Senator feels, very well. It is now 25 minutes to 4 o'clock. I should like to suggest to the Senate leaders and to the Senator from New Jersey that we agree now, if we can, and I think we can, on an executive session to be held tomorrow, or agree on some future time when we can take up this nomination. It cannot be disposed of today unless we run far into the night. I wish to ask the Senator from New Jersey if such an arrangement would not be agreeable to him.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I think we ought to proceed now. Last Friday, for the convenience of my colleagues who intend to oppose the nomination, I served notice that I intended to move to proceed with it today. I think we ought to proceed with it now. Some of my colleagues can dispose of the speeches which they wish to make in opposition, and we can reach a vote that much sooner tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me make a suggestion. Tomorrow will be the last day of the fiscal year. We may have conference reports and appropriation bills before us tomorrow which would make it impossible to devote any time to the discussion of this nomination. It may develop that those matters will not require much time, but they may take all day; and if they do, we shall not be able to reach this nomination.

It seems to me, inasmuch as it was expected that the nomination would be taken up today, that we should proceed at least until the regular adjournment time. I do not see any reason why we should quit now merely because we cannot finish today. I think we should proceed so far as we can today, and if we cannot finish consideration of the nomination today, we can resume it later.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to proceed in an orderly way. It is not vital whether the nomination is passed upon today, tomorrow, or next week.

Let me say that during the entire proceedings the Senator from New Jersey has been very accommodating. I have no fault to find with him. However, inasmuch as there are appropriation bills which ought to be disposed of before the end of the present fiscal year, no one would be injured if we were to put this nomination off until the beginning of the next fiscal year.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say that taking it up now would not interfere with any appropriation bill. We have nothing else before the Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. No; but the Senator stated that there will be appropriation bills before the Senate.

Mr. BARKLEY. I said that that will be the situation tomorrow. I should not be willing to have this nomination interfere with vital appropriation bills tomorrow, even if we were unable to resume its consideration tomorrow. However, I see no objection to beginning and going so far as we can.

Mr. NORRIS. I cannot say definitely, but I know that if I am physically able to do so I shall consume more time than there is between now and the regular time for adjournment. I cannot possibly finish with what I have to say in the time left today.

Mr. President, I do not want to be put in the attitude of chopping up my remarks into small sections, saying something today, something more tomorrow, and not being able to finish my remarks tomorrow because of appropriation bills, and then concluding what I have to say next week, or at some future date. The result would probably be a repetition of much of what I might say today. I do not want to be in that attitude, and I do not want to put the Senate in that position. Again I say that there is no reason I can think of why this nomination ought to be disposed of today or tomorrow.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. Let me suggest to the Senator that perhaps other Senators could proceed today. I understand that the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] has a very brief speech. Can we not use an hour and a half of the time for some other speeches, and let the Senator from Nebraska begin his address tomorrow?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should not want to impose on any of my colleagues in that way. I have discussed the matter with the junior Senator from New Jersey. He has very few remarks to make, but he does not wish to open the debate. I ought not to be the one to make the opening speech and lead in the opposition. That should be the task of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who was a member of the subcommittee. I was not a member of the subcommittee.

I am somewhat handicapped in proceeding at this time. I have talked with another member of the Judiciary Committee who is not now present, and who has not as yet been able to read the testimony. He wishes to speak. At least he ought to have some time to read the testimony. If there were some reason for disposing of the nomination promptly, as is the case with appropriation bills, I should not speak for very long on it, and I should not ask that the matter be delayed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I dislike to be arbitrary in this matter, but the nomination has been delayed for one reason or another for 2 months. I insist that the nomination is on the calendar and that the Senate should proceed to consider it.

Mr. NORRIS. I agree with what the Senator has said. As I have already stated, I think he has been very fair. So far as I know there has been no disagreement in the Judiciary Committee or the subcommittee about taking up the nomination or handling it. I think the procedure has been conducted under the chairmanship of the Senator from New Jersey in a way which is agreeable to everybody. I am not finding fault with him at all. Still, that does not overcome the argument that there is no urgency about it. If it interferes with other business of the Senate, there is no reason why it should not take its place after the appropriation bills are disposed of.

I realize, as does every other Senator, that we are now just at the end of the fiscal year. There are appropriation bills still in conference. They may be disposed of in a few minutes, or we may not be able to dispose of them tomorrow. I should not like to be guilty of trying to crowd in something which can just as well wait. If I must proceed today and suspend when I am only fairly started, begin again tomorrow, and again suspend so that the Senate may take up an appropriation bill or a conference report, of course I shall do so.

I know that is not the way Senators are usually treated. That goes without saying. I know that under circumstances in which there is no reason to crowd something to a vote, when there is plenty of time, and when time is not of the essence of the matter which must be settled, the convenience of Senators is usually given respectful attention, and as a rule a Senator is not crowded under those circumstances to commence making an address which he knows he will not be able to finish without running far into the night.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I appreciate the Senator's position. We know that as a rule we have executive sessions late in the afternoon, after everything else has been disposed of. For the past hour I have been expecting that we could proceed with this nomination, but debate on other matters has proceeded longer than I anticipated.

There is no assurance that we shall have enough time on any day this week—at least in the next 2 or 3 days—for a long speech to be finished without interruption. I do not mean a long-winded one, in any offensive sense. The Senator indicated that he could not finish in an hour and a quarter, which would take us up to 5 o'clock. There is no assurance that any Senator who wishes to speak for that length of time could finish on any given day. So the prospect is that the speeches will have to be split up.

This is a part of the Senate's business, and it is an important part. It seems to me that if the Senator does not wish to begin speaking now because he cannot finish, other Senators who intend to make speeches might do so until we reach the time when we can take a recess. There is no virtue in either starting an argument or closing it. I do not think it makes much difference.

Mr. NORRIS. No attempt has been made unnecessarily to delay this nomination. There has been a sort of understanding among those on this side of the Chamber who are opposed to the confirmation of the nomination that I should open the debate. The program has been arranged in that way. I shall not ask for any change in the arrangement. If it is necessary to proceed with the debate, I shall suffer the ill consequences and go ahead, stopping whenever the Senate wishes to adjourn.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the able Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] wishes to address himself to a very important subject, and I think he is prepared to do so at this hour. That might solve the difficulty and relieve the eminent Senator from Nebraska from the necessity of proceeding at this time.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I dislike more than I am able to say that I am forced to take an arbitrary position, especially against my distinguished colleague the Senator from Nebraska, for whom I have great affection and admiration. However, a number of my colleagues who intend to vote on the nomination have made their plans to go home tomorrow night, and I see no reason why we should throw away an hour and a quarter or an hour and a half today. I shall insist on my original position.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Oregon to make reference to the fact that I am prepared to speak. I hope the Senator from New Jersey will not feel that my remarks will be entirely a waste of time. I think the address which I have in mind to make will be informative, if not interesting, to Senators.

I spoke to the distinguished majority leader earlier in the day and told him that I wished to make an address at some appropriate time when it would not interfere with the business of the Senate.

I am perfectly willing to proceed now, if that is agreeable to Senators but I do not wish to force myself on the attention of the Senate at this time.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator from Maine spoke to me earlier in the day about speaking. He said he had about an hour's address which was agitating in his bosom, and we wanted to know when it would be convenient for him to deliver the address. I suggested that he put it off until tomorrow, because I did not know how long we should be engaged today on other matters. He agreed to do so. Of course, the Senator from Maine is always ready to speak. I do not think the fact that he would have to proceed now would be any inconvenience to him, although his speech will be on a different subject, and has nothing to do with the nomination of Judge Meaney; and I presume that if he obtained the floor he could make the speech even in executive session. The situation reminds me of a lawyer at home who used to refer to a technicality as a "technimacality."

I do not want to inconvenience any Senator. The nomination has been pending in the committee for a long time—whether for too long is not for anyone to say. The nomination undoubtedly received careful consideration. Exhaustive hearings were held and the nomination was reported one day last week. I do not now recall whether it was reported Thursday or Friday.

Mr. SMATHERS. It was reported Thursday.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am informed that it was reported Thursday. I realize the importance of disposing of the nomination. Whether it is voted on today or tomorrow may not be a vital matter; but I realize that Senators probably have waited here so as to be able to vote on it. Of course, there is no argument in favor of a Senator's leaving the Chamber to go home when there is business on the calendar. Although some Senators may have made arrangements to go home tomorrow, there is no way to avoid the conclusion that a Senator's duties require him to be here, and not somewhere else, if there is important business to be transacted.

In recent months we have had more or less informal recesses, and some Senators have found it convenient, and in many cases necessary, to absent themselves. I include myself in that reference, since I was away all of last week, and therefore I am in no position to cast any reflection on any other Senator who leaves temporarily. Let me say that I am hopeful that in the near future we may be able to obtain a little surcease from our activities here. I am not in a position to make any definite announcement about the matter because of the pendency of the tax bill, which will govern our ability to recess or adjourn for a short space of time. However, in these times Senators have been and are now, from the very nature of things, more or less at ease, and able to absent themselves from the Senate for a few days, and are not required to remain here when no important business is pressing.

The pending nomination is important. The people of New Jersey are entitled to know whether they are to have Judge Meaney or someone else to be a Federal judge in their State. I realize the inconvenience which may result from requiring Senators who may have made their plans to leave Washington tomorrow or tomorrow night to stay over a day. Yet the Senator knows that it is always possible to delay for a day or two a vote on any matter pending here, if that is desired, and if sufficient Senators vote to do it.

I was anxious that we should proceed to consider the nomination this afternoon. It is obvious that we cannot conclude its consideration today. I myself do not see any good reason why any Senator should refrain from delivering an address if he is prepared to do so. The fact that his address comes first, last, or in the middle of the proceedings probably would not affect the result, anyway.

However, I cannot force any Senator to rise in his place and deliver a speech. Frequently I have had occasion to wish that I could force Senators to sit down and to stop making speeches but I cannot force any Senator to make a speech. [Laughter.] I suppose nature will have to take its course as best it may.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Thomas F. Meaney to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey?

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, I want to keep faith with the majority leader. When I conferred with him earlier in the day he suggested that my address, which has been festering in me for 2 or 3 days, go over until tomorrow; and I agreed that it should go over until tomorrow. I am not willing to proceed now unless I have his consent to do so.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say to the Senator that, as I suggested, when tomorrow comes, it probably will be just as inconvenient to have his speech delivered then as it would be today.

Mr. WHITE. That is the way it has seemed to me.

Mr. BARKLEY. Because tomorrow will be the last day of the fiscal year, and at that time we hope to have conference reports on two or three appropriation bills. Furthermore, there is a large appropriation bill which has not yet been acted upon. So there is no assurance that the situation tomorrow will be any better than the situation today.

So far as I am concerned, if the Senator from Maine desires to proceed, I release him from any obligation not to proceed until tomorrow, even though I know he will not talk about the nomination of Judge Meaney, because he advised me of the subject upon which he wished to address the Senate. With that understanding, I am willing to have the Senator proceed or not, as he wishes.

Mr. WHITE. In the circumstances I think I shall proceed at this time.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I do not think the Senator from Maine will proceed. I object, and insist that the Senate proceed to consider the question before the Senate.

Mr. WHITE. I know of no rule of the Senate which limits a Senator to speaking on the pending question. I take it that I can talk about anything I please. If I have been recognized, Mr. President, I shall proceed.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator desires the Chair to state what is before the Senate, in executive session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question before the Senate is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Thomas F. Meaney to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey? The question is debatable, and there is no rule of the Senate which requires that the debate be germane.

THE AMERICAN PATENT SYSTEM

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, am I recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine is recognized.

Mr. WHITE. It is my purpose to talk about the patent situation in the United States, and some of the legislative proposals which are now pending before the Senate Committee on Patents.

Mr. President, the Committee on Patents of the Senate has been engaged from April 13 to May 22, 1942, inclusive, with hearings on two measures, S. 2303 and S. 2491, introduced respectively February 23 and March 30, 1942, and both sponsored by Senators O'MAHONEY, BONE, and LA FOLLETTE.

The hearings have been conducted under the authority of Senate Resolution 40, agreed to January 14, 1941, and authorizing—

> The Committee on Patents, or any subcommittee thereof * * * during the Seventy-seventh Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said committee, etc.

While various amendments to the patent law have been under consideration in both House and Senate during the past few years, the principles and policies of the pending bills find their genesis, I believe, in the final recommendations of the majority members of the T. N. E. C., in the views of the Department of Justice, and in Monograph No. 31 of the T. N. E. C., entitled "Patents and Free Enterprise."

I regard it as appropriate to bring to the notice of the Senate that for the further study of our patent system the President by Executive order of December 12, 1941, established the National Patent Planning Commission, to which he appointed as the five members thereof Dr. Charles Kettering, chairman; Owen D. Young; Chester C. Davis; Edward F. McGrady; and Dr. Francis P. Gaines, president of Washington and Lee University. The purpose of this Commission is stated

in the second paragraph of this order, which reads as follows:

2. The Commission is authorized, in conjunction with the Department of Commerce, to conduct a comprehensive survey and study of the American patent system, and consider whether the system now provides the maximum service in stimulating the inventive genius of our people in evolving inventions and in furthering their prompt utilization for the public good; whether our patent system should perform a more active function in inventive development; whether there are obstructions in our existing system of patent laws, and if so, how they can be eliminated; to what extent the Government should go in stimulating inventive effort in normal times; and what methods and plans might be developed to promote inventions and discoveries which will increase commerce, provide employment, and fully utilize expanded defense industrial facilities during normal times.

This Commission is to report the result of its studies and recommendations to the President.

Opening the hearing on S. 2303 the chairman of the committee, the senior Senator from Washington, Senator BONE, declared:

This is not a patent reform bill; this is really a war bill (p. 7).

The senior Senator from Wyoming, Senator O'MAHONEY, following, stated:

Before this bill was introduced I had the privilege of discussing its terms with him (the chairman) and with the staff of the Department of Justice. * * * Its operation is limited to the time of war (p. 8).

It is apparent that this limitation, however it applied to S. 2303, has been abandoned in the second measure, S. 2491.

Let me now analyze briefly S. 2303. This measure is entitled:

A bill to provide for the use of patents in the interest of national defense or the prosecution of war, and for other purposes.

Its purpose was made clearer by the explanation of Mr. Francis Shea, Assistant Attorney General, who, I understand, aided in drafting the measure, and who alone, among the many representatives of the Department of Justice appearing before the Patent Committee, discussed its terms. He explained that section 1 would authorize the President during any war in which the United States may be engaged—

To find and declare that the manufacture, use, or sale of any material, article, product, or commodity, or that the expansion of facilities or capacity therefor is in the interest of national defense or of the prosecution of war.

He maintained that two results would follow such a finding and declaration. He stated them as follows:

(a) The President may grant licenses authorizing the use of any patented inventions relating to such manufacture, use, or sale, prescribing in such licenses the terms and duration thereof, and a reasonable royalty to be paid by the licensee to the patent owner. The patent owner's sole remedy against the licensee will be the royalty fixed in the President's license.

(b) Whether or not licenses are issued under section 1 (a), the owners of patents infringed by any manufacture, use, or sale specified in the President's declaration will no longer be entitled, during the period specified by the President, either to an injunction against such infringements or to treble damages therefor. The patent owner's sole remedy will be the recovery of a reasonable royalty fee from the infringers for the period in question.

These dual effects of the President's finding and declaration may operate independently or together. The President may declare, for example, that the manufacture of magnesium is in the interest of the prosecution of the war for the duration, but may choose to issue no specific licenses thereunder. The declaration will have the effect of a general license to whoever desires to use any patents relating to the manufacture of magnesium, whether or not he or anyone else holds a specific license from the President under those patents. The patent owner will be precluded for the duration of the war from obtaining an injunction against infringement of his patent by such manufacture, and from recovering treble damages on account of the infringement. The exclusive remedy of the patent owner will be the recovery of a reasonable royalty from the infringer, which may either be agreed upon by the parties or fixed by a court.

A study of the bill makes clear to me:

First. That the license issued by the President under its authority is not exclusive. Anyone may manufacture, use, or sell under any patent covering the materials or commodities which are the subject of the President's finding and declaration.

Second. That the only difference between anyone operating under a Presidential license and one engaged in unlicensed operation is that the President fixes the royalty without judicial appeal in the first instance, and in the second the patent owner's only remedy is the recovery of a reasonable royalty through an action for infringement in a Federal court.

Third. That in neither case does the United States assume any liability for recovery of just compensation for the use of the patent property infringed. The section in effect licenses infringers by condemnation of the owner's vested right in his patent without assuring just compensation.

The second effect is to invite general infringement of all patents covering the affected articles and leaving the patent owner to identify infringers and secure "fair" compensation from them subject to all known defenses.

Fourth. That the President fixes the duration of any license issued and is not limited in such fixation by the war. On the contrary, it was made plain that, in the opinion of Mr. Shea and of some members of the committee, it would be essential that such licenses extend over a considerable period of years in order to assure acceptance by investors of the risks involved.

While the first section of the bill deals exclusively with licenses, the second section authorizes "in the interest of national defense" not only during time of war but during "any period of national emergency" declared by the President to exist that he, the President, may acquire patents, applications therefor, inventions, or licenses by donation, purchase, or taking, and in turn issue licenses thereunder.

The Commissioner of Patents is required to mail a notice of taking to the last owner of record and publication of the same in the Official Gazette. The owner thereupon is paid nothing, but may bring suit in the Court of Claims for fair compensation, the United States availing itself of all known defenses.

The President may exercise these powers under appropriate regulations through any department, agency, or officer.

Mr. Shea made it plain that he employed the term "fair" compensation instead of "just" as "there may be some doubt whether patents are the kind of property included within the constitutional requirement for just compensation." The chairman, the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], made it equally clear that he shared that view:

My opinion has always been that a patent right is more in the nature of a franchise or a license than a vested property right (p. 1258).

Assistant Attorney General Arnold agreed, saying:

I think your statement is correct.

The statements of Mr. Shea with respect to Senate bill 2303 were directed to section 2, involving the exercise of the power of eminent domain—in this instance the taking of a patent. One who speaks for the Department of Justice is peculiarly the voice of the law. But here at the outset of a discussion of patents an Assistant Attorney General of the United States, for the first time in our history, repeatedly expresses doubt, and invites Congress to express by legislation a similar doubt as to whether patents are property and whether either seizing them or authorizing their use without the owner's consent requires compensation. Mr. Shea, under interrogation, reemphasizes this view, again referring to "fair" compensation:

I think it could clearly be interpreted as just compensation if it constituted the taking of property. On the other hand, there may be some doubt as to whether or not patents are the kind of property included within the constitutional requirement for just compensation. If it is not a taking of property within the fifth amendment, then the patent owner will receive such compensation as the courts deem fair. This does not intend to express congressional opinion as to whether or not it is a taking within the meaning of the Constitution (82).

The issue is whether or not it is a franchise or whether or not it is a license granted under such conditions by the Constitution (83).

I direct attention to the fact that under section 2, if the President takes a patent under the conditions stated he not only offers no compensation, as is the case in all other forms of the exercise of eminent domain, but by the seizure he excludes the patent owner from the use of his own patent during the period in which he seeks compensation by suit against the United States.

If it is the use of patents by the United States for the prosecution of the war that is necessary, section 2 of the bill could be eliminated and the President

empowered to authorize any person to manufacture, use, or sell commodities found necessary during the period of the war; and, having thus thrown patents into the public domain, he could prescribe a reasonable royalty subject to judicial review, as is now the case in the requisitioning of all other property. So far as I know, in all other cases in which the United States takes or uses property or authorizes its use, it assumes obligation for just compensation. This would be the simple approach and the practical one. But this would not meet the requirements of a theory that patents are not property and may be taken without compensation; for if they are not property there can be no compulsion to give compensation. It is therefore vital to determine whether Mr. Shea declares the law as it is or whether he does not; for in my opinion the whole structure of both bills under consideration and all the theories upon which pending recommendations are based, measures are being drafted, and hearings are proceeding, ignore the present state of the law.

Let us next consider Senate bill 2491, introduced by Senators BONE, O'MAHONEY, and LA FOLLETTE on April 28 after hearings on Senate bill 2303 had been under way since April 13. The former measure, Senate bill 2303, by its title, its sponsors' declared intention, and its major terms, is confined "to any war in which the United States may be engaged." The application of any of its terms beyond such period exceeds the declared intention of its proponents, or is incidental to its operation, or is the result of poor drafthmanship.

But Senate bill 2491 is avowedly permanent legislation with a revolutionary effect upon the patent system. All patents issued after its enactment become subject to the following restrictions:

(a) The Commissioner of Patents may, upon his own initiative or complaint, investigate and determine whether a patent owner fails for 3 of more years to make, use, or sell a patented invention, or license the same for reasonable compensation, whether such action violates the Antitrust Act or is without reasonable justification. An adverse decision authorizes the Commissioner to license subject to review.

(b) No patent shall authorize selling, assigning, or licensing which imposes any restriction as to the quantity or value which machines may produce, the price at which a patented product may be sold, the purpose for which it may be used, or any limitation of the geographical area within which the patented article may be produced, sold, or used.

(c) Ninety days after the enactment of the proposed measure its terms shall retroactively apply to all restrictions, agreements, or understandings in effect with respect to preexisting patents.

(d) The United States may bring an action in any district court for a violation of (b) or (c) before a judge without a jury. If sustained, a decree may thereafter be issued canceling the patent or the limited rights, if any, of the defendant. The patent is extinguished save for a reversal on appeal.

(e) All sales, assignments, or other conveyance of preexisting or new patents, and all licenses or other agreements thereunder, must be in writing and filed with the Federal Trade Commission within 30 days after execution by the seller, assignor, or grantor.

Such file is public and copy therefrom may be had on payment of a reasonable fixed fee. There is a penalty of $1,000, and $10 for each additional day for failure to comply.

(f) Infringement suits against sellers or users of patented articles are prohibited unless the complainant first gets a decree against the manufacturer or supplier sustaining the validity of the patent. Suits for contributory infringement are likewise prohibited unless the complainant is an assignor or vendor and has first obtained a decree against the primary infringer.

(g) It would be made unlawful to convey any patent or interest therein in any manner or grant any license which, through any condition, agreement, or understanding would tend substantially to lessen competition or grant a monopoly "unless such restriction is necessary to promote science or the useful arts."

(h) The Commissioner of Patents and the Federal Trade Commission are given authority to conduct investigations, assure attendance of witnesses and the production of books, records, and documents, with the aid of the district courts.

Incidentally, the counsel of the Federal Trade Commission submitted a proposal similar in terms but more drastic in penalties, to be administered exclusively by the Commission.

At no time during the hearings was this second measure—S. 2491—analyzed as was S. 2303 by Assistant Attorney General Shea. It was the subject of only incidental reference. It proposes:

First. Permanent compulsory licensing.

Second. Unrestricted licensing.

Third. It would not only affect patents issued after its enactment, but retroactively operate upon all patents heretofore issued, and all rights which have vested in them or arrangements made under them.

Fourth. It ambiguously amends the Antitrust Act, authorizing penal prosecution without a jury.

Of compulsory licensing, it may be said that it has been proposed many times and was a special subject of discussion during extended hearings by the House Committee on Patents in the last Congress. The proposal was abandoned after extensive discussion, finding no substantial support.

Of unrestricted licensing, it may be said that without exception the courts of the United States and the Congress have recognized uniformly and repeatedly that various restrictions are "reasonably within the reward which the patentee by the grant of the patent is entitled to secure." Assistant Attorney General Arnold, with equal uniformity and unique consistency, has steadily insisted that that is not the law. He has with equal emphasis, as have some legislators, disregarded the fact that within limits a patent is a constitutionally authorized monopoly, the limits of which are clearly fixed and within which the patent owner is clearly entitled to assert rights which are equally sharply condemned whenever they are exceeded. The failure to recognize this condition is the cause of much confusion in the discussion of this whole subject.

Under the patent law a patentee is given by statute a monopoly of making, using, and selling the patented article (Chief Justice Taft, *U. S.* v. *General Electric*, 272 U. S. 485).

The present Chief Justice for the Court declared in 1940:

The patent law confers on the patentee a limited monopoly. The right or power to exclude all others from manufacturing, using, or selling his invention. * * *. He may grant licenses to make, use, or vend restricted in point of space or time or with any other restriction upon the exercise of the granted privilege, save only that by attaching a condition to his license he may not enlarge his monopoly and thus acquire some other which the statute or the patent together did not give (*Ethyl Gas Corporation* v. *United States*, 309 U. S. 436).

On May 11, 1942, the Chief Justice again spoke for the Court, saying:

The declared purpose of the patent law is to promote the progress of science and the useful arts by granting the inventor a limited monopoly, the exercise of which will enable him to secure the financial rewards for his invention. The full extent of the monopoly is the patentee's "exclusive right to make, use, or vend the invention or discovery" (*United States* v. *Univis Lens Co.*).

Of course, a patent is a monopoly. It is made one by law for the purposes stated by the Court. But it is a limited monopoly and cannot be used beyond its terms. This is just as clear as the nature of the patent itself.

PATENTS AND THE ANTITRUST ACT

Patents, like any other property, may be and have been used to violate the Anti-Trust Act. The courts have recognized that fact and have clearly reinforced the Government's remedies to meet that condition by broad interpretation of the law. The patent owner, it is true, restrains competition because it is necessary to obtain a license from him by which he waives his limited monopoly in return for a financial reward for the use of his invention. When he grants the use of it for a limited time or within a limited territory he is doing nothing different from what a property owner does who limits the length of his lease for that part of his land which may be occupied by another. When he does these things he is on an equality with other property owners in general, but he cannot enter into private agreements with others by which he relates his property to theirs either to use it for unlawful purposes or unreasonably to restain trade or assist in the creation of some other monopoly forbidden by law.

There is nothing new about that. More than 80 years ago Chief Justice Taney declared that when a patented article—

passes to the hands of the purchaser, it is no longer within the limits of the monopoly, it passes outside of it and is no longer under

the protection of the act of Congress (*Bloomer* v. *McQuewen*, 14 How. 539).

So all attempts upon the part of copyright or patent owners to fix the resale price of their product or on the part of the latter to compel the use of materials essential to the working of a patented machine but not covered by the patent, have all been defeated. In every form in which the improper extension of the limited patent monopoly has been attempted it has been defeated. *Bobbs Merrill Co.* v. *Straus* (210 U. S. 339); *Dr. Miles Medical Co.* v. *Parke and Sons* (220 U. S. 373); *Henry* v. *Dick Co.* (224 U. S. 1); *Boston Store* v. *American Gramophone Co.* (246 U. S 8).

It is well settled that where the patentee makes the patented article and sells it he can exercise no future control over what the purchaser may wish to do with the article after his purchase (*Mr. Justice Taft, U. S.* v. *Gen. Electric*, 272 U. S. 489).

Referring in the same opinion to the patent owner's rights and discussing them as distinct from his offenses, he points out exactly how the patent owner violates the Antitrust Act:

It is only when he adopts a combination with others by which he steps out of the scope of his patent rights and seeks to control and restrain those to whom he has sold his patented articles in their subsequent disposition of what is theirs, that he comes within the operation of the Antitrust Act (idem).

So, too, in the latest expressions of the Supreme Court we find the distinction between the rights and wrongs of patent owners restated with reference to all the older cases.

The public policy which includes inventions within the granted monopoly excludes from it all that is not embraced in the invention. It equally forbids the use of the patent to secure an exclusive right or limited monopoly not granted by the Patent Office, and which it is contrary to the public policy to grant (*Morton Salt Co.* v. *Suppiger Co.*, January 5, 1942).

So, too, in its latest decisions the Court looks through a selling agreement where, under color of a patent, the selling facilities of competitors are employed, and finds a price-fixing combination in an effort to control sales prices under the color of agency, and points out:

If it were sanctioned in this situation, it would permit the patentee to add to his domain at public expense by obtaining command over a competitor. He would then not only secure a reward for his invention; he would enhance the value of his own trade position by eliminating or impairing competition. That would be no more permissable than a contract between a copyright owner and one who has no copyright, or a contract between two copyright owners or patentees, to restrain the competitive distribution of the copyrighted or patented articles in the open market (*U. S.* v. *Masonite Corporation*, May 11, 1942).

So, too, a lens company controlling the patent in a refracting lens cannot fix the resale price of the blanks which express its patent and which it sells to another who, after buying them, finishes the lens to fit a particular pair of eyes. The patent monopoly could not extend to a new and finished article represented by the individual lens (*U. S.* v. *Univis Lens Co.*).

Both the preceding cases limit the patent monopoly and subordinate it to the Antitrust Act whenever the patent is used to establish restraining agreements between persons or competitors with respect to the conduct of their business which is outside the patent itself.

I come now to the question, What is a patent? There seems to me to be much confusion of mind as to the rights accorded a patentee by the patent he takes out, and as to the limitations of law upon these rights.

WHAT IS A PATENT?

It is a public instrument given to an inventor or author, securing to him, under the constitutional grant of Congress, the exclusive right to his discoveries. It is the means constitutionally provided by which Congress is directed—

to promote the progress of science and the useful arts by securing for limited times to * * inventors the exclusive right of their * * * discoveries.

The patent does not give the right to manufacture, use, or sale. Everyone had that right before the Constitution. What a patent does is to give the right to exclude others from making, selling, or using an invention without the inventor's permission. One can be an inventor without having a patent, but he cannot get a patent without being an inventor. For to get the patent he must make public disclosure of the subject matter of the invention, and at the expiration of the limited period—17 years—for which his exclusive right continues, his invention becomes public property. Indeed, during that time it is open to anyone in the world to improve it, perhaps so effectively that the original patented invention is commercially worthless without the improvement.

Early in our judicial history Chief Justice Marshall described a patent:

It is the reward stipulated for the advantages derived by the public for the exertions of the individual, and is intended as a stimulus to those exertions. * * * The public yields nothing which it has not agreed to yield; it receives all which it has contracted to receive. The full benefit of the discovery, after its enjoyment by the discoverer for 14 (now 17) years, is preserved; and for his exclusive enjoyment of it during that time the public faith is pledged (6 Peters 217, 241–2).

A license to use a patent is nothing but a waiver by the owner of his right to exclude others from making use of that which is his. Nor are the legitimate restrictions placed in licenses as to time, space, or other limitation modern innovations, as is suggested by the author of monograph No. 31, Patents and Private Enterprise. They are as old as the patent system. One hundred years ago, when Goodyear was discovering the uses of rubber, he was issuing licenses limited, for example, to civilian clothing, and excluding Army or Navy equipment and limiting the production to a particular establishment and nowhere else. Such a license was sustained by the Supreme Court of the United States (*Goodyear* v. *Providence*, 9 Wall. 788). Furthermore, similar limitations have been recognized up to the last decision of the present Supreme Court of the United States.

The present Chief Justice of the United States expressed the unanimous opinion of the Court in 1940 when he said:

The patent law confers on the patentee a limited monopoly. The right or power to exclude all others from manufacturing, using, or selling his invention. * * * He may grant licenses to make, use, or vend, restricted in point of space or time or with any other restriction upon the exercise of the granted privilege, save only that by attaching a condition to his license he may not enlarge his monopoly and thus acquire some other which the statute or the patent together did not give (*Ethyl Gas. Corp. et al.* v. *U. S.*, 309 U. S. 436).

The most recent word of the Supreme Court from the lips of the same justice reasserts the same principles in determining the point at which the recognized patent monopoly ends and the control of the patent owner ceases (*United States* v. *Univis Lens Co. et al.*, May 11, 1942).

IS THE PATENT PROPERTY?

Are the rights of the patent owner privileges which may be withdrawn at will, as suggested by the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], or is the patent during its limited life a right of property entitled, like all other forms of property, to constitutional protection?

The answer has been given many times. It was summed up in 1918 by Chief Justice White for a unanimous Court in the famous case involving the interpretation of the act of 1910, authorizing the United States, but not its contractor, to engage in the unlicensed use of patents. The Chief Justice declared:

At the time of the enactment of the Law of 1910 the following principles were so indisputably established as to need no review of the authorities sustaining them, although the leading cases as to all the propositions are referred to in the margin.

(a) That rights secured under the grant of letters patent by the United States were property and protected by the guaranties of the Constitution, and not subject therefore to be appropriated even for public use without adequate compensation (Chief Justice White in *Cramp & Sons S. & E. B. Co.* v. *Intnl. Curtis M. T. Co.*, 246 U. S 39–40).

Years before, Mr. Justice Bradley, in a similar summing up of the status of the law, had declared:

That the Government of the United States, when it grants letters patent for a new invention or discovery in the arts, confers upon the patentee an exclusive property in the patented invention which cannot be appropriated or used by the Government itself, without just compensation, any more than it can appropriate or use without compensation land which has been patented to a private purchaser, we have no doubt. The Constitution gives to Congress power "to promote the progress of science and useful arts by securing for limited times to authors and inventors the exclusive right to their respective writings and discoveries," which could not be effected if the Government had a reserved right to publish such writings or to use such inventions without the consent of the owner (*James* v. *Campbell*, 104 U. S. 356).

With prophetic foresight, the Court met suggestions which have been made in the course of hearings on the pending bills, saying, in the same case:

The Government of the United States, as well as the citizen, is subject to the Constitution; and when it grants a patent, the grantee is entitled to it as a matter of right,

and does not receive it, as was originally supposed to be the case in England, as a matter of grace and favor.

In 1927 the Supreme Court was confronted with the question of whether a Federal statute was to be so construed as to deprive an assignee of a patent owner of a cause of action not only against the Government, but also against the infringing contractor. Mr. Justice Taft, speaking for the Court, declared that such a construction would raise a serious question of constitutionality under the fifth amendment. To avoid doubting the constitutionality of the act of Congress, the Court preferred to presume that Congress—

intended to secure to the owner of the patent the exact equivalent of what it was taking away from him (*Richmond Screw Anchor Co.*, v. *U. S.* (275 U. S. 345)).

Nor to this day can any case be found in which any Federal court has done other than recognize that patents are on a parity with all other property.

Yet, Mr. President, a patent is unique property; for to acquire the property right to a patent for a limited time the owner agrees to give away that property right at the expiration of the fixed period.

There would doubtless be less confusion if critics had read the statement of Webster, made 90 years ago:

The Constitution does not attempt to give an inventor a right to his invention, or an author a right to his literary productions. No such thing. But the Constitution recognizes an original, preexisting, inherent right of property in the invention and authorizes Congress to secure to the inventors the enjoyment of that right. But the right existed before the Constitution and above the Constitution, and is as a natural right, more clear than that a man can assert in almost any other kind of property (The Writings and Speeches of Daniel Webster, vol. 15, p. 438).

Furthermore—

said Webster—

the right of an inventor to his invention is no monopoly. It is no monopoly in any other sense than a man's own house is a monopoly (id.).

This is apparent when we consider that one may exclude any one from the use of his house or his hat, or permit the use of either upon such terms as he may choose. One may sell, rent, or give away his house. He may occupy it or not occupy it. He may rent it for such period as he likes, and limit in any lawful way its use. But he may not use it to violate the law, any more than he may use a patent for such a purpose. But no one ever suggested the destruction of property rights in realty or personal property because it had been misused.

One of the great authorities on our patent system calls attention to the following fundamental facts:

(1) Patents represent an addition to and not a subtraction from the public wealth; the giving of something to the public, not taking anything away from it.

(2) A patent is the reward to the patentee for the creation of something new, the disclosure thereof and its entrance into the public domain upon the expiration of the patent. It is a stimulus to invention and disclosure thereof.

(3) The patentee's control over his property is temporary.

(4) A patent at best is a precarious and highly speculative kind of property.

(5) A license does not create any new monopoly—the patent itself creates the monopoly—and a license is essentially a waiver, in favor of the licensee, of the monopoly held by the patent owner. (George E. Folk, Patents and Industrial Progress.)

Finally, the nature of the so-called patent law monopoly is stated with remarkable clarity in the recent words of the dean of the Northwestern Law School, the great law teacher, John H. Wigmore, in an introduction to a recent work, Patents and the Antitrust Law. He says:

I take the opportunity to intrude my personal opinion, that neither courts nor treatise writers have been radical enough in defending the legitimacy of the "monopoly" in a patent, as distinguished from the ordinary trade monopoly. Is it not a fact that every property right that we have in a "monopoly"? The right to our house or our automobile is simply a right to keep anyone else from entering or using it without our consent; and is that not a monopoly? Take the case of the miner; he discovers a deposit of gold; he stakes it out and registers it, and he gets a monopoly—and not merely for 14 years, but forever! Yet no one ever publicly attacked his monopoly or proposed to cut down its duration, or to take it away from him unless he worked it; and so on. When Sir Isaac, by thinking and thinking, discovered the law of gravity, and when Alexander Bell, by thinking and tinkering, discovered electric telephony and the California gold miner, by digging and sinking, discovered gold, they all three were doing an identical thing, i. e., discovering a condition of nature which had been existing all along but nobody else had ever found it out. Yet the third man gets a perpetual property right—monopoly; the first one gets no legal recognition at all; and the second one is awarded grudgingly a temporary right, and every once in awhile he is reproached for even that temporary "monopoly" (id., p. vii; January 31, 1942).

To date the Supreme Court of the United States has made plain the nature and limit of the patent as property. It has definitely set its boundaries and greatly fortified the Government in any attack upon the misuse of the patent, making it clear that beyond the limits of the patentee's definite rights, situations arising under the Antitrust Acts are dealt with as though the patent did not exist.

Mr. President, I believe there is also public misunderstanding of the present right of the Government to use patents in the war effort, with or without the patentee's consent. We should know our present law before we attempt the writing of new law.

THE PRESENT STATE OF THE LAW ON UNLICENSED PRODUCTION BY OR FOR THE UNITED STATES

Is it true that the United States is presently hampered by the inability to use or authorize the use of patents necessary for war production? I deny the truth of any assertion to this effect. It is expressly, provided by statute (act of June 25, 1910, as amended by act of July 1, 1918), that anyone in time of war or peace can manufacture anything for the Government as a contractor or subcontractor without liability for the use of applicable patents, the United States assuming responsibility for compensating the patent owner; and neither itself nor its contractor can be stopped by injunction.

The act of 1910 was thought to accomplish this purpose, but was held to apply only to unlicensed production by the Government itself (*Cramp & Sons* v. *Intnl. Curtis M. T. Co.*, 246 U. S. 28, March 1918).

A month later Acting Secretary of the Navy Roosevelt communicated to the Chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs of the Senate the situation resulting from this decision. It held, he said—

that a contractor for the manufacture of a patented article for the Government is not exempt, unless he is only a contributory infringer, from injunction and other interference through litigation by the patentee.

The substance of the amendment thereafter adopted was:

Whenever an invention described in and covered by a patent of the United States shall hereafter be used or manufactured by or for the United States without license of the owner thereof or lawful right to use or manufacture the same, such owner's remedy shall be by suit against the United States in the Court of Claims for the recovery of his reasonable and entire compensation for such use and manufacture (title 35, sec. 68, U. S. C. A.).

The statute in its original and in its amended form has received broad construction in many cases in the courts below and from the Supreme Court of the United States. In the first case in which it was construed, in the district court of New York (*Foundation Company* v. *Underpinning and Foundation Company*, 256 Fed. 374, Jan. 27, 1919), the plaintiff alleged a patent infringement by a subcontractor on the United States Assay Building, who was asserted to be using the plaintiff's patents in caissons for the foundation. An injunction was immediately sought. The injunction was denied, and the court pointed out that the act of July 1, 1918—

Was intended, in any event, to prevent the issuance of an injunction in a case such as that at bar.

The court said:

It may fairly be assumed that the amendatory act of July 1, 1918, was enacted to overcome the delays and difficulties which confronted the Government in the use of patented articles, and which was still possible under the act of 1910, as that act had been construed by the Supreme Court.

The case at bar was alluded to as "typical" of the condition to which the statute was addressed.

This case was never appealed, but has frequently been referred to and quoted with approval, notably in *Luellen* v. *Baldwin Locomotive Works* (C. C. A., 20 Fed. (2d) 449). It has been subsequently held that a manufacturer under a supply contract with the Government may not be enjoined, even though it be alleged that an accounting would show manufacture for individual private customers. It was held that Congress intended the Government to be free to contract with anyone for any article used by it. The only remedy by a patent owner against the use of

a patented invention by or for the United States without license of the owner was in the Court of Claims, and not a United States district court (*Floyd Smith Aerial Equipment Co.* v. *Irving Airchute Co.*, C. C. N. Y., 276 Fed. 834, 1921).

The Court of Claims held that not even an infringing contractor manufacturing for the Government's account could voluntarily appear as a defendant. Only the United States could be such under the act of 1918 (*Waite* v. *U. S.* 57 Ct. Cls., 546, 1922).

The act of 1918 was qualified by holding that a contractor not required to infringe a patent by his contract could not claim the benefit of the act of 1918 for unnecessary infringement of his own free will (*Wood* v. *Atlantic, Gulf and Pacific Co.*, 296 Fed. 718, D. C. Ala., 1924).

In an action brought in the district court against a defendant constructing gun mounts for the United States, the court held that plaintiff's remedy for infringement was exclusively in the Court of Claims (*Luellen* v. *Baldwin Locomotive Works* (11 Fed. (2d) 390, D. C. Pa., 1926; affirmed C. C. A. 20 Fed. (2d) 449, 1927)).

An employee of the United States being outside the benefit of the act of 1918 required a special act of Congress to enable him to sue under it (*Van Meter* v. *U. S.* (47 Fed. (2d) 192, C. C. A. 1931)).

Apparatus being manufactured and sold to the Coast Guard, and it being an agency of the United States, any infringement must be an action against the United States in the Court of Claims (*Hazeltine Corp.* v. *General Electric* (19 Fed. Supp. 898, 1937)).

The Federal Government did construction work for a municipality. The Government's contractor was alleged to have infringed patents in the making of sluice gates. The Federal court dismissed the bill against the contractor on the ground that the sole remedy was against the United States in the Court of Claims (*Browne* v. *Hardy-Tynes Manufacturing Co.* (92 Fed. (2d) 886, C. C. A., 1937)).

After the above followed the case of *Olsson* v. *U. S.* (25 Fed. Supp. 495, C. Cls. 1938). This was a suit against the United States to recover compensation for the infringement of a gun patent. The case was interesting in that it placed all patentees whose inventions were used by the Government on the same plane; that is, it obliterated the distinction between patents used by agreement and those infringed, each being entitled to just compensation.

The case which followed—*Pierce* v. *Submarine Signal Company* (25 Fed. Supp, 862, D. C. Mass., 1939)—was an action in the district court for the infringement of certain patents with interrogatories filed by the plaintiff. Objection was made by the defendant on the ground that the interrogatories related to apparatus sold to the United States. The district court held that it was without jurisdiction to entertain even interrogatories under these circumstances since exclusive jurisdiction was vested in the Court of Claims.

The last case of record (*Pollen* v. *Ford Instrument Co.*, 108 Fed. (2d), 62 C. C. A. 1940) follows the pattern of previous cases.

While the lower courts were interpreting the statute of 1918, the Supreme Court in 1928 also considered it (*Richmond Screw Anchor Co.* v. *U. S.*, 275 U. S. 331). This was an appeal from the Court of Claims by the assignee of a patent owner for infringement by the Government's contractor. The Government asserted that section 3477 of the Revised Statutes voided the assignment.

Mr. Justice Taft for a unanimous Court pointed out that if this were true it took away from the present owner—

> not only the cause of action against the Government but also deprived it of the cause of action against the infringing contractor for injury by his infringement. The intention and purpose of Congress in the act of 1918 was to stimulate contractors to furnish what was needed for the war without fear of becoming liable themselves for infringement to inventors or the owners or assignees of patents.

The Court previously pointed out that the broad purpose of the amendment was—

> to relieve the contractor entirely from liability of every kind for the infringement of patents in manufacturing any thing for the Government and to limit the owner of the patent and his assigns and all claiming through or under him to suit against the United States in the Court of Claims for the recovery of his reasonable and entire compensation for such use and manufacture (Id. 343).

Following this broad statement the Court pointed out that if it were held that section 3477 of the Revised Statutes destroyed the right of an assignee, it would leave neither a remedy against the Government nor a private infringer and such a construction would raise a serious question of constitutionality under the fifth amendment. The Court, therefore, sustained the view that it was the intent of Congress "to secure to the owner of the patent the exact equivalent of what it was taking away from him." It was therefore held that the defense did not apply.

It is clear from the above cases that the act of July 1, 1918, removed all obstacles to anyone contracting with the Government as a primary or subcontractor when manufacturing for its account and under its direction. The Government, furthermore, assumes all liability for just compensation. This it does not do under Senate bill 2303, as is plainly required under the fifth amendment.

The act of 1918 applies to all patents issued by the United States, whether owned by the citizens or others. In addition, the Trading With the Enemy Act of October 6, 1917, authorizes the Government to seize and administer all patents owned by enemy aliens, the Alien Property Custodian acting as the agent for the President.

It is furthermore to be noted that the act of 1918, like all other exercises of the power of eminent domain, authorizes the ultimate determination of just compensation by judicial proceeding. But above all, it cannot be overemphasized that by whatever form of action the United States takes or authorizes the taking or using of private property for a public purpose, it must assure just compensation.

In addition to its rights under this 1910 act, as amended, the Government now possesses the further authority under section 9 of the Selective Service Act to require any person or corporation to accept a contract from the Secretary of War or Navy for reasonable compensation to manufacture or to engage in other than its usual forms of production for our war needs if, in the opinion of such agencies of the Government, it is qualified to do so. The penalty for refusal is fine and imprisonment for the recalcitrant company, and seizure and operation of the plant by the Government.

Furthermore under the Requisitioning Act of October 16, 1941, the President is authorized on a finding of fact after reasonable efforts have failed to requisition military and naval supplies, material, and machinery. And, finally, under the Lend-Lease Act, these powers extend to the use of all this authority for production and transfer to our allies on such terms as may be fixed by the President.

If there be any gap in these tremendous powers, as is suggested by Mr. Shea, in production for civilian requirements, it may be met by a very simple amendment without either undertaking to deny that patents are property or to impair the integrity of the patent system.

There is a suggestion for the further amendment of the act of 1918, since its benefits do not apply to those "in the employ or the service of the United States," without special legislation. There may be many patent owners among those who enter the armed services or accept civil employment for the duration of the war. Surely these should not be penalized in their property for serving their Government. This may be an appropriate subject for amendment.

It is submitted that if legislation such as Senate bill 2491 is to be considered, involving as it does a variety of complex questions both of law and policy, it should await the investigation and report of the National Patent Planning Commission. The President appointed this Commission for the express purpose of extensively studying and making recommendations on every phase of the patent system so that this system should not be the subject of superficial study and hasty action. It should be accorded more patient consideration than has yet been given to the subject matter by the Patents Committee.

HEARINGS ON THE BILLS

The hearings of the Senate Committee on Patents began April 13 and recessed May 22. All appearing before the committee were sworn and submitted to cross-examination, in particular by the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and special counsel to the committee, Mr. Creekmore Fath, an official for whom there is no authority in the resolution under which the committee has been acting.

Exclusive of Mr. Francis Shea, Assistant Attorney General, appearing April 14 to analyze Senate bill 2303, the various representatives of the Department of Jus-

tice appeared "in obedience to subpenas duces tecum" served by the committee on them or their superior and requiring them to produce hundreds of documents and exhibits, the character of which is suggested by the testimony of Mr. Allen Dobey, special assistant to the Attorney General attached to the Antitrust Division of the Department of Justice and engaged in prosecutions of the Sherman Act:

> • • • The documents I am producing and the facts they disclose were first revealed to the Government in 1940 when they were voluntarily submitted in obedience to a subpena duces tecum served in aid of a routine grand-jury investigation of possible violations of the Sherman Act. The subpena was issued June 19, 1941, and the documents which I am producing have been in the possession of the Department of Justice since some time last fall (p. 479).

The statements are varied by the declaration that others have been voluntarily submitted to the Department of Justice.

In specific instances, as on May 15, Mr. Charles D. Pack, special attorney, Antitrust Division, testified to a subpena served and declared:

> Yesterday a Federal grand jury, sitting in Trenton, N. J., returned an indictment charging 8 corporations and 20 of their officers and directors with a world-wide conspiracy to suppress competition in and to monopolize sales of dye stuffs in the United States and other countries in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act. It is the story of the dyestuffs industry and of its organization that I propose to tell before this committee (p. 2193).

Mr. Arnold presented his familiar views within the whole patent field. Mr. Lewin presented the relations of the General Electric and its wholly owned subsidiary, the Carboloy Co., in the field of cemented tungsten carbide. Mr. Dobey testified in the field of tetracene, "the chemical compound used as a sensitizer or combustor initiator in the priming composition of firearm ammunition."

Mr. Hutchinson's presentation was devoted to the field of synthetic resins, and especially to acrylic plastics and the casting of methyl methacrylate which is shaped into sheets known as Lucite and Plexiglass, employed on military airplanes for cockpit enclosures, transparent bomber noses, gun turrets, landing light covers, and windshields.

Consent decrees and their uses were presented by Mr. Levi, an elaborate history of the German cartel system through Mr. Kronstein, while Mr. Pack gave an elaborate picture of the dyestuff industry, its condition before World War No. 1, the rights and development of the dyestuff and chemical industries during and after that, through the seizure and sale of the dominating German patents by the United States Alien Property Custodian, and the rights and development of the American industry, with the endeavor of the Germans and Swiss to reenter the American market.

The general character of these presentations involved the selection of correspondence, agreements, memoranda, or other documents from which selected parts were given to the committee with the interpretations and comments of the testifying officials. All such documents were subpenaed by the committee from the files of the Department to which they had come, either through the presentation by the companies involved, to grand juries, or investigators of the Department. The presentations, while therefore ex parte, were under oath.

Most of the records began about 1928 and a few were as late as 1941. They purported to show the business transactions of various American companies with owners of both foreign and American patents. In a number of instances either consent decrees had been obtained or practices complained of had been abandoned. In two or three instances, as in the case of the Carboloy Co., the General Electric lamp patents, and the dyestuff indictments, the cases were awaiting trial. How fair trails can be expected in view of these public assaults upon the defendants by officers of the Government is difficult to see. It is difficult to resist the conclusion that the Antitrust Division prefers to try these indictments before a political committee rather than in a court of law.

Mr. Arnold, during his appearance on the 13th of May, presented a summary of two antitrust prosecutions awaiting trial and in doing so deprecated the partial presentation of correspondence or documents, which, however, was generally followed by all his predecessors and assistants. The committee session of May 13 was substantially given to examination of why pending prosecutions had been delayed at the request of the Army or Navy Departments because of their interference with war production.

In substantially over a month only three witnesses appeared on behalf of companies which were the subject of attack or severe criticism, and they received scant consideration. The Carboloy Co., appeared through its chairman, Mr. Jeffries, the Rohm-Haas Co., a Philadelphia corporation, through its secretary, S. C. Kelton and Messrs. Dzus, president of the Dzus Fastener Co. and his counsel, D. H. Kane. A public statement by the Carboloy Co. in response to criticism led to the recall of Mr. Lewin on May 7 for a sharp reply. Testimony of Mr. Kelton on behalf of the Rohm-Haas Co. (p. 869) is an excellent illustration of the dangers of ex parte testimony, since his evidence and that of Mr. Dzus (p. 1808) in my opinion completely disposed of the charges made.

The whole body of the Department of Justice testimony, occupying many days of delivery, so far as it tended to show alleged violations of the antitrust acts by the use of patents, in my judgment, is completely met by the continuing and most recent decisions of the courts, heretofore alluded to, which show how completely and broadly the Antitrust Act has been interpreted as a controlling remedy.

Even before the later decisions, Mr. Arnold in his own well-known publication, examining the use of patents to violate the antitrust law, declared:

> Such situations are easy to deal with if there is an organization in the Antitrust Division able to take care of complaints, and to watch the distribution of the principal necessities of living. If that organization is on the job ripples of one antitrust investigation will spread in all directions.

All Mr. Arnold has to do, as he has recognized, is to present in a judicial proceeding his particular facts, and the courts have never failed to sustain violations of the antitrust acts by their use.

The antitrust presentation before the Patents Committee has added nothing to the argument for Senate bill 2303, and has not reinforced the proposals for permanent legislation in that bill.

It is to be noted that Senate bill 2491 was at no time subjected to analysis such as Attorney General Shea gave to Senate bill 2303.

It is finally to be observed that so far the hearings have been not only ex parte, with the exception of three representatives of companies subjected to criticism, but numerous applications for hearings by businessmen, lawyers, persons of special patent experience, inventors, and scientists have not resulted in opportunities for hearings. Neither has the Secretary of Commerce nor the Commissioner of Patents, representing the department of the Government charged with the administration of the patent law, been invited to appear or to make any suggestions or recommendations.

While the pending bills attack the very essentials of the patent system, no one has paid the system more practical tribute than the distinguished chairman of the Temporary National Economic Committee, the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], one of the cosponsors of the pending bill. Immediately after the presentations on the subject of patents before the T. N. E. C. the Senator made the following statement:

> There seems to be a general agreement by these witnesses, as well as by those who previously testified at the Department of Justice hearings some weeks ago, that inventors and business still need the protection and stimulation of patents.
>
> The fact that patents are keystones in many industries has been brought home to us with great emphasis. I doubt whether I had realized their significance as a primary force in the operations of the economic system. These hearings may lead more of us to give to patents the attention they so certainly deserve.
>
> There was practically unanimous agreement among the witnesses that Congress, by the enactment of the patent law, has given this country a system far superior to that which exists in any other country (January 24, 1939).

In a letter to the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], chairman of the Patents Committee, the President said:

> It is fitting that you should open these hearings on April 13, the birthday of Thomas Jefferson, who was our first superintendent of patents. No surer guidance for your action could be found than a constant consciousness of the spirit and intent of that great designer of American democracy.

I join in this admonition that the spirit and intent of Jefferson should guide the lawmakers of today in this field of enterprise and law. Jefferson drew a sharp distinction between trade monopolies, which he detested, and the limited patent monopoly to which he gave approval. I urge his views and his intent upon the

membership of the Senate and the committee. Jefferson said:

An act of Congress authorizing the issue of patents for new discoveries has given a spring to invention beyond my conception. * * * In the arts, and especially in the mechanical arts, many ingenious improvements are made in consequence of the patent right giving exclusive use of them for 14 years. Certainly an inventor ought to be allowed a right to the benefit of his invention for some certain time. Nobody wishes more than I do that ingenuity should receive liberal encouragement (Patents and Anti-trust Law, Laurence L. Wood, p. 17, exhibit B).

Mr. President, I have made this long talk because of my belief that there exists in the public mind a misconception as to what a patent is, and as to both private and public rights affected by the issuance of a patent as such rights have been defined by our courts; because I am persuaded that in these hearings the law has been stated to be what it never has been, what it is not now, and what it should not be; and finally, because of my feeling—and I say this with regret—that the Patents Committee of the Senate is not studying the problems presented in the spirit and purpose which the questions and the public interest involved demand. I have given much study to the record thus far made in the committee hearings. I feel constrained to express the hope that the Senate will view with critical eye recommendations based upon that record as it now stands.

Mr. President, I believe, as did Jefferson, that the granting of patents has given a spring to invention beyond conception. I believe our patent system has made an amazing contribution to the industrial life of our country and to the comfort and betterment of all our people. I hope it is not to be thoughtlessly and recklessly dealt with by the administrative agencies of our Government or by the Congress.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, June 30, 1942, at 11 o'clock a. m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 29, 1942:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The following-named passed assistant surgeons to be surgeons in the United States Public Health Service, to rank as such from the dates set opposite their names:

George William Bolin, July 1, 1942.
Claude D. Head, Jr., July 1, 1942.

IN THE NAVY

Capt. George D. Murray to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 7th day of May 1942.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 29, 1942:

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

James Lawrence Fly to be a member for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1942.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Milton Omar Beebe, Jr.
Felix Claudius Feamster
Winston Clarkson Hainsworth
Laurence Mercer Hursh
John Joseph Maloney
Edward Kernaghan Mills
John Charles Benson, Jr.
Edward Lloyd Seretan
William Morrow Webb

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

Lt. Col. Norman Paul Williams.

TO BE FIRST LIEUTENANTS, MEDICAL CORPS, WITH RANK FROM DATE OF APPOINTMENT

Robert Haney Brooks
Francis Winters Anderson
Morris Eldred Brackett
Robert Joseph Brennan
Donald Larue Brubaker
John Charles Cressler
Ralph Nelson Greene, Jr.
Francis William Lanard
Philip Jordan Noel, Jr.
Samuel Hope Sandifer
Edward Patrick Shannon, Jr.
Mack Simmons
Charles Mac Stanfill
Lowell Richard Steele
Gilbert Alfred Twichell
William Sherwin Wolf

APPOINTMENT, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO QUARTERMASTER CORPS

First Lt. Austin Andrew Miller.

PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY

TO BE COLONEL WITH RANK FROM JUNE 11, 1942

Frank Victor Schneider, Infantry.

APPOINTMENTS, PROMOTIONS, AND APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFERS, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

The nominations of Robert McDonald Gray, et al., and the nominations of Andrew Carroll Offutt, et al., for appointment, promotion or appointment, by transfer, in the Regular Army of the United States, which were received by the Senate on June 18, 1942, and which appear in full in the Senate proceedings of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for that day, under the caption "Nominations."

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Effie Mann, Nauvoo.
Roy G. Underwood, Summerdale.
Maida C. Mosley, Thomaston.

GEORGIA

L'Bertie Rushing, Glennville.
Jesse W. Mundy, Jonesboro.

ILLINOIS

Clyde P. Stone, Carmi.
Harry O. Given, Crossville.
Preston C. Beal, Dupo.
Martin L. Hunt, McLeansboro.
James W. Jesk, Oak Forest.
George F. Proff, Oaklawn.
E. Agnes Zook, Prairie City.
Harlow B. Brown, Princeton.
Dow E. Anderson, Vienna.

NEW YORK

William S. Brown, Antwerp.
Bartholomew Francis Mannion, Dobbs Ferry.
Fred S. Tripp, Guilford.
Henry J. Myer, Haines Falls.
George C. Kent, Hurley.
Edward G. Watts, Silver Bay.

OKLAHOMA

Georgie M. Jeffers, Inola.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, JUNE 29, 1942

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Edward G. Latch, pastor, Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and Everlasting God, who art the source of light and life and whose glory is in all the world, we pause a moment before Thee. By the might of Thy spirit lift us into Thy presence, where we may be still and know that Thou art God.

Drop Thy still dews of quietness,
'Til all our strivings cease;
Take from our souls the strain and stress,
And let our ordered lives confess
The beauty of Thy peace.

Grant unto us wisdom to save us from false choices. Grant unto us courage to face the tasks of this day unafraid. Grant unto us an understanding mind and a sympathetic heart that in Thy light we may see light and in Thy straight and true path we may not stumble.

Help us to use the freedom that is ours to maintain justice and liberty and honor among men and nations, to the glory of Thy Holy Name. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, June 27, 1942, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

On June 22, 1942:

H. R. 1349. An act for the relief of Annie Brown;

H. R. 2419. An act for the relief of Chan Tsork-ying;

H. R. 3402. An act for the relief of Catherine R. Johnson;

H. R. 5610. An act for the relief of G. H. Condon, M. E. Cannon, W. J. Esterle, C. C. Gasaway, James F. Retallack, and L. G. Yinger;

H. R. 6634. An act to facilitate the employment by defense contractors of certain former members of the land and naval forces, including the Coast Guard, of the United States;

H. R. 6676. An act for the relief of F. A. Holmes, former United States disbursing clerk for the State of Illinois;

H. R. 6953. An act to amend the District of Columbia Income Tax Act, as amended, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7066. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto; and

H. J Res. 303. Joint resolution to codify and emphasize existing rules and customs pertaining to the display and use of the flag of the United States of America.

On June 23, 1942:

H. R. 780. An act for the relief of Harvey C. Artis;

H. R. 6925. An act to provide additional compensation for Joseph Sharfsin, Esq., for

professional services rendered the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7182. An act making additional appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal years ending June 30, 1941, 1942, and 1943, and for other purposes.

RESOLUTIONS OF HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER laid before the House a communication from the Secretary of State, which was read by the Clerk:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, June 25, 1942.

The Honorable SAM RAYBURN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I transmit herewith two copies of despatch No. 101 of June 6, 1942, from the American Embassy at Habana, with which are enclosed translations of communications received by the American Embassy from Cuban governmental officials relative to certain resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives on February 2, 1942.

Sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

[Enclosures: Despatch No. 101 from Habana, June 6, 1942, with enclosures.]

No. 101. HABANA, *June 6, 1942.*

Subject: Transmitting acknowledgements of resolutions of the House of Representatives regarding a visiting group of Congressmen.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington.

SIR: With reference to the Department's diplomatic serial of April 29, 1942, enclosing copies of resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives on February 2, 1942, expressing appreciation for the courteous treatment accorded a visiting group of Congressmen last year, I have the honor to inform the Department that copies of these resolutions were transmitted to the Ministry of State, the President of the Senate, and the President of the Chamber of Representatives. The Embassy is now in receipt of acknowledgements from the Minister of State and the President of the Senate. Copies of these acknowledgments are transmitted herewith in translation.

Respectfully yours.

For the Ambassador:

ELLIS O. BRIGGS,
Counselor of Embassy.

[Enclosures: 1. Communication from Minister of State dated May 27, 1942.

2. Communication from President of Senate dated May 28, 1942.]

[Enclosure No. 1 to despatch No. 101 dated June 6, 1942, from the Embassy at Habana]

[Translation]

REPUBLIC OF CUBA,
MINISTRY OF STATE,
Habana, May 27, 1942.

His Excellency SPRUILLE BRADEN,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America, Habana

MR. AMBASSADOR: I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of Your Excellency's valued note No. 267, dated the 21st instant, with which you transmit with the request that it be delivered to the President of the Republic, a registered copy of the resolutions adopted by the House of Representatives of the United States of America on February 2 last, in which are set forth the gratitude of that high legislative body for the treatment and courtesies dispensed in Cuba to a group of its members which visited Habana in November of last year.

In reply I am pleased to advise Your Excellency that, in accord with your wishes, said copy was sent to the President of the Republic.

In appreciating the said remittance made by Your Excellency, I beg of you in behalf of Major General Batista to express to the House of Representatives of the United States his sincere appreciation for such a kind initiative which is additional proof of the close and constant bonds between our two peoples.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurance of my highest and most distinguished consideration.

J. M. CORTINA.

[Enclosure No. 2 to despatch No. 101 dated June 6, 1942, from the Embassy at Habana]

[Translation]

GUILLERMO ALONSO PUJOL,
PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE,
Habana, May 28, 1942.

The Honorable SPRUILLE BRADEN,
Ambassador of the United States, City.

EXCELLENCY: I had great pleasure in receiving Your Excellency's courteous letter of the 21st instant, transmitting a certified copy of the resolution adopted by the House of Representatives of the United States on February 2 of this year, expressing gratitude for the courtesies, well deserved, accorded to the North American legislators who honored us with their visit during the month of November of last year.

I wish to assure you that I highly appreciate that courtesy.

It will be a great pleasure for me to bring the resolution which Your Excellency kindly transmitted to me to the cognizance of the legislative body which I preside over.

Please accept the assurance of my most distinguished consideration.

GUILLERMO ALONSO PUJOL.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MACIEJEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the businessmen of my district.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an editorial from the Detroit Times on the subject of post-office employees' pay.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE TO DEAL WITH NATIONAL DEFENSE LEGISLATION

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COLLINS addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

A $24,000,000,000 TAX BILL, NOT A $6,000,000,000 TAX BILL, AS ADVERTISED

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. REED of New York addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DEATH PENALTY FOR AID TO ENEMY AGENTS

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, reference is made to H. R. 7015 introduced by me on April 29, 1942, to make the death penalty mandatory for any person, citizen or noncitizen, who gives aid and comfort to a member of the military, air, or naval forces of any country with which we are at war. In my remarks on the floor of the House that day, I stated that in this war for survival we must fight fire with fire and pointed out the urgent necessity of the enactment of my bill into law because of the probability, among other dangers, of enemy submarines sending landing parties ashore to engage in sabotage and guerrilla warfare. During the past week end, we have learned that that probability has, with dramatic suddenness and stark and vidid realism, emerged into the realm of fact. Had not the F. B. I. so promptly and efficiently rounded up the eight Nazi rattlesnakes who were landed from submarines on the coasts of Florida and Long Island, they would even now doubtless be sheltered and aided in their nefarious work by Nazi sympathizers in this country. The existing statutes do not adequately cope with this grave problem. I know of no law under which a noncitizen can be adequately penalized for giving aid and comfort to an enemy soldier, sailor, or agent, except the laws relating to the taking into custody and internment of dangerous and undesirable aliens. There are laws which flirt with the problem, but do not cover it. Citizenship is a condition precedent for prosecution under the statutes relating to treason, and even a conviction for treason might carry with it a penalty not nearly commensurate with the gravity of the offenses covered by my bill in these days of grim and total warfare.

Therefore, I am again calling the attention of the House to H. R. 7015 and again earnestly urging that prompt action be taken thereon.

[Here the gavel fell.]

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION TO PROVIDE GAS TO ENABLE VOTERS IN RURAL AREAS TO VOTE AT FALL ELECTIONS

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, since the gasoline-rationing program was put into effect on the east coast, considerable thought by legislators and others interested in good government has been given to the problem of relieving the gasoline-rationing orders issued by the Office of Price Administration, so that voters residing in the rural districts of the United

States would be assured of gas for their cars to get to the polls on election day.

With this in mind, I addressed a communication to Mr. Leon Henderson, the Price Administrator, on June 3, 1942, in which I asserted that the rural population, where gasoline is rationed, should not be penalized by the gas-rationing order, which might deny them the right to exercise their franchise to vote in the coming elections, and I suggested to Mr. Henderson that his department study the problem and offer some assistance to the rural voters so that they might be able to get to the polls on election day. I also suggested that the various rural townships might make use of the school busses to take rural residents to the polls, but that, in any event, an extra amount of gasoline should be allocated to all voters who signify their intention to go to the polls and whose residences in the rural communities were so distant from the polling booths that they might not otherwise be able to exercise their right to vote.

I am now pleased to acknowledge a communication from Mr. Henderson, the Price Administrator, under date of June 25, 1942, in which he stated that in the event the President should decide to order Nation-wide rationing of gasoline provision would be made by the Office of Price Administration for rural consumers and that special provisions would be made to enable voters to reach the polls on election day.

I am giving this information to the Congress because I know you will all be interested to learn that special provisions will be made by the Office of Price Administration to enable all voters to reach the polls on election day this fall.

[Here the gavel fell.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the remarks which I expect to make later today some tabulated material.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today, after the conclusion of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objction?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars in the RECORD and to include in one an editorial from the New York Times and a statement by Mr. Rex Stout.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a Flag Day address by Mr. L. H. Smith.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THREE AND ONE-HALF PERCENT INTEREST ON FARM CREDIT LOANS

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, from the White House this morning came a message announcing that the President had signed the farm interest bill, H. R. 6315, which I introduced. That is the bill extending for 2 years the 3½-percent interest rates on loans of the Farm Credit Administration.

As far as I know, that closes the attempt to amend the Farm Credit Act at this session of Congress.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PIERCE. I yield.

Mr. FULMER. I am glad to state to the gentleman, in view of the interest manifested by many members with reference to H. R. 5336 and the revised bill, H. R. 7091, that the committee will not give any further consideration to those bills during this session of the Congress.

Mr. PIERCE. During the next Congress the Farm Credit Act must be revamped and rewritten or that important agency will be forced into liquidation. Only about one-tenth of all farm loans are now coming to the Farm Credit Administration, because private companies can make better terms than are possible under the present law.

[Here the gavel fell.]

SYNTHETIC-RUBBER PRODUCTION

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

[Mr. TREADWAY addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

MISINFORMATION FROM GOVERNMENT DEPARTMENTS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, for several months members of the California delegation have been attempting to secure assistance from various interested Government departments to help solve a serious farm labor shortage that exists in our State. The fact that such a shortage exists is borne out by Ray Wiser, president of the California Farm Bureau Federation. Mr. Wiser recently pointed out that—

California was short 15,000 workers in May and we face even more acute shortages when the harvest season gets in stride in July and August.

Recently, and at the suggestion of Members of Congress from California, Mr. Fay Hunter, head of the Farm Placement Service, visited California and made a personal investigation of the farm labor problem. He found the situation critical enough to immediately recommend the importation of 6,000 Mexican farm workers, and this proposal is presently receiving attention from the State Departments of the United States and Mexico.

Now comes the State director of the United States Employment Service in a statement that no shortage exists. An Associated Press dispatch dated June 23, and published widely in California, reads as follows:

The farmers' contention that an acute shortage of farm workers now imperils the Nation's food-production program in California was sharply disputed yesterday by Ralph Wadsworth, State director of the United States Employment Service.

There is no serious farm-labor shortage at the moment—

Wadsworth testified at the meeting of the Senate Interim Committee on Economic Planning.

Mr. Speaker, this is another example of misleading information from Government departments that only serves to complicate and confuse an already serious situation. The farmers of California are desperately in need of additional farm labor, and they want and deserve prompt and effective action, not misinformation and inaction.

[Here the gavel fell.]

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on today, after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and other special orders, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein a letter received from Mr. Charles E. Sweet, president of the Agriculture Publishers Association, Chicago, Ill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a technical statement on dry milk and dry-milk products.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to revise, correct, and extend remarks which appeared in the Appendix of the RECORD beginning with page A1829.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

CORRECT NAMES OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, so many people on the Federal pay roll are using assumed names; some married women are drawing pay under a name other than that of their husbands—and perhaps the other way around. Anyway, there are too many of them there whose status and real names we do not know. I have therefore introduced a joint resolution requiring all Federal employees except those in the military service or connected with the Navy, the Army, or the Intelligence Department, or the F. B. I. who are not using the name that was given to them when they were born

to register with the department and give the assumed name, or names, or succession of names, together with the information which will show where each changed his name, what he changed it from and to, and why he did it, so we will know something about these folks who are using names which are not their own or which they assumed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 7319) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 2295), which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. TABER reserved all points of order on the bill.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SABATH]?

There was no objection.

[Mr. SABATH addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—REPORT OF AMERICAN RED CROSS

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, June 29, 1942.

SIR: I have the honor to transmit herewith a report, prepared by the American Red Cross, of obligations under the appropriation of $50,000,000 for refugee relief contained in section 40 of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act, fiscal year 1941, as extended by the Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, and the appropriation of $35,000,000 for foreign war relief contained in the Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, approved December 17, 1941.

Submitted pursuant to the provisions of section 40 (d) and title III, respectively, of the above-mentioned appropriation acts, this report is of necessity an interim report prepared as of April 30, 1942, since the refugee and foreign war relief programs are still in progress, and since, furthermore, there is now pending in Congress a proposal to consolidate and extend the availability of the appropriations into the fiscal year 1943. A final report must await the conclusion of the war relief program.

There are also transmitted herewith reports from the Treasury Department, the Department of Agriculture, and the War Department, which are serving as purchasing agencies under the programs of refugee and foreign war relief. It will be noted that the reports of these Departments are prepared on an obligation basis as distinguished from the report of the American Red Cross, which is prepared on the basis of requisitions submitted to these Departments.

Respectfully,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The unfinished business is further consideration of the conference report on the appropriation bill for the Department of the Interior, 1943. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] is recognized.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently no quorum is present.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 91]

Baldwin	Heffernan	Osmers
Bates, Ky.	Hendricks	O'Toole
Beckworth	Hook	Plauché
Blackney	Jarrett	Reed, Ill.
Boykin	Jenkins, Ohio	Robertson, N. Dak.
Bradley, Mich.	Jenks, N. H.	Robsion, Ky.
Buckler, Minn.	Johns	Rogers, Okla.
Buckley, N. Y.	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Scanlon
Capozzoli	Kee	Schaefer, Ill.
Celler	Kefauver	Schuetz
Clark	Kennedy, Martin J.	Schulte
Cluett	Kennedy, Michael J.	Scott
Cole, Md.	Keogh	Shannon
Cullen	Kerr	Sheridan
Delaney	Klein	Smith, Pa.
Dickstein	Kocialkowski	Smith, W. Va.
Dies	Lane	Somers, N. Y.
Douglas	Larrabee	South
Ellis	McKeough	Starnes, Ala.
Fish	Maas	Sweeney
Gavagan	Marcantonio	Thomas, N. J.
Gifford	Mills, Ark.	Tinkham
Gilchrist	Mitchell	Vreeland
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Murray	Walter
Halleck	Myers, Pa.	Wilson
Harness	O'Leary	Winter
Harrington	Oliver	Wolfenden, Pa.
Hart	Osmers	Worley
Healey	O'Toole	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and forty-seven Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

On motion of Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, first let me assure the Members of the House that I did not make the point of no quorum, but there were Members present who believed that, inasmuch as there is at least one controversial item in the pending measure, that Members ought to be present and would like to be present to hear the facts with reference to the matter.

As the Members know, when this conference report was laid aside on Saturday last, I was about to refer to the totals in the bill as agreed upon by the conference between the House and Senate on Friday. I had just made the statement to the House that I was not altogether satisfied with every item in the bill, but the second conference made considerable savings involving millions of dollars, and I believe that it is the best possible compromise that may be had between the two bodies.

At this time, I should like to give some of the totals, and I wish you would follow these totals, so that you may have in mind what accomplishments have been made by your conferees.

The total Budget estimates considered in connection with the bill were $189,897,076. The total provided for the Department of the Interior last year, which, as you know, includes 26 important agencies of Government, was $238,101,000. The bill, as agreed to, if we are also to include funds inserted in the Senate for the Central Valley projects—and I may say that, so far as I know, this is actually the only really controversial item in the bill at this time, although some 13 items have been brought here in technical disagreement—carries $178,099,712.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. That project is not in the conference report, however. It will come up on a separate vote.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct. I thank the gentleman for calling my attention to that fact.

The Senate receded in conference in the amount of $8,825,276. The House receded in conference on $11,763,497.

Bear in mind, however, as I have heretofore pointed out, that the Senate received Budget estimates totaling nearly $10,000,000 after this bill had passed the House of Representatives and been sent over to the Senate. You will recall that many matters came to the attention of the Senate after the bill passed the House. You understand that the Budget estimates for the Interior Department were made long before Pearl Harbor. It is unnecessary for me to tell you that a lot of water has run over the dam since Pearl Harbor which necessitated a number of changes and additions not only in this bill but in many other measures that have been presented to this body since Pearl Harbor.

It occurs to me that the House may be interested in an itemized statement of these reductions. The reductions made by the conferees in the second conference are as follows: Travel expense, $561,000. Members will recall that we stated when the Interior Department appropriation bill was being considered some weeks ago that the House had taken up each agency and had reduced every travel-expense item in this bill. We attempted to do it

on a fair basis. For example, the Bureau of Mines, which is now virtually a war activity, was reduced very little, I believe only 5 percent, and that was the case with some other strictly war activities. In connection with other activities which are not classified as national defense or war activities, however, the travel items were reduced as much as 50 percent, making an average reduction of about 20 percent.

When the bill went to the Senate that body evidently took the position that this travel-item cut should be the same as it is in other annual appropriation bills that have passed the House. It was pointed out to the conferees that the Interior Department, next to the War and Navy Departments, is more nearly composed of war activities than any other department of the Government. The Senate conferees were insistent and seemed to us to be adamant. Finally the conference agreed to the 10 percent figure, the same cut as is provided in other appropriation measures. However, the House last Thursday made it clear to your conferees that it was dissatisfied with this item, and we so advised the Senate conferees, who finally receded and accepted the House language and figures on all travel items. That was one of the controversial items. So I desire to make it plain that in yielding to the House on this controversial matter that the figures accepted are now exactly as passed by the House. As I said a moment ago, the reduction in travel expenses alone is $561,000.

On the item relating to the Bituminous Coal Division the Senate receded, making a saving of $107,174. The Riverton project in Wyoming was slashed $100,000. The Colorado-Big Thompson took another tremendous cut of $250,000. This, you understand, is in addition to a cut of $500,000 in the first conference. The Yakima project, Roza division, was sliced $100,000, in addition to a cut of $100,000 in the first conference.

The item of $4,000,000 for helium-plant construction was eliminated as a direct appropriation from the Treasury. Let me tell you why it was eliminated. All members of the conference felt that it was and is a tremendously important item, and no member of the conferees of either House was opposed to the item. However, investigation disclosed that Congress has heretofore appropriated in excess of $1,000,000,000 under the heading "Aviation, Navy, 1943," and we believed the $4,000,000 for this purpose should be made available from that fund.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, that is No. 101, on page 105 of the bill, and that amendment does not appear among the amendments on which the Senate recedes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that it is in disagreement and the money is to be secured from 1943 appropriations to the Navy Department. I made the statement a moment ago that this House has already approved $1,000,000,000 for that purpose. While I say that we are heartily in favor of increasing facilities for helium, it occurred to your conferees that the money should rightfully come from naval appropriations; and if they cannot find $4,000,000 out of $1,000,000,000, then we have also provided that it might come from appropriations hereafter made in the 1943 appropriations for the Navy. Personally I did not favor eliminating this item. But some members were fearful of duplication of activities. Whether this is an actual saving, or a saving on paper, the bill is actually reduced $4,000,000 because of the elimination of that item.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, a distinguished member of the committee.

Mr. RICH. If the Army and the Navy find out that they have not appropriated the $4,000,000 for the helium, and since we took this out of the bill in conference, then will there be a saving?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would say that the Army and the Navy could not find that out because I have just made the statement that there is over $1,000,000,000 in the naval appropriation bill for 1943 for naval aviation, from which funds for this purpose could be secured. We made the provision that if every dollar of that is expended without using it for this purpose, and the Navy desires further funds, this can be taken from any appropriation hereafter made for naval aviation during the fiscal year 1943.

Mr. RICH. Is it not a fact that the conferees thought they would try to stop any duplication on the part of the Army, the Navy, or the Interior Department and that, since all these things are placed in the hands of the Army and the Navy, it had better be there in order that we do not have duplication?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I can say to the gentleman that I am of the firm opinion there would be no duplication because the Navy will call upon the Bureau of Mines to do this work. I am advised that the Bureau of Mines are the only people who are able to do the work. There is no question the need is increasing for helium and that experts in the Bureau of Mines have done a good job in this respect. The gentleman understands, of course, that we shall have time to debate this matter further when the amendment comes up for consideration, if there are further questions to be asked in connection with it.

There is one little item in the bill that some of us thought very important, an item in which the Izaak Walton League, farmers, and others, are tremendously interested, which was quite unfortunately presented under the heading of "Food habits of birds." But there were Members of the House who did not like the heading "Food habits" and therefore, rather than offend anyone or have a controversy about it, the Senate receded, and that is no longer in the bill.

We were able also on the second conference to make a reduction of $135,000 in the item under the heading of "Predatory animals."

Then there was another little item for fur seal investigation in Alaska of $15,840.

Another item was for deferring the deficit of the Virgin Islands of $15,200.

This made a total saving in the second conference of $5,434,214.

As I stated on Saturday, the Senate receded on 171 amendments. The House receded on 43 amendments. The House receded with an amendment on 70 amendments. There are 13 amendments in technical disagreement, as I stated a moment ago, but, as I also stated on Saturday, only one of these amendments is in actual disagreement so far as a majority of the conferees is concerned.

On the 70 amendments that the House agreed to with amendments, the Senate in many instances receded more than the House did, even on those amendments, as the record will show.

No doubt there will be some criticism during this debate, as there was on Saturday, of this report with reference to the Central Valley project, and the item for construction of helium plants. I wish to impress on the House at this time that neither of those items is in the conference report as pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZPATRICK] a moment ago. They are both in disagreement, and Members will have an opportunity to vote on them separately after the conference report is acted upon.

At this time I want to urge on all Members the importance of adopting the conference report. Every day of delay after tomorrow will result in holding up funds as vital to national defense as funds carried in the Army and Navy supply bills. Let me name a few of them. They consist of funds for the Bonneville Power Administration, which is building transmission lines to carry power to war plants in the Pacific Northwest; funds for Grand Coulee Dam, which will buy additional generators to provide power essential to the manufacture of war materials; funds to protect our great reclamation and power development projects, such as Boulder Dam, Grand Coulee Dam, and many others, from sabotage.

There has also been some criticism because several important items were placed in this bill that did not have Budget estimates. As I stated a moment ago, the Budget was prepared before Pearl Harbor, and the Senate, in its wisdom, in this instance, at least, found it necessary to put in some items even though they did not have Budget estimates. Let me refer to one of them. The Senate, without Budget estimates, thought it was essential to hire guards to protect the major reclamation projects in this country. It did not wait for a Budget estimate. Those of you who read the shocking newspaper account yesterday of those eight damnable, murderous spies, two of whom I am ashamed to say were American citizens, who were sent here fresh from a sabotage school in Berlin for the purpose of destroying lives and property of American citizens, know the necessity of safeguarding against sabotaging our dams and great reclamation projects. Those low-life scoundrels were caught, but there are no doubt lurking among us many others who would sabotage and murder innocent women and children at the beck and call of their master, Adolf Hitler.

There are no doubt many such polecats among us carrying orders from Hitler to sabotage important aluminum plants and other plants essential to American war production. Events of yesterday and today must remind us that this Congress has its own responsibility regardless of whether or not it happens to have Budget estimates. I do not know how all Members here may feel, but as one member of the committee, I reserve the right to use my own judgment and accept the responsibility of putting in such items as appear in this bill without Budget estimates if and when I am convinced they are important to national defense. The gentlemen at the other end of the Capitol did put in several items that did not have Budget estimates. One of those items was to provide armed guards at every major reclamation project and other projects over which this committee under this bill has jurisdiction. So we are not going to apologize for accepting this, even though there were no Budget estimates, because, as I said a moment ago, a lot of water has run over the dam since Pearl Harbor, and these estimates were made up before Pearl Harbor.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. How much do those items total?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The total items without Budget estimates in the bill amount to $7,472,225. Let me say that practically every one of those projects had either direct or very near connection with the war effort.

Mr. DONDERO. How much of that amount is allotted for armed guards on projects?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Of course, that is just one of the smaller items.

Mr. DONDERO. I am trying to ascertain whether it is a large part of it or just a small part.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I will say to the gentleman that the additional amount for this purpose is $300,000 for the armed guards alone. In this bill there is another item for guards in the Indian Service in the sum of $53,000. Throughout the bill there are items without Budget estimates, but in every instance, they are essential for the war effort, else the committee would not have agreed to them.

Mr. DONDERO. May I ask the gentleman one further question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. DONDERO. Do I understand that the conference report on which we are about to vote does not include the Central Valley project, and one other—I do not recall the name of it at the present time?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct. It does not include the Central Valley and it does not include the matter of the helium plant, which conferees felt the House would like to vote on separately.

Other items of value to the defense program are funds for the continuation and construction of 8 or 10 reclamation projects, from which power is necessary to be had if the war program is to be successfully carried forward; also, funds for the raising of guayule plants from which we hope rubber can be secured. Funds have been appropriated to the Geological Survey for the location of strategic and critical minerals in this bill; also, for most essential research work in connection with the war effort, which will be slowed up if funds are not provided for the Bureau of Mines, and I shall now enumerate just a few of the most important activities they want to undertake with funds in this bill. First, there are studies to be made in connection with the development of strategic and critical materials, already stated, and I am sure that there will be no objection to that. Then there are funds provided for the construction of an experimental plant for the production of sponge iron, to take the place of the scrap iron, of which I regret to say there is a most serious shortage. Then there is the investigation of raw-materials resources for western steel. That is a very important item. Then there is the construction and equipment of an electrodevelopment laboratory, and manganese beneficiation pilot plants and research; also, the production of alumina from aluminum clays and alunite. Also, there is an investigation of deposits of critical and essential minerals. Funds are provided the Fish and Wildlife Service to make a survey with a view to locating materials to replace tin and steel heretofore used in packing sea food.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK. In relation to the strategic and critical material referred to, are other materials, other than war minerals, intended to be investigated or is the matter confined solely to the Bureau of Mines? I would like to have investigated all possible sources of needed strategic and critical materials, both metallic and nonmetallic.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Strategic materials, of course, refers to a number of different minerals, a multiplicity of minerals. As the gentleman also is aware, research in that science has developed in a most remarkable way during the past few months. I am hopeful that the investigations suggested by the gentleman from Arizona will actually be made.

I have referred to some of the items that are in this bill without Budget estimates. Let me suggest to Members that before they unduly criticize the committee for accepting some of these items without Budget estimates that they examine the bill and investigate the urgency for some of these items. As one member of the Committee on Appropriations, I have never felt that we have to accept Budget estimates without changing the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." I have never brought a bill to this House that was not several million dollars below Budget estimates, and this committee has consistently reserved the right to change some of the items, to take from and to add to where in its opinion such changes are justified. Now, let me hurriedly enumerate a few of those items in this bill, as I want to give other Members an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman has used half an hour now on this conference report, and I am wondering whether we are to get an opportunity to speak upon it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I apologize to my good friend from Pennsylvania for using more time than he apparently thinks I should. May I say modestly that I am sure that most Members here actually appreciate the information that I am trying to give the House. I have made a detailed study of the bill, but if the gentleman who seldom speaks wants the rest of my time I am perfectly willing to yield at this point.

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. COX. I think the gentleman has made a very excellent statement, and it must be apparent to everyone that the gentleman and his House colleagues on the conference committee have done their best. I think they have done an excellent job, and I hope the House will follow the gentleman and his colleagues and accept the conference report.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I am deeply grateful to the distinguished gentleman from Georgia for his kind and most generous statement, and sincerely thank him for his generosity. Let me say in reply that I have long regarded the gentleman as one of the ablest Members of the House, a man who is not only a statesman and a scholar, but one who has fought for economy on all occasions.

Now let me mention four or five items in the next minute or two, and I assure the gentleman from Pennsylvania I will not use much more time. Here are a few important items that were allowed even though there were no Budget estimates for them. They are as follows:

Fire protection of forests, forest industries, and strategic facilities, $96,000. The committee did not feel it could afford to object to that item.

Protection of project works, irrigation in the Indian Service, $53,000.

Testing fuel: Synthesis of motor fuel, $23,000.

Construction and equipment of electro-development laboratory, $500,000.

Production of alumina from low-grade bauxite, aluminum clays, and alunite, $650,000.

Investigation of deposits of critical and essential minerals, $900,000.

And so on. Each and every one of them will play an important part in connection with the war effort.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] 5 minutes and am sure he will give the House much valuable advice, timely suggestions, and wise counsel.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARNES). The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, you have heard the chairman of the subcommittee make the statement not only today, but on Saturday that the conferees agreed to this report with the exception of one item. The chairman was in error in that statement. The conferees had discussed this bill, and I want to say that the House did a good thing in sending that bill back to conference, because it made the conferees both of the House and of the Senate realize that you were not going to stand for everything that is in this bill.

It had a wholesome effect, but it probably should be returned again to conference.

The only reason I signed this report was that I was told our conference would be blocked and we would not get any place and we would have to adjourn and come back and let the Speaker appoint new conferees if I did not sign this one in order to bring the bill in here Saturday. I did not want to hold up the legislation that way, so I signed the report with the distinct understanding that I was against this bill and many, many items that are in it, but I did want to bring it back to the House so we could have it considered on Saturday. Then what happened? We met for the purpose of taking up this conference report on Saturday. We came here at 11 o'clock Saturday. The chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] made his statement. Then something happened. At 12:30 we had a roll call and when they announced the number of members present, like a thunderbolt out of a clear sky we were told we were going to adjourn; that we were not going to do anything further Saturday. Why, I do not know. Nobody ever told me. The majority of Members did not know why. We were not advised, but we adjourned, and they said we could do as much on Monday and Tuesday as if we had worked all day on Saturday. That is pure bunk of the first order. Now, that statement is just as sensible as it was that we did agree to everything in the conference and brought this bill in here in harmony. Why we adjourned on Saturday and went home after we came here for a full day's work, your guess is as good as mine, but the members of the committee on this side of the House knew nothing about it. If they did, they did not tell me. The RECORD does not reveal it to the public.

Now, this is the situation you are confronted with today: We have taken out of this bill $5,434,000. We actually only took out of the bill $1,434,000. That $4,000,000 for helium was simply checking the item over to either the Army or the Navy and letting them get the money, because they know they are going to get this money and we thought there might be some object in doing it because we would prevent possible duplication. That was a good thing to do.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. If you will give me more than 5 minutes I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. The gentleman heard the statement that there had already been appropriated a billion dollars for naval aviation from which funds can be secured for this purpose. Unquestionably, $4,000,000 can be secured from that large sum for helium plants. Therefore it is not a saving on paper, but an actual saving of $4,000,000.

Mr. RICH. Well, it was with the idea of trying to stop duplication. On that I congratulate the committee.

Now, there are some items in this bill that are in dispute. You can save more millions of dollars this afternoon than we saved in our conference if you vote right. When we come to take up these items—I say this in respect to my colleagues, there are millions of dollars in this bill that go to their districts. There was only one Member who was willing to give up anything in the bill from his district. There were none of the conferees who were willing to help strike out three or four million dollars that should have been stricken out. If we take out $200,000 for a steam plant we will save $15,000,000, because if you spend the $200,000 you will spend $15,000,000 before the year is out. That will be brought to your attention later on, when we consider amendment No. 156, which is in disagreement.

Mr. Speaker, this Nation is at war. There are many things in this bill that should have been taken out, they are nonessential at this time. I say to you with all the sincerity that I possess, if we do not save every dollar we can on nonessentials, on things that will put people to work when we need them in industry, it is just going to be too bad. The Ways and Means Committee is striving earnestly to tax the people in order to keep the country from going into bankruptcy. But we come in here and there is item after item in this bill that will only make additional unnecessary expense, additional items that will cost the Nation much money, and it is not necessary at this time. We will bring those items to your attention later on during the discussion this afternoon. If you economize it certainly will be wise.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I must, of course, respectfully disagree with my chairman in his statement that only one amendment is in disagreement of those that have been reported in disagreement, for I reserve the right to disagree to all of those amendments that are in disagreement where any appropriation is involved.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Is it not true that a majority of the conferees agreed to everything except one amendment? Is not that a fact?

Mr. CARTER. No.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is not a fact?

Mr. CARTER. My colleagues on this side who are on the conference committee will testify that they did not, and I say that I did not. That is all I have to say on that subject.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I never said it was unanimous, but I repeat that a majority of the conferees did agree on all amendments except one.

Mr. CARTER. I do not yield further, Mr. Speaker.

Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that we went to conference, and as usual, we were shoved around by the Senators. They thought they would make a great showing by coming back here and telling you on how many amendments the Senate had receded, but they have failed to tell you that in actual dollars and cents this bill is a trifle under $1,300,000 less than it was before. According to the statement of our chairman, it would be $1,434,214 when you disregard the helium item. This helium item was shifted from one appropriation to another and while it is true that this method results in reducing the amount of the Interior Department bill it does not take any load off the backs of the taxpayers of the country; it does not make any difference to them whether it is spent through the Army, the Navy, or the Interior Department; so far as that is concerned, it might have been less in the Interior Department's bill.

I am not again urging that this bill be sent back to conference because I went over there once and had the Senators laugh at me; I do not want to go over again and have them laugh at me on the same subjects a second time. I feel that we can make far greater savings by voting out of the bill the amendments in disagreement than we can by having a further conference and again surrendering to the Senate conferees.

Listen to these very prophetic words I read from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, words spoken in this House the other day by the Chairman of the great Appropriations Committee of this House, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I read:

> Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we are engaged in total war. And we are losing the war. In the last week the enemy has broken through the Russian front and have taken some of the strongest positions. In Africa they have driven back the Allied forces and are striking at vital objectives. They have taken Sumatra, Burma, the Indies, and the Philippines, and are sweeping the gallant Chinese back in critical retreats. They have occupied, and are holding, territory in continental America. We are fighting on our own doorstep and their U-boats are patrolling Atlantic waters at the gates to our coastal cities. And yet at this time of gravest national peril, when we are straining every national resource to meet the enemy, we are confronted with this amendment to use money we have not got for such a purpose as this.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I propose to show this afternoon when these amendments in disagreement are taken up that the appropriations therein contained are not necessary at this time, that this money could be used for better purposes, that it might be used for the building of planes, and tanks, and other

war paraphernalia; and I hope we shall be successful in cutting out of this bill this afternoon more than $5,000,000 even though our efforts with the Senate conferees resulted in our cutting out only a little more than $1,000,000 while we were in conference with them.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Did the conferees finally agree to abandon the investigation of the food habits of birds?

Mr. CARTER. I want to congratulate the gentleman from North Carolina; he has won a signal victory. The bird amendment is entirely out of the bill.

Mr. COOLEY. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. CARTER. This means a saving of $50,000 which can now be applied to the war effort, and I do sincerely appreciate the splendid work the gentleman did. I hope he will help us cut this bill still further.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES], a member of the committee.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am as much against this conference report today as I was the other day; I am against it because there are still many items that might be cut from the bill.

When we went into conference complaint was made that I had quoted on the floor a statement to the effect that the Senate had inserted $7,472,225 of items in 33 amendments in the bill above the Budget estimate. You will remember that at the time of my statement we were discussing the justification for the increases in the Senate version of the bill. It was said by the majority Members on the floor that Senate increases were accounted for in great part by over $9,000,000 of supplemental Budget estimates that arrived at the Senate after House consideration of the bill. Since the first conference I have analyzed the changes in 33 amendments to the House bill by the first and second conferences. These 33 amendments were $7,472,225 in the Senate bill, and $6,597,695 above the Budget estimate in the first conference. The second conference cut out $435,000 from these same 33 amendments, leaving $6,112,695 above the Budget estimate in this second conference.

Mr. Speaker, it is a crime and a shame for us to allow the deficit to be raised $6,112,000 with the small debate that was engaged in over in the Senate without any semblance of a Budget estimate, and permit it to be approved by adoption of this second conference report.

I will now insert a table which will show by analysis of each of the 33 amendments which I have been discussing, how they have been changed from the Senate version of the bill to the first conference version, and to the second conference which we are presently considering.

The table is as follows:

Senate amendments to Interior bill, 1943, which are not covered by Budget estimates

Amendment No.	Appropriation title	Amount	First conference above Budget	Second conference above Budget
	OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY			
10	Fire protection of forests, forest industries, and strategic facilities	$96,000	$96,000	$96,000
	BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS			
29	Acquisition of land for Indians	160,000	160,000	160,000
62	Protection of project works	58,000	57,300	57,300
	Construction, repair, and rehabilitation of irrigation systems:			
63	Montana: Fort Peck project	40,000	40,000	40,000
64	Oregon: Warm Springs project	15,000	15,000	15,000
65	Wyoming: Wind River project	50,000	50,000	50,000
68	Indian-school support	135,750	91,500	91,500
	Minnesota contract	$40,000		
	Mission schools	88,850		
	Terrebonne School, Louisiana	6,900		
87, 88	Conservation of health	13,475	13,475	13,475
90	Fort Yuma Hospital	+$23,475		
89	Colorado River Hospital	−10,000		
	Net increase	13,475		
110	Roads, Indian reservations—Mavarick Springs Rd	105,000	105,000	105,000
113, 115	Construction, etc., buildings and utilities—Walker River Hospital	25,000	----------	----------
	Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs	602,225	532,275	532,275
	BUREAU OF RECLAMATION			
	Reclamation fund, construction:			
133	Sun River project, Montana	100,000	50,000	50,000
134	Deschutes project, Oregon	200,000	100,000	100,000
138	Riverton project, Wyoming	750,000	750,000	650,000
145	Colorado River development fund	300,000	201,645	201,645
151	Colorado River Dam fund—All-American Canal	250,000	----------	----------
	General fund, construction:			
154	Gila project	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000
159	Tucumcari project, New Mexico	500,000	450,000	450,000
160	Luzert-Altus project, Oklahoma	300,000	300,000	300,000
167	Yakima project, Washington, Roza Division	600,000	500,000	400,000
170	Administrative expenses	100,000	27,325	27,325
	Total, Bureau of Reclamation	4,100,000	3,378,970	3,178,970
	BUREAU OF MINES			
191	Testing fuel:			
	Synthesis of motor fuel	43,000	53,000	53,000
	Semibituminous and lignite coals investigations, Golden, Colo	30,000		
199	Construction and equipment of a Northwest electrodevelopment laboratory	500,000	500,000	500,000
206	Production of alumina from low-grade bauxite, aluminum clays, and alunite (for pilot plants)	650,000	650,000	650,000
211	Investigation of deposits of critical and essential minerals in the United States and its possessions	1,000,000	1,000,000	900,000
	Total, Bureau of Mines	2,223,000	2,203,000	2,103,000
	NATIONAL PARK SERVICE			
254	Travel Bureau	30,000	----------	----------
	FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE			
260	Inquiry respecting food fishes	14,000	14,000	14,000
262	Fishery industries	172,000	172,000	172,000
270	Control of predatory animals and injurious rodents	235,000	151,450	16,450
	Total, Fish and Wildlife Service	421,000	337,450	202,450
	Grand total	7,472,225	6,597,695	6,112,695

I am against this conference report because the second conference did not respond to the will of the House.

In my argument against the first conference report on this bill I said that the Information Service of the Department of the Interior cost the Government $2,430,777. This is used up by 115 full-time employees, and 1,918 part-time employees with salaries totaling $1,765,471. Other obligations amount to $665,306, making the total I have just quoted you of $2,430,777.

Since the cuts in this bill under 1942 bills are largely nonrecurring construction items, from my analysis of it, I think the above figures from the 1941 fiscal year are a comparable statement of the condition today in the Interior Department.

The conferees in the upper House had the impression that $100,000 for the Office of Information in the Secretary's Office was all of the information costs of the Department of the Interior. They, therefore, thought they did a good job on this bill when they agreed in conference to restore $50,000 for the Office of Information of the $100,000 eliminated by the House.

I am, therefore, placing in the RECORD the tables furnished me by the Interior Department, after 1 year's efforts to get the truth about their Information Service.

So that the House may have authentic proof of what the cost of their Information Service is, I insert the following tables:

Department of the Interior—Estimated expenditures for education, information, promotion, publicity, fiscal year 1941

1. PUBLICATIONS

Function	Departmental				Field				Total			
	Personal services		Other, amount	Total, amount	Personal services		Other, amount	Total, amount	Personal services		Other, amount	Total, amount
	Man-years	Amount			Man-years	Amount			Man-years	Amount		
Division of Information	5.7	$14,306	$9,679	$23,985					5.7	$14,306	$9,679	$23,985
Consumers' Counsel Division	.6	2,164	680	2,844					.6	2,164	680	2,844
Division of Territories			1,640	1,640							1,640	1,640
Grazing Service	.4	940	900	1,840	0.5	$1,900	$10	$1,910	.9	2,840	910	3,750
General Land Office	.33	1,167	30	1,197					.33	1,167	30	1,197
Bureau of Reclamation	4.75	11,771	73,104	84,875	2.5	4,723	40,600	45,323	7.25	16,494	113,704	130,198
Geological Survey	157	408,000	195,000	603,000	55	119,000	$3,000	122,000	212	527,000	198,000	725,000
Bureau of Mines	31.8	83,405	75,600	159,005	39.75	99,565	23,460	123,025	71.55	182,970	99,060	282,030
National Park Service	14.425	19,080	75,117	94,197	24.696	36,221	4,449	40,670	39.121	55,301	79,566	134,867
Fish and Wildlife Service	11.2	24,705	30,146	54,851	12.65	35,760	3,710	39,470	23.85	60,465	33,856	94,321
The Alaska Railroad					.10	600	4,790	5,390	.10	600	4,790	5,390
Puerto Rico Reconstruction Administration	.025	160	22	182					.025	160	22	182
Miscellaneous Service Division	3	4,050		4,050					3	4,050		4,050
Bonneville Power Administration					4.666	11,600	8,553	20,153	4.666	11,600	8,553	20,153
Bituminous Coal Division	.082	262	9	271					.082	262	9	271
A. Estimated total expenditures	229.312	570,010	461,927	1,031,937	139.862	309,369	88,572	397,941	369.174	879,379	550,499	1,429,878

2. PRESS SERVICE

Division of Information	6.7	$17,412	$800	$18,212					6.7	$17,412	$800	$18,212
Consumers' Counsel Division	.1	150	50	200					.1	150	50	200
Grazing Service	.1	290		290					.1	290		290
Office of Land Utilization	.75	2,100	325	2,425					.75	2,100	325	2,425
Commission of Fine Arts	.006	20	60	80					.006	20	60	80
General Land Office	.01	26	28	54	9.22	$500	$50	$550	.23	526	78	604
Bureau of Indian Affairs	.2	1,896		1,896					.2	1,896		1,896
Bureau of Reclamation	.8	2,176	400	2,576	1.95	4,374		4,374	2.75	6,550	400	6,950
Geological Survey	.2	785	15	800					.2	785	15	800
Bureau of Mines	.55	1,690		1,690					.55	1,690		1,690
National Park Service	3.159	6,975	75	7,050	2.0	2,040		2,040	5.159	9,015	75	9,090
Antarctic Service					.6	1,740		1,740	.6	1,740		1,740
Bituminous Coal Division	.583	2,119	276	2,395					.583	2,119	276	2,395
Bonneville Power Administration					.75	2,417	2,040	4,457	.75	2,417	2,040	4,457
Fish and Wildlife Service	2.5	5,993	57	6,050	.1	315	2	317	2.6	6,308	59	6,367
Miscellaneous Service Division	9	11,880		11,880					9	11,880		11,880
A. Estimated total expenditures	24.658	53,512	2,086	55,598	5.62	11,386	2,092	13,478	30.278	64,898	4,178	69,076

3. RADIO BROADCASTING

Division of Information	3.9	$13,512	$3,600	$17,112					3.9	$13,512	$3,600	$17,112
Consumers' Counsel Division	.1	258		258					.1	258		258
Office of Land Utilization	.25	400	50	450					.25	400	50	450
Bureau of Reclamation	.3	679		679	0.3	$685	$200	$885	.6	1,364	200	1,564
National Park Service	.083	224	50	274	.017	38	10	48	.1	262	60	322
Fish and Wildlife Service	2.3	6,158	12	6,170	1.2	3,118	7	3,125	3.5	9,276	19	9,295
Bonneville Power Administration					1	2,910		2,910	1	2,910		2,910
Miscellaneous Service Division	.5	630		630					.5	630		630
A. Estimated total expenditures	7.433	21,861	3,712	25,573	2.517	6,751	217	6,968	9.95	28,612	2,929	32,541

4. GROUP CONTACTS

Consumers' Counsel Division	0.1	$108	$125	$233					0.1	$108	$125	$233
Office of Land Utilization	.125	325	50	375					.125	325	50	375
General Land Office	.04	180	125	305	3.1	$6,500	$1,100	$7,600	3.14	6,680	1,225	7,905
Bureau of Indian Affairs	.1	500	300	800	.5	2,000	100	2,100	.6	2,500	400	2,900
Bureau of Reclamation	.35	1,945	500	2,445	16.5	31,100	600	31,700	16.85	33,045	1,100	34,145
Geological Survey	1.5	6,400	2,000	8,400	.7	2,700	1,000	3,700	2.2	9,100	3,000	12,100
Bureau of Mines	.69	3,904	647	4,551	1.32	6,014	1,448	7,462	2.01	9,918	2,095	12,013
National Park Service	.874	3,403	150	3,553	.912	1,994	1,962	3,956	1,786	5,397	2,112	7,509
Fish and Wildlife Service	.9	3,440	3,065	6,514	1.1	3,223	2,219	5,442	2.0	6,672	5,284	11,956
The Alaska Railroad					.15	900		900	.15	900		900
Bonneville Power Administration					3.75	15,498	8,317	23,815	3.75	15,498	8,317	23,815
A. Estimated total expenditures	4.679	20,214	6,962	27,176	28.032	69,929	16,746	86,675	32.711	90,143	23,708	113,851

Department of the Interior—Estimated expenditures for education, information, promotion, publicity, fiscal year 1941—Continued

5. PAID ADVERTISEMENTS

Function	Departmental				Field				Total			
	Personal services		Other, amount	Total, amount	Personal services		Other, amount	Total, amount	Personal services		Other, amount	Total, amount
	Man-years	Amount			Man-years	Amount			Man-years	Amount		
Bonneville Power Administration					0.083	$261	$250	$511	0.083	$261	$250	$511
The Alaska Railroad							3,859	3,859			3,859	3,859
A. Estimated total expenditures												4,370

6. EXHIBITS

Grazing Service	0.1	$290	$100	$390			$900	$900	0.1	$290	$1,000	$1,290
Office of Land Utilization	.125	325	200	525					.125	325	200	525
Commission of Fine Arts	.014	50	25	75					.014	50	25	75
General Land Office					0.12	$200	100	300	.12	200	100	300
Bureau of Reclamation	.95	2,438	200	2,638	1.2	2,360	1,000	3,360	2.15	4,798	1,200	5,998
Bureau of Mines	.1	600		600	1.0	2,400	1,000	3,400	1.1	3,000	1,000	4,000
National Park Service	1.166	5,095	100	5,195	11.28	25,675	11,400	37,075	12.446	30,770	11,500	42,270
Fish and Wildlife Service	2.01	5,042	1,300	6,342	.03	70	170	240	2.04	5,112	1,470	6,582
Bonneville Power Administration					.666	1,520	1,550	3,070	.666	1,520	1,550	3,070
Bureau of Indian Affairs	1.6	6,500	4,350	10,850	1.5	3,680	3,000	6,680	3.1	10,180	7,350	17,530
A. Estimated total expenditures	6.065	20,340	6,275	26,615	15.796	35,905	19,120	55,025	21.861	56,245	25,395	81,640

7. MOTION PICTURES

Division of Information	3	$7,212		$7,212					3	$7,212		$7,212
Consumers' Counsel Division	.1	596	$210	806					.1	596	$210	806
Office of Land Utilization	.125	300		300					.125	300		300
Bonneville Power Administration					1.666	$6,724	$18,949	$25,673	1.666	6,724	18,949	25,673
General Land Office					.09	150	50	200	.09	150	50	200
Bureau of Reclamation	1	2,852		2,852	.2	495		495	1.2	3,347		3,347
Bureau of Mines	1.1	5,400		5,400	11.35	18,625	145	18,770	12.45	24,025	145	24,170
National Park Service	.104	316	61	377	.083	1,300	300	1,600	.187	1,616	361	1,977
Antarctic Service					.3	870	300	1,170	.3	870	300	1,170
Fish and Wildlife Service	.03	105	87	192			1,600	1,600	.03	105	1,687	1,792
The Alaska Railroad							150	150			150	150
A. Estimated total expenditures	5.459	16,781	358	17,139	13.689	28,164	21,404	49,658	19.148	44,945	21,852	66,797

8. LANTERN SLIDES AND LECTURE MATERIALS

Office of Land Utilization	0.333	$500	$100	$600					0.333	$500	$100	$600
Commission of Fine Arts	.008	30	50	80					.008	30	50	80
General Land Office					0.04	$50	$50	$100	.04	50	50	100
Bureau of Reclamation	.9	1,987	500	2,487	.75	1,586		1,586	1.65	3,573	500	4,073
Bureau of Mines					1.05	3,150	75	3,225	1.05	3,150	75	3,225
National Park Service	.489	1,444	485	1,929	4.117	8,843	1,279	10,122	4.606	10,287	1,764	12,051
The Alaska R. R.							20	20			20	20
Bonneville Power Administration					.333	920	1,300	2,220	.333	920	1,300	2,220
A. Estimated tota. expenditures	1.73	3,961	1,135	5,096	6.29	14,549	2,724	17,273	8.02	18,510	3,859	22,369

9. PHOTOGRAPHY

Division of Information	6	$14,933		$14,933					6	$14,933		$14,933
Grazing Service			$560	560							$560	560
Office of Land Utilization	.5	950	500	1,450					.5	950	500	1,450
Commission of Fine Arts	.019	70	100	170					.019	70	100	170
General Land Office					0.16	$200	$200	$400	.16	200	200	400
Bureau of Reclamation	1.7	3,342		3,342	1.85	3,605	150	3,755	3.55	6,947	150	7,097
Bureau of Mines					.4	940	145	1,085	.40	940	145	1,085
National Park Service	.201	853	75	928	.740	1,589	1,499	3,088	1,031	2,442	1,574	4,016
Fish and Wildlife Service	1.9	3,726	200	3,926					1.9	3,726	200	3,926
Antarctic Service					.1	290	700	990	.1	290	700	990
The Alaska Railroad							100	100			100	100
Bonneville Power Administration					1.166	2,590	2,200	4,790	1.166	2,590	2,200	4,790
A. Estimated total expenditures	10.41	23,874	1,435	25,309	4.416	9,214	4,994	14,208	14.826	33,088	6,429	39,517

10. CORRESPONDENCE

Division of Information	2	$3,492		$3,492					2	$3,492		$3,492
Consumers' Counsel Division	1.1	2,247		2,247					1.1	2,247		2,247
Division of Territories	2	3,720		3,720					2	3,720		3,720
Office of Land Utilization	.25	400		400					.25	400		400
General Land Office	.09	234	$15	249	0.43	$1,000	$50	$1,050	.52	1,234	$65	1,299
Bureau of Reclamation	3.9	7,770		7,770	3.9	8,687		8,687	7.8	16,457		16,457
Geological Survey	23	74,140	800	74,640	3.7	9,160	100	9,260	26.7	83,300	900	83,900
Bureau of Mines	13.8	37,758	400	38,158	11.85	38,355	400	38,755	25.65	76,113	800	76,913
National Park Service	4.151	9,623	88	9,711	5.801	7,643	175	7,818	9.952	17,266	263	17,529
Fish and Wildlife Service	.5	1,340	10	1,350					.5	1,340	10	1,350
Bituminous Coal Division	.08	256		256					.08	256		256
Bonneville Power Administration					3.75	8,750	400	9,150	3.75	8,750	400	9,150
A. Estimated total expenditures	50.871	140,980	1,013	141,993	20.431	73,595	1,125	74,720	80.302	214,575	2,138	216,713

Department of the Interior—Estimated expenditures for education, information, promotion, publicity, fiscal year 1941—Continued

11. INDIVIDUAL CONTACTS

Function	Departmental				Field				Total			
	Personal services		Other, amount	Total, amount	Personal services		Other, amount	Total, amount	Personal services		Other, amount	Total, amount
	Man-years	Amount			Man-years	Amount			Man-years	Amount		
Division of Information	0.6	$1,768		$1,768					0.6	$1,768		$1,768
Office of Land Utilization	.333	400	$100	500					.333	400	$100	500
Bureau of Reclamation	.45	1,643		1,643	1.8	$3,356		$3,356	2.25	4,999		4,999
Geological Survey	3.5	13,700		13,700	3.2	12,300		12,300	6.7	26,000		26,000
Bureau of Mines	3.3	16,075		16,075	6.1	27,523		28,523	9.4	43,598		43,598
National Park Service	.279	946	100	1,046	108.918	218,233	$3,650	221,883	109.197	219,179	3,750	222,929
Bituminous Coal Division	.218	1,003		1,003					.218	1,003		1,003
Bonneville Power Administration					.333	1,656	984	2,640	.333	1,656	984	2,640
A. Estimated total expenditures	8.68	35,535	200	35,735	120.351	263,068	4,634	267,702	129.031	298,603	4,834	303,437

12. EDUCATIONAL COOPERATION WITH SCHOOLS, ETC.

Division of Information	1.6	$5,508		$5,508					1.6	$5,508		$5,508
Consumers' Counsel Division	.6	1,960	$700	2,660					.6	1,960	$700	2,660
Office of Land Utilization	.125	300	100	400					.125	300	100	400
Commission of Fine Arts	.008	30	50	80					.008	30	50	80
General Land Office					0.92	$2,000	$250	$2,250	.92	2,000	250	2,250
Bureau of Reclamation	.20	678		678	.5	459		459	.7	1,137		1,137
Bureau of Mines	1	2,800		2,800					1	2,800		2,800
National Park Service	.462	1,463		1,463	.995	3,055	439	3,494	1.457	4,518	439	4,957
Bonneville Power Administration					.583	1,420	500	1,920	.583	1,420	500	1,920
A. Estimated total expenditures	3.995	12,739	850	13,589	2.998	6,934	1,189	8,123	6.993	19,673	2,039	21,712

13. POSTERS

Consumers' Counsel Division	0.2	$720	$450	$1,170					0.2	$720	$450	$1,170
Bonneville Power Administration					0.666	$1,432	$762	$2,194	.666	1,432	762	2,194
General Land Office					.12	200	100	300	.12	200	100	300
Fish and Wildlife Service	.02	55	700	755					.02	55	700	755
A. Estimated total expenditures	.22	775	1,150	1,925	.786	1,632	862	2,494	1.006	2,407	2,012	4,419

14. MISCELLANEOUS AND OTHER

Division of Information	2.5	$4,707		$4,707					2.5	$4,707		$4,707
Office of Land Utilization	.084	230	$50	280					.084	230	$50	280
Commission of Fine Arts	.003	10	25	35					.003	10	25	35
General Land Office	1	3,300	10,000	13,300	0.33	$700	$100	$800	1.33	4,000	10,100	14,100
Bureau of Reclamation	1.15	2,593	100	2,693					1.15	2,593	100	2,693
Bureau of Mines	.1	204		204					.1	204		204
National Park Service	.077	338	50	388					.077	338	50	388
Bituminous Coal Division	.75	2,050		2,050					.75	2,050		2,050
A. Estimated total expenditures	5.664	13,432	10,225	23,657	.33	700	100	800	5.994	14,132	10,325	24,457

The Committee of the House had bravery and I think showed good judgment in cutting out $4,000,000 for helium plant expansion. This is not in fact and will not be a saving. Certainly we will spend the millions of dollars necessary to fill all the lighter-than-air craft with helium requested by the Navy to sink the submarines off our coast. There is no question about that. The $4,000,000, with the hair pulled off the issue, is merely a bookkeeping item—a saving until the Navy asks for more helium production.

Let us look at some of the other items. It is said that we must have an investigation of the deposits of strategic and essential materials in the United States by the Bureau of Mines to the extent of $900,000, as provided in this second conference report. Why? Because the Army does not know what it wants. Bless your souls, if the Army, the Navy, the Marine Corps, and the Coast Guard do not know what it takes to win this war we are in a pretty bad way. To adopt the idea that we, the Senators and the Members of the House of Representatives, know more about what should be the appropriation for strategic and critical materials than the Army, Navy, or Marine Corps is the same as saying that the alumni sitting in the bleachers of a football game know more about how the football game ought to be played. We must of necessity rely upon the advice of the Army and Navy in what we shall appropriate. Certainly we did it in connection with the helium plant. This conference committee says, in effect: "We will not build these helium plants until the Navy orders them."

We should turn down this conference report because there are $6,112,000 of such items in the bill, some of them not even claimed to be so connected with the war effort. They should be turned down in this conference report. It is said that we will not be successful in turning down this conference report because a great many Members are interested in certain appropriations in this bill and that there may be some feeling that those Members who are interested in appropriations in this bill will be misunderstood by their constituents if they vote against this second conference report; but if this conference committee has had the courage to face facts and to cut out $4,000,000 in the conference report that is vitally needed for the filling of lighter-than-air craft, the other Members should have the courage to vote it down. We have confidence that if the Army and Navy want these things they will ask for them. Why should we not wait until the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps ask for this $6,112,000 that is above the Budget estimate before we appropriate this money?

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the conference report be turned down.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes back here with cuts in the conference report below what it was before of about $1,000,000; that is all. I hope the House will not agree to it.

When this bill was before the House on March 24 the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] made the following statement:

I may say to the gentlemen that, in my opinion, there are many items in this bill that are cut severely, but again I must say that it was done deliberately, not as a slap or criticism of this or that agency. I believe the time has come when the Congress must cut and cut to the bone and then cut again, especially in all nondefense items.

That makes my speech. I do not believe that this conference report represents anything like the reductions that we ought to see with the differences involved between the House and Senate of $24,000,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker and Members, you have before you now acceptance or disagreement of the conference report of this subcommittee. I took the position the other day when the same presentation was made to the House that it should be returned for further conference. I think the results that have been indicated from that conference more than justify the attitude of the House.

I want to pay my compliments to the chairman of the subcommittee for the fine, splendid manner in which he has handled a very difficult situation. His party members on the committee have been divided, and I have been a controversial member; so I say to you, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] that you have rendered both your State and Nation a very splendid service and for that I compliment you.

I am in disagreement with my chairman on one issue that still remains in this bill and which will be presented to the House. The House will then have the opportunity to either vote it up or down. I am sure that the House is going to be consistent in its policy this afternoon, as it was in its directive ability the other afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY], the distinguished judge. This may be his last speech before this House. He is a gentleman who has served diligently and well and he has the love and affection of every Member of the House.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, naturally I appreciate the applause, even though it comes out of my time. However, I am just a little fearful that it may have been due to the fact that the announcement was made that this might be my last speech. I am going to be here still for a day or two, and will probably make another speech today.

I want to briefly refer to this conference report. Probably the House did a good thing the other day in somewhat chastizing its own conferees and in sending the report back for further conference. I say "probably" because there are some features of what we did in this second conference with which I am not in full accord.

Apparently many Members voted the other day on the adoption or rejection of the conference report based purely upon a percentage basis. This bill had 297 Senate amendments as it came out of the Senate, and when it went into conference 151 of them, about 52 percent, involved travel pay. On these 151 amendments the House receded and then agreed to an amendment that modified the formula by which travel pay would be applied, which, in my judgment, greatly improved the bill over what it was when it left the House. However, the House seemed persuaded here the other day that the dignity of this body as compared with that of the other body had been offended, so the Senate conferees graciously receded at once from 151 amendments. On a percentage basis of receding we have the other body badly licked. If we are going to decide it on that basis, certainly we should adopt this report; but upon a sounder and a more serious basis we are confronted with this situation, and I wish all the Members would get this clear. Tomorrow night, at midnight, all appropriations for the Interior Department cease unless we act upon this appropriation legislation. There is in the conference report now practically nothing in serious controversy. The gentleman from California himself, who is leading the fight on the only controversial issue that we have here, advises his colleagues to adopt this conference report. Anything short of its adoption would be folly. It would be tragic to deny to a great department, many of whose activities are now directly engaged in war work, any appropriation at midnight on June 30.

There is in this Interior Department appropriation bill an item upon which there is a sharp division of opinion. However, it comes back here in disagreement. It cannot receive the attention of this body until we have adopted the conference report. When we adopt this report, then we will come to the famous Central Valley item and will have an opportunity to express ourselves upon it. The other 12 items in disagreement are minor in their nature.

I hope that even without a roll call the conference report will be adopted. Let me say to my friends from the western half of the United States, whether you be Democrats or Republicans, that the failure to adopt this conference report means the failure to permit a single reclamation project to proceed after midnight tomorrow night. I trust that the report will be adopted.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LEAVY. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. In the gentleman's closing speech on this conference report, I wish to compliment him for what he has done for the Interior Department.

We are told this may be the last speech the gentleman from Washington may make on the adoption of this vitally important conference report. The gentleman and I came to Congress at the same time in January 1937. I have watched his fruitful efforts and achievements with deep solicitude, not unmixed with envy. I have been thankful that our vast undeveloped West had such a champion.

Uncle Sam is a great husbandman, and my colleague from Washington has been his effective and faithful servant in administering this magnificent estate.

The gentleman has a fine legal mind, able to cope with intricacies of the western water law. By untiring energies the gentleman has familiarized himself with engineering problems and economic possibilities of reclamation throughout the West. I congratulate the West in particular and the whole Nation on the gentleman's statesmanship.

Mr. LEAVY. I profoundly appreciate the kindly remarks of my able and distinguished colleague. Let me assure him that he is and has been one of the outstanding leaders of this great body, and Arizona may well be proud of the constructive record he has made. The people of Arizona are indeed fortunate to have a spokesman of the great ability possessed by the gentleman.

By all means, this conference report should be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. JONES) there were—ayes 83, noes 52.

So the conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 109: On page 62, beginning in line 14, insert the following: "That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay to the enrolled members of the Seminole Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma entitled under existing law to share in the funds of said tribe, or to their lawful heirs, out of any money belonging to said tribe in the United States Treasury or deposited in any bank or held by an official under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior, not to exceed $50 per capita: *Provided*, That said payment shall be made under such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe: *Provided further*, That in cases where such enrolled members or their heirs are Indians who belong to the restricted class the Secretary of the Interior may, in his discretion, withhold such payments and use same for the benefit of such restricted Indians: *Provided further*, That the money paid to the enrolled members or their heirs as provided herein shall be exempt from any lien for attorneys' fees or other debt contracted prior to the passage of this act: *And provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to use not to exceed $1,500 out of said Seminole tribal funds for the payment of salaries of necessary employees and other expenses for the distribution of said per capita payments."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment, and I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee is recommending that the House recede and concur in this amendment. Let me tell you what the Department has to say about this amendment, and then see whether or not you

want to concur in the amendment. I quote:

It is recommended that this amendment be rejected.

That comes from the Department of the Interior, the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Why do they recommend that this amendment be rejected? I wish you could read this whole statement, as I will not have time to do it because I have only 5 minutes, but the Department wants this amendment rejected. This is one reason:

For many years this Department has opposed the dissipation of tribal assets through per capita payments. Especially if the payments are small, they almost invariably result in no lasting benefits to the recipients.

The Bureau of Indian Affairs recognizes that to pass $50 apiece out to these Indians in Oklahoma is just wasting tribal funds. Remember that when you use up these tribal funds you have to come here and ask the people of this country to continue to carry on the affairs of these Indians.

There is one other reason for rejecting this amendment—another reason—and I quote:

This school fund was set apart as a permanent fund by agreement with the tribe and should not be used for making a per capita payment.

They want to take money that was set aside for their schools and use it to give each Indian $50 for a real joy ride. I do not know how they are going to take that joy ride now, because they are not going to get the automobiles and the gasoline they thought they would.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Montana for a question.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that this tribal money belongs to the Indians. It is their money, but it is held here in Washington by the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Mr. RICH. While this money belongs to the Indian tribes, yet the Government is the custodian of it for the Indians. A lot of these Indians are rich, and to give them $50 apiece now out of their school funds seems foolish. It is bad practice. It is wasteful.

I quote further from this letter from the Secretary of the Interior recommending the rejection of this amendment:

In addition to these objections to a per capita payment, I believe that only absolutely necessary and completely justifiable withdrawals of Indian funds from the Treasury of the United States should be made during the war. I do not mean that no per capita payments should be made during the war, but I do urge that they should be made only out of income and then only after a showing of the most pressing need.

That is a sensible attitude for the Bureau of Indian Affairs to take. They object to this payment, and I hope the House votes down the motion to recede and concur in the amendment. Since we have the Bureau of Indian Affairs, why not have a little bit of faith in them? If this is not sound advice to the Members of Congress at this time, then I do not know anything about good, sound, sensible business. They are the custodians of these Indians, and they are looking after them. They know that the money will only be dissipated in many instances, and should not be passed out promiscuously. Do your duty. Save this money.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a couple of questions?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I would like to ask a few questions about these per capita payments. I was not able to find anything in the House or Senate hearings on it. Were any hearings held on the proposal to make these per capita payments during the deliberations of the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me say to the gentleman that there were no hearings at this particular time, but the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. BOREN] introduced a bill. I believe possibly such a bill passed the House a time or two and I will therefore ask the gentleman to answer the inquiry.

Mr. BOREN. It has long been a custom to make per capita payments to the Indians out of their own money. This is their own money and it is held in escrow by the Government just like such money is held in a bank. Except they cannot draw the money out without the consent of the Government. Many times we have passed such bills for various tribes in the past. Twice such bills were passed for the Seminoles and twice the Indian Affairs Committee unanimously approved such a measure and twice the bill passed the House.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. How much money does the Seminole Tribe have in its tribal fund?

Mr. BOREN. I do not know exactly, but more than $200,000.

Someone has referred to this as a school fund, but that is a mistake. This is their total tribal fund. It is true that the bureaucrats do not ever want to turn loose any of this money. As long as they keep it down here there are that many more fellows to look after it and draw salaries.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I received the impression somewhere that this would take more than half of the tribal funds that they have. Is that correct?

Mr. BOREN. The only way I can answer that is to say that I introduced a bill for $50 per capita payment 2 years ago, and on a per capita basis it required $59,000, and they have over $200,000, so there is bound to be a surplus.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. How long has this money been accumulating and what is it from?

Mr. BOREN. It is from some oil resources on their tribal lands. They have a few oil wells on their tribal lands that they get some income from. Of course, I do not want to leave the impression that the tribe is rich because the Seminoles do not hold their land in severalty. They have had land allotments but some are extremely poor. There are a few individuals who are among the richest people in America.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. What is the money being used for at the present time?

Mr. BOREN. For almost every purpose that tribal funds are used. They pay for special meetings and services or they can use it for any purpose that the tribe authorizes and the Secretary of the Interior is willing to approve. The tribe held a tribal meeting and asked for this payment. As I say, in the 6 years I have been in Congress we have passed such a bill twice.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is the gentleman of the opinion that a per capita payment of $50 to each Indian will be more beneficial to the Indians than would be the use of this money to be spent for a tribal purpose?

Mr. BOREN. I would not want to see this money spent if it were specifically coming out of their educational fund, but I believe that is not true. I am of the opinion that this is vitally important to them because $50 per capita in the case of an average family of five or six, means $250 or $300. They need it for feed, seed, and tools and things of that sort. These Indians are farmers, but a lot of them are extremely poor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman think they need it more than these folks up here in Washington who are taking care of it for them?

Mr. BOREN. Yes; I certainly do.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman made the statement that this was not coming out of the school funds. Let me quote what the Department said on that. I made that statement myself and I want to substantiate it by a quotation from the Bureau of Indian Affairs:

There are insufficient funds to make this payment unless the Seminole school funds are used.

This statement was made by the Bureau.

Mr. BOREN. I was not questioning the good faith of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but we know that bureaucrats here always try to keep every penny they can control and this is something that does not belong to them. Personally I have always doubted the wisdom of letting them hold these funds and keep these Indians under their thumb. These Indians are intelligent people. They are able to conduct their own affairs. One of the outstanding doctors in my home town is a Seminole Indian. There are lawyers and doctors and ministers and businessmen among them, and yet we have some little clerk in the Department here who tries to tell them whether or not they can spend their own money. Every cent of it has to be passed on by some clerk, and if that money was out of their hands they would not have any job any more. Of course, they may decide to take it out of the school funds, but despite whatever motive they may have, there is still money enough to afford this without touching the school fund.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic side of the House is responsible for the Department down here. It is

their Department, and if they have no more faith in the Department than they state they have, then I think they had better get a new department.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH)—there were ayes 74, noes 35.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 111: Page 64, line 6, insert:

"The State of Minnesota is hereby authorized to acquire by condemnation under judicial process, for use for highway purposes in connection with State Trunk Highway No. 61, also designated as United States Highway No. 61, any lands or interests in lands within the Grand Portage Indian Reservation in Cook County, Minn. The United States District Court for the District of Minnesota shall have jurisdiction of proceedings for such condemnation. The practice, pleadings, forms, and modes of proceedings in proceedings for such condemnation shall conform, as near as may be, to the practice, pleadings, forms, and proceedings in like cases in the courts of record in the State of Minnesota."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me a few minutes on this motion?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, the Department says that they recommend that this amendment be rejected. The Department also states that there are bills before the House of Representatives and the Senate, whereby there can be discussion of the real merits of this proposition. I am not here to say whether the motion ought to be agreed to or not, but I think the matter ought to be discussed in the House in a proper way, and that we should not permit conferees to make legislation that is not in accordance with sound legislation. I think this amendment should be rejected.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have no particular interest in the dispute involved in this matter. I understand that the State of Minnesota has one road through this reservation, and would like to build another one to save some 6 miles of distance, for tourist travel between those two great grain-shipping points, Duluth and Port Arthur. The Bureau of Indian Affairs tells me that they feel that they are entitled to a hearing, and that a bill was introduced in the Senate on October 16, 1941, S. 1984. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] says that a similar bill has been introduced in the House. I would not undertake to speak on the merits of the proposition. I do think that the request for a hearing is not unreasonable, and I also think that the practice so frequently indulged in by the other body of putting legislative riders on appropriation bills is not desirable. I am told that the State of Minnesota could not build this road until after the war is over in any event. No one would be injured, it seems to me, by giving the Bureau an opportunity for a hearing. I hope the House will vote down the motion to recede and concur.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER], in whose district this project is located.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I hope the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON] prevails. It ought to prevail. I was very much interested in the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], in which he stated that the Interior Department ought to have a hearing. Let me tell you what happened. Last September a subcommittee of the Senate conducted hearings at Duluth, Minn., and the opponents and the proponents of this relocation of this highway were heard. The testimony was taken down and it was typewritten. Senator SHIPSTEAD introduced a bill in the Senate. A copy of that bill and a copy of that testimony went to Secretary Ickes and he never reported on it.

There are 4 miles of road over some scattered Indian tracts of land involved. The State of Minnesota has acquired highway rights over all of this other land, and for some 4 or 5 years the Secretary of the Interior has been opposed to this relocation of the highway. It does not cost the Federal Government a single dollar. All this amendment does is to authorize the State of Minnesota to start condemnation proceedings and pay the value of this land that is taken for highway purposes. The Highway Department of Minnesota wants this amendment and the Governor of the State of Minnesota wants it. The attorney general of the State of Minnesota wants this amendment. This amendment is necessary if we are to keep faith between the State of Minnesota and the Province of Ontario, because this highway is continued over into Ontario by the Government, in accordance with a gentleman's agreement between the Highway Department of Minnesota and the Highway Department of Ontario.

I would say there is very little opposition to this amendment. Now, what has happened? Mr. Ickes ignored the request of the Senate committee for a report. The practice over there, of course, is not to conduct hearings on a bill until they get a department report. They did not get a department report. A former very able Member of this House who is now working for Mr. Ickes has been lobbying continuously ever since this conference report has been here, and apparently he is trying to accomplish some very effective results. Do not be misled by this suggestion that we are overriding the Department. That is the prerogative of Congress. I think it is for Congress to tell the Department what it wants after the facts are explained, rather than to have the Department run Congress.

So I hope the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma will prevail. The people of Minnesota want it. It is in my district. I am not inviting anybody else to come into my district and tell the people up there what they want and what they need. So I ask you to support the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER] 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to rise in support of this motion. This right-of-way is located in the district of our colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER], who has just addressed us. I think his wishes should be considered. I want to verify what he said about the great Secretary of the Interior trying to direct the Congress of the United States by sending one of his men up here. His man has been going from floor to floor and door to door in the House Office Building, lobbying for this bill. He is a former colleague of ours, a very splendid gentleman, working under the direction of the Secretary, to be sure. I do not hold that against our former colleague, but I do believe that the Secretary of the Interior, after he makes his representations to the committee, should leave it to the membership of the House rather than to send his emissaries up here trying to lobby the House of Representatives on a certain proposal.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. PITTENGER. As a matter of fact, this highway up in my district is in the same situation as is the highway in the next amendment, which is in Oklahoma. Is that not the fact?

Mr. CARTER. Yes. That is true. I am constrained to vote for this amendment for the further reason that a special committee of the Senate went up there and made a thorough investigation of this matter on the ground. The chairman of that committee appeared before us and made a statement in regard to the matter in which he recommended that this legislation be passed. Ordinarily I am not in favor of legislation on an appropriation bill, but this is a matter that has been dragging for some time. It seems that it cannot be accomplished otherwise. It is within the district of our colleague the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER]. I propose to vote in favor of it.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Did the gentleman give the House to understand that this will not cost the Government a penny?

Mr. CARTER. It is my understanding that this will not cost the Federal Government one cent. The State of Minnesota is given authority to condemn the right-of-way over Indian lands.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER].

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, like the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON] I have no great interest in the Grand Portage Reservation. However, if this amendment is adopted it would accomplish the purpose of Senate 1984 now pending before the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs. The Interior Department has made no report on the bill and the committee has held no hearings in Washington on it. The committee did hold a hearing last summer in Duluth, but this hearing was in effect an ex parte proceeding, as practically the whole of the time was consumed by representatives of the State of Minnesota.

From the standpoint of the Department of the Interior the Senate amendment is especially objectionable because the Secretary of the Interior now has before him the application of the State for this right-of-way. The Secretary has ample authority and discretion under existing law to grant the right-of-way which the State desires to acquire for highway purposes. The effect of the Senate amendment would be to override the discretion of the Secretary, if he should finally reject the application as submitted.

It does not appear that the Congress is sufficiently informed at present to decide on the merits of the proposed legislation. I therefore ask that the amendment be rejected.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 112, page 64, line 17:

"The State of Oklahoma is hereby authorized to acquire by condemnation, under judicial process, for use for highway purposes in connection with the highway designated as United States Highway No. 60, any lands or interests in lands within the Seneca Indian School property in Ottawa County, Okla. The United States District Court for the Northern District of Oklahoma shall have jurisdiction of proceedings for such condemnation. The practice, pleadings, forms, and modes of proceedings in proceedings for such condemnation shall conform, as near as may be, to the practice, pleadings, forms, and proceedings in like cases in the courts of record in the State of Oklahoma."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I just want to tell the membership what the Department of the Interior has to say about this amendment, then you fellows do the voting, because you men employed the Secretary of the Interior and are supporting him. I read the justification which comes from the Department:

It is recommended that this amendment be rejected. The Department has been in correspondence with the State Highway Commission of Oklahoma and has conferred with officials of that body over a considerable period of time with respect to a right-of-way which the State desires to acquire over land now used by the Seneca Indian School. The location of the right-of-way has been agreed upon and the State has agreed to construct fences and two underpasses for the protection of the Indian children attending the school. The sole point of difference remaining to be settled is the amount of cash damages to be paid by the State. Originally the Department asked for a payment of $6,000 but subsequently reduced this amount to $1,500. The State, however, has indicated a willingness to pay only $300 despite the fact that affidavits submitted by one of the State highway commissioners show estimates of damage running as high as $3,500. The proposed legislation is particularly objectionable because the State highway commission has been arbitrary at all times. It contracted for the construction of two bridges at control points and for the grading of the highway up to the school property line after the Department had declined to approve the State's application for a right-of-way.

There is the State of Oklahoma wanting something for nothing. The Indian Bureau states it will cost $3,500 to put this road through and they have an agreement to put the road through and have offered to give them the right-of-way, but they do not want to pay the $3,500. If you fellows are going to vote that kind of legislation against the efforts of those trying to look after the interests of the Indian Bureau, if you are going to vote for this amendment and not ask the State to pay, what do you expect the Ways and Means Committee to do to get the money to spend this way?

I read again from the justification:

The proposed legislation is particularly objectionable because the State Highway Commission has been arbitrary at all times.

There is the statement of your own Indian Bureau of the Department of the Interior, but if you fellows want to do that kind of a job, pass that kind of legislation, let the responsibility be yours.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield.

Mr. BEITER. The gentleman stated that we employed the Secretary of the Interior and read what he said was the Secretary's recommendation. The gentleman will admit that the Secretary is one of the best we have ever had, will he not?

Mr. RICH. If he is, then why does not the gentleman follow him in this instance? I am not agreeing that he is the great Secretary he states he is. There is a difference of opinion.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has made a very touching appeal, speaking as he does for the Interior Department. It is a very significant and altogether unusual situation to see the great statesman from Pennsylvania, whose most consistent attitude with reference to the Department of the Interior has been that of violent criticism against that Department, suddenly assume the role of defender of the same Department. It is somewhat amusing to see the gentleman stand on the floor of the House with a tear in his voice pleading to this House to follow the suggestions of the Department of the Interior.

I shall not take the time, nor have I the inclination, to answer the gentleman's splendid oration; but when the gentleman deliberately charges that the people of Oklahoma want something for nothing, then I must tell him politely but plainly that he is altogether unfamiliar with the facts. The State of Oklahoma asks merely an opportunity of bringing condemnation proceedings so that it shall not have to pay more than the amount the court says this land in question is worth. I have a statement here from Mr. L. S. Robson, member of the State Highway Commission of Oklahoma, in which he says the following:

Will the Oklahoma State Highway Commission be required to pay $11,020 for 10.10 acres of land for the purpose of constructing United States Highway 60 across the Seneca Indian School ground, this being a distance of three-quarters of a mile?

That is the issue. The State simply desires the opportunity to go into court. I will add that this item was placed in the bill at the request of the senior Senator from Oklahoma, who is familiar with all the facts in the matter, and who is perfectly willing to assume full responsibility for same. I might add that my own Senator THOMAS is no doubt in a better position to know what the real facts are in the State of Oklahoma than is the great statesman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 112 and concur in the same.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 156: Page 84, line 4, strike out "$34,840,750" and insert in lieu thereof "$39,019,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the managers on the part of the House, I am directed to move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 156.

I make this motion, and express the sincere hope that the House will refuse to approve the motion.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEAVY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment No. 156 and concur in the same.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM].

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the facts of this situation are as follows:

The Central Valley project was authorized principally for irrigation, power, and salinity control. It is expected that the powerhouse which is now under construction will be in operation early in 1944. The project includes the Shasta Dam and powerhouse, which will have a capacity of 375,000 kilowatts, and the Keswick power plant, which will have a capacity of 75,000 kilowatts.

CONSTRUCTION OF TRANSMISSION LINES, $3,723,000

Prior to this year Congress has appropriated $3,723,000 to construct transmission lines to take the power from Shasta and Keswick to the load center

in central California. For the fiscal year 1943 the Bureau of the Budget recommended an additional $7,000,000 for the transmission lines. The House not only disallowed the $7,000,000, but also eliminated the $3,723,000 which had been previously appropriated but not expended.

The Senate restored the $3,723,000 for transmission lines. It is hoped that the House will concur in the Senate's action.

STEAM PLANT, $200,000

The original plans for the Central Valley project included a steam plant to firm up the hydroelectric power. It is contemplated that this steam plant will have an ultimate capacity of 150,000 kilowatts. The steam plant is needed in order to firm up the Shasta and Keswick power. In the hearings before the House Appropriations Committee on the present bill, Mr. Page testified that the steam plant would increase the firm-power output of the system from 700,000,000 to 1,950,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually, and increase the net power revenues by more than $80,000,000 in 40 years.

The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. has made an offer to buy the power of Shasta and Keswick at the bus bar. This offer is not a firm offer, but is dependent upon a delivery of a minimum amount of power, which may or may not be deliverable. In addition, Commissioner Page testified before the House Appropriations Committee that with the construction of the transmission lines and the steam plant, a revenue in excess of $1,500,000 a year greater than the best offer of Pacific Gas & Electric would be obtained, even after allowing for all costs of the steam plant, including amortization.

The Senate approved an appropriation of $200,000 for engineering work necessary to begin the steam plant. It is hoped that the House will see fit to concur in the Senate's action in this respect.

DONALD M. NELSON'S POSITION

Mr. Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, has strongly recommended to both the House and the Senate that funds be provided for construction of the transmission lines. This is necessary in order that the power be made available for war purposes. Pacific Gas & Electric does not have the transmission capacity necessary to transmit the additional power to be generated at Shasta and Keswick. Mr. Nelson also recommended that an appropriation be authorized to permit the Bureau of Reclamation to undertake the preparatory work for construction of the steam plant. Copies of Mr. Nelson's letters to the House and Senate subcommittees follow:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,
Washington, D. C., March 19, 1942.

The Honorable JED JOHNSON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Interior Department Appropriations, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. JOHNSON: This is in response to your letter of March 11, requesting the views of the War Production Board on various electric-power projects of the Bureau of Reclamation and the Bonneville Power Administration which are included in the Interior Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year of 1943.

We have given study to the proposals in the list attached to your letter, with particular reference to the necessity of the funds requested in accelerating our war production. As you know, the Bonneville Power Administration and the several Bureau of Reclamation projects are being called upon to provide their maximum power supplies for various war industries in the West, and further substantial expansions of war production are under way or projected in this area. For example, in Washington and Oregon the Bonneville and Grand Coulee projects will provide power for a substantial part of the greatly expanded aluminum and magnesium production as well as for numerous other vital industries including ferrosilicon, phosphorus, and shipbuilding. We expect that every kilowatt of power which these projects can produce will be taken as soon as the new industrial plants are ready. Boulder Dam, and the other projects on the Colorado River, as well as the projects in California will be instrumental in safeguarding an adequate power supply for the vital war industries on the West coast. There is now under construction at Las Vegas, Nev., one of the largest magnesium plants in the country, which will utilize Boulder Dam power. In central California a magnesium plant is already in operation and a second is under construction, and there are also in this area a number of highly important shipyards, military bases, and fabrication plants. The situation is similar in Colorado where the Big Thompson project is under construction.

On the basis of our study we regard the hydroelectric plants and appurtenant facilities designated in the Budget request as essential in providing adequate power for war production. We also believe that the Antioch steam plant is an essential part of the ultimate development of the Central Valley project and therefore strongly recommend that sufficient funds should be provided at once to complete all the engineering work necessary in preparation for the actual construction. However, we are unable to say at this time when priorities could be made available to secure the steam-station equipment necessary to proceed with the construction. Although additional power would be very useful in this section of California, there are at present other parts of the country which have a much more serious need for turbo generators, and in view of the extreme shortage of such equipment the relative urgencies of the situation would require that actual installation at Antioch should be deferred for the time being. As soon as it becomes possible to locate new steam generation in the San Francisco Bay region we should regard Antioch as the first choice.

We are not in a position to comment on the amounts included in the Budget request for specific transmission items, but we consider it of paramount importance that these agencies have adequate funds to meet promptly the war-production-power loads placed upon them. Time is of the essence. The situation changes so rapidly that it is impossible to predict now all the transmission lines which will be of greatest urgency or the specific route or size of the lines which will be essential, but our experience clearly demonstrates the importance of prompt action in constructing the facilities needed to deliver power from the projects to war industries, once the exact location of such plants has been determined. We respectfully suggest that sufficient flexibility be granted so that the funds appropriated may be used for facilities which are essential to bring power from generation plants to the point of use in war production whether or not such facilities are specified in the appropriation request.

You realize, of course, that each individual transmission project which is not already under way will require further consideration by the War Production Board before the necessary priorities are issued for its construction. At that time it will be necessary for us to take into account the then needs of war industries, the availability of materials, the time when additional power will be needed, and other relevant considerations. The Department of the Interior has been cooperating closely with the War Production Board on such matters.

We shall appreciate any help the committee can give in expediting consideration of this appropriation.

Sincerely yours,
DONALD M. NELSON, *Chairman.*

APRIL 30, 1942.

The Honorable CARL HAYDEN,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Department of Interior Appropriations, United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN HAYDEN: This is in response to your letter of April 23, requesting expression of our present views with regard to the funds to be provided for the Central Valley project under the appropriation bill for fiscal 1943 for the Department of the Interior.

Your inquiry calls attention to my letter of March 19 to Congressman JOHNSON, Chairman of the House Subcommittee on Interior Department appropriations, the text of which appears on page 1110 of the hearings held before the House subcommittee. To the opinions and recommendations contained in that letter, which also reflect our present views I want to add a strong recommendation that the funds for the construction of transmission lines for the Central Valley project, eliminated from the bill by the House, should be restored. I should also like to call special attention to the recommendation, contained in my letter of March 19, that funds should be provided at once to complete all the engineering work necessary in preparation for the actual construction of the Antioch steam plant. Even though we are unable to endorse the appropriation of funds for the steam plant itself, we regard the plant as an essential part of the ultimate development of the Central Valley project and believe that the preparatory work for its construction should be undertaken.

We shall greatly appreciate any help your committee can give in expediting considering of this appropriation.

Sincerely yours,
DONALD M. NELSON, *Chairman.*

Mr. BEITER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BEITER. Is it not a fact that these funds are not available, that the proper distribution of power cannot be made in that area; that at the present time the only customer that can be sold to would be the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. That is my understanding.

Mr. BEITER. And if the transmission lines are constructed, other customers can be had?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, to get the parliamentary situation clearly in mind, the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON], has moved that the House further insist on its disagreement with

the Senate relative to the so-called Central Valley project. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] has offered a preferential motion that the House recede and concur. If the preferential motion is agreed to, it will be the initiation of an over-all expenditure that certainly will reach, on present estimates, $38,000,000 and possibly a great deal more.

I say "a great deal more" for the very good reason that the original estimate for this whole project was $170,000,000, which was revised upward by the Bureau of Reclamation to $228,000,000, while the last known estimate was $260,000,000, if I remember the figures correctly. So if they do not get any closer to it than $38,000,000, and they were 60 percent off in their first estimate, this might conceivably by adopting the preferential motion generate an expenditure of as much as $50,000,000.

I am very frankly and very candidly opposed to the preferential motion, and I will tell you why. It is proposed to use this money to build a transmission line or two of them 200 miles long, if I remember correctly, and to build a steam plant. Why build transmission lines when you already have lines? Why build a steam plant to firm this power from Shasta or Keswick Dams when a company that is already operating 49 hydro plants and 10 steam plants in California now has the capacity and has the facilities to distribute this power? Are we so lacking in confidence in the business structure of the country that we cannot take the word of the man who came before the committee and submitted a memorandum and said:

> I will tell you what we will do. We will make a deal with you on a long- or short-term contract. We will buy the power. We will give you more than $5,000,000 for it, and you will have a net profit over and above operating expenses, together with some extra power thrown in, of about three and a half million dollars.

That looks like a pretty decent agreement to me so far as the Federal Treasury is concerned, and especially now when materials for use in this construction are critically needed in the war effort.

Mr. MAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. And the purpose of this whole thing is to compete with this same taxpaying industry that is now being taxed?

Mr. DIRKSEN. Yes; very definitely. That same industry paid $13,000,000 into the State and Federal Treasuries last year. I think it is high time that we quit throwing so many rocks at business if it is doing a good job and accept the facts that were laid before the committee that there is an enterprise already there in California which can undertake to handle and distribute this power, that is willing to buy it, that is willing to transmit it, and that is willing to pay a cash fee into the Federal Treasury and still do the job. That is the issue before us today.

The Reclamation Bureau says, in effect, "Well, we can do it a whole lot better." Well, when they have missed the estimate by so many million dollars for the completion of this project in the first instance, I am not so sure they can do it better than could be done by the Pacific Gas & Electric that is operating all through that area at the present time. I for one am not going to give a vote to a proposal that will initiate an expenditure of anywhere from $38,000,000 to $50,000,000 when it is unnecessary at the present time, and when this power will get to the necessary industrial sources and to the places of consumption over lines and through the facilities of the company that is operating in that area at the present time. There is the whole thing. Lines are already available, so why construct duplicating lines?

The first vote will come on the preferential motion, Shall we recede and concur and initiate this extra expenditure in time of war? Or, Shall we maintain our disagreement with the Senate in the hope that this thing can be worked out and perhaps the offer can be taken, which will mean cash to the Treasury and mean the distribution of this power to the consumption centers so that the war effort can go forward as it should?

This project was authorized in 1935 out of general construction funds and provides in a general way for the storage of the waters of the Sacramento River and others by means of two dams at Shasta and Keswick.

The first estimate on the whole project was $170,000,000. Later that estimate was revised upward by the Bureau of Reclamation to $228,000,000. The latest estimate on the whole project is $264,000,000. Here is persuasive evidence of how the costs of projects of this type increase after the original estimates have been submitted.

It is now proposed to build two transmission lines 200 miles long from the dams to Antioch, Calif., and to build a steam plant to "firm" this power in the hope that it will bring in revenues.

It is generally agreed that it will be 1944 before the project is completed. It is presently in the design stage. The estimated cost of the steam plant is $15,000,000 while the total estimated cost of the transmission lines is $23,000,000.

To build these auxiliary projects would, according to the best testimony, require 10,000 tons of steel, 1,150 tons of zinc, 7,700 tons of copper, and 50,000 barrels of cement. This, of course, will require priorities and will withdraw those critical materials from uses more directly related to the war effort.

It has been said that all this is necessary in the interest of defense and of the war effort. That, however, does not square with the letter dated February 18, 1942, which General Marshall, Chief of Staff, wrote to Senator HOLMAN in reference to the War Department's attitude on a proposed aluminum plant, in which he said:

> In this matter protection is the only factor which comes under the purview of the military agencies of the War Department; other factors are matters for consideration by the Under Secretary of War. If we are to assure protection of such installations it would not be wise to place them along the coast where they would constitute remunerative targets for hostile air raids. In case of a determined attack against our coast line we would be deliberately sacrificing the defense value of terrain. In this event plants along the coast would be in the most active part of the combat zone. Their preservation would not only be threatened but their protection would constitute an added burden on the military commander.
>
> We are now embarrassed by the location of vastly important aviation plants along the Pacific coast. I believe the people on our coast lines now recognize that the construction of additional vital defense plants in their midst only increases the possibility of hostile action, dangerous not only to the industries but to the people themselves.

The record is abundantly clear that the area to be served by this line and this steam plant is already well served by an operating electric company in California, which has available lines for 150,000 kilowatts of power. This company now operates 49 hydroelectric and 10 steam plants, with nearly 1,900,000 horsepower of installed capacity and more than 40,000 miles of transmission lines.

It has been willing on a short-range or long-range basis to buy this power for which the transmission lines and the steam plant are to be built, and to pay a gross of $5,567,000 per year, and also provide power for pumping plants. This offer would pay all operating costs and leave a net profit of $3,500,000 per year. That, in my judgment, is a most acceptable proposal at this particular time when materials are scarce and when the construction of these lines and the steam plant would be a duplication of facilities which already exist.

If the operating company were maintaining excessive rates it might be a different matter, but page 959 of the printed hearings discloses that in the last 6 years this company has reduced rates for an aggregate sum of $11,244,000, and in addition has been paying taxes in the sum of $13,000,000 per year. Moreover, its rate structure is under continuous study by the California Utility Commission, and there is no good reason why this project should be carried forward when the company is in a position to transmit this power under existing facilities.

It is conceded by everyone that if the project is approved it will be 1944 before the Government can utilize this power over its own facilities, and that can scarcely be regarded as in the interest of national defense. The record, in my humble opinion, amply justifies a vote against the pending proposal.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS].

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. does not have facilities available to handle this power. They have transmission lines but they are carrying a full load and the company is building more dams and generating capacity at this very moment. How is it to be transmitted? The further fact is that if you refuse this appropriation, if you literally take away from the State of California the $3,700,000 previously appropriated for this project,

you will in effect say, "We are going to use just as much material, just as much copper, and just as much everything else, but we are going to let the P. G. & E. build the necessary transmission line and in the future the necessary steam plant so that the P. G. & E. will be the only purchaser of all this power produced by a project costing the people of our State and Nation, as the gentleman from Illinois says, in excess of $200,000,000.

An effort will be made before the debate on this amendment is over to confuse the issue by trying to set over against this necessary production of power for war purposes, agricultural and industrial, under circumstances where we can get our money back by having a decent competitive market, the interest of the users of water.

Let me merely point out to anybody who knows anything about such projects this simple fact. Unless this whole project can be operated as a unified project you cannot guarantee to the farmers or to the water users or to flood control or anything else a proper flow of water. If you tie yourself up to a contract with this monopoly power company of northern and central California you will not only have to sell most of the power at dump power rates and permit it to be resold at a substantial profit by the company to the very people who are paying for this project, but you will have to deliver the power to them on the basis of their contract. Once the power is tied up, in this way the water in these huge dams may not be able to be held back when you need to for purposes of irrigation and similar needs. Unless the people have this transmission line in their own hands, indeed, unless in the future they have a steam plant in their own hands, this great water project can hardly be managed in the way the farmers need to have it managed.

I do not blame the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. for attempting to protect the monopoly position it now enjoys in that portion of our State, but I do seriously object to the Congress of the United States even considering putting itself in the position of spending all this money and still not protecting the Government's investment by enabling us to sell this power where we can get the best price and where it will do the people the most good.

This project is recommended by the President of the United States. He asks for it. It is recommended by Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board; by the Governor and by the California State Water Power Authority, including in its membership, by the way, the present Republican candidate for Governor of California. It is recommended by every thoughtful person I know of who is interested in seeing this power gotten where it will do the most good and where it is most needed. Remember, unless you adopt the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington, the private power company will have to build the line. It will use the critical materials. It will be the sole possible customer of the Central Valley project. It is altogether a question of who is going to have control of this power and whether or not it is to be got to where it is needed in the shortest possible space of time.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES].

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I am against this amendment because it carries on a fight that should not be carried on while we are at war. I expect the boys on Corregidor, our brave and gallant men at Midway, the men who are in Africa today, our soldiers and the soldiers of our Allies, do not care whose power, public or private, builds their machines, guns, tanks, and planes to win the war for America. Our gallant men are interested in who can get there first with the most material. Certainly this is no time for us to be engaged in a little private warfare to put private utilities on their knees during the war effort. This is a death struggle such as we have never before seen in this country. We need the support of everyone.

If power was available for transmission over the proposed lines, and it is not, we certainly would want to make a business-like arrangement to get the job done the quickest and the cheapest that we possibly can. If I understand the testimony correctly, with very little cost, this private power company can hook on to the Central Valley power plant, the Shasta Dam project. If this amendment is adopted, public power lines will parallel this private power company's lines, with that much waste of copper and manpower, for a duplicate transmission line. Further than that, the testimony discloses that this despised utility offers to pay a fair price for Central Valley electricity when it is available, and use its own private equipment to firm the power. This allegedly degraded utility has now 14 steam plants and 47 water power plants to firm the power. It pays $14,000,000 income taxes to the Federal Government. You may want to win a battle against the private power companies, but I am telling you now, that we should all have our minds and hearts directed toward a united country, backing up our men at the front. We need everybody's support, if I understand the significance of the headlines we are reading today.

We know full well that tonight, tomorrow night, the next night, and in the months to come, our soldiers and sailors will thank God for the machines, the tools, and the equipment that will save their lives, and we should make available to them from the combined resources of public and private power all the equipment necessary for them to win.

Without adopting this amendment, I think we can do what the Senate committee recommended in their report, as follows:

> In order to accomplish these objectives, your committee recommend:
>
> 1. That, as has been patriotically accomplished elsewhere in the United States by public and private interests, the Secretary of the Interior and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. immediately enter into a contract, for the duration of the war and a reasonable time thereafter, for the complete pooling of all public and private power facilities which will result in delivering the greatest amount of power to war industries in the least possible time and with the greatest economy in the use of critical and strategic materials. Any such contract should provide for the recapture, without prejudice, of any advantages which temporarily may accrue to either party.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. Is this brought in here as an essential war measure?

Mr. JONES. I do not think it is.

Mr. DONDERO. How long will it take to complete this project?

Mr. JONES. It will certainly take much longer to complete it than it will take the private utility to do it.

Mr. DONDERO. How long will it take?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the gentleman from California on that question, who has personal knowledge of the case.

Mr. CARTER. There are two items involved here. I think the steam plant would take several years to complete, becase they could not get the priorities on the material necessary. The transmission line can be built in perhaps 1 year.

Mr. JONES. Why should we build a duplicate transmission line?

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS F. FORD].

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, may I observe at the outset of my remarks that apparently the gentleman from Ohio does not know much about this subject, because the power that is involved here does not mean anything to the boys on Corregidor, in Australia, or any place else.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] to concur in the amendment.

I do so for the reason that if this power line is not built—and I want to interject here that it will not be built if the California members of the conference committee have their way—either the Treasury's investment in the great Shasta Dam will be lost, or else the water users of the Central Valley will pay the bill through increased charges for water for irrigation.

The proposition is fairly simple: If the transmission line and the stand-by plant at Antioch are built, the Government will receive an annual income of approximately $7,202,000. It will require $6,652,000 to amortize, at 3 percent that portion of the Shasta Dam chargeable to power. That will leave $650,000 to apply to the repayment of such other expenditures as are recoverable by the Treasury.

Now, I do not think that the farmers of the Central Valley should be saddled with the additional cost of the Shasta Dam. But if the two California members of the conference committee have their way, this will be one of the results.

I do not think that the power users of the Central and Sacramento Valleys should be left to the tender mercies of the Pacific Gas & Electric Corporation. If the transmission line and the Antioch steam plant are not built, the people of

this region will be forced to pay whatever rates the private corporation pleases to charge.

One thing is certain, those rates will be at least 20 percent in excess of what the Government will charge.

If the Members of the House wish to protect the United States Treasury and assure it of getting its money back, they will vote for Mr. LEAVY's motion to recede and concur. If the Members of the House wish to protect the people of the two great valleys, they will vote to recede and concur. Of course, this vote will not please the Pacific Gas & Electric Corporation—nor those who so faithfully serve it.

Let me say right now that the Pacific Gas & Electric Corporation has for 36 years, to my personal knowledge, fought, by every trick and and device known to corporate ingenuity, every attempt on the part of the people of California to free themselves from its widespread and strangling tentacles.

That these tentacles reach the very Capital of the Nation is evident in this attempt to defeat the Treasury's well-considered plan to secure reimbursement for its expenditures on the Central Valley project and to insure justice and opportunity to the people of the two valleys.

Donald Nelson approves of this. I hope the House will agree with them and with all those who realize that to vote for this relatively small appropriation is to vote to carry out the original plan of supplying low-cost power as well as water to the people who have waited so long for this development. As for myself, I shall continue to fight for the transmission line and the power plant.

Surely the majority of this House is in favor of the public ownership and control of the power generated by all such great projects as this one. Surely we are immune to such worn-out arguments as those that succeeded in holding back for many years cheap public power developed by the people and for the people. It is argued that a private power company stands ready to purchase the power generated at Shasta Dam "thus obviating the necessity of the Government constructing transmission lines or installing a steam plant." This is the old gag. For years the Power Trust and its subsidiaries have kindly permitted the people to construct aqueducts and dams in order to secure an ample supply of water and power for irrigation and other purposes. Then the men who serve this octopus in legislative bodies have listened to the argument that, while power might be generated by public funds, it would be a mistake for the people to build the absolutely essential transmission lines and supply the power at low rates to themselves. Never has this been done without organized opposition. The private companies, forsooth, must build the transmission lines and must have the right to sell the power to the people at ruinously high rates.

In Los Angeles we fought for three decades and more to have and to hold the control of the power generated by water development. We won that fight and thereby opened for Californians from every State opportunities in farming, in manufacturing, in every branch of industry where cheap and plentiful power is a factor. And we supplied our homes and business houses with electricity at a low cost. That is what built up the metropolis of the West coast. Now we are trying to build up, to develop the two great central valleys of California so that they will abound in flourishing farms supplied by cheap water for irrigation and cheap power to pump the water, as well as for commercial and industrial uses. One without the other will not accomplish our purpose. We must have full control of our power and keep it cheap and plentiful. And to do this we must have the transmission lines and the stand-by plant.

The Central Valley project of California is one of State-wide interest. It was approved at a State election held in 1933, and specifically included the transmission line and authorized the steam plant. These features have received widespread approval both in Washington and California; are directly endorsed by President Roosevelt, Department of Interior's Bureau of Reclamation, Federal Power Commission, and War Production Board.

Endorsements from California include American Federation of Labor, State Grange, California Irrigation Districts Association, and many public agencies in the Central Valley.

The appropriation is for $3,923,000 in all. By voting to recede and concur in the Senate amendment this Congress will deal a body blow to power corporation control — in plain words — the Power Trust.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this Central Valley project was established primarily for purposes of reclamation and now it seems to have turned into a power project endorsed by the President. They now have in this locality in California over 58 hydroelectric power plants and they have 11 large steam plants. The Government now wants to establish, by an initial appropriation of $200,000, a steam plant which before the end of the year will require $15,000,000.

Remember now that they had this up last year asking for $5,000,000 and now they come in and ask for $200,000. They think you are going to be fooled into granting them this $200,000 and before the year is up they will want $15,000,000.

The company referred to here is paying the Government $13,000,000 in taxes. They have offered to make a contract with the Government which would net the Government about $5,000,000 from the use of this power. The Government would not need to invest $1 to do it.

Mr. Speaker, every dollar of resources we have in this Nation should be used for war purposes at this time and we should not be engaged in entering upon an enormous power venture just because we think that under the guise of war the Members of the House will agree to it, it is not necessary to winning the war. It is not right, it is not honorable and it is not just to say it will win the war. The greatest problem America has today is to spend every dollar we have to win the war. This is your obligation and it is your duty. In the name of our American liberty and in the name of our freedom do not go on and on until you wreck this grand old Government of ours. I am afraid, and I think rightfully so, that you will bankrupt the Nation the way you are going. How can you support the Nation? How can you support the Army? How can you support the Navy? How can you support the Air Corps? How can you support the Marines on a bankrupt Nation?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART].

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely trust the House will adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY], an amendment which will write into this bill the Central Valley amendments which were added to the bill when it was under consideration in the other body.

In 1935 this Congress authorized the Central Valley project and adopted it as a part of the Federal reclamation program. The items we have under consideration today—the transmission lines and the steam stand-by plants were approved of by the Congress in that initial legislation. Since then the Congress has reaffirmed and readopted this policy in many a subsequent bill. We are now in the situation of having carried forward this project as originally conceived to the point where we have now investe more than $110,000,000 of Federal money in this colossal multiple-purpose program. We have built a great dam, the third largest in the world, up in the high mountains of northern California. We have appropriated the money for and built at the foot of this dam a generating plant which will produce eventually over 450,000 kilowatt-hours of electrical power. This has been done up in the mountains of northern California where no one lives, if you please, where there are no consumers of electricity. In the face of this situation, we are called upon today to consider, seriously, if you please, whether we should appropriate the money which will make it possible to bring that electricity which is produced in those high mountains down to the cities where there are consumers and a demand for its use.

AN ABSURD POSITION

Think of the ridiculous position the opponents of this motion are seeking to put us into, a position which will isolate up in the mountains, 300 or 400 miles from where people live, a great dam and a great generating plant, a generating plant without a single foot of copper wire to bring the electricity that is produced there down to the San Francisco Bay area where millions of people are today waiting for that power anxiously. As legislators, are we willing to be caught in such an absurd position?

Congressmen are made the butt of many jokes as a consequence of the ridiculous and foolish situations they get themselves into. What are they going

to say about us when they learn that we have built a generating plant high in the mountains of California at a cost of more than $100,000,000 and failed to provide a single cent to bring that electricity down to the place where the people can consume it?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield on that point?

Mr. GEARHART. Yes, gladly.

Mr. O'CONNOR. How much money has the Government spent in the construction of what is already there, including the dam and generating plant?

Mr. GEARHART. There has been over $110,000,000 already spent in construction of the project.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And how much is asked for the transmission lines?

Mr. GEARHART. Less than $5,000,000. Not only for the transmission lines, but for the preliminary work on the steam plant, too.

Congress has brought down on itself much criticism and it will bring down more than we have ever incurred heretofore if we pursue so ill-considered a course with respect to this proposition as that which the opposition is pressing upon us.

Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in this project as an electric-generating project, except incidentally. It is only because the generation of the power on the project will make the project economically feasible and make possible the delivery of irrigation water to the farmers at a price they can afford to pay, that I have arisen to discuss this phase of this great conception. Primarily, I am interested in the project as a water project, as a project through the operation of which our San Joaquin Valley agriculturists can obtain the irrigation water of which they are in such dire need.

NEED FOR STEAM PLANT AT ANTIOCH

We need very much more water in the San Joaquin Valley than we now have. We see in the Central Valley project the possibility of acquiring the water we need, and for that reason I am very strong for and extremely hopeful that the House will provide the funds with which to commence the construction of the steam plant for the generation of electricity under emergency conditions at Antioch. We want water down in the San Joaquin Valley, and we want to be sure that we get the water that is available. We have learned from experience that there are bound to be years when there will not be enough water to operate all of the services of the Central Valley water project all of the time.

Now, if the Central Valley water project makes a contract with our farmers in the San Joaquin Valley to deliver to them so much water at given times, and at the same time makes a contract with the people who live in the San Francisco Bay area to deliver to them electricity, firm electricity, so much every day of the 365 days of the year, and it should develop that there is not enough water in a given year to supply both the farmers with firm irrigation water and the city people with firm electricity, one of the other of those contracts will necessarily have to remain unfulfilled. Now, we, the farmers down in the San Joaquin Valley, fear that in such a situation the contract that would be broken is the contract with the farmers. Therefore, we want a situation developed in respect to the Central Valley water project which will not make it possible for there to be a diversion of water to the generation of electricity when it ought to go to the farmers who have a primary claim to it for irrigation. This was an irrigation project in the beginning, and it should ever remain a water project, nothing else. The building of the transmission lines and the construction of the stand-by steam plant would make that certain.

WATER DEMANDS ON CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

What are the water demands upon the project? Primarily, there is the demand for an adequate supply for irrigation; there is the demand for water for saline control in the delta region; there is the demand for water for navigation improvement upon the Sacramento River, which is the third most important navigable stream in the United States; and there is the demand for the control of waters as a protection against floods; all these in addition to the demand for water control for power generation.

SHORTAGE OF WATER FOR FARM USE

If the water is retained behind the dam for use in the generating of electricity for transmission to the people down in the city, you may have a great number of acres of the most fertile land in the world in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Rivers delta region infiltrated with salt because the pressure has been lessened against the ocean's encroachment. If water is retained behind the dams for the generation of electricity and is not released so as to maintain surface levels, it means that navigation is going to be stopped in the higher regions, or, to say the least, seriously interfered with. If we hold back water for the generation of electricity in years of water scarcity, the project will be unable to deliver irrigation water during the irrigation season to our farmers down in the San Joaquin Valley where it is so badly needed.

So, I am pleading with you to build this steam plant and the transmission lines so that the demands for electricity on the project will never interfere with the primary demands of the farmers for water for irrigation purposes and domestic use, water at a price the farmers can afford to pay.

AVERAGE RAINFALL IN THE SAN JOAQUIN VALLEY

To impress you with the importance of this, let me point out that the average rainfall in the San Joaquin Valley is about 10 inches per year, of which only 2 inches per year falls during the growing season; that is, when the farmers need the water. If we did not have our magnificent irrigation systems in the San Joaquin Valley, that area which now supports nearly 600,000 people would not be able to support one-tenth of that number. And if our irrigation systems fail us, and the Central Valley project is an important component thereof, and if it fails, too, it means that thousands upon thousands of our people will be uprooted, be compelled to move away.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is why I have arisen from my seat to plead for the steam plant and the transmission lines. It is not possible for me to overemphasize its importance to those that are depending upon the completion of this great project with all of its interrelated services as a source of supply of the water they need and must have to irrigate their lands to meet their domestic requirements.

IMPORTANCE OF STEAM TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

Now, there is a national-defense phase also which I think you should not disregard. That there is an approaching scarcity of electricity in California will be admitted, I am sure, by all disinterested observers. The development of our national-defense industries within the State of California renders it imperative that provision be immediately made to meet this developing situation.

Dams and reservoirs which are used in the generation of electricity are of great strategic importance. Their protection against enemy attack is a matter of great concern to every American who is interested in the outcome of this war. If enemy airplanes fly over California it will be for the purpose of destroying, if they can, dams and generating machinery of our Pacific coastal States. In other words, dams will become their primary targets.

Should they come, enemy pilots will try to blast out the dam at Shasta, the dam at Keswick, and if they are lucky enough to drop a bomb in the right place those dams are going to cease to exist insofar as the effective generation of electricity is concerned during the remaining days of this war, and the loss of electricity that we anticipate generating there is going to be a severe blow to our cause.

If that dire eventuality should occur, what explanation would the Members of Congress give to the people of this country for having failed to have made a small appropriation of less than $5,000,000 to commence the construction of a stand-by steam plant, the operation of which in the face of such a catastrophe would make possible the replacement of the electrical energy previously produced through the use of the blasted-out dam?

So, in the name of national defense I plead with you, and beg of you that you include a provision for the construction of this steam plant in the bill which you will report so that construction can be commenced just as speedily as possible.

I am not here to quote statistical data because I know that you have been deluged with evidence of that kind since the commencement of these hearings. What I have tried to emphasize in my statement has had to do with practical considerations alone, practical considerations which the people in the San Joaquin Valley are discussing on every street corner, upon the parched acres of our cultivated farms.

Let it suffice for me to point out that the items to which I have referred have

been approved by the Budget, requested by the Bureau of Reclamation, endorsed by the Commander in Chief of our armed forces, and urged by the Director of the War Production Board—all in the name of national defense.

Mr. Speaker, it is unthinkable that the Congress should withhold its approval under circumstances such as these.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, this debate brings back memories of the long ago. I remember when the Republican Party had control of the Department of the Interior it was argued by some of them that we had better turn Teapot Dome over to certain big oil interests, because they said they could get the oil out better than the Government could. You all know what happened. They have not yet got all of the oil off the Republican elephant.

It will also be recalled that many years ago we had this same fight over Muscle Shoals. We had there a great wealth of power that we wanted distributed at reasonable rates. Oh, how familiar all these arguments by the opposition to this motion sound. They sought to turn the power at Muscle Shoals over to the Commonwealth & Southern or the Alabama Power Co. That company was buying this power at 2 mills a kilowatt-hour, and selling it to domestic users in sight of the dam at 10 cents a kilowatt-hour—a spread of about 5,000 percent.

In this instance we have a great dam in the Central Valley that has been built at public expense. We want that power for the people of California at reasonable rates. We want to do for the people of northern California what we have done for the people of north Mississippi and the people of north Alabama and the people of Tennessee—to supply them electricity at reasonable rates for centuries to come.

The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is trying to gobble this power up so as to wring the lifeblood from the people of that section of California long after the war is over. Today, with one of the greatest public-power systems on earth in Los Angeles, with all of its influence in reducing rates, the people of California today are overcharged more than $40,000,000 a year for their electric light and power, and if you were to put into effect all over the State the rates the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. now charges, the people of California would be overcharged about $100,000,000 a year.

This is one of the greatest economic questions that ever confronted the people of California. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. JONES] says that to build this line and stand-by plant now would hurt the boys at the front. The gentleman assumes an untenable attitude. Instead of injuring the boys at the front it would be a great benefit to them in helping to provide the weapons they need.

Besides, along with Shasta Dam, it will provide about 2,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity a year to the people of that section of California at rates they can afford to pay. It will provide a yardstick for cheap electric rates for those people for generations to come.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT].

Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the pending amendment providing for a total of $4,178,250 to start the transmission line in the Central Valley project from Shasta Dam to Antioch, and also providing funds for the engineering work necessary in preparation for construction of a steam plant at Antioch, or some other suitable site, and funds for the Friant-Kern and Madera Canals. Three million seven hundred and twenty-three thousand dollars of this amount is for the transmission line, $200,000 for the work necessary in preparing for the steam plant at Antioch, and $1,250,000 for the Friant-Kern and Madera Canals.

The amendment has been recommended in a letter from the President of the United States to Senator HAYDEN under date of May 19, 1942. Mr. Donald M. Nelson of the War Production Board has urged the appropriation to start the transmission line and the steam plant.

I believe it may help clarify many statements that have already been made if we had the picture before us as to what the authorization law provides with reference to the construction of this project. I desire to ead from Public Law No. 868, Seventy-sixth Congress, which is the act that sets forth the purposes of the Central Valley project. This is an act that originally came from the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House and starts off by stating that $12,000,000 is recommended for the expenditure for that part of the Central Valley project chargeable to navigation. Further, the act outlines the purposes of the Central Valley project as follows:

> For the purposes of improving navigation, regulating the flow of the San Joaquin River and the Sacramento River, controlling floods, providing for storage, and for the delivery of the stored waters thereof, for construction under the provisions of the Federal reclamation law of such distribution systems as the Secretary of the Interior deems necessary in connection with lands for which said stored waters are to be delivered for the reclamation of arid and semiarid lands and lands of Indian reservations, and other beneficial uses, and for the generation and sale of electric energy as a means of financially aiding and assisting such undertakings and in order to permit the full utilization of the works constructed to accomplish the aforesaid purposes.
>
> *And provided further*, That the said dam and reservoirs shall be used first, for river regulation, improvement of navigation, and flood control; second, for irrigation and domestic uses; and, third, for power.

Permit me to reflect a bit as to why the law is worded in such a manner. The Central Valley project, as now outlined, had its origin from an act of the California legislature. Under the State law the project was to be constructed by the State of California through the sale of revenue bonds. The provisions and purposes of the State law were similar to the provisions of the Federal law, or Public Law No. 868, Seventy-sixth Congress.

Why were the demands set up as to priority of use? Because the Sacramento River and the San Joaquin River for many years have not been navigable above the city of Sacramento or above the city of Stockton. The water in the river, due to diversion for irrigation and domestic purposes each year, has been becoming less, with the result that for many years there has been no navigation above the two mentioned cities. As the demand for irrigation water increased in the San Joaquin Valley the farmers resorted to underground waters, and at one time there were some 20,000 wells pumping water in the south San Joaquin Valley. The water table, as the result of this great number of wells, has gradually lowered until it was no longer feasible to pump water for farm purposes. Some wells are as deep as 700 feet.

In the northern end of the project in the Sacramento Valley very disastrous floods occur annually in high-water years, and the lower portion of the valley and the city of Sacramento are threatened each year with the menace of disastrous floods. To protect the valuable and rich farm lands of the region, the various cities and communities within the possible flood area, a great system of levees has been constructed by the Corps of Army Engineers.

So, as set out by the Federal law, one of the prime purposes was to make the river navigable from Sacramento to Red Bluff, and to protect the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys from floods.

The next question of great importance as the population of the two great valleys increased, was to provide water for domestic uses and also to prevent large areas of lands in the San Joaquin Valley from turning into desert. Due to the lowering of the water table in the south San Joaquin Valley some 400,000 acres of land have reached a stage practically of a desert. These lands at one time were highly cultivated farms.

In the neighborhood of 400,000 acres in the delta region of the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers have been ruined for agricultural purposes, due to the lowering of the water of these streams in the summertime. The lowering of the water in these two rivers has permitted the salt water from the San Francisco Bay region to encroach upon the delta lands and turn them to an alkaline condition. This is known as the salinity problem of the delta lands of the said streams.

The third purpose of the act, which is set out in two places in the law, pertains to the generation of electric energy. When electric energy is first mentioned, the law states as follows:

> For the generation and sale of electric energy as a means of financially aiding and assisting such undertakings and in order to

permit the full utilization of the works constructed to accomplish the aforesaid purposes.

In other words, the generation and sale of electric energy were to make possible the accomplishments of providing for navigation, flood control, and for the reclamation of arid and semiarid lands, and for the delivery of stored waters for such uses, and other beneficial use.

When the State of California endeavored to construct this project as a State project through the sale of revenue bonds, and this was not found feasible, the State appealed to what was then the Public Works Administration and requested aid to finance the project. The then Public Works Administration made a detailed examination of the project and found it was not economically feasible unless the feature of power was considered. Therefore, there was written into the present law the power feature, and as stated twice, it is for the purpose of assisting and financing the other purposes of the act and making the whole project financially possible.

At the time the Public Works Administration was considering loans to the State of California, the Federal Power Commission went over the economic setup and rendered a report to the effect that hydroelectric power would have to be supplemented by a steam plant in order to provide firm power for contracts. The steam plant was also considered necessary to keep the flow of water constant in the Sacramento River during the long summer period. In order to carry out the first purpose of the act, that is navigation, it will be necessary to draw from the reservoirs behind the Shasta Dam a constant flow of a minimum of 5,000 second-feet of water during the long dry season.

To make such a constant flow possible in the summertime in the Sacramento River it is, of course, necessary to store the water in the wintertime. If firm contracts are to be made with municipalities, farmers, individuals, or others, power will have to be provided that can be delivered in a firm manner. Likewise, in order to provide water for the reclamation of the arid lands, to provide water for irrigation, municipal, and other domestic uses, it will be necessary to firm the output of water. In order to satisfy the navigation feature, the irrigation feature, and the domestic feature, the steam plant was deemed to be absolutely necessary by the Federal Power Commission and other Federal Government agencies that investigated the project.

In order to make the power available to the market in the region of the great San Francisco Bay area, to the municipalities and other users throughout the great Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys, the transmission line was necessary. The transmission line is provided for in the act of Congress that set out the original outline in the River and Harbor Act wherein an outline is given of the project; this outline provides for a dam to be constructed on the Sacramento River and what is now the Shasta Dam, and a dam near Fresno, which is now known as the Friant Dam. There was also provision made for canals to make water available to the San Joaquin Valley, to the delta regions, and it further provides for a transmission line from Shasta Dam to Antioch, a distance of 300 miles.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that the total cost of the Central Valley project, including the steam plant and the transmission line, will be approximately $228,000,000. Of this amount there has already been appropriated $110,950,000. It is estimated that the total cost of the transmission line will be $20,000,000 and the cost of the steam plant to firm the power and also to firm the delivery of water will be $15,000,000. By the end of 1943 power will be brought into production at the Shasta Dam. This power is badly needed for industrial purposes in our war effort.

Mr. Speaker, I do not look on this as a question of public ownership of power or private ownership. The United States Government has an investment here already of $110,000,000, and the completed project will cost $228,000,000. The law has provided certain purposes to be carried out and the power-line feature has already been approved, in order to make the power to be generated available to the market, and hence, make the project economically feasible.

Mr. Speaker, I am asking that the House approve the pending amendment so that the purposes of this act may be carried out, and that firm contracts for both power and water can be entered into for the benefit of the people of northern California.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT].

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I asked for 5 minutes. The chairman of the subcommittee assured me I could have 5 minutes, and now I find myself with 2 minutes after a battle on the floor to get time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention to the fact that this project was set up as an irrigation project in the first place. I hold in my hand a folder just released by the Interior Department.

I read:

To many farmers whose very existence depends upon an adequate supply of water for irrigation, the most important features of the Central Valley project are the two large gravity canals leading from Friant-The Madera Canal on the north side of the canyon and the Friant-Kern Canal on the south side.

Now, what are we up against here? Instead of going ahead and completing this project as a water project, it has gone into a power project. Right now, when our own boys are trying to win on the battle front, we need copper and steel, and this House is asked today to vote for 15,000 tons of steel and 7,700 tons of copper and over 1,000 tons of zinc.

What did my colleague from California [Mr. GEARHART] say over in the Senate? His district joins my district on the north. That is what he said in the Senate, and I read from the Senate hearings:

We down our way don't expect to get a single kilowatt-hour of electricity which is to be generated at Shasta or Keswick, at the northern end of the valley. We are interested only in water.

Then he stands before this House today and pleads for a steam plant and a transmission line.

Mr. GEARHART. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. I do not yield.

Mr. GEARHART. I told you why.

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Sure you told me why, but at the same time our people are crying for water. Down where the gentleman from California [Mr. GEARHART] and I live, last year we used 371,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electric energy. About 45 to 60 percent of that can be released immediately for other purposes if we have completion of the Central Valley water project as it was set up in the first place, for water, but not as a power project.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA].

CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT

Mr. LEA. Mr. Speaker, the principal sources of power for the Central Valley project are at the Shasta and Keswick Dams. These dams are above the head of Sacramento Valley, about 180 miles north of Sacramento, and about 230 miles from a proposed central distribution point in the San Francisco Bay section. There is a market area for electric current between the plants and Sacramento such as we ordinarily find in an important agriculture valley. There is a further market of importance at Sacramento. Part of the lower valley and the bay area will be important consuming sections for developed power.

The appropriation proposed in this conference report contemplates the construction of a transmission line from the power plants along the east side of the Sacramento Valley to Oroville, where it would connect with existing lines of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and integrate with the electric supply of that company.

The Pacific Gas & Electric Co. is the principal producer and distributor of electric current in the whole of northern California. It has 49 hydro and 12 steam plants in operation at favorable sites. Its system of supply is integrated and firmed by the diversity of its sources of supply and by its 12 steam plants.

The plans of the Central Valley project contemplate the beginning of production in the early months of 1944. Regardless of the plans for long-time operations, the immediate necessity is to integrate the production of the Government plants of the Central Valley project with the Pacific Gas & Electric so that the greatest possible production of power at the earliest practicable time can be provided to meet possible war necessities for 1944. Cooperation of these two agencies of production necessitate, at least, a connecting line between the Central Valley

power plants and the Pacific Gas & Electric lines at Oroville, from which power can be transmitted to any places where needed in northern California.

The line from the plants to Oroville would be over 100 miles long. The Pacific Gas & Electric now has a line running by the Central Valley power plants to Oroville. That line now carries its capacity.

So, whether built by the Pacific Gas & Electric or the Government, this line is needed for the earliest practical coordination of distribution by these two sources of power. Either its total or joint construction by the Government, is in my opinion, warranted at this time.

The amount of this appropriation is not sufficient to build a steel power line for this distance, but probably is sufficient to build a wooden tower line. This is suggested on account of a shortage of critical steel materials. It is within the possibilities, also, that the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. and the Government may unite in the joint construction and use of this line.

Two generators are to be first installed at the Shasta Dam. The line to Oroville will serve to carry the production of these two generators. Within a year later, 1945, it is expected the production will be increased by six other generators at Shasta and Keswick so that the full capacity of 450,000 kilowatts will be reached and that will require two additional transmission lines. Those two lines are not provided for by this appropriation.

A permanent policy in reference to relations between the Pacific Gas & Electric and the Central Valley, from a distribution standpoint, should be determined before these two main lines are built.

The legal authorization for the Central Valley project contemplates a completed production and distribution unit including lines of transmission. It is within the legalized authority, however, for the project to be operated in cooperation, or integration, wholly or partly, with other power distribution agencies.

The distribution policy finally adopted must determine as to whether the sale of its power is to be at the plant, or from its transmission lines to other distributors, or to municipal and other consumers directly from the lines of the project. That question is not necessarily involved in the appropriation before us in this conference report.

The Reclamation Bureau requested an appropriation of $750,000 to include preparation of plans for a steam plant and for the purchase of a site therefor. Funds thus requested have been reduced in this proposal to $200,000 to be used for the preparation of plans. It is for that purpose this sum is to be applied if approved by Congress.

If plans for a steam plant are fully prepared, Congress, when the occasion arises, can determine whether or not it desires in the light of conditions at that time, to authorize the construction of a steam power plant by appropriating funds for that purpose.

Looked at from the standpoint of production and distribution, the weakest point in the project's power production is the fact that we must expect years of deficient water supply which now and then will very substantially reduce power production and limit the ability to make firm contracts. In effect the ability to make firm contracts for power is determined by the minimum rather than the average production.

So, if we regard the Central Valley project as a single unit, self-sufficient for production and distribution, its production of electricity and, consequently, its earning capacity, is materially reduced for lack of firm power. If the project is to be continued as a separate unit, especially without integration with existing power facilities, then a steam plant to supplement and firm its power would be a very necessary part of the project. This is particularly true when we look toward the ultimate end of making the project self-supporting.

Therefore, it seems perfectly plain that if the project is to be properly managed from the basis of financial returns, it must be supplied by an auxiliary source of power production. Such an auxiliary service can be provided by constructing a steam plant as part of the project, or by integrating this project with the facilities of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

When the general policy is adopted it will involve the question whether or not, even though distribution should be left to other agencies, the sale by the Government should be from its plant, with or without reenforcement of stabilized power by a steam plant.

It has developed in recent years, through unusual periods of restricted rainfall, that the firm power possibilities of the project are greatly reduced by years of low water supply.

A steam plant which contemplates 150,000-kilowatt production would increase the firm power of the project to the full extent of that production. Though not needed in some years, it would be greatly needed in a sufficient number of years to make it essential, if the project is to be operated as an independent unit, both in production and distribution.

The only opportunity for firming its power other than by a steam plant is by cooperation and integration with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co., where the production of the Government project would be augmented by the supply and firm provisions of that private company. Whether that shall be done is a question that must be answered by Congress when we are called upon to vote for or against the establishment of a steam plant and main transmission lines and is not necessarily involved in the question today.

Government distribution would give the Government the advantage of operating as an independent unit and selecting its own customers, so far as it could do so, in competition with the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

Other considerations in making that decision are as between investment of private and public funds and the relative resulting benefits by net income that may come to the public.

I realize that construction on this project must be placed with due regard to our military situation. The large amounts involved, the importance of completing the project to secure its benefits, and to place it in production to relieve the carrying charge for construction and for the investments already made must also be accepted as reasons for the earliest practical completion of the project.

We must take into consideration the multiple character of the relief and benefits that will be given by this project. The water supply of the watersheds of the northern reservoirs is generally abundant, but, as demonstrated in recent times, there are years of very substantial deficiency. Next to the need of impounding the water available, one of the most important needs for the project is to augment the water and power supply over these intermittent deficiency periods.

This project offers several fundamental benefits. They include an irrigation supply, the need of which becomes particularly acute in the years of deficient rainfall or snow.

There is the need of maintaining sufficient volume of water for navigation needs. This volume of water is decreased in years of water deficiency by irrigation and low stream flow. The Sacramento River is notable among streams of similar size in the country for the amount of its transportation.

Equally related to the deficient stream flow is the problem of preventing the incursion of the vast and productive lands of the Delta area by salt water due to the deficient flow of fresh water into the bay tidewater.

The irrigating canals south of the junction of the San Joaquin River and Sacramento River will furnish irrigation that is greatly needed.

The water supply made possible by a comparatively constant summer flow will afford a dependable source for domestic and industrial enterprises of importance.

The power-development feature of the project is primarily essential as the means of financing the project to accomplish its main purposes. The normal activities of power plants supplied by the northern reservoirs will ordinarily permit a volume of water to meet these main purposes of the project.

Each one of these main uses of the project is important and necessary to the economic progress, production, and stabilization of agriculture and industry in this great interior section of California. The satisfaction of these needs constitutes an urgent and very important reason, while the construction of the project should advance with all practical speed.

This project was originally estimated to cost $170,000,000. Those figures were based upon costs prevailing in the depression period.

The increased size and cost of the canals and the increased cost of labor by about 35 percent, and the steam plant whose completion will cost $15,000,000,

have been added to the original estimates, making the present estimate for completion $264,000,000. The project includes these several beneficial purposes which greatly contribute to the public good, to the increased economic importance and stabilization of the Pacific coast area. The increased cost of the project has necessarily increased its burdens and the necessity of placing its operation on an efficiency income-producing basis to the full extent that the circumstances will fairly permit. The compensation must be looked for not entirely in its net income but in its ultimate value to the country.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD].

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I decline to yield until such time as I have completed my statement.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to treat this situation unemotionally, because frankly I consider there has been enough dog fighting and political messing in this issue without having any more injections of that character.

I would like to say to my colleagues who have preceded me on the floor of the House and expressed concern about my future I feel responsible to my constituency in the great State of California, and they do not have to worry or pave the way for my reelection. Consequently they can forget my future welfare. I will try to take care of myself politically without their assistance as expressed by their indirect treatment of the issue.

Now, let us discuss the issue we have before us. In the first place, this subcommittee received a very definite mandate to go back to the Senate conference and bring back to the House a bill that would be accepted by the House with some degree of economy effected in what we brought back. I say definitely that the conferees tried to and did do a pretty good job in that second conference. We made a considerable reduction in the bill to the extent of $5,434,214; $4,000,000 of that was transferred over to the Navy, so that in turn it could be handled through that source of appropriations, to the Bureau of Mines. It left a balance of $1,444,214 as a saving in the second conference.

I would like to call your attention to this fact if today you wish to reiterate larger savings, there is left a further procedure by which you can make a reduction in this bill, and in my opinion hurt nobody who is interested in facts. That is, by reducing the sum that is now under discussion—Central Valley—in the amount of $3,723,000 plus $200,000, a total of $3,943,000 which is for transmission lines and engineering.

In doing that, from the information I have been able to secure you are not going to hurt the development of the project or the so-called wartime program. With that in mind I call attention to a communication that was written on June 4, signed by F. W. Crandall, major, Specialists Corps, Power Branch, Resources Division, of our Government, from which I quote the following:

To: Governmental Requirements Branch, third floor, first wing, Temporary "E."

From: Power Branch, Resources Division, S. O. S., War Department, Munitions Building.

Subject: Sacramento Valley, construction of high-tension transmission line (Central Valley project) from Shasta Dam and Keswick to San Francisco area.

It is recommended that this project be indefinitely postponed until the end of 1942 for the following reasons:

1. The first unit at Keswick will not be delivered before September 1943 and there is a possibility that this delivery date will be delayed until the end of 1943.

2. Nine months will be ample time for the construction of this line and, therefore, this project should be resubmitted later for construction on wood poles.

That is certified to by Lt. Col. John C. Damon. He is one of the members of the board.

In picking up this morning's Washington News my attention was called to the headlines on Raymond Clapper's column: Raw Material Mess. In his column he goes to great length to discuss the priorities situation in this country on copper and various other materials, including rubber and iron. I quote a portion of his statement:

A similar situation is developing with regard to steel. It won't hit the average citizen so directly, but it already is being felt in war production.

The war-production program expands steadily but steel production, which is the basis of war output, is hitting its ceiling. We could produce 90,000,000 tons of steel this year. But we may fall 5,000,000 tons short for lack of scrap.

Why at this time dissipate the needed material? It is not necessary, and Judge LEAVY's motion should be voted down.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK].

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield before he begins his statement?

Mr. MCCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. COX. I simply want to express my appreciation of the statement made by the gentleman from California [Mr. LEA]. The gentleman happens to be very much of a favorite of mine. I regard him and know him to be one of the most careful legislators in this House. He helped me make up my mind. I trust the preferential motion will prevail.

Mr. MCCORMACK. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself constrained to disagree with the position taken by my good friend and colleague from California who just preceded me. I take my position upon the broader aspects of the question involved in the pending motion. The Central Valley project, while located in California, is a matter of extreme importance in these days to our country. Donald Nelson has recommended the appropriation of $7,000,000, and certainly this amount of $3,723,000 is necessary in connection with the war effort. It seems to me that the evidence and the opinions of Mr. Nelson cannot be disregarded; certainly, I cannot place myself in a position where I am going to disregard the significance that should be attached to the views and the opinions of Mr. Nelson who in these trying days occupies such an important position in the life of our Nation.

In addition to that I hold in my hand a letter addressed to Speaker RAYBURN, dated June 23, 1942. It reads as follows:

MY DEAR SAM: In connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1943, the Senate restored an item of $3,723,000 which had been previously appropriated to commence construction of transmission lines in connection with the Central Valley project. This item had been eliminated by the House. The Senate also approved an appropriation of $200,000 for preliminary engineering in connection with the construction of a steam plant to firm up Central Valley power.

I hope that the House will concur with the Senate's action on these two items. They are vital to the success of the project, and particularly the transmission lines should be speedily built in order to make Central Valley power available for war industries.

Sincerely yours,

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the statement of the President of the United States as the Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy of the United States, and the evidence submitted by Donald Nelson is of such convincing nature as to make up my mind that this is a matter of national importance.

I hope the House will recede and concur with the Senate amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this proposal for two reasons: First, an appropriation for this sum at this time, the letter of the President of the United States to the contrary notwithstanding, is not necessary and essential now. If our distinguished majority floor leader will contact a member of the Army and Navy Munitions Board, to which matters of priority are referred by the War Production Board, he will find that an application was made by the Bureau of Reclamation for the beginning of this transmission line, and, as stated by the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD] a few moments ago, was refused on January 4, 1942, because they said it is recommended that this project be indefinitely postponed for the following reasons, and then they go on to say that the power will not be available for some time and therefore the appropriation at this time should not be made, that subsequent appropriation bills could carry the appropriations, and that the power line can be built within ample time. I had a telephone conversation with Col. John C. Damon, who is a member of that Board and who, by the way, if any Member wishes to talk to him can be called at Republic 6700, Extension 72111. He will tell you what he told

me. I asked him if this appropriation should be made at this time. He said: "Not one dollar should be appropriated at this time. We are here to win a war." That is what he has most in mind, and he said that at the proper time, as suggested in their communication, this application could be made, but that not one dollar should be appropriated for the steam plant or for the transmission lines at this time.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield.

Mr. FADDIS. I might say to the gentleman at this time that shell factories are being shut down for want of copper to make brass.

Mr. CARTER. I have no doubt of that. My second reason for opposing this proposal is that if it were necessary and essential and if we wanted to save the greatest amount of strategic metals and materials possible the thing to do would be to run a temporary line to the already existing power lines of the power company that operates in that vicinity.

Here is what we save, and I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be interested in this. If this is done and temporary wooden poles are used, 8,770 tons of steel will be saved, 1,000 tons of copper, 620 tons of zinc, and 35,000 barrels of cement. If that temporary line is not run over there and connected up with the power company, from this letter I have received signed by Major Crandall, they are only going to permit a temporary line on wooden poles to be built the entire length of the valley. That power line is estimated to cost $23,000,000.

I submit to you just as a cold-blooded business proposition should you build a temporary line, which you should build, a short one connecting up with the already existing power company line that has vacant wires running down to where the longer line is proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation to be built, or to build a long temporary line suggested by the Bureau of Reclamation?

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. Whose congressional districts are those lines and this project in?

Mr. CARTER. The project covers several districts. The steam plant is entirely within my district, and, Mr. Speaker, I am in this unusual position: The Bureau of Reclamation wants to build a $15,000,000 steam plant in my district and I am saying "No." I am voting against it. I wonder why that is? Do you not think I would like to have a $15,000,000 project there? I most certainly would, and the day may come when I will be in here asking you for that $15,000,000. But the plant cannot possibly be built within the next 3, 4, or 5 years, and I say that the $200,000 that is set out there for this steam plant may better be used for military and other purposes.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARTER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Does not the gentleman think that some of this copper could be better utilized in constructing grain-alcohol synthetic-rubber plants?

Mr. CARTER. Probably so. May I say to the gentleman from Nebraska, however, that if a transmission line were necessary now and if it were necessary to start that transmission line now in order to take advantage of that power when it comes into being, I would be here advocating the creation of that transmission line. I would be here advocating this appropriation. But it is absolutely unnecessary, and power will not be available until 1944.

The Bureau of Reclamation, without this appropriation, and after cutting this amount out of the bill, will still have $34,840,750 with which to carry on the work of the Central Valley.

Let me read you an order of the War Production Board. This is an absolute order, known as order L-94, promulgated by the War Production Board on May 1, 1942, and it reads as follows:

> Each utility shall so operate its reservoirs, generation plants, substations, transmission lines, and other facilities, and shall so interchange electric power with other utilities as to achieve the maximum coordination of power supply for war production and essential civilian use, and for relief of power shortages.

What should be done at the present time and as soon as this power is available is to have a coordinated use of the already existing power lines.

The Senate committee in reporting this bill back to the Senate a few days ago said this in its report:

> The hearings held by the committee conclusively show that the quickest way to make a part of the power to be produced at the Shasta Dam available to war industries located in northern California with the least expenditure of critical and strategic materials is by transmitting the same over a comparatively short line, east of the Sacramento River, to Oroville, Calif., where the power can be fed into the existing line of the Pacific Gas & Electric Co.

That is the sane, sensible thing to do, and I, therefore, trust that the motion of the gentleman from Washington will not prevail.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER].

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my own remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BEITER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. This amendment increases by $4,178,250 the appropriation for the Central Valley project being constructed in California by the Bureau of Reclamation for flood control, navigation, irrigation, and power production.

The principal items in this amendment are $200,000 to complete engineering work on a stand-by steam plant, and $3,723,000, which would restore appropriations heretofore made to begin construction of project transmission lines. Although previously appropriated, the funds for the transmission lines were eliminated by the House Appropriations Committee.

May I call your attention to the Senate committee report? On page 2 you will find the following statement:

> This action by the House does not appear to be justified by the testimony presented to the committee and cannot be construed in any other way than as the adoption of a policy which contemplates that all power, both firm and fluctuating, generated at the Shasta and Friant Dams shall be sold when produced to but one customer, which is the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. A majority of your committee believes that this is unsound public policy because:
>
> 1. The acts of Congress authorizing the construction of the Central Valley project, the total cost of which is now estimated as $264,990,000, contemplates the return to the Treasury of the greater part of its costs through sales of power.
>
> 2. To obtain maximum revenues from that source, the Bureau of Reclamation should be in position to deliver the power to the best obtainable market and to more than one customer. When transmitted to such point or points said Bureau should be able to make such power firm by the construction of an auxiliary steam plant.
>
> The committee recognizes that the congressional policy respecting the Central Valley project was adopted during a period of profound peace and that our country is now engaged in a desperate struggle for its existence. Everything must yield to winning the war, but any action taken to insure victory should not be of a character which will prevent a prompt return to the power plan heretofore established for the Central Valley project.

These funds are necessary to make certain the proper distribution of the supply of power for war industries in northern California.

Both items are strongly recommended by Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, in a letter printed on page 525 of the Senate hearings. Mr. Nelson had previously urged funds for these purposes in a letter to Congressman JED. JOHNSON on page 1110 of the House hearings.

Without the steam plant the firm power produced by the project would be severely limited, and the rate of return of the construction cost of the project facilities to the Federal Treasury would be retarded.

The transmission lines are absolutely essential to carry the project power to the markets of northern California. Otherwise the output would be "bottled up" at the dams and war industries deprived of this vital power supply.

A third item in the amendment increases by $250,000 the appropriation made by the House for Friant-Kern and Madera Canals to expedite, as a war measure, the irrigation of land for the production of guayule rubber.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 9 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY].

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, there is much more reason for me to say at this time than earlier that this may be my valedictory, because I am shortly leaving Congress to assume my new duties on the Federal bench. I go with a feeling of sad-

ness. You are a great group of people, my colleagues.

I came to Congress 6 years ago. I came then fighting for Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and Government transmission lines. I came fighting for mighty projects and to preserve them as blessings for all the people. I have the happy satisfaction of now leaving the Congress with the kindliest feelings toward all of my colleagues, those who have opposed as well as those who have supported me in my efforts, supporting the great works now completed in the Pacific Northwest. By October of this year 33 percent of the aluminum that goes into our planes will come as a result of power carried from the Columbia River projects at Grand Coulee and Bonneville over those Government lines. Can you conceive of anything that has more to do in the winning of this war than the magic energy we now get in such large volume?

Let me say just a word or two about Central Valley. It is not in my State, it is hundreds of miles away; but as a member of the Interior Committee, and being particularly interested in reclamation, I became quite familiar with that project over the last 6 years. This is a giant reclamation project. It will cost somewhere between $225,000,000 and $275,000,000.

Every dollar of this is to be paid back to the Federal Treasury over a period of 40 years, the reclamation feature without interest and the power feature with interest.

When it was engineered and set up, it was stated that the project to be feasible at all, must look to power for a part of the revenues to pay this enormous burden. A part of the plan then was to not only build this series of dams and install the generators but to build the transmission lines away from the busbar down to the market center. Then the private power group or any public agency could buy the power from the Government, but the power and transmission features would belong to the Government.

It was with that in mind that this project has gone forward. The steam plant, some 200 miles away from this great dam, is proposed for the purpose of leveling off what they call the firm power as distinguished from the secondary power. This is the hydro project. If there is no provision to firm up the power when the water level is low, since primarily this is a reclamation project, so if the land needs the water it must be taken out, then you have to be able to turn somewhere to get power for existing uses, and that is when the steam plant becomes absolutely essential. The steam plant increases the firm-power output of the Shasta Dam over 300 percent.

The private power companies are paying the Government on reclamation projects something like one-half a mill per kilowatt-hour for secondary power, and they classify virtually all of it as secondary power. This steam plant would make valuable firm power worth 2, 3, or 4 mills a kilowatt-hour and accordingly increase the income to the Government and save a like sum for the landowners.

In the 6 years I have been in the House I have never knowingly made a statement—and I shall not do so now—that I could not support by facts. In the first place, the power at Shasta Dam today is bottled up. There is no way to take it away. If these lines had been built as a part of a coordinated plan as first designed, there would be a transmission line leading away from Shasta Dam and there would be installed today two generators of 75,000 kilowatts each. They were ordered 3 years ago and are finished and delivered, but they cannot be used there at Shasta, so they are being taken up to Grand Coulee. This must be done because we are tragically short of electric energy, so they are being installed there where we have transmission facilities. These generators are misfits at Grand Coulee. We would rather have had the big 108,000-kilowatt generators that the dam was designed to use. But the Government must have electric power because we must have aluminum and magnesium to build planes, which we must have or else face defeat. Thus, since there is no line from Shasta to a power market, they cannot use their completed generators.

I am making these statements upon absolute authority. You can verify them from Mr. Page, Commissioner of Reclamation, or you can verify them from the hearings before the House and the Senate for this year.

There is a small transmission line leading from Oroville, I understand, which is 100 miles away, up to Shasta dam. That is the line over which the power was carried in to construct the dam. The dam is now practically built. It provides for 5 great generators there of 75,000 kilowatts each. That little line would no more carry away the power from one of those generators than a garden hose would carry the water you would expect a 4- or 5-inch fire hose to carry.

Somebody has to build this transmission line. What does Mr. Page say? He says, "If the Government builds these transmission lines and the firming up steam plant at Antioch, it will mean to the people under this project and to the United States Treasury a net of $1,500,000 a year better than any offer that has ever been made to buy power by the private utility that now operates and controls in that region. Over the life of the irrigation contract it will mean from $60,000,000 to $80,000,000 more to the people in that reclamation project. It will likewise amortize the project itself." Are you going to give this great and valuable prize to the private utility?

Another thing, every dollar of the money here involved has been in this amendment heretofore appropriated by the House and the Senate, and the President signed the bill carrying this appropriation almost a year ago. We have a most unusual situation here. In the regular Interior supply bill of a year ago we had $1,100,000 provided for this purpose. You never heard a word of objection then, did you? Then in a deficiency bill we had $3,000,000 more, making $4,100,000. Mr. Page has obligated and spent $377,000 of that money on this transmission project already, and the $3,700,000 is the remainder of the money we have heretofore appropriated.

You may say, "How did that unusual situation arise?" It arose in this manner. The Bureau of the Budget said, "For 1943 we will give this project $15,000,000, but we will include therein the $3,700,000 that has heretofore been appropriated but not yet expended."

In the subcommittee, by a vote of 4 to 3, with one member being away, we cut out the $15,000,000, very unfortunately, I think. The bill went in the Senate, and the Senate restored only the $3,723,000 for the transmission lines, and $200,000, not to build the steam plant, but to do engineering work, looking to future construction of such a plant.

To my reclamation friends, let me say that in this same item you are now asked to vote upon, particularly I say this to the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT], who stated that this is primarily a reclamation project, there is $250,000 for reclamation for the Friant-Kern Canal, a vote against this amendment is a vote against the reclamation features of Central Valley.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will follow the lead of our Commander in Chief in a time like this, and vote favorably on my motion to recede and concur.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington be read by the Clerk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. LEAVY moves that the House recede from its disagreement to Senate amendment No. 156 and concur in the same.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Washington.

The question was taken; and, the Chair being in doubt, the House divided; and there were—ayes 107, noes 79.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 195, nays 141, not voting 96, as follows:

[Roll No. 92]

YEAS—195

Allen, La.	Boehne	Byrne
Andersen, H. Carl	Boggs	Byron
Anderson, N. Mex.	Bolton	Camp
Angell	Bonner	Cannon, Mo.
Arnold	Boren	Cartwright
Barden	Bradley, Pa.	Case, S. Dak.
Barnes	Brooks	Casey, Mass.
Barry	Brown, Ga.	Cochran
Beiter	Bryson	Coffee, Wash.
Bland	Buck	Collins
Bloom	Bulwinkle	Colmer
	Burdick	Cooper
	Burgin	Costello

Courtney	Hunter	Rankin, Miss
Cox	Imhoff	Rankin, Mont.
Creal	Izac	Richards
Crosser	Jackson	Rivers
Culkin	Jacobsen	Robinson, Utah
D'Alesandro	Jarman	Rogers, Mass.
Davis, Ohio	Johnson, Calif.	Romjue
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Luther A.	Sabath
Dingell	Johnson, Okla.	Sacks
Domengeaux	Keefe	Sanders
Doughton	Kelley, Pa.	Sasscer
Downs	Kelly, Ill.	Sauthoff
Drewry	Kopplemann	Scanlon
Duncan	Kramer	Schulte
Dworshak	Lea	Scrugham
Eberharter	Leavy	Shanley
Eliot, Mass.	Lesinski	Sikes
Englebright	Lewis	Smith, Pa.
Fitzgerald	Ludlow	Smith, Wash.
Fitzpatrick	McCormack	Snyder
Flaherty	McIntyre	Sparkman
Flannagan	McMillan	Spence
Fogarty	Maciejewski	Steagall
Folger	Maciora	Sullivan
Forand	Magnuson	Sumners, Tex.
Ford, Miss.	Mahon	Sutphin
Ford, Thomas F.	Manasco	Tarver
Gale	Marcantonio	Tenerowicz
Gamble	Mason	Terry
Gearhart	Merritt	Thom
Gehrmann	Mills, La.	Thomas, Tex.
Gibson	Monroney	Thomason
Gore	Mott	Tolan
Granger	Murdock	Traynor
Grant, Ala.	Nelson	Vinson, Ga.
Green	Nichols	Voorhis, Calif.
Gregory	Norton	Ward
Haines	O'Brien, Mich.	Wasielewski
Harris, Ark.	O'Connor	Weaver
Harris, Va.	O'Hara	Weiss
Harter	Pace	Welch
Hartley	Patman	Wene
Healey	Patton	Whelchel
Hébert	Peterson, Fla.	White
Hefferman	Peterson, Ga.	Whitten
Hill, Colo.	Pfeifer, Joseph L.	Whittington
Hill, Wash.	Pierce	Wickersham
Hinshaw	Poage	Williams
Hobbs	Priest	Wolverton, N. J.
Holbrock	Rabaut	Wright
Holland	Ramsay	Young
Hope	Ramspeck	Zimmerman
Houston	Randolph	
Hull		

NAYS—141

Allen, Ill.	Graham	Pittenger
Anderson, Calif.	Grant, Ind.	Ploeser
Andresen, August H.	Guyer	Plumley
Andrews	Gwynne	Powers
Arends	Hall, Leonard W.	Reece, Tenn.
Bates, Mass.	Hancock	Reed, N. Y.
Baumhart	Hare	Rees, Kans.
Bell	Heidinger	Rich
Bender	Hess	Rizley
Bennett	Hoffman	Robertson, Va.
Bishop	Holmes	Robsion, Ky.
Brown, Ohio	Howell	Rockefeller
Butler	Jenks, N. H.	Rockwell
Canfield	Jennings	Rodgers, Pa.
Carlson	Jensen	Rolph
Carter	Johnson, Ill.	Russell
Chapman	Johnson, Ind.	Satterfield
Chenoweth	Johnson, W. Va.	Secrest
Chiperfield	Jones	Shafer, Mich.
Clason	Jonkman	Sheppard
Clevenger	Kean	Short
Coffee, Nebr.	Kilburn	Simpson
Cole, N. Y.	Kilday	Smith, Maine
Cooley	Kinzer	Smith, Ohio
Copeland	Kleberg	Smith, Va.
Cravens	Knutson	Smith, Wis.
Crawford	Kunkel	Springer
Cunningham	Lambertson	Stefan
Curtis	Landis	Stevenson
Day	Lanham	Stratton
Dirksen	LeCompte	Sumner, Ill.
Ditter	McGregor	Taber
Dondero	McLaughlin	Talle
Durham	McLean	Thill
Elliott, Calif.	Martin, Iowa	Tibbott
Elston	Martin, Mass.	Treadway
Engel	May	Van Zandt
Faddis	Meyer, Md.	Vincent, Ky.
Fellows	Michener	Vorys, Ohio
Fenton	Miller	Wadsworth
Ford, Leland M.	Moser	West
Fulmer	Mundt	Wheat
Gathings	Norrell	Wigglesworth
Gerlach	O'Brien, N. Y.	Winter
Gillette	Paddock	Wolcott
Gillie	Pheiffer, William T.	Woodrum, Va.
Gossett		Youngdahl

NOT VOTING—96

Baldwin	Halleck	Myers, Pa.
Bates, Ky.	Harness	O'Day
Beam	Harrington	O'Leary
Beckworth	Hart	Oliver
Blackney	Hendricks	O'Neal
Boykin	Hook	Osmers
Bradley, Mich.	Jarrett	O'Toole
Buckler, Minn.	Jenkins, Ohio	Patrick
Buckley, N. Y.	Johns	Pearson
Burch	Johnson, Lyndon B.	Plauché
Cannon, Fla.	Kee	Reed, Ill.
Capozzoli	Kefauver	Robertson, N. Dak.
Celler	Kennedy, Martin J.	Rogers, Okla.
Clark	Kennedy, Michael J.	Schaefer, Ill.
Claypool	Kocialkowski	Schuetz
Cluett	Lane	Scott
Cole, Md.	Larrabee	Shannon
Crowther	Keogh	Sheridan
Cullen	Kerr	Smith, W. Va.
Delaney	Kirwan	Somers, N. Y.
Dewey	Klein	South
Dickstein	Kocialkowski	Starnes, Ala.
Dies	Lane	Stearns, N. H.
Disney	Larrabee	Sweeney
Douglas	Lynch	Thomas, N. J.
Eaton	McGehee	Tinkham
Edmiston	McGranery	Vreeland
Ellis	McKeough	Walter
Fish	Maas	Wilson
Gavagan	Mansfield	Wolfenden, Pa.
Gifford	Marcantonio	Woodruff, Mich.
Gilchrist	Mills, Ark.	Worley
Hall, Edwin Arthur	Mitchell	
	Murray	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Clark with Mr. Eaton.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Wolfenden of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Jenkins of Ohio.

Mr. Burch with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.

Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Reed of Illinois.

Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Blackney.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Fish.

Mr. Mills of Arkansas with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. Scott.

Mr. Claypool with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Keogh with Mr. Cluett.

Mr. Hook with Mr. Dewey.

Mr Boykin with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Oliver.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. Hart with Mr. Tinkham.

Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Harness.

Mr. Beckworth with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Harrington with Mr. Douglas.

Mr. Capozzoli with Mr. Johns.

Mr Schuetz with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Murray.

Mr Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mr. Disney with Mr. Crowther.

Mr. Cullen with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. South with Mr. Stearns of New Hampshire.

Mr. Lane with Mr. Gilchrist.

Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. Cannon of Florida with Mr. Marcantonio.

Mr. Klein with Mr. Sweeney.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Edmiston.

Mr. Dies with Mr. Lynch.

Mr. Worley with Mr. Myers of Pennsylvania.

Mr. McKeough with Mr. Pearson.

Mr. O'Toole with Mr. Patrick.

Mr. Beam with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Buckley of New York.

Mr. Schaefer of Illinois with Mr. Somers of New York.

Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Kirwan.

Mr Dickstein with Mr. Rogers of Oklahoma.

Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Kee.

Mr. Kocialkowski with Mr. McGranery.

Mr. Shannon with Mrs. O'Day.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 162: On page 84, in line 18, after the word "works", insert "including the operation and maintenance of camp and construction facilities heretofore or hereafter turned over by construction contractors, and similar facilities and the furnishing of services related thereto."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield for a question?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Will the gentleman tell us what this amendment involves? It seems to be setting us up in the housing business.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I would be glad to have the gentleman from Washington [Mr. LEAVY] answer the gentleman's question in detail if the gentleman desires to do so.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, when the original contract was let for the construction of Grand Coulee Dam, it provided that when the contractor completed his work, all facilities which he had constructed in the way of buildings of every type, including living quarters and so forth used in connection with his work, should revert to the Government. The contract is now a completed matter and this property has come over to the Government. This is not putting the Government into business, but the Reclamation Service is carrying on the scores of details that are to be done there to operate this great property, but the personal property which is valued at thousands of dollars has become the property of the Government in accordance with the provisions of the contract.

Mr. TABER. Is it proposed that the Government shall continue to maintain a lot of houses around this place?

Mr. LEAVY. No; that is not proposed.

Mr. TABER. How many houses are involved?

Mr. LEAVY. The Reclamation Service has a little village of its own, since it requires six or seven hundred men on this project. These buildings are permanent while the buildings referred to here are the buildings where the employees lived during the construction over the last 9 years. It will require a year or more to complete the clean-up work there. The buildings are of a temporary nature and when the clean-up work is done that part of the building no longer needed will be taken out.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 171: On page 86, line 9, strike out "$70,317,970" and insert "$80,384,000."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 171, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$78,979,340."

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 192: On page 97, after line 8, insert:

"Experimental plant for synthesis of motor fuel, Pittsburgh, Pa.: For the construction and equipment of a building on Government-owned land adjacent to the Bureau of Mines Central Experiment Station at Pittsburgh, Pa., for chemical engineering study of processes for the synthesis of liquid motor fuels and lubricants from gases, and all necessary expenses incident thereto, including supplies and equipment and the engagement by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine of the services of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof necessary to design, construct, and equip the building, $85,000.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment and yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] 5 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we just got licked on amendment No. 152. I am used to getting licked, but I am not in the habit of stopping a fight. I am here to fight to the end.

Now here is the situation with respect to this amendment No. 192: They are asking for $85,000,000 to build a laboratory as an addition to the laboratory at Pittsburgh, Pa., for the purpose of trying to see whether we can get gasoline out of coal. That is probably all right. Then the next amendment you are going to have here will be for another laboratory out in the Northwest, and you are going to be asked to spend $500,000 there to see what you can do with electricity.

Then the next amendment is to build another laboratory some place out in the West for $600,000, and then you are going to see what you can find out there about getting things out of oil. These are all experimental development stations. We now have set up 11 different experiment stations. This morning we had the first deficiency appropriation bill. In that deficiency appropriation bill under the War, the Army, and the Navy, and the other agencies, the House Committee on Appropriations voted out $73,000,000 for that particular purpose. Certainly, we are going to have duplication; it is bound to come unless you centralize your efforts to one body. I don't want to take anything away from the Bureau of Mines. I think that is work that should be done. That is where it should be done, but when you spend $73,000,000 for this purpose in one bill you ought to know where the money is going. Let me give you a list of the experimental stations that we have already established. This list was given out by Dr. Fieldner. There is one large experimental station at Pittsburgh, Pa. There is the eastern experimental station at College Park, Md.; the southern experimental station in Tuscaloosa, Ala.; the electrical technical laboratory, at Norris, Tenn., and they want to put another one like it in the Northwest. Then there is the Mississippi Valley experimental station in Missouri; and the petroleum experimental station, at Barnsville, Okla.; and one at Laramie, Wyo. Then there is another experimental station at Salt Lake City, Utah; and there is the Northwest station at Minneapolis; and one at Seattle; and one at Boulder City, Nev., and a rare-metals station at Reno, Nev.; an experimental station at Berkeley, Calif.; and the southwestern station, at Tucson, Ariz. Now you want to go ahead in this bill and build three more. There are not going to be three more agencies by the time you have them built, because I do not believe that the departments will give you the equipment for fixing them up. I don't think they will be agencies to help in this war movement. I think it is about time that we eliminate things from this Department, when you are going to have an appropriation bill here before the week is out for $73,000,000 for the same purpose.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with interest but with disagreement to our colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] as he has discussed this item of expenditure of $85,000 for an experimental station for the United States Bureau of Mines to be located at Pittsburgh.

The reason I take the Well of the House today in opposition to the view expressed by the gentleman who has just spoken is to call attention of the membership to the information on this subject that a subcommittee of the Mines and Mining Committee of this House has received while engaged for several weeks in the study and investigation of the processes of making rubber and gasoline and plastics and other materials from coal or coke.

These developments should now be used in creating materials which today should be going into our war effort and would be, if we had carried forward experiment and research in years gone by, instead of being found now, literally, closing the door after the horse is stolen, or to use another popular phrase of too little, too late. It is part of a sane, wholesome, economic policy for this Congress to carry on experimental and research work. Dr. A. C. Fieldner, Chief of the Coal Division of the Bureau of Mines, before our subcommittee told us that approximately 50 percent of all of the gasoline being used by the German war machine today is being produced from coal. I am not now arguing especially for coal or for farm products being turned into rubber, but it is true that Dr. William J. Hale stated to us last Wednesday that corn and potatoes could be used in producing rubber and other items now valuable in the prosecution of the war.

I do appeal to this House today, regardless of the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], to continue the experimental plant in this bill in the amount of $85,000 for this work at Pittsburgh.

This plant would provide for the construction and equipment for chemical engineering studies of the synthesis of gasoline and oils by the Fischer-Tropsch process. I believe it would be interesting to state that this process is called after Franz Fischer, who is the director at the present time of the Institute for Coal Research laboratory in Germany. This plant is operated by Hitler and it is estimated that 500,000 tons of gasoline were produced in 1939 by this process. Partner of Dr. Fischer in this work was Hans Tropsch, who is now dead. Germany and Japan have conducted extensive research and in both these countries we are today face to face with the fact that fuels and lubricants are being used in the war effort against us by these strong enemies. No experimental work has yet been carried forward in this country. We need first-hand information. This plant, which will be able to produce 100 pounds of gasoline daily, will be concerned with research. Dr. A. W. Gauger, director of the Mineral Industries Research laboratory, Pennsylvania State College; Dr. Gustav Egloff, noted research advocate for the oil industry; Dr. H. H. Lowry, director of the Coal Research Laboratory at Carnegie Institute of Technology; Dr. C. H. Fisher, and Dr. Fieldner all testified before our committee on the importance of an increasing experimental and research program.

Some day we will realize that dollars spent in this way in further investigation and research will pay dividends a hundred or a thousandfold to the America of tomorrow.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. Yes; I yield.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman know that there is going to be a bill here before the week is over for $73,000,000 for scientific research and development under the War and Navy Departments, and that then they could concentrate their efforts and see to it that there is no duplication?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I am sorry that the gentleman opposes this small amount vitally needed now—not later—for carrying on experimentation in the uses of coal for synthetic processes for the production of rubber and gasoline.

Mr. RICH. I am not opposed to a proper development of laboratory work, but I think that we have laboratories enough now, and that you will bring about duplication by building these.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from West Virginia has expired.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] 5 minutes.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, it is significant that on the day we get the report from Libya that we lost 18,000 men and millions of dollars worth of equipment we should be meeting and voting millions of dollars more for nondefense

purposes here. This is a sample of the technique the majority has adopted here of late. A moment or two ago we voted millions of dollars for nondefense expenditure in California, an item that is not necessary for the war effort, as was indicated by the statement read by the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER], a member of the committee.

I am constrained to read an editorial from the Democratic Cleveland Plain Dealer. This is what they say about this procedure:

WHEREIN CONGRESS FAILS

Several matters of importance come to mind in connection with the huge war appropriation voted by the House Tuesday.

The first is that the appropriation of money is but the beginning both of the production of essential war materials and the raising of revenue.

The second is that a vote in the House for a huge war appropriation is a mark neither of statesmanship nor of warm approval of the war effort.

The third is that a public which has read of huge war appropriations for a year or more and has been subjected both to high taxation and serious inconvenience as a result of war activity is beginning to wonder when it may expect a reasonable dividend on its investment.

Many of the Members of Congress who have voted consistently for appropriations have apparently taken the position that their responsibility ends when appropriation bills were enacted. There has been all too little disposition in Congress to get behind the movement sponsored by Senator BYRD to compel the executive departments to curtail sharply their expenditures for nonessential purposes. What we mean to say is that in these times statesmanship and patriotism demand not only the voting up of war appropriations but also the voting down of proposed appropriations for the multiple Federal activities which are remote from the war.

A vote for a war appropriations bill is, moreover, no demonstration of statesmanship unless it is by inference, at least, a vote also for sound means of raising the money in question. It is an unhappy commentary on the present Congress that it has displayed virtually no leadership in the matter of prudent war finance. It has been content rather to follow the leadership of the Treasury which has not been marked by virility and has been content to think of taxation rather in terms of social reform and the persecution of big business than in terms or revenue production.

The situation in Congress has been much the same with respect to the production of war materials. Congressional committees have been appointed to investigate this and that aspect of war activity, but in too few cases with the thought of promoting the war effort and in too many for the purpose of embarrassing corporate executives; of placing responsibility upon them for shortcomings on the part of the administration itself, as in the synthetic rubber controversy, and of promoting as usual the New Deal campaign against successful business enterprises and the economic system for which, among other things, we are fighting.

If, as the public has had reasons to believe in the last few days, the war itself is not going well for the United Nations it is a definite responsibility of the Congress to determine the reasons. It is significant in this connection that a cry went up immediately in the House of Commons for a full explanation of the facts behind the fall of Tobruk.

The American public has a right to expect from the Congress a similar sense of responsibility and a determination on its part to see to it that those charged with the direct conduct of the war use our manpower, materials, and money wisely and prudently. The prevailing notion that Congress must follow along until some major catastrophe such as Pearl Harbor occurs before asserting the authority of the legislative branch of the Government is not only wrong but is injurious to the entire war effort.

It will be indeed the exceptional Congressman who can go back to his constituency this autumn asking for reelection on the ground that he has done a first-rate job representing his district and the Nation in the first year of American participation in the war.

The New Deal moves in a mysterious way its wonders to perform!

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were ayes 70 and noes 31.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 199: On page 103, in line 1, insert:

"Construction and equipment of a Northwest electrodevelopment laboratory: To cover the construction and equipment of an electrodevelopment laboratory in the Northwest to study the application of electrical energy to the processing of minerals occurring in that region, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies, typewriting, adding and computing machines, accessories and repairs; professional and scientific books and publications; traveling expenses; purchase of land; construction and equipment of a building or buildings to house the electrodevelopment laboratory; engagement by contract or otherwise, and at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, of the services of architects or firms or corporations thereof, that are necessary to design and construct the building or buildings; and for all other necessary expenses not included in the foregoing, $500,000, of which amount not to exceed $8,300 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) shall not be construed to apply to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is hereby authorized to accept lands, buildings, or other contributions from public or private sources offering to cooperate in carrying out the purposes of this laboratory."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate, No. 199, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Construction and equipment of an electrodevelopment laboratory: To cover the construction and equipment of an electrodevelopment laboratory to study the application of electrical energy to the processing of minerals, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies; typewriting, adding, and computing machines, accessories and repairs; professional and scientific books and publications; traveling expenses; purchase of land; construction and equipment of a building or buildings to house the electrodevelopment laboratory; engagement by contract or otherwise, and at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, of the services of architects or firms or corporations thereof, that are necessary to design and construct the building or buildings; and for all other necessary expenses not included in the foregoing, $500,000, of which amount not to exceed $8,300 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) shall not be construed to apply to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is hereby authorized to accept lands, buildings, or other contributions from public or private sources offering to cooperate in carrying out the purposes of this laboratory."

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, a member of the committee, 3 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, this item is for the construction and equipment of the Northwestern Electrodevelopment Laboratory which was placed in the bill on the recommendation of Senator WALLGREN. It has no Budget estimate. It has not been asked for by the Army, the Navy, or anybody else responsible for carrying out the war. It seems to me we should do the appropriating in the regular form and manner prescribed by law. Certainly, the Senator who proposed this amendment knows of the regular procedure of asking for a Budget estimate. Certainly he is acquainted with the fact, after his long years of experience, that these matters should be gone into with a great deal of care. Had he done that, he certainly would have discovered that there was pending before the Bureau of the Budget an item for $73,000,000, which will be voted upon probably this afternoon, in the first supplemental national defense appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1943. Seventy-three million dollars is provided for the centralization of investigation that is contemplated by this amendment. Certainly we do not want to turn around and do a thing that we looked upon with disfavor with reference to the helium appropriation. Let us not undo what we corrected earlier in the day in the conference report, when we turned down the $4,000,000 appropriation for helium and said in effect, "We will wait until the Navy wants it." We said to the Navy, "If you want $4,000,000 to lift lighter-than-air craft with helium to run the submarines away from our very front door, ask for it in your requests for appropriations and we will give it to you." If the Navy needs it, surely we will give it to them without any argument. In this case, certainly we will want to be consistent and defeat this item for $500,000 above the Budget estimate. Let us say to the Army and Navy in this instance, "If you want this investigation, you ask for it." The $73,000,000 in this first sup-

plemental national defense appropriation contemplates doing under one single head all the investigation that the Army and Navy want to win this war. We should have confidence in our own handiwork. I am asking you now to do the same thing with reference to this item that you have done with reference to the helium amendment: Strike it out until the Army or the Navy asks for it. By turning down this $500,000 amendment now, we will save $500,000 worth of money until the Army asks for it.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ANGELL] such time as he may desire.

NORTHWEST ELECTRO-DEVELOPMENT LABORATORY

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of amendment 199, which provides for the construction and equipment of a Northwest electro-development laboratory. The great need of this laboratory for the study, research, and development of the immense deposits of critical and strategic materials in the Northwest is apparent. It is essential to the prosecution of our war effort.

On May 8, 1940, I addressed this House on the commercial, economical, and defense analysis of the strategic and critical mineral problem. At that time I foresaw a coming shortage of critical materials. I then pointed out a solution of this problem which is now impeding war production.

When I made this analysis I pointed out that the lack of strategic and critical material sources would become a national handicap in case of emergency and urged that this problem be solved without waiting until the arrival of such emergency, as our entire industrial system depends upon an ample supply of basic materials.

The Northwest, and in particular the Pacific Northwest, is a vast natural storehouse of unmined metals. These western occurrences are found in ores having complex structures and a quality lower than a conventionally accepted standard.

Germany is processing such ores by electrolytic process. When our stores of these materials are being rapidly depleted, not only to meet our own needs but the needs of all nations fighting the Axis, we cannot afford to leave these western ores unmined. It is imperative that these ores be worked through advance processes. The appropriation which is before you meets the needs which I pointed out 2 years ago. I therefore strongly urge that the Senate amendment No. 199 be retained so that the western country can make the war contribution that is warranted by the raw materials that are available.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, this seems to be a wholly unnecessary nondefense appropriation. As has been stated here the Office of Scientific Research and Development has been set up. At this very moment there is a bill pending here to appropriate $73,000,000 to carry on that work. I made particular inquiry as to the nature of the work to be carried on. They are going to investigate all kinds of scientific devices, make experiments of every kind including such experiments as would be carried on under this appropriation of $500,000.

We are in war, we are in a serious war. I have opposed some of these appropriations because I did not feel they were defense appropriations. Most emphatically let me say it perhaps will be several years before this plant can be built and in operation and before the fruits of any of these investigations can be produced for the use and benefit of this country. I think it is an appropriation that should be voted out of this bill at this time.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If I cannot get more than 1 minute I do not want any time. We have an hour to discuss this motion.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that at least 15 or 20 Members have come to me. We have other conference reports and bills to consider. I have been asked to try to hurry the bill through. The gentleman, of course, has not had much time to talk today and we all sympathize with him.

Mr. RICH. I do not want to waste time any more than does the gentleman from Oklahoma, but I feel it is my duty to do everything I can to stop needless expenditure of money and its diversion from the war effort.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I assure the gentleman the House is always delighted to hear him. I will yield him 3 minutes.

Mr. RICH. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we have the Intermountain Experiment Station at Salt Lake City, Utah, we have the Northwest Station at Seattle, Wash., and we have the Boulder City Experiment Station at Boulder City, Nev. It seems to me we might very well enlarge one of these stations if necessary to do this work rather than build a new station which will cost $500,000 to erect and at least $125,000 a year to operate after it is established.

Certainly I do not want to stand here today and try to get the Members to do something they feel they ought not to do, but I do not think this item is essential, I do not think it is necessary; I think you ought to conserve money. Mr. Speaker, this country is at war and I do not believe we shall be able to get equipment to establish this laboratory even if we appropriate the money; I do not think priorities will be granted for it. Further than that, it will take 3 or 4 years to get this laboratory into operation. It seems to me that if ever there was a time in the history of our Nation when the men responsible for conducting the affairs of its Government ought to give some consideration to the realities of the situation as it is today. We have gone over nineteen billions in the red this year and will go in the red over forty billions next year. Every dollar that can be raked or scraped together should be used for the furtherance of the war effort rather than to be used to do something because some Senator or Representative wants to see some structure built in his district. When will you fellows wake up to the fact that you must have a sound financial structure if you want to conduct the affairs of this Nation as they should be conducted and carry this war to a successful conclusion?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. PIERCE].

Mr. PIERCE. Mr. Speaker, the best investment of money we can make today is in experimental work. The German Army at this minute is fighting and winning precisely because of the work they have done in their laboratories within the last 20 years. Research specialists in the laboratories are finding out what can be done with strategic metals, how to amalgamate them into other and more useful forms; they have made over the technical world. The German Army would collapse tomorrow if it were not for what had been done in their laboratories since World War No. 1.

I feel there should be a research laboratory of this kind in the Pacific Northwest where is being made the aluminum so absolutely necessary to winning this war. Consider the present situation in this respect: Bauxite is shipped from South America to Mobile by water and then by rail to the Columbia River where it is made into aluminum. Scientists tell me we have plenty of clays in the Northwest that carry the alumina that is taken out of the bauxite ores which come out of South America. Give these scientists a chance to develop the local clays near the river where the power is being generated. This is but one of many like metals these laboratories will develop. You say this war will soon be over; I wish it might be so, but Japanese shells have already dropped on Oregon shores, and it does not look to me as though we were winning in northern Africa. This war may be prolonged many years.

We are going to need all that scientific men and research men can do. What is this little half-million dollars compared with the $200,000,000,000 we have already poured into the war effort? It will help to make more helpful expenditure of that great sum. This is just one of the life lines we are throwing out for the future, and one of the things that may be necessary before this struggle is over. I am strongly in favor of the laboratory. It must be located where there is an abundant supply of cheap power.

Two years ago I pointed out for the benefit of Office of Production Management the coming critical material shortage. The northwestern delegation, when we met with representatives of the old Office of Production Management, were

told that there would be no base material shortages in case of an acute war emergency. They were totally wrong, as events have since shown.

Our military effort is being seriously handicapped because of the shortages of critical materials like aluminum, magnesium, chrome, steel, rubber, and some 20 other items. Our stocks of these vital war materials are being exhausted, not only to supply our own needs, but the needs of all nations fighting the Axis Powers. There are large occurrences of these critical minerals located in the West, and these have not been developed because of lack of foresight and technical action. Germany has for the past 10 years been energetically working on what has been called ersatz processes in order to overcome her lack of native materials. We should do the same thing, and especially along the line of electric processes. All the critical materials of the future will be produced through the electric furnace and the electric cell. This method allows the commercial use of low-grade and complex ores.

The purpose of this laboratory appropriation is to accomplish what should have been done 3 or 4 years ago, and which the northwestern delegation and of sound defense, that the Senate amend- this speaker have continuously advocated during this period. I urge, in the name ment covering the technical laboratory be retained as a small-price insurance when this Nation is being drained of its natural resources. The results that can be accomplished will repay many times the relatively small sum asked for this technical development. The West has untapped resources which should be put to work.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS].

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, back in 1929 in writing about Alaska I stated that the Nation that held Alaska had the key to the military situation throughout the world. At its nearest point it is only 50 miles across the Bering Strait to Asiatic Russia. Dutch Harbor is 2,547 miles from Yokohama, and is only 1,261 miles from the Russian harbor of Petropavlovsk. The short line between the Orient and the United States—the mainland of the United States—goes by Alaska and not by Hawaii. All of the merchant vessels proceeding from the coast of the United States to Yokohama and from Yokohama to the coast of the United States along the Aleutian Islands sail close to the coast of Alaska and are more than 2,000 miles from the Hawaiian Islands.

There is validity to the military argument that the Nation in possession of the short line has a military advantage and there is tragedy that Alaska has not been developed in a military way long ago.

I have insisted for the past 15 years that the airplane will be the weapon of the future and that the Nation that has control of the air will be the master of the battlefield of the future and with Alaska affording our protection against attack from the Orient I have urged that our flyers be fully trained to fly the cold reaches of the Arctic. Consequently, back in the early thirties I urged the establishment of flying operations in that part of the world, even when the depression was at its worst and when it was almost impossible to secure appropriations from an economy-minded Congress. Back there then, there were more than 150 pilots in that territory. Recognizing the situation, I tried when I was chairman of Military Appropriations to establish a National Guard air unit up there so that these pilots would be given military aviation training and at a small expense, for it is well known that a National Guard air unit costs about one-tenth of a similar Regular Army unit.

When I was chairman of Military Appropriations during the year 1933 I caused to be written into the military appropriations bill an appropriation which was used to employ Mr. Vilhjalmur Stefansson, the greatest of Arctic explorers, to write for the Air Corps of the United States Army a manual giving a broad and general view of the living and working conditions which an Army would encounter in Alaska, the purpose being to enable our men to protect themselves against the extreme cold and to provide themselves with the ways and means of living. Afterward another appropriation was made to complete this great work which was finished in 1940. Because I initiated and sponsored the idea, Mr. Stefansson presented me with the first copy of volume No. 1 (the other four volumes being secret documents), prepared under the direction of the Air Corps, with this inscription written to me:

> To the more-than-author of this book, the Honorable ROSS A. COLLINS, who started the work moving and saw it through to its end, from his friend (and the book's author).
>
> VILHJALMUR STEFANSSON.

My interest in Alaska prompted Mr. Stefansson to write this about me:

It is at least remarkable that one of the most aggressive advocates of Alaska preparedness has been (to my personal knowledge since 1934) a Congressman from a Southern State, ROSS A. COLLINS, of Mississippi. I give some examples:

An early thing I learned about Mr. COLLINS, in 1934 or 1935, was that he had been advocating for some time already the creation of underground air bases and underground storage bases in Alaska.

In 1934 Mr. COLLINS put into an appropriation bill an item authorizing the President to purchase information which might be of value to the Army and Navy with regard to Alaska and other northerly regions. I know about this, for when the appropriation had been passed I was the one selected to compile the information. As a result I worked for the Army, first during nearly 3 years and again during 2 more years, compiling information about Alaska and other northerly regions. Five books resulted: 4 are confidential documents ranging from 1,200 to 2,200 pages, each page more than 200 words. The fifth (or rather the first) was published in 1940 by the Government Printing Office as Arctic Manual, volumes 1 and 2.

An Alaska industry of great potential value to the Army is that of reindeer; in case of military action we could use them there as the Finns have used their reindeer—for ambulance purposes, as a northern equivalent of the southern pack mule, and as a source of fresh meat for the troops. Although a Mississippian, Mr. COLLINS has worked to salvage this Alaska asset.

The above things are from personal knowledge. I judge from the conversation of friends that for a decade or more Mr. COLLINS has supported a number of other projects for Alaska, among them the construction of civilian airfields and highways, and that of military air bases.

And Gen. George Leach, former Chief of the National Guard Bureau, likewise had this to say about my interest in Alaska:

I believe I am qualified to testify, being a major general, retired, 39 years in the National Guard, colonel of General MacArthur's artillery supporting regiment in the World War, and Chief of the National Guard Bureau from 1932 to 1936. During the first half of my tour in Washington, Congressman COLLINS was chairman of the Subcommittee on War Department Appropriations, and during the latter part of my term was a member of that committee. It was entirely to the credit of Congressman COLLINS that I was able to motorize the Field Artillery of the National Guard against the strongest opposition of the then General Staff. It was finally accomplished when Chairman COLLINS and his committee gave my bureau $2,000,000 with 100 percent interchange ability to purchase commercial trucks to motorize our regiments. At that time I guaranteed to the committee that I would save the purchase price in 1 year out of horseshoes, oats, hay, caretakers, and so forth, and I succeeded in keeping my agreement. I am convinced that this motorization was so successful that it at least encouraged the Regular Army to change theirs as far at least as the 155's and 75's were concerned. The National Guard and I give Chairman COLLINS almost sole credit for this, which in the light of present events should have been done years before.

During these 4 years I was in constant contact with Congressman COLLINS. I know exactly his effort to get the War Department to buy tanks. I know the whole history of Christie's first tank. I know the staff it was parked in back of the old War Department Building, and I know the efforts that Chairman COLLINS and his committee made to provide the Army with suitable tanks. I know of no one in my almost 40 years of military service who worked so strenuously to have the War Department adopt automatic and semiautomatic rifles. During these 4 years that I was Chief of the Bureau, Congressman COLLINS and I did everything possible to have the War Department permit the National Guard to establish an air squadron at Nome, Alaska. At that time through the cooperation of Mr. Carl Lomen, of Nome, Alaska, we could have established that squadron at no expense to the United States Government outside of initial equipment. We have several times as many experienced flyers in Nome to fill the complement of officers. During this time it was learned that the Air Corps were not equipped or properly trained in Arctic flying and through the individual efforts of Congressman COLLINS an appropriation was made available to write the first handbook on operating in the Arctic. Afterward Mr. Stefansson was employed to do the work. That handbook is now a public document and without it every soldier in the Arctic would be greatly handicapped. Furthermore, speaking as a soldier and, I hope, knowing the value of food in a country that we might occupy, Congressman COLLINS gave the reindeer situation in Alaska careful study and helped pass bills to preserve these herds for food and clothing.

In the hearings on the War Department appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1938,

held in March 1937, in urging the advisability of establishing a National Guard air unit in each State, including Alaska, I stated:

It was always my idea to establish a National Guard air unit there. These people know the cold weather and they would be tickled to death to get a unit up there. They would fly all over that country up there. You would have perhaps a hundred or a hundred and fifty men there—aviators—who would take great pride in the unit. I believe it would be quite a step forward in cold-weather flying.

And on August 20, 1937, I said on the floor of the House of Representatives:

I have always taken a very keen interest in Alaska, because from a modern military standpoint it is the one place in our country of greatest importance. Furthermore, Alaska has poured into the Treasury of the United States millions of dollars. It is one of our Territories that has been profitable to us financially. Naturally, therefore, I am interested in this bill. Reindeer furnishes both the food and the clothing for the Eskimos. Officials of the Interior Department have advised me that there are between 500,000 and 700,000 reindeer in Alaska; that between 200,000 and 350,000 of these reindeer are in private ownership.

Hon. ANTHONY DIMOND, delegate in Congress from the Territory of Alaska, testified at the hearings on the military appropriation bill for 1939 on February 18, 1938:

Mr. COLLINS. What would you think about having a National Guard air squadron in Alaska?

Mr. DIMOND. I think it would be fine; anything of that kind would be a great help.

Mr. COLLINS. It would give those young men up there a very fine opportunity to learn how to fly.

Mr. DIMOND. It would be a grand thing.

Mr. COLLINS. It would be in a part of the world where very few people know how to fly. If we should have any trouble in the Orient, Alaska is the key to the entire situation.

Mr. DIMOND. I happen to have brought with me a map which shows the strategic situation of Alaska with relation to the United States and with relation to the great nations of the Orient.

Mr. COLLINS. I should like to see a National Guard air squadron stationed there.

On March 16, 1939, in speaking to the House of Representatives I said:

Mr. Chairman, during my service in this House I have given considerable study to our military problems. There is no part of this great country that offers us the military protection than does Alaska. Look at your maps and you will see that Nome and other cities of Alaska are nearer to many cities of the Orient than they are to many of the cities on the Pacific coast of the United States. In my opinion, Alaska offers greater military protection to this country than does Hawaii or the Aleutian Islands. When I make that statement I am giving you, not only my own opinion but also the best thought of the best-informed military men in this country. It has been known for the last 10 years that we must build in Alaska a strong, well-constructed air base in the vicinity of Nome or some other Alaskan city. That means that there will be a large military force in Alaska, especially a large air force, capable, if necessary, of going to most any part of the Orient over a land route, not a water route. I know nothing about the ownership of these reindeer and I care not about that, but I do insist that as a military protection, our country should see to it that reindeer are preserved for the food and clothing necessary for the armed forces of the United States located in Alaska.

I have never visited Alaska. My interest is purely in the interest of the general welfare of the country.

For many years I have advocated the building of a highway to Alaska because I feared the time might come when submarines might endanger shipments by water so that supplies could not be transported to that section in the quantities needed. I gave two informal dinners in Washington, one several years ago and the other more recently, to groups of Members from the House of Representatives and high-ranking, policy-forming Army officers so that they could listen to Mr. Stefansson, who spent over 10 years in Alaska tramping over it on foot and making about 2,000 miles a year, discuss the importance of that territory and the necessity for building a highway from the United States to it. Several months ago I introduced a bill to provide for the construction of a highway from the United States to Fairbanks, Alaska.

The National Guard Air Squadron, which I advocated many years ago, has in recent years become a reality. In the last few years the War and Navy Departments have become much concerned about Alaska and have urged the appropriation of funds to build Army and Navy air bases and air landing fields in a number of sections of Alaska. All of these appropriations have been made and without any delay.

It has been my very great pleasure to see the entire people of our great country realize the military importance of this bleak expanse of territory and to realize fully its strategic importance to the protection of the United States.

Homer Lea, in a great bock written by him in 1909, titled "The Valor of Ignorance," makes a statement which I feel should be burned into the hearts of Americans:

The principal consideration that now concerns this Republic is the defense of the Pacific coast for, once it passes under the military sovereignty of Japan, the Pacific and its possessions are not alone lost but the fairest and richest portion of the Union. If Japan once gains control of Washington, Oregon, and California, these States will not only be segregated from the rest of the Union by her armies but by uninhabitable deserts that moat their eastern frontiers and mountains that rampart them. No number of men nor amount of treasure, as we will hereafter show, can bring about their restoration. The defense, therefore, of the Pacific coast depends solely upon the power of the Republic to prevent Japan from gaining a foothold. To rely upon the untried hope of reconquering these Coast States is but the slothful procrastination of that evasion and national vanity now so rampant in the Republic.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 200: Page 104, after line 3, insert the following:

"Gaseous and solid fuel reduction of iron ores (national defense): For all necessary expenses, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, for pilot-scale tests on the gaseous and solid-fuel reduction of iron ores, including laboratory research and maintenance and operation of pilot plants; procurement of necessary materials and ores; purchase or lease of land or buildings; construction and equipment of buildings; engagement by contract or otherwise, at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof necessary to design and construct the buildings and pilot plants; supplies and equipment; travel expenses; not to exceed $9,500 for personal services in the District of Columbia; not to exceed $500 for printing and binding; books of reference and periodicals; purchase not to exceed $2,775 (including exchange), operation, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; special wearing apparel and equipment for the protection of employees while employed; purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation "Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior," $600,000, to be immediately available and remain available until June 30, 1943: *Provided*, That the Secretary of the Interior, through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources for the purposes hereof, and to carry out projects in cooperation with other agencies, Federal, State, or private."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment, and at this time I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] 3 minutes.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, here is another item for another laboratory, $600,000. We have spent $85,000 for one laboratory, then you spent, under amendment 199, $500,000, and now you are coming in here and asking for $600,000 more. Where are you going? Where are you going to get the money?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I hope that we are going to go toward Tokyo and we can only do that by being prepared.

Mr. RICH. There is nothing in this amendment that will take you toward Tokyo. It will take you toward bankruptcy. There is not a man on that side of the House but what knows that, yet you spend and spend. The first thing you know you are going to have a wreck and it will be a terrible wreck. It will be a wreck that will shock the world. It will not only shock the world but this country will go by the board just because we did not have men in the House of Representatives who had the intestinal fortitude to stand up here to stop spending, spending, and spending.

You come back to me when I am out of this Congress, when I am back home trying to get a little rest after having tried to stop you fellows from spending, and see if you can tell me that you have done a good job. I hope that you have, but I am just as sure that you have been foolish in your spending as I am of anything else, and I know that every Member over there knows that you have been foolish in your spending; yet you go on ahead. Do you not know that we are at war? How can you stand up there, how can the Speaker of the House stand up here, how can the majority leader come in here and ask you fellows to appropriate and appropriate when you do not know where you

are going to get the money and when you cannot find the money? It seems to me that you ought to have a little sense sometime.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN].

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania did not utter one word in reference to the merits of this item. All he said was that this provides for an appropriation of $600,000 and then asked, "Where are you going to get the money?"

The gentleman knows that we are facing a steel shortage even insofar as national defense requirements are concerned. We are going all over the country collecting scrap. There is a shortage of scrap, and if the gentleman will read the hearings before the Senate committee in justification for this item he will change his tune. This is one of the most important items in this bill. It is justified by the Bureau of Mines.

May I tell the gentleman that I have been making an investigation in reference to this matter for the last 3 months. I talked to two men who told me that they have this same method in use in Japan today and also in Germany, that the projects were built by American engineers, and that they had visited the projects in peacetime. This is a matter that concerns the welfare of this country insofar as the national defense effort is concerned. It is an effort to produce from ores sponge iron to replace scrap. The opposition comes from the big steel mills. The Bureau of Mines is right. They endorse the proposal. You can manufacture pig iron from sponge iron cheaper than you can from scrap.

The Bureau of the Budget endorses the item, and if you will take the time to read the paragraph you will note it is in the interest of national defense. To defeat this small appropriation and authorization would be a serious mistake, and I hope the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma to recede and concur in the Senate amendment prevails.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 50, noes 33.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 201: Page 105, after line 5, insert:

"Construction and equipment of helium plants: For all necessary expenses, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, to enable the Secretary of the Interior to increase and improve the capacity for the production of helium, as authorized by the act approved September 1, 1937 (50 Stat. 885), by the acquirement by purchase, lease, or condemnation, of lands or interests therein or options thereon; the making of contracts and agreements (with optional provisions where necessary) for the acquisition, processing, or conservation of helium-bearing gas; the construction and equipment of buildings or additions to existing buildings; the drilling of wells and construction of pipe lines, and other appurtenant facilities; and to conduct investigations with respect to available resources of helium-bearing gas and the transportation of helium; engagement by contract or otherwise, at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, of engineers, architects, or firms or corporations thereof necessary to design and construct the buildings, structures, and equipment; travel expenses; books of reference and periodicals; supplies and equipment; purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of other items otherwise properly chargeable to the appropriation 'Contingent expenses, Department of the Interior', purchase not to exceed $16,600 (including exchange), operation, maintenance, and repair of passenger-carrying automobiles; and not to exceed $30,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia, $4,000,000 to be immediately available: *Provided*, That the unexpended balances on June 30, 1942, of the appropriations under the head 'Helium plants and investigations' contained in the First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941, and the Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1942, and of the appropriation 'Construction and equipment of helium plants' contained in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942, shall be added to and constitute one fund with the amount herein appropriated, which fund shall be available until June 30, 1944, for all the objects and purposes of said consolidated appropriations: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is authorized to accept lands, buildings, equipment, and other contributions from public or private sources for the purposes hereof;

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 201 and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In lines 26 and 27 of said amendment, strike out "$4,000,000 to be immediately available" and insert in lieu thereof the following: "the sum of $4,000,000 is hereby transferred from the appropriation 'Aviation, Navy, 1943', and made available for the purposes of this paragraph."

In line 35, strike out "appropriated" and insert "made available."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I am advised by the Navy Department that they have no funds available in the appropriation "Aviation, Navy" for this purpose, that everything they have available is obligated or set aside for particular purposes in connection with airplanes and their operations. I would not oppose appropriating money out of the Treasury if it is necessary in order to get the helium produced and the helium is necessary, but I am not going to be a party to stripping the airplane appropriations of the Navy Department for this purpose.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman that I took the same position he did, that it was false economy to eliminate this $4,000,000 item, but it was rather difficult for me to answer the statement that there had been $1,000,000,000 heretofore appropriated to the Navy for this particular purpose, and it would seem on the face of it that it would be rather difficult for the Navy Department to say now that in that $1,000,000,000 they could not possibly find $4,000,000 for this particular project.

Mr. TABER. The funds appropriated to the Navy for airplanes are far beyond $1,000,000,000. They run beyond $7,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000, perhaps more. I do not have the exact figure available at the moment.

I took this matter up with the Navy Department. I have been advised by the acting chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics as follows:

JUNE 28, 1942.

MY DEAR MR. TABER: In response to your inquiry as to whether the sum of $4,000,000 is available under the appropriation "Aviation, Navy" for transfer to the Department of the Interior for enlargement of helium plants, I beg to advise that all of the funds appropriated by Congress under "Aviation, Navy," for both 1942 and 1943 fiscal years, are either obligated, or are urgently required for obligation in the near future, for procurement of aircraft and for operation of aircraft and maintenance of the aviation activities under the Bureau of Aeronautics. The transfer of these funds would cause a deficit under this appropriation and would make it necessary to request a deficiency appropriation from Congress in this amount later on. All funds so far appropriated for the Bureau of Aeronautics are urgently required in carrying out the existing war program of the Navy.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH DAVISON,
Captain, United States Navy,
Acting Chief of Bureau.

With that statement, I would not want to be a party to scuttling the airplane appropriations of the Navy, and would be opposed to the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. At the present time the plant we have at Amarillo has a capacity that I believe will provide for all the helium needs we may contemplate. According to the figures that have been presented to the subcommittee on Navy appropriations, the Amarillo plant can turn out 13,000,000 cubic feet per year. According to the present program, both as to the Army and the Navy, that should enable both establishments to have more than sufficient at the present time. Further, the plant at Amarillo may be expanded if additional needs for helium present themselves.

I believe the entire item should be eliminated, that even the availability of funds should not cut into the general aviation Navy program, and that the item should be deleted from the bill. Unless the gentleman can give the House something on which to base the need for facilities to produce helium over and above what the plant at Amarillo has the capacity to produce, it seems to me the gentleman should withdraw his motion to concur.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say to the gentleman in response to his statement that the best evidence I have is the Budget estimate from the Presi-

dent of the United States, who says in no uncertain terms that $4,000,000 will be needed. The gentleman will notice that the language of the amendment provides that this $4,000,000 may be spent from any money heretofore appropriated or any money hereafter appropriated during the fiscal year 1943, so if it is needed there is no question but that they will actually be able to get the money to expand this plant or to construct an additional plant. If it is not needed, then it ought not to be spent, of course. But I do say this. I would rather spend $4,000,000 more than needed and be prepared for any emergency than spend $4,000,000 less on this particular thing and be left short of what is actually needed to protect our boys now fighting on the Pacific.

Mr. DITTER. I take no exception to the first part of the gentleman's statement. The observation I made was in no way predicated on the thought of counting the cost of this in dollars and cents. The exception I am taking is that if we presently have a plant that is capable of producing what we need in the way of helium, I can see no reason for the establishment of a new plant. The $4,000,000 that might be made available here might better be used for some other purpose I am not questioning this item in any way on a dollars-and-cents basis. But it does seem to me that the gentleman should justify in a better way the establishment of a new facility than by simply saying the President of the United States wants it. As much regard as I may have for the Commander in Chief, it seems to me that when we justify an appropriation we should come in here and say, "The facility we presently have will not produce sufficient helium, and I am giving you the figures. They are taken from the Navy and from the Army. They cannot be denied."

At the present time we are doing very little in the way of building lighter-than-air craft. The Navy has very little in the way of a request for lighter-than-air craft. We have some blimps. The Army may be contemplating some lighter-than-air work, but that Amarillo plant will provide all the helium we can possibly use.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Replying to my distinguished friend, for whom I have great respect, may I say that no living person can say today what the needs of the Army or the Navy or the Air Corps or any other branch of the service may be 60 days or 6 months hence. May I remind the gentleman who states that we have a plant at Amarillo, Tex., that will produce all the helium necessary for our military needs—may be he knows, but I am afraid he does not—only a few months ago appropriations were brought in here for the Army and Navy that were supposed to be sufficient for the entire year. But that was only the beginning. Those first appropriations looked large then and many questions were raised. Many were asking, "Will the gentleman assure the House that this is all the money that will be asked for the Navy during the present year?" Of course, no one could give such assurance now. I do not wish to embarrass the gentleman or any of his colleagues on his side of the aisle, but I also remember that as far back as 1938 a bill was brought here upon the request of the President of the United States asking for 5,000 fighting planes and bombers, and we saw many Members on the gentleman's side of the aisle, and I regret to say, some on my side of the aisle, throw up their hands in holy horror and ask, "What in the world does the President want with 5,000 modern planes?" But the President knew what he was doing and saying then just as he knows what the score is now in asking for additional facilities for helium at Amarillo or elsewhere.

The country has not forgotten that when the President asked for a mere 5,000 planes back in 1938, that many gentlemen whose hindsight has proved to be better than their foresight stood in the Well of this House and cried out against what they called wasteful extravagance. It will be recalled that we debated nearly all the afternoon that question and won by only a few votes, giving the President of the United States 5,000 planes. At that time we have not forgotten how gentlemen also stated that this House should have more than the word of the President of the United States that 5,000 were actually and urgently needed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Not now.

May I add that as far back as 1933 the President of the United States asked for 16 ships. This was in May 1933. I saw gentlemen stand here and say, "What does the President want with such a large fleet? What does he want with such a big Navy? Whom does he expect to fight, and will the gentleman give us assurance that he will not be asking for more ships?" This sounded absurd to some who then said they wanted more than the word of the President. Then again, when the President, in 1934, in 1936, in 1938, and again in 1940, was pleading with a pacifist-minded Congress to give him the necessary number of ships, planes, tanks, and guns and the the necessary number of men to build up a respectable Army and Navy, there were men who stood here and said they wanted more than the mere word of President Roosevelt to convince them that preparedness on land, on water, and in the air was actually needed.

So I do not pretend to say to the gentleman that this is all the helium that the present grave emergency may require. I would like to say to the gentleman that we are going to start another helium plant or materially enlarge the one at Amarillo. Another one may be necessary before this terrible disaster is over. If the gentleman will read what has been happening today he will know that no person can say today that this is all the helium that we may need.

No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot tell the gentleman that this is all the helium that may be required. I cannot say that this will be sufficient to meet all of our military or naval needs. I hope and pray we will not have to build more helium plants, but I am afraid we will be compelled to do so before the end of this terrible war will be in sight.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes; I always yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I had hardly thought that my very distinguished friend from Oklahoma, for whom I have not only a high regard but a real affection, would resort to the statement that he has made in trying to justify this item. If I were tempted to reply in kind, of course, I might recall the leaf-raking programs, and I might recall many of the other wasteful projects that were endorsed by some of the gentlemen on the other side of the aisle. It was not my purpose to indulge in anything that even smacked of personalities or partisanship. My purpose in raising this issue was but one thing and that was to ask whether the Army or the Navy had made a request, based upon a justification of its needs, for greater helium-production capacity. To the best of my knowledge, there had been no such request made. In fact, I challenge my distinguished friend from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], who happens to be the chairman of the Naval Appropriations Subcommittee, and who now is serving on the Interior Committee, and I ask him whether the Subcommittee on the Navy has had before it a request for additional helium-production capacity, and whether he does not agree with me that at the present time we have practically nothing or only a very small amount of lighter-than-air craft. We have nothing presently in contemplation that might require a large amount of helium. I simply am seeking information. I am sorry if the patience of the gentleman from Oklahoma has been tested to such a degree that instead of coming here today and saying that the Navy has come in and said that they need so many cubic feet and the Army needs so many cubic feet—instead of using the persuasive ability that he has, that instead of doing that, the gentleman resorts to this very cheap method of saying what was done back in 1933. Many of us have a memory, too. Many of us might recall some comments that were made in the very recent past about the need for a two-ocean navy. We might ask how many of those 5,000 airplanes were really built. We might resort to all those things.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. My answer is that they were all eventually built. At that time we had limited facilities for building planes, but that was a modest beginning in spite of a short-sighted Congress. Yes; we eventually built all of them and more.

Mr. TABER. The fact is that they were not.

Mr. DITTER. The fact is that we are not resorting to that sort of thing; we are only asking for common sense and that the use of time and money and materials and men be adjusted to the best possible ends. If the gentleman from Nevada can refute from the record of the hearings on the Navy appropriations the statement I have made with reference to helium needs, I will be glad to stand corrected.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I would first yield to my friend from Nevada, and, of course, I do not have the floor, Mr. Speaker, I am sorry to say.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have a high regard for the sincerity of purpose of my distinguished colleague from Pennsylvania, the ranking minority member of the Naval Affairs Appropriations Subcommittee, but this is no time for a partisan controversy.

Mr. DITTER. I was not seeking to provoke partisan controversy.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The losses of American shipping are continuing at a shocking rate due to the activities of enemy submarines. One of the best defenses in this respect has been found to be the blimp, carrying depth bombs. To supply these nonrigid dirigibles we require a very considerable increase in the production of helium as soon as practicable. Under date of May 20 the President of the United States, who is Commander in Chief of the Army and the Navy, sent this Budget request to Congress asking for this authorization for increased production of helium. I shall not take the time to read the statement from the President, but if a request from him as Commander in Chief does not stand for the Army and the Navy, I would like to know what it does stand for. This is the request I have here in full and I will read it if the gentleman desires it.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to me?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Yes.

Mr. DITTER. I should like either one of the gentleman to tell me how much helium was used in the last calendar year by either the Army or the Navy, and what excess there has been at the helium plant at Amarillo, and what might probably be presently stored with full capacity.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Those facts are in the records of the department.

Mr. DITTER. I make the assertion at the present time that the Amarillo plant capacity is not being used, and the contemplation at the present time is that it will not be used.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM], who knows something about helium.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, these gentlemen who serve on the Committee on Appropriations are better prepared to advise us whether the funds mentioned in this bill for helium production are already available, and naturally we assume that the Bureau of the Budget has made careful investigation of the necessity for such use of such funds for the purposes stated in the pending measure. The debate on those matters is properly in the province of those who serve on the respective committees that have jurisdiction of such proposals.

With no intent to poach on their preserves, I have risen to call attention to another important feature of this general subject. It is my purpose to direct your attention to our helium policy in general, and I think I can convince you that that policy has been definitely short-sighted. Those of you who have served in these Halls for many years are familiar with the fact that I was a pioneer with reference to helium legislation. When I first began to speak of this important element we were experimenting with reference to its acquisition by methods of separating it from natural gases which contained it. Our plants for this purpose were known as Argon plants, and the general public, unfamiliar with helium, knew nothing of its nature and characteristics. Capt. C. E. Rosendahl, of the Navy, deserves the lion's share of praise for proving the adaptability of this element to lighter-than-air aviation and stressing the necessity of a proper policy concerning it.

We have been providentially blessed in this beloved country of ours in having practically all of the available supply of helium in the world in sufficient volume for purposes of offense and defense. Other nations have sought it in vain, and you will recall that Germany made vigorous efforts to acquire a part of our supply. In those talks that I made years ago I called attention, among other things, to the availability of helium-filled aircraft for our coastal patrol and for reconnaissance. I called attention also to its adaptability to the promotion of the good-neighbor policy in this Western Hemisphere. If we, with an abundance of this God-given element, had inaugurated airship travel between the United States and Central and South America, we could have promoted good will mutually advantageous for commercial purposes in times of peace and for solidarity and defense in times of war. Germany, without this noninflammable gas, saw the opportunities which we overlooked, and at great expense and hazard began and carried on its trans-Atlantic travel of airships to Brazil. That operation so caught the fancy of the South American people that the Brazilian Government at its own expense constructed a large hangar to house the dirigibles from over the sea. That traffic continued until the lack of helium resulted in a tragedy which forced Germany to discontinue the route.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. In just a moment. I wish to complete this statement.

Yet we sometimes wonder, in spite of the fact that we alone are blessed with this God-given element which renders such South American travel feasible, why it is that Germany and some other foreign countries gained commercial and social advantages on that great continent which we heretofore have not possessed.

I have not risen for the purpose of saying "I told you so," but to impress upon you that our policy has been short-sighted, and to impress upon you and those in authority that it behooves us, before it is too late, to use our helium for purposes to which it is admirably adapted. We know that today perhaps the most effective weapon we have in our coastal patrol in combatting submarines is the helium-filled blimp. Unfortunately we have too few of them. Whether another plant is necessary to assure a sufficient volume of helium for all our needs is for the determination of the appropriate committees, but for offense and defense and the promotion of the good-neighbor policy we have certainly been taught by another nation that the helium-filled dirigible has an important and valuable place.

I hope that whatever is proper to be done will be done, and that at last we may awaken to our advantages through this element which the Almighty has given us, and that we may use it for ourselves and for mankind to preserve the blessings of liberty which the Almighty has vouchsafed unto us. The peoples of the United States and of Central and South America are closely akin in their devotion to freedom. Today they are united in a firm determination to vanquish those who would deprive them of their liberty. We must not hide under a bushel any light of our opportunity to preserve that unity and that freedom.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Oklahoma yield me time in my own right?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield the gentleman 3 minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, my only purpose was to direct the attention of the House to the capacity production at Amarillo. I am in hearty accord with what my distinguished friend from Texas [Mr. LANHAM] has said. I have at no time objected to or raised an issue with reference to lighter-than-air travel. I think everything the gentleman said with reference to the desirability of lighter-than-air craft in that earlier day was well said. But that is not the issue presently before us. I have asked just one question. That is whether the Army or the Navy has made a request for helium in such quantity as might require the establishment of a new plant and the appropriation of this fund. No one has yet indicated that any Army officer or Navy officer has come before the Interior Department subcommittee and requested this fund. I am not in disagreement with my friend at all. I am in hearty accord with him.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. LANHAM. Of course I am not in a position to give that information.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman volunteered that statement.

Mr. LANHAM. Because I do not serve on that committee. Of course, helium has been a governmental operation. There has never been but one private company and we have acquired that company. We do have reserves in the United States at which if necessary other plants could be established. The burden of my remarks is that if we have been so short-sighted and are now suffering from our failure to adopt a wise policy with reference to the lighter-than-air field, now, while it is still not too late, whatever is necessary to be done let us

do it and let us correct these blunders of the past.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

The motion was agreed to.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were ayes 73 and noes 11.

So the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 212: On page 114, after line 22, change the period to a colon and insert "*Provided*, That section 3709, Revised Statutes, shall not be construed to apply to this appropriation, or to the appropriation for development and operation of helium properties (special fund) in section 3 (c) of the act of September 1, 1937 (50 U. S. C. 164)."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 212.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 213: On page 116, after line 3, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"Effective immediately and for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter, the Secretary of the Interior, or any official to whom he may delegate such authority, may, without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, appoint skilled and unskilled laborers, mechanics, and other persons engaged in a recognized trade or craft, including foremen of such groups, employed at experimental plants and laboratories of the Bureau of Mines."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 213.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield me 5 minutes?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this amendment will do away with the Classification Act of 1923 in the Bureau of Mines experimental station.

Let me read to you a statement made by the Department:

The wage-rate situation at the Bureau of Mines Experiment Station in Boulder City, Nev., has become acute because of the proximity of the Bureau of Mines laboratories to the plant of Basic Magnesium, Inc., and the work of the Bureau of Reclamation in connection with Boulder Dam. Under a contract with Basic Magnesium, Inc., the employees of that organization are performing the same type of work for the United States Government as is performed by the Bureau of Mines employees, and are paid prevailing wage rates with time and one-half compensation for time worked in excess of 40 hours per week. The Bureau of Reclamation is authorized by law to pay prevailing rates, as determined by a wage board, to all laborers and mechanics at Boulder Dam. Under the present law there is no way to equalize the rates for Bureau of Mines employees in Boulder City with the rates paid by these two organizations.

Now, the fact is this: If you adopt this amendment all these Government employees will be paid time and a half for overtime. If you do that with one branch of the Government why should you not do it with all departments of the Government?

Another thing, these Government employees get 30 days' vacation and 30 days' sick leave. You will pay them then more at these laboratories at Boulder City than you pay the employees who are working in industry.

Another thing, because the Government now gives these gratuities to their employees it seems to me you should not increase them over and above people working in the same classification in the District of Columbia or any other branch of the Government.

Another thing, whenever you set up these various organizations with which an average manufacturing concern in this country has to compete, you are setting up higher labor standards in those war industries than men can pay regular employees in industry, and you will create another complication there. If this is good for one branch of Government employees it ought to be good for all branches. If it is good for this country to do away with the Classification Act of 1923 in this instance, then it seems to me that the Classification Act, on account of the war, should be annulled in all branches of the Government.

I cannot see why you have to make a special case out of the Bureau of Mines experimental station in Boulder City.

Let me go on further and read:

If this authority is given, it is the intention of the Bureau to place the employees concerned on prevailing hourly rates of pay and to provide for time and one-half compensation for time worked in excess of 40 hours per week. Moreover, such authority will not only remedy the situation at Boulder City but also enable the Bureau to meet future contingencies of the same character that will undoubtedly arise at other points where Bureau of Mines experiment stations are located.

In other words, they will not only increase the rates and do away with the Classification Act in the case of the plant at Boulder City but they will do it at all their other experiment stations. This amendment certainly will prove to be far reaching. If you adopt it you will be establishing a precedent which I doubt very much the House wants to establish. The responsibility is yours, the duty is yours, to investigate this thoroughly before you establish this policy.

I feel that the amendment ought to be rejected.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 minutes.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, in quoting from the justification, told only half the story. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is certainly laboring under a misunderstanding of the situation that exists at Boulder City. The Boulder City Experiment Station of the United States Bureau of Mines is now engaged almost solely in the production of metallic manganese, and is, probably, the principal producer of this form of the metal, which is urgently needed in alloys as a substitute for nickel and other noncorrosive metals such as monel metal. The passage of this amendment at this time is necessary to keep up full production of the metal. The present employees are keeping on the job, at about half the salary paid in adjacent industry, because they are patriotic.

One need of metallic manganese is to take the place of nickel in coins, but the greatest need seems to be in propellers for ships and airplanes. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania want to take the responsibility for slowing down the production of this needed manganese? I am sure if he understood the situation, he would urge passage of the amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma.

The question was taken, and on a division (demanded by Mr. RICH) there were—ayes 50, noes 1.

So the motion was agreed to.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RICH. The RECORD will show that only 50 Members voted for this motion and one against it——

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not stating a parliamentary inquiry.

The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 214: Page 116, line 12, strike out "$8,405,290" and insert in lieu thereof "$15,647,339."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, this amendment merely corrects a total. I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 214 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$11,482,140."

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, this is the last amendment. I want to thank the Members for their patience and their fine spirit of cooperation.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I would like to say to the majority members of the committee that we on the minority side recognize you as friends and wish you all the prosperity and happiness in the world. We hope the country will be able to withstand the onslaught on the Treasury you are making in this bill, but still I think you are all good fellows. God be with you till we meet again.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Oklahoma to recede and concur with an amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

By unanimous consent, a motion to reconsider the votes by which the several motions were agreed to was laid on the table.

GENERAL PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS ON THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BILL

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just completed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the Members that there are four more conference reports we expect to dispose of today. The Chair will now recognize the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], if he is present. In his absence the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 42, 43, and 44 to the bill (H. R. 6709) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate further insists on its amendments numbered 81, 83, 85, 86, 90, 91, 93, 95, 96, and 97 to the said bill, agrees to a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. TYDINGS, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. SMITH, Mr. NYE, and Mr. MCNARY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate further insists upon its amendments numbered 21 and 23 to the bill (H. R. 6599) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; requests a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. WHITE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment numbered 6 to the bill (H. R. 7232) entitled "An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 2032) entitled "An act to amend section 7 (a) of the act of May 21, 1920 (41 Stat. 613), as amended by section 601 of the act of June 30, 1932 (47 Stat. 417), to authorize interdepartmental procurement by contract," requests a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. THOMAS of Utah, Mr. LEE, Mr. SCHWARTZ, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. GURNEY to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 29. Concurrent resolution authorizing a change in the enrollment of the title of the bill (S. 2586) to amend sections 1 and 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition articles and materials for the use of the United States and for other purposes," approved October 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue the act in effect during the existing war, and for other purposes.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the Senate amendments to the bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and for the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the two amendments in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 21: On page 41, line 10, after the word "division" insert ": *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the payment of any person hereafter appointed at a salary of $5,000 or more for the enforcement of antitrust and kindred laws unless such person is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Senate amendment No. 23: On page 45, line 12, after the word "duties", insert ": *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the payment of any person hereafter appointed at a salary of $5,000 or more and paid from this appropriation unless such person is appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the two amendments may be considered together.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I offer motions which are now at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. RABAUT moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the sum "$5,000" where it appears in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the sum "$7,500."

Mr. RABAUT also moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the sum "$5,000" where it appears in said amendment and insert in lieu thereof the sum "$7,500."

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RABAUT. I yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. CARTER].

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, may I say to the membership of the House that the conferees are in unanimous agreement on this. The Senate gave way and the amendment disagreed to provides for confirmation by the Senate where the salary is $7,500 or more. We had some argument with them as to whether or not we should lower that to $5,000, but it was finally agreed to let it remain at $7,500.

Mr. RABAUT. I may say to the gentleman that $7,500 has been the rule heretofore. Because these two amendments have been in controversy so long, I ask for the yeas and nays. First, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on taking the vote by yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Messrs. RABAUT and CARTER) there were—ayes 92, noes 0.

So the motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial written by Tom Linder.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an address by the Librarian of Congress, Archibald MacLeish.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. RABAUT]?

There was no objection.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on the subject of forest-fire protection in the Pacific Northwest and to include statements which I made before the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. SMITH]?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two topics, in one to include a radio address of mine, and in the other to include two letters from constituents.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. DOMENGEAUX asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT FROM COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to file a supplemental report from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds on House Joint Resolution 323.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. ELLIS] may extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HARRIS]?

There was no objection.

IGNACE JAN PADEREWSKI

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD at this point and to include a brief tribute to the memory of Ignace Jan Paderewski, who died a year ago today.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DINGELL]?

There was no objection.

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, this day marks the anniversary of the passing of the great artist, statesman, and patriot, Ignace Jan Paderewski, of Poland. I want to devote a reverent few moments to pay homage to the memory of a great man whose deeds have inspired the world and which have been engraved for all time upon the tablets of time.

In a brief, though impressive, ceremony which took place today in the crypt beneath the mainmast of the battleship *Maine*, in Arlington Cemetery, a mournful delegation of distinguished Americans of Polish antecedents, joined by His Excellency Jan Ciechanowski, the Polish Ambassador, and by Count Stephan Zamojski, former military aide to General Sikorski, and a group representing the great organization of the Polish Roman Catholic Union, headed by Louis Gieron, vice president, concluded the service when wreaths were placed by Miss Andzia Stefanowicz, of Chicago, and by the Ambassador of Poland.

Apropos of the occasion, the Reverend Karol Kotlarz gave the invocation. The benediction was imparted by the Reverend Stanislaus Wikarski. Thereupon, the assemblage departed in dignified silence.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. BRADLEY] may have permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there ojection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter and a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Hampshire?

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a short statement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. BAUMHART. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made earlier in the day and include therein certain tables.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

WAR HOUSING AND WAR PUBLIC WORKS, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. LUDLOW submitted the following conference report and statement on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on amendment numbered 1 of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) "making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia", having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$15,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARTER GLASS,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P. NYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on Senate amendment No. 1 to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) entitled "Joint resolution making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia", submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report with respect to such amendment, namely:

The House provided an appropriation of $12,000,000 for the construction of 15,000 dormitory units for single workers. The Senate increased this amount by $13,500,000 to provide 3,000 family dwellings for married workers on the basis of construction of permanent dwellings at $4,500 each. The conference agreement provides $15,000,000—$12,000,000 for the dormitory units contained in the House measure, and $3,000,000 to provide 1,000 temporary family dwelling units at a cost of $3,000 per unit.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMET O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

Mr. TABER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is not this a unanimous report of the conferees?

Mr. LUDLOW. It is.

Mr. TABER. It provides $3,000,000 above what the bill carried as it passed the House, and about $9,000,000 less than the bill carried as it passed the Senate?

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman has stated the fact.

Mr. TABER. Under these circumstances, I suggest that the gentleman might ask unanimous consent that the reading of the statement be dispensed with.

Mr. LUDLOW. I make that request, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF, FISCAL YEAR 1943

Mr. LUDLOW submitted the following conference report and statement on the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 324) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 324) "making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5 and 7; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree

to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 33. Not to exceed $225,000 of the funds made available in this joint resolution shall be used for personal services in not to exceed three regional offices of the Work Projects Administration."

And the Senate agree to the same.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
JED JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the part of the House.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARTER GLASS,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P. NYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 324) entitled "Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943," submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Nos. 1 and 2, relating to the limitation on amounts that may be used for administrative expenses: The House measure provided a limitation of $16,000,000 and the Senate raised this to $17,000,000. The Senate recedes.

Nos. 3 and 4, relating to Presidential appointment and Senate confirmation of certain positions with salaries in excess of $5,000: The Senate eliminated House language exempting from such appointment and confirmation persons already serving under previous law. The Senate recedes restoring the House exemptions.

No. 5: Senate section 32 added to the bill restores the provision in the current law, eliminated by the House, requiring maintenance in each State of an Office of State Administrator. The House agrees to the Senate amendment.

No. 6: Senate section 33 of the bill prohibits use of W. P. A. funds after September 1, 1942, for the maintenance of regional offices. The House agrees with an amendment permitting the maintenance of not to exceed three regional offices and the expenditure therefor for personal services of not more than $225,000.

No. 7: The House accepts Senate section 34 making the appropriations and authority in the joint resolution effective as of July 1, 1942, notwithstanding the date of the approval of the joint resolution.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JED JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, there is complete agreement on the amendments, and the amount returned is unchanged. It is the Budget estimate and is the amount carried in the bill as it passed the House. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. The amount that is allowed for administrative expenses is $16,000,000, the same as it passed the House. This is too large a figure, but the House conferees did not yield to the $17,000,000 proposed by the Senate.

The Senate did add some amendments requiring the maintenance of State offices, which should not be maintained, and the wasting of a very considerable portion of these so-called relief funds. I suppose it is because of the political value of these State offices in an election year, but we have to expect that, so we are not so much worse off than we have a right to expect.

The bill itself shows on its face that it should not be and is not needed for relief purposes. Otherwise they would not adopt these amendments to load it down with a lot of juicy jobs in State offices.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course, it is necessary to make concessions on both sides. The Senate made a concession on the amendment to which the gentleman refers, and we made concessions for the House. In this way we were able to reach an agreement which we have embodied in the conference report.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7319) to make supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and pending that motion, I would like to reach an agreement with the gentleman from New York as to time for debate.

It occurs to me that we could probably dispose of this matter in a couple of hours of general debate, if that is agreeable to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I have requests for time aggregating about 3 hours. I am willing to cut these requests to 2 hours, but I do not see how we can get along on this side without 2 hours of debate on the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that general debate be limited to 4 hours, to be confined to the bill, and to be equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from New York and myself.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H. R. 7319, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield so that I may ask a question of the majority leader as to the program?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. May I ask the majority leader what the program is with reference to this bill and with reference to the conference report on the Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill?

Mr. McCORMACK. It is the intention to finish the general debate on this bill tonight.

Mr. TABER. Are you planning to read the bill for amendment tonight?

Mr. McCORMACK. No. I think if we go along for 4 hours and get through with the general debate we can read the bill tomorrow morning.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. In other words, if we complete the general debate in 3 hours, that will end the program for the night, anyway?

Mr. McCORMACK. Exactly. Then a unanimous-consent request will be submitted in the House that we meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock.

Mr. TABER. We will not take up the other conference report tonight?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will permit, the conference report on the Labor and Federal Security bill is now in process of formulation and we will have it ready some time this evening.

Mr. McCORMACK. Of course, we all know the difficulties that confront us between now and tomorrow midnight. One has to make more or less snap judgments, but it is my thought, if it is agreeable to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and I make this as a suggestion to him, that we proceed with general debate and take up the conference report on the Labor and Federal Security bill the first thing tomorrow morning. If that would be agreeable to the distinguished gentleman who is chairman of the Committee on Appropriations I would make that as a suggestion to him.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That will be entirely satisfactory.

Mr. McCORMACK. Then the House can understand that the conference report on the Labor and Federal Security bill will be taken up the first thing tomorrow and we will proceed with general debate tonight. I hope that general debate on this bill will be completed before the House adjourns.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may say then that there will be nothing for the remainder of today's session except general debate on the pending bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is the last bill the Committee on Appropriations will report to the House during this fiscal year. And it is the first supplemental national defense bill for the coming fiscal year of 1943. It comprises a number of items, but all, with one or two minor exceptions, are directly connected with the prosecution of the war. After extensive hearings on the measure we have been able

to reduce the estimates as originally submitted by $86,008,719, and report the bill today carrying appropriations aggregating $1,830,487,615.47.

The first item of general interest in the bill is the provision for the Office of Censorship. This is a new agency, established in December 1941 by Executive order. It deals solely with war work. It has nothing to do with the dissemination of news, official information, or propaganda, and is devoted solely to control, through the press, the radio, and international communication, of information which might be of service to the enemy.

The principal bone of contention in the bill, and one which has received earnest consideration by the committee and which no doubt will receive attention in the House, is the appropriation for the Office of Price Administration.

As originally presented, the request for the Office of Price Administration was for 90,000 paid employees at a cost of approximately $196,000,000. The Budget estimate reduced the amount to $161,000,000, providing for 66,000 annual employees. The subcommittee reported the item to the committee carrying an appropriation of $95,000,000 and providing for about 40,000 employees, and the Committee on Appropriations now reports it to the House in the sum of $75,000,000, authorizing between 31,000 and 32,000 paid employees.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Montana.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Do I understand from these figures that the Price Administrator in the beginning wanted $200,000,000?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. $210,000,000, including a reimbursement to the President's fund of $14,000,000, which left $196,000,000 for administrative purposes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And you have reduced it down to what?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. To $75,000,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR. And the number of employees from something like——

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. From approximately 90,000 to 31,000 or 32,000. In other words, the number of employees under the bill as reported to the House will provide for approximately one-third of the number of employees originally requested of Congress.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BENDER. Did I understand the gentleman correctly when he said 90,000 paid employees?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Approximately 90,000 employees were originally contemplated.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. Was the reduction made so as to provide for volunteers and on the assumption that the consuming public can do some of this watching as to price fixing and that sort of thing?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It was thought by the committee that much of this work could be done by volunteers, as in the handling of the rationing program. It was also believed by the committee that the measure would be to a large extent self-enforcing and self-policing. The consumer at the corner grocery could not fail to understand if he were overcharged and would promptly report it. The amount provided here was believed to be sufficient to carry out the purposes of the bill.

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. O'HARA. Of this total of 31,000 or 32,000 employees which the gentleman has indicated will be required for the operation of O. P. A., will the gentleman tell me how many of them are for detective purposes or enforcement purposes?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The committee did not indicate in its reduction where the cut should be applied. We provided a lump sum and left it to the Administrator to himself allocate funds as he deemed most advantageous. Of course, it was the committee's intention to supply sufficient funds to provide for an inspection force which would serve the purpose.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Did the committee give any consideration to the possibility of using volunteer workers in the administration of O. P. A. as in the case of the Selective Service System?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It was the original plan, as outlined by the Administrator himself, that in addition to the 90,000 paid employees, he would recruit a number of volunteers. The committee felt that even a larger proportion of his force than originally planned could be drafted without pay.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. Could the gentleman tell us how many paid employees there are in O. P. A. in Washington and in the country as a whole, and how many unpaid employees they have?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They have about 18,000 employees at this time, and some unpaid employees. They have been using some volunteers, but, of course, their entire personnel, both paid and unpaid, is in process of mobilization.

Mr. HINSHAW. The local rationing boards are still composed of volunteers?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes, almost entirely. They were manned largely by teachers from public and parochial schools, and did a remarkably efficient job. I take this opportunity of expressing appreciation of their generous contribution to the common weal. They served without pay, and in many instances far into the night, frequently without dinner. We are glad to be afforded an opportunity to voice our appreciation and the appreciation of the country for their patriotic service. We hope similar use can be made of volunteers in other activities of the Office of Price Administration, although I venture to hope it can be arranged so that the service will be less strenuous and on more reasonable schedules.

Mr. HINSHAW. I join the gentleman in that appreciation. Does the gentleman know how many volunteers as a whole in the United States are engaged in this program?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The number is indefinite. There are no accurate data as to the exact number utilized. It was a matter of allocating stations, and securing sufficient personnel to discharge the requirements of the particular locality. In some cases it required a much larger number than in others, and for that reason only an approximate estimate can be made.

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. McGREGOR. I take it for granted that the figure of 90,000 was requested by the Administrator, and that 66,000 employees was the amount the committee granted. Does the gentleman consider the difference between 66,000 and 90,000 would be made up of volunteer workers?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No. The 66,000 was the figure submitted by the Budget estimate. The Budget after considering the requisition by the Administrator, reduced the number from 90,000 to 66,000 and the subcommittee reduced the 66,000 to about 40,000. Last, the committee reduced the number recommended by the subcommittee from 40,000 to 31,000–32,000. These numbers, based on what the committee allowed, are arrived at by applying the percentage of cut in the appropriation to the number of employees, and of course are approximate.

Mr. McGREGOR. Then the committee feels that 32,000 are adequate?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The committee feels that we have a duty to perform in providing funds to administer the law. The law was enacted after careful consideration, and has a laudable purpose. It is intended to stabilize prices, and limit the fluctuation of the markets and retard inflation. It is important that the Government itself secure its supplies at reasonable prices and that the public especially those on fixed incomes be not discommoded. There is a real need for wartime control, and the committee recognizes its responsibility in instrumenting the legislation. The desire of the committee is to provide sufficient funds to administer the law.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Would the gentleman mind if I asked him a question about war manpower at this point?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I would be very glad to yield on that paragraph if the gentleman wishes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I wondered if the committee had given consideration to the problem of farm labor. I recall a short time ago that Mr. McNutt, the head of the War Manpower Committee, issued a directive to the Farm Security Administration, and the United States Employment Service, to see to it that there is a sufficient supply of farm labor available in certain sections of the country, and I am wondering whether the committee had under consideration at any point the implementing of such an order or the consideration of the problem of the transportation of these people or anything of that kind?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The importance of sufficient labor for agricultural production as a part of the war program was recognized both by the committee and by the Department, and especial attention was given to that subject, as the gentleman will note from the hearings, although some of it may have been off the record. We were told that the manpower in agriculture and industry will be critical but we are hopeful it can be met. That was the reason for establishing this Commission to assure adequate supply for the war needs.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I think that is altogether proper. I wonder whether in connection with the United States Employment Service any consideration was given to what I understand has been their own contention that they did not have sufficient funds to do the kind of job in connection with their farm-placement service that they really ought to do.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Our particular interest was to see that needed men were not taken from the farms by the draft boards; that men indispensable to the operation of the farm and the production of raw materials for civilian and military use were exempted or deferred as circumstances required.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Reverting to the subject of the Price Administration, I wonder if the gentleman's committee gave any consideration to the advisability of requiring these rationing orders, such as sugar, rubber, and gasoline, which so directly affect the domestic and personal lives of the people, to be approved by the Congress?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That was not considered. It would hardly be possible to submit such details to the Congress.

It would be wholly impracticable to attempt to submit administrative minutae of that character to the House. I will say, however, that the evidence submitted to the committee indicated a sincere desire upon the part of the Price Administration to work out these problems in a practical way so as not to inflict unnecessary inconvenience on the people, and at the same time secure the materials needed in the war program. We cannot win the war without rubber. If it is a question of dispensing with rubber on the part of the civilian population or handicapping the war program, any patriotic citizen would favor making every personal sacrifice possible to provide the necessary materials and advance the war program. It may require some self-denial but when we consider the Spartan regime under which wartime England, Germany, Italy, and particularly occupied Europe, are existing today, we realize that in comparison we are living in the greatest comfort and luxury.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. I appreciate what the gentleman said a moment ago about the loyalty with which school teachers did their task in the rationing of sugar. I want to confirm his statement, as that is my observation also. We often hear it said, and more often it is probably thought, that public servants are having an easy time on the public pay roll. They are often called tax-eaters by citizens who work half as hard and contribute one-fourth as much to the general weal. I notice that when the postmasters are called upon to take the fingerprints of aliens they work overtime to complete this work with fidelity and dispatch. I notice that many other public servants are doing the same thing in a patriotic spirit, whether in the Post Office Department or in minor Government work, as in the case of school teachers. As one who has observed classroom teachers at their work, I know of no more loyal, patriotic group of citizens effectively working for the good of their communities without thought of pay. The sacrificial spirit and patriotic devotion so wholesome to the good of society is frequently found among our lowest-paid or volunteer public servants.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. One of the most heartening features of the emergency is the whole-hearted unanimity with which all citizens, officials of the Government, businessmen, professional men, and particularly teachers all over the country, have responded and the efficient service they have rendered without complaint, frequently at great personal sacrifice.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. KEAN. On page 11 I notice you provide that the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs may set up corporations, and then on page 12 it is provided that the Coordinator shall transmit to the President a complete financial statement of the corporations.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. KEAN. In other words, what I mean is that in a general case here, usually the corporations have to report to the Congress. This time it is to report to the President, and the Congress is losing control of knowing what those corporations are doing. I wondered why that was put in.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I hardly think such view could be taken of it. It is an administrative function. It is not a legislative function. Undoubtedly the best results could be secured by making these reports direct to the executive authority, where they would have immediate attention and appropriate action.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I dislike to return to the subject matter which the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK] was discussing with the distinguished chairman of the Appropriations Committee, except I should like to add what I believe would be a worth-while word of gratitude, especially to the postmasters in the third- and fourth-class post offices, where they do not have sufficient help to carry on, yet some of them work, to my personal knowledge, from 6 o'clock in the morning to 7 or 8 o'clock at night to give to the public the type of service to which the public is entitled during the war.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The routine work of the Post Office Department has been tremendously increased by war conditions throughout the country. The volume of business is so much heavier than heretofore as to tax the capacity of the average office force, and the way in which the postal employees have taken over these additional duties is most commendable. We cannot speak too highly of the patriotism and efficiency with which they are carrying these additional burdens.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. CARLSON. Would the chairman of the committee inform the House as to whether this appropriation for the Office of Price Administration contains money for subsidies? As I understand it, the Office of Price Administration is considering the payment of subsidies to retailers, business, and industry in order to keep their price level.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That subject did not come before us. There is no authority for such appropriations. It is a matter which is legislative in character and therefore would have to be brought up in a separate measure.

Mr. CARLSON. Do I then understand the chairman to state that it is necessary to have legislation before we can enter into a subsidy program?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There would have to be authorization.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I notice that the Appropriations Committee reduced the Budget estimate for the Office of Price Administration from $161,000,000 down to $95,000,000. If that figure stands and Congress takes the responsibility of making that big reduction under the Budget estimate, does not the gentleman believe that in the event the Price Administration fails, the responsibility will be lodged upon Congress rather than upon the administrator of the Price Administration law?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman has his figures a little confused. The subcommittee recommended $95,000,000 and the committee reduced it to $75,000,000.

Mr. PATMAN. The committee reduced it still further, did they?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The committee reduced it $20,000,000 and now recommend $75,000,000.

Mr. PATMAN. Does not the gentleman agree with me that if Congress reduces the appropriation to the extent that the Price Administration is unable to carry out the law we all voted for, that the responsibility will be upon Congress and not upon the Price Administrator?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman realizes that the question of how many employees and how much money will be required is the subject of wide variation of opinion. There are some who contend that if we had the entire Army and Navy we could not fully carry out the provisions of the act—an act which contemplates the fixing of the price of every commodity throughout the United States. Some take the position that no matter how much money we supplied we would not be able efficiently to police every business transaction to which the law would apply.

The practical view of it, of course, is that the law is largely self-enforcing and that it needs merely the general oversight of central officers and field forces in strategically located districts to administer it. We might provide all the money and all the employees asked and it still might fail. Its enforcement is in that respect somewhat analogous to the enforcement of the Prohibition Act.

Mr. PATMAN. It is worse than that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Unless we have the cooperation of the people we cannot enforce it regardless of how much money we may appropriate or how much personnel is provided. We expect to have that cooperation. So failure of the act would not necessarily mean that failure was due to lack of funds. However, Congress expects to remain in session, and if it later develops that there is need for additional money the O. P. A. can come back to Congress at any time, submit a Budget estimate, and we are ready to take it up and consider it as expeditiously as we have the pending estimate. This estimate was submitted to us on May 30, and we have it on the floor today. If there is need for additional funds and an estimate is submitted we will be in position to consider it promptly and grant any additional moneys which we may decide necessary.

Mr. PATMAN. How much does the President recommend on this?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The Budget estimate was $161,000,000.

Mr. PATMAN. The President recommended that. Since the President appointed the Price Administrator and we passed the act giving the Price Administrator the power he now exercises, if we fail to grant the money the President has asked how can Congress dodge that responsibility?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman knows it is not the general rule that we give any agency the amount that the Budget estimate requests. As a matter of fact, it is a point of ethics on the part of the subcommittees of the House that every bill reported to the House shall be below the Budget estimate. A chairman subjects himself to possible censure in the committee if he persistently brings out bills above the Budget estimate.

It is our understanding that the President submits the Budget estimate as the maximum figure. He submits that as the outside figure within which he expects the agencies to operate, and I have no doubt he is willing for us to go below if conditions warrant. The expectation is that we will not go above it.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman mean to say that the President would be satisfied with this amount, $75,000,000?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do not know, but I am certain the President would not expect us to go above the Budget estimate. He has never expressed disapproval so far as I recall of the many instances in which we have submitted bills below the Budget estimate.

Mr. PATMAN. If the gentleman will bear with me, I thoroughly agree this is worse than enforcing the prohibition law, because it only involves one commodity.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This involves every commodity.

Mr. PATMAN. This involves 1,800,000 different commodities, if we take styles and things like that into consideration.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is also said to involve some services.

Mr. PATMAN. The Price Administrator will never apply price rules and regulations to all commodities. He will only select a few commodities that are about to get out of control and apply the rules and regulations and price fixings to those.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The general price order froze everything across the board. The Administrator stated that the ideal enforcement of the law involved the freezing of prices of everything. From the practical point of view, he conceded that we could not expect the ideal, that we could not expect 100-percent compliance, but that, at least, is the objective proposed by the law.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Could the gentleman refer us to the place in the hearings where the duties of these enforcement officials are described? I am wondering whether it is not possible to use the ordinary law-enforcement machinery for this primary enforcement problem of our country. In prohibition times the laws were so drafted that States, municipal, and other court systems and officials were involved in enforcement. I wonder whether the gentleman could tell us the place where we could read up on just what this vast army of enforcement officials are to do.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will look opposite Mr. Henderson's name in the appendix and locate his statement, the gentleman will find that he gives a very good outline of the subjects in which the gentleman is interested. I will add to that the committee hoped it would be possible for him to employ other Government agencies in some instances. For example, we thought it would be possible to dispense with the service of some of the lawyers requested on the assumption that other departments could supply that service.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is aware of the tremendous difficulties confronting the small businessmen of the country, particularly the small retailers and many of the manufacturers. The price ceiling that was fixed by Mr. Henderson applies to the price ceiling for each individual store. Each individual store may have a different price level.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. The same commodity may sell for a different price in two stores in the same block.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. What I want to point out is this: I have heard rumors of a tremendous organization of inspectors or of auditors who were to go in, examine the books of every little store, really have a policeman police that store to see that they kept the price level. Personally I think it would be a big mistake to go that far, because, after all, the men and women who go to the stores will know pretty well what the old prices were and they will police the system. If there is anybody who is taking advantage of the price level by increasing the price, the customers will refuse to buy and they will go to stores that do maintain the price level. I do not feel it is necessary to have such a large force even as the one mentioned in the bill, 32,000, to go out to police the small retailers of the country. Most of the retailers are honest men and want to do business. They want to stay in business and they are squeezed now between two stones so that many of them will be forced out of business due to some of the policies put into operation by the O. P. A. and Mr. Henderson. I hope the O. P. A. will not make it too hard for these small business men to survive.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman expresses admirably the opinion of the committee. Of course, as was stated awhile ago, the Administrator could go to the extreme of sending an auditor to every store. But the consumers will be the first to know if they are overcharged and being familiar with the prices, no merchant will subject himself to the penalty of the law, and particularly subject himself to the loss of trade which would follow an attempt to violate the law. As a matter of fact, I think you will find throughout the country a general acquiescence and compliance with the law, and a general desire on the part of all businessmen to cooperate. For this reason it is hoped the amount recommended by the committee will be sufficient to met the needs of adequately enforcing the law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Just another observation. These people who

are in small businesses will really be in that great American middle class. A good many of them are being squeezed out of business because of the lower price levels they may have had in an effort to try to compete with some of the large chain stores of the country. They are in a difficult situation. I think some relief should be afforded them, so that they may stay in business. It is impossible for a man who does say a ten, fifteen, or twenty thousand dollar business to compete with someone who does business on a million or a hundred-million-dollar scale.

Did Mr. Henderson indicate that there might be some relief for the small business men?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As the gentleman knows, the Price Administration has repeatedly set prices and outlined regulations which, after experience, it has been found necessary either to revoke or readjust. The routine of the O. P. A. in the short time it has been in force indicates that it is sufficiently flexible to meet the needs of the occasion and of the individual, as the case may be.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman knows that if the small business man is wiped out, big business will come in and take over, and we shall no longer have small business in the country.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is certainly no desire to interfere with business, large or small, and every reason to believe that the small business men will be amply protected.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I noticed the gentleman mentioned the fact that he anticipated that Mr. Henderson's organization would be fixing prices not only on civilian commodities but also on war materials. When the price-control bill was before the Committee on Banking and Currency originally, it was contemplated, I think, by all of us, that he would fix prices for raw materials as well as civilian commodities. After that, the Navy and War Departments and the Maritime Commission set up negotiation boards which have been fixing prices. At the same time, I understand that Leon Henderson's organization is encroaching upon that work, and while the War Department has been leaving to them the price-fixing of war materials and raw commodities for use in manufactured products, there is a little controversy over who should have the right to fix the prices of manufactured products needed by the War and Navy Departments and the Maritime Commission.

I should like to know if the gentleman's committee considered that subject and what your intention is, because it seems to me it ought to be made clear in this bill whether Henderson's organization or the War and Navy Departments are to fix those prices.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentlewoman herself participated in the drafting of this law. In that connection, I wish to take advantage of the opportunity to express my admiration for the manner in which the chairman of that committee, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL], has handled the authorizing legislation. The Committee on Banking and Currency is one of the great and historic committees of the House. The gentleman from Alabama has served longer in the capacity of chairman of that committee than any Member who has ever held that distinguished position. In my opinion, he rendered a great service to the country in his statesmanlike consideration of the bill and the form in which he finally reported it.

Of course, it is not intended that there should be any conflict between the Price Administration and the War Department. Each has its separate duty, and each is expected to remain within its own jurisdiction. Inevitably, however, the fixing of all prices will be reflected in the prices of many commodities required by the War Department in the war program, and especially in lend-lease operations, because most of these manufactured commodities are processed from raw material which, with the exception of the farm products, are subject to action by the Price Administration.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I understand there is no desire on the part of any of the War or Navy people to reach into the field of raw materials, but when it comes to the point of manufactured materials, I understand that the feeling is that there is a better incentive if they can adjust prices rather than have a blanket price. I think the feeling is that there might be a paralyzing of the war effort if the Price Administration control were extended to those articles.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no intention to interfere.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Can the gentleman say, then, as a policy, that it is not the intention of the committee to cover that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is the policy.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I appreciate the gentleman's yielding to me a second time.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am always glad to yield to my friend from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I desire to supplement the observation of the gentleman from Minnesota relative to the plight of the small business men in the country today. I believe this Congress, through its membership, is fully cognizant by communication and contact with the fact that the small business man, over the period of recent years, has increasingly come in contact with the Federal agencies of Government by way of filling out complicated forms which it is necessary for him to fill out under certain of the laws now operative. He is fearful in these days that he will be faced with an added burden of filing out, and I believe your committee brought out this information, a form A which has 14 pages of answers he has to make, and another form B of 6 or 7 pages. In other words, I think he is frightened by the very mechanics of the Office of Price Administration procedure in this matter.

The small business man I know in my district, as throughout the Nation, is fully desirous of cooperating in every way for the successful prosecution of the war, but he does at times, and I believe rightly so, fear that from Washington there is such a prying and a prodding into the business he undertakes to carry forward successfully for himself and a small group that in this particular he wants to be sure that the information is vitally necessary to the successful prosecution of the war. We should seek to help him, not harass him.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. One of the results we hope to effect by reduction of personnel and retrenchment of funds is the simplication of procedure, the curtailment of red tape, and the elimination of all unnecessary reports and other lost motion.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I wish to ask the gentleman one or two, maybe three, questions, in this form.

Having in mind Mr. Henderson's statement before our Banking and Currency Committee, wherein he specified rather categorically the things that should be done in order to enable him to prevent an inflation in the price level, and having in mind what the gentleman said to the Appropriations Committee as published in the hearings made available today, which I have read very carefully, of some 100 or more pages, I wish to submit these two or three questions.

In the opinion of the gentleman, who is chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, does he feel that Mr. Henderson's administration of the Price Control Act can be reasonably effective and beneficial, and reasonably prevent an inflation in the price level, unless the necessary legislation is passed to bring about enforced savings, to bring about a material spread in the tax base and a material increase in the tax burden, and the arresting of the advance in the wage-salary level. I want to get the gentleman's opinion on that.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Perhaps, to best answer the gentleman's question would be a quotation from Mr. Henderson himself, and with the permission of the Committee I will include in my remarks at this time eight items—which include each one the gentleman has enumerated—in the article which Mr. Henderson publishes in the June issue of the Federationist. Mr. Henderson mentions the items to which the gentleman has referred and gives his opinion as to the importance of utilizing them in securing a really effective control of prices.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield for the purpose of permitting me to quote the chairman of the Appropriations Committee in a statement he

made to Mr. Henderson and the answer Mr. Henderson made which, I think, shows what our chairman's attitude was?—and I want to heartily commend the gentleman.

On page 24 of the hearings I find the chairman said this:

> Of course, you realize, Mr. Henderson, that if you attempt to police every market in the country and supervise every sale, whether it is a pound of beans or whether it is a locomotive, that is physically impossible. You could not do it with the entire Army and Navy.
>
> Mr. HENDERSON. That is correct.

I call the attention of my colleague to that part of the hearing where our chairman was attempting to get Mr. Henderson to say that this job could not be enforced and policed and that existing agencies and voluntary activities with respect to obedience of the law rather than enforcement had to be the backbone of American compliance.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Henderson's reply was rather conclusive.

One of the features brought out by the farm organizations appearing before the committee was their interest in securing strict compliance with the requirements of the statute in the fixing of prices of farm commodities.

As will be noted in the statements by the National Grange and by the Farm Bureau, paragraph (c) of section 3, requires affirmative action by the Secretary of Agriculture preliminary to establishment of ceilings on prices of those commodities processed from raw agricultural commodities. The committee agrees there should be meticulous compliance with the law.

As to the National War Labor Board, the Bureau of the Budget submitted an estimate for $1,167,000 which the committee reports in full with favorable recommendation for its enactment by the House.

The Labor Board is engaged in mediation and arbitration activities and reported a satisfactory record in which agreements had been secured between employer and employees and plants kept in operation, strikes discouraged, and other interferences with production avoided. As a result production on practically every item of war materials has far exceeded original estimates. It is evident from the record of production that management and labor are operating fully and are securing results, in some instances amounting to 100 percent in excess of original schedules.

The War Relocation Authority is allocated $70,000,000.

The census of 1940 shows about 126,000 Japanese living in the United States, one-fourth of them aliens and three-fourths in the first-generation American citizens. Military orders required the entire Japanese population, both aliens and citizens, to be removed from areas which were considered of military importance. They are being segregated in new areas for the duration of the war. The United States provides housing, food, essential clothing, medical care, and education. It also allocates $10,000,000 of the $70,000,000 for wages, and a schedule of salaries has been agreed upon under which we pay $12 per month for common labor, $16 for semiskilled labor, and $19 for skilled workers, which is paid only as compensation for work or labor. It is hoped that by next year this colony will be largely self-supporting. Of course this first year land has to be cleared and buildings erected, irrigation ditches laid out, and in the first year production will be limited, but beginning with the second year, it is hoped that they will be in position to produce for their own use everything essential to their needs.

The Smaller War Plants Corporation Act approved June 11, 1942, also reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, and in which Chairman STEAGALL also has rendered exceptional service, authorized an appropriation of $150,000,000 of capital stock.

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman goes to that, and getting back to the relocation of the Japanese, will he yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. NORRELL. Does the gentleman know how these camps are to be operated and whether the inmates would be permitted to go outside when they want to, or will they be confined and kept under guard?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They are supposed to live within the area assigned to them, but under certain conditions or in exceptional cases, they may be authorized to move about. Of course, they will be at all times under the jurisdiction of the Government.

Mr. NORRELL. The reason I asked the question is that they are considering putting relocation camps in Arkansas, and one is in my district, and one is partly in my home county. I wanted to be sure they would be kept under guard. I have been so advised, but I just wanted to get that in the RECORD.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to say they have complied willingly, and I know now no instance in which these Japanese, seriously discommoded as they are, with as great a financial loss as they must suffer, have caused any trouble. They are ready to go along and seem anxious to cooperate in every way possible.

Mr. NORRELL. A very large percentage will probably be American citizens. They may have dual citizenship, but I did want to make it plain for the record that we would certainly expect the Japanese to be kept under guard.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. They are in large measure American citizens and will be under the supervision of the Government at all times. I think the communities in which they are placed will find them cooperative.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California?

Mr. HINSHAW. Would the gentleman be interested in hearing a short letter written by a Japanese confined in camp to his former employer?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman for that purpose.

Mr. HINSHAW. This is written from Manzanar, and he says:

> Thank you very much for your kind letter, and it surely has been a pleasure to know there are people still think of me and welcome me to work when I should be able to go back there.
>
> The life here is so much difference from what I used to and getting tired of not having enough to do.
>
> It seems to me we are just about eating all day long, 7–8 breakfast, 12–1 lunch, 5–6 supper, and just about thinking of next meal when you get through with one. I am temporarily working as janitor, as you know I couldn't be kept idle any time.
>
> I am living with Glendale people of six in family making total of eight in the apartment.
>
> Each person is given steel-framed single bed with straw stuff mat as mattress and three Army blankets.
>
> There are about 24 blocks in our side and there are number more blocks on other side of sentry lines.
>
> The snow-capped hills are very pretty and picturesque and sure enjoy living here in spite of wind.
>
> I don't think I could ever dream of having a vacation in such a place otherwise. There are still dusty and dry for there is not any green lawns or much of trees at present, but soon as they begin to put in lawns here there will be entirely different Manzanar in future.
>
> I am earnestly hoping that they soon will start on landscaping or that sort of improvement so that I can be of any use in that line.
>
> Well I will be closing now, but I must tell you that I have given another baby girl. Weighs 6 pounds 15 ounces—May 20 at county hospital, and both mother and baby doing well. I am naming my baby Nancy Sumiko. Please say "Hello" to everybody and let me know about your garden and future planning. How are the strawberries and vegetables?
>
> Sincerely yours,
>
> ——— ———.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Judging from the evidence before the committee that would be a reflection of the typical attitude of the evacuees.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Missouri has consumed 1 hour.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

This bill calls for $1,830,000,000, and is about $111,000,000 below the Budget. Most of these items are items with reference to the war effort. There are some items that are supposed to be for the war effort that decidedly are not.

We had before us the Budget officer in connection with a proposal to make an emergency fund appropriation for the President of $100,000,000, and we found that items were being considered that had absolutely no relation to the war effort, and that many of them were of a type that should unquestionably come before the Congress. An item such as an additional appropriation for the National Resources Planning Board, a board that

has never yet shown anything of a constructive character, and a board whose operations might rather be dispensed with and the activities of those who are engaged in it directed toward the war effort rather than things that may never develop. If they are any good at this time, they ought to be going all-out for defense.

There were hundreds of other small items that should have come before the Committee on Appropriations for consideration. I am hopeful that the abuses of this fund by the President will cease and that from here on it will be used entirely for those things that relate to the war effort and that are absolutely necessary and that require such immediate action that they cannot be presented to the Congress in detail.

There is a large item for the Board of Economic Warfare. Frankly this organization covers a great deal of territory that is covered by other organizations. There were enormous number of liaison officers mixed up in it, indicating that they were trying to settle difficulties. There is another set of appropriations for just liaison officers, $113,000 in the office of the liaison officer. In the office of the chairman of the War Powers Board, in the Office of Statistics, and scattered all through the Price Administration and the War Powers Board are liaison officers. Now, what does that mean? It means that in this critical period of American affairs when we need to be working forward all the time with a view of getting things out, getting the things done that need to be done for the war effort, we have a great group of superimposed agencies and committees that have conflicting authority. All these liaison officers are needed to settle the difficulties between different groups, to decide which group is going to have this thing to do or that thing to do. An enormous number of lawyers; an enormous number of liaison officers running back and forth between one group and another. The result of that is tremendous confusion. There could be no greater service performed by the President at this time than to pick out the very best lawyers he can get in this country, a small group, three or four, or perhaps five, and let them study those conflicting authorities. Let them bring a program to him that would eliminate that conflicting business and get rid of the delay and red tape that result from that conflicting authority.

I present that as perhaps one of the most constructive suggestions that could be made at this time in connection with the war effort. I believe that its adoption would produce great acceleration of the work of the War Production Board, of the Army, and the Navy, and of every unit everywhere connected with it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HINSHAW. How much of an increase in personnel is the Board of Economic Warfare going to have this year over last year?

Mr. TABER. The amount of their appropriation that is recommended by the committee and that was asked for by the Budget is exactly the same as the figure that they had for the current fiscal year.

Mr. HINSHAW. I understand they have had something in the neighborhood of 1,600 employees to date, and they expect to go up to 5,000 very shortly, and that $30,000,000 of an appropriation has been transferred from the executive offices to this Board to carry on its functions, in addition to the ordinary appropriation.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. According to the figures I have here, the personnel for the current year was 1,971. The personnel asked for next year is 2,634.

Mr. HINSHAW. That is what is asked for, but I understand it is to be double that before they get through.

Mr. TABER. I would think it would be decidedly contrary to proper procedure for an allotment of that kind to be made without figures and an estimate being submitted to the Appropriations Committee. It is an existing agency which needs no temporary help, and if it has to have funds they should tell us frankly and submit the matter to the Appropriations Committee and to the Congress.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does the gentleman know whether funds were transferred to that agency from any other agency this past year?

Mr. TABER. There were no funds that would amount to a great deal. There was a direct allotment to this Board from the President's emergency fund.

Mr. HINSHAW. Of how much?

Mr. TABER. About $3,000,000. With reference to a lot of these set-ups there is the Office of Civilian Supply, with an estimate for about $1,800,000, that is before us. This set-up is headed by Mr. Leon Henderson. It is filled up with a group of derelicts from the W. P. A. The operations of that office are in direct conflict with the Office of Price Administration, a direct duplication.

The Office of Price Administration is also filled up with a group of derelicts from the W. P. A., the National Labor Relations Board, and folks of that type, the kind of folks who have been on the pay roll for the last 10 years and who have just been legislated upon the body politic without contributing anything of a substantial character or constructive nature. It is time a lot of them were eliminated.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Why did not the committee insist that these perpetual Federal employees be forced to do some constructive war work and permit voluntary workers throughout the country to take over and do some of this essential O. P. A. work? Certainly the Selective Service System is working largely on a basis of volunteers, and there is no reason why this O. P. A. should not be so conducted.

Mr. TABER. The administration of the O. P. A. has been very inefficient. They are loaded up with a terrific lot of lawyers. They came to us with a Budget estimate for 2,756 lawyers scattered all over the country designed to annoy and harass those people who are still trying to do business in America; it was at least nine times as large as they would need if they had competent lawyers. Almost none of these lawyers had ever tried a case in court or had any real experience in the private practice of law. They were not the type of people who were fit to administer that sort of thing. I asked them what they needed so many lawyers for and they said because they had such long-drawn-out regulations to interpret. Then I asked them if they were paid by the yard for drawing the regulations. It was perfectly apparent that they were and that there was no competency anywhere in connection with the administration.

Mr. DWORSHAK. The gentleman certainly is aware of the fact that the American people are concentrating their efforts on winning the war. If they recognize that it is essential to expand O. P. A., they will be more effective and more cooperative under such circumstances and will do more toward preventing inflation through a voluntary system, than could be accomplished by having thousands and thousands of paid snoopers and checkers harassing our people and actually retarding the war effort of the Nation.

Mr. Chairman, I insert at this point a letter which I received today from the secretary of a local chamber of commerce in Idaho:

HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK.

DEAR SIR: The following information may not be news to you and we have not taken occasion previously to bring this matter to your attention, but we do wish that you have the following facts.

1. All rationing and Office of Price Administration work in this State could be handled without one dollar's expense to the Federal Government. I believe I could guarantee to arrange for the setting up of the necessary offices in every county in Idaho where all of the above work would be carried on by public-spirited businessmen who would volunteer their services. It is a difficult thing to urge our people to save and deprive themselves of the necessities of life, to buy stamps and bonds, to finance a program which public-spirited people started in our State and would continue to handle without any remuneration.

2. Our people are very apprehensive that with the close of the war we shall still have an expensive regulatory program, reaching into every hamlet of the country. Recently a representative of the Labor Department in Washington used our office to interview applicants for positions which the Labor Department will set up in connection with Office of Price Administration work. This party stated that the key positions in this local labor set-up would be hired on a permanent basis. We presume from Washington dispatches that it is your opinion that this Office of Price Administration and labor set-up will expire at the end of the war, so we are mentioning the above statements made by the Labor Department representative, that they are hiring their personnel on a permanent basis.

3. Our people are greatly worried over the proposed Office of Price Administration regulation of inventories. We understand this proposed regulation is now in the fifth draft and that each draft would operate more severely than the previous one on the retailer. We would appreciate word from you as to what the last draft of this proposed inventory

regulation contains, and what is the basis for calculating the amount of merchandise local stores will be permitted to purchase for the last half of this year or for the first half of 1943. We call attention to the fact that Idaho is a long way from eastern manufacturing markets and our merchants necessarily must carry larger stocks than a community a hundred miles from New York City. From advance information on this inventory control, it is our calculation that from 25 percent to 50 percent of our merchants will be thrown out of business, and these will be mainly the smaller firms in which the Government has stated it is particularly interested. As stated above, we shall appreciate any information you can send us on this proposed inventory regulation.

We realize this is a lengthy statement, but our people are greatly confused over the entire war situation. We have several committees devoting time to every phase of the war effort and we are anxious to do everything possible to speed the war program. We do believe that the Office of Price Administration could attract much more support to its program if it would take the people it proposes to regulate more into its confidence and let them know what they are planning and what the expenses will be.

Mr. TABER. I do not believe there are enough people in this country who are not prepared to go along with the war effort and who are not prepared to make every possible sacrifice to amount to as many as the employees of the Office of Price Administration.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Then, in reality, this system we are now inaugurating will retard our war effort instead of stimulating and expediting the prosecution of the war?

Mr. TABER. The committee to a very considerable extent appreciated that situation. That was undoubtedly an impelling reason for the reduction of the estimates that were sent to the committee from $161,000,000 to $75,000,000. My own opinion is that Mr. Henderson would do a better administrative job if he would go out and pick competent lawyers, and competent economists, and competent business specialists for what he has to do that absolutely needs to be done right there, that he would be benefited if this appropriation were reduced to $30,000,000, that we would get better administration. I think we are getting the poorest kind of administration the way the thing stands.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman has made a very serious charge against the Office of Price Administration. Can the gentleman cite from the hearings testimony to bear out his statements?

Mr. TABER. I can show the gentleman the statements by Mr. Henderson and how all the way through instead of answering questions directly he beat around the bush and took up his own time. He would have been able by answering questions directly to be through with the hearings in a quarter of the time he did take.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman contend that he can cite any place in the hearings to bear out the statements he made?

Mr. TABER. I can only cite the gentleman what has been said there in the hearings to the effect that they needed all these lawyers and then they produce the names and their experience and they had not had any of a substantial character in practice. They had regulations and all sorts of programs that were absolutely unnecessary to enforce the things that he wanted to do.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman does not claim that his statements are based upon the printed hearings, does he?

Mr. TABER. A very large part of it is. Part of it is based upon observation of the group of men that were brought up there and the way they operated. I will give the gentleman an illustration so that he may, with his great influence in the Office of Price Administration, do something to correct the situation.

Mr. PATMAN. I do not have any influence down there.

Mr. TABER. I want the gentleman to hear this because I think maybe he might perform a useful function. He had a man down there named Paul Porter, Rent Administrator, who had worked over in the Agriculture Department, who knew nothing about the real estate business and nothing about renting property, a man who gathered around him a group of people who had no real estate experience, a man who went out into places and picked up people as assistants to administer the rent law who had no experience. He wanted $13,000,000 to administer that rent law.

Here is the situation as it should be. He could have gone into these communities, he could have asked real estate men with experience to set up boards for the operation of the rent law. Instead of that he put people in with no experience whatever. Maybe that is all right, maybe that is good administration, but I do not think it is. What we need is good administration and that is what I am trying to suggest to the gentleman to see if he cannot help Mr. Henderson achieve this.

Mr. PATMAN. Does not the gentleman expect a few mistakes to be made out of 7,500 appointments?

Mr. TABER. I do not think there should be a set-up where there are $13,000,000 or 10 percent of what his request was practically set up in an incompetent organization, an organization that is obviously incompetent.

Mr. PATMAN. I am not admitting there was a mistake, but the charge of incompetency is rather serious without supporting testimony.

Mr. TABER. Incompetence is what does that sort of thing.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think if the gentleman from Texas, Mr. PATMAN, will refer to pages 80 and 81 of the hearings and then four or five pages following, he will find considerable support for the remarks of the gentleman from New York. Mr. Henderson goes into detail and states where he has taken a number of these policy-makers from—that is, old agencies of government. May I ask the gentleman, when his committee arrived at the rough estimate of say 40,000 paid employees instead of 90,000 paid employees, as Mr. Henderson requested, were you not proceeding on the assumption that it would be possible for the Administrator to obtain competent help from volunteers throughout the 48 States and Territories, and was it not your belief that competent volunteers could be obtained, and was not that one of your major reasons for reducing the amount requested?

Mr. TABER. That and the fact it was perfectly obvious to anyone who had, as I have had, nearly 40 years of law experience, what the situation was. This estimate that came to us for 2,756 lawyers was perfectly ridiculous and the estimate for 644 economists was equally ridiculous.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Also 1,804 business specialists was ridiculous.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the gentleman this question. Do not the hearings clearly show that the general procedure is to the effect that young, inexperienced lawyers write up the most complicated rules and regulations that only young lawyers can design?

Mr. TABER. The trouble is they take a form that they have used on something else, whether it applies or not, and copy it. That makes yardage.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Then they proceed to ask you for appropriations to provide for these thousands of attorneys to be set up in the various local board headquarters to try and interpret those complicated regulations when people come in and say, "Just what does this language mean?" Is that not about the situation?

Mr. TABER. It is. I am going to give the gentleman an illustration. The War Powers Board with John Lord O'Brien, one of the ablest lawyers in America, probably, as the chief counsel, with all the responsibilities that they have to meet, with all the things that they have to follow up in connection with priorities and all that sort of thing, has a staff of 129 lawyers, whereas this outfit, with minor responsibility and minor work as compared with the War Powers Board is asking of 2,756 attorneys.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I get the gentleman's judgment on this: Assuming that 90,000 paid employees and 2,000,000 volunteer workers, as set forth in the hearings, with 5,600 or 5,700 attorneys, were to proceed to administer the prices on 15 groups of commodities, what kind of a chaotic situation will we have when we move into the control of 50, 300, or 500 commodity groups with, say, 250,000 employees and with maybe 25,000 or 30,000 lawyers?

Mr. TABER. There will not be anybody left to go into the Army.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is the general direction in which it appears to me we are moving.

Mr. TABER. I am afraid the gentleman is correct. I do not believe this

Congress is going to stand for letting the bars down like that. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. I went home last week over the week end, and I came in contact with a company in one of my home towns there that was manufacturing universal joints. They have had their stenographers working for a week and a half on some form that was sent to them. After they got it out and finished, which put them to considerable expense, then they had a directive that the folks up here in Washington would not need it.

Do those lawyers decide that, or what sort of a crackpot down there figured that out?

Mr. TABER. I do not know. If it related to priorities it would come under the War Production Board. If it related to rationing or anything of that kind, it would come under Mr. Henderson.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It related to prices.

Mr. TABER. That would come under Henderson.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Which would this one come under? The Detroit Free Press carries an article about a major who is down in one of the clubs drunk, and he orders a private out. Then finally he finds that the private outranks him, he did not happen to be a private at all, he just had on some old clothes, so the major had to get out. That same major up there just fired a technical man who has been giving us something between $40,000,000 and $50,000,000 worth of production over in that little southwestern section. How can I get at that fellow and get that major fired?

Mr. TABER. That ought to go to the Secretary of War.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I thank the gentleman.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. About the selection of the personnel, in fairness to the Office of Price Administration, is it not a fact that the personnel are selected through the civil service?

Mr. TABER. I do not see how they could ever pick up so many derelicts from the W. P. A. if they are selected that way.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that they are selected from the Civil Service?

Mr. TABER. If they are, I do not see how they could pick up so many derelicts. I would not want to answer that, but I do not see how they could be.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. I may say to the gentleman from Texas that I just had a long-distance telephone call this afternoon from Raleigh, N. C., from a young lady who has a civil-service rating and has passed the civil-service examination. She applied to the O. P. A. for a job and was told by the person in charge of personnel that that agency was not under civil service.

Mr. PATMAN. The printed hearings on this bill disclose that the Civil Service Commission passed on every one of them.

Mr. TABER. Maybe they passed on them, but it was noncompetitive. The Civil Service Commission simply passes the employees with the lowest possible rating.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW].

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I have asked for this allotment of time in order that, if possible, I may give the House and the country somewhat of a picture of the organization for the sale of war securities; how that organization operates, and the results that are being obtained in this gigantic sales campaign. The bill that is presently before us carries $12,000,000 to maintain and expand that organization during the next fiscal year, which is part of the appropriation of $45,000,000 under the title of "Expenses of Loans."

In the first place, I would like to pay a tribute to Harold N. Graves, assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury, who has general over-all charge of the sale of Government securities, to raise the funds that are so vitally necessary for winning the war. I do not believe it would have been possible to have entrusted this task of monumental importance to more competent hands. Mr. Graves' judgment is sound, his vision is clear, and his industry is indefatigable. He is a genius for details and knows everything that is going on in every branch and ramification of his vast organization. He came to this difficult task splendidly equipped with long experience in governmental operations and with intimate knowledge of the personnel and functions of the public services. He is a born organizer whose feet are always on the ground.

He started out with the premise that the raising of the multiplied billions necessary to win the war will require a maximum of volunteer effort and cooperation far beyond anything that has ever been known in this country. It was his conception—and I think an eminently sound one—that if the campaign to finance the war is to be put over successfully it must be the willing, patriotic people of America who will do it. It was a nation's job, and about all that could be expected of a paid organization and all that could be done by it would be to devise the plans and give direction to the effort.

Both in the purchase of bonds by the public and in the campaign for selling them to the public the volunteer principle is being invoked with amazing success. Literally millions of people are helping by their personal services to sell the bonds, without receiving one cent of compensation for their efforts. These volunteer workers include 270,000 persons who are serving as members of State, local, and county committees without pay. The newspapers, the magazines, and the radio had most generously contributed their part gratis and Mr. Graves' staff estimates that in the 11 months of the fiscal year just ending, the bond sales campaign has received $65,000,000 worth of free publicity. It is estimated that 25,000 persons are giving their full time to the sale of War bonds without pay from the Treasury. The banks which serve Mr. Graves' organization as issuing agents, are employing at their own expense an equivalent of 20,000 persons to do that particular job.

Having made voluntary service the keystone of his organization, Mr. Graves came before us in an anomalous attitude in marked contrast with the usual efforts of Government chiefs to get all of the personnel that could possibly be extracted from an unwilling Appropriations Committee. On page 169 of the hearings there is a bit of interesting testimony on this point which I quote:

Mr. LUDLOW. It is your theory, on which you are building your organization—and I think very wisely—that you do not need a large paid personnel?

Mr. GRAVES. That is right.

Mr. LUDLOW. And you do not contemplate a large paid personnel?

Mr. GRAVES. We do not want it.

Mr. LUDLOW. You have enough paid men to help provide the administration of it and to serve as a liaison with the volunteer organization?

Mr. GRAVES. That is right.

Mr. LUDLOW. That is the conception of your organization?

Mr. GRAVES. That is right.

Mr. LUDLOW. I think that is a very wise plan, and it is in direct contrast, I think I may say, with another Nation-wide activity which is proposing a paid personnel of 90,000 people. Your conception is that you get all the service that is needed to put over the job on a voluntary basis, if that voluntary effort is given the direction that it needs by trained, paid personnel?

Mr. GRAVES. That is right.

An activity which has its sights fixed at a billion dollars a month in revenue would be expected, I think, to have a personnel running up into many thousands, but Mr. Graves has only 800 salaried persons on his roll, 300 in Washington and 500 in the field. The appropriation carried in this bill would enable him to add 675 salaried persons, to be distributed in the field among the forty-nine State organizations. These additional employees will range from the usual clerical grade of $1,440 to a maximum of $4,600 for specialists, publicity representatives, and the higher grades of personnel. Immensely valuable and indispensable as voluntary service is, it needs direction and one competent paid emissary who knows his business can vitalize and direct the activities of many hundreds of volunteer workers, so as to achieve the maximum results. That is the principle on which Mr. Graves is proceeding to perfect his organization, and I believe it is a sound and wholesome principle. If it is possible for Mr. Graves to achieve his ultimate goal of sales of a billion dollars a month at a cost of a million dollars a month, that will be operating at a cost of one tenth of one percent. I do not believe that there has ever been any comparable operation at any time, in

any country, in the history of the world, on as low a percentage of cost as that.

At this point I submit testimony by Mr. Graves giving the basis of his program for next year. He said:

We have in mind, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to get from the public, in these bonds, approximately 10 percent of all income; $12,000,000,000 represents roughly 12 percent of the national income. As our objective and goal we are trying to induce all the people to invest, on the average 10 percent of their salaries or wages or other income—current income—in these securities. That accounts for our billion-dollar monthly quota. We carry that all the way down the line. About 90,000 industrial and commercial companies in the United States have adopted pay-roll allotment plans for the purchase of War Savings bonds. The objective we are trying to set before all these companies and their workers is the investment of 10 percent of current wages and salaries in War bonds.

The monthly national quota and the quotas set for counties, States, and companies are based upon that objective. I think the economists have concluded that it is necessary for us to secure the investment of that percentage of current income to combat inflation.

Some idea of the results already secured in the bond-sales campaign may be obtained from the fact that the current redemption value of United States Savings bonds outstanding on May 31, 1942, was $9,569,035,314.16.

These bonds are distributed among 18,000,000 holders.

The number of War Savings bonds issued during the fiscal year which will end tomorrow will be about 54,000,000 and it is expected that 120,000,000 pieces will be issued next year.

The sales for the month of May 1941 amounted to $349,000,000; for June 1941, $314,000,000; for July, $342,000,000; for August, $265,000,000; for September, $232,000,000; for October, $270,000,000; for November, $233,000,000.

Then came December and Pearl Harbor. The sales shot upward to $528,599,000 in December, and the sales for January 1942, the first full month after we entered the war, skyrocketed to $1,060,000,000. Monthly sales subsequent to that time have been as follows: February, $703,000,000; March, $557,000,000; April, $530,000,000; May, $634,000,000. The June figures are expected to top those of May.

The most popular of the War Savings bonds is the one formerly known as the baby bond, which has been rechristened with the more dignified title of War Bond. This is the denomination that costs $18.75, with a maturity value of $25. Pearl Harbor pirouetted the sales of that bond to dazzling heights, but the April 1942 sales exceeded even those of January, the first month after Pearl Harbor. The sales of the $25 bond, in terms of the number of units, in May 1941 were 356,000; in June 1941, 431,000; in July 1941, 530,000; in August 1941, 553,000; in September 1941, 595,000; in October 1941, 700,000; in November 1941, 725,000; in December 1941, 2,661,000; in January 1942, 3,846,000; in February 1942, 2,807,000; in March 1942, 3,529,000; and in April 1942, 4,055,000.

So energetic has been the bond-sales campaign and so notable have been the results that Mr. Graves was moved to say in testifying before our committee:

I think one thing can be said about savings bonds. Everybody in the country has learned about them and is familiar with their characteristics and the reasons why their sale is being pressed.

The following table shows the distribution of the war-savings field staff as of May 31, 1942, by States and Territories, the increases in field employees proposed, and the distribution of field personnel as it will be in the fiscal year 1943 if the increase of personnel provided in the bill before us is granted:

War Savings staff—List of field personnel by States or Territories

State	Number of employees as of May 31, 1942	Number of employees proposed for fiscal year 1943
Alabama	7	17
Alaska	2	6
Arizona	3	6
Arkansas	6	13
California (northern)	15	44
California (southern)	9	35
Colorado	5	22
Connecticut	9	27
Delaware	5	11
District of Columbia	9	10
Florida	7	27
Georgia	8	17
Hawaii	3	6
Idaho	4	11
Illinois	28	48
Indiana	17	44
Iowa	11	23
Kansas	7	24
Kentucky	6	20
Louisiana	6	18
Maine	3	6
Maryland	6	19
Massachusetts	11	55
Michigan	12	40
Minnesota	12	31
Mississippi	7	11
Missouri	20	35
Montana	5	9
Nebraska	6	17
Nevada	2	6
New Hampshire	4	4
New Jersey	10	43
New Mexico	4	8
New York	79	125
North Carolina	6	14
North Dakota	4	6
Ohio	17	77
Oklahoma	10	24
Oregon	9	19
Pennsylvania	20	63
Rhode Island	5	12
South Carolina	4	9
South Dakota	3	6
Tennessee	5	28
Texas	7	55
Utah	4	12
Vermont	3	6
Virginia	11	24
Washington	12	38
West Virginia	4	9
Wisconsin	6	19
Wyoming	2	6
Total	490	1,265

The following factual statement, based on accurate and authoritative information, is presented in further elucidation of the bond sales campaign:

The amount of $45,000,000 recommended by the committee under the heading "Expenses of loans, 1942," is for all expenses of the Public Debt Service during the year, no provision having been made in the Treasury-Post Office bill for that purpose. The item was omitted from the regular bill in order to permit later and more accurate estimates to be provided by the Treasury as to the cost of the War Savings bond program.

This item of $45,000,000 falls into two subdivisions: (a) $33,000,000 for the cost of manufacturing, issuing, registering, paying, and redeeming bonds, notes, and certificates involved in all issues of Government securities, and other expenses in connection with the administration of the public debt; and (b) $12,000,000 for the cost of promoting the sale of War Savings bonds.

WAR SAVINGS BONDS

War Savings bonds, then called Defense Savings bonds, were placed on sale May 1, 1941. From that date to the present time total sales of savings bonds have amounted to approximately $6,700,000,000. Expenditures for promoting the sale of these bonds in the same period have amounted to approximately $8,000,000. The bulk of this cost has been for promotional material distributed by the Treasury to all communities in the country, including stamp albums, posters, billboards and window displays, pamphlets, and so forth.

The cost of promotion has been slightly in excess of one-tenth of 1 percent of the dollar volume of sales based on the issue price of the securities.

It is estimated by the Treasury that not fewer than 18,000,000 persons are now purchasers of Defense or War Savings bonds. Of this number approximately 14,000,000 are buying regularly out of current salaries or wages under pay-roll-allotment plans now operating in more than 100,000 establishments throughout the country.

VOLUNTEER WORKERS

The War Savings program is being carried on largely by voluntary workers. Paid employees are used only sparingly. The total number of such paid employees in the War Savings staff on May 31, 1942, was approximately 800. Of this number some 500 were on duty in the field and about 300 in Washington.

Committees of volunteers representing every significant group and occupation are now carrying on this work in every State, city, and county in the Nation. On May 31, 1942, there were more than 4,000 such committees, with an aggregate membership of over 270,000. All of these persons, many of them giving full time, are serving without compensation.

These figures do not include thousands of other volunteers who on a full-time or part-time basis are giving invaluable aid in promoting the sale of War Savings bonds and stamps. For example, they do not include the thousands of persons engaged in direct selling, nor the 1,500,000 volunteers serving as Minute Men and Women in the War Savings pledge campaigns.

The War Savings staff has scrupulously disregarded partisan considerations of every kind in selecting the chairmen of voluntary committees and in the appointment of all paid personnel. Workers of nearly every political affiliation are cooperating loyally and zealously in this program.

SALES OUTLETS

Except for the post offices, the sales outlets for War Savings bonds are provided entirely without cost to the Treasury. About 15 percent of the dollar volume of sales has been through the

post offices; 85 percent has been accounted for by banks, building and loan associations, saving and loan associations, credit unions, industrial corporations, and other issuing agents, all of which perform this service without remuneration in any form.

The numbers of such voluntary agencies now serving as issuing agents are—in round numbers as follows:

Agency:	Number
National banks	5,000
State banks	9,000
Mutual savings banks	550
Building and loan associations and saving and loan associations	2,500
Credit unions	2,900
Corporations	2,450
Total	22,400

It is estimated that these agencies are providing the equivalent of the full-time services of not fewer than 25,000 employees in performing their functions as sales and issuing agents, all on a voluntary basis.

It is estimated that over 500,000 retail stores are selling War Savings stamps without cost to the Treasury. Many such stores are also selling and issuing bonds, and the number doing so is rapidly increasing.

Nearly 900 newspapers are using their carrier boys to sell War Savings stamps to their subscribers. Throughout the country between 150,000 and 200,000 carrier boys are performing this service. Since the beginning of the program, these boys have sold more than 350,000,000 10-cent stamps, aggregating over $35,000,000. Their sales are now proceeding at the rate of about $1,000,000 weekly.

As has been said, more than 100,000 establishments employing some 23,000,000 people, are administering pay-roll savings plans. A growing number of these employers are issuing the bonds purchased by their employees under these plans.

Fifteen thousand motion picture theaters have volunteered to sell War Savings stamps to their patrons. In addition, there are innumerable other unpaid outlets for War Savings bonds and stamps in schools and colleges, trade unions, radio stations, victory houses, and so forth.

ADVERTISING AND PUBLICITY

The Treasury Department does not pay for advertising space or time. War Savings advertising and publicity on the radio, the motion-picture screen, on billboards, in newspapers and magazines, and through other media, has been a cooperative undertaking of the entire advertising, entertainment, and publicity industries. Space, time, and talent have been generously contributed. Some idea of the magnitude of this contribution may be gathered from the following brief and incomplete analysis:

Radio

Radio stations and networks, without exception, and program sponsors in large numbers have cooperated. They have contributed a total of not less than 60,000 station hours of time.

Newspapers and magazines

News stories, special articles, and features promoting the sale of War bonds and stamps appear in practically every newspaper in the country. Upward of 10,000 daily, weekly, labor, religious, farm, and foreign language publications are cooperating in this campaign. Literally millions of column inches of space have been devoted to the sale of War Savings bonds and stamps.

More than 200 monthly magazines, a dozen leading national weeklies, and trade, company, and labor magazines are carrying material dealing with the War bond program.

In addition to news, special articles, and features, newspapers and magazines have contributed advertising space. Hundreds of national and local advertisers, such as retail stores, manufacturers, and banks have also contributed advertisements on behalf of the War Savings program. They have systematically included war bond copy along with their own.

Outdoor advertising

More than 70,000 outdoor advertising panels have already been posted and the volume is steadily increasing. Approximately half of this has been contributed by members of the outdoor advertising industry and the balance by national and local advertisers.

Motion pictures

Besides sellings stamps and bonds in theaters, the motion picture industry has contributed feature end clips, trailers, shorts, and newsreel shots in large numbers. Moreover, the industry has made liberal contributions of talent to every phase of War bond promotion.

CONCLUSION

As we have seen, the War Savings program is being carried on almost wholly on the basis of unpaid cooperation and voluntary service. The estimated annual value of such contributed service is certainly not less than $100,000,000. The appropriation of $12,000,000 recommended by the committee will be used merely to provide the facilities necessary to permit this voluntary program to go forward.

The estimate contemplates the addition of local offices in a limited number of communities in which such facilities are not now provided, and a moderate increase in the paid staff. But of the amount recommended by the committee, almost half, or approximately $6,000,000 will be used for stamp albums, the preparation of copy, posters, and other display material, and literature for the use of volunteer workers.

COST OF LIBERTY BOND PROMOTION

It would be very difficult to make any fair or accurate cost comparison between the Liberty Loan drives of World War No. 1 and the present War Savings campaign. The differences between the Liberty bonds and the present War Savings bonds, as well as the restrictions now imposed on the purchase of the present securities, preclude any such comparison.

Nevertheless, the following figures concerning the cost of Liberty bond promotions may be interesting.

A total of $22,580,000,000 worth of bonds were sold in a series of five drives.

The Government's total over-all direct cost, for fiscal agency and Liberty Loan organization expense, for the Liberty and Victory bonds and related issues from 1917 to 1920, inclusive, was almost $63,000,000.

Of this total roughly one-half or some $30,000,000 represented the cost of promotion.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. With pleasure.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me the distinguished gentleman from Indiana is making a splendid contribution, pointing out the fine work that is being done and I cannot help but express the regret that a large majority of his audience has to be on the minority side and that he has not the benefit of giving this information to larger group. I do regret it. It seems to me that he should have a larger group on the majority side to commend him for his presentation and for the work that, I know, he is boasting of, that the administration is presently carrying. I just wanted to call the attention of the Committee to that fact at least. The gentleman has a fine representation on the minority side who commend him for his presentation and who are duly appreciative of the way in which he is presenting this matter on behalf of the Treasury.

Mr. LUDLOW. I thank my friend from Pennsylvania for his kindness, and I appreciate the attendance on the minority side of the House, but also wish to say that the attendance on the majority side, while somewhat diminutive, is very high in quality. I do appreciate very much the opportunity afforded me of preaching the real gospel to such a fine representation on the minority side.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG. I also desire to compliment the gentleman from Indiana on his splendid presentation, and also express regret that there are not more Members here on both sides of the House. Of course, it is about a quarter after 7 o'clock in the evening, and we have had a very hard day.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DITTER. I hope the gentleman from Missouri will yield the gentleman from Indiana 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I will.

Mr. DITTER. Despite how late it may be, despite how arduous are our tasks during the day, and no matter what time we put in, I should hardly feel that to be any excuse for failing to sit at the feet of the distinguished gentleman from Indiana, to drink in the wisdom that he is giving us, and I hardly feel that is an excuse for the unappreciative attendance on the part of the majority, who by their

absence are missing a real treat. I cannot think of anything that will condone for the failure of the majority to appreciate the contribution that is being made.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I again express my thanks to my dear friend the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, whose kindness touches me very much, and I again make the observation that while the attendance on the majority side is, indeed, somewhat attenuated, nevertheless, it is of a very superlative quality.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. Yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In the gentleman's own judgment, does he feel that the sales of War bonds are running as heavy as they should in this country with our national income, and involved in a war as we are at the present time?

Mr. LUDLOW. I have no hesitation in saying that I do not think they are. I think the sales should run much higher. I think with the additional appropriation that is being given to Mr. Graves' excellent organization in this bill he will see to it that they do run much higher.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries a total of $1,830,000,000, or thereabouts, which is $86,000,000 or thereabouts under the Budget estimates.

The principal items are as follows: For the War Shipping Administration, $1,100,000,000; for 12 agencies under the Office for Emergency Management, including War Production Board, $274,000,000; for the Treasury, $156,000,000, which includes $150,000,000 for the Smaller War Plants Corporation; for the President's emergency fund, $100,000,000; for the Office of Price Administration, $75,000,000.

The bill covers 18 of the newer set-ups in the Government, many of them organized pursuant to Executive order. It is impossible in the time available to even scratch the surface in the way of a thoroughgoing discussion of this bill. All that is possible is to refer to a few of the more important agencies and some of the evidence developed in the course of the hearings.

EMERGENCY FUNDS FOR THE PRESIDENT

The bill carries a total of $100,000,000 for emergency funds for the President. Of course, no one wants to unduly limit the President in time of war in respect to expenditure which is either emergency in character or confidential in character, to the extent that the desired appropriation cannot be properly considered by the Congress.

I submit, however, Mr. Chairman, as I have submitted before on the floor of this House, that expenditures from these funds should and must be limited to war expenditure which is either emergency or confidential in character. To use the funds under other conditions, in my judgment, is indefensible, tending to break down the entire appropriating power of the Congress.

On pages 545–550 of the hearings Members will find a complete list of the allocations of emergency funds which have been granted to the President. They will also find in the hearings reference to pending requests against the unexpended balance of these funds.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that no one can read these items without coming to the conclusion that the privilege extended by the Congress has been abused and is today threatened with abuse. With Congress in continuous session there is no justification for that abuse. I hope that in the future the expenditure of these funds will be limited strictly to the purposes for which they have been made available by the Congress.

COORDINATION

Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has said something about the matter of coordination. I want to speak of this in connection with this bill, because the policy of so-called coordination is reflected in agency after agency provided for in the bill. In my judgment the alleged coordination oftentimes is in fact something very different, and quite the reverse of coordination.

My idea of coordination is work done by an individual or a small group which results in the elimination of overlappings between agencies in increasing efficiency and in cutting down the total expenditure by the agencies coordinated.

That does not seem to be the purpose of so-called coordination under present conditions. On the contrary, under present policy when coordination is announced it seems more often than not to involve a huge new organization, superimposed on the old, which fails to eliminate overlappings, which fails to increase efficiency, which fails to reduce total expenditures, and which in fact actually increases the total expenditure of the agencies supposed to be coordinated.

The general idea seems to be to set up one agency to do a job; then to set up another agency to do somewhat the same job; then to superimpose a third overall agency for the alleged purpose of coordinating the work of the two other agencies, but in fact to duplicate in large measure the work of the two agencies which it is supposed to coordinate.

You will find this general principle again and again in recent reorganizations under this administration. It is wasteful, it is inefficient, and runs directly against the announced policy of holding down nonessential expenditure to the minimum.

You will find this general policy reflected, in my judgment, in the Bureau of Economic Warfare in the War Manpower Commission; in the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services; in the Office of Agricultural War Relations, and in other agencies provided for in this and other bills.

BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE

The bill carries $13,818,000 for the Board of Economic Warfare. This is one of the newer organizations to which I have referred, set up under Executive order.

It appears to me, based on the hearings, that this agency is endeavoring to carry out a perfectly enormous program, not only here but elsewhere throughout the world. It appears to me that a large part of that program is in the impractical world, in the world of dreams, and that a very large part of the program is in respect to fields already covered by other Federal agencies.

The Board of Economic Warfare tells us it has three principal functions. One is the licensing of exports. Of course, somebody has to do that work. The second is programing the development and production of strategic materials needed from abroad. Certainly there are a number of other agencies in that field. The third is supplying the Army and the Navy with economic information. There are many agencies contributing to that objective at the moment.

You will find if you read the hearings that incident to these three objectives the Board requires a requirements set-up of 52 people, supposed to ascertain the needs of other governments. Surely those needs have to be determined in the first instance by these governments themselves. Surely also we have a State Department and a Department of Commerce, and various other agencies in a position to find out and report what those essential needs may be.

The Board also requests a trade intelligence set-up with 156 people. Surely we have got all sorts of agencies operating in this general field.

It asks for a development set-up with 173 people for the purpose of dealing with new sources of materials that may be necessary to the war effort. Surely we have got the R. F. C., the Defense Supplies Corporation, the Metals Reserve Company, and various other agencies operating in this field.

It asks for an industrial engineering set-up with 37 people. They tell us this is to step up the production in other countries. The R. F. C. or its subsidiaries has been in that field.

It asks also for an economic-warfare-analysis set-up of 553 people to make studies for the Army and Navy. The Board presented confidentially a list of studies already made in this connection. Judging by the list furnished, many of the studies made or contemplated are studies similar to those made by other existing agencies. Some of them I think could be taken right out of the files of other agencies immediately without further research or work of any kind.

If you will notice the Executive orders applicable to this agency, you will see that among other things it is supposed to advise the State Department in respect to master agreements under lend-lease. Judging by recent history, I am sure the State Department welcomes that authority. It is also supposed to advise W. P. B. in respect to priorities; in just what respect I do not know. It

is supposed to advise the President on post-war economic reconstruction. It is about the sixth agency, I should say, that is supposed to give advice on post-war reconstruction. It is supposed to organize corporations to obtain materials necessary for the prosecution of the war. This field until recently has been covered by Jesse Jones.

I call your attention particularly to the fact that the Executive orders prescribe that the administration of the various departments and agencies relating to economic defense shall conform to the policies formulated and approved by the Board. In other words, if I interpret this order correctly, B. E. W. can lay the law down to all departments and agencies relating to economic defense.

I think, as I have stated, that a lot of the work outlined in the justifications of this agency is in a field which is impractical. I think a lot of it is in fields already covered by various other Federal agencies. I think the appropriation for the agency should be reduced.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

The bill carries $3,114,000 for the War Manpower Commission. This is another of the newer agencies set up by Executive order. Its announced purpose is to secure the mobilization and maximum utilization of the Nation's manpower.

It includes representatives from the Army, the Navy, Agriculture, Labor, War Production Board, Selective Service, Civil Service, Transportation, and Housing.

All of its duties, according to Governor McNutt, aside from running the national roster of scientific and specialized personnel, for which we have already given funds to at least three other agencies, are duties of coordination and direction. It works through existing agencies.

I call your attention again in this connection to the Executive order governing the operations of this agency, in which you will find that certain other agencies are required to conform—

To such policies, directions, regulations, and standards as the Chairman—

That is, of the War Manpower Board—

may prescribe in the exercise of the powers vested in him by this order.

And further, that these agencies—

shall be subject to such other coordination by the Chairman as may be necessary.

There is a list of 10 agencies coming under this blanket authority. You will find them listed in the committee report. Among them is the Civil Service Commission, which is supposed to conform—

with respect to functions relating to the filling of positions in the Government service.

Among them also is the Selective Service System, which is supposed to conform—

With respect to the use and classification of manpower needed for critical industrial, agricultural, or governmental employment.

Governor McNutt states he would not think of instructing the Civil Service Commission how to conduct itself in all respects in filling positions, but he seems to have that authority under this Executive order.

He admits that he can issue definite instructions to General Hershey and the Selective Service System as to what persons shall or shall not be deferred, as to priorities in deferment, or anything of that kind.

He also admits that in operating within the scope of the power placed in him by Executive order, the entire Selective Service System and other agencies referred to become subordinate agencies and subject to his direction.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Who has the authority to deal with this situation: Take the order that has just gone out now to the effect that married men shall be reclassified and not inducted into service; it is all married men, as I understand it. Many married men were recently inducted into the service—men with dependents, family obligations, and so forth. Is there anyone with power to change the status of those who are in the service and throw them back out so they will have the same type of treatment as those who are being deferred by reason of this new arrangement?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I take it that under this Executive order Governor McNutt can issue any directive to the Selective Service System in the general field of deferment as long as his directive is based on what he considers the need of critical industrial, agricultural, or governmental employment. Otherwise, I suppose that General Hershey still has jurisdiction within the law laid down by the Congress.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman mean to say that he feels Administrator McNutt can reach into the military service and bring these men out?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. He says he cannot deal with individuals, but that he can lay down general directives as to this or that group in accordance with determinations which he and his advisory board may make.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Whether in the service or out of the service?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is my understanding.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Did I understand the gentleman to say that Mr. McNutt, Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, could lay down a general order granting deferment, for example, to all college students who might be engaged in the study of a certain profession that he might consider to be necessary upon graduation for the war effort?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understand he has that authority, provided, of course, that he does not go outside the law itself.

Mr. KEEFE. That gentleman is familiar with the fact there was a proposal in the Labor-Social Security appropriation bill in the form of a supplemental estimate, which has been included by the Senate, providing for a student loan fund to give loans to worthy students in certain lines of scholastic activity, such as medical, dentistry, and so forth. Do I understand that Mr. McNutt has the power as Chairman of his Commission to grant a blanket deferment to all students who might be enrolled in those studies which his Commission has determined are necessary and vital for the prosecution of the war effort?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think the answer is yes. As I understand it, the Governor states that he can issue definite instructions as to what persons shall or shall not be deferred, provided those instructions are based on what his commission determines to be needed for critical industrial, agricultural, or governmental employment.

Mr. KEEFE. That is purely a discretionary function that may be exercised by this War Manpower Commission?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is my understanding, as long as it stays within the law as written by the Congress.

Mr. KEEFE. Then it supersedes to that extent at least the written law creating and setting up the Selective Board?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not think the Board can supersede the outlines of the law itself. I understand it claims that it can supersede the Selective Service System in the administration of that law.

Mr. KEEFE. My understanding has been that heretofore General Hershey has issued a public statement, as recorded in the press, that the Selective Service System very definitely opposed blanket deferment for a whole class of people who might be engaged in a certain specific activity. Now, if the gentleman's statement is correct, and I have no reason for doubting it, under the Executive order setting up this War Manpower Commission they have given discretionary authority to that Commission to overrule the Selective Service Board and grant blanket deferment?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understand Governor McNutt to state that the Selective Service and every one of the other agencies referred to is subordinate and subjected to his control insofar as he is acting within the scope of his authority.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Going a little further, let us assume that student A, who has had say two or three deferments by the local draft board, is now within 6 months of graduating as a doctor of medicine. He is now about to be called into the service and has received his notice from the local draft board that he must come into the military service. Then the Administrator of the War Manpower Commission could issue a blanket authority which would serve as a dragnet and bring this particular student into the group deferred, thereby permitting him to continue his education and secure his degree and stay in school another 6 months?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. That is my understanding.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In other words, Governor McNutt in that way overrides the decision of the local draft board. Would that be this law?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I do not think he can deal with individuals. I think he can issue a general directive, which the

local draft board will be compelled to follow.

Mr. KEEFE. Supposing the local draft board refuses to conform to that general directive and elects to assume the responsibility that is placed upon them under the provisions of the Selective Service Act. Do the hearings indicate what that situation might involve?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. No; I do not think they do, except the statement I have already quoted to the effect that the Governor considers all the agencies referred to subordinate and subject to his direction.

Mr. KEEFE. Then the authority of the local draft board as it has been heretofore announced, which places the control and the destiny of the men of this country in the hands of the local draft boards for their determination, subject only to appeal to the appeal boards and then to the President, is virtually superseded by this Executive order if authority is given to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to enforce blanket deferment?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I think General Hershey's authority can be superseded. I do not think the War Manpower Commission can supersede the actual law or go outside the confines of the law as written by Congress. Within that law, I understand that it can supersede or override a decision by General Hershey, the present head of the system.

Mr. Chairman, may I say at this point that I have the highest regard for General Hershey and that I believe he has been doing a very efficient piece of work. May I say also that, if the Civil Service Commission is not functioning properly in respect to its prescribed duties, the way to cure that situation, in my judgment, is to reorganize the Commission. I frankly cannot see the wisdom of setting up a commission of 1,074 people, ostensibly to coordinate the work of the agencies referred to; in fact I am afraid, in large measure to duplicate that work and to that extent reflecting the general tendency which I have already criticized.

Mr. Chairman, time is limited. It is impossible to go into things as I should like to.

OFFICE OF DEFENSE HEALTH AND WELFARE SERVICES

I think you will find the same general policy reflected in the Office of Defense Health and Welfare Services, for which the bill carries $2,440,000.

This agency desires to carry a recreation set-up costing $380,000. It asks for a nutrition set-up costing $647,000. It asks for a small family security set-up. It requests a physical fitness set-up costing $54,840. It requests also a social protection set-up costing $215,000, devoted to the repression of prostitution and the rehabilitation of prostitutes.

This agency is supposed to coordinate the health, welfare, nutrition, recreation, and educational activities of Federal, State, and local governmental and private activities near military or naval concentrations and industrial war plants.

In my opinion, much of the work upon which it is embarked is work which belongs not to the Federal Government but to the military authorities and the local authorities and to the organized charities which have been working in these fields for many years. I do not believe the Federal Government as a rule can tell a local community how to handle its own problems in this general field.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

OFFICE FOR AGRICULTURAL WAR RELATIONS

The Office of Agricultural Relations, for which the bill provides $475,000, is a relatively small organization. In my judgment, however, it reflects the same general policy. It is supposed to estimate the requirements of farm industries and to keep the war boards fully informed. Its work is primarily that of coordination and liaison.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I should like to propound a parliamentary inquiry. If I propound a parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman, does it come out of the gentleman's time?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry, to be taken out of his time?

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I yield, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DITTER. The parliamentary inquiry I propound at this time is, if the minority has sufficient votes here at the present time to carry a motion to rise, and then, going back into the House, has enough votes to adjourn the House at this time, would the time that we had agreed upon for general debate extend over into tomorrow?

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate will extend until it has expired, under the rules of the House.

Mr. DITTER. Pursuing my inquiry further, if the Committee were to rise now and the House then adjourn, we on the minority side having consumed only one-half of our time, would the other half of our time be available to us when we went into the Committee of the Whole tomorrow?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair may say to the gentleman that the question of rising is in the hands of the Committee of the Whole and the question of adjourning is in the hands of the House. The time allotted for debate will exist until it is exhausted.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will withdraw his point of order. I believe the distinguished majority leader and the minority leader had an understanding, and in order not to embarrass the commitments that either made to the other, I hope the gentleman will, with his usual graciousness, withdraw the point of order.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not know that anybody would be embarrassed in the matter. We are considering here an important bill, involving nearly $2,000,000,000. There ought to be somebody here to listen to this debate, if it is worth listening to at all.

Mr. DITTER. If the gentleman insists on his point of order the House will adjourn.

Mr. KEEFE. If the House does adjourn, then we will have somebody here when it convenes tomorrow to listen to this debate. The chairman has just ruled that the debate extends over to tomorrow.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. COOPER). The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DITTER. As I understand, the motion to rise was defeated and, therefore, we continue in the Committee of the Whole.

The CHAIRMAN. Unless the point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, I should hesitate to trespass upon any understanding or agreement that may exist between the majority leader and the minority leader. Because I am now advised that such an agreement exists, and I do not care to embarrass anybody by insisting on my point of order, I withdraw the point of order.

OFFICE OF PRICE ADMINISTRATION

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to say a word now about the Office of Price Administration.

I want to say at the outset that no one realizes more than I the dangers of uncontrolled inflation. I came face to face with the results of that frightful affliction years ago on the other side of the water. I have preached its dangers under the present administration for many years on this side of the water. I want no part of it in America if it can be avoided and for this reason I felt compelled to support the price-fixing bill despite what to me were its obvious weaknesses.

It seems to me, however, Mr. Chairman, perfectly clear that in providing for the administration of the work of O. P. A. the Congress must hold the organization within the bounds of reason.

When this agency came before your committee from the Budget it came with an estimate which, in my judgment, in the light of the hearings, was out of all reason, particularly in view of the fact that Congress is in session and presumably will be continuously in session and therefore in a position to deal with any unexpected situation which may arise.

It came before your committee with a request for $161,000,000 representing 66,230 employees, in addition to some 25,000 voluntary workers which it contemplated obtaining. It came before us with a request for its other obligations amounting to $34,900,000 as compared with a figure of $14,800,000 for the current year.

It came before us with a request for a staff, including 1,255 persons with salaries of $5,600 or better. It came before us requesting a legal staff of 4,418, a business-specialist staff of 1,084, and an economist staff of 647.

It came before us requesting offices numbering 5,819, or about 125 per State, including 1 Federal office, 9 regional offices, 51 State offices, 230 district offices, 323 defense-area offices, 5 territorial offices, and 5,200 local boards.

It asked, I believe, for something over 17,000 temporary paid workers. It asked for a travel item of more than $10,000,000, for a rent item of more than $8,000,000, for a printing and binding item of over $6,000,000, and for a communications item of about $4,750,000.

Personally, Mr. Chairman, I think the enforcement of much of the work of this agency, important as it is, is going to depend largely upon public support. If the agency creates the right sentiment among the public generally and enlists its cooperation, I think a very small force, in terms of enforcement will be required. If it does not enlist that public cooperation, then in my judgment you can put a million people in the field to enforce its edicts and you will not get enforcement. As the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] has said, the problem is very similar in many respects to the prohibition problem years ago.

The amount which has been allowed by the committee, will, I believe, permit the agency to start off with something like 32,000 full-time workers, plus additional part-time workers, plus additional voluntary workers, as compared with something like 17,700 paid workers on the rolls at the present time.

If this force, for any reason, appears to be inadequate as we go along, the Congress is here and the situation can be dealt with.

The suggestion has been made in various newspapers of late to the effect that politics has been creeping into and undermining the organization of the Office of Price Administration. In this connection I read to Mr. Henderson the following quotation from a Kentucky paper:

> The absolutely deadly suspicion that politics is reaching into an agency which must be above everything else nonpolitical, is having its dangerous and decisive effect elsewhere. Mr. Roosevelt ought not to have to be distracted from his other heavy responsibilities by such a thing as this, but a situation is developing where he is simply going to have to step into it and straighten it out. Only he has the authority now to show the country that the patronage brokers will be kept out of the Office of Price Administration; only he has the power to implement and to enforce that assurance.

I asked Mr. Henderson if he felt there was any basis for this charge in this and other papers to which he replied, and I quote:

> I know damn well there is not. I do not want to appear to say we have not had political recommendations. Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, I have taken very, very seriously that part of my statute which says that in the appointment, selection, classification, and promotion of officers and employees of the Office of Price Administration, no political test or qualification shall be permitted to be given.

Again, after an interruption:

> Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I understand that in your opinion there is no justification for the Kentucky paper's charge?
>
> Mr. HENDERSON. I made it very strong. I said I know damn well there is not. I handle these matters myself. They have taken many hours of my day. I have followed the policy of giving consideration to all suggestions that were made and I have applied the test of whether or not a person is competent to carry out the work. I am willing to have anybody look at the State directors I have appointed.

I call attention in this connection, Mr. Chairman, to the fact that Mr. George H. Goodman has been appointed State administrator for the State of Kentucky. I do not know Mr. Goodman personally. I do know, however, that Mr. Goodman was formerly State administrator for the W. P. A. at the time of the Sheppard committee investigation in the Senate, and the W. P. A. investigation by the House Committee on Appropriations. In this connection I quote two paragraphs from an open letter addressed to the President on or about June 5, 1942, also appearing in this Kentucky paper:

> Mr. George H. Goodman has been spoken of as the probable Kentucky director. Mr. Goodman's appointment in my estimation would be a national calamity because it would prove to the people of this country that politics rather than merit and ability is the yardstick.
>
> Mr. Goodman was director of the Work Projects Administration in Kentucky during the Barkley-Chandler primary of 1938. The Senate investigating committee found numerous cases in Kentucky where the administration of the Work Projects Administration had coerced recipients of Work Projects Administration benefits to support Senator BARKLEY'S candidacy. The Senate investigating committee condemned this practice and a public scandal resulted. Mr. Goodman as well as other administrators of the Work Projects Administration in Kentucky shared the unenviable publicity. At a time like this I feel that it would be very unwise to appoint an administrator whose public record as set out in the Sheppard investigating committee's report shows him to be unfit to act as administrator in the national emergency.

Mr. Henderson tells us that he is very proud of the personnel which he has gathered and is gathering together. I hope that personnel will measure up to his appraisal.

I may point out in this connection that I have a letter from Mr. Henderson dated June 25, in which he informs me that Mr. Howard Hunter, formerly Commissioner of the W. P. A., has been appointed as special assistant "to me and will be assigned to assist in the coordination of the field operations of the Office of Price Administration."

I call attention also to the fact established in the hearings that Mr. Thomas Emerson, assistant general counsel, and Mr. Walter Gellhorn, regional attorney for New York, are both now admitted members of the National Committee of the International Juridical Association. I have no personal knowledge of this association. It has been mentioned on the floor of the House several times lately, as the Members will recall. It is said by members of the Dies Committee to be a straight Communist auxiliary organization.

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

Mr. Chairman, just a word before closing in reference to the War Production Board, for which this bill provides $68,546,300, with a personnel of 23,827, incidentally considerably less personnel than that provided for the Office of Price Administration.

You will find in the hearings a most interesting statement by Mr. Nelson, a statement indicating that conversion from civilian to war basis has been about 95 percent completed, indicating that the President's schedule of 185,000 planes, 120,000 tanks, 55,000 antiaircraft guns, and 18,000,000 tons of shipping over a period of two years can be met, indicating also that marked reductions in cost are now beginning to be realized indicating that of about $224,000,000,000 made available for the war effort, about $100,000,000,000 is now under commitment, containing various other matters of great interest to the Congress and the country generally.

Your committee heard almost every one of the 10 division chiefs of this organization.

Personally I think there is evidence that the organization is overstaffed, particularly in the Statistical Division, particularly, also, in the Civilian Supply Division under Mr. Henderson.

It appears, however, that Mr. Nelson has himself set up an organizational planning committee under Dr. Luther Gulick. In view of that fact, and in view of the tremendous importance of this organization to the war effort, I am personally content to approve, in the main, the funds requested for this organization.

Mr. Chairman, my time is expiring. I regret very much not to be able to refer to the work and requests of other agencies provided for in this bill, including the National War Labor Board, the Office of Censorship, the Office of Civilian Defense, the Office of the Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs, the Office of Defense Transportation, the Office of the Petroleum Coordinator for War, the Office of Scientific Research and Development, the Smaller War Plants Corporation, the Treasury War Savings bond staff, the War Relocation Authority, and to the War Shipping Administration. All of these merit discussion.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time now as he may desire to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. ROCKWELL].

Mr. ROCKWELL. Mr. Chairman, 8 years ago President Roosevelt signed a bill "to stop injury to the public grazing lands by preventing overgrazing and soil deterioration, to provide for their orderly use, improvement and development, to stabilize the livestock industry dependent upon the public range, and for other purposes."

That bill immediately became known as the Taylor Grazing Act which will perpetuate the name of the late Congressman from Colorado, Edward T. Taylor.

In signing this bill the President celebrated the occasion with this statement:

The passage of this act marks the culmination of years of effort to obtain from Congress express authority for Federal regulation of grazing of the public domain in the interests of national conservation and of the livestock industry.

Each year, on the birthday of this Grazing Act, Congressman Taylor reported to the House on the progress of conservation and stabilization of the livestock industry which his act fostered.

In my humble position as his successor in the Fourth Colorado District, I desire to continue this custom, thereby paying tribute to his memory and to the law which is doing so much not only for my State of Colorado but also for the West and the Nation.

I distinctly recall the bitter disputes of those earlier days, quarrels between the sheep and cattle interests that often resulted in bloodshed and much bad feeling. The public domain was a no man's land and strong men fought for their right to use it. I remember some of the struggles that followed the passage of this act, how the people of my locality looked at the new range law with mixed emotions of hope and skepticism. As the president of the Delta County Livestock Association, I came to the meeting at Montrose when that grazing district was formed. My neighbors asked me to serve as chairman of the first advisory board election. In that hall some 400 stockmen, half sheepmen and half cattlemen, chose the men who would represent them on the district advisory board. Looking back, I see a vivid picture of what Ed Taylor referred to as "Home Rule on the Range." I have watched the cattlemen and sheepmen change from feelings of mutual distrust and ruinous competitive practices and put that policy to work. I salute the first grazing director, Farrington R. Carpenter, who organized the present system of local grazing boards that has proven so satisfactory to the western stockmen, and the present grazing director, R. H. Rutledge, who is so ably carrying out that policy.

This Bureau was the first to move its headquarters from the congested city of Washington to the West. Since that time the United States has become embroiled in the world conflict and the wisdom of that move has spread to many other Government agencies. In placing the Service right on the ground in the center of the range country, it brought a closer working relationship with the people in the livestock industry.

In the drought of 1934 many cattle and sheep died on the parched, overcrowded ranges. Range wars, sometimes leading to bloodshed, waste of resources, and losses from competitive range use, were common.

Today the scene has shifted. The war has brought added and significant importance to conservation and use of the public domain which ties in so prominently with the economy of the arid West. The war has given every stockman an opportunity to contribute to the utmost to the Nation's need.

The National Advisory Board Council composed of 18 leading stockmen in 10 western States recommended last January a program to maintain the ranges in full productive capacity, organize range users to protect the ranges and forests against fire and other destructive elements, combat subversive activities, and sabotage, and to produce more pounds of meat, wool, and leather to meet military and civilian requirements by improved range and animal husbandry, rather than by overstocking ranges by increasing numbers.

The American National Livestock Association and the National Woolgrowers' Association, both of which met at Salt Lake City in separate annual conventions last January and who represent half of the sheep and two-fifths of the beef cattle produced in the United States, pledged the range livestock industry to "keep more grass than stock on the range."

More than 20,000 licensees and permittees in the Taylor grazing districts, with many of the top hands in uniform or in war industry, are working long hours to keep production on a high level. In their isolated places they keep in close touch with district graziers and local defense organizations to nip in the bud any possible enemy action, such as sabotaging water supplies and starting range fires. Also in many localities stockmen have mobilized pack horses and trucks to assist the Grazing Service and military authorities in salvage of American planes if downed in the rugged country.

The experience of the past years, resulting in orderly use of the range resources for time of extreme need, will ease the task of turning them to the job of winning the war. "Food will win the war and write the peace," said the Secretary of Agriculture. No small part of that task is in the hands of the livestock producer, and with his range in good shape the job is that much easier.

The national goal for increased production of meat animals to meet peak war demand has found the western stockman in a strong position. Having swung from a philosophy of more numbers to one of more pounds, he is meeting that challenge without cutting seriously into his breeding herds. In late years the West has been favored with good moisture.

Today, in contrast to the abuse and overstocking stimulated by the first World War, we find order, security, and cooperation in the grazing districts. The opportunity to plan with reasonable assurance that "tramp" sheep outfits will not upset the plan has brought this condition about, and it has replaced the abusive, wasteful methods of former years. Instead of a trackless, unwatered, unmanaged desert, one sees here a stockwater reservoir, there a well with storage tank and drinking troughs, contour furrowing to hold and distribute run-off bridges and roads that save hundreds of miles of livestock and truck travel, signs pointing to desert watering places, to stock driveways, and range-allotment boundaries. In brief, there are countless benefits to the land itself and to the people who must have use of the land for a stable western economy.

Eight years, Mr. Chairman, provides no great perspective from which to survey the full impact of range conservation, so long neglected by a policy which clung to the theory of developing homes on the dry and impoverished lands of the public domain. No one can say truthfully that all the problems are ironed out. But a good start has been made and the foundation is solid. No one would be so bold as to stand before this House and say, "See the finished product." But like the cowboy trailing his herd up the mountainside to seek green, fresh grass in the spring, we may pause at the bend in the trail and survey the valleys that lie below.

Those who led us to this mountain trail, Edward T. Taylor, and those who helped him in passing the Taylor Grazing Act, did a great service to the livestock and conservation interests of the West. They saw beyond the valley, beyond the drought, depression, and dust of 1934; accepted the challenge and the risks that are inherent in any new venture.

As the cowboy looks down from the trail on the mountainside he might be making an observation such as this: "The cattlemen, the sheepmen, and the Government are now rubbing shoulders—not bumping heads."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the distinguished gentleman from Vermont [Mr. PLUMLEY].

A BAD LAW WORSE ADMINISTERED

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Chairman, nobody should misunderstand my position with reference to price control. I am for it. The record proves it. However, I do not think the law as enacted goes far enough because of its certain omissions, over the insistence of many of us who tried to perfect it against administration opposition. By the terms of the very act it is prescribed and declared, namely, that—

In the interest of the national defense and security and necessary to the effective prosecution of the present war, and the purposes of this act are, to stabilize prices and to prevent speculative, unwarranted, and abnormal increases in prices and rents; to eliminate and prevent profiteering, hoarding, manipulation, speculation, and other disruptive practices resulting from abnormal market conditions or scarcities caused by or contributing to the national emergency; to assure that defense appropriations are not dissipated by excessive prices; to protect persons with relatively fixed and limited incomes, consumers, wage earners, investors, and persons dependent on life insurance, annuities, and pensions, from undue impairment of their standard of living; to prevent hardships to persons engaged in business, to schools, universities, and other institutions, and to the Federal, State, and local governments, which would result from abnormal increases in prices; to assist in securing adequate production of commodities and facilities; to prevent a post emergency collapse of values; to stabilize agricultural prices in the manner provided in section 3; and to permit voluntary cooperation between the Government and producers, processors, and others to accomplish the aforesaid purposes. It shall be the policy of those departments and agencies of the Government dealing with wages (including the Department of Labor and its various bureaus, the War Department, the Navy Department, the War Production Board, the National Labor Relations Board, the National Mediation Board, the National War Labor Board, and others

heretofore or hereafter created), within the limits of their authority and jurisdiction, to work toward a stabilization of prices, fair and equitable wages, and cost of production.

Yet I am for the forceful, reasonable, proper, and complete administration of such law as written and as we have enacted, so far as it goes. I do not think it can be successfully administered by anybody. My position with respect to this has been made plain.

BUREAUCRACY OCTOPUS

So, in the premises, I am opposed to universally spending the people's money unnecessarily to feed the bureaucracy octopus, increase the army of Federal employees, interfere with States' rights and internal economies for which the act provides, or does it?

All this talk about what somebody has done is egocentric bunkum. This is no time to forget the people. They are the ones who did it. They are the ones who can and will do it again if given a chance without being hamstrung, gagged, bound, tied, and robbed of their rights.

There is no need, nor is there justification, for setting up a new, paid, octopean bureau with tentacles reaching into every hamlet in this land. There is no real reason why the Federal Government should undertake to make more Federal jobs or further to arbitrarily deprive the States of their rights and their authority over their own citizens.

PAID OR VOLUNTEERED

There is no sound argument for creating the multitude of places and offices suggested by the Office of Price Administration, under pay, for they could be filled and would be filled by volunteers. Moreover, it is not fair or right or just to go into a community or into a State or into an area and offer to pay one group for services rendered as against the millions who have been and are contributing their services gratuitously. It is invidious discrimination.

INSULT ADDED TO INJURY

When a man volunteers his services, and has given them and is still ready to give them, it adds insult to injury to set up as a parallel agency a paid group to render a comparable service. The pay for this group comes from your pocket and from my pocket and from the pocket of the man who volunteers his services. Think it over. It is preposterous. That is what the competent volunteers in my district write me and that is what the people think.

PURE NONSENSE

Now, I am a lawyer and I know that lawyers are held up to criticism, but not justly. Yet the idea that the O. P. A. needs 534 paid attorneys on duty in the office, plus 2,222 in the field, is nonsense. The attorneys general of the several States, plus a few addded lawyers who would be willing to give their services, could handle all problems. What is more, it has been suggested that under the proposed set-up there will be some 2,756 different rulings, more or less. Three hundred outstanding lawyers to be called upon in an emergency are enough.

Then there are the 644 economists and 117 statisticians and 1,804 business specialists, plus 5,500 field offices. It is ridiculous.

Now, when you get right down to brass tacks, 50 economists—whatever they are—are 45 too many. Ten statisticians, if they know their jobs and are competent, should suffice instead of 117.

BUSINESS SPECIALISTS

That brings us to business specialists. Who is qualified as such in the several States? The State chambers of commerce and other such organizations could supply competent men. When there are so many sources to supply man-material in the several States, this question of 5,500 field offices is a wild guess. Why not put the Rotary and the Kiwanis Clubs to work? They will do the job.

UNWORKABLE SET-UP

The whole set-up as proposed is cumbersome, unworkable, un-American, unfair, and unnecessary. This attempt to build up, unnecessarily, an army of from 66,000 to 90,000 men and women will not stand the light of day. The maximum number justified could not reach 12,000.

FIFTY MILLION TOO MANY

Fifty million dollars is altogether too much to appropriate. They ask for many thousands more people than the Budget said they needed. I am opposed to the figures as approved by the Appropriations Committee. The committee has given them too much money.

THE PEOPLE MUST BE HEARD

In the last analysis it is the people, not the O. P. A., that will operate and make this price control a success.

For the good which has already been accomplished, the people, and not the O. P. A., are responsible.

Let us stop and think it over. Let us realize that the people are incensed by the manner in which this thing is being handled. When aroused righteously and justly, as in this case, to protect themselves, the people are mighty and will prevail. Franklin D. Roosevelt found that to be true when he tried to pack the Supreme Court. Popular as he was, he just could not do that to the people. They would not let him; he was helpless.

THE N. R. A. REDIVIVUS

When the people make up their minds, individuals do not count. The people know what they think is best for them. They get what they want. In this Government of ours, we proceed on the theory, as Dr. Gallup said the other day, that the majority of the people instinctively know what is best for them. The proof is found in the fact that they discarded the N. R. A. long before the Supreme Court rejected it.

THE CAT IS OUT OF THE BAG

Right here and now, while we are speaking of the N. R. A., let me read you a letter I received this morning:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *June 27, 1942.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PLUMLEY: Some say that when the Supreme Court in 1935 laid National Industrial Recovery Administration to rest, the fourth-term candidate took a solemn vow that he would some day resurrect this illegitimate child of Miss Democracy. Anyone who will examine the set-up and the aims of the National Industrial Recovery Administration and of the Office of Price Administration will at once become convinced that resurrection morn is here and that the Angel Gabriel is none other than the former economic adviser of National Recovery Administration, one Leon Henderson, back on the pay roll at good wages, after a long dry spell.

Yours very truly,

_____.

I have permission to show the letter to anybody interested to see it, but I am not inclined further to publicize my friend by adding his signature.

"I know not what the truth may be, I only tell the tale as it was told to me," but I am suspicious that my correspondent is telling you people something that a lot of folks would be just as well pleased not to have published. The cat is out of the bag. Some people can see the forest despite the trees. A lot of people can see a hole in a ladder.

A RESURRECTED N. R. A.

If we do not watch our step, we will resurrect, resuscitate, and revive the N. R. A.

As further evidence of the fact that the people know what is best for them, it is to be noted that they favored the selective-service proposal and were out to win the war a month before the bill was enacted. They were opposed to isolationism and appeasement, as some of you may know.

They realize their power when they get ready to let it loose, and woe be to the man who gets in their way when they glow and pulsate with the vigor injected into them by the founding fathers more than a century and a half ago. They are determined to protect their rights, to keep the administration of their affairs within their control and out of the hands of spoilsmen, would-be dictators, and over-enthusiastic theorists, and to win the war.

PEOPLE ON THE WARPATH

Just now the people are on the warpath. Take notice and govern yourselves accordingly. This appropriation should be cut to the bone. Only half of it should be made available until a report has been made to Congress and to the taxpayers, accounting for the way in which the money has been expended.

It is time to listen to the people.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. GUYER].

Mr. GUYER. Mr. Chairman, with the loss of the sources of natural rubber to our enemy, the Japanese, one of the most critical shortages confronting our country and of serious import both as it affects the production of war equipment and the maintenance of our domestic transportation facilities is the shortage of rubber.

Charged with the responsibility of meeting this situation is the Rubber Reserves Corporation. Its task is to find every possible pound of rubber—virgin natural rubber, reclaimed rubber, and synthetic rubber—by whatever proved process it can be produced—and that with the utmost speed. To the end that rubber may be conserved the Office of

Defense Transportation has ordered drastic reductions in truck mileages, and it is proposed that gasoline be rationed throughout the Nation. Except as to the area along the Atlantic seaboard, and a small area in the far Northwest, the only purpose claimed for gasoline rationing is the conservation of rubber, and throughout this vast Midwest area where gasoline production is restricted because of surpluses there exist troublesome surpluses of grain, great amounts of which are already owned by the Government, which are an undisputed source of an essential raw material for the production of synthetic rubber.

A subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the United States Senate has conducted an extensive inquiry into the rubber situation, and particularly the production of synthetic rubber, and in its report to accompany S. 2600, to establish a Rubber Supply Agency, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry says:

> The subcommittee has had undisputed evidence presented to it by outstanding chemists and engineers of national reputation to justify the conclusion that the quickest way to bring about the production of synthetic rubber, with the use of the least amount of critical materials, is through the conversion of alcohol from grain or forest products to butadiene (the principal ingredient necessary for the manufacture of synthetic rubber). The subsequent synthesis of butadiene with styrene to make finished rubber is a well-established process. The bottleneck in the synthetic-rubber program is the production of butadiene.

In a recent series of broadcasts Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr., one of the most careful and reliable commentators on public events and affairs, has revealed a deplorable lack of wisdom or meditated negligence on the part of the Rubber Reserve Company; a course which, according to the weight of evidence, has been and is slowing up the production of synthetic rubber and at the same time retarding our defense effort and disrupting our domestic economy.

Mr. Lewis reports that while the Rubber Reserve Corporation has advanced over a half billion dollars to erect synthetic plants, all of which, however, went to organizations controlled by the petroleum industry to produce rubber from petroleum. In his investigations he found that efforts of persons seeking to produce butadiene, the essential ingredient the absence of which is the immediate bottleneck in synthetic rubber production, from alcohol, made from grain, providing their own finances, were denied the small quantities of critical materials necessary for construction. In one instance a man in Nebraska has assembled 90 percent of the equipment necessary to produce 17,000 tons of rubber a year. He was denied some 150 tons of reinforcing steel bars needed to build concrete fermentation vats. He pointed out that the plants using the petroleum base required four times as much critical materials as was required for the alcohol plants, and that construction took 18 months whereas the alcohol plants could be in actual production in 5 to 6 months.

In this connection the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry says:

> It is undisputed in the record of the subcommittee that the only known and commercially tested processes for the production of synthetic rubber, developed principally in continental Europe by the Germans, Poles, and Russians, were from alcohol produced from grain and potatoes. There is no explanation by any responsible official of why this country in setting up a program for the production of synthetic rubber gave consideration only to untried laboratory experiments from petroleum which will require twice the time and many times the critical material needed to produce the same synthetic rubber from alcohol.
>
> The only plausible explanation seems to be that the dollar-a-year men in the chemicals branch of the War Production Board were fearful that the war might end suddenly and that there might then be some surplus industrial alcohol that would provide competition for companies with which many of these officials have been associated for a long period of time.

Further, the Senate Committee says:

> The production of synthetic rubber has been handicapped and delayed by an apparent lack of coordination within the governmental departments charged with, or which assumed to handle, the problem. Lip service has been generously given to the principle of utilizing that process which would produce the synthetic rubber in the quickest time with the use of the least amount of critical materials. Yet, belatedly and only after months of hearings was alcohol from agricultural products allowed to share in the program—and then only to the point—and not one step beyond—that whisky and molasses distilleries could be converted to the making of industrial alcohol from grain. Such meticulous care to avoid the possibility of post-war competition may bespeak a high degree of business shrewdness, but it likewise portrays a serious failure to appreciate the necessity of keeping America on wheels and winning the war.

Obviously high Government officials charged with the responsibility for solving the rubber problem either have deliberately permitted selfish interests to determine policy or have muffed the opportunity to employ the one source of raw materials having a promise of supplying, before it is too late, the essential ingredient, butadiene, in quantities sufficient to insure that the production of war equipment can be maintained at maximum output and that this production can and will move; that the wheels of transportation will be kept rolling.

The farmers of America can and will step up the production of the products to supply these alcohol plants up to the full extent of our rubber requirements, but when the demand for these grains for food comes following the war there will be the opportunity for the petroleum industry to take up the slack. In the emergency too much valuable time has already been squandered by neglect to take advantage of the facilities and raw materials at hand to meet the demands for rubber—synthetic rubber—with the least possible delay and the least cost in money and in critical materials. Incidentally it will utilize surplus grain stocks now occupying the storage capacity of the Nation and restricting the grain production of the agriculture of our Nation.

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry of the United States Senate has unanimously reported the Thomas bill, S. 2600, to authorize the establishment of a Rubber Supply Agency directed by Congress to proceed with the production of rubber by the alcohol process. This bill should be passed at the earliest possible moment in order to prevent gas rationing in the Middle West by supplying the rubber needed, for we are assured that the only reason for any gas rationing in the middle section of our country, which also produces gasoline, is the necessity for conserving rubber; and at the same time it will provide the farmer with a market for his grain.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DEWEY].

Mr. DEWEY. Mr. Chairman, the bill before us appropriates approximately $1,830,500,000. With one or two exceptions, all the items carried in the bill are directly connected with the prosecution of the war. All measures essential to the successful prosecution of the war have my full support, and I intend to vote for this bill.

I was indeed pleased to hear the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, state on the floor this afternoon that his committee has been able to reduce the estimates submitted by the executive agencies involved by eighty-six-million-odd dollars. While all of us are prepared to appropriate every dollar essential to the war effort, as has been so frequently demonstrated, it is nevertheless incumbent upon us, as Representatives of the people whose dollars we are actually appropriating, to examine every single expenditure recommended to make certain it is essential. In this respect I frankly think the Congress has been all too lax.

But my purpose in rising at this time, Mr. Chairman, is not to discuss the general subject of expenditures and taxes. Rather I wish to confine my remarks to the item of appropriation carried in this bill for the Office of Price Administration under Mr. Leon Henderson. Having had some part, as a member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, in the drafting of the Price Control Act, I naturally have a more than ordinary interest in the appropriation for the administration of the act.

For over 4 months my Committee on Banking and Currency listened to testimony on the subject of price control. The present Price Administrator, Mr. Leon Henderson, for whom I have a high regard in many ways, was the chief witness. Throughout the hearings I endeavored to emphasize the point that price control depended upon coordination of the Treasury Department's tax system, the Federal Reserve Board's credit regulation, but most important of all, an intelligent and willing cooperation of the people. I was convinced then, and I am convinced now, that the objective can be obtained without a wholesale bureaucratic regimentation.

While Mr. Henderson's response to my questions along this line seemed to indicate a concurrence in my position, I reluctantly concluded that his concurrence was more theoretical than real. And my conclusion in this respect was substantiated somewhat by the spontaneous reaction of Mr. Henderson to the voluntary cooperation principle I advocated in a round table discussion held on September 7 of last year by the American Forum of the Air, when the price-control bill was pending before my committee.

The participants in this discussion were Mr. Leon Henderson, Mr. Donald M. Nelson, Representative Robert W. Kean, of New Jersey, and myself. In my opening remarks I stated as one of my ideas of price control the following:

I interpret the duties of a price-control administrator first:

He should be the champion of the people and of small industries not directly associated with national defense.

Second, as a benevolent policeman to prevent infringement of the rules.

It is my belief that the American people will cooperate patriotically and will enforce price ceilings if they understand what is wanted, provided, however, there are no favored groups, nor attempts to permanently invade their personal liberties.

It is my conviction that the people themselves, if given the opportunity to know what the price ceilings are on respective articles, will see that those ceilings are maintained. And I pointed out in the course of this radio debate that each year two large mail-order houses, namely, Sears, Roebuck, with which Mr. Donald Nelson was formerly associated, and Montgomery Ward, send out over 137,000,000 large catalogs and price sheets listing the prices of all kinds of articles. I used this as an illustration of one manner in which the people might be kept informed as to price ceilings.

Mr. Henderson characterized this whole idea as "Pollyanna." That is the word he used. It was perfectly clear from his reaction that he preferred to enforce a price-control law through regimentation, and had little confidence in voluntary cooperation from people themselves.

Mr. Chairman, that is precisely the issue presented to us here in connection with this appropriation for the Office of Price Administration. It is whether we are going to follow the bureaucratic regimentation principle or whether we will emphasize voluntary cooperation in the administration of the Price Control Act.

In the figures of the Office of Price Administration submitted to the Bureau of the Budget it asked for 90,000 employees for the next fiscal year. The Budget Bureau cut that figure to 66,000. The subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations then held extensive hearings on the subject and voted to reduce it still further to 40,000 employees. The full committee inquired into the matter and reduced the number to 32,000.

When Mr. Henderson testified before the Committee on Appropriations he stated that he felt he should have 75,000 employees. I know no better way to describe such an organization than to say that it would amount to an economic gestapo, which would reach into every American home. It would have tremendous power. This was recognized by the very able chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. I noted that on page 21 of the hearings the chairman said:

Mr. Henderson, 75,000 people distributed throughout the country geographically at this tremendous expense are in a position to exert tremendous influence both politically and economically. Would you say that not only is there no intention but that there is no probability and no possibility that this vast machine will be used for the purpose other than for which it was organized?

Of course, there would be no intention that it would be used for purposes other than which organized. I would not accuse Mr. Henderson of having any sinister intentions. I have no good reason to make such an accusation. But Mr. Henderson is only one individual. There is always the probability that such a vast governmental machine will get out of hand and go beyond its original purpose. Surely we have learned something from the history of governments throughout the world. Surely we have learned something about the factors and forces that ultimately destroy democracy.

As I stated at the outset, having the honor of a seat on the Banking and Currency Committee, I had some part in the drafting of the Price Control Act. I confess that the bill our committee brought to the House was not entirely satisfactory to me, but I supported it. I recognize the necessity of having some legislation of this character n order that we may afford the people protection against unfair rises in the price of foods, clothing, and rents—in short, against inflation. I am most interested in seeing this act efficiently and effectively administered.

I certainly shall support an appropriation for the Office of Price Administration to enable that office and its various local volunteer boards throughout the country having whatever clerical assistance those volunteer boards may require. But I am not willing, Mr. Chairman, to give my approval to an appropriation to permit the hiring of thousands of agents who, while starting in the humble role of helpers to the volunteer boards, may gradually take over the role of snoopers. That is the way regimentation starts.

We must guard against regimentation. And that is the question before us in this appropriation.

Mr. PLOESER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DEWEY. I yield.

Mr. PLOESER. Has the gentleman seen the proposed annual report that I understand the Office of Price Administration is attempting to get from business enterprises? It comprises about 28 pages to be made annually, giving all of the same figures now in the possession of the Internal Revenue Department, and every 3 months requiring about a 12-page report?

Mr. DEWEY. I have not seen that, but I have been informed that there is such a paper. As a matter of fact, I have received some complaints from reputable businessmen about these detailed reports required of them.

Mr. PLOESER. I have one in my possession, and it is probably one of the most ridiculous attempts to pry into the affairs of business that has ever been made in this Nation, even in view of the fact that the Treasury Department has made it known that these war agencies might have the information in their possession.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back 1 minute.

Mr. TABER. I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, in the Detroit News of yesterday, on page 3, is an article by Blair Moody with a subhead reading "Busts six brigadiers." Then he goes on to state that an officer of the Army, because of inefficiency, "busts" six officers so he could get production in connection with Army work. Then below is another article saying that General Somervell is going to be in Detroit the last of this week. If this be true I hope he will see the editor of the Detroit Times, or the publisher, and get his answer to this question. It was asked in the Times:

Question: Three guesses as to the name of the socially, politically prominent man of wealth who has been given a high Army commission, and who loves to get good and "plastered" in the cocktail bars, tell about his "service," and wear his cap backwards until friends "pour" him into a taxicab.

Another thing he could look into is this article in the Detroit Free Press:

George Schaefer is one of those patriotic chaps who has given a good boat and a lot of good time to the job of helping the Coast Guard maintain a river patrol. So the other night after some arduous hours of chugging up and down the river, George docked his boat, and dropped into the club dining room in his common sailor's outfit for a bit of food. Into the place walked a party of Army officers, guests of the club, ranked by a major whose shoulder emblem indicated he was in a noncombat job. This officer stared across the room at George and called the head waiter. "Get that enlisted man out of here," he ordered. The head waiter tried to explain about George but the major insisted. So the head waiter traipsed over to George's table and explained the situation to George, and George blew up. "Enlisted man," he roared, "I'm staying. Get that blank major out of here."

For the record, the major left before George did.

What I would like to have General Somervell do when he goes to Detroit is to look into these newspaper reports and if he finds they are correct and if he finds that the officer referred to in the story is a major over in the Ordnance Department, if it is that man I wish he would pass the word along to Donald Nelson, because this major in the Ordnance Department fired a man up there who has given us production outside of Detroit. A competent expert who has a son in the service who himself served in the last war. I see the Member here from Detroit, and may I add Detroit is doing a wonderful job. Probably no city anywhere, not even New York, probably no city anywhere in the country could equal the job that Detroit has been doing, but Detroit cannot do it all. You know there is one Detroit corporation with a plant over at Lansing that has 600—now get that—600 subcontractors and they placed a lot of the work out-

side of the State though that work is charged or credited to Michigan. Over on the western side of Michigan—and when I get permission to revise my remarks I will put a list of the towns in—we have been producing these war materials but nowhere near half, nowhere near 50 percent of our capacity, is being used and our people would like some more of these orders, so that they may do their utmost to aid in production.

This major in Detroit, this socially, politically prominent man of wealth I have referred to as being poured into a cab after he gets "plastered"—I do not think—I know—that fellow does not have any technical training, and he may be just a monkey wrench in the production machinery. I know that fellow does not have any technical training, while the man he has been firing has. And the man he fired for personal reasons has been rated by the War Department as qualified for a colonelcy. Yes, and I repeat, he served in the last war as an officer.

I would not speak about these things here, but you know how hard it is for an unknown Republican to get the ear of one of these bureaucrats. You cannot do it except to come on the floor and say these things. They do not listen to you when you call them on the phone, write them a letter, or send them a wire. You cannot get an answer. But sometimes if you say something on the floor, it gets back to them through three or four newspapers. That is the only reason I am speaking today, so that Mr. Nelson, who is doing a good job, will get this information about his major up there who is gumming up the whole works and let us on the western side of Michigan go ahead.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman said that he had a hard time getting information from these bureaucrats. I have noticed that sometimes they seem to have just as hard a time getting information to us.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. In the Ladies Home Journal there is a serial in two installments——

Mr. HOFFMAN. It is not our fault if they do not get information to us; we are always ready to listen. In fact, we listen too often and too long.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. In which is given the foreign policy of this Government, including conversations of the President with Churchill. I think it is a shame that Members of Congress have to look through a lot of weekly magazines and stumble through a lot of love yarns in order to find information on public policy that is important to our work. I think the gentleman will agree with that.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I agree with everything the gentlewoman says.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 25 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, repeated attempts have been made here in the House to stifle criticism. Those attempts have been based on the assertion that any criticism of the administration undermines confidence and is an aid to the enemy. I do not agree with that assertion. It seems to me that the best way by which confidence can be encouraged is by frankness, by competency, and by an abandonment of political trenches. It seems to me that any aid to the enemy which possibly could come by any discussions here would be infinitesimally small compared to the aid that would come as a result of the confusion, chaos, conflict, and incompetency that has been so painfully apparent.

I yield at this time to the majority, if anyone cares to take issue with that statement.

Since that invitation is not accepted, I proceed on the premise that honest criticism, not captious criticism but honest criticism, fairly directed with the hope of improving the administration of the Federal Government and particularly with the hope of improving the means for the prosecution of the war cannot be construed as an aid to the enemy. As I see it, a realistic appraisal on our part is no more defeatism than is a persistent disregard of conditions a guaranty to victory.

To simply close our eyes and say that all is well, that all has been well in the past, and that what we have done and that which is presently being done is calculated to bring the greatest forces together for the successful prosecution of the war, is wishful thinking—a complacency which is extremely dangerous.

Tonight we are making an appraisal. We are making an appraisal of some of the gigantic agencies which have been created. As I studied the justifications, as I read the hearings, and as I listened to the testimony, I was impressed with the thought that these gigantic agencies were crowding each other for recognition, each one jealous of its own prerogatives and ambitious for the extension of its own domain, each one emphasizing its own indispensability and its own importance. I am not at all surprised that we have the confusions, the misunderstandings, and the conflicts which have developed. I ask the simple question, How could it be otherwise when we see this jumble of effort? Instead of a simplicity of operations, the objective appears to be a complexity of activities. There are duplications and overlaps to such a degree that to find where the authority of one agency begins and another ends approaches the task of finding a needle in a hay stack.

The tragedy to me is not only the glaring incompetencies that are present; it is that this is all part of our war effort. We cannot dismiss from our minds that this jumble is a part of the tears and toil and sacrifice—this job of winning the war. The tragedy of the incompetency itself is bad enough, but when we take that as a part of this very critical problem we cannot escape a feeling of frustration. There is a failure to see conditions in their true perspective.

As I see it, we are in danger today of having what I diagnose as an organizational paralysis. Every pet scheme that some crafty politician creates or that some Utopian dreamer conceives results in the creation of an agency. Immediately a corps of statisticians, economists, specialists, and analysts is gathered together. To save any intrusion on either their time or their patience a larger band of assistant statisticians, analysts, economists, and specialists is recruited. They are a bulwark to keep the undesirable or the inquisitive away from the chief directors. Then the call is made on the Civil Service Commission, and a great army of all types and kinds of secretaries, stenographers, clerks, and typists is inducted into service.

I have been trying to find the reason for the extraordinary increase in personnel. One reason might be to make the agency formidable in its appearance and its functions all the more pretentious. Of course, I would not presume to suggest that there were any political motives connected with the creation of any of these agencies or with the recruiting of the vast army of employees. The result has been that Government operations have become a sprawling octopus which threatens to paralyze us in its embrace. There is a point where organization becomes a hindrance rather than a help—a deterrent rather than an aid—where overorganization is worse than no organization. I am afraid we have reached that point—the point where organization appears to be the objective rather than the means by which an objective is to be attained. I believe that it is high time for us to set ourselves to the important task of simplifying operations, of pulling ourselves out of the labyrinth of endless red tape, of eliminating experimental excursions into fields which at best are only very remotely related to the war effort, and get down to the serious undertaking at hand. If ever there were a time when hard-boiled, cold common-sense tactics were necessary, it is right now. Instead of paying for novelties in government, we had better confine ourselves to necessities. Setting up clumsy contrivances that are continually in conflict with each other means one thing—incompetency. We can and we should prove to the dictators that free men and free institutions can cope successfully with their cunning and their tyranny.

No one can deny the urgent need at this time for a maximum productive effort on our part. We cannot afford to waste a thing—time, money, materials, men, skills, or any one of the many factors which enter into mechanisms of war. Much less can we afford to permit our efforts to run at cross purposes—conflicting and confusing. The saving in dollars and cents should in itself appeal to us as the colossal cost of this war is translated into an ever-increasing tax burden and an ever-growing national debt. We can afford what is necessary and essential, but we cannot afford any frills and furbelows. But aside from the very important consideration of saving the dollars and cents—the saving in productive effort—the saving of skill and ability, the creative capacity of heads and hands—makes the simplification of

operations a solemn duty. Every ounce of our energy, every atom of our strength, the full force of our vigor and vitality should be directed to the doing of first things first. And by the same token, secondary things should be sidetracked. The people are being called upon to sacrifice conveniences and even comforts, and the Government should set an example.

I believe it to be our duty to provide the necessary funds for implementing the authorizations of the Congress, to carry out the expressed will of the people, to execute the law as it has been enacted. But I am not prepared to permit the executive agencies set up for these purposes to be the sole arbiter of the question of what is necessary. Nor am I prepared to transfer that responsibility to the Budget Office. If we are to continue to hold the purse strings, a very substantial part of that responsibility rests right here. I am not prepared to assume the duty of getting the money, whether it be by taxation or borrowing, and surrender the right of saying how it shall be spent. Unless we are careful, these agencies will be like weeds in the garden, growing unnoticed, spreading wherever they can, difficult to control, and proving harder day by day to check. How many of us here contemplated when the Price Control Act was passed the creation of an agency to employ 66,000 and to cost $161,000,000 for its operation in the first full year of its existence? That was the Budget figure, and the Administrator wanted about forty million more than that. I believe we have the responsibility of passing upon critically and of scrutinizing carefully the requests for every appropriation and to refuse those which cannot be fully justified. To take any other course would only tend to increase the arrogance and defiance of those who have indicated a comtemptuous disregard of legislative limitations and restraints. Any other course may be interpreted by these officials as an invitation for the imposition of arbitrary edicts of any kind. It would mean a free rein for some who have been disposed to run wild in wielding the authority and power which they consider they have. We have a clear duty to our people to prevent such imposition and to avoid saddling on them the cost of the program.

As I have suggested, the Office of Price Administrator Henderson is a case in point, an agency, which in my judgment, seeks a personnel entirely out of proportion to its needs. I confess that I have not been favorably impressed with the procedure adopted by the Administrator. I believe he has failed to take into account all the factors involved in the task which he has undertaken. I realize that rationing can hardly be said to be a policy which makes for popularity. And I also realize that inflation must be guarded against. Whether present national policies make price control a possible means of avoiding inflation is a very debatable question. I doubt that they do and I think Mr. Henderson doubts it too.

I have said that I take exception to Mr. Henderson's methods. I want you to read in the hearings the admission that he made of the treatment of a greedy hoarder and a frugal housewife. The words "greedy hoarder" are Mr. Henderson's words.

In one of the recent magazines Mr. Henderson came out with a full spread letter to the housewives of America.

In that article he sought to be persuasive in his appeal and yet adamant in his attitude. No one could mistake the club in his hand. In his appearance before the committee he admitted that having a normal supply of a commodity, such as sugar, on hand is not hoarding. But he was unable to suggest any method by which the frugal housewife was to be distinguished from a greedy hoarder when it came to the matter of rationing sugar. He admitted that under his program the innocent and the guilty had to be treated alike—that the capable housewife and the greedy hoarder fall into the same class. This, to my mind, is a tragic admission.

It is a sad day when the frugality and the industry of the American home, the good housewife, who budgets not only the money but the time and the effort of the home, who looks after the multitude of needs—when that industrious, careful, frugal housewife cannot be differentiated by the Federal Government from the greedy hoarder who sets out to acquiring a store of goods for the purpose of increasing his own profits. Surely, some means should be at hand to make a distinction, but Mr. Henderson has failed to find the means.

I believe the Administrator has a duty—a duty to discover means by which the devotion of our people will be challenged, and that duty, as I see it, is more important than the establishment of arbitrary, unyielding, and unreasonable rules and regulations, some of which I have been told even brush aside the sorrow and bereavement of the passing of a loved one. It seems to me the Administrator might well direct his attention to the solution of fundamental problems, some of which he admitted he had not solved, before setting out to establish his far-flung inquisitorial and enforcement agency. Before the crack-down there should be some distinction established between the greedy hoarder and the frugal housewife.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. You always catch me in the middle of something; I will yield when I finish here.

The trouble is this economist, this academic specialist, has not been able to distinguish between an academic theory and the human factor that enters into our everyday living. Mr. Henderson is skilled in the scientific laboratory experiments of academic theories with which he has toyed through the years. Unfortunately, he seems to disregard the experiences of people or the flesh-and-blood part of the problem. Restraints, rationing, both involve the factor of heads and hearts and hands. This is not an algebraic problem to be solved by set, arbitrary rules. This is not a laboratory experiment on guinea pigs. This is an intensely human problem in which confidence and trust and understanding are vital factors.

Two mistakes have been made: There has been too much resort to terrorizing the people and then confusing them. When sugar rationing started, we were told of a serious sugar shortage which required a drastic curtailment.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. No; I am not yielding. Yet, down in my friend's State of Texas—my distinguished friend who just asked me to yield—I am told they have so much sugar accumulated that the capacity of the storehouses is being taxed.

Now, what is the purpose of these conflicts; one moment fear and trepidation in every household in America of a serious scarcity of sugar, and the next moment an undenied statement—a statement to which no exception has been taken—that we have so much sugar on hand that we have no place to store it.

I refer you to the hearings again. I asked Mr. Henderson at one point whether the purpose of his statement in this magazine article to the housewives of America was intended to be persuasive and yet adamant.

Persuasive, oh, cooing, winsome, and wooing, up to the point where it is necessary to get out the club of compulsion and then the crack-down comes. Surely some better method can be found to deal with the problem of prices than this arbitrary one, and Mr. Henderson has engaged a sufficient number of specialists who should be able to do it.

That which is necessary as a contribution to the war effort has the approval, in my opinion, of the American people. But it is exceedingly distressing to have the war effort used as a vehicle for purposes other than that for which such an agency was intended, or to have it resort to methods which arouse resentment and antagonism. With all the skill that has been gathered under Mr. Henderson's operation, certainly there should be some way found by which the devotion and the loyalty and the love of the American people could be challenged rather than inviting open opposition. The American people are responsive to appeals which are based on reason and common sense. They can be depended upon to rally to a cause in which they have confidence and which challenges their devotion. Intimidation and fear will not be helpful factors. Speaking for myself, and I believe speaking for a great group of the minority, we are not taking exception to that which would provide a barrier against inflation. But Mr. Henderson long ago admitted that a price-control program could not be successful unless all factors entering into prices were controlled. In the recent hearings he admitted that all these factors had not been brought under control. If inflation is to be avoided we had better be realistic in our efforts to accomplish this purpose.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. Now, Mr. Chairman, I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman will quote all the questions that the gentleman asked Mr. Henderson and his

replies rather than to the case he mentioned awhile ago.

Mr. DITTER. I cannot quote them all because I do not want to take the time, but may I say this in answer to my friend from Texas—that I will let the hearings speak for themselves. Mr. Henderson's examination starts, on page 1 of this second part of the hearings, and I invite your careful study of all of it.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further for one question?

Mr. DITTER. No I want to use these last 5 minutes for one thing that I believe is causing a considerable amount of the difficulty that is present in our business operations. I refer to the practice on the part of these agencies to require a multitude of reports from everybody connected with the business life of the country. I do not know how many of you men have had them, but I know I have had numerous complaints from businessmen—the small business men and the larger ones—that there is a variety of reports required by every new agency. They tax the time, patience, and ability of business. The admission was made by Mr. Knowlson, of W. P. B., as we tried to direct his attention to the possibility of decreasing this avalanche of reports that is presently required, when he said:

There is too damned much paper work.

These are not my words. These are Mr. Knowlson's words—"too damned much paper work." What does that mean? That means just one thing. It means that business operations are bogged down, with monkey wrenches in the wheels, as a result of the confused, jumbled efforts that exist in these executive agencies. Here is a field that should have the attention of the executive department. A multiplicity of effort could be avoided. Statistics have been allowed to get out of proportion. Give industry the chance to make implements of war without sabotaging its efforts by "too damn much paper work." Let us substitute lathes and drill presses for the overworked typewriters. Let us substitute the actual doing of things for the reports of how they may be done. Let us substitute simplicity for complexity.

For the encouragement of my friends on the minority side, I pay this compliment to Mr. Henderson. Many of you will remember that for a long time the minority contended that the decentralization of the relief program would result in a better administration. We contended that the relief administration should be returned to the local communities. I pay the compliment to Mr. Henderson. He has adopted that policy. He claimed that local administration would be tougher and fairer. This is certainly a vindication of the position which the minority took.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the agencies which are provided for in this bill and all other executive agencies will assume the responsibility which I believe they have to separate the essentials from the nonessentials, to reduce the demands which are being made on the productive capacity of the country by reason of their activities, to save wherever possible the efforts of heads and hands as well as the wastage of funds resulting from duplications and overlaps and to limit to a minimum the complex and confusing operations of Government. We are at war. That is a serious undertaking. We have much at stake. Nothing can be left undone to assure an all-out victory. The devotion of our people must be challenged, and it can best be challenged by the example of those in authority.

Here in the House there is also a duty—a duty which requires our utmost care and attention—a duty which can only be discharged by our willingness to make a fair, dispassionate, and honest appraisal of the value of the executive agencies, to be critical, if necessary, of their requests and to weigh all the factors which enter into our program by which the ingenuity and industry of the Nation is to be geared for the winning of the war. This is not an easy task. Bias and partisanship must be laid aside. Captious criticism has no place. Political advantage and privilege must be dismissed. We can have but one objective—the winning of the war; and that can be accomplished only as the devotion and the loyalty of freemen are inspired by a leadership of efficiency and competency.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman from Missouri to yield the gentleman from Pennsylvania 1 minute in order to ask him a question.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. Yes.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman will insert all of the questions and answers relating to the case that the gentleman mentioned. I think they commence on page 68 of the hearings and end on page 70. I don't think the gentleman has been exactly fair to Mr. Henderson in what he said, and I know he wants to be fair, and since he does, I hope he will insert all of those questions and answers in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Mr. DITTER. As I said I am willing to let that record speak for itself. To put it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would simply mean an additional expense to the taxpayer, and I remind my friend from Texas that some of us are at least a bit concerned with what things cost. Others are not. I realize that, but we have a sense of frugality in Pennsylvania; it is a homely virtue that is still cherished there. I must refrain from accepting the invitation of the gentleman from Texas and I hope that all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD will read the record of the hearings, which speaks for itself.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

THE OFFICE OF CENSORSHIP

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, it is strange how experiences in World War No. 1 come back to mind as we go into the problems that are created by this war. Some 24 or 25 years ago I was a senior in college. We had just entered the war. Our college debate question that year was, "Resolved, that in time of war the administration be granted absolute censorship of the press."

In my own thinking I have never been able to get away from the conclusions I reached at that time with regard to the fundamental importance of protecting the freedom of the press as a guaranty that we would arrive at truth in the prosecution of the war in wartime as well as in the prosecution of our ideals in government in times of peace. So I was disturbed tonight as I read the bill and read these words:

OFFICE OF CENSORSHIP

Salaries and expenses

For all expenses necessary to enable the Office of Censorship to perform the functions and duties prescribed by the President, including personal services, $26,500,000.

I asked the gentleman from New York, Mr. Taber, what was meant in this grant of authority to the Office of Censorship to perform the functions and duties prescribed by the President. He advised me informally that that had reference to an Executive order issued by the President last December 19, Executive Order No. 8985. So I referred to that in the hearings and I find that in the establishment of a Director of Censorship the President said:

The Director of Censorship shall cause to be censored in his absolute discretion, communications by mail, cable, radio, and so forth, passing between the United States and any foreign country, or which may be carried by any other vessel or vessel transportation touching at any place or territory, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President shall from time to time prescribe.

So it would appear that by reference to the Executive order the President from time to time may prescribe the rules and regulations that shall govern the Director of Censorship in carrying out this charge.

Then I read the hearings in detail on this subject and I find that that Executive order is based upon a section in the first War Powers Act, which provides that during the present war the President may cause to be censored, under such rules and regulations as he may from time to time establish, communications between this country and a foreign country.

The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] was a member of the subcommittee that took the testimony on this subject and I am sure the gentleman from Indiana in his characteristic understanding of the problems of the press is interested in this problem. The question that bothered me was whether or not we are by reference to an Executive order giving to the Office of Censorship the power to censor domestic communications. I know that in the hearings on

page 332 Mr. Price, the Director of Censorship, in answer to a question asked by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. O'NEAL] said:

> We do not censor domestic mail, we do not censor on a compulsory basis the domestic circulation of newspapers, but if they are sent out of the country, the censorship for newspapers and private letters is on the same basis.

It is not, however, a question of what is being done at this time; it is what may be done under powers or purposes granted or recognized by the language proposed. Personally, I believe that an absolute domestic censorship would damage our war effort.

If there is any one thing that is running through the thought of the people of the country today it is that if they are given the truth they will do what is necessary to be done. The thing that destroys confidence in the prosecution of the war is the feeling if it ever comes, that news is being doctored, that important news is being withheld, and that we cannot rely upon what we are being told. I know that the Office of Censorship is not a propaganda- or news-disseminating agency but——

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, it is important that the people have confidence in the administration of the Office of Censorship. In the college debate to which I referred, in opposing an absolute censorship in the hands of the administration, any administration, we suggested the creation of a censorship board, a tripartite board, one section representing the administration to be appointed and selected by the Commander in Chief, the President, one section to be selected by the press associations of the country to insure the confidence of the press, and one section to be selected upon nomination by the Congress of the United States. That was long before I ever had any idea of coming to Congress, but I believed that Congress was the nearest we could get to a guaranty of representation by the public; so the conviction I have on this is not something that just bobbed up. I have a settled belief that the legislative body is the guardian of a people's government. It is the people's government.

It is interesting to me to note that the President's Executive order setting up the Office of Censorship created a Censorship Policy Board. The difference, however, is that instead of its being a tripartite board it is entirely an executive or administration board consisting of the Vice President, the Secretary of the Treasury, the Secretary of War, the Attorney General, the Postmaster General, the Secretary of the Navy, the Directors of the Office of Government Reports and of the Office of Facts and Figures. On the other hand, as Director of Censorship, the President named Byron Price, a member of the press, and possibly the one man the press itself would have chosen. I know the gentleman from Indiana has a high regard for Mr. Price, as do I; but I am also aware that the customary way for free governments to lose their freedom is to surrender powers to good persons for laudable purposes and later find that those powers have been transferred or have fallen into the hands of careless or selfish or incompetent persons who use them to destroy liberty. So I would ask the chairman of the committee or the gentleman from Indiana or any member of the committee who heard these hearings whether they believe that we are here giving authority, and absolute authority, to the Office of Censorship to censor domestic publications for domestic circulation.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. If the gentleman will notice on page 362 of the hearings which carry the Executive order in full, there is no reference to domestic communications; it refers only to communications between the United States and foreign countries. In that respect it follows——

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The first War Powers Act.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes; section 303, title III, and it uses the precise phraseology. If there is any censorship of domestic communications it is a voluntary compliance upon the part of our own citizens. In the testimony of Mr. Price given on page 313 of the hearings he states that they are—

> supervising a voluntary effort on the part of newspapers and other publications, and radio broadcasters to withhold from circulation certain classes of information of value to the enemy.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I am glad to have that in the RECORD, and, with permission from the House, I wish to make a part of the RECORD a sentence from a letter by the President to the Director on January 27, 1942. As given at page 360 in the hearings on this bill, the President said:

> As President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, I hereby authorize and direct you, in your capacity as Director of Censorship, to coordinate the efforts of the domestic press and radio in voluntarily withholding from publication military and other information which should not be released in the interest of the effective prosecution of the war.

My purpose in drawing attention to this matter has been to place in the RECORD, as a matter of legislative history, exactly what is understood. So I have quoted the language employed in the bill before us and carried that back to the Executive order creating the Office of Censorship under the first War Powers Act, in order to establish as a matter of legislative history that the use of such phrases as "to perform the functions and duties prescribed by the President," and "a censorship in the absolute discretion of the Director, in accordance with such rules and regulations as the President shall from time to time prescribe," is limited to communications going out of the country. To sum it up: Then, there is nothing intended by the language in this appropriation bill to expand the first War Powers Act, and nothing proposed here to set up a compulsory domestic censorship?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The statute, and the Executive order, and the testimony, and the hearings are all perfectly clear; there should be no misunderstanding or confusion as to that point.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the bill.

The Clerk read down to line 6 on page 1.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7319) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in revising the remarks I made in the Committee of the Whole I may insert a quotation from a letter from the President of the United States on January 27, 1942, relating to the Office of Censorship.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. CLEVENGER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his own remarks.)

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks made in the Committee of the Whole and to include therein a letter from the secretary of a local chamber of commerce.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

HOUR OF MEETING TOMORROW

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourn today it adjourn to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

DEPARMENT OF LABOR FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HARE submitted a conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7181), making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all who have spoken on the bill today may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ELLIOTT of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of business on the Speaker's desk on Wednesday and after any previous orders heretofore entered I may be permitted to speak for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. ELLIOTT]?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized for 10 minutes.

THREE SERVICE STARS IN ONE HOME TURN TO GOLD

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time in order that I might call the attention of the House to the precious sacrifice which one of my constituents has made on the altar of our country.

In a modest little home at 35 North Beville Avenue, Indianapolis, a father looks at the pictures of his three sons and mourns.

In this modest little home there is a service flag of four stars and three of those stars have turned to gold.

When I think of the bereavement that has come to this home, I am reminded of the letter of consolation the great, big-hearted President, Abraham Lincoln, wrote under similar circumstances to Mrs. Lydia Bixby, of Boston, in 1864. That letter will endure forever as one of the classics of our literature. It was as follows:

DEAR MADAM: I have been shown in the files of the War Department a statement of the Adjutant General of Massachusetts that you are the mother of five sons who have died gloriously on the field of battle. I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. But I cannot refrain from tendering to you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save. I pray that our heavenly father may assuage the anguish of your bereavement, and leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of freedom.

Yours very sincerely and respectfully,
ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

The awful war that is convulsing the world struck close to the people of Indianapolis when it robbed that home of three of the finest specimens of our young Indiana manhood—the three sons of Mr. Nelson E. Craig—Nelson Leroy, aged 28; Russell, aged 20; and Charles Frank, aged 24. Nelson went down with the U. S. S. *Langley*, Russell was aboard the U. S. S. *Pillsbury* when she was sunk, and Charles is now reported missing in naval action.

In the living room of the little home the heartbroken father has erected a shrine on which he has placed photographs of his sons, all in a row, dressed in their Navy uniforms. They are the pictures of three fine-looking young men, handsome as Adonises, faces all aglow with youth's radiant bloom. How proud the father was when they went away to join the Navy—the Navy he loved, for he himself had served in it from 1908 to 1912. "I guess that's where they got the idea," he says.

As Mr. Craig stands before his shrine, looking hollow-eyed at the pictures of his dead children, his memory harkens back to the time when they were babies, before their lips had learned to form a word; he remembers how they toddled to greet him when he came home from work and how they romped on his knee; he recalls a thousand hallowed memories as they grew taller and taller and blossomed into man's estate, and then his voice chokes as he says: "It has been hard to take."

Notwithstanding the terrible calamity that has befallen Mr. Craig there has been no faltering in his devotion to his country. His spirit of service remains perfectly fine and splendid and it should be an inspiring example to all of us. He goes to work every day in an Indianapolis defense factory, determined to do more than ever before to produce the implements needed to save and perpetuate freedom and civilization. But the loss of his three sons has indeed been hard for him to take, and it has been hard for the people of Indianapolis to take. There are half a million people in our city and county and half a million hearts are bleeding for this good man. In its warmth of sympathy for him in his sorrow our community gives striking evidence of the eternal truth of the beatitude: "Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted."

I know that I express what every citizen of our city feels in his heart when I pray to the Father of us all: "Keep Thy loving arms around Mr. Craig forever; make the light of Thy countenance to shine upon him, and give him peace."

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. CLAYPOOL, for 2 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. HALLECK (at the request of Mr. ARENDS), for several days, on account of death in family.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2014. An act for the relief of Carl L. Jones;

H. R. 6295. An act to suspend the requirement for the performance of annual labor on certain mining claims;

H. R. 7184. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7232. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 10 minutes p. m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until 10 o'clock a. m., tomorrow, Tuesday, June 30, 1942.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Tuesday, June 30, 1942.

Business to be considered: Hearing on Federal Communications Commission.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, July 1, for consideration of H. R. 7153, room 1304, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, July 9, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1616, to amend section 509, as amended, of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1781. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1782. A letter from the Clerk of the House of Representatives, transmitting a letter of the Secretary of State of June 22, 1942, enclosing a copy of a note received from the Ambassador of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1783. A letter from the Commissioners, Civil Service Commission, transmitting a draft of a bill extending the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under certain acts; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. LANHAM: Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. House Joint Resolution 323, part 2. Joint resolution to create a commission for the emergency safeguarding of the Capitol and other buildings in the legislative group, and other buildings under the Architect of the Capitol; without amendment (Rept. No. 2280). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2471. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to prevent pernicious political activities," approved August 2, 1939, as amended, with respect to its application to officers and employees of educational, religious, eleemosynary, philanthropic, and cultural institutions, establishments, and agencies, commonly known as the Hatch Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2296). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NICHOLS: Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents. House Resolution 125,

Seventy-seventh Congress, first session. Resolution creating a Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents; without amendment (Rept. No. 2297). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. NICHOLS: Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents. House Resolution 125, Seventy-seventh Congress, first session. Resolution creating a Select Committee to Investigate Air Accidents; without amendment (Rept. No. 2298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. POWERS:

H. R. 7320. A bill to provide for a temporary increase in the rate of compensation of certain employees of the Department of the Navy; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 7321. A bill to provide that enlisted members of the armed forces of the United States shall be allowed at least two furloughs each year for periods of at least 1 week each; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FENTON:

H. R. 7322. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the eastern section of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan:

H. R. 7323. A bill to provide temporary additional compensation for employees of the Post Office Department of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VINSON of Georgia:

H. R. 7324. A bill to amend the act approved August 27, 1940 (54 Stat. 864), entitled "An act increasing the number of naval aviators in the line of the Regular Navy and Marine Corps, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. J. Res. 328. Joint resolution requiring filing of information for a Federal Who's Who; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. RAMSPECK:

H. J. Res. 329. Joint resolution extending the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under certain acts; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. MAY:

H. Con. Res. 73. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the report (H. Rept. No. 2272) of the Committee on Military Affairs relative to the progress of the national defense program; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. COLLINS:

H. Res. 513. Resolution providing for the amendment of rule X of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 7325. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to settle claims for damages to private property resulting from sewage disposal at Camp Forrest, Tenn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RICHARDS:

H. R. 7326. A bill for the relief of the estate of John H. Cathcart; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SATTERFIELD:

H. R. 7327. A bill for the relief of Walter Ormes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEARNS of New Hampshire:

H. R. 7328. A bill for the relief of Robert M. Crain; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3145. By Mr. CULKIN: Petition of members of the Women's Christian Temperance Union of Pulaski, N. Y., urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3146. Also, petition of approximately 82 residents of the Thirty-second Congressional District of New York, urging the passage of Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3147. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of Rev. W. Scheurermann, Methodist minister, and 70 other citizens of Indianola, Iowa, urging passage of legislation providing for the abolishment of liquor traffic as an aid to an all-out war effort; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3148. By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of 2,527 adult citizens of Beaver County, Pa., requesting Members of the Senate and House of Representatives to keep the Sheppard bill (S. 860) from becoming law; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3149. By Mr. HEIDINGER: Petition presented by Florence Moore, of Flora, Ill., and signed by 20 residents of Clay County, Ill., urging the passage of Senate bill 860 as a part of our national defense program; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3150. By Mr. HOFFMAN: Petition signed by sundry citizens of Cassopolis, Mich., with reference to Senate bill 860; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3151. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the California State Council of Defense, relative to the passage of legislation providing for a system of compensation insurance for all trained and certified volunteers engaged in the carrying on of essential civilian protection activities for official city and county defense councils; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3152. Also, resolution of the Pacific region of the North American Gasoline Tax Conference, relative to the exemption from State taxation by persons connected with contracts for national defense, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3153. Also, resolution of the Joint Committee on Water Problems of the California Legislature, relative to securing sufficient appropriation to relieve the steel shortage in order to facilitate completion of the Central Valley project, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3154. By Mr. LECOMPTE: Petition of the Reverend Clifford Carter, pastor at Seymour, Iowa, and citizens of Seymour, Sewal, and Lovilia, Iowa, urging the House of Representatives to vote for legislation which will provide the largest possible protection for the men in our Army and Navy against the insidious influence of vice and intoxicating liquors, especially asking for the passage of the Sheppard bill (S. 860) at an early date; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3155. By Mr. MILLER: Petition of John W. Allen and 59 other citizens of Luzerne County, Pa., urging the prompt passage of Senate bill 860, which provides for the elimination of the sale of all intoxicants in and around military camps and naval bases; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3156. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of the North American Gasoline Tax Conference, Pacific region, relative to increase in the Federal gasoline tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3157. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Middletown Post, No. 218, the American Legion, Middletown, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the unjust criticism of our Congress; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3158. Also, petition of the State, County, and Municipal Workers of America, Congress of Industrial Organizations, Local 246, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 7144; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

3159. Also, petition of the Middletown Post, No. 218, the American Legion, Middletown, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

3160. Also, petition of Samuel D. Chabet, of Flint, Mich., submitting further request omitted from original petition sent to Congress and entered in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as No. 3100, June 18, 1942; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JUNE 30, 1942

(Legislative day of Monday, June 29, 1942)

The Senate met at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. Edward G. Latch, pastor, Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

O God, our Father, the Eternal Rock of Thy people in time of trouble and their Refuge in every hour of need, unto Thee do we lift up our hearts. We are Thy children, created in Thy image, redeemed by Thy grace and sustained by Thy spirit. Assure us always of Thy presence, we beseech Thee.

Grant unto us and unto all our people a clearer understanding of Thy will for our Nation, and may we have the courage to do Thy will and the confidence to walk in Thy way.

Save us from discord and confusion, from pride and prejudice. Fashion us into a body that will agree to differ yet determine to love and be united to serve Thee and our country faithfully and well. We pray through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, June 29, 1942, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Chaffee, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 21 and 23 to the bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and concurred therein each with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the reports of the committees of conference on the disa-

greeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to each of the following joint resolutions:

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia; and

H. J. Res. 324. Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 2014. An act for the relief of Carl L. Jones;

H. R. 6295. An act to suspend the requirement for the performance of annual labor on certain mining claims;

H. R. 7184. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7232. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Andrews	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Rosier
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Barbour	Hayden	Schwartz
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hughes	Smathers
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Burton	Lee	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McNary	Truman
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Tydings
Connally	Millikin	Vandenberg
Danaher	Murdock	Wagner
Davis	Murray	Walsh
Doxey	Norris	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
George	O'Mahoney	Willis

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senators from Washington [Mr. BONE and Mr. WALLGREN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BROWN], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. BULOW], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. BUNKER], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HERRING], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MALONEY], the Senator from Texas [Mr. O'DANIEL], the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON], the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. SPENCER], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. HOLMAN] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are absent on public business.

The Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PERSONNEL OF THE LAND FORCES

A letter from the Secretary of War, reporting, pursuant to law, relative to the personnel of the land forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DIVERSION OF WATER FROM KLICKITAT RIVER TO THE TOPPENISH-SIMCOE AND AHTANUM AREAS, WAPATO PROJECT, WASHINGTON

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, in response to Senate Resolution 165, 76th Congress, 1st session, a report concerning the feasibility of providing an increased supply of water for irrigation purposes in Ahtanum Creek Valley, the Yakima Indian Reservation, Wash. (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

REPORT ON PROVISION FOR TEMPORARY DEFENSE SHELTER—FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, pursuant to law, a detailed report by the Farm Security Administration relative to the allocations, obligations, and expenditures (provision for temporary defense shelter in certain localities), pursuant to authority contained in the Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941 (as amended) as of February 28, 1942 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Appropriations.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Treasury, War (2), Navy, and Agriculture (3); Federal Works Agency, National Housing Agency, and the United States Maritime Commission, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking toward their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS

Petitions were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CAPPER:

The petition of the pastor and members of the congregation of the First Christian Church, of Concordia, Kans., praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

By Mr. HUGHES:

The petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Marshallton, Del., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, and also for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the manufacture and sale of all alcoholic liquors for the duration of the war; and also petitions, numerously signed, of sundry citizens, churches, and organizations, all in the State of Delaware, praying for the enactment of the bill (S. 860) to provide for the common defense in relation to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States and to provide for the suppression of vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; ordered to lie on the table.

REPORT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

Mr. SCHWARTZ (for Mr. KILGORE), from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2619) to amend Article of War 114 so as to broaden the power to administer oaths and to take acknowledgments, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 1530) thereon.

ADDITIONAL CLERK, COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, from the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, I report favorably, without amendment, Senate Resolution 262, and request unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 262) submitted by Mr. RUSSELL on June 1, 1942, was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Immigration hereby is authorized to employ an additional clerk to be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate at the rate of $1,800 per annum until otherwise provided by law.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. SCHWARTZ:

S. 2633. A bill for the relief of Dr. Douglas E. Lawson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDREWS:

S. 2634. A bill for the relief of Mrs. St. Claire Livingston Dodd; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 2635. A bill to provide for granting to the State of New Mexico the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in New Mexico; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

By Mr. TAFT:

S. 2636. A bill for the relief of Dr. J. M. Scott and his wife, Wilma Scott; to the Committee on Claims.

COMPILATION OF FEDERAL LAWS RELATING TO THE REGULATION OF CARRIERS

Mr. TYDINGS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 270), which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission is hereby requested to prepare in such manner as is deemed by it to be necessary and desirable in the circumstances and transmit to the Senate a manuscript in form suitable to be printed, to supplement and bring as closely to date as is practicable Senate Document No. 166, Seventieth Congress, first session, Senate Document No. 139, Seventy-third Congress, second session, and Senate Document No. 202, Seventy-sixth Congress, third session, entitled "Compilation of Federal Laws Relating to the Regulation of Carriers Subject to the Interstate Commerce

Act, With Digests of Pertinent Decisions of the Federal Courts and the Interstate Commerce Commission and the Text of or Reference to General Rules and Regulations," and that such manuscript when transmitted by the Commission to the Secretary of the Senate be printed as a Senate document.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES—LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES

Mr. MURRAY (for himself, Mr. MALONEY, Mr. ELLENDER, Mr. MEAD, Mr. STEWART, Mr. CAPPER, and Mr. TAFT) submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 271), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures under Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress (providing for a study and survey of the problems of American small business enterprises), agreed to October 8, 1940, is hereby increased by $146,760.

INVESTIGATION OF CAUSES FOR RECENT DECLINES IN AGRICULTURAL PRICES

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 272), which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete investigation and study of the causes for the recent declines in the prices of agricultural commodities. The committee shall report to the Senate, at the earliest practicable date, the results of its investigation with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-seventh and succeeding Congresses, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed $——— shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

MEMORIAL ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY TO VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him in connection with the memorial services held by the Veterans of Foreign Wars at Eau Claire, Wis., June 25, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

BULWARKS OF FAITH—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by him before the P. E. O. State convention at Chippewa Falls, Wis., June 17, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

REVIEW BY SENATOR O'MAHONEY OF THURMAN ARNOLD'S BOOK, DEMOCRACY AND FREE ENTERPRISE

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a review by Senator O'MAHONEY of the book Democracy and Free Enterprise, by Thurman Arnold, which appears in the Appendix.]

WAR HOUSING AND PUBLIC WORKS IN AND NEAR THE DISTRICT—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on amendment numbered 1 of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$15,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARTER GLASS,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P. NYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
EMMETT O'NEAL,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
JOHN TABER,
R. B. WIGGLESWORTH,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I move that the Senate consider and agree to the report.

Mr. McNARY. What is this measure?

Mr. McKELLAR. House Joint Resolution 308 is the war housing resolution for the District of Columbia. It will be remembered that the measure was held up some time, and finally the conferees came to a full agreement by the addition of $3,000,000 for dormitory units. That seems to be satisfactory for the time being to the Housing Administration and to both Houses, and I am glad to report a full agreement.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Tennessee.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the report.

The report was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR WORK RELIEF AND RELIEF—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 324) making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 5 and 7; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"SEC. 33. Not to exceed $235,000 of the funds made available in this joint resolution shall be used for personal services in not to exceed three regional offices of the Work Projects Administration."

And the Senate agree to the same.

KENNETH MCKELLAR,
CARTER GLASS,
CARL HAYDEN,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
GERALD P. NYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

CLARENCE CANNON,
C. A. WOODRUM,
LOUIS LUDLOW,
J. BUELL SNYDER,
LOUIS C. RABAUT,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
JED JOHNSON,
JOHN TABER,
Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 7280) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 7, line 19, after the word "War", it is proposed to strike out "*Provided further*, That the foregoing limitation relating to advertising shall not apply to the advertising of services or commodities of personal utility or enjoyment such as are sold at post exchanges and not of a military character."

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, this very important bill went over until today in order that we might have an opportunity to read the report and consider the provisions of the bill. I should like to have the able Senator from Oklahoma, in charge of the bill, make as full a statement as possible, keeping in mind the necessity of observing the inhibitions of secrecy. I am sure the Senator is capable of doing it, and will be glad to do it, so that in the RECORD we may have specified what the bill contains, a statement of the general objectives, and what use is to be made of the funds appropriated.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, on page 6 of the report submitted by the committee may be found a breakdown of the entire sum proposed to be appropriated. By referring to the table there printed, we find that the total sum to be appropriated for pay, subsistence, clothing, medical care, and welfare is $10,739,559,342.

The second item is for training and education—a relatively small amount—only $44,097,840.

The third item is for the Signal Corps, $2,617,506,025.

The fourth item is for the Air Corps—and we find there a rather large sum—$11,316,898,910. As stated yesterday, this

fund is to be used, in the main, to pay for 23,550 additional combat airplanes.

The next item is for the Engineer Corps, in the sum of $874,132,192.

The next item is for ordnance, a rather large sum, almost $10,000,000,000. The money is to be used almost exclusively for the purchase of tanks and other automotive fighting equipment, such as armored cars, and various forms of trucks. The bill carries money with which to build a very large number of this class of fighting equipment. The record does not disclose the number of each particular class of tanks, but if any Senator is interested, I can cite him to the break-down, which will give the exact number of each class of tanks and cars in this category.

The next item is for chemical warfare, in the sum of $620,546,241.

The next is for seacoast defenses, only $97,249,641. That sum is to be used, in the main, for procuring large cannon and the installations necessary to place the cannon ready for service at strategic seaboard points.

The next item is for transportation, including equipment, a rather large sum, almost $4,000,000,000. Of course, it is obvious that to transport the large army we now have, and the one we will assemble in the next few months, and to procure the necessary equipment, the appropriation of a sizable sum is necessary.

The next item is construction and maintenance of establishments, almost $2,500,000,000. This sum is to be used to complete construction of camps already started. There are under way throughout the country a great number of airplane schools, airfields, and military camps. Some of the construction has been under way for some time, and money has been used by the contractors in the first instance, and perhaps some unallocated money has been used to pay the bills. This appropriation is to continue construction, and to reimburse the funds which have been drawn upon so far in order to pay the expenses of such construction.

The next item is for miscellaneous supplies, equipment, and services, $158,403,730.

The next item is for miscellaneous, including administrative expenses, $229,967,951.

The next and last item is for civil components, $5,684,000.

Among these various items we find the sum of twelve and one-half billion dollars. That is to be used for lend-lease purposes. A special board has been created to supervise the requests for lend-lease assistance, and the same board recommends the allocations. So of these sums not all the money is to be used for the purposes which are indicated in the break-down. They may be used for those purposes, but in place of being used in connection with our Army they may be used in connection with the support of the armies of our Allies.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I notice in the report an item of $12,700,000,000 for lend-lease. As a matter of information, what is the whole amount that has been authorized for that purpose in all the appropriations since the lend-lease bill was passed?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The record shows that when the pending bill shall have become law, and if the sum provided in it is used, as it may be used, it will raise the total sum made available for this purpose and chargeable to the War Department to $32,170,000,000.

Mr. McNARY. Thirty-two billion one hundred and seventy million dollars for lend-lease?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Chargeable to the War Department.

Mr. McNARY. Of that sum authorized, what amount has actually been expended under the provisions of the Lend-Lease Act?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I think practically all this money has been allocated to date.

Mr. McNARY. Without any idea of being critical at all, I will say that I have observed in the press, which is usually accurate, that someone high in authority stated that $5,000,000,000 only had been used under the lend-lease authorization.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am advised by good authority that the fund has all been allocated, save about $1,000,000,000. I make that statement based upon information which I think is reliable and correct.

Mr. McNARY. All of what sum?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. All that has been heretofore appropriated. I believe that the $1,000,000,000 which is now unallocated, plus the $12,700,000,000 appropriated by this bill, which will make a total of some thirteen and one-half billion dollars, will be available to the Board for allocation after the pending bill shall become law. That is my information, which I think is reliable.

Mr. President, at this point I should like to place in the RECORD some figures which are official, and I do so in response to some questions which were submitted yesterday.

The question was asked yesterday how much money had been actually expended in our war effort to date. I have a statement before me of date June 26, 1942. It gives the total actually expended in the sum of $13,000,000,000. I stated yesterday it was approximately $15,000,000,000. I was giving the outside maximum sum, and I find upon checking the figure for accuracy that the sum is $13,000,000,000 rather than $15,000,000,000.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Yes; I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. Referring to the appropriation for lease-lend, does the Senator know if any of this money has been spent for maintaining the economies of other countries in Europe, South America, or elsewhere in the world, for such purposes, for instance, as the purchase of the Peruvian cotton crop, or perhaps to help some country to pay for crop failures, or anything of that nature? Does any money come out of the lease-lend appropriation for such purposes?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the committee did not go into that phase of the matter for the reason that on June 12 of this year the President sent to the Congress his report, being the fifth report to Congress of lend-lease operations, and the report is for the period ending June 11, 1942. A copy of the report was placed upon the desk of each Senator, and while I have given the report consideration, my committee did not go into this matter specifically, because we relied upon the report to give us the facts. I think any Member who is interested can obtain from the report all the information the administration thinks it proper to make public.

Mr. AIKEN. Does the Senator know the source of the funds which are being used to buy crops grown in foreign countries, particularly such crops as might come in competition with crops grown in this country?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I have no information which I consider to be reliable which I should like to make public.

Mr. AIKEN. It seems to me the Congress should know whether we spend funds to an unwarranted extent, in order to maintain the domestic economies in other countries, perhaps to the detriment of our own economy. I know we want to help other countries all we can, but as I understood it, the main purpose of the Lend-Lease Act and the appropriations under it was to strengthen in a military manner the other nations who were opposed to the Axis.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the law authorizing the lend-lease appropriations was passed by the Congress, of course, and the law provided that the administrative authorities should take the money appropriated and expend it, and then make reports to the Congress as to how the money had been expended. Under that procedure we cannot anticipate how they are going to expend the money, and we can only learn what has become of the money after it has been expended. The report I referred to gives all the information I know of that is available on this particular question.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. NORRIS. Would it discommode the Senator if I asked him to explain one of the items referred to on page 6 of the report, the ordnance item? It calls for practically $10,000,000,000. It would include the construction of tanks, would it not?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. That item very largely is for tanks, and for armored trucks, and man-carrying trucks.

Mr. NORRIS. Can the Senator give the Senate any information as to the nature of the tanks which are to be constructed? The information I have obtained, which may not be reliable, which I get mainly if not entirely from what is published in the newspapers, is that the recent defeat of the British Army in North Africa came about by reason of the fact that the German Army had many tanks which were larger and superior in quality to the British tanks or to the American tanks, and I got the

idea that that battle resulted as it did principally on that account. I was wondering if the Senator could give us any information which would throw any light on that subject. Have we any tanks, or have the British any tanks, which are equal to the German tanks with which they must contest?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have no report on the relative merits of the American tank and the German tank. I think the General Grant was the tank we sent abroad in the main. I have no report, however, which I would wish to make public, in which I have confidence, as to the relative merits of the American tank and the German tank or any other tank.

Mr. NORRIS. How long will it be, assuming the pending bill becomes law at once, before tanks provided for in the bill can be constructed and put into service?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, yesterday I placed in the RECORD a statement taken from the New York Times of last Sunday, and I think I might read one or two sentences from that statement. It is to be found on page 5675 of the RECORD of yesterday. It is taken from the release of the President's statement, and was published, as I said, in the New York Times of last Sunday. The President is reported to have said in this release:

> In May we produced nearly 4,000 planes and over 1,500 tanks. We also produced nearly 2,000 artillery and antitank guns. This is exclusive of antiaircraft guns and guns to be mounted in tanks.

Then I placed in the RECORD yesterday a statement from the Maritime Commission, as follows:

> The current armament goals of the United States in 1942 are:
>
> Sixty thousand airplanes, including 45,000 combat craft.
>
> Forty-five thousand tanks.
>
> Twenty thousand antiaircraft guns.
>
> Eight million deadweight tons of merchant shipping.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the statement of the number of tanks does not quite give the information I am seeking. What can the Senator tell us, if anything, about the size of the tanks as compared to the tanks they will have to meet on the battlefield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have before me that information. I asked permission of those from whom I thought it necessary to ask permission to make the statement public, and they denied me permission. If the Senator from Nebraska wishes the information, I shall send for and obtain the break-down. It is in one volume, but all contained on one page. I shall be glad to furnish the Senator information as to the size of tanks, as to the number of tanks, and what each particular group of tanks costs. I do not have the information as to their weight, but that information can be obtained.

I will say that we are now making two general groups of tanks. One, of course, is larger than the other. We will make them in very large numbers. I do not desire to disclose the exact number.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Is there any so-called bottleneck in the construction of tanks?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Not to our knowledge. The only bottleneck is the supply of steel.

Mr. WALSH. Is that limited?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Our information is that to date there is an ample supply, but unless the supply is increased by new iron coming in, and additional scrap, the supply may be depleted, and there may be a bottleneck some time in the future.

Mr. WALSH. The Senator is of the opinion that there is nothing to prevent the rapid building and construction of tanks?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No; not at the present time. So far as we can foresee the program is going along and the administrative goals are being met, in many cases increased, and we see nothing that is going to retard or hold us back.

Mr. WALSH. That is gratifying information.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to ask the Senator if he is able to give the information in response to one of the questions I asked, upon which I admit I do not have first-hand information. I have to depend upon the newspapers for what information I have. I should like to know whether the battle in North Africa, which resulted in the capture of Tobruk and a large portion of the British forces, so resulted on account of the inferior class of tanks which the British had, as compared with the German tanks. The British were reported to have had both British and American tanks; but the information in the newspapers was that both the British and American tanks were inferior to the tanks which the Germans had at the beginning of that battle.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the committee did not go into that phase of the matter. It is quite obvious that no one would be justified in stating that our tanks were inferior to any other tanks in the world. If there were some question about it, the authorities would be silent. If they knew that the American tanks were inferior, they would still be silent. We have no information, direct or otherwise, that our equipment is inferior in any particular. We do have information that much of our equipment is superior to anything else that exists in the world. It is conceded that we have the best small rifle in the world. The Garand rifle is conceded by all who profess to know anything about guns to be the best small rifle in the world.

Mr. NORRIS. I believe that. I rely on that statement; but when we are told in what particulars our armament is superior to any other, I do not see any reason why we should not be told in what respects, if any, it is inferior, in order that we may improve the situation, if possible. It seems to me it would be of great value to know, first, whether the report is true, whether, in the battle of North Africa around Tobruk, the Germans used a tank which was superior to and outclassed the British and American tanks which were defending in that battle.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Because of lack of time we did not go into that phase of the matter. No testimony was given, either on or off the record, as to the relative merits of the American tanks in comparison with German tanks. As the Senator knows, the battle occurred only a few days ago, and probably sufficient time has not yet elapsed for us to have reports from our observers in that area. If the authorities have such reports, they were not submitted to us. In fact, our committee did not solicit information along that line.

Mr. NORRIS. I remember reading the report of a correspondent who claimed to have been on the ground, and ostensibly knew what had taken place, and why the Germans were successful. He stated in that report that the German tanks were heavier than the British or American tanks, and that they were able to remain out of range of the British and American tanks and destroy them without any risk of the German tanks being injured.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Of course, it is obvious that if the Germans had tanks with larger and more destructive guns, or guns of greater range than those in the American or British tanks, the German tanks could remain out of range of the American and British tanks and almost pick them off at will.

Mr. NORRIS. That is the way it seemed to me. I thought that if that were the case, and we were making a large appropriation for additional tanks, we should understand the situation and try to remedy the defect if possible.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am sure that if the condition suggested by the Senator from Nebraska exists, it will be remedied.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know that it exists. All I know about it is what I read in the newspapers.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. If it be true that our enemies have larger tanks than we have, and larger guns in their tanks than we have, if those guns have a longer range than our guns, so that the enemy tanks can remain out of range of our tanks and pick off our tanks at will, the War Department will take notice of that condition, and no doubt will readjust its plans and specifications, and try, at least, to procure the best tanks in the world.

I should like to furnish one further figure in response to the question which was asked yesterday by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MCNARY] as I remember, the statement was made that we had a backlog of something like $35,000,000,000. The facts are, as stated a moment ago, that to date we have expended about $13,000,000,000. That means that we have actually written checks on the Treasury in payment of bills for goods delivered and for construction completed, to the sum of about $13,000,000,000.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I assume the Senator is referring to the War Department?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. The War Department only, which, of course, covers the Air Corps.

Second, the record shows that recently—say 30 days ago—the War Department had unexpended money to the extent of $20,000,000,000. Of that $20,000,000,000, $16,000,000,000 was made available only on the 28th of April, 2 months ago. So, of the $20,000,000,000 which was reported unexpended, $16,000,000,000 was not made available until the 28th of April.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator refer to the amount unexpended and in the Treasury, or the amount unobligated?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I am talking about the amount uncommitted and unobligated. The amount expended is the amount paid out by check. The amount obligated is the amount under contract or commitment, or under letters of intent, which means obligated in good faith.

Mr. BYRD. What is the amount which is unexpended?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. All money appropriated to date which has not been depleted by checks. Of that sum, $16,000,000,000 was made available only 2 months ago. Since that time funds have been allocated at the rate of from $3,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 a month. That is the present rate of allocation. The statement shows that on April 28 there was only about $4,000,000,000 of free money. Since that time $16,000,000,000 has been added, making a total of $20,000,000,000; and of that sum no doubt a very large percentage is now either committed by contracts or by statements in the form of letters of intent.

Mr. BYRD. On July 1, after this bill shall have been passed, the total unexpended for national defense will be $160,000,000,000. Of course, that includes the Army, the Navy, and all other branches of national defense. I have prepared a statement which I should like to place in the RECORD, showing that there will be $160,000,000,000 of unexpended balances. That is money which can be spent. I do not mean to say that is unobligated; but after the pending appropriation bill shall have been passed, there will be available in the Treasury, for expenditure for all national defense purposes, $160,000,000,000.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. No doubt, the statement is substantially correct.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I used those figures yesterday. They were given to me voluntarily by a special committee of the Senate which had explored the situation. I gave them not as an argument against the passage of the bill but to show that the bill might go over for 24 hours. I think my point was well taken.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I appreciate the statements made yesterday and again today; but since the question was raised yesterday I thought we should obtain the best information we could for the RECORD. That seems to be the very best information obtainable up to this moment.

In answer to another inquiry, as to the allocation and expenditure of the lend-lease money, I call the attention of the Senate to section 13, on page 58 of the bill. That section provides for the expenditure of $12,700,000,000 carried in this bill. The section is rather brief, and I shall read it:

SEC. 13. Whenever the President deems it to be in the interest of national defense, he may authorize the Secretary of War to sell, transfer title to, exchange, lease, lend, or otherwise dispose of, to the government of any country whose defense the President deems vital to the defense of the United States, any defense articles procured from funds appropriated in this act, in accordance with the provisions of the act of March 11, 1941 (Public, No. 11): *Provided*, That the total value of articles disposed of under this authority shall not exceed $12,700,000,000: *Provided further*, That the term "defense article" as used herein shall be deemed to include defense information and services, and the expenses in connection with the procurement or supplying of defense articles, information, and services.

That is authority for the expenditure of this sum. Under the law the authorities are not required to divulge what they intend to do with the money, but they are required to submit reports from time to time as to what they have done with it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 7, commencing in line 19.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, in support of the pending amendment, I ask that a copy of a letter just received from the National Editorial Association be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL EDITORIAL ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D. C., June 30, 1942.

Hon. ELMER THOMAS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: As you know, the National Editorial Association is a Nation-wide organization of newspaper publishers and editors located largely in the smaller cities and towns. These community newspapers, which are doing their best to stay in business and render an important wartime public service to the reading public, are the particular type of newspapers affected by competition from many Army camp newspapers. Therefore it is of vital concern to these thousands of community newspapers that camp publications should not be permitted to compete with legitimate privately owned daily and weekly newspapers in the vicinity of Army camps.

You are undoubtedly familiar with the fact that economic disruptions due to the war have greatly diminished the advertising revenue of small-town newspapers. If camp newspapers are permitted to solicit local advertising from merchants and other establishments the chances are that many privately owned newspapers will be forced out of business. The National Editorial Association legislative committee has instructed me to express the sincere appreciation to you and your colleagues of the Senate Appropriations Committee of the many newspapers which would be affected by the provisions of the House bill permitting camp newspapers to solicit advertising in the areas surrounding military establishments. The time is too short to allow the various State associations of publishers and editors affiliated with the National Editorial Association to contact Senators from their respective States. However, we hope that in discussing the pending amendment that you will bring the views of this association to the attention of the Senate with the recommendation that the committee amendment be sustained.

With kindest personal regards.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM L. DALEY,
Washington Representative.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment just agreed to is the only committee amendment.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, because this is the last day of the fiscal year, and for fear that something might happen before the bill becomes a law, which would result in a period of time when the money would not be available, I offer an amendment in the form of a new section, to be known as section 19. It is a copy of the section being placed in all appropriation bills now passing through the Senate. It provides that if there should be a delay, the expenditure or obligation of moneys will be legalized.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 60, after line 12, it is proposed to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 19. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1942, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. All obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1942, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill is before the Senate and open to further amendment. If there be no further amendment to be offered, the question is on the engrossment of the amendments and the third reading of the bill.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill, H. R. 7280, was read the third time and passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerks will be authorized to renumber the section at the end of the bill.

NAVAL PROCUREMENT FUND

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1957) to establish the naval procurement fund,

and for other purposes, which were, on page 2, line 16, after "counterwarrants:", to insert "*Provided further*, That advance check payments may be made to the naval procurement fund upon written request to the Paymaster General of the Navy from the appropriate naval appropriation for all or any part of the costs ultimately chargeable to such naval appropriation, subject to appropriate adjustments being made on the basis of the completed actual cost of the supplies, materials, equipment, and services involved:"; on page 3, line 4, to strike out all after "transportation" down to and including "available", in line 6, and insert "costs on materials so procured, and similar transportation costs on materials procured under other contracts shall be charged to the appropriation under which each contract is drawn or to the corresponding current appropriation as may be available, or the Secretary of the Navy may direct any transportation costs to be charged directly to the proper appropriation which would otherwise be ultimately chargeable."

Mr. WALSH. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 109, 111, 112, 156, 162, 192, 200, 212, and 213, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 171, 199, and 214, and concurred therein severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 201, and concurred therein with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to Senate Concurrent Resolution 29, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 2586) to amend sections 1 and 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue the act in effect during the existing war, and for other purposes, to change the title so as to read: "An act to amend sections 1 and 3 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue the act in effect during the existing war, and for other purposes."

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, another conference report is ready; but the Senator in charge of it is not on the floor. Therefore, I move that the Senate proceed to consider executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Several postmasters.

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah, from the Committee on Education and Labor:

Dr. Paul H. Nystrom, of New York, to be a member of the Federal Board for Vocational Education (reappointment).

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

NOMINATION OF THOMAS F. MEANEY

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Thomas F. Meaney to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to this nomination?

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Andrews	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Rosier
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Barbour	Hayden	Schwartz
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hughes	Smathers
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Burton	Lee	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McNary	Truman
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Tydings
Connally	Millikin	Vandenberg
Danaher	Murdock	Wagner
Davis	Murray	Walsh
Doxey	Norris	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
George	O'Mahoney	Willis

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENTS OF STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE JUDICIARY

The VICE PRESIDENT, as in legislative session, laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6599, which was read, as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 29, 1942.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 21 to the bill (H. R. 6599) making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment, as follows: Strike out the sum "$5,000" where it appears in said amendment and insert "$7,500"; and

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 23 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: Strike out the sum "$5,000", where it appears in said amendment and insert "$7,500."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House to Senate amendments Nos. 21 and 23.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada

The motion was agreed to.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I submit a conference report and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, as in legislative session, the report will be received and read.

The Chief Clerk read the report as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 4, 5, 6, 8, 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 37, 39, 43, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 61, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 91, 96, 105, 113, 114, 115, 118, 119, 123, 124, 125, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 135, 144, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 155, 158, 163, 172, 174, 179, 180, 184, 189, 190, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 202, 207, 208, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 259, 264, 265, 266, 267, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 277, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, and 297.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 15, 24, 29, 45, 63, 64, 65, 88, 89, 90, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 106, 107, 108, 120, 121, 126, 136, 137, 147, 148, 160, 164, 165, 166, 173, 176, 185, 186, 203, 204, 205, 210, 261, 280, and 281; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$967,170"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,447,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 9: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,340,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 10: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"Fire protection of forests, forest industries, and strategic facilities (national defense): For an additional amount to be added to the appropriation contained in the

'Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942' for 'Fire protection of forests, forest industries, and strategic facilities (national defense)', $95,900, to be immediately available, of which not to exceed $3,000 may be used for personal services in the District of Columbia."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$47,320"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$703,680"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$115,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$125,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$32,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$32,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 42: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 42, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$210,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$65,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 60: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$165,980"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$85,130"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$134,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$551,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,822,505"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,551,936"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,620,870"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 93: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 93, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$925,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 94: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 94, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$44,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$39,700"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: ", including not to exceed $40,000 of said amount to be used for exterminating wolves and coyotes"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 110: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 110, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,253,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 116: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 116, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$40,650"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 117: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 117, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$147,850"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 122: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 122, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$113,875"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 132: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 132, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$43,855"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 133: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 133, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 134: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 134, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 138: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 138, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$724,840"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 139: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 139, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$375,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 140: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 140, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$80,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 141: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 141, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$175,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 142: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 142, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,475,840"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 143: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 143, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,647,060"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 145: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 145, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$399,750; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 146: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 146, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$9,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 154: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 154, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,249,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 157: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$6,249,070"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 159: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 159, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$750,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 161: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 161, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 167: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 167, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$800,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 168: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 168, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$625,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 169: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 169, and

agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$225,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 170: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 170, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$525,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 175: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 175, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$997,015"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 177: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 177, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$644,580"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 178: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 178, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 181: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 181, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,298,800"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 182: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 182, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$170,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 183: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 183, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$975,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 187: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 187, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$339,750"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 188: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 188, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,691,090"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 191: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 191, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$356,205"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 206: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 206, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$742,875"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 209: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 209, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$55,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 211: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 211, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$2,167,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 258: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 258, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$910,715"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 260: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 260, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$467,080"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 262: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 262, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: "$365,540, of which $25,000 shall be available immediately"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 263: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 263, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$85,690"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 268: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 268, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$35,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 269: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 269, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 270: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 270, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$748,550"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 276: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 276, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$4,661,570"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 278: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 278, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$5,911,570"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 279: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 279, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$921,505"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 109, 111, 112, 156, 162, 171, 192, 199, 200, 201, 212, 213, and 214.

CARL HAYDEN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
ELMER THOMAS,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY,
GERALD P. NYE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

JED JOHNSON,
J. G. SCRUGHAM,
JAMES M. FITZPATRICK,
CHAS. H. LEAVY,
HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
ROBERT F. RICH,
Managers on the part of the House.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the report?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the report.

Mr. HAYDEN. I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may I ask a question of the Senator from Arizona?

Mr. HAYDEN. Certainly.

Mr. McCARRAN. An item was inserted with reference to the Bureau of Mines. I wonder if the Senator has in mind what was done with that amendment.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator has reference, I presume, to the amendment adopted by the Senate providing an increase of a million dollars in the appropriation for investigation of deposits of critical and essential minerals?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. HAYDEN. In conference it was made $900,000.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then, the conference committee "nicked" me for a hundred thousand dollars?

Mr. HAYDEN. Not in the first conference, but in the second conference when the bill came back from the House of Representatives, the House insisted on the lesser amount and we had to agree. However, $900,000 is quite a substantial sum.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT, as in legislative session, laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 6845, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 29, 1942.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 109, 111, 112, 156, 162, 192, 200, 212, and 213 to the bill (H. R. 6845) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and concur therein.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 171 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$78,979,340."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 199 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

"Construction and equipment of an electrodevelopment laboratory: To cover the construction and equipment of an electrodevelopment laboratory to study the application of electrical energy to the processing of minerals, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase in the District of Columbia and elsewhere of furniture and equipment, stationery and supplies; typewriting, adding, and computing machines, accessories and repairs; professional and scientific books and publications; traveling expenses; purchase of land; construction and equipment of a building or buildings to house the electrodevelopment laboratory; engagement by contract or otherwise, and at such rates of compensation as the Secretary of the Interior may determine, of the services of architects or firms or corporations thereof, that are necessary to design and construct the building or buildings;

and for all other necessary expenses not included in the foregoing, $500,000, of which amount not to exceed $8,300 may be expended for personal services in the District of Columbia: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (41 U. S. C. 5) shall not be construed to apply to this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the Bureau of Mines, is hereby authorized to accept lands, buildings, or other contributions from public or private sources offering to cooperate in carrying out the purposes of this laboratory."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 201 to said bill and concur therein with amendments as follows: In lines 26 and 27 of said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "$4,000,000 to be immediately available" and insert "the sum of $4,000,000 is hereby transferred from the appropriation 'Aviation, Navy, 1943', and made available for the purposes of this paragraph"; and in line 35 of said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "appropriated" and insert "made available."

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 214 to said bill and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum inserted by said amendment insert "$11,482,140."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I move——

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HAYDEN. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I observe a good many concessions made by the Senate conferees. I should like to have the able Senator give us sort of an airplane view of the record made in the conference. I have in mind particularly the Central Valley project in California and other amendments which the Senate adopted. I should like to have a little light thrown on the subject.

Mr. HAYDEN. The House, by a record vote—yeas 193 to nays 141—concurred in the Senate amendment No. 156 relating to funds for the Central Valley project in California. Consequently that amendment is no longer in disagreement.

I will say to the Senator that when we went to conference the first time we made what was thought to be a very equitable adjustment of the differences between the House and the Senate, but when the conference report was submitted to the House it was pointed out in the House that that body had receded in a very much larger number of instances than had the Senate. The reason for that was that the Senate had adopted 151 amendments affecting travel pay. The House had taken the travel pay for each bureau and reduced it in some instances 5 percent, in other instances 10, 20, and 25 percent, and, indeed, in one instance, as high as 50 percent. Following the precedent established in the agricultural appropriation bill for the next fiscal year the Senate restored all the Budget estimates, and then at the end of the bill inserted a provision directing the Secretary of the Interior, before the 1st of August, to return to the Treasury a lump sum equal to 10 percent of the total appropriations made for travel pay. This left to the determination of the Department apportionment among its various branches of the sum of money which must be returned to the Treasury rather than stating in the bill just where the specific cuts should be made. That provision did not appeal to the House. So when we went to conference the second time the Senate conferees very promptly receded on all the 151 amendments relating to the subject of travel pay.

As the bill now stands, the Senate receded 171 times, the House 43 times; the House agreed to Senate amendments with amendments in 70 instances, and there was disagreement in 13 instances. In the 13 instances where amendments in disagreement were returned to the House, that body, as I have said, concurred in the Senate amendment relative to the Central Valley project, and the House has agreed to all the other amendments except 4, and in those cases they agreed with amendments. It is my purpose now to move that the Senate agree to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate Nos. 171, 199, 201, and 214. If the motion is adopted, it will complete the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Arizona.

The motion was agreed to.

AID FOR SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I desire to make a few remarks concerning the little businessmen's bill which was recently passed by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee to address the Senate, as in legislative session? The Chair hears none, and the Senator will proceed.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, a little less than 2 months ago the Congress passed a bill which was entitled "A bill to mobilize the productive facilities of small business in the interest of successful prosecution of the war, and for other purposes." The bill provided, among other things, that, in addition to the powers and duties of the Chairman of the War Production Board, it should be his duty to appoint a deputy to mobilize aggressively the productive capacity of all the small business concerns throughout the country for the purpose of determining the means by which such small business concerns could most efficiently and effectively be utilized to augment war production.

The act also provided that a corporation, known as the Smaller War Plants Corporation, should be set up, with a central office in the city of Washington; that it should have a corporate stock of $150,000,000, subscribed by the United States through the Secretary of the Treasury; that there should be five directors of the board of the Corporation, appointed by the Chairman of the War Production Board; and that the directors should have control and management of the Corporation.

Among other things, it was provided that the deputy appointed by the Chairman of the War Production Board should certify to the Government procurement officers with respect to the competency, capacity, and credit of the small business concerns throughout the country, their ability to perform specific Government contracts, their ability to make subcontracts, their need for loans, and like things. The bill was signed by the President, I think, some 18 or 20 days ago, and, as I have already stated, it had been passed by the Senate and the House nearly 2 months ago.

Up to this date, as I understand, no appointment has been made by the Chairman of the War Production Board of a deputy to serve under him who would perform the functions I have mentioned and other functions set out in the act; nor have there been appointed the group of directors—five in number—provided by the act, who would control the affairs of the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

Precious time is being lost, nearly 2 months having passed, with the larger concerns of the country doing business as usual, while, according to information many of us receive, the condition of the smaller business concerns throughout the country is becoming increasingly serious. Many of them are actually out of business now, having recently closed their doors, and now in order that something might be done as rapidly as possible to save the situation, I hope the Chairman of the War Production Board will make the selections of the men who are to set up and manage the Smaller War Plants Corporation, and of the deputy provided for.

A great deal of gossip has been going about here and there as to why there has been delay and who might be appointed. I do not place much credence in some of the gossip, because I have a great deal of confidence in Mr. Nelson, who has the power of appointment in these cases. I think he has an earnest desire to do a worth-while job for the small businessman. In my opinion, he realizes that each day sees more of them forced out of business. I think he realizes that each day that passes sees their condition becoming more precarious.

To point out some of the things I have mentioned about the gossip going around, the rumors which are being heard, I refer to a clipping from a Kentucky newspaper which quotes the Pearson and Allen Merry-Go-Round, and says, among other things:

> Biggest undercover wire pulling in Washington, affecting millions of little businessmen, is in the selection of the five-man board to spend the $200,000,000 appropriated for small business under the Murray bill.

That should be $150,000,000 instead of $200,000,000. It refers to the Murray bill. That is because the so-called Small Business Committee, of which I happen to be a member, is presided over by the junior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the bill for the relief of small business was known as the Murray bill.

The article continues:

> Big question is whether this new Small War Plants Corporation is to be administered by real friends of little business or by the same conservative big businessmen responsible for leaving little business out in the cold.
>
> This has been one of the biggest botches of the defense program. In Germany every little garage has been given a war order, a small part of an airplane to put together and then send to the assembly line. In England, Beaverbrook licked the bottleneck on airplane production by distributing the business among a host of small factories.

But in the United States, the big motor and munitions moguls insisted on taking the time and much needed steel to erect brand new plants covering acres of land, instead of farming out production to small factories forced into idleness because of lack of materials.

Finally Congress, exploding over the plight of small business, enacted the bill for the Smaller War Plants Corporation under the leadership of Senators JIM MURRAY, of Montana, and JIM MEAD, of New York.

This was a great triumph over the $1-a-year men and their big-business-minded bureaucratic pals. But now if certain of Nelson's $1-a-year generalissimos have their way, little business is apt to continue just as much out in the cold as before.

For the man strongly urged on Nelson as head of the Smaller War Plants Corporation is Mark Brown, "big shot" Chicago banker. Leader of this undercover drive for Brown is his close buddy, Sidney Weinberg, Wall Street banker and Nelson's executive assistant. In inner War Production Board circles, Weinberg is credited with being largely responsible for the retention of so many business-as-usual-minded $1-a-yearers in War Production Board.

The writers of the column then discuss one or two other men who have been mentioned.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the Senator repeat what the article said about Mr. Brown, of Chicago, Ill.?

Mr. STEWART. Referring to the selection of the five members of the small businessmen's group to control the Smaller War Plant Corporation, the column says:

For the man strongly urged on Nelson as head of the Small War Plants Corporation is Mark Brown, big-shot Chicago banker. Leader of this undercover drive for Brown is his close buddy, Sidney Weinberg, Wall Street banker and Nelson's executive assistant.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know anyone by the name of Mark Brown who is a prominent banker.

Mr. STEWART. I do not know him. There are very few bankers I do know. [Laughter.]

Mr. LUCAS. As I recall, in the early part of the story the writers made a mistake in their figures; what was it, a mistake of $50,000,000?

Mr. STEWART. They stated that $200,000,000 was appropriated for small business under the Murray bill. The act itself, as I have called to the attention of the Senate, provides for only $150,000,000.

Mr. LUCAS. The act is, of course, available to everyone, and it seems to me rather strange that they could make a mistake of $50,000,000.

Mr. STEWART. I hope some of the other statements they make in the article will also prove to be mistakes.

Mr. LUCAS. That is the point to which I desire to call attention. In other words, if they made a mistake of $50,000,000 with respect to something about which everyone knows, something that is a matter of public record, I am wondering if their observations and speculations on these other matters are not equally wrong.

Mr. STEWART. I have no way of knowing, but I have heard rumors and gossip to the effect that the big business interests are undertaking to control the Smaller War Plants Corporation.

Mr. LUCAS. I hope that is not true.

Mr. STEWART. I, too, hope it is not true.

Mr. LUCAS. In great measure I agree with the sentiments expressed in the article, so far as big businessmen controlling the situation is concerned, but, at the same time, this is typical of a great many articles that apparently are not based on authentic information but on rumor only, as the Senator has pointed out.

One of the worst situations existing in Washington and throughout the country at the present time is that concerning rumors. One cannot go into a Washington hotel or in a public building, or scarcely anywhere, without being confronted with a group of rumors, or a certain amount of propaganda, which, it seems to me, is tremendously effective from the standpoint of the Axis Powers.

There apparently are but few news commentators or news writers who have knowledge of the facts, and of those who possess such a familiarity with the facts there are some who prefer not to use them because, as a general rule, they do not make sensational headlines. If there is some skepticism associated with a situation, if there is something concerning it that someone can write which will lead the individual who is reading it to wonder whether or not it is right or wrong, that is the very thing that makes news. If the reading public is furnished accurate information concerning a subject, it will accept it, and that will be the end of it. However, if it is given something to think about, some conjecture or speculation about some great problem existing in the country today, that is the thing that makes news and keeps people in a mental query. It disunites people in this country.

It seems to me that the commentators and people who are writing news articles in this great emergency, when the life of America is threatened, should be able to place their fingers upon facts, and from those facts give the American people the information to which they are entitled.

I have heard statements made over the radio time and time again. I have heard commentators, and I have read news articles from various individuals who are writing about this war, and time and time again they have substituted their opinions, based upon unreliable facts, for the opinions of the Army and Navy and the War Production Board, and other agencies in Washington who are attempting, in my humble opinion, to do a good job.

So long as individuals on the War Production Board, so long as the men who are running the Army and Navy are the type of men we think they are, so long as we believe in their honesty and their integrity and their patriotism, it does seem to me that if one of these men should make a mistake we ought to give him the benefit of the doubt, unless he continues to make too many mistakes, and then, of course, it is time for our country to condemn and criticize. However, unless the American Congress and the American people have faith and absolute faith in those who are running this Army and running this Navy, then we shall never get, in my humble opinion, the maximum effort out of them we are entitled to, and the war will last longer.

Mr. President, we have spent millions and millions of dollars—yes, billions perhaps—over a long period of time, in training men at Annapolis and West Point and at other places for the Army and Navy, giving to them a career, in the particular field for which they are best fitted, and after years and years of experience and study along these lines it seems to me the American people should have faith in that group in the Army and Navy. I for one have faith in them, and until someone can show me some fraud or some corruption or some graft in connection with these different departments, the Senator from Illinois is going to continue to defend them as a matter of national unity.

I do not say they have not made mistakes. I do not say that they will not continue to make mistakes, but I do say that since Pearl Harbor the Army and the Navy and the War Production Board, and every other agency, practically, here in Washington, have done a magnificent job. They have been working overtime, hours and hours and hours, and have been attempting to perform a patriotic service in behalf of the American people and this great Nation of ours. For the life of me I cannot understand why it is that commentators and individuals writing newspaper articles take upon themselves to substitute their judgment for the judgment of men who have lived a life of 25 or 30 or 40 years in the Military, Air, and Naval Establishments. It is beyond me; I cannot understand it. I hear some fine commentators who really comment on the news and comment on the real facts as they understand them, and then I hear others tell the world, practically, what this Nation ought to do in connection with conducting the war.

I undertake to say there is no group of individuals, whether they belong in the United States Senate or outside the United States Senate, who can sit here or there as arm-chair strategists and tell the Navy or Army what they should do.

Mr. President, if the time shall ever come when any group of individuals substitute its judgment for that of the Army and the Navy, and if the Army and the Navy are going to follow the judgment of such group of individuals, then we can be sure that defeat will be ours, because war cannot be successfully waged on such a basis. Anyone who has had experience in the armed service, who has had experience in dealing with the different branches of government, in my humble opinion can reach no other conclusion, if he is honest about the matter.

Mr. President, I plead with commentators and I plead with those who are writing in the press—and I do it with the utmost sincerity—that as a matter of national unity, as a matter of winning the war as soon as possible, as a matter of saving boys from destruction in the great catastrophe which is overwhelming the

world, that they quit speculating and conjecturing about this or that unless they really know what they are talking about.

Mr. President, I make this argument because in the beginning the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART] said that those who wrote this column had made a mistake of $50,000,000 in connection with the amount of money that had been appropriated by the Congress of the United States in aid of small business men, and if they make a mistake of $50,000,000 in connection with a matter which is common knowledge to every Member of the Senate and the House of Representatives, then I am wondering how far anyone could go in saying that the article is correct in any of its parts.

My criticism is uttered in the best of faith. I have friends in the newspaper game and among those who are on the air. I am talking now for my country in the greatest hour of peril it has faced in all its history. All one has to do is to look about over the world and see what is going on in Libya, in Russia, and in the Pacific to understand that this is no pink-tea party, and this is no time, Mr. President, for individuals to sit around in the cocktail lounges of Washington and other places and constantly spread rumors and gossip with respect to matters concerning which they know nothing.

This morning I heard a radio commentator say that he believed this and that was going to be done, and that this and that would happen, and so on. Mr. President, it is not right to do such a thing. Last Sunday I heard Upton Close on my radio in the Wardman Park Hotel. I never heard such a miserable sermon in all my life. I never heard such a pessimistic sermon as that which I heard Upton Close deliver over the radio for 15 minutes. Following that 15-minute period I heard Colonel Dupuy speak on the "Army Hour" for 15 minutes, and he gave a speech which was really worth while, about which the American people could readily think and from which they could take heart. I compared those two speeches as I sat in my room, and I wondered which one of the two speakers had more at stake, which one had more interest in our Government and our way of life; whether it was Colonel Dupuy of the Army, who is ready to lay down his life for his country, or Upton Close out in California.

Mr. President, I say it is not fair, it is not right for commentators or newspaper writers to speculate in the manner some of them do. I sometimes wonder how far commentators ought to go. God knows I am for the Bill of Rights, hook, line, and sinker. I am for the civil rights which exist in the Constitution. I never want to see them destroyed. But, Mr. President, we are in a great emergency, we are in a real emergency. The life of America is threatened, and do not think it is not. All one has to do is to look across the Libyan Desert at this hour in order to find out exactly what is going on so far as the Axis drive is concerned, or to look into the Russian front, or look into the Pacific area, as I stated before.

Mr. President, I did not expect to make this speech, but the mere fact that the great discrepancy referred to by the Senator from Tennessee occurred has caused this outburst for whatever it may be worth. I have never been more sincere in my life in pleading to the press and to the commentators of America to quit submitting their judgment for the judgment of the men in the Army and the Navy and in other high places, who really ought to know what is going on; and if they do not know, God help us.

Is there a single Member of the United States Senate who would submit his judgment in place of that of General Marshall, Admiral King, or General Arnold, or any of the high officials who have been trained for many years in the military, air, and naval way of life? Yet we can find a radio commentator, we can find a newspaper expert, almost every day, ready to say that he knows just what America ought to do and what the United Nations ought to do in this great crisis.

Mr. President, from time to time I shall comment in connection with what seems to me to be one of the things that has constantly divided the American people because the radio commentators and the writers in the press have their adherents and their fans, and I am one of them. I listen to them. It seems to me they are in a position to do the greatest good, if they will do it, especially the radio commentators. They are in a better position to do good than practically any single group that exists in America today. I admire those who give the facts and the news; they are doing a real service to their country. But those who do otherwise should not continue and attempt to submit their judgment and give their own ideas as to what should be done. I sometimes wonder why they do it. I confess I cannot understand why they do, especially when the world is on fire and our beloved country is not beyond the conflagration.

Mr. President, I am sorry I took so much of the time of the distinguished Senator from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], and I thank him for yielding.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. STEWART. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY. As one of those who proposed this legislation in the first instance, I have followed it through its course in Congress and since it has been signed by the President. I have also been in touch with Mr. Donald Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, in regard to the personnel to be set up to carry the act into effect. I think it is very important that there should not be any misunderstanding or misapprehension with regard to the attitude of Mr. Nelson in connection with this legislation. Mr. Nelson has been in favor of and supported this legislation from the very beginning as an effective means of utilizing the small plants of the country in war production. It was through his assistance and his able advocacy of the measure to an important degree that we were able to put it through the Congress by a unanimous vote. He is earnestly anxious to see that the law is now put into effect, and that a proper and competent set-up is provided to make it effective.

Of course, it is true that some little time has elapsed since the measure was signed by the President. I think it is 18 days since it was signed. In the meantime, Mr. Nelson has been engaged consulting various persons whom he is considering for the board of directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation. He is also devoting some time and study to the problem of securing the services of an able and qualified man who will act as his deputy to carry out the purposes of the legislation. Senators can easily see that this is not a simple problem for Mr. Nelson. It requires care and study.

Mr. President, the selection of the proper men to carry out this work is vital to the success of the program. The success of the act will depend on the ability and character of the men who will be selected to put it into effect. It is important, of course, that Mr. Nelson should exercise the greatest care in the selection of those men. It is not a simple matter. He must have able men but he must have men also who are sympathetic with the objects to be achieved. I am satisfied that he is moving as rapidly as he can under all the circumstances. In addition to the work of setting up this personnel for the Smaller War Plants Corporation, of course he is engaged in scores of other important problems connected with the war program which take his time.

For instance, I undertook to contact him this morning and I found that he was appearing before a committee of the Senate. It can easily be seen, therefore, that while there has been a little delay, it is not due to any neglect on his part. He is as earnestly desirous of setting up an effective personnel for this corporation as any Member of the Congress is. I am satisfied that when he does set it up it will be a competent board, and that he will have an able and qualified deputy to carry the provisions of the act into effect.

I believe he is now about on the verge of naming the personnel, but he must of necessity consult these men and it may take him a day or two finally to make up his mind as to who shall serve on the board. I thought I should say this so as to prevent any misapprehension on the part of the Senate regarding Donald Nelson. I am confident he is going to appoint men on the board who will be deeply interested in the welfare of the small business men of the country, and who will not be influenced or dominated in any manner by any other interests or considerations whatever.

I thank the Senator from Tennessee for yielding to me.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] for their contributions to the debate. I will say to the Senator from Illinois that I share his views with respect to the idea of national unity. I am deeply concerned about such things. I think everyone is. There is nothing I have said or nothing in the article I read

which is critical of the War Department or of the Navy. The criticism, if such there be, I feel is directed at the Chairman of the War Production Board, Mr. Nelson.

I stated at the outset that I had confidence in Mr. Nelson's desire to appoint men on the Board who would be sympathetic toward the interests of small business men. Let me say to the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] who is chairman of the Small Business Committee, that I agree with the remarks which he has just made. However, the fact remains that nearly 2 months have elapsed since the bill was passed. Time is of the essence. If the reports which we receive are correct, many small business enterprises are going out of business every day. Hearings on the bill were held many months preceding the date on which the bill was passed and later signed by the President. As I understand, the bill in its entirety was practically agreed upon between Mr. Nelson and the Small Business Committee, through its chairman, before it was finally passed. In the beginning a somewhat different bill was introduced, the philosophy of which was not acceptable to the Chairman of the War Production Board. The bill which was finally passed and signed by the President represents a measure which in the main is agreeable to Mr. Nelson, I believe.

Of course, there must be some delay in connection with appointing these men, but this question has been before us for a long time. While the delay up to this point has hurt some persons, it has not destroyed the effort. However, the thing which would destroy the effort would be the appointment as directors of the Smaller War Plants Corporation of men who do not have a sympathetic interest in the smaller business men of the country.

The other day I wrote Mr. Nelson a letter in which I stated that I felt that he had a desire to appoint to the directorate of the Smaller War Plants Corporation men who have a sympathetic interest in small business concerns. I stated in the letter that small business concerns must have attention within a short time if the reports which I have been receiving are true, because they are going broke and going out of business. They must have prime contracts. They cannot subsist on crumbs. They must receive real financial aid.

The Senator from Illinois criticizes the Pearson and Allen column from which I have just read. I do not vouch for its truthfulness. I hope it is entirely incorrect. When I read it I stated that it confirmed in print some of the rumors which have been circulating by word of mouth for weeks. While that article may be subject to criticism, at the same time it points out that the big interests of the country, true to form, and true to what many witnesses who appeared before the small business committee from time to time said, are about to undertake to scuttle the Smaller War Plants Corporation from the inside. Such can be done very easily. That ship can be scuttled just as an American vessel manned by German sailors could be scuttled. Just appoint the wrong men as directors and as deputy and all we have done goes for naught.

My only interest in the matter—which I am sure is the interest of every other Senator—is that something definite be done as quickly as possible for the purpose of giving relief to small business concerns. If men not in sympathy with small business are appointed as directors they can destroy our efforts. I have been informed recently by representatives of two or three small business concerns in my State who came here seeking Government contracts which they were able to perform, that they were told absolutely that they would not even be allowed to bid on the contracts because the contracts were to be given to larger concerns in other sections of the country without competitive bidding.

Of course, this type of business ought to be distributed over the country. The smaller business concerns must have contracts in order to exist. Many of them have been put out of business because they have been unable to obtain materials with which to carry on. Their business is perhaps not classified in the category of war business or essential civilian business, and they cannot obtain materials affected by priority orders.

I believe that the small business committee, under the leadership of the Senator from Montana, has done a fine job, and I hope it will continue its efforts. I understand that the funds under which it has been operating have been nearly all spent, and that further appropriations will be necessary to continue its efforts. I think it is highly important that a reasonable appropriation be made for that committee, because I think it is to the interest of the small business concerns and of the people throughout the Nation as a whole that this be done.

I conclude my remarks merely by repeating that the reason I rose to make this statement in connection with small business concerns was not to be unfairly critical of Mr. Nelson or anybody else. As I stated, I have confidence in him and I hope he will not listen to big interests. However, I emphasize the fact that the Small War Plants Corporation should begin operations as soon as possible. Its directorate should be selected to that end; and the men who comprise the directorate should have a full understanding of and complete sympathy with the problems of the small business concerns of America. The small business concerns are the backbone of the Nation's business. In each town and community they employ manpower; they pay taxes, Government, State, county, and municipal; and to mistreat them now is to do a real injury to America.

CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS ON EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Thomas F. Meaney to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, there are a number of other nominations on the calendar. I ask unanimous consent that they be disposed of before taking up the Meaney nomination.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none. The clerk will state the next nomination.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Peirson M. Hall to be United States district judge for the southern district of California.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of George F. Alexander to be United States district judge for division No. 1, district of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of William T. Mahoney to be United States marshal for division No. 1, district of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Joseph A. McDonald to be United States marshal for division No. 4, district of Alaska.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the Executive Calendar, with the exception of the nomination passed over.

STATE DIRECTORS FOR THE OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS—NOMINATIONS REPORTED AND CONFIRMED

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, I report favorably sundry nominations of State directors for the Office of Government Reports, and ask unanimous consent for their present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nominations? The Chair hears none. The nominations will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Louis F. Hutchinson to be State director for the Office of Government Reports for the State of Indiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Rexford C. McCullough, Jr., to be State director for the Office of Government Reports for the State of Louisiana.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Oliver Jenkins to be State director for the Office of Government Reports for the State of New Hampshire.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harry L. Griffin to be State director for the Office of Government Reports for the State of North Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John E. Walsh to be State di-

rector for the Office of Government Reports for the State of Vermont.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael Francis Prendergast to be State director for the Office of Government Reports for the State of Maryland.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be immediately notified.

NOMINATION OF THOMAS F. MEANEY

The Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Thomas F. Meaney to be United States district judge for the District of New Jersey.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I should like to inquire whether the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] wishes to proceed with his remarks.

Mr. SMATHERS. No.

Mr. NORRIS. Very well, Mr. President; I shall proceed with mine. The Senator from New Jersey was to have opened this debate. However, he has declined to do so, and the other side will probably have to go ahead.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of suggesting the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from North Dakota for that purpose?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Andrews	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Rosier
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Barbour	Hayden	Schwartz
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hughes	Smathers
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Burton	Lee	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McNary	Truman
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Tydings
Connally	Millikin	Vandenberg
Danaher	Murdock	Wagner
Davis	Murray	Walsh
Doxey	Norris	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
George	O'Mahoney	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LEE in the chair). Sixty-nine Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, it is refreshing to know that the RECORD shows that there is a quorum present, but it will not do to look around over the Chamber, because it will be observed at once that there is not a quorum present. So, to a great extent, it is to empty seats I shall talk, but I realize now, as I have all the while, that one of the reasons why I shall be compelled to do that is that, as I understand the question now at issue, it is a question of machine control, and I think when we look over the vacant seats we can accept the situation as an illustration of machine control.

Mr. President, as I see it, this is an important question. The confirmation or rejection of the nomination of Mr. Meaney is a national question. It is not a local question; it is not a question affecting New Jersey alone, but it is a question affecting the entire United States. In this question California, Florida, Maine, Michigan, Louisiana, and all the intervening States are vitally interested; and they know about it, Mr. President. The question involved is whether the Hague machine, which is one of the most disreputable, demagogic, political machines that ever existed shall extend its power beyond New Jersey and take in the Federal Government.

It is said that there is no politics in this question, but, Mr. President, there is, there always has been, and there always will be. If Senators think that the settlement of this question and the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Meaney will quiet patriotic people all over this Nation, they have another guess coming. It is impossible to keep this question out of politics, and my Democratic friends are going to meet it on every stump in America if they vote solidly for the confirmation of Mr. Meaney's nomination. It is well known by the child in the streets in New Jersey particularly that Meaney is a representative of the Hague machine. That is not denied, so far as I know. No one questions the fact that Mr. Meaney is the selection of Mr. Hague for a judicial position for life.

Mr. Meaney was formerly common pleas judge in New Jersey, drawing a salary of $15,000 a year. He quit that position because, he said, it did not pay sufficient money, and that is the report we have from the Judiciary Committee submitted by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS]. As a matter of fact, what happened was that Mr. Hague's son was desirous of going on to the Supreme Court of New Jersey. He was not a lawyer; so far as I know he had never run for a political office or anything of that kind; but a member of the supreme court, the court of appeals and errors, had to resign in order to make a vacancy. So Mr. Meaney resigned; young Mr. Hague was appointed to the court, and is there now. But something had to be done for the man who resigned.

A vacancy had to be made for him, and Meaney, as judge of the common pleas court, resigned in order to make a vacancy for that man.

Meaney gave up his position on the court in order to practice law, ostensibly because $15,000 a year was not enough of a salary for him. He then became an attorney, at $20,000 a year, for the liquidator of a failed bank, in most places ordinarily called a "receiver." He held that position until he was removed last April, as I recall the date. He is now about to get his reward. He has been nominated to be Federal district judge. So that he resigned a position paying him $15,000 a year, which was not salary enough, and is making a bitter struggle to get this position, which will pay him only $10,000 a year. That is a circumstance worth considering.

It is said by those who advocate the confirmation of Mr. Meaney that the Federal judgship will be a life position, and that the place on the common pleas bench was not. For all practical purposes, the position he held before was a life job. I believe the law of New Jersey provides that the judges on the court of common pleas, the court over which Meaney presided, must be divided between the great political parties. At least, that has been the practice; I do not know whether it is the law. The Senators from New Jersey can correct me if I am wrong about that. Even though an anti-Hague man, as is the case now, had been Governor of New Jersey, he could not have appointed to fill a vacancy on the court of common pleas a man of his party, if the vacancy belonged to the other party. So, as a matter of fact, Meaney resigned a $15,000 job in order to get a $10,000 job.

Hague had a large measure of control over New Jersey and over all the officials of the State. He owned and carried in his pocket the city where he lived in Hudson County. Senators now present and those who are not present know of some of the things which happened in the courts of New Jersey. Mr. Hague was not satisfied with being ruler of a city and State. He is now extending his authority, through the means of this appointment, into the domain of the United States Government.

Sometime ago, when Mr. Hague was carrying on his rule in Jersey City, when he was prohibiting men from making speeches, when he was interfering with the right of assembly and free speech, it became necessary, in order to insure citizens liberty, that an injunction be issued. A case was commenced against Hague to enjoin him from interfering with the liberties and the rights of American citizens.

The man then sitting in the United States district court, Judge Clark, was one Hague could not handle and could not control, and Judge Clark issued the injunction, and on the trial of the issue made it final. The case went to the Supreme Court of the United States, and the decision was affirmed. So there was one loophole which Hague had not closed, and confirmation of this nomination would close it. Who will say that if Meaney had been on the bench instead of Clark, that injunction would have been issued?

As I understand, the State of New Jersey elects only three whose jurisdiction covers the entire State. One is the Governor; the other two are Senators. The Governor of New Jersey was opposed to this nomination and is opposed to its confirmation. One of the Senators from New Jersey is opposed to it and, I understand, will make an argument against confirmation. He has already issued a

public statement in which he condemns the appointment of Mr. Meaney to this life position.

Mr. President, the Governor of New Jersey opposed the appointment of Meaney, and he is opposed to his confirmation, as I have stated. Almost daily I have been in receipt of comments in reference to this nomination of Hague-controlled newspapers, which seem to have forgotten that Meaney and Hague are involved in it, but they spend their time, their space, their eloquence, and their ability in abusing the Governor of New Jersey.

The Governor of New Jersey appeared before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, in opposition to confirmation. He was confronted there by Members of the House of Representatives. Before I conclude I shall read the testimony taken before the committee. A Member of the House of Representatives, who is chairman of the Democratic State Committee of New Jersey, appeared before the subcommittee when Governor Edison testified. She asked permission of the committee to ask the Governor a question, which privilege of course was granted. So she made a stump speech, though a question was involved in it. The Governor answered the question.

The Governor of New Jersey is a modest man. He does not boast of his ability to make great speeches, or brag of his mixing in politics. He is like his father, a modest, humble citizen. The Governor of New Jersey is the son of one of the greatest American citizens who ever lived. He is the son of a man of international fame and reputation. But when he exercises his prerogative to oppose the confirmation of a man like Meaney, he is denounced, as he was before the subcommittee by the Member of the House of Representatives to whom I have referred. I shall read the exact language used before I conclude, but, as I recall, he was charged there with being the greatest hypocrite who ever walked through New Jersey. I think that is the exact language.

I presume similar treatment will be accorded those here who have the effrontery to oppose the confirmation of this man. They will be denounced. However, Mr. President, the American people know something about the Hague machine; in every hamlet and every community in our country they know about it.

The statement has been made that we should keep this nomination out of politics. To do so would be as impossible as to stop the flow of the tides or the rising and setting of the sun. I think it should be so. People will not often condemn a man merely because he is a candidate for public office, but if one is identified as a Hague candidate, backed by the Hague machine, that in itself is enough to condemn him in the eyes of the American people.

I do not claim to have any ability as a prophet or a judge of the reactions of people, and I shall not charge anything for the judgment or the prophecy which I am about to make, but if I know anything about human nature and the American people, I say to you, Mr. President, that if the Senate confirms this nomination, its action will be received with condemnation and shame on the part of nearly all liberty-loving people in the United States.

Mr. President, I do not suppose my remarks will be logically arranged. I am not the one who started the opposition. I was not a member of the subcommittee to whom the nomination was referred for investigation. However, I have read the evidence, and I heard it discussed in the full committee. I listened to the reading of the report of the subcommittee. Three members of the Judiciary Committee were appointed on the subcommittee. Two of them were for a favorable report, and one of them was opposed. The one who was opposed does not happen to be present today. I expected, because of the advantage he had had in seeing the witnesses face to face, that he would lead the opposition upon the floor, but it is not possible for him to be present. Therefore, this burden has fallen upon my unworthy shoulders.

I shall not confine myself to the general proposition that this nomination should be rejected because the nominee is a part and parcel of the Hague machine, although I think that is an ample and sufficient reason for his defeat. However, as I go into that point and others that are raised in opposition, I shall not always be able in the course of my remarks to present the points in an order which will be completely logical. Some of the letters I shall read, for instance, go into several objections. I think they all go into the general contention that this man is unfit for public office because he is a part and parcel of the Hague machine. Yet other reasons are given. So the points may be interspersed.

If I had my way about the presentation of my remarks, and had time to prepare my statement in the way I should wish to present it, I would try to have all the evidence adduced on one point presented at the time I spoke on that point, and then would pass to another. I beg Senators to remember that I have not been able to do that, and in some respects the various objections to this confirmation will intermingle themselves, and we will be on one objection and then another, and back to the other again, before we get through.

To start with, I desire to read a letter from Governor Edison, sent from the State of New Jersey. He wrote this letter to every member of the Judiciary Committee, as I understand. He afterward appeared before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary and testified and was cross-examined. His letter is dated May 16, 1942. On the letterhead appears:

State of New Jersey, Executive Department.

The letter is as follows:

MY DEAR SENATOR NORRIS: From the day when his name was first mentioned, I have opposed the appointment of Mr. Thomas F. Meaney for Federal district judge in New Jersey, and I still oppose it. Not because I have any personal antipathy to him—for so far as I know I have never met him—but because he represents an attitude toward the judicial office which is to me repulsive, and is and ever will be, I hope, repulsive to all Americans.

This democracy, I am profoundly convinced, will survive so long, and only so long, as there is unimpaired confidence in the evenhanded, nonpartisan administration of justice. The courts of Germany, by common knowledge, do the dictator's will, regardless of the merits of the litigants' causes; if American courts do the same, we take leave of those rights of individual citizens to the equality of justice for which we fight this war.

The recent career of Mr. Meaney has demonstrated that he is a pawn in the hands of a man who has expressed his conception of the nature of justice in the now-famous phrase, "I am the law." And lest it be said that that un-American assertion was torn from its context to be used against its author, permit me to remind you that, in the same Federal court in which he now seeks to install his minion, Mayor Hague testified that in the daily functioning of the government of his domain the statement "is to all practical intents and purposes true." At the time the mayor made the statement, one of his judges administering the law was Thomas F. Meaney.

It is at least interesting to speculate whether that famous case—

Mr. President, I intend to quote from that case before I conclude my remarks. I shall read to the Senate the direct evidence that was given in the trial of the injunction case against Mr. Hague.

It is—

Says Governor Edison in his letter—

at least interesting to speculate whether that famous case in which the Federal courts stopped Mayor Hague from his various violations of the civil rights of American citizens would have turned out as it did if Mr. Meaney had then been the Federal judge instead of the independent one who sat.

Mr. Meaney was a part in the notorious series of moves in our State that put Frank Hague, Jr., a lawyer who had never practiced law, upon our highest court. This young man had no record and no career, except that he was the boss's son, to justify his elevation to the court of errors and appeals. A judge was induced to resign to make way for young Hague; then Judge Meaney was induced to resign as common pleas judge of Hudson County to make way for that judge, and then Meaney was rewarded by being appointed counsel in a bankruptcy case from which he has recently been removed, on the grounds that his fees and expenses were excessive and that he did not do the work for which he was paid. It is now proposed to reward this obliging jurist by installing him for life in a Federal court.

What is to be expected on the Federal bench of a man who moves here and there, up and down, in and out, off and on, at his boss's command? Can it be assumed that he will divest himself of the habits of a lifetime and administer his court with a justice unstained by politics? To judge from his record, will he administer his court to please the man to whom he owes everything—the man who says he is the law—in the hope that sooner or later, maintaining the dictator's favor, he may go on to a higher bench, or at an appropriate time may resign to take charge of some lucrative bankruptcy case?

Many of the editors of the best newspapers in New Jersey are so uncertain of the answers to these questions; thousands of our citizens are so dubious of the quality of justice they will obtain under these auspices that, if for no other reasons, I believe the United States Senate would be justified in withholding confirmation.

I beg you to believe me that this opposition of mine is no mere political dispute; it is a deep conflict of principle. I hold that no man should ascend the bench to pass upon the rights, even the lives, of other men when he is obligated to a political boss, when,

worse, the judge has been a part of unsavory political-judicial moves. Still worse, it seems to me, would be a judge long associated with and long beholden to a man who says that and acts as if the law begins and ends with himself. This kind of dictatorship ought, in my judgment, to be entirely foreign to the American judiciary.

I beg you to believe that, in my opposition to this appointment, I do not, as Governor of New Jersey, seek to impose any man of my choice upon the Federal judiciary. I have sought during my term as Governor to improve the quality of the State bench to provide a brand of justice free from the taint of boss dictation. I have reason to believe that the people of the State have approved these efforts. I cannot now stand idly by and see a Federal judge appointed to pass upon the rights and lives of our citizens when the nominee appears under the most dubious auspices. I could not answer to my own conscience if I remained silent while he was appointed, and then if at some future time a judicial scandal rocked the Federal court in New Jersey.

My opposition to this nomination is not intended to be, and I will not have it distorted into being, any criticism of the President's policies or of his conduct of the war. I am in fact so anxious to see his policies carried out and the war successfully prosecuted under his direction that I deplore the mistake of this nomination—which obviously must have been made without the full facts having been presented to him—as hazardous to morale in these times of supreme national effort.

The Judiciary Committee, bearing in mind the high reputation of the courts of the United States, will, I trust, carefully consider and investigate this man further before they report his name to the Senate. The quality of justice is of such overwhelming importance to the morale of the people in these times that no hasty act should be taken that might conceivably impair it.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES EDISON, *Governor.*

Mr. President, the Governor appeared as a witness before the subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary and testified. In due time, when I take up the evidence before the Judiciary Committee and comment on it, I shall refer to, and perhaps read, for it was not long, all his testimony and some of the questions which were asked him, so as to show how the opponents of the Governor tried to take away attention from Hague and Meaney and put the blame on the Governor. It was charged that the Governor, elected on the Democratic ticket, was obligated to Mr. Hague. It seems to me that no pretense was made by the friends of Mr. Meaney of doing away with the charge that Hague is the real man here, because it was said to the Governor, "You received the support of Hague in the election for Governor." Some have said, "You could not have been elected without Hague's support. Now you are guilty of ingratitude in opposing the confirmation of the man whom Hague wants for judge." There is no question about that attitude.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Would we be justified in considering that as a charge that the Governor is not paying his debts for election support?

Mr. NORRIS. I suppose that is the attitude.

Mr. President, there may be no doubt that Hague supported the Governor, who had the regular Democratic nomination. Hague represents a regular Democratic machine. But, Mr. President, the Governor is abused because he ran on the Democratic ticket and Hague supported him, and now he has the audacity to say that he will not bend the knee and bow his head at the command of the dictator chief, Hague.

What is the theory of that kind of a doctrine? Where will it logically lead us? Because Hague supported him, therefore he must obey Hague's demands and must support every man whom Hague suggests. It is treason to Hague to refuse to support the confirmation of Mr. Meaney's nomination. If that is the doctrine which must prevail, then it is only a question of time until democracy on this earth shall have perished.

All Senators know that sometimes among their political supporters for public office are their enemies, men who believe in principles and philosophies of government for which they cannot stand. Unless a candidate for office makes a promise, I do not see why he should be bound, if he should happen to be elected, even though such support were necessary to his election, to still his conscience and say to the boss, "I am your slave. Give me your commands," or to kneel down with bowed head in his presence and say, "I will carry out your orders. What are they?"

According to the testimony, at a certain meeting at which a Member of the other House, now chairman of the Democratic Committee, was present, Hague sat on the platform, and the Governor said in his speech:

If I am elected Governor of New Jersey, I will be beholden to no man. I will follow the convictions of my conscience.

I do not know what more he could have said. Even though a man who represented a machine which was distasteful to him as a candidate sat on the platform, in order to clear his skirts would he have to denounce him then and there and to say that he did not want his support? How many Senators have done such a thing when they were campaigning? The Governor did go so far as to say, in the presence of Hague, that if he were elected Governor he would be the Governor. He said:

I will do only what my conscience tells me I ought to do.

It seems to me that that was far enough for him to go. That was an honorable thing to say. If there ever was any greater pledge than that, I have never heard it. I have never made any pledge beyond that; and yet the Governor is now denounced as having gone back on his plans and opposed the man who represents the most disreputable political machine on earth.

If that is the proper doctrine, then we are wrong in sending our boys across the seas to fight for that liberty and freedom which we thought was guaranteed by our Constitution. We are wrong when we toil and spend our money to pay taxes and let our boys go into the trenches and fight for that freedom which we say is necessary to save free democratic government. If that theory be sound, we are all wrong. What good does it do, Mr. President, for a man to gain the whole world if he loses his own soul? If our boys across the sea succeed in bringing victory to our arms and crushing the dictators, will we not feel embarrassed to have them come back home and have to confess to them that, while they saved freedom abroad, we passed it on to political machines like Hague's in their home country?

In a speech which he made some time later, in honor of the homecoming of some crippled veteran, the Governor said, in substance, that he wanted to preserve this country for freedom and righteousness, so that he could say to the boys when they return bearing the banner of victory, "Here is your country. Save it as you have saved it in foreign lands. Here the seeds of liberty and freedom grow and blossom. While you have been on the battlefields defending it, we have defended it in our legislatures, our courts, and all our civil tribunals in your homeland. We give to you the same freedom which you possessed when you went away to bring new laurels and honor to your country as a result of your efforts and your sacrifices."

In my humble opinion, if we now trespass upon that sacred right of freedom by tarnishing the courts of the United States, we shall destroy the very thing we have asked our boys to fight for abroad.

Mr. President, of all the departments of government, especially in a free country, the highest, and the one which we ought most to revere, is the judiciary. We may have a perfect President, a perfect Senate, and a perfect House to make and enforce our laws; but if we have corrupt and dishonest courts they can nullify everything we do. So the most important thing to preserve our liberties and rights as citizens is to keep on the bench judges who have ideas of right and wrong, who have the courage to enforce them, and who will not be interfered with by the mandate of any boss on earth. They will do what Governor Edison said he would do if he were elected Governor. They will follow the dictates of their conscience.

Mr. President, I have before me a letter written by a man in the service. He is a New Jersey boy. He left his mother in New Jersey. He says in substance that under the control and domination of the Hague machine Jersey City has so degenerated that even the ordinary citizen is likely to lose everything because of the huge expenses brought about by this machine. From another source I have a table which gives a comparison of the taxes in quite a large number of cities comparable in size with Jersey City. Jersey City leads them all with a tax burden of more than $170 per capita.

The same report—and if I get to it I probably shall read from it—shows that in many instances in Jersey City houses and other buildings cannot be rented for enough money to pay the taxes. This young man in military life says, I think,

that his mother pays as much as $100 a month in taxes on the home in which she lives. I read the second paragraph of his letter:

I have lived in Jersey City all my life until 6 months ago. It was like moving from Berlin to the Hague. Now I am going into the Army in a few weeks and I will have to leave from Jersey City. They will tell me that I am going off to save democracy. I won't believe them as far as Jersey City is concerned. Freedom of speech in Jersey City? No. Freedom of press in Jersey City? No. Freedom of religion? Yes; but with a great many ministers, priests, etc., on the Hague pay roll. Freedom of assembly? Yes—only because of an honest Supreme Court and Federal Judge Clark (now in the Army) do we have some freedom of assembly in Jersey City. And the boys should go off to fight to save a little Hitler here by fighting a big Hitler over there!

I shall not read all the letter, but shall read another extract from it:

I sign my name and address only because an anonymous letter is an insult. I beg of you to keep the name out and secret because I fear that my mother's tax rate in Jersey City would be jumped up even higher than the $100 a month she now pays for her humble dwelling. It is just like a German over here with relatives in Germany being afraid to speak the truth for fear of loved ones being sent to a concentration camp. It is a tragic state of affairs, but nevertheless true.

I have in my hand a memorandum prepared on the subject of the confirmation of the nomination of Thomas F. Meaney as judge of the United States district court for the district of New Jersey, a memorandum on charges of dereliction of duty as counsel to the liquidator of a defunct bank. The memorandum does not deal with other reasons for not confirming the nomination of Mr. Meaney, reasons presented at the hearing, but is confined to the single subject of nonfeasance as counsel to the liquidator. I think I have explained that Meaney was common pleas judge, and that when it was necessary to get a place for the man who had been one of the supreme court judges, but who had resigned in order to let young Hague have a job there, it was found necessary for Meaney to resign in order to provide a place for the judge who had resigned; and then Meaney was appointed as attorney to the liquidator.

I read from the memorandum, as follows:

In the three-way judicial struggle referred to in the testimony (see p. 54, for example) which resulted in Frank Hague, Jr., becoming a Judge of the Court of Errors and Appeals in New Jersey, Meaney resigned as Common Pleas Judge of Hudson County and was appointed counsel on February 21, 1939, to Louis A Reilly, Commissioner of Banking and Insurance of New Jersey, and liquidator of the closed bank, designated in the course of the hearing as "a Hague Banking Commissioner" (p. 49). He continued as counsel until he was removed by Reilly's successor, Dr. Eugene E. Agger, in 1942. Meaney received $20,000 salary annually for 3 years. He also applied for and received an additional allowance of $10,000 from the Court of Chancery of New Jersey (pp. 64 and 65).

In his testimony before the Senate committee on May 13, 1942, which was 6 days before Governor Edison issued his first public statement opposing the appointment of Meaney as District Court Judge Meaney answered the bank charge in the following manner (p. 48):

"I should like to say, so far as the charge of my having suppressed records, that that is absolutely untrue.

"And insofar as withdrawals being made by favored Hagueites, that is definitely and absolutely untrue.

"The largest withdrawals in the week or 10 days previous to the closing of the bank were a Polish Catholic Church, the Scottish Rite Masons, and a Dr. McLaughlin."

I have been reading from the testimony of Meaney himself. I hope the Members of the Senate will remember the last paragraph of that testimony. I shall read it again:

The largest withdrawals—

He says—

in the week or 10 days previous to the closing of the bank were a Polish Catholic Church, the Scottish Rite Masons, and a Dr. McLaughlin.

During the course of my remarks I shall be able to show that, as I remember, between the 1st and 11th of February, $1,700,000 was withdrawn from that bank by depositors. The 11th of February was the last day the bank remained open for business, and that was Saturday, a half holiday.

The withdrawals thus referred to—

Says the memorandum—

were those of St. Ann's Polish Catholic Church, $50,000; the Grand Lodge, Free and Accepted Masons of New Jersey, $10,000; and Dr. Frank McLaughlin, $30,000 (p. 83). These totalled $90,000.

The undisputed fact about withdrawals from this bank during the 10-day period from February 1 to February 11, as shown by both the records of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the New Jersey Banking Department, is that the withdrawals of $1,000 or more totaled $1,746,512 (see pp. 69 to 79, inclusive).

That amount does not include any withdrawals of less than $1,000.

A further undisputed fact is that of these withdrawals, there were 73 separate withdrawals of over $5,000 each (pp. 83 and 84). Many of those who withdrew $5,000 or more also withdrew smaller amounts, as shown on the more complete list of withdrawals on pages 69 to 79 of the printed record.

I should state here, because it will figure all through the evidence about withdrawals, that under the law which we passed, administered by the F. D. I. C., there was a guaranty of all deposits of less than $5,000. We all remember that that is the law. The withdrawals which took place during the 10 days, in a great many cases, if not in a large majority of them, left in the bank an amount of either $5,000 or less, so that the persons making the withdrawals took out of the bank only the money which was not guaranteed by law. It is interesting to remember that fact.

The memorandum continues as follows:

It is interesting to note that practically all of the withdrawals were in round-figure amounts. Another obviously suspicious circumstance is that several of the individuals and companies making these withdrawals made a series of them a day or so apart.

There was no attempt to contradict the significant testimony that a great number of those making large withdrawals in the last 10-day banking period were connected with the Hague organization in Jersey City, or were directors or counsel for the banks, or had similar connections.

I do not now recall whether the statement appears in the memorandum from which I am now reading, but it appears in the evidence, that these withdrawals were made in part by directors of the bank and by the attorneys for the bank. I think that of one firm of attorneys, having three members, each member having an individual account there, all of them drew out their money, and some of their best and richest clients drew out their money; so that altogether over $1,700,000 was withdrawn. Undoubtedly some of it was honestly withdrawn; I do not know how much; but it seems to me no man can look at the list and see who made the withdrawals and how they were connected and not realize that, as a matter of fact, if the attorney had done his duty for the liquidator or receiver, there could have been collected most of that money which was taken out of the bank during those days.

Meaney testified there were only three important withdrawals. As a matter of fact, there were three important withdrawals amounting, in the aggregate, to $90,000; but they do not constitute a drop in the bucket compared with the others.

There is no doubt that the officers, directors, counsel, and other favored ones knew of the insolvency of the bank prior to its closing on February 11.

The report in the testimony, resulting from conferences of the subcommittee with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation placed in the record by Senator AUSTIN is as follows (p. 51):

"On February 1, 3, and 8, conferences were held with the bank; on February 5 a letter from Mr. Crowley to President Gardner of the bank, denied a loan or an agreement to purchase the assets of the bank. This was principally because of the contingent liabilities on mortgages which would follow the transaction. Thereafter the only solution was to close the bank."

While it would seem logical beyond question to assume that Meaney, as counsel to the liquidator, was familiar with these suspicious withdrawals in the last 10 days, there can be no doubt of his actual knowledge, because a depositor instituted a discovery proceeding in the Court of Chancery of New Jersey in August 1939, charging that there had been improper withdrawals, and demanding that Meaney take action or that he make discovery of the withdrawals so that the depositors could take action.

There was no answer filed to this suit until December 1939, when Meaney filed an answer stating that the withdrawals in the last days of the bank were in the regular course of business and that he had been unable to ascertain sufficient facts to bring suit against depositors, and he denied the list of withdrawals to the complaining depositor in that suit. Meaney continued as counsel to the liquidator for 2½ years after he had notice through this suit of the charge concerning the withdrawals, but took no action in the matter.

When Meaney appeared before the Senate subcommittee on May 13, he deliberately attempted to deceive the Senators by misrepresenting the number and nature of the withdrawals in question. The testimony and the records of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and the New Jersey Banking Department completely unmasked his deception. In the face of this evidence, Meaney

did not offer himself again as a witness, or present new testimony that would rebut the charge that he stood idly by without attempting to recapture the large sums withdrawn by officers, directors, and counsel of the bank, as well as others.

Instead, he offered a statement through a witness appearing at the close of the hearing, in which he entirely evaded the charges made against him and the proof supporting these charges. In this statement he said (p. 166):

"Something has been said about a withdrawal of funds by certain depositors in the bank on the eve of its closing, these depositors being called favored. I had not the slightest relation to such withdrawals, if any there were. Conceivably I could not have had, because I did not enter the bank until 10 days after it was closed, and prior to the closing had no knowledge, information, or hint of what was impending. Immediately upon the closing the bank was taken over by the New Jersey banking commissioner, conjointly with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Certainly, there were no withdrawals thereafter."

Every one knows that he was not appointed attorney until about 10 days after the bank closed. Of course, no one charged him, and no one now charges him with being a conspirator with the depositors in drawing out their funds, because the drawing out of the funds happened before Meaney was counsel for the receiver, but he did have notice, legal notice, in the case that is mentioned here where an action was brought for that specific purpose, and he filed an answer. I understand that case is still pending.

Here is what Meaney said in his statement, a part of which I read:

I could not have had because I did not enter the bank until 10 days after it was closed, and prior to the closing had no knowledge or information or hint of what was impending. Immediately upon the closing the bank was taken over by the New Jersey banking commissioner, conjointly with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. Certainly there were no withdrawals thereafter.

What a very wise statement for a man who wants to be judge for the United States District Court for life. He says that after they took over the bank and had closed its doors there were no more withdrawals. That is the man we are called upon to make a Federal judge for life.

The Senate is asked to confirm a man who thus tried to deceive the Senate subcommittee, who failed to carry out the clear duties of his office as counsel to the liquidator in making no attempt to recapture the large part of the $1,746,512 withdrawn in the closing days of the bank by officials of the bank and those "in the know."

We respectfully submit that a careful study of the references made in this memorandum to the testimony before the Senate subcommittee will establish the fact that the nominee does not possess the character and fitness to fill the high office of United States judge.

Mr. President, this memorandum was prepared and submitted by the city affairs committee, an organization composed of some of the leading and outstanding citizens of Jersey City. They have no interest in this matter except to see that the law is enforced and that justice is done.

I wish to read from a copy of a letter sent to various newspapers and forwarded to me by Mr. Seavey. The letter is dated June 11, 1942:

DEAR SIR: According to Associated Press dispatches in today's (Thursday's) newspapers, Senator SMATHERS, of New Jersey, resents criticism by nine members of the Harvard Law School faculty of the appointment of Thomas F. Meaney as Federal judge.

I shall not read what follows in the letter, because it refers to matters of which I have no knowledge, but I call attention to this statement in the letter:

At this time when the Nation is fighting for the preservation of human freedom in a war which calls for universal sacrifice, the people have a right to demand that their leaders rise above the low plane of partisan politics. Above all, they have a right to demand capable, fearless, and independent judges; to demand that judicial office should not be the reward of political service. There can be no greater blow to democratic institutions and the destruction of the faith of the people in the integrity of the judiciary.

Mr. President, I should like to dwell on that subject for a moment. When the common people, the laymen, the farmers, the merchants, the school teachers, lose their faith in the judiciary, then we have not anything left that is worth preserving. They do not always understand a technical, legal question, but they want to know that the judges of our country are untarnished. Like Caesar's wife, they must have the appearance of being right. They must not come from machines, they must not come from politicians, they must not be connected with political machines. They must be free, honest, and independent. When the common people of our country get the idea that our judges are corrupt, that they are controlled by political machines, then the elements of decay have already entered our body politic, and it will be only a question of time before the pillars of justice and freedom will fall down upon the crumbling foundation of the Republic. I think this case presents that picture.

Mr. President, I shall read a portion of a letter from an attorney of Newark, N. J., named Bernard S. Glick. I do not suppose an attorney could be found in Jersey City who could write this kind of a letter. Mr. Glick says, having just asked that the nomination be rejected:

My request is not based upon any personal reasons, but is by reason of the fact that Mr. Meaney is a member of long standing in the political machine of Frank Hague, the notorious character of this machine and its leader with which you are undoubtedly familiar.

Mr. Meaney permitted himself to be a supine tool of Hague in resigning a judicial post in this State which he held in order that Hague's son might be elevated to a judgeship. Upon resigning, Mr. Meaney was appointed as counsel in the liquidation of the New Jersey Title Guarantee & Trust Co.

Says Mr. Glick further on:

It is significant, and the record will bear this out, that upon assuming that position, certain irregularities in the conduct of the bank were obvious. These consisted of the withdrawal of funds from the bank in large sums for a few days and up to the closing of the bank. * * *

Nothing was ever done by Mr. Meaney in his job as counsel to remedy this situation. The only conclusion to be drawn from such conduct is that Mr. Meaney was put in this job for that specific purpose and performed accordingly.

Further he says:

How can a person who has for the past quarter of a century been a willing and pliable instrument of a vicious political machine suddenly cleanse his soul and mind in order to, with proper dignity, fulfill the obligations of a judge of a United States court?

* * * * *

My candid opinion is that the confirmation of Mr. Meaney will create the impression in the minds of the public here in New Jersey that Frank Hague has finally gained a foothold in the United States courts.

How can we draw any other conclusion? It is common knowledge that he has control of New Jersey to a very great extent, completely, in some respects, and when the Governor opposed this nomination they boasted by saying, "You could not have been elected Governor if Hague had opposed you."

It is understood and known by practically everyone from the little child in the eighth grade to the person who is ready to die of old age that Hague owns and has in his vest pocket the city of Jersey City. As I have already said, it took an injunction from a Federal judge in the very court to which this appointment is sought to restrain Hague from interfering with the liberties and rights of citizens of the United States.

The city affairs committee submitted another statement which I am about to read. I think I shall read it in full. I may omit a portion of the beginning, because it merely explains the composition of the city affairs committee. I have heretofore described the committee. I quote from the statement:

The City Affairs Committee of Jersey City, standing as it does for the honest and efficient administration of governmental affairs, vigorously protests against the appointment of Thomas F. Meaney as United States district court judge, and respectfully requests that your committee report his nomination unfavorably.

Without complete independence of thought and action in their judicial functions, our judges cannot and will not administer justice. In our opinion, Thomas F. Meaney will be incapable of any such independence either in thought or in action, for he is bound over hand and foot to the disreputable control of a corrupt political machine, a political dictatorship so cruel and unrelenting, that Jersey City today more closely resembles the cities in Fascist Europe, rather than its neighboring cities in democratic America.

Your committee should know that the press of Hudson County is completely dominated by the Hague machine, and that the Jersey City public reads what Frank Hague wants the public to read, and no more. Only in this past week, a public official of Jersey City was arrested and jailed for embezzlement of a large sum of public funds, and because of political expediency, the Hudson County press completely suppressed this information.

This, of course, has nothing directly to do with Meaney, but the City Affairs Committee is attempting to show how this powerful Hague machine controls even the newspapers. It states that this crime was absolutely suppressed.

The statement continues:

Such suppression required complete coordination of the police department, the judiciary, and other public officials, which even

extended to informing the public, upon inquiry, that the accused was absent from his duties because of "illness." It was only by sheer accident that the New York Times learned of the incident 6 days after the arrest, and published the facts on Sunday.

Your committee should know that thousands of Jersey City residents maintain an angry silence in the face of their oppression only because they fear reprisals.

Senators will recall the letter which I read from a soldier. He signed his name and his address, but he did not want them to be revealed because he feared reprisal might be visited on his mother.

I continue reading from the statement:

And the history of Hague domination only too bitterly recounts how persons who dared to cry out in protest went to jail for their pains. As a result, the majority of the population is too terrorized to speak out on public matters, and those not so terrorized are corrupted by the monetary blandishments of the machine.

Your committee should know that this political oppression has made Jersey City the most expensive and wasteful municipal government in the United States, and that the stupendous tax burden borne by its public has resulted not in lawful taxation but in shocking confiscation.

Your committee should know that these things could not be without a controlled judiciary. It is in New Jersey that the courts have held that the legislature cannot inquire into criminal acts by public officials but may only investigate legal acts. It is in New Jersey that a court has held it permissible by law, in the investigation of ballot frauds, to open the ballot boxes in connection with a Hudson County election, but that it is not permissible to look at the ballots after the boxes have been opened.

The court held that it was proper for the committee of the legislature to open the boxes for inspection, but that those inspecting them could not take them out with their hands, they could not look them over. They could stand off and gaze at the open ballot boxes, but could not go any further.

Your committee must know that it required the mandate of the United States Supreme Court to assure to the people of Jersey City the exercise of their constitutional right of free speech.

Your committee should know that the mass appearances in favor of Mr. Meaney before this subcommittee at the last hearing on May 13 was not a spontaneous and honest response to his appointment, but was a practical demonstration of an efficient political dynamo manufacturing a demonstration as though Goebbels himself had set the stage. And for another illustration of this practice, your committee should know that during this past week end this same Hague machine controlled a convention of the New Jersey State Bar Association in Atlantic City by paying membership fees and railroad fares for new members in order that they might dominate the will of the honest majority of that association.

Because of the governmental, economic, and personal devastation caused by this corrupt political machine in Jersey City, the city affairs committee was organized, and we have spoken and we propose to speak for the inarticulate thousands of Jersey City citizens who have been momentarily silenced by a fear that is no less menacing than that of the concentration camp.

In the course of the last hearing serious charges were made to the effect that Mr. Meaney, while acting as counsel for the defunct New Jersey Title Guaranty & Trust Co., suppressed facts concerning large withdrawals in anticipation of the institution's closing, and that he failed to take such action against guilty directors, or others, as his legal and moral obligations would require. Since learning of those charges the City Affairs Committee of Jersey City has conducted an investigation, and upon request made of Dr. Eugene E. Agger, commissioner of banking and insurance in New Jersey, received from him a list of the names of depositors and amounts withdrawn from that bank during the last 10 days of its operation. We are of the opinion that such records, standing alone, are sufficient to disqualify Mr. Meaney from the high judicial office he seeks. The following is a partial résumé of that hurried and incomplete investigation—

I wish Senators would listen to the reading of this list. I am about to read a large number of withdrawals from the bank:

At the time of its collapse on February 11, 1939, the New Jersey Title Guaranty & Trust Co. had as counsel the law firm of Collins & Corbin, of Jersey City. Three of the members of that firm, Clement K. Corbin, Edward A. Markely, and Robert Bain, were also bank directors. On February 6, 1939—

That is just before the closing of the bank—

Clement K. Corbin—

Who was a member of the law firm—

personally withdrew $21,000 from the bank's main office. Edward A. Markely—

Another member of that law firm—

drew $2,000 from the same office on February 3, and his wife drew $2,700 on the same day. In addition, on February 7, 8, and 9, the firm of Collins & Corbin withdrew an aggregate sum of $5,594.

In addition to being a director in the bank and a partner in the law firm Edward A. Markley was and is president and instructor of John Marshall College of Law. On February 9, John Marshall College drew $3,000 from the Journal Square branch, and on February 7 drew $8,089 from a savings account in the same branch.

Senators must understand that the New Jersey Title Guaranty & Trust Co. had five or six branch banks.

The dean of that law school was and is Judge Alexander F. Ormsby, of the Hudson County Court of Common Pleas.

In 1939, A. Harry Moore was Governor of New Jersey. In its issue of February 14, 1939, the first business day on which the bank was closed, the Jersey Journal stated that Governor Moore was listed among 17 directors of the bank. On the next day the Jersey Journal said:

"Governor Moore was a director of the bank until December 31, and his name appears as a director on the latest financial statement, but he announced in Trenton that he had resigned on January 1."

On the date of closing, A. Harry Moore was and still is a member of the board of trustees and instructor in ethics in the same John Marshall College of Law. On February 11, Jennie Moore, wife of A. Harry Moore, withdrew $2,500 from the bank's Lafayette branch.

Among the other directors of the defunct bank were James B. Throckmorton, George R. Beach, and George F. Perkins. At the same time Mr. Throckmorton was president and a member of the board of the Provident Institution for Savings, another Jersey City bank, while Mr. Beach was vice president and a member of the board, and Mr. Perkins was a member of the board. Between February 1 and 11, 1939, the Provident Institution for Savings withdrew $50,309 from the Bergen branch of the title company.

Another director of the closed bank was Harry V. Moser. On February 8, 9, and 10, Harry V. Moser, Inc., a corporation owned and controlled by this director, withdrew an aggregate of $12,000. Between February 6 and 11, Harry V. Moser, Inc., as agent, withdrew an additional sum of $9,500.

Insley, Decker & Cross, a Jersey City law firm, represented the Provident Institution for Savings. On February 11, 1939, this firm withdrew $4,500 from a trust account in the main office.

On February 14, 1939, the Jersey Journal stated:

"Former United States Senator John Milton was special counsel to the bank. He said he had been engaged for the past month 'in connection with certain efforts' to prevent its closing."

Charles Rovegno, of Jersey City, is one of the owners of Rovegno-Hall Co. and other large building-material companies in Hudson County. He has always been and still is associated with John Milton in business enterprises. On February 1 Charles Rovegno withdrew $7,000 from the main office of the bank. It is significant that by this withdrawal a balance of $4,874.94 remained, all of which was insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

John F. Boyle, prior to his death, was Frank Hague's adviser, associate, campaign treasurer, and owner of Boyle's Thirty Acres of Dempsey-Carpentier fight fame. Boyle owned the Hudson Dispatch, a Hague-controlled newspaper, now run by the Boyle estate. John Milton was and is executor of that estate. On February 7, Mary Boyle, John Boyle's daughter, withdrew $12,600 from the main office, and thereby left a balance of exactly $5,000 to her credit.

Joseph Newman, Inc., is an electrical contracting company handling a great deal of work for Jersey City. On February 11 that corporation withdrew $14,000 from the Journal Square branch.

Charles Hershenstein is personal counsel for Mayor Hague. On February 11 his daughter, Lucille Hershenstein, withdrew $3,500 from a savings account in the Bergen branch.

George Siegler Co. is a building concern specializing in Jersey City contracts. Between February 9 and 11 the firm withdrew an aggregate of $23,414, of which $15,214 was withdrawn from a savings account in the Journal Square branch.

On Saturday, February 11, 1939, a legal half holiday, and the last day upon which the bank transacted business, Helen, Frederick, Albert, and F. W. Rader, connection unknown, withdrew an aggregate sum of $79,955 from the Bergen branch. Helen Rader's balance thus became $4,803; Albert Rader's, $4,291.24; and F. W. Rader, $4,712.46.

What was left, being less than $5,000, was insured under the guaranty of bank deposits.

Between February 3 and February 11 the Kiernan-Hughes Co. and James M. Kiernan, one of the owners and Hague politician, withdrew $10,083 from the main office.

J. I. Hass Co., Inc., painting contractors for the city of Jersey City, withdrew $26,000 between February 1 and February 11.

Among the largest withdrawals made in the various branches of the defunct bank during its closing days, many of which were made on the last day of business, are the following: Frank Gardner, $41,000; Dr. George H. Meuller, $23,200; A. M. Dietrich, $46,000; Air Reduction Sales Co., $73,671; Bowe Construction Co., Inc., $50,500; Standard Laundry, $31,200; Charles F. Mueller, $20,000; W. Graham and Marian L. Rendell, $38,700; Andyck Corporation, $33,446; R. H. Perry & Co., $29,600; George H. Blake, $39,500; Frank McLoughlin, $30,000; Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Newark, $50,000; All Saints Church, $44,417; St. Ann's Polish Catholic Church, $53,500; St.

Anthony's Roman Catholic Church, $25,000; Church of Christ the King, $29,750; Grand Lodge, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons of New Jersey, $10,000; American Numismatic Association, $22,500; trustees of Jersey City and Harsimus Cemetery, $26,000; H. E. Salzberger Co., Inc., $20,600; the Donander Co. in Liquidation, $20,700; Meadox Weaving Co., Inc., $20,300.

Despite this overwhelming evidence to the contrary, on May 13 Mr. Meaney testified before your committee that the only withdrawals were by a Masonic Lodge, a Polish Catholic Church, and a Dr. McLaughlin.

It is inconceivable to the City Affairs Committee that Mr. Meaney was unaware, at least in part, of these record facts. And if perchance he had no knowledge of the conditions complained of, he should have so stated to your committee.

There is little that your committee can do to correct governmental mismanagement in Jersey City, but it is solely within your power to prevent judicial abuse.

We are constrained to view Mr. Meaney's conduct and political sponsorship as not consistent with the requirements of an honest and independent judiciary. In the interest of justice and good government, we urge that your committee report against Mr. Meaney's confirmation.

ADDENDA

George T. Smith was chairman of the board of directors of the defunct bank. He was also on the board of the Provident Institution for Savings. On February 6 his wife, Hattie Smith, withdrew $10,000 from the main office. On February 3 he himself drew $1,100.

On February 6 George F. Perkins, member of the boards of the closed bank and of the Provident Institution, withdrew $4,000 from the Bergen branch. On February 9 Louise Perkins drew $2,400 from the main office.

Howard Cruse was title officer and vice president of the New Jersey Title Bank. He was at the same time the highest State official in the Ancient Free and Accepted Order of Masons. On the bank's last day of business the Grand Lodge, Ancient Free and Accepted Masons of New Jersey, withdrew $10,000 from its main office savings account.

Willard L. Brown was vice president of the defunct bank. He was also official of Union Towel Supply Co., which on the closing day drew $4,600 from the main office.

William Cahill is assistant prosecutor of Hudson County and held that position at the time of the bank's cessation of business. On its last day he drew $1,200 from a main-office savings account.

On February 7 the Rotary Club withdrew $1,200 from an ordinarily dormant savings account.

All that evidence, Mr. President, came out before the subcommittee which took the evidence. Whether it was examined by the subcommittee or the full committee, it is all in evidence. That is not all. I think it will be found that others who held positions of profit and trust in connection with this bank drew out large sums.

I wish to read a letter dated June 3, 1942, from Joseph I. Gordon, a businessman of West New York, N. J.:

TRICO DISTRIBUTORS,
West New York, N. J., June 3, 1942.

Hon. GEORGE W. NORRIS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SIR: May I add my protest to the growing numbers of letters you are daily receiving, according to your press statement, in opposition to the confirmation of Mr. Thomas F. Meaney, whose appointment to the United States district court is now pending.

This writer is an independent businessman, who has no ax to grind politically. But I am vitally interested in the preservation of democracy. To that end, I believe we must not alone fight for democracy abroad but we must bend our efforts to defend it from attack here at home as well.

As a citizen of Hudson County, I have had opportunity to observe the Hague machine in action at close range. I, for one, have witnessed its cruel reprisals against any courageous soul who may have the intestinal fortitude to oppose it. I have seen every basic concept of American freedom and fair play flouted by this brazen, dictatorial organization.

Good citizens of both parties, regardless of politics, scorn Frank Hague and hold him up as a symbol of civic corruption. His vast majorities in this place are due to the fear and terror which his very name strikes into the hearts and minds of the people. As a general practice, business and professional people are intimidated into silence and assent. We in this county are living under a virtual American fascism.

To confirm Thomas Meaney, particularly at this time, would be a deadly blow to the great crusade for decency being waged in this State today by an indignant and aroused citizenry led by that great Democrat, Gov. Charles Edison.

Moreover, to confirm Meaney would be equivalent to putting Hague himself on the Federal bench. It would be an endorsement from the United States Senate of all the sordid, un-American things which Boss Hague stands for, not only in the daily life of this State but in the eyes of the whole American people.

I appeal to you and your committee to reject Mr. Meaney. By doing so you will be preserving the freedom and honor of our Federal courts.

Respectfully,

JOSEPH I. GORDON.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. While the Senator from Illinois was in the chair for a few moments he heard the Senator read a long list of grievances against the nominee for the Federal bench. As I understand, the statement was signed by the City Affairs Committee of Jersey City.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator give me any information as to who compose the City Affairs Committee of Jersey City?

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, I have no personal knowledge.

Mr. LUCAS. Does the Senator have any information in his file which would show who they are?

Mr. NORRIS. I can state what they said they were.

Mr. LUCAS. That will be sufficient.

Mr. NORRIS. I myself made the inquiry of other persons. That fact does not appear in the record. Of course, I should not have presented the statement here if I had not thought or believed that it was proper.

Mr. LUCAS. I know the Senator would not have presented the statement unless he thought so. I was not in the Chamber when the Senator began his statement. Perhaps he did state the background of the City Affairs Committee before I entered the Chamber. If he has done so, I withdraw the question, and shall obtain the information I seek by reading the Senator's statement in the RECORD.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; the question is perfectly proper, and I find no fault with it. The man who appeared for the city affairs committee was Paul A. Doherty, who was a member of the board of trustees of the committee. He appeared before the subcommittee and presented to the subcommittee the record itself from which I have read. I have inquired of other persons I know, persons who I think are respectable and fine citizens, about the committee; and I received the impression that it is composed of business and professional people of the city who have, as is said in the statement, taken an interest in the enforcement of law and the preservation of law and order in the city. I judge that the committee is composed of a very high-class group of citizens.

Mr. LUCAS. Can the Senator tell me how long the committee has been in existence?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not know whether I gave that information or not, but somewhere in the record appears the information that the committee succeeded another organization of citizens which was formed quite a number of years ago. When or how the particular name of the committee was adopted, I do not know. Let me ask the Senator from Ohio if he knows.

Mr. BURTON. No; I do not know.

Mr. LUCAS. If the Senator from Nebraska will indulge me, let me ask the Senator from New Jersey if he can give us the information.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nebraska permit me to reply to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. BARBOUR. I have already talked to the Senator from Illinois about the citizens' committee about which he has just inquired. The present organization is a comparatively new one, as I understand. It is made up of business and professional people. I know some of them by name and am casually acquainted with others of them. As I told the Senator awhile ago when we had our little personal colloquy on the subject, I do not pretend to be very familiar with the organization. On the other hand, I am quite sure that no one can establish for a moment that it has any sinister origin or purpose. I know, and everyone else in New Jersey knows, that the persons who are most alarmed about Hudson County are those who live in Hudson County, because they have every justification to be alarmed. Jersey City has a higher tax rate than any other city in the United States which has a population of over 100,000. There are many persons who cannot leave Jersey City or Hudson County simply because they cannot abandon what they have there. As the Senator from Nebraska said, I think there was a prior organization, civic in nature, and very much of the same sort as the present organization. As a matter of fact, I think there have been several such organizations. I cannot give offhand the names of the officers of the committee. I am sure that the

information can be obtained. My colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], may have the information.

However, let me ask what is the nature of the inquiry in this connection by the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. Let me say to the Senator from New Jersey that the charges and grievances presented by the committee against the applicant for the judgeship are so serious that I merely rose to make inquiry as to who might be the officers of the city affairs committee which was making the charges. Now I find that the Senator from New Jersey does not know who they are.

Mr. BARBOUR. What the Senator from Illinois says is not entirely correct; I just told him the nature of the organization.

Mr. LUCAS. I think I am entitled to the information I have requested. If any organization makes a charge against me, I should like to know what the organization is, of whom it is composed, and just what its objects and purposes may be.

Mr. NORRIS. I am not questioning the Senator's right to that information, or his purpose in asking the question.

Mr. LUCAS. I know the Senator is not, and the Senator has very frankly answered in reply to the question. However, the Senator from New Jersey asked why I rose; and I have stated that I am endeavoring to obtain information.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I tried to answer the Senator's question. In any event, I do not believe I can answer it satisfactorily to the Senator, because I do not believe he wants to have the committee identified as a reputable one. I say that without any reflection on someone of whom I am very fond.

I admit that I cannot state the names of the officers of the committee. I have heard about it. I know other civic-minded persons who are alarmed and who are taking an interest in their county and everything having to do with it. Of course, the names of the officers of the committee can be furnished, if that is what the Senator is interested in.

Mr. LUCAS. In all fairness, I should state that I rose for the sole purpose of trying to ascertain the source of the information relating to the charges. The Senate is called upon to make a very serious decision. The charges laid in the long letter read by the Senator from Nebraska are very serious, and I listened to the Senator read them when I was in the chair a moment ago. My only thought was to ascertain who were the individuals responsible for the charges, and to ascertain the purpose and object of their organization. In other words, any corporation, association, or club has certain objects and purposes for its formation, and I was attempting to obtain a brief history of the background of the organization referred to. When I made inquiry of the Senator from New Jersey, he apparently did not know anything about the organization either; and the senior Senator from New Jersey states that he thinks it is a mythical organization.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, no; I do not think anything of that kind is the case.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, my impression is that the organization came into existence in the last few months for the purpose of fighting this nomination and is a paper organization composed of a few soreheads who ran for office in Jersey City and were ignominiously defeated. [Laughter.]

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, that is a charge which can very easily be made. There is no evidence to sustain it. While of course I am not personally acquainted with the organization, and do not know it, there is in the record a statement as to when the preceding organization, an organization with a different name, was organized, and it was continued by the present organization with its name changed. The organization which preceded the present one was in existence for quite a number of years. I think the date was given, but I do not remember it. The present organization grew out of that one. It is a civic-affairs organization. I have stated to the Members of the Senate the name of the man who appeared before the subcommittee as a member of the organization's board of trustees. His testimony stands as a part of the record uncontradicted. I think that not a statement in it has been contradicted in any way by Mr. Meaney or by Mr. Hague or by any other witness whom they produced. If the organization is a disreputable one, composed of soreheads, I should think that after the evidence was offered by the organization, either Mr. Meaney or Mr. Hague would have produced any evidence they might have had as to the disreputable nature of the organization. It seems to me that such evidence would have been produced either on cross-examination of the man who testified or otherwise.

Mr. LUCAS. I am very grateful to the Senator.

Mr. NORRIS. The present situation is rather an illustration of what I suppose will happen to me, and of what will happen to my brother Senator who sits beside me, after he speaks, and of what will happen to the junior Senator from New Jersey after he speaks. If any person confronts this contemptible, crooked machine with any accusation, that person is accused of being a sorehead, or a disappointed office-seeker, or of having violated a pledge of duty which he owed to Hague because Hague supported him when he ran for office. That is the answer to these accusations; and so we all shall have to take our share of it and admit our responsibility, and go to the concentration camp, and suffer whatever humiliation may be inflicted upon us, merely because we have asserted our rights as citizens. It took a courageous judge in New Jersey, Judge Clark to enjoin this culprit from depriving citizens of the United States of their rights of liberty and freedom, and Judge Clark's action had to be supported by affirmation of the Supreme Court of the United States. Now this man Hague, recognizing the existence of that loophole which prevents him from controlling the Federal court, a branch of the Federal Government, is trying to put on the bench as a Federal judge, one of his tools, who would occupy the same place as that which Judge Clark occupied when he issued the injunction. Hague wants to stop up that loophole.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator know how long Judge Meaney has been presiding over some of the State courts of New Jersey?

Mr. NORRIS. A great many years.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the record show that any charges of misconduct ever were made against him?

Mr. NORRIS. No; the record does not show anything of the sort.

Mr. ELLENDER. What does the record show in that regard?

Mr. NORRIS. It does not show anything.

Mr. ELLENDER. It must then be assumed that he has a good record. Do the hearings show the manner in which Judge Meaney was selected for the judgeship in New Jersey which he has held for the many years that he has served in the State courts?

Mr. NORRIS. He was appointed by the Governor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Were any charges ever lodged against Judge Meaney when selected by the Governor?

Mr. NORRIS. No. I have said, and I repeat, that no charges ever were brought against him. He stands unsullied. No one ever accused him of stealing or of robbery or of anything of the sort. There is much that might be said on that point. I have not said it; I have not gone into it; I do not want to go into it. I know that a boss like Hague, when he has his tools carrying out his orders, does not have to send an order to them every day. He is not a fool. When he puts a man on the bench he does not interfere with what the appointee may be trying to do, and the appointee may make a good judge until Hague's machine comes in and then the judge redeems his pledge.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. ELLENDER. I am glad to hear the Senator say that the record of Judge Meaney is unsullied. Does the record show who appointed Judge Meaney as judge of a State court?

Mr. NORRIS. The Governor of New Jersey appointed him; I do not know who he was.

Mr. ELLENDER. I should have been more specific; I meant what Governor? Were there not some Republican Governors who appointed him?

Mr. NORRIS. This machine, like other Democratic machines, does not depend entirely upon Democrats. It is tools and not merely Democrats. It is bipartisan. It has many Republicans in its organization, just as every Republican machine has Democrats in its organization.

They do not care whether one is a Republican or Democrat if he will perform their commands.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I have not read the entire record from cover to cover, but I am informed that the evidence shows that Judge Meaney served very commendably and that there is nothing in the record to the contrary. Would the Senator state if that is true?

Mr. NORRIS. I will state that there is nothing in the record to the contrary. That ought to be sufficient; that is as far as I will go.

Mr. ELLENDER. The only point the Senator makes is that since Hague is backing the nomination of Mr. Meaney and has asked that his nomination be confirmed, the Senate should not confirm him.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. I repeat what the Governor of New Jersey said, namely, that the confirmation of Meaney would be like putting Hague on the Federal bench. Hague has his son on the Supreme Court of the State, and I suppose we ought to put him on the Supreme Court of the United States.

Mr. ELLENDER. How can the Senator take such a position when the record shows that during the past 13 or 15 years Meaney has conducted himself beyond reproach, if I may put it in that way?

Mr. NORRIS. I do not want to charge and I will not charge that he is a corrupt man.

Mr. ELLENDER. But is that not the issue?

Mr. NORRIS. If the head of a machine puts his tool on the bench, and he has not anything for him to do, and he goes on and is not interfered with, then, it may be said, he has not done anything bad while that situation was continuing. Meaney did resign as a judge of the common pleas court, where he drew a salary of $15,000. I cannot go on the witness stand and testify that he resigned because Hague told him to do so, but it is well known that he is a Hague tool; it is well known that he got a $20,000-a-year job later, and he gave as a reason for resigning from the New Jersey court that it did not pay him salary enough—only $15,000—and that he could not live on it, but now he is moving heaven and earth to get a job paying $10,000 a year.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is a somewhat more stable position, is it not?

Mr. NORRIS. I referred to that a little while ago.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is a life job, is it not?

Mr. NORRIS. I discussed that some time ago. Of course, I do not expect the Senator to stay here and be persecuted by my remarks, and I am not finding fault with him because he did not hear me, but I have gone over that once.

Mr. ELLENDER. The Senator, though, has made certain charges and is advocating that the nominee should not be confirmed, and, in the next breath, the Senator states that the record does not show a single, solitary mark against the conduct of the man whose nomination he is challenging and which we are asked to confirm.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator from Lousiana can draw his own conclusion, and that is, of course, the conclusion Hague would draw.

Mr. ELLENDER. It is, however, true, is it not?

Mr. NORRIS. He would say, "I put him on; he is my man; but I never asked him to do anything." But wait until the time comes when he wants something done.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. Meaney has not done wrong in the past.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes. For instance, he resigned to make room for another judge; he resigned to make a job for Hague's son to go on the court.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. SMATHERS. Will the Senator state where there is any proof of the suggestion or charge that there was a shifting of judges around? I should like to have one iota of proof.

Mr. NORRIS. Proof of what?

Mr. SMATHERS. Of the suggestion that this man is a tool of Hague or that he moved off the bench and left a job paying $12,000 a year.

Mr. NORRIS. No; and I cannot offer any proof, either, that Hague went to Meaney and said, "Resign"; but I can offer proof from the record that he did resign and that Hague's son was put on in his place. I cannot offer any proof that anyone got any money for it, or that Meaney did it willingly. He might say it was just accidental; he merely happened to think of it; but he resigned [laughter]; and perhaps it was also an accident that Hague prevailed on the Governor to appoint his son to that place.

Mr. SMATHERS. Is the Senator willing to say, in the absence of any proof to that effect, that this man Meaney because he gave up a $12,000 a year job to take a $20,000 a year job was doing something for Hague?

Mr. NORRIS. No; but I can tell what the Senator said before the Judiciary Committee, that Hague resigned and he told him it was because he was not getting salary enough.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator means Meaney, does he not?

Mr. NORRIS. Meaney, yes, but it does not make much difference whether it is Hague or Meaney; it is all the same. [Laughter.] I suppose the Senator meant that; I took him at his word; I believed him; I thought then and think yet that he told the truth about it, but that is what Meaney told him. If I should ask a man who stole my automobile, "Did you steal my automobile?" would he say "Yes; I stole it"? Would I not have the right to prove some circumstances? First, I might say that he was a member of a gang of thieves dealing in stolen automobiles. That would not be direct proof; and there is not any direct proof in this case; indeed, there never is when one is fighting a political machine. They are as smart as anybody; much smarter than I am; they cover up their tracks; and that is what Hague does. It is impossible to prove it. I do not suppose the evidence exists that he got his son appointed to the supreme court bench by demand that the judge who was on the bench resign in order to make a place for his son. It cannot be proved by direct evidence that he went to the Governor and said, "Here is the place that I fixed up; put my boy there." I do not suppose any such evidence exists. No one is hunting for it, and I have not tried to do so. I do not want in making this fight to make personal charges against men. I would not say this if it had not been brought out by the objections. I have had plenty of opportunity to produce evidence. I would not do it; I have not done it. I do not know whether it is true, as I do not know about other matters. I have not any personal knowledge about it, but I have had statements in writing, which I can show to the Senate, proving a set of circumstances that would make one's hair curl.

Mr. ELLENDER. Does the Senator mean as to this nomination?

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; as to this nomination.

Mr. ELLENDER. Why does not the Senator produce it? Why did he not submit the proof to the committee?

Mr. NORRIS. I did not produce it because I am not fighting the confirmation in that way. I would not have mentioned it if the Senator himself had not asked the questions. I think the Senator is wrong about his white-robed angel; he is not white to me, but I have not any proof that he is a thief or a robber or a murderer. I have not any proof that the Hague outfit, or that Hague, has pulled the strings and made Meaney dance or made him jump at the whistle; but if the Senator is so naive and so partial that he does not know a political machine when he sees it—and coming, as he does, from Louisiana, I should expect him to know that, anyway [laughter]—then, I have nothing to say about it.

Mr. ELLENDER. All of that is beside the question and I do not propose to engage in personalities. The Senator states that he has proof that would make one's hair curl—why does he not produce such proof? That would be pertinent, but to argue here that because a man named Hague is backing the nominee and then, an admission on his part that the nominee has a record as a State judge that remains unsullied to this moment, is not consistent. Hague is not up for confirmation.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I take it the Senator from Nebraska does not feel it is necessary to prove one guilty of a crime in order to make it appropriate to vote against the confirmation of his appointment to the Federal bench.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one more question?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not know whether I am correct in the thought, but I understood there was evidence before the subcommittee in this case, although I am frank to say I have not read the evidence, to the effect that Meaney was appointed a judge in the State of New Jersey on a number of occasions.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; and he was confirmed by the State senate, which fact is offered in his defense. I concede that the proponents of the nomination have a right to offer that evidence and I am not objecting to the evidence.

Mr. LUCAS. I understood that on each occasion when he was confirmed, a majority of the State senate was Republican. I may be wrong about that, and if I am, I should like to be corrected.

Mr. NORRIS. I think that is correct.

Mr. SMATHERS. And he was confirmed without one word of criticism or opposition.

Mr. NORRIS. So far as I know, that statement is correct. That is what is said, and I do not deny it. I presume it to be true. However, all that occurred before a great many other things happened which the evidence discloses. I think it all occurred before Frank Hague's son was put on the Supreme Court. At least it all occurred before Frank Hague was as powerful as he is today. I think it all occurred before Judge Clark issued an injunction restraining Hague from interfering with the freedom and the liberties of American citizens. Whether it did or not, I call attention to the fact that a man who runs a political machine is not an idiot or a fool. If he put his tool on the bench or in the legislature, and then sat by the side of him and controlled every action he took, it would soon be apparent that that man was his tool, and that he was not trustworthy. But Hague does not wish to interfere with the tools whom he puts into office. So long as they go along and do not interfere with his prerogatives, he does not molest them. I do not suppose he follows their actions. But when he wants something done, then he does pull the strings. That is why I do not want a subservient man on the Federal bench. He may go on the bench and remain there all his life, and have nothing before him in which Hague is in any way interested. But suppose Meaney had been the judge on the bench instead of Clark when American citizens went before him and asked for an injunction against Hague. Hague was the defendant, and they asked for an injunction to restrain him from interfering with the right of free speech and the liberty to which every citizen is entitled.

Suppose Meaney had been the judge instead of Hague; where would those citizens have gotten, how far would they have gotten? They probably would have been in concentration camps themselves. They would have been treated as some friends of Meaney are trying to act in this instance. They would crucify a man who dared open his mouth; and there is evidence already in the record, some of which I have read, which answers the statement made by Senators, at least in part, to this effect, "Why, this man has been judge a good while. He has not been corrupt, he has not done anything very bad."

The evidence shows that the people of New Jersey, especially of Jersey City, are afraid for their lives. There are many letters to that effect. The citizens do not dare go against that machine. Any man in Jersey City who raises his voice against it is, as the junior Senator from New Jersey has suggested, called an old "sorehead" or something of the kind, and he gets pushed out the window; he does not have any standing at all.

Mr. President, I stated a while ago that the reputation of the Hague machine has gone all over the United States, that everyone knows about it. I shall now read an editorial on that point. I had not intended to read it at this time, because I have many other editorials, from various newspapers of the country, showing that the writers know what Hague is, and the kind of machine we are dealing with.

I shall now read a portion of an editorial appearing in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. The title is "Politics as Usual." The first paragraph reads:

> The American people lost a battle in their war against rule by dictators yesterday afternoon.

That was when the Committee on the Judiciary reported favorably on this nomination. That is what is thought about it in St. Louis; that is what is thought about it all over the country. That is the reputation this machine has.

No one here will deny, the senior Senator from New Jersey will not deny on the floor of the Senate, that this nominee is Hague's candidate. It is well known; everyone knows it, and nearly everyone knows what Hague's machine is. It is known all over the United States.

The editorial reads:

> The American people lost a battle in their war against rule by dictators yesterday afternoon.
>
> They lost it, not in some military engagement on the other side of the world, but in a meeting of the Judiciary Committee of their United States Senate, held within sight of the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial.

Is that worth thinking about when we are dealing with this kind of a machine? I could fill the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with editorials from all over the great West to the same effect.

Let me read further from this editorial:

> They lost it 11 to 5—11 votes in favor of confirming Boss Hague's stooge, Thomas F. Meaney, to be a Federal judge, and 5 votes for rejecting the nomination. It was a humiliating defeat.

That is what they think about it in St. Louis. That sentiment is not confined to New Jersey, but the whole Nation feels the disgrace.

The editorial continues:

> There is only one explanation for this rout of the people. That explanation is politics, the thing which accounts for the appointment in the first place. Partisan politics—partisan politics on just about its lowest level.
>
> Hague is a tin horn Hitler who thinks he owns Jersey City.

I am inclined to think he almost does.

> He wants his man on the Federal bench in New Jersey in order to make that possession effective.

That is just what I have been trying to emphasize.

Further on the editorial says:

> If anyone thinks that "politics as usual" was suspended for the duration of the war along with "business as usual," a glance at the way the committee voted will dispel the thought. Only one Democrat had the courage of his convictions to say "no." He was the chairman, VAN NUYS, of Indiana, and he deserves a national salute for refusing to bend his knee to partisanship.

I read further from the editorial:

> What will the Senate do? Will it follow its weak, driven Judiciary Committee? Or will it cast out this unfit appointment in the name of the freedom for which we fight the Axis dictators?
>
> Committee approval does not necessarily mean confirmation. A bad committee endorsement can be corrected on the Senate floor. That is what is needed, urgently needed, in the Meaney case.
>
> The American people lost a battle in their war against rule by dictators yesterday afternoon.

Mr. WHITE. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. If the Senator will permit me, I should like to read a line or two of the editorial which the Senator did not read.

> Three Republicans and one Independent——

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, I cannot yield for that purpose. I would rather not yield for that.

Mr. WHITE. It should be in the RECORD, because it is a well-deserved tribute to a great Senator of the United States.

Mr. NORRIS. I thank the Senator.

Mr. McNARY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. McNARY. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Pepper
Andrews	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Gurney	Reynolds
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Barbour	Hayden	Schwartz
Barkley	Hill	Shipstead
Bilbo	Hughes	Smathers
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Smith
Burton	Lee	Stewart
Butler	Lucas	Taft
Byrd	McCarran	Thomas, Idaho
Capper	McFarland	Thomas, Okla.
Caraway	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	McNary	Truman
Clark, Idaho	Maybank	Tunnell
Clark, Mo.	Mead	Tydings
Connally	Millikin	Vandenberg
Danaher	Murdock	Wagner
Davis	Murray	Walsh
Doxey	Norris	White
Ellender	Nye	Wiley
George	O'Mahoney	Willis

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-nine Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had

agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7280) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 9 to the bill, and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 16 to the bill.

The message further announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 329) extending the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under certain acts, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

NOMINATION OF THOMAS F. MEANEY

The Senate resumed the consideration of the nomination of Thomas F. Meaney, to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, suppose a political campaign were taking place and that during the campaign charges were made such as are made in the present case, with respect to the nominee, Mr. Meaney, and with respect to Mr. Hague, and a campaigner were to say, as some Senators have done in reporting on this nominee, "Why, there is nothing wrong with Hague. He is an exemplary man. His soul is pure white, and angels of peace hover over him. He has not done anything. Where is your evidence against him?" How far, Mr. President, do you think such an argument would go before any audience in the United States? Those who heard such a statement would laugh the speaker off the stump. The people all know what the Hague machine is, even if some Senators do not. Senators will be reminded of it, I am sure, in the future.

Mr. President, what the American voters, what the intelligent people of America think of the Hague machine, is no secret. I do not imagine that in any place, except in one dominated by a machine such as this, could a person even get a receptive hearing if he wanted to support it.

I wish to call attention to what newspapers have said in different sections of the country respecting the Hague machine. They know about it, and even if we have not heard about it they can tell us all about it. I challenge Senators to go home and ask their constituents about it. They will tell Senators about the Hague machine. They will tell them that it will disgrace any organization with which it is connected. They will say they have no use for it. The Jersey City boss was convicted by the Supreme Court of the United States for having tried to throttle free speech and the free press. They know what that means. They know what it means for the receiver of a bank, or for the counsel for the receiver not to commence an action to recover hundreds of thousands of dollars which dishonest directors and officials of a bank have stolen from the depositors for whom they were trustees. The American people know about that. They know that it is the duty of such a counsel to take steps to begin an action in such a case.

Mr. President, I am reminded of something that happened in the hearing before the Committee on the Judiciary. One of the Senate members of the subcommittee, during the discussion which occurred with respect to these large withdrawals from the bank, told of his own experience in a somewhat similar case. He had been appointed attorney for a receiver, and shortly after that, as his duties required, he looked into the condition of the bank. He conceived it to be his duty as attorney for receiver, first of all to protect the interests of the depositors, and second, the interests of the stockholders. He discovered, he said, that the board of directors had robbed the corporation of enough money to pay all its debts, and he told the receiver so, and that they ought to proceed to collect that money and pay the debts of the corporation. The receiver would not do that. The attorney said, "That is what I am here for," and he thereupon resigned.

Mr. President, why did not Meaney do that? Is it an answer to say, "Why, Meaney could not commence a lawsuit; he was only the counsel for the receiver, and unless the receiver comes to him and consults him in respect to the matter, he cannot proceed."

Mr. President, he was drawing a $20,000 salary. Of course, he did not want to be bothered about anything like recovering $1,700,000 of the depositors' money which had been illegally taken out of the bank. Why did not Mr. Meaney resign under those circumstances? He testified before the committee that there were only three large withdrawals, and altogether those three large withdrawals amounted only to $90,000, only a drop in the bucket. The evidence shows that a great many large depositors withdrew the bulk of their deposits, and often left something in their accounts—less than $5,000, $5,000 being the amount which was guaranteed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. He was not suspicious that anything was wrong. He was like some Senators. He could not see anything wrong. The thing looked quite rosy to him. Mr. President, it does not look quite rosy to the person of ordinary intelligence. He knows that things do not happen that way.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF LABOR, FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY, ETC.—CONFERENCE REPORT

As in legislative session,

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 25, 26, 27, and 28.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 31, 32, 33, and 34; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,091,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$331,310"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$284,581"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,752,942"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the sum "$4,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000", and in line 4, strike out the sum "$7,000,000" and insert "$8,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows:

In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the sum of "$15,000,000" and insert "$12,500,000", and in line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the sum of "$195,000" and insert "$130,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$222,560"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$62,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 9 and 16.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
HARRY S. TRUMAN,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

BUTLER B. HARE,
M. C. TARVER,
ALBERT THOMAS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BURTON. Will the Senator explain just what conclusion has been reached? Does the conference report affect the C. C. C.?

Mr. McCARRAN. It does not affect the C. C. C. The C. C. C. amendment is in disagreement. This conference report is with respect to the amendments as to which an agreement has been reached. It should have been submitted earlier in the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on certain amendments of the Senate to House bill 7181, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 30, 1942.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 9 to the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and concur therein with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert:

For all necessary expenses to enable the Secretary of War to provide for the liquidation of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the conservation and disposition of all of the property of whatever type (including camp buildings, accessories, equipment, and machinery of all types) in use by said Corps, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; payment for accrued annual leave of employees separated from the Government service due to the discontinuance of Corps operations; and for such travel (including the return of enrollees to their homes) and other necessary expenses as may be incurred in connection with liquidation of said Civilian Conservation Corps from the unexpended balances of the appropriations made to the Civilian Conservation Corps in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1942, not exceeding $8,000,000.

There is hereby transferred to the War Department all property and supplies of the Government procured from funds appropriated or allocated for the operation and maintenance of the Civilian Conservation Corps (including funds allotted by the Director of such Corps to cooperating Federal departments or agencies) and not previously transferred. Notwithstanding any other provision of law the War Department may transfer to any department, establishment, or other agency of the Government, upon such conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, any camp buildings, accessories, equipment, and machinery of all types not needed by the War Department in the prosecution of the war and, upon such terms as said Secretary may approve, transfers may be made to any State, county, municipality, or nonprofit organization for the promotion of conservation, education, recreation, or health: *Provided*, That in the case of buildings located on land owned by the United States any such disposition shall be subject to the approval of the agency of the United States having jurisdiction of such land.

That the House insist upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 16 to said bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I move that the Senate disagree to the House amendment to Senate amendment numbered 9, further insist on its amendments numbered 9 and 16, request a further conference with the House, and that the Chair appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

The motion was agreed to; and the Presiding Officer appointed Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. WHITE conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

NOMINATION OF THOMAS F. MEANEY

The Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Thomas F. Meaney to be United States district judge for the district of New Jersey.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I had started to cite some editorial opinions. Here is one from the Hunterdon County Democrat. I think Hunterdon County is the adjoining county. I shall not read it all. The heading is, "The Meaney appointment." The writer rehearses the evidence, including Meaney's connection with Hague, with which everyone is familiar. All the school children in New Jersey know it, even the Senate has not yet found it out.

If the Senate, in the face of such evidence, chooses to confirm the Meaney nomination, it will by its action further reduce faith and confidence in our Government at a time when men are giving their lives to uphold the principles upon which it is founded—principles which the Jersey City ruler has time and again demonstrated are not to his liking nor in keeping with his methods.

Let us go further from the field of action. Practically every daily newspaper in the United States of any prominence has editorialized over and over again about the Meaney appointment, which we have before us at this minute. They all know that something is wrong, and they wonder why it is that the Senate cannot see what is so plain to everybody else.

This is an editorial from the Washington Post, right at home. I shall not read the entire editorial, but it concludes by saying:

He is the prize exhibit of what Bryce called the blot on our democracy, namely, our city machines. The Senate committee would be acting as keeper of the President's conscience by refusing to accept the nomination which has come from the President's pen.

From the New York Herald Tribune:

The issue, it cannot be sufficiently repeated, is that Mr. Meaney is Boss Hague's henchman and has, throughout his political career, been regarded as a "Hague man."

Up to this hour Hague has not disowned him, either.

It is precisely because he has been subservient to Mayor Hague, rather than independent, that his nomination has been so bitterly assailed. From his record it is argued that, as he has always done Boss Hague's bidding in the past, he will continue to do so in the future. Thus, in effect, Mr. Meaney would be a Hague agent if he were appointed to the Federal bench.

What about the New York Times, by which so many Senators swear? The editorial from the New York Times is headed "Spotlight on Mr. Hague." The editorial states:

The Senate committee hearings on the President's appointment of Thomas F. Meaney to the Federal District Court of New Jersey took a new turn on Tuesday. It seemed to be Mr. Meaney's patron, Mayor Hague, of Jersey City, rather than Mr. Meaney himself, who was being looked into. Governor Edison made the charge that Mr. Meaney lent himself, 3 years ago, to what the Governor called "Hague's plan to dominate the courts of New Jersey," and raised the question whether Mr. Meaney was "again to be the pawn by which Frank Hague seeks to work out a strategy to dominate the Federal courts also."

Representative Mary Norton, Corporation Counsel Charles A. Rooney, of Jersey City, and Representative Edward J. Hart, also came to Mr. Hague's rather than to Mr. Meaney's defense.

This was as it should have been. The chief objection to this appointment is that Mr. Meaney is a Hague man. His record in the juvenile and domestic-relations court and the court of common pleas is beside the question. In Governor Edison's words, he was "a part in the notorious series of moves" by which Mayor Hague's inexperienced son became a Jersey judge. His support is Hague's support. His confirmation would be a Hague confirmation.

For those who believe in good and free government it is not necessary to argue the case of Mr. Hague. There was no excuse, except a narrow partisan political excuse for this appointment. The President's warmest friends must feel that he erred in this step and must devoutly hope that the Senate will rescue him from his error.

I think it can be said without any contradiction whatever that the New York Times is conceded to be one of the leading newspapers in the United States.

We ought not only to read the editorials, but we ought to get some word from the columnists who analyze the news. Here is an article by a very able columnist whom all Senators know. The article was printed in the Scripps-Howard newspapers. It is by Thomas L. Stokes. I shall not read it all. I read an extract from it:

This was emphasized by contrast when the Republican State chairman, H. Alexander Smith, pleaded before the committee for support of the Governor in his fight to preserve the integrity of the judiciary. He has often disagreed with the Governor, he said, but he wanted to offer his help on this fundamental issue.

That is the opinion of high-class men, regardless of politics. I could name any number of them. These things have come to me without any solicitation.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator is not quoting H. Alexander Smith "regardless of politics"; is he? I have before me an announcement in the New York Times of last Sunday that he is to be the Republican candidate for the United States Senate.

Mr. NORRIS. So far as I know, he has a right to be.

Mr. SMATHERS. The Senator's statement was "regardless of politics."

Mr. NORRIS. Very well. I take it that even a Senator or a candidate for the office of Senator has a right to support a nonpartisan judiciary if he wishes to do so.

Mr. President, I desire to read a letter from the pastor of the Methodist Church of Hackensack, N. J.:

MY DEAR SENATOR: I was in the years of fighting to force Mayor Hague to allow the civil rights of the citizens of Jersey City to function, not to speak of his violent use of the police to deny rights to outsiders, and anyone not from Hudson County, in those days, was a foreigner. Finally the Supreme Court instructed him; but it has given little freedom to citizens of Jersey City.

Any State-wide practicing lawyer will say, if he will speak at all, that "the Hudson County boss" has an unhealthy influence in the State courts and with some judges. Nothing could be more detrimental to all decent concern for the State than to have that influence extended into Federal courts.

Let the President and Jersey representatives select a man above reproach. The judgeship itself has a right to demand that.

It was disheartening to hear from a group of fine citizens who were meeting for a wholly other matter yesterday, "you can't do a thing with the connections he (Mr. Hague) has. He has the votes to give." A United States Senate Judiciary Committee can give a lesson to the whole Nation through judicial handling of this spotlighted, humiliating case.

To confirm this nomination is to repudiate every person and group that dares to seek the best interests of this State, including Governor Edison who has the confidence of all public-spirited folks even when they disagree with him. They know that he is trying to fight their democratic battle against an entrenched ruthless set-up.

I can send you the names of 60 pastors throughout the State who are informed in these matters but do not write under the impression that to send in a mass of letters to an important committee is presumptuous.

Next I shall read a portion of the letter from a man who, with his letter, sends a copy of a communication which he has written to Governor Edison:

I am taking the liberty of enclosing a copy of a letter which I wrote to Governor Edison on May 21. * * *

The writer has frequently disagreed with Governor Edison and, upon occasion, has vigorously opposed portions of his program. Indeed, during the last gubernatorial campaign, the writer served as campaign manager for Governor Edison's Republican opponent.

In the present issue, however, I believe that Governor Edison is not only right, but that he reflects the point of view of the great majority of thoughtful Jerseymen.

Very truly yours,

ALFRED E. DRISCOLL.

That is the letter of the man who, in the gubernatorial campaign in New Jersey, was the manager of Governor Edison's Republican opponent.

I read now the letter he wrote to the Governor:

May I take this opportunity of indicating to you my whole-hearted approval of the opinions expressed by you in your letter to the members of the Senate Judiciary Committee, which appeared in the public press on May 18. I am entirely confident that the overwhelming majority of the serious-minded citizens of this State approve the position you have taken.

In the concluding paragraphs of his letter he writes as follows:

Irrespective of what the facts may be, there can be no question but that this appointment will result in a further loss of confidence by many of our citizens in the judiciary process. In these critical times, we can ill afford this loss which could be so easily avoided by the appointment of a man whose previous record of independent action would win the confidence and approval of Jerseymen. It is to be hoped that the members of the Judiciary Committee will give due heed to their responsibility and serious consideration to your letter.

As a private citizen, may I again express to you my personal appreciation for the action which you have taken.

That is the letter which was written by the manager of the campaign of Governor Edison's Republican opponent in the last gubernatorial campaign.

Next I shall read from the letter of the Republican candidate himself, Mr. Hendrickson. In a letter written to the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, he expresses himself. His letter is a lengthy one; I shall not read it all unless some Member of the Senate requests that I do so. Otherwise, I shall read extracts from it.

Mr. Hendrickson says in his letter:

I realize that first things must come first; that to win the war must be the first objective of not only the Congress but of every patriotic citizen.

It is most essential, however, that while the free peoples of the world are winning the war, if we are to win the peace which follows and preserve the time-honored and sacred devices by which freemen live, we must maintain here at home integrity and decency in the processes of government for the preservation of which our young Americans are fighting all over the world.

Further on in the same letter Mr. Hendrickson says:

The issue, therefore, is not Meaney's qualifications but his subservience to Hague.

All over the world today Americans are fighting to preserve our cherished democratic institutions, and, in meeting its responsibilities in the Meaney issue, the Senate Judiciary Committee in a very real sense is trustee of the people's heritage at a time of crisis.

The Meaney nomination is a brazen challenge to the maintenance of a free and independent Federal judiciary.

It is bad enough that Frank Hague has a voice in the courts of New Jersey. He should not be given a voice in the courts of the Nation.

The letter is signed by Mr. Hendrickson, the Republican candidate for Governor who ran against Mr. Edison, the present Governor.

Mr. President, I could stand here for a week and give evidence of what the people of the United States think of the Hague machine. When I am asked to point to a specific instance in which he has committed a crime, I cannot do it. He could not be convicted in New Jersey, even if it were possible to point to a specific crime. He controls the courts, the juries, and everything else in New Jersey. As I have tried to explain, the Meaney nomination is the entering wedge in the move by which Hague may control the Federal courts in New Jersey.

Mr. President, machine men do not do their contemptible work openly. They do it in the dark. They are shrewd. If they did do their work openly and aboveboard they would not last long. If they control Senators or Representatives or judges or members of the legislature they are not continually pulling the strings; because it would too soon be known that such men were tools. However, they do pull the strings when they need to have their tools work for them; and the whole country knows it. Everyone knows it. Those who believe the country does not know it will be enlightened, I hope, before long, and will realize that that boss control, especially of the judiciary of the United States, is a dangerous business, and one that will not be tolerated by the people of the country or by the Senate of the United States.

I have read the letter of Governor Edison to the committee. Governor Edison appeared before the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary. His testimony commences at page 55, near the bottom of the page. I do not intend to read it all, for it runs over several pages, but I shall read extracts from it. I quote from a statement he read before the committee:

My chief objection to the confirmation of Thomas F. Meaney as Federal district court judge rests upon the principle that the judiciary should be free of the control of bosses and political machines. No dictatorship ever existed without control of the courts. On the other hand, democratic government cannot exist without free courts. Those are facts of history which no one can dispute.

The record of Thomas F. Meaney indicates beyond any question that he has done his boss' will. And right there it is appropriate to point out that his master has expressed his notion of courts and judicial processes in the phrase, "I am the law." So we know what sort of will his master has.

You are not considering an ordinary appointment of a man with ordinary political background—the basic question is whether in the confirmation of Mr. Meaney you are not, in effect, putting Frank Hague on the Federal bench. The conclusion is inevitably "Yes."

The name of Mr. Meaney had scarcely reached you gentlemen when editorial writers of leading newspapers and magazines denounced him as a tool of Frank Hague, a ruthless political dictator. These editorials appeared before you gentlemen heard any protests from me. Hence it cannot be said that I am alone in my objections to Mr. Meaney or that I inspired such objections.

It was charged, I may say, against Governor Edison that he had stirred up this opposition. An attack was made on him at once as soon as he opposed the confirmation in the letter which I have already read. Among other things, he was charged not only with ingratitude but with having fomented the opposition which later on arose.

I continue reading from the testimony of Governor Edison before the committee:

The people will always be dubious of the quality of justice obtainable from a judge who, all his adult life, has been a part of and obligated to a sordid political machine.

In my letter to the Judiciary Committee I detailed the nimble part that Mr. Meaney played in the strategy of Hague's plan to dominate the courts of New Jersey.

I ask you to weigh well the question: Is Mr. Meaney again to be the pawn by which Frank Hague seeks to work out a strategy to dominate the Federal courts also?

The very breadth and character of the campaign that is being waged to place Mr. Meaney on the bench shows how important it is to Hague and his group to have this particular Federal judge.

May I also respectfully remind you that of three men who alone are elected to office by all the people of New Jersey, I am one. The two Senators from New Jersey are the others.

Hence I submit that when the interests of those people on a State-wide basis are in

jeopardy, I have an equal right and obligation to speak out for them.

I have been striving with all the sincerity and with every ability I possess to free the judiciary of New Jersey from the suspicions that constantly circulate in the public mind that the judiciary is not the free and independent guarantor of our basic liberties but is, rather, in some cases amenable to the suggestions of the boss. Whatever Mr. Meaney's qualifications, or lack of them, may be for appointment to the Federal bench, the fact remains that if he is confirmed an unalterable record will be made in the public mind that their worst suspicions are also confirmed.

It is on those grounds that I register my objections. It is because I feel that our democracy itself rests on the faith of the people in the sanctity of justice that I urge you to ask that another name be submitted.

The Senate of the United States has voted that the young men of this country shall go to war to protect our liberties—to die for them if need be. We are under contract to those young men to be worthy of their sacrifice. If we believe in the American way of life enough to send young Americans away to die for it, we must believe in it enough to keep our States—our courts—clean and free. We must fight here at home for the same things that our young men fight for abroad. We must not permit the sabotage of democracy by petty political tyrants at home.

He was cross-examined by various members of the subcommittee and, later on, by Members of the House of Representatives who came over to question him. The Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], who was chairman of the subcommittee, said:

Mrs. Norton wants to ask you a question, Governor Edison.

Mrs. NORTON. Governor, I have listened to your statement—

That is the statement I have just read to the Senate—

with a great deal of interest and, may I say, amazement. I am chairman of the Democratic State Committee. I went through the State with you when you were a candidate, arranged many meetings in your behalf. At those meetings and everywhere that I ever talked with you, you had the greatest respect, apparently, at that time, for the Honorable Frank Hague. I recall on one occasion, when we had a very large meeting at Sea Girt, and if I recall correctly, I think we called at Mrs. Stultsberry's after that, following the meeting, you came there and you were quite amazed at the performance you had just seen.

You said to me, and I think I am quoting your exact words, "Mrs. NORTON, I have never seen a meeting equal to that anywhere. I think Mayor Hague must be a great leader."

Now she is coming to the question. She was to ask a question.

Will you please tell me why you have changed your mind to such an extent since that time? You accepted Mayor Hague's assistance at that time, you accepted the assistance of the State committee, you accepted the assistance of the organization of Hudson County, without which you never could have been elected. I think you will admit that, and all of that you accepted at that time.

It was long before that that the newspaper articles calling Mayor Hague all kinds of names had been printed, but apparently you had a personal interest in thinking at that time that Mayor Hague was a great name, and it is only now, since apparently you have had some dispute or quarrel with him, that you have changed your mind.

I could not help thinking, as I listened to you this morning, that this country would not be in the condition it is, nor would the world be at war if it were not for the horrible sin of hatred, and apparently that is the thing that has taunted you to come here and speak against a man who has the respect of everybody in Jersey City, and I am referring to Tom Meaney.

I have known Tom Meaney since he was a little boy. We were neighbors. His sister and I were at school together and he was one of my very dearest friends. I have never known anything of Tom Meaney that was not good, and I think it is an outrage that Tom Meaney should be made the object of your dislike and hatred of Mayor Hague.

That is what I want to say to you.

Governor EDISON. Are you asking a question?

Mrs. NORTON. I asked a question; yes. I started in by asking you a question. You heard my question. My questions were: Why you have changed your mind about Frank Hague, why you have accepted everything that Frank Hague and his organization in Hudson County and the State organization had to give you, and then turn against him because of some private quarrel?

Governor EDISON. Mrs. NORTON, I have never changed my mind about Frank Hague.

Mrs. NORTON. Then I think you were the most arrant hypocrite that ever walked through New Jersey.

Senator SMATHERS. Wait a minute, Mrs. NORTON.

You asked the Governor a question.

Governor EDISON. May I answer your question?

Mrs. NORTON. You may.

Well, she has finally consented to have her question answered. That is quite a relief, at least.

Senator SMATHERS. You may proceed, Governor.

Governor EDISON. I never changed my mind about Frank Hague, and as long as you mentioned the Sea Girt meeting, which was thrust upon me, I might say that it was at that meeting that I stood on the platform with Mr. Hague alongside of me and said that I would not be beholden to any man, and that I would be responsible only to my own conscience, giving notice to the people that I was not going to be under Mr. Hague's thumb.

Later on, at Princeton, N. J., I condemned the burning of the poll books and election records in Jersey City, again giving notice that I was not one of Mr. Hague's minions.

The mere fact that there is a political organization in New Jersey that felt it was to their interest to back me for Governorship is something that I could not control. I never sought for one minute the aid of the Hague organization.

I did seek the aid of the political party called the Democratic Party, which, unfortunately, has been kept weak in New Jersey by the policy of Frank Hague keeping the party weak, except in Hudson County.

I sought the aid and support of the Democratic Party, but I did not and do not seek the aid of Frank Hague. I have never changed my opinion about him, and I cannot be accused of being a hypocrite with those two public announcements on the record.

Mrs. NORTON. All I can say is, Governor, a man who accepts the help of somebody for whom he apparently had the contempt that you have evidenced here today certainly places himself in a very peculiar position. You did accept his help. I know that, as chairman of the State committee, you did accept the help of the Hudson County organization, no matter what you may say today to the contrary, and I am very sorry I have to disagree with you.

Governor EDISON. Can you point to any way that I could have avoided having the help thrust on me?

Mrs. NORTON. Yes. If it had not been for his help, you would not be sitting here as Governor of the State of New Jersey, and I think you know it.

I have had some occasion, Mr. President, to comment on that kind of a philosophy, and I think it must be apparent to all citizens, no matter what their political belief may be, or what other belief they may hold, that that kind of a theory of government would eventually destroy every democracy on earth. No democracy can survive if such a philosophy of government is to prevail. It would mean that all of us would be beholden to people who supported us and voted for us, and any one of them would have a right to say, "I supported you." Perhaps he could truthfully say, "You would not have been elected had it not been for me." I know that statement has been made to me many times. Yet, no matter what pain it might cause, if one were a true American, if he honorably performed the duties of his office, and tried to perform them with conscientious ability, he could not permit anyone even though he had to admit that he was responsible for the election, say that he had a right to control him, after he had been elected to office. Any public official who assumes office with that kind of a string tied to him, I care not who he may be, I care not what office he may hold, is not worthy to hold any office of honor under our flag.

Mr. President, the Governor completed his testimony by quoting from an address which he had recently delivered on an occasion when a returned soldier was being honored, or some similar occasion. I shall not read all of the address, although I have it here. It is a part of the record, found on pages 62 and 63. I read from the bottom of page 62, where the Governor is quoted as follows:

With these high purposes, there can be no disagreement. Now, let us be completely candid and ask ourselves if we citizens of New Jersey are preserving American freedom, American democracy, American decency in our home State to the ultimate degree which warrants our young men dying for it.

I say that we owe to them a better State, a much better State than we have yet made of New Jersey.

How sacred are the constitutional guaranties of freedom in New Jersey when there is a city where people can be hustled out of town if they want to criticize the point of view of the mayor?

That is just what brought on the injunction case that was tried before Judge Clark, as a result of which Hague was enjoined from interference with those rights.

The speaker continued:

How democratic is our government in New Jersey if a few petty overlords of political machines can dictate the choice of candidates by telephone from Florida or of judges and departmental executives by deals in Trenton?

I am sure that the people of New Jersey understood whom the Governor had in mind when he referred to the dictation of nominations of candidates by telephone from Florida. That practice was alleged many times as one indulged by Frank Hague and as one of his methods of doing business.

Further on the Governor said:

All of us have an obligation to get into every local election, into every county committee election, every county government election, every State election, and every na-

tional election. We have a duty to get in as candidates ourselves or to work for candidates who will represent the free, democratic, decent principles of Americanism.

Let me remind you, also, that the executives of businesses and the heads of civic groups and the chiefs of labor groups also have a chance to prove their own courageous citizenship every day in little private dealings where they have the choice of knuckling under to the forces of political corruption or fighting out in the open for their American rights. I don't think there is need for me to elaborate on that subject.

Fellow citizens of the Newark area, I have made a simple, direct talk about public affairs to you because I think all of you are ready to hear plain talk on that subject. Either we Americans at home are going to have the courage to stand up against the dilutions and the sabotaging of democracy in our State or we are sending our young men to fight under false pretenses.

If we believe in the clean, free, democratic, American way of life enough to vote that young Americans should die for it, we must believe in it enough to use our political power to keep New Jersey clean and free. We must fight here at home for the same things that our young men fight for abroad. I call on you men to enlist in this fight.

Mr. President, those who support the Hague machine in connection with the nomination of Mr. Meaney heap criticism on the Governor of New Jersey because he has the courage to speak out his conscientious convictions.

Mr. President, I have not yet concluded my remarks. I shall want to use more time later on, and go into some matters which I have not mentioned up to this time. I do not feel able to continue my remarks today; but I have no objection to some other Member speaking at this time.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I have some legislative business which I should like to have considered, if there is no objection.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, may I ask what the nature of the proposed legislative business is?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. A message came from the House today with respect to House Joint Resolution 329. It deals with the matter of extending for 90 days the rules governing overtime pay. There is on the Senate Calendar a bill, S. 2628, Calendar No. 1570, reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, which would extend the time for a year. The Civil Service Commission has asked that extensions be allowed for only 90 days in order that it may have time to act upon the matter.

Mr. McNARY. May I inquire of the Senator from Utah if he refers to a bill on the calendar, or to a conference report, or to a House bill?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. It will be rather confusing to explain the whole matter. I think we should begin with Senate bill 2628, Calendar 1570.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, let me say to the distinguished majority leader, that the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who has had the floor, is somewhat exhausted and does not feel that he can continue this afternoon. He has not completed his remarks, however. I submit to the Senator from Kentucky the question as to what should be done during the remainder of the afternoon; or does the Senator think that a recess should be taken until tomorrow?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the conferees dealing with the Labor Department-Federal Security appropriation bill will meet at 4:30. I believe there will be no trouble about reaching a conclusion with respect to the measure. It will be absolutely necessary for us to pass the bill today. I hope the Senate will not take a recess, but will continue in session until a report can be submitted on the measure.

Mr. BARKLEY. There are other speakers on the subject of the confirmation of the nomination of Mr. Meaney. Why cannot they proceed? I do not know how many more there are, or how long they will take. It seems to me we should continue with the regular order.

Mr. NORRIS. I suggest that Senators on the other side speak on the confirmation. Let the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] proceed for a while.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not know whether the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] is going to speak. There is no rule by which a Senator can be forced to speak unless he wants to speak.

Mr. NORRIS. No.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no definite information on the subject, but there are other Senators who are going to speak on the subject, and they ought to speak.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator from Kentucky will agree with me that we should follow the usual procedure. Those who wish to speak on one side should not all be required to speak consecutively. It should not be necessary that all the speakers on one side should conclude before the speakers on the other side begin.

Mr. BARKLEY. I have no information that any Senator on the other side is going to speak.

Mr. NORRIS. I think the Senator can find out about that.

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I am willing to vote on the question right now. Thus far I have not heard anything said that I feel should necessitate my speaking. If the speaking on the other side is concluded I am perfectly willing to have the vote taken right now.

Mr. BARKLEY. I understand the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. BARBOUR] desires to address the Senate.

Mr. BARBOUR. I, of course, will say something, but while I appreciate what the Senator from Kentucky has said, that there is no rule or regulation with respect to procedure, or that perhaps in this instance there is no reason why my colleague should speak, certainly we shall have a very peculiar situation if no Senator on the other side feels free or wants to say anything in favor of the nomination.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is not a matter over which I have any control.

Mr. SMATHERS. In answer to that statement, Mr. President, I will say to my distinguished colleague that the report of the Committee on the Judiciary should relieve any Senator from speaking on this side of the House.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, we all understand that when nominations come to the Senate, unless there is objection, they are confirmed as a matter of routine. The burden is usually on those who object, to make out a case against confirmation. The burden is not on those who advocate the confirmation of a nominee to indulge in oratory unless something develops which is not referred to in the report or in the testimony, and, frankly, I do not quite understand why there is so insistent a demand that the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] speak regardless of whether he wants to do so.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I do not think anyone insists on the Senator from New Jersey speaking, although we all like to hear his eloquent and melodious voice.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure of that. I do myself.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not understand why the leader of the majority insists that all who oppose the confirmation of the nomination speak first. I have been here for some time, and have always found when Senators did not agree on certain questions, and when the debate continued for some time, that Senators on opposite sides of a question alternate in taking up the time. I submit that is the proper way to proceed. That has always been done. Often when a speaker has taken a good part of a day to discuss a matter, and has not concluded, although the hour was not as far advanced as it is today, the opposition has acceded courteously to the suggestion that a recess be taken, and that the discussion be resumed by the speaker the next day.

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say to the Senator from Nebraska that no one on this side, or on the other side, has indicated to me that he intends to speak in favor of the nomination. The presumption is that the report of the committee speaks for itself. It has been an unbroken rule in the Senate that those who advocate a matter have a right to close the argument if they wish to. Not even the Senator from New Jersey has indicated to me that he is going to speak. The Senator from Nebraska would not attribute to me the duty of scouring around over the Senate to find out if some Senator wishes to speak, and bring in a derrick and get him up on his feet in order that we might proceed. I feel that it is asking a good deal of me to ask me to drum up oratory even in favor of a confirmation.

Mr. NORRIS. I believe the Senator used the word "our." Of course, that has a meaning which is significant.

Mr. BARKLEY. "Our"—I do not know what the Senator means.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator spoke of "our side."

Mr. BARKLEY. Well, I am going to vote for the confirmation of the nomination.

Mr. NORRIS. Of course, the Senator is. We all know that from what he has said.

Mr. BARKLEY. And if that means "our side"——

Mr. NORRIS. It does.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am perfectly willing for it to mean that. But I do not see why Senators who are bursting with oratory, whose bosoms are heaving for an

opportunity to speak against the nomination, should be sitting around waiting for someone else to speak in favor of the nomination. If no one speaks in favor of it we can vote on the question.

Mr. NORRIS. The Senator knows that there will be some Senators who will speak for the nomination.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not, I will say to the Senator in all sincerity.

Mr. NORRIS. For 2 days the desk of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] has been piled sky high with documents, which it will take him a week or more to go through.

Mr. BARKLEY. I presume he has ammunition on his desk ready in the event he has to shoot it.

Mr. NORRIS. Well, let him shoot it.

Mr. BARKLEY. He may not want to fire a shot. I do not know. I do not undertake to say whether he will or will not.

Mr. BARBOUR. Mr. President, I do not wish to imply that I have any hesitancy in speaking now, because I do not have in the least. But I and two or three of my colleagues discussed the matter, and it was rather felt, and I agreed, that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], who is a member of the Committee on the Judiciary, should be the next speaker, particularly in view of the fact that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who is not only a member of that committee but was a member of the subcommittee, is necessarily absent. I think that is a rather logical procedure, provided and assuming that my colleague from New Jersey is not going to say anything at all. As the debate has proceeded it has rather developed that he was not going to say anything.

So far as I am concerned, I should be glad to say anything I have to say now, but I think the other procedure perhaps would be a little better, if it is agreeable to the Senator from Ohio, if he does not feel that the hour is too late, but feels he has time enough to speak this afternoon. That is the only reason I did not immediately begin to speak.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I think we can bridge this awkward pause. I should ask the able Senator from Kentucky to recess at this time until tomorrow if it were not for the fact that there are two conference reports which must be considered this afternoon. I think they will be ready about 5 o'clock.

The able Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] is a member of the committee, and desires to speak. He could not conclude his remarks between now and 5 o'clock. He is always accommodating. I think he would be willing to go forward until we receive the conference report, with the understanding that we may recess at that time until tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, so far as I am personally concerned I am willing to accommodate myself to the convenience of Senators. However, the Senator from Oregon knows that a number of Senators had planned to depart from the city tonight on important business. I do not know whether they can remain over until tomorrow. Of course, the Senate cannot help that situation. I do not know that their votes would be vital one way or the other. Among Senators who had arranged to leave the city tonight there may be some who would vote for and some who would vote against confirmation of the nomination. Frankly, I do not think the Senate would be willing to hold a night session because of this nomination.

Let me say to my friend from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS] that although I know he is anxious to have the nomination disposed of, I doubt very much if it would be feasible to try to hold a night session on it. It is entirely satisfactory to me to go along until we reach the usual time for recess or adjournment.

Mr. McNARY. I thought it would be. Let me suggest to the distinguished leader, in the very eloquent phrase which he has often used, that the duty of Senators is here in the Senate, and not traveling to their homes.

Mr. BARKLEY. I agree to that.

Mr. McNARY. Therefore I am not concerned about staying here tonight to finish a job so as to accommodate a few Senators who want to leave the city. I think it would be well if we could have an understanding that the Senator from Ohio may proceed until we receive the conference reports, in the neighborhood of 5 o'clock, and then take a recess until tomorrow.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as I am concerned, that is satisfactory. I am not certain that we shall receive the conference reports by 5 o'clock, but I do not think we should recess before that time.

OVERTIME RATES OF COMPENSATION UNDER CERTAIN ACTS

As in legislative session,

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if we do not act today, this being the 30th of June, there will be a change in the law in regard to overtime rates of compensation for practically all the employees of the Federal Government. I shall ask unanimous consent that we proceed as in legislative session until we can dispose of this question.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, to what measure does the Senator refer?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. On the Vice President's desk there is House Joint Resolution 329, which has just come over from the House of Representatives. I ask that it be laid before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 329) extending the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under certain acts, which was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the provisions for the payment of overtime rates of compensation contained in the act approved June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676); the act approved October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205); and the act approved June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241), are hereby extended from June 30, 1942, to and including September 30, 1942.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, has this measure been referred to a committee?

Mr. BARKLEY. No. A similar Senate bill, which has been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs, is on the calendar.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should like to make a statement with regard to the joint resolution.

Senate bill 2628, amending Public Law No. 873, Seventy-sixth Congress, approved October 21, 1940, is on the calendar. That bill would merely extend for another year the law enacted in 1940. The House of Representatives has not acted upon the Senate bill. Instead, the House has acted upon the joint resolution which has just been laid before the Senate.

The measure was sent to the House of Representatives yesterday with a special message from the Civil Service Commission, which I shall read. The message was also addressed to the Vice President.

JUNE 29, 1942.

The VICE PRESIDENT,
United States Senate.

SIR: On June 30, 1942, certain acts expire which provide for the payment of overtime to employees of the War and Navy Departments. It is not likely that any currently pending legislation can be enacted by that time to cover both departments. A serious situation will exist unless a measure can be passed which will preserve the status quo until the Congress has had full opportunity to consider H. R. 7144, "A bill regulating compensation of employees working in excess of 40 hours a week in the executive departments and agencies."

Since the Civil Service Commission has urged the enactment of H. R. 7144 as vital war legislation, it is taking the initiative in presenting the enclosed joint resolution "extending the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under certain acts" which is drafted with a view of taking care of the immediate situation in the War and Navy Departments after June 30, 1942, and to permit consideration of H. R. 7144.

We have been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that the proposed joint resolution is in accord with the President's financial and administrative program.

We have the honor to be,
Very respectfully.

The letter is signed by the three members of the Commission.

Mr. President, I rise with all the apologies which a humble man can offer to anybody. I shall ask to have done what I should not need to ask.

No committee of the Senate has acted upon the joint resolution which has been laid before the Senate; but the Senate Committee on Military Affairs has acted upon a similar bill which would extend the law for a year so far as the Military Establishment is concerned. I think the Naval Affairs Committee has considered the same question.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the Committe on Naval Affairs has had to deal with the same situation which has confronted the Military Affairs Committee. The law granting wages for overtime, so far as the Navy is concerned, would have expired on June 30, today. In a bill which was recently enacted we continued that law for 2 years. An effort was made at the last minute to have the Army included, because the provisions of law affecting overtime in the Army also expire on June 30, today. Am I not correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is correct.

Mr. WALSH. We were unable to have the Army included. So far as the Navy is concerned, the situation is taken care of for 2 years. Would the joint resolution extend the provisions of law which now exist, or would a new law be substituted?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The joint resolution would merely extend for 90 days the law as it now exists, so as to give Congress an opportunity to act.

Mr. WALSH. Does the Senator understand, as I do, that various departments of the Government have been collaborating for the purpose of establishing a fixed standard of wage for overtime?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. WALSH. That measure is not yet before the Congress.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No. It is not before the Senate.

Mr. WALSH. So that unless the joint resolution is passed, the provisions of law relating to the Army, so far as overtime is concerned, would cease.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. WALSH. I assume the Senator desires to have the existing law continued for 90 days so that the proposed new general policy affecting all the departments of the Government, and not merely the Army and Navy, may be considered by the Congress.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true. The Senator from Massachusetts has stated the situation very much better than the Senator from Utah could state it. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WALSH. I thank the Senator for his compliment.

Under the circumstances, in view of the problem before the Navy, it seems to me that there is much merit in the request of the Senator from Utah. As I understand, the joint resolution would only continue the existing law for 90 days. In the meantime, it is expected that a general policy will be formulated by the Government which will affect not only the Army and Navy but the overtime work of employees in all the departments, which should be done.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Again, Mr. President, let me say that I am extremely loath to bring the matter up in this way, because the Senate Military Affairs Committee acted as expeditiously as it possibly could upon the notice which was given to us that the present law would come to an end today.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. WALSH. If the joint resolution is not passed, the failure of Congress to act will amount to a reduction in wages for overtime to a considerable number of employees in the Army.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes. Worse than that, it would bring about great confusion, especially in arsenals, where the Army and the Navy are carrying on war work.

Mr. WALSH. Do I correctly understand that the present provisions of law with respect to overtime are not applicable to all Army employees, but only to certain classes, as is the case in the Navy?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Is it not true that the provision is applicable to employees in the field and not to clerical employees in Washington?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I do not know how to answer that question, because I do not know how the employees are classified. However, the law is not satisfactory from the standpoint of all employees.

Mr. WALSH. As I understand, the Senator is not asking for any additional or broader law in behalf of overtime workers than exists at present.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No. I am merely asking that the present arrangement be continued for 90 days, so that confusion incident to the change in law may not arise.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, the colloquy between the able Senator from Utah and the able Senator from Massachusetts has made clear the purposes of the request. The committee of which the Senator from Utah is chairman——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, if I may interrupt the Senator, let me state that I am acting chairman of the committee. The matter was handled by the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. McNARY. I thought probably it was handled by the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. No; it is a military matter.

Mr. McNARY. The committee has reported a bill which is on the calendar; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Yes.

Mr. McNARY. Is that bill similar to the joint resolution now on the desk, which passed the House?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The measures are similar, except that under our bill the period for which overtime compensation may be paid employees of the Army would be extended for a full year. The joint resolution now being discussed would extend for 90 days the period for which, under the present laws, overtime compensation may be paid Federal employees, including employees of the Army and Navy.

Mr. McNARY. The joint resolution would continue for a period of 90 days the provision of existing law, without in any way enlarging or changing its scope; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That is true.

Mr. McNARY. In the meantime, it is the purpose to examine the matter in a comprehensive way, with a view to permanent legislation; is that correct?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think the problem will be handled by the Civil Service Committee, and not by our committee. Inasmuch as the law is an all-embracing law, including all Federal employees, I assume that the Civil Service Committee would handle the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, of course, as the Senator knows, the request is an unusual one. However, these are unusual times and unusual circumstances. In view of the limitation and the desire to extend the operation of the acts, and inasmuch as the extension would be limited to 90 days, I have no objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I remind the Senate that this situation was not called to the attention of Congress until yesterday, the 29th of June.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 329) extending the period for which overtime compensation may be paid under certain acts was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PARITY LOANS ON 1942 BASIC AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

As in legislative session,

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a few moments ago it was stated by the majority leader that several Senators were planning to leave the city.

There is on the calendar a bill, S. 2585, introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] and myself, providing for full parity loans on the 1942 crops of basic agricultural commodities. In order that all Senators may be advised, I wish to state that it is our purpose to move the consideration of the bill at the earliest possible date. I hope that Senators who are interested in the proposed legislation will take notice of that fact, because we should like to have as full an attendance in the Senate as possible when the bill is considered.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, when does the Senator propose to request that the bill be made the unfinished business?

Mr. RUSSELL. We hope to reach the bill tomorrow, if it is possible to do so.

Mr. McNARY. When the bill was reported from the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and placed on the calendar, I understood that it was not to be pressed for the time being.

Mr. RUSSELL. The bill has now been on the calendar for several weeks.

Mr. McNARY. Perhaps I am mistaken as to the number of the bill. Is it Calendar No. 1521?

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct. The bill was reported favorably on June 11.

Mr. McNARY. Yes; of course, I have no control over the wishes of other Senators.

Mr. RUSSELL. Anything the Senator from Oregon might think would be very persuasive with the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. McNARY. I do not favor the proposed legislation. If it comes up, of course I desire to oppose it; but I did not expect that it would be brought up at as early a date as tomorrow. The decision as to when to request consideration of the bill rests wholly with the Senator from Georgia and depends upon his desire in the matter, but I shall attempt in every way possible to prevent the immediate consideration of the bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. Of course, I regret that the Senator from Oregon does not

view the bill with favor. I hope that he will not close his mind regarding it, but that he will give it the careful attention which he always gives to legislative matters in the Senate.

If the bill is to be considered at all, there are very substantial reasons why it should be considered at the very earliest possible date. For that reason I hope to be able to have the bill considered by the Senate in the very near future.

CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN AUXILIARY NAVAL VESSELS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of House bill 7159, Calendar No. 1556.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the chair). The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 7159) authorizing the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MCNARY. Mr. President, should not a statement be made in advance by way of explanation?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the bill as it passed the House authorized the expansion of auxiliary vessel construction for the Navy by 500,000 tons.

The bill was considered by the Senate Committee on Naval Affairs, and was favorably reported. While the bill was pending on the calendar, the Navy Department made a request that the amount of construction authorized by the bill be increased from 500,000 tons to 1,200,000 tons. The committee heard testimony as to the reasons for the requested increase in construction of auxiliary vessels, and reported the House bill with an amendment providing for 1,200,000 tons instead of 500,000 tons.

In the past 2 years, three acts relating to auxiliary vessels have been passed. The first was passed on May 24, 1941. It authorized the President to acquire and convert or to undertake the construction of 550,000 tons of auxiliary vessels of such size, type, and design as he may consider best suited for the purposes of national defense. Later, on December 17, 1941, the authorization was increased to 1,350,000 tons.

The bill now under discussion would, if enacted, increase that authorization by 1,200,000 tons, making a total authorization of 2,550,000 tons.

The naval appropriation bill which recently passed provided funds for obtaining some auxiliary vessels in excess of the 500,000 tons provided for in the House bill, and originally provided for in the Senate bill. The Navy reports that the tonnage for which contracts have been let under the three authorizations is 1,411,306. The tonnage for which contracts have not been let but for which definite plans have been made is 372,285. The tonnage provided for future contingencies is 66,409; and vessels aggregating 700,000 tons have been in use by the Navy under time charters.

While the bill now being discussed would increase the tonnage to 1,200,000 tons, practically all the authorization heretofore given has been used, and the bill really amounts to an authorization for construction of 372,285 tons of auxiliary vessels for which contracts have been left and for which plans have been made.

As the Senate knows, such auxiliary vessels are used in connection with the fleet. They consist of tankers, repair vessels, hospital ships, and so forth, and also a large number of yachts and other small vessels which have been seized or purchased for the purpose of aiding the Navy in attempting to suppress the submarine menace.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 7159) authorizing the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Naval Affairs, with an amendment, in section 1, on page 1, at the beginning of line 5, to strike out "five hundred" and insert "one million two hundred", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States is hereby authorized to acquire and convert or to undertake the construction of 1,200,000 tons of auxiliary vessels of such size, type, and design as he may consider best suited for the purposes of national defense, such vessels to be in addition to those heretofore authorized.

SEC. 2. There is hereby authorized to be appropriated out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, such sums as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed, and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill, H. R. 7159, was read the third time, and passed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Calloway, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House insisted upon its amendment to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; that the House further insisted upon its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 16 to the bill, agreed to the further conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. HARE, Mr. TARVER, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. KEEFE were appointed managers on the part of the House at the further conference.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolutions:

S. 2586. An act to amend sections 1 and 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue the act in effect during the existing war, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 303. Joint resolution making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia; and

H. J. Res. 324. Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate stand in recess for 15 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

(There being no objection, the Senate stood in recess until 5 o'clock and 21 minutes p. m., when it reassembled.)

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the conferees on the remaining appropriation bills which are to be acted on today are still in session, and report that they will be ready within a few minutes. I therefore ask that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the chair). Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

At 7 o'clock and 32 minutes p. m. the Senate reassembled, when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. CLARK of Missouri in the chair.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Swanson, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 16 to the bill, and concurred therein with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

H. R. 6599. An act making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes;

H. R. 6845. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 7280. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT

As in legislative session,

Mr. McCARRAN submitted the following report:

The Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate and the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 9: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said House amendment, insert the following:

"For all necessary expenses to enable the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps to provide for the liquidation of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the conservation and disposition of all of the property of whatever type (including camp buildings, accessories, equipment, and machinery of all types) in use by said Corps, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; payment for accrued annual leave of employees separated from the Government service due to the discontinuance of Corps operations; and for such travel (including the return of enrollees to their homes) and other necessary expenses as may be incurred in connection with liquidation of said Civilian Conservation Corps from the unexpended balances of the appropriations made to the Civilian Conservation Corps in the "Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1942", not exceeding $8,000,000: *Provided*, That said liquidation shall be completed as quickly as possible but in any event not later than June 30, 1943."

And the House agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 16.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
HARRY S. TRUMAN,
STYLES BRIDGES,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

BUTLER B. HARE,
M. C. TARVER,
ALBERT THOMAS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move the adoption of the conference report.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question. In a word, what is the meaning of the report?

Mr. McCARRAN. Amendment numbered 9 is the amendment relating to the Civilian Conservation Corps. The Senate receded from its amendment, which would have retained the Civilian Conservation Corps and would have appropriated approximately $70,000,000 for its operation. By a vote of the House which was quite overwhelming, it became apparent that we could not succeed; so we receded from the amendment and then adopted an amendment to the language agreed to by the House, which amendment provides that the Civilian Conservation Corps shall be liquidated within 1 year, and provides $8,000,000 to carry out the liquidation.

The amendment also provides that the Civilian Conservation Corps shall, under the law, transfer its enrollees to their homes and take care of other necessary items.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. The appropriation of $8,000,000 would be from the unexpended balances; is that correct?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator if this is a complete report?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes; it is a complete report.

Mr. BARKLEY. What was done regarding the amendment pertaining to student training?

Mr. McCARRAN. In a moment I shall make a motion in that connection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a message from the House of Representatives announcing its action on an amendment of the Senate to House bill 7181, which was read as follows:

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
June 30, 1942.

Resolved, That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 16 to the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and concur therein with amendments as follows:

Lines 6 and 7 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "pharmacy," insert "whose technical or professional education can be completed within 2 years."

Line 8 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment, after "students" insert "whose technical or professional education can be completed within 2 years"; and line 20 of the matter inserted by said Senate engrossed amendment strike out "$7,500,000" and insert "$5,000,000."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate concur in the House amendments to Senate amendment numbered 16.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, as I understand, that completes the procedure with reference to the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. It does.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 1, 1942, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 30 (legislative day of June 29), 1942:

THE JUDICIARY

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGES

Peirson M. Hall to be United States district judge for the southern district of California.

George F. Alexander to be United States district judge for division No. 1, district of Alaska.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

William T. Mahoney to be United States marshal for division No. 1, district of Alaska.

Joseph A. McDonald to be United States marshal for division No. 4, district of Alaska.

OFFICE OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS

STATE DIRECTORS

Louis F. Hutchinson for Indiana.
Rexford C. McCullough, Jr., for Louisiana.
Michael Francis Prendergast for Maryland.
Oliver Jenkins for New Hampshire.
Harry L. Griffin for North Carolina.
John E. Walsh for Vermont.

POSTMASTERS

INDIANA

George W. Purcell, Bloomington.
Cassius W. Cottingham, Sharpsville.

KANSAS

Clyde S. Drake, Attica.
Berton J. Haworth, Plainville.

MICHIGAN

John T. Burke, Ishpeming.

MISSOURI

William P. Clarkson, Callao.
Elizabeth A. Farnan, Clyde.
William G. Inlow, Curryville.
Joseph F. Hargis, Downing.
Albert Linxwiler, Jefferson City.
Louis N. Bowman, King City.

NORTH DAKOTA

Orpheus H. Halverson, Northwood.

PENNSYLVANIA

William H. Heacock, Marcus Hook.

PUERTO RICO

Sergio A. Valentine, Catano.

TENNESSEE

Joseph M. Dedman, Columbia.
Donald B. Todd, Etowah.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JUNE 30, 1942

The House met at 10 o'clock a. m.

Rev. Edward G. Latch, Metropolitan Memorial Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Our Heavenly Father, the Father of all wisdom, understanding, and true strength, who art a strong tower of defense to all who put their trust in Thee, make strong our faith that we may become aware of Thy presence about us and within us. In Thee alone is our hope, our life, and our peace.

During the hours of decision, of temptation, and of responsibility, speak Thou to us the word of understanding and courage that we may shun the voice of moral compromise and ever follow the path that leads to moral greatness.

Guide Thou our Nation, we beseech Thee, and lead the nations of the world into the way of justice and truth.

Hasten the day when peace shall come and righteousness shall rule in the hearts of all men—we pray in the spirit of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CHANGE IN ENROLLMENT OF TITLE OF BILL

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table Senate Concurrent Resolution 29 for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed, in the enrollment of the bill (S. 2586) to amend sections 1 and 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 19, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue the act in effect during the existing war, and for other purposes, to change the title so as to read: "An act to amend sections 1 and 3 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue the act in effect during the existing war, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OVERTIME RATES OF COMPENSATION

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 329) extending the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under certain acts.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

The Clerk read the joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the provisions for the payment of overtime rates of compensation contained in the act approved June 26, 1940 (54 Stat. 676); the act approved October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205); and the act approved June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241), are hereby extended from June 30, 1942, to and including September 30, 1942.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, as I understand, this is a resolution extending legislation already passed by both the House and Senate and already in effect in both the Army and the Navy Establishments.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The situation is this: The Congress in 1940 and 1941 provided overtime pay in the War and Navy Departments for certain employees, all of which expires today. The House has already passed legislation continuing these acts. The Senate has passed one of the extension bills or possibly two of them; there are three bills. The House Committee on the Civil Service has pending before it general legislation to cover all the employees of the Government, but we have not been able to report that yet.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. That is the reason why the gentleman wants a 3 months' extension?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right, so that we can work the problem out.

The situation is that we now have about 1,000,000 employees who are entitled to overtime pay and we have another million who are not. In many instances they are doing exactly the same work and working the same hours, but some get overtime pay and some do not. We want time to work that problem out.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, it seems only an act of common justice to do this.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think so.

Mr. RICH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, why do we have legislation creating this discrepancy by giving overtime pay to some employees and not to other employees of the Government?

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is a long, long story, and I do not know that I could answer the gentleman's question right now. I think it was a mistake that was made last year and the year before.

Mr. RICH. If you made a mistake last year by passing this legislation, why continue it? Why not wait until the legislation the gentleman's committee is now drafting is completed, so that you will treat all employees alike? Why not hold this up until that time?

Mr. RAMSPECK. I may say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the situation is this: The people covered by this resolution have been getting paid overtime for a couple of years. It would create considerable confusion and interfere with our war effort to cut it off right now. We are trying to work the problem out in an orderly way, and we want time in which to do it.

Mr. RICH. I appreciate that, but the gentleman said a few moments ago it was bad legislation. I do not think that when you have bad legislation you should continue it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not believe the gentleman said it was bad legislation.

Mr. RAMSPECK. No; if the gentleman understood me to say that, he misunderstood me. I said it created some discriminations.

Mr. RICH. In the gentleman's first remark he stated that the legislation is not good because it does not cover all Government employees. I think that is right myself. If we are in that position, then why extend it, and until what date? To what date are you extending the operation of these acts?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Only 90 days, to September 30.

Mr. McCORMACK. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, in answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, which I think is a proper one, may I say that unless this resolution goes through the employees who are now getting the benefits of the overtime rate of pay will be denied it.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is correct.

Mr. McCORMACK. Unless this goes through there will be further discrimination. The purpose of this resolution is to protect the rights of those who are now getting overtime pay. Then during the next 3 months an opportunity will be afforded to consider the whole question and its application to others.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. RICH. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I say that if the legislation takes in only a part of the Government employees, if it is good for them it ought to be good for all the employees.

Mr. McCORMACK. Correct.

Mr. RICH. Whenever we discriminate, whenever we find that we are doing something for some people and not doing it for all the people, it is not good legislation. Every man should be treated alike.

Mr. McCORMACK. I agree with the gentleman, but the situation is this: Unless this resolution goes through, those who are now getting the benefit will be denied it. Of course, the purpose of this is to protect them against that situation, and then get additional legislation to take care of the others.

Mr. RICH. Two wrongs do not make a right.

Mr. McCORMACK. I think that is the constructive viewpoint to take.

Mr. RICH. It does not seem to me it is the right thing to do.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand, all the gentleman from Georgia is trying to do is to prevent a greater injustice by having us take this action now, so we can study the problem and work out something that will provide justice for all.

Mr. RAMSPECK. That is right.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN O. SNYDER

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I have asked this permission in order that the House may pause for a moment to recognize the valuable service of one whom we all admire and whom we all like, who, after 41 years, 3 months, and 26 days of faithful and loyal service to the organization of the House, will retire at the end of today's business, one of the few legislative House employees to retire, as I understand, in the history of the country, our very good friend and our loyal employee, John O. Snyder, of Brooklyn, N. Y.

Mr. Snyder first came to the House as a result of an appointment by the late George Henry Lindsay, of New York, becoming employed in the organization of the House in the Fifty-seventh Congress, March 4, 1901. He has been a continuous employee of the House during the last 41 years. He was first appointed as assistant messenger, then special assistant to the doorkeeper, and, later, became Democratic pair clerk in 1919, in which capacity he has acted to date. Since 1911 he has also been assistant whip of the New York Democratic delegation.

I know we are all going to miss John Snyder, his welcome smile and his pleasant personality, and I also know we have all been inspired by the wonderful example of loyalty and devotion to duty which he has always evidenced.

We shall always be glad to see John Snyder back among us to visit us at least occasionally, and we hope frequently. I know I speak the sentiments of the House when I extend to John Snyder our sincere feeling of appreciation of his many years of loyal service and extend to him our best wishes for many more years of life, or rest, and of happiness.

To him I extend my congratulations. He and his family may well feel proud of the great record of loyalty and devotion to duty that he has evidenced to the House organization during the past 41 years.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I will be very glad to yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I wish to concur in the sentiments so ably and eloquently expressed by my friend the distinguished majority leader. While Mr. Snyder is listed as an employee on the Democratic side, Republicans and Democrats alike appreciate his sterling worth, his genial disposition, his fine personality, and his great service to the country. He has never failed to render aid whenever requested. His departure will be a source of keen regret and I join with the majority leader and his many friends in wishing Mr. Snyder all happiness and prosperity in the days that are to come.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I value and appreciate very much the fine contribution made by my distinguished friend from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN] and I may also say that we do not look at the employees of the House from the Republican or the Democratic side. They represent all of us. They are a fine body of men and young men and we are all proud of them and we are all proud of the fine example set by John Snyder, an example that all of the other employees of the House are following and which I know they will follow in the future.

And, to you, John Snyder, in closing, Godspeed and good luck.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield to me?

Mr. McCORMACK. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, as Mr. Snyder's neighbor in Brooklyn, I should like to express my deep appreciation both to the majority leader and to the minority leader for their splended words, and I should like, too, to have a moment to say that after creditable service of 41 years, 3 months, and 26 days, John O. Snyder retires from active duty as deputy sergeant at arms. With his retirement the House suffers a great loss, but my personal loss is much greater. John has been a faithful and loyal employee of this body for many years and he leaves with the good will and friendship of the thousands of Members whom he has served. With his departure, however, I shall be deprived of the sound advice, wise counsel, and helpful cooperation which he has extended to me before and since my election as a Member. He has been my "father" in Washington and he has been a grand one. He will always have my deep and abiding gratitude.

Mr. Speaker, my hope and prayer is that when John returns to his home, his family, and respecting neighbors in Brooklyn, he will find the peace and rest and comfort that his years of service entitle him to and that he will enjoy good health for many years to come.

I salute him.

RECORD OF SERVICE IN THE HOUSE

John O. Snyder, of Brooklyn, N. Y.

Continuous-service record, 41 years 3 months 26 days, March 4, 1901, to June 30, 1942, Fifty-seventh to Seventy-seventh Congress.

Secretary to late Hon. George H. Lindsay, Fifty-seventh to Sixty-second Congress.

Secretary to late Hon. Harry Howard Dale, Sixty-third to Sixty-fifth Congress.

Appointed messenger, House of Representatives, May 12, 1911.

Appointed special assistant to the Doorkeeper March 1, 1917.

Appointed Democratic pair clerk May 20, 1919, and acted as such to date.

Appointed assistant whip of the New York Democratic delegation, 1911, by the late Hon. Daniel J. Riordan; reappointed by Hon. John F. Carew, now Supreme Court Justice; and reappointed by Hon. Thomas H. Cullen.

First legislative House employee to retire.

Education: School of hard knocks; went to work at the age of 14.

Speakers: David B. Henderson, of Iowa; Joseph G. Cannon, of Illinois; Champ Clark, of Missouri; Frederick H. Gillette, of Massachusetts; Nicholas Longworth, of Ohio; John N. Garner, of Texas; Henry T. Rainey, of Illinois; Joseph W. Byrns, of Tennessee; William B. Bankhead, of Alabama; Sam Rayburn, of Texas.

Presidents: William McKinley, Theodore Roosevelt, William Howard Taft, Woodrow Wilson, Warren G. Harding, Calvin Coolidge, Herbert Hoover, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Served in the Forty-seventh Regiment, National Guard of the State of New York.

JOHNNY SNYDER RETIRES NEXT WEEK—DEPUTY SERGEANT AT ARMS AN AIDE IN HOUSE SINCE 1901

(By the Associated Press)

WASHINGTON, June 28.—John O. Snyder, who has been a friend and adviser to scores of Representatives since the days of William McKinley, is going to retire as deputy sergeant at arms next week after 41 years of continuous service in the House.

Only two other men now in the Capitol have served the House longer than Mr. Snyder—William Tyler Page, the House minority clerk, and Joseph J. Sinnott, the House Doorkeeper.

A lifelong resident of Brooklyn, N. Y., "Johnny," as he is popularly known to House Members, came to Washington in 1901 as secretary to the late George H. Lindsay, Representative from Brooklyn. Subsequently he became secretary to the late Representative Harry H. Dale, of New York, Democratic pair clerk and deputy sergeant at arms in charge of pairs.

A modest, quiet-spoken man of 67, Mr. Snyder was an important cog in the congressional machinery. It was his job to arrange pairs for absent Members who desired to be recorded on important legislation. When Democratic late-comers arrived during roll calls, they could always count on "Johnny," standing by the House Chamber door, to tell them how the administration forces were voting.

When Mr. Snyder first came to Congress, House Members had no offices and a bar in the Capitol Building did a rushing business. Times have changed since then, he said, but not the Congressmen.

"They were fine fellows then; they are fine fellows now," said Mr. Snyder.

Eight men have been President since he came to Washington and 10 have been Speakers of the House.

Johnny will check out officially on Tuesday. He is going to the Catskills for a rest, but beyond that, he said, his plans are indefinite.

CAPITAL SIDELIGHTS

(By Will P. Kennedy)

After 42 years of service at the Capitol, John O. Snyder, deputy sergeant at arms of the House, in charge of pairs, is retiring on July 1, and his associates are going to give him a heart-warming send-off. Mr. Snyder already had seen 8 years of service before any present Member of Congress had been elected. He is exceeded in length of service by only two persons now on the Capitol pay roll—William Tyler Page, former House Clerk and author of The American's Creed, who has been employed at the Capitol for 61 years, and Joseph J. Sinnott, Doorkeeper, 55 years—the only man ever to be an elected officer for 20 years. Mr. Page most appropriately has been selected to be toastmaster at a luncheon in Mr. Snyder's honor tomorrow in the Speaker's private dining room. Speaker RAYBURN, House Leader MCCORMACK, and Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN are to pay tribute at the luncheon to Mr. Snyder's record. Congressional secretaries are preparing to present Mr. Snyder with a farewell gift, and Democratic members of the New York delegation are contributing a purse to show their appreciation of his long and efficient services.

Mr. Snyder was secretary to the late Representatives George H. Lindsay and Harry H. Dale for 18 years. He was appointed a messenger in the House in 1911, and special assistant to the Doorkeeper in 1917. He has been Democratic pair clerk since 1919. He has served under 10 Speakers—Henderson, Cannon, Clark, Gillett, Longworth, Garner, Rainey, Byrns, Bankhead, and Rayburn—and 8 Presidents—McKinley, Roosevelt, Taft, Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, and Roosevelt. Neither Mr. Page nor Mr. Snyder enjoyed the advantages of much schooling. They both claim that they are "graduates of the school of hard knocks."

The undersigned, friends and fellow workers in the House of Representatives, congratulate John O. Snyder on his long and faithful service to the House for 41 years, and we

deeply regret his decision to retire to private life. We wish him length of days, health, and happiness.

The Honorable Sam Rayburn, Hon. John W. McCormack, Hon. Joseph W. Martin, Jr., Hon. William Tyler Page, Hon. Sol Bloom, John Andrews, John Bennett, George Buchheister, R. M. Calloway, Hon. Gordon Canfield, Bill Cantrell, A. E. Chaffee, Bob Chase, Elmer B. Clark, A. Cochran, Frank W. Collier, Lew Deschler, C. H. Emerson, Bert Fangmeyer, W. L. Fenstermacher, Jimmy Griffin, Hans Jurgensen, E. T. Kinnaly, Elmer Lewis, George Malone, Hon. Carter Manasco, John McCabe, George McKean, M. L. Meletio, Harry Megill, Paul L. Miller, F. S. Milberg, Landon Mitchell, John Oberholser, C. H. Parkman, Harry Pillen, W. L. Price, John Pugh, Ralph Roberts, Kenneth Romney, Bill Roy, William Russell, James Scanlon, Finis E. Scott, Crawford Shanks, Scott Shaw, Marc Sheild, C. I. Stengle, I. W. Swanson, Evan Taylor, George Taylor, Hon. South Trimble, H. B. Weaver, R. L. Whitman, Ansel Wold, Nell Barrett, Ethel Cherry, Olive Fortier, Mary Gallagher, Anastasia Garrity, Hilda Greenbank, Antoinette Hart, Irene McCallan, Agnes Mathisen, Mary Alice Myers, Margaret Randall, Margaret Roche, Virginia Sherman, Alice Tuohy, Harriott G. Daley, Marie Morris.

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, Johnnie Snyder, as has been said, is completing 41 years as an employee of the House. He has been faithful, efficient, kind, friendly, and helpful. He leaves this service with the respect and affection of every Member here or who ever served here during 41 years. His going is personal to me as I am deeply devoted to him as a man and a citizen. May his remaining years be filled with happiness, prosperity, and peace.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, on this date John O. Snyder, of New York, will retire as pair clerk of the House of Representatives after 41 years of active service.

The Members of the House from his home State of New York, and others here who have valued his friendship through the years, desiring to record the high esteem in which they hold him, take this opportunity to let him know that he leaves us with our sincere wishes for his health and happiness in the coming years.

John Snyder has been the guide, the mentor, and friend of practically every Member of this House. He has always taken an unusual interest in the careers of the newer and younger Members of the House and freely offered them his advice, his counsel, and his friendship. With courtesy and efficiency he has aided each of us on numerous occasions. He has performed important tasks carefully and well and each separate assignment has been carried through with a meticulous sense of duty.

In rendering service to his country and his party he has no equal.

Congress bids him farewell with gratitude for his contribution to the efficiency of the House and as a well-respected employee and friend. We want him to enjoy the rest which he has earned so well but we hope he will come back now and then to keep in touch with his friends and associates.

Mr. MERRITT. Mr. Speaker, it is indeed a pleasure for me to take this opportunity to say a few words in parting to the man who has been very friendly to me during my 8 years of service in this body.

A friend not only of mine but a friend of all of the Members of the House, namely, John Snyder.

His desire to be of assistance at all times will be ever uppermost in my memory, therefore his retirement from our midst today will be a distinct loss to me.

I trust that he will have many years of retirement that will bring him much happiness and a well-earned rest.

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to pay tribute to my good friend John O. Snyder, deputy sergeant at arms in charge of pairs, who is retiring after a distinguished and notable career covering 41 years of service.

John and I have been friends for many years, and during his long tenure of office I have always found him to be a most loyal and devoted friend. He has at all times been highly efficient and painstaking in the performance of his arduous tasks and has rendered invaluable service to the Democratic Members of the House from his native State of New York. He also enjoys the high esteem and respect of the entire membership of the House, irrespective of political affiliations.

His achievements and good deeds during his long and active career are too numerous to mention at this time. If I were selfish I would feel reluctant about his retirement as men like John are difficult to replace. However, I feel that he is entitled to a rest which he has earned in the fullest measure. I hope that he will have many years of peace and enjoyment ahead of him.

His 41 years of service entitled him to a real celebration. I hope his many devoted friends and comrades will seat him on a comfortable pedestal and bring to him much food and drink and song and praise, and with it all I desire to lay before him my affection and congratulations and good wishes for many years of happiness.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult for me to believe that John Snyder, who, when I first met him in 1937, was recommended to me as the man upon whom I would depend for information regarding procedure in the House, is to terminate his services with our body.

I had not met John before I came to Congress in January 1937, but I had heard much of him from men in Brooklyn who for many years have been in Congress, and who had been dependent upon his watchfulness for guidance in their attention to details in connection with the activities of the Congress. They had told me of John's great loyalty, not only to country and party but also to the individual, and so in time, like all the rest of our delegation from New York State, I found myself very largely dependent upon John for many attentions too numerous to mention. I will miss very much the weekly telegram, above John's signature, indicating the proceedings for the coming week. I will miss his presence in the office of the gentleman from New York, GENE KEOGH, where I would frequently consult John regarding his attention to matters in which I had an interest. I will miss his kindly advice and the logic of his long experience; and it does seem to me that John, while justified in his retirement, is, nevertheless, canceling his services with the House many years too soon.

I wish to paraphrase a delightful expression of one of Ireland's great poets in making my regretful farewell to dear John, an expression of love and affection for the dear old isle which the poet expressed so delightfully as, after an absence of many, many years, he spontaneously exclaimed as the outline of Ireland came to view, in a form slightly changed to fit my feelings of affection for John, at this time in the following language: "O John, isn't it grand you look, like a bride in her rich adorning, and with all the pent-up love of my heart, I bid you, God bless you, the top of the morning."

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD for the purpose of bidding farewell to the gentleman in charge of pairs, Mr. Snyder, who is retiring.

Today I am happy to join with his many friends in paying tribute to John O. Snyder, deputy sergeant at arms, in charge of pairs, who is retiring after many years of faithful and exemplary service.

I am proud to count myself as one of John's stanchest friends; although my friendship with him has not been of long duration, he impressed me from the moment of our meeting as a true gentleman, and his long years of service in the House of Representatives is ample proof of his integrity and ability.

You are taking a well-deserved rest, John, and as you leave us, rest assured that you take with you the best wishes and gratitude of one who benefited by your guidance in our Halls of legislation.

Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, I rise at this time to say a few words in behalf of a gentleman who has been employed in the services of this great deliberative body, the House of Representatives, for over 41 years and who bids us adieu this very day. This man is none other than the genial, sincere, ambitious, loyal Democrat, John O. Snyder, of Brooklyn, N. Y.

John has been a faithful servant not only to the Democrats but to all Members of this House. He was always on the alert, shining as a guiding star to all Members. John through his faithful service has been called Johnny on the spot. He was to be found at his post during all important roll calls. His word was taken by all. Never once would he misguide any Member. He leaves this House with the sincere regrets from us all, and I know I speak the sentiments of

this body when I say may God restore his physical state so that he may enjoy health and happiness for many more years.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I wish at this time to pay tribute to a man who is retiring as an employee of the Capitol after 41 years of faithful service. His position was a very important one. He came in contact daily with all Members of the House, who always found him willing and ready to serve them whenever possible.

John Snyder will be missed by many Members of this House, especially those of the New York delegation, as he always kept them well informed concerning the daily program of the House. His helpful aid and valuable service will be a great loss to each and every one of us.

However, my wish at this time is that he may enjoy many, many years of happy retirement from the turmoil of Capitol Hill, and trust that he will find time to visit us occasionally and meet his old friends here.

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, today marks the end of 41 years of faithful public service for our friend John O. Snyder, Deputy Sergeant at Arms. Although we regret to see him leave us, and will miss his friendly greeting at the door, we have the complete satisfaction of giving the flowers while he is with us.

Retirement will be a strange thing for Johnny, and I venture to say that he will always miss the quorum and vote calls and the breathless Members responding.

It must be a matter of greater satisfaction to him that he leaves with the good wishes of not only all the Members of the House but their office staffs as well. We wish his remaining years will be filled with the contentment and happiness which so fine and lovable a character deserves.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I include the following article which appeared in the New York Times on Monday, June 29, 1942, with reference to John O. Snyder upon the occasion of his retirement as deputy sergeant at arms.

The article, in my opinion, represents an excellent summary of the man, as well as the services rendered by him over a long period.

The article is as follows:

"JOHNNY" SNYDER RETIRES NEXT WEEK—DEPUTY SERGEANT AT ARMS AND AIDE IN HOUSE SINCE 1901

WASHINGTON, June 28.—John O. Snyder, who has been a friend and adviser to scores of Representatives since the days of William McKinley, is going to retire as deputy sergeant at arms next week after 41 years of continuous service in the House.

Only two other men now in the Capitol have served the House longer than Mr. Snyder—William Tyler Page, the House minority clerk, and Joseph J. Sinnott, the House Doorkeeper.

A lifelong resident of Brooklyn, N. Y., Johnny, as he is popularly known to House Members, came to Washington in 1901 as secretary to the late George H. Lindsay, Representative from Brooklyn. Subsequently he became secretary to the late Representative Harry H. Dale, of New York, Democratic pair clerk, and deputy sergeant at arms in charge of pairs.

A modest, quiet-spoken man of 67, Mr. Snyder was an important cog in the congressional machinery. It was his job to arrange pairs for absent Members who desired to be recorded on important legislation. When Democratic late-comers arrived during roll calls, they could always count on Johnny, standing by the House Chamber door, to tell them how the administration forces were voting.

When Mr. Snyder first came to Congress, House Members had no offices and a bar in the Capitol Building did a rushing business. Times have changed since then, he said, but not the Congressmen.

"They were fine fellows then; they are fine fellows now," said Mr. Snyder.

Eight men have been President since he came to Washington and 10 have been Speakers of the House.

Johnny will check out officially on Tuesday. He is going to the Catskills for a rest, but beyond that, he said, his plans are indefinite.

Mr. CAPOZZOLI. Mr. Speaker, when I first came to Washington, as a newly elected Member of this House, one of the first friends I made was John Snyder.

Frankly, when I first met him I did not know of his long service as a Clerk in this House and how valuable he could be as an adviser and counselor, particularly to a new Member. However, it did not take me very long to appreciate the soundness of his judgment and the great practical experience which contributed to his sound judgment.

Ever since my first contact with him I have found him to be friendly and sincerely cooperative. As we all know, by virtue of our experience as Members of the House there are many things for a new Member to learn when he gets to Congress. It is especially helpful to have such a new Member receive the guidance and advice of one who has served over 40 years.

During all these years John Snyder rendered faithful and intelligent service. I dare say that his resignation means a loss to the public of a splendid official with a wealth of experience. He has enjoyed, and does now enjoy, the confidence of many of our Government officials. It shall be difficult to replace him.

Of course, every Member of Congress must and does retain his individual judgment and every decision which he makes must be his own. Yet how helpful it is to discuss various problems with able, experienced friends who are unselfishly anxious to contribute light on the problems which confront us at the moment. Such a friend has John Snyder been.

I join John's many friends in wishing for him long life, great happiness, and success in whatever future activities may be his.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, John O. Snyder, Deputy Sergeant at Arms, is retiring from public life after having served with the House for 42 years.

Many Members of the House have taken the floor to pay tribute to Johnny for his loyal services, his courtesy, his tact, and his friendship. There is very little I or anyone else can add to these well-deserved praises and his splendid record which speaks more eloquently for him than any of us can do.

I do want to take this opportunity, however, to say a few words of farewell to Johnny. I want to say how much his friendship has meant to me and my colleagues. I want to assure him that his eagerness to be of assistance to all of us and his dependability and loyalty were appreciated and will be remembered by all of us.

We will miss him in Washington, but we can well understand his desire to retire. Our best wishes go with him. May he have all the happiness he deserves.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on two subjects.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Paul Mallon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and to include two articles.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

RECLASSIFYING OF MARRIED MEN BY DRAFT BOARDS

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call the attention of the House, and particularly of members of the Military Affairs Committee, to disquieting reports that agencies of the administrative branch of the Government appear to be disregarding the express desire of Congress.

Two weeks ago, Mr. Speaker, Members of this body believed they had issued instructions for draft boards to summon married men with children for military service only after all other physically fit men had been inducted.

To my astonishment I learn that, notwithstanding the legislation enacted by Congress, draft boards still are reclassifying married men before all single men have been called to duty. I am informed the Selective Service System has done little more than advise State directors of our wishes. Information has reached me that the test of financial dependency or independency—rather than the family status, the length of the marriage, and the number of members of the family—still is the only yardstick used in reclassifying individuals formerly placed in class III and in classifying the men between 36 and 45 who registered but a few months ago.

I trust that a prompt inquiry will be conducted before much hardship is done. Thousands of families thought, when we passed the recent legislation authorizing various new categories, they would be deferred for some months at least. They now are discovering there was little basis for this belief, with the result that greater anguish and suffering has resulted than would have been the case if we had taken no action.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHENOWETH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article on sugar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

WILBUR CARR

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute and include an editorial in my remarks from the Washington Star on the late Wilbur Carr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts addressed the House. Her remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including a radio speech I made on enemy aliens and the action of Congress, on June 26.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may address the House tomorrow for 15 minutes after the disposition of business on the Speaker's table and any other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article which appeared in this morning's Washington Post, by Denys P. Myers, on the subject of Woodrow Wilson's foresight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by the inclusion of a eulogy on the Most Reverend Joseph M. Corrigan, late rector of Catholic University.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a short article that appeared in the New York Times yesterday on John Snyder.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a short article by Cyrus S. Eaton, of Cleveland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article showing the disposition of the tax on ammunition under the Pittman-Robertson Act of 1937.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

COLLECTION OF INCOME TAX AT THE SOURCE

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and include in my remarks a letter from the Merchants and Manufacturers Association of Los Angeles, addressed to the members of the Ways and Means Committee.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. LELAND M. FORD addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. NELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include therein an editorial and a letter, both dealing with the present serious flood situation in Missouri and the attendant crop and soil losses.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, and I ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7181) "making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 25, 26, 27, and 28.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 24, 31, 32, 33, and 34; and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,091,250"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert '$331,310"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 6: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$204,561"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 7: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$450,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 8: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 8, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$1,752,942"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the sum "$4,000,000" and insert "$5,000,000"; and in line 4, strike out the sum "$7,000,000" and insert "$8,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In line 1 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the sum "$15,000,000" and insert "$12,500,000"; and in line 4 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out the sum "$195,000" and insert "$130,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 29: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 29, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$222,560"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$62,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered "9 and 16."

BUTLER B. HARE,
M. C. TARVER,
ALBERT THOMAS,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
Managers on the part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
HARRY S. TRUMAN,
WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments to the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report as to each of such amendments, namely:

Amendments Nos. 1 and 2. Authorize the purchase of an automobile for the use of the Secretary of Labor at a cost of $1,500 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 3. Appropriates $1,091,250 for traveling expenses, Department of Labor, instead of $932,500 as proposed by the House and $1,250,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 4. Appropriates $975,695 for commissioners of conciliation (national defense) as proposed by the Senate instead of $930,735 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 5. Appropriates $331,310 instead of $317,310 as proposed by the House and $345,310 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 6. Places a limitation on amount which may be expended for salaries in the District of Columbia of $284,561 instead of $272,557 as proposed by the House and $296,606 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 7. Appropriates $450,000 for apprentice training (national defense) instead of $300,000 as proposed by the House and $600,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 8. Appropriates $1,752,942 for traveling expenses, Federal Security Agency, instead of $1,730,894 as proposed by the House and $1,775,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 10 and 11. Include the Civil Aeronautics Administration with the War and Navy Departments as the agencies of the Government to which surplus camp buildings and equipment of the Civilian Conservation Corps shall be tendered for use in prosecution of the war, as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 12. Lowers from 17 to 16 the minimum age for employment on National Youth Administration Projects as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 13. Provides $5,000,000 for aid to college students as proposed by the House and $3,000,000 for aid to high school students as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 14. Appropriates $3,500,000 for administrative expenses of the National Youth Administration as proposed by the Senate instead of $3,275,000 as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 15. Establishes the national average labor cost per employee of the National Youth Administration as of the close of the fiscal year 1942 as the national average labor cost for the fiscal year 1943 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 17. Strikes out the word "youth" and inserts the word "persons" as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 18. Provides for approval of courses in vocational training by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission as proposed by the Senate instead of the Director of the Labor Division of the War Production Board as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 19. Provides for approval of subjects of visual aids to education by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission as proposed by the Senate instead of the War Production Board as proposed by the House.

Amendment No. 20. Appropriates $12,500,000 for the Division of Venereal Diseases, Public Health Service, instead of $8,101,050 as proposed by the House and $15,000,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 21, 22, and 24. Provide certain minor changes in language as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 23. Eliminates language restricting the establishment of blood banks to the area within 300 miles of the coast line as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 25. Appropriates $2,467,670 for selecting, testing and placement of defense workers as proposed by the House instead of $7,467,670 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 26. Eliminates a proviso proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 27. Eliminates a proviso proposed by the Senate. The conferees have considered the evidence relating to the employment by the Social Security Board of an individual receiving $7,500 per annum from the Government for full time service and several times that amount from private employers, part of whom at least have interests which are affected by Social Security Board administration. The conferees believe this to be subject to severe criticism and admonish the Social Security Board and all other organizations provided for in this bill to correct this and all other similar practices. The Senate has receded from its amendment because of the belief that the matter may be corrected in this way and that it will be done.

Amendment No. 28. Appropriates $2,128,130 for salaries for the National Labor Relations Board as proposed by the House instead of $2,174,130 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 29 and 30. Appropriate $62,500 for salaries and expenses of referees, National Railroad Adjustment Board, instead of $55,000 as proposed by the House and $70,000 as proposed by the Senate.

Amendments Nos. 31 and 32. Provide for payment of expenses of referees, National Railroad Adjustment Board, in addition to compensation as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 33. Makes the act retroactive to July 1, 1942, in event of failure to secure final enactment until after that date as proposed by the Senate.

Amendment No. 34. Corrects a section number.

Amendments in disagreement

Amendment No. 9. Makes appropriations for the Civilian Conservation Corps.

Amendment No. 16. Makes provision for loans to college students to enable them to continue their education in certain specialized fields. The Senate amendment proposes an appropriation of $7,500,000 and the managers on the part of the House will move to recede from disagreement and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment appropriating $5,000,000.

CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
BUTLER B. HARE,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
M. C. TARVER,
ALBERT THOMAS,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 93]

Baldwin	Dies	Johnson,
Bates, Ky.	Ellis	Lyndon B.
Beam	Fish	Kefauver
Beckworth	Flaherty	Kennedy,
Blackney	Gavagan	Martin J.
Boykin	Gifford	Kennedy,
Bradley, Mich.	Gilchrist	Michael J.
Buckler, Minn.	Hall,	Kerr
Buckley, N. Y.	Edwin Arthur	Kilday
Burch	Halleck	Klein
Byron	Hancock	Kocialkowski
Capozzoli	Harness	Larrabee
Celler	Harrington	Lea
Clark	Hendricks	Leavy
Cluett	Hook	Lesinski
Cole, Md.	Jarrett	McGehee
Cullen	Jenkins, Ohio	McGranery
Delaney	Johns	McKeough
Maas	Rankin, Mont.	South
Magnuson	Reed, Ill.	Starnes, Ala.
Marcantonio	Robertson,	Sumners, Tex.
Mitchell	N. Dak.	Sweeney
Murray	Rogers, Okla.	Thomas, N. J.
Myers, Pa.	Schaefer, Ill.	Tinkham
O'Day	Schuetz	Vreeland
O'Leary	Scott	Walter
Oliver	Shannon	White
Osmers	Sheridan	Winter
O'Toole	Simpson	Worley
Pearson	Smith, W. Va.	
Plauché	Somers, N. Y.	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and forty-six Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

Further proceedings, under the call, were dispensed with.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 9: Page 18, line 11, strike out lines 11 through 21 and insert:

"For all necessary expenses to carry into effect the provisions of the act of June 28, 1937, as amended (16 U. S. C., ch. 3A), including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the purchase and exchange of lawbooks, books of reference, and periodicals; the purchase (including exchange), operation, maintenance, and repair of motor-propelled and horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; hire, with or without personal services, of work animals, animal-drawn and motor-propelled vehicles, and watercraft; printing and binding; travel expenses, excluding not to exceed $2,000 for expenses of attendance at meetings concerned with the work of the Corps when specifically authorized by the Federal Security Administrator; transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940, and regulations promulgated thereunder; construction, improvement, repair, and maintenance of buildings, but the cost of any building erected hereunder shall not exceed $25,000 as follows:

"For pay, subsistence, medical services, etc.: For pay, subsistence, travel, clothing (and repair thereof), medical services, including hospitalization, fees and travel of physicians, dentists, veterinarians, and nurses; burial of enrollees, payment (not exceeding $50 for any one transfusion) to any enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps or other individual furnishing blood for transfusion to the veins of an enrollee or discharged enrollee of the Civilian Conservation Corps undergoing treatment in a hospital authorized to treat such patient, $48,499,288.

"For all other necessary expenses, both field and departmental, in connection with the administration of camps and work projects, $28,030,512.

"The Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps may authorize the exchange of motor-propelled and horse-drawn vehicles, tractors, road equipment, and boats, and parts, accessories, tires, or equipment thereof, in whole or in part payment for other vehicles, tractors, road equipment, or boats, or parts, accessories, tires, or equipment of such vehicles, tractors, roads equipment, or boats."

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARE moves that the House insist on its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 9.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion of the gentleman from Georgia.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. TARVER moves that the House recede and concur in Senate amendment No. 9.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] is recognized.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, the House is about to decide definitely and finally whether the Civilian Conservation Corps shall be abolished as of today.

The Senate restored to the bill the language providing for the appropriation for the Civilian Conservation Corps by a majority of one, the Vice President voting. It is therefore to be anticipated that whatever action may be taken by the House upon the motion which I have offered will be decisive of this question. If the House insists upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment, the matter will be ended, and today the Civilian Conservation Corps will go out of business.

Of the camps which are now engaged in work on military reservations, in national forests, and on soil-conservation work, 159 have been allocated to military reservations. If the motion I have offered is not agreed to by the House, tomorrow morning the men who are engaged in carrying on that necessary work on military reservations, represented by the President in his Budget message as important in the war program, will lay down their tools and walk out. I say "walk out," because there will not be any money available to even pay their way home. Sixty-one thousand Civilian Conservation Corps enrollees will be stranded wherever they happen to be located, because none of the funds which have been appropriated for the present fiscal year will be available tomorrow, even to furnish them with the necessary food, clothing, and transportation home.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. TARVER. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. Fifteen thousand of those 61,000 are veterans of the World War.

Mr. TARVER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. TARVER. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. As I understand the situation, if the Civilian Conservation Corps is abolished today in the name of economy, which seems to be in the making, it will prove to be false economy. Is it not true that such action will cost many millions more if the work must be done by private contract than if the Civilian Conservation Corps is continued? Does not the record disclose that to be true?

Mr. TARVER. As to the amount of expense that will be incurred, I am not in a position to state definite figures to the House, but I do say that the House hearings disclose the fact that the work which is being done on these military reservations by the Civilian Conservation Corps camps cannot be done as economically if the work is let out by contract.

Let us see just what you are doing. I call your attention to the testimony of General Ulio, The Adjutant General of the Army, on page 296 of the Senate hearings:

The projects on which they are engaged are: Construction of narrow-gage railroads; construction and repair of roads and bridges; construction of firebreaks and lookout towers; construction of truck trails for fire suppression; construction of training aids such as bayonet courses, rifle ranges, antitank ranges, pistol ranges.

Constructing telephone lines and power lines; fencing military reservations; clearing wooded areas for fire prevention; clearing maneuver and impact areas; clearing, grading, and seeding or sodding landing fields for aircraft; drainage; mosquito control, etc.

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at this time for a question?

Mr. TARVER. I am sorry, but I have very limited time and there are some things I want to say.

When these boys go off these reservations and out of these national forests tomorrow if you fail to continue the C. C. C. in the modified form in which it is suggested by the Senate amendment I presume there is no one present who doubts but that the work on which they are engaged will be done. The Army officials have testified before our committee that it can be more economically done in the way in which it is being done. I think that when we examine the record of expenditures by certain departments of the Government we must reach the conclusion that this is true. I called attention a day or so ago to the fact that the Federal Works Agency through contractors is paying $103 a week for common labor in the construction of this underpass down here in southwest Washington. When cost to the Federal Government is considered there must be added to the contractor's cost the contractor's profits and the contractor's profits according to the evidence we have had in this House have in many cases been very unreasonable; otherwise it would have been impossible for from five hundred to six hundred millions of dollars of Federal money to have been voluntarily repaid by contractors who acknowledged they had received that much more than they should have collected from the Government of the United States. So I insist that this work can be done more economically by the C. C. C. and that the continuance of this organization is justified from an economic standpoint if it could not be justified from any other standpoint.

A great deal has been said with reference to the boys in the C. C. C. being within draft age. Examine page 298 of the Senate hearings and you find that 82 percent of them are less than the draft age, boys of 17, 18, and 19. Being enrolled in the C. C. C. carries no exemption from the draft.

Many of those enrolled in the C. C. C. have been drafted when their names were reached in due course. By the continuance of this organization in modified form, however, these boys who are under the draft age will be accorded an opportunity for further training that incidentally would fit them to be better soldiers when they reach the draft age and when they are selected for military service. The organization could also be used for the boys who have been rejected from military service because of physical disqualifications and who if given the training and advantages that are possible in the Civilian Conservation Corps might have their physical condition improved to the point where they would be capable of rendering military service to their country.

I advanced upon the first House consideration of this matter other views which appeared to me to be compelling in character but which did not appeal to the majority of those who voted in the Committee of the Whole against a reinstatement of the Corps. I shall not review those arguments at this time, but I do insist that as a matter of economy, as a matter of carrying on necessary work, as well as a matter of affording these boys who are not within the ages to be drafted for military service chances of the kind which have been of so much benefit to 2,800,000 other boys in the past, this organization ought to be continued.

Mr. Speaker, suppose you could do this work on military reservations cheaper by contractors than by the C. C. C.; consider the situation that will ensue: How long is it going to take the War Department to complete plans and specifications and advertise for bids and get contractors? Even if the carrying on of this very necessary work could be accomplished more economically, undoubtedly some 3 or 4 months at least would have to elapse before that could be done. In the meantime this essential work would have to be stopped. Surely you do not contemplate doing something which would interfere with the orderly carrying on of our war program by insisting upon disagreement to the Senate amendment. I sincerely hope, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the membership will agree with the motion to recede and concur.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] 10 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the question of whether or not the C. C. C. should be abolished was discussed fully when the bill was before the House some time ago. The gentleman from Georgia at that time introduced an amendment to reinstate what the full committee had eliminated.

If there ever was a time when we should reduce nondefense expenditures, it is now. Every department is trying to prolong its life and increase its appropriations on the plea of being necessary in the national defense. We had occasions before our subcommittee where the claim for appropriation on the ground of national defense was absolutely ridiculous.

We can all concede that the C. C. C. has done some good work in the past, but I believe the time has come when we should discontinue its service. I know

of no way of cutting down expenditures except by reducing the operations of government. The Ways and Means Committee has been holding hearings for months trying to raise the amount of taxes required and asked for by the Treasury Department, and after holding hearings for months they are still something like two or three billion dollars short of what the President is asking.

It is sought to justify continuation of the C. C. C. on the ground of national defense, that these camps, or some of them, are going to be used in the military reservations. I am wondering just what the Army did for services of this kind before the C. C. C. came into existence. You talk about cost. They were hiring common labor in the South when I went through the cantonments a year ago for 30 and 40 cents an hour under the contract system. It is costing us under this set-up over $1,000 a year per enrollee.

I asked Mr. Morrell, in charge of the forestry camps, this question, and here is his answer:

> I have talked during the past number of years with several State foresters. I have talked with State regional foresters, and with some national regional foresters, and they have, almost without exception, made the statement that if we would give them one-third or one-half the money that we are using for the Civilian Conservation Corps in the forest areas they would give the same amount of work. Do you have any opinion on that?
>
> Mr. MORRELL. I think that is true.

In other words, for $1,000 per enrollee we are getting one-third to one-half of the work that we could get if we hired the work done in the same areas. It means every C. C. C. worker is costing $1,000 a year whereas we are only getting from $300 to $500 worth of work out of them. Putting it another way, it is costing us from two to three thousand dollars per man-year under this system. Where is there any economy in that sort of a proposition?

Mr. Speaker, let us consider for a moment these C. C. C. camps operating in an Army cantonment. We will find a quartermaster warehouse filled full of rations. The C. C. C. under the law cannot draw those rations. They have to have a separate ration supply and a separate purchasing department. They cannot draw a clothing allowance from the Army. They have to have a separate clothing allowance. They cannot be paid by the Army paymaster. They have to have their own paymaster. They have an independent organization for every operation necessary to run the C. C. C. in the camp itself. Where is there any economy on a proposition of that kind?

Let us now consider forest-fire protection. The gentleman from Georgia came in here at first and supported the C. C. C. on the ground that we were going to save the forests. Another bill came up about the same time involving forest-fire protection. The Senate wanted to give $3,000,000 additional for fire towers, forest-fire lines, and so forth. The gentleman from Georgia voted against increasing that appropriation in his own agricultural bill by $3,000,000 to give the very same forest-fire protection that he is asking us to give them in this bill. He voted against the $3,000,000.

Mr. TARVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. At the same time I explained there was in my judgment still hope for restoration of the Civilian Conservation Corps and that that should affect our judgment in the provision of funds by direct appropriation.

Mr. ENGEL. Oh, yes; after the House had voted 158 to 121 against the C. C. C. the gentleman refused to accept the judgment of the House and was still hoping that we could go on with the old C. C. C. set-up costing us $1,000 to $1,250 per man and getting only one-third value in services.

Mr. DONDERO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. The gentleman from Georgia spoke of the C. C. C. coming back to the House in a modified form. Will the gentleman explain to the House in what way it is modified?

Mr. ENGEL. It is the same old C. C. C. There is no modification whatever. It is in the same situation as it was when we got the bill in here.

Now, a vote to recede and concur is a vote to continue the C. C. C. A vote to refuse to recede and concur means you are voting against the C. C. C. Let us have this clear. If and when the motion to recede and concur is voted down, a motion will be offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE] that the House insist on its position abolishing the C. C. C. This motion should be passed.

Let me say again that in 1942 63 percent of these boys came from the farm areas, and from towns under 2,500. We need labor out on the farms. You have stripped the farms of labor. You have taken the selectees from there. Country boys have flocked to the cities attracted by high wages. You have taken all of the labor out of the rural section. Now, you want to take these 17- and 18-year-old boys (something like 54½ percent of them are 17 years old) away from the farms, take them to the city, thereby take away the last source of labor that the farms have.

In 1941, 76.5 percent of these boys were 17 and 18 years old, nothing but kids, yet they would take them and put them in military reservations.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGEL. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Going back to the statement which I understand was made to the effect that $45,000,000 would be saved by having the C. C. C. do the work in the military camps as against having it done otherwise, does that $45,000,000 statement take into consideration the overhead expense to which the gentleman has referred, and will there be a net saving of $45,000,000, or would the other overhead expenses eat up the $45,000,000?

Mr. ENGEL. I do not know where you will save any $45,000,000 by spending $76,000,000 for the C. C. C. and getting one-third the value out of each dollar you spend.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON].

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include therein a brief excerpt from a letter from a friend in London.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBERTSON of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina to insist on the position of the House.

In my district, and I believe throughout the Nation, the Civilian Conservation Corps was the most popular of all relief agencies started during the depression. The first camp in the United States was built in my district. The law creating this agency and all appropriations for it have had my unqualified support, but the emergency that brought this relief agency into existence has ceased and, instead of looking for jobs for men, our present problem is to find men for jobs on the farm as well as in war industries. When this appropriation bill was first before us, I voted to eliminate the Civilian Conservation Corps camps for the remainder of the war period, and I am glad the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee is now insisting upon maintaining in conference the position then taken by the House.

When I have spent some months studying a particular tax problem I would like the members of the Committee on Appropriations to concede that I know more about that problem than they. By the same token, when they spend a lot of time studying the details of an appropriation item, I am glad to follow their leadership on those details.

We have now presented to us an issue involving a matter of policy on which the committee has divided. By a substantial majority the House voted in this emergency to save about $76,000,000, or at least to reduce this appropriation bill by that amount, by the elimination during the emergency of the C. C. C. camps.

The time has come when we must think of appropriations in terms of taxes. If you want to know what it would take to finance this item, let me offer a suggestion. We have worked for months to try to bring in an adequate tax bill. The Treasury announced this week that it was not adequate, that it fell some $2,500,000,000 short of what the Treasury Department recommended. Two items that we did not include are a 2-cent tax on checks and a 15-percent sales tax on candy. Neither one of these items would finance this expense. It would take all of the revenue of one and about half of the other.

You can go down the list and pick out any unpopular tax you want to, but

sooner or later you must relate those taxes to what you spend.

I have been 10 years in this House. More vital matters are coming to us for decision today than in any other one day during that time. The big-brother bill of $42,000,000,000 would be a right good day's action, but in addition to that we have the seven little sisters, of which this $1,000,000,000 bill is one. In each one of these bills, each involving more than it used to take before the first World War to run the entire Government, we have increases brought to us from the Senate.

There are two things we need today. We need to put on heavy taxes and we need to save what we can on all expenditures that are not vital in the war effort. This is one way we can save. I hope very much the House will adopt the recommendation of the gentleman from Michigan, who said that on the Tarver motion we should vote "no" and on the Hare motion we should vote "aye," and insist upon going back to the Senate, which divided equally on this matter of policy. One way of helping to keep the finances of the Government sound is not to spend where it is not vital to spend.

After July 13, or whenever the 1942 revenue bill reaches the floor of the House, the Members of this body will get a clearer picture of the concern felt for months by the members of the Ways and Means Committee over our fiscal policy. With the adoption today of the $42,000,000,000 bill for military needs, appropriations first for defense and then for war will have exceeded $200,000,000,000. Expenditures in the fiscal year commencing tomorrow for war purposes alone may exceed $70,000,000,000, while total revenue to meet normal expenditures, plus war expenditures, will probably not exceed $22,500,000,000, unless a sales tax be added to items tentatively selected for inclusion in the new revenue bill. After struggling for hours and sometimes for days over new sources of revenue that would not produce as much as $50,000,000, any unnecessary expenditure of as much as $50,000,000 is viewed by members of our committee in a new light, and I predict the time will come, and in no distant future, when they will be viewed by the rank and file of the people in a new light.

It is most unfortunate for us to have to consider in the brief limitation of 1 legislative day eight appropriation bills, each one of which carries items that have been increased by the Senate, with the exception of H. R. 7319, on which general debate was concluded last night and on which final action I assume will be taken when we finish the pending conference report.

With respect to the latter bill, if members of the Appropriations Committee agree on the amount needed for the proper and efficient operation of the O. P. A., I intend to follow their leadership, as I have had no opportunity to study the detailed needs involved. But I desire to take this opportunity to refer to two fundamental issues which, in my opinion, transcend the importance of the amount appropriated for O. P. A. If Mr. Henderson or any other O. P. A. administrator is to make a success of price-fixing, wages must be stabilized and a reasonable proportion of surplus purchasing power created by the war effort must be siphoned off by means of taxes. The need for those two actions was stressed by Mr. Henderson in his last appearance before the Ways and Means Committee, at which time he stated that the surplus purchasing power referred to would probably aggregate $17,000,000,000—far more than enough to blow the lid off of any price ceilings he might attempt to fix. As one of the 435 Members of this House I have endeavored to discharge my responsibility to the people of the Nation who will be so disastrously affected by uncontrolled inflation. When the price-fixing bill was before the House some months ago, I offered an amendment to provide in effect that no Government agency having the power to approve a request for a wage increase should hereafter do so unless the Price Administrator certified to the agency that the granted increase would not necessitate a price increase. No price-control law could be milder than that and still accomplish any good and none, in my opinion, could be fairer. Yet the amendment was overwhelmingly defeated. Promises by high officials were made at the time and have since been made that the situation would be satisfactorily handled by voluntary action, yet many wage increases have since been granted and other demands of a very vital character are now pending, which many think will be granted. In fact, there is cloakroom gossip to the effect that Mr. Henderson will shortly ask for a tremendous appropriation to subsidize industries forced to pay increased wages but unable to do so without increasing the price of their products.

With respect to siphoning off surplus purchasing power by means of taxation, I have urged the desirability at this time of a general sales tax to raise not less than $2,500,000,000 of additional revenue, and to accomplish the double purpose of helping to finance the war effort on the one hand, while limiting the demand for and competitive buying of consumer goods on the other. We can no longer afford to temporize with necessary retrenchment in nondefense spending and with necessary war controls. War, and especially an all-out war for survival (and that's what this war is), is the antithesis of peace, and it would appear that many of the things most desirable to be done in times of peace are the least desirable in times of such a war. The personal rights and freedom of action, if you please, of the civilian, as well as those in military service, must be subordinated to the war effort. In the civilian effort, as in the Army and the Navy, there must be unity of command and unity of action.

The unity of command and of action achieved in Great Britain was forcibly brought home to me by a letter received on yesterday from a friend whose business headquarters has been for the past 20 years in London. Among other things, he said:

The CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of your address of last October enclosed with your letter was read with the greatest interest and I congratulate you on the style as well as the subject matter. I see eye to eye with you in your views concerning big business. If you extend these observations abroad you have an explanation of the cause of the chaos that has descended upon us. It is deplorable that we have lived like so many ostriches; our leaders, if such a description is appropriate, have exploited situations that we all ignored.

It is unfortunate that the two great democracies, which until recently controlled about four-fifths of the world resources, have failed to recognize the responsibility in proportion to the economic power at their disposal. Fortunately, or otherwise, it is not a case of "the kettle calling the pot black" as we have been in the same boat and must share the same fate.

When we last met you told me of your visit to the Philippines and the Far East and no doubt you had a very vivid picture of the situation there. As you know I went to Siberia with the American engineers during the last war and incidentally spent several months in Japan where I made some pertinent observations. It astounds me to think that our Government with sources of information available and organizations established to follow developments abroad was not awake to the situation—here again our similarity to the British is disclosed. At every opportunity Hitler told this country what his intentions were and whenever I visited Germany there was no difficulty in observing confirmation. The Japs followed the same policy but applied it to our country—together we slept.

We are now having a respite from air raids and are trying to forget the life we lead in the front line; ——— and I have been living with friends in the country for the past year as our home was damaged by a bomb which destroyed five houses just opposite; we only lost our windows and sustained other minor damage which has been repaired and we hope to return to town early next month. With the conscription of males and females you can imagine that the days of servants are finished, at least for the duration; ——— is cooking and I am the scullerymaid—an experience that newlyweds cheerfully accept; however, at my age I find my style very much cramped.

In view of the fact that 75 percent of the food required to feed this country is imported, the control has been amazing. It must be said that the rationing (except for instances of the black market, which corresponds with our bootleg activities on a reduced scale) has been most skillfully managed; the health of the country has never been better and no one should go hungry. ——— and I live entirely within our rations, the schedule of which you have. I look forward to having one egg every fortnight with the same pleasure as we used to regard a turkey. The fruit which we thought was necessary for life has disappeared, and I have not seen a banana or orange for nearly 2 years.

The Nation's finances, which are complementary to the rationing scheme, have been equally well controlled, it is almost impossible to spend money on anything but actual necessities. It is not a question of money, but of coupons—I have to scheme as much to buy a pair of socks as I did pre-war a suit of clothes. The private use of motorcars is at long last being stopped and as we had to get rid of ours last year, it gives us great satisfaction to see others making the same sacrifice. Of course, transport here cannot be compared with the United States of America where the shortage of motorcars will have serious repercussions; on the other hand I should think the people of ——— will find it a great relief. In a recent letter from ——— he tells me of getting out his horse and buggy again, recalling the happy days of our childhood.

The British generals in Malay and Libya may not have been up to par, but the rank and file of the British people from the bombing of London in September 1940 to the present time have been above par. It is an example we may well emulate.

I have a feeling that constantly gnaws at my heartstrings that there is still something of a vital character lacking in our war effort. Our fighting men in every engagement have been superb and will continue to be superb. Industry has at last struck its stride, and in instances has exceeded my fondest hopes in the production of war material. Yet, notwithstanding the fact that far more is at stake for us in this war than in the last World War, I fail to find as yet the enthusiasm and the will for victory which was so evident then. Possibly that is due to the fact I was younger then and a part of the armed forces, and not so closely in touch with civilian problems. However that may be, for me, at least, Woodrow Wilson put a degree of idealism into that effort that gave buoyancy to those in the Army and I believe to those behind the lines as well. In my humble opinion, this war will not be won unless we win it, and the job of winning it will be infinitely harder unless the present thought of who will be on top in this country after it is won is submerged into the realization that all will be on the bottom if it is lost.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I think there are one or two things we ought to get clearly in mind before voting on this proposition.

Many Members of this House are basing their judgment on the request of the President for this appropriation. They are further basing their judgment on the fact that it is now claimed that the Civilian Conservation Corps' continued existence is necessary in order to perform vital functions necessary for the war effort on the Army cantonments.

I call the attention of the Members of the House to this fact. This provision for the Civilian Conservation Corps came before our committee originally by virtue of the Budget estimate transmitted by the President of the United States on May 1, 1942. I suggest that you read the President's letter of transmittal. Let me read a portion of it. He states:

> These estimates of appropriations represent definitely wartime activities.

He was referring to this C. C. C. appropriation.

> The protection and conservation of forests and other resources which are subject to sudden and violent destruction is the main purpose of the small nucleus of Civilian Conservation Corps camps provided for in this estimate.

There was not one word from the President of the United States in transmitting this estimate to the committee about the necessity of installing these camps in military reservations. The message of the President made the appeal to the committee on the basis of the necessity for continuing the fundamental purpose for which the Civilian Conservation Corps was originally provided, that is, in the field of conservation and forest protection.

The committee heard the evidence of Mr. McEntee on the subject, as well as that of representatives of the Department of the Interior and the Department of Agriculture, and those representatives all told the committee that it would be silly and futile to continue the C. C. C. under that proposed Budget estimate and the letter of the President. The committee voted to abandon the C. C. C. in accordance with that advice.

The original estimate only provided for 150 camps and then a supplemental estimate came from the President that provided for 350 camps, approximately 206 of the camps to be devoted to carrying on C. C. C. activities on military reservations and the balance to be scattered throughout the country, some of them doing work for the Department of the Interior and some of them doing work in forest protection.

In my own State, for example, is it not silly to talk about C. C. C. protecting the great forests of my State when the provision in the pending bill only provides for the maintenance of four camps in the whole State of Wisconsin, and I understand that one of those camps is to be maintained upon a military reservation.

Look at the estimates and see the allocation of these camps in your various States. Then you will see that if you adopt this proposal today, you are abandoning the principle and the purpose for which C. C. C. was established, namely, to provide for the development of our conservation resources and the protection of the forests of this Nation. Where is there the greatest opportunity for sabotage of our forests today? It is said in the Senate hearings that this exists in the great Alaskan Territory. I would say to you that there is not a single provision for a single C. C. C. camp in the whole Territory of Alaska.

It seems to me that in view of what the President said originally, we are abandoning those purposes, and we ought to vote down this proposal of the gentleman from Georgia.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RANDOLPH].

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, early in the Roosevelt administration in 1933, the Labor Committee, of which I had just become a member, brought the original bill to this House, creating the Civilian Conservation Corps.

I am sure there was no Member of this body then, or on later occasions, who felt more deeply the need for creating and maintaining this Corps than the man who now addresses you. Hardly any district in the United States or any State lends itself more appropriately to Civilian Conservation Corps activities than the one I represent. I arise today, however, to say that I believe the House should stand strongly for the action that it took recently in bringing to a conclusion the activities of the Civilian Conservation Corps of the United States. I pay tribute to the splendid work which has been accomplished during the life of the C. C. C. But that is no argument in wartime for its continuance.

Every extravagance which men indulge these days in unnecessary Federal expenditures, every excess in which we indulge ourselves in the operation of Government here at home, decreases by just that amount the money, the equipment and the manpower which is vitally necessary if we are to carry forward a successful prosecution of this war on the fighting fronts.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Can the gentleman tell us what amount of money is involved in this item?

Mr. RANDOLPH. I do not know the exact amount, but it is approximately $76,000,000.

Mr. HARE. Seventy-six million five hundred thousand dollars.

Mr. RANDOLPH. It is not only the amount of money, although that certainly is a tremendous sum—it is enough, of course, to build perhaps 30 4-engine bombers which can protect America, and carry the fight to our enemies.

I express in all sincerity today that I believe the membership of the House of Representatives, regardless of action of the Senate, is going to display that sanity, that common sense and that courage which is necessary for a legislative body to demonstrate not only to the people of America, but to the Allied Nations who are fighting with us in acommon cause.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the majority leader the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, when this matter was pending in the House before, there were certain arguments made against continuance of the C. C. C., which I think should be answered and which I hope in the minds of some Members will be of assistance to them in making their decision as to how they will vote on the pending motion. For example, the argument about $28,000,000 of administrative funds was strongly made, and it was argued that $28,000,000 in relation to $80,000,000 is entirely out of proportion. Well, the answer to that is that the $28,000,000 is not all for administrative salaries. Of that amount six-million-seven-hundred-thousand-and-some-odd dollars is for administrative salaries. The rest is for the purchase of equipment, for materials, and for providing for the guarding of the camps that have been discontinued. This has got to be done. Part of this amount is for the automobile mechanics who are employed, and they have got to be employed; also for the working foremen in the various camps and for various other employees connected with the C. C. C.

The Senate amendment calls for $76,519,800, and I am informed that the administrative salaries based on that amount would be $6,200,000. This is information that I received from Mr. McEntee this morning. So the $28,000,000

is not for administrative expenses as we ordinarily understand that term. The $28,000,000 includes the purchase of equipment, the purchase of materials, the purchase of everything necessary along that line, and it also includes the salaries of guards and caretakers of discontinued camps, as well as other necessary employees.

There is another point that seems to me to be the controlling influence in making up my mind. I do not take the position that the C. C. C. is a war agency.

I do take the position that the work which the C. C. C. will do, if the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina is adopted, during the next fiscal year is war work. In other words, unless this amendment is agreed to, a message will come up, in my opinion, from the President asking the Congress to appropriate money to take care of the very work that will be done by the C. C. C. and its employees and enrollees during the next fiscal year.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. And unless I am mistaken, the estimates will be in a greater amount than the $76,000,000 involved in the pending question. I yield briefly.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Is it not a fact that if that situation develops, as the gentleman believes, then the youth who can now find employment in factory and on farm, and properly so, without the C. C. C. will not do that work, but such employment will be given to older men back home who are partially physically disabled but who can well perform this type of endeavor?

Mr. McCORMACK. No; I do not agree with that statement. It is also a fact that we have to protect the vast lands of our country in which are contained the great forests of our country. From the Rockies to the Pacific Ocean there are vast natural forest resources. We have to have fire protection; and if this appropriation is carried, a substantial part of it will be utilized for that purpose.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. McCORMACK. If the motion is not adopted, then money will have to be appropriated to some other agency to carry on that work. To conclude, as I see it, the argument in support of the Senate amendment is that unless the amendment is agreed to, unless the pending motion is adopted and the C. C. C. continued during the coming fiscal year, the Congress will have to appropriate money for the very purposes intended in this appropriation, and that the appropriation of money will in all probability be in a much larger amount than the $76,000,000 plus included in this appropriation. Millions of young men have benefited from this, and millions of young men will remember that the C. C. C. turned their minds from despair only a few years ago to confidence, and the entire country, particularly those millions of young men who have benefited, are watching today to see whether or not the C. C. C. is going to be discontinued.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has again expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, it was stated during the debate on this motion by one of the members of the Committee on Appropriations of the House, who no doubt knows what he is talking about, that the continuance of the Civilian Conservation Corps for the next year under this bill would be $45,000,000 cheaper than to discontinue it. If that is true, and I can save $45,000,000 by voting to continue it, I want to do so, and my purpose in asking the gentleman from South Carolina to yield me these 2 minutes is to find out if there is a member on the Committee on Appropriations here who can give us that information and verify that statement. I ask that question and wait for an answer from any member of the Committee on Appropriations. I see the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] is on the floor, although recently he refused to yield to me. Perhaps he can inform the House on the question.

Mr. TARVER. I think I said awhile ago that the House hearings show that in the judgment of the War Department authorities the work can be done much cheaper with the Civilian Conservation Corps camps than with the use of funds appropriated to make contracts for the work. How much cheaper has never been definitely disclosed, but it is said it can be done more economically.

Mr. MAY. The statement was that we could save $45,000,000.

Mr. TARVER. I never made that statement.

Mr. MAY. No, but Mr. JOHNSON from Oklahoma did.

Mr. ENGEL. There was no testimony before our committee as to any amount that could be saved if the C. C. C. were continued.

Mr. McCORMACK rose.

Mr. MAY. Perhaps the gentleman from Massachusetts can tell us.

Mr. McCORMACK. I cannot answer that on the matter of $45,000,000, but the President sent a message to Senator McCARRAN in which he used this language:

> Make it clear that the abolition of the Civilian Conservation Corps saves the Nation no money.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kentucky has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON].

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK], the majority leader, has well said, the Civilian Conservation Corps was established during the depression to provide for the unemployed youth on the highways and streets of the country. I gladly supported the establishment and I supported the maintenance of the C. C. C. during the depression. The President and the Director of the Budget have recommended a reduction from the peak of five or six hundred million to $76,000,000 for the next fiscal year. During the past year, after Congress made an appropriation 12 months ago, the President, realizing evidently that there was not the same reason for the continuance of the C. C. C. that there was for the establishment of it, voluntarily impounded about $90,000,000 of the money that we appropriated a year ago to be used for other purposes.

Now, we have preached reduction of the expenditures of government that will not destroy and cripple essential functions, and from time to time when we have not reduced, as individual Members have advocated, we have said it was largely the fault of the Committee on Appropriations. We have an opportunity this morning to match our preachments with our votes. The Appropriations Committee has recommended for the emergency the elimination of this item of $76,000,000 and abolishing the C. C. C. It has come to a rather sorry pass when, as the distinguished majority leader admits, only forty-eight million of the $76,000,000 would go to pay the enrollees and for their subsistence, and we are asked to appropriate $76,000,000, twenty-eight million of which is to be used for administration and for equipment.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER] says that if this appropriation is eliminated we will leave the C. C. C. youth stranded. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States might as well admit that it is utterly impotent to abolish any emergency or relief program if that sort of argument is to prevail. The gentleman himself the other day offered an amendment which, if the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina which I advocate is sustained, will provide for $500,000 to send these boys back home and provide for conserving C. C. C. property and equipment. That amendment could well be substituted for the Senate amendment. We might as well be frank. We are either for a reasonable reduction and retrenchment in the nonessential affairs and expenditures of Government or we are against it. The reason for the establishment of the C. C. C. camps no longer exists. There is need for employment on the farms. There is lack of workers on the farms. Seventy-three percent of these C. C. C. boys come from the farms. If the reason no longer exists we ought not consider mere excuses for the continuance of this program.

It is said that the C. C. C. is necessary to provide for the fighting of forest fires. We have provided for an increase in the appropriations recommended in the Interior Department appropriation bill for forest-fire protection. We have provided for an increase for fighting forest fires in the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill.

The original reason for the establishment of the C. C. C. was to provide for unemployment. It is said that now they can be used for work on the roads and in the military camps. Mr. Speaker, if I know anything about the campaigns

waged by Grant and Lee and Jackson, if I know anything about the overrunning of France by Germany in the present war, it is because in the War between the States, and the present World War, they have used and utilized the Corps of Engineers in their Armies. If we have to have engineers to provide for the establishment of camps in the field, when we are engaged in actual warfare, it occurs to me we ought to provide for the training of the workers of Corps of Engineers in our camps that we are providing for the temporary shelter of our soldiers, as they are being trained.

I insist that the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina should be supported and that the House further insist upon its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

I extend by reminding the Members of the House that the Civilian Conservation Corps was established as an emergency measure and in the depth of the greatest depression the country has ever known. I repeat it was established primarily to provide for the idle and unemployed youth of the country. The corps should have been reduced as unemployment was reduced, but like other bureaus established for one purpose it was urged that the C. C. C. could be used for other purposes. In floods the C. C. C. did rescue work; in droughts the C. C. C. constructed ponds and lakes and windbreaks. When there were no longer floods and droughts, forest-fire fighting was emphasized, and now as we are in war it is urged that the C. C. C. camps be retained because many of them are located in Army camps and can be used in building Army roads. Apparently once a bureaucracy always a bureaucracy. It is much easier to establish than it is to abolish. Those who oppose abolition of the C. C. C. camps are placed in the unfortunate position of changing their advocacy with the changing times. It is like a drowning man grasping at straws. If not used for one purpose it can be used for another. In peace it can be used to relieve the depression. In war it can be used to promote the armed services.

As I have indicated, the Corps of Engineers is an important part of every army. The engineers are trained to construct bridges, to build highways, as they are building highways in Alaska today. They are expected to construct railroads, to operate sawmills, to construct pontoon bridges. We remember the fall of France. We recall that Hitler's engineers were on the job. They were a component part of the blitzkrieg; they were conspicuous as Germany overran Holland, Belgium, and France. They must be trained. The Corps of Engineers and the Quartermaster Corps can be used in the improvement of Army camps where soldiers are to be trained for armed duty. Those in the Corps of Engineers will thus get valuable experience that will be of benefit to them in war.

It is said that roads can be constructed by the C. C. C. more economically than by the Army. I have already answered the argument. The pending appropriation is for $76,000,000. Only $48,000,000 will go to the enrollees for paying their salaries and for providing their subsistence. The remaining $28,000,000 will be for supervision and equipment.

Members of Congress have observed the work of the Civilian Conservation Corps. Whatever else be said of the operations of the Corps, on reflection, I believe no thoughtful citizen will argue or urge that economy has characterized the work of the C. C. C. camps. I think all will admit that the trails and roads and the fire fighting could have been more economically constructed by private employment. The economy argument falls of its own weight.

The C. C. C. was established as a depression measure. There were other emergency agencies. I believe that Congress should keep faith with the American people. Depression and emergency matters are for depressions and emergencies; they are not for perpetuation. Those who advocated their establishment maintained that when normal conditions returned they could be abolished. The purpose in advocating was to relieve unemployment and to overcome the depression. Both have ceased to exist. There were the idle on the farms and in the cities. There is a universal need for labor on the farms at present. It is not only wasteful and extravagant, but it is worse than senseless when 73 percent of the young men now in the C. C. C. camps are from the smaller towns, villages, and countryside that the C. C. C. should be continued.

The President of the United States recommended the establishment of the Corps. With national defense, as I have said, a year ago the President recommended a reduction in his Budget message from the peak of five or six hundred million dollars to about $200,000,000. The appropriation was made. After Pearl Harbor the President impounded $90,000,000, or approximately one-half of the appropriation for the past fiscal year. The administration promoted the abandonment of many camps.

If the President was right in impounding, if the President was right in reducing, surely Congress is now justified in abolishing.

Senators and Representatives have advocated the reduction of nonessential governmental expenditures wherever reductions can be made without crippling or destroying the normal functions of Government. Members of Congress have advocated for the duration the elimination of social experiments and the abolition of depression and emergency measures. We have given lip service to reduction in the cost of Government. I repeat, Congress has now the opportunity to match its words with its votes. The reason for inaugurating the C. C. C. is gone. Nothing but excuses are now offered for continuing it.

If Congress refuses to abolish the C. C. C., it will thus confess its impotence to abolish any depression or emergency measure. The C. C. C. should be liquidated. All nondefense appropriations should be reduced to amounts that will not hinder or cripple the normal functions of Government. All nonessential expenditures should be eliminated. The taxpayer is entitled to a break.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, referring to the remarks of the gentleman who has preceded me in the Well, Mr. WHITTINGTON, I was in the Corps of Engineers in the last war and spent a year on the other side of the Big Pond engaged in certain important engineering and construction work. At that time many infantry regiments were assigned to us to perform labor, in order to harden them up, in order to teach them the use of certain tools, such as mattocks, picks and shovels, bridge tools, and many other things that were necessary for the infantry to know about before engaging the enemy.

I understand from what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. ENGEL] has said that this work being done on Army reservations by the C. C. C. today can be done by the Army itself to great profit to those who are in the Army. I believe that the C. C. C. should not be placed in Army posts, but that that work there should be done by the men in training. It would be very profitable to them, as components of the Army, to learn how to use the tools of the fields and forests as well as the tools of construction and demolition. The time may come when such experience might be useful.

Soil conservation is an important thing, but it can wait until a sunnier day. The only question in my mind in regard to this appropriation is the subject of forest-fire control, and those of us who have highly inflammable brush and forests in our districts know what that means. I agree with the gentleman, and I have heard also from the Forestry Service that this work can be accomplished better and cheaper by them. The only thing I want is assurance from the Appropriations Committee that they will not again cut the appropriation for forest-fire control as they did recently.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. ENGEL. Under an agreement between the forestry division and the Appropriations Committee the forestry division can spend all the money they need for forest-fire protection and come in for a deficiency appropriation and the Appropriations Committee will allow it.

Mr. HINSHAW. Can they build roads and trails?

Mr. ENGEL. They are the only division that can incur a deficiency, and this only in connection with forest protection.

Mr. HINSHAW. Can they build roads and trails without an appropriation?

Mr. ENGEL. They cannot do that without an appropriation; no.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, if the original purpose of the C. C. C., namely, forest-fire control and conservation, were to be the main objective of this appropriation, I would support it vigorously. But the C. C. C. has gone far afield. I cannot condone their employment on Army reservations in these times. I trust

that the Appropriations Committee will, in the future, give more favorable consideration to requests from the Forest Service for necessary funds for roads and trails and brush clearance, all so necessary for the control of forest fires. Incendiary forest fires are a real menace to us on the west coast, as well as elsewhere in the United States. It is all well and good to say that deficiencies may be incurred for fire fighting, but we must prepare the way for the fire fighters by building forest roads and trails and clearing out the underbrush. The Forest Service knows its needs, and so do we.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON].

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, one of the extraordinary idiocrasies of the House is the rapidity with which it swings from one extreme to the other. On one occasion it overrides every effort toward economy, and on the next votes to emasculate one of the most useful activities of the Government.

There is a wise economy, a real economy, and there is mistaken economy, false economy. There is such a thing as being penny wise and pound foolish, and this is a fair sample of it.

The Civilian Conservation Corps is a vital part of our national war effort. Under the estimate submitted by the President, approximately 40,000 men in 200 camps will be employed on essential work on military reservations. An additional 30,000 will be employed in 150 camps on war resource-protection activities, particularly in the heavily timbered areas of the West. Over and above this number, about 10,000 Indians and territorials will be engaged also in resource-protection work, largely in critical timbered and agricultural areas.

The Army has testified repeatedly as to the necessity of this work on military reservations. The Department of Agriculture and the Department of the Interior have testified similarly as to the vital need for the protection facilities which the Corps will afford on the forest areas at the present time. The present fire season, even from natural causes, bids fair to be one of the most severe in the history of the Nation. Coupled to this is the possibility or probability of enemy sabotage or attack which could make a shambles of our best merchantable timber at the time when we need it the most.

This work of protection must be done and the work on military reservations must be done. It has been clearly indicated that any method of doing this work other than by the Civilian Conservation Corps will entail grave delays, loss of efficiency, and probably increase the costs of carrying on this necessary work.

With an appropriation of $80,529,800 the Corps will have an enrollment of 80,000 men, of which 55,000 will be juniors, 15,000 war veterans, and 10,000 Indians and residents of Hawaii, Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Alaska.

It is true, as my colleague has just said, they did not use the C. C. C. in Lee and Jackson's time. One uncle rode with Stonewall Jackson and another marched with Lee. And as has also been said earlier in the debate, it was not a part of the American forces in the first World War. That is why England and the Allies are where they are today. They wanted to fight this war like Lee and Jackson fought the Civil War. They expected to take Germany with the same equipment they used at Verdun.

Still more essential in the defense program is the use of the C. C. C. in national-resource protection, especially on the tenuated Pacific coast. There is every reason to believe that saboteurs have been landed on our coasts and are now at work. It is true we apprehended four on Long Island and four in Florida. But we do not know how many got away. Unquestionably enemy groups have been landed on the Pacific as well as on the Atlantic side. Our great timber areas, as valuable in their field as steel in its field, will be one of the principal objectives. The Department of the Interior charged with the protection and conservation of these forest areas earnestly urges the retention of the C. C. C. for that reason.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. I just wanted to comment on the gentleman's remark about forest-fire protection, because the fact the Forestry Department can spend money to put out a fire does not provide the more constructive and essential job of preventing devastating fires from getting started or of having adequate protective forces already prepared to deal with them.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The gentleman is exactly right. I am glad to have his corroboration.

And still in furtherance of the defense program these camps are needed to condition American youth both for war industry and for later Army service. The percentage of physically deficient and malnourished youth among the boys admitted to these camps is surprisingly high. A large percentage of them if unrehabilitated could not pass the physical examination for the draft. But when they leave the camps every one of them is fully developed, alert mentally and physically, disciplined, and conditioned, and ready for factory or drill ground as the needs of his country dictate.

These camps are needed. The War Department says they are needed. The President of the United States, in the estimate submitted by the Bureau of the Budget, says they are needed.

And the Civilian Conservation Corps was without a doubt the most popular of all the emergency agencies. It was universally popular, with the enrollees, with their parents, and especially with the communities in which they were stationed. I trust the House will agree to the motion of the gentleman from Georgia, and thereby preserve a useful activity, effect a much needed economy, and contribute to the success and advancement of the national defense program.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recede and concur.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the House and the clarification of the situation, the vote now is on the Tarver proposal to recede and concur, is it not?

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my motion may be again reported.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again report the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

The Clerk reread the Tarver motion.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 121, nays 230, not voting 81, as follows:

[Roll No. 94]

YEAS—121

Allen, La.	Healey	Patman
Angell	Hébert	Patrick
Barry	Heffernan	Pfeifer, Joseph L.
Beckworth	Hill, Wash.	Pierce
Belter	Hobbs	Rabaut
Bloom	Holland	Ramsay
Bonner	Houston	Ramspeck
Boren	Hull	Rankin, Miss.
Bradley, Pa.	Izac	Robinson, Utah
Brooks	Jackson	Romjue
Brown, Ga.	Jacobsen	Sacks
Burdick	Jarman	Sanders
Burgin	Johnson, Okla.	Sauthoff
Cannon, Fla.	Kee	Scanlon
Cannon, Mo.	Kelley, Pa.	Schulte
Capozzoli	Kelly, Ill.	Scrugham
Cartwright	Keogh	Shanley
Casey, Mass.	Kirwan	Smith, Pa.
Cochran	Klein	Smith, Wash.
Coffee, Wash.	Kopplemann	Snyder
Collins	Kramer	Sparkman
Crosser	Lane	Spence
Dickstein	Leavy	Steagall
Dingell	Lesinski	Sullivan
Domengeaux	Lewis	Sweeney
Downs	Lynch	Tarver
Eberharter	McCormack	Tenerowicz
Eliot, Mass.	Maciejewski	Terry
Englebright	Maciora	Thom
Fitzpatrick	Magnuson	Tolan
Flaherty	Manasco	Traynor
Fogarty	Merritt	Vincent, Ky.
Folger	Mills, La.	Voorhis, Calif.
Forand	Mott	Ward
Ford, Thomas F.	Murdock	Weaver
Gehrmann	Myers, Pa.	Weiss
Gibson	Nelson	Welch
Granger	Nichols	Whelchel
Green	Norton	Wright
Harris, Ark.	O'Brien, Mich.	
Hart	O'Connor	

NAYS—230

Allen, Ill.	Bender	Chapman
Andersen, H. Carl	Bennett	Chenoweth
	Bishop	Chiperfield
Anderson, Calif.	Bland	Clason
Anderson, N. Mex.	Boehne	Claypool
	Boggs	Clevenger
Andresen, August H.	Bolton	Coffee, Nebr.
	Brown, Ohio	Cole, N. Y.
Andrews	Bryson	Colmer
Arends	Buck	Cooley
Arnold	Bulwinkle	Cooper
Barden	Butler	Copeland
Barnes	Camp	Costello
Bates, Mass.	Canfield	Courtney
Baumhart	Carlson	Cox
Bell	Carter	Cravens

Crawford	Howell	Rees, Kans.
Creal	Hunter	Rich
Culkin	Imhoff	Richards
Cunningham	Jenks, N. H.	Rivers
Curtis	Jennings	Rizley
D'Alesandro	Jensen	Robertson, Va.
Davis, Ohio	Johnson, Calif.	Robsion, Ky.
Davis, Tenn.	Johnson, Ill.	Rockefeller
Day	Johnson, Ind.	Rockwell
Dewey	Johnson,	Rodgers, Pa.
Dirksen	Luther A.	Rogers, Mass.
Disney	Johnson, W. Va.	Rolph
Ditter	Jones	Russell
Dondero	Jonkman	Sasscer
Doughton	Kean	Satterfield
Douglas	Keefe	Secrest
Drewry	Kilburn	Shafer, Mich.
Duncan	Kinzer	Sheppard
Durham	Kleberg	Short
Dworshak	Knutson	Sikes
Eaton	Kunkel	Simpson
Elliott, Calif.	Lambertson	Smith, Maine
Elston	Landis	Smith, Ohio
Engel	Lanham	Smith, Va.
Faddis	Lea	Smith, Wis.
Fellows	LeCompte	Springer
Fenton	McGregor	Stearns, N. H.
Fitzgerald	McIntyre	Stefan
Flannagan	McLaughlin	Stevenson
Ford, Leland M.	McLean	Stratton
Ford, Miss.	McMillan	Sumner, Ill.
Fulmer	Mahon	Sutphin
Gale	Martin, Iowa	Taber
Gamble	Martin, Mass.	Talbot
Gathings	Mason	Talle
Gearhart	May	Thill
Gerlach	Meyer, Md.	Thomas, Tex.
Gillette	Michener	Thomason
Gillie	Miller	Tibbott
Gore	Mills, Ark.	Treadway
Gossett	Monroney	Van Zandt
Graham	Moser	Vorys, Ohio
Grant, Ala.	Mundt	Wadsworth
Grant, Ind.	Murray	Wasielewski
Gregory	Norrell	Wene
Guyer	O'Brien, N. Y.	West
Gwynne	O'Hara	Wheat
Haines	Pace	Whitten
Hall,	Paddock	Whittington
Leonard W.	Patton	Wickersham
Hancock	Peterson, Ga.	Wigglesworth
Hare	Pfeiffer,	Williams
Harris, Va.	William T.	Wilson
Harter	Pittenger	Winter
Hartley	Ploeser	Wolcott
Heidinger	Plumley	Wolfenden, Pa.
Hess	Ponge	Wolverton, N. J.
Hill, Colo.	Powers	Woodruff, Mich.
Hinshaw	Priest	Woodrum, Va.
Hoffman	Randolph	Young
Holbrock	Rankin, Mont.	Youngdahl
Holmes	Reece, Tenn.	Zimmerman
Hope	Reed, N. Y.	

NOT VOTING—81

Baldwin	Harness	O'Neal
Bates, Ky.	Harrington	Osmers
Beam	Hendricks	O'Toole
Blackney	Hook	Pearson
Boykin	Jarrett	Peterson, Fla.
Bradley, Mich.	Jenkins, Ohio	Plauché
Buckler, Minn.	Johns	Reed, Ill.
Buckley, N. Y.	Johnson,	Robertson,
Burch	Lyndon B.	N. Dak.
Byrne	Kefauver	Rogers, Okla.
Byron	Kennedy,	Sabath
Case, S. Dak.	Martin J.	Schaefer, Ill.
Celler	Kennedy,	Schuetz
Clark	Michael J.	Scott
Cluett	Kerr	Shannon
Cole, Md.	Kilday	Sheridan
Crowther	Kocialkowski	Smith, W. Va.
Cullen	Larrabee	Somers, N. Y.
Delaney	Ludlow	South
Dies	McGehee	Starnes, Ala.
Edmiston	McGranery	Sumners, Tex.
Ellis	McKeough	Thomas, N. J.
Fish	Maas	Tinkham
Gavagan	Mansfield	Vinson, Ga.
Gifford	Marcantonio	Vreeland
Gilchrist	Mitchell	Walter
Hall,	O'Day	White
Edwin Arthur	O'Leary	Worley
Halleck	Oliver	

So the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Vinson of Georgia for, with Mr. Crowther against.

General pairs:

Mr. Burch with Mr. Maas.

Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Gilchrist.

Mr. Gavagan with Mr. Edwin Arthur Hall.

Mr. Clark with Mr. Harness.

Mr. Boykin with Mr. Thomas of New Jersey.

Mr. McGehee with Mr. Reed of Illinois.

Mr. Martin J. Kennedy with Mr. Oliver.

Mr. Mansfield with Mr. Baldwin.

Mr. Ellis with Mr. Case of South Dakota.

Mr. Delaney with Mr. Cluett.

Mr. Plauché with Mr. Jenkins of Ohio.

Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. Halleck.

Mr. Hendricks with Mr. Gifford.

Mr. Michael J. Kennedy with Mr. Osmers.

Mr. Beam with Mr. Robertson of North Dakota.

Mr. Ludlow with Mr. Tinkham.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Johns.

Mr. Kilday with Mr. Scott.

Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Vreeland.

Mr. O'Neal with Mr. Buckler of Minnesota.

Mr. Bates of Kentucky with Mr. Marcantonio.

Mr. Kerr with Mr. Jarrett.

Mr. Cullen with Mr. McKeough.

Mr. McGranery with Mr. Dies.

Mr. Pearson with Mr. O'Toole.

Mr. Buckley of New York with Mrs. Byron.

Mr. Hook with Mr. Lyndon B. Johnson.

Mr. Larrabee with Mr. Somers of New York.

Mr. South with Mr. Edmiston.

Mr. Walter with Mr. Schaefer of Illinois.

Mr. Schuetz with Mrs. O'Day.

Mr. Cole of Maryland with Mr. Sheridan.

Mr. Starnes of Alabama with Mr. Sumners of Texas.

Mr. White with Mr. Kocialkowski.

Mr. Sabath with Mr. Harrington.

Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Worley.

Mr. Rogers of Oklahoma with Mr. Shannon.

Mr. CREAL changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, to clear the action taken, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my motion to insist, and move to recede and concur with an amendment on the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 9 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out and inserted by the said amendment, insert the following:

"CIVILIAN CONSERVATION CORPS

"For all necessary expenses to enable the Secretary of War to provide for the liquidation of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the conservation and disposition of all of the property of whatever type (including camp buildings, accessories, equipment, and machinery of all types) in use by said Corps, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; payment for accrued annual leave of employees separated from the Government service due to the discontinuance of Corps operations; and for such travel (including the return of enrollees to their homes) and other necessary expenses as may be incurred in connection with liquidation of said Civilian Conservation Corps from the unexpended balances of the appropriations made to the Civilian Conservation Corps in the Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1942, not exceeding $8,000,000.

"There is hereby transferred to the War Department all property and supplies of the Government procured from funds appropriated or allocated for the operation and maintenance of the Civilian Conservation Corps (including funds allotted by the Director of such Corps to cooperating Federal departments or agencies) and not previously transferred. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the War Department may transfer to any department, establishment, or other agency of the Government, upon such conditions as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War, any camp buildings, accessories, equipment, and machinery of all types not needed by the War Department in the prosecution of the war and, upon such terms as said Secretary may approve, transfers may be made to any State, county, municipality, or nonprofit organization for the promotion of conservation, education, recreation, or health: *Provided*, That in the case of buildings located on land owned by the United States any such disposition shall be subject to the approval of the agency of the United States having jurisdiction of such land."

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I submit a point of order against the motion which has just been submitted by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, the motion of the gentleman from South Carolina proposes to increase the amount of an appropriation provided in the House bill for the liquidation of the Civilian Conservation Corps from $500,000 to $8,000,000 and proposes to vest jurisdiction in the Secretary of War for the liquidation of the Corps, divesting the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps of that jurisdiction.

The subject matter of his proposed amendment, therefore, goes far beyond any matter of difference between the House and Senate, the House having appropriated only $500,000 for this purpose and the proposal submitted by the gentleman being to increase that amount to $8,000,000.

I wonder if I may have the opportunity to address an inquiry to the gentleman from South Carolina at this point for the information of the House, while it would not be an appropriate inquiry in the discussion of the point of order?

I wish to inquire of the gentleman from South Carolina if the amendment which he proposes and which involves an expenditure of $8,000,000 instead of $500,000 as proposed in the House bill has ever received the consideration of his subcommittee or if any of his subcommittee has known he was going to propose it until it was offered a moment ago?

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. ENGEL. The gentleman from South Carolina consulted with the two minority members of the committee and we consented to the amendment being submitted. I do not know anything about the other side.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, so far as I am concerned, I never heard of the amendment until a moment ago. May I say further that the Senate conferees advised the House conferees that if the House insisted on its disagreement to the Senate amendment they would recede,

but that we should consider further in conference the matter of providing for liquidation of the Corps. I assume that the Senate conferees are relying upon what I consider to be the agreement that we reached to that effect.

It seems to me that we ought merely to insist on disagreement to the Senate amendment and then go back to conference for the purpose of trying to work out a plan for the liquidation of the Corps; that it is not fair at this time to adopt language which I at least never have read and never heard read until a moment ago and which at best has originated with the chairman of the subcommittee. However, that is aside from the point of order, which, it seems to me, is good.

Mr. HARE. In answer to the inquiry of the gentleman from Georgia, may I state that before offering the motion I did confer with the other members of the subcommittee, but I regret that I did not have the time or the opportunity to confer with my good and genial friend from Georgia, upon whom I have learned to rely a great deal in the activities of this committee. However, the motion was considered by the other members of the committee. The thought was that since the Senate amendment had been killed, this amendment would offer an opportunity for conference with the Senate conferees.

As to the point of order, I shall ask the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to discuss that matter.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, my friend the gentleman from Georgia makes the point of order that the proposition contained in the amendment offered by the chairman of the subcommittee is outside the matters in disagreement between the two Houses and, therefore, is not in order.

When the Senate amendments are again taken from the Speaker's table, as in the present instance, they come up for consideration de novo, and there is no restriction as to the attitude of the two Houses in former conferences. The only requirement is that any amendment proposed shall be germane. The point at issue, therefore, is solely a question of germaneness. I think no one will deny that the motion offered by the gentleman is germane. There can be no ground for any other conclusion. I submit, therefore, Mr. Speaker, that the point of order presented by the gentleman from Georgia is not well taken.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the chairman of the subcommittee appears to have consulted with all the other members of the subcommittee except myself, and this matter meets with their approval, I withdraw the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate amendment No. 16: On page 39, after line 10, insert the following:

"Loans to students in technical and professional fields (national defense): To assist students (in such numbers as the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall determine) participating in accelerated programs in degree-granting colleges and universities in engineering, physics, chemistry, medicine (including veterinary), dentistry, and pharmacy, as follows:

"Loans: For loans to students to enable them to pursue college courses, who attain and continue to maintain satisfactory standards of scholarship, who are in need of assistance, and who agree in writing to participate, until otherwise directed by said Chairman, in accelerated programs of study, in any of the fields authorized hereunder, and who agree in writing to engage, for the duration of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, in such employment or service as may be assigned by officers or agencies designated by said Chairman, such loans to be made by such colleges or universities or public or college-connected agencies from funds paid to them upon estimates submitted by them as to the amounts necessary therefor, $7,500,000: *Provided*, That in case it shall be found that any payment to any such college, university, or public or college-connected agency is in excess of the needs thereof for the purposes hereof, refund of such excess shall be made to the Treasurer of the United States and the amount thereof credited to this appropriation. Loans hereunder shall be made in amounts not exceeding tuition and fees plus $25 per month and not exceeding a total of $500 to any one student during any 12-month period, said loans to be evidenced by notes executed by such students payable to the Treasurer of the United States at a rate of interest at 2½ percent per annum. Repayments of such loans shall be made through the colleges, universities, or other agencies negotiating the loans and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided*, That indebtedness of students who, before completing their courses, are ordered into military service during the present wars under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, or who suffer total and permanent disability or death, shall be canceled. The foregoing loan program shall be administered in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Commissioner of Education with the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

"Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Education in the administration of the foregoing program, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and exchange of equipment; printing and binding; travel expenses, including not to exceed $2,500 for actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Commissioner of Education, $100,000: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any purchase from this appropriation when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $100."

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 16 and concur in the same with an amendment as follows: In line 20 of said amendment strike out the sum "$7,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof the sum "$5,000,000."

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE].

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina is to recede and concur in the Senate amendment. You will recall that when this bill was before this body earlier you were advised that the Budget had sent up an estimate to our committee very late in the consideration of this bill which provided for the appropriation of the sum of $10,000,000 to provide for a student-loan fund. The committee voted to eliminate that suggestion from the bill, so when the bill came before the House there was no provision for a student-loan fund to be administered by the Office of Education.

The Senate, by the amendment which is now under consideration—amendment No. 16—restored that proposal to this bill and provided for the establishment of a student-loan fund to be administered by the Office of Education, but cut the amount from $10,000,000 to $7,500,000. The conferees agreed yesterday, in accordance with the motion made by the gentleman from South Carolina, that if the House were to recede and concur in this amendment the amount provided would be reduced to $5,000,000.

I think before we vote upon this proposition we should understand exactly what we are proposing to do. I recall that when the bill was before the House earlier I offered an amendment to the bill to give $5,000,000 to the N. Y. A. to permit them to carry out this very program by permitting students who are worthy and in need of assistance to work for these funds and thus to permit them to remain in school while they are studying courses in medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, chemistry, and so forth. The House in its wisdom rejected that amendment. The Senate has put it back, and the conferees have agreed on the sum of $5,000,000, the fund to be administered by the Office of Education.

Let us see exactly what will happen if you adopt the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina. This amendment reads, in part, as follows:

Loans to students in technical and professional fields: To assist students (in certain numbers as the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall determine) participating in accelerated programs—

And so on. Remember that if you adopt this amendment you are delegating to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission the right and power to determine the number and the character of the individuals who will be permitted to receive $500 a year maximum out of the Treasury of the United States to enable them to remain in school.

I think it is worthy of note that in connection with the discussion which took place on the floor yesterday I propounded a question to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] as to the power that has been given by the President to the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission to issue blanket deferments. It is contended by Mr. McNutt that he now has the power—and that is set out on page 5746 of yesterday's RECORD—under the executive order of the President to grant blanket deferments.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. That is exceedingly important because the Selective Service System has indicated to the country heretofore that there would be no blanket deferments, that each case would stand on its own individual merits, and that the local draft boards would have the power continuing in them to determine whether or not a man was to be placed in the service.

If, as was stated yesterday, Mr. McNutt has the power under the President's executive order to supersede the action of the Selective Service System and give a blanket deferment to all individuals or students who are engaged in the study of medicine, dentistry, pharmacy, chemistry, or engineering, we would then by the adoption of this amendment later put in the hands of Mr. McNutt the power to say that John Jones and John Smith shall be deferred from participation in military service under a blanket deferment, and he will have the power to determine who shall come within the provisions of that blanket deferment.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Is there any requirement that to be eligible for these loans the students must be in their sophomore, junior, or senior years?

Mr. KEEFE. There is not. The evidence disclosed yesterday in the conference of the conferees admitted that a student who leaves high school and expresses a desire to study medicine will be required under most State laws under the accelerated program to spend 6 years qualifying as a doctor.

This amendment then would provide that such a student, if selected and approved by Mr. McNutt, would be granted a maximum of $500 a year out of the Treasury of the United States to finance him for 6 years while studying to become a doctor. If he entered the military service of the United States upon finishing his course, the note which he would give to the Government for the sums thus advanced would be canceled and it would represent an absolute gift out of the Treasury of the United States.

When I offered the amendment which I did, transferring this activity to the N. Y. A., it was on the theory that this proposal was necessary, that it was a step in the right direction, but I insisted that these people should have to do some work in order to get this money under the N. Y. A. program. Now, see what you are doing. You are giving to Mr. McNutt the power to select the students, and name them, who shall be the beneficiaries under this proposed program, and you are giving him, or have given him, the power to defer those he wants to select to go into this program.

I am not charging that Mr. McNutt would arbitrarily misuse the power which we are giving him, but I want to call your attention to the fact that you are offering an opportunity for the Chairman of the Manpower Commission to defer the sons of his friends and his people and put them into college where they will be deferred from military service, and at the same time give them a gratuity out of the Treasury of the United States of $500 a year.

I personally want to express the fact that I cannot support that type of proposal. I believe that those who receive aid out of the Treasury for this purpose, and it is necessary, should do some work before they obtain these gratuities. I hesitate, Members of the House, to give the power to one man not only to grant blanket deferments, but to name the people who shall be deferred. This thing will rise up to haunt you in the months that are to come, and you will find some criticism, I am sure, before this is over on account of blanket deferments that are bound to be given on account of the character, perhaps, of the students that will be granted them. You are opening the door of opportunity for abuse of power whether it is used or not.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WASIELEWSKI. Does this bill provide that such a student must be indigent in order to qualify?

Mr. KEEFE. The language is simply this:

> For loans to students to enable them to pursue college courses who attain and continue to maintain satisfactory standards of scholarship and who are in need of assistance.

That is all it says.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. As I understand it now, if a young man is attending college, in his second year and from there on, he can enlist in the reserve of any branch and his being called into active service is suspended until he graduates unless the country actually needs his services. Is that correct?

Mr. KEEFE. I think that is true.

Mr. McCORMACK. I am not talking now about where this power should vest, but unless something like this is done, it seems to me that the poor boy is going to be unable to go to college, and the college will be the haven for the rich man's son. There is an important question involved here because the officials of the Boston University in Boston called this to my attention several weeks ago, that in view of the accelerated college courses and the pushing forward, so to speak, of semesters, unless something of this kind is done, with the program I have referred to on the part of the Army, suspending the calling of these students into active service after enlistment, colleges are liable to become a refuge for the sons of wealthy persons and the poor boys will be discriminated against.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin 1 additional minute.

Mr. KEEFE. May I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that I made that very argument when I offered the amendment to put $5,000,000 into this bill for the N. Y. A. to provide for this type of training for needy students who would work and do some public service for the gratuity which was given to them out of the N. Y. A. program. I pointed out at that time that unless this was done, if a blanket deferment were issued, the poor students under the accelerated program might have to drop out of school on account of not having the advantage of their summer vacation to earn money. This would leave a situation where you would have the sons of the rich come under this blanket deferment. That is exactly what we are up against now.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KEEFE. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am in full sympathy with the gentleman's argument, but I want to point out the reverse of that situation. I am referring to the poor devil who has not a chance to get into any medical school. The boys that are in that situation are not taken care of by this appropriation.

Mr. KEEFE. I do not agree with that statement at all. I know the sons of many poor people who are in medical schools, but there are plenty of medical schools that have been overcrowded in the past. I can state from my own knowledge that many students who have taken premedical courses in the University of Wisconsin have found extreme difficulty in securing matriculation into certain medical schools, not because they are poor, but because the facilities of the schools are so overcrowded that they could not take them.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. And, furthermore, because they belong to a certain race of people.

Mr. KEEFE. Oh, I do not agree with that. People of all races are studying medicine.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has again expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. VORYS].

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to differ with my good friend from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]. Let us get this clear. In this war effort we have a great need of certain professional skills that require great study and long study. We have colleges and universities that are in a position to teach those skills. We have to have that kind of manpower. How shall it be obtained?

First, shall we do nothing about subsidizing such study and permit deferments solely to those who are wealthy enough to continue such courses? That is one possibility which I deplore and reject.

Second, we have a possibility of putting such people on the tip system of N. Y. A., as my dear friend from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] suggests, and I reject that, because under these accelerated courses where you do not have a summer vacation, where the colleges are pouring it into these students day and night, students are not going to have time to have this money really earned by outside effort.

The third proposition is the one before us here today, and that is a loan to a student selected for his ability to absorb the work, to take a course needed in the national war effort, provided he agrees to enter the war effort as directed. If he does so enter, then the loan is canceled, and it becomes merely a part of the cost of preparation for this particular part of the war effort, just as we do not require a man who goes through an officers' candidate school to pay for his tuition in that school, because he has trained for services the country needs.

Who should make the selection of these students? I happen not to be any profound admirer of Paul McNutt, although he did have some educational experience as dean of a law school.

I also happen to feel that the Manpower Commission should be set up by law and not by Executive order, and that the Congress should have some control over how it should operate; but the fact remains that we have now an over-all Manpower Commission. Its duty is to look into just such situations, and to make sure what the needs are for all sorts of skills, and to make sure that there is trained manpower coming along not only for this summer but possibly for years to come, to fill our manpower needs. The Manpower Commission is the one which should be making these assignments. If they show favoritism in deferments, then is the time for Congress to step in, but someone, and I think the Manpower Commission, should pick the men best able to absorb this training that our country needs, give them a loan so that they will spend all of their time on their studies, and not spend hours of it raking leaves, or doing make-work jobs, and then assign them to war service after they have finished their training and the loan is canceled. Therefore, I feel that this proposal is a step which is a most democratic step, a most efficient step in securing trained manpower for the war effort.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I think what the House would like to know is whether or not these young men and women must qualify before they come under the authority or purview of Paul McNutt, or whomever we assign this authority to. Is not that correct? In other words, you cannot go out and select men at random to give benefits to under this act. There must be some qualifying basis for it. They must be poor, or they must have the necessary intellectual qualifications. Is that correct?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I understand that is correct, although I cannot refer to the exact language in the amendment which requires it. As I understand it, every Tom, Dick, and Harry who would like to stay out of the war and go to college is not going to get a loan. It must be shown that he is qualified to absorb the knowledge, is needy, and he has to agree in writing to serve as directed in the war.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would not this be true, that in order to get into college itself, a man would have to be qualified, that is, so far as most of the colleges are concerned?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. The language of this amendment very definitely provides that it is open to students who attain and continue to maintain satisfactory standards of scholarship and who are in need of assistance. I assume that a high-school graduate who seeks the benefits of this provision of law would, under that law, have to be a student who had, during his high-school career, maintained or attained a certain degree of scholastic training. I assume that that is one of the guides that would control the War Manpower Commission. But I call your attention to the fact that on page 41 there is a provision that the foregoing loan program shall be administered in accordance with rules and regulations promulgated by the Commissioner of Education, with the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. HINSHAW].

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know if there has been any proposal made about apportioning the students who may obtain these benefits in any special manner, perhaps similar to the apportionment of students in the Military and Naval Academies, that is, among congressional districts, or will they be selected at random?

Mr. HARE. No proposal has been made to definitely distribute them. The committee has in mind that if this amendment is concurred in by the House, then in the distribution the distribution should take into consideration the needs of the various States and distribute them accordingly.

Mr. HINSHAW. Has any provision been discussed that would give the student the right to select the school to which he would go, or are those schools to be selected by the War Manpower Commission?

Mr. HARE. The student would have the right, as I understand, to make application to a school.

Mr. HINSHAW. Through a school or to a school?

Mr. HARE. To a school for admission. Then the question would arise whether or not he could qualify. Under the conditions he must first have the training necessary for admission, and it must be found that he is in need.

Mr. HINSHAW. Must he be approved by the school to which he applies before the War Manpower Commission selects him?

Mr. HARE. Certainly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HINSHAW. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I understand it also applies to young men who are now in college.

Mr. HARE. Certainly.

Mr. McCORMACK. Principally for the young men who are in college who are unable to go out and work during the summer months, because of the accelerated college work. And is it the intention that the students themselves shall apply through the college authorities and they will make the necessary certification?

Mr. HARE. That is my understanding.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] well said, this proposal is in a little different form to that submitted to your subcommittee a few weeks ago. After due consideration our subcommittee rejected the proposal and did not bring it to the House for consideration. The committee thought at that time that it was such a new policy, providing loans by the Government to students irrespective of need, that it would be unwise, and for that reason we rejected it.

The other reason advanced was that much of the money probably would not be repaid. After it was rejected by the committee a special supplemental estimate, as I understand, was sent to the Senate committee asking for an appropriation to make loans to students to train them primarily for work in the defense program.

This new estimate provided that the loans should be made to needy students, but they shall first have the qualifications necessary to enter the institution and qualify on the subject they plan to study. It has been stated that many sections of the country today are being depleted of physicians necessary to take care of the people in those communities. It was stated in the conference committee yesterday by one of the Senators that there were nine counties in his State today that do not have a practicing physician because they have all been called into military service. The people there are suffering for lack of proper medical attention.

That was one of the points emphasized for approving this estimate. A young man who applies for admission to a medical college, for instance, would necessarily be required to qualify under the rules and regulations of that institution. If he can meet the mental and physical requirements and it is found he is in need, just as has been required under N. Y. A., then he could be furnished with a loan of $500 per annum, with the understanding that when he completes his course he will be subject first to the call of his country. If not, then he would be qualified to go out and meet the demands of the public where there is need of the services of a physician. I have the thought that the Government, following his graduation, could take charge of him, and if it did not need him in the military forces it could place him in those communities in need of a physician, and he could there discharge his duties as such.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. As a matter of fact, I think we are all getting off the track. This whole set-up would apply only to students who are now in their second or third year, allowing them to finish their courses. It would not apply to any new students.

Mr. HARE. Let me ask the gentleman where he gets his information.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I have affidavits to support my statements.

Mr. HARE. I heard all the testimony before the committee and heard nothing like that.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I shall be glad to go before the gentleman's committee and present documentary proof. The whole thing is all a mistake; not one new student who at present has completed his premedical course can enter one of these schools under this plan.

Mr. HARE. I may say to the gentleman from New York that I am not standing up here sponsoring this legislation, because I have my own philosophy about the thing, and I have not heretofore subscribed to the plan, but as a member of the committee and as the chairman of the subcommittee I am bringing it to the attention of the House in order to get an expression of the membership of this House and let the House assume the responsibility as to whether or not this provision shall be included; and I am trying to present to them the best way I can the information that has been submitted to the committee so far.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. May I state for the information of the gentleman from New York, who apparently has some subterranean method of obtaining information that the committee does not have, that this matter was most thoroughly discussed and the records will so disclose. It was thoroughly discussed yesterday by the conferees of the Senate who put this amendment in the bill. The contention the gentleman makes, according to the opinion of the conferees, is absolutely in error.

Mr. HARE. I appreciate very much the gentleman's addition to my interpretation.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I think the purpose of this amendment is highly desirable, but it seems to me it would be a very wise thing to have a legislative committee of the House go into the matter with a great deal of care, because it is important; it is important to all the young people of the Nation that these qualifications may be so drawn that everyone has his opportunity to gain the advantages this legislation gives.

Mr. HARE. I should like to say to the gentleman that this does afford an opportunity to every young man in the Nation who can qualify under its provisions, and if it is approved I hope a proper distribution of students may be made to the several States.

Mr. HINSHAW. It does provide an opportunity, but the thing is there should be some competition for these things.

Mr. HARE. It provides only for a very limited number. It is only $5,000,000. It is thought that $5,000,000 would be enough to enable them to get men to qualify and prepare themselves as physicians, surgeons, chemists, and so forth. It is also found we are in need of engineers. There is not an industry in this country today but what has come before our committee directly or indirectly complaining of the great need right now for men trained in engineering; then we have demand for men and women trained in physics, trained in chemistry, specialists in chemistry. Right now the demand is unusually large for young men and young women trained in chemistry, pharmacy, dentistry, and so forth.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Would the amendment have this effect: If a young man is in college, in one of the many Catholic universities or other universities in these large areas where children are encouraged to go to college and work their way through, they could not go out and work during vacations because of the accelerated courses—would this amendment allow a poor boy if he qualified to stay in college and complete his course and be trained for the things he is majoring in?

Mr. HARE. If he can qualify, but the gentleman should remember that this legislation is not designed for the benefit of the individual; this legislation is designed to meet a necessity forced upon us by this war, and the purpose of this proposal is to get men and women placed where they can be of the greatest service in its prosecution. It is found we do not have a sufficient number of technicians in many of our defense efforts. The question is, How are we going to get them? We have several ways already provided, but it seems they have not succeeded to the fullest extent. To promote the work loans have been suggested in the manner provided for in the Senate amendment; and let me say that under this no loan will be canceled unless the man is called into the service before he completes his course in medicine, engineering, pharmacy, and so forth; that is the only condition upon which his loan will be canceled. Let me say further that there is nothing in this bill to insure his deferment. We cannot take into consideration the rules and regulations to be made by the Selective Service, and there is no provision for deferment here; we do not know who will be deferred. The point is there is need of physicians, there is need of pharmacists, there is need of engineers, and there is need of experts trained in chemistry. The only way the War Department and those in charge of the prosecution of this war effort have found to supply this need is to supply loans to needy young men who can qualify and meet the requirements.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Such men will be furnished a loan with which they can complete their education or training.

My belief is there is a distinct difference between this and the N. Y. A. Under N. Y. A. the young man goes to college, gets his training, and is paid for work during that time, but when he completes it he does not owe a penny.

Provision could be made for drafting the necessary number of men and women to meet the needs and pay them just as any other person in the service, but those promoting this amendment contend that it will be much cheaper to make the loans under the terms herein provided and then you would be certain to get men and women who have selected this type of work because they plan to make it their life work, and it would be in line with what they would consider their calling, and they would naturally become more proficient than one drafted for such work.

The man who avails himself of this provision, when he completes his course, still owes the full amount, and he owes it together with 2½ percent per annum.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. In the case of a young man who completes his education and does not enter the military service, what guaranty does the Government have that this young man will repay the loan to the Government?

Mr. HARE. I do not know as it has anything except his honor and his integrity, but he will be in the service, and I assume they will have control of his salary.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I am speaking of the young man who does not enter the service.

Mr. HARE. As I understand it, if a man asks for a loan he has to give what security he has. If he has no credit, he pledges his word, his honor, and his integrity, and if he is found to be in need and qualifies, and he is selected to go into the college or university, he takes his training. If he comes out and refuses to go into the service and refuses to pay it, I do not know of any way you can make him do it, except there is a provision in the bill that makes the college or university receiving the student responsible for the loan. On page 40, beginning on line 17, it says:

> Repayment of such loans shall be made through the colleges or universities negotiating the loans, and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. I think the gentleman will find that practically all colleges and universities have had student-loan funds for years, and that these student-loan funds have a perfectly remarkable record of repayment, because the students automatically pay off the loan.

Mr. HARE. I do not think that answers the question of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman will observe that there is a provision in the bill itself and in this amendment which reads:

> Loans hereunder shall be made in amounts not exceeding tuition and fees plus $25 per month, not exceeding a total of $500, to any one student during any 1-month period, said loans to be evidenced by notes executed by such student payable to the Treasurer of the United States at the rate of interest of 2½ percent per annum.

If the student goes into the military service his note is canceled; he owes nothing. He has performed his obligation. If he does not go into the military service, then his note is still outstanding, and if my experience with the collecting authorities of the United States Government is any criterion to go by, I think they will pay the note eventually.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. The gentleman has stated that it is contemplated under the pending amendment that we take students perhaps from high schools and give them an engineering course, or other courses, which takes about 7 years. Would it not be better to have this amendment limited only to those students who qualify under this amendment and in addition are either women or people who are physically disabled to serve in the military services?

Mr. HARE. I would not like to have the gentlewoman place me in the position of vouching for everything in this amendment. I am trying to present the best I can the facts submitted in justification of this amendment.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I appreciate that.

Mr. HARE. Because I am not the proponent of the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Is the gentleman not fearful that the discrimination sought to be prevented under the terms of this amendment in giving deferment to military service may serve to destroy the public confidence in our selective-service system?

Mr. HARE. I am fearful of any agency that is left entirely to the whims of human weaknesses. I would not guarantee that everything will be carried on perfectly and in order and efficiently.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. If the man enters the service and his note is canceled, how long is he supposed to serve his country?

Mr. HARE. He is supposed to serve it at least during the war.

Mr. RICH. Then, if he is put in the military service and the war terminates in 1 month his whole obligation is automatically canceled?

Mr. HARE. If he completes his service and goes into the service his obligation is not canceled. The only time his obligation is canceled is if he has pursued his course 1 or 2 years and has not completed his course and he is carried into the service, then his note is canceled. But if he completes the course or he completes whatever work he undertakes and goes into the service, his note is not canceled.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The military authorities are at the present time snatching or pulling young men out of college within 6 months of graduation as medical students. How can that be reconciled with this proposed program?

Mr. HARE. This proposed program will give the colleges an opportunity to keep them in there and give the War Department or whoever is snatching them out the idea that Congress feels that these students should stay there and complete this course.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Fellows who are paying their own expenses are being pulled out within 6 months of graduation with a medical degree.

Mr. HARE. I do not know; that may be true, but I hope the gentleman is not going to hold me responsible for that.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE].

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, the need for aid to students who are taking the shortened courses in engineering and medicine and similar subjects is evident to anyone familiar with what the Government has asked the technical and professional schools to do. The boys who cannot work during the summertime but must stay in school need some help. The danger in this proposition, it seems to me, is that we do not have the safeguard against abuse that the Army and Navy use in connection with the Reserves. To qualify for student deferment in either the Army or the Navy Reserves one must be at least in his second year of college. Here, however, we would create authority for somebody to set up a cyclone cellar for a boy just out of high school, to insure himself a draft deferment and also to get a $500 loan.

May I ask the chairman of the subcommittee if he would be agreeable to adding to his amendment, in line 18, on page 39, where it states "for loans to students", the word "advanced" before "students", so that it would read "for loans to advanced students"? That would give the same protection against abuse that the Army and the Navy have in requiring that the Reserves shall be in at least their second year of college.

Mr. HARE. I would not be prepared to assume that responsibility, because I am doubtful whether or not that would meet the purpose. I am sure that in the administration of this act the Chairman of the Manpower Commission will be guided by nothing except a desire to promote the war effort.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. The country is getting doubtful of some of these authorities where we depend too much upon the human element to which the gentleman himself earlier referred.

The chairman is in control of the time. Will he yield to me for the purpose of offering this as an amendment to his amendment?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Expressing merely my own personal opinion, I hope the chairman will adopt the suggestion of the gentleman from South Dakota. It seems to me that if we confine this to young men who are in college at the present time we are meeting the immediate necessity. The suggestion of the gentleman seems to be a very excellent one.

Mr. HARE. The original proposition made to the House provided that no students would be considered except those beyond their second year in college. As far as I am personally concerned, I do not object to inserting the word "advanced" there. If the gentleman desires to ask unanimous consent that that be done, I shall not object.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to offer an amendment.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Will this mean that they will have to take that back to conference again?

The SPEAKER. It all depends on whether or not the Senate accepts the action of the House. If not, it will have to go back to conference.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota.

The Clerk read as follows:

> Amendment offered by Mr. CASE of South Dakota to the motion offered by Mr. HARE: At the end of the motion add the following: "And in line 18, page 39, strike out the word 'students' and insert 'advanced students'."

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to speak in opposition to this amendment, but I do want to point out some factors that have not been brought out on this very important question.

I assume that by "advanced" the gentleman means second year students?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Yes; under the explanation I made, to make it

the same as the policy of the Army and Navy.

Mr. MAGNUSON. The amendment then would put this in line with the announced policy of the Army and the Navy in taking men who are now in universities and giving them Reserve commissions?

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Reserve status, not necessarily Reserve commissions.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Reserve status; yes. Then they say to these men, "You finish your course, because of your technical training and your technical value, and we will later pick you up and take you into the service." This places all this in the same category. I have no doubt that with the $5,000,000 provided here there are plenty of worthy young men in all the technical colleges of the country who will benefit by this particular amendment to its fullest extent.

If, as the gentleman from South Dakota said, we are going to pick up younger students, we will run into all kinds of trouble and not enough money to go around.

I think the amendment is justified. It will help the poor boy and, above all, it will do this—there has been a lot of criticism throughout the country by mothers and fathers, of the policy of the Navy and the Army in saying to a young man, "Because your name is John Doe, because you have had the opportunity to have 2 years of college, and because your parents can afford to keep you there for 2 more years, you do not have to go into the military service until we need you." This will give all the opportunity. This would alleviate a lot of that and would give the poor boy who is in college and in need of help a good chance to go through on an equal basis with other men. I hope the amendment will carry.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The amendment to the motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON].

Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, I hope before the House puts the Federal Government into the student-loan business it takes advantage of the experience which many organizations have had in that work. All over this country there are organizations which for years have been lending money to students for the purpose of putting them through schools. There are such organizations in thousands of communities. I have had the opportunity of making a study of more than a thousand student-loan funds, and I can tell you now that if loans to students are going to be administered from Washington, they are going to fail. The only thing that has made them successful has been the fact that somebody in an individual community, a doctor or a lawyer or a merchant, who knows the boy puts his name on the note and then appeals to the young man to see it through for his sake. I may say to you that before you launch into any program with respect to a student-loan fund you ought to debate the matter in a legislative bill very carefully, because you will find there are certain methods that have been developed over a period of years that you will need to study and know about.

The whole program of student loans in America was started by very well intentioned men who had made a lot of money, and when they established such funds they always failed, because the students could say, "What difference does it make to him whether I make good or not, because he has a lot of money?" But when you have a woman's club or some local club or charity tied in to that young life, that young man says, "I must pay this back in order to make good my obligations."

I think this is very bad legislation, and I hope it is turned down.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. HARE) there were—ayes 55, noes 67.

So the motion was rejected.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further insist on its disagreement to the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider the votes by which the several motions were acted upon, was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7280. An act making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1957. An act to establish the naval procurement fund, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 308) entitled "Joint resolution making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 324) entitled "Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 6845) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendments of the House to the amendments of the Senate numbered 21 and 23 to the bill (H. R. 6599) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of State, the Department of Justice, the Department of Commerce, and the Federal judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes."

MILITARY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 7280) making appropriations for the Military Establishment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments thereto.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Page 7, line 19, strike out all after "war", down to and including "character" in line 23.

Page 60, after line 12, insert:

"SEC. 19. The appropriations and authority with respect to appropriations contained herein shall be available from and including July 1, 1942, for the purposes respectively provided in such appropriations and authority. The obligations incurred during the period between June 30, 1942, and the date of the enactment of this act in anticipation of such appropriations and authority are hereby ratified and confirmed if in accordance with the terms thereof."

Page 60, line 13, strike out "19" and insert "20."

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has not changed a single money item in the bill. There are but two changes. One strikes out a proviso which would permit service magazines or publications to run paid advertising of nonmilitary materials, such as are sold at post exchanges—candy, cigarettes, tobacco, and the like. Personally, I feel that the proviso should remain in the bill. Its deletion, in my judgment, has been prompted by selfish interests.

The other change makes the bill effective as of July 1, in case approval should occur later.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House concur in the Senate amendments.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION ACT, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 7319) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7319, the first supplemental national defense appropriation bill, 1943, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bil.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

BOARD OF ECONOMIC WARFARE

Salaries and expenses: For all expenses necessary to enable the Board of Economic Warfare to carry out its functions and activities, including salaries of an Executive Director at $10,000 per annum and four assistants to the Executive Director at $9,000 per annum; personal services (including aliens) in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; the acceptance and utilization of voluntary and uncompensated services; the temporary employment of persons or organizations by contract or otherwise without regard to the civil-service and classification laws or section 3709 of the Revised Statutes; procurement of necessary services, supplies, and equipment without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, for use (1) outside the continental limits of the United States, including the rental of office space, and (2) within the United States when the aggregate amount involved in any one case does not exceed $300; traveling expenses, including (1) expenses of attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Board, (2) actual transportation and other necessary expenses, and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving while away from their homes without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Board, (3) payment to the Chairman and the Executive Director of the Board of actual and necessary transportation, subsistence, and other expenses incidental to the performance of their duties, and (4) expenses outside the United States without regard to the Standardized Government Travel Regulations and the Subsistence Expense Act of 1926, as amended, or any limitation of law or regulation governing the payment of transportation and subsistence to military or naval personnel, and section 901 of the act of June 29, 1936 (49 Stat. 2015); transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1105); preparation and transportation of the remains of officers and employees who die abroad or in transit, while in the dispatch of their official duties, to their former homes in this country or to a place not more distant for interment, and for the ordinary expenses of such interment; purchase and exchange of lawbooks and books of reference; the rental of news-reporting services; the purchase of, or subscription to, commercial and trade reports, newspapers, and periodicals; the purchase or rental of typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices, and the repair and exchange of same; the purchase, exchange, maintenance, operation, repair, and hire of motor-propelled or horse-drawn passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding, $13,818,000, of which amount such sums as may be authorized by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may be transferred to other departments or agencies of the Government for the performance by them of any of the functions or activities for which this appropriation is made: *Provided*, That no other agency of the Government shall perform work or render services for the Board of Economic Warfare, whether or not the performance of such work or services involves the transfer of funds or reimbursement of appropriations, unless authority therefor by the Bureau of the Budget shall have been obtained in advance: *Provided further*, That not to exceed $500,000 of this appropriation shall be available to meet emergencies of a confidential character to be expended under the direction of the Executive Director, who shall make a certificate of the amount of such expenditure which he may think it advisable not to specify, and every such certificate shall be deemed a sufficient voucher for the amount therein certified.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH: Page 5, in line 15, strike out "$13,818,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$12,000,000."

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries an appropriation of $13,818,000 for the Board of Economic Warfare. It includes about $6,000,000 for special projects. It includes about $1,268,000 for transfers to other agencies to conduct studies for the Board. It includes also $6,549,450 for salaries and expenses, as compared with a total of $3,199,000 made available to the Board during the current fiscal year. It calls for an expansion of the staff of the Board from 1,971 to 2,624.

Last evening I spoke at some length in reference to the functions of the Board of Economic Warfare as I see them. I emphasized the fact that it appears to me that these functions are in large measure in a field which is entirely impractical, that these functions are also in very large measure in fields which are already covered by other Federal agencies.

I mentioned specifically the requirements set-up which is supposed to ascertain the needs of other governments; the trade intelligence set-up, which is supposed to procure trade intelligence for our own Government; the development set-up, which is supposed to develop new sources of materials required by this Government; the industrial engineering set-up, which is supposed to step up production in other countries; and the economic warfare analysis set-up, which is supposed to prepare studies for the Army and the Navy.

I pointed out in each instance existing agencies operating in each field, including the State Department, the Commerce Department, the Treasury Department, the R. F. C. and its subsidiaries, the F. B. I., the Tariff Commission, and other agencies.

I think the functions of this organization are not only in large part impractical, in large part merely duplicating those other agencies. I think under the Executive orders applicable to this agency it is accorded an unwise and unjustified control over all departments and agencies in any way connected with economic defense.

My amendment will reduce by $1,818,000 the proposed appropriation for this agency. It will provide the agency with $12,000,000, as compared with a total of $3,199,000 in the current fiscal year. I hope the committee will adopt the amendment.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that debate upon this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Board of Economic Warfare is one of the most important of the war agencies that are provided for in this bill. I think I can say with confidence that we had one of the most interesting and enlightening hearings on this agency with Mr. Milo Perkins, who is the head of the agency, or rather the executive head—the Vice President is the chairman of the Board—who came before our committee and discussed the very intricate and involved matters with which this Board has to do, much of which, of necessity, had to be off the record. This Board asked the Budget for $17,000,000. The Budget cut it to $13,818,000, and they stated to us very frankly that they had no complaint to make about the reduction made by the Budget, but if the war continued, and the situation continued as critical as it appeared it is going to continue, undoubtedly they would have to come back for additional funds.

This Board has the function of issuing separate licenses after careful separate individual consideration, for every export out of the United States. That numbers something like six or seven thousand a day, and that is something of the magnitude involved merely in the licensing activity of the Board. It has to do with our economy as it is integrated with the economy of the other nations of the world today, a world that is gradually restricting insofar as our trade relations are concerned, with more and more vital strategic materials being harder and harder to get. In other words, as Mr. Perkins expressed it, it is a question of dividing as best possible a deficit of the strategic and critical things we have to have in this war. I think it would be a great mistake to make a cut in this appropriation. It would be a purely idle gesture, because I am confident they are not going to be able to get along if the war continues, as I am afraid it will, on the amount of money provided in this bill.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. DITTER. I am glad the gentleman referred to Mr. Milo Perkins and the important place he has in this set-up. I am wondering whether the gentleman feels that we should give blanket approval to a philosophy such as I presently refer to now, quoting from Milo Perkins, when he says that "complete victory will not be won until there is a full and increasing use of the world's resources to lift living standards from one end of this planet to the other." That is taking in a pretty big field.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Why does the gentleman complain of that?

Mr. DITTER. Because I feel it is simply so idealistic and so impractical that if we try to do it, I believe the gentleman is practical enough to see that it is a hopeless task.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. No; I would not say that. I think it is a Herculean task, but it is not a hopeless task.

Mr. DITTER. Then it will only begin by pulling down our standards of living.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not think so. The position that Mr. Milo Perkins presently has is Executive Director of the Board of Economic Warfare. Before our committee he gave one of the finest and most intelligent and most understanding discussions of this highly intricate and involved problem of anyone who appeared before our committee.

Mr. DITTER. I am not taking issue with that, but I am taking issue with an ideology that is so impractical as the one espoused by Mr. Perkins.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not think we need disturb ourselves too much about ideologies, but try to be a little more practical with the things that are presently before us.

Mr. Chairman, I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WIGGLESWORTH) there were—ayes 43, noes 57.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed Mr. WIGGLESWORTH and Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia to act as tellers.

The committee again divided; and the tellers reported there were ayes 65 and noes 59.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAR. 9. Office of Scientific Research and Development: For the Office of Scientific Research and Development, $73,000,000, including purchase of reports, documents, plans, and specifications: *Provided*, That there may be paid from this appropriation to the National Academy of Sciences a sum not exceeding $113,790 for the administrative and overhead expenses incurred by said academy during the fiscal year 1943 in carrying out research projects for Federal agencies and such sum shall be in addition to any reimbursement otherwise provided for. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 3679 of the Revised Statutes (31 U. S. C. 665), the Office of Scientific Research and Development is authorized, in making contracts for the conduct of investigations or experiments, to agree on behalf of the United States to indemnify the contractor from such funds as may be hereafter appropriated for the purpose, against loss or damage to persons or property arising from such work: *Provided further*, That advances of funds may be made in connection with contracts entered into by the Office of Scientific Research and Development without regard to section 3648, Revised Statutes: *Provided further*, That funds available to any agency of the Government for scientific or technical research, development, testing, construction of test models, experimental production, or the provision of facilities therefor, shall be available for transfer, in whole or in part, to the Office of Scientific Research and Development, and funds so transferred shall be expendable in the same manner as this appropriation.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. RICH: Page 13, line 19, strike out "$73,000,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$68,000,000."

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I offer to strike out $5,000,000 from this $73,000,000 for the Office of Scientific Research and Development. The reason I offer this amendment is because I am trying to eliminate, if possible, any duplication.

Yesterday, when the Interior Department appropriation bill was before us, we established 3 new laboratories at a cost of $1,200,000, in addition to the 9 or 10 that have already been established in the Interior Department. The situation is just this: We have these laboratories in the custody of the Interior Department and in the Bureau of Mines, and we have a great system of experimental investigation and many, many college laboratories. I am in hopes that by striking this $5,000,000 from this appropriation, those in charge of the Office of Scientific Research and Development will use all the facilities that we have now constructed and those that you authorized yesterday and not duplicate this work. The college laboratories of the country are going to be employed to a very great extent for this scientific research and development, and rightfully so.

This is the first deficiency appropriation for 1943. We do not start 1943 until tomorrow. A great many times during the year we figured we would be $18,000,000,000 in the red, but it looks as though by the time the books are closed tonight we will be nearer $20,000,000,000 in the red. A red, red, red year for the Treasury. This is the tenth year of the reign of Mr. Roosevelt, and every year he has had a great deficit. Every year a deficit, and the last his greatest. This is the greatest deficit of all time in the history of all nations for any country of the world. Next year, according to the figures that are prognosticated, you will more than double this deficit. It will be near $40,000,000,000. You are getting this country into a very serious position. Nearer and nearer bankruptcy. If you use the facilities that you have and if we stop the duplication of effort and try to concentrate all of our affairs in scientific research in the laboratories already established in this country, $5,000,000 taken from this appropriation of $73,000,000 will not hurt this Department at all. If it is found necessary later, it can be appropriated. The coordination of all the facilities and laboratory work in the various Government laboratories and the various college scientific research laboratories will react to the betterment of the service that will be rendered by this Bureau.

I hope that this amendment will be adopted.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I think we should stop and give a little thought to just exactly what some are trying to do with appropriations that have to do with national defense. I am in favor of saving money and have always been, but I am not in favor of saving any money that the Administration says is necessary in connection with our national defense program.

What is this organization from which the gentleman seeks to take $5,000,000 instead of granting the $73,000,000 which the committee recommends and the Budget estimated it needed? I read the following from the report of the Committee:

The Budget estimate of $73,000,000 is approved. Duties carried on by this wartime organization consist of research on instruments and weapons of war for the Army and Navy, upon which the National Defense Research Committee advises, and medical research in aid of medical groups of the Army and Navy, upon which the Committee on Medical Research advises. The Army and the Navy are represented on both committees which consist of eminent citizens distinguished for service in their respective fields.

At the present time the office has 663 contracts with academic institutions involving 94 colleges and universities with a value of $22,000,000. It also has contracts with industrial and private laboratories involving 110 industrial establishments with a value of $12,000,000; a total of 1,001 contracts with a value of $34,000,000. These contracts are all on a no-profit, no-loss basis. Of the 1,001 contracts for research and development 169 are in the medical field and the remainder involve war weapons and war materials and are in response to requests from the Army and Navy.

Most of the testimony with respect to the activity of necessity was "off the record." The committee, however, is satisfied with respect to the type and quality of work and with the results being obtained. So far over 100 different articles, formulas, or developments are in use as the result of this research. Testimonials of the effectiveness of the research are set forth in letters from the Secretary of War and Secretary of the Navy printed in the hearings. A short quotation from the letter of the Secretary of War is illustrative. He wrote: "For example, the War Department has placed orders amounting to approximately $560,000,000 for items developed by one section alone of your office. Further, as a result of a new production method developed for a new explosive by another section of the National Defense Research Committee the Army has placed orders for plant and production amounting to about $270,000,000. It is anticipated that the new process will result in an initial saving of approximately $100,000,000 in plant construction costs and additional savings of many thousands of dollars a day in operating costs."

The amphibian jeep, which is now in production for the War Department, is a development of which the Nation can be proud. The nonprofit contract which brought it to the stage of production cost $143,307.19.

This war is a war of mechanical weapons and one in which those weapons are constantly undergoing improvement with a view to having superior equipment. We face antagonists who are ingenious in devising and manufacturing mechanical weapons and the ammunition to be used by them. Their reputation for research and development is well known, and the United States cannot afford to lag in this important aspect of preparation.

Just as important is research in the medical field. Our armies are fighting and will fight in parts of the world to which they are unaccustomed and where health and sanitation conditions are primitive and difficult.

The sources of some important medical supplies have been cut off and substitutes must be developed. Strenuous conditions of mechanical warfare are producing effects on the human system which must be met with adequate medical treatment.

The Nation eagerly looks to this research program for the development of much valuable assistance.

Mr. COCHRAN. I cannot conceive that any Member of this House can at this time vote against the Budget estimate in view of what your committee says. Just because one does not know something about an agency's activities is not justification for offering an amendment that will cripple that agency.

Do not forget all the contracts are all on a nonprofit, no-loss basis.

I feel you are treading on very dangerous ground when you come in here and attempt to strike $5,000,000 from an appropriation of this character. I will not vote for such an amendment and I hope it will be defeated.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. WIGGLESWORTH. I simply want to say, Mr. Chairman, that I believe this agency is one of the most essential and important agencies in the entire set-up here in Washington.

Mr. COCHRAN. I do not know anything about its set-up. I accept my friend's view as I must get my information from your committee.

The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] is a member of the Appropriations Committee. Surely when he can indorse the work of an agency, as he has just done, is not that sufficient evidence that it would be a mistake to adopt this amendment? I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Destroy or cripple this work and you might keep the Army or the Navy from getting some kind of weapon that might win this war.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COCHRAN. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Cannot this organization use the laboratories that were authorized yesterday in the Interior appropriation bill?

Mr. COCHRAN. Those laboratories have not a thing in the world to do with this organization. The gentleman will find that out if he will but read the report of the Appropriations Committee, of which he is a member.

Not only do I want to see this amendment defeated, but, Mr. Chairman, I think it very important that Members be sure of their ground before offering amendments that would hamstring a national defense agency. A few minutes ago an amendment was adopted, and I doubt if half of the Members understood how important that activity is. I have made up my mind I do not propose to economize at the expense of national defense agencies and projects.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I desire to be recognized in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, this item of $73,000,000 was put in the bill as a result of the vote of every member of the subcommittee from the majority side straight down through the minority side; there was no opposition to it. Every member of the subcommittee felt that we should go ahead just as far as we could go in trying to develop through experiments and research work the things that our boys who are required to fight in the field need. This outfit is headed by Dr. Vannevar Bush, the head of Johns Hopkins University. He has allied with him the greatest scientists in America, and they are really accomplishing things.

I think that a vote by anyone in the House of Representatives against this item is a great mistake, and I favor the rejection of this amendment right away.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. The attitude of the gentleman from New York and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WIGGLESWORTH] is a clear indication of how they are cooperating on important matters in connection with national defense. When these gentlemen, members of this committee, say this is one of the most important activities we have, I think the House should listen to them.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. Is it not true that Dr. Bush told us some very interesting and important matters off the record showing the very profound accomplishment of this organization in the matter of combating submarine warfare?

Mr. TABER. He did; and I would say to the gentleman that a great deal of the work that he is doing would not be proper for him to lay before the committee. I think these scientists should have a full opportunity to develop these things with the idea that they will be put to use just as fast as they can be put to use for the sake of victory.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. LUDLOW. Is it not true that any person who could be privileged to read the record would not be able to understand the real importance of this organization and the value of its work because its accomplishments are in a large degree secret and it is not in the national interest to reveal them or to discuss them publicly?

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. One of the answers to submarine warfare is the development of sound detectors. This group, I understand, is working on this matter.

Mr. TABER. I think that is correct.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. RICH. I have no desire to hinder any scientific research.

The appropriations granted by this subcommittee were to establish laboratories, and we had them in yesterday's bill. I am hoping that by proper economies and the utilization of those laboratories we may be able to save a few dollars and still continue to do the work.

Mr. RABAUT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. RABAUT. The gentleman from Pennsylvania says he has no desire to cut it down or injure the program, yet he offers an amendment to cut $5,000,000 off the amount, or seeks to.

Mr. TABER. That is a mistake. This organization is given the power under this paragraph to have transferred to it any activity, any work, and any work that is appropriated for any other unit in the Government conducting experimental work in connection with the war activity. I cannot see the amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAR. 11. War Production Board: For the War Production Board, $68,546,300, including not to exceed $50,000 for the employment of aliens; not to exceed $50,000 for the temporary employment of expert witnesses, by contract or otherwise, without regard to the civil-service or classification laws; and not to exceed $500,000 for scientific research on materials, material substitutes, and other subjects related to the functions of the Board, without regard to section 3648, Revised Statutes: *Provided*, That funds available for expenses of the War Production Board for the fiscal years 1942 and 1943 may be used for the rental, maintenance, and operation of one airplane.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: Page 15, line 4, after the word "Board", strike out "$68,546,300" and insert "$67,546,300."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I have offered this amendment with the view of cutting down the amount of money available for the Division of Civilian Supplies under Mr. Henderson. For that division there is estimated $1,868,000. This is the place where they have gathered together a lot of those people who were in the old Consumers' Division. This is a direct duplication of the work carried on in the Office of Price Administration, and it does not serve the kind of purpose that promotes national defense. There is nothing for them to do. It would be just as well if there were a coordination of the War Powers Board and those items that have not anything to do with it were taken out and put in the other places where they belong. It is a mistake to carry this thing here at all, and I think it ought to be cut down, indicating that the Congress does not approve of that kind of duplication.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In all seriousness and fairness to Mr. Henderson, does the gentleman know of any research work in the field of American economics that is not being done at the present time by Mr. Henderson's staff and those which he proposes to add thereto and which would be left for some other group to accomplish?

Mr. TABER. I do not think there is a single thing in that connection that is not being covered by Mr. Henderson's 640 economists and 1,804 business specialists, and I cannot see how it is possible for this outfit and duplication to serve a useful purpose. I think the more we encumber and blunder the war effort the more we are going to be in trouble. Instead of helping the war effort, I think it is a liability to us.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. Chairman, I think we ought not to make any reduction in this appropriation for the War Production Board. Every one of the items in this budget for the War Production Board has had the careful consideration and approval of Mr. Nelson. The Statistics Division referred to by the gentleman from New York is headed by Dr. Stacy May, a very eminent and distinguished economist.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, Dr. May is not the head of this. Mr. Henderson is the head of this outfit, and Mr. Weiner is his assistant.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. This is not a part of the O. P. A., I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. TABER. Only Mr. Weiner's testimony before our committee; that is all. The list of these people is here in the RECORD.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. This budget was gone over with Mr. Donald Nelson, and we asked him when he was before our committee to go over it. He told us that he personally approved this and he felt it was a minimum for his needs. The War Production Board today must be cognizant of all the detailed information with reference to not only critical materials but everything practically that goes into the production of what we are using in the war effort. That takes in practically the whole category.

Mr. TABER. If the gentleman will yield, on page 377 Mr. Weiner said:

> Only 14 percent of the total personnel is $5,600 or over.

I asked him:

> Who is the head of that? Are you the head of this division?

Mr. Weiner replied:

> No. Mr. Leon Henderson is.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Henderson is on the Board. Do not get this confused with the Office of Price Administration, which will come up later. This is the War Production Board, the key war agency in our whole war effort. We would make a great mistake to cripple this agency that is asking for enough money to get along in this great war effort. I hope the amendment will not be agreed to.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the hearings will indicate that in discussing the question of whether or not Mr. Henderson draws his statistical information from the War Production Board and the question of allocation of war supplies and all that, or whether the War Production Board draws information from the O. P. A., Mr. Henderson testified that the information is drawn from the O. P. A. records.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They might use information they got from O. P. A., but their statistics and information are an entirely different field.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am mixed up, then, if that is true.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. They may have certain studies that are of use to the War Production Board. The agency we are now seeking to curtail utilizes the facts, studies, and figures that industry, the Army, the Navy, the Maritime Commission, the Office of Defense Transportation, and all of the other agencies have, but there must be some agency in the War Production Board in which all this information can be consolidated into one study for the information of the Board. That is this agency we are now seeking to curtail.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. The appropriation is for a national defense activity, regardless of who may be at the head of it?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. And Mr. Donald Nelson says it is vitally important.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were—ayes 39, noes 57.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAR. 13. General provisions: Total, Office for Emergency Management, paragraphs 1 to 12, inclusive, $270,681,890, to be expended for, or in the administration of the affairs of, the agencies within the Office for Emergency Management, paragraphs 1 to 12, inclusive, hereinafter called the constituent agencies, in accordance with the following provision:

(a) There may be transferred from any of the foregoing appropriations for the constituent agencies sums to other agencies of the Government for the performance by such other agencies of any of the functions or activities for which these appropriations are made: *Provided*, That no other agency of the Government shall perform work or render services for any of the constituent agencies, whether or not the performance of such work or services involves the transfer of funds or reimbursement of appropriations, unless authority therefor by the Bureau of the Budget shall have been obtained in advance.

(b) The head of any of the constituent agencies may delegate to any other official in such agency the authority to make appointments of personnel and to make other administrative determinations necessary for the conduct of the business in such agency.

(c) Any employee of any of the constituent agencies is authorized and empowered, when designated for the purpose by the head of such agency, to administer to or take from any person an oath, affirmation, or affidavit, when such instrument is required in connection with the performance of the functions or activities of such agency.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this opportunity to direct the attention of the committee to a matter that was deleted by the Committee on Appropriations but which, nevertheless, I feel should have the attention of the House. I refer to the fact that $15,000,000 was deleted by the committee from the request made by the Agricultural Marketing Administration for the disposition of foodstuffs in Puerto Rico.

It seems to me that the statement of the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico before the Appropriations Subcommittee should have attention. I refer to page 911 of the hearings, at which point the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico made this very significant statement:

> Governor Tugwell came to Puerto Rico with his head full of theories and experimental schemes, without a single practical or sound idea in his mind to improve the economic conditions or to foster the welfare of the people. * * * In other words, he openly expressed the idea that the island would be excellent as a guinea pig.

Some of us who served in an earlier day in the House will recall Rexford Tugwell. We associate with that name of Tugwell the scheme he advanced at that time for the remaking of America. Many of the socialistic ideas he held near and dear were advanced at no small cost to the American taxpayer. It is probably a rather disastrous thing, but I feel that as the Resident Commissioner speaks of guinea pigs in Puerto Rico, we should not overlook the guinea pigs in the resettlement centers that were established, and the other idealistic programs that were fostered by the New Deal and paid for out of the funds of the Treasury.

The interesting thing, however, Mr. Chairman, in connection with the Resident Commissioner's statement, is the fact, as you will remember, that for a while Tugwell withdrew from the Federal service and went back to New York with some molasses concern. If you will read these hearings further, you will find that the one man who advocated this program of $15,000,000, to which the Resident Commissioner objected, was the head of a molasses concern in New York. I think it is called the American Molasses Co. So we have the molasses moving back and forth. There was no attempt to cover this program. It was open. One drop of molasses, you know, will catch more flies than a gallon of vinegar. They did not stop with just a drop of molasses to get the flies, they took it by the barrelful.

I think the majority ought to be commended. To me, it is an encouraging sign. It indicates a change of heart. It indicates that they have seen the error

of their ways. It indicates that a lot of this fancy planning program, planned economy, is no longer going to be persuasive with the majority as it maps its war program.

I think the Resident Commissioner from Puerto Rico should be commended on the forthright way in which he made his declaration. I think that if we only give the majority time, undoubtedly the spirit of repentance that was indicated by the deletion of the sum will become the greater day by day. I think there will be not only an acknowledgment of error but a desire to cure and correct conditions.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in one-half minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the great virtue of repentance is a wonderful thing. There is always hope as long as there is chance for repentance, and I am still praying for the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The Clerk read as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Price Administration in carrying out the provisions of the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 (Public Law 421), and the provisions of the act of May 31, 1941 (Public Law 89), as amended by the Second War Powers Act, 1942 (Public Law 507), and all other powers, duties, and functions which may be lawfully delegated to the Office of Price Administration, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; expenses of in-service training of employees, including salaries and traveling expenses of instructors; not to exceed $55,000 for the employment of aliens; not to exceed $30,000 for the temporary employment of persons or organizations, by contract or otherwise, without regard to section 3709, Revised Statutes, or the civil-service and classification laws; contract stenographic reporting services; witness fees; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, newspapers, press clippings, and periodicals; printing and binding; procurement of supplies, equipment, and services, including typewriters, adding machines, and other labor-saving devices and their repair and exchange; maintenance, repair, and operation of passenger-carrying vehicles; transfer of household goods and effects as provided by the act of October 10, 1940, and traveling expenses, including (1) attendance at meetings of organizations concerned with the work of the Office of Price Administration; (2) actual transportation and other necessary expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence of persons serving while away from their homes in an advisory capacity without other compensation from the United States, or at $1 per annum; $75,000,000, of which amount such sums as may be authorized by the Director of the Bureau of the Budget may be transferred to other departments or agencies of the Government for the performance by them of any of the functions or activities for which this appropriation is made: *Provided*, That no other agency of the Government shall perform work or render services for the Office of Price Administration, whether or not the performance of such work or services involves the transfer of funds or reimbursement of appropriations, unless authority therefor by the Bureau of the Budget shall have been obtained in advance: *Provided further*, That such appropriation of $75,000,000 shall be so administered during the fiscal year 1943 as to constitute the total amount that will be furnished to such Administration during such fiscal year for the purposes set forth in this paragraph and shall not be augmented by allocations or transfers of funds from any other appropriation: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the compensation of any officer, agent, clerk, or other employee of the United States who shall divulge or make known in any manner whatever to any person the operations, style of work, or apparatus of any manufacturer or producer visited by him in the discharge of his official duties, or the amount or source of income, profits, losses, expenditures, or any particular thereof, set forth or disclosed in any questionnaire, report, return, or document, required to be filed by order or regulation of the Administrator or to permit any questionnaire, report, return, or document or copy thereof or any book containing any abstract or particulars thereof to be seen or examined by any person except as provided by law; nor for any person who shall print or publish in any manner whatever, except as hereinafter provided, any questionnaire, report, return, or document, or any part thereof, or source of income, profits, losses, expenditures, or methods of doing business, appearing in any questionnaire, report, return, or document: *Provided further*, That the foregoing provisions shall not be construed to prevent or prohibit the publication or disclosure of studies, graphs, charts, or other documents of like general character wherein individual statistics or the source thereof is not disclosed or identified directly or indirectly.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: On page 23, at the end of line 2 and before the period, insert "nor to prevent the furnishing in confidence to other executive agencies of the Federal Government such data and information as may be useful to them in the performance of their duties."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I would not imagine the gentleman from New York would have any objection to that, Mr. Chairman. It is merely a clarifying amendment.

Mr. TABER. I think that is all right.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. TABER: On page 21, line 12, strike out "$75,000,000" and insert "$50,000,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, if I had wanted to play politics with this proposition, I would have sat still when the Budget estimate of $161,000,000 was submitted to the Congress, and would not have opposed the insertion in the bill of an amount of that character, but I felt it my duty to the people of the United States to do everything I could to procure efficient and competent administration of that office. I felt it my duty to do everything I could to see that the Office of Price Administration was administered on the basis of public cooperation and not with a sledge hammer.

If all the snoopers, all the investigators, and all the lawyers that were provided for in the original estimate were employed, the people of the United States would have felt their resentment growing and growing as time went on and their personal and private affairs were intruded upon by this group of snoopers, snipers, accountants, lawyers, and all that sort of thing.

Just so you will have a picture of what was presented to us, I want to give you the facts:

The estimates called for 2,756 lawyers; for at least nine times as many as were necessary to do a decent job if they were competent lawyers. They called for 1,804 business specialists, when there could not possibly be work for over a couple of hundred, if you stretched the thing inside out. They called for 644 economists, when if they had 50, they would have an enormous number.

In addition to this they called for all sorts of investigators. They called for the setting up of 200 and over regional offices and 5,000 district offices.

Now, it is perfectly apparent that with a force of over 60,000 paid employees they would have an enormous number. For instance, to show the kind of set-up they presented, they called for $13,000,000 to enforce the rent program, and they put that in the hands of a man named Paul Porter, who did not have any experience whatever with the real-estate situation. He went ahead and made a set-up all over the country. Instead of calling on the real-estate men and having voluntary boards to pass on these rent questions, composed of people who would know something about it, he got others who knew nothing about it. He goes down to Atlanta and gets a young fellow, 26 years old, who had been a clerk in the department store, and a window dresser, to be regional director covering several States.

You talk about the 2,756 lawyers, the whole set-up of the War Powers Board, with double the activities that this outfit could possibly have, only calls for 129 lawyers. Why is that? Because the head counsel of the War Powers Board is John Lord O'Brian, one of the greatest trial lawyers and a lawyer with great experience before the Supreme Court of the United States. He has picked out lawyers who are lawyers and who understand what the law is all about, and with three or four times the responsibility and the work that this Price Administration will have for lawyers, they were set up with only one-twentieth of the number of lawyers.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Who is the present chief counsel of O. P. A.?

Mr. TABER. David Ginsberg.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman know anything about his background?

Mr. TABER. He has never had any experience in practicing law in private prac-

tice. He is a young man of considerable attainments, but one of those young men whose service has been practically entirely in the Government service. A year or so ago, or maybe a little more, he was getting $2,600 in one of these outfits.

Mr. COOLEY. And now he is chief counsel for O. P. A.?

Mr. TABER. And his chief assistant is Thomas Emerson, of National Labor Relations Board fame. Maybe that is the way to do business.

Now you can see why the committee made some cuts. Frankly I think, if they had $50,000,000, it would improve the administration, because it would require Mr. Henderson to go ahead and make intelligent and fair set-ups all the way through in every unit.

I appreciate that I am doing my own political party a disservice in offering this amendment, because I appreciate that, if the people had to be subjected to all the annoyances of that gang that Henderson had set up, it would build up the vote for my party tremendously. The resentment created would do this. I appreciate this, but I feel that it is my duty to the country to protect the country as far as I can from the administration of these gentlemen and to give Mr. Henderson an opportunity to organize his force on an intelligent and progressive line, and to call into force all the patriotic citizens who are ready and willing to do everything they can to cooperate with a patriotic program wherever it is necessary and to do whatever is necessary to keep prices down.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Does the gentleman know whether or not any consideration was given to the advisability of entrusting the enforcement of these rules and regulations to the Federal Trade Commission, which organization I understand does now have a large corps of trained lawyers who have had great experience in the enforcement field.

Mr. TABER. I do not believe I have ever heard that brought up. I can see whether that might be a source from which a group could be built up to do whatever work is needed to be done and do it efficiently along this line.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. If the gentleman will look at the hearings on the independent offices appropriation bill, with respect to the section dealing with the Federal Trade Commission for the coming fiscal year, he will find that that suggestion was proposed by me during those hearings, and he will find some testimony by members of the Federal Trade Commission as to what they did on price control during World War No. 1.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH of Ohio. In the hearings, Mr. Henderson testified that the British Government is using 35,000 people engaged in the fixing of prices and in rationing, but there is nothing shown here as to what that is actually costing.

Mr. TABER. That is a large number, an exceedingly large number. I do not believe such a large organization in this country, taking into consideration that we are calling upon volunteers who are prepared and eager to do everything they can to meet this situation, is necessary. I believe that Mr. Henderson could promote a much more efficient organization, if he did not have so much money, and if he did it on the basis of calling for service instead of trying to promote and create jobs.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I think it is a mistake to confuse a discussion of personalities and the administration of this act, taking into consideration the job that is to be done and the amount of money that should be employed and is necessary for it. The legislative branch of the Government after very careful thought, and after much agonizing, passed the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942, one of the most comprehensive and far-reaching and revolutionizing acts ever passed by the House of Representatives. It was done upon the philosophy that it was necessary to do that in order to prevent inflation, and in order to administer the act some administrator had to have pretty wide authority in its administration. That act affects intimately the lives and daily comfort and conduct of all of the American people—all of them. Not only that, but it affects the business and the financial efforts of 2,200,000 firms that come under its jurisdiction. In every crossroad, in every village, in every township, in every city, the forces of government, comprehended by the Price Control Act, reach out and touch each very vitally. There is a whale of a job for somebody to do. My good friend the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], with whom I agree often and occasionally disagree, though usually on some matters of details and not fundamentals, tells you how many lawyers, and how many business experts, and so forth, and that all sounds ridiculous, and the committee thought so; and for that reason the committee reduced the appropriation from $161,000,000 as recommended by the Budget to $75,000,000. Seventy-five million dollars is a good deal of money, it is true, but I submit to you that with this act upon the books, and with our citizens coming under its purview, that we will not be helping the situation any by taking all of the money away so that there will be no organization to administer. Under the $75,000,000 as reported to the House, the Office of Price Administration will not be able to continue with its present set-up. They will have to dismiss people from their pay roll. They now have 30,000 people on the pay rolls, and 18,000 of them are employees of these local boards, and if we make too drastic a cut of this appropriation, we will find that there is where complaints will come, and Members of Congress will find out mighty quickly from their districts and from every township and hamlet, when the merchants in the little towns are not able to go to these local boards and get any satisfaction about these various things that come under the purview of the Office of Price Administration.

Here is the sugar rationing, and the gasoline and the tire rationing, and many other things that ultimately undoubtedly are going to come under the rationing power of this Board that we have delegated to them. In addition to that, there is the matter of rent control in the country, wherein we provided what we hoped would be a safeguard against any unconscionable increases in defense areas. That comes under the administration of this Board, and undoubtedly many other commodities will be rationed as the war presses closer and closer to us. All of that has to be done by some administration. I say again, let us not confuse our displeasure with some individual, or some particular act of that individual, by depriving the agency of enough money to continue its affairs. I do not believe that $75,000,000 is going to be enough for the Office of Price Administration to administer the Price Control Act, and I sincerely and honestly believe that it would be infinitely better for this Congress to repeal the Price Control Act, just wipe it off the books and take our chances on what inflation would come, what run-away there would be, rather than to set up an agency and then starve it to death in the matter of funds with which to carry on.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. COOLEY. Does not the gentleman think it would be a good idea for Congress to repeal the Price Administration?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not think that is an issue before the Congress at the present time, but I am glad the gentleman asked that question, because I do not think that is the way to reach that. If we do not want the Price Control Act, let us repeal it, because, honestly, we will be throwing away $50,000,000, and it would be the most irritating thing any Member of Congress ever had to contend with. They say use local people on these boards. The committee thought that the Office of Price Administration could use more local talent, and therefore we drastically cut the appropriation.

Bear in mind the fact that the Office of Price Administration wanted $200,000,000 to run this show. The Budget cut them to $161,000,000. Still, the Appropriations Committee, after full hearings felt that they had not sufficiently availed themselves of local help and local assistance that they could get in communities, and has made a further cut. But when you get down to your local board in your local community that have gasoline, tires, sugar, and many other things that will be added to this roster of things that are to be rationed, to say nothing of the price- and rent-control functions, you may get three or four patriotic local citizens, members of the chamber of commerce or of your bank to agree to meet once or twice a week with

the local board and pass on policies, but those men will not stay in the office from 7 o'clock in the morning until dark every day answering individual questions that merchants, tradesmen, and individual citizens file in there and ask them about. Somebody has to be there who has sense enough and information enough to handle this thing. That is where the pinch will come if we do not give them enough money to run this business.

I hope it will be the pleasure of the House to back up what the committee has done and leave the $75,000,000 there. Let us try to improve the administration of this thing. If it is not enough, the Congress will be here and they can come back.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we cannot agree on time for debate on this amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman will not try to cut off debate on this thing because a number of us were here yesterday and we were told if we did not insist on time under general debate liberal time would be granted under the 5-minute rule. Personally I would like to have 15 minutes.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Well, I do not want to shut off debate, but we are all very anxious for reasons that everyone is interested in to get this bill out.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments be limited to 1 hour.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I hope the gentleman will not insist upon that at this time. I have spoken to the gentleman about this. It is a very important matter. It involves inflation. It involves the greatest questions confronting our country today. The gentleman has been before the Appropriations Committee. He has made speeches on the floor. Others of us who are equally interested have not had a single opportunity. We have not been speaking on other questions, waiting until we came to this question. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his request. Personally I would like to have 15 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, I want to speak in opposition to this amendment.

If we are going to have a price-control bill we must provide the means of administering it. You may have some doubt in your mind as to whether price administration is wise or whether it is foolish. You may be opposed to price administration generally, but if we embark on this system then certainly we have to do it right. Personally I think the Appropriations Committee has cut this appropriation too much. I think that Mr. Henderson should have more money to administer this act, because the whole thing comes down to proper administration if it is to be a success.

When the price-control bill was before the Committee on Banking and Currency we all realized that the difficulty with an over-all price ceiling was the fact that there was not administrative personnel available at that time to administer the act. Therefore we reported a bill in which we favored a selective price control. Then events transpired so rapidly. Japan attacked us at Pearl Harbor and the war came on so quickly that we had to take so many steps so fast that it was necessary to put over-all price control into effect much sooner than anybody expected would be necessary.

Mr. Henderson has been faced with a terribly difficult problem to put the over-all price administration into effect all of a sudden, without adequate personnel to administer it.

In this appropriation all we are doing is giving him enough men to try to administer the act properly. I think the Appropriations Committee has cut this appropriation too much. I will admit that I may be one of the few Members of this House who thinks that Mr. Henderson is doing an excellent job on price administration. There has been a lot of complaint about him, but anyone who started in to try to do the job he has been trying to do would certainly have been criticized all over the country by everyone and his sister and his aunt. It seems to me he has done a magnificent job up to date. I do not want to see him handicapped. I want to see him given a real opportunity. I think that inflation is the most serious menace that faces this country internally today and therefore I would like to see the Price Administrator given enough money so that he can administer the Price Control Act so as to curtail and eliminate the threat of inflation insofar as it is possible.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KUNKEL. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman believe that if this Congress would give Mr. Henderson $500,000,000 or $1,000,000,000 that he could administer this act and prevent inflation in prices at the present time, under present conditions?

Mr. KUNKEL. I do not believe we can do it under the Price Control Act. I believe if the Congress takes the proper steps to give the functional controls necessary in addition to power over prices, then it could be done.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I agree with that.

Mr. KUNKEL. I do not believe we can completely control price rises; I think prices are going to rise, but I think we can keep them from going out of sight. We can hold them in line so they will not jump too much and too suddenly.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think the gentleman is sound in that last statement, and that is what I have always wanted to see Congress do: Take the necessary steps so that an administrator could prevent a rise in the price level, but we have not done that, and Mr. Henderson repeatedly told us that he could not prevent inflation under the machinery we have given him. Why do we not give him the right machinery?

Mr. KUNKEL. I ask the gentleman from Michigan if he does not believe Mr. Henderson has done just as much as he could with the machinery he had available?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that is true. Here is today's headline "O. P. A. warns that subsidies alone can hold prices." Does not Mr. Henderson know that the granting of subsidies merely extends the powers of inflation and makes his job impossible? He ought to be economist enough to know that.

Mr. KUNKEL. The question is, Are you going to raise the ceiling of prices? Or are you going to give subsidies? Personally I favor giving subsidies in selected cases; for instance, I believe that the 2½-cent rise in the gasoline price along the eastern seaboard was wrong.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, I wish to be heard on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Chairman, my purpose in addressing the Committee at this time is to urge that we view the pending amendment from a rational angle and not to react to any of our personal feelings with reference to any individual. As for myself, I have a high regard for Mr. Henderson. I think there is no question about the man's intellectual honesty, and there is no question about his sincerity. The fact is he has probably got one of the toughest jobs any man has ever had in the history of this country; certainly he has one of the toughest jobs any public official has during these trying days.

We have passed a law for the purpose of trying to control prices, to prevent, as the distinguished gentleman from Virginia has well said, ruinous inflation. Every one of us remembers what happened during the World War; every one of us remembers the aftermath of the World War, which was mainly due to uncontrolled inflation—the tremendous values of farm property during the war and then after the war the tremendous drop in value of the same property and the serious economic repercussions and dislocations that flowed therefrom.

I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KUNKEL] made a very fair statement a few minutes ago when he said he doubted if you could definitely freeze prices, but that changes from time to time might take place in connection with some kind of a subsidy. If we reduce this item to $50,000,000, I am reliably informed it will be practically impossible for the office of price control to function. They will have a great deal of difficulty in functioning on the $75,000,000 recommended by the full committee; and, by the way, the full committee cut down to $75,000,000 the recommendation of $95,000,000 made by the subcommittee. I am informed that the reduction to $75,000,000 means that retail price control and therefore the cost of living is in serious jeopardy. Control over prices of services will be withdrawn, because virtually no staff has been re-

cruited so far for this work. Facilities are not available for necessary rationing; there will be no rent control in 231 areas where rent control is necessary, involving 63,000,000 people.

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCORMACK. I yield.

Mr. KUNKEL. If one item in the cost of living index is increased, this automatically increases the whole cost of living—the price of gasoline, for instance—it goes all the way through the whole price structure.

Mr. McCORMACK. There is no doubt about that. The problem that confronts Mr. Henderson is to try to keep the March 1 prices as long as he can, because if you change one then there is difficulty in restraining changes in the others, and all along the line.

The worst thing that could happen in this country and for us as Members of the House whether we are Republicans or Democrats is to have a sharp and ruinous increase in the cost of living. So, talking temperately, refraining completely from any discussion of personalities, refraining completely from a discussion of any emotional appeal, I hope the House sitting as the Committee of the Whole will view this question from the rational angle that it should. The $75,000,000 appropriation is too small; I agree with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] that it should be increased. Undoubtedly we shall have to make supplemental appropriations in the future, but certainly to reduce the $75,000,000 appropriation to $50,000,000 at this time would be given but one construction by the people throughout the country: That the House of Representatives is trying to punish an individual. I do not believe that you and I, no matter what our personal feelings may be, want to place this body in that position.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I take this time primarily to get a few questions straightened out in my own mind. They have to some extent been indicated by the interrogations that I have submitted to some members of the Committee. After having read Mr. Henderson's testimony, as printed in the hearings, questions arise in my mind. Is it worth while to spend approximately a quarter of a billion dollars annually in order to supply him with 90,000 paid employees, around whom he proposes to gather 2,000,000 volunteer workers throughout the country, establishing thousands of control boards, employing thousands of attorneys, hundreds of technicians, hundreds of economic advisers, together with the licensing of our people who are engaged in industry, and all the other things that go with it, when at the same time Mr. Henderson keeps saying to the Committee and saying to the public and saying to other committees of the House that he positively cannot prevent inflation unless certain other very fundamental steps are taken, among which are these: A stabilization of the wage question, enforced savings, enormous increases in the tax burden, subsidies, and other things not of such great importance. As I read this testimony seeking information, and as I talk with others, I wonder if it is worth a quarter of a billion dollars per annum to carry on such effort, facing a situation where the price level and the cost of living continues to rise, and where Mr. Henderson from time to time says it must necessarily continue to rise, unless these other things are done. I do pray that some day he will succeed in pounding into our heads that he cannot prevent inflation by the use only of the tools which the Congress gave him. He keeps emphasizing the fact that it is utterly impossible to do the job with the tools given to him thus far. Some day the people of this country will awaken to the shadow boxing in which we are participating and they will turn on those who are guilty with a vengeance.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Did you find anything in the hearings that would illustrate to your satisfaction what type of attorneys he has appointed, and if so what the total amount is and how many of them have had practical experience that is going to guide the legal destiny of this bunch of satellites he has got there?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Not being an attorney, my opinion may not be worth very much except from a practical standpoint. That is this: I dislike for the industries in which I have a few dollars invested to be subjected to complicated rules and regulations issued by legal-minded men who have never had any practical or only very limited experience in the courts, or any practical experience in industry in connection with the operation of corporations, proprietorships, or partnerships. I believe that his legal staff consists mostly of inexperienced and generally young attorneys who are proficient in designing very complicated rules and regulations, but who are short on practical application at low cost and with great simplicity considering the questions and problems involved.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. I have often wondered if those young men over there are exempt from the draft because of the fact that they are working in that organization?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think that is a pertinent question to raise and I think it is one that the people of this country are entitled to have answered.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. They certainly are.

Mr. CRAWFORD. As you study these hearings you will find that something like five or six commodities have been rationed. He proposes with these 90,000 paid employees to ration some 15 different groups. You will find the testimony shows that in Macy's store—pardon me for the advertisement—in New York City there are, I believe the record indicates, something like 160,000 articles listed in the merchandise inventory. If it is going to require $210,000,000 to make an attempt to administer the price level on 15 groups of commodities, where will we land when we proceed to do the whole job effectively? Where will we land from the standpoint of dollar outgo? Where will we land from the standpoint of the building of a bureau such as our minds have never comprehended?

Now, let me go ahead with my question. If the efficacy of the effort is not worth while, then how can we justify even $75,000,000 which I understand is roughly the amount that the committee has recommended? I do not intend to offer an amendment to strike out the $75,000,000, but if under the 5-minute rule some better evidence is not submitted to this House I am not at all sure that I would not vote for an amendment to strike out the whole thing, because why should we so trifle with our people? I voted against the price-control proposal because I did not think there was in it a sincere effort being made to prevent inflation. And based on what has since happened in the inflation of prices which we now are suffering I believe my action has been justified. I voted against it in committee. I voted against it on the floor. I voted against it when it came back on the conference report. I am still unconvinced that this half-hearted proposal will enable any administrator to do the job.

Let me state a few reasons involved in current procedure and proposals, why I believe the O. P. A. is destined to develop more in the way of quandaries than in effectiveness as time passes.

The notion that rationing and price control can be used instead of appropriate fiscal policies seems to have dominated this whole procedure. It seems certain to lead to what is pointed to by Professor Fellner, of the University of California, in the current American Economic Review, as a very substantial and costly effort on the part of the Government which, as the monetary pressure increases for lack of sound fiscal controls, is virtually certain to fail in its task. Indeed, we who believe in democratic methods must undertake to maintain their inherently automatic efficiency by keeping policing activities down to that minimum which is indispensable for military activity. This requires control of the flow of money exchanges rather than of the distribution of goods by rationing and price controls. Otherwise we shall create conditions which will sooner or later give rise automatically to a cumulative upward movement of prices, certainly as soon as the arbitrary controls are relaxed. The implication is that unless we correct our fiscal policies we are in for an indefinite perpetuation of bureaucracy.

As the California writer puts it, the emphasis of a consistent anti-inflation program must be placed on taxation. But note this: Once the degree of taxation becomes sufficient we cannot expect the savings-bond program to cover any considerable proportion of the whole rate

of expenditure; or rather, such nonbanking, popular loans to the Government can be substantial only if they are undertaken by means of depleting idle cash balances, in which event these savings-bond sales must fail of their purpose as a means of preventing inflation. In other words, to the extent that the public reduces its cash hoards or increases its borrowings from the banks while buying Government bonds or paying taxes, there is a lack of control over the active flow of money. Hoards, however, have their limitations, but bank credit as indulged when financing war has few limitations. Hence taxation, by obviating public borrowing, can definitely prevent the expansion of purchasing power so that other interacting influences, such as wage rates and the cost of living, will be prevented from boosting prices and thus the vicious spiral can be checked.

The fact is that the prosecution of modern war places an unlimited demand upon the productive capacity of the people and their equipment; this in order that the war may be brought to a quick conclusion with a minimum loss of life and property. There is a corresponding lack of limitation to monetary spending except as it may be imposed first by the physical limitations on effort and available resources, and second by the need for preventing inflation. These limits have been tremendously broadened by modern mechanics and science. We can now scatter more resources to the winds or sink more of them in the seven seas than we could a decade ago; and the possibilities are pyramiding and with them the problem of maintaining some semblance of sound finance.

Of course, the so-called ordinary budget should be pared to the bone. But we must not deceive ourselves into thinking that this economizing can have any effect on the danger of inflation. Indeed, as the "silly old dollar sign" is set aside completely "for the duration," the more ordinary activity is curtailed, the more rapidly war measures come to the fore and create scarcities for consumption. Result: Rising prices and their tendency to bring about an increase in bank-credit inflation. This is, indeed, unimportant as contrasted with Treasury financing with bank credit; but it remains true that as long as we are at war we can do nothing effective toward preventing inflation by putting crimps in the budgeting of the administration's so-called social gains.

During the war, therefore, public control of the stream of money in civilian payments, which is where inflation develops, must hinge upon taxation. At best, sales of War Savings bonds serve only to lessen the rate at which credit is expanding in war financing. They certainly cannot reduce any inflation that has already occurred in the money supply. They are of dubious anti-inflation value as long as any appreciable amount of credit expansion is occurring in financing the war effort, either through the Treasury or through private financing of war contracts or other business, by the banks. In the long run, moreover, there can be no possible advantage in these cashable bonds as against hoarding the cash itself in preventing ultimate inflationary trouble.

The bizarre fiction of designating, as does Executive Order No. 8843, upon which Regulation W is based, as banking institutions every second-hand dealer who trusts his friends until pay day, can hardly be offered as an offset for heavy Government financing with bank credit. This curbing of ordinary credit, on installments or otherwise, can hardly be offered as anything but a curb on marriage, since would-be newlyweds must go unwed under Regulation W until they can pay cash on the barrelhead on most of their home and its furnishings. Such alleged controls are more or less of a smoke screen thrown around the failure to balance the war budget.

No sharper presentation of this tax difficulty has developed than that in Australia. There, the authorities have recently come to realize that the National Government was helpless to handle the financing of war without inflation unless it could have complete control of the taxing power. But the plan to bring the state premiers to surrender their taxing powers for the duration has twice been rejected by them.

This has led to a proposal which has the most serious danger of dictatorship or communism behind it, namely, the attempt to abolish the use of money and substitute a complete system of rationing. This has been proposed by no less a person than the director of the Queensland Bureau of Industry, Mr. Colin Clark, an oft-quoted British economist. Yet Mr. Roosevelt is still telling us that we need ration only scarce commodities. Need we remind him that during an inflation everything is scarce because no one can afford to sell anything for money? "Effective demand" then greatly exceeds effective supply; that is, the goods which are actually offered for sale.

Mr. Chairman, I think the RECORD should show that approximately 11 months ago, or to be exact, on July 29, 1941, this House received a message from the Chief Executive on this question of inflation and price control, asking for statutory authority to establish this agency. In due course the price-control bill was entered into law.

While the hearings were in progress on that bill, Mr. Henderson, who had been selected practically to be the administrator of this act, repeatedly notified the country and notified this Congress that he would be unable to prevent an inflation in prices under the tools which were set forth in the bill. In my opinion, he has time and again presented to the country a perfect alibi for his failure to do the job. It seems to me that we have had ample warning from him in particular and from these hearings which are now before us to the effect that we have no reason to assume that this job is going to be half done whether you give him $50,000,000, $75,000,000, $161,000,000, or the $210,000,000 requested originally. In my opinion, he cannot half do the job if you give him 250,000 employees and a billion dollars with which to administer this act.

Take your papers of today. You have your steel wage increase coming up. What will that do to prices? You have a statement published here in the Washington News today which says on page 14:

> Price Administrator Henderson has notified congressional leaders price ceilings cannot be held at present levels unless subsidization legislation is enacted immediately.

In these hearings he warns you and warns you of the destructive effect of inflation and how imminent it is at the present time. The people of this country know that it is on the wing today, it is blossoming fully, and we as Congress sit here and play with this proposition and refuse to do the necessary, refuse to provide all the required tools with which to do the job. I think it is an insult to Mr. Henderson and his organization for us to lead our people to believe that he can do the job with $50,000,000, or $75,000,000, or any additional millions unless we do these other things.

So far as I am concerned, it is not a personality proposition, and I will not permit the majority leader to inject personalities into it so far as I am concerned. Henderson is perhaps as good as anybody you can get. But what right have we got to expect him to make a success out of this? Why do we not face the issue on additional savings, on additional heavy taxes, and on additional stabilization of wage levels.

Unless we do much more than pass these appropriations, subsidies will, on the whole, only add to the difficulties of price control. For are we not developing a degree of monetary pressure, by inflationary war finance through numerous avenues of expansion of bank credit, that is highly discouraging to any genuine hope of success in the O. P. A.'s efforts at rationing and price control? And is it not obvious that the bill for subsidizing rising costs, to avoid the squeezing out of essential industries by O. P. A. ceilings that cannot be rolled back onto primary producers or wage earners, cannot but add seriously and progressively to the already unbalanced Budget and therefore to the extent of the increase in monetary pressure that is being engendered by the existing methods of financing these pyramiding deficits? Must it not be true, therefore, that subsidies will certainly defeat their own ends by increasing the budgetary deficit and therefore the extent of monetary pressure on prices? Would it not, then, be better actually to employ higher prices to curtail consumption rather than make deliberate use of fiscal methods that build up such excess purchasing power as is sure to create needless scarcities and black markets?

According to Mr. Henderson's publicly stated opinion, our price controls are about to fail unless a system of subsidies is adopted promptly. But if these subsidies merely put the attempt at control in a worse dilemma by obviating the possibility of effective money controls, they are worse than futile. So long as subsidizing is only a way of paying for the war, it can bring no inflationary implications. But if subsidizing inflation is to be a method of preventing inflation, then we have got a brand-new idea in price control that is just too good to be

true. What more vicious spiral could be devised?

I submit that inflation consists primarily of an excessive money supply arising in the form of bank credit under the conditions induced by that system of banking which is prevalent in practically all the nations involved in this war. High prices on goods that become scarce in war cannot of themselves induce any pyramiding of purchasing power. Rising prices would restrict, not expand, purchasing power, were it not for the reserve system of banking by which bank credit is always expanded to meet the needs of business, or, in war, of the Government.

Even while the administration and Congress is failing to place a tax adequate to the needs of the existing rate of spending, the Federal Reserve Board is practically forced to ask Congress for authority to reduce reserve requirements to permit the continued employment of inflationary bank credit in lieu of taxation as a source of public purchasing power. What hope can there be for control of inflation through O. P. A. under such a financial set-up? It ought to be suggested that Mr. Henderson's willingness to resign should hinge upon an honestly and soundly conceived fiscal policy rather than upon subsidies that are inconsistent with the establishing of such a policy. That is the job for us to do. And I mean the Congress.

Mr. KUNKEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KUNKEL. The gentleman has refused to give Henderson the functional controls that he has asked for.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Congress has. I have advocated it myself.

Mr. KUNKEL. I know the gentleman has, so have I. We have refused to give him the functional controls he wants. Now you are trying to take away the only instrument he has to try to enforce price control. I do not think you can enforce price control with just the price-control bill, I agree with the gentleman, but if you do not give him the materials to utilize to enforce price control, where is the man going to be?

Mr. CRAWFORD. If we do not provide the necessary other conditions then there is no use wasting the money. As pointed out in debate by a member of the Ways and Means Committee, you have this tax burden. We are in a war. There is only one job on earth ahead of me with which I am concerned, and that is to win the war in the shortest possible time, with the least loss of life and property. Let us get this war behind us and ignore these other minor issues. If, in order to prevent inflation, it is necessary to give him additional powers, let us give them to him and all regardless of the political consequences to us as individuals. Why should I be concerned about being reelected if the men in the front lines are not concerned with their lives? We might just as well get down to bedrock. We will get nothing if we do not win the war. Let us cut out all foolishness as quickly as possible.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN].

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

WHO IS LEON HENDERSON?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House that considered the price-control bill for 3 months. Mr. Henderson came before our committee in support of the bill. I had never seen him before that time. I had only heard of him. The reports were not all good. I know it was talked generally around this Congress and around Washington when he was given that tough job at first that he was not the kind of man that should be placed in charge of any great department. It was told here, and it has been charged on this floor by a good, honest, conscientious Member, that he was going under an alias. It has been told that he was an alien, born in Russia, with a name as long as your arm, the last three letters being s-k-y. It was said that he came over here to try to change our form of government, that he was a Communist, that he belonged to Communist-front organizations. Every one of you knows those charges were made. Therefore the Committee on Banking and Currency could not have thought very favorably or kindly toward that kind of man.

Do you know that we have learned that every one of those charges are untrue, notwithstanding the fact that some people insist upon telling them throughout the length and breadth of this land? Is he an alien? The first Henderson member of his family came over here more than 200 years ago. A Henderson has been in every war that this country has ever fought. Capt. Leon Henderson himself rendered distinguished service during World War No. 1, and at least one Member of this House served with him. Therefore he is not an alien. He worked his way through school the hard way. His Scotch-Irish grandmother on his mother's side made him go to school. He worked his way up. He is a man that you should be proud of if you knew his life and knew his background. A story of his life would read like a Horatio Alger story.

Mr. Chairman, you have often heard that ministers' sons are bad.

Leon Henderson is the son of a Methodist minister. I do not know of any Methodist ministers' sons who are Communists. Maybe there are some, but Leon Henderson is not. He is not as good as the best son of a minister, nor is he as bad as the worst, but he is as smart as any minister's son who ever lived in this country, and I believe every member of the Committee on Banking and Currency will say that I am telling you the truth about that.

Is he a Communist? He started out with Woodrow Wilson in the Democratic Party and helped to organize the State of New Jersey for Woodrow Wilson for Governor of that great State, and later helped to elect him President of the United States. He has been a real, loyal, true Democrat ever since. That does not sound like communism. The charge that he belonged to Communist organizations is absolutely untrue.

Further, I am a member of a great fraternity. More than 50 percent of the Members of this House are members of that fraternity. I refer to the Masonic fraternity. He is a Mason. You do not see any Masons who are Communists or trying to break down our form of government.

That is the truth about Leon Henderson, regardless of any whisperings or statements to the contrary that are made throughout this land. You know a lie has no legs and cannot stand, but it has wings and will fly far and wide. Lies about Leon Henderson have flown over the country, but they could not stand because they had no foundation.

Therefore I changed my mind about him. I was compelled to because I was convinced that he was an honest, conscientious man. I believe the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency, without exception, will tell you that he was as smart a witness as ever appeared before that committee and knows more about more different things than any man I have ever heard testify before a congressional committee or in a court of justice.

The name of Ginsburg was mentioned here. Yes; David Ginsburg is the general counsel, and I have never known a smarter attorney or a more courteous one than David Ginsburg. He has as much information at his fingertips as any lawyer I have ever known. Why criticize him? No one could do a better job in his place.

You have an able man in charge of price administration. Congress gave him that job. It is a tough job. It is a job that no man will ever be popular at if he enforces it. You gave it to him—224 Members of this House. Did you select him? No. The President had the right to select him; we did not have that right. He was selected in the legal, constitutional way. Then he was confirmed by the Senate. Two Senators from your State voted for him. He was unanimously confirmed by the United States Senate.

Who are we to say that he is not qualified? He has been appointed in the right way and he has been confirmed according to constitutional methods. Why should we now say he is not qualified? No man makes the charge that he is not qualified, no man makes the charge that he is incompetent. Some of his ways are not liked. I do not like some of his ways myself, but I do know that he is a man who will get the job done.

What is this job? It is one of the most important jobs outside of the job of Chief of the War Production Board and the job of Commander in Chief that there is in the United States during this war. It is the job of keeping that dollar worth a dollar. It is the job of making that $50 you are giving the private soldiers worth at least $50 from now on. If you vote to give the soldiers $50 and

then do not protect them on prices, it will not be long until that $50 will not buy half a dozen packages of cigarettes. The dollar will not be worth 5 cents.

I am known in this country as an inflationist. I have been branded as an inflationist almost ever since I have been here. I do not think the charge was true. I know it was not true, yet it has been talked about that I am an inflationist. The charge was made that I was trying to wreck the country by paying a $2,000,000,000 honest debt to the veterans of World War No. 1. Time and subsequent events have proven that the charge was unfounded. Yet if any of you believe I am an inflationist let me warn you now that we are facing the most ruinous inflation this country has ever faced. If immediate and effective steps are not taken at once, if every step that can be taken is not taken, the people who are on pensions, who are on retirement benefits, who are working for wages, or are dependent on insurance, fixed salaries, fixed dividends, or fixed interest, or limited incomes, will have everything taken away from them through inflation. We do not want inflation in this country, and we can have it almost overnight.

You can have inflation without putting too much money in circulation. You can have inflation with velocity of money. You do not need volume. Velocity will do it. We now have both volume and velocity.

Unless you fix the prices on these scarce materials and scarce commodities and articles, the velocity of money will make them go sky high. I say to you it is absolutely necessary now that we take every step, and every effective step, to stop inflation.

Since we have voted this price-administration law, and since Mr. Henderson has been given the job and has been confirmed according to constitutional ways and methods, should we try to hamstring him, hinder him, and block him by not giving him enough money to do the job well? I do not think that is a good way to do it.

The Bureau of the Budget has estimated that he needs $161,000,000. To say that he needs less is, in a way, directly or indirectly, an attack on the Budget. I do not mind that so much. I often vote against the Budget, and I am not caring about that. But there is just one other point. We have given the President the power and charged him with the duty of seeking a man who will stop inflation through increased prices. Now, should we back up that President; should we back up that man he has entrusted with that job? If so, why not give him the $161,000,000? If we do not do it, where will the responsibility be? The responsibility comes right back upon the shoulders of the Members of Congress. If this job fails, we are responsible for it because we are failing to cooperate in enforcing the very law that we passed and placed on the statute books of this country. Are we going to do it? Is it not too much like voting for something and then voting against the taxes to raise the money to provide it?

Mr. KUNKEL rose.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the gentleman will not insist upon my yielding right now.

Mr. KUNKEL. I just want to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. PATMAN. All right, go ahead.

Mr. KUNKEL. I will put myself on the spot before I put the gentleman on the spot by saying that if I had to appoint a price administrator I cannot think of anybody who would be better to appoint than Leon Henderson. Does not the gentleman agree with me?

Mr. PATMAN. I agree with the gentleman, and you cannot find some timid "milk toast" person who would be worth anything as administrator of a law like this. It takes a two-fisted man like Leon Henderson to do it, whether we like it or not.

I listened here last night to a lot of charges made against the personnel in the Office of Price Administration. Well, out of 7,500 people I suspect some mistakes were made. The law of averages has not been repealed and never will be, and the law of averages will give him a few mistakes, but you cannot indict the whole organization because a few whom you consider are not the right kind of people are appointed. But let it be said to the credit of that Office that every one of the people employed by the Price Administration was passed upon by the Civil Service Commission, composed of two Democrats and one Republican, and if there is anything wrong about that method, or if the Democrats do anything wrong, the Republican can speak out. If the Republican is doing anything wrong, the Democrats can speak out. The Civil Service Commission passed upon everything along this line that Leon Henderson has done.

An effort is now being made to enlist the cooperative help, the voluntary help of 2,000,000 people in our country, in our local cities, precincts, counties, and States. You know what those local people will tell you. They will tell you, "I do not mind giving my time, but I think my actual and necessary expenses ought to be paid. In addition to that, I think you ought to have some paid help here," as the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] has said, "to answer the inquiries of people who will come here from daylight until dark," and if you do not have that money to provide the extra help and those expenses, the applicant is going right back on Congress for passing a law and refusing to provide the money to enforce the law.

As to everyone who votes that way, I believe his constituents will feel that he should at least have voted in a way to carry out the very law that he helped to place upon the statute books.

I know the charge has been made that there are 5,000 lawyers or some number like that—I do not know just how many—but they can say 10,000 or 50,000, and what does that mean? You could have 50 and what does that mean? The Budget passed on it, and they said they were necessary. I do not think the Budget would try to pad this pay roll with lawyers. The work requires a lot of lawyers. It involves 1,800,000 articles and commodities, including grades and styles, and whenever your constituents want an answer to an inquiry they want it now. They do not want to have to wait 6 months. If you cut down the lawyer personnel to where you do not have people to answer these inquiries and intelligently cooperate with the people in the local districts, you are not going to get any support and cooperation locally in the enforcement of this law.

Let me say to you, my friends, let us give the Administrator the money that he needs, the money that the Budget has said is necessary, and then hold him responsible if he does not enforce this law. Let us at least give him that money.

A vote for this Taber amendment is a vote for ruinous inflation. If you want ruinous inflation in this country you would take the longest step that has ever been taken by voting for this amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SACKS. Is it not true that over 90 percent of the newspapers in this country were in favor of the price-control set-up and if we do what is proposed in this amendment we are absolutely undoing at this time what we did in the passage of this act and we are voting against what the people want?

Mr. PATMAN. Absolutely, and instead of crippling the enforcement of this law, let us hold it as it is, enforce it 100 percent, and then increase its effectiveness by passing more laws to stop inflation. May I suggest to my friends on the Republican side of the aisle—and they are my friends—if you vote to cut this appropriation to $50,000,000 you will be voting for inflation, ruinous inflation, and your action in that respect will be just as injurious in time of war as the isolationist attitude of some of your members before Pearl Harbor.

If the appropriation remains at $75,000,000, the consequences will be terrible. It is thought that we should not attempt to raise the amount above $75,000,000 in the House because the whole Appropriations Committee would be obligated to oppose the increase. But after the Senate raises the amount, as we hope the Senate will, then we can make an effort to get the increase accepted in the House.

CONSEQUENCES OF THE PROPOSED HOUSE CUT IN THE O. P. A. BUDGET

First. O. P. A.'s estimates of Budget requirements for the next year were originally around $210,000,000. The Bureau of the Budget cut this to one hundred and sixty-one million. The House Appropriations Subcommittee cut this to ninety-five million. The House Appropriations Full Committee cut this to seventy-five million. This means simply and starkly that O. P. A. is cut below its present authorized operating staff.

Second. O. P. A. has presently about 38,000 employees, more than 20,000 of whom are clerks for the War Price and Rationing Boards. There are presently about 6,270 people in the Washington office and about 11,000 in the regional, State, and district offices. The proposed

House appropriation means a cut of about 5,500 employees from the present authorized staff.

Third. Every branch of O. P. A. is working overtime and is behind in the prompt handling of work important to American industry and consumers. The local board situation is critical. They are operated by volunteers who have been frantically asking for clerical help. Unless that help is forthcoming, these volunteer boards will break down.

Fourth. This is the measure of O. P. A.'s job: The general maximum price regulation applies to about 1,800,000 retailers and is just getting under way. On July 1, a comparable regulation for service industries becomes effective, affecting 650,000 service establishments. Adjustments under both these regulations must be made if equity is to be done; it is impossible to handle them from Washington. The severe curtailment of consumer goods clearly indicates about 10 additional major rationing programs ahead. The projected rent program calls for the establishment of rent control in 366 rent areas; rent regulations have been issued for only about 75. In order to give quick service to retail and service establishments, and to consumers on rationing and price problems, 230 district offices throughout the country were projected. Only a few of these have so far been set up.

Fifth. The proposed cut means that retail price control and, therefore, the cost of living is in serious jeopardy. Control over the prices of services will be withdrawn, because virtually no staff has so far been recruited for this work. Facilities are not available for necessary rationing. There will be no rent control in 231 areas where rent control is necessary, involving 63,000,000 people. This protection against inflationary rents was authorized by the Price Control Act. The elimination of district offices means that business people who have to deal with O. P. A. on rationing and price matters will have to travel to State or regional offices; they will have no service within their own community. In addition, and perhaps most serious, the proposed decentralization and local handling of rationing and price problems by volunteer boards faces almost certain collapse or drastic reduction in the number of programs assigned.

Sixth. Printing, in this context, would seem to be relatively unimportant. Yet the proposed cut means that O. P. A. will not even be able to furnish those who are subject to its regulations with copies of the regulations involved.

Seventh. Briefly, the proposed cut means that the whole program of O. P. A.—stabilizing the cost of living, safeguarding appropriations—faces certain deterioration under the present proposed limitations. Comparison of the O. P. A. work loads with other agencies is almost impossible. No other Government agency has undertaken to deal continuously with 130,000,000 consumers, with almost 3,000,000 business establishments, and with several hundred thousand landlords.

O. P. A. has not one but three programs—price control, rationing, and rent control. The Budget Bureau's proposal of $161,000,000 was conservative, and would probably result in severe cuts in the rent-control program.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see if we can agree upon time on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto close at 4 o'clock.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask how many amendments that would include. I have an amendment and I would like to have 5 minutes on it.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The request just includes debate on the Office of Price Administration.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. My amendment is on that, and I would like to offer the amendment. May I inquire how much time each one of us will have if the gentleman's request is granted?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I revise my request to apply to this particular amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to object, and ask the gentleman from Virginia whether he thinks it is fair, after the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has had 15 minutes, to shut off some of the rest of us?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am not shutting off anybody. We have been discussing this now for an hour and 15 minutes. The gentleman cannot say we have not been fair. We have to finish this bill tonight, and we were compelled last night to sit very late.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then why did not the gentleman cut 10 minutes off the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think if we discuss this amendment for an hour and 45 minutes, that it will be pretty well discussed.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I noticed that there were 15 Members standing, and if each Member is allowed 5 minutes—and I think I should like to have 5 minutes—that would entail a debate of 75 minutes. I would have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate upon this amendment close at 4 o'clock.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. It is very important that the Chair should know those who are entitled to this recognition. The Chair will read the list of names he has had taken down who desire recognition: Miss SUMNER of Illinois, Mr. VAN ZANDT, Mr. CLASON, Mr. SMITH of Ohio, Mr. COLE of New York, Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts, Mr. COOLEY, Mr. SACKS, Mr. VOORHIS of California, Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts, Mr. COFFEE of Washington, Mr. SABATH, Mr. BARDEN. Were there others who were seeking recognition whose names do not appear on that list?

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I was on my feet from the beginning.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair requests all those who desire recognition, whose names the Chair has not called, to remain standing. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]. The Chair observes no others.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COLE of New York. Does the motion just adopted limit debate only to the pending amendment or to other amendments?

The CHAIRMAN. To the pending amendment.

Mr. COLE of New York. Then the Chair may strike my name from the list.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Also my name may be stricken from the list.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Also, Mr. Chairman, my name may be stricken from the list.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] be permitted to close debate.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] for 3 minutes.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, it amazes me when I realize that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], who has just made such a vigorous speech against inflation, is the same Mr. PATMAN who sponsored the Patman bonus bill during my first term of Congress, and on that occasion expressed views so contrary to those he has expressed today. I am sure that the gentleman is now afraid of inflation, but I am frank to say that I cannot become greatly disturbed over the fear of inflation when I realize that cotton is selling at 18 cents a pound and wheat is selling in the market places at only 80 percent of parity.

I voted against the price-fixing bill. I have not changed my views on the subject, and I suppose that I could on this occasion very consistently vote against any appropriation for the Office of Price Administration. I have no personal grievance against Mr. Henderson or any other person connected with the Office of Price Administration. I stated on the floor of the House at the time the price-fixing bill was being considered, and I reiterate now, that no man has ever been born who can safely be trusted with the powers which Mr. Leon Henderson is now wielding over the lives and destinies of the people of the Nation. He now has the power of economic life and death over every businessman and business in the

Nation, and he is reckless and ruthless in the exercise of that power. He has not exercised the power vested in him as contemplated by Congress in the measure which conferred those powers upon him. He has an advisory committee, but on at least two occasions I have heard him admit before committees of Congress that he has issued very important orders without even calling his advisory committee together, and no reasonable excuse was offered by him for having failed to confer with the members of his advisory committee. It appears that he issues orders without first being in possession of all the material and pertinent facts and without giving due consideration to the far-reaching effects of such orders.

The people of this country want to know and they have a right to know the true facts. Unfortunately, the people of the country do not even now know that there is a shortage of sugar, a shortage of gasoline, or of rubber, or of any of the other critical materials which have been rationed. The truth is, the people do not believe that there is a shortage of sugar, or gasoline, or that there is any excuse or justification for the recent order advancing the price of gasoline 2½ cents per gallon on the eastern seaboard. Sugar refineries are closing down, not because they do not have raw sugar to refine but because of a lack of storage space. There is an abundance of gasoline in sections of the country in which gasoline is now rationed. New automobiles and other motor vehicles have been frozen in the hands of dealers and thousands of new cars and trucks are now stored out in open pastures and fields, without any covering over them to protect them from the weather. Even though thousands of new cars have been frozen, and even though used-car lots of America are jammed and packed, there is still talk around Washington of the imminent possibility of the Government's commandeering privately owned automobiles. If the Government needs automobiles and trucks why does it not use the new cars and trucks which have been frozen, or at least resort to the used-car lots of America for the purpose of filling its needs, before talking about commandeering privately owned motor vehicles?

Again I repeat, the people want the truth and they have a right to know the truth. If I knew that the money appropriated for the Office of Price Administration by this bill would be spent for the purpose of ascertaining the truth and passing it on to the people of the Nation, I would not hesitate to vote for this particular appropriation. If the people of America knew the truth it would not be necessary to employ so many investigators and prosecuting attorneys.

Time will not permit me to discuss the various phases of the work of the Office of Price Administration but we now know that it is nothing more nor less than economic dictatorship in all of its far-reaching ramifications. If it is necessary, that is one thing. If it is not necessary, it is quite a different thing. The people do not believe that it is necessary, and I, frankly, do not believe that any of the authors of the price-fixing bill believe that inflation will be prevented or even controlled by Mr. Henderson and his organization. At any rate, if the national debt goes to two hundred and fifty or three hundred billion dollars, as some well-advised persons predict, how in the name of high heaven will we ever pay the national debt unless the income of the American people is permitted to increase greatly? You can talk all you want to about inflation and the high cost of living, but compare the prices which farmers are now receiving with the prices which farmers are now paying for the things they buy. Think of the increase in the price of farm labor, and remember that cotton is still selling at 18 cents a pound. Certainly, it is a serious situation. Yes, it is a serious situation when an agency of the Government is authorized by Congress to tell your wife how short her skirt must be and to design the pants which must be worn by the men of America.

How far is this thing going, anyway? Just listen to this Associated Press news dispatch:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD LIBERALIZES RULES ON WOMEN'S LINGERIE

Orders establishing specifications for women's and children's lingerie were amended by the War Production Board today to exempt lingerie for maternity wear.

In addition, double-material yokes will be permitted on flannelette gowns and pajamas, providing increased warmth for those wintertime garments. Wider and longer measurements on evening slips were allowed.

Today's order also will permit use of ruffles on two-seam garments in children's sizes 3 to 6, and girls' sizes 7 to 14.

So, we are told that little boys under 6 years of age can still wear ruffles but little girls over 14 years of age will not be permitted to wear ruffles. Now, I ask you just why are not little girls going to be permitted to wear ruffles? It does not apparently make any difference whether the ruffles are made of wool or rayon, nylon or cotton, the little girls just cannot wear ruffles, that is all, and nobody seems to know why.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CLASON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Chairman, this bill is of great importance. The winter is coming on. The question of fuel, both anthracite coal and fuel oil, is going to be of prime consideration in the Northern States. Already we have seen a jump in the price of gasoline this week of 2½ cents per gallon in the rationed area. I am wondering how high the price is going to go in the northern areas this winter for fuel, and what control is going to be exercised in order to see to it that our people, poor and otherwise, can get what fuel they need in the Northern States.

I would like to know if the chairman in charge of the bill can tell me how many offices in a city of 100,000 or 200,000 Mr. Henderson is going to set up? Is there going to be one for rent administration, another for sugar rationing, and another for rubber, or will it be possible for this organization to have one office where a person can go and secure the answers to the various questions?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. It is the thought that they could handle the rent control from one office, which would be a comparatively small set-up. But the rationing and price control will be in one office in the city. There will be two offices—price control and rationing handled in one office, because they are related matters, and an office for rent control.

Mr. CLASON. Would it require the services of a lawyer for each of those offices, or would it be possible for a first-class lawyer to handle all questions which would arise?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. The committee thought they had too many lawyers on their rolls, but undoubtedly many of the questions propounded by citizens, by merchants, and by organizations will require some legal knowledge to give an intelligent answer to the citizen, and he ought to have the benefit of legal talent in those offices.

Mr. CLASON. I agree that they should have enough lawyers in order that the matter can be handled satisfactorily, because otherwise there is not any sense in setting up the offices, but I am glad that the committee has seen fit to place proper limits on the number of lawyers permitted to be hired.

Then we come to the point which the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] just raised. That is, Why is it that citizens back home are not told the facts in regard to the different questions which arise? Is there or is there not a rubber shortage?

In my district the dealers tell me they have thousands upon thousands of tires in their stocks. They are not in cold storage. They are where they can be damaged, and they have been there for months. If the Government needs them, why are they not stored in one place in a community under proper conditions and at less expense to the public? Then why is there not a sufficient production of synthetic rubber already on the way? What is the true answer to the failure to adopt the method of synthetic-rubber production championed by Fulton Lewis, whose statements have never been refuted by the officials concerned to my knowledge? The question of oil comes up and they say the President has had the right since July 30, 1941, to build a pipe line, and no pipe line has been constructed, although 11 months have passed. Here we are on the eastern seaboard faced with a tremendous shortage in oils and gasoline, with winter coming on. Why have the authorities or administrators not actually completed a pipe line? I am told that 26 Federal agencies make rulings affecting the petroleum industry. Why?

One thing I would like to have taken care of out of the money, however much or little may be appropriated, would be for Mr. Henderson to tell the facts to the people and keep them informed of the reasons why he is acting as he does. The sugar shortage is a case in point. Photographs of warehouses full of sugar appear in newspapers. We are told that there may be a lifting of restrictions. Then the question of lack of shipping is raised. What are the facts? The Amer-

ican public should be told. It makes for understanding and for national unity.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SACKS] is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SACKS. Mr. Chairman, as one of the members of the Committee on Banking and Currency which established the policy of control of inflation, I have not always agreed with Mr. Henderson upon some of the actions taken by his organization. However, I sincerely believe that it is necessary in order to prevent ruinous inflation that we do something at this time to carry out the provisions of that act.

I have been informed that it is necessary to have even more money, as the chairman of this committee told you today. I feel that if we vote to cut this sum of money to $50,000,000 we might as well tell the people of America that we do not believe in the act which we passed and we do not want it enforced, and let prices run away with themselves. That is a serious problem. America is facing a great crisis. We are being attacked by one of the most powerful tyrants this world has ever seen, yet we come here not caring what happens to the economy of America, and we fight about how much money is necessary to operate. This is a large country. Many businesses are involved. One hundred and thirty million people are involved. We talk about $50,000,000 for enforcement. Mr. Chairman, this is a problem that affects the morale and the home front. America must keep up that morale. If we allow run-away prices, uncontrolled rents, the morale of the American citizen—the worker who is producing the materials and the sinews of war which our boys need on the battle front—will be seriously hampered in our war effort.

I do not know of a country in Europe today—and this was testified to before our committee also—that has not controlled inflation. If we do not control inflation in this country I say to you now that America will be in a serious condition on its home front.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ELIOT] for 3 minutes.

Mr. ELIOT of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, if we adopt this amendment, if we even stick to the recommendation of the committee the following results among other things will ensue: First, all the local rationing boards will be without any clerical help. As a result they will be unable to function. We are forced to rationing in many commodities, yet we are making it impossible to carry it out.

Second, retail price control will virtually be imposisble, and price control in the service industries will be completely impossible because people have not yet been recruited for this work.

Third, rent control will be impossible. Those of us who have friends, or have houses, in the District of Columbia know how at times of overcrowding rents can go up out of sight. We know the need for action, yet we are deliberately tying the hands of the Government in this field.

Fourth, there will be no money for the printing of regulations to put in the hands of everyone affected by those regulations, and people will have to travel long distances and ask many questions instead of being informed of their duties and obligations under the law.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] spoke of growing resentment against snoopers. Mr. Chairman, I feel that the resentment against this Congress will know no bounds if by niggardly action now we are promoting the march of inflation by making the Price Control Act unenforceable, a farce, and a sham.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. VOORHIS] for 3 minutes.

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Chairman, the importance of the enforcement of this act is not that it simply be enforced, but that it be enforced fairly. In order for it to be enforced fairly, if we have any real shortages of consumer goods, as we are bound to have, and do not have adequate enforcement machinery, what will happen will be that it will be to the interest of both the well-to-do consumers and the sellers to violate the law, and those scarce goods will get into the hands of people who have a sufficient amount of money to buy them. Other people, those with fixed incomes, our older people, many farm people, and low-paid workers will just go without. That is point number one. Without some sort of program of control what would the price of gasoline be right now here in Washington? And who would get the limited supply of gas when a shortage occurs? Obviously those with the most money, not those who necessarily need it most.

In the second place I want to show the House, if I can in the short period of time at my disposal, what the job is that the Office of Price Administration is supposed to do. I shall preface it by saying that in my opinion there is much in what the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] had to say this afternoon. Assuming that we shall spend $60,000,000,000 on the war in the coming year, and I think we shall—at any rate we are going to try to—the degree of the job of the Office of Price Administration is precisely equal to the difference between $60,000,000,000 on the one hand and the amount collected in taxes plus the amount of bonds sold to individuals for real money that they give up to buy them on the other. What I mean is this: if we do raise $27,000,000,000 in taxes and if we do succeed in selling $12,000,000,000 worth of war bonds to individuals—not banks that create the money with which to buy them, but to individuals who give up some of their money, we shall then have withdrawn $39,000,000,000 to pay our $60,000,000,000 war bill with. But there will remain $21,000,000,000 in the hands of the people which they will wish to spend on goods of one kind or another. But the goods will not be there because the entire $60,000,000,000 represents war equipment, not things people can buy or use. This $23,000,000,000 will be a great pressure on the market. In the absence of either the passage of measures to fundamentally prevent price inflation or the implementing of this Office of Price Administration, it is, I am afraid, quite certain that some prices, especially those controlled by monopolies, will go sky high It is utterly irresponsible to hamstring the O. P. A. unless you are going to courageously do the other things that are necessary to prevent advantage being taken of the American people in this completely abnormal war economy in which we find ourselves. That is the picture. If we tax more vigorously; yes. If we had a program of compulsory saving—and I am one of the people who believe we are going to have to have such a program, if we could stop the borrowing of money from banks which create new demand deposits with which to buy the bonds we might affect the situation very markedly. But we have not done those things, and until we do, Mr. Chairman, indeed the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is a hundred percent right when he says the Congress will be doing a very wrong thing if it withholds from the Office of Price Administration, which has been given perhaps the hardest and most unpopular of all civilian jobs, sufficient money to do its job. That job must be done better than has been the case up to now I believe. Certain mistakes must be corrected, but denying funds for an adequate staff is a step away from, not toward, that goal.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY] for 3 minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. Chairman, I am in favor of reducing this O. P. A. appropriation for the following reasons:

First. The evidence to date does not justify the expansion of one-man power.

Second. This is too much power for one man. We should revamp this Office and give the powers delegated to public men without partisan consideration and in whom the people have some confidence.

Third. Just because England or Germany has to follow rationing there is not any sense to try to ration commodities in a country that has a surplus of the commodity. I think most people prefer even inflation than too much Henderson and too much starvation.

Fourth. If anyone of us here had 1 percent of Henderson's power, we could reduce the milk bill of our cities by 25 percent.

Fifth. If people of the big cities complain about food prices, why do they not remove the trade barriers around their own cities? We can follow the President, establish a parity ceiling as he suggests, and if additional food products are needed, they can be secured by incentive payments to the producers of our country.

Sixth. This is not the time to promote arrogant bureaucrats whose ego overshadows their common sense.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington [Mr. COFFEE] for 3 minutes.

Mr. COFFEE of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the Taber amendment. Just by way of introduction, I would remind the Members of the House that the incident cited by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. COOLEY] refers to the War Production Board and has no relation whatsoever to the Office of Price Administration, that regulation having to do with ruffles upon young girls' garments and lingerie. So I suggest that we confine our objections to the O. P. A. to matters directly dealing with or stemming from that Bureau.

Leon Henderson has his faults. So have we all. I know him rather well. He is human, finite, fallible, as are all God's creatures. He is a driver—a man who has fire in the flesh. He believes thoroughly in the principle of limiting prices as a counterirritant to inflation. He is carrying out the will of the American people and the statutory mandate of this Congress. Granted that his regulations impose rather painful restrictions on certain groups, I know every Member of this Congress has received numerous objections and remonstrances from individuals representing farmers, consumers, and business organizations. But we are in a war. As the French say: c'est la guerre. The answer that the French always gave in the last war was c'est la guerre. Of course, that is not a satisfactory explanation to offer anyone, but we have to win this war, and in order to do it we are compelled inevitably to tread upon the toes rather heavily of relatively isolated categories in order to hold the prices down for the vast majority, the consumers of all the Nation.

I agree with the brilliant gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] in his statement that the amount we have granted is not even sufficient or effective for the efficient administration of the Office of Price Administration; accordingly, certainly, Mr. Chairman, we should not reduce it still further. We may have some grievances against the Administrator because of appointments made in our respective districts or because of some remarks made by certain foolish subadministrators. The liberty-loving and often hedonistic people are frequently indignant at being shoved and pushed around. In the Office of Price Administration there have been some individuals, some loquacious subordinates of Mr. Leon Henderson, who gave utterance to tactless and ill-considered pronouncements, but in setting up an enormous organization of that character there are bound to be a few functionaries of that type who will creep in; however, we must not allow our attitude toward the whole organization to be befogged, prejudiced, or tinctured by our antipathy to certain minor bureaucrats who adventitiously make these provocative challenging assertions and press releases apropos of the rubber shortage and anent how the public must submit. The O. P. A. has growing pains in its adolescent stage. It will soon mature.

We have a bold and invincible driver in Mr. Leon Henderson; we have in him a man who possesses tremendous ability, dynamic energy, and tenacious courage; in my judgment one of the most brilliant men in Government service.

I hope the House will vote down the Taber amendment.

If price increases were allowed to continue and if these prices followed the pattern of World War No. 1, our actual direct war costs would be increased $62,000,000,000 during the next 20 months on the basis of appropriations already made.

Henderson took the job realizing he might become unpopular if he did what was necessary. After all, what sort of a fellow do we want for Price Control Administrator? A hail fellow well met, or somebody who faces the issues by defending public interest?

Price control is a serious business. It has been proven that stringent measures are necessary. Every law requires enforcement, otherwise it becames a laughingstock and worse than useless.

Prices in the World War No. 1 soared to dizzy heights, and now we find Mr. Baruch, who did the job last time, telling us we have not acted quickly enough nor gone far enough.

To date on actual war purchases the savings, because of price control, total $6,000,000,000.

Price control is vital to the war effort. The public will not forgive Congress if it frustrates price control by telling them enforcement was not necessary.

A large part of the O. P. A. appropriation is for administration and enforcement of rationing. There is much confusion as to the locus of responsibility for rationing policies. The power to ration has been voted by Congress as a part of the Priorities Act and has been entrusted to the President. The President has delegated this power to the War Production Board, and that is where the responsibility of determining what articles need to be rationed rests. The O. P. A. is the administrative agent of W. P. B. by assignment of this function by W. P. B., but because O. P. A. is in direct contact with retailers and consumers it was thought wiser, simpler, and more economical to have rationing administered by O. P. A. rather than by an independent agency under W. P. B.

The hearings regarding the O. P. A. introduced comparative statistics on the administrative personnel of similar agencies. From these statistics we learn that in the first World War, when we had no rationing and when most of our price control was administered without a statute—only food and fuel administered by statute—some 11,000 paid personnel and 24,000 volunteers were required. Great Britain today, with about one-third our population, has nearly 40,000 employees for price control and rationing.

We are just getting into the irritable stage of the war when shortages and controls are beginning to pinch; our tempers are starting to react accordingly. We should not let these momentary irritations determine our legislative policy or to develop a breach between the legislative and executive branches, a breach that can only serve the interest of our enemies.

We cannot afford to let prices reach levels where only the wealthy can buy our limited supplies.

We still have many poor people, or people on substandard incomes. The figures for the first 6 months of this year indicate the upper 10 percent of our people received 41 percent of the national income. In other words, 90 percent of our people received only 59 percent of the total income.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, there has been no evidence presented to the committee that Mr. Henderson is either physically or politically ill and the eulogy delivered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] gave us no information as to how this price-control legislation is working. As to the political aspect I am not greatly concerned, because I doubt very much whether the influence that can be exerted by 66,000 or 660,000 enforcers of the law will overcome the resentment that will be created by their own activities. The thing that disturbs me is how long will it be before we will cease trying to prevent inflation by partial price fixing.

My colleague from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] stated the situation quite clearly. If memory serves correctly, the President told us that we needed price fixing to prevent inflation, and he gave us seven points that we must adopt before that objective could be accomplished. One of those was stabilization of wages. He stated in no uncertain terms that if we were to prevent inflation we would have to adopt a price ceiling. He said, too, that you would have to keep farm prices down. The administration seems to be doing that very successfully; very successfully. I think that while they are doing that, they are forgetting that, after all, all the things come from the ground in the first instance and that the prosperity of all depends upon the prosperity of the farmers. But they are not making any effort at all to stabilize wages or put a ceiling on them.

We read today that a war board panel has recommended a dollar-a-day increase in steel. Very well. The question is coming up shortly as to the increase in Ford's plant. Do not forget that every dollar of profit made by the Ford Co. is going back and will go back to the United States Government, so the dollar a day will come out of the taxpayers and not out of the Ford Co. You are not skinning Henry Ford out of 1 cent, but that board is adding to the war cost and is putting more money into circulation and is encouraging inflation.

If you want to follow the leadership of your President, as you so often tell us we must do, why is it when he tells you in no unmistakable terms that you must have a ceiling on wages if you are to prevent inflation—and I address my question to the gentleman from Texas and to the other new dealers, the other

administration followers—why is it you do not follow your President on that? Have you not the courage to fix the ceiling on wages when you know and you have been told by your leader that you never can have effective price control until you do it? Now, sometime tell me why it is that you do not follow his advice on that. It cannot be because you fear the result, because you fear the loss of the labor vote, can it?

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. BARDEN].

Mr. BARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I shall certainly not attempt to discuss Mr. Henderson personally, but I think there must be some underlying cause for this uprising in the House. I think part of it is probably due to some of the treatment accorded Members during their visits to the Office of Price Administration. I think some of the disagreement with the committee with reference to the amount involved is due to the fact that when you go down to handle a matter in the department you have to see about six times too many people. The business could be transacted in half the time with double the accuracy if they would just get these extra folks out of the line. That is my reason for thinking along the line of a small appropriation.

I know that there has been much juggling and tampering with the sugar question. We look in the paper one day and see a picture of 20,000,000 pounds of sugar. The big sugar refineries are all closing down. I spoke to my good friend from Texas, Judge MANSFIELD, and he told me it is an actual fact that they are closed down. Then I look into my district and I find my agricultural people scrambling and trying as best they can to get a little sugar to put up fruit and can those things they will use next winter. Those people are being prevented from canning the very things they will need next winter. Then when next winter arrives, they will declare rationing on canned goods because we are short. And the worst part of it all is that when you get information it is risky to depend on it and if they change their minds after you have given it out then embarrassment results.

That is simply attributable to one thing; they do not have people in that set-up who understand rural people or their problems properly. If they do, I have not found them. I found one man some time ago who, after I had talked to him for nearly an hour about a tobacco problem in tobacco flues, looked at me with a perfectly blank face and asked me what we did with tobacco flues, was that what we packed tobacco in. The gentleman is a highly intelligent gentleman and is probably trying to handle his job, but he just does not know anything about it. I think the big trouble right now is they do not have people from the great rural areas in this country who understand the problems of the rural people. When I use the term "rural" I mean to include the small towns. The fact that a man is a graduate of a great college or a great law school or some other institution of higher learning in this country certainly does not mean that he is capable of understanding or does understand the detailed problems that are going to come to him.

I am sincere in my belief that if the number of people were reduced and if substantial, dependable, and capable men were put in charge and given the authority and responsibility to act, we would get further and enjoy more peace of mind. Certainly we are all trying to win the war, and in my opinion a better and smoother handling of this problem would mean that the people would have more time and resources to throw into the war effort. The Department is taking too long to do too little, for which red tape, confusion, and lack of experience are to blame.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Jersey [Mrs. NORTON].

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I am unalterably opposed to the Taber amendment. I endorse the remarks of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM].

I believe Mr. Henderson has done a very good job. It has been a most difficult job. I think to accomplish it 100 percent successfully is almost beyond the ability of any man. I hope that the dear good Lord will help him, because if He does not it will just be too bad.

As I listen to this debate I am thinking of what will happen to the consumers of this country if this appropriation is cut so that there will really be no proper enforcement to maintain the ceiling on prices. I keep house here in Washington. I do not mind telling you, and I presume your wives have told you this many times, that food prices have already, in spite of all that has been done to hold them down, increased about 12½ percent during the past year. The other day in one of the big stores on Connecticut Avenue, I tried to get some coffee. The man in charge said, "I wish to goodness they would ration everything. I do not have a package of coffee on my shelves and have not had one since early this morning. Somebody said the story got around that coffee was going to be rationed, consequently everybody came in to buy coffee." He said, "That has been going on for some time. Mrs. NORTON, if you have any influence down there in Congress, I wish you would tell the Members that unless food commodities are rationed or the price is kept down, we are going to be without a lot of the essentials of life."

I am passing that along to you. Unless this appropriation is maintained and, I would say, enlarged, the consumers of America are going to be the sufferers, your people and my people, in every district throughout this country. You will find when the election comes around that you are going to hear from the women of America when they find they simply cannot meet their food bills.

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from New Jersey yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I will be pleased to yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. GORE. The gentlewoman from New Jersey will, perhaps, recall that I was one Member who thought that this should have been done differently, but we chose this way and I am glad to join with the gentlewoman in voting for sufficient appropriations to see that enforcement is brought about.

Mrs. NORTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman from New Jersey yield?

Mrs. NORTON. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. Is it not a fact that it will cost the Government many millions of dollars more if we have inflation than this appropriation will mean to the Government?

Mrs. NORTON. Of course, it will cost many millions more to feed the soldiers without going beyond that. It will also deprive the middle class and poorer people of our country of much that is absolutely necessary to properly maintain our standard of healthy living.

I hope you will vote down this amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] is recognized to close the debate on the amendment.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing Republican or Democrat about this issue. This is an issue that demands statesmanship of the highest order. You have heard some humerous interjections. I think humor is a good thing in these heavy times of tribulation, but I wonder if we appreciate the seriousness of this vote which we are about to take?

When this present crisis began to take shape, we took out of the field of peacetime economy great forces and machinery, men and women and machines which were making clothes, food, and furniture, and all the things we needed in peacetime were taken out of peacetime production, and there is not so much of these things now. At the same time, wages began to rise, and more people got jobs in wartime occupations. This means more money in circulation and less peacetime goods produced. It does not need an economist to tell you that the sure and logical conclusion from that situation is a spiraling of prices unless we take steps to prevent it. We recognized this when we passed the Price Control Act. We discussed it then in full and because we recognized this situation we passed the Price Control Act. Mr. Henderson was selected to administer that act. We have had some altercations. He has not conducted himself with the diplomacy and the suavity some of us might have expected of him. I think his difficulty might be that maybe he did not take the Dale Carnegie course on how to win friends and influence people. But he is a good economist. He is an efficient man in his field. He knows more about the broad economy of America in a practical way than any other economist. He is a driver, he is an executive, and he steps on toes, but the American people are behind

him because he has been getting results. The housewives who buy furniture, who buy clothes, who buy shoes, who buy the things that are necessary in their daily lives, are with him. If they see prices going up, they are going to blame it upon the action which the Congress takes here today in sabotaging the Price Control Act by cutting the appropriation necessary for its efficient administration.

We should not discuss the merits of the act. We have passed the act. If we do not like the act, let us be men and repeal the act. But a good law badly administered is worse than no law at all. Fifty million dollars will mean a badly administered act. It will fall of its own weight, and prices will go up higher and higher.

Why, $75,000,000 will mean that they must decrease their present force at a time when they are meeting the full effect of inflation, at a time when they are entering the retail commodity field and the rent field and have joined with W. P. B. in setting up rationing boards throughout this country. When they are now about to meet the peak of the effect of the forces of inflation you are going to cut them to less than they have had in the past. You have got to have secretarial help on these rationing boards in the various districts and towns of the country. No man will contribute his entire time, and you must have somebody there from morning until night.

This is a matter that affects the consumers of America, which means all the American people. This program should not be sabotaged. It should not have a knife driven into its back by failure to give it a sufficient amount of funds so it can be properly administered.

I hope we recognize what we are fixing to do here this afternoon. We are setting the stage for uncontrolled inflation. Why, billions of dollars can be taken from the people of America if this program fails, and this program will fail if we adopt the Taber amendment.

Originally, they asked for $210,000,000. The Budget, after careful consideration, cut it to $161,000,000, and then a subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, sitting day after day and hearing all of the testimony, in their judgment and after solemn consideration, set the figure at $95,000,000. Then shortly before 12 o'clock on Monday a member of the Appropriations Committee offered an amendment, and because of Mr. Henderson's unpopularity with members of that committee that amendment reducing the amount to $75,000,000 was adopted. But the subcommittee that studied the measure, that knows more about it than any other committee of the House, said that $95,000,000 was the amount that should be appropriated. Yet you are acting upon an amendment that further cuts this figure of $75,000,000, which is niggardly in itself. Ye gods, to cut it to $50,000,000 is worse than repealing this act. It is a green light for inflation.

Gentlemen, do not adopt this amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLE of New York: Page 23, line 2, after "appropriation", strike out the period and insert semicolon, and add the following: "*: Provided further*, That on and after 60 days after enactment of this act, no part of the funds herein appropriated shall be used for the administration or enforcement of any order prohibiting, restricting, rationing, or limiting by way of amount or number, the sale in retail trade of any article or commodity unless such order shall have been approved by a concurrent resolution of the Congress."

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that that is legislation on an appropriation bill. This changes the basic principles of the Price Control Act. Under that act we set up a certain policy, and gave discretion to an agency, and this seeks definitely to change the basic act.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I submit that this is definitely a limitation on the use of funds contained in this appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is prepared to rule. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment which has been reported by the Clerk. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM] makes the point of order against the amendment on the ground that it is legislation on an appropriation bill and goes further than a limitation. The Chair has endeavored to analyze the amendment, and is of opinion that the gentleman from Virginia has correctly stated the situation. The amendment appears to go much further than a mere limitation and provides that the existing law be in effect amended, and imposes certain requirements as to further legislation. The Chair, therefore, sustains the point of order.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, it is regrettable that a point of order has been made against the amendment which I attempted to offer for the consideration of the House.

The amendment was submitted without any spirit of rancor or antagonism toward Mr. Henderson or the Office of Price Administration. I recognize the tremendous task which the Congress has placed upon Mr. Henderson, but doubt his ability to succeed in checking the constant rise of price and inflation under the authority which the Congress has given him.

One of the gravest tasks confronting this Congress, of no less importance than the successful prosecution of the war, is that of restoring in the minds of the people a confidence in Congress as an institution of government. For the past 10 years whenever a complicated or difficult problem has faced us, we have delegated to the executive department authority to solve it. About the only responsibilities the Congress has retained are those of making appropriations for the operation of government and measures for raising revenue.

The public has gradually come to feel that if the Congress is to surrender to the Executive all powers of government, then why retain a Congress?

It is unnecessary for me to impress upon the membership here the low estate into which the Congress has fallen in the minds of the people. Articles by newspaper columnists discuss it, letters received from constituents describe it, and personal contacts by those who have visited their home districts show that there is a general dissatisfaction with Congress. It is no answer to the critics of Congress to assert that the criticism is fostered by subversive and un-American elements. We must prove to the public our capacity to serve and to merit their confidence.

Whether justifiably or not, the Congress is being held responsible for the prosecution of the war; it is being held accountable for the rapid production of war materials; whatever waste or extravagance there is in war production and military construction is charged to the Congress; the stupendous increase of national debt occasioned by reason of the war expenditures is laid at our doorstep; drastic tax increases of recent years and threat for the immediate future are both blamed on Congress. In addition, the Congress is being blamed for the orders rationing tires, sugar, gasoline, and other commodities when, in truth, the responsibility lies with the executive department.

The amendment which I attempted to offer would have required any order rationing to the consuming public any article or commodity to be approved by the Congress. I recognize that because of the complicated and intricate nature of the problem, we cannot pass upon all orders of the Office of Price Administration. However, there have been but few orders rationing commodities to the public generally and not many more are in the offing. It does not seem an insurmountable task for the Congress to assume the responsibility of approving these orders. Many wholesome and beneficial results would flow from such a procedure. If there is an acute and imminent shortage of any commodity, the Office of Price Administration can present the facts to the Congress and receive a speedy approval. In the investigation incidental to granting such approval, inquiry would be made into the necessity for the order and remedial steps that are being taken by the Government to obtain substitutes. There is currently considerable confusion in the minds of the public as to what is being done by the Government to produce synthetic

rubber. A controversy apparently exists between the petroleum people and the distilleries of alcohol from grains as to which commodity can best be adapted to the manufacture of a rubber substitute. It is reported in the press that the warehouses of sugar refineries are filled to overflowing and that in many instances reduction in sugar refinement has been necessary. It is claimed that there are in the storehouses and garages throughout the country thousands of automobile and truck tires which are gradually deteriorating. The Congress has made no effort to investigate into these circumstances, but if this amendment had been adopted, all these situations could be disclosed and the people would accept the rationing orders, however difficult and inconvenient they may be, if they had the assurance that their elected spokesmen at the seat of Government had approved the order after careful investigation.

It is not unlikely that the Office of Price Administration may come back to the Congress for additional authority in order to more effectively accomplish its responsibility of curbing inflation, and when that request comes, I sincerely hope that the Congress will then give serious consideration to the suggestion of having retail rationing orders approved by the people's representatives.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Miss SUMNER of Illinois: Page 23, line 2, after the period, insert the following: "No part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer or employee of the Office of Price Administration who is liable for training and service in the land or naval forces of the United States under the provisions of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended."

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, men on the selective boards in the various counties of the United States should not defer young men because of service in the O. P. A. However, it is too much for them to take the responsibility of deciding whether or not each particular job in the Government is more essential than service in the armed forces. They are too far from Washington, and they are unable to get the proper information. At the time the price-control bill was before our committee it occurred to some of us that it was a mistake to employ so many young men—I believe there were 150 at the time—as lawyers in the O. P. A. I understand that Mr. Henderson is going now to have several thousand in his legal set-up. These were young men of fine aggressive spirit, getting sometimes several thousand dollars per annum, more than they could get in private life. Such aggressive spirit would be useful in the armed forces. It occurred to some of us, on the other hand, that with the plentitude of lawyers in the United States the work might be done more efficiently and quickly by lawyers who would have out of their wealth of experience the ability to decide offhand and give information offhand which would take these youngsters days to search through lawbooks and compile. The effect of this amendment, if adopted, will be to draw into the O. P. A. older and wiser heads in most positions, men with a greater understanding of the problems of our constituents, due to their longer experience in private life. It is a pity that with justification charges have been made here that there are too many Utopian theorists in the O. P. A. It is what you might call a "utoctopus." However that may be, I think none of us wants to give the army of the O. P. A. a priority over the Army of the United States in the selection of personnel. We want those men who are fitted to be permitted to go into the Army.

So I hope you will agree with me that it is advisable to adopt such an amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, I believe the gentlewoman from Illinois has offered an amendment that has merit. There may be others who want to speak on the amendment. I hope the distinguished gentleman from Virginia will give an opportunity to others.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There is no one seeking recognition. Does the gentleman wish to speak?

Mr. DITTER. No; but I did not know but what others might want to speak.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I do not see anyone else seeking recognition. I renew my request, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I am thoroughly in accord with the principle involved in the amendment which has been offered by the lady from Illinois. I cannot conceive, possibly, that any civil employee of the Office of Price Administration would be deferred from military service. I have not heard that any such employee has ever been deferred. I have no idea that any local board would do that. If they did they would violate their oath of office.

It would be a great mistake, in my judgment, to undertake on appropriation bills to write into these different departments the selective-service law. We passed the Selective Service Act and laid down broad, fundamental principles. Anyone working in the Office of Price Administration, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the Treasury Department, the War Production Board, or even civil employees of the War Department, are subject to that act. I call attention to the fact that every day employees of the War Department are being drafted into service. They are not asking for exemption, and if they do ask for it the local boards are passing upon them.

The test is this: Mr. Henderson has nothing whatsoever to do with whether or not people working for him are taken into military service or left out. That is entirely and solely a matter for the selective-service boards. If a young man feels that he is entitled to deferment, he makes his application for deferment, and he must show to that board that he is indispensable to a war agency. I cannot conceive that a clerk or a lawyer in the Office of Price Administration could or would make any such claim as that. There would be just exactly the same reason for writing that provision into the War Production Board or into every one of this score of defense agencies. There is no occasion for that. If the Price Administration had control over that, there might be some possibility of that being done.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. This is an agency which has so many young lawyers, so many young people.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Lawyers are not the only ones involved. Young clerical employees are involved also. They are being taken out of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and these other agencies every day. Every Member of the House knows, within his own information, that young lawyers are being taken out of these Federal agencies right along. There is no reason whatsoever why they should be deferred unless they are indispensable, and I cannot conceive that they could be held to be indispensable.

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HINSHAW. I am glad to hear what the gentleman has to say on this subject, but I have been told that indispensability is judged by the amount of salary that a person receives from the Government.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I am sure the gentleman's information on that is wrong.

Mr. HINSHAW. Anybody who receives $2,400 or more is conceived to be indispensable.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. If that is true that is an indictment of the local draft boards, because we were scrupulously careful to put it into the hands alone of these local boards who would know these boys.

Mr. HOBBS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. HOBBS. Is there not a wide distinction between the term "liable for" and "subject to"?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. There is quite a wide distinction, I think. If we start out to undertake to settle on the floor of this House the questions involved in the selective-service administration, then we are certainly letting ourselves in for a major proposition.

Mr. HINSHAW. Does not the gentleman think it would be wise for the House to find out definitely what this question amounts to in the Government? I mean the question I mentioned a moment ago.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I think we should.

Mr. HINSHAW. I have heard that it was $2,400, and above that they were considered indispensable.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I read in the Washington newspapers a list of appeals for deferments, and I notice they are refusing deferments of people who work for the Government, almost daily. The overwhelming majority of the cases that are asking for deferment because they work for the Government are being turned down by the local boards, as they should be.

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. I yield.

Mr. JENNINGS. I have been advised by various agencies that where a civil employee has been employed as much as 6 months it is the policy of such agency, if they deem his service indispensable, to make a request of the local draft board. But, of course, in the last analysis, as you have already clearly stated, it is a question for the local draft board.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. We ought to leave it there; we ought not to interfere with that.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Miss SUMNER of Illinois) there were—ayes 39, noes 81.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. VAN ZANDT: On page 22, line 3, after the word "appropriation", insert *"Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay the compensation of any person engaged in administering or enforcing any order providing for rationing of any commodity which is not applicable uniformly to the entire continental United States."

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is designed to remove the gross discrimination that exists under the rationing program for gasoline and other commodities.

The entire gasoline rationing program is a farce and a fizzle. Certain sections of the country are asked to submit to a rationing program, while their neighbors in adjoining counties are free to use the highways to their hearts content.

Several weeks ago when the rationing program was placed in effect, an imaginary line was drawn from Lake Ontario to the Gulf of Mexico. West of this imaginary line the area is nonrationed, while in the eastern sector it is under the rationing program.

The gasoline dealer in the rationed area is being given 50 percent of his regular supply and is required to sell only to those persons having rationing cards.

Like many of you, I too represent hundreds of gasoline dealers whose business is located a short distance over the imaginary line establishing the rationing area.

Let us not forget these dealers are patriotic Americans with purchases of Defense Bonds to their credit, and in a vast majority of instances they have sons in the armed forces. These dealers are willing to accept any rationing program and make any sacrifice necessary for the successful prosecution of the war. But they rightly insist that this is everybody's war—and every American has a duty to share the common sacrifice necessary for victory.

Mr. Chairman, these dealers who are the victims of such rank discrimination in many instances have gasoline stations a few yards or miles east of the rationing line. Their business represents their life savings which are slowly dwindling away as the gasoline-rationing program destroys their right to make a living and receive a fair return from their investment.

To begin with, imagine yourself a gasoline dealer in the rationed area witnessing tank cars being unloaded daily in front of your eyes. Then you are treated to the spectacle of trucks hauling gasoline past your front door into the nonrationed area where the dealer is furnished an unlimited supply while you, in the rationed area, receive only 50 percent of your usual requirements.

While that is a depressing sight, it is aggravated by the fact that your neighbors and customers, rather than worry about a rationing card, simply cross the line and are able to forget that any rationing program ever existed because of the ability to purchase an unlimited supply.

With your neighbors and customers able to purchase all the gasoline they need, you find that you cannot sell the supply you have because your business has been diverted. And that is exactly what is happening today with gasoline stations in the nonrationed areas operating 24 hours a day while those in the rationed areas are required to observe a 12-hour closing period each 24 hours.

From the standpoint of business, the nonrationed dealer has enjoyed an increase in business on a general average of over 200 percent, while those in the rationed areas has reported that they are only doing 20 percent of their former business. Some have been forced to close their businesses, while others struggle desperately to keep from surrendering their moral virtues of honesty and integrity by becoming chiselers.

Yes, the rationing program is not alone making chiselers out of the gasoline dealers but it is corrupting the morals of good American citizens who are customers of these dealers but who resent the inequitable system of rationing gasoline.

There is a great hue and cry for national unity in order to win this war. I submit, gentlemen, that if we are to achieve a unity of purpose and action, let each citizen be treated alike under the rationing programs.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Surely.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does not the gentleman's dealer east of the line sell all of the gas he has?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Unfortunately, as I said a moment ago, the consumer with a rationing card, instead of bothering about his rationing card, goes across the line where he can purchase unlimited quantities of gasoline, and the retailer east of the line cannot sell even the 50 percent that has been allocated to him.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman means he has more gas than he can sell.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Exactly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I should like to meet him.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If the gentleman will visit my district you will meet many gasoline dealers who are standing idly by and watching their life savings gradually diminish as a result of the effect of the unfair rationing program.

Mr. HANCOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK. The gentleman's situation is exactly like that in my district. The people in my district are willing to suffer any necessary privations but they are deeply resentful when they are made the victims of unfair discrimination.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentleman is exactly correct.

These gasoline dealers of whom I am now speaking have——

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM T. PHEIFFER. Is it not true that the operating cost of running these stations, rent, taxes, employees, and so forth, remains static in the face of these events?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. That is correct.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Has it been shown whether there is a scarcity of gasoline or whether the scarcity is in transportation available to bring gasoline to the gentleman's area?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It is contended generally there is a shortage of transportation and not gasoline, but in my congressional district we watch tank cars come into our area. They are unloaded and trucks take that gasoline from our area which is a rationed area across the line where consumers can purchase an unlimited supply of gasoline.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. How will it help the dealers in the gentleman's district to shut down the dealers west of the line?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. It will give the gasoline dealers east of the line the same privilege of selling gasoline to consumers as the gentleman's people enjoy west of the line at the present time. In short, it will make the burden fall equally on the shoulders of every American citizen.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. In my congressional district in West Virginia there is one ra-

tioned county which is supplying gasoline for a county in the rationed area across the line in the State of Maryland.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The condition the gentleman mentions is identical with conditions in many of our districts.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. There are a number of oil wells in my district. They tell us the reason you cannot get gasoline is because there is no transportation. Why should you in the east put our oil stations out of business and deprive our farmers of the chance to take their produce to market? What good would it do you?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Of course, that is your problem out in Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. But the gentleman is asking that we be rationed too.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. If we are going to ration commodities, especially gasoline, it should be rationed to your people just the same as to my people. I do not feel that your people should enjoy any privileges that my people do not. War demands that we share its burdens equally.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. If a bomb should fall on your district, are you going to ask that they send bombers out to bomb our districts too?

Mr. VAN ZANDT. The gentlewoman from Illinois knows that we are not discussing bombings but rather the rationing of gasoline. Since we are told that this is everybody's war let us don the cloak of sacrifice in the traditional American spirit by sharing the common burdens incident to this war and not adopt the proverbial attitude "Let George do it."

The adoption of my amendment will be the means of lodging a protest against the obnoxious manner in which the gasoline rationing program is being administered.

Congress must heed the plea of those gasoline dealers and their patrons who have been subjected to such gross discrimination. Therefore, if you are sincere in your desire to rescue a group of real Americans from the evils of bureaucratic doctrines, you will vote for this amendment and thus remedy the intolerable conditions given birth to by the present system of rationing gasoline.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOODRUM]?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. PACE].

Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, a few weeks ago the Congress passed the war risk insurance bill, to protect the people against loss from bombing and enemy attacks. If you will recall, the Congress fixed the rate the same all over the United States, although the west coast and the east coast are in more immediate danger of being bombed. We provided in that bill that the people of Kansas or elsewhere in the heart of the country should pay exactly the same rate as those in the more dangerous areas.

Mr. Henderson not only limits gasoline in the eastern area but on yesterday he raised the price of gasoline in this area an additional 2½ cents a gallon. Every businessman, every farmer along the east coast must not only be satisfied with a limited supply, but they and they alone must pay the entire increased cost. There are many districts, like my own, traversed by pipe lines. It so happens that a pipe line passes within a few feet of the incorporated limits of my home town. There are millions and millions of gallons of gasoline passing through this pipe line. Our gasoline is not received by any transportation system other than pipe lines which have been in operation for months and months. There has not been one penny additional cost in the transportation by pipe lines. Yet the farmers and the businessmen must not only be satisfied with half of the gasoline they have been accustomed to, not only is my State rationed while the pipe lines are dumping the gas into States that are not rationed, but in addition my people must pay an additional 2½ cents per gallon.

This is unfair, it is unjust. It is not right to place this additional burden on the people of my State. If it is costing more to transport gasoline to the Eastern States there can be no serious objection to providing for this additional cost, but it is a national problem and should be borne equally by all the people. A general increase of one-quarter or one-half cent all over the Nation should have been authorized instead of imposing the entire cost of 2½ cents per gallon on just the people in the States now being rationed. It is hard for me to believe that it is costing 2½ cents per gallon more to transport this gasoline.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. EBERHARTER].

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Chairman, as I gather from the argument of the gentleman from Pennsylvania who introduced the pending amendment, he feels that because in his particular district some of the gasoline dealers are suffering and some of his constituents are not receiving all the gasoline they would like to have, those hardships should be scattered all over the country and every person and every gasoline dealer should suffer the same hardship whether or not it is necessary. I cannot see the logic of that argument.

There is a very good reason why a certain portion of western Pennsylvania has been exempted from the gasoline rationing plan. The reason is simple. It is because there is plenty of gasoline in that area. It is one of the great oil-producing sections of the country, and the pipe lines come into that section from the West. It has been found also that there is more gasoline there than is necessary for the needs of the people. That is the reason that that particular part was exempted.

If we follow the argument that because some States are rationed all States should be rationed, it would mean that we are placing the hardships on people, all of which would in no way help the war effort. The gentleman spoke about an imaginary dividing line. This imaginary dividing line is drawn from a point in New York to a point some place in West Virginia, and follows a mountain range. Everybody knows that pipe lines in the past have been run from New Jersey to the Pittsburgh area because the oil was brought from the South in tankers, but the oil is not being brought that way any more, and those pipe lines are being reversed. When those pipe lines are reversed the oil that is brought from the wells will be piped to the Eastern States and they will have a plentiful supply of oil.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania would impose gasoline rationing on every section of the country without any benefit to the war effort, and I hope his amendment will be defeated.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania. I can appreciate some of the difficulties of the gentleman and of his constituents. I will agree with him that there have been some serious and inexcusable mistakes made by the Price Administrator's office, not only with reference to the rationing of gasoline but in many other matters. Certainly better judgment ought to be used in rationing gasoline and possibly other commodities. Let me suggest, however, that merely because gas rationing has not been satisfactory in his State of Pennsylvania, I do not think the gentleman would seriously insist that every part of the country should suffer the same hardship.

It would be just as reasonable to contend that because we in Oklahoma do not have oysters excepting by shipping them in, that the people of Baltimore, where they have unusually fine oysters, should be required to ration the oysters because forsooth we are unable to produce them in my State of Oklahoma. It would be just as reasonable to say that because they may have one case of smallpox in some part of Washington today we should insist that they have at least one case in every city in the country. It would be just as reasonable to say that merely because two of my children have just had the measles, that your family must also have measles.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. MURDOCK. It would not be an equal hardship, if all the country should be rationed, but there would be more hardship in the western half of the country, out in the great open spaces, where they depend more completely on that sort of transportation. Rationing of

gasoline in the far West would disrupt our whole economy—much more than here.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Let me show the gentleman how unreasonable it would be. Out in my area we have many refineries, large and small, which employ thousands of people. The same situation exists in Louisiana, Texas, Kansas, and several other oil-producing States. The gentleman's amendment, if adopted, would break down the entire economic structure of our country. This Nation is absolutely dependent on oil and gasoline for the prosecution of this war. It would be very unreasonable, impracticable, and it would entirely disrupt and seriously impair our tax structure if the gentleman's amendment were permitted to be adopted.

Now with reference to the 2½-cent increase allowed in the price of gasoline this week, mentioned a few moments ago, I agree that the increase is inexcusable. Let me remind you that this is the fourth increase Leon Henderson has allowed on the refined product, yet he admitted to our committee he had not even considered the application for increase of the independent producers of crude oil.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Oklahoma is not the only State in the Union that produces oil. Pennsylvania does.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is correct, which is additional reason why his amendment must not prevail. What I have said of the situation in my State is equally true in Louisiana, in California, in Illinois, and in some 17 or more other oil-producing States in the Union.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BROOKS. That amendment would tend to have this effect, that it would help to put out of business the producers of the gasoline and oil that is being shipped into the areas that are presently being rationed.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is true. Except for the oil wells of the gentleman's State and mine and other oil-producing States, this Nation would be helpless in the war effort.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MONRONEY. Does not the gentleman from Oklahoma agree that without the use of the gasoline produced in these refineries the price of the fuel oil that the people of the East need to heat their homes this winter would be more than doubled; that it is the gasoline that is being consumed that is helping to carry the load of the fuel oil? Further, does not the gentleman agree that 100-octane gasoline for airplanes cannot be made without the refining of this oil to produce gasoline?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. That is very true. The Government right now is in great need of additional high-octane gasoline. In the district I represent in Congress the Government is backing a $10,000,000 plant to produce at the earliest possible date 100-octane gasoline. Of course, they could not produce it without first having the regular gasoline.

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOGGS. For the benefit of the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from Georgia, who talked about the increased cost of transportation, may I say that the Committee on Banking and Currency is now considering legislation which should alleviate that condition.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. I may say that that bill has been introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] and is receiving consideration by that committee. I thank the gentleman for the suggestion. It is a matter that ought to have serious consideration by this Congress at a very early date. But that matter cannot be heard now. Let us vote down this amendment.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. All time has expired on the pending amendment.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7319) making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. McDaniel, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7181), entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to the foregoing bill, further insists on its amendments numbered 9 and 16 to said bill, asks a further conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. MCCARRAN, Mr. MCKELLAR, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. TRUMAN, Mr. BRIDGES, and Mr. WHITE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Department of Agriculture.
2. Department of the Navy.
3. Department of the Treasury.
4. Department of War.
5. Federal Works Agency.
6. National Housing Agency.
7. United States Maritime Commission.

LABOR DEPARTMENT AND FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 7181, the Labor Department and Federal Security Agency appropriation bill, with Senate amendments thereto, insist on the House amendment to Senate amendment No. 9, further insist on the House disagreement to Senate amendment No. 16, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri? (After a pause.) The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. HARE, TARVER, THOMAS of Texas, CANNON of Missouri, ENGEL, and KEEFE.

FIRST SUPPLEMENTAL NATIONAL DEFENSE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1943

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7319.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 7319, with Mr. COOPER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Title II—General provisions.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SCRUGHAM: On page 36, after line 17, insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to employ in the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts three additional employees at salaries per annum in excess of $5,000, but not in excess of the appropriate rates established in accordance with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended."

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, this is an emergency item sent in by the Navy Department. The last Navy appropriation bill contained a proviso that employees paid in excess of $5,000 should not be appointed except by special permission of the Congress. This is an emergency case, and it appears to be entirely justified. As the amendment states, the rate of pay is to be not in excess of the appropriate rates established in accordance

with the Classification Act of 1923, as amended.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. What are these men to do? What is the reason for their employment?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. They are all in the clerical division of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. The extra work is caused by the change in the pay rates of the men employed in the Navy.

Mr. TABER. Is not this the same thing for which a Budget estimate was submitted, and the committee turned it down?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Not that I ever heard of. This came to me only a day or two ago.

Mr. TABER. How did it come?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. It was given me by Mr. Pugh, the clerk of the committee, on Monday morning.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. If my memory serves me well, the Secretary requested originally five of these specialists, and the item was before the deficiency committee. The deficiency committee carefully went over the types of specialists that were requested and ultimately provided for two, leaving three for whom we did not make any provision.

It seems to me that rather than pressing an item of this kind as an amendment, the deficiency subcommittee or the subcommittee for the Navy might subsequently look into this matter and decide it upon its merits rather than accept such an amendment at this late hour.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The amendment provides for three certified public accountants whose services are badly needed by the Navy Department and due to a technicality in the wording of the naval appropriation bill they are unable to employ them.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DITTER. I wonder whether the gentleman would give the House the benefit of any information he has as to the type of work these men are to do.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. They are certified public accountants——

Mr. DITTER. The sky is the limit under the amendment.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. No; they are to be paid $5,600.

Mr. DITTER. Who are they and what work are they to do?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. They are certified public accountants and they are needed in the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

Mr. DITTER. The gentleman knows that I have supported the Navy program in every way, but it seems to me we are going far afield if we cannot keep within the $5,000 limit for these certified public accountants. As the gentleman knows, we have spent a very substantial sum for specialists to provide certain plans of accounting and we have made certain changes in the Department with reference to the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts. I do hope that the gentleman will give reconsideration and not press this matter at this time.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. This was presented to me as an urgent matter by the Navy Department and the urgency was such that I did not have time to discuss it with the ranking minority member or the other members of the committee.

Mr. DITTER. We have not reached the point where the hiring of a certified public accountant is a matter of urgency. If this were something for shipbuilding, if this were something in the nature of a fighting job or something to do a better fighting job, it would be a different thing.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. It has to do with the checking of contracts by the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts.

Mr. DITTER. And probably provide for some additional red tape.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for recognition in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER] is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I shall not detain the House at length on this matter. I think I have definitely established with the membership my position in supporting the Navy program. I have served with the distinguished gentleman from Nevada on the Navy Committee and in every way I have given support to those items in the Navy bills which were necessary to carry out the needs of the Navy. However, it does seem to me that the request, coming in the form it does, for three certified public accountants is a most unusual one. If they were certified in other ways, if they had qualifications to be a part of the fighting forces, if they were to have a part in the elimination of the submarine menace or looking after the other combat problems that are ours, I would feel entirely different. It seems to me that the plea of urgency is poorly presented. If these certified public accountants were as necessary or if the need for them were as urgent as the gentleman from Nevada claims, the Secretary of the Navy might well have recognized my distinguished friend from Missouri, the chairman of this subcommittee, and submitted his request to him in due course. The deficiency committee could have looked into the merits of the matter and, if necessary, we would have approved the item. So I ask, so far as this present request is concerned, that the amendment be defeated.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DITTER. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Do I understand that the law specifies that certified public accountants must be engaged for this particular job?

Mr. DITTER. If that is the case, I confess I do not know it. I do know that we appropriated $50,000 not very long ago for the Secretary of the Navy and the purpose of that appropriation was to permit the Secretary to establish an efficiency system. Efficiency experts were called in with the idea of improving the office operations.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am not questioning that.

Mr. DITTER. But I cannot see how $5,600 each per year for three accountants at this time can be justified in view of the demands which I think are more essential. I cannot answer the gentleman's direct question.

Mr. CRAWFORD. May I ask the chairman of the Navy subcommittee whether the law specifies that these men shall be certified public accountants?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. My information is that it does.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Does the gentleman know about that? I am very serious about this matter and I want to know.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I did not suppose we would take up so much time in discussing small details here. I do not wish to take up the time of the committee.

Mr. CRAWFORD. It may be a small detail to the gentleman, but as a Member of this House, I may say that it is not a small detail to me.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The idea I wished to convey was that they had to have competent men to fill these positions.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I happen to have the floor. Yielding further to my distinguished friend from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] I know of no law which requires that the men who are engaged on this work shall be certified public accountants.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I do not think there is any such law on the books.

Mr. DITTER. I know of no such law, and while my friend from Nevada has not stated that the law does so provide, he has left the inference that the law does provide that they must be certified public accountants.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I did not mean to convey the impression that the law requires that. I meant that the requirements of the position were such that they were required.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I yield to my friend from Kentucky.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. If I understand our distinguished friend from Nevada, the Clerk handed him a request for these three employees. I think we would establish a bad precedent here if on the spur of the moment we appointed these people by special act of Congress.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I cannot let that go unanswered. I must say that if the Clerk has made the suggestion he had good cause to do so. I do not care to have any reflection cast upon the clerk of the committee whose value to the House cannot be overestimated. I know the Clerk would not have had it presented had it not come from the Navy Department. My point is that the Secretary in the usual procedure should have presented this item to the committee, and should have presented the justifications which are always made in cases

of this kind. If the appointments are necessary, they merit the attention of the Department and a request for funds in the regular way.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Nevada.

The question was taken and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 201. No part of any appropriation contained in this act shall be used to pay the salary or wages of any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided*, That for the purposes hereof an affidavit shall be considered prima facie evidence that the person making the affidavit does not advocate, and is not a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence: *Provided further*, That any person who advocates, or who is a member of an organization that advocates, the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force or violence and accepts employment the salary or wages for which are paid from any appropriation in this act shall be guilty of a felony and, upon conviction, shall be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both: *Provided further*, That the above penalty clause shall be in addition to, and not in substitution for, any other provisions of existing law.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DIRKSEN: On page 37, after line 11, insert a new section, to read as follows:

"SEC. 202. No part of any appropriation contained in this act or authorized hereby to be expended shall be used to pay the compensation of any officer, agent, clerk, or any employee of the United States who shall divulge or make known in any manner whatsoever to any person the operations, style of work, or apparatus of any manufacturer or producer visited by him in the discharge of his official duties, or the amount or source of income, profits, losses, expenditures, or any particular thereof, set forth or disclosed in any questionnaire, report, return, or document, required to be filed by order or regulation of the administrator or executive head of any agency for which an appropriation is provided in this act or to permit any questionnaire, report, return, or document, or copy thereof, or any book containing any abstract or particulars thereof, to be seen or examined by any person except as provided by law; or for any person who shall print or publish in any manner whatsoever, except as hereinafter provided, any questionnaire, report, return, or document, or any part thereof, or source of income, profits, losses, expenditures, or methods of doing business, appearing in any questionnaire, report, return, or document: *Provided further*, That the foregoing provisions shall not be construed to prevent or prohibit the publication or disclosure of studies, graphs, charts, or other documents of like general character wherein individual statistics or the source thereof is not disclosed or identified directly or indirectly: *Provided further*, That the foregoing provisions shall not be construed to prevent or prohibit the confidential disclosure to other executive agencies of the Federal Government of such data and information as may be useful to them in the performance of their duties."

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not so formidable as it sounds. It is virtually identical with the amendment that was adopted in the full committee when this bill was reported, and is found on page 22 of the bill except for the last proviso. It does nothing more than to provide for the integrity of documents and their contents, that may be submitted to any agency. The proviso adopted by the full committee applies only to the Office of Price Administration, but you will notice that there are several other agencies in this bill. Consider for a moment the Small Work Plants Corporation. Before they can certify the competency of a small plant, they have to know all about it, about its output and its machinery, its processes, its secrets, its credits, and the credit standing and all that sort of thing, and that information ought to be confidential. Certainly it is confidential under the income-tax law, and there is no reason why any person who may have access to that information ought to be permitted to peddle it to a competitor. We should not forget that we have a lot of dollar-a-year men scattered through the Government, and also specialists that came in to the Government from plants all over the country, who do business competitively, and if they had access to it, and if it were not confidential, of course, they can use it. It merely follows out the language that has already been adopted by the full committee on page 22, and merely applies to other agencies besides the O. P. A. I suggest to my friend, the chairman of the committee, that he accept this amendment, and indicate that it is agreeable to the full committee.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this but illustrates the evil of trying to legislate on the impulse of the moment. Of course, amendments like this thrown suddenly into the melee of consideration without opportunity for examination, sound very well, and they have a laudable and commendable purpose. But this is no place for intricate and involved legislation of this sort. This is an appropriation bill and as such is not subject to amendments of this character even as limitations. That is conclusively demonstrated by the fact that when you examine this amendment with any degree of deliberation, you discover it is wholly unenforceable. It cannot be enforced, and it would not be enforced. It places on the Comptroller of the United States an unenforceable duty. Under such a provision he must deny every one within the category his pay chart until it is demonstrated that he does not fall within the perview of the limitation. The only thing that he could do by way of enforcement would be to require with every voucher a certificate reciting the phraseology of the limitation. And the net results would be exactly nothing. Even if such a proposition merits enactment, why attempt to tack it on an appropriation bill without notice and without consideration? No committee has had an opportunity to look at it. No one has had a chance to study it. What would be the proper course? The gentleman should introduce a bill and have it referred to the legislative committee which has jurisdiction of the subject matter of the proposal.

It is a violation of the rules of procedure, an interference with the budgetary system of the House, to attempt to bring it in on an appropriation bill. The gentleman should take it to the legislative committee where it properly belongs and which has jurisdiction, and secure legislation providing a penalty. This inhibition as outlined in the amendment is purely negative. You cannot get any results. It merely denies a man his salary, in case it can be shown to have violated the limitation, which cannot be shown.

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my esteemed friend from Illinois.

Mr. DIRKSEN. The gentleman makes an argument that tickles my sense of humor a great deal, because this identic language was adopted when the gentleman presided over the full committee, by a vote of 3 to 1. If it is out of order now, it was out of order when adopted by the full committee.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Of course it is. And it is just as unenforceable. There is no way to enforce either that amendment or this one. That amendment also was sprung on the committee without notice. Nobody had time to consider it. All at once the gentleman said, "Here is a good thing. Let us adopt it." And it has been adopted—just like that. I hope the House, sitting this afternoon in deliberative assembly as the greatest legislative body in the world, will not be stampeded by such a mob proposition as this. Let us follow legislative procedure. The gentleman has his remedy. He has but to take it up with the proper committee and he will receive both consideration and appropriate action. He can get neither here.

I sincerely hope that this House will not agree to such a half-baked proposition as this on such inadequate consideration.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. DIRKSEN) there were—ayes 59, noes 96.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. COOPER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 7319, and directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments, with the recommendation that the amendments be agreed to and the bill as amended do pass.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill and all amendments to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to correct totals in the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE APPROPRIATION BILL—CONFERENCE REPORT AND ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the House conferees on the Department of Agriculture appropriation bill may have until midnight tonight in which to file a report, if they arrive at an agreement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I am not going to object, I do this for the purpose of letting the membership know what is to happen tonight and tomorrow.

Mr. McCORMACK. After the unanimous-consent request is granted I am going to submit a request that the House stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair, because we expect a conference report on the labor and social-security bill will be ready in an hour or so. After that is disposed of there is no other business for today. Of course, if the Committee on Agriculture agrees by that time it will be taken up. I urge that they do arrive at an agreement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. With reference to tomorrow, there is a bill from the Committee on Civil Service relating to the salaries of certain employees. Then there is a bill from the Committee on Military Affairs establishing a new medal of honor of some kind. Then on Thursday there is a bill from the Committee on Banking and Currency, which, I understand, will ask for 1 hour of general debate. I am informed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. STEAGALL] that there is no serious opposition to it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does that complete the program for the week?

Mr. McCORMACK. If there is any change, anything further for Thursday, I will advise the House.

PROVISION FOR RECESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order during the balance of the day for the Chair to declare the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair, the bells to be rung 15 minutes before the House meets after the recess.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for all Members desiring to do so to extend their remarks on the retirement of John O. Snyder in the RECORD following the remarks on that subject by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK].

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'TOOLE] may be granted an indefinite leave of absence on account of illness.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein several editorials relating to the recent visit to the Capitol of His Majesty, King Peter II of Yugoslavia.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of Latin America, its people, problems, resources, and share in the war.

As required by the rules of the Joint Committee on Printing, I have obtained an estimate from the Public Printer. This exceeds the normal amount by a page and a quarter. I ask that I may be permitted to make this extension.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter on taxation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. STEVENSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a resolution by the Independent Petroleum Association of America.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to incluude a newspaper editorial.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. PADDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein two newspaper articles.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the method of voting in time of war.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

(Mr. PLUMLEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include the contents of a brochure put out by the Economist National Committee for Monetary Policy. I have prepared an answer thereto at the expense of considerable time and in considerable detail. I ask unanimous consent that the brochure may be included in the RECORD together with my answer thereto. I have an estimate of cost from the Public Printer.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

RECESS

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

According (at 5 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.), pursuant to order heretofore made, the House stood in recess subject to call.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 6 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.

STILL FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A still further message from the Senate by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed

without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 329. Joint resolution extending the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under certain acts.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with an amendment in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 7159. An act authorizing the construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding the adjournment of the House, the Clerk of the House be authorized to receive messages from the Senate and the Speaker be authorized to sign any enrolled bills duly passed by the two Houses and examined by the Committee on Enrolled Bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK]?

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR-FEDERAL SECURITY AGENCY APPROPRIATION, 1943—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. HARE submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on certain amendments of the Senate and the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9 to the bill (H. R. 7181) "making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

Amendment numbered 9: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said House amendment, insert the following:

"For all necessary expenses to enable the Director of the Civilian Conservation Corps to provide for the liquidation of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the conservation and disposition of all of the property of whatever type (including camp buildings, accessories, equipment, and machinery of all types) in use by said Corps, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; payment for accrued annual leave of employees separated from the government service due to the discontinuance of Corps operations; and for such travel (including the return of enrollees to their homes) and other necessary expenses as may be incurred in connection with liquidation of said Civilian Conservation Corps from the unexpended balances of the appropriations made to the Civilian Conservation Corps in the 'Federal Security Agency Appropriation Act, 1942', not exceeding $8,000,000: *Provided*, That said liquidation shall be completed as quickly as possible but in any event not later than June 30, 1943."

And the House agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendment numbered 16.

BUTLER B. HARE,
M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
Managers on the part of the House.

PAT MCCARRAN,
KENNETH MCKELLAR,
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
J. H. BANKHEAD,
HARRY S. TRUMAN,
STYLES BRIDGES,
WALLACE H. WHITE, Jr.,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the further conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the conferees and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

Amendment No. 9: Amends the amendment of the House to the amendment of the Senate providing for liquidation of the Civilian Conservation Corps to provide for liquidation by the Director of the Corps instead of by the Secretary of War as proposed by the House and limiting the period of liquidation to 12 months.

Amendment in disagreement

Amendment No. 16: The managers on the part of the House will move to recede from disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and concur in the same with amendments providing for loans only to students who can complete their technical or professional education within 2 years and appropriating $5,000,000 instead of $7,500,000 as proposed by the Senate.

BUTLER B. HARE,
M. C. TARVER,
CLARENCE CANNON,
ALBERT THOMAS,
ALBERT J. ENGEL,
FRANK B. KEEFE,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 7181) making appropriations for the Department of Labor, the Federal Security Agency, and related independent agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House may be read in lieu of the full report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE]?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on agreeing to the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment No. 16: Page 39, line 11, insert the following:

"Loans to students in technical and professional fields (national defense): To assist students (in such numbers as the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission shall determine) participating in accelerated programs in degree-granting colleges and universities in engineering, physics, chemistry, medicine (including veterinary), dentistry, and pharmacy, as follows:

"Loans: For loans to students to enable them to pursue college courses, who attain and continue to maintain satisfactory standards of scholarship, who are in need of assistance, and who agree in writing to participate, until otherwise directed by said Chairman, in accelerated programs of study, in any of the fields authorized hereunder, and who agree in writing to engage, for the duration of the wars in which the United States is now engaged, in such employment or service as may be assigned by officers or agencies designated by said Chairman, such loans to be made by such colleges or universities or public or college-connected agencies from funds paid to them upon estimates submitted by them as to the amounts necessary therefor, $7,500,000: *Provided*, That in case it shall be found that any payment to any such college, university, or public or college-connected agency is in excess of the needs thereof for the purposes hereof, refund of such excess shall be made to the Treasurer of the United States and the amount thereof credited to this appropriation. Loans hereunder shall be made in amounts not exceeding tuition and fees plus $25 per month and not exceeding a total of $500 to any one student during any 12-month period, said loans to be evidenced by notes executed by such students payable to the Treasurer of the United States at a rate of interest at 2½ percent per annum. Repayments of such loans shall be made through the colleges, universities, or other agencies negotiating the loans and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts: *Provided*, That indebtedness of students who, before completing their courses, are ordered into military service during the present wars under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, or who suffer total and permanent disability or death, shall be canceled. The foregoing loan program shall be administered in accordance with regulations promulgated by the Commissioner of Education with the approval of the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission.

"Salaries and expenses: For all necessary expenses of the Office of Education in the administration of the foregoing program, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; purchase and exchange of equipment; printing and binding; travel expenses, including not to exceed $2,500 for actual transportation expenses and not to exceed $10 per diem in lieu of subsistence and other expenses of persons serving while away from their homes, without other compensation from the United States, in an advisory capacity to the Commissioner of Education, $100,000: *Provided*, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes shall not apply to any purchase from this appropriation when the aggregate amount involved does not exceed $100."

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HARE moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate No. 16 and agree to the same with amendments, as follows:

In line 7 of said amendment, after the comma, insert the following: "whose techni-

cal or professional education can be completed within 2 years."

In line 8 of said amendment, after the word "students" insert the following: "whose technical or professional education can be completed within 2 years", and in line 20 of said amendment strike out the sum "$7,500,000" and insert in lieu thereof the sum "$5,000,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE].

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HARE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill, H. R. 7181.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. HARE]?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made today and also to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE]?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHAFER of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SHAFER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. BRYSON asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. O'TOOLE, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. OLIVER (at the request of Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT), for 10 days, on account of official business.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include comments by Mr. Frederick H. Haskell, appearing in the Washington Star of June 28.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. SHEPPARD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULMER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an address by the Honorable Edgar Brown of South Carolina.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial by Mr. Long, of Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia; and

H. J. Res. 324. Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2586. An act to amend sections 1 and 3 of the act entitled "An act to authorize the President to requisition certain articles and materials for the use of the United States, and for other purposes," approved October 10, 1940 (54 Stat. 1090), to continue the act in effect during the existing war, and for other purposes.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. KIRWAN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills and joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 2014. An act for the relief of Carl L. Jones;

H. R. 6295. An act to suspend the requirement for the performance of annual labor on certain mining claims;

H. R. 7184. An act to establish the composition of the United States Navy, to authorize the construction of certain naval vessels, and for other purposes;

H. R. 7232. An act making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes;

H. J. Res. 308. Joint resolution making appropriations to provide war housing and war public works in and near the District of Columbia; and

H. J. Res. 324. Joint resolution making appropriations for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 54 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 1, 1942, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 10 a. m., Wednesday, July 1, 1942.

Business to be considered: Hearing on Federal Communications Commission.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds at 10 a. m. on Wednesday, July 1, for consideration of H. R. 7153, room 1304, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, July 9, 1942, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 1616, to amend section 509, as amended, of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1784. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers recommended to him for disposal by certain agencies of the Federal Government; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

1785. A letter from the Acting President, Board of Commissioners, District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to amend section 754 of the act of Congress entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7145. A bill to authorize the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia and the Secretary of the Interior to make exchanges with the Defense Homes Corporation of certain lands in northwest Washington, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2302). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANDOLPH: Committee on the District of Columbia. H. R. 7235. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Emergency Rent Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2303). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia: Committee on Naval Affairs. S. 2454. An act to prescribe the relative rank of members of the Navy Nurse Corps in relation to commissioned officers of the Navy, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2304).

Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. PAGÁN:

H. R. 7329. A bill providing a supplementary appropriation for the Department of Agriculture for emergency supplies for the Territory of Puerto Rico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANDERSON of New Mexico:

H. R. 7330. A bill to provide for granting to the State of New Mexico the right, title, and interest of the United States in and to certain lands in New Mexico; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 7331. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940 by making it a criminal offense to possess unlawfully or to reproduce various certificates issued pursuant thereto; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 7336. A bill to permit the reemployment of persons retired under the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee:

H. R. 7332. A bill for the relief of Dr. Alma Richards and Mrs. Mary Block; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas:

H. R. 7333. A bill for the relief of Arkansas Gazette, Hope Star, the Hope Journal, Arkansas Democrat Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. HINSHAW:

H. R. 7334. A bill for the relief of Richard P. Beale and Eva M. Beale; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 7335. A bill for the relief of Louis Courcil; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3161. By Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Petition of Rev. E. I. Selden, pastor, Methodist Church of Adel, Iowa, and sundry citizens of Dallas County, Iowa, urging the enactment of legislation for elimination of the sale of liquor in and around the camps where soldiers are located; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3162. By Mr. ELSTON: Petition of William Kissel and 73 other citizens of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Ohio, opposing the enactment into law of House bills 7101 and 7108, or any other similar bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3163. Also, petition of Walter W. Fangmeyer and 93 other citizens of Cincinnati and Hamilton County, Ohio, opposing the enactment into law of House bills 7101 and 7108, or any other similar bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3164. By Mr. LAMBERTSON: Petition of Lulu Gnagy and 154 other citizens of Blue Rapids, Kans., and vicinity, protesting against the manufacture, transportation, and sale of liquor when legitimate business is being subordinated to production; asking why trucks are being stopped which carry bread when trucks continue to carry liquor; why sugar is being rationed as a food, but is not rationed when it is distilled into liquor; and requesting that distilleries be turned into factories for the production of commercial alcohol; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

3165. By Mr. ROLPH: Resolution of California State Board of Agriculture, Sacramento, Calif., relative to synthetic rubber production; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.